


GOULD'S HISTORY
OF
FREEMASONRY
THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

VOLUME III



From a photograph by Underwood and Underwood.

King Gustav of Sweden.

From the painting by Bernhard Osterman.

GOULD'S HISTORY
OF
FREEMASONRY
THROUGHOUT THE WORLD



VOLUME III

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
NEW YORK

GOULD'S HISTORY OF FREEMASONRY
THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

REVISED BY DUDLEY WRIGHT
EDITOR OF THE MASONIC NEWS

THIS EDITION IN SIX VOLUMES EMBRACES NOT ONLY AN INVESTIGATION OF RECORDS OF THE ORGANIZATIONS OF THE FRATERNITY IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, IRELAND, THE BRITISH COLONIES, EUROPE, ASIA, AFRICA AND SOUTH AMERICA, BUT INCLUDES ADDITIONAL MATERIAL ESPECIALLY PREPARED ON EUROPE, ASIA, AND AFRICA, ALSO

CONTRIBUTIONS BY DISTINGUISHED MEMBERS OF THE FRATERNITY COVERING EACH OF THE FORTY-EIGHT STATES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND THE POSSESSIONS OF THE

UNITED STATES
THE PROVINCES OF CANADA AND THE
COUNTRIES OF LATIN AMERICA

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF

MELVIN M. JOHNSON

Past Grand Master of Masons in Massachusetts, and M. . . P. . . Sovereign Grand Commander of the Supreme Council, 33°, for the Northern Masonic Jurisdiction of the United States

AND

J. EDWARD ALLEN

Foreign Correspondent and Reviewer Grand Lodge, Grand Chapter, Grand Council, Grand Commandery of North Carolina and the Grand Encampment K. T. of the United States

ILLUSTRATED

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

VOLUME III

	PAGE
CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION OF FREEMASONRY ABROAD — THE RISE OF ADDITIONAL RITES — THE CHEVALIER RAMSAY	I
CHAPTER TWO	
FREEMASONRY IN FRANCE	20
CHAPTER THREE	
FREEMASONRY IN THE GERMAN EMPIRE	89
CHAPTER FOUR	
FREEMASONRY IN AUSTRIA AND HUNGARY	161
CHAPTER FIVE	
FREEMASONRY IN RUSSIA	173
CHAPTER SIX	
FREEMASONRY IN DENMARK AND HOLLAND	201
CHAPTER SEVEN	
FREEMASONRY IN SWEDEN, NORWAY AND FINLAND	221
CHAPTER EIGHT	
FREEMASONRY IN SWITZERLAND	233
CHAPTER NINE	
FREEMASONRY IN ITALY	241
CHAPTER TEN	
FREEMASONRY IN BELGIUM	255
CHAPTER ELEVEN	
FREEMASONRY IN SPAIN	262

	PAGE
	CHAPTER TWELVE
FREEMASONRY IN PORTUGAL	273
	CHAPTER THIRTEEN
FREEMASONRY IN MALTA	282
	CHAPTER FOURTEEN
FREEMASONRY IN POLAND	290
	CHAPTER FIFTEEN
FREEMASONRY IN BOHEMIA AND CZECHO-SLOVAKIA	299
	CHAPTER SIXTEEN
FREEMASONRY IN RUMANIA AND JUGO-SLAVIA	307
	CHAPTER SEVENTEEN
FREEMASONRY IN TURKEY, GREECE AND CYPRUS	313

ILLUSTRATIONS

VOLUME III

King Gustav of Sweden	<i>Frontispiece</i>
	FACING PAGE
A Masonic Lodge in Paris, 1740	16
Comte de Clermont	26
Regalia of the Grand Orient of France (Colour)	40
Louis Philippe Joseph d'Orleans	42
Joseph Bonaparte	54
Napoleon Bonaparte, at the Lodge of Faubourg St. Marcel	56
A Masonic Banquet — A Toast	66
The Reception of an Apprentice	84
A Freemason's Lodge, Frederick the Great Presiding	90
F. L. Schroeder, Ritual Reformer, 1744-1816	92
Freemason's Sword of Frederick the Great	94
A Representative Selection of German Lodge Jewels (Colour)	108
J. G. Fichte, Masonic Historian and German Philosopher, 1762-1814	132
Altar in the Little Temple, Berlin	144
A Master with Apron	158
Headquarters of the Grand East of the Netherlands, at The Hague	204
Lodge Room at Copenhagen, Denmark	206
Masonic Temple, Amsterdam	214
Masonic Temple, Amsterdam — West End	218
Freemasons' Hall, Oslo, Norway	222
A Rare Swiss Jewel of the Second Degree	234

	FACING PAGE
Heinrich Zschokke	240
Grand Master Giuseppe Garibaldi	250
The Duke of Cumberland	256
Prominent Churchmen, Members of the Masonic Fraternity	
Hosea Ballou, Edward Bass, Gregory T. Bedell, Sr., Thomas C. Brownell, Thomas Chalmers, Philander Chase, Leighton Coleman, James E. Freeman, Alexander V. Griswold, Thomas Starr King, William H. Odenheimer, Henry C. Potter, Samuel Seabury	
	<i>At end of volume</i>

GOULD'S HISTORY
OF
FREEMASONRY
THROUGHOUT THE WORLD
VOLUME III

A HISTORY OF FREEMASONRY

THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

VOL. III

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION OF FREEMASONRY ABROAD—THE RISE OF ADDITIONAL RITES—THE CHEVALIER RAMSAY

IT has been regarded as a matter for astonishment that, in the short space of from ten to twenty years after the establishment of the Grand Lodge of England, Freemasonry should have obtained a firm footing in the remotest parts of the continent of Europe. The circumstance, however, seems to be a natural result. England at that time was, without doubt, the centre of all eyes and any important movement in this country was bound to attract especial attention from the world at large. Marlborough's brilliant achievements abroad had made her weight felt on the Continent; the States of Europe were distracted and impoverished by constant wars, whilst England was at least undisturbed within her own frontiers and had become exceedingly wealthy. Her possession of Hanover brought her into close contact with Germany, but her alliance and, above all, her large subsidies, were desired by each of the contending States in turn and, as a consequence, her capital was the rendezvous of thousands of foreigners. In these circumstances the formation of the Grand Lodge could barely have escaped notice; but, when noblemen of high position and men celebrated for their learning began to frequent the assemblies, to accept office, to take part in public processions, proudly wearing the jewels and aprons, no foreigner resident in the City of London could fail to be struck with the phenomenon. For in those days London was not a province of vast extent. It was a city of ordinary dimensions and each citizen might fairly be expected to be acquainted with every part of it, as well as with the personal appearance of its chief notabilities. A duke or earl was not lost amongst the millions of people who now throng the thoroughfares. His person, equipages and liveries were familiar to the majority of residents, his words and actions the talk of every club and coffee-house. The Fraternity, so suddenly brought into prominence, must have attracted everyone's attention and many visitors to the metropolis must have been introduced into its circle. Returning to their own country, what more natural than a wish to enjoy there also those charming meetings

where kindness and charity prevailed, where the strife of parties was unknown, where the slightest allusion to political or religious controversy was forbidden. What more natural than that those debarred from visiting its shores should desire to benefit by the new whim of "those eccentric islanders" and that, given a sufficient number of the initiated in any one town, Lodges should be formed? Even before regular Lodges were constituted, it cannot be doubted that informal receptions into the Fraternity took place whenever a few Freemasons met together. Wherever the earliest Lodges existed, there are found traces of previous meetings and, in no other way, can the presence in the first stated Lodges, of undoubted Freemasons initiated elsewhere, be accounted for. There seems little doubt that, within five years of 1717, Freemasons were by no means scarce on the Continent. But little doubt can exist that no single Freemason ever lived on the Continent or elsewhere, whose Masonic pedigree did not begin in Great Britain. No former association, guild or otherwise, ever grew into a Fraternity of Freemasons outside these islands, nor was any connexion with the building trades of the Continent ever claimed by the first Freemasons of Europe. The Craft there is a direct importation from England and, in its infancy and for many subsequent years, was confined entirely to the upper classes without the least admixture of the artisan. Even in Germany the language of the Fraternity was French, being that of the court and of diplomacy. All the earlier Minutes are recorded in that tongue and all the names of the first Lodges are French. For a few years the references are invariably to England and to English usages but, about 1740, a change took place. In contradistinction to English Masonry, a Scottish Masonry, supposed to hail from Scotland, but having no real connexion with the sister kingdom, arose, which was presumed to be superior to the hitherto known Craft and possessed of more recondite knowledge and extensive privileges.

Fertile imaginations soon invented fresh Degrees based upon and overlapping the English ritual. These Scottish Degrees were supplemented by additions of Chivalric Degrees, claiming connexion with and descent from all the various extinct orders of knighthood, till finally we meet with systems of 7, 10, 25, 33, 90 and, eventually, 95 Degrees! The example was no doubt set in France and the fashion spread throughout Europe, till the Craft's stated origin in the societies of English builders was utterly lost sight of. It has been maintained that the impulse was given by the partisans of the Stuarts—refugees in France at the court of St. Germain—and that it was the result of intrigues to win the Craft to their political purposes. Colour is lent to this view by the fact that the earliest names mentioned in connexion with French Freemasonry are those of well-known adherents of the Pretender. That Scotsmen and Englishmen residing in Paris should take the lead in an essentially English institution, does not appear sufficiently remarkable to warrant such a conclusion and, in the absence of anything like proof, cannot be entertained. In a solitary instance—the Strict Observance—it is possible that some such political design may have been cherished but, if so, it was dropped as useless almost before it was conceived and, certainly, the Stuarts themselves, on their own showing, never

were Freemasons at all. Contemporary records are so scarce, that little argument can be adduced on either side, whereas any amount of assertion has been freely indulged in. As the inducement to change possibly arose from the unlucky speech of a Scotsman—the Chevalier Ramsay—every arbitrary innovation was at first foisted on Scotland, as the most likely birthplace—in contradistinction to England, the land of the original Rite. How could a new Rite be fathered on France, Spain, Germany or Italy, where twenty years previously, as could at once be demonstrated, no Freemasonry had ever been heard of? There was absolutely no choice but Scotland, or peradventure Ireland, so Scotland obtained the credit of every new invention. The alleged connexion with the Jacobites was clearly an afterthought.

What is designated as Scots Masonry was unknown before the date of Ramsay's speech, but it appeared shortly afterwards. There is, therefore, a certain plausibility in representing the two as cause and effect; but the man and the discourse will now be considered and an endeavour made to present the facts in what seems to be their true light, for probably never was any character in Masonic annals with, perhaps, the single exception of the Baron von Hund, more unjustly held up to opprobrium and the scorn of posterity. Yet von Hund has always had a few upholders of his probity, whereas until quite recently no name has been too bad for Ramsay. Every petty author of the merest tract on Freemasonry has concurred in reviling a dead man on whose public or private life no slur can be cast, who was highly esteemed by great and good men of his own generation—whilst even writers of weight and authority have not disdained to heap obloquy upon him without one thought of his possible innocence. The general accusation against Ramsay is, that he was a devoted partisan of the exiled Royal Family of England; that he delivered or wrote a speech; that, in this speech, he wilfully and knowingly, of malice prepense, fouled the pure stream of Masonic history; and that he so acted in the interests and to further the intrigues of a political faction. In view of acknowledged principles, no impeachment of a Freemason could be more serious, no action more reprehensible. Therefore, such a charge should only be brought on the clearest possible proof. Now the only particle of truth is, that Ramsay certainly did write the speech. As for the other statements, if it can be shown that Ramsay was not a partisan of the Stuarts the whole libel loses the little consistency it ever possessed.

Rebold (*Histoire des trois grandes-loges*, Paris, 1864, p. 44) says: "Ramsay was a partisan of the Stuarts and introduced a system of Masonry, created at Edinbro' by a chapter of Canongate-Kilwinning Lodge, in the political interests of the Stuarts and with the intention of enslaving Freemasonry to Roman Catholicism." The statement respecting the Edinbro' Chapter is too absurd to require refutation.

Even the usually critical and judicious Kloss (*Geschichte der Freimaurerei in Frankreich*, Darmstadt, 1852, vol. i, p. 46) declares "that it is clear that Ramsay purposely introduced higher Degrees in order to make a selection from the ranks of the brotherhood in the interests of the Stuarts and to collect funds for the Pretender"; whilst Findel does not scruple to call him "infamous." Two

4 INTRODUCTION OF FREEMASONRY ABROAD—THE RISE OF

writers only have attempted to clear Ramsay's good name. Pinkerton (*Notes and Queries*, 4th series, December 18, 1869), the first of these, unfortunately takes up wrong ground. He argues that the speech is evidently a skit on Freemasonry and, therefore, not Ramsay's at all; further, that in view of Pope Clement's Bull—*In Eminentissimi*—Ramsay, who was a sincere convert to Romanism, could not by any possibility have been a Freemason. But facts have since come to light which render it probable that the speech was delivered on March 21, 1737, whilst the Bull is dated 1738; while it is well known that, in spite of repeated Bulls, many conscientious members of the Roman Church have been at all times, are even now, members of the Craft. A few years ago, however, the Rev. G. A. Schiffmann, who, on other occasions, has shown that he possesses an unprejudiced mind and the courage of his convictions, published a pamphlet study of Ramsay (*Andreas Michael Ramsay, Eine Studie*, etc., Leipzig, 1878) and, although a few trifling details in his work may be subject to correction, his views—in spite of Findel having done his best to prove their fallacy—are in the main those which merit the adoption of every critical reader. Had Masonic history always been studied in the same spirit of fearless, candid inquiry, there would be fewer fables and errors to correct. Although Schiffmann held an official appointment in Zinnendorff's Grand [National] Lodge, he, in 1870-6, gave expression to his opinion of the duplicity and deceit on which the whole Rite was based, supporting the Crown Prince's demand for inquiry and reform. He was consequently expelled in 1876, but received with high honour by all the more enlightened Lodges of Germany.

One of the most romantic figures in the history of Freemasonry is the Chevalier Andrew Michael Ramsay. He was born in Ayr on June 9, 1686, his father being a baker and, apparently, a strict Calvinist. The dates ascribed to his birth vary considerably. Rees' *Cyclopædia* states he died in 1743, aged 57, which would place his birth in 1686, as stated. Chambers' *Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen* gives the date as June 9, 1688. Findel also has 1686 and that date has been accepted by D. Murray Lyon. But, according to his own account (if correctly reported), he must have been born in 1680-1, because in 1741 he told Herr von Geusau that he was then sixty years old. This would make him sixty-two at the time of his death in 1743. Herr von Geusau was tutor to the son of the sovereign prince of Reuss, whom he accompanied in his travels through Germany, France and Italy. In Paris they met Ramsay, then tutor to the Prince of Turenne. Geusau kept a careful diary, anecdotal, personal, historical and geographical of the whole tour. This diary came into the possession of Dr. Anton Friedrich Buesching, who made extensive use of it for his *Geography*. He further gave copious extracts from it in *Beiträge zu der Lebensgeschichte denkwürdiger Personen*, Halle, 1783-9, 5 vols. In vol. iii some fifty pages are devoted to Ramsay's conversations with Geusau, respecting himself in general and his Masonic proceedings in particular, together with Geusau's reflections thereon. The *Diary* has unfortunately never been published *in extenso*, all allusions therefore by Masonic writers to Geusau's *Diary* are really to this collection

of anecdotes of celebrated men. The value of the work consists in the fact that we have here a contemporary account of Ramsay, written with no ulterior object and, although at second-hand, Ramsay's own words concerning his Masonic career. Geusau was not a Freemason—a fact which enhances the value of his testimony.

After a brief period of tuition in a school at Ayr, Andrew entered Edinburgh University at the age of fourteen and, for three years, studied classics, mathematics and theology. He attained some fame in classical research and, throughout his life, the great Greek thinkers were his constant study and delight. Eventually he broke with Calvinism and was attracted to the mystical writings of Antoinette Bourignon, who was at that time enjoying a considerable following in Aberdeen. It was at one time believed that the famous Quietist travelled through Scotland in the dress of a hermit. She became famous at a time when both Scottish Episcopalianism and Scottish Catholicism had lost nearly all their spiritual vigour. As the outcome of her teachings, Ramsay got into touch with Poiret and the Quietist Movement in France, although he had become known as a Deist.

On leaving the University he took up the work of a tutor and was engaged to teach the two sons of the Earl of Wemyss. About 1706, however, he left Britain, only to return to it for short periods. He went first to Flanders, where he entered the army under the Duke of Marlborough, who was then engaged in the War of the Spanish Succession. In 1710 he obtained an introduction to Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai and, as the outcome of an interview with him, Ramsay left the army and took up his abode with Fénelon, to study religion and to endeavour to gain peace of mind. He entered the Catholic Church in order to come directly under the Quietist Movement and he remained with Fénelon until the death of that dignitary in January 1715. Ramsay afterwards wrote the life of Fénelon, which was published at The Hague in 1723, in which there are vivid sketches of Madame Guyon and the violent Bishop Bossuet, the bitter opponent of Fénelon.

There is no need to wonder that Ramsay was attracted by the beautiful life, words and actions of the celebrated Archbishop, whose all-embracing Christianity never shone more conspicuously than during the Flemish campaigns and by whom he was converted to the Roman faith. There is no proof or symptom of proof that Ramsay became such a fervid Ultramontanist as has been stated. The character of his master would almost forbid it. Fénelon was one of the pillars of the Gallican Church, which was by no means in servile submission to that of Rome, although in communion with it; and the liberal breadth of his views was so widely spread as to incur the enmity of the great Bossuet and the open hostility of the Jesuits. Ramsay's printed works breathe a spirit of toleration worthy of his master. To Geusau we are indebted for an anecdote which goes far to prove that he was no bigot. During his short residence at Rome an English lord lived at James's Court who was married to a Protestant lady. A little girl was born to the couple and, the parents being in doubt as to their proceedings, Ramsay advised that she should be christened by one of the two *Protestant* chaplains of the household and exerted himself to such good effect in the cause as to win the consent of the Cardinal Chief of the

6 INTRODUCTION OF FREEMASONRY ABROAD—THE RISE OF

Inquisition. And Geusau, himself a Protestant, declares that Ramsay was a learned man, especially well informed in both ancient and modern history. He praises his upright and genial nature, his aversion to bigotry and sectarianism of all kinds and avers that he never once made the least attempt to shake his faith. Was this the kind of man to pervert Freemasonry in the interest and at the bidding of the Jesuits?

After Fénelon's death Ramsay went to Paris and became tutor to the young Duc de Château-Thierry and gained the friendship of the Regent, Philippe d'Orleans. The Regent was the Grand Master of the Order of St. Lazarus, into which he admitted Ramsay, who thus became known as the Chevalier Ramsay. This Order was founded in the fourth century in Palestine and erected hospitals for lepers, which were known as Lazarettes. It was founded as a military and religious community, at the time of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. Popes, princes and nobles endowed it with estates and privileges, but the knights were driven from the Holy Land by the Saracens and, in 1291, migrated to France and to Naples in 1311. It is now combined with the Order of St. Maurice and is conferred by the King of Italy, who is Grand Master, on persons distinguished in the public service, science, art, letters and charitable works, to which last-named its income is devoted.

Ramsay remained in Paris until 1724, when he accepted the post of tutor to Charles Edward and Henry (afterwards Cardinal of York), the two young Princes of the exiled House of Stuart, sons of the Pretender, James Francis Edward (James III), who had been on terms of friendship with Fénelon. He found the strange, though interesting, Court of St. James at Rome an uncomfortable abode and, after about a year, he resigned his position, in consequence of the constant intrigues and petty jealousies that surrounded the unfortunate James. Ramsay was an ardent Jacobite and he described the Pretender as "a very clever, fine, jovial, free-thinking man."

In 1725, Ramsay was offered the post of tutor to the Duke of Cumberland, the second son of George II, but refused because of his adoption of the Roman Catholic faith and because he had no liking for that reigning monarch. He was, however, given a safe conduct to Britain and, towards the end of 1728, he arrived in London and immediately proceeded to Scotland, where he became the guest of the Duke of Argyll at Inverary. The Duke possessed one of the largest libraries in the United Kingdom, was a man of culture and a friend to higher education.

Ramsay made his way quickly into literary circles. He was in Oxford in 1728 as the guest of the Marquis d'Abais. On March 12, 1729, he was made a member of the Gentlemen's Society at Spalding, the membership of which was composed largely of Freemasons and, in the same year, he was elected F.R.S., whilst, in the following year, Oxford conferred upon him the degree of D.C.L., he having previously been admitted a member of St. Mary's Hall. There was a strong minority opposed to him, which showed itself after the Earl of Arran, then Chancellor of the University, had proposed him for the honour. The opposition was on the grounds that he was a Roman Catholic, a Jacobite and had been in the service of the Pretender. Dr. King, the principal of St. Mary's Hall, spoke in Ramsay's defence and concluded

his speech by saying: *Quod instar omnium est. Fénelonii magni archi-præsulis Camaracensis alumnus præsento vobis.* There were 85 votes in favour of his receiving the degree and 17 against. He was the first Roman Catholic to receive a degree at Oxford since the Reformation.

Hearne's *Diary*, under date of April 20, 1730, has the following entry :

Last night Mr. Joyce and I (and nobody else) spending the evening together in Oxford, he told me that the Chevalier Ramsay (who is gone out of town) gave (before he went) in consideration of Dr. William King's Civilities to him in Oxford, the perpetual right of printing his *Travells of Cyrus* in French (wch is) original, (the English being a translation and the Right given to another) provided the profits be turned to the benefit of St. Mary Hall. Inquirie more of this. Mr. Joyce was one of the witnesses to the deed of gift.

Chambers (*Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen*, 1835, vol. iv, p. 137) is under a mistake in stating that the degree was conferred upon him by Dr. King, principal of St. Mary's Hall. Dr. King not being Vice-Chancellor, could not have conferred the degree, though he might have been instrumental in procuring it for him. The only record of members of St. Mary's Hall is the buttry-book and Ramsay's name first appears there as charged for battels on the same date but, although his name is kept on the books for some years afterwards, he is never again charged, so that it is to be presumed he never went into residence. Curiously enough the usual entry of his admission to the Hall cannot be found, while another peculiarity is, that he is always described in the buttry-book as "Chevalier Ramsay, LL.D.," probably in error, this being the Cambridge degree, whereas the Oxford degree was D.C.L. Evidently this man, taking such a prominent position in London life, could not have been a notorious Jacobite *intrigant*.

Ramsay's work, the *Travels of Cyrus*, had been published in Paris in 1727 and immediately attained world-wide popularity, although the author was denounced by the critics as a "deistical, freethinking, socinian, latitudinarian, despiser of external ordinances." The work was widely translated and editions published at London, Glasgow, Breslau, Lisbon, Madrid, Naples and Leyden; the last British edition being published at London in 1816. It had, as an appendix, *A Discourse upon the Theology and Mythology of the Pagans*, the design of which was to show that "the most celebrated philosophers of all ages and of all countries have had the notion of a Supreme Deity, who produced the world by his power and governed it by his wisdom."

That Ramsay was no Freethinker is proved by the opening lines of his poem on "Divine Friendship" :

O sovereign beauty, boundless source of love,
From Thee I'm sprung, to Thee again I move !
Like some small gleam of light, some feeble ray
That lost itself by wandering from the day.
Or some eclips'd, some faint and struggling beam
That fain would wrestle back from whence it came.
So I, poor banished I, oft strive to flee
Through the dark maze of nothing up to Thee !

When Ramsay returned to France, he accepted the post of tutor to the Vicomte de Turenne, son of the Duc de Bouillon. He became actively associated with Freemasonry and it is claimed that he instituted new Degrees, the funds of which were devoted to the assistance of the exiled Stuarts. In 1737 he was Chancellor or Orator of the Grand Lodge of France, during the Grand Mastership of Lord Harnouster, when he delivered an oration, which has made his name famous in the annals of the Craft. This was published afterwards as the *Relation apologique du Franc-Maçonnerie* which, Kloss says, was the first thorough and circumstantial defence of the Craft. It was publicly burned at Rome by command of the Pope, on the ground that it was a work which tended to weaken the loyalty of the people. The incident is referred to in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1738, in the following words :

There was lately burnt at Rome, with great solemnity, by order of the Inquisition, a piece in French, written by the Chevalier Ramsay, author of the *Travels of Cyrus*, entitled *An Apologetical and Historical Relation of the Secrets of Freemasonry*, printed at Dublin, by Patric Odonoko. This was published at Paris in answer to a pretended catechism, printed there by order of the Lieutenant of Police.

That Ramsay was a Freemason and Grand Chancellor of the Paris Grand Lodge is known from his conversations with Geusau, but he never stated when and where he was initiated. Inasmuch as he was in Flanders in 1709 and did not return to England till 1725 at the earliest, he could scarcely at that time have been a member of the Craft, unless "entered" at Kilwinning previous to the era of Grand Lodges. Lyon (*History of the Lodge of Edinburgh*, p. 308), however, vouches for the fact that he was not a member of Kilwinning. It would appear probable that he was initiated in London *circa* 1728-9. Among his fellow members of the Gentlemen's Society of Spalding, were no fewer than seven very prominent Freemasons and among his brother Fellows of the Royal Society, from 1730 to 1736 (the probable limit of his stay in England), were Martin Folkes, Rawlinson, Desaguliers, Lord Paisley, Stukeley, the Duke of Montagu, Richard Manningham, the Earl of Dalkeith, Lord Coleraine, the Duke of Lorraine (afterwards Emperor of Germany), the Earls Strathmore, Crawford and Aberdour, Martin Clare and Francis Drake. In such a company of distinguished Freemasons, it can scarcely be doubted that Ramsay soon became a prey to the fashion of the hour and solicited admission to the Fraternity, also that the Lodge to which he is most likely to have applied was that of the "Old Horn," of which Desaguliers and Richard Manningham were members. This supposition cannot be verified, because that Lodge (unlike some of the rest) has preserved no list of its members for 1730. If he left the Continent *circa* 1726, he could scarcely have been initiated there, except perhaps by individual Brethren, in an irregular manner, because the first Lodge heard of—out of Britain—was held at Paris in 1725. The facts, however, are by no means as clear as might be desired.

The *Almanack des Cocus* was published in Paris from 1741-3. Pinkerton states it was a vile and obscene publication. If so, it merely reflected the lascivious

tendencies of the age and country and there is no reason on that account to declare that Ramsay could be the author of no part of its contents. It naturally treated the subjects of the day and might have published his Oration without previously consulting the writer. In the edition for 1741 appeared "Discourse pronounced at the reception of Freemasons by Monsieur de R——, Grand Orator of the Order." The next publication of the same Oration was in 1742 by De la Tierce (*Histoire, Obligations et Statuts de la tr. ven. Confraternité des F.M., etc., 1742, 1745*), who describes himself as a former member of the Duke of Lorraine's Lodge, London, whose book is in substance a translation of the *Constitutions* of 1721, supplemented by the new articles of 1738, with various introductions by the author. He claims to have produced facts omitted by Anderson; indeed gives a very detailed account of the Grand Masters, from Noah onwards, reserving a distinguished place to Misraim. The introduction preceding the "Obligations of a Freemason" consists of "the following discourse pronounced by the Grand Master of the Freemasons of France, in the Grand Lodge, assembled solemnly at Paris, in the year of Freemasonry, five thousand seven hundred and forty." It reappeared in other publications, London, 1757 and 1795 (in French); the Hague, 1773 (also French); in the appendix to the second (1743) and third (1762) editions of the first translation into German of Anderson's *Constitutions* (Frankfort, 1741); and elsewhere. It will be observed that the *Almanack* attributes the speech to a Mr. R. and gives no date; Tierce, to the Grand Master in 1740; whilst, according to Kloss (*Geschichte, etc., op. cit., vol. i, p. 44*), the German translations merely state that the Grand Orator delivered it. That the speech was Ramsay's is known from his confession to Geusau and the only remaining matter of doubt is the exact date of its delivery. Jouast (*Histoire du Grand Orient de France, Paris, 1865, p. 63*) maintains that it was delivered on June 24, 1738, on the occasion of the installation of the Duc D'Antin as Grand Master, referring to the Duke some expressions therein which probably applied to Cardinal Fleury; states that the speech was first printed at the Hague in 1738, bound up with some poems attributed to Voltaire and some licentious tales of Piron. If such a work really existed at that date, it was probably the original of the *Lettre philosophique par M. de V——, avec plusieurs pièces galantes*, London, 1757 and, again, in 1795; but Kloss, in his *Bibliographie*, knows nothing of it.

Thory dates the appearance of Ramsay as Orator, December 24, 1736 (*Acta Latomorum, Paris, 1815, vol. i, p. 32*). But J. Emile Daruty would appear to have settled the matter almost beyond doubt, by the discovery, in a very rare work (P. E. Lemontey, *Histoire de la Régence et de la Minorité de Louis XV, jusqu'au Ministère du Cardinal de Fleury, Paris, vol. vii, pp. 292 et seq.*) of the two following letters (*Recherches sur le rite Écossais, etc., Mauritius and Paris, 1879, pp. 287, 288*), addressed by Ramsay to Cardinal Fleury, the all-powerful prime minister of France.

March 20, 1737.

Deign, *Monseigneur*, to support the Society of Freemasons [Ramsay used the English spelling] in the large views which they entertain and your Excellency will render your name more illustrious by this protection than Richelieu did his by

founding the French Academy. The object of the one is much vaster than that of the other. To encourage a society which tends only to reunite all nations by a love of truth and of the fine arts, is an action worthy of a great minister, of a Father of the Church and of a holy Pontiff.

As I am to read my discourse to-morrow in a general assembly of the Order and to hand it on Monday to the examiners of the *Chancellerie* [the censors of the Press—prior to publication], I pray your Excellency to return it to me to-morrow before mid-day by express messenger. You will infinitely oblige a man whose heart is devoted to you.

March 22, 1737.

I learn that the assemblies of Freemasons displease your Excellency. I have never frequented them except with a view of spreading maxims which would render by degrees incredulity ridiculous, vice odious and ignorance shameful. I am persuaded that if wise men of your Excellency's choice were introduced to head these assemblies, they would become very useful to religion, the state and literature. Of this I hope to convince your Excellency if you will accord me a short interview at Issy. Awaiting that happy moment, I pray you to inform me whether I should return to these assemblies and I will conform to your Excellency's wishes with a boundless docility.

Cardinal Fleury wrote on the margin of this letter in pencil, *Le roi ne le veut pas*. This probably explains Ramsay's meteor-like appearance in Masonic annals; for the only sign we have of his activity in Lodge is connected with this speech. Thory's assertions that he promulgated a new Rite was made sixty years afterwards without a shadow of proof. His speech may possibly have given rise to new Degrees, but what grounds are there for ascribing their invention and propagation to him? But precisely because Ramsay is only known by this one speech, does it appear probable, that in the above letters he is alluding to this one and no other; if so, it was beyond doubt delivered on March 21, 1737.

The speech itself—in its entirety—is unknown in an English garb and, as the various versions differ slightly, the translation chosen is that of De la Tierce, which is generally accepted as the most correct.

RAMSAY'S ORATION

The noble ardour which you, gentlemen, evince to enter into the most noble and very illustrious Order of Freemasons, is a certain proof that you already possess all the qualities necessary to become members, that is, humanity, pure morals, inviolable secrecy and a taste for the fine arts.

Lycurgus, Solon, Numa and all political legislators have failed to make their institutions lasting. However wise their laws may have been, they have not been able to spread through all countries and ages. As they only kept in view victories and conquests, military violence and the elevation of one people at the expense of another, they have not had the power to become universal, nor to make themselves acceptable to the taste, spirit and interest of all nations: Philanthropy was not their basis. Patriotism badly understood and pushed to excess, often destroyed in these warrior republics love and humanity in general. Mankind is not essentially

distinguished by the tongues spoken, the clothes worn, the lands occupied or the dignities with which it is invested. The world is nothing but a huge republic, of which every nation is a family, every individual a child. Our Society was at the outset established to revive and spread these essential maxims borrowed from the nature of man. We desire to reunite all men of enlightened minds, gentle manners and agreeable wit, not only by a love for the fine arts but, much more, by the grand principles of virtue, science and religion, where the interests of the Fraternity shall become those of the whole human race, whence all nations shall be enabled to draw useful knowledge and where the subjects of all kingdoms shall learn to cherish one another without renouncing their own country. Our ancestors, the Crusaders, gathered together from all parts of Christendom in the Holy Land, desired thus to reunite into one sole Fraternity the individuals of all nations. What obligations do we not owe to these superior men who, without gross selfish interests, without even listening to the inborn tendency to dominate, imagined such an institution, the sole aim of which is to unite minds and hearts in order to make them better, to form in the course of ages a spiritual empire where, without derogating from the various duties which different States exact, a new people shall be created, which, composed of many nations, shall in some sort cement them all into one by the tie of virtue and science.

The second requisite of our Society is sound morals. The religious orders were established to make perfect Christians, military orders to inspire a love of true glory and the Order of Freemasons to make men lovable men, good citizens, good subjects, inviolable in their promises, faithful adorers of the God of Love, lovers rather of virtue than of reward.

*Polliciti servare fidem, sanctumque vereri
Numen amicitia, mores, non munera amare.*

Nevertheless, we do not confine ourselves to purely civic virtues. We have amongst us three kinds of brothers : Novices or Apprentices, Fellows or Professed Brothers, Masters or Perfected Brothers. To the first are explained the moral virtues ; to the second the heroic virtues ; to the last the Christian virtues ; so that our Institution embraces the whole philosophy of sentiment and the complete theology of the heart. This is why one of our Brothers has said :

Freemason, illustrious Grand Master,
Receive my first transports,
In my heart the Order has given them birth,
Happy I, if noble efforts
Cause me to merit your esteem
By elevating me to the sublime,
The primeval Truth,
To the Essence pure and divine,
The celestial Origin of the soul,
The Source of life and love.

Because a sad, savage and misanthropic philosophy disgusts virtuous men, our ancestors, the Crusaders, wished to render it lovable by the attractions of innocent pleasures, agreeable music, pure joy and moderate gaiety. Our festivals are not what the profane world and the ignorant vulgar imagine. All the vices of heart and soul are banished there and irreligion, libertinage, incredulity and debauch

are proscribed. Our banquets resemble those virtuous *symposia* of Horace, where the conversation only touched what could enlighten the soul, discipline the heart and inspire a taste for the true, the good and the beautiful.

*O noctes canaque Deum . . .
Sermo oritur, non de regnis domibusve alienis
. . . sed quod magis ad nos
Pertinet, et nescire malum est, agitamus ; utrumne
Divitiis homines, an sint virtute beati ;
Quidve ad amicitias usus rectumve trahat nos,
Et quæ sit natura boni, summumque quid ejus.*

Thus the obligations imposed upon you by the Order, are to protect your Brothers by your authority, to enlighten them by your knowledge, to edify them by your virtues, to succour them in their necessities, to sacrifice all personal resentment, to strive after all that may contribute to the peace and unity of society.

We have secrets ; they are figurative signs and sacred words, composing a language sometimes mute, sometimes very eloquent, in order to communicate with one another at the greatest distance, to recognize our Brothers of whatsoever tongue. These were words of war which the Crusaders gave each other in order to guarantee them from the surprises of the Saracens, who often crept in amongst them to kill them. These signs and words recall the remembrance either of some part of our science, of some moral virtue or of some mystery of the faith. That has happened to us which never befell any former Society. Our Lodges have been established, are spread in all civilized nations and, nevertheless, among this numerous multitude of men never has a Brother betrayed our secrets. Those natures most trivial, most indiscreet, least schooled to silence, learn this great art on entering our Society. Such is the power over all natures of the idea of a fraternal bond ! This inviolable secret contributes powerfully to unite the subjects of all nations, to render the communication of benefits easy and mutual between us. We have many examples in the annals of our Order. Our Brothers, travelling in divers lands, have only needed to make themselves known in our Lodges in order to be there immediately overwhelmed by all kinds of succour, even in time of the most bloody wars, while illustrious prisoners have found Brothers where they only expected to meet enemies.

Should any fail in the solemn promises which bind us, you know, gentlemen, that the penalties which we impose upon him are remorse of conscience, shame at his perfidy and exclusion from our Society, according to those beautiful lines of Horace :

*Est et fideli tuta silencio
Merces ; vetabo qui Cereris sacrum
Vulgarit arcanum, sub iisdem
Sit trabibus, fragilemque mecum
Salvat phaselum. . . .*

Yes, sirs, the famous festivals of Ceres at Eleusis, of Isis in Egypt, of Minerva at Athens, of Urania amongst the Phœnicians, of Diana in Scythia were connected with ours. In those places mysteries were celebrated which concealed many vestiges of the ancient religion of Noah and the Patriarchs. They concluded with banquets and libations when neither that intemperance nor excess were known into which the heathen gradually fell. The source of these infamies was the admission

to the nocturnal assemblies of persons of both sexes in contravention of the primitive usages. It is in order to prevent similar abuses that women are excluded from our Order. We are not so unjust as to regard the fair sex as incapable of keeping a secret. But their presence might insensibly corrupt the purity of our maxims and manners.

The fourth quality required in our Order is the taste for useful sciences and the liberal arts. Thus, the Order exacts of each of you to contribute, by his protection, liberality or labour, to a vast work for which no academy can suffice, because all these societies being composed of a very small number of men, their work cannot embrace an object so extended. All the Grand Masters in Germany, England, Italy and elsewhere, exhort all the learned men and all the artisans of the Fraternity to unite to furnish the materials for a Universal Dictionary of the liberal arts and useful sciences, excepting only theology and politics. [This proposed Dictionary is a curious *crux*—it is possible that the Royal Society may have formed some such idea? But at least Ramsay's express exclusion of theology and politics should have shielded him from the accusation of wishing to employ Freemasonry for Jesuitical and Jacobite purposes. With the exception of the constant harping on the Crusades, there is so far nothing in the speech of which to complain.]

The work has already been commenced in London and, by means of the union of our Brothers, it may be carried to a conclusion in a few years. Not only are technical words and their etymology explained, but the history of each art and science, its principles and operations, are described. By this means the lights of all nations will be united in one single work, which will be a universal library of all that is beautiful, great, luminous, solid and useful in all the sciences and in all noble arts. This work will augment in each century, according to the increase of knowledge, it will spread everywhere emulation and the taste for things of beauty and utility.

The word Freemason must therefore not be taken in a literal, gross and material sense, as if our founders had been simple workers in stone, or merely curious geniuses who wished to perfect the arts. They were not only skilful architects, desirous of consecrating their talents and goods to the construction of material temples; but also religious and warrior princes who designed to enlighten, edify and protect the living Temples of the Most High. This I will demonstrate by developing the history or rather the renewal of the Order.

Every family, every Republic, every Empire, of which the origin is lost in obscure antiquity, has its fable and its truth, its legend and its history. Some ascribe our institution to Solomon, some to Moses, some to Abraham, some to Noah, some to Enoch, who built the first city, or even to Adam. Without any pretence of denying these origins, I pass on to matters less ancient. This, then, is a part of what I have gathered in the annals of Great Britain, in the Acts of Parliament, which speak often of our privileges and in the living traditions of the English people, which has been the centre of our Society since the eleventh century.

At the time of the Crusades in Palestine many princes, lords and citizens associated themselves and vowed to restore the Temple of the Christians in the Holy Land, to employ themselves in bringing back their architecture to its first institution. They agreed upon several ancient signs and symbolic words drawn from the well of religion in order to recognize themselves amongst the heathen and Saracens. These signs and words were only communicated to those who

promised solemnly, even sometimes at the foot of the altar, never to reveal them. This sacred promise was therefore not an execrable oath, as it has been called, but a respectable bond to unite Christians of all nationalities in one confraternity. Some time afterwards our Order formed an intimate union with the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. From that time our Lodges took the name of Lodges of St. John. This union was made after the example set by the Israelites when they erected the second Temple who, whilst they handled the trowel and mortar with one hand, in the other held the sword and buckler. [This idea forms the groundwork of all subsequent Scots grades: Knightly Scotch Masons who, in the old Temple, rediscovered the Sacred Name, the trowel in one hand, the sword in the other. Ramsay's allusion, it will be observed, is not to any existing Degree of his day, but an innocent allegory in illustration of his thesis.]

Our Order, therefore, must not be considered a revival of the Bacchanals, but as an Order founded in remote antiquity, renewed in the Holy Land by our ancestors in order to recall the memory of the most sublime truths amidst the pleasures of society. The kings, princes and lords returned from Palestine to their own lands and there established divers Lodges. At the time of the last Crusades many Lodges were already erected in Germany, Italy, Spain, France and, from thence, in Scotland, because of the close alliance between the French and the Scotch. James, Lord Steward of Scotland, was Grand Master of a Lodge established at Kilwinning, in the West of Scotland, MCCLXXXVI [this passage has been seized upon by the inventors of Scots rites, all pretending to hail from Heredom Kilwinning, asserting the superiority in point of antiquity and pure tenets of the Grand Lodge held there—which body, it is almost unnecessary to say, never existed], shortly after the death of Alexander III, King of Scotland, and one year before John Baliol mounted the throne. This lord received as Freemasons into his Lodge the Earls of Gloucester and Ulster, the one English, the other Irish.

By degrees our Lodges and our Rites were neglected in most places. This is why of so many historians only those of Great Britain speak of our Order. Nevertheless it preserved its splendour among those Scotsmen of whom the Kings of France confided during many centuries the safeguard of their royal persons.

After the deplorable mishaps in the Crusades, the perishing of the Christian armies and the triumph of Bendocdar, Sultan of Egypt, during the eighth and last Crusade, that great Prince Edward, son of Henry III, King of England, seeing there was no longer any safety for his Brethren in the Holy Land, whence the Christian troops were retiring, brought them all back and this colony of Brothers was established in England. As this prince was endowed with all heroic qualities, he loved the fine arts, declared himself protector of our Order, conceded to it new privileges and then the members of this Fraternity took the name of Freemasons after the example set by their ancestors.

Since that time Great Britain became the seat of our Order, the conservator of our laws and the depository of our secrets. The fatal religious discords which embarrassed and tore Europe in the sixteenth century caused our Order to degenerate from the nobility of its origin. Many of our Rites and usages which were contrary to the prejudices of the times were changed, disguised, suppressed. Thus it was that many of our Brothers forgot, like the ancient Jews, the spirit of our laws and retained only the letter and shell. The beginnings of a remedy have already been made. It is necessary only to continue and, at last, to bring everything back to

its original institution. This work cannot be difficult in a State where religion and the Government can only be favourable to our laws.

From the British Isles the Royal Art is now repassing into France, under the reign of the most amiable of Kings, whose humanity animates all his virtues and under the ministry of a Mentor [evidently Cardinal Fleury], who has realized all that could be imagined most fabulous. In this happy age when love of peace has become the virtue of heroes, this nation [France] one of the most spiritual of Europe, will become the centre of the Order. She will clothe our work, our statutes, our customs with grace, delicacy and good taste, essential qualities of the Order, of which the basis is the wisdom, strength and beauty of genius. It is in future in our Lodges, as it were in public schools, that Frenchmen shall learn, without travelling, the characters of all nations and that strangers shall experience that France is the home of all peoples. *Patria gentis humanæ.*

Now to what does this speech amount? a mere embellishment of Anderson! Builders and princes had united in Palestine for a humane purpose; the Society had been introduced into Europe, especially Scotland; had perished and been reintroduced into England by Prince Edward. From that time they had continued a privileged class of builders—Ramsay no longer claims for them knightly attributes—and had lost their moral tenets during the Reformation, becoming mere operative artisans; they had lately recovered or revived their old doctrines; and France was destined to be the centre of the reformed Fraternity. The introduction of the legend of the Crusades may be taken to be a natural consequence of Ramsay's position in life, of the high nobility and gentry he was addressing, to whom the purely mechanical ancestry may have wanted toning down. But surely the Oration is not such a very heinous one? More dangerous and absurd speeches are still made in the Craft. That inventive minds, for their own purposes, may have seized upon and falsely interpreted certain passages, is no fault of Ramsay. It was looked upon with approbation by his contemporaries; it is simply impossible to find in it any indication of a desire to pervert Masonic ceremonies. One or two points may be further inquired into. The cause of the allusion to Kilwinning may simply be that Ramsay was from Ayr and, probably, as an antiquary acquainted with its very ancient history, brought in the Lodge merely as an ornament. His choice of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem may easily be accounted for. It was not the St. John of Malta, nor was he ever known to allude to the Templars. The fact is, he was himself a Knight of St. John of Jerusalem and thus paid a tribute to his own Order. In 1714–19 Helyot's great work on the spiritual and temporal orders was published at Paris (*Hist. des Ordres Monastiques, Religieux et Militaires*). The third volume contains the history of the Order of St. Lazarus, of which Ramsay was a knight. Who can doubt that he read it? This states that in the fourth century an Order of St. Lazarus was established in Palestine and erected everywhere hospitals for lepers, which were called Lazarettes. Later on the Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem were established. The two associations united and worked under the same master, called the Master of the Hospital. When the Order of St. John added the vow of celibacy, these two separated. One retook the name of St.


Lazarus, the other changed theirs to St. John the Baptist. At the time that the Hospitallers were in the service of the King of Jerusalem, they consisted of three Orders—knights to fight, servitors to nurse and clerics or chaplains. King Henry of England increased considerably their income, but France did most for the Order and it ultimately took refuge in that country. The Grand Master of that day was styled Grand Master of the Holy Order of Lazarus *cis et transmare*. In 1354 the Grand Master empowered John Halliday, a Scot, to rule over the temporal and spiritual affairs of the Order in Great Britain. In some sort, then, Ramsay was a descendant of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, which, however, as such, was extinct and thus may be understood the very natural selection made of that Order on which to found his romance.

Following the Oration we have a copy of *Statutes in usage* [at that time] *in France*. These are a paraphrase, more or less, of Anderson's *Old Regulations*. One in particular must be quoted, because they are all attributed to Ramsay—though without rhyme or reason—and because this especial one has been used to prove that he intended to employ Freemasonry for the propagation of the Roman Catholic religion.

Every incredulous brawler who shall have spoken or written against the holy dogmas of the ancient faith of the Crusaders shall be for ever excluded from the Order ; etc., etc.

But who would think that this was meant to exclude Protestants ? The ancient faith of the Crusaders was Christianity. At a time when the Protestants were not thought of, no distinction could possibly be made between them and the then Universal Church. It would be absurd to call the Crusaders Roman Catholics in contradistinction to Protestants. The article simply means that Masons must be Christians ; must be of the Catholic Church : whether Roman, Anglican, Greek or any other variety, was not even thought of. Therefore, even should these articles owe their inspiration to Ramsay—owing to want of evidence—they are quite powerless to strengthen the odious calumny under which he has so long lain.

One other matter must be referred to, although of no great importance. In 1736, the Lieutenant-General of Police in Paris, Hérault, is said to have obtained, through an opera dancer, Madame Carton, a Masonic examination, mainly a translation of Pritchard's *Masonry Dissected*, which he caused to be published as an exposure of Freemasonry. In reply to this appeared *Rélation apologique et historique de la Société des F.M.*, par J. G. D. M. F. M., Dublin, Chez Patrice Odonoko, 1738, 8°—2nd edition, in London, 1749. It was burned at Rome, as mentioned already, by the Public Executioner, on February 1, 1739. Many ingenious attempts have been made to prove the truth of this statement and to show the community of style and ideas between Ramsay's Oration and the *Rélation*. As long as there was reason to suppose that the Oration was delivered in 1740, it was difficult to decide why Ramsay should have been selected to father this production and the very audacity of the assertion carried conviction with it. It could only be assumed that the



From l'Histoire Pittoresque de la Franc-Maçonnerie par Clavel, 1844.

A Masonic Lodge in Paris, 1740.

From a contemporary print.

correspondent of the *Gentleman's Magazine* was possessed of certain private information. But if the Oration was delivered in 1737, it is easy to conceive that the *Rélation* might well have been attributed to the same hand in 1738. A mere guess at the hidden authorship. This fact tends to corroborate the Oration's date of 1737, for it may safely be affirmed that Ramsay did not write the *Rélation*. Its style is far less pure than his, the orthography is totally distinct. Ramsay doubles all his consonants in such words as *apprendre, combattre, difficile*; the author of the *Rélation* writes *aprendre, combatre, difcile*, etc. The initials of the author, J. G. D. M. F. M., might perhaps be read as J. G., Dr. Med., Free Mason.

A word must, however, be said as to the case for the plaintiff.

Dr. George Oliver paid the Chevalier a high tribute for inventive genius, when he said :

If I had not found certain unmistakable inventions of a Master's part at an earlier date than the period when the Chevalier Ramsay flourished, I should have assigned the invention of this legend to him, as he was possibly the fabricator of the Degrees called Ineffable, which exemplify and complete the allegory of Hiram Abiff and, if judiciously managed, might, together, have formed a pleasing fiction.

Prince Charles Edward Stuart is said to have established the Rite de la Vielle-Brethren at Toulouse, which he denominated *Écossais Fideles*, in honour of the kind reception his aide-de-camp, Sir Samuel Lockhart, had received from the Freemasons in Scotland. The Degrees of Ramsay were blended in this Rite. Ramsay issued a manifesto to the town of Arras, giving to the Lodge there the power to confer his Degree of the Eagle and Pelican. This thus formed the first authorized Chapter for the working of the higher grades.

There were nine Degrees in Ramsay's system, the first four of which comprehended Symbolical Masonry and formed the first Chapter. The second Chapter was composed of four further Degrees and comprehended what was called the Masonry of the Crusaders. The third Chapter was formed of those who had been admitted to the ninth or last Degree or into the secrets of Scientific Masonry. The three Chapters were united into a Consistory.

It would appear indisputable that Freemasonry was used as a tie to cement the adherents of James more closely to each other, notwithstanding the Papal denunciations of the Craft. Ladislas de Malezovich, in his *Sketch of the Earlier History of Masonry in Austria and Hungary* (*A.Q.C.*, vol. v) claims that Ramsay must be regarded as the father of the Higher Degrees, for, in his famous oration, he first connected—without historical foundation—Masonry with the Crusades and the great historical orders of knighthood. He asserts that Ramsay established three Degrees, viz. *Écossais*, Novice and Knight Templar and that out of this system sprang up, with a number of others, the so-called Rite de Clermont, which was founded at Paris, in 1754, by the Chevalier de Bonneville, although some claim that this was of Jesuit origin and that the Jesuits introduced several new Degrees, founded on Ramsay's system, which they used for the extension of their order. Ramsay, he says, added four other Degrees, making seven in all, viz. *Maître Écossais*, *Maître Élu* or

Chevalier de l'Aigle, Chevalier illustre de Templier, also called Knight of the Most Holy Sepulchre ; and Chevalier Sublime or Knight of God.

Baron Hunde, then a Protestant (though he afterwards became a Roman Catholic at the importunity of his wife), contrived to obtain admission to the Order. The lessons he learned there formed the nucleus in his mind for a new system of the Degrees, seven in all, which he introduced into Germany, under the imposing title of Templeorden or Orden des Stricten Observantz.

Oliver, in his *Historical Landmarks*, asserts that Ramsay changed the names of the Degrees from Irlandais to Écossais, as he was a Scot by birth and made use of the existing machinery for the purpose of excluding all Masons who were not prepared for partisanship. In inventing the new Degrees, Ramsay claimed that they dated their origin from the Crusades and that Godfrey de Bouillon was the Grand Master. He began, says Oliver, like all other innovators, by exacting the most inviolable secrecy from his novices. He told them that

silence and secrecy are the very soul of the Order and you will carefully observe this silence, as well with those whom you may have reason to suppose are already initiated as with those whom you may hereafter know really belong to the Order. You will never reveal to any person, at present or hereafter, the slightest circumstances relative to your admission, the Degree you have received ; nor the time when admitted. In a word, you will never speak of any object relating to the Order, even before Brethren, without the strongest necessity.

Oliver also asserts that, stimulated by the success which attended the promulgation of his manufactured Degrees in France, Ramsay

brought his system of pretended Scottish Freemasonry into England, with the intention, it is supposed, of extending it indefinitely, if he found it acceptable to the English Fraternity, being commissioned by the Pretender, as an agent, to convert his interest with the Freemasons to the advantage of his employer. The attempt, however, failed and the overtures of Ramsay were unceremoniously rejected.

Ramsay, continues Oliver, returned to Paris, where he was received with enthusiasm and his system became the root and stem of so many additional Degrees of Scottish Masonry (so called) that their number cannot accurately be ascertained.

According to Burnes's *History of the Knights Templar*, Ramsay appeared in Germany under the sanction of a patent with the sign-manual of Edward Stuart

appointing him Grand Master of the seventh province ; but, although he had invented a plausible tale in support of his title and authority—both of which he affirmed had been made over to him by the Earl Marischal on his death-bed—and of the antiquity of his Order, which he derived, of course, from Scotland, where the chief seat of the Templars was at Aberdeen, the imposture was soon detected ; it was even discovered that he had himself enticed and initiated the ill-fated Pretender into his fabulous order of chivalry. The delusions on this subject, however, had taken such a hold in Germany that they were not altogether dispelled until a deputation had actually visited and found, among the worthy and astonished Brethren there, no trace, either of very ancient Templars or Freemasonry.

But if Ramsay stands acquitted of wilfully perverting Freemasonry, can he be brought in guilty of unintentionally being the cause of the numerous inventions which so soon followed his discourse? Given a nation such as we know the French to be, volatile, imaginative, decidedly not conservative in their instincts, suddenly introduced to mysterious ceremonies unconnected with their past history—given a ritual which appeals in no way to their peculiar love of glory and distinction—which fails to harmonize with their bent of mind—it was almost inevitable that some “improvements” should have been attempted. Add to this a certain number of more or less clever men, ambitious to rise at once to an elevated position in the Craft, perhaps to replenish their purses by the sale of their own inventions. All these elements existed, as events have proved and thus France was ready for the crop of high grades which so soon sprang up. Finding in Ramsay’s speech indications which they could twist to their own purpose, they cleverly made use of them as a sort of guarantee of the genuineness of their goods. But they soon went far beyond any allusions contained in the Oration, for not a word can there be found pointing to the various degrees of vengeance, *Elus*, *Kadosch*, etc., or to the Templars. Although this speech did not suggest additional Degrees, it is probable that it aided intending inventors in their previously conceived designs. The distinction is a fine one and not worth arguing. It will suffice to have proved that Ramsay did write the speech, that his intentions were quite compatible with the most absolute innocence, that he was neither a Stuart intriguer nor a Jesuit missionary in disguise. As already remarked, he immediately disappeared from the Masonic stage, although he lived for seven years afterwards. His name had not previously been mentioned in connexion with Freemasonry, therefore, if any persons assert that he was the concocter of a new rite of seven Degrees, the onus of proving anything so wildly improbable rests entirely upon themselves.

Ramsay’s great and final secret was that “every Mason is a Knight Templar.” His monumental work was published posthumously at Glasgow in 1749 and was entitled *The Philosophical Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion*. It created considerable stir in Roman Catholic circles, as the author enunciated views at variance with the doctrines of that Church. It was highly praised by Jonathan Edwards and Dr. A. V. G. Allen, in his *Biography* of that Calvinistic divine, describes the book as one of the most remarkable works of the eighteenth century.

Always a great linguist, Ramsay, towards the end of his life, studied Chinese and became able to read that difficult language. His intimate friends were few in number, his chief confidant in Edinburgh being Dr. John Stevenson. He was also acquainted with Dean Swift and on friendly terms with J. B. Rousseau and Racine.

Ramsay passed away on May 6, 1743, at St. Germain-en-Laye, where he was buried and, at his own request, on his tomb was engraved *Universitæ Religionis vindex et Martyr*. His heart was removed from his body and transferred to the nunnery of St. Sacrament at Paris. He was survived by his wife, who was a daughter of Sir David Nairn.

CHAPTER II

FREEMASONRY IN FRANCE

A NATIVE historian of French Freemasonry would, naturally, turn first of all to the archives of the Grand Orient of France. These have been utilized to their full extent, but unfortunately they contain little to aid research before the commencement of the nineteenth century.

The Grand Librarian thus describes them in an official report (Rebold, *Histoire des trois Grandes Loges*, p. 173):

The library consists only of some few profane [i.e. non-Masonic] volumes, about forty volumes in German, some English works and a bundle of pamphlets. The minutes of the Grand Orient from 1789 onwards are in a tolerably satisfactory state. In a portfolio are to be found the minutes of the *Grande Loge de Conseil* from 1773 to 1778; those from 1788-1800 are very incomplete. There is no collection of its circulars to subordinate Lodges and it would be impossible to form a complete series of printed calendars. The earliest is that of 1807 and numerous intervals occur in subsequent times.

Kloss (*Geschichte der Freimaurerei in Frankreich*, vol i, p. 193) adds that no complete list of French Lodges is anywhere in existence of a date preceding the end of the last century.

French Freemasonry is supposed to date from about the year 1721 and, as no Minutes whatever, relating to any earlier period than 1773, are to be found, it is obvious that, failing contemporaneous writings, the history of its first half century must be open to much doubt. The first comprehensive account of the French Craft appeared in 1773 as a five-page article, s.v. "Franche-Maçonnerie," by De Lalande, in the *Encyclopédie Yverdon*. Joseph Jérôme Lefrançais de Lalande, the celebrated astronomer and director of the Paris Observatory, was born July 11, 1732 and died April 4, 1807. He could, therefore, have scarcely been initiated before *circa* 1750, so that his account of early French Masonry resolves itself into hearsay. He was Master of the famous Lodge of the Nine Sisters (or Muses) at Paris, of which Benjamin Franklin, John Paul Jones, together with the French leaders of the arts and sciences, were members. Subsequent writers have been enabled to make use of some few pamphlets, circulars, or exposures and none had more opportunities in this respect, or availed himself of them to greater advantage, than Kloss. Another historical contribution is that of De-la-Chaussée in his *Mémoire Justificatif*, a printed defence of his official conduct, which had been impugned by Labady, published in 1772.

The first real historian of French Freemasonry was Thory (1812-15, *Annales Originis Magni Galliarum Orientis* and *Acta Latomorum*) and his principal successors in chronological order have been Von Nettlebladt (circa 1836, *Geschichte Freimaurischer Systeme*, published 1879), Kloss (1852, *op. cit.*), Rebold (1864, *op. cit.*), Jouast (1865, *Histoire du Grand Orient de France*) and Daruty (1879, *Recherches sur le Rite Écossais*). De-la-Chaussée's work is a defence of his own particular conduct and, therefore, not always to be trusted implicitly. Thory wrote nearly ninety years after the first beginnings of Freemasonry in France. His early facts are taken from Lalande and, in the total absence of any other authority, every later historian has been more or less obliged to follow him. It may also further be remarked that Thory was an uncompromising partisan of the High Degrees and can be proved to have distorted historical facts and misquoted documents to suit his own views. Nettlebladt was as strong a partisan of Zinnendorff's system and equally guilty of historical perversion. Kloss was painstaking, though sometimes blinded by his hatred of the High Degrees. Rebold suffered under the same defect, combined with a prejudice against the Grand Orient, of which his party became a rival. Jouast, on the contrary, wrote as the avowed advocate of that body and errs in the opposite direction; whilst Daruty, a member of the rival Ancient and Accepted Rite, with a personal grievance against the Grand Orient, is very one-sided in his views and not sufficiently critical in his acceptance of alleged facts. In these circumstances it will be seen that the history of the first fifty years of French Freemasonry cannot be otherwise than a series of possibilities, probabilities, surmises and traditions; whereas, in recording that of the following hundred and fifty years one must steer very carefully between contending opinions—with a leaning towards those of Kloss in doubtful matters.

According to De Lalande, or tradition, which, in this case, amounts to much the same thing, the first Lodge in France was founded in Paris by the Earl of Derwentwater in 1725 on a Warrant from the Grand Lodge of England. It is true that a Lodge at Dunkirk (*Amitié et Fraternité*), which affiliated with the Grand Orient in 1756, then claimed to have been constituted from England in 1721; that claim was allowed; but, as it certainly never was constituted by the Grand Lodge of England at all, its alleged early origin may be ascribed to the ambition of its members. Anderson, in his *Book of Constitutions*, mentions the 1725, but not the 1721, Lodge. The colleagues of Lord Derwentwater are stated to have been a Chevalier Maskelyne, a Squire Hénquelty, with others, all partisans of the Stuarts. The Lodge assembled at the restaurant of an Englishman called Hurre, in the Rue des Boucheries. A second Lodge was established in 1726 by an English lapidary, Goustand. Neither of these names has the sound of being English. A circular of the Grand Orient—September 4, 1788—mentions as existing in 1725-30 five Lodges, Louis d'Argent, Bussy, Aumont, Parfaite Union and Bernouville. Lalande ascribes no name to Derwentwater's Lodge and calls the Louis d'Argent the third Lodge in Paris. Clavel (who was an active Freemason and Master of the Lodge Emeth) makes the Lodge of 1726 the third in Paris, says it was called St. Thomas and was

identical with the Louis d'Argent. Ragon agrees, but gives the date as 1729. Rebold looks upon these names as those of two distinct Lodges under the dates 1726 and 1729 respectively and thinks the first one identical with Derwentwater's Lodge. Speaking of the latter Lalande says (Daruty, *Recherches*, etc., p. 84, note 42):

In less than ten years the reputation of this Lodge attracted five to six hundred Brethren within the circle of the Craft and caused other Lodges to be established.

Nothing, however, can positively be said of these early Lodges for want of contemporary evidence. If we turn to the English *Engraved Lists* we find that whatever Lodge (or Lodges) may have existed in Paris in 1725 must have been unchartered, for the first French Lodge on the roll is on the list for 1730-2, No. 90, the King's Head, Paris (see Gould's *Four Old Lodges*, p. 50). King's Head is identical with Louis d'Argent—a silver coin bearing the effigy of King Louis. In 1736-9, No. 90 is shown at the Hotel de Bussy, Rue de Bussy and the date of constitution as April 3, 1732. This was known afterwards as Loge d'Aumont, because le Duc d'Aumont was initiated therein. The first two of the five Lodges cited by the Grand Orient in 1788 were, therefore, in reality one and the same. In 1740 it became No. 78 and met at the Ville de Tonnère, Rue des Boucheries—in 1756 it received the number 49 and was erased in 1768. It would appear probable—more cannot be said—that Derwentwater's Lodge is identical with this Lodge; that it was an informal Lodge and did not petition for a Warrant till 1732. Further proof of irregularity is afforded by extracts from the daily papers (reprinted in *Masonic Magazine*, vol. iv, 1876, p. 419).

St. James's Evening Post, September 7, 1734.—We hear from Paris that a Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons was lately held there at her Grace the Duchesse of Portsmouth's house, where his Grace the Duke of Richmond, assisted by another English nobleman of distinction there, President Montesquieu, Brigadier Churchill, Ed. Yonge and Walter Strickland, Esq., admitted several persons of distinction, into that most Ancient and Honourable Society.

St. James's Evening Post, September 20, 1735.—They write from Paris that his Grace the Duke of Richmond and the Rev. Dr. Desaguliers ∴ ∴ now authorized by the present Grand Master (under his hand and seal and the seal of the Order), having called a Lodge at the Hotel Bussy in the Rue Bussy, [several] noblemen and gentlemen were admitted to the Order. . . .

It is noteworthy that this assembly was held in the premises of the only Lodge then warranted in France, but was evidently not a meeting of that Lodge, as it was "called" or convoked by the Duke of Richmond and Dr. Desaguliers. On May 12, 1737—the same journal informs us—on the authority of a private letter from Paris, that "five Lodges are already established." Of these one only is known to have been warranted. The second in France was constituted at Valenciennes as No. 127 (*Four Old Lodges*, p. 52), but dropped off the English roll (as No. 40) in 1813. The third on August 22, 1735, as No. 133, by the Duke of Richmond and

Aubigny, at his castle of Aubigny (see Anderson's *Constitutions*, 1738), and was erased in 1768. It is also known that, at that time the English Lodge at Bordeaux (Loge l'Anglaise, No. 204) was working, though not yet warranted by the Grand Lodge of England and it seems certain that no other French Lodge received an English Charter until 1766. It is, therefore, clear that of these five Paris Lodges, four were either self-constituted or derived their authority irregularly from the first, Au Louis d'Argent, No. 90.

The earliest publication which fixes a date for the introduction of Freemasonry into France is the *Sceau Rompu* of 1745 (*Le Sceau Rompu, ou la Loge ouverte aux profanes, par un francmaçon*, Cosmopolis), twenty-eight years before Lalande. It states:

As regards Freemasonry, its introduction may be placed at eighteen years ago [consequently in 1727], but at first it was worked under the deepest secrecy.

Lalande says:

Lord Derwentwater was looked upon as Grand Master of the Masons; he afterwards went to England and was beheaded. My Lord Harnouester was elected in 1736 by the four [Clavel says six, the *St. James's Evening Post* mentions five] Lodges which then existed in Paris; he is the first regularly elected Grand Master. In 1738 the Duc d'Antin was elected General Grand Master *ad vitam* for France. . . . In 1742 twenty-one Lodges existed in Paris.

On the other hand, a Frankfort publication (*Gründliche Nachricht*) of 1738 declares that nothing was heard of the French Craft before 1736; whilst another Frankfort publication of 1744 (*Der sich selbst vertheidigende Freimaurerei*) affirms that at the end of 1736, there were six Lodges in France and more than sixty Masons [one-tenth of the number cited by Lalande], who at that date [which is usually assigned to Lord Harnouester] elected the Earl of Derwentwater to succeed James Hector Maclean, who had served some years previously. How is it possible to reconcile all these conflicting statements?

Putting aside the above solitary reference to an alleged Grand Master Maclean anterior to Derwentwater, as a question impossible of solution with our present knowledge, it may well be asked how came Derwentwater to be a Mason at all? Charles Radcliffe was the brother of James Radcliffe, third and last Earl of Derwentwater. They were arrested for rebellion in 1715 and James was beheaded. Charles escaped to France and assumed the title—which had been forfeited for high treason—became concerned in the rebellion of 1745 and was beheaded on Tower Hill December 8, 1746 (Collins, *Peerage of England*, 1812, vol. ix, p. 407), meeting his fate as became a brave gentleman (*General Advertiser*, December 9, 1746). Having left England before the revival, where was he initiated? Not in Paris apparently, because he opened the first Lodge there. Also, why does the *St. James's Evening Post*, which mentions many men of lesser note in its Masonic news, never say a word about Charles Radcliffe, who was then at the head of the Craft in France? Moreover, who were the Chevalier Maskelyne and Squire Hénquelty, his colleagues? Their identity cannot be traced. Maskelyne is an English name, that of a Wiltshire

family, from which Nevil Maskelyne, the distinguished Astronomer-Royal, born in 1734, was descended, but there is no identification of this Chevalier Maskelyne with that family. The name Hénquelty has been spelt in various ways—Héguerty, Heguetty, Heguelly, etc. Above all, who was Lord Harnouester?

It must be admitted that Frenchmen—indeed, Continental writers generally—are not renowned for orthographical accuracy. By them Charles Radcliffe is invariably styled “Dervent-Waters,” even M. de St. Simon continually calls the eldest son of John Dalrymple, created Viscount Stair by William III, “Mi-lord Flairs.” The editor of the private reprint of Heutzner, on that writer’s tradition respecting “the Kings of Denmark who reigned in England,” buried in the Temple Church, metamorphosed the two Inns of Court, Gray’s Inn and Lincoln’s Inn, into the names of the Danish Kings, *Gresin* and *Lyconin*. Erroneous proper names of places occur continually in early writers, particularly French ones. There are some in Froissart that cannot be at all understood. Bassompierre is equally erroneous. *Jorchaux* is intended by him for York House; and, more wonderful still, *Inhimthort* proves by the context to be Kensington! (Disraeli, *Curiosities of Literature*, ed. 1859, vol. i, p. 327). But can the utmost ingenuity convert Harnouester into the similitude of any name known to the English peerage? The only satisfactory hypothesis is that, previously to 1738, there existed in Paris one and, in the Departments, two regularly constituted Lodges, besides several others more or less irregular and that the fashion had, probably, been set in the first instance by refugees at the court of the Pretender and by other English visitors to the capital. Whether these Scottish names were not an afterthought, consequent on the rage for what is termed Scots Masonry which arose in 1740, or whether they really played an important part in the early days of the Craft in France must be left undecided.

We first appear to touch really solid ground in 1738, when the Duc d’Antin, a peer of France, said to have been initiated by the Duke of Richmond at Aubigny in 1737, was elected Grand Master *ad vitam* of French Freemasonry. That, from this moment, French Freemasonry, as such, distinct from the English Lodges warranted in France, was recognized as existing, may be gathered from Anderson’s *Constitutions* of 1738 (p. 196).

All these foreign Lodges are under the patronage of our Grand Master of England, but the old Lodge at York City and the Lodges of Scotland, Ireland, France and Italy affecting independency, are under their own Grand Masters; though they have the same Constitutions, Charges, Regulations, etc., for substance, with their brethren of England.

This also tends incidentally to prove that up to this date French innovations on the rite of Masonry had not made themselves known. There is no authentic record that the Grand Lodge of England or any Grand Master of England ever granted a Warrant, Deputation, Dispensation, or Authority for the establishment of a Provincial Grand Master or Grand Lodge of France. Mackey in his *Revised History of Freemasonry* (Clegg’s edition, p. 1266), says:

It has been very plausibly urged that the granting of such a Deputation to the titular Earl of Derwentwater would have been a political impossibility. He was a convicted disloyalist to the English Government and his execution had only been averted in 1715 by his escape from prison.

In opposition to this Rebold (*Histoire des trois Grandes Loges*, p. 44) says :

Lord Derwentwater, who, in 1725, received from the Grand Lodge at London full power to constitute Lodges in France, was, in 1735, invested by the same Grand Lodge with the functions of Provincial Grand Master. When he quitted France to return to England, where soon after he perished on the scaffold, a victim to his attachment to the Stuarts, he transferred the full power which he possessed to his friend, Lord Harnouester, whom he appointed as the representative during his absence, of his office of Provincial Grand Master.

Thory says that Derwentwater was chosen Grand Master by the Brethren at the time of the introduction of Freemasonry into Paris, whilst Lalande (*Encyclopédie*) says that, as the first Paris Lodge had been opened by Lord Derwentwater, he was regarded as the Grand Master and so continued until his return to England, without any formal recognition on the part of the Brethren.

In 1743 d'Antin died and, on December 11, 1743, sixteen Masters of Paris Lodges elected as his successor Prince Louis de Bourbon, Count de Clermont. The country Lodges accepted the nomination. Of the chief fact—Clermont's election—there can be no doubt; the other statements are on the authority of a Grand Orient publication of 1777. Admitting them, we arrive at the probable number of Lodges in Paris and at the conclusion that Grand Lodge consisted only of the Paris Masters and that the Provinces were not represented in the governing body. But, whilst the Grand Orient in 1777 thus lays claim to only sixteen Lodges, Lalande in 1773 had referred to twenty-one. Perhaps five were not represented? Meanwhile the new Society had awakened the suspicions of the police under Louis XV who, in 1737, ordered his courtiers, under threat of the Bastille, to abstain from joining it. The meetings of English Masons resident in Paris appear to have been tolerated, but the police sought to prevent Frenchmen from joining. The same year Chapelot—an innkeeper—was severely fined for receiving a Lodge on his premises. On December 27, 1738, the Lieutenant-General of Police, Hérault, dispersed an assembly in the Rue des Deux Ecus (*Acta Latomorum*, vol. i, p. 38) and really did imprison some of the members for a time. His machinations with the opera danseuse Carton in the same year and the consequent issue of the *Rélation Apologique*, are well known. All this did not prevent the Count de Clermont from accepting the Grand Mastership; nor did his acceptance prevent the police interdicting Masonry once more in 1744 and, in 1745, descending on the Hôtel de Soissons, seizing the Lodge furniture and fining the proprietor, Leroy, heavily. This seems to have been the last act of the French authorities against Freemasonry. Findel, quoting Lalande, says that

at first only the nobles solicited and obtained admittance into the Lodges and, as long as this was the case, Freemasonry remained unmolested ; but, when the middle classes began to take an interest in it and the Lodges were gradually formed of less immaculate materials, the expediency of suppressing them altogether began to be debated. Louis XV, urged thereto, it is alleged, by his Father Confessor and his mistress, published an edict in 1737, in which he declared that, as the inviolable secrets of the Masons might cover some dreadful design, he prohibited all his loyal subjects from holding any intercourse with them. All Freemasons belonging to the nobility were forbidden to appear at Court. But, instead of being discouraged by this prohibition, curiosity was only the more awakened. Lodges were assembled in secret and the number of candidates for initiation increased daily. The wealthy Englishmen resident in Paris warmly defended the cause, nor could they easily be intimidated. One of them had the temerity boldly to announce publicly that a Lodge would meet for the purpose of electing a Grand Master.

Findel also says that Hérault published the Ritual which was found among the confiscated papers.

The Bull issued by Pope Clement XII in 1738 was non-effective in France, it not being published in that country ; nor was that issued a few years later by Pope Benedict XIV. One of the results of the Bull, however, was the formation of the Society known as the Mopses, whose customs are described in *L'Ordre des Francs-maçons trahi*. This Society is said to have originated in Germany in order to take the place of the Masonic Order among Catholics, who composed the membership. Instead of an oath, the word of honour was taken and several of the Princes of the German Empire became Grand Masters of the Society, into which women were admitted as members.

During the period just sketched, it has always been maintained that Ramsay introduced a Rite of five Degrees between 1736-8, called the Rite de Ramsay or de Bouillon. Beyond mere assertions, echoes of Thory, there is not the slightest evidence that a Rite de Ramsay ever existed. The appellation is a comparatively modern one, not being heard of until Thory invented it. Nevertheless, about 1740, various Rites or Degrees of what has been called Scots Masonry did spring into existence, followed shortly afterwards by Scots Mother-Lodges controlling systems of subordinate Scots Lodges. At first all these had reference to the recovery of the lost word, but before long additions were made. In 1743 the Masons of Lyons invented the Kadosh Degree, comprising the vengeance of the Templars and thus laid the foundation for all the Templar rites. It was at first called Junior Elect ; but developed into Elect of 9 or of Perignan, Elect of 15, Illustrious Master, Knight of Aurora, Grand Inquisitor, Grand Elect, Commander of the Temple, etc. 1751 is given as the date of the Lodge St. John of Scotland, subsequently Mother-Lodge of Marseilles and Mother Scots Lodge of France ; 1754 as that of the establishment of the Chapter of Clermont ; 1754 of Martinez Paschalis's Elect Coëns, etc. These dates may not be altogether accurate, but that they are sufficiently so is probable. Three works (*Le Secret des Francs-maçons*, Pérau, Geneva, 1742 ; *L'Ordre de Francs-maçons trahi*, Amsterdam, 1745 ; and *Catéchisme des Francs-maçons*, Leonard Gabanon



Comte de Clermont.

Grand Master of the Grand Orient of France from 1743 to his death in 1770.

(Travenol, Paris) à Jerusalem, 1744. Cf. Kloss, *Bibliog.*, Nos. 1848, 1850, and 1851) of 1742-5 make no mention of anything beyond the Master's Degree, but the *Sceau Rompu* of 1745 alludes to the connexion with the Knightly orders, as do Travenol's further editions of his *Catéchisme* in 1747 and 1749. *Le parfait Maçon ou les véritables Secrets des quatre grades d'Apprentis, Compagnons, Maîtres ordinaires et Écossais*, etc., of 1744 professes to expose a Scots Degree, speaks of there being six or seven such and says that "this variation of Freemasonry is beginning to find favour in France"; and the *Franc Maçonne* of 1744 reproaches the majority of the Paris Masters with not knowing that Freemasonry consists of seven Degrees. Article 20 of the *Rules and Regulations of the Grand Lodge*, dated December 11, 1743, reads :

As it appears that lately some Brothers announce themselves as Scots Masters, claiming prerogatives in private Lodges and asserting privileges of which no traces are to be found in the archives and usages of the Lodges spread over the globe, the Grand Lodge, in order to cement the unity and harmony which should reign amongst Freemasons, has decreed that these Scots Masters, unless they are Officers of Grand Lodge or of a private Lodge, shall not be more highly considered by the Brothers than the other apprentices and fellows and shall wear no sign of distinction whatever.

It was possibly on account of the intrigues of these so-called Scots Masons that Clermont's Grand Lodge in 1743, according to Thory, took the title of Grande Loge Anglaise de France. Thory, for his own purposes, has chosen to consider that the title implied a connexion with England, a sort of Provincial Grand Lodge for France. Anderson, in 1738, acknowledged that the independent authority of the Grand Master of French Freemasonry was recognized in England. As a member of the High Degrees, Clermont naturally felt disinclined to see in the title either a protest against innovation, or a disclaimer of any connexion with the Scots Masters; but, in order to support his assertions, he has been disingenuous enough to invent an alleged correspondence with England, of which not a trace exists.

He belonged to the royal family of Orleans and was the uncle of the Duke of Chartres, afterwards Duke of Orleans, the father of Louis Philippe, the popular King of France.

Louis de Bourbon, Count de Clermont, was born in 1709 and entered the Church, but, in 1733, joined the army—the Pope granting a special dispensation and allowing him to retain his clerical emoluments—succeeded Marshal Richelieu as commander, but got soundly thrashed by Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick at Crefeld in July 1757, left the army, retired from court, applied himself to science and works of benevolence and died June 15, 1771 (*Allgemeines Handbuch*).

Although elected Grand Master in 1743, it was not until 1747 that he succeeded in obtaining the royal permission to preside, even then he appears to have taken no great interest in the affairs of the Craft. Under his rule a state of confusion and mismanagement arose. Thory attributes it chiefly to the low character of his Deputies, as well as to the irremovability of the Masters of Lodges; Kloss and

Rebald to the factions and strife of the different systems of High Degrees ; others to the neglect of the rulers ; and many of the exposures to all these causes, combined with the negligence shown in admitting men of worthless character to the privileges of the Society. Almost the only clue we possess in this labyrinth is the already cited *Mémoire Justificatif* of Brest-de-la-Chaussée in his quarrel with Labady. Unfortunately no copy is procurable.

Taking these allegations in their order, let us first inquire into the personality of the Deputies of the Grand Master and of a later class of officials called Substitutes. Thory and, following him, all French writers, knew of only one Deputy, the banker Bauer, appointed in 1745. But Kloss shows clearly enough that two others, La Cour and Le Dran, had previously filled the office, so that it was probably an annual appointment. We also hear of another called Daché. Bauer is charged with having neglected his duties ; but, if the office was only held for one year, his neglect could not have been of vital importance. In 1761 it would appear that the office no longer existed, having given place to that of Substitute. Clermont's Substitut Particulier was Lacorne, a dancing master. This wretched person has been burthened with the sins of many other people. La Chaussée refers to him merely as having assisted the Duke at some initiations and speaks of him as an amiable man. Thory (*Acta Latomorum*, vol. i, p. 78 and *Annales Originis*, p. 20), on his own authority, improves upon this. He declares that Lacorne's amiability extended so far as to assist Clermont in his amorous intrigues, which procured him his post of Substitut Particulier ; that he surrounded himself with all the lowest characters in Masonry, out of whom he composed the Grand Lodge ; that all the better members retired, setting up a rival Grand Lodge in 1761 ; that the split was only healed on June 24, 1762, by revoking Lacorne's appointment in favour of Chaillou de Jonville as Substitut General. It is probable that at this epoch there were two bodies claiming to be *the* Grand Lodge for a few months, but the facts are evidently distorted, as the signatures to Morin's patent in 1761 will sufficiently attest. We there find Lacorne associating intimately with the *élite* of the Craft—the Prince de Rohan, Chaillon de Jonville (Master of the Premier Lodge of France), Count Choiseul, etc. and that the assembly of the Emperors is called at Lacorne's request. This does not look as if he were a despicable pandar, nor as if his associates were the dregs of Masonry. Brest-de-la-Chaussée, who was a co-signatory of the same document, makes no such charge against him. As to Lacorne's being deposed in favour of Jonville, that very patent records their signatures side by side—each with his well-known title of Substitute-General and Substitute-Particular. It is evident, therefore, that one office was not merged in the other, but that they were co-existent.

Another charge is, that the Lodges were proprietary, presided over by irremovable Masters who had bought their patents and, in order to make a profit out of them, initiated every applicant, however unworthy. That this may have happened in some few cases, especially where the Master was an innkeeper, cannot be denied ; the taunts of some of the contemporary so-called exposures would almost imply as much ; but, considering how many high names were enrolled in the Craft at

this period, it cannot be imagined that the evil was of intolerable extent. Thory maintains that from the very first, Patents of Constitution were made proprietary, but Lalande says that, in 1738, the Masters were elected quarterly. Nevertheless, irremovable Masters did exist at the period we are considering and there is proof of their existence as early as 1742, i.e. before Clermont's time. Lalande again gives the reason. Grand Lodge was composed of the Paris Masters only, not the Provincial and, to avoid the effect of inexperienced Masters assuming the rule of the Craft, the Paris Masters were made such *ad vitam*. That this agrees with facts, so far as they are known, may be inferred from the Minutes of the Versailles (a Provincial) Lodge which elected its W.M. yearly (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 47). In view of the questions arising out of Morin's patent, it is well to note that this Lodge calls the Grand Lodge "The Grand Lodge of St. John at Paris." The statutes of the Grand Lodge of 1755 ordain, in Article 29, that the Master shall be elected annually on St. John the Baptist's Day. But, although Masters *ad vitam* doubtless existed, even in considerable numbers, there is no proof that the Lodges were proprietary, nor would such a state of matters have conduced to the prosperity of the Grand Lodge funds. The perpetual Masters, say a few of them who were innkeepers, may have had a bad effect upon the status of the Craft in general, but it is scarcely possible to connect them with the dissensions in Grand Lodge. Kloss has furnished the true reason in the strife of rival high-grade systems and Rebold, Findel and Jouast were perfectly justified in accepting his conclusions.

Studying the history of the Grand Lodge chronologically, the facts appear to be as follow. In 1754 the Chapter of Clermont was established and granted supplementary Degrees, being joined chiefly by the *élite* of the Craft. In 1755 Grand Lodge revised its statutes and dropped the title of English which it had hitherto borne, possibly in deference to the wishes of its members, many of whom belonged to the Clermont Chapter and all were probably admitted to some of the various Scots Degrees. No copy of these statutes is to be found in France, but Kloss was enabled to use a magnificently illuminated edition belonging to a Frankfort Lodge. (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 28. Published in full with translation, in *The Freemason*, June and July 1885, by G. W. Speth, from a certified copy of the original manuscript. Cf. also the letters on the subject in previous numbers of *The Freemason*, beginning January 17, 1885, between Speth and the Rev. A. F. A. Woodford, who combats the views entertained by Speth.)

They are headed, *Status dressés par la Resp. L. St. Jean de Jerusalem de l'Orient de Paris gouvernée par le très haut et très puissant Seigneur Louis de Bourbon, Comte de Clermont, Prince du Sang, Grand Maître de toutes les Loges régulières de France, pour servir de Règlement à toutes celles du Royaume*. They consist of forty-four articles, and conclude thus :

Given at Paris, in a Lodge specially summoned for the purpose and regularly held between square and compass, in the presence of 60 Brothers, Masters and Wardens. In the year of the Great Light 5755, on July 4, of the vulgar era 1755.

Attached is the "mysterious seal of the Scots Lodge," in red wax with gold and sky blue thread; signed, Louis de Bourbon. Articles 1, 2 and 3 contain the Mason's duty to God, his sovereign and the civil authorities. Article 4 preaches the equality of rich and poor. Articles 5 and 11 describe the moral requisites of a Mason. Article 13 gives the age of a candidate as twenty-five—a Lewis may be made and passed before that age, but not raised. Article 19 provides that the Master on the day of St. John Baptist shall fix the dates of the twelve ensuing monthly meetings. Article 21 provides for the relief of applicants of all nations. Article 23, "Only the Master of the Lodge and the Scots Masters are permitted to remain covered," etc. Article 29 enacts that the Lodge is to attend Mass on St. John's Day, elect its Master, who shall appoint the officers, etc. Article 33 refers to the governing body as Grande Loge de France, omitting the word Anglaise. It therefore becomes evident that the Grand, like every private Lodge, possessed a title and that it was St. John of Jerusalem—an echo possibly of Ramsay's discourse. Article 42 is important:

The Scots Masters are to superintend the work. They alone can censure faults. They are always at liberty to speak (*prendre la parole*), to be always armed and covered and, if they fall into error, can only be impeached by the Scots Masters.

That there must have been a powerful high-grade influence at work in Grand Lodge can no longer be doubted, but it must not therefore be imagined that Grand Lodge worked the so-called High Degrees; this was doubtless done by the same individuals, but in another capacity and in Chapter.

In 1756 the Knights of the East were established, consisting principally of the middle class, in rivalry of the Chapter of Clermont and the two organizations probably intrigued for the direction of Grand Lodge, the triennial election of Grand Officers forming, of course, the chief ground of battle.

In 1758 arose the Sovereign Council of the Emperors of the East and West. This was probably only a development of the Clermont Chapter and very likely possessed a preponderating influence in Grand Lodge, as we know that both the Substitute-General and the Substitute-Particular were members of the Council. It bestowed Warrants for the Lodges of the Higher Degrees, nominated Grand Inspectors and Deputies for the furtherance of the so-called "Perfect and Sublime Masonry" throughout Europe and organized, in the interior of France," several special Councils, such, for example, as the Conseil des Princes du Royal Secret at Bordeaux.

1761.—The Lodge was divided into two camps, each arrogating to itself the authority of Grand Lodge, but Thory goes beyond the truth in his statement, that Lacorne withdrew with a rabble and set up a Grand Lodge of his own. In this year, indeed, the faction (or Grand Lodge) headed by Lacorne and Jonville, held a joint meeting with the Emperors, which resulted in the grant to Morin of his famous patent.

1762.—Owing to a quarrel, the College de Valois, the governing body of the Knights, was dissolved and a Sovereign Council of the Rite took its place.

The triennial election of Grand Officers took place June 24. A compromise having been effected between the rival camps, each faction ensured the election of some of its members. There not being room for all, Lacorne was unprovided for. As to his removal by the Count de Clermont, it rests only on Thòry's assertion. As an indication of the probable innocence of Lacorne, it is a curious fact that the only mention of his name in any documentary evidence which has been handed down, occurs in his own signature to Morin's patent. Nothing whatever of his official career as a Mason is known and from that moment he entirely disappears from the scene. The two momentarily separated Grand Lodges now only formed one.

1765.—At the next election, it would appear as if the battle had been fought out to the end and that the Emperors had secured almost all the offices. This gave rise to violent debates and recriminations, both in Lodge and in print, which ultimately became unendurable. As a consequence the most violent were banished ; they appear to have belonged some to one faction, some to another. But the Emperors must always have had a great support in Brest-de-la-Chaussée, the Grand Keeper of the Seals and Chaillou de Jonville, the Substitute-General. Among the exiles may be mentioned Daubertin, the former secretary of the Emperors and Labady, Chaussée's subsequent enemy.

On August 14, 1766, to put an end (if possible) to all strife, the Grand Lodge issued a circular forbidding its Lodges to have anything to do with any High Grades whatsoever. It is probable that this was the result of another battle royal. That the Knights had been thoroughly worsted may be gathered from the fact that on October 2, 1766, Gaillard, the Grand Orator, moved and carried that the decree be repealed and insisted upon the necessity of incorporation with the Council of the Emperors. The proposal was placed before the private Lodges by circular for their consideration. The Knights retaliated by a circular denouncing all Templar degrees ; they themselves not working any of that description.

On February 4, 1767, the Knights made a last effort in Grand Lodge and this time came to blows. Labady, who had been expelled, afterwards declared before a committee of the Grand Orient, August 13, 1773, that he had been present at this meeting and had engaged in a personal quarrel. From which it appears probable, as before stated, that the excluded Brethren entered Grand Lodge by force and were expelled by the stronger party.

The report of these occurrences having reached the ear of the King, a decree of State was laid before Grand Lodge on February 21, 1767, ordering it to cease to meet. Freemasonry itself, however, was laid under no ban, but the dissolution of Grand Lodge made the governance of the Craft very difficult and, of course, prevented the proposed amalgamation with the Emperors. The direction of affairs remained in the hands of Jonville and Chaussée and it is the latter's conduct during the interval that was afterwards impugned by Labady, who, on his side, formed a Grand Lodge of his own and entered into correspondence with the Provincial Lodges ; but Chaussée, who, of course, kept possession of the seals, etc., issued

a circular giving the names of the excluded Brethren and so prevented his doing much mischief. In this way the strife was continued and, in spite of the dissolution of Grand Lodge, new Lodges were chartered, the Warrants being antedated by Chaussée (see Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 78-120).

On June 15, 1771, the Grand Master, the Count de Clermont, died. As his death was followed by the establishment of two new and rival Grand bodies, neither of which can exactly claim to be the successor of his Grand Lodge, its history may be considered closed at this point. Rebold asserts that from 1743 to 1772 it had constituted over 300 Lodges in all and has rescued the names and dates of seventy-four, of which he gives a list (*Histoire des trois Grandes Loges*, pp. 53-5).

One curious fact remains to be mentioned before we proceed to the establishment of the Grand Orient of France. The following is an extract from the English *Book of Constitutions* :

January 27, 1768.—The Grand Master informed the Brethren that two letters had been received from the Grand Lodge of France expressing a desire of opening a correspondence with the Grand Lodge of England; and the said letters being read, Resolved, that a mutual correspondence be kept up and that a *Book of Constitutions*, a list of Lodges and a form of a deputation, bound in an elegant manner, be presented to the Grand Lodge of France.

As the original Grand Lodge of France had ceased to exist legally for over a year, it would be interesting to know from which Grand Lodge these letters came, whether from Jonville or from Labady and, above all, to whom the answer was directed and how its arrival was ensured. Apparently the English rulers knew nothing whatever of French Freemasonry and took it all as a matter of course; but as will presently be shown, the English Grand Lodge was never kept *au courant* of passing affairs and, in consequence, on more than one occasion, acted outrageously towards its own most faithful Continental daughters. This official recognition of the Grand Lodge of France did not apparently entail any acknowledgment of its sole sovereignty. In 1767 England had constituted the English Lodge at Bordeaux, according to seniority from 1732 and the Lodge Sageesse at Havre and, in 1767, one at Grenoble. Subsequently to the receipt of the letters it warranted in 1772 the Lodge Candour at Strasburg (which, in 1774, became the seat of government of the Province of Burgundy under the Strict Observance) and, in 1785, the Parfaite Amitié at Avignon Languedoc. None of these Lodges was carried forward on the roll of the United Grand Lodge of England in 1813; and those at the Louis d'Argent and at Aubigny were erased on the same day that the letters from France were received, because they had either "ceased to meet or had neglected to conform to the laws of the Society."

The death of the Count de Clermont was the signal for momentous events. His influence at court had long been nil; if, therefore, he could be replaced by someone of more power, the Grand Lodge might again be allowed to meet. This really took place and the new Grand Lodge thereafter immediately split into two rival

Grand Lodges. Up to the present it has been necessary to pick the way to a great extent between conflicting traditions but, in describing approaching events, a choice must be made between diametrically opposite views based on documentary evidence, of which a great quantity exists. No point of Masonic history has given rise to greater bitterness and recrimination than the foundation of the Grand Orient. It has been variously maintained that it was a base scheme of the Brethren exiled in 1765, to revenge themselves on the former Grand Lodge; that it was the work of a rabble of no standing; that it was a deeply laid device of Montmorency; that it was brought about by the High Degrees; that it was a usurpation of the Provinces; that it was un-Masonic and illegal; and that it was a conspiracy of the Commissioners of Grand Lodge—together with other accusations equally diverse and imaginary. Exigencies of space prevent these allegations being brought before the bar of history, or dwelling upon them in any way. They are all the fruits of a marked enmity to the Grand Orient; the example was set by Thory. That writer, like all the others, can only make a lame attempt to prove his charges by tampering with documentary evidence, or by wholesale suppression and perversion. There follows, therefore, a bare recital of events in chronological sequence, further details of which can be seen in Kloss's *History of French Freemasonry*, vol. i, pp. 121-86 and in the pages of Jouast. The strife between De-la-Chaussée and Labady—so frequently alluded to—is interwoven with these proceedings and contributed, possibly, not a little to the ultimate results.

In the first place it will be well to cite the names of the exiled Brethren, viz. *Perrault, *Pethe, *Pény, Hardy, Duret, Guillot, *Daubertin, *Guillet, *Lacan, Bigarré, Morinand *Labady. Of these, Daubertin and Labady were certainly members the Council of the Emperors and, possibly, also some of the others, though this is uncertain and they all appear to have held the status of simple citizens. The seven whose names are marked with an asterisk were Masters *ad vitam* of Paris Lodges and Guillot was a Paris Master, but whether elected or irremovable cannot be ascertained.

From subsequent statements of De-la-Chaussée and the Duke of Montmorency, we learn that the latter had already been preferred to high office under the Count de Clermont, who had appointed him Substitute, in which capacity he had initiated the Duke of Chartres in his own Lodge. The date of this initiation is nowhere stated.

Tradition has it, that immediately on the death of Clermont—June 15, 1771—the exiles communicated with Anne Charles Sigismond, Duke of Montmorency-Luxemburg and, through him, induced Louis Philippe Joseph, Duke of Chartres—from 1787 Duke of Orleans, a Prince of the blood Royal, father of Louis Philippe, born April 13, 1747, guillotined as Citizen Egalité, November 6, 1793—to declare that if he were elected he would accept the post of Grand Master. In view of the social position of the exiles, we may perhaps inquire with Kloss whether the Duke of Luxemburg did not act on his own initiative and simply communicate the result through these Brethren. But this is a matter of small moment!

1771—*June 21.*—Six days after Clermont's death a meeting was held of the Paris Masters, who then and there resolved to revive the Communications of Grand Lodge. As the Grand Lodge consisted of the Paris Masters only, they were doubtless within their rights. At whose suggestion the Lodge was convoked is not clear, but it was summoned and very properly, according to Masonic usage, presided over by De Puisieux (initiated December 15, 1729), assisted by L'éveillé and Le Lorrain, the three Senior Masters of Lodges present. As the assembly was proceeding to elect a new Master, the exiles were announced and admitted. They demanded restitution of their rights, throwing the blame of past events on Zambault, Grand Secretary, then deceased. They retired and the Grand Lodge agreed not to go into the matter too closely, out of respect for Zambault's memory, but hinted that this Brother's conduct in other respects tended to justify the charge. The exiles were readmitted and received with open arms and the kiss of peace. One of them, Duret, then announced the glorious news that through their efforts the Dukes of Chartres and Luxemburg had consented to accept the offices of Grand Master and Substitute-General respectively. In order not to waste time, it was decided not to consult the Provinces—*pro hac vice*—and the election was fixed for June 24. A committee was then appointed to verify De-la-Chaussée's acts during the interregnum. These were Martin, Pirlet, Leroy, Daubertin, Bourgeois, Sec.-Gen.; Duret, Le Lorrain, Lescombart, Bruneteau, Guillot and Labady, four of whom were former exiles. Although the reinstatement of the exiles was accomplished on this day, it was not placed on the Minutes before October 17, possibly because this meeting of the Grand Lodge was considered informal.

1771—*June 24.*—Grand Lodge. Unanimous election of the two Dukes; appointment of a deputation to the Duc de Chartres to acquaint him thereof and to pray his acceptance of office. The deputation consisted of Pény, Duret, L'Eveillé, Guillot, Daubertin and Bruneteau—with the exception of L'Eveillé and Bruneteau—all former exiles. The Duc de Chartres showed no great anxiety to take over the duties of his office and, from 1771 to 1778, the Duke of Luxemburg, who soon assumed the title of General Administrator, was, in all but the name, the real Grand Master.

August 14.—Grand Lodge. Approbation of revised Statutes in 53 and 41 Articles. Legend on seal, Grande Loge des Maîtres de l'Orient de Paris. "Art. 1. G. Lodge is composed of the Masters of all regularly constituted Lodges." It will be observed that there is here the first step in a very salutary reform. Article 3 gives Wardens a consultative voice in Grand Lodge, but no vote. Article 5 ordains that the twenty-seven Grand Officers be elected from the Paris Masters only. These Grand Officers formed the Loge de Conseil or Managing Board. Article 8. The Loge de Conseil to meet monthly.

October 17.—Circular of Grand Lodge announcing past events and calling upon the Lodges in the Provinces to appoint Deputies to attend the installation of the Grand Master at a date to be subsequently decided. It gives a list of the Grand Officers, of whom may be named as important for our researches, Daubertin,

Secretary-General ; Guillot, Treasurer ; Duret, Warden of the Seals ; Labady, Secretary for the Provinces ; Bigarré, 2nd Expert ; Maurin, Assistant Secretary for the Provinces. So that of twenty-four officials six belonged to the exiled party.

1772—*January 29*.—Committee reported on De-la-Chaussée's acts during the interregnum. Labady, among others, signed "of his own free will and accord" and all was pronounced in order, showing a balance of 201 *livres*, 16 *sols*, against De-la-Chaussée, who was granted an Honorary Diploma as Past Grand Warden of the Seals.

April 5.—Chartres signs a document, wherein he says that in view of the resolution passed in Grand Lodge June 24, 1771 and in the Sovereign Council of the Emperors, August 26, 1771, he has accepted the offices of Grand Master of all regular Lodges in France and Sovereign Grand Master of all Councils, Chapters and Scots Lodges of the Grand Globe of France. This last phrase was the newest title of the organization of the Emperors.

April 18.—Grand Lodge. The Duke of Luxemburg is congratulated on the birth of a son and proposes that the Lodge St. Jean de Montmorency-Luxemburg, in which the Grand Master had received initiation, shall be made members of Grand Lodge. Agreed that they shall all have seats and votes in Grand Lodge and that three in turn shall sit and vote in the Loge de Conseil. These Brothers were all members of the nobility and thus helped to weaken the majority in Grand Lodge, composed of Parisian perpetual Masters. Labady, as Secretary for the Provinces, then reported on the state of the Lodges and reviewed the past legislation from 1765. The speech is lost, but it contained a malicious impeachment of De-la-Chaussée and was the immediate cause of the *Mémoire Justificatif*. It will be remembered that, during the interregnum, Chaussée officiated for the Grand Lodge and that Labady attempted to set up a Grand Lodge of his own. The embittered personal quarrel which ensued is sad to contemplate but, perhaps, not unnatural. Labady had on February 29 thoroughly approved De-la-Chaussée's acts, so that his conduct was inconsistent, to say the least. The Grand Master's manifesto of April 5 was read to and approved by Grand Lodge.

1772—*July*.—Circular to all Lodges reporting past events and preparing their Deputies to receive an invitation for the installation in November or December.

July 26.—Meeting of the Emperors of the East and West, Sublime Scots Lodge, President, the Duke of Luxemburg. The Grand Orator Gaillard, Secretary-General Labady, Baron Toussaint and De Lalande were appointed a Deputation to Grand Lodge to renew proposals of fusion made October 2, 1766.

August 9.—Grand Lodge. President, Puisieux. Appeared the Deputation of the Emperors. Gaillard submitted the proposal, Bruneteau, Grand Orator of Grand Lodge, replied. It was

unanimously and irrevocably decided that the Supreme Council of the Emperors of the East and West—Sublime Mother Scots Lodge—shall be, and from this moment is, united to the very respectable G.L. to constitute with it one sole and

inseparable body, uniting all Masonic knowledge and legislative power over all the Degrees of Masonry under the title of Sovereign and very respectable Grand Lodge of France.

The Commissioners of the Emperors had been empowered to request the appointment of Grand Lodge Commissioners and, with them, to revise the Statutes, the revision to be approved of at a joint meeting of the two bodies. The Grand Lodge appointed their Grand Secretary, Daubertin—himself an Emperor and a signatory of Morin's patent—Bruneteau, Lacan and Boulainvilliers. These are the eight commissioners who were afterwards accused of treachery to Grand Lodge. It will be observed that Labady, Daubertin and Lacan were old exiles.

August 29.—Grand Lodge. The Commissioners receive extra instructions. I. They are to obtain audience of the Administrator-General and request him to represent to Grand Lodge the possible inconvenience of his accepting the Presidency of other Councils, Chapters, etc. III. To circulate such representation, when obtained, amongst the Lodges. IV. They are enjoined to occupy themselves at once with the preparation of the necessary reform of the abuses which had crept into the Craft. The other instructions may be omitted. It will be observed that No. IV gives them very wide powers indeed.

September 4.—Luxemburg declares that, although he had accepted the Presidency of the Lodge of the Knights of the East [erected March 7, 1771], Grand Lodge may be assured that he will never acknowledge any foreign body as independent of it and that, in this particular case, he will never allow said Lodge any special jurisdiction, etc., etc. From this it would appear that the Knights of the East were then so reduced in number as to consist of no more than one Lodge, that only lately re-established. He also informed Grand Lodge that the Grand Master had fixed December 8 for his installation and ordered that all Parisian and Provincial Lodges be informed of the fact; that they be requested to accredit Deputies for the festival; that they be further informed Commissioners would then be appointed to examine the proposed new statutes.

1772—*September 12.*—A circular to the above effect was sent to all the Lodges.

September 17.—Circular signed by seven of the eight Commissioners, Lalande failing to sign. After describing the disorders produced by so many independent Chapters all claiming a supremacy over Grand Lodge, it continues :

The Grand Lodge is occupied with the means of meeting this evil. . . . Since it resumed work its first care has been devoted to this subject, . . . and it has united with the Sovereign Council of the Emperors, etc., to form one sole body, etc., etc.; . . . further, it intends to examine all Grades, to bring them back to their original form and to indicate their rank. We have been specially instructed to make the necessary preparations. . . . We flatter ourselves you will help us by forwarding your views upon the administration in general, etc.

October 9.—Grand Lodge. Labady *v.* De-la-Chaussée. Resolved by 30 to 15 as follows : I. All titles conferred by Chaussée during the interregnum, except-

ing that of W.M., are declared *nul*. II. Chaussée is within fourteen days to deliver to Grand Lodge all documents in his possession. III. He is to refund to the Treasurer, according to his own proposal, 336 livres. V. He is to pay the Tyler 6 livres for unintentionally accusing Boucher de Lenoncourt of having been excluded from Grand Lodge. VI. Chaussée is acquitted of all other faults imputed to him in Labady's essay. De-la-Chaussée was, apparently, not satisfied, for, on March 9 following, appeared his *Mémoire Justificatif*.

November 16.—Circular postponing the installation. Several Deputies returned to the Provinces, the greater number, however, remaining in Paris to participate in the work of the Commissioners.

December 10.—Last meeting of the revived Grand Lodge. None was subsequently called under the pretence of superior orders. As a matter of fact the decree against the meeting of Grand Lodge had never been revoked.

December 24.—The old Grand Lodge of France was declared to have ceased to exist.

1773—March 5.—Meeting at the Hôtel de Chaulnes, the residence of the Duke of Luxemburg, between the eight Commissioners and the Deputies of Provincial Lodges. Jouast gives the list of these Deputies; including the Duke of Luxemburg and the Grand Officers they number ninety-six and, for the most part, were men of high position or attainments. Nor were they all Provincials. Either as Grand Officers or Provincial Deputies, the Paris Masters were represented by Bodson, Bruneteau, Daubertin, Baron Clauzels, Gaillard, Gouillard, Guillot, Labady—alone the proxy of twenty-seven Lodges in the Provinces—Lacan, Lafin, De Lalande, the Abbé Boulainvilliers and others. But it will, of course, be seen that the Parisians were in a minority for the first time in French Freemasonry. Nothing was decided at this meeting, but the first two chapters of the new Constitutions were read.

March 8.—Meeting of the Provincials only. The election of June 24, 1771, by the Paris Masters was confirmed amid acclamation. Count Buzençois de Luxemburg, Bacon de la Chevalerie and Richard de Bégnicourt were elected to form with three Paris Masters (Baron Toussaint, De Lalande, and Bruneteau), a Deputation to inform the Dukes of the confirmation. Resolved to join the deliberations of the Paris Brethren respecting the welfare of the Order.

March 9.—Meeting of Commissioners and Provincial Deputies. President, Luxemburg. The sole and unique tribunal of the Order was proclaimed with the title of "National Grand Lodge of France," exercising in the greatest amplitude the supreme power of the Order. The first two chapters of the new Constitutions were accepted, subject to definition. A committee of definition was appointed, consisting of Buzençois, B. de la Chevalerie, Chev. Champeau, R. de Bégnicourt, De Bauclas, Morin, Toussaint, De Lalande and Bruneteau, the four latter being Paris Masters. Chaussée's *Mémoire*, which had recently appeared, was brought to the notice of the meeting. A Judicial Committee was appointed to take it into consideration, revise the decision of October 9, 1772 and adjudicate in the matter,

their judgment to be without appeal, to be made known to all the Lodges and Chaussée to refrain from further publishing his *Mémoire*. Hence the scarcity of that valuable document. The Committee consisted in great part of the same members as the committee of definition; only to avoid any chance of partiality, the Paris Masters were replaced by Provincials. President, De Bauclas; members, Count Buzençois, Bégnicourt, Abbé Roziers, Guillotin, Furcy, Varenne de Béost, Mariette de Castaing. They received their written authority the next day, Pyron was added to the number as Secretary, Carbonnel as a member of the former Committee, but in each case without a vote.

March 19.—Labady demanded permission to print his defence and offered to accept a coadjutor in his office of Secretary for the Provinces. The first request was denied and he was relieved of his appointment during inquiries. Bégnicourt, Castaing and Buzençois, being on the point of leaving Paris, were replaced by Lamarque l'Americain of St. Domingo, Lucadon and the Abbé Jossot. This Commission sat seventeen times.

The last meeting of the Commissioners and Provincial Deputies had taken place on March 9. It was probably felt that the former could scarcely be considered to represent Grand Lodge in arriving at a decision, as their duty was merely to prepare a scheme; but that the Provincial Lodges being represented by Deputies, the Paris Masters should follow suit. Whether that was the reason or not, a long interval occurred and, during the delay, twenty Paris Masters met and chose three Deputies, viz. De Méry d'Arcy, Leroy and Mangeau; a second division—or as it was termed, column—of fifteen Masters, chose two Deputies, Régnard and Gouillard, Senior; a third column, of twelve Masters, chose four Deputies, Richard, Joubert de la Bourdinière, Count de Jagny and Hérault; while a fourth column, of fourteen Paris Masters, elected two Deputies, Packault and Théaulon. As they took care not to elect members already on the board, they thus strengthened their own side considerably.

April 7.—Meeting of Provincial and Paris Deputies, Commissioners and Grand Officers. Toussaint appointed Secretary to the Board of Revision—this name is not historic and is merely used for convenience.

April 13.—A fifth column, of twenty Masters, elected three Deputies, Gerbier, Martin and Caseuil, Jun.

April 14.—Board of Revision. Junction of last-named Deputies.

April 17.—Board of Revision. The first chapter of the new *Statutes* as amended by the new Commissioners adopted with enthusiasm.

April 22.—Board of Revision. The second chapter read amidst partial applause. In recognition of his services Luxemburg was permitted to nominate—*pro hac vice*—all the officers of Grand Lodge.

May 24.—Board of Revision. Savalette de Langes, in the name of Chaillon de Jonville, acknowledged the two Dukes as regularly elected and resigned his appointment. Jonville now disappears from the scene as mysteriously as Lacorne had previously done. First chapter of the *Statutes* confirmed with acclamation.

May 28.—Board of Revision. Count Buzençois de Luxemburg and fifteen honorary Grand Officers elected, installed and acclaimed. Revision proceeded with.

June 2.—Board of Revision. Confirmation by the Administrator-General of all officers elected. The second chapter of the *Statutes* also confirmed. Three members of the Committee of Definition being absent, were replaced by the Marquis de Tonnerre, Varenne de Béost and Leroy, the latter being a Paris Master.

June 7.—Board of Revision. Final confirmation of the first two chapters.

June 14.—Board of Revision. First signs of dissatisfaction on the part of the Paris Masters. They began to perceive that a most salutary reform—the abolition of perpetual Masters—affected their vested interests. The *Statutes*, strange to say, presented at the first meeting of the Board on March 5, recognized as Masters, only such as should have received the 15 Degrees and the last three, i.e. 18 in all. It must not be forgotten that the Grand Lodge was at that time practically identical with the Emperors, so that we are left somewhat in the dark as to whether the Emperors really worked 25 Degrees. If they did not, then there can remain no doubt that the *Grand Constitutions of B*—in 1762, which particularize 25 Degrees, were really manufactured—like the last 8 Degrees themselves—in America. The new Committee of 9—March 9—had, however, defined as follows :

Article 4. The Grand Orient acknowledges in future only such Masters as shall have been freely elected to this office by the Lodge.

Article 5. The Masonic body of France shall in future be represented in the Grand Orient by all actual Worshipful Masters or by the Lodge deputies.

The term Grand Orient had first been used in a circular of June 5, 1772, by the unreformed Grand Lodge. Grand Orient is a term used by the Latin races, such as those of France, Spain, Italy and the South American States and is, in a sense, synonymous with Grand Lodge. The Grand Orient frequently exercises jurisdiction over the High Degrees. This is, however, the first instance of its use. It will be perceived that these two articles not only struck a blow at the perpetuity of a Paris Master's tenure of office, but also changed entirely the nature of Grand Lodge, which had previously consisted of these monopolists only. However, concessions were made to their protests. Article 4 was maintained, but it was agreed that each Master *ad vitam* should resign "name and seniority to his Lodge" and receive in recompense the title of Founder and Past Master; all charges incurred by him for purchase of Warrant, jewels and furniture, etc., to be refunded by the members. He might be re-elected but could not be forced to accept an inferior office; took precedence immediately after the Master and was a member of Grand Lodge. To enjoy these prerogatives, however, those who held a personal Warrant, but no Lodge, were required to affiliate with one forthwith. This justifies the conclusion that every one of the Paris Masters of the 5 Columns—81 in number—could not actually have presided over a Lodge, a rather curious state of things. This was, of course, the opportunity for Labady, who had been, pending process, relieved of his office on March 19.

June 17.—Paris Masters' Grand Lodge. A general assembly of the old Grand Lodge was called. Present 42 of the 81 Paris Masters; in all, 48 Parisians, including Labady, Toussaint (Sec. of the Board of Revision), De Lalande, Bruneteau, Lacan and Boulainvilliers. Gaillard and Daubertin did not appear. The powers granted to the 8 Commissioners of August 9, 1772, were withdrawn; the 15 Deputies declared divested of their charge; and a protest sketched out by a Committee of 18. Lalande and Toussaint withdrew before the Minutes were signed; Bruneteau, Gaillard and Daubertin subsequently joined the new Grand Orient; of the eight Commissioners, three only—Labady, Lacan, and Boulainvilliers—went back to the old Paris Masters' Lodge.

June 18 and 20.—Meetings of this Committee and preparation of the protest.

June 21.—Board of Revision. Labady presents himself as the emissary of the Old Grand Lodge and hands in the protest, which, after many "whereas's," declares that every act of the board is illegal, null, of no value, calls upon the Lodges to rally to their old Grand Lodge, to help him in persuading the Duke of Luxemburg to put himself once more at their head. He then declared the so-called National Grand Lodge non-existent and desired to withdraw from several Brethren the title of Deputy (of various Lodges) with which he had formerly entrusted them. The meeting declared this to be impracticable and Labady retired. New honorary Grand Officers were appointed, the third chapter of the *Statutes* agreed to and it was ordered that the first three chapters should be printed.

June 24.—Grand fête given to the new Grand body by the Duke of Luxemburg; present 81 convives.

June 26.—Last meeting of the Board of Revision. The fourth chapter of the *Statutes* approved of and ordered to be printed and a circular detailing the whole course of events drawn up and confirmed. The assembly then separated and, from this day, may be dated the final completion of the National Grand Lodge of France, which, however, soon changed its name to Grand Orient. Among the 45 officials of the new Grand Lodge are 19 Paris Masters, who therefore resigned their privileges.

Kloss and Jouast—who are in substantial accord—are authorities for the foregoing. These writers rely on the following publications. The numbers within parenthesis refer to the *Bibliographie der Freimaurerei* by Dr. Kloss. *Statuts et Règlements de la Grande Loge de France*, arrêté par délibération du 14 août 1771 (203 and 4122); *Grand Elu*, etc., Paris, 1781 (1916); *La très R.G.L. de France à toutes les loges régulières*, June 24, 1771 (4121); *Procès-Verbal de la séance*, etc., du 18 juin 1772 (4123); *La très R.G.L. de France à toutes les loges régulières*, May 18, 1772 (4124); *Extrait des registres de la Souv. G.L. de France*, September 12, 1772 (4126); *Mémoire Justificatif*, 1772 (4128); *La Grande Loge Nat. de France à toutes*, etc., 1773 (4129); *Statuts du Grand Orient de France*, etc., 1773 (4130); *Extrait des Registres*, etc. (4131); *La très R.G.L. de France à toutes*, etc., 1773 (4132); *Au Grand Orient de France*, etc. (4341).

July 23.—The old Lodge—which, in future, will be referred to as the Grand

FRANCE

REGALIA OF THE GRAND ORIENT

THIS plate shows some old specimens of the clothing worn in Lodges under the Grand Orient of France. The Grand Lodge of England has no present fraternal intercourse or relationship with this Grand Orient, on account of its violation of all Masonic principles of late years, by the expunging of the name of T.G.A.O.T.U. from its laws and by its avowed political tendencies. No authoritative details of the present clothing, therefore, can be given.


No. 1 is a Master Mason apron of satin, embroidered in coloured silks, gold and spangles. The edging is of blue ribbon and, on the fall, is an irradiated star enclosing a G. On the body of the apron are the sun and moon and two stars; the letters M and B; the crowned compasses; the tetragrammaton in an irradiated triangle and acacia branches.

No. 2 is an older specimen, is printed on leather and hand-coloured, with an edging of crimson silk. The design is very handsome and shows, amongst a number of other emblems, a temple on a chequered floor; the two pillars J and B, with two acacia trees; altars, working tools, &c.

No. 3 is more recent and is embroidered in gold and colours on a white satin ground with the blazing star and G, the temple, the letters M and B, the level, the compasses and two acacia sprays. It is bound with red silk and the flap is imitated by a semicircle of red edging.

No. 4 is an old M.M. sash of blue silk, on which are embroidered seven stars, the square and compasses, with level, and acacia, the letters D, M and M, with a red rosette at the point, whilst the inside is lined with black silk, embroidered with the emblems of mortality and "tears," in silver, for use when working the 3rd Degree.

No. 5 is the jewel of the W.M., consisting of a square, compasses, star and acacia leaves.



Regalia of the Grand Orient of France

Lodge—met again and on July 29 held a festival in the name of the Duke of Luxemburg, whom it continued to look upon as its head.

It may be admitted that the taunts and gibes of Thory and his congeners are misplaced, that all things were done in perfect order and with due legality. The Paris Masters, that is, the old Grand Lodge, concurred in all the proceedings until their vested rights were threatened. That the Grand Lodge was justified in abrogating these rights in the general interest must be freely conceded. "In all countries [and communities] the legislative power must, to a general intent, be absolute." Compensation was offered, which was not always the case—witness the emancipation of the slaves in the United States. Neither, indeed, could the Masters raise any valid objection to their privileges having been cut down by a mixed body of Metropolitan and Provincial Deputies, because, on August 14, 1771, they had themselves enacted Article I of the first new *Statutes*. They might certainly have contended that the compensation offered was inadequate and have said, "If *you* prefer a new Grand Lodge, well and good, *we* are satisfied with the old one and will revive it by virtue of our inherent authority." This is what practically they did, but when they proceeded to stigmatize the new body as illegal, they went altogether beyond their province. Both parties, therefore, were strictly "within their rights" and to cast imputations upon one or the other is unjust. Nor can either of them be denominated a rabble—certainly not the brilliant assembly of the new Lodge and, with equal certainty, not the older body, because, in spite of the possibly worthless character of Labady himself, it comprised within its ranks many honourable men and some who were highly distinguished both by their social position and intellectual attainments. A very peculiar fact is, that the Council of the Emperors was quite overlooked in the new *Statutes*, so much so that they soon showed themselves again as an independent body.

August 13.—Sitting of the Judicial Commission. De-la-Chaussée *v.* Labady. Seventeenth meeting. Report. 1. The Commission refers the validity of *Constitutions* delivered during the recess to the Grand Orient. 2. De-la-Chaussée to make a stipulated declaration before the next assembly. 3. The money alleged to be owing is remitted for want of proof. 5. The fine of 6 livres formally imposed is unjustified. 5. General acquittal. The declaration stipulated for, which he eventually made most handsomely, was to the effect that he was sorry he had published his *Mémoire*, or that it should be considered that he intended to injure any person, which was far from being his intention. Labady is convicted of having maliciously renewed on April 18, 1772, unfounded charges, of which he had himself acquitted De-la-Chaussée on January 29 previously and of having failed to clear himself of Chaussée's counter charges. He is therefore suspended for nine months and other charges made against him by private Lodges are left to the judgment of the Grand Orient.

September 1.—National Grand Lodge. Chaussée reinstated and made a Grand Officer.

September 10.—The Grand Lodge issued a circular stamped with the old seal,

calculated in many ways to lead to confusion, especially as it made use of Montmorency's name and was signed by Duret and Labady, names familiar in another capacity to the Provinces. Montmorency forgot himself in his anger and obtained a *lettre de cachet* under which Labady and Duret were imprisoned, in order to force them to deliver up the documents, seals and archives of the old Lodge. They were shortly released, but without the desired effect being produced. The Emperors made common cause with the Grand Lodge at first, but, after 1775 *circa*, were once more quite independent, although we do not hear much more of them. Labady became their Secretary-General and, in 1780, they erected a bust to this Masonic martyr, bearing the punning lines, "Whilst abhorring vice, fly the pit of perdition" (*La Chaussée de perdition*). A librarian by profession, he appears to have made an income by selling cheap rituals, those of the Emperors included.

The Composition of the new body as finally settled by the last board meeting of June 26, 1773, was a distinct advance on any previous Grand Lodge in France. The entire Brotherhood, or confederacy, which took the title of Grand Orient and met for the festivals, was composed of all the Masters or their Deputies. Out of these members, 77 were chosen to form the Grande Loge Nationale, viz. the Grand Master, Grand Administrator and Grand Conservator, 15 officers d'honneur of the Grand Orient, at their head being the representative of the Grand Master; 45 officers (*en exercice*)—composing the subsidiary boards—7 Lodge Masters of Paris and 7 of the Provinces. The Grande Loge Nationale thus constituted, met quarterly. The subsidiary boards were—1. The Loge de Conseil or Chamber of Appeal. 2. The Chambre d'Administration or Board of General Purposes. 3. The Chambre de Paris or Metropolitan Board; and 4, The Chambre des Provinces for the Lodges outside Paris. The three superior officers were elected *ad vitam* and the honorary officers for the whole duration of the Grand Master's tenure; the working Officers, i.e. the other 45, went out by thirds each twelve-month, but were eligible for re-election by the Grand Orient. On December 27, 1773, the Grande Loge Nationale was dissolved as such and its members, from thenceforth, constituted the Loge de Conseil, meeting monthly. In its place the whole of the Grand Orient was to meet quarterly, so that at last every Lodge was represented by its Master or Deputy in the governing body. From that date, therefore, the Grande Loge Nationale à l'Orient de Paris became the Grand Orient of France.

Up to October 14 the Grand Master had refused to receive the deputations from Grand Lodge. On that day he received them and appointed the date of his installation. It was to take place after his return from a visit to Fontainebleau.

October 28.—Installation of the Duc de Chartres in his own house in the Rue de Montreuil.

December 27.—Grand Orient constituted as above. A commission consisting of Bacon de la Chevalerie, Count Stroganoff and Baron Toussaint was appointed to revise and examine all the High Degrees and all Lodges were directed to work meanwhile in the three Symbolic Degrees only.

December 27.—The Grand Lodge—professing to work under the auspices of



Louis Philippe Joseph d'Orléans, Duc de Chartres (Better Known as Philippe-Égalité).

Grand Master of the Grand Orient of France from 1771 to 1793.

the Duc de Chartres—appointed its officers in his name, inveighed against the Grand Orient as illegal and forbade its members to visit Lodges of the rival body. It assumed as its full title Très respectable Grande Loge, seul et unique Grand Orient de France.

1774.—*March 7.*—Grand Orient. Proposal to establish thirty-two Provincial Grand Lodges in order to lighten the labours of Grand Orient. Subsequently carried on October 20, but the resolution produced little effect, as there were never more than four or five established. In 1806 they were declared unnecessary and, in 1810, were entirely done away with (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 198).

June 24.—Resolution not to admit artisans until they shall have attained the Mastership in their trade. Domestic servants were declared ineligible, except as Serving Brothers. In the course of this year, members of the theatrical profession were precluded from receiving the privileges of the Craft, on the ground of their being too dependent on the favour of the public. An exception was made, however, in the case of musicians.

Deputies to Grand Orient were only allowed to represent in future five Lodges each and Grand Orient formally approved of Lodges of Adoption in which ladies were admitted to ceremonies somewhat resembling Freemasonry. These Lodges soon became brilliant assemblies, that is, having regard to the persons who took part in them, especially under the Empire, but, inasmuch as they are scarcely of Masonic interest, there will be no further allusion to them.

August 12.—The Grand Orient having completed its new premises in the Rue Pot-de-Fer, took possession of them. The grand address on this occasion was delivered by De Lalande.

September 9.—A new Lodge, St. Jean de Chartres, was constituted at Mousseaux near Paris, for H.S.H. the Duc de Chartres, in which he occupied the Master's chair.

December 27.—On the proposal of Luxemburg the Honorary Grand Officers were in future to hold their offices subject to re-election every three years; their appointment was left in the hands of the Grand Orient.

In this year—1774—three Templar Directories were formed at Lyons, Bordeaux and Strasburg. The Grand Orient is stated to have been at the head of 144 Lodges, of which 64 had been constituted or rectified during the year and the Grand Lodge had constituted 3 new ones (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 204).

1775.—*February 3.*—The Inquisition dispersed the Mère Loge du Comtat Venaissin and, during the year, the old Grand Lodge warranted eight Lodges in Paris and nine in the Provinces.

1776.—*March 24.*—The Grand Orient replaced the former Committee to inquire into the High Grades, by Guillotin, Savalette de Langes, Morin, De-la-Chaussée and De Lalande.

May 31.—From the beginning of 1775 a Commission had been engaged in formulating a compact between the Scots Directories of the IInd, IIIrd, and Vth Provinces and the Grand Orient. Several of the Commissioners representing the Grand Orient were already members of the Strict Observance system, so that it is

not surprising that the treaty concluded on this date was more advantageous to the Directories than to the Grand Orient. The Templar Lodges were to use their own ritual and obey their own Superiors, but had to be chartered by the Grand Orient and pay fees to that body, returning also a list of their members. Mutual visiting was to be permitted and, although a French Mason was not allowed to belong to two French Lodges at one and the same time, he might under this Concordat belong to one Lodge under each of the two contracting systems. Many French Lodges protested, for two especial reasons. By the treaty French Masons were rendered subject to unknown (and presumably *foreign*) Superiors, which Superiors were themselves no party to the contract. It is probable that the success of the Scots Philosophic Rite, a Scots system purely French, may be ascribed to the feeling of patriotism thus awakened.

The circular of June 24, 1776, announcing the conclusion of the treaty, was not issued till later and contains an appendix of August 19, with a list of 205 Lodges—Paris, 34; Provincial, 148; Regimental, 23. Some, however, are described as dormant. In the same year the Lodge Neuf Sœurs (Nine Muses) was founded by De Lalande. It comprised much of the literary, artistic and scientific talent of Paris. On April 7, 1778, a few weeks before his death, Voltaire, whose pungent pen had previously satirized Masonry, was initiated in this Lodge.

December 9.—The Grand Orient refused to recognize the Contrat Social as a Mother-Lodge and ordered it either to withdraw its pretensions or to submit to erasure. This recent head of the new Scots Philosophic Rite replied by electing a Grand Master, constituting a Lodge at Rome (December 31), also by a circular discountenancing Templar Degrees (February 20, 1777). On May 18, 1778, the Lodge was erased, to which it replied by a circular—July 5, 1778—which procured it the adhesion of many Lodges (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 230, 231).

1777.—*July 3.*—Grand Orient. The Duc de Chartres attended for the first time since his installation, the only occasion on which he is mentioned as being present.

October 3.—Circular of the Grand Orient chiefly respecting the High Degrees. It adverts to the Committee as being still at work on the subject, counsels the Lodges to await the end of its labours, meanwhile to confine themselves to three Degrees. It may almost be assumed that the document owes its origin to the increasing influence of the Scots Philosophic Rite and of another recent invention, the Sublime Elects of Truth, whose field lay chiefly in Rennes and the north of France. It was, however, powerless to prevent the rise in 1778 of yet another Rite, the Academy of True Masons, at Montpellier, with alchemical tendencies.

Of the Grand Lodge all we know is that on January 19, 1777, it installed three representatives of the Grand Master—still assumed to be the Duc de Chartres; and that, according to Thory, it constituted five Lodges.

November 21.—The Grand Orient forbade its Lodges to assemble in taverns.

To ensure the exclusion of irregular Masons, *le mot de semestre* was introduced in this year, the knowledge of which was necessary to obtain admission to a strange

Lodge. It was changed half-yearly and communicated through the Masters of Lodges.

1778.—*January 18.*—The Grand Lodge published a circular, to which was attached a list of its Lodges. It enumerates 200 Paris Masters of Lodges, besides 27 absent and 247 in the Provinces. Now, as the Masters of the five Paris Columns in 1773 were only 81 in number and Thory, the great partisan of this Grand Lodge, has only claimed that, in the interval, it had constituted 16 Lodges, if we admit that these were all Paris Lodges, also that the list of 81 was not a complete list of all the Paris Masters, we shall still have great difficulty in converting the number from 81 to 200! It is also known for a fact that many of the 81 Masters joined the Grand Orient. Therefore we are driven to the conclusion that the number of Masters by no means corresponded with that of the Lodges, in fact that the great majority of these Masters had no Lodges to preside over. As regards the Provinces, Jouast asserts, after due comparison, that many of these Lodges were also on the list of the Grand Orient and suggests that the Grand Lodge simply continued to carry forward all such as had not actually announced their affiliation with the former.

February 26.—The Grand Orient published a list, in all 258 Lodges, of which there were in Paris 34 and 7 dormant; in regiments 30 and 1 dormant. In this list a Lodge in the Irish Regiment “Walsh,” quartered at Bapaume, claims as its date of constitution March 25, 1688! It is scarcely necessary to refute this assumption. Of foreign Lodges we find 4 at St. Domingo, 5 at Guadaloupe and 1 at Martinique. Of Strict Observance Lodges there are 6, besides 3 Directories.

November 25 to December 27.—The Convent des Gaules—under the Strict Observance—was held at Lyons.

For the next few years nothing very remarkable is to be recorded of the rival Grand bodies, but the systems opposed to either or both of them began to multiply exceedingly and to wax strong. In 1768 the Martinists, confined hitherto to Bordeaux, Lyons and Marseilles, made a settlement in Paris; in 1770 the Illuminés of Avignon came to the front; and, in 1780, the Emperors had apparently recovered momentarily some strength and consistency.

1779.—*October 8.*—On this date Cagliostro founded his Egyptian Rite in a Strasburg Lodge and this androgynous system had arrived at such favour in 1784 that the Duke of Luxemburg actually accepted the dignity of a Grand Master Protector. In the same year the Lodge Constance at Arras erected the Chapitre Primordial de Rose Croix. Its patent is alleged to have been granted by the Pretender, Charles Edward, April 18, 1745. According to Thory’s version it commences, “We, Charles Edward Stuart, King of England”; whilst Jouast gives it as prétendant roi d’Angleterre! It will be sufficient to point out that Charles Edward did not call himself “King” during his father’s lifetime, or Pretender at any time. The use of the latter term indeed he, very naturally, left to others. Moreover, no historian has yet shown that he ever was in Arras, where, according to this legend, he remained for a period of six months—whilst we have it on his own authority that he never was a Freemason at all.

1780.—In this year the Chapter at Arras founded another in the capital under the title of Chapitre d'Arras, de la Vallée de Paris, with constituent rights, which it exercised to a large extent and, finally, went over—with its progeny—to the Grand Orient in 1801. The original Chapter at Arras remained, however, independent. In 1779 Count Schmettau, who had some thirty years previously carried the Scots Degrees to Berlin, imported the Zinnendorff Rite into Paris and established a Lodge there; and in the following year—1780—the Lodge Amis Réunis (Philalethes) began to make progress with its system and was immediately followed by the Philadelphes of Narbonne. The Grand Lodge, in 1780, appointed three Honorary Presidents, who were to supply the place of the Grand Master in his absence from the meetings.

1781.—*March 6.*—The Scots Directory of the Strict Observance for Septimania at Montpellier became a party to the pact already subsisting between the Grand Orient and the other Directories.

July 11.—Grand Lodge issued a circular and a list of Lodges. Of the Masters of 1772, 47 were still in existence; 4 Lodges date from 1774, 7 from 1775, 8 from 1776, 5 from 1777, 9 from 1778, 18 from 1779, 7 from 1780, and 3 from 1781; there were also 28 Provincial Lodges: in all, 136.

November 5.—Compact between the Grand Orient and the Scots Philosophic Rite.

1782.—*January 18.*—The Grand Orient erected a Chamber of Grades to continue and conclude the work of the Committee previously appointed. With such a number of rivals all conferring High Degrees it became urgent to take some step or other.

December 27.—Grand Orient. A question arose as to the eligibility of a blind candidate. Given in his favour by 24 votes to 19. The Minutes were not confirmed on January 21, 1783 and, on April 4 ensuing, a contrary decision was arrived at. In 1803, however, after the Egyptian campaign, owing to the prevalence of ophthalmia among the officers, blindness ceased to be a bar to admission.

1783.—*May 16.*—Circular of the Grand Orient calling upon its Lodges to send copies of all High-Grade rituals in their possession to the Chamber of Grades, as a help to its labours.

Then followed a series of remarkable events, which ultimately relieved the Chamber of Grades of its commission, by placing in its hands four extra Degrees all ready made—culminating in that of the Rose Croix. Kloss produces cogent reasons for looking upon the whole transaction as a prearranged drama calculated to supply the Grand Orient with what a brand-new Rite would have lacked, i.e. a respectable antiquity. It is, however, evident that the Rite Français was invented neither by the Commission nor the Chamber of Grades, but simply accepted by the latter. Space will only admit of the most material facts being quoted.

Among the Paris Lodges dependent upon the Grand Orient at the beginning of 1784 there were 9, each of which possessed a Rose Croix Chapter, probably self-constituted. Roëttiers de Montaleau, the most conspicuous Mason of post-revolutionary days, was a member of one of these fraternities.

1784.—*January 18.*—Montaleau brought forward in his Chapter a compre-

hensive plan which was to redound to the benefit of the Rose Croix Grade and a Committee was appointed to secure the co-operation of other Chapters under the Grand Orient.

February 2.—Present 80 Knights Rose Croix, representing seven Chapters; Montaleau, Grand Orator, proposed that the seven Chapters should unite and form a Grand Chapitre Général de France, gradually to attract and absorb all other Sovereign Chapters and form the sole constitutive capitular body in France. A pact of union in 8 articles was then and there drawn up and agreed to. Three only need be adverted to. Article 6. Affiliation will only be conceded to Chapters grafted on Lodges under the Grand Orient. Article 8. Grand Chapter resolves at once to prepare a simplified revision of all existing High Degrees. This, we see, was practically undertaking the work confided to the Chamber of Grades. Article 7 ordered statutes to be drawn up.

March 19.—Grand Chapter General. New *Statutes* approved and confirmed.

It will be perceived that the Chapter was less dilatory than the Chamber of Grades; also that the assertions of Thory and his followers that this body was the result of a fusion between the Emperors and the Knights is unfounded.

October.—Grand Orient. Waltersdorff complained of these proceedings in Grand Orient, which, as he was one of those who met in Grand Chapter General, looks like a piece of prearranged by-play.

November 20.—The Grand Chapter General seized the opportunity procured by Waltersdorff's speech to declare that it was only "acting for the greater honour of Grand Orient and, in order to lay its acquired light at the feet of Grand Orient, so soon as that body should decide to use its undoubted right of conferring High Degrees." After this the Grand Orient and Grand Chapter entered into *pourparlers* and Act I is closed. But if the fusion had then taken place the Grand Orient would only have possessed a usurped authority with no flavour of antiquity, so the curtain rises on Act II.

Dr. Humbert Gerbier de Werschamp now appears upon the scene claiming to be the sovereign authority in Rose Croix matters. He produced three documents in support of his claim. 1. In Latin, given at the Orient of the World and Sanctuary of Edinburgh, January 21, 1721, constituting a Grand Chapter, Rose Croix, at Paris, for France, in favour of the Duc d'Antin. This voucher was very unskillfully manufactured, for, not to mention the alleged Edinburgh authority, it must be remembered that there was no Freemasonry in France before 1725 at the earliest. Also that the Duc d'Antin was not made Grand Master until 1738—in fact in 1721 he was only fourteen years of age, then Duc d'Epéron, his grandfather the Duc d'Antin being still alive (Daruty, *Recherche sur le Rite Écossais*, p. 94). But it was necessary before all things to produce an earlier authority than that of the Chapter of Arras (1745). 2. A certificate from the Lodge of Perfect Union at Paris, signed Antin, under the date June 23, 1721, in favour of Brother Quadt as a Chevalier Rose Croix. This was to prove that Antin's Chapter had really been at work. 3. A certificate, dated February 6, 1760, signed by De Tellins—who is not otherwise

known—Substitute-General of the Count de Clermont, from the Grand Chapter of France, appointing Gerbier Très Sage *ad vitam* of the said Chapter. These documents are worthless, really beneath contempt. One is known to have been manufactured in a café and the wine stains are plainly perceptible; but they answered the required purpose and are preserved in the archives of the Grand Orient, constituting, in effect, the foundation of its claim to control the High Degrees. Owing to these parchments, no Frenchman, in the midst of all the ensuing party strife, ever questioned the right of the Grand Orient to confer the 18° or Rose Croix grade. But the old Paris Masters were not to be outdone; they immediately concocted another fabulous genealogy, proving the existence of a Chapter connected with their Lodge, dating from still earlier times, viz. 1686! and managed to bring over the Arras Chapters in Paris to their side.

As regards this last date it was apparently thought necessary to produce an earlier authority than the alleged Charter of the Welsh regiment of 1688, so as to make the Chapter referred to the first of its kind in France.

1785.—*March 24.*—Treaty of fusion in thirteen articles between the Chapitre Général de France and Gerbier's Grand Chapitre de France. Gerbier deposited his papers in the archives, ceded his rights, received the title of Past Grand Master; and Roëttiers de Montaleau was appointed Grand Master of the Rose Croix.—Close of Act II.

We now come to an interlude not arranged by the Grand Orient.

December 13.—A self-constituted Chapter at Rouen asked for affiliation, which was refused, but reconstitution was offered. With this the Lodge was not satisfied and applied to the Royal Order of Heredom of Kilwinning at Edinburgh for a patent.

1786.—*February 17.*—Opening of Act III. The Grand Orient resolved to amalgamate with the Grand Chapter and commissioners were appointed.

May 1.—The Royal Order of Scotland grants to Jean Mathéus of Rouen a patent as Provincial Grand Master of all France. His installation followed on August 26 and Louis Clavel was named Deputy Grand Master. Thus arose a fresh rival system to that of the Grand Orient. In 1811 this system comprised twenty-six Lodges and Chapters. (Thory, *Annales Originis*, p. 173, gives a list of these; two were Colonial, two Italian, one at Brussels.)

1787.—*July 13.*—The Grand Orient approves of a Treaty of Fusion in twenty-four articles between the Grand Orient and the Grand Chapter. The Grand Chapter follows suit on August 4 and a circular of September 20 conveys the information to the Lodges. Article 6 provides that the Chapter shall in future be called Chapitre Métropolitain, receiving a patent from Grand Orient, recognizing its activity from March 21, 1721. Article 11, the present Orders, i.e. collections of grades, in number 4—worked by the Chapter, are to be continued till otherwise decreed. The ritual was never altered in any great degree, so that there are the four extra Degrees of the French Grand Orient, denominated the Modern or French Rite. The first order comprised all the Kadosh or Degrees of Vengeance, renamed

Secret Elect; the second, the Scots Degrees, called the Order of the Scottish Knights; the third, the Crusading Degrees, under the style of Knights of the East and West; and the fourth, the Christian or Rose Croix Degrees, under the appellation Knights of the Eagle and Pelican. Article 15 provides for new *Statutes*.

1788.—*August 13*.—Installation of the Metropolitan Chapter. End of Act III.

November 21.—Epilogue. Rearrangement of the Grand Orient into the three following Boards:—Of Administration, Symbolic Freemasonry and High Degrees.

December 5.—New *Statutes* approved and communicated by circular of January 19, 1789, also a list showing forty-five Chapters at work. Thus the curtain falls on this very pretty little comedy. (For further details, see Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 280-330.)

Nothing of very great importance remains to be recorded anterior to the French Revolution. Both systems (Grand Orient and Grand Lodge) apparently continued to prosper until 1788 or 1789, at which time they arrived at their greatest prosperity. Then came the political troubles and, one by one, the Lodges closed. The *Etât* of the Grand Orient, November 16, 1787, enumerates 636 Lodges, of which 30 were dormant. Of these, 35 were in the colonies, 71 in various regiments, 17 in foreign countries, 67 in Paris. The Grand Lodge *Etât* of 1788 shows 88 Paris, 43 Provincial and Colonial Lodges, the latter being mostly warranted during the years 1780-7. Under the two governing (or Grand) bodies, there were, therefore, 767 Lodges (more or less) and if to these are added the Lodges of the Scots Philosophic Rite (37) of the Philalethes, the Illuminés, the Royal Order of Scotland, the various Scots Mother-Lodge systems, the English Lodge (No. 204) at Bordeaux, the number might easily reach 900 or more. The first to close its doors was the Philosophic Rite—July 31, 1791—on the 16th it had sent a circular to its Lodges, advising them to cease from working, if required to do so by the magistrates and not to forget their duty towards their sovereign, Louis XVI. It is therefore not at all surprising to find that many of its members fell victims to the guillotine.

1791.—In this year the Grand Lodge ceased to meet and, on October 13, the French branch of Royal Order of Scotland. The Grand Orient constituted two Lodges and, in 1792, three more. On February 24, 1793, it issued a circular, stating that it had taken precautions to preserve the archives and, on the same date, the Grand Master, the Duke of Orleans, published the following abject manifesto in the *Journal de Paris*.

From Citizen Egalité to Citizen Milscent.

. . . Notwithstanding my quality of Grand Master, I am unable to give you any information concerning these matters to me unknown. . . . However this may be, the following is my Masonic history:—At a time when truly no one foresaw our Revolution, I joined Freemasonry, which presents a sort of picture of equality, just as I entered Parliament, which presented also a sort of picture of freedom. Meanwhile I have exchanged the shadow for the substance. Last December the Secretary of the Grand Orient applied to the person who in my household filled

the post of Secretary of the Grand Master, in order to hand me a question relating to the affairs of this Society. I replied to him under date of January 5, as follows :—“ As I know nothing of the composition of Grand Lodge and, moreover, do not believe that there should exist any mystery, nor any secret assembly in a republic, more especially at the commencement of its rule, I desire in no way to be mixed up with the Grand Orient, nor with the assemblies of Freemasons.” . . . L. P. J. Egalité.

On August 8, 1793, the Grand Orient published a circular announcing that on May 13 the office of Grand Master had been declared vacant. In the usual stamps impressed on this document the fleurs-de-lys had been effaced.

1794.—In this year—it may be remarked—Freemasonry in France had practically ceased to exist.

Three Lodges only in Paris had the courage to continue working throughout the reign of terror. The Master of one of these, the Amis Réunis, was Roëttiers de Montaleau, whose acquaintance has already been made. Born at Paris in 1748, he was made in the celebrated Scots Mother-Lodge of Marseilles in 1772 and joined the Grand Orient in 1780; in 1785 became Grand Master of Grand Chapter; in 1788, President of the Chamber of Paris and, in 1793, of the Chamber of Administration, his predecessor having been removed by the guillotine. He was subsequently imprisoned, but July 28, 1794, which restored so many wretched *détenus* to their liberty, broke also his bonds. Thory attributes to him the preservation of the Grand Orient archives. In 1795 he ventured to summon the remnant of the Grand Orient together with other Masons not previously eligible; and to resume work. The members of the Grand Orient had in great part consisted of personages attached in one way or another to the court of Louis XVI, so it is not surprising to find that, even on June 24, 1797, the number which assembled was only forty. Montaleau was offered the post of Grand Master, which he modestly declined, but accepted, however, the title of Most Worshipful (Grand Vénérable) and, in that capacity, presided over Grand Lodge. The first new Constitution was issued to a Geneva Lodge June 17, 1796; and the report of June 24 only includes eighteen Lodges, of which three met at Paris.

1796.—October 17.—Grand Lodge also reassembled for the first time since 1792. This governing body found itself in an even worse plight than its chief rival. In the Grand Orient certain members were dispersed, others killed, the same may be said of each private Lodge, but these at least retained the power of revival as soon as a few members once more met together. But with the Grand Lodge, if a Paris Master was killed or had fled his Lodge, being proprietary, became extinct and it is asserted that, at the period now under consideration, very few of the perpetual Masters remained alive.

Montaleau saw his opportunity arrive and at once seized it. He made personal overtures to the Grand Lodge, which lasted for more than a year, but ultimately were crowned with success. On May 3, 1799, he was able to inform the Grand Orient that the Grand Lodge was ready to accede to a fusion. A committee was appointed

and, on May 20, Grand Lodge also named its commissioners. On May 21 a contract in nine articles was drawn up, agreed to by the Grand Orient on May 23 and by the Grand Lodge on June 9. Article 1 abolished Perpetual Masters. Article 2 prolonged their tenure of office for nine years and provided for certain honourable compensations. Article 3 withdrew the appointment of officers from the Master and conferred it on the Lodge. The others need not be specially alluded to.

1799.—*June 22.*—Formal junction of the two Grand bodies. June 28, Grand Festival. There were present 4 Past Grand Officers, the first on the list being Lalande. Among the 28 officials of the Grand Orient there were 5, and among the 15 Masters 9 of the old Grand Lodge (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 358).

The following figures will show the rate at which the Craft recovered itself in these early years. On December 27, 1800, we know of 74 Lodges which had resumed work and of these, 23 were in Paris. In 1802 there were 114 Lodges, of which 27 were in Paris, also 37 Chapters seem to have been in existence at that time.

1801.—*June 24.*—The Scots Philosophic Rite recommenced work under the lead of the Lodge St. Jean d'Écosse, the Social Contract having almost taken its last sleep during the Revolution.

The Grand Lodge having united with the Grand Orient, it was only natural that its former Chapter and all the dependent Chapters of Arras should follow suit. It will be sufficient to state that this final step was completed on December 24, 1801.

But, although the Grand Orient had thus made an ally of its former most powerful rival, many others still remained in the field. The Philaethes had died out during the Revolution and the Scots Directories of the Strict Observance were still dormant; but the Provincial Chapter of Arras, the Scots Mother-Lodge of Marseilles, the Scots Philosophic Rite and the Royal Order of Scotland, besides various other smaller Rites unnecessary to name, were warranting Lodges and Chapters in every direction. Even many of its own Lodges, not content with a single comprehensive Scots Grade—the Rite Français—had opened Lodges and Chapters to work one or more of the Scots Degrees, whose number was infinite, while the latter found a leader in Abraham, the publisher of a Masonic paper called the *Mirror*. A curious circumstance in all these quarrels is, that we invariably find one and the same member highly placed in two or more Rites that were fighting to the death. To give a solitary example: Thory was the life and soul of the Scots Philosophic Rite, yet, from 1804 to 1813, he was also Treasurer of the Grand Chapter of the Grand Orient and a member of it still in 1814. In 1808 he was Tersata or Grand Master of the Royal Order of Scotland in Paris; and, until 1821, he was the Secretary of the Holy Empire in the Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Rite. Members of these Scots Lodges—grafted on the Grand Orient Lodges—assumed airs of superiority and, at last, in 1801, appeared at the Lodge Réunion des Étrangers at Paris in clothing unrecognized by the Grand Orient. The result was an official indictment of their proceedings on November 17 and, again, on March 25,

1802. This was met by a circular from Abraham in June 1802 calling upon the Scots Masons to rally round the standard. A meeting of the Scots Masons was accordingly held on August 5 and elicited another circular from the Grand Orient on November 12, 1802; the ultimate result being a very embittered feeling on both sides (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 373-400).

1803.—*August 5.*—The Grand Orient resolved to reappoint Grands Officiers Honoraires. This was an institution dating from Luxemburg's time, by which all officers of the Grand Orient were duplicated, one set for active service, the other for show on state occasions, the latter class being, of course, composed of very highly placed court personages. On this occasion the leading idea was, that by appointing generals and other military officers, as well as state officials, the active support of the First Consul would be acquired. Among the Honorary Officers and members actually elected on September 30 then ensuing, may be mentioned Murat, the Governor of Paris; Lacépède, the Director of the Jardin des Plantes; De Lalande, Director of the Observatory; Generals Beurnonville and Macdonald and Marshal Kellermann. Meanwhile French Freemasonry followed the French arms and increased so remarkably that, on March 23, 1804, upwards of 300 Lodges were in existence and a corresponding number of Rose Croix Chapters. But, although outwardly prosperous, the spirit of Masonry had, to a great extent, departed, to make way for a fulsome adulation of Napoleon, far exceeding the bounds of loyalty so properly set up in all countries by the Craft. Lodges were convoked for no other purpose than to celebrate the victories of the French idol of the day. Even the orators ceased to confine themselves to Masonic themes, in order to vaunt the majesty and power of the French army—and of its hero. This excess of patriotism naturally led to very awkward results in 1814; and a continuance of the practice was followed by very similar consequences at every subsequent change of Government. Yet, although this feature of Continental Freemasonry need not be further dwelt upon, it must not, however, be forgotten that the French Brethren might have adduced very weighty reasons for the habit into which they had fallen. The Craft there has never existed by virtue of the freedom of the subject—to assemble when and where he likes, provided he transgresses not the law. It has never rested on any such solid basis, but simply on the sufferance of the civil authorities and, at any moment, even under the third Republic, a mere police decree might compel every Lodge in France to close its doors. Ought one, therefore, in fairness, to wonder very greatly that the French Masons have always been time-servers, or that they should have abased themselves at successive periods, with a boundless docility, at the shrine of authority?

In 1804 Hacquet appeared on the scene with his revived Rite of Perfection 25° and De Grasse-Tilly with the Ancient and Accepted Rite 33°. Around the latter rallied all the disaffected Scots Masons and the Scots Philosophic Rite granted them the use of its temple. From January 11 to September 1804, Tilly lavished his 32 and 33 Degrees right and left and erected his Supreme Council; and, on October 22, 1804, the Grande Loge Générale Écossaise was constituted, all the various Scots

Rites assisting and becoming constituent parts of that Grand Lodge. Even the Rite Philosophique for a time effaced itself, in spite of Thory's assertions, for on September 6, 1805, it was distinctly agreed "from this day the Lodge St. Jean d'Écosse resumes its title and attributes of a Mother-Lodge." This, to a certain extent, was an advantage to the Grand Orient, as it reduced its innumerable rivals to one body, with whom it might be possible to treat. The new Grand Lodge had, without his previous consent, proclaimed Prince Louis Buonaparte as its head. The Grand Orient replied on November 7, 1804 (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 423), by resolving to petition the Princes Joseph and Louis Buonaparte and Marshal Murat to accept its highest offices. But here, as we know by repeated statements of Cambacères at a later period, the Emperor himself stepped in and directed his brother, Joseph, to accept the office of Grand Master and the Chancellor, Prince Cambacères, that of Associate Grand Master, holding the latter directly responsible for the good conduct of the Craft and for its internal peace. In fact, as events proved, the astute Emperor was apprehensive lest, by altogether suppressing the Craft, he might encounter the attendant ill-will of such a numerous body and, therefore, resolved to make it subservient to his interests and keep it under the powerful control of his most trusted Minister. From that time every one who wished to please the Emperor became a Freemason and the highest officials were soon made members and officers of the Grand Orient. That Cambacères thoroughly understood his mission and, with a firm hand, kept peace among the rival factions, will shortly become clear. No sooner was the Grand Scots Lodge established, than Roëttiers de Montaleau took measures to avert the blow and caused negotiations to be opened for a union. Marshal Massena represented the Grand Orient and Marshal Kellermann the Scots Masons; then, when matters were somewhat in trim, they were joined by Montaleau and Pyron. But here again we are startled to find, as was always the case, that all four of the Commissioners were officers of the Grand Orient. Pyron, however, who was a thorough-going partisan of the Supreme Council, eventually libelled the members of the Grand Orient infamously and was suspended for several years. Matters were so hurried that the pact of union was signed before the necessary alterations in the *Constitutions* of the Grand Orient were settled, which gave rise to the subsequent quarrels.

At midnight on December 3, 1804, in the palace of Kellermann, the treaty was concluded and signed in duplicate; but Pyron was incomprehensibly allowed to retain both copies. The instrument contained the following passage: "The G.O. therefore declares that it incorporates with itself the Brethren of every Rite." When Pyron at a later period—March 1, 1805—was forced to deliver up these writings, we may imagine the consternation of the Grand Orient at reading the following substituted passage: "The G.O. therefore declares that it incorporates itself with the Brethren of every Rite." This slight distinction represents the different views of the contracting parties. The Scots Masons desired to rule Grand Lodge by force of their High Degrees, whilst the Grand Lodge intended to rule all Degrees through those members of its body who possessed them. On one hand

the 33° was to be supreme ; on the other hand it was to be accountable, like every other body, to the Grand Orient in its collective capacity.


1804.—*December 5.*—Grand Orient. The treaty was approved and, at midnight, the Scots Masons, De Grasse-Tilly at their head, were admitted. De Grasse-Tilly and Montaleau each received the oath of fealty to the Grand Orient from the other, one as representative of the Grand Master in the Supreme Council, the other as representative of the Grand Master in the Grand Orient. Kellermann and Massena were deputed to wait upon his Majesty and to request him to permit his brothers to preside over the Order.

December 19.—Circular of Grand Orient announcing the union and informing its Lodges that in future it would grant Warrants of Constitution for each and every Rite. In order to carry this plan out, it was decided to form a Grand Chapitre Général to confer all Degrees above the 18° or Rose Croix, which was the limit of jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Chapter. It was therefore necessary to confer the 33° on various members of the Grand Orient, which was accordingly done on the 29th of the same month (Rebold, *Histoire des trois Grandes Loges*, p. 102).

1805.—*January 2.*—Inauguration of the Grand Chapitre Général and election of Grand Officers. Joseph Buonaparte and his brother Louis were proposed as Grand and Deputy Grand Masters (*ibid.*, p. 98). The former was not at that time a Mason, nor did he ever attend a Lodge meeting, although he signed all official documents as Grand Master and even certificates of initiation. Rebold (*ibid.*, p. 106) asserts that he was made by Cambacères, Kellermann and Murat on April 15, 1805, at the Tuileries and that a circular issued two days later announced the fact to the Lodges. It may be so, but Rebold does not quote his authority and the circular has escaped the notice of all other writers, even of Thory, who, writing only eleven years afterwards, ought to have been well aware of the fact, if such it were. The exact date of Joseph's accession is somewhat doubtful, for, although Jouast says he was appointed by the Emperor—October 11, 1805—Cambacères, on April 27 previously, in promising to attend the meetings of the Grand Orient as often as possible, already speaks of Joseph as the Grand Master. Prince Louis seems never really to have been elected ; in fact in 1815 he left for Holland.

July 21.—Circular of the Grand Orient announcing the formation of a Directory of Rites. This Board was to rule all the allied Rites and all such as might in future be aggregated. The members were to be chosen by the body of the Grand Orient but, although necessarily possessing the highest Degrees of the various Rites, were to be in no way privileged in the Grand Orient or to assert any supremacy over the other members. The new Board, or Grand Committee, of course, destroyed all hopes which the members of the Supreme Council had conceived of ruling the Craft autocratically by virtue of their 33°.

September 6.—Protest of Scots Masons in the palace of Kellermann and, on September 16, the pact of union was declared broken. But here the power of Cambacères made itself felt and the Supreme Council, instead of at once warranting Lodges, Chapters, Consistories and other bodies, prudently resigned itself to



Joseph Bonaparte.

Grand Master of the Grand Orient of France from 1804 to 1814.

raising individual Masons to its highest Grades; and, as the Grand Orient already worked a Rose Croix Grade equal to the 18° Ancient and Accepted Rite, it merely advanced its members on application. So that for years subsequently the Supreme Council, instead of being a governing and constitutive body, was nothing more than a private Lodge of the 33°. The Grand Orient, on the other side, although counting among its most faithful members more than one Grand Inspector-General, was quite content to let matters remain on this footing. The arrangement has sometimes been called a compact or treaty. It was nothing of the kind; there is no proof that it was even a verbal understanding. The fact is, the Supreme Council was simply restrained by Cambacères from aggressive measures and the Grand Orient was only too glad to see the threatening danger thus averted. There existed, doubtless, a sort of implied but unexpressed understanding to let matters rest on both sides, but no mutual agreement of any sort, nor did the Grand Orient ever admit that the compact of union was vitiated. Most of the allied Scots Rites recovered their liberty at the same time; Hacquet's Rite of Perfection (Heredom 25°) remained, however, true to the Concordat and worked under the shield of the Grand Orient, but gradually became extinct. Hacquet himself, although at the head of his own Rite, filled nevertheless important offices in the Ancient and Accepted Rite and De Grasse-Tilly, on the other hand, for many years subsequently appears on the list of officers of the Grand Orient. With the exception of one Consistory of the 32°, which it dissolved in 1810, it was not till 1811 that the Supreme Council began to erect Tribunals, Councils, etc., but not Lodges or Chapters.

1805.—*October 21.*—Joseph Buonaparte was proclaimed Grand Master in the Grand Orient and, on December 13, Prince Cambacères was installed as first Assistant Grand Master.

December 27.—The Grand Orient celebrated the solstitial fête of the Order and, at the same time, the victories of the French armies. At this meeting, *le mot de semestre*, which had not been given for many years, was again communicated.

1806.—*July 1.*—Cambacères was elected Sovereign Grand Commander of the Supreme Council 33° and installed as such August 13.

Shortly afterwards—*October 25*—he was also elected Honorary Grand Master (Tersata) of the Royal Order of Scotland in Paris.

November 17.—The Grand Orient published its new *Statutes*, chiefly remarkable for suppressing any further erection of Provincial Grand Lodges. It feared they might become powerful rivals. Grand Orient was to be composed of a Deputy from each Chapter and Lodge, such Deputy to be a resident Parisian. A Deputy might represent as many as five Lodges. There were also 169 Grand Officers—viz. 7 Grand Dignitaries, 63 honorary and 99 working officers, the last-named being chosen from the Deputies. These officers formed six Boards (Ateliers): I. Grande-Loge d'Administration; II. Grande-Loge Symbolique; III. Grande-Loge des Grands-Maîtres; IV. Grande-Loge de Conseil et d'Appel; V. Grande-Loge des Grands-Experts; and VI. Grande-Directoire des Rites. A certain number of Deputies also served on these Boards, with the exception of No. VI, which was composed ex-

clusively of Grand Officers. The whole scheme was of a most centralizing character and it will be perceived that Provincial Lodges were forced to entrust their affairs to Paris Deputies.

The Ordre du Temple (New Templars) was instituted *circa* 1805 and grafted on Les Chevaliers de la Croix, a Lodge—formed October 14—from which its members were subsequently recruited. The pretensions of this Society—which claimed a lineal descent from the Knights Templars and did not even profess to be a Masonic body—are elsewhere referred to. It ultimately developed religious views of a somewhat peculiar nature, but of its remaining history, it will be sufficient to add, that it lay dormant during the restoration, revived about 1830 and apparently died of inanition about 1845. In 1807 a Portuguese called Nuñez grafted on another Paris Lodge the Order of Christ, also a Templar Rite with a Templar Degree beyond the 33° of the Ancient and Accepted Rite. It erected a few subordinate Chapters at Perpignan, Limoges, Toulouse, etc., but soon died out. A proposed new Ordre de la Misericorde in 1807 never acquired any substance. An Order of St. Sépulchre also arose and, according to Begue-Clavel, died out with its commander, Vice-Admiral Count Allemand, in 1819. The latter was an important personage in the strife between the rival Supreme Councils. It will be seen that the era of new Rites had not yet closed.

1807.—*January* 29.—The Rit Primitif de Narbonne joined the Grand Orient and deputed three representatives to the Grand Directoire des Rites.

March 26.—Cambacères was installed Supreme Chief of the French Rite in the Metropolitan Chapter and, on March 30, Grand Maître d'Honneur of the Rite Philosophique.

April 4.—Death of De Lalande. January 30, 1808, of Roëttiers de Montaleau.


1808.—*January* 23.—Cambacères installed Grand Master of the Order of Christ. *February* 8.—Montaleau's son—Alex. H. N. Roëttiers de Montaleau—appointed to succeed him as representative of the Grand Master, chiefly as a compliment to his father's memory. He was installed on the 12th.

March 8.—Cambacères was installed Grand Master of the Rit Primitif de Narbonne and, in June, of the V^e Province at Strasburg. In March and May 1809 the II^e and III^e Provinces at Lyons and Montpellier followed suit. In the same year he was elected Protector of the High Alchemical Grades of Avignon. Being thus at the head of all the Rites of any importance, one can understand how the peace was kept.

1809.—*August* 11.—The Grand Orient allowed its Lodges and Chapters to cumulate several Rites, i.e. to work as many as they pleased under as many different warrants, all of which were to be obtained from the Directoire des Rites.

1810.—*December* 29.—The existing Provincial Grand Lodges (three in number) were dissolved (Rebold, *op. cit.*, p. 119).

1811.—*January* 19.—The Ancient and Accepted Rite resolved to commence instituting subordinate bodies beyond the 18°. The fact is, they found that such



From l'Histoire Pittoresque de la Franc-Maçonnerie par Clavel, 1844.

Napoleon Bonaparte at the Lodge of Faubourg St. Marcel.

were being erected without their Warrant by private individuals and their hand was thus forced.

June 24.—Renewal of the former Concordat with the Scots Directories. *August 9.*—A circular of Grand Orient was issued, severely censuring certain foreign Jurisdictions and a few French Lodges for refusing to initiate Jews.

1813.—October 27.—The Supreme Council for America recognized the sole authority of the Grand Orient and sought amalgamation. Political events prevented further action.

Of this period little remains to be recorded. From 1796 to 1813 the Grand Orient practically acquired sole and supreme authority in Masonic matters, other Rites being merely subsidiary or supplementary, but not antagonistic. Its Lodges increased remarkably in France itself, also beyond the borders, for every fresh conquest meant an increase of French Masonic jurisdiction. In 1813, however, owing to the members being in such great numbers with the army, very many Lodges became dormant. On the restoration in May 1814 of Louis XVIII almost all the Imperialists who were officials of the Grand Orient became conspicuous by their absence. The Craft immediately became effusively Royal and the number of its Lodges dropped suddenly, owing to the reacquired independence of so many European States. During the Hundred Days the Craft was once more violently Imperial and, after Waterloo, it professed to breathe freely at last, owing to the removal of the Napoleonic incubus. On July 1, 1814 (Rebold, *op. cit.*, p. 123), several Lodges united to celebrate the return of Louis XVIII and their labours were concluded by a unanimous vote and oath to "protect the Lilies and die in defence of the Bourbons." The Grand Orient made speed to declare the Grand Mastership vacant and—May 11—voted 1,000 francs for the restoration of the Statue of Henri IV, whilst, on June 24, its orators expatiated on the joy which Masonry felt in at length seeing its legitimate king surrounded by his august family.

According to Rebold's list the progress of the Grand Orient was as follows : 1803, 60 new Chapters and Lodges ; 1804, 49 ; 1805, 67 ; 1806, 47 ; 1807, 56 ; 1808, 47 ; 1809, 44 ; 1810, 36 ; 1811, 27 ; 1812, 27 ; 1813, 18 ; 1814, 7—but these figures do not include the dormant Lodges which resumed work. The last list under the Empire, published in 1814, gives 764 active Lodges and 290 Chapters in France ; in the infantry, 63 Lodges and 24 Chapters ; in the cavalry, 7 Lodges and 2 Chapters ; in the auxiliary forces, 4 Lodges ; in the colonies, 16 Lodges and 7 Chapters ; abroad, 31 Lodges and 14 Chapters—in all, 886 Lodges and 337 Chapters. When we remember that, after the Revolution, the report of the Grand Orient on June 24, 1796, could only enumerate 18 Lodges, it must be confessed that the Craft had advanced by leaps and bounds. The list of 1814 also mentions 6 dormant Lodges as about to reopen and that there were applications for 35 new Lodges and 24 new Chapters, bringing the total number up to 1288, the result of eighteen years' activity.

At this period the Grand Orient of France was in communication with the Grand Lodges of Baden in Swabia, of the kingdoms of Italy and Naples, of Poland

and Lithuania, of the Three Globes at Berlin, of the Duchy of Warsaw, of Vienna and of the kingdom of Westphalia (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 582). The Grand Lodges at Frankfort, Hanover, The Hague, etc., were ignored by French Masons as having no right to exist in territory occupied by France.

One further allusion, which is of historical interest, will be made to Dr. Guillotin, an officer of the Grand Orient, who died March 26, 1814. There is the authority of the Grand Orator on June 24 of that year, for the statement that his last days were embittered by the thought, that his name had been so prominently connected with the excesses of the Revolution; the dreaded instrument which bore his name having been suggested by him out of pure pity for the former sufferings of condemned criminals (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 3). This oration consequently refutes the so often alleged fable that Dr. Guillotin's head was one of the first to fall under his own invention.

On the whole, the restoration had a disastrous effect on French Freemasonry. Apart from the number of foreign Lodges which naturally reverted to their own native Jurisdictions, a great number of French Lodges had so identified themselves with Napoleon and were so largely composed of his adherents, that nothing remained for them but to close their doors, at least for a time. In addition to this, the police and clergy under the restored family were by no means favourable to the Craft and prevented its progress. The king himself firmly refused to allow a prince of his family to be placed at its head and no Grand Master, consequently, was elected, but, in his place, three Deputies of the non-existent Grand Master or Grand Conservators and one representative of the Grand Master, viz. Montaleau. General—afterwards Marshal—Beurnonville offered the king to become surety for the good behaviour of the Craft, if allowed to assume the command, to which His Majesty agreed, so that the General, as first Deputy Grand Master, or first Grand Conservator, took the place previously occupied by Cambacères. The precarious state of toleration in which the Craft managed to drag on its existence is reflected in its own conduct. The individual initiative of the Lodges was everywhere hemmed in and fenced around; representations of the police, even if unfounded, were immediately followed by erasure of the supposed peccant Lodges; Masonic publications were on several occasions forbidden by the Grand Orient, which did its best to suppress them entirely; and, in sympathy with the government, the increasing centralizing tendency of its authority was day by day more pronounced. The influence of political events is shown by the fact that immediately after the Hundred Days more than 450 Lodges became dormant (Rebold, *op. cit.*, p. 145).

1814.—*July 1.*—The Grand Orient declared the Grand Mastership (Joseph's) vacant and sent a Deputation to Cambacères to require and accept his resignation.

July 29.—The Grand Orient received a report of the fruitless efforts of its Committee to induce the king to grant them a Royal Grand Master; elected and proclaimed in his stead three Grand Conservators, Marshal Macdonald, General Beurnonville and Timbrunne, Count de Valence. Montaleau was elected special representative of these three officers and, among the other officers of later interest,

may be mentioned the following members of the Ancient and Accepted Rite : Lacépède, Kellermann, Rampon, Muraire, Perignon, Lefèvre, Massena, Clément de Ris, Beurnonville, Montaleau, Valence, De Ségur, Challan and Tour d'Auvergne. Beurnonville declared that he would extend his protection to the Grand Orient alone, as in his eyes it was the legal Masonic authority (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 4, 11).

August 19.—The Grand Orient, at a meeting of one of its Boards, the Grande Loge de Conseil, resolved to exercise the control to which it laid claim over all rites of Freemasonry (*ibid.*, p. 5) and, on August 26, informed the Supreme Council of its intention, announcing that it had appointed a Committee to treat with them.

As the events which followed this step are, even at the present day, the source of mutual recriminations between the members of the two leading systems of French Freemasonry, the facts will be related in chronological order with minuteness of detail, allowing readers to arrive at their own conclusions. A few introductory words, however, are necessary, in order that the position of the parties may be clearly understood. The Grand Orient, although shorn of some of its higher dignitaries, had not been severely crippled by the change of government. The Supreme Council, on the other hand, which largely consisted of military officers attached to the late Emperor, had fallen into a state of paralysis and was quite dormant. This is admitted on all sides. The last list of the Supreme Council enumerates the following members : Cambacères, *Valence, Pyron, Thory, Hacquet, *Challan, *Kellermann, *Lacépède, d'Anduze, Rénier, *Massena, *De Ris, *Beurnonville, *Muraire, Aigrefeuille, d'Aunay, Rapp, Chasset, *Ségur, *Rampon, Langiers-Villars, Pény, Rouyer, *Montaleau, Joly ; honorary members, De Grasse-Tilly, Trogoff, Baillache, *Tour d'Auvergne, d'Harmensen and De Villière. Of these thirty-one Brethren, the twelve whose names are in each case distinguished by an asterisk, are known to have been Officers of the Grand Orient. Moreover, Hacquet and some of the others were members of the same body ; all were, of course, in the circumstances which had hitherto obtained, members of Lodges under the jurisdiction of the Grand Orient, because the Ancient and Accepted Rite had not, so far, warranted any bodies under the 18°.

September 8.—Joly reported the announcement of August 26 to the Supreme Council, which on September 23 appointed a Committee of Inquiry, consisting of Beurnonville, Muraire and Aigrefeuille, the two former being officials of the Grand Orient (*ibid.*, p. 6).

October 28.—The Supreme Council handed in an answer declining a fusion, signed *Valence, Pyron, Thory, *Hacquet, *Challan, *De Ris, *Beurnonville, *Pérignon, *Muraire, Aigrefeuille, d'Aunay, *Lefèvre, *Ségur, Langiers-Villars, Pény, Rouyer, Joly and Desfourneaux. This list is remarkable and affords evidence of the continual play of cross purposes in French Freemasonry. Desfourneaux was not a real member at all of the Supreme Council for France, but of the Supreme Council for America, dormant until better times ; the nine names marked * were Officers of the Grand Orient and General Beurnonville, its Senior Grand Conservator—who

had declared he would acknowledge no authority but that of the Grand Orient itself. But, still more remarkable is the fact, that a Committee previously appointed by the Grand Orient on August 22, to prepare a report on the subject, did unanimously—November 12—approve of a fusion—or, in the language of the Scots Masons, a usurpation—and that of the nine members of this Committee, two were Joly and Hacquet, who signed the answer of October 28, as above.

November 18.—The Grand Orient considered the report and resolved to resume its inherent authority over all Rites, to dissolve the Directory of Rites as no longer necessary, etc. Among the signatures we find Joly's; the others, with the exception of Montaleau's, are not given in any work at command. The results of this resolution on the organization of the Grand Orient may now be taken out of their chronological sequence. That body separated the legislative from the administrative functions of the 33° and it constituted on one hand a *Chambre du Suprême Conseil des Rites* (another name for the old *Grand Chapitre*) to warrant and administer ALL bodies beyond the 3°, on the other a *Grand Consistoire des Rites* divided into two sections. Section 1, the Grand Council of Prince Masons, to initiate into the 32° or the equivalent Degree in the other Rites and to delegate the right to other Consistories in France. Section 2 to be the sole authority conferring the 33°. The Grand Consistory was erected September 12 and inaugurated November 22, 1815. It will be observed that the autocratic powers of a few 33° members were thus suppressed and that they became only an integral part in one combined whole—the Grand Orient.

November 25.—The Supreme Council issued a circular protest against the action of the Grand Orient on the preceding 18th. This was only signed by Muraire, Aigrefeuille, d'Aunay and Pyron (*Kloss, op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 8). So that apparently all the others had joined the party of the Grand Orient.

December 3.—De Grasse-Tilly returned, revived the Supreme Council for America and attempted to assume the place left vacant by the moribund Supreme Council for France.

December 28.—Installation of a modified list of Grand Officers. Among these are found the following former members of the Supreme Council for France: Beurnonville, Valence, Lacépède, Kellermann, Rampon, Muraire, Masséna, Challan, Tour d'Auvergne, De Ris, Hacquet, Montaleau, Perignon and, possibly, others, as Kloss does not give the complete list (*ibid.*, p. 12). As it includes Muraire, it would appear as if the protesting remnant of the Supreme Council had been reduced to three. Of course those who were not in Paris at the moment, owing to political reasons, cannot be reckoned with. Certain it is, that the great majority had at this time rallied to the Grand Orient, although some afterwards went back to their previous allegiance. But of what effect can a majority be, in a society where one single 33° man who may hold out, is allowed to make others and, with them, reconstruct the whole edifice?

1815.—*March 15.*—Napoleon lands at Cannes, when the Grand Orient reinstated Prince Joseph and Cambacères and became imperialist. On June 18 the

Emperor was overthrown at Waterloo and the order, "As you were," was passed along the line.

August 18.—The Supreme Council for France issues a fresh circular protest, which had affixed to it the signatures of Aigrefeuille, Thory, Hacquet, Muraire, d'Aunay, De Tinan and Pyron. Here we meet with the last sign of this body for some years, with the exception of Joly's resignation on November 10 following, when he joined the Grand Orient. That Hacquet should have signed is incomprehensible, seeing that he presided over the Grand Consistory of Rites, or, in other words, was the head of the Scots branch of the Grand Orient. Muraire and Lacépède, it may incidentally be observed, had, however, at that time deserted the Grand Orient.

December 27.—This meeting of the Grand Orient is of interest, because it afforded Admiral Sir Sidney Smith an opportunity of presenting several printed projects for freeing the white slaves in Algiers.

1815 is also remarkable as being the year in which the Rite of Misraim began to arouse attention. Joly, to whom allusion has frequently been made, was a member at the time and so, of course, was Thory, who seems to have joined everything! Joly and other members of the Grand Orient united in a petition to that body, that the new Rite might be placed under the ægis of the Grand Consistory of Rites, which, however, was rejected on January 14, 1817 (Rebold, *op. cit.*, p. 126).

1817.—*August 8.*—The Grand Orient passed a resolution—embodied in a circular, September 18, 1817—declaring all soi-disant Masonic bodies not warranted by itself, to be irregular and clandestine and forbidding its Lodges to recognize any such associations as Masonic, or to exchange visits with their members (Kloss, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 37). This attitude was persisted in by the Grand Orient until 1841. The Ancient and Accepted Rite, on the other hand, always professed tolerance and acknowledged as legitimate all Masons, under whatever Jurisdiction. As a stroke of policy coming from the weaker side, this action was eminently well conceived and met with the success which has invariably attended every such proceeding, from historic times down to the present day. It would nevertheless be difficult for an English Mason to dispute the strict legality of the proceedings of the Grand Orient; nor, from the point of view of that body, would it be altogether easy to call in question their expediency; but, even as in England at the time of the rival Grand Lodges, so in France, the prohibition of mutual recognition was constantly broken by the subordinate Lodges of the Grand Orient, which more than once entailed erasure. At all great meetings, it may be observed, of the Supreme Council, members of the Grand Orient were present in large numbers and were invariably well received.

October 7.—The Grand Orient prohibited its Lodges from assembling at the Prado because the Supreme Council for America and a Misraim Lodge met there. It was not until September 12, 1821, that the proprietor of the Prado purged himself of his offences and the Grand Orient reinaugurated the premises, besprinkling them

with water to exorcize the unclean spirits of the past ; a proceeding which brought down upon its head the Homeric laughter of its rivals, indeed, of all Paris.

November 7.—A letter was read from Marshal Beurnonville enjoining the Grand Orient to follow the example of the Government and to look upon all Lodges not dependent upon itself as secret societies prohibited by the law.

December 27.—The Grand Orient declared the Rite of Misraim to be illegal and erased a Lodge for taking its part. It also called upon its own members to leave the Rite within thirty-three days, an order which they one and all obeyed.

1818.—*February 23.*—The Supreme Council for America, having completed its organization, met for the first time. The list of Grand Officers comprises names which subsequently became of importance, but none was connected with its past proceedings except those of De Grasse-Tilly and Desfourneaux, the latter of whom signed the document of October 28, 1814, which professedly emanated from the dormant Supreme Council for France, of which he was not even a member.

March 24.—Constitution of the Rainbow Lodge as the Mother-Lodge of Misraim.

April 8.—The Supreme Council marked its new departure by warranting two Craft Lodges. This is the date of its first attack upon the Craft in the sense that expression is understood generally.

August 7.—Pyron, in a circular, attempted to revive the Old Supreme Council for France, but unsuccessfully. He died on September 28 following.

August 18.—De Grasse-Tilly, having been deposed by the Supreme Council which he had constituted anew, issued a manifesto and retired with his adherents to the Pompei.

October 15.—The Grand Consistory of Rites, established September 15, 1815, issued its *Statutes*.

November 9.—The Supreme Grand Scots Lodge, at the Pompei (De Grasse-Tilly's), completed its *Statutes*, which, however, were not published until July 9, 1819.

1819.—*April 24.*—This date marks the commencement of one of many efforts on the part of the Grand Orient to conciliate the Ancient and Accepted Rite. The negotiations were conducted with the Supreme Council at the Pompei, the one in the Prado being moribund and the ancient Supreme Council for France, or rather what remained of it, not having yet awoke from its slumber. On the day in question, the highest officials of the Supreme Council met at a ball in a Paris Lodge—Commanders of Mount Tabor—two influential members of the Grand Orient, de Mangourit and Boule. As a consequence of advances made by the latter, commissioners were appointed and, on May 2, Roi and Baccarat on the one side and de Mangourit and Boule on the other, held a conference. Boule's proposal was as follows :

A friendly fusion, the Count de Cazes to be third Deputy Grand Master, Baron Fernig to be Lieutenant Grand Commander, the other members of Supreme

Council to receive posts or become honorary members, all members of the 33° to be recognized and all former inimical manifestoes to be annulled.

This liberal offer surprised the other side, who had only come prepared with a proposal that the independence of the Supreme Council should be acknowledged and harmony—though not fusion—established between the rival bodies. According to Kloss, on May 7, additional commissioners were appointed by both parties; whilst if we follow Jouast, this occurred two days previously. The names, however, of the Supreme Council representatives given by these two authorities do not agree. Conferences were held on June 16, from 10 A.M. to 5 P.M. and, again on June 21 and the Grand Orient appears to have been so confident of a happy result as to prepare for the festival of reunion. But the negotiations were wrecked on the usual rock. The Grand Orient insisted that the united body ought not only to be supreme but singly governed; but the Supreme Council refused to part with its fancied prerogative of ruling the first three Degrees. The Supreme Council wished to absorb and rule the Grand Orient, whilst the latter wished to place the other side in the same position as its own branch of the Ancient and Accepted Rite. The independence within itself of a small body of men—*an imperium in imperio*—naturally enough could not be tolerated and the other side would accept nothing less. The Count—afterwards Duc—de Cazes appears to have been unfeignedly sorry at the rupture of these negotiations; and Lacépède demitted from the Supreme Council in order to accept the post of Grand Administrator-General in the Grand Orient. The circular of Grand Orient of July 31, 1819, gives a complete history of all these transactions and conclusively proves that the Grand Orient never relinquished the rights acquired by the Concordat of 1804, but merely held them in suspense until 1815, at which date the great majority of the old Supreme Council had joined it in erecting the Grand Consistory of Rites.

1820.—*June 20.*—The Grand Orient renewed its decree forbidding Masonic assemblies in public-houses, but excepted four by name.

1821.—*March 9.*—Vassal opened the discussion on the projected new *Statutes*. These were not presented in a complete form to the Grand Orient until 1826, although the Committee of Revision had been appointed in 1817.

April 23.—Death of Peter Riel, Marquis de Beurnonville, Marshal and Peer of France, Senior Grand Conservator of the Grand Orient; born May 10, 1752. Valence, one of his co-Deputy Grand Masters, had deserted to the Supreme Council. Lacépède took the position vacated by the decease of Beurnonville and was replaced in 1823 by Count Rampon. The Marquis de Lauriston succeeded Valence in 1822.

May 4.—What remained of the original Supreme Council for France met, after a repose of six years and, on the 7th, amalgamated with the Pompei Council for America; the united body becoming the Supreme Council for France and the French possessions. The Articles of Union were signed by Valence, Muraire, Ségur and Pény. The Prado Council attempted to organize a festival as a counter-demonstration on June 28 and July 31 and then incontinently expired. Hacquet

demitted and threw in his lot finally with the Grand Orient, Lacépède becoming Grand Director of Ceremonies in his place. It was discovered that of the ancient (or original) Supreme Council eight members were dead, three in continuous absence and four others resigned. In the list of the new Supreme Council we find the following names of members of the old—Counts *de Valence, *Séguir and *Muraire, Baron de Pény, Thory, *Challan, Counts *Lacépède, De Grasse-Tilly, *Rampon, *De Ris and Langier-Villars, the seven marked with an asterisk having all at different times, sanctioned, by their participation therein, the former action of the Grand Orient in assuming the control of this Rite. It is singular that De Ris and Rampon for many subsequent years held high office in the Grand Orient. Through this constant shuffling of names and transfer of allegiance, the study of French Freemasonry is beset with almost insuperable difficulties.

June 24.—Lacépède—notwithstanding the occurrences of May 7—presided in the Grand Orient at the proceedings in memory of Beurnonville. He afterwards resigned his membership, retaining only that of the Supreme Council.

August 6.—Erection by the Supreme Council of the Very Illustrious Lodge of the Supreme Council, to admit members to the 30°–33°. The Lodge de la Grande Commanderie had been constituted on June 24 preceding, to admit to the 29° inclusive.

December 21.—The Grand Orient denounced the Rite of Misraim to the civil authorities and, on September 7, 1822, the latter took advantage of a slight infraction of the police rules to suppress the meetings of the Rite, which became dormant (Rebold, *op. cit.*, pp. 133, 134).

1823.—*November 20.*—The Royal Order of Scotland (Hérédom) united with the Grand Orient and, on November 25, the Grand Orient met to mourn the death of Louis XVIII.

1824.—The accession of Charles X does not seem to have been very beneficial to the Craft. In this year many Lodges in the Provinces were forcibly closed by the police.

1826.—*June 26.*—The new *Constitutions*, commenced in 1817, were completed and laid before the Grand Orient; they consisted of 898 articles. The Grand Orient—in its entirety—was to consist of a Grand Master (not appointed at this time), three Deputy Grand Masters (Marshals Macdonald and Lauriston and Count Rampon), Grand and Past Grand Officers and Masters and Deputies from the Lodges. The Boards, or Grand Committees (Chambres), were to be five in number. 1. Correspondence and Finance, or La Chambre d'Administration. 2. La Chambre Symbolique. 3. La Chambre des Hauts Grades, or Suprême-Conseil des Rites. These three Boards were called Chambres Administrative. 4. Counsel and Appeal—a composite body—consisting of nine officers of each of the three first Boards and some others. The members were required to possess the highest grades of the Rites practised. Besides hearing appeals, this Board settled the agenda paper for the Grand Orient. 5. La Comité Central et d'Élections, formed by the union of the three first, or Administrative Boards. Its functions were to nominate to all

the different offices. Besides these, there was a Grand College of Rites, formed of all members of the Grand Orient holding the 31°-33° and directed by thirty-six officers of that body, its duty being to grant the 31°-33°, or the corresponding ones of the other Rites and to warrant Consistories of the 32°.

These *Constitutions*—containing more than 400 regulations for private Lodges—were declared subject to revision every five years.

November 30.—We now meet with another series of efforts to accomplish a fusion between the two rival Rites. On this date Benou wrote anonymously to the Duc de Choiseul, Grand Commander of the Supreme Council, urging a union. Choiseul answered anonymously on December 5, expressing a willingness to treat on the basis of the Concordat of 1804. On the 6th these letters were laid before the *Chambre des Rites*, which appointed Commissioners and prepared a room for the committee. Benou informed Choiseul of the foregoing on the 7th. On the 10th the Supreme Council for France appointed its Commissioners. The first meeting took place December 22, and the Deputies from the Grand Orient handed in their proposal—complete fusion: Choiseul to be made a Deputy Grand Master; Muraire, President of the *College des Rites*; 15 members of the Supreme Council chosen by Choiseul, to be made Grand Officers; 5 others to enter the *College des Rites*, 5 the *Chambre Symbolique* and 5 the *Chambre d'Administration*; all Choiseul's Lodges to be acknowledged, etc. It will be seen that, as on every other occasion, the Grand Orient was the first to make overtures and proffered generous terms. But the same cause was ever destined to nullify the most well-meant efforts. Besuchet (Secretary to this Committee of Fusion) relates an anecdote of these meetings. General Pully, in order to explain the views of his colleagues, betook himself to professional terms and remarked, "We wish to enter in amongst you with shouldered arms as a battalion square (*bataillon carré*). Yes, was the reply; it only needs that you should place your fieldpieces at the four corners and we shall doubtless conclude a famous treaty of peace!"

After this declaration of first principles, it will occasion no surprise that, in spite of frequent meetings and interminable colloquies, the Supreme Council announced—April 8—that further negotiation was useless, whereupon the Committee dissolved. On April 13, 1827, the Grand Orient received the report of its Commissioners, and the proceedings closed.

1830.—The documentary evidence preserved, presents very little of importance, till we come to the three revolutionary days of July 28-30, which deposed the elder branch of the Bourbons and placed Louis Philippe on the throne. The Lodge of the *Trinosophes* at Paris fêted the event on August 6 and a Deputation of the Supreme Council attended, Muraire at its head. Bouilly and Merilhon of the Grand Orient took the opportunity of improving the occasion by desiring that the auspicious political events should be followed by a fusion of the two Rites. Muraire replied and concluded by expressing a wish to exchange the kiss of peace with Bouilly. Then followed a truly French scene. Desétangs seized each orator by the hand, led them into the middle of the Lodge and, amidst the acclamation of the assembly,

they threw themselves into each other's arms. A speech in honour of Lafayette, the hero of the hour, followed. On October 10 the Supreme Council gave a fête in honour of Lafayette, at which he was present and the official chairs of the Lodge were partly vacated in favour of officers of the Grand Orient, who attended in a body. A similar festival in compliment to Lafayette was given by the Grand Orient, at which the Supreme Council assisted. But these reunions were only of passing importance; the rivalry was very soon resumed.

This would seem a fitting point to review the progress of both systems since the last comparison. In 1827 they stood thus: Grand Orient, Paris, 67 Lodges, 37 Chapters, 6 Councils 30°, 1 of the 32°; in the Provinces, 203 Lodges, 78 Chapters, 8 Councils 30°, 1 Tribunal 31°, 5 Councils of the 32°; in the Colonies, abroad and in regiments, 20 Lodges, 18 Chapters, 3 Councils 30°, 2 Councils 32°: in all, 450 bodies, besides 156 dormant. At the same date the Supreme Council had only warranted 27 bodies. In 1831 the Grand Orient stood thus: 268 Lodges, 130 Chapters, 27 Councils in France; abroad 54: in all, 479 bodies. Of these, 114 met in Paris, 97 were still dormant. At the same date the Supreme Council ruled over 10 Lodges and 8 Chapters in Paris; in the Provinces, 10 Lodges, 4 Chapters, 1 Council; abroad 1 Lodge: in all, 34. The net result as regards these, the only two remaining constituent bodies in France, is thus: 513 Lodges, all told; which compares unfavourably with the 1,288 of 1814. According to Rebold's lists, the annual progress of the Grand Orient was (Lodges and Chapters) in 1814, 7; 1815, 1; 1816, 6; 1817, 8; 1818, 17; 1819, 23; 1820, 9; 1821, 14; 1822, 10 (35 at least closed during the preceding two years); 1823, 5; 1824, 12; 1825, 15; 1826, 12 (though the grand total was no higher than in 1820); 1827, 6; 1828, 6; 1829, 17; 1830, 9 (more than 60, however, ceased work during this year).

The first efforts of the Grand Orient, on the accession of Louis Philippe, were directed to procuring his assent in the nomination of the Duke of Orleans as Grand Master. Failing in this, the office was still considered vacant and held, as it were, in commission by the three Grand Conservators or Deputy Grand Masters, as they were variously styled. These were the Marquis de Lauriston (1822), Count Rampon (1823), Count Alexander de Laborde (1825); Roëttiers de Montaleau, Jun. (1808), being still the representative of the Grand Master.

According to the Statute requiring a revision of the *Constitutions* every five years, this duty was entrusted to a Committee, October 27, 1831. A report was furnished to the Grand Orient—March 24, 1832—and remitted to the Boards. Here it underwent revision from June 12, 1832, to June 11, 1833 and returned to the Committee, who apparently went to sleep over it for the next six years.

1833.—*August 21.*—The Grand Orient was obliged to caution its Lodges against inter-meddling with politics. During the whole of this reign, 1830-48, the Lodges showed a tendency to political discussions, which often began innocently enough with politico-economic questions and humanitarian projects, but were not kept within due bounds. Many Lodges were, in consequence, from time to time suspended, some at the instance of the police and, on these occasions, the Grand



From l'Histoire Pittoresque de la Franc-Maçonnerie par Clavel, 1844.

A Masonic Banquet—a Toast.

Orient was so anxious to make submission, that it occasionally refrained from any inquiry into the alleged offences. The first to suffer was the Indivisible Trinity of Paris, September 11.

1834.—A police law of April 10, placed the Lodges still more under the arbitrary control of the police ; so much so, that the Grand Orient thought of asking the special protection of government, but Bouilly induced the members to reject this dangerous project. The result was, however, that the Grand Orient became more pusillanimous than ever and even sought to suppress all Masonic publications. In this it could not succeed, but it could and did exclude their authors and the next to suffer was Peigné (1835), the editor of the *Revue Maçonique*. This course of action was by no means new to the Grand Orient, but earlier examples could not have been mentioned without excluding matters of more importance.

The anathema pronounced by the Grand Orient on the Supreme Council was a constant source of remonstrance from its own Lodges. In 1835 fresh efforts at a fusion were made, but the proposals on either side were a counterpart of those of 1826 and, therefore, failed.

1836.—The Grand Orient received continual complaints as to the tardy progress made with the revision of the *Statutes*. At one tumultuous meeting the President closed the Lodge, but the members would not disperse. Besuchet harangued the assembly and proposed to withdraw from the tyranny of the Grand Orient by forming a new body with the title Central and National Grand Lodge. As a consequence, on October 14 and 28, the Orator and his Lodge were alike suspended. Six other Lodges then ranged themselves on the side of the Schismatics ; and, on January 14, 1837, at the recommendation of Laborde, not only were these also suspended, but the names of their members were even handed in to the civil authorities. In 1836, Bouilly succeeded Montaleau as Representative of the Grand Master.

1837.—The Committee of Revision complained of the difficulties under which they laboured and, on October 27, their meetings were, in consequence, declared to be private and visitors were pronounced incapable of taking part in their discussions.

1838.—Rise of the Rite of Memphis.

1839.—A general amnesty was granted to all previous Masonic offenders on January 4. The new *Statutes* were at length produced—March 15—and approved and published on June 24. There were few alterations of importance. Honorary officers were discontinued ; all articles making it impossible for members of the two Masonic Jurisdictions to inter-visit were withdrawn. As a check to the admission of members already verging on pauperism, a minimum initiation fee was fixed for each separate Degree. Visitors to the Grand Orient were deprived of the right of addressing the Lodge—which, in spite of the absence of voting power, had, in 1829 and 1836, led to scandalous tumults. The historical introduction to these *Statutes* (or *Constitutions*), affords a melancholy proof of the lamentable Masonic ignorance of those by whom they were compiled.

November 13.—The Loge l'Anglaise, No. 204, Bordeaux, petitioned the Grand

Orient to put an end to its enmity with the Supreme Council. In 1840 several other Lodges joined in the plea for toleration and a circular of the Grand Orient—October 19, 1840—which sought to awaken slumbering animosities, was severely criticized on all sides. The Supreme Council seized the opportunity—December 15—of once more proclaiming that it opened its arms to all Masons, either as members or visitors ; and, in spite of the intolerance of the Grand Orient, it forbade its own Lodges from entering upon reprisals of any sort.

1841.—A last effort at a fusion was made by the Grand Orient and, in order to ensure success, it was agreed that the negotiations should be conducted by the five highest dignitaries on either side. These, severally headed by Bouilly and the Duc de Cazes, met for the first time on March 28, 1841. The Supreme Council proposed a return to the tacit understanding of 1805, that the Grand Orient should place all Degrees above the 18° under the authority of the Supreme Council. Each body to remain independent, but under the same Grand Master and two Deputy Grand Masters, one for each Rite ; with the joint title “ The Grand Orient of France and the Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Rite United.” The Grand Orient could not accept those terms, but it made every possible concession. Nothing, however, would satisfy the Supreme Council but absolute supremacy and the conservation of their hierarchical system. Later—June 29—it declared that no fusion could ever be possible between two bodies so fundamentally different in organization. In the same year—November 6—the Grand Orient at length gave way to the wishes of its Lodges, and decreed “ That Lodges under its jurisdiction might interchange visits with those under the Supreme Council.” From that time all quarrels were buried and the two Grand bodies have worked side by side in peace, although the Grand Orient has never ceased to confer the 33 Degrees of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, or the Supreme Council to warrant Lodges of the Craft.

1842.—February 11.—Baron Las Cases was named Deputy Grand Master *vice* De Laborde and installed on the 19th ; and—September 3—Bertrand was installed as Representative of the Grand Master in the place of Bouilly deceased.

1843.—Ragon, the author of *Cours Philosophique et Interprétatif des Initiations Anciennes et Modernes*, was censured—September 29—for publishing the second part of that work and—October 20—Begue-Clavel was expelled for publishing his *Histoire Pittoresque*. On November 8, however, the latter penalty was commuted to a formal censure.

1844.—September 6.—The Lodge of the Trinosophes at Paris affiliated a Brother Noel de Quersoniers, aged 115 (Rebold, *op. cit.*, p. 186).

1845.—In this year there began a series of Congresses to discuss questions of general and Masonic interest, such as pauperism, schools and cognate subjects, some of which approached perilously near to the *malum prohibitum*, viz. current politics. The Revolution of 1848 was already in the air. The first Congress was held—July 30—at La Rochelle ; and August 31, the Lodges at Strasburg inaugurated one at Steinbach in honour of Erwin, the architect of the cathedral, at which many German Lodges were represented. Six Lodges met at Rochefort June 7, 1846 ;

others assembled at Strasburg, August 18 ; at Saintes, June 5-7, 1847 ; at Toulouse, June 22. A further one was projected at Bordeaux for 1848, but the Grand Orient stepped in on January 17, 1848 and forbade these Congresses altogether.

1846.—*February 27.*—The Grand Orient held a Lodge of mourning for its deceased members—1843-5—amongst whom was Joseph Napoleon, last Grand Master of France.

April 3.—Reports and complaints that the Prussian Lodges refused to receive as visitors Frenchmen who were Jews, were taken into consideration. The Grand Orient expressed its indignation and instructed its representatives at the Berlin Grand Lodges, to endeavour to procure an alteration in the *Statutes* of those bodies, but, at the same time, strictly enjoined French Lodges to refrain from reprisals. A more pronounced action on the part of England may have possibly assisted in bringing one at least of those bigoted Grand Lodges more into harmony with the spirit of the age.

June 1.—The Supreme Council issued its first code of Regulations.

1847.—*April 2.*—Bertrand was elected Deputy Grand Master and was succeeded in the office of Representative—June 24—by Désanlis. On December 17 the Commission entrusted with the revision of the *Statutes* made its report to the Grand Orient.

1848.—*March 4.*—The Grand Orient met after the overthrow of the Monarchy and the formation of a Provisional Government and resolved to send a Deputation to the latter expressing sympathy with the Revolution and joy at finding that its own maxim of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity had become the watchwords of the nation. Thus, again, it was unable to refrain from political action—and worship, more or less sincere, of the rising sun. These sentiments were expressed to the Lodges in a circular of the 13th. The Deputation presented itself on the 6th and was received by Crémieux and Garnier-Pages, members of the government, both wearing Masonic regalia. The addresses on either side may be passed over with the bare comment that, though confining themselves to the letter of the truth respecting the rôle of the Craft, they violated its spirit by implication. But political events also tinged the preparations for passing the new Constitutions just announced as complete. A resolution was agreed to—March 20—ordering a new election of Deputies in all Lodges to assist at the framing of the new ordinances and a circular of the 25th calls upon all Lodges, without regard to Rites and jurisdictions, to send Deputies to form in the Grand Orient a really National Masonic assembly for all France. A further circular of April 7 was still more explicit. It invited all Lodges and Masons in France to come and aid in establishing a Masonic unity of government. Here we plainly recognize the cloven hoof, the idea presumably being, to utilize the awakened democratic spirit of the nation, to the detriment of the aristocratically governed Supreme Council.

At the close of this epoch it will be convenient to review the progress of the Grand Orient from 1830. According to Rebold's list, the following Lodges, Chapters, etc., were constituted by the Grand Orient in 1831, 4 [it had lost over 90

bodies of all sorts in the year and the number of its Lodges was reduced to 229]; 1832, 14; 1833, 4; 1834, 8 [but some 15 had become dormant]; 1835, 6; 1836, 10; 1837, 3; 1838, 4 [but so many Lodges had become dormant that there remained only 216 active ones]; 1839, 11; 1840, 3; 1841, 6; 1842, 6; 1843, 4; 1844, 8; 1845, 7 [the number of active Lodges had risen to 280]; 1846, 9; 1847, 9 [but as upwards of 30 had closed, the number of Craft Lodges only reached 255]. The same year the number of bodies of all sorts under the Supreme Council amounted to 71.

A further incentive to the unusually liberal action of the Grand Orient, may be found in a movement then recently initiated, of which, as it was of short duration, an account will here be given before proceeding with the history of that body. Curiously enough, this democratic attempt arose in the bosom of the oligarchical Ancient and Accepted Rite; or, rather, the fact is not really curious, because the worst tyranny usually gives birth to the most republican sentiments. A detailed account of this movement, which deserved a better fate than befell it, is concisely given by Rebold in his *Histoire des trois Grandes Loges*.

It would appear that, in the course of 1847, a few earnest Masons discussed the possibility of erecting a really representative Grand Lodge, on the model of the Grand Lodge of England, confining itself to the simple ceremonies of the Craft. The first step was taken by the Lodge Patronage des Orphélins of the Ancient and Accepted Rite under its Master, Juge Jun. and a manifesto was issued—March 5, 1848—in conformity with certain resolutions duly passed August 10, 1847. After inveighing against the monstrosities in the direction of affairs under both Rites, it declared that the time had arrived for the Lodges, which are the basis of the Craft, to govern themselves for themselves and to assert their absolute right to form their own By-laws, subject to the confirmation of the Grand Lodge. It proposed that each Lodge should send three representatives to form a National Grand Lodge (no Deputy to represent two Lodges), to choose their own Grand Officers, to work only three Degrees and to suppress all others; that in private Lodges each member should be at liberty to address the chair—a right hitherto confined to the Orators and High Degree Masons—the liberty of the Masonic press to be established, the Grand Lodge to have no right to control the election of Deputies, etc. These clauses indicate very plainly the grievances of the Craft. It concludes—

No more Rites of 7, 33, or of 90 Degrees, each anathematizing and fighting with the others; but one simple Rite, founded on good sense, comprising in itself all useful instruction and which shall at length annihilate the nonsense, the revolting absurdities and the perpetual strife which these brilliant fantasies have introduced amongst us.

Six other Lodges of the Ancient and Accepted Rite soon joined this party and were, naturally enough, erased. A committee was appointed, which—March 10—waited on the authorities at the Hôtel de Ville, to obtain police permission for their future action and to congratulate the Provisional Government. Lamartine's reply

was as poetical as might have been expected ; space forbids its insertion. The next step was to placard Paris with an invitation to all Masons to meet in General Assembly on April 17. The circular was forwarded to all the Lodges, signed by Barbier, Vanderheyen, Jorry, Du Planty, Juge, Minoret, Lefrançois, Desrivières and Dutilleul. Juge, however, almost immediately afterwards withdrew ; he had conceived the fanciful idea of causing the new Grand Lodge to be inaugurated by the Grand Lodge Union of Frankfort, with himself as Grand Master. On April 17 the assembly met and resolved to call a larger one, requesting each Lodge in France to send three Deputies. At this second assembly 400 Masons appeared, by whom, unanimously, the original self-elected Committee was directed to prepare a code of ordinances. Full meetings of the new Grand Lodge were held on November 29, December 14 and 17 ; each article was discussed and the code adopted on the last-named date. A report and manifesto, dated February 25, 1849, signed, among others, by Rebold, was then forwarded together with the new *Constitutions*, to every Lodge in France. On April 29, the Committee summoned a meeting of Grand Lodge for May 19 following, announcing that no insignia beyond that of the three Degrees would be permitted. At this meeting seven Grand Officers were elected, viz. the Marquis du Planty, M.D., Mayor of St. Ouen—Master of the Grand Lodge ; Barbier, Avocat Général—S.W. ; General Jorry—J.W. ; Rebold—Grand Expert ; Humbert—Secretary General, etc. During the whole of that year the Grand Lodge occupied itself with settling its rituals, organization, etc., but does not appear to have attempted to seduce the Lodges under other governing bodies, from their allegiance ; and, in answer to all inquiries, refrained from persuasion, contenting itself with forwarding its manifesto and *Constitutions*. It is more than probable that more energetic proceedings would have resulted in the ruin of the Grand Orient and the Supreme Council but they were not taken.

In 1850 the Supreme Council and the Grand Orient both applied to the authorities to suppress the new body ; whilst fear on the one hand, caution on the other and the apparent wish to reform itself evinced by the Grand Orient, combined to diminish the number of Lodges which adhered to the National Grand Lodge. At this time they were only eight. Towards the end of the year, several Lodges in France—for one cause or another—were closed by the police and the enemies of the National Grand Lodge were astute enough to throw the blame on their young rival. The result was, an edict of the Prefect of Police, dated December 6, 1850, dissolving the Lodge. The Grand Lodge resolved to obey the authorities and issued a circular to that effect to all its members on January 10, 1851. On January 14 it held its final meeting. Its 5 Lodges and more than 600 visitors, met on the occasion, when, amid a mournful silence the President delivered his valedictory address and closed the Lodge. Had it not been for Rebold himself, matters might have turned out differently. On December 14, 1848, some members of the Provisional Government of the Republic, who also belonged to the Grand Lodge, came to a meeting of the latter, prepared to counsel its members to petition the government to dissolve both the Grand Orient and the Supreme Council and to hint that

the request would meet with a ready compliance. Rebold, however, who was taken into their confidence, evinced a strong repugnance to make use of the Civil arm and so worked upon the members in question, that the communication was never made. Herein he showed much Masonic feeling, but little worldly wisdom—but to return to the Grand Orient.

1848.—*June 9.*—The Deputies summoned by the Grand Orient assembled and were addressed by the president Bertrand, Junior Deputy Grand Master. One sentence of his allocution will describe the purpose of the meeting. “To revise the whole Masonic Code and to establish the institution on new bases, in consonance with the present state of feeling.” The Master dissolved the old Grand Orient by laying his insignia on the table before him and was unanimously elected President of the new constituent assembly. The powers of the Deputies were examined, five officers elected to administer the Craft *ad interim*, etc., etc. From then to August 10, 1849, twenty-six meetings were held and, on the latter date, the new *Constitutions* were confirmed by the Grand Orient thus newly erected. In spite of the liberal promises of the circulars of 1848, the organization was scarcely more democratic than previously, but one fact deserves mention, for the first time in French Freemasonry this code unequivocally declares (Art. 1), that the basis of Freemasonry is a belief in a God and the immortality of the soul.

1850.—*December 13.*—Appointment of Berville as Senior Deputy Grand Master and of Desanlis as President of Grand Orient and Representative of the Grand Master. They were installed on the 27th following.

1851.—*June 12.*—The following words sum up the report made to Grand Orient on this date: “Confusion in the archives, confusion in the property, confusion in the finances, this is what our researches have disclosed, this is what we are forced to report to you.” On December 10, following, in view of political disturbances which were then anticipated, the Grand Orient ordered all Masonic meetings to cease. In the same month Louis Napoleon was elected President of the Republic for ten years, and—January 1, 1852—the Grand Orient withdrew its prohibition.

The existence of Freemasonry appearing very precarious, Prince Lucien Murat was asked whether he would accept the Grand Mastership and, having obtained the permission of his cousin, signified his assent. Whereupon, he was unanimously elected—January 9, 1852, received the 33° on the 27th—and was installed February 26. On the same date Bugnot was invested as President of the Grand Orient, *vice* Desanlis, who had resigned that office July 11, 1851.

The first act of the new Grand Master was to adopt measures for the erection of a Masonic Hall in the Rue Cadet. He succeeded, thanks to a large loan (125,000 francs) from his son, but the expenses were for years a heavy burden on the resources of the Craft. A house was purchased and sufficiently altered, in part, to be opened formally on June 30 of the same year.

1853.—*March 11.*—Desanlis was installed as second Deputy Grand Master and, on April 12, three members were nominated for the Presidency of the Grand Orient from whom the Grand Master selected Janin, who was installed on the 29th. It

was on this occasion that Murat gave the first indication of the despotic manner in which he intended to rule. On the occasion in question, the Grand Secretary, Hubert, had voted against the candidate most acceptable to the Prince—which, although a salaried officer, he was quite entitled to do—but he was immediately relieved of his duties by the Grand Master, in spite of the fact that, during his short tenure of office, he had contrived to increase the correspondence tenfold, to restore order in the bureau and to convert the financial deficit of the Grand Lodge into a balance on the other side.

1854.—*December 15.*—The Grand Master convoked a Constituent Convent for October 15 to “take measures for Masonic unity and to assure to the directing power the means of action which are indispensable, etc.” On the 16th the Convent met and verified the mandates of the Deputies and the following day the questions to be discussed were submitted, the first being the modifications of the *Constitutions*. The Grand Master allowed it to become known, through Desanlis, that the Government had resolved not to permit in future a deliberative and legislative assembly. It required that all power should be in the hands of the Grand Master, who would be assisted by a Council—that this was the only way to offer the Government a valid guarantee, etc. The Commission of Revision was chosen from those members most likely to be amenable to such thinly veiled hints—and proceeded to work. On October 26 it brought up its report, which was so badly received and gave rise to such tumult, that the sitting was prematurely closed. As the whole spirit of the new ordinances may be gathered from one single article, it is here reproduced side by side with the corresponding paragraph of 1849 :

1849

Art. 32.—The Grand Orient, the legislator and regulator of the Order, is possessed of all its power. It exercises directly the legislative power, delegates the executive to the Grand Master, assisted by a council and confides the administrative to Boards (Chambres) formed of its own members.

1854

Art. 31.—The Grand Master is the Supreme Chief of the Order, its representative near foreign Masonic Jurisdictions and its official organ with the Government ; he is the executive administrative, and directing power.

In fact Murat had determined to rule the Grand Orient and the Craft after the manner of a general in the field, who directs everything, although he may and, for his own convenience, occasionally does, ask the advice of his staff—the members of which, however, would hold their offices by a very frail tenure, were they in the habit of often disagreeing with their chief. In spite of protests and struggles, the Convent was obliged to ratify these *Constitutions* on October 28. Next day the members of the Council were appointed and, on the 30th, the Grand Master by a decree appointed Desanlis and Heuillant Deputy Grand Masters. The most noticeable name on the Council is that of Rexès, of whom more will be heard. In order to convey some faint impression of the pitiable state of subserviency into which the Craft was reduced during this period of its history, a few of Murat’s many arbitrary acts may now be cited.

On May 13, 1856, a member of the Grand Orient demanded that certain decrees of the Grand Master should be submitted to the assembly. He was informed that such decrees could not be discussed and, continuing to urge the point, was ordered to resume his seat. Blanche, a member of the Grand Master's council, on one occasion indignantly exclaimed, "But what are we then?" "Nothing without me," said Murat, "and I—I am everything, even without you." Blanche resigned his seat. In 1861, Murat suspended, in one month, more than 40 Presidents and Deputies of Lodges for opposing the arbitrary government of the Grand Orient. Previously—April 16, 1858—he had distributed, of his own will, the 40 Paris Lodges amongst the 13 Chapters of the city and, on November 30, of the same year, he decreed that no Masonic writings should be published, except by the printers to the Grand Orient. A Lyons Lodge was suspended—March 31, 1859—for having "permitted itself to discuss a decree of the Grand Master" and a similar fate befell a Paris Lodge on May 9, ensuing. In 1858, the Grand Master warned the assembly general "to deliberate only on such subjects as are placed before it by his council and, on no account to wander, accidentally or otherwise, from the *ordre du jour*." These are only a few incidents taken at haphazard, yet, something, after all, may be urged in Murat's favour. He was the first French Grand Master who ever interested himself in the slightest degree in the affairs of the Craft. His intentions were doubtless good—according to his lights—his speeches often had a true Masonic ring, but he was apparently much misled by worthless and ambitious members of his Council and wholly unable to appreciate the beauties of self-government, or to divest himself of the effects of his barrack training. In his eyes the Craft was a regiment and himself the colonel and there—so far as he was concerned—was an end of the matter. Discussion meant mutiny and was therefore to be kept under with a firm hand.

1855.—*February 26*.—The Grand Master invited all the world to a Masonic Congress at Paris, to be held June 1. Desanlis resigned the position of Deputy Grand Master March 30 and, on June 4, was made an Honorary Grand Officer, and Razy appointed Deputy Grand Master *ad interim*.

June 7.—The Grand Masonic Congress assembled under the presidency of Heuillant, Deputy Grand Master and was officially opened on the 8th by Murat in person. The Grand Orient was represented by twenty-two members and officers. Five foreign Grand Bodies had accepted the invitation, but did not put in an appearance, viz. the Grand Lodges of Switzerland, Hamburg, Louisiana, Saxony and the Supreme Council of Luxemburg. Three—the Grand Lodges of Haiti, New York and Sweden—had appointed Deputies, but they were unable to arrive in time. Four Grand Lodges and one Provincial Grand Lodge were really represented, viz. Columbia, Ireland, Virginia, Holland and the Provincial Grand Lodge of Munster. Inasmuch as there are some ninety Grand Lodges in the world, besides any number of Provincial Grand Lodges, the outlook was not encouraging. Only five proposals were agreed to; these were of the most unimportant description and not one of them was carried into effect.

1857.—June 6.—By a decree of Murat, Doumet was appointed Deputy Grand Master, *vice* Desanlis resigned; and Razy, who had acted *ad interim*, was made an Honorary Grand Officer. A decree of September 30 placed Rexès at the head of the correspondence of the Grand Orient and entrusted him with other important charges. In fact, the Deputy Grand Master became such an unimportant personage that Heuillant resigned. From that time the Grand Orient was practically under a triumvirate—Murat, Doumet and Rexès. This paved the way for a very disgraceful transaction. On June 2, 1860, Murat accepted the resignation of Rexès, but asked him to continue his duties *ad interim*. On the 11th Rexès presided over the Grand Master's Council and delivered a message to the effect that the finances of the Grand Orient being now capable of supporting the charges upon them, the Grand Master was unwilling to ask any longer for the services of such an important officer as Rexès' successor would be, without offering an equivalent. The Council was therefore requested to name the sum it could set apart for the purpose and, on the 18th, offered a maximum of 9,000 francs per annum. As a matter of fact, the finances of the Grand Orient showed a large and increasing annual deficit, but the Council was chiefly composed of Brethren, who are best described as the creatures of the Grand Master. Moreover, as Rexès' successor could only be appointed from among themselves, each member felt that he had at least a chance of being appointed to an office worth some £350 a year. Their consternation, however, may be imagined when a decree appeared—June 21—stating that on and after July 1 the office formerly occupied by Rexès would be endowed with a salary of 9,000 francs—which was followed by another of July 17, appointing Rexès himself to this office and instructing him to assume thenceforth the title of Representative of the Grand Master.

We now approach some scandalous series of scenes in French Freemasonry. Many thinking Masons had, long since, become disheartened; in fact, very many Lodges in France had, for years, preferred to declare themselves dormant rather than live on shamefully. Only one hope remained, the Grand Master was not appointed *ad vitam* and the next election was no longer far distant. Murat had been appointed on June 9, 1852; Art. 30 of the Statutes provided for a renewal of election every seven years but, as the election was confirmed by the Constitutive Convent—October 28, 1854—his appointment was regarded as bearing that date. The new election ought, therefore, to have taken place October 28, 1861, but Murat, in convoking the General Assembly falling due May 20, 1861, had warned the Grand Orient to take that opportunity of renewing the election, in order to avoid double journeys and expenses to the Deputies. Already the attention of the Brethren had been called to the liberal tendencies of Prince Jerome Napoleon, as exemplified by his parliamentary conduct, which contrasted favourably with the Ultramontane votes of Prince Murat and there is no doubt that canvassing on a large scale had been used to promote his possible candidature. The first open act of hostility was an article in the March-April number of *Initiation*, respecting the approaching election and contrasting the two princes much in Hamlet's style, with regard to the Two

Pictures. At some time in April a number of the Paris Masters addressed a letter to Prince Napoleon. Space will only admit of a short extract :

Whereas Prince Murat's attitude of late incapacitates him from acting any longer as the representative of the Craft, whereas we have finally decided not to re-elect him, but have cast our eyes on you, who, though not yet the representative of the Craft, have nevertheless always proclaimed its principles aloud ; whereas it behoves us under present circumstances to choose a leader who will, etc., etc., we have decided to nominate and elect your Imperial Highness and beg to remind you that, being a Freemason, you owe certain duties to the Fraternity, etc., etc.

The Prince's reply, stating his readiness to accept the office, if elected, was received by the Masters, April 19. About the same time, or shortly afterwards, appeared a circular of Murat to the Lodges respecting the election. It speaks of an intrigue organized amongst some Masons, desirous of utilizing Freemasonry for political ends, to produce a schism on the occasion of the election. The name of an illustrious prince having been used to cover these machinations, the Grand Master desirous not to enter into rivalry with a member of the Imperial family, had inquired of Prince Jerome whether he intended to stand ; and this prince had answered, that, having ceased to occupy himself with Freemasonry since 1852, he should certainly decline a nomination. Murat therefore warned the Brethren against these intriguers, but disclaimed any idea of wishing to influence the election. It appears that Jerome omitted to inform Murat of his change of views until May 17 and the latter was thus placed in a very equivocal position, because, at the time his circular appeared, Jerome's letter was already in the hands of the Paris Masters. On May 2 a decree of Murat suspended the author of the newspaper article in question, as being in the highest degree disrespectful to the Grand Master whose civil actions it had ventured to criticize. About the same time Rexès reported several Brothers for daring to intrigue to procure the nomination of Prince Jerome and denounced them as factious. On May 14 they were consequently suspended. Two of them were members of the Grand Master's Council. Among the names of nine others is that of Jouast. This wholesale suspension of voters was certainly a curious way to avoid influencing the elections. After all this it is easy to conceive that, when the Grand Orient met, it was in no very equable frame of mind.

1861.—*May 20.*—First meeting of the Grand Orient. President—Doumet, Deputy Grand Master. The first business was necessarily of a routine character, to verify the powers of the deputies. Rousselle proposed that this should be undertaken by a Committee of Scrutineers nominated *ad hoc* by the assembly, as in the olden days, not by the Grand Master's Council as had been arbitrarily carried out since 1852. After debate Rousselle carried the day ; each of the nine Boards (or Chambers) of the Grand Orient named one member to form a Committee of nine Scrutineers. Only one belonged to the party of the Grand Master. From that moment the majority escaped from the control of Rexès.

May 21.—The Committee of Scrutineers and the Boards met, when the Scru-

tineers commenced the examination of the mandates. Dissatisfaction became soon openly expressed and, in his excitement, Hovins, the member of the Grand Master's party, so far forgot himself as to exclaim, "Your methods will produce excitement and the police will be called upon to interfere." The Boards began to review past decrees and rejected almost all the propositions of the Grand Master. They decided that it would be wise to at once elect the new Grand Master and were about to resolve themselves into a plenary séance, when a decree of that very morning was presented to them, suspending the sittings of the full Orient till the 24th, but permitting the Boards to continue sitting. A Committee to interview the Grand Master and procure the repeal of this decree was about to be elected, when Doumet expressed his intention of taking that duty upon himself the first thing in the morning, it being then five o'clock and too late. The meeting broke up, to resume at eight o'clock—at which hour the committee rooms being occupied by private Lodges, all nine Boards met in the large hall in separate groups to continue their work. Whilst thus engaged, Rexès strolled into the room, struck his hand on the table to procure silence and said, "Sirs, I come to tell you that you are not legally assembled, the hour is unsuitable, you must retire." On being remonstrated with, he exclaimed, "If you persist I must call in the police" and withdrew. Steps were taken that one man only should protest for all, if the police interfered and the work was continued. Meanwhile a squad of police entered the building under the orders of Rexès. Masons leaving their private Lodges met these in the corridor and ordered them to leave. Rexès ordered the police to clear the building. The Masons present, answered by warning the police that they were the proprietors of the building, both as shareholders and as rent-payers and that Rexès was their salaried servant. Rexès exclaimed, "Sirs, you are ruining Freemasonry." "Sir," they replied, "you disgrace it." In the end the police retired. The Committees, who had meanwhile remained undisturbed, not being able to meet as a Grand Orient, had, in each Board, separately elected Prince Napoleon and drawn up a Minute to that effect, after which they left to meet the next day at nine o'clock.

May 22.—Doumet and the Council called upon the Grand Master, who, after persuasion, consented that they might announce to the assembly the repeal of the decree. The Council returned to the hall and was about to summon the Boards to meet as a Grand Orient, when Rexès appeared and announced that the Council had misunderstood the Prince. The indignant members sent to request Murat's presence; but meanwhile Doumet was called away to the Ministry of the Interior and, as he did not reappear, the Boards were not summoned. These meanwhile obtained 98 signatures to the Minute of Election out of a possible 152 and left, in order to return at eight o'clock to resume their departmental work. On arriving at that hour they found the building closed, not only to themselves, but to private Lodges whose night of meeting it was. The Lodge of the United Brothers had even prepared for a brilliant soirée and were not made acquainted with the order until their arrival at the Hall.

May 23.—A deputation waited upon Prince Napoleon at ten in the morning

and handed him a written report showing that, debarred from effecting a regular election, they had had recourse to the best means available, accompanied by a Minute of the election signed by 98 Deputies. They were graciously received and proceeded thence to a notary public in order to deposit with him a Minute of the election, etc. They then separated to meet at two o'clock as a Grand Orient. But Rexès had meanwhile interviewed the Prefect of the Police and, when the Brethren arrived, they found this notice on the door—"Freemasons are forbidden to meet for the election of a Grand Master before the end of next October. Signed Boitelle," etc., etc.

May 24.—The members of the Grand Orient published a formal and dignified protest against all these proceedings, attaching, very naturally and, it may be, justly, all the blame to Rexès, the only one interested, to the extent of 9,000 francs per annum, in the then existing arrangements.

May 28.—The *Opinion Nationale* published a letter from Prince Napoleon thanking the Fraternity for their sympathies; but, in view of the strife which the election was engendering, requesting that his name might be no more mixed up in the matter. Then followed decrees of Murat. The Grand Orient would not be convoked till October. Lodges in the metropolitan department of the Seine were suspended till further notice. A third, on May 29, after many "whereas's," goes on to say:

All Brothers who have taken part in these illegal and un-Masonic meetings in the hotel of the Grand Orient, without our authority and in spite of our prohibition, are hereby declared unworthy; as soon as their names shall be known and, failing a disavowal on their part, they will be suspended. [Then follow the names of 24 Brothers who were known and consequently suspended.] Signed Murat.

July 29.—In a long manifesto, very dignified and Masonic, but misstating the facts, Murat declared that thenceforth the duties devolving upon him as Grand Master had ceased to be pleasing. In fact he declined re-election and appointed a Committee composed of Boubée, Desanlis, Rexès and the Grand Master's Council to manage affairs until the election in October.

September 29.—The Grand Master's Council convoked an extraordinary General Assembly for October 14. As its sole business was to elect a Grand Master the sitting was to close on the same date. This was followed by a dignified letter of advice from Murat to the Fraternity and the publication of a private letter of Prince Napoleon begging the Craft to give their votes to some other Brother.

October 10.—

We, Prefect of Police, on information received, in the interests of public security, do decree; all Masons are hereby interdicted from meeting in order to elect a Grand Master before the month of May 1862. Signed Boitelle.

This naturally raised further protests, amid which October 28 arrived and the Order was without a Grand Master. Murat's time had lapsed and no successor

had been elected. In these circumstances a committee handed in the name of three Brothers to the Minister of the Interior, as administrators of the Craft and claimed that their legal power should be acknowledged ; but Murat had already advised the minister of five of his own appointing, so that there now were two Committees claiming to rule the Craft and more discord.

1862.—*January 11*.—At last the Emperor took the matter into his own hands :

Napoleon, by the grace of God, ∴ ∴ whereas, etc. Art. 1. The Grand Master of Freemasons in France, hitherto elected every three years according to the *Statutes* of the Order, is now appointed directly by me for the same period. Art. 2. His Excellency, Marshal Magnan, is appointed Grand Master of the Grand Orient of France. Art. 3. Our Minister of the Interior is charged with the execution of this decree. Given at our palace of the Tuileries, 11 Jan. 1862. Napoléon.

January 12.—Rexès waited upon Magnan to receive instructions for his initiation. This took place on the following day, Rexès and four others conferring upon him from the 1° to the 33° at one sitting ! This, of course, was exceedingly irregular and Blanche and Sauley told the Marshal so the day succeeding, when they in turn came to make arrangements. Their conversation with the new Grand Master resulted in Rexès's immediate impeachment, trial and degradation from his office.

It will scarcely be expected that the Craft should have prospered during these troublous times. According to Rebold's lists, the Grand Orient constituted Lodges and Chapters, etc., in 1848, 7 ; 1849, 8 ; 1850, 9 ; 1851, 4 ; 1852, 4 ; 1853, 2 ; 1854, 2 ; 1855, 0 [about 10 had become dormant this year ; the total number of Craft Lodges was only 180 active, as against 255 in 1847] ; 1856, 2 ; 1857, 5 [and 5 relieved from suspension] ; 1858, 12 ; 1859, 7 [and 3 reinstated] ; 1860, 9 [and 7 reinstated] ; 1861, 5 [and 3 reinstated].

In 1852, at the election of Murat, the bank book of the Grand Orient showed a credit to the amount of over 50,000 francs (£2,000) ; at the close of his term, October 31, 1861, it presented a deficit of 68,446 francs.

One more and last fact to show the decadence which had overtaken the spirit of Masonry during the past lamentable period. In order to provide funds for the continually increasing needs of the Grand Orient, the Grand Master's Council had hired out a part of its premises, within the very walls of its own hotel, to serve as a ballroom for the use of the demi-monde. Need it be wondered that thoughtful and earnest Masons, meeting within the same walls, should have grown indignant at this forced proximity of a school of morals to a rendezvous of immorality and that, in their own corridors, the sons of light should jostle the modern representatives of Phryne and the Bacchantes.

At the entrance of Magnan on the scene, the position of the rival Jurisdictions was, as nearly as can be estimated : Grand Orient—France, 158 Lodges, 59 Chapters, Councils, etc. ; Algeria, 11 Lodges, 7 Chapters ; Colonies and abroad, 20 Lodges, 14 Chapters : in all, 189 Lodges, 80 Chapters. Ancient and Accepted Rite—France, 41 Lodges, 10 Chapters ; Algeria, Colonies and abroad, 9 Lodges, 5 Chapters :

in all, 50 Lodges, 15 Chapters. Rite of Misraim—5 Lodges. Grand total of French Freemasonry :—244 Lodges practising Degrees of the Craft and 95 bodies—composed of Masons—playing at philosophy.

January 15.—Magnan presided over the Grand Orient for the first time and appointed as his Deputy Grand Masters, Doumet and Heuillant. He was installed on the 8th February. His speeches on these occasions foreshadowed his subsequent conduct. He admitted, in so many words, that his appointment by the Emperor was an infraction of the Landmarks, but he promised to rule constitutionally and to obtain as soon as possible, the restoration to the Grand Orient of its privileges, and observed, “Your Grand Master is but one Brother the more—*primus inter pares.*” Of this Latin phrase he was very fond, often using it to define his position. Under his sway order and regularity were soon restored and the arbitrary character of Murat’s administration considerably amended. Magnan, however, could himself occasionally play the tyrant, as his action respecting the Ancient and Accepted Rite will show. Soon after his nomination he met Viennet, the Sovereign Grand Commander of the Supreme Council, whom he informed that he read the Emperor’s decree as appointing him to be Grand Master of all French Freemasons and concluded “prepare to receive me as your Grand Master also, I will no longer suffer *petites églises.*” Viennet smiled and retired. On February 1, he wrote kindly to Viennet, announcing his formal intention of reuniting dissenting Lodges to the Grand Orient. Viennet replied on the 3rd, pointing out that the Constitution of the Supreme Council rendered this absolutely impossible and that so long as a single 33° man remained, he would become the head of the Rite, etc. On April 30 Magnan addressed a circular to all the Scots Lodges :

For many years a deplorable schism has desolated French Masonry, . . . a Sovereign Will desires to-day its unity . . . and has confided to me the universal direction of all French Rites. . . . I trust you will not force me to use measures repugnant to my fraternal feelings. . . . Presidents of Lodges under the ex-Supreme Council, do not misunderstand the position : it is from me, from the Grand Orient, that you now hold. . . . On June 9 I trust to be surrounded by the Deputies of *all* Lodges. Signed Magnan.

No satisfactory answers arriving, on May 22 he issued a decree abolishing the Supreme Council.

Whereas . . . by this decree the Emperor recognizes only one Masonic authority, that of the Grand Orient. . . . Art. 1. The Masonic powers known as Supreme Council, Misraim, etc., are dissolved, etc., etc.

Viennet replied on May 25 :

M. le Maréchal, for the third time you summon me to recognize your authority. . . . I declare I will not comply. . . . The Imperial decree named you Grand Master of the Grand Orient, established 1772, but gave you no authority over ancient

Masonry dating from 1723. . . . The Emperor alone has power to dissolve us. If he should believe it to be his duty to do so, I shall submit without hesitation ; but as no law obliges us to be Masons in spite of our wishes, I shall permit myself, for my own part, to withdraw from your domination. Signed Viennet.

Shortly afterwards the Emperor expressed to Viennet his wish to see a fusion accomplished. The latter replied that he could not, according to the *Statutes*, allow a fusion, but would dissolve the Supreme Council if the Emperor wished it. As nothing further was done, it is probable the Emperor hinted to Magnan to let the matter drop. The circular of April 30 above mentioned caused, however, the dormant Rite of Memphis to petition for admission under the College of Rites, which took effect on October 18.

1862.—*March 25*.—Magnan wrote to the Minister of the Interior that, as he was now the person responsible to the Emperor, he must insist on the decrees closing several Provincial Lodges being annulled. To which Persigny consented on the 29th.

May 20.—Magnan summoned the Grand Orient to meet on June 9 to revise the Constitution. Accordingly, on that and succeeding days it was slightly altered, the change consisting in increasing greatly the number of the Grand Master's Council, which was made entirely elective and vested with the administrative power, subject to a veto of the Grand Master, who preserved the executive functions. This was certainly a step in the right direction. In 1862, 22 Lodges and Chapters were constituted and 3 restored from dormancy to activity—a joyful sign of progress.

1864.—*May*.—Magnan, having restored order and won the general approbation of the Fraternity, induced the Emperor to restore to the Craft its right of election and was immediately re-elected by the Grand Orient. He died May 29, 1865.

1865.—*June 5-10*.—Meeting of the Grand Orient. General Mellinet was elected Grand Master. A movement in favour of abolishing all High Degrees made itself strongly felt and the motion was only lost on the 7th by 86 votes to 83—a very narrow majority.

1868.—In this year even the Supreme Council made advances towards a more liberal Constitution. The lately appointed Sovereign Grand Commander, Crémieux, caused his appointment to be confirmed by the Lodges and thus abrogated the hitherto existing right of a Sovereign Grand Commander to appoint his successor—a great blow at the autocratic nature of the institution.

1869.—*July 8*.—The Grand Orient passed a resolution that neither colour, race, nor religion, should disqualify a man for initiation. This procured the friendship of the Supreme Council of Louisiana, the first Grand Body to receive ex-slaves, but entailed the rupture of amicable relations with almost all the other Grand Lodges in the United States.

1870.—*June*.—At the General Assembly, Mellinet resigned the office of Grand Master, which the Grand Orient resolved to abolish and, until the confirmation of a resolution to that effect, elected and installed Babaud-Larivière.

1871.—*September 6.*—The Grand Orient confirmed the above resolution, the Grand Master resigned and was appointed President of the Council. In 1872 he was succeeded by St. Jean, M.D., as President. Although it is possible that true Freemasonry might exist without a Grand Master, subsequent events proved that this was only the first step in a series marking the decadence of the French Craft, which resulted in its being ignored entirely by almost all the Freemasons of other countries. The Lodges had become filled by men of advanced socialistic ideas. Their influence made itself felt in a sphere which should have been jealously kept free from political or religious controversy ; and the French Fraternity, which, as seen, never did possess a distinct idea of the true purposes of the Craft, or of its history and origin, gradually and surely effaced every landmark till it arrived at its present pitiful condition. One landmark, that it should not interfere in the politics of its native land, it had, from the very first, constantly overstepped ; the deposition of the Grand Master—himself the type of a constitutional monarch—was the reflex action of the Republican feelings of its members. We shall next see it intermeddling in the most ridiculous fashion with international politics and, finally, effacing the very name of the Deity from its records. One single virtue it retains ; it still exercises great charity in the narrowest sense ; charity in its divine signification, in its highest attributes, it has seldom exemplified. At various times, individual Lodges have indeed excelled in all that Freemasonry should be, but, as a whole, the Freemasons of France have ever been wanting in dignity and independence ; and their representative bodies, whether Grand Lodge, Grand Orient, or Supreme Council, have been arbitrary, quarrelsome, slavishly subservient to the Government, repressive towards their Lodges, bureaucratic and devoid of all idea of their true mission.

A general Masonic Congress was projected for December 8 in reply to the Œcumenical Council at Rome in 1869, but it was first delayed, then rendered impossible by the Franco-German war of 1870.

1871.—*September 16.*—Ten Paris Lodges published a ridiculous circular, citing the German Emperor and Crown Prince to appear before them and answer to a Masonic charge of perjury ! In November, another Paris Lodge summoned a convent of impartial Masons to meet on March 15, 1871, at Lausanne, in Switzerland and try their cause of complaint against Brothers William and Frederick of Hohenzollern, i.e. the Emperor and Crown Prince. All the Grand Lodges of Europe and America, those of Germany excepted, were invited to attend and, in case of the non-appearance of the accused, they were threatened with divers pains and penalties. It is surprising that the Grand Lodge Alpina of Switzerland should have even deigned to protest and, of course, nothing else was ever heard of this insane project. During the time of the Commune, many Paris Lodges united in a public demonstration against the French Government ; and, after the war, many Lodges throughout the country excluded all Germans from their membership ; even the Loge l'Anglaise, No. 204, of Bordeaux, descended to this exhibition of malevolence. The number of Lodges under the Grand Orient was considerably

reduced at this time by the loss of Alsace and Lorraine and the formation of a Grand Orient in Hungary, where many French Lodges existed.

1873.—*September 22.*—The Grand Orient held its centenary festival. On this occasion the High Degrees, as such, were refused participation by 111 votes against 99. The Chapters, etc., threatened to secede from the Grand Orient in consequence, but few really did so. The war had very much thinned their ranks and reduced their importance.

1875.—In this year the veteran academician Littré was initiated ; his reception was considered in the Craft as an anti-clerical demonstration and awakened much satisfaction in consequence.

1877.—*September 10.*—The Grand Orient resolved to alter the first article of the Constitutions of 1849. As already pointed out, on August 10, 1849, for the first time in French Masonry, it was distinctly formulated “ that the basis of Freemasonry is a belief in God and in the immortality of the soul, and the solidarity of Humanity.” With the consent of two-thirds of the Lodges, this now reads, “ Its basis is absolute liberty of Conscience and the solidarity of Humanity.” The rituals were then changed in conformity ; all allusions to The Great Architect of the Universe being everywhere eliminated, though it was not forbidden to be used. At one time any ritual containing this reference may be used, on the formality of obtaining permission from the College of Rites, but this permission was refused to Loge Le Centre des Amis in 1913. In consequence of this measure, the Grand Lodges of England, Scotland, Ireland and Canada ceased to be in communion with the French Craft. Not that the relations between England and the Grand Orient had ever been very close. The latter was, doubtless, tacitly acknowledged by England as an independent Masonic power, never formally so. No correspondence passed between the two, no exchange of representatives was ever made. But French Masons who were formerly received and welcomed in all English Lodges could, afterwards, only be admitted, on certifying that they were made in a Lodge acknowledging T.G.A.O.T.U. and that they themselves hold such a belief to be a prerequisite to Freemasonry.

In December 1877, the United Grand Lodge of England appointed a Committee of eleven to consider the matter and, in the following February, that Committee reported that the alteration in its Constitutions by the Grand Orient of France was “ opposed to the traditions, practice and feelings of all true and genuine Freemasons from the earliest to the present time.”

The following circular, which is placed in the hands of every candidate for initiation in a Lodge under the Jurisdiction of the Grand Orient of France, will be of interest :

GRAND ORIENT OF FRANCE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CANDIDATES PROPOSED FOR INITIATION

The Candidate for initiation should read carefully the following instructions, which will enable him to understand the principles of Freemasonry and to decide

whether he will persevere in his application. At his initiation he will be questioned upon the general sense of these instructions.

Freemasonry is essentially a philanthropic, philosophic and progressive institution, having for its object the search for truth, the study of morality and the practice of brotherhood. It aims at material and moral development and the intellectual and social perfection of humanity. Its principles are mutual toleration, respect for others and for self and absolute liberty of conscience. Regarding metaphysical conceptions as belonging exclusively to individual appraisement, it refuses all dogmatic affirmation. Its motto is Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

The duty of Freemasons is to extend to the whole of humanity those fraternal ties which bind together the whole body of Freemasons throughout the globe. The duty of the individual Freemason is, on every occasion, to assist, enlighten and protect his Brother, even at the risk of his own life and to shield him against injustice. Freemasonry regards work as one of the essential duties of humanity. It honours equally manual labour and intellectual work.

Initiation consists of several Degrees or Grades. The three first Degrees are those of E.A., F.C. and M.M., the last alone conferring full Masonic rights upon the candidate. Nothing can dispense with these Degrees as prescribed by the ritual. No one can be admitted and enjoy the privileges attached to the title of Freemason :

1. If he is not of full age—that is, at least 21 years ;
2. If he is not of irreproachable reputation and morals ;
3. If he has not honourable and sufficient means of existence ;
4. If he does not possess at least education sufficient to comprehend Masonic teachings.

The Masonic qualification, together with its rights and privileges, are lost :


1. By dishonourable action ;
2. By undertaking work regarded in the social scale as notoriously disreputable ;
3. By the violation of the Masonic obligations undertaken on initiation.

No one can be admitted until his application has been considered by a special committee appointed for that purpose and every admission is subject to ballot.

The Grand Orient of France does not constitute Lodges in foreign countries where there is existing a regular Masonic organization in fraternal communication with it.

Freemasonry having to provide its own working expenses and funds for other fraternal purposes, the candidate must, immediately prior to his initiation, pay to the Treasurer of the Lodge to which his application has been made the sum of and undertake to pay an annual fee of

NOTE.—Freemasonry has at all times granted full liberty to all creeds and faiths. The United Grand Lodge of England, in contradistinction to the Grand Orient of France and Lodges allied to it, imposes the obligation of a belief in a Living, Supreme Being, whilst the Grand Orient regards all creeds as personal matters. The United Grand Lodge of England, while proclaiming the liberty of human conscience, yet at the same time believes in the imposition of a dogma, which compels not infrequently acts of hypocrisy. The Grand Orient of France, adopting a logical, sincere and tolerant attitude, objects to the imposition of such a religious belief, which is a modern innovation in Freemasonry and takes its stand on the individual liberty of each of its members, a liberty to be exercised in the paths of honour and brotherhood.



From l'Histoire Pittoresque de la Franc-Maçonnerie par Clavel, 1844.

The Reception of an Apprentice.

As was the case in 1848, from the bosom of the autocratic Scots Rite the cry arose for the autonomy of the Craft ; it was the Ancient and Accepted Rite Masons, who, feeling most the yoke, made one more effort to free themselves from the irresponsible rule of the High Degrees.

On January 3, 1879, papers were read in the Lodge, La Justice, No. 133, Ancient and Accepted Rite and subsequently printed, calling for a judicious re-arrangement of the *Constitutions*. On March 15 following, the first Section of the Grande Loge Centrale (corresponding to a Grand Lodge of Master Masons) met. A Bro. Ballue of the Lodge Justice dropped a proposal of amendment into the box. On April 15, five members of the first Section, viz. the Vice-President Goumain-Cornille ; the Senior Warden Denus ; the Orator Mesureur ; the Secretary Dubois ; and Ballue, Master of Justice, issued a circular embodying these proposals, calling upon Masters of Lodges for support. A few extracts from this circular will define the grievances of the Lodges and explain the wished-for reforms.

Scottish Freemasonry in France is passing through a crisis, crushed by the dogmatic authority which rules it. . . . Without control over the finances of the Rite, our Lodges find their existence seriously menaced by the many taxes and dues which weigh upon them. All manly effort is blamed, all work inspired by the spirit of liberty censured, all initiative is rendered sterile by excessive regulations which condemn all to a fatal stagnation. . . . We ask then to be free, . . . etc.

The chief points of the proposal to the first Section were :

(1) The President of the first Section to be elected by members of the Masters' Lodges ; (2) the first Section to itself arrange the dates of its meetings and the agenda paper, instead of this being done by the Supreme Council ; (3) the Supreme Council to confine itself to governing the High Degrees, but the Lodges to govern themselves, through their Deputies assembled in the first Section.

In a word, it was sought to establish a procedure, like that obtaining in England with regard to the Craft and the Royal Arch.

It will readily be understood that strife at once arose. Lodge La Justice and the first Section were both accused of irregularity in issuing circulars without the previous consent of the Supreme Council. Their accusers, however, committed precisely the same offence and were not reprimanded by the Supreme Council, whereas at a meeting of the first Section on May 20, 1879 (the officers having been all replaced by others), a decree from the Supreme Council was read, suspending for two years the five subscribers to the circular, closing Lodge Justice and forbidding the first Section to entertain the proposal of said Lodge. Hereupon ensued a scene of disorder, the President quitted the chair, the gas was turned off and the meeting broke up.

1879.—*July* 14.—No fewer than sixteen Lodges protested against the recent proceedings of the Supreme Council, and—*August* 12—a circular was issued signed by 103 Masons, announcing the formation of a provisional Committee of five for the following purposes :

(1) To inform the Supreme Council of the resolution to form a Grande Loge Symbolique under the obedience of the Supreme Council, or temporarily outside such obedience ; and (2) to obtain as soon as possible the support of the various Lodges who had already shown themselves favourable to the movement.

Crémieux, the Sovereign Grand Commander, then intervened and, of his own accord, reinstated all the suspended members, but the Supreme Council disavowed his act on October 30, by erasing the names of the six most prominent offenders. This naturally meant war to the knife and nine Lodges issued a circular on November 20, declaring that they thereby constituted themselves into a Grand Independent Symbolic Lodge and inviting the other Lodges to join them. Therein, they curiously profess to remain, as ever, Ancient and Accepted Masons ; they did not wish to establish a new Rite, but to resume the rights and power which the Supreme Council had usurped in their despite. Their motto is thus expressed—"The government of the High Degrees to the Supreme Council, that of the Lodges to the Grand Lodge." This retention of the (so-called) Scottish Rite, with its 33 Degrees, has been further emphasized by a change of title to Grande Loge Symbolique Écossaise, but in Lodge or Grand Lodge no Degree beyond that of Master Mason is recognized. The first constituent assembly was called for December 20, 1879.

The Supreme Council replied to this on November 29 and December 5 by erasing more names ; and on February 10, 1880, all hopes of a reconciliation were destroyed by the death of the Sovereign Grand Commander, Crémieux.

On February 12 the new Grand Lodge received the permission of government to hold its meetings and announced its existence at home and abroad by circular of March 8. It was composed of 12 Lodges—8 at Paris and 1 each in Havre, Saintes, Lyons and Egypt.

1880.—*March 11.*—The Supreme Council, thoroughly worsted, issued a general amnesty, but it was too late. The Grand Lodge had attained a separate existence and refused to give up its independence ; but it acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Supreme Council, in all matters concerning the High Degrees, over such of its members as passed beyond the 3rd Degree.

Its *Constitutions*, approved August 23, 1880, deserve a few words of notice. The first declaration of principles reads, "Freemasonry rests on the solidarité humaine." This evasion of the acknowledgment of a Divine Power placed it outside Anglo-Saxon Freemasonry. It required of its members loyalty to their country and abstention from politics in Lodge. The Grand Lodge is composed of deputies from each Lodge, who need not be members of the Provincial—but must be of the Paris Lodges and residents in the metropolis. Three members of Grand Lodge are elected as the Executive Commission ; they may not accept or hold Grand Office. A President directs the meetings of Grand Lodge, but he is not a Grand Master, having no executive power. Also—unheard-of liberality in French Masonry—no restriction or censorship is placed upon Masonic publications, whether emanating from an individual or a Lodge. The remainder of the 71 articles breathe a like spirit of liberty with order and were it not for the agnostic

principles of that new body, it would appear worthy of support. Its jurisdiction on November 10, 1884, extended over 26 Lodges, of which 19 were in Paris, 5 at Lyons, 1 at Havre, and 1 at Tours.

In October 1913 there was formed by Loge Le Centre des Amis and Loge l'Anglaise of Bordeaux, La Grande Loge Nationale Indépendante et Régulière pour la France et Les Colonies Françaises, which requires its Lodges to observe the following rules :

During the work the Bible shall always be upon the altar at the first chapter of St. John.

The ceremonies shall conform strictly to the Ritual of the Rectified Regime, revised in 1778 and approved in 1782. [This is a Deistic Rite similar to English and American practice.]

Communications shall always be opened and closed with prayer in the name of The Grand Architect of the Universe. Lodges shall insert upon their documents the inscription A.L.G.D.A.D.P.U [the initials of the French words meaning, "To the Glory of the Grand Architect of the Universe"].

Religious and political discussions shall not be allowed in the Lodges.

The Brethren shall never officially, as a Lodge, take part in political affairs. Each Brother shall reserve his own personal liberty of action.

Lodges of this obedience shall receive as Visitors only the Brethren belonging to bodies recognized by the Grand Lodge of England.

This Grand Lodge was recognized officially by the United Grand Lodge of England in December 1913, when the following message was read from the Grand Master :

A body of Freemasons in France, confronted by a prohibition on the part of the Grand Orient to work in the name of the T.G.A.O.T.U., have, in fidelity to their Masonic pledges, resolved to uphold the true principles and tenets of the Craft and have united several Lodges as the Independent and Regular National Grand Lodge of France and of the French Colonies.

This new body has approached me with the request that it may be recognized by the Grand Lodge of England and having received full assurance that it pledged to adhere to those principles of Freemasonry which we regard as fundamental and essential, I have joyfully assented to the establishment of fraternal relations and the exchange of representatives.

In 1924 the Grand Orient severed relations with the Supreme Council but retained its relations with the Grand Lodge of France (formed in 1880).

THE ENGLISH LODGE, No. 204, BORDEAUX

This Lodge, L'Anglaise, No. 204, merits a short sketch. Not because it founded a new system, but because, for a long series of years, it remained independent of the Grand Bodies of France—clinging to its English parentage—and usurped the privileges of a Grand Lodge. Another claim to notice is, that

throughout the Masonic revolutions of the eighteenth century, it remained true to the three Grades of English Freemasonry, a distinction which it probably alone shares with the Lodge Union in Frankfort-on-the-Main. It is the only Lodge still active in France which was constituted by the Grand Lodge of England and retains to this day, as part of its title, the last number granted to it on the roll of that body.

This Lodge first appears on our roll in the list for 1766, where it is shown at the number 363, with the clause, "have met since the year 1732." According to the *Handbuch*, its first meeting was held under the presidency of Martin Kelly, Sunday, April 27, 1732 and, doubtless, its original members consisted largely of English merchants. The labours of the Lodge appear to have been several times suspended, but from 1737 they were for many years uninterrupted, although the civil authority ordered it—but in vain—to close its doors in 1742. It constituted in 1740 the Lodge, *La Française*, in Bordeaux; in 1746, two Lodges in Brest; in 1751, one at Limoges; 1754, one at Paris; 1755, one at Cayenne; 1760, one at Cognac; and in 1765, one each at Périgueux and New Orleans. Over these Lodges it exercised the patriarchal sway of a Mother-Lodge—i.e. all the authority of a Grand Lodge without its representative character. In 1749 it threatened to erase *Lodge La Française* unless it ceased at once to content itself with a promise instead of an oath and, from the fact that the latter did not receive a Warrant from the Grand Lodge of France until 1765, it may be concluded that it made due submission. In 1782 it showed itself equally active in enforcing pure and ancient Freemasonry, for it threatened the proprietor of the building in which it met, to leave the premises if he continued to allow a Rose Croix Chapter to assemble there. On March 8, 1766, the Lodge obtained a Warrant of Confirmation from the Grand Lodge of England as No. 363, which number was successively altered in 1770 to 298, in 1781 to 240 and, in 1792, to 204. The Lodge would appear at one time to have joined the Grand Orient, being included in the list of that body for 1776 as constituted May 11, 1775. The *Calendar of the Grand Orient* of 1810 gives, however, the date as 1785 and that of 1851 as 1778. In 1790 L'Anglaise was once more independent, for on August 31 of that year this Lodge and four others of Bordeaux formed a separate body and it only joined the Grand Orient definitely in 1803, preserving its number 204 and date of 1732. None of its daughter Lodges received at any time an English number or constitution. During this long period its rivalry was a cause of much uneasiness to the rulers of the Craft in France. To-day it is registered as No. 96 on the register of the Grand Lodge of France and is, therefore, no longer in communion with the Grand Lodge of England.

CHAPTER III

FREEMASONRY IN THE GERMAN EMPIRE

THE whole organization of German Freemasonry was demolished by the Great War of 1914-18. Until that event the Craft was divided in its allegiance amongst eight Grand Lodges. There were also five perfectly regular and recognized Lodges which were "a law unto themselves." Besides these, many Grand Bodies of the Craft lived their span and died and, without some allusion to their former existence, a history of German Freemasonry would be incomplete and incomprehensible. An endeavour will, therefore, be made to describe all these communities and this branch of the inquiry will conclude by a reference to various combinations of German Masons, which do not come under the heading of Grand Lodges. The Chart given with this Chapter will serve to present the various governing bodies in their contemporaneous aspect.

GRAND LODGES

I. THE GRAND LODGE OF HAMBURG

Of all the German Grand Lodges this deserves the first mention, for two reasons,—its earliest beginnings can be carried farthest back along the stream of time and, in the purity and legitimacy of its English origin, it is only equalled by the Grand Lodge of the Eclectic Union, at Frankfort, which, however, falls slightly behind it in point of antiquity.

The earliest date connecting the Craft with Hamburg, is contained in a speech delivered January 30, 1765, by Dr. Jaenisch, then Provincial Grand Master, who, according to Nettlebladt, *Gesch. Freim. Systeme*, p. 555, declared that his appointment as such dated from the time of his departure from London between 1718-20. This assertion can only be explained by supposing that at this very early period Jaenisch had received some verbal permission to make Freemasons on the Continent; anything more definite or formal is inconceivable.


The next reference to Hamburg occurs under the administration of the Duke of Norfolk (see *Constitutions*, 1756; p. 333), when a Monsieur Thuanus, sometimes called Du Thom, was appointed in 1729 Provincial Grand Master for the circle of Lower Saxony. This person, however, is no more heard of, therefore his influence, if ever exercised, must have been of a very fugitive character.

In 1733 the Earl of Strathmore is stated by Preston (1821, p. 213) to have granted to eleven German Masons a Deputation to open a Lodge at Hamburg, concerning which there is no further information.

The Minutes (in French) of an anonymous Hamburg Lodge have been preserved, dated December 6, 1737. According to these, the meeting was held under the presidency of Karl Sarry, English Provincial Grand Master for Prussia and Brandenburg. This gentleman's name is not mentioned in the English records, but he may have had some reason for assuming the above title nevertheless. The Lodge in question is usually considered to have developed into the Absalom. If so, it performed the unnecessary act of obtaining a fresh Charter, because it was almost certainly already warranted in 1733, for in the *Engraved List* for 1734 we find No. 124 at Hamburg without a date and, in the later List for 1740, as No. 108, constituted in 1733. Findel says the reason for the previous non-adoption of the name was because Lüttmann did not receive his patent as Provincial Grand Master until 1740. It is possible, however, that it was the Lodge of the eleven German Masons, as above. On October 23, 1740, Lodge Absalom at Hamburg was warranted as No. 119 (see *Engraved List*, 1756), the dates and numbers both showing that the Lodges were considered distinct in England. If one Lodge was a continuation of the other, it is somewhat difficult to account for these two Warrants and the consequent loss of seniority. In all probability when, in 1740, Lüttmann was appointed Provincial Grand Master for Hamburg and Lower Saxony, he applied for a Warrant for a new Lodge—Absalom—and that the old Lodge gradually died out. The latter had been ruled in turn by Brothers Carpser, Von Oberg and Lüttmann himself. The most remarkable incidents of the existence of this old Lodge are, that on March 7, 1738, according to Nettlebladt, it drew upon itself the very short-lived prohibition of the magistrates and, in the same year, sent a Deputation to initiate the future Frederick the Great.

Lodge Absalom was warranted October 23, 1740 and, on the 30th, Lüttmann received his patent as Provincial Grand Master. He was also the Master of Absalom, but having perfected and opened the Provincial Grand Lodge in 1741—the highest Masonic authority in Germany—he resigned the chair of the Lodge in 1742 and, says Keller in *Gesch. der Freem. in Deutschland*, 1859, p. 82, accepted the position of Treasurer. Even Marschall, the Provincial Grand Master for Upper Saxony, did not disdain to occupy a Warden's chair in this Lodge whilst residing at Hamburg.

The first act of the Provincial Grand Master, was to legitimate an existing unchartered Lodge in Hamburg, under the name of St. George, September 24, 1743. This Lodge first appears in the English List of 1744 as No. 196. The constitution of a Lodge in Brunswick followed in 1744; at Copenhagen, 1745; Hanover, 1746; Celle, 1748; Oldenberg, 1752; Schwerin, 1754; and at Hildesheim, 1762. The last two received English numbers, but the subsequent history of all was very soon divorced from that of the Grand Lodge of Hamburg. Scarcely was the Provincial Grand Lodge established before Scots Masonry made itself felt. In 1744 Count Schmettau, who had carried the Scots Degrees to Berlin, introduced them to Hamburg and erected the Scots Lodges Schmettau and Judica, of which von Oberg and von Rönigk, the Masters of St. George and Absalom, became respectively the Scots Masters (*Håndbuch*, s.v. Hamburg). At the same time many



After an old copper plate.

A Freemasons' Lodge, Frederick the Great Presiding.

surreptitious Lodges sprang up and, in 1749, there even existed a clandestine Tylers' or Serving Brothers' Lodge, in which other Serving Brethren were initiated (see *op. cit.*). In 1747 there was at Hamburg an African Lodge, which, although it passed away and left no trace, has been viewed as a forerunner of von Koppen's Rite of African Architects, 1768-97.

Lüttmann (a dyer), who resigned in 1759 and had ceased to exist in 1764, was followed—November 20, 1759—by Gottfried J. Jaenisch, M.D.—born 1707; initiated in Lodge Absalom, December 18, 1743; and died May 28, 1781. The latter's patent as Provincial Grand Master was signed by Lord Aberdour (*Constitutions*, 1767); but he was scarcely installed before, in 1762, he associated himself with the Degrees of the Clermont Chapter introduced by Rosa from Berlin. The way was thus prepared for the Strict Observance.

In the first month of 1765, Schubart arrived in Hamburg, where he consorted with Bode, who had been present at Johnstone's Altenberg Convent. The rule of the Strict Observance, which required noble birth of its candidates, proved no bar to Schubart's success in this notably plebeian city, for Hund was induced to sanction Schubart's proposition whereby enhanced fees not only ensured knighthood, but also ennoblement. A prominent Hamburg Mason at this time was Joh. Gottfr. von Exter, M.D.—born in Bremen 1734—who was made a knight (together with Jaenisch) by Schubart, January 11, 1765. The Templar missionary promised to raise Hamburg to the position of an independent Prefecture. Accordingly, on January 30, Jaenisch appeared in the Provincial Grand Lodge, dissolved all Lodges formerly warranted by its authority, closed the Provincial Grand Lodge, declared the Strict Observance Rite the only true one, reconstituted the Lodges Absalom and St. George and proclaimed Hamburg as the Prefecture Ivenach. (Nettlebladt, *Geschichte Freimaurerei Systeme*, p. 558). Bode, who had been made in the Absalom Lodge—February 11, 1761—became for a time a leading light in the Strict Observance. The Chapter, which had been formed of 12 members, grew in the space of a few weeks to 29. The generality of the Fraternity proved, however, by no means enthusiastically disposed towards the new Rite; for, in 1768, the two Hamburg Lodges were practically dormant and the Grand Lodge closed (*Handbuch*, s.v. Hamburg), a state of things which permitted other systems to force an entrance.

In 1768 Rosenberg—who is mentioned in connexion with Russia—erected in Hamburg the Lodge of the Three Roses, Sudthausen that of Olympia, both according to the Swedish Rite. But Zinnendorff, who had cast off the Strict Observance in 1767 and founded his own rival Swedish Rite in 1768, came to Hamburg in 1770, and reconstituted these two Lodges under his own system; and, in 1771, founded two others, the Pelican and Red Eagle, in Altona, a suburb of Hamburg. At the head of Olympia, afterwards the Golden Sphere, was J. Leonhardi—not to be confounded with Leonhardi of Frankfort—who was for many years Zinnendorff's representative in the Grand Lodge at London. (For Leonhardi's actions in London, see *History of Loge der Pilger*, *Masonic News*, London, October 26, 1929.) The first two Lodges took part in the formation—June 24, 1770—of Zinnendorff's Grand

National Lodge. Meanwhile, in spite of the efforts of the Provincial Grand Master for Foreign Lodges, De Vignolles, who seems to have been the only English Mason who thoroughly understood the character of Zinnendorff's usurpation, the Grand Lodge of England had recognized the sole authority in Germany of the Grand National Lodge at Berlin—November 30, 1773—so that when Jaenisch at length attempted to resume his duties as English Provincial Grand Master, he found that his patent had been annulled by Lord Petre, May 31, 1773. In the letter of Heseltine, the Grand Secretary, demanding the immediate return of his patent, Jaenisch is deservedly reproached, not only with regard to former acts of negligence, but for having made an illegal use of the document for the furtherance of the Sect of the Strict Observance (Nettleblatt, p. 778). The proceedings of Zinnendorff, however, in whose favour the letter was issued, were no less illegal and far more reprehensible.

In 1774 fourteen Brethren deserted Zinnendorff's Lodges and were constituted by Jaenisch as a Strict Observance Lodge under the name Emanuel, thus forming the third Lodge of the system which had once been the Provincial Grand Lodge and was destined to become so again. This Lodge was, of course, not immediately registered in England and first appears in the list for 1792, as No. 508, with the note "have met since 1774." In the same list (1792), Lodges Absalom and St. George, which were dropped out at the closing up of numbers in 1770, reappear.

The year 1774—September 8—witnessed the initiation in this Lodge Emanuel, of Fried. Ludwig Schroeder, one of the most prominent reformers of German Freemasonry, who was born at Schwerin, March 3, 1744. Schroeder's public career as an actor and dramatic poet is well known and, in his later function of impresario, he was, at least, equally successful. At a comparatively early age he was enabled to devote his well-earned leisure to the reform of the Craft; here also success attended him. He was Master of the Emanuel Lodge, 1787-99; Deputy Provincial Grand Master of Lower Saxony, 1799-1814; and Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Hamburg from 1814 until his death, September 3, 1816. His first acts as a Freemason showed no promise of his future career, for in 1774, being then only an Apprentice, he opened a clandestine Lodge in Hamburg, Eliza of the Warm Heart, which lasted until 1777.

In 1776 the Princes Karl of Hesse and Ferdinand of Brunswick founded the Lodge Ferdinand Caroline in Hamburg, the fourth Lodge of the Hamburg system. In 1792 this Lodge received the English No. 509, with the date of 1776.

In 1778 Bode was Master of Absalom; Dresser of St. George. This latter not being acceptable to the Brethren, who under the Strict Observance rules, were powerless to remove him, the Hamburg Fraternity seized the occasion of Karl's presence in Altona—then a town of Denmark, although apparently a suburb of Hamburg—to offer him the presidency of all four Lodges. This he accepted—March 28, 1778—but disappointed the Brethren in his choice of a Deputy; so the ruse having failed, the Chapter was induced to influence him to resign the office in 1780, accepting the title of Protector, allowing the Lodges, *pro hac vice*, to choose their own Masters. Dresser, as will be easily understood, was not re-elected.



F. L. Schroeder, Ritual Reformer, 1744-1816.

Meanwhile, the Hamburg Fraternity had grown tired of the Strict Observance, which was itself moribund. On May 28, 1781, Jaenisch died and was succeeded by Dr. von Exter, under whom—by amalgamation—the four Lodges became two and renounced the Templar Rite. Exter, however, was won over by the New or Gold Rosicrucians and announced himself as a Grand Master under this system, with Dresser as Deputy. Through the latter, Hamburg was nearly induced by the Wetzlar Brotherhood to join the newly-formed Eclectic Union as a third Directoral Lodge; but the negotiations were interrupted by his death. At this period Aug. Graefe, a former Provincial Grand Master for Canada, arrived in Hamburg as the representative in Germany of the Grand Lodge of England. He was a strong opponent of Zinnendorff, although accredited to his Grand Lodge by a patent dated March 24, 1785 and strongly encouraged a return to first principles, holding out hopes of the Provincial Grand Lodge being revived (Keller, pp. 199, 200).

In 1783 Hamburg was invaded by Eckhoffen with a Lodge of Asiatic Brothers and, in 1785, Schroeder returned from Vienna (Findel, p. 497), his influence soon making itself felt throughout the Hamburg Craft.

In 1786, the negotiations with England being now complete and Zinnendorff disowned, the two Hamburg Lodges redivided into the original four and, on August 24, Graefe installed von Exter as Provincial Grand Master for Hamburg and Lower Saxony (Keller, pp. 200, 201). Exter's patent was dated July 5, 1786.

In 1787 Schroeder was elected Master of Lodge Emanuel and soon after was intrusted with the revision of the *Statutes*. He completed his work in 1788 and laid the first stone of his reform by establishing the Old Charges of 1723 as the foundation of all Masonry. But, whilst bent on cutting down extravagance on the one hand, he was equally energetic in preventing extreme measures on the other; and it must be ascribed to his influence that a proposal made in 1789 to forego rites and ceremonies of all kinds was rejected (Findel, pp. 497, 498).

This return to English Freemasonry was naturally distasteful to Karl of Hesse, Ferdinand's coadjutor, in the direction of the Rectified Strict Observance. He, therefore, in 1787, erected a Lodge, Ferdinand of the Rock, at Hamburg, which was, of course, looked upon as clandestine, as were also at this time the Zinnendorff Lodges. In September 1790 Bode, who had migrated to Gotha, issued a circular proposing a General Union of German Lodges. The circular failed to shake the allegiance of a single Hamburg Lodge, but possibly it had the effect of stimulating Schroeder to further measures, for we next find that—at his instigation—the Scots Lodges and Degrees were abolished in 1790-1, thus leaving nothing but pure English Freemasonry. This step was followed in 1795 by the adhesion of Lodge Ferdinand of the Rock, which, in the *Freemasons' Calendar* for 1798, appears as No. 562, with the words "have met since 1788" in a parenthesis.

At Exter's death—April 12, 1799—Beckmann became Provincial Grand Master and Schroeder Deputy (Nettleblatt, p. 598). The latter, who had previously revised the *Constitutions*, now turned his attention to the Ceremonial and, having discovered what he imagined to be the earliest diction, recast it in a form more


applicable to the times. The result was a simple yet impressive Ritual, differing little from the English, which was approved and accepted by the Grand Lodge of Hamburg, April 29, 1801. Its daughter Lodges had meanwhile increased from 5 to 9 (Nettleblatt, pp. 600, 601).

In 1802 Schroeder procured the acceptance of what, until quite lately, was the distinguishing feature of the Hamburg system, viz. the *Engbund*—i.e. Select Bond. It was intended to forestall any hankering after High Degrees by rendering it possible for Master Masons to become historically acquainted with all the High Degrees of the various Rites. At the same time, to raise its value as a distinction, it was not open to all Master Masons, while it possessed its own means of recognition, etc. Certain Grand Officers and all Masters of Lodges were *ex officio* members and, in each Lodge, a certain number of the Master Masons were admitted. The Hamburg *Engbund* was a sort of Grand *Engbund* for all the private ones; a further selection from each *Engbund* conducted the correspondence with the others. This second division was called the Correspondence Circle. The members, as such, exercised no influence over their Lodges and their intention was, by research into all the usages and fallacies of the High Degrees, to demonstrate their uselessness and absence of historical basis.

Under its new guise the Provincial Grand Lodge of Hamburg prospered for some years, until, in 1811, the success of the French arms and Napoleon's Interdict rendered it impossible to continue the connexion with England. On February 11, 1811, therefore, the Provincial Grand Lodge declared itself independent, under the name of the Grand Lodge of Hamburg (Nettleblatt, p. 613). At that time its sway was exerted over 12 Lodges (Findel, p. 499). The remainder of its history is uneventful enough.

Beckmann died—June 28, 1814—and was succeeded as Grand Master by Schroeder; at whose death—September 3, 1816—Beseler was elected and, at his resignation, Schleiden, July 28, 1825. In 1828 W. H. Göschen (a member of Loge der Pilger, No. 238, London) was appointed the first representative at the Grand Lodge of England. In 1834 Schleiden resigned and was succeeded by Moraht. On December 6, 1837, Lodge Absalom held its centenary festival and, in 1838, the Grand Lodge of England appointed H. J. Wenck as its first representative at Hamburg. Hamburg was from that time closely allied with England and its representative often enjoyed the special honour of being appointed Grand Secretary for German Correspondence. Moraht died February 13, 1838 and was succeeded by Dav. Andr. Cords, under whom the *Constitutions* were revised in 1845. The latter was followed by his former Deputy, Dr. H. W. Buek, in 1847 and, under this Grand Master, the *Constitutions* were again revised in 1862. The 150 years' jubilee of Freemasonry was held in 1867.

In 1869 it was considered expedient that the historical acquirements of the *Engbund* should no longer be reserved as the special privilege of a select few. The Grand *Engbund* was therefore dissolved and reconstituted as a private *Engbund*, open to all Master Masons; the daughter associations followed suit. They then



Freemason's Sword of Frederick the Great.

existed as purely literary Masonic societies ; but the want of the previous cohesion and superior direction had so seriously hampered their efforts, that in 1878 the Lodge at Rostock made proposals for re-establishing the former organization (Findel p. 501). The completion of Dr. Buek's twenty-fifth year as Grand Master was celebrated by the Grand Lodge, June 24, 1872. He then resigned and was followed by Glitza. In 1874 and 1875 the Grand Lodge of Hamburg recognized the coloured Lodges of Prince Hall in Boston and of Ohio and, in 1877-8, the *Constitutions* underwent a last revision.

In 1878 the Grand Lodge of Hamburg ruled over 32 Lodges, of which 5 were in that city and 19 in other parts of Germany, 8 being abroad. In Hamburg itself there existed 9 other Lodges owing allegiance to other German Grand Lodges. The total number of Masons under the Grand Lodge was 3,726, an average of 116 per Lodge. Two foreign Lodges were then added, one at Bucharest, another at Vera Cruz (*Cosmopolitan Calendar*, 1885). With a solitary exception, Hamburg was the only German Grand Lodge which warranted Lodges outside the Empire ; it ignored the American theory of Grand Lodge sovereignty, possessing no fewer than three Lodges in New York itself. The Pilgrim Lodge (Loge der Pilger) in London, works in German according to the Hamburg or Schroeder Ritual, but under the rule of the Grand Lodge of England.

The history of the Grand Lodge of Hamburg may thus briefly be summarized :—1730, Du Thom, Provincial Grand Master ; 1733-40, anonymous Lodge ; 1740-65, Provincial Grand Lodge for Hamburg and Lower Saxony under Lüttmann and Jaenisch ; 1765-82, a part of the Strict Observance system ; 1782-8, under Exter, indoctrinated with the fancies of the New Rosicrucians, though always—it must in fairness be recorded—inclining more and more towards a return to the practice under the Grand Lodge of England ; 1786-1811, Provincial Grand Lodge once more ; from 1811 to 1855, Grand Lodge of Hamburg.

II. THE MOTHER GRAND LODGE OF THE ECLECTIC UNION, FRANKFORT-ON-THE-MAIN

This system claims emphatically the first place in an English Mason's regard for two reasons other than antiquity, viz. the filial persistency with which it adhered under most difficult circumstances to its connexion with England and the strong common sense which, under every allurements, kept it practically free at all times from the blighting influence of High Degrees, Strict Observance and other Masonic aberrations. The Lodge Union of Frankfort and its allies have never ceased for one moment to work in the purely English and only Freemasonry of three Degrees. Individual members have taken accessory Degrees, have even been commissioned by the Lodge to join other Rites in order to report upon their value and have always reported adversely ! The history of this body affords no mysteries to be cleared up ; its Minutes are full and complete from the earliest one to the latest ; its records are admirably preserved ; every statement—on their authority—rests on documentary evidence and, from 1742, literally no question is open to doubt.

The annals of the Eclectic Union have been written by three of its own members—Kloss (*Annalen der Loge zur Einigkeit*, 1842), Keller (*Geschich. des Eklektischen Freimaurerbundes*, 1857), and Karl Paul (*Annalen des Eklektischen Freimaurerbundes*, 1883). The *Handbuch* also gives a parallel account, s.v. Frankfurt and Eklektisches-Bund), and as to facts do not differ in the slightest degree. Paul's account is compiled in chronological order, therefore, no difficulties of verification can be experienced.

Frankfort, from its position as a free town of the Empire, the seat of Germany's largest banking houses, the coronation city of its Emperors and the place of meeting of the Imperial Diet, enjoyed obvious advantages for the early propagation of Freemasonry. Evidence, indeed, is not wanting of informal meetings of the Craft at a very early date. But the first indications of a permanent Lodge are the records of fines inflicted as *per* cash-book of the Union Lodge under date of March 1, 1742. In the same year—March 29—By-laws were drawn up and signed by the members, June 27. On the last date the Lodge was formally constituted by General de Beaujeu, Marquis de Gentils and Baron von Schell, styling themselves Grand Master and Grand Wardens *pro tempore*. It is not known by what right they assumed to represent the Grand Lodge of England in this matter; but even if the offices were self-conferred, in this very irregularity itself may be perceived a striving after the regularity which has since so honourably distinguished this Lodge. That the act (if a usurpation) was soon afterwards condoned, may be gathered from the Charter granted by Lord Ward, Grand Master—February 8, 1743—which recites that Brother Beaumont, oculist to the Prince of Wales, having assured "us" that the Lodge had been constituted in due form, under the name of Union, as a daughter of the Union Lodge in London, "we do hereby recognize it, etc. and order that the members of either Lodge be considered equally members of the other." Its first Master was Steinheil, its first Warden De la Tierce, who in 1742 produced one of the earliest translations of Anderson's *Constitutions* (1723) for the use of the Lodge. In the *Engraved List*, 1744-5, it is depicted as a Union of Angels and its date of constitution is acknowledged, June 17, 1742, with the number 192. Its proceedings were conducted in French until 1744, when it was resolved to work alternately in German and French.

In 1743 Count Schmettau, whose name has several times been mentioned, established a military Lodge in Frankfort, which amalgamated with the Union—January 17, 1744—and in 1745 the Union assumed the powers of a Mother-Lodge by constituting the Lodge of the Three Lions at Marburg, which was not, however, registered in England at the time and first appears in the *Engraved List* for 1767 as No. 393.

In 1746—October 24—the Lodge resolved to close its doors, owing to the paucity of attendance and other reasons. It was reopened August 16, 1752, by Steinheil. In 1758 a Constitution was granted to a very short-lived Lodge at Mayence and the occupation of Frankfort by the French army gave rise to several irregular Lodges in the city. The Lodge strove its best to preserve order, but ineffectually for some time, until it at length singled out for mutual support and

assistance a Lodge which had grown up in the Swedish regiment, Royal Deux Ponts, quartered at Frankfort. On May 12, 1761, it constituted the Lodge Joseph of Union in Nuremberg and—May 29, 1762—legitimated the Royal Deux Ponts Lodge. The invitation of the Berlin Three Globes—March 8, 1765—to join the Strict Observance, was declined, also a proposal to pay Schubart's expenses in order that he might instruct them in the new Rite. The Daughter-Lodge at Nuremberg was, however, at this time won over to the Templars, although it did not formally sever its connexion with Frankfort till two years later—1767. The greatest blot on the history of the Lodge Union, is its refusal from a very early date to recognize the eligibility of Jewish candidates, an error nevertheless which it amended much earlier than many other German Lodges. In 1766 it refused a warrant to Cassel, because Jews were among the petitioners. At this period J. P. Gogel, a former Master of the Lodge, whose commercial pursuits often called him to England, was commissioned to petition for a Provincial Grand Lodge patent for Frankfort, which was granted by Lord Blaney, Grand Master—August 20, 1766—to J. P. Gogel, Provincial Grand Master for the Upper and Lower Rhine and of Franconia. Gogel produced his patent in Frankfort—October 28—and the Provincial Grand Lodge was accordingly constituted on the 31st, with the Lodges Union of Frankfort, Marburg, Deux Ponts and Nuremberg as daughters. On this occasion Gogel declared that he invested the Lodge Union with his personal rights and that no Provincial Grand Master should, in future, exercise the office for more than two or three years. In this he exceeded his powers, because a Provincial patent is always a personal distinction, a Provincial Grand Master not being elected by the Province, but appointed by the Grand Master; and, as events proved, the well-meant intentions of Gogel were incapable of realization. The officers of the Provincial Grand Lodge—Deputy Grand Master, Senior and Junior Wardens—were the Masters of the Union, Marburg and Nuremberg Lodges respectively; but the members, at first all Master Masons, afterwards Wardens—present and past—were drawn from the Union only. Out of the latter, each of the other Lodges might select a representative. It will be seen that the Union, subsequently the other Lodges in Frankfort, were always exceptionally favoured. Among the first members of the Provincial Grand Lodge were Karl Brönner, Peter F. Passavant and F. W. Möhler.

In 1767 the Nuremberg Lodge threw off its allegiance and joined the Strict Observance, whose emissary, Schubart, had arrived in Frankfort in December 1766. His propaganda failed to influence the Provincial Grand Lodge or its daughter, Union, but he succeeded in erecting, in February 1767, a Lodge of the Three Thistles at Frankfort, which for many years proved a thorn in the side of the Brethren.

According to his promise Gogel resigned—October 23, 1768—but was re-elected—November 10, 1770—Möhler serving as Grand Master in the interim. The former, on his return from England in 1772, constituted a Lodge at Strasburg, which almost immediately afterwards seceded to the Strict Observance. In the same year the Deux Ponts Lodge also joined the enemy.

In December 1772 Prince Ludwig George Karl of Hesse, an enthusiastic convert to von Hund's system, addressed a letter to the Provincial Grand Lodge, expatiating on the advantages of the new Rite, invited the Grand Lodge to join him and quietly proposed that Gogel should abdicate in his favour! The offer was declined.

On November 30, 1773, Zinnendorff concluded his compact with England, by which all the existing German Lodges were handed over to him. The Provincial Grand Lodge at Frankfort, however, was given the choice, during Gogel's life, either of retaining its then existing position, or of making terms for a Provincial Grand Patent with Zinnendorff. In either case, after Gogel's death, the district was to revert to the newly erected National Grand Lodge for all Germany, i.e. Zinnendorff's Prince Ferdinand, Provincial Grand Master for Brunswick, was granted the same alternative. The treaty was not communicated at once to Frankfort and, whatever excuses England might have urged in extenuation, so far as regarded Hamburg, which had strayed from the right road, its action was not only uncalled for, but highly discreditable in the case of Frankfort, the truest daughter the English Grand Lodge ever had cause to rejoice over. No excuse whatever can be pleaded, except the profound ignorance of the Grand Lodge of England—or, it may be, of its Secretary, James Heseltine—with regard to the true state of the Craft abroad, an ignorance which, in the opinion of all dispassionate inquirers, will heighten rather than extenuate, the grave error related.

In 1774 the Marburg Lodge formally threw off its allegiance, leaving the Union as the sole support of the Provincial Grand Lodge. In spite of this isolated position Gogel accompanied a letter of inquiry respecting the arrangement with Zinnendorff by a contribution of £30 for Freemasons' Hall and £4 for the Charity. At the same time he pointed out that the only truly English Lodge in Germany was the Frankfort Lodge and that both the Zinnendorff and Strict Observance systems were something totally different. This and further protests on Gogel's part only produced an answer from England in 1775, in which, after praising Frankfort as the best and only support of true Freemasonry, he was nevertheless advised to come to some arrangement with Zinnendorff. It being quite evident that, in these circumstances, England would not acknowledge a successor to Gogel—in whose name the Provincial patent was made out, on which Frankfort based its claims—it was determined that he should not resign his office as at first intended. Freemasonry in Frankfort, however, languished and, between 1775 and 1777, no sittings of Grand Lodge were held. From 1777–80 negotiations, initiated by the Landgrave Karl of Hesse, were carried on with this Prince, who held out special inducements to Frankfort to join the Strict Observance. Gogel, Brönnner, Passavant and Küstner were advanced to the highest Degree of this Rite as a test and—advised against it. The negotiations then fell through at the last moment. Knigge, with the teachings of the Illuminati, failed even to obtain a hearing from the Lodge in 1780, although here again several Brethren—for example, Küstner, Brönnner, J. P. von Leonhardi, Pascha, Noël, Du Fay, etc.—gave the Society a trial. The Provincial

Grand Lodge refused to yield to, or capitulate with, Zinnendorff and, with its daughter Union, plodded on its lonely road.

In 1782—March 12—Gogel died; on the 17th Peter F. Passavant was elected Grand Master; on the 18th Pascha, who was about to leave for London, was commissioned to apply for a new Provincial patent, made out this time in the name of the Lodge, not in that of the Grand Master, also to procure answers to several other questions. In London he failed to obtain the ear of Grand Lodge, except through J. Leonhardi, Master of the Pilgrim Lodge (*Loge der Pilger*), who, as Zinnendorff's representative, was scarcely likely to assist him. The utmost concession offered to Pascha was, that like the Berlin Royal York, the Frankfort Union should content itself with the position of an English constituted Lodge, independent of any German superior. The result is not surprising. The Frankfort Fraternity decided—November 24, 1782—to assert, maintain and exercise its acquired rights as the Provincial Grand Lodge for the Upper and Lower Rhine and Franconia, omitting the title English. They contended—with much force—that the right of assembling as a Provincial Grand Lodge had been granted to them, *quamdiu se bene gesserint*, therefore could not be revoked, except by mutual consent, or on cause shown, that the Frankfort body had been guilty of misconduct or neglect.

It will be remembered that it was precisely at this period that von Hund's Templar system received its *coup de grâce* at Wilhelmsbad and German Freemasonry entered upon a transition state. From the consequent confusion emerged the Eclectic Union. In order thoroughly to understand this movement, we must for the moment turn to the free city of Wetzlar-on-the-Lahn, in Rhenish Prussia. In that city the Frankfort Three Thistles warranted in 1767 a Strict Observance Lodge, Joseph of the Three Helmets. To this was added the Scots Lodge, Joseph of the Imperial Eagle—a mother Lodge, which warranted a whole string of Strict Observance Lodges. The Templar Chapter was, in 1777, transferred from the unfruitful soil of Frankfort to Wetzlar, at its head being von Ditfurth. On the decay of the Templar system, the Scots Lodge assumed the position of an independent Provincial Grand Lodge. Von Ditfurth then conceived the idea of the Eclectic Union and communicated with Brönnner of Frankfort, who revised his suggestions—considerably improving them—and at a meeting of the Frankfort Provincial Grand Lodge—February 9, 1783—sketched out the future lines of the proposed body. The result was a joint circular to all German Lodges from the two Provincial Grand Lodges in question, dated March 18, and 21, 1783. The daughter Lodges—one at Wetzlar excepted—to the number of 14, immediately gave in their adhesion to the new organization, viz. at Wetzlar, Munich, Augsburg, Neuwied, Münster, Lautern, Cassel, Rothenburg, Aix-la-Chapelle, Salzburg, Wiesbaden, Brunn, Giessen and Bentheim-Steinfurth.

On August 24, 1783, after due consideration, the Union Lodge also joined and, in December of the same year, the Strict Observance Lodge of the Three Thistles (at Frankfort) rejected the Rectified Templar Rite and amalgamated with the Union Lodge.

The success of the new organization was such, that by 1789 no fewer than 53 Lodges had expressed a desire to be enrolled under its banner, including Lodges in Copenhagen, Warsaw, Kiew, Naples, etc. ; but a great number of these could not be accepted for political and other reasons, while many others had soon after to be closed on similar grounds.

The chief features of the Eclectic Union were as follow :—Perfect equality of all Lodges among themselves and entire independence of any superior authority—Masonry, by common consent, held to be composed of three Degrees only—uniformity of ritual in those three Degrees—every Lodge free to superimpose any fancy Degrees it chose (hence the term Eclectic), but the Degrees so conferred and the members thereof were to enjoy no recognition as such in the Lodge—the Master to be elected and himself to appoint the other officers—the bond of union to consist in the regular communication to each Lodge of every other Lodge's proceedings—the Provincial Lodges for Frankfort and Wetzlar to be the two centres, undertaking this work of distribution under the name of Directorial Lodges—the Master Masons of other systems to be admitted as visitors to the Lodges, without any recognition of professedly superior Degrees of which they might be in possession—Warrants of Constitution to be granted in the name of the Eclectic Union by either of the Directorial Lodges, etc. The permission to add High Degrees soon lapsed by non-user and was subsequently withdrawn, even before the *Statutes* were definitely altered ; with the result that an attempt, a very few years afterwards, to introduce the Royal Arch into Frankfort was summarily suppressed. The Wetzlar Lodge also from the first took a less leading position than Frankfort and gradually died out. In 1783 the Ritual was revised, conformably in all essentials with the English Rite, save that it insisted upon the candidate being a Christian—an enactment which was the cause of much trouble.

In 1784 the Harmony and Concord and, in 1785, the Compasses, Lodges at Trieste and Gotha respectively, joined the Eclectic Union.

In 1785 Graefe, of whom mention has already been made in connexion with Hamburg, offered his services to Frankfort and negotiations with England were commenced.

On May 21, 1786, Passavant died and was succeeded as Provincial Grand Master by J. P. von Leonhardi. At this date the roll of the Union showed 25 Lodges, 7 of which, however—probably for political reasons—were unnamed in the published list.

Through Graefe's exertions, a compact was entered into with England—March 1, 1788—reinstating the Provincial Grand Lodge. The clauses of most interest to this sketch are §1, granting the Lodge permission to elect its own Grand Master every two or three years ; §2, promising on the part of London not to issue Warrants in the Jurisdiction of Frankfort, except in cases where the Provincial Grand Lodge could not grant them ; §6, Frankfort Lodges might obtain English registry on payment of the usual fees.

The last Minute of the Wetzlar Lodge which reached Frankfort is dated July 11,

1788; it expresses a wish to conclude a similar treaty with England. But the Lodge was already moribund and the desire was never realized.

On January 13, 1788, new *Statutes* were passed by 30 Lodges, of which 8 by desire were unnamed. It is noteworthy that the Provincial Grand Lodge was still formed exclusively of members of the Union Lodge, every other Lodge being allowed—as before—to appoint one of these as its representative.

Leonhardi's patent as Provincial Grand Master for the Upper and Lower Rhine and Franconia, signed by Lord Effingham, Acting Grand Master, is dated February 20, 1789; on its receipt the installation festival was held, October 25, 1789; and Kloss remarks that no fewer than 29 Lodges sought and obtained English registry (*Annalen der Loge zur Einigkeit*, p. 238). A careful comparison of the English Lodge lists, however, shows at most 10 Lodges. These are, according to the numeration from 1792 to 1813, Nos. 456, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479 and 588. On December 5, 1789, Leonhardi was elected Provincial Grand Master for a second term.

The peculiar position of the Grand Lodge as a Directorial Lodge of the Union and, at the same time, a Provincial Grand Lodge under England, gave rise to some apprehensions respecting the future independence of the private Lodges. Bode cleverly seized this incident to lend colour to his circular issued November 24, 1790, by the Eclectic Lodge at Gotha, calling on all Eclectic Lodges to rearrange themselves under a new organization with the title of German Masonic Union. As a result the Gotha Lodge was naturally erased from the roll of Eclectic Lodges. In the same year the Lodge at Carlsruhe closed for political reasons, that at Giessen on account of quarrels among its members. The Lodge at Nuremberg, Three Arrows, protested against Gotha's exclusion, because it had been effected without the assent of the other Lodges or hearing Gotha's defence; ultimately, in 1792, it severed its connexion with the Eclectic Union and joined the Gotha or Bode's Union.

In 1790 a few members of Lodge Union attempted to introduce the Royal Arch. Although they kept the Chapter entirely separate from the Lodge, they met with decided opposition from the other Brethren and the Degree was soon suffered to lapse. After many years it is heard of again. In 1842 the three surviving members of this stillborn Chapter deposited a sealed case in the archives containing the statutes, rituals and documents, to be opened after their deaths. On August 30, 1791, von Ditzfurth, of Wetzlar, resigned his office of Provincial Grand Master, also that of Master of his Lodge, from which time Frankfort reigned supreme without even the shadow of a rival.

Leonhardi resigned his office—October 19, 1792—and was succeeded—February 6, 1793—as Provincial Grand Master by Johann Karl Brönner. During this year the Lodge at Kaufbeuren closed for political reasons. These made themselves also felt in Frankfort, so that—June 8, 1793—Brönner closed the Grand Lodge. On the 9th the French troops entered the city and, although the private Lodges still showed some slight activity throughout the occupation, the Grand Master did not reopen Grand Lodge until October 29, 1801. Of all the former

Eclectic Lodges only seven survived these eight troublous years—those of Aix-la-Chapelle, Altenburg, Frankfort, Hildesheim, Münster, Rudolstadt and Krefeld; of these only the Frankfort Union had remained faithful to the Provincial Grand Lodge of the Eclectic Union.

Unfortunately this long slumber had induced the English Lodge Royal York, at Berlin, which, in 1798, had constituted itself a Grand Lodge, to consider the Provincial Grand Lodge for Frankfort as extinct and, in consequence—December 4, 1801—it warranted a Frankfort Lodge, Socrates of Constancy. Brönner protested against this infraction of jurisdiction and, in his appeal to England in 1805, complained of being left for three years without any replies to his letters. This letter also was left unanswered, for which perhaps the wars may be responsible; but the consequent strained relations between Frankfort and Berlin prevented the former joining a union which the Royal York, the Grand Lodge of Hanover and the Provincial Grand Lodge for Hamburg had formed among themselves. This Lodge Socrates remained as a stumbling-block for many subsequent years.

Between 1803 and 1805 the Grand Lodge was once more closed, to which act many reasons, political and otherwise, contributed. Meanwhile the Nuremberg Lodge (formerly of the Eclectic Union) had endeavoured to induce Frankfort to accept Schroeder's Ritual. The Provincial Grand Lodge for Frankfort once more, in spite of England's neglect, showed her filial allegiance by declining—February 27, 1805—to accede, being unable to take upon herself the responsibility of eliminating the obligation without superior permission. This subject also formed part of Brönner's letter already alluded to.

In 1806 Frankfort became a Grand Duchy, with Karl von Dalberg over it as Prince Primate (*Fürst Primas*). Brönner petitioned for permission to prosecute Masonic work and closed the Provincial Grand Lodge until a reply was received. This arrival—verbally transmitted—July 2, 1808, to the effect that, as Prince Primate, he must ignore their labours, but, as Karl von Dalberg, he would permit them.

On July 12, 1808, the Grand Orient of France warranted a Lodge in Frankfort, composed chiefly of Jews, under the name of the Nascent Dawn. This Lodge also was a source of trouble and vexation in later days.

But the Provincial Grand Lodge was strengthened in 1808 by the reawakening of the Ulm Lodge, in 1809 by the revival of the Lodges at Carlsruhe and Freiburg and by a new Lodge at Heidelberg. In this same year the above Lodges at Carlsruhe and Freiburg, together with an old Lodge at Heidelberg, joined in erecting a National Grand Lodge, Union of Baden, without, however, seceding from the Eclectic Union; merely ceasing to own allegiance to the Provincial Grand Lodge as such. On May 3, 1811, a compact was made with the Lodge Socrates, in view of its adhesion to the Provincial Grand Lodge, that the latter should in future be composed of members of the Socrates and Union Lodges equally, but that the Grand Master should always be elected from the Union. Lodge Socrates accordingly entered the Eclectic Union—May 12, 1811. June 24, Lodge Joseph of Nuremberg, which had been constituted by the Union in 1761 and had seceded to the Strict Observance

in 1767, took advantage of its jubilee to join the Eclectic Union. *Per contra* the Ulm Lodge was compelled to close by a royal decree.

Brönner died March 22, 1812, and was succeeded as Grand Master by Jean Noë Du Fay.

April 4, 1813, a new Lodge was warranted at Offenbach; but a Grand Ducal decree of February 16 of the same year, closing all Lodges in Baden, robbed the Eclectic Union of its daughter Lodges in Freiburg, Heidelberg and Carlsruhe.

A decree of the Prince Primate of April 30, 1813, detrimental to the progress of Freemasonry, had little time allowed it in which to take effect; the events of 1814 being still more detrimental to the Prince himself.

1814 witnessed a revisal of the Ritual, in which the oath was ordered to be recited but not taken. With the exception of a few exclusively Christian allusions, this Ritual remained in force until 1871.

1816 brought an accession of strength in the Lodges Ernest at Coburg and St. John the Evangelist of Concord at Darmstadt. A new Lodge was constituted at Giessen, May 29, 1817 and, on the 25th of the same month, a Lodge at Worms warranted by the Grand Orient of France in 1811 was affiliated. In 1817 also, a quarrel arose between the Frankfort Provincial Grand Lodge and the Grand Lodge of England. The Lodge Nascent Dawn, chiefly Jewish, warranted by the Grand Orient of France in 1808, sought a new Constitution. The Jewish element rendering a resort to the Provincial Grand Lodge futile, the Brethren applied to the Landgrave Karl of Hesse, who at once enrolled them among the rectified Templar Lodges, even forced upon them a Scots Lodge with the peculiarly Christian Degrees of that Rite. As a natural consequence, the Lodge split up. The Christians retained Karl's warrant for Lodge Karl of the Dawning Light, whilst the Jews applied to the Duke of Sussex and were constituted as the Nascent Dawn. Both Lodges were treated by the Provincial Grand Lodge as clandestine and much bitterness arose. The Grand Lodge of England, however, in this case had clearly acted within the meaning of §2 of the 1788 compact, although perhaps more time for reflection ought to have been granted to the Provincial Grand Lodge. The latter body, however, by its notorious prohibition of Jewish members, had put itself quite out of court.

In 1818 a new Lodge at Mayence was warranted, but seceded to the Royal York Grand Lodge in 1821.

Du Fay died February 24, 1820 and, on August 5, Leonhardi, under whom the compact of 1788 was made with England, was elected Grand Master for the second time. It was fated that under him also the broken bonds which he had himself reknit should finally be severed. It was resolved—August 5, 1821—to make one more effort to obtain redress from England for its alleged encroachment and this having failed, it was agreed—January 13, 1822—to renounce the English supremacy. Accordingly—March 27, 1823—the Provincial Lodge assumed the title of “The Mother Grand Lodge of the Eclectic Union” and notified this

act to the Masonic world by a circular of November 14, 1823. All allusions to a mere directorial Lodge, *primus inter pares*, were apparently dropped for ever.

The Grand Lodge commenced its new career with a following of 9 Lodges.—In Frankfort, 2—Union, Socrates ; in Nuremberg, 2—Three Arrows, Joseph ; and 1 each in Darmstadt, Giessen, Coburg, Offenbach and Worms.

Leonhardi, who resigned March 3, 1826 and refused a re-election on account of his advanced age, died November 23, 1830. Constantine Fellner succeeded him as Grand Master.

On May 2 following Dr. George Kloss was first elected a member of the Grand Lodge. This celebrated Mason, skilful physician, diligent Masonic student and historian, was born at Frankfort July 31, 1787, admitted to the Fraternity at the age of 18 as a Lewis—September 28, 1805—by the Lodge Union, of which he was elected Master in 1828. His Masonic works have been quoted so repeatedly in these pages, as to render any further allusion to them unnecessary. As a Masonic critic, he was emphatically *facile princeps* and, owing to the strength of his convictions acquired by the study of Masonic documents, it is easy to conceive that from the moment of his entering Grand Lodge, that body would have no peace until it renounced its errors, at the head of which Kloss naturally placed the exclusion of Jews—as he doubtless would have done in the case of any members of a particular race or religion—from the benefits of the Craft.

With the altered position of the Grand Lodge there remained no valid reason why the Grand Master should be elected from the members of the Union Lodge only. The Socrates Lodge now commenced to agitate for a *status* in all respects equal to that of the Union and, in 1828, a revision of the *Constitutions* was commenced, but the work lasted many years.

Owing to the religious intolerance of the Grand Lodge, its territory was once more invaded by the Grand Orient of France, which—December 2, 1832—warranted a Lodge, Frankfort Eagle, composed largely of Jews. In the following years a strong feeling favourable to the Jewish Lodges and to the Landgrave Karl's Lodge, Karl of the Dawning Light, sprang up in the Fraternity and was reflected by the younger members of the Grand Lodge. The Grand Officers, who were all old members, finding themselves powerless to stem the current, resigned in a body—November 14, 1834—and, on December 23, Johann Friedrich Fiedler was elected Grand Master, with Kloss as his Deputy. The Landgrave Karl died August 17, 1836 and his Lodge almost immediately afterwards began to negotiate for admission to the Union. On September 24 following, Fiedler died and—March 3, 1837—Kloss was elected Grand Master. In 1839 one of Karl's Lodges—in Alzey—joined the Eclectic Union.

1840 witnessed two important steps. On March 9 it was resolved to admit Jewish Brethren as visitors. This being the date of Kloss's retirement from office, he could, at least, congratulate himself that the battle was half won. He was succeeded as Grand Master by Gerhard Friedrich, D.D. The second step

was the conclusion of the negotiations with the Lodge Karl of the Dawning Light and its admission to the Eclectic Union, September 27, 1840.

The centenary festival of the Union Lodge was held June 27, 1842, when, as already stated, the documents of the long-forgotten Royal Arch Chapter were deposited in the archives and the proceedings were graced by the presentation of Kloss's *Annals of the Union Lodge*—an invaluable mine of Masonic lore—compiled for the occasion.

Kloss was re-elected Grand Master, May 12, 1843 and, under his inspiration, the Grand Officers made a vigorous effort to render the Grand Lodge ordinances less sectarian in their tenor, but unsuccessfully, as the motion was adjourned *sine die*—December 4, 1843.

But, although most of the Eclectic Lodges were tending towards a more enlightened view on this subject, the newly-joined Lodge, Karl of the Dawning Light, showed itself strongly conservative. It still insisted on working the Scots Degrees and allowed itself great licence with the Eclectic Ritual. This led to expostulations, recriminations and strife, finally to its exclusion, July 2, 1844. The Lodges at Darmstadt and Mayence took the part of Lodge Karl and seceded in September 1845; these three then united in order to found the Grand Lodge of Concord at Darmstadt on a purely and rigidly Christian basis. The gap caused by the absence of these Lodges was only partially filled in the same year by a new warrant for a Lodge Of Brotherly Truth at Hamburg, granted to nine dissenting members of the Golden Sphere (Zinnendorff Rite).

A necessary statute, the Reorganization Act, was at length passed, December 27, 1845. The arrangements which chiefly interest us were, that the High Degrees were absolutely forbidden; the Grand Lodge was composed of two representatives from each Lodge, to be chosen by them from subscribing members of the Frankfort Lodges (at this time only two, Union and Socrates)—they were, however, permitted in lieu of this to depute two of their own members; the Grand Master and the Grand Officers were to be elected for a term of three years from among the representatives.

June 17, 1846, Gerhard Friedrich was again elected Grand Master. In the following year—October 1—the Grand Lodge was reorganized, as provided by the above Act and the voting for Grand Master resulted in the election of Franz Fresenius, of the Socrates Lodge—the first holder of that office who was not a member of the Union Lodge.

December 15, 1847, twelve more Brethren of the Golden Sphere Lodge in Hamburg were granted an Eclectic Constitution as the Lodge of the Brother-Chain.

At length, early in 1848, the last relic of intolerance was cast aside and the ritual purged of its specifically Christian requirements. This resulted in immediate negotiations with the Jewish Lodge Nascent Dawn, which, however, did not bear fruit for some months. The other Jewish Lodge, Frankfort Eagle, joined the Grand Lodge of Hamburg in the same year. On July 15, 1848, Past Grand Master Fellner died.

The revision of the *Statutes*—November 13, 1849—is of interest, as, by a clause which insisted that country Lodges should choose their representatives, one from each Frankfort Lodge, the whole power was once more thrown into the hands of the metropolitan Fraternity. It was also decided to elect the Grand Master alternately from the two Frankfort Lodges.

Meanwhile, the members of Lodge Karl had altered their views since assisting at the birth of the Darmstadt Grand Lodge. A few of them formed a new Darmstadt Lodge in Frankfort, Karl of Lindenberg; but Lodge Karl itself, with the majority of the Brethren, rejoined the Eclectic Union, June 30, 1850.

In the same year—December 2—Dr. J. W. J. Pfarr was elected Grand Master, after whom—November 28, 1853—came Fresenius once more, then Pfarr again, December 1, 1856. The most important event of these six years was the death of Dr. Kloss, February 10, 1854.

In 1858 a Constitution was granted to Wiesbaden—May 2—and the *Statutes* of Grand Lodge were revised in December, so as to place Karl on an equality with the other two Frankfort Lodges; the Grand Master to be elected from each Lodge alternately every two years.

In 1859—January 13—the Grand Duke of Hesse-Darmstadt ordered all Lodges in his dominions to rally round the Darmstadt Grand Lodge. This entailed the loss of four Lodges to the Eclectic Union.

In the following year—March 23—the Grand Lodge was reconstituted under the new Act and Dr. George Dancker elected Grand Master. The roll comprised ten Lodges—Union, Socrates and Karl, of Frankfort; Joseph and Three Arrows, of Nuremberg; Brotherly Love and Brother-Chain, of Hamburg; Ernest, of Coburg; Libanon, of Erlangen; and Plato, of Wiesbaden.

December 6, 1861, Johann Kaspar Bauer was elected Grand Master; December 4, 1863, Julius Fester; and, January 12, 1865, Dr. Dancker once more.

In 1866 Frankfort became an integral part of the Kingdom of Prussia, in which, according to law, no Lodges were allowed to exist except those dependent upon one of the three Grand Lodges at Berlin. There was, therefore, much danger of the Eclectic Union being dissolved by the authorities. This, however, was obviated by the prudent and patriotic course of action pursued by its members. Under closely analogous circumstances—and, presumably, for reasons which did not apply in both cases—the Grand Lodge of Hanover was extinguished; but the law, although in force, had not been applied as regards Frankfort.

In 1867—December 6—Hermann Hörster (of Lodge Karl) was elected Grand Master; and, December 3, 1869, Heinrich Weismann, under whom—December 8, 1871—the *Statutes* were once more revised; the Grand Lodge still consisting of Frankfort Brethren as members, but country Lodges were to depute two of their own members as representatives, with votes in certain cases and a consultative voice in all. The Grand Master was to be elected for three years from the Frankfort Lodges only, dropping the rule of alternation. On January 26, 1872, Grand Lodge was reconstituted under the new Act and Weismann re-elected.

A new Lodge was warranted at Hanau, April 20, 1872 and, on January 10, 1873, the English Lodge at Frankfort, Nascent Dawn, which had been the chief cause of the local declaration of independence, joined the Eclectic Union, entering at once into all the privileges of the other three metropolitan Lodges.

Karl Oppel was elected Grand Master December 4, 1874. In 1877 a regular correspondence was resumed with England; and, May 26, 1878, the Darmstadt Lodge, Karl of Lindenburg, at Frankfort, was affiliated. Revised *Constitutions* were passed on September 21, 1879; G. E. van der Heyden was elected Grand Master January 21, 1881; and, in 1882—February 17—another of the Eclectic Lodges was warranted at Strasburg.

The Centenary Festival of the Eclectic Union, held March 18, 1883, was graced by the distribution of the lucid and detailed *Annals* of that body, from the pen of the Grand Secretary, Karl Paul.

The epoch-marking dates of the Grand Lodge of the Eclectic Union are:—1742, constitution of Lodge Union; 1746–52, state of dormancy; 1766, erection of English Provincial Grand Lodge, 1775–7, temporary closing of Provincial Grand Lodge, 1782, first period of independence; 1783, formation of the Eclectic Union; 1789, reinstatement of the Provincial Grand Lodge at Frankfort; 1793, Provincial Grand Lodge closed in anticipation of the entry of French troops; 1801, reopened with one daughter only and territory invaded by the Grand Lodge Royal York; 1803–5, Provincial Grand Lodge suspended; again, 1806–8, whilst awaiting Karl von Dalberg's approbation; 1808, invasion of jurisdiction by Grand Orient of France; 1809, loss of Lodges by the formation of the Grand Orient of Baden; 1814, abolition of the oath; 1817, invasion of jurisdiction by the Grand Lodge of England and Prince Karl of Hesse; 1823, declaration of independence and proclamation of the Grand Lodge of the Eclectic Union, with 9 daughter Lodges; 1834, first success of the enlightened party in Grand Lodge; 1840, Karl's Lodge absorbed the Jewish question partly settled; 1845, loss of Lodges by formation of the Grand Lodge of Darmstadt; 1848, Jewish question solved and Jewish Lodges absorbed; 1859, loss of Lodges by forced union with Darmstadt; 1866, incorporation of Frankfort with Prussia; 1883, Centenary Festival.

III. THE GRAND NATIONAL MOTHER-LODGE OF THE PRUSSIAN STATES, CALLED "OF THE THREE GLOBES"

The archives and Minutes of this Grand Lodge are complete from September 13, 1740, to 1914, with the exception of a short period in 1765. In 1840 O'Etzel, the Grand Master, compiled a history of the Grand Lodge based upon these Minutes, so that, as far as actual facts extend, its accuracy is unimpeachable. This was revised and continued in 1867, 1869, and 1875; and the *Constitutions* ordained in 1873 that every initiate should, in future, be presented with a copy. This history has been carefully collated with many accounts by other writers, whose works will be quoted whenever used, but otherwise the following

sketch is given on O'Etzel's authority and may easily be verified by the dates affixed. The edition employed is *Geschichte der Grossen National-Mutter-Loge zu den drei Weltkuglen*, etc., Berlin, 1875.

In pursuing the history of this Grand Body, none can fail to be struck by a feature to which attention has already been directed in the case of the Eclectic Union, viz. the absence of a representative form of government. This, however is only a natural consequence when a Grand Lodge is established before the birth of *any* of the private Lodges, which it is destined to control—the daughter Lodges, in all such cases, accepting the inferior and dependent position usually accorded to them, as a necessary adjunct of their constitution. When, on the other hand, several Lodges, with equal rights, join in establishing a ruling body or Grand Lodge, the representative form of government seems to follow as a matter of course. The relations between a Mother-Lodge and her daughters may be likened to those between England and her Crown colonies; whilst those between Grand and private Lodges—which follow the English precedent—are in closer approximation to the system of government of the United States. But, in like manner as the power of the House of Commons, at first restricted, has gradually increased, so do we find that under Grand Lodges—even where the sway is most despotic—something approaching a representative system is in gradual course of introduction.

Individual Masons doubtless existed in Prussia at an early date, but the introduction of Freemasonry into that State may without exaggeration be attributed directly to Frederick the Great as, during the lifetime of his father, who had conceived an aversion to the Craft, no open assemblage of Masons could possibly take place. In July 1738 the King of Prussia and the Crown Prince Frederick, being on a visit to the Prince of Orange at Loo, the conversation at table took a Masonic turn. The King attacked the Order violently, but Count Albert Wolfgang of Lippe-Bückeburg took its part so successfully as to awake in the Crown Prince a desire to join the Craft. Great secrecy was naturally essential to the carrying out of such a project. Count Albert undertook the arrangements and, as the King had announced his intention of visiting Brunswick during the annual fair, it was resolved that the ceremony of initiation should be performed in that city.

A letter from Baron von Bielfeld written to Baron von . . . [Oberg] the Master of the Lodge in which Bielfeld had been initiated, tells how it was that the Crown Prince Frederick became interested in the Craft. The letter is dated July 20, 1738 and is as follows:

You behave towards me, not as Brother, but as a Father Mason. You are desirous that I should participate in the glory of receiving the Crown Prince of Prussia into our Order. I am fully sensible of the high value of this favour, and am ready to accompany you to Brunswick. It appears by the letter of the Count of Lippe Bückeburg that the idea of becoming a Freemason struck that great prince in a manner very singular. You cannot but admire, Worshipful Master, the concatenation of uncommon events. It was necessary that the King of Prussia should come with a numerous retinue to Loo to visit the Prince of Orange, that he

GERMANY

A REPRESENTATIVE SELECTION OF GERMAN LODGE JEWELS

No. 1 is the jewel of Lodge Zu den drei Säulen am Weinberge, at Guben ; founded 1843 ; under the Grand Lodge of the Three Globes. It consists of a golden crown, above a Maltese Cross enamelled white, on its centre a golden star, bearing the three columns enamelled within a blue border.

No. 2 is the jewel of Lodge Zur Beständigkeit und Eintracht, at Aachen, founded in 1778 ; under Grand Lodge Three Globes. It consists of a gold cross, in the centre of which are enamelled two hands clasped around a thunderbolt, on an irradiated triangle.

No. 3 is the jewel of Lodge Zum Verein der Menschenfreunde, at Trier ; founded in 1805 ; under the Royal York Grand Lodge. It consists of a gold ornamented star, in the centre of which, on a white ground, are three hands grasping a wreath. The more modern form of this jewel has a wreath of flowers instead of leaves only.

No. 4 is the jewel of Lodge Alexius zur Beständigkeit, at Bernburg, founded 1817 ; under Grand Lodge Three Globes. On a silver triangle are an A, seven stars, the name of the Lodge on a blue oblong ; and, behind this silver triangle, a gold inverted triangle, together forming a star. The ribbon is black, with gold edge.

No. 5 is the jewel of Lodge Zun den drei Seraphim, at Berlin ; founded 1744 ; under Grand Lodge Three Globes. It consists of a gold cross, enamelled in blue, with three seraphim, "3," and "S" in silver, on the arms and centre of the cross respectively.

No. 6 is the jewel of Lodge Prinz von Preussen, zu den drei Schwertern, at Solingen ; founded 1840 ; under the National Grand Lodge of Germany. It consists of three golden swords, supporting a laurel wreath, within which, on a blue ground, is a crowned eagle on the one side, on the other (No. 6a) a crown and a W.

No. 7 is the jewel of Lodge Wittekind zur westfälisch Pforte, at Minden ; founded in 1780 ; under the Grand Lodge Three Globes. It consists of a silver triangle, on which is a W and a view of the sunrise over a mountain village. Around this is a gold irradiation ; the whole is mounted on a large black velvet star, with two ends of blue ribbon appearing below.

No. 8 is the jewel of Lodge Zum goldenen Apfel, at Dresden ; founded 1776 ; under the Grand Lodge of Saxony. This Grand Lodge was founded September 28, 1811. It has 45 subordinate Lodges and a membership of 7,344 Brethren. The Craft Degrees only are worked.


No. 9 is the jewel of Lodge Wahrheit und Einigkeit zu den sieben vereinigten Brüdern, at Jülich ; founded 1815 ; under the Grand Lodge Three Globes. It consists of a golden crown, beneath which is a gold Maltese cross set with mother-of-pearl, on the arms of which are clasped hands, W, U and E, respectively. In the centre is an irradiated triangle on a blue ground, surrounded by a snake.

No. 10 is the jewel of Lodge Zum schützenden Thor, at Warendorf. It was founded in 1817, and became extinct in 1840. It consists of a golden cross, enamelled in blue, and bearing the name of the Lodge, whilst in the centre is a wall, with a gate partly open. Suspended from the bottom are the compasses, trowel and hammer.

No. 11 is the jewel of Lodge Zum goldenen schwerdt, at Wesel ; founded 1775 ; under the Grand Lodge Three Globes. It consists of a golden crown, from which hangs a silver triangle with a blue centre and golden ornaments, whilst over all is the Golden Sword.

No. 12 is the jewel of Lodge Georg zur deutschen Eiche, at Uelzen ; founded 1860 ; under the Grand Lodge Three Globes. It consists of two silver triangles, the upper of which bears a tree with a golden G entwined around the stem ; the lower part of this triangle has a dark-blue ground.

No. 13 is the jewel of Lodge Hermann zum Lande der Berge, at Elberfeld ; founded 1815 ; under the Grand Lodge Three Globes. It consists of a golden cross enamelled in black, bearing the name of the Lodge ; whilst in the centre is a group of three mountains, the centre one a volcano, properly coloured.



A Representative Selection of German Lodge Jewels.

should be accompanied by the Crown Prince, that at table the conversation should turn to Freemasonry, that the King should speak of it disadvantageously, that Count Lippe should undertake its defence, that he should not be dazzled by the authority of majesty, but that, with a noble freedom, he should avow himself to be a Freemason; that, in going out from the entertainment, the Crown Prince should express to him, in confidence, a desire of becoming a member of that Society and that he should wish his reception to be at Brunswick, where the King, his father, had resolved to go and where the concourse of strangers of every sort, during the approaching fair, would give less suspicion of the arrival of the Brother Masons, who were invited to come there to form a Lodge for that purpose, that Count Lippe should address himself to you to procure to our Order that glorious acquisition and that your friendship should induce you to remember me, that I might also be of the party. Behold, Worshipful Master, a series of remarkable incidents, which make me prophesy a favourable issue to this enterprise. You know that my present station is displeasing and my country irksome to me. I resemble one of those plants which are nothing worth if not transplanted. At Hamburg, I shall, at most, run up to seed and perish. Perhaps the Great Disposer of the Universe will give me a better fortune and will lay the foundations of it at Brunswick. I am preparing all things for my journey. For the rest, I know perfectly well how necessary it is to observe an approving silence with regard to the exhibition of so much delicacy.

The task of receiving the Prince into the Order was confided to von Oberg, Master of the then anonymous Lodge in Hamburg, who, with the secretary, Bielfeld and a Baron von Löwen, travelled to Brunswick and, on August 11, met by arrangement the Count of Kielmansegge and F. C. Albedyll from Hanover, also Count Albert. Count Wartensleben joined the Prince as a second candidate. During the night August 14-15, 1738, the Prince and his friend came to the hotel where the Hamburg Brethren were staying and, after midnight, the two candidates were received in due form; no difference being made as regards the Prince, in compliance with his own special request.

The following letter, written from Brunswick, where the initiation of the Crown Prince took place, on August 24, 1738, to Herr von St. . . . at Hamburg (evidently a member of the Craft) contains a detailed account of the initiation of the Prince, together with some further particulars. Its interest and importance must be a set-off to its length.

Your villainous fever, my very dear Brother, appears to me more insolent than that of the Princess Urania. It has not only attacked you in the flower of your days, but has laid this snare for you at a period that might have influenced all the remainder of your life. It has deprived you of the glory and the advantage of having assisted at the reception of the Crown Prince of Prussia and of there performing the office of Overseer, to which you were appointed. How unfortunate! Turn it out then, whatever may be said of your rich apartment, this villainous fever and be radically cured against our return. We do not expect to make any long stay at Brunswick, because there is here one crowned head too many, who might discover

that we have received the Prince, his son, into our Order and, in his ill-humour, might be wanting in respect to the Worshipful Master.

In the meantime, my dear Brother, I shall acquit myself of my promise, and here employ the first moments of my leisure in giving you an exact account of our journey and success.

We left Hamburg, Baron O. . . . [Oberg], Baron L. . . . [Löwen], and myself the 10th of August and arrived the next evening at the gates of Brunswick. The officers of the custom began to examine our luggage. This authoritative ceremony put us into a great consternation. Judge of our embarrassment. We had with us a large trunk filled with the furniture, insignia and instruments necessary for holding a Lodge. All these might be deemed contraband, notwithstanding the privilege of the fair. We held a council instantly. If the officer should persist in opening the trunk, there was nothing to be done but to declare ourselves conjurers or mountebanks. But we were soon eased of our fears, for, by virtue of a ducat which I slipped into the officer's hand, he declared that we were persons of quality and incapable of defrauding the customs.

We took up our quarters at the Corn Hotel : it is the principal inn of the town ; anywhere else it would be reckoned a tolerably good alehouse. Count L. . . ., Count K. . . . and Baron A. . . . of Hanover arrived there almost at the same instant and joined us the same night. Rabon, valet to M. O. . . ., and a good Mason, was appointed to the duties of Tyler and acquitted himself to a miracle.

The next morning, the cannons of the rampart declared the arrival of the King of Prussia and his train. The presence of a crowned head and the affluence of all sorts of strangers, which the fair had brought to Brunswick, made the town appear highly animated. We agreed that none of us should appear at Court, except Count L. . . ., whom we deputed to the Crown Prince to receive his orders relative to the day, the hour and the place of his reception.

H.R.H. appointed the night between the 14th and 15th and chose it should be in our apartment, which was, in fact, very spacious and quite convenient for the business.

There was only one inconvenience, which was the vicinity of M.W. . . ., who lived in the apartment adjoining to our antechamber and was separated from it by a thin partition. He might, therefore, have heard all and told all. This reflection alarmed us, but as our Hanoverian Brethren knew the hour at which he was sent to drown, as the song says, his sorrowful reason in wine, we seized his foible, we attacked him by turns after dinner and, being prepared to encounter with him at chinking of glasses, we left him towards night so fast, that he would have slept by the side of a battery and the thyrsus of Bacchus served us on this occasion as effectually as could have done the finger of the god Harpocrates.

On the 14th the whole day was spent in preparation for the Lodge and, little after midnight, we saw arrive the Crown Prince accompanied by Count W. . . ., Captain in the King's Regiment at Potsdam.

The Prince presented this gentleman as a candidate whom he recommended and whose reception he wished immediately to follow his own. He defied us likewise to omit in his reception any rigorous ceremony that was used in similar cases, to grant him no indulgence whatever, but gave us leave on this occasion to treat him merely as a private person. In a word, he was received with all the usual and requisite formalities. I admired his intrepidity, the serenity of his countenance

and his graceful déportment, even in the most critical moments. I had prepared a short address, of which he testified his approbation and, after the two receptions, we opened the Lodge and proceeded to our work. He appeared highly delighted and acquitted himself with as much dexterity as discernment.

I do assure you, my dear Brother, that I have conceived very great expectations from this Prince. He is not of a remarkable stature and would not have been chosen to have ruled in the place of Saul, but, when we consider the strength and beauty of his genius, we cannot but desire for the prosperity of the people, to see him fill the throne of Prussia. His features are highly pleasing, with a sprightly look and a noble air; and it depends altogether on himself to appear as perfectly engaging. A *petit maître* of Paris would not, perhaps, admire his curls; his hair, however, is of a bright brown, carelessly curled, but well adapted to his countenance. His large blue eyes have at once something severe, soft and gracious. I was surprised to find in him so youthful an air. [The Prince was, at this time, in his twenty-seventh year.] His behaviour, in every respect, is that of a person of exalted rank and he is the most polite man in all that kingdom over which he is born to rule. He gave to the Worshipful Master, Baron von O. . . . the most delicate and flattering instance of regard. I say nothing of his moral qualities: it would be difficult to discern them at one interview, but I protest to you that there was no part of his conversation which did not mark great dignity of mind and the utmost benevolence of temper and, for the truth of this, I appeal to the public voice.

All was finished soon after four in the morning and the Prince returned to the Duke's palace, in all appearance as well satisfied with us as we were charmed with him. I hastened to bed completely fatigued with the business of the day.

The letter contains the following amusing postscript:

The Freemasons have certainly good reason to please themselves on having for their Brother one who is undoubtedly the greatest genius of any Prince in Europe, but if they think that this, or any other relation, will supply with that wise Prince the place of merit, they are greatly deceived. Some time since a Freemason, it is said, endeavoured to intrude himself on a King by virtue of this connexion, but the monarch, finding that the man had no other merit, took no notice of him. The man, therefore, determined to enforce his application by making a sign, which the King answered by turning his back on the man and waving the hind flap of his coat.

Baron Jacob Friedrich von Bielfeld, who was one of the earliest known members of the Craft in Germany, was initiated in 1738, when he was twenty-one years of age. He became a well-known German diplomat of the eighteenth century, among the high positions held by him being Secretary of Legation to the King of Prussia, Preceptor to Prince Ferdinand, Chancellor of the Universities in the Dominions of his Prussian Majesty, which duties took him in turn to the Netherlands, France and England. In 1748 he was raised to the peerage and he was also honoured with the appointment of Privy Councillor. He was the author of several works, which were translated into Italian, Russian and German, as he invariably wrote in the French language but, during the later years of his life, he

edited and published a German weekly, which was translated into French. Among his works are four volumes of *Intimate Letters*, in one of which is an interesting exposition of his reasons for seeking initiation. It is evidently addressed to his betrothed and it is dated from Hamburg, February 6, 1738. As will be seen from the extracts given, it is of some importance.

So you are quite alarmed, Madame, very seriously angry! My reason tells me you are wrong, but my passion tells me you can never do wrong, for it makes me perceive that I love you more, if it be possible, since I have been a Freemason and since you have been angry with me for so being, than I ever did before. Permit me, therefore, by this opportunity, to employ all my rhetoric to dissipate your discontent, that you may approve the motives which have induced me to take this step, that you may restore me to your favour and that I may be enabled to reconcile my reason with my passion.

Nothing can be more unjust or ridiculous than to imagine that the secret assemblies of the Freemasons can tend to disturb the security or the tranquillity of a State, for, though our doors are shut against the profane vulgar, they are at all times open to sovereigns and magistrates and how many illustrious princes and statesmen do we count among our Brethren? If ought passed in our Lodges that was dangerous or criminal, must they not have been long since abolished? But the experience of many ages, during which the Order has never been known to perform any actions but those of morality and munificence, is a stronger argument in its favour than any I can produce. I shall, therefore, say no more upon this matter and I should not have said so much, if I did not know that you are capable of feeling the force of these arguments.

The postscript to the letter runs :

I herewith send you a pair of lady's gloves that were given me by the Lodge at my reception. The apple was decreed by Paris to the most beautiful, but these gloves are for the best beloved.

It is interesting to note the stress made by Baron Bielfeld on the antiquity of the Craft. This was within twenty-one years of the formation of the Grand Lodge of England, while eight years previously, in England, Dr. Rawlinson, in the manuscript collections which he left, which are in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, emphasized the same feature. Although neither produces any historical confirmation of the statement, it must be remembered that both were scholars and held no ordinary positions in the world of letters.

Von Oberg afterwards erected and presided over a Lodge in the Prince's castle of Rheinsberg and, when he left for Hamburg in 1739, Frederick himself assumed the chair. At his father's death—May 31, 1740—Frederick openly acknowledged himself as a Mason; and—June 20, 1740—presided over a Lodge in the Royal Palace of Charlottenburg, with Bielfeld and Jordan as his Wardens. On that occasion the following candidates were initiated by the King in person :—his

two brothers, August Wilhelm and Heinrich Wilhelm ; his brother-in-law, Karl, Margrave of Brandenburg-Onolzbach ; and the Duke of Holstein-Beck. At a subsequent date he initiated the Margrave of Brandenburg-Baireuth. This Lodge was called the "Royal Lodge," but ceased to work about 1744, when the outbreak of war diverted Frederick's attention to other matters.

Immediately after his accession Frederick empowered Jordan, the secretary of his Lodge, to erect a Lodge in Berlin for the convenience of the numerous Masons there resident. Its first meeting was held September 13, 1740 and it took the name of the Three Globes. This Lodge, which became the Grand Lodge of the same name, was, therefore, founded simply on the King's authority, who, from the very first, assumed all the privileges of a Grand Master in his own dominions. He continued to bear the title, even though, during the Seven Years' War and the heavy duties of his government, he was prevented from attending to his Masonic calls.

The names of some of the affiliates and initiates of the Lodge during its first year of existence are of interest in the history of Freemasonry in Germany. For instance, Baron Schmettau, already mentioned in connexion with Scots Masonry ; Bielfeld, secretary to the Prussian Embassy at London, an honoured visitor of our Grand Lodge, March 19, 1741, who, July 21, 1741, was able to assure the Three Globes that England readily looked upon the King as the natural Grand Master in his dominions, which was, of course, equivalent to acknowledging the regularity of the Three Globes Constitution ; the Marquis de Gentils, who, June 27, 1742, styled himself English Senior Grand Warden *pro tempore* and helped to found the Union Lodge at Frankfort ; and Ch. Sarry, who, on December 6, 1737, had presided over the first Hamburg Lodge as Provincial Grand Master for Prussia and Brandenburg, where, at that time, no Lodge existed. Other notable members were Prince William, the Duke of Holstein-Beck, the Margrave Karl of Brandenburg, Count Waldburg (also a visitor at the Grand Lodge of England, March 19, 1741) and Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick-Bevern, subsequently known as Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg-Wolfenbützel, initiated December 21, 1740.

The first code of By-laws was drawn up and accepted November 9, 1740. In October a Deputation from the Lodge initiated Karl Frederick, Duke of Saxe-Meiningen and the Three Globes issued its first Warrant of Constitution to a Lodge, the Three Compasses, in that Prince's chief city.

Findel says (p. 244) that the Grand Lodge of the Three Globes imitated the example set by the Grand Lodge of England and organized a Steward Lodge, but, in Germany, the task of that Lodge was to manage the financial affairs of the Jurisdiction. This caused great luxury to be displayed at their festivals, exhausted the treasury and became an inducement to members to join, but who did not prove a desirable acquisition. To prevent persons unlawfully constituted from sharing in the business of the Lodges, a new sign was adopted and communicated to the Lodges. Hamburg and Frankfort agreed to do the same and the latter, as an extra precautionary measure, gave to its members, by way of certificate, an impression of the seal of Grand Lodge, on the reverse of which were recorded the names of the

Master and Wardens. But neither this arrangement, nor another proposition made by von Heinitz in Brunswick in 1762, that all regularly constituted Lodges should enter correspondence, ever met with general approbation.

In 1742, Schmettau having made several Scots Masters, these formed themselves into a Scots Lodge, Union, November 30, 1742. Although the membership of this Lodge was restricted to Masons of the Three Globes, it never attempted, like the French Scots Master Lodges, to exercise any control over the Craft.

From 1742 to 1744 six Warrants of Constitution were granted, some of which were for localities beyond the confines of Prussia. It was, therefore, only natural that—June 24, 1744—the Lodge should assume the title of Grand Royal Mother-Lodge of the Three Globes. It did not cease, however, on that account to continue working as a private Lodge. Frederick the Great was nominally Grand Master, though, as seen, he could not, for want of time, give much attention to Masonic matters and, in September 1747, the Duke of Holstein-Beck, Governor of Berlin, was elected Vice or Deputy Grand Master—a step designed to strengthen the Lodge, which had meanwhile somewhat deteriorated. These offices, however, were rather ornamental than useful, as the real power in the Lodge was still vested in the Master. The changes in that office need not be tabulated, but it may be mentioned that von Printzen—initiated March 18, 1748—who was elected Master of the Lodge, May 5, 1749, held the post until June 5, 1752 and became the foremost figure in its early annals.

December 9, 1754, a second Lodge was constituted at Berlin, under the name of La Petite Concorde, but with very limited powers. It soon felt the inconvenience of this arrangement and took advantage of some irregularities in the election of the officers of the Mother Lodge—May 28, 1755—to protest and declare itself independent. On the death of Holstein-Beck, Sarry—in May 1755—made preparations for nominating von Rammelsberg as Vice Grand Master and he was duly elected. Von Rammelsberg proved to be a very efficient ruler, notwithstanding the protest and withdrawal of La Petite Concorde. Lord James Keith, who was then Governor of Berlin, and claimed to be Deputy Grand Master of all English Lodges in North Germany, interfered to prevent the Concord being closed by force, and promised it an English Constitution. Although the Mother-Lodge had meanwhile warranted, in 1746, five and, in 1751, two Lodges, matters were far from satisfactory and, in May 1757, von Printzen was once more called to the direction of affairs. His first efforts to restore peace between the Three Globes and the Concord were, however, only partially successful. In 1758 the latter also erected for itself a Scots Lodge, under the name of Harmony.

In the same year Gabriel de Lernais, a French prisoner of war, appears upon the scene. The Three Globes granted him a Warrant for a French Lodge, without the right of initiating. This Lodge Fidelity died out after the exchange of prisoners. De Lernais also induced von Printzen to give his powerful support to the Clermont Degrees and, *circa* 1758, these two erected a Chapter—Knights of Jerusalem—which—June (or July) 19, 1760—assumed the title of Premier Grand Chapter of

Clermont in Germany, with von Printzen as Chief. This Chapter exercised no supremacy over the Lodges: it was and remained, until the advent of the Strict Observance, outside the real work of the Craft. Rosa, as already related, somewhat modified the ritual and established subordinate Chapters in many cities.

Besides four other Lodges, the Three Globes warranted—August 10, 1760—the Berlin Lodge of the Three Doves, afterwards the Grand Lodge Royal York. This Lodge consisted originally entirely of French Brethren, but, in 1761, it obtained permission to include Germans in its membership, when it changed its name to Friendship. On the motion of von Printzen they expressed their willingness to join in with the two other Lodges in Berlin to form an independent Grand Lodge. Ultimately, as will be seen, it became the Grand Lodge Royal York of Friendship.

In 1763, however, a member of the Lodge Friendship (the new name of the Three Doves) was excluded by the Tribunal for six months for a Masonic offence. This proceeding caused so much friction that the Grand Master and officers of the Tribunal resigned; and, as no fresh ones were elected, the Tribunal ceased to exist. Von Printzen, however, continued for years to be referred to as Grand Master, probably out of respect for his character. In 1762 and 1763 eight new Lodges were constituted—the last sign of activity for some years, for the time was now fast approaching when the Three Globes and its daughters were to merge into the system of the Strict Observance.

It will be remembered that in 1763 Schubart was named Deputy Grand Master and, superseding Rosa in his missionary efforts, was appointed by von Hund his Delegate-General in November of that year. In 1764 he returned to Berlin to convert the Fraternity there and, finally, so far succeeded that the new *Statutes* accepted by the Three Globes—November 20, 1764—were fashioned on the lines of the Strict Observance. His success was all the easier because Rosa's Clermont Chapters had to a certain extent prepared the way. On January 13, 1765, von Hund granted a warrant to Krüger to open a Strict Observance Lodge in Berlin. In 1765, also, Lodge Friendship acquired an English patent and separated from the Three Globes, ultimately developing, as stated, into the Grand Lodge—Royal York of Friendship.

At this period Zinnendorff appears upon the scene. He was already a member of von Printzen's Jerusalem Chapter and, in June 1765, was elected Master of the Three Globes. On August 24, 1764, he signed the Act of Strict Observance at Halle, was knighted by von Hund on October 3 and made Prefect of Templin (i.e. Berlin) on the 6th, with Krüger as second in command. The two together carried the Berlin Lodges with them and—January 13, 1766—von Hund constituted the Three Globes a Scots or Directoral Lodge, with power to warrant Strict Observance Lodges. The daughter Lodges all naturally went over to the new system, with the exception of the Royal York, which had placed itself under the Grand Lodge of England. Zinnendorff, however, made himself enemies, acted in a very arbitrary manner, used the Lodge funds—it is averred—for his own purposes and

was, therefore, not re-elected at the expiration of his year of office. He was succeeded in June 1766 by Krüger, who, in July, procured the acceptance of the Strict Observance Ritual and the formal renunciation by the Lodge—August 9—of the Clermont Degrees.

On November 16, 1766, Zinnendorff formally notified to von Hund his renunciation of the Strict Observance and, six months later—May 6, 1767—all things being in readiness for the foundation of his own Rite, he resigned membership of the Three Globes. The members of that Lodge were by no means agreed as to their future proceedings for, in the same year (1767), another notable member, Köppen, also seceded and founded a Rite—that of African Architects—which only came to an end at his death in 1797.

In 1769 Köhler became Master of the Three Globes and Krüger, Head Scots Master (the Scots Lodges of the Strict Observance controlled those of the Craft) and, in accordance with the rules of the Templar system, both offices were declared permanent.

In the following year—February 24—the Mother-Lodge constituted the Berlin Lodge of the Flaming Star, of which C. A. Marschall von Bieberstein was Master. One relative, C. G. Marschall—von Hund's predecessor—founded the Naumburg Lodge; another, H. W. von Marschall, was appointed by Lord Darnley, in 1737, Provincial Grand Master for Upper Saxony. Other members of this family were also prominent Masons. This Lodge, with the Three Globes and the Concord, now formed one body, as it were, under the Scots Lodge—so much so, that, in 1787, the Berlin Masons did not know to which Lodge they belonged and steps had to be taken to remedy the confusion.

November 16, 1770, the Crown Prince—afterwards Frederick William II—wrote to the Lodge of the Strict Observance—i.e. the Three Globes—assuring it of his protection.

In 1772 Krüger and Wöllner attended the Kohlo Convent, at which the Strict Observance system was reorganized. Each national division of the Order acquired a Grand Lodge to rule the Craft; the National Grand Master and the Head Master of the Scots Lodge acting together formed the Scots Directory, ruling all Degrees, including the 4th; the Supreme Grand Master, i.e. Duke Ferdinand, presided over all the separate Directories; the higher or knightly Degrees were subject to the Provincial Grand Master, von Hund. Prince Frederick Augustus of Brunswick (nephew of Ferdinand) was made National Grand Master of Prussia; and the Three Globes, in accordance with the new arrangements, took the title of Grand National Mother-Lodge of the Prussian States, which it retained.

In 1773 the former Grand Master, von Printzen, died; and, in the following year, the Lodge Frederick of the Three Seraphim was constituted in Berlin. May 2, 1775, Krüger resigned and the National Grand Master, Prince Frederick Augustus, appointed as Head Scots Master, Wöllner, who was imbued with the alchemical and mystical mania of the day. In 1775 two new Lodges (one Silence, in Berlin) and, in 1776, two others, were constituted. This brings us to the date of von Hund's

death (November 18, 1776) and to a new period in the history of this Grand Lodge.

Many causes combined to produce dissatisfaction with the Rite of the Strict Observance about this time. Wöllner himself had become allied with the New or Gold Rosicrucians and naturally influenced his *entourage*; the idea of a Templar restoration had ceased to attract or to retain favour; the object of the Duke of Sudermania in desiring to succeed von Hund was looked upon with suspicion; the position of the Mother-Lodge was, after all, only a secondary one. The consequence was, that no Deputies were sent from Berlin to the Convent at Wolfenbüttel in 1777 and—July 5, 1779—it was resolved in Grand Lodge to cease working the High Degrees, but not formally to dissociate the Lodges of the Jurisdiction from the Strict Observance. The Grand Master, Prince Frederick Augustus, informed the subordinate Lodges of this resolution by a circular—April 7, 1780—which contained very palpable allusions to a Hermetic Society and announced the formation of a 5th Degree, immediately succeeding the Scots Masters, the very existence of which was to be kept secret from all those not admitted to it. The four “ at present ” imperfect lower Degrees were to be retained till the Unknown Superiors should send them corrected rituals. Theden was to be the only one entitled to confer this 5th Degree, but Wöllner, as Head Scots Master, was to direct the whole system, etc. From that moment, although it would be incorrect to describe the Three Globes system as a Rosicrucian one, inasmuch as the hermetic leaders at no time controlled whole Lodges, yet it may safely be averred that the Rosicrucian Degrees were extensively practised by a very large number of individual Masons selected from these Lodges and that the Grand Lodge of the Three Globes became the centre of the Rosicrucian Fraternity. From 1777 to 1781 five new Lodges were warranted, one each year.

In 1780—June 26—a first step towards a representative system was made by a resolution conferring honorary membership of Grand Lodge on all acting Masters of subordinate Lodges.

The meeting of the Wilhelmsbad Convent—and with it the practical subversion of the Strict Observance—took place in 1782. This furnished an opportunity for the Three Globes to avow its principles. In a circular of November 11, 1783, it declared its independence of all superior authority, but was willing to honour Duke Ferdinand, as before, in the capacity of Grand Master; it refused, however, to conform to the rectified Templar system, but offered to recognize as legitimate all Masons of every system as far as concerned the first three Degrees (always excepting the Illuminati) and counselled all Grand Lodges to follow its example. Not a word, however, did the circular contain of their own special vanity, the Hermetic Degrees.

The next few years present little of importance. In 1783 three Lodges were warranted; in 1784 Theden became Master of the Three Globes; and, in 1785, Bieberstein was elected Scots Head Master. In 1786, however, two important events occurred—Frederick the Great died and the unknown Rosicrucian Fathers

ordered a general Silanum, so that the two prominent disciples of this folly, Wöllner and his pupil, Frederick William II, had to content themselves with prosecuting their researches unaided; and, for the next few years, the Lodges worked only the original three Degrees, with a Scots Degree superadded. In 1787 one new Lodge was warranted and, in 1788, the first list was published, showing 16 active subordinate Lodges, with 763 members. 1790 saw the end of the mutual interdiction between the Lodges under the Three Globes and the National (or Zinnendorff) Grand Lodge, which was succeeded by a pact of tolerance and amity. In 1791, in order to remedy the evil caused by the continual absence from Berlin of the Grand Master Prince Frederick Augustus of Brunswick, Wöllner was elected his Deputy. Wöllner, however, was now a Minister of State and his scanty leisure was devoted to alchemical studies, so that not much advantage accrued from this step. More to the purpose was the appointment of a Commission—January 4, 1794—to formulate a Grand Lodge Constitution and ordinances and a resolution to re-elect all officers yearly, thus effacing the last reminiscence of the Strict Observance system. In 1796 Theden resigned on account of his advanced age and Zöllner was elected Master of the Three Globes.

In the same year—February 9—Frederick William II granted the Grand Lodge his special protection, together with all the privileges of a corporate body. The greater part of the ensuing year was taken up in devising a scheme for a governing body and in formulating *Constitutions* for the entire system; but the work was, at length, concluded November 22, 1797. The Grand Master and Deputy Grand Master were deprived of all authority and became mere figureheads to whom a certain amount of outward honour and deference was shown, but who were not even required to sign Warrants, which were to be issued by the Grand National Mother-Lodge. The Grand Lodge became the legislative body and was composed of 36 active members chosen from the Berlin Lodges. Seven of these formed a species of acting committee, with the style of a Scots Directory, the president taking the name of Head Scots Master. This Directory represented the Lodge before the law and was entrusted with the administration of affairs; all resolutions of the Grand Lodge required its ratification and all its acts required the assent of the Grand Lodge. To a certain extent its president even took precedence of the corresponding dignitary of the Grand Lodge. Its members were to be Scots Masons. In matters of dogma it took the name of Inner Orient and was entrusted with the preservation of the purity of ritual, etc. As regards ritual, only three Degrees were acknowledged. Four higher steps were, indeed, instituted—the first being derived from the old Scots Lodge—and in these the history of the Craft, the dogmas of Freemasonry and the arcana of the High Degrees were unfolded. They were not, however, Degrees, although membership of each was preceded by a ceremony and they exercised no influence over the Lodges; they more nearly approached close literary societies and were attached to individual Lodges provided the consent of the Master could be obtained and each particular Lodge of this class was considered as a branch of the Berlin Lodge. The arrangement in fact was not unlike the Hamburg *Engbund*. It

will be observed that the Provincial Lodges had no share in the government of the Craft.

In 1798—October 20—there appeared a royal edict suppressing all secret societies. The three Grand Lodges in Berlin, however, with Lodges holding under them, were expressly exempted from its provisions ; but Lodges erected in Prussia by other Grand Lodges were declared illegitimate. The names of all members were to be handed to the police authorities yearly. The Grand Master and the Deputy Grand Master were asked whether their names should also be cited and whether they would accept the accompanying responsibility. They declined and resigned their posts in February 1799.

During the ten years 1788–98 six Lodges were warranted and the number of active Lodges increased to 20, with a total membership of 941.

In 1799—March 7—it was determined not to elect any special National Grand Master, but to consider the Master of the Three Globes as such *pro tem*. Zöllner, therefore, thenceforth took the title of Grand Master. June 24—New *Statutes* were agreed to : these must not be confounded with the *Constitutions*. All German Grand Lodges make a distinction between the two, although it is at times somewhat difficult to explain the difference. In 1801—February 10—the special *Constitutions* of the Inner Orient received final approbation ; and, November 1, 1804, the *Constitutions* were revised ; the Grand Lodge to consist of 11 Grand Officers and 36 active members.

In 1804—September 12—Grand Master Zöllner died and was succeeded by Guionneau. A Past Grand Master, Prince Frederick Augustus, Duke of Brunswick, died November 8, 1805.

In October 1806 the French troops entered Berlin and the Lodges there under the Three Globes system were ordered to suspend work. The Committees of the Grand Lodge continued, however, to meet and transact all necessary business. It was even during this interregnum, that the first steps towards a closer union of the three Berlin Grand Lodges were taken, for, on December 12, 1807, a Committee was instituted consisting of four Deputies of each Grand Lodge, to consider and arrange matters of common interest and profit. This led to the Masonic Union of the Three Grand Lodges of Berlin—January 6, 1810—which was dissolved in 1823. Unfortunately one of the first acts of this Committee—April 2, 1808—was to confirm the already existing ordinance that a Jew could not be initiated, nor could a Jew already made a Mason elsewhere be affiliated. His right to visit was left undecided. This Jewish question was now beginning to make its importance felt.

The Berlin Lodges resumed work December 16, 1808. During the preceding ten years 40 Lodges had been added to the roll but, owing to a few dropping out, the total of active Lodges had only risen from 20 to 55, with a membership of 3,694, or an average of 67 per Lodge as compared with 47 in 1798.

The formation of the Grand Lodge of Saxony, at Dresden, in 1811, withdrew the Lodge at Bautzen from the jurisdiction of Berlin. That Grand Lodge was,

however, liberal enough to permit former Lodges to retain their peculiar rituals, thus it came about that in 1812 a pact was entered into between the Three Globes and Dresden, by virtue of which that Lodge remained under Berlin in all matters regarding ritual and work but, otherwise, passed under the jurisdiction of Dresden.

In 1812—November 26—the *Constitutions* underwent their septennial revision, the chief alterations being that the Provincial Lodges were granted a sham representation and allowed to appoint a Berlin member of the Grand Lodge as their proxy, which was an unsatisfactory concession to a demand for a seat in that body for every Master of a Lodge ; that the number of members of Grand Lodge might be raised in consequence of this demand for representation as high as 7 by 7, i.e. 49 ; that the membership was never to be less than 5 by 5, or 25 ; and that 3 by 3, or 9, formed a quorum of the Grand Lodge.

1817 is the year given by O'Etzel for the initiation by a Deputation from the Three Globes of Prince Frederick, second son of the King of Holland and subsequent Grand Master of the Netherlands.

In the last ten years 39 Lodges had been added to the roll, but a great many must have become extinct, since from 55 active Lodges in 1808, the total had only risen to 74 in 1818, with 6,545 members, an average of 88-9 per Lodge.

In 1821 the Czar's edict closing the Polish Lodges, caused a loss of several Lodges to Berlin ; and the revision of the *Statutes*, in 1825, once more enforced the regulation that a Jew could neither be initiated, affiliated, nor received as a visitor. It may also be observed, that in 1821, O'Etzel, the subsequent Grand Master, joined Lodge Concord and was elected a member of the Grand Lodge in 1822.

From 1818 to 1828 fifteen Lodges had been constituted and the total number of active Lodges amounted to 87, with a membership of 6,842, or an average of 78 per Lodge—somewhat less than before.

In 1829 the National Grand Master, Guionneau, died and was succeeded by Rosenstiel, who also dying—March 18, 1832—was followed by Poselger.

In 1838 Grand Master Proselger resigned on account of ill-health and O'Etzel, who had entered the Directory in 1836, was elected in his stead. Proselger died shortly afterwards, February 9, 1838. The periodical revision of the *Constitutions* produced no change of more than passing interest. In this year the Grand Lodge acquired, for ten Frederichsd'or, the apron and gavel of Frederick the Great. Since 1828 six new Lodges had been added to the roll. The total number, as against the 87 of 1828, was only 88, with 7,225 members, an average of 82 per Lodge. In 1839—December 28—there was formed a Grand Masters' Union of the three Berlin Grand Lodges and one of its first acts—May 22, 1840—was to initiate Prince William of Prussia, afterwards German Emperor.

In 1840—September 13—the Grand Lodge held its centenary festival, on which occasion it was presented by the Master of the Lodge Horus—on the roll of the Royal York—with the sword used at the initiation of Frederick the Great at Brunswick in 1738 ; whereupon it was resolved, that the Master of Lodge Horus,

although under another Jurisdiction, be *ex officio* an honorary member of the Grand Lodge of the Three Globes.

The revision of the *Constitutions* in 1843, raised the possible number of members of the Grand Lodge to 7 by 9, or 63; and the revised *Statutes* of 1841 once more excluded the Jews even from visiting—the Grand Masters' Union making this ordinance incumbent on all three of the Prussian Grand Lodges in 1842. As a last resort H.R.H. the Protector was appealed to and—April 26, 1843—delivered himself to the same effect. In 1848 a Cologne Lodge affiliated a Jewish Brother and appointed him to office: the Lodge was erased.

O'Etzel resigned office in 1848 and was succeeded as Grand Master by Messerschmidt. In the preceding ten years, 12 new Lodges had been warranted or revived. The total of active Lodges was 96, with 8,589 members—an average of 89-90, showing a steady increase both of Lodges and members.

A revision of the *Constitutions* being due in 1849, the Lodges were requested to vote with regard to the admission of Jews as visitors. Out of 71 Lodges which replied, 56 voted for and 15 against their admission. After this expression of opinion the Grand Lodge, nevertheless, only approved the resolution by 19 to 16 votes. It called upon the Directory to say whether this was one of those resolutions which required to be passed by a two-thirds majority. The Directory answered that it was a dogmatic question, requiring to be submitted to them as the Inner Orient and sided with the majority. The result was that—July 11, 1849—all Masons subject to a Grand Lodge recognized by the Three Globes were declared admissible as visitors, thus the first step towards placing Jewish on a level with Christian Masons was at last conceded. The quorum of the Grand Lodge was raised from nine to one-third of its active members.

On Christmas Day, 1850, O'Etzel—or, rather, von Etzel, died, the latter prefix having been granted to him by Royal decree in 1846.

Since 1848 only four new Lodges had been warranted and some of the Lodges in Hanover had been forced to join the Grand Lodge of that country at King George's desire. The total number of active Lodges in 1858 was 94, with 9,744 members—an average of 104 members per Lodge.

In 1861 E. E. Wendt, English Grand Secretary for German Correspondence, succeeded in establishing a correspondence between the Three Globes and the English Grand Lodge and, at length, in 1867, some approach to a representative system was inaugurated. At the Annual Conference in May, at which proposed alterations of the *Statutes* were usually discussed, the Masters of Provincial Lodges were for the first time invited to attend and did so to the number of 20.

In 1868—February 20—it was resolved to present every initiate with a copy of O'Etzel's *History of the Three Globes*, a liberal and praiseworthy arrangement.

In May—7th and 8th—the question, whether Jewish Masons were to be admitted, was again raised. Their affiliation or initiation was rejected by 54 votes to 20; but it was resolved to receive them, if actual subscribing members of a

regular Lodge, as permanent visitors (a position much resembling honorary membership in England) by 54 votes to 24.

In this year the total number of active Lodges was 106, with a membership of 11,271, or an average of 106 per Lodge, the Warrants granted in the previous ten years being 14.

In 1869 representatives were for the first time exchanged with England and in the May Conference the Jewish question was adjourned as inopportune. In 1873 a Lodge was warranted at Shanghai. This was the only German Lodge in foreign parts, which was not under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Hamburg.

At the periodical revision of the *Constitutions* in 1873, the Provinces made a great effort to secure a better representation in Grand Lodge. They obtained—not all they wanted—but a great concession. It was resolved—April 19—that no law or statute should be made or amended except at the May Conferences, in which every Master was entitled to a vote. As, however, Grand Lodge was allowed to attend in full force, the Masters still found themselves, as a rule, much out-numbered, whilst a majority of two-thirds was requisite to carry a new law or an amendment to an old one. The Jewish question was again fought out, but left *in statu quo*.

In 1873, on the occasion of completing twenty-five years as Grand Master, Messerschmidt resigned, on account of old age and was succeeded by von Etzel, the son of O'Etzel, Messerschmidt's immediate predecessor.

In 1874 the Lodges had voted on the Jewish question as a guide to the Grand Lodge—66 Lodges for their admission, 44 against; but of the individual members actually voting there was a majority of 7 against. At the May Conference there were present 47 Grand Lodge members and 28 Masters and the voting was 45 to 30—adversely to the Jews. In 1876 the majority was at last in their favour, but the necessary two-thirds majority was not attained. The more enlightened Masons then tried to secure their ends by a reorganization of the legislative body, and—May 25, 1878—it was resolved that thenceforth not all the members of Grand Lodge should take part in the May Conferences, but only 25—that is, 5 from each Berlin Lodge—the Provincial Masons thus standing a better chance of procuring a two-thirds majority.

IV. THE NATIONAL GRAND LODGE OF ALL GERMAN FREEMASONS AT BERLIN

The above title of this Grand Lodge was never justified. It is a barefaced usurpation. The Lodge was never national in the way claimed, as embracing all Germany, even at its birth was not so in the more restricted sense as applying to Prussia, where the National Grand Mother-Lodge of the Three Globes already existed. That it assumed to be the only legal Grand Lodge in Germany, that it posed as infallible, the only true exponent of Freemasonry with the sole exception of Sweden, was, however, only in perfect keeping with the imperious temper of its founder. From its inception the Lodge was dictatorial and oppressive towards its own daughters; scornful, even impertinent towards its equals; boastful of its own

superior light, yet persistently shrouding itself in darkness ; founded by a violation of all Masonic legality, yet a stickler for legal forms when they suited its own convenience ; revolutionary at its birth and rigidly conservative. Nevertheless this Grand Lodge was the second largest in Germany and produced Masons of the highest culture, whose very names must always remain an honour to the Fraternity. Zinnendorff and his immediate friends and successors knew their own minds at a time when their German Brethren were vacillating between Clermont Degrees, Strict Observance Rites, Rosicrucianism, *et hoc genus omne* and, so knowing, carried out their views astutely, ruthlessly and persistently—with the success that usually attends all well-directed efforts. No official history of this Grand Lodge has ever been published ; its partisans spoke with awe of its ancient documents and hid them from the gaze of the student. Like holy relics they were only accessible to devout believers ; nay, even a complete *Book of Constitutions* has never been placed within reach of the public ; and Masters, in order to govern their Lodges, were constrained to gather together the decisions pronounced at various times by the Grand Lodge, each thus forming for himself a species of digest of the common law as settled by decided cases. Such a collection has been made in Vol. XXVI of the *Latomia* but many gaps still remain to be filled up.

The early annals of this Grand Lodge are indissolubly connected with Zinnendorff, one of the most remarkable, perhaps, unscrupulous Masons of whom there is any record. Ellenberger was his patronymic and he was born August 11, 1731, at Halle ; but, being adopted by his mother's brother, took his uncle's name of Zinnendorff. He followed the medical profession and rose to be the chief of that department in the Prussian army, retiring in 1779. His initiation took place at Halle, March 13, 1757. When he joined a Berlin Lodge, or even which Lodge it was, are alike unknown ; but he was one of the early members of the Berlin Chapter of Jerusalem. When Schubart, the Deputy Grand Master of the Three Globes, was, in November 1763, won over by von Hund, Schubart's first step was to despatch a letter in von Hund's interest to the Three Globes, which was to be opened in the presence of 24 Brethren, who were specified. On its arrival, Zinnendorff and three others being with von Printzen, the Grand Master Zinnendorff persuaded them to open the letter then and there ; and, to extenuate their fault as an excess of zeal, Schubart, being asked for more light, insisted upon the letter being shown to the others when, as a result, Zinnendorff and Krüger were selected to visit von Hund. Probably from selfish motives, the former of these emissaries appeared alone, saying that the latter was ill, but this was afterwards denied by Krüger, who ultimately arrived on the scene. Zinnendorff signed the act of Strict Observance (or Unquestioning Obedience), August 24, 1764, was knighted by von Hund October 30 and made Prefect of Templin, i.e. Berlin, on the 6th.

In June, 1765, Zinnendorff was elected Grand Master of the Three Globes, possibly because the Lodge was already tending towards the Strict Observance system, of which he was the resident chief in Berlin. Scarcely was he installed before complaints arose of his arbitrary proceedings and haughty independence, not

only from his Masonic, but also from his Templar subjects. Almost his first act was to despatch his friend Baumann to Stockholm in order to obtain information there respecting the Swedish Rite. The requisite funds were taken from the treasury of the Three Globes, though the Lodge was not consulted either with regard to the mission or the appropriation of its money—and, worst of all, Zinnendorff kept for his own use the information so acquired, at a cost to the Lodge for travelling expenses of 1,100 thalers. Baumann obtained from Dr. Eckleff not only the Rituals of the Swedish High Degrees, but a Warrant of Constitution; and Findel states that the latter was 220 ducats in pocket by the transaction. (Findel, 4th ed., p. 419. For the particulars concerning Zinnendorff see *Allgemeines Handbuch*.) It is a somewhat important point to decide whether Eckleff was at this time Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Sweden, or merely, as the Swedish Grand Lodge subsequently affirmed, the Head-Master of the Scots Chapter at Stockholm. As seen already, the Grand Lodge of Sweden was formed in 1759 and, on December 7, 1762, the King assumed the Protectorate, so that the probability is that he was virtually its Grand Master. But, even if Eckleff were at the time Grand Master, it is obvious that, if he acted in the matter without the knowledge of Grand Lodge, the step was equally *ultra vires*. Both these grounds were alleged when, in 1777, Sweden repudiated Zinnendorff; but, on the other hand, it should be mentioned that, as late as 1776, the Swedish authorities were in close and fraternal correspondence with him and those intimate relations must be held to have condoned any irregularities in the initial stages.

In 1766 the Berlin Templars complained strongly of the impossibility of obtaining any financial statements from Zinnendorff, but Krüger, who was sent by them on a mission to von Hund, advised the Provincial Grand Master to treat him delicately, because he might become dangerous and create scandal—another testimony to the character of the man.

In June 1766 Zinnendorff was not re-elected Grand Master of the Three Globes but, of course, retained his office as Prefect of Templin (which was not elective) and, on August 9, the Three Globes formally joined von Hund's system. The financial dispute between Zinnendorff and the Three Globes now assumed a threatening aspect, so Schubart and Bode were deputed to arrange matters in July 1766. Zinnendorff, being called to account, made up a statement on the spur of the moment showing that, even admitting for argument's sake the debt of 1,100 thalers, there still remained 800 thalers owing to him. In the interests of peace and quietness it was at length decided to let the matter drop on both sides. On November 16, 1766, Zinnendorff wrote a formal letter to von Hund renouncing the Strict Observance; and, on May 6, 1767, he resigned the Three Globes. By the Three Globes, however, as well as by the Provincial Chapter of von Hund, a sentence of expulsion was passed upon him and, from that moment, he became the bitter and confirmed enemy of the Strict Observance system (von Etzel, *Geschichte*, p. 55).

In 1768, "by virtue of his inherent power," i.e. as a Scots Master, Zinnendorff erected his first Lodge on the Swedish system in Potsdam; on August 10, 1769,

his second, the Three Golden Keys, in Berlin—of which he became Master and—November 3, 1769—he instituted the Scots or St. Andrew's Lodge Indissoluble in Berlin. His conversion of two clandestine Swedish Lodges at Hamburg, in 1770, to his own Rite has already been noticed; in fact, such was his energy and activity, that, before Midsummer, 1770, he had already 12 Lodges at work.

Then began a series of attempts to obtain a patent enabling him to erect a Grand Lodge. He first of all applied to the High Chapter at Stockholm, but his request was refused on the ground that Sweden never constituted Lodges abroad, a statement tending to invalidate Eckleff's proceedings. Undaunted, Zinnendorff called his 12 Lodges together and proclaimed the National Grand Lodge for all German Freemasons (*Acta Latomorum*, p. 96). According to his view none but those of his own Rite were entitled to be called Freemasons and, least of all, the Brethren under the Strict Observance. Apparently all Masters (in office) were members. As the election of these Masters, however, was invalid unless approved by the Grand Lodge, the system of representation was defective and a sham, because the Grand Lodge practically became self-elective. Now, although Zinnendorff always professed the greatest contempt for the Grand Lodge of England as being deficient in true knowledge—and possessing the shell only, of which he and the Swedish Masons held the kernel—yet his advances meeting with no encouragement from Sweden, he made application to London—March 29, 1771—requesting recognition as a Grand Lodge, partly on the ground of possessing superior Degrees and partly from the circumstance of his holding a Swedish patent. The petition, however, failed to elicit any response (Findel, p. 422).

Upon this followed the constitution of a second Berlin Lodge, The Golden Ship and the election of Martin Kronke as Grand Master with Zinnendorff as Deputy Grand Master.

On October 29, 1771, he renewed his request and, on this occasion, to De Vignolles as Provincial Grand Master for foreign Lodges. But De Vignolles, at least, understood the course affairs had taken and answered that he could not even acknowledge him as a Brother until he had proof that he was received in a legitimate Lodge. The only legitimate Lodge in Berlin was the Royal York; the Three Globes had never been warranted by England; was now a Strict Observance Lodge and all such were clandestine. That beyond this it would be most unseemly of England to subordinate such personages as the Duke of Brunswick (Grand Master of Brunswick in 1770, who had already joined the Strict Observance) and other Provincial Grand Masters to unknown men like Zinnendorff and Kronke (Findel, p. 422 and *Allgemeines Handbuch*, s.v. Zinnendorff). Zinnendorff's efforts were therefore turned to procuring a show of regularity—and a prince as Grand Master.

Accordingly, on January 8, 1772, he applied to the Royal York Lodge for permission to use their rooms for an initiation and invited that Lodge to be present on the 10th. This was done, a sheet of paper was clandestinely inserted in the Minute-book of Royal York, the proceedings taken down, signed by the Royal York members, the sheet secretly abstracted and forwarded to England, in order

to prove that Zinnendorff and his friends were acknowledged as regular Masons by a properly constituted English Lodge (*Hauptmomente der Geschichte der Grossen Loge von Preussen Royal York zur Freundschaft*, p. 19).

On August 11 following he further induced the Landgrave Louis of Hesse Darmstadt to accept the office of Grand Master and negotiations were resumed with England; this time with Grand Secretary Heseltine and, in spite of De Vignolles, who, writing to Du Bois (Grand Secretary, Netherlands) in Holland, stated that matters were arranged behind his back and accused Heseltine of receiving a £50 bribe (*Allgemeines Handbuch, loc. cit.*). The following excerpt from the Minutes of the Grand Lodge of England—April 23, 1773—may possibly serve to explain De Vignolles's mistake and clear the Grand Secretary from an odious charge:—"Bro. Charles Hanbury, of Hamburg, Esq., attended the Grand Lodge and, on behalf of the Grand Lodge of Germany, situated at Berlin, paid in the sum of £50 towards the fund for building a Hall and received the thanks of the Grand Lodge thereupon."—But although Heseltine personally could not have benefited by this, yet the transaction does bear the appearance of at least a propitiatory gift to the Grand Lodge. The donation was made in April and the contract with Zinnendorff in the following October and November at Berlin and London respectively. In the same year a third Berlin Lodge—Pegasus—was warranted and the total of subordinate Lodges had risen to 18.

Zinnendorff's great argument, of course, was that the Strict Observance had strangled pure Freemasonry in Germany and that it was necessary to erect a powerful Grand Lodge as a counterpoise. That his own system was as great an innovation as any of the others he naturally concealed, as he did the fact that all he wanted was England's name to conjure with. In its lamentable ignorance the Grand Lodge of England fell into the trap—De Vignolles appears to have been the only one of its officers *au courant* of passing events—and, in consequence, acted very unjustly towards its faithful daughter the Provincial Grand Lodge for Frankfort.

On November 19, 1773, "the Grand Secretary (Heseltine) informed the Grand Lodge of England of a proposal for establishing a friendly union and correspondence with the Grand Lodge of Germany, held at Berlin, under the patronage of H.S.H. the Prince of Hesse and Darmstadt, which met with general approbation" (*Constitutions*, 1784, p. 305).

The compact with Zinnendorff (for the text see Findel, pp. 822-4) was signed (on behalf of the Grand Lodge of England) November 30, 1773. As it was executed in Berlin on October 20, it is evident that the terms had already been settled by Zinnendorff and Heseltine prior to the latter's motion in Grand Lodge. §§1 and 2 confirm in their offices Prince Ferdinand at Brunswick and Gogel at Frankfort for their respective lifetimes, protect their districts and leave them free—in the future—to make terms with the Grand Lodge of Germany. §3 deposes various other Provincial Grand Masters (who had gone over to the Strict Observance), among whom was Jaenisch of Hamburg. §4 reserves Hanover as common ground for England and Berlin. By §5 Berlin is to contribute to the Charity according to its

increase of power, but never less than £25 per annum. §6 recognizes the German Grand Lodge as the only constituent power in Germany, always excepting Brunswick and Frankfort, these only for the term of the then existing personal patents. §7 forbids the Grand Lodge at Berlin to exercise its powers outside Germany. In clause 9 both parties bind themselves to combat all innovations in Masonry, especially the Strict Observance.

Zinnendorff had thus, although under false pretences, obtained his point and was constituted the sole Masonic authority in Germany, by the Mother Grand Lodge of the Craft and, on July 16, 1774, his own Grand Lodge obtained the protection of Frederick the Great (O'Etzel, p. 61). Prince Louis having served the end for which he was elected, was evidently treated with scant courtesy, for on September 20, 1774, the Landgrave resigned, alleging as his reason for so doing, that he was ignored in his own Grand Lodge (*Allgemeines Handbuch, loc. cit.*). Zinnendorff was elected Grand Master, but in the following year—June 30, 1775—made way for Duke Ernest II of Saxe-Gotha-Altenburg. This high-minded prince exerted all his efforts to heal the strife which raged between Zinnendorff's Lodges and the Strict Observance and, though he failed to accomplish a union, at least succeeded—July 1776—in effecting a pact of mutual recognition and tolerance. This, however, being at once broken by Zinnendorff, the Duke—unable to endure the petty quarrels any longer—resigned and was succeeded by Grand Master Golz (Findel, p. 425)—December 21, 1776—and by Dr. T. Mumssen in 1777 (*Ibid.*, p. 429). Meanwhile the system had increased considerably; in Berlin alone Lodge Constancy was erected in 1775; Lodges Pilgrim, Golden Plough and Ram in 1776, making a total of no fewer than 7 Lodges in that city.

At this period began the negotiations between the Strict Observance and the Duke of Sudermania, threatening to end in the withdrawal of Sweden's tacit support of the National Grand Lodge. The Strict Observance Masons may at this time be said to have had only one formidable rival, viz. Zinnendorff, whose party enjoyed the great advantage of knowing their own minds, whereas Ferdinand and his friends did not. Such an opportunity of humiliating Zinnendorff could not be allowed to pass, but that able tactician, who probably saw the storm brewing, took measures to draw still closer the bonds between England and himself. In April 1777 he despatched his attached ally, Leonhardi, to London, who, in August 1779, obtained a Warrant to establish there the Pilgrim Lodge (Loge der Pilger), No. 516 (now No. 238), under a special dispensation to work in German and use their own ritual. Leonhardi was admitted to Grand Lodge—February 7, 1781—as the representative of the National Grand Lodge and took rank immediately after the Grand Officers. As seen already in 1782 Leonhardi frustrated the efforts made by the Frankfort Brethren through Pascha, subsequently to Gogel's death.

Meanwhile—April 27, 1777—the Swedish Grand Lodge, to please the Strict Observance members, drew up a document signed by Karl of Sudermania and others, declaring that Eckleff's patent to Zinnendorff had been granted without the knowledge or consent of the Chapter and, therefore, being illegal, was thereby cancelled

and annulled. (For the text see Paul, *Annales des Eclectischen Freimaurerbundes*, p. 225.) In August the Swedish envoys, Oxenstierna and Plommenfeldt, arrived in Berlin, published this document and formally repudiated Zinnendorff and all his doings. Zinnendorff's circular to his Lodges announcing the foregoing proceedings is a masterpiece (Findel, pp. 426 *et seq.*) and, however one may disapprove of his conduct, it is quite impossible to withhold respect for his singular ability. He clearly places the Grand Lodge of Sweden in the wrong and demonstrates its inconsistency; he also frankly avows, "moreover, we no longer require the help of the Swedish fraternity and can well spare their recognition." Nor was this an idle boast, for at that time (1778) eight years only after its birth, the National Grand Lodge ruled over 34 Lodges, with Provincial Grand Lodges in Austria, Silesia, Pomerania and Lower Saxony (Findel, p. 425).

In 1780—June 24—Zinnendorff replaced Mumssen as Grand Master and two years later—June 6, 1782—this eminently strong and masterful man was struck down by apoplexy, gavel in hand, at the very moment he was opening his Lodge of the Three Keys. His death produced no ill effect on his life's work. Able and resolute Brethren—trained up in his school—were ready to carry on the system where he left it. His immediate successor as Grand Master was Castillon; and that the death of the founder had not destroyed the spirit implanted by him, may be gathered from the fact that, in 1783, the Three Globes having made advances by permitting the visits of Brethren of the Zinnendorff Rite, the National Grand Lodge replied by enacting—October 30, 1783—that only Lodges on the official list were to be considered legitimate and no communication was to be held with others (*Latomia*, vol. xxvi, 1868, p. 89).

One more heavy blow awaited the National Grand Lodge. That which De Vignolles had been unable to avert in 1773, Graefe was destined to undo in 1786. Count Graefe, a Brunswicker, was a captain in the English service in America. He had also been a Deputy Provincial Grand Master of Canada and returned to Brunswick in 1785, with an appointment as representative of the Grand Lodge of England at the National Grand Lodge, which, under the contract of November 30, 1773, was, of course, tantamount to representative for all Germany. On August 15, 1785, he wrote from Brunswick to the National Grand Lodge that, instead of harmony among the Fraternity in Germany, he found only discord and antipathy and called upon it to assist him in finding a remedy (Nettleblatt, p. 575). The National Grand Lodge—October 20—expressed a willingness to receive and aid him, but objected to the term Supreme Grand Lodge as applied to that at London and expected that he would only visit such German Lodges as were recognized by their own body. Graefe's eyes were soon opened to the state of affairs and, in the spring of 1786, he left for England. We find the results of his report in the *Minutes* of the Grand Lodge of England, April 12, 1786, when the Grand Treasurer announced that the intolerant spirit of the Berlin Grand Lodge had evoked quarrels and scandals in Germany and that many Lodges looked to London for redress. It was resolved that the proceedings of the Berlin Grand Lodge tended to divide the Fraternity, to limit its

progress, were in contravention of the treaty of 1773 and that steps should be taken to abrogate or alter that compact. As already seen, this was followed by the reinauguration of the Hamburg Provincial Grand Lodge under Graefe, by whom—August 17, 1786—a letter was despatched to Berlin inviting the presence of the National Grand Lodge at the ceremony. He added “that Berlin appeared to doubt the power of the Supreme Grand Lodge to make new arrangements, but he prayed them not to force him to take steps which old friendship had hitherto restrained” (Nettleblatt, p. 575). Castillon replied by excluding all Hamburg Lodges, even Graefe himself, upon which the latter issued a circular inveighing against the intolerance and injustice of the National Grand Lodge and declaring it to be his duty to pronounce that body and all its daughter Lodges illegitimate (Findel, p. 462). This action was approved in London, and Leonhardi, finding his presence no longer of any use, left that city—April 9, 1787—and betook himself to St. Petersburg (see *Masonic News*, London, October 26, 1929). In 1788—April 23—the Grand Lodge of England apprised the Berlin Lodge by letter of the abrogation of the treaty and—November 26—the Grand Master communicated to the Grand Lodge that he had acted on the resolution of April 12, 1786 and gave his reasons for so doing (O’Etsel, p. 91 and *Grand Lodge Minutes*, November 26, 1788). They are very cogent and show more knowledge than usual of Continental affairs, but are too long even for partial reproduction; suffice it to say, that the Berlin Lodges, although deprived of all supremacy, continued to be recognized by the Grand Lodge of England as legitimate. But, in spite of all difficulties, the National Grand Lodge continued to prosper as before.

In 1789—June 24—the National Grand Lodge became wearied of its isolated position in Germany and passed a decree whereby the legality of all Lodges constituted by any recognized authority was acknowledged and mutual intercourse permitted, excepting, of course, in the case of Brethren of the Hebrew faith (*Latonia*, vol. xxvi, p. 91). This Grand Lodge has from the first been so intensely Christian that the Jewish question has never been even mooted and it is only recently that, yielding to outside pressure, Jews are allowed to be present in Lodges as occasional visitors.

Castillon resigned June 24, 1790 and was succeeded as Grand Master by C. A. von Beulewitz. By the Royal Edict of October 20, 1798, the National Grand Lodge was included as one of the three Grand Lodges of the Prussian States and, in 1799—January 14—Beulewitz died, whereupon Castillon was re-elected Grand Master. From 1807–9 the Grand Lodge was closed on account of the presence of the French Army of Occupation. In 1814—January 27—the Grand Master, Castillon, died; and, on December 27 ensuing, the previous Deputy Grand Master Joachim F. Neander von Petersheiden, was elected in his stead, who was followed in turn (1818) by J. H. O. von Schmidt.

Under Grand Master Schmidt the quarrel with Sweden was made up and a contract of mutual amity and support signed, April 6, 1819 (O’Etsel, p. 140). On this occasion the Grand Lodge of Sweden furnished complete copies of its

Constitutions, Ritual, etc.; and Nettleblatt, one of the foremost Masons of Zinnendorff's Rite and an ardent defender of his master's probity, was at once set to work to revise the ritual of the National Grand Lodge (Findel, p. 516). Although Nettleblatt wrote a history of all the other Masonic systems and Rites (including the English)—in which the ignorance and credulity of their votaries are pitilessly denounced—unfortunately he has not favoured us with one of the National Grand Lodge. He always, however, maintains its infallibility in strong terms. A glance at the account of Freemasonry in Sweden will enable the reader to discern that at the time of the Eckleff transaction the Swedish Rite was still incomplete, as the cope-stone of the highest Degrees had not been placed on the structure. In consequence the National Lodge had always been deficient of two Degrees and knew nothing of a Vicarius Salomonis. These defects were now remedied, the ceremonies throughout brought into unison and a Vicarius Salomonis, under the title of Master of the Order, elected. In 1821 we first hear of Palmié under that title and his election was probably in 1820. The Grand Master—Schmidt—took the title of First Assistant of the Master of the Order in 1821 and retained it so long as he remained Grand Master. A decree of October 2, 1820 (*Latomia*, vol. xxvi, p. 95), affirms that Masters of Lodges are elected for life, the triennial re-election being a concession on the Master's part, not a right of the Lodge. The election of the Master, according to a decree of March 2, 1824 (*Latomia*, vol. xxvi, p. 95), was to take place by casting the names of all those eligible into an urn; the youngest member drew a name, its owner had to leave the Lodge and his merits were canvassed. A ballot was then taken for him and required a two-thirds' majority in his favour. If unfavourable, a second ticket was drawn and so on until the necessary majority was obtained. In 1825—December 5—it was affirmed that the election must be approved by the Grand Lodge; in 1830—December 20—that Lodges which became dormant ceded their property and funds to the Grand Lodge; and in 1837—September 11—that the "Master of the Order shall be *eo ipso* also Grand Master, but he may appoint his First Assistant to this office for life."

In 1838 Count Henckel von Donnersmark was elected Grand Master in succession to Schmidt, but in 1841 the Master of the Order—Palmié—dying, he was elected in his room and, conformably with the above last-quoted law, retained both offices until his death.

In 1843 *Constitutions* were printed, but were only issued to Masters of Lodges—who were not allowed to show them, or even give extracts and they were kept under three keys held by different Officers of the Lodge. Keller, however, gives some excerpts (*Geschichte der Freimaurerei in Deutschland*, 1859, pp. 14–17) and Findel, pp. 423 *et seq.*), while the chief points are naturally more or less well known. The Inner Orient was composed of members of the highest Degrees only. It comprised, at its head, the Master of the Order, his two assistants, called Senior and Junior Architects and nine Officers. These twelve represented the twelve Apostles and, to a certain extent, the Master of the Order was the Vicar of Christ. Their functions were to supervise everything, but especially the ritual and dogma. The members

had the right to preside and vote in any Lodge and could even stop the proceedings. The Grand Lodge, with the Grand Master at its head, was divided into two bodies, the St. John's and the St. Andrew's Lodges, to rule respectively the Degrees of pure Freemasonry and the Scots Degrees. Grand Officers must at least be Scots Masters. The ritual is identical with that of Sweden and Denmark.

In 1849—July 24—Henckel von Donnersmark died and—October 23—K. F. von Selasinsky was elected Master of the Order.

On November 5, 1853, an event of great importance to Masons throughout Germany took place; this was the initiation of Frederick William, Prince, afterwards Crown Prince, of Prussia. The ceremony took place in the palace of his father, the then heir to the throne, who presided in person, in the presence of the Grand Officers of the three Prussian Grand Lodges and in the name—or under the banner—of the National Grand Lodge, of which he became a member. The Master's gavel used on this occasion was that formerly belonging to Frederick the Great. The eighth and last of the Berlin Lodges under this system was constituted exactly two years afterwards—November 5, 1855—and named in his honour Frederick William of the Dawn.

In 1860—April 26—Selasinsky died and Prince Frederick William of Prussia accepted the office of the Master of the Order on June 24 following.

Ten years later—June 24, 1870—the Grand Lodge celebrated its centenary, with the Prince in the chair. On this occasion a bombshell fell amongst the Brethren. The Grand Master alluded to the superior knowledge and greater purity of origin to which the National Grand Lodge had always laid claim—also to its persistence in requiring that those statements should be taken as articles of faith, whilst the documents on which they rested were jealously preserved from the vulgar ken. He showed how impossible it was to resist libellous misrepresentations from outside, except by frankly producing proofs to the contrary and how the assumption of infallibility was not only untenable in the nineteenth century, but injurious to the best interests of the Grand Lodge; and concluded by calling upon all to aid him in ascertaining the historical truth of those supposed documents and traditions and freely to give up whatever should be found unsupported. An English translation of this address was read before the St. Mary's Lodge, No. 63, by Dr. E. E. Wendt, Grand Secretary for German Correspondence—March 20, 1873—and will be found in the *Centennial History* of that Lodge, 1883, by George Kelly and Wilmer Hollingworth. The excitement caused throughout the Lodges of the system was intense and two opposing parties—of light and leading, of mystery and conservatism—were at once formed. In 1873 twenty Brethren at Hanover were suspended for advocating reform, whilst in 1871 six Lodges attempted to found an historical and archæological union—a crime almost amounting to treason under this Grand Lodge. Schiffmann of Stettin received the prince's commission to undertake researches, but was denied access to the archives. Wearied by this persistent opposition, the Crown Prince at length—March 1, 1874—resigned his office, he being the third Royal Grand Master of the National Grand Lodge who

resigned the chair in disgust. In his place von Dachroden was elected, with Schiffmann as Senior Architect. The danger then became obvious that Schiffmann might at the next election be appointed Master of the Order and have the archives at his disposal. The *Statutes* were, therefore, arbitrarily altered and the election placed in the hands of the highest Degree only. It was also laid down that the Grand Master should live in Berlin. As Schiffmann held an ecclesiastical appointment in Stettin, he was thus rendered ineligible for election, but he nevertheless proceeded with his researches and made damaging discoveries. For this the Grand Lodge suspended him—May 1, 1876—but his part was warmly taken by several Lodges and many, especially of other systems, made him an honorary member. Two months later—July 1—Schiffmann was expelled and several Lodges who supported him were erased; others transferred their allegiance (*Allgemeines Handbuch*, vol. iv, 1879, s.v. Schwedischer System, also Findel, p. 568).

In 1872 G. A. von Ziegler had been appointed Grand Master and succeeded the Master of the Order—Dachroden—on his retirement, in both capacities. He in turn was followed by F. R. A. Neuland.

V. THE GRAND LODGE OF PRUSSIA, CALLED ROYAL YORK OF FRIENDSHIP, AT BERLIN

On May 5, 1760, the Lodge of the Three Globes was informed that several resident French Masons—Frederick the Great had established a large colony of that nationality in Berlin—had petitioned for a Warrant to enable them to meet as a Lodge—Joy and Peace—to initiate Frenchmen only, offering to pay all their income into the funds of the Mother-Lodge. In fact it was to be merely a distinctly French branch of the Three Globes. The request was granted and, in the same year—August 10—von Printzen constituted the Lodge under the name of the Three Doves. No reason is assigned why the title originally chosen was not adhered to. In 1761—March 13—the Mother-Lodge took into consideration a request to enlarge the powers of its daughter, as it was found impossible to recruit the Lodge solely from Frenchmen and to carry it on without funds. The petition was acceded to and a fresh Warrant granted—April 12—whereby the Lodge became an independent sister Lodge of the Three Globes. Its title had at this time been altered to Friendship of the Three Doves. In the same year it joined with the Three Globes and Concord in forming the Masonic Tribunal of which von Printzen was elected Grand Master.

From the character and composition of the Lodge it was inevitable that Degrees beyond that of Master Mason would be wrought. These appear as early as 1763 to have included some or all of the following:—Elect of 9, of 15 and of Perpignan; Red Scots Degree and St. Andrew's Scot; Knight of the East; Knight of the Eagle or Prince Sovereign Rose Croix: the members of this last and 7th Degree forming a Sublime Council, which ruled all the others. To vest these



J. G. Fichte, Masonic Historian and German
Philosopher, 1762-1814.

Degrees, it is possible, with an enhanced authority, the Lodge procured—March 6, 1764—a Scots patent from the Scots Lodge Puritas, at Brunswick.

The work was, of course, conducted in French, but not without exceptions. Thus in 1764 there is an instance of a Lodge transacting its business in German, but the *Minutes* record a resolve not to do so again. A curious *Minute* occurs in 1765, when a member proposed for initiation, “somebody”—having forgotten the candidate’s name!

July 27, 1765, was an important date for this Lodge. On that day it initiated into the Craft H.R.H. Edward Augustus, Duke of York, the brother of George III and his companion, Colonel Henry St. John. On August 2 the Prince signified his acceptance of the title of patron of the Lodge and authorized it to assume the name of Royal York of Friendship. The Lodge then applied to the Grand Lodge of England for a patent and entrusted the petition to St. John. To this circumstance may be due the fact that the Lodge never joined the Strict Observance system but, on the contrary, always strenuously opposed it.

The next few years furnish two events which may be recorded. On September 6, 1765, the Lodge warranted its first daughter, at Rheims; and in 1767—June 6—it initiated a Jew. This is remarkable because, in 1779, it had so far modified its views as to refuse admission to two English Masons because they were of the Hebrew persuasion. The latter position it retained until the revision of the *Statutes* in 1872; but the Jewish question does not appear to have evoked the same strife in this Lodge as in the Three Globes and in the Eclectic Union.

In 1767—June 24—it received a Warrant from England as No. 417, successively altered by the closing up of numbers to 330, 260 and 219 (1770, 1781, 1792)—after 1813 it disappears from the English Lists.

Its next step was to apply for a patent as a Grand Lodge, but—February 14, 1769—De Vignolles wrote refusing the request as beyond England’s power to grant—a Grand Lodge being the result of several Lodges combining for the purpose. He, however, authorized the Lodge to grant a three months’ dispensation to Brethren to act as a new Lodge, during which time they were expected to apply for a Constitution from England (Nettleblatt, p. 624).

The Royal York formally seceded from the Three Globes in 1768. In 1772 it sent a cypher to London in which to conduct its correspondence and the same year forwarded by this means the Statutes and Rituals of its Scots Degrees for approval. In the same year also it warranted a Lodge at Besançon. Of this and the former Lodge at Rheims no further notices appear. In 1773 the Lodge gradually ceased to work in French and—August 13—constituted its first legitimate daughter at Cassel. This Lodge was registered in London, November 19, 1773, as No. 459.

Meanwhile the treaty—so often cited—had been contracted between Zinnen-dorff and the older or legitimate Grand Lodge in London and, by it, the Lodge Royal York came under the jurisdiction of the National Grand Lodge. The Royal York succeeded in making terms by which it was to preserve its own Ritual

and, in a great measure, its former autonomy and concluded a Treaty of Union May 19, 1774. Quarrels, however, ensued with appeals to London and, in the end, the Royal York reasserted its independence in 1776, a course of action which was approved by England, April 11, 1778.

In 1778 the Royal York constituted its second Lodge—at Mannheim—and, in 1779, one each at Munich and Potsdam. A proposal for union with the Three Globes fell through in this year, but a treaty of friendship was entered into.

In 1779—November 24—Baron Heyking was commissioned by the Lodge to travel throughout Poland and, where he found Masons in sufficient numbers, to erect Lodges. This resulted in the formation (1780) of no fewer than eight Lodges and ultimately of an English Provincial Grand Lodge for Poland. From 1782 to 1795 nothing of importance demands record beyond the constitution of seven Lodges and the occasional use of the names Mother-Lodge and Grand Lodge as applied to the Royal York, but without a specific assertion of either of these titles.

With 1796 there commenced a period of evolution and internal change in this Lodge, not unaccompanied by strife. The central figure of the movement was one of the most prominent Masons of that or any time, noteworthy not only as a Mason, but also as a theologian, politician and author—Ignatius Aurelius Fessler.

Fessler was born in Lower Hungary in 1756, his father being a retired soldier, his mother a religious devotee. Educated by the Jesuits, but refused admission to their ranks, he took the Capuchin vows in 1773. In 1779 he was ordained priest and was, at that time, of a serious and earnest disposition, verging on bigotry. But above all things he was plain-spoken and, in 1781, called the Emperor's attention to the state of conventual life. No longer safe in the monasteries from papal vengeance, he was placed in professional chairs at the universities and led, from that time to his death, an eventful and kaleidoscopic life, pursued by the unrelenting hate of the Jesuits. In 1789 he embraced the Lutheran faith and, in 1796, went to Berlin. He entered the Craft at Lemberg in 1783, a period coeval with the fall of the Strict Observance, the founding of the Eclectic Union and the commencement of the first serious attempts to study and appreciate Freemasonry. Throwing himself with his usual ardour into this new pursuit, he succeeded in a few years in making himself acquainted with the broad facts of Masonic history and the whole series of fantastic theories and Rites to which the original institution had nearly succumbed. Such a man could not fail to attract the attention of his Masonic fellows and, accordingly, having joined the Royal York, May 12, 1796, he was much against his wish forced by the Brethren—November 20—to become a member of the Sublime Council. The Three Globes, Frankfort and Hamburg Grand Lodges having all reformed their Rites or were engaged in so doing, the Royal York felt it necessary to follow suit and in Fessler lay their best hope. One other matter also loomed large on the horizon. In consequence of the French Revolution an edict against secret societies might be expected, when, although the Lodges would probably be tolerated, yet it was to be feared that the Royal York would be called upon to submit to the jurisdiction of a Grand Lodge, unless its position as a

Grand Lodge in itself could satisfactorily be settled. De Vignolles's letters had indicated the only legal means of attaining this object and Fessler was not the man to neglect such a hint.

Scarcely was Fessler a member of the Sublime Council than he received a commission to draft a Constitution and to revise the Ritual and bring the various Degrees into accord. He threw himself with almost superhuman energy into the work. His first inclination, as was natural to an enlightened Masonic student, was to abolish all High Degrees and he made this proposal, April 12, 1797 (Findel, p. 485). His coadjutors were, however, not yet prepared for such a drastic remedy, so he contented himself with making each (so-called) High Degree a separate course of philosophy and with remoulding the Sublime Council, which became the Innermost Orient. His new Ritual and Constitutions were rapturously approved and accepted, August 3, 1797. The Constitution was to be subject to revision in three, six and, afterwards, every nine years. In 1798—June 11—at Fessler's instance, the Lodge, Royal York of Berlin, was divided into four Lodges—Frederick William of Justice, Victorious Truth, Urania of Immortality (with Fessler as Master) and Pythagoras of the Flaming Star. These four Lodges remained in many respects one. Membership was interchangeable. The Officers of one Lodge might be chosen from the members of another. They also possessed in common a general and a charity fund. These four Lodges then combined to erect from among themselves the Grand Lodge of Prussia, called Royal York of Friendship, with 14 daughters, viz. 4 in Berlin and 10 previously warranted elsewhere. The Grand Lodge was at once recognized by the Three Globes and by the King; but the National Grand Lodge refused to do so, maintaining that a Grand Lodge could not be formed by a single Lodge divided *ad hoc*, nor could such a body be established in a kingdom where one already existed—though when Zinnendorff established his Grand Lodge for Germany, the Three Globes and others were already in existence.—But, even in the Royal York itself, the measure met with bitter opposition from shortsighted and undiscerning Brethren. Fessler, a strong man, imperious, hasty, though wanting in conciliation, overbore all opposition, but his victory made him enemies.

De La Goannère was first Grand Master and Fessler Deputy Grand Master; but the Grand Master being called to Coruña as Consul, resigned, October 5, 1798 and was succeeded, October 28, by F. W. A. Von Sellentin.

In the same month—October 20—the Royal Edict appeared, wherein the Royal York was named as one of the three authorized Grand Lodges of Prussia.

On December 20, 1798, the Berlin Lodge, Victorious Truth, initiated and admitted to active membership H.R.H. Augustus Frederick, Duke of Sussex, sixth son of George III, nephew of the Duke of York, initiated in 1765. From 1813 to 1843 the Duke of Sussex was Grand Master of England. Some idea of Fessler's Rite may be acquired from the following facts. The Duke of Sussex was passed to the Degree of Fellow Craft, January 19, 1799; raised a Master Mason, February 4; received the Degree of Perfect Scots Architect, March 6; of Master

of Mount Heredom, March 10 ; of the Cross and Eagle, March 22 ; and became an Elect of the New Jerusalem, December 23. In 1839, being then Grand Master of England, he renewed his permission to continue his name on the books of the Lodge as an active member. Long previously—April 5, 1799—the Duke had agreed to accept the position of representative of Grand Lodge, Royal York, at the Grand Lodge of England.

In the same year (1799) three new Lodges were warranted and, in 1800, the period arrived for the first revision of the *Constitutions*. Fessler, meanwhile, had entered into very friendly relations with another reformer—F. L. Schroeder—whose influence now began to act through him on the Royal York.

In August 1800 Fessler once more proposed to abolish High Degrees, but the time for this salutary reform had not yet arrived. Something in the nature of an extrinsic Degree was still urgently in demand. A compromise was effected. In lieu of the High Degrees Fessler elaborated a history of Freemasonry, its origin, revival in 1717, early progress and subsequent obliquities. This was communicated to Master Masons in five Steps to Knowledge, *Erkenntnis-stufen* and, to satisfy all parties, each step was preceded by a ceremonial, designed symbolically to illustrate various phases in man's life on earth. The ritual of the three Degrees was remodelled on the basis of that of Schroeder and the *Constitutions* altered in accordance therewith. The complete revision was accepted, December 31, 1800 (Nettlebladt, p. 636 and Findel, p. 487).

In that year (1800) one new Lodge was warranted and the Sun Lodge at Bayreuth—now the Grand Lodge of the Sun—was affiliated and remained for a time a Provincial Grand Lodge under the Royal York.

In 1801—June 5—the Grand Master Von Sellentin resigned on account of ill-health and—September 13—Ern. Ferd. Klein was installed as Grand Master. The same year saw the birth of a Lodge at Charlottenburg and of the Lodge Socrates at Frankfort. The total of private Lodges had now risen to 16 (Findel, p. 490). In 1802 one Lodge was warranted and the closing scenes of Fessler's connexion with the Lodge were enacted. For some time angry feelings had been at work on both sides, want of appreciation on the one produced bitterness on the other and Fessler's own domineering temper added fuel to the flame. At length the Grand Master himself went over to Fessler's enemies. According to the *Constitution* the Deputy Grand Master was the all-powerful prime minister—the Grand Master, a very limited monarch. But Klein—a man of character and determination—was little inclined to play the part of *Roi Faineant* to that of Fessler's *Maire du Palais* and the position became too strained to continue.

On April 30, 1802, Fessler wrote that to facilitate a reconciliation he intended to lay down his offices *pro tem.* and requested all complaints against him to be preferred openly at once. On May 7 the Grand Lodge agreed to consider this as a formal resignation and Fessler, indignant, resigned his offices as Deputy Grand Master and Master of Urania on the 9th. His Lodge was then ordered to exclude him from membership and Fessler, hearing of this order—August 15—wrote—

September 6—with haughty scorn, washing his hands once and for all of both Lodge and Grand Lodge (Nettleblatt, p. 641). After many troubles in private and public life, Fessler entered the service of the Czar Alexander in 1809 and died December 15, 1839, aged 83, being at the time President of the Russian Lutheran Consistory at Saratow.

In 1803 the *Statutes* underwent their periodical revision, the Innermost Orient was remodelled and, besides overlooking the dogma and ritual of the Fraternity, became the dispenser of the Steps to Knowledge, while its subordinate Inner Orientes were charged with the same duties in the Provinces. But these steps were reduced to a single one under the name of Scots Master and the initiations were abolished, so that practically from henceforth we have a modification of the Hamburg *Engbund* and the Rite of the Royal York may be looked upon as in all essentials that of Schroeder. The irony of fate willed that Fessler's original plans should be adopted within a few months of his expulsion.

In 1806 the Grand Lodge was closed during the French occupation, but the presence of the enemy served to draw closer the rival German rites and the National Grand Lodge entered into a pact of amity with the Royal York. In 1808 the Grand Lodge resolved that the officers of private Lodges must be confirmed and approved by itself, thus somewhat, though possibly unintentionally, limiting its own representative character. And at the revision of the *Statutes* in 1872, the distinctively Christian requirements for initiation were modified, so that Jewish candidates were accepted.

In 1810—March 18—Grand Master Klein died, and—April 30—J. H. A. Hey was elected to the office. In 1832 Hey resigned from sickness and old age and died December 17, 1838. He was succeeded by Prof. H. F. Link as Grand Master, who died in office—January 1, 1851. On June 2 ensuing, Dr. C. von Kloeden was elected Grand Master and also died in office—January 10, 1856. A similar fate befel the next Grand Master—Dr. C. W. F. Amelang—who died December 3, 1858; and, in the following year—March 26—Prince Louis William Augustus of Baden, a brother of the Grand Duke, was installed as Grand Master. The Grand Master's tenure of office being terminable with the periodical revisions of the *Constitutions*, the Prince declined re-election at the revision of 1863, but was appointed Hon. Grand Master. In 1864 Dr. J. F. Schnakenburg was installed Grand Master (under whom the *Statutes* were altered to admit of Jews being initiated) and, in 1873, Professor Chr. Fr. L. Herrig, who was re-elected in 1882.

VI. THE GRAND LODGE SUN AT BAYREUTH

On January 21, 1741, the Margrave Frederick of Brandenburg-Kulmbach erected in his own castle at Bayreuth, the capital of his dominions, a Lodge under the name of the Sun, of which he remained Master till his death in 1763. On December 5, 1741, this Castle Sun instituted in Bayreuth a City Sun with much pomp, the Margrave himself taking part in the procession. The Castle Sun soon

grafted on itself a Directory of Scots Masters, which, in some respects, discharged the functions of a non-representative Grand Lodge.

In 1757—October 24—this Directory opened the Lodge Lebanon of the Three Cedars, in Erlangen; and, in 1758—May 17—that of the Three Stars, in Anspach, the capital of the Onolzbach or cadet line of Brandenburg.

In 1763 the Margrave was succeeded by his uncle, the Margrave Frederick Christian, both in his civil and Masonic capacity.

In 1769, the elder line being extinct, the Margrave Frederick Carl Alexander of Brandenburg-Onolzbach (the younger or Anspach line) united the two Principalities. The Anspach Lodge of 1758 being also possessed of a Scots Directory, the new ruler caused it in 1772 to amalgamate with the (Castle) Sun Directory and removed the seat of this conjoint Directory to Anspach, granting it jurisdiction over the two Sun Lodges in Bayreuth, the Lebanon Lodge in Erlangen and the Three Stars Lodge in Anspach. From 1774 therefore the Sun ceased to work as a Mother-Lodge. In 1776 the City Sun went over to the Strict Observance, which the Margrave himself had joined in the same year, being the first reigning Prince who ever signed the act of Implicit (or Unquestioning) Obedience. He himself was the son of the Margrave Carl who had espoused the sister of Frederick the Great and been initiated by that king in 1740 in Frederick's Royal Lodge. The Margrave Frederick dying childless in 1799, the Brandenburg Principalities reverted to Prussia.

By the Royal Edict of October 20, 1798, all Prussian Lodges were required to hold from one of the three Berlin Grand Lodges. Accordingly, in 1799—November 19—the Anspach and Erlangen Lodges joined the Three Globes; whilst the two Suns joined the Royal York in 1800, the Castle Sun being made a Provincial Grand Lodge. It naturally accepted the Fessler Rite and was granted an Inner Orient, April 1, 1802. The Lodge of Truth and Friendship at Fürth, warranted by the Royal York—March 4, 1803—was placed under its rule, also the Morning Star at Hof, constituted June 9, 1799.

In 1806 Anspach fell to the new kingdom of Bavaria. It had meanwhile been raised to the rank of a Provincial Grand Lodge Anacharsis, under the Three Globes, with several daughter Lodges and, at the time of these all becoming Bavarian, Freemasonry was under an interdict in that country by virtue of decrees issued March 2 and August 16, 1785; renewed by the Elector—afterwards King of Bavaria—Maximilian Joseph, himself a Freemason, November 4, 1799 and March 5, 1804. In 1807, however—May 8—the King issued an edict of toleration, to which were attached very stringent conditions. A list of all members was to be forwarded to the authorities every three months, all changes of officers or by-laws to be notified, correspondence with Berlin to cease, etc. A further edict was published January 17, 1808, forbidding all State servants to join the Craft. As this deprived the Lodges of all their best members, judges, notaries, professors, military officers, even schoolmasters and clergymen, the blow was a severe one; but many of the Lodges nevertheless continued to struggle on as independent communities, until in better times

they were able to join one of the Grand Lodges of Germany. By an English patent—dated June 6, 1806—“Charles Alexander, Prince of Thurn and Taxis, Principal Commissary to His Imperial Majesty in Germany,” was appointed Provincial Grand Master for Bavaria. This description, however, is vague and misleading, since with the exception of Ratisbon—which was not permanently incorporated with the new kingdom until 1810—Bavarian Masonry was extinct.

In 1810—June 30—Bayreuth also was acquired by the kingdom of Bavaria and the Lodges had to conform to the same rules, the Sun losing not fewer than fifty of its best members.

The Provincial Grand Masters meanwhile, under the Royal York Grand Lodge, were Count von Giech, von Volderndorf and Schunter.

In 1811—December 13—the Provincial Grand Lodge of the Sun declared itself an independent Grand Lodge, with four daughters, viz. the City Sun under a new name—Eleusis of Silence—the Truth and Friendship at Fürth, the Morning Star and the Golden Balance at Hof—which was warranted February 20, 1804, by the National Grand Lodge of Berlin. By slow degrees and in spite of difficulties, it added to this number. The ritual was naturally the so-called Fessler, that is, the Schroeder slightly modified, which does not differ materially from the English. The first Grand Master—Schunter—was followed by Münch, Birner and, in 1844 by S. Kolb—under whom, in 1847, the *Constitutions* were amended so as to admit Jews to the full benefits of the Fraternity. In 1849—August 25—Chr. K. Künzel was elected Grand Master and, in 1862, Friedrich Feustel. At this time the Grand Lodge Sun numbered ten daughters. New *Constitutions* were drawn up in 1868 and accepted in 1869. They were among the most liberal in Germany. The Grand Lodge was thoroughly representative of the English system; its seat as an executive body was at Bayreuth, but it held, in turn, an annual deliberative meeting and festival at the various towns where it possessed a Lodge.

In 1872 Bluntschli became Grand Master and, in 1878, Feustel once more.

VII. THE NATIONAL GRAND LODGE OF SAXONY AT DRESDEN

Many Provincial Grand Masters for the circle of Upper Saxony and for the Electorate of Saxony were appointed by England in the eighteenth century. For instance, in 1737, by Lord Darnley, H. W. von Marschall to the Circle of Upper Saxony; in 1762, Major Aloys Peter D'Agdolo to the Electorate; and, in 1766, Count von Werthern to Upper Saxony. There were possibly others, but it cannot be shown that they ever warranted a single Lodge or exercised their office in any way. Of Marschall it is known that he joined and accepted office in the Lodge Absalom at Hamburg and nothing more, whilst, at that very time, Rutowsky was active in his especial district; and, of the two latter, they were expressly relieved of their duties in the 1773 contract with Zinnendorff (cf. Findel, p. 822). Werthern indeed went over to the Strict Observance immediately after his appointment.

Nevertheless a Grand Lodge of Saxony existed at a very early date. Count Rutowsky—initiated at Warsaw in 1735—who had been a brigadier in the French service, entered that of the Elector of Saxony in 1731, was a Field-Marshal and Governor of Dresden in 1741. He died March 16, 1764. In 1738 he erected a Lodge of the Three Eagles at Dresden. It increased so rapidly that in 1739 a new Lodge of the Three Golden Swords was formed also at Dresden which, two years afterwards, numbered over fifty members. In 1741—February 15—a third Lodge—of the Three Swans—was founded. These three met together, June 24, 1741, raised the Three Swords to the rank of a Grand Lodge and chose Rutowsky as Grand Master. It appears to have been taken for granted by German writers that Rutowsky held an English patent—which may possibly be true, although, in the absence of anything like evidence to authenticate the belief, it must of necessity remain an open question.

The Three Swans amalgamated with the Three Swords, July 2, 1741. Earlier in the same year—March 20—a Lodge was formed at Leipzig, which subsequently became Minerva of the Compasses and, afterwards, the independent Lodge Minerva of the Three Palms. If not warranted by Rutowsky in the first instance, it certainly owned his sway *circa* 1747.

In 1742—January 31—this Lodge Minerva inaugurated the Lodge at Altenburg, afterwards Archimedes of the Three Tracing Boards, one of the five independent Lodges of Germany. This also joined the Union.

Rutowsky further warranted—September 2, 1743—the Three Roses at Sachsenfels, which was one of the first to join the Strict Observance; and in 1744 the Three Squares in Nossen, which soon afterwards died out. There are also traces of one or two other Lodges. The existence of this flourishing body at so early a date is very remarkable.

In 1755 the first efforts of von Hund's still undeveloped imaginings may be traced in a Lodge—Of the Three Palms—warranted by him in Dresden on September 5.

In 1760 the Three Globes also began to constitute a few Lodges in Saxony. But this part of Germany was the very centre of the Strict Observance—von Hund possessed large estates in the neighbourhood, at Lausitz and elsewhere—and naturally the first to be overrun by the new Rite. In 1762—September 5—the Three Swords accepted the Templar Ritual and system and every Lodge in the Electorate followed suit. The history of the Craft in Saxony for the ensuing half century is comprised in that of the Strict Observance, the three Grand Lodges at Berlin and the Grand Lodge of Hanover, all of which bodies constituted Lodges in the country at various times.

In 1805 some of the Dresden Lodges began to moot the question of establishing a National Grand Lodge. The idea met with general favour, four Lodges only—those at Görlitz and Bautzen and the two at Leipzig—raising objections. But the project came to naught, the stern necessities of war occupying men's minds to the exclusion of other matters.

In 1811, however, the subject was revived and a National Grand Lodge for Saxony erected. Twelve Lodges combined for the purpose. These had been constituted, in the years within brackets, as follows :—By Rutowsky—1, The Three Swords, Dresden, being the original Grand Lodge of 1742 : By the Grand Lodge of the Three Globes—2, Golden Wall, Bautzen (1802) ; 3, Leopard, in Lübben (1809) ; 4, Golden Cross, in Merseburg (1805) : By the National Grand Lodge of Prussia—5, The Desert Well, at Kottbus (1797) ; 6, Golden Apple, Dresden (1776) ; 7, the Three Hills, Freiberg (1798) : By von Hund—8, the Crowned Serpent, Görlitz (1751) : By the Three Roses of 1743 under the Strict Observance—9, the Three Flames, Plauen (1788) : By the Grand Lodge Royal York—10, Harmony, in Hohenstein (1799) : By the Provincial Grand Lodge of Hamburg—11, the Three Pillars, in Triebel (1806) : By Lodge Archimedes of Altenburg—12, Archimedes of the Saxon Union, Schneeberg (1806). It will be remarked that Nos. 1, 9 and 12 connect this new Grand Lodge historically with the extinct Grand Lodge of Rutowsky. From this date the Grand Lodge, in spite of a few losses, gradually, but continuously, increased the number of its Lodges. Some, however, of these were lost in 1815, because a part of Saxony then passed under Prussian rule.

The *Constitutions* were accepted September 28, 1811 and signed by the Lodges of the Union. They were the most liberal in Germany. The Union did not forbid High Degrees, but simply ignored them and dealt only with the Craft. It permitted any ritual in the three Degrees provided a copy was approved by Grand Lodge. The Grand Lodge consisted of two bodies. A legislative, composed of the Master, Deputy Master and Wardens of each Lodge, with a Dresden Brother specially appointed to represent each Lodge. These all had a deliberative voice, but each Lodge only had one vote. An executive, composed of the Grand Officers chosen from among the members of the legislative body. The ritual used by the Grand Lodge and recommended to its daughters was that of Schroeder.

Of the earlier Grand Masters of this body there is no list available. In 1866 G. H. Warnatz, M.D., was elected to the chair and, dying in 1872, was succeeded—October 27—by Dr. Eckstein, who gave place to Albert Wengler in 1881. Under Dr. Eckstein the revision of the *Statutes*, begun in 1874, was completed October 18, 1876. The chief alteration was a declaration that Jews were eligible for initiation—they had already been admitted as visitors in 1837. The executive still remained at Dresden, but it was enacted that the annual meeting of Grand Lodge might be movable.

VIII. GRAND LODGE CONCORD AT DARMSTADT

When Louis X, Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, commenced his reign in 1790, the only Lodge in his dominions was that at Giessen, of which he was a member, as well as its chief and patron. In 1785 it had joined the Eclectic Union. In 1793 the English Provincial Grand Lodge at Frankfort commenced to warrant a series of Lodges in this principality ; which, in 1806, was made a Grand Duchy, Louis X

becoming the first Grand Duke Louis I. By the events of 1814 he acquired a considerable extension of territory and in the new Provinces of his state existed other Lodges. He died in 1830, protector of all these Lodges and his successor, Louis II, who took an active part in Lodge work, also assumed the title and duties of Protector. By 1839 all the still existing Hessian Lodges had joined the Eclectic Union.

In 1808 the Grand Orient of France had constituted the Lodge Nascent Dawn in Frankfort, which contained a large Jewish element. After various quarrels this Lodge split into two factions: the Landgrave Karl of Hesse-Cassel reconstituted the Christian members as Karl of the Dawning Light, according to the Rite of the rectified Strict Observance, whilst the Jewish Brethren received in 1817 a warrant from London as the Lodge of the Nascent Dawn (No. 684). In 1836 Prince Karl died; and in 1840—September 27—Karl of the Dawning Light joined the Eclectic Union. The Lodge, however, could not agree on all points with its new Grand Lodge, more especially in relation to the High Degrees and, after many quarrels and bickerings, was excluded on July 2, 1844. Its part was taken up warmly by the Friends of Concord at Mayence and St. John the Evangelist of Concord at Darmstadt, with the result that in 1845 these two Lodges retired from the Eclectic Union.

The three Lodges, which had thus recovered their independence, petitioned the Grand Duke and Protector, Louis II, to form a new Eclectic Union; their prayer was granted and nine prominent members were deputed to frame a Constitution. This act of foundation (*Grundvertrag*) emphasized the purely representative system of Grand Lodge government, forbade all High Degrees (Karl of the Dawning Light voluntarily dissolved its Scots Lodge, which had been the origin of the whole quarrel!) and had but one fault. It refused even the right of visiting to Jews. It was signed by the three Lodges—February 27, 1846; approved by the Grand Duke—March 22—and on the following day the three Lodges met, proclaimed the Grand Lodge Concord and elected J. H. Lotheissen, President of the Court of Appeal, as their first Grand Master.

Curiously enough the Lodge Karl, whose traditions were so purely Christian, was the first to protest against the intolerance of the new Grand Lodge and this it did within fifteen months. On December 14, 1847, a majority in the Lodge repealed the By-law which debarred Jewish Masons from entering their doors and the minority, headed by Leykam (one of the nine mentioned above), resigned their membership. In 1849—March 15—nine of this minority petitioned the Grand Lodge for a Warrant for a new Lodge in Frankfort, to be called Karl of Lindenberg. The old Lodge desired to raise no objection, but as it felt that it could not meet the new one in perfect amity, sought permission—November 18—to leave the Darmstadt Grand Lodge. Both petitions were granted and Karl of the Dawning Light rejoined the Eclectic Union June 30, 1850. Karl of Lindenberg also seceded to the Eclectic Union in 1878.

The Grand Lodge Concord—consisting of three Lodges in all—elected Betz as Grand Master in 1851 and, in 1853, Lotheissen once more.

Meanwhile, Louis II, who died in 1848, had been succeeded by Louis III, who was not a Mason, nor did he appear to interest himself at all in Masonic matters. Great therefore was the astonishment produced by a Grand Ducal decree of 1859, expressing a wish to see all Hessian Lodges united under the authority of the Grand Lodge Concord at Darmstadt. This affected four Eclectic Lodges, one each at Alzey, Giessen, Offenbach and Worms; and a royal wish being equivalent to a command, non-compliance probably meant dissolution. On the other hand, submission was difficult, because the Eclectic Union having admitted Jews to initiation in 1848, whereas the Darmstadt Union would not even allow them to visit, the Lodges ran the risk of losing their Jewish Brethren, who had become very dear to them; Giessen especially was largely recruited from members of the Hebrew race. Grand Lodge, however, passed a resolution to allow these four Lodges to violate the *Constitutions*, provided they would consent to certain disabilities, viz. deprivation of the right to vote on matters of Ritual and inability of their members to fill offices in Grand Lodge. The four Lodges then joined, making seven in all.

In 1859—September 11—Lotheissen died and Matthew Leykam, Doctor of Laws, was elected Grand Master. As the latter resided in Frankfort, the Grand Lodge was removed for nine years to that city.

A new Lodge (No. 8) was constituted at Friedberg on November 10, 1862 and, in the same year, the *Constitutions* were revised. Intercourse with their Jewish Brethren having removed many prejudices, the right of visiting was conceded to all Masons of that faith.

The ninth and last Lodge was warranted at Bingen, July 7, 1867, and—a further sign of progress—its *Constitutions* permitted it to initiate Jews, but it had to submit to the same restrictions as the other four Lodges.

In 1868 the Christian Lodges, “out of their exceeding love,” voluntarily conceded full rights to the five mixed Lodges, merely debarring them from furnishing a Grand Master from among their members. Leykam, who died on February 20 in this year, was succeeded as Grand Master by the Postmaster-General, Pfaltz.

At the revision of the *Statutes* in 1872 the Jews were granted full rights; so that in all Germany there are now only two Grand Lodges, the National and Three Globes, both at Berlin, which insist upon a candidate for Freemasonry being a Christian.

INDEPENDENT LODGES

I. MINERVA OF THE THREE PALMS, LEIPZIG

In 1736 seven Masons who had been made abroad were in the habit of meeting together in Leipsic and, on March 20, 1741, they formed themselves into a Lodge. This Lodge is usually accounted a member, from the commencement, of Rutowsky's Grand Lodge of Upper Saxony; but it is also possible that it only entered into friendly relations with the Three Gold Swords. The Lodge had no special name, but it prospered exceedingly and, at the end of the year, already numbered 46

members. In 1742 its services were called into requisition to inaugurate the Lodge at Altenburg. In 1745 it split up and divided into a French Lodge of the Three Compasses and a German-speaking Lodge, Minerva. These reunited on June 5, 1747, as Minerva of the Three Compasses, which was confirmed by the Grand Master Rutowsky. In 1747—November 20—a Scots Lodge, Apollo, was grafted on the Lodge.

In 1766 a difference of opinion respecting the expediency of joining the Strict Observance caused a majority of the members to found a new Lodge, Minerva of the Three Palms, under von Hund and, in 1772, they finally severed themselves entirely from Minerva of the Three Compasses, which gradually died out. The Knightly Chapter was erected March 16, 1767.

In 1773 the Lodge constituted Minerva of the Three Lights at Querfurt and, in the following year, the Scots Lodge Apollo changed its name to Karl of the Three Palms, in honour of Prince Karl of Courland, a member of the Lodge.

The Lodge took an active part in all the affairs of the Strict Observance, but began to tire of the folly about 1776. It therefore sent no Deputies to the Wilhelmsbad Convent in 1782, nor did it adopt the rectified system. On the contrary, it ceased in 1776 to create fresh knights, so that the Chapter gradually died out, until at last the Count Hohenthal alone was left—who, to keep the history of the Chapter alive, formed a so-called Inner Union of a few chosen members of the 4th or Scots Grade. The exact scope of this institution has, however, eluded research.

In 1783 the Lodge for a time showed signs of an inclination to join the newly formed Eclectic Union, but it decided ultimately to remain isolated, or, rather, independent.


The last of the Knights, Hohenthal, died in 1819 and the *Constitutions* of the Lodge were remodelled, April 8, 1820. The old Scots Lodge Karl was formed into a Directoral Lodge, governing the affairs of the Lodge. It consisted of twenty-seven Masters. Seven members of this Directoral Lodge combined to form an Inner Union, who also completed their number from time to time in a similar manner. The duty and privilege of the Inner Union was to discuss all matters of importance before they were submitted to the Directoral Lodge, etc.

Mahlmann, Master, 1813–26, revised the Ritual which had suffered much during the Strict Observance times and this version was accepted in 1829, three years after his death.

The *Statutes* underwent revision in 1832 and 1867. On the latter occasion Jews were freed from all disabilities. In 1863 the Lodge had 359 members, which in 1878 had increased to 414, and in 1885 to 447.

II. BALDWIN OF THE LINDEN, LEIPZIG

In 1776—February 7—several Masons, among them some of the Minerva members, founded a Lodge Baldwin under the Zinnendorff Rite. The Lodge was constituted on February 23 by Duke Ernest of Saxe-Gotha-Altenburg, Grand



Altar in the Little Temple, Berlin.

Master of the National Grand Lodge of Berlin. It suspended work July 24, 1781, but resumed on March 13, 1783, under the title of the Linden (lime-tree). In 1807—November 7—this Lodge threw off its allegiance and declared itself independent.

Beckmann, the English Provincial Grand Master for Hamburg, granted it a new Constitution—January 14, 1809—as an independent Lodge under the title Baldwin of the Linden. The Lodge adopted the Schroeder Ritual and new *Constitutions*—which were revised in 1833 and 1854.

The Lodge joined the Grand Lodge of Saxony in 1815, but retired once more in 1824, after which date it maintained its independence. Its members numbered in 1864, 302; in 1878, 424; and in 1885, 509. The strength of the Leipzig Lodges was remarkable. There were but three in the city: Minerva, independent, with 447 members; Baldwin, independent, with 509; and Apollo—under the Grand Lodge of Saxony—with 384.

III. ARCHIMEDES OF THE THREE TRACING-BOARDS IN ALTENBURG

In 1741 several Altenburg Masons applied to H. W. von Marschall, Provincial Grand Master for Upper Saxony, for permission to erect a Lodge. Marschall granted the prayer and forwarded a copy of the English Ritual, but advised them to apply elsewhere for a Warrant. The Brethren turned to the Minerva Lodge at Leipsic and were constituted by a Deputation from that body, January 31, 1742. From the very first, Lodge Archimedes conducted its proceedings in the vernacular idiom and was probably the earliest German Lodge that ever did so; in 1743 it published the first German Masonic song book. In 1751 Prince Louis Ernest of Saxe-Gotha-Altenburg was Master of the Lodge and he procured from the Three Globes a Warrant for a Scots Chapter, which, however, died out almost immediately afterwards. The Altenburg Fraternity, which always adopted innovations with reluctance, worked pure English Masonry until 1775. As seen already, on June 30 of that year, Duke Ernest II of Saxe-Gotha-Altenburg was elected Grand Master of Zinnendorff's Grand Lodge; and Archimedes naturally joined the National Grand Lodge and accepted the Swedish Rite. Although the Duke resigned in disgust the following year, the Lodge did not reassert its independence until 1785 and, subsequently to that date, continued to use the Ritual, to which it had become accustomed in the preceding ten years, even keeping up the practice after joining the Eclectic Union in 1788.

It seceded from the Eclectic Union, in anticipation of the threatening political troubles, in 1793; the same reasons induced it to suspend its meetings on January 9, 1795, after having declared its officers "permanent" during the interim. In 1796 it reopened. At the beginning of the nineteenth century it rejected the Zinnendorff Ritual and accepted as a temporary measure that of the Eclectic Union. Pierer received orders to compile a new one and, after carefully comparing the Rituals of England, Scotland, Ireland, the Royal York and Hamburg, his version

was accepted in 1803. In the same year Schneider published the *Constitutions* of the Lodge, a work even now much sought after for its valuable contributions to Masonic archæology, which show a wonderful power of just criticism considering the time at which they appeared. From this epoch may be dated the rise of the brilliant Altenburg school of Masonic historians and students, to whose labours all are much indebted. No fewer than three Masonic journals owe their birth to this school—the *Journal für Freimaurer*, the *Zeitschrift für Freimauerei* and the *Ziegeldecker*—which in later years became the *Bruderblätter*. The last-named publication continued to appear until 1854. Fallou, whose work has been alluded to so often, was a member of the Lodge.

In 1803—December 18—the Lodge opened a branch at Gera, but this was afterwards constituted by it an independent Lodge, October 25, 1804. The Altenburg Lodge divided into two in 1803 and erected a Directoral Lodge to govern the Lodge at Gera and the two new divisions at Altenburg; but the whole arrangement was abrogated in 1805, when the old position was resumed.

In 1809 the Lodge established a branch in Schneeberg, but this joined the Grand Lodge of Saxony in 1812.

In the election of its officers, etc., this Lodge followed the English plan; but it possessed a sort of permanent committee to sift matters before they came before the Lodge, consisting of the Master and Deputy Master, the Wardens, all Past Masters and Wardens. Its library contained over 700 valuable works. In 1823 it opened a savings' bank, largely used by the surrounding population. In 1861 its members numbered 210; in 1878, over 250; and in 1885, 271.

IV. ARCHIMEDES OF ETERNAL UNION AT GERA

On January 16, 1803, several resident Masons formed a Masonic club in Gera (the capital of the principality of Reuss the Younger, one of the pigmy independent states of Germany) and, at the close of the same year—December 18—this club was declared a branch establishment or Deputation Lodge of Archimedes at Altenburg, under the name Archimedes of Eternal Union. That is, it could only act under the directions of its parent and in its name, much as an agent acts for his principal. This state of tutelage proving inconvenient, the Lodge petitioned for independence and, in the result, was reconstituted by Lodge Archimedes (of Altenburg), October 25, 1804. The German Grand Lodges, however, refusing to acknowledge the right of one Lodge to constitute another and declaring the Lodge at Gera to be clandestine, the subject of this sketch at last petitioned Schroeder in Hamburg to grant it an English Charter. This was issued April 30, 1806. It then accepted and worked the Schroeder or Hamburg Ritual. Gera was not in the jurisdiction of Hamburg; but Grand Master Beckmann granted the Warrant by virtue of his right to do so outside his district in states where no Grand Lodge existed. (G. W. Speth gave the Warrant at length in *The Freemason* of May 16, 1885.) At Gera and Hamburg the Lodge was considered as directly dependent

on London, whilst by the English authorities it seems to have been regarded as subject to Hamburg. This may account for the fact, that it only received an English number (669) in 1815, five years after the Provincial Grand Lodge for Hamburg had ceased to exist. Virtually, however, Archimedes retained its independence. The princes of Reuss were members and patrons of this Lodge. Speth (in *Royal Freemasons*) gives as such Henry LIV of Reuss-Lobenstein (1810), Henry LXXII of Reuss-Ebersdorff and Lobenstein (1827), Henry LXXVI of Reuss-Lobenstein (1852) and Henry LXVII of Reuss-Schleiz (1852). In 1862 the membership of this Lodge was 121; in 1885, 187.

V. KARL OF THE WREATH OF RUE, HILDBURGSHAUSEN

Hildburgshausen is a town in the small Duchy of Saxe-Meiningen. According to the *Handbuch*, a Lodge, Ernestus, was warranted here by England in 1755, which only lived a few years. No trace of it is to be found in the English Lodge lists.

In 1787 a second Lodge was warranted—also from London, which was continued in the English Lists till the Union; this was the Lodge Charles of the Ruewreath, but the Lodge lists call it Lodge of St. Charles, No. 495. The Wreath of Rue is part of the armorial bearings of the Dukes of Mecklenburg. It worked independently under the immediate protection of its princes and the number of its members in 1885 was 54.

In 1883—October 14—the five Independent Lodges entered into a Treaty of Alliance and Bond of Union.

EXTINCT GRAND LODGES

I. HANOVER

Of all the extinct Grand Lodges of Germany this is, by far, the most important and, naturally, of most interest to English readers.

On July 26, 1743, Provincial Grand Master Lüttmann, of Hamburg, deputed Simon as Provincial Grand Master for Hanover, but no sign exists that he ever displayed any activity in that office. There was, indeed, inanition, almost complete, between 1743 and 1746, explained by Findel as due to an inquiry instituted by the ecclesiastical court of Hanover against the theologian Kirchmann, who had been initiated in Harburg. The court forbade all clergymen to belong to any Fraternity whatever.

On January 19, 1744, Lieutenant, afterwards Captain, of Horse Grenadiers, Mehmet von Königstreu was initiated in Lodge Absalom at Hamburg. His father, Mahomet, had been taken prisoner of war as a child in Candia during the Venetian Wars. Prince Maximilian of Hanover brought him home and had him baptized Louis Max. Mehmet. He was subsequently ennobled, appointed Gentleman of the Bedchamber to King George and died at Kensington Palace, 1726. In 1746—

January 21—he obtained a Warrant from Lüttmann and, on the 29th, founded the Lodge Frederick in Hanover, so called in honour of Frederick, Prince of Wales. In 1753—June 27—Hinüber was elected Master and, in 1755, in consequence of a slight difference of opinion with Hamburg and of discovering that the Lodge had not been registered in England, he made use of his business relations with England to ascertain if there was any chance of obtaining a Provincial Warrant for Hanover. Being assured that if the Lodge would indicate some special Brother, a patent would be forthcoming, the Lodge elected Hinüber as Provincial Grand Master—June 25—and—November 28—he was appointed Provincial Grand Master of all His Majesty's German dominions, “with a power [in the Province] to choose his successors” (*Constitutions*, 1756, p. 333). The Grand Lodge Frederick in Hanover was registered as No. 208, became No. 122 in 1792, and was “dropped out” at the Union (1813).

There sprang up in Austria and Germany a system of Deputy Lodges, one of which—The Three Hearts—was formed in connexion with the Lodge Frederick at Hanover (see *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, v. 15). Deputy Lodges were of two kinds, viz. those meeting on single occasions for specified purposes away from the accustomed meeting-places, held at The Hague and at Hamburg, for the initiation respectively of the Duke of Lorraine and of Frederick, Crown Prince of Prussia; and those of a more permanent character, where the Lodge empowered some of its members residing at a place distant from the regular meeting-place to assemble, appointing, for that purpose, a Deputy Master, who was authorized to initiate candidates and, generally, to transact Masonic business. All expenses attendant upon such meetings were borne by the parent, who also received, without deduction, the fees paid by the candidates, together with any other revenue.

In 1754 John Frederick Raban de Spörcke, attached to the Danish Court and a member of Lodge Frederick, went on a short visit to Vienna, where he met some members of the Craft and others, who desired to be initiated. Knowing that, in 1747, permission had been granted for Deputy Lodges elsewhere—one especially at Göttingen (named Augusta), dissolved in 1753—he sought and obtained permission to hold one at Vienna, on condition that the Lodge should be closed when he left the city. He was, of course, appointed Master. The furniture and all requisites were sent to Vienna from the Lodge Frederick. The patent was dated May 22, 1754 and the Lodge was bound to Anderson's *New Book of Constitutions*. This Deputy Lodge was opened on June 21 following under the name of The Three Hearts. One of the candidates on June 28 is described as “Hobart, son of Lord Buckingham.” From particulars given afterwards this was evidently George Hobart, eldest son of John, first Earl of Buckinghamshire, who succeeded as third Earl on August 3, 1793. He was M.P. for St. Ives in 1754 and for Beeralston in 1761, 1768 and 1774. He was for a time Opera Manager in London and, in 1762, was appointed Secretary to the Embassy in St. Petersburg (as it was then known), where his half brother, John, who became second Earl, was Ambassador. Hobart was raised to the dignity of a Master Mason on July 12 of the same year. Overtures

were then made by the Lodge of The Three Cannons for an amalgamation, but this was not possible because of the condition that the Lodge must be under the control of de Spörcke. One interesting feature in connexion with this Lodge is that all the members adopted assumed names, such as Cleander, Liberty, Minerva, Galen, Nagel, Xerxes and the like. After the departure of de Spörcke for Hanover, notwithstanding the injunction, J. A. Hinüber became Master, rendering account of all transactions to Lodge Frederick at Hanover. This Deputy Lodge came to an end on July 21, 1755.

On June 24, 1756, the Grand Lodge made a formal visitation to the Lodge Frederick and the next year—January 31—Frederick accepted a Warrant of Confirmation from the new Grand Lodge of Hanover.

On the outbreak of war all Masonic meetings “with the enemies of their country” were avoided and this put a complete stop to Masonic work until 1758. In 1760 a Scots Lodge, Karl of the Purple Mantle and, in 1762, May 24, the Lodge George of Hanover, were founded.

In 1764 Hanover was formed by von Hund into the Prefectory Callenberg under the Strict Observance system, which, at first, was vigorously opposed by the Grand Lodge and its daughters, but gradually acquired preponderating influence. The last Craft meeting of the Lodge Frederick occurred January 12, 1765.

Schubart arrived in Hanover October 13, 1766 and commenced his propaganda on the 27th. Prince, afterwards Grand Duke, Karl of Mecklenberg-Strelitz joined the Strict Observance in Celle and was appointed Protector of the district; on November 25 the Lodges George and Frederick dissolved in order to reconstitute themselves as the Strict Observance Lodge of the White Horse and thus the Grand Lodge of Hanover ceased to exist. As a consequence, in 1773 Hanover was made a neutral territory, open alike to the Grand Lodge of England and the National Grand Lodge of Prussia at Berlin.

Zinnendorff, who immediately invaded the district, met with remarkable success. In 1774 he established a Lodge of the Golden Compasses at Göttingen; in the same year this Lodge warranted the Black Bear in Hanover and the Crocodile in Harburg, in 1775 a Lodge in Lüneburg; whilst, in 1777, the National Grand Lodge constituted the Cedar in Hanover, a Lodge in Stade and, in 1778, one in Hameln.

Meanwhile the Fraternity had found themselves disappointed in the Strict Observance and took no interest in Lodge matters, so much so that the White Horse did not meet between 1775 and 1778. The Protector, Grand Duke Karl, to remedy this state of affairs, ceased working the Strict Observance Rite, gradually altered the Ritual of the first three Degrees and, without formally renouncing the Templar connexion, practically revived the extinct Grand Lodge by converting the Scots Lodge Karl of the Purple Mantle into a Directoral Lodge over all Lodges of the Strict Observance in His Majesty's dominions in Brunswick, Lüneberg and Hanover. After the Wilhelmsbad Convent of 1782 the Fraternity in these lands declined to accept the rectified system and calmly continued in their own

way. Some few of the Zinnendorff Lodges, more especially the Black Bear, at this time entered into more or less intimate relations with the Lodges under the Grand Duke, Governor of Hanover for George III.

In 1786 this Prince, being in England, procured, with Col. Graefe's assistance, the reinstatement of the Provincial Grand Lodge of the Electorate of Hanover and British Dominions in Germany (the patent granted to Prince Charles of Mecklenburg-Strelitz bore date July 5, 1786—*Grand Lodge Records*) together with a Warrant under the No. 486 for the former Zinnendorff Lodge of the Black Bear. The Lodge White Horse then prefixed its former name and became Frederick of the White Horse and, November 28, this Lodge and the Black Bear joined in re-establishing the Provincial Grand Lodge. A Royal Arch Chapter was also added by Graefe, but was very short lived.

The district was, however, invaded in 1786 by the Eclectic Union at Hoya and, in 1792, by the National Grand Lodge of Germany at Osterode.

In 1796 new *Statutes* were enacted in consonance with the new arrangements, of which the chief fault was the non-admission of Jewish candidates.

In 1791 the Provincial Grand Lodge constituted new Lodges in Münden and Einbeck. In 1799 Fessler visited Hanover and was enthusiastically received, as was Schroeder in 1800. The immediate result of these visits was a closer bond of union between the Grand Lodge Royal York and the Provincial Grand Lodges for Hanover and Hamburg. But of still greater importance was the consequent adoption by Lodge Frederick—August 10, 1801—of the Schroeder Ritual, an example soon followed by the Provincial Grand Lodge and all its daughters. This opened the door to candidates of the Jewish persuasion.

A troublous time now awaited the Fraternity in Hanover: in 1803 the French troops entered into possession of the country and, in 1806, were replaced by the Prussians. Meanwhile the Lodges only met when absolutely necessary, but it is worthy of note that they yet managed secretly to celebrate the birthday of King George. In 1806 the Grand Lodge of the Three Globes constituted a Lodge at Osnabrück. In 1807 the Lodges summoned courage to resume work; in 1808 new *Statutes* were promulgated; in 1809 the Provincial Grand Lodge warranted a Lodge in Lüneburg and that of the Three Globes another in Goslar; and in 1810 Hanover became an integral part of the short-lived kingdom of Westphalia. The Grand Lodge of that kingdom was, however, so tolerant that the Lodges were not compelled to give in their adhesion and, although some few Hanoverian Lodges joined it, the Provincial Grand Lodge retained its separate existence, as did most of its daughters.

In 1813—November 30—Ernest Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, fifth son of George III, visited the Lodge Frederick of the White Horse and, at the ensuing banquet, prayed admission as an active member. It is needless to say that the request was joyfully granted. The events of 1814-15 raised the Electorate of Hanover to the rank of a kingdom, besides considerably enlarging its boundaries. In 1815 the Provincial Grand Lodge constituted a Lodge in Nienburg and affiliated

the one warranted in Celle by Hamburg in the previous year. It also received the adhesion of a Lodge in Göttingen which had been erected by the Grand Lodge of Westphalia and several of its daughters who had joined that body now returned to the national fold.

Karl, Grand Duke of Mecklenburg, died November 6, 1816 and was succeeded as Provincial Grand Master by Count L. F. von Kilmansegge, whose appointment is first noticed in the *Freemasons' Calendar* for 1822. In the same publication Lodge Frederick of the White Horse reappears as No. 146* and eleven other German Lodges—Nos. 734, Frankfort; 735, Nuremberg; 736-44, Hanover—are added to the roll, all under the year 1821. Gradually, however, a feeling arose that the Grand Lodge should declare its independence. In consequence—November 1, 1828—the Duke of Cumberland proclaimed the autonomy of the Grand Lodge of the Kingdom of Hanover and was himself elected its first Grand Master.

The year 1828 saw the accession of the Lodge at Hildesheim, Door to Virtue, No. 312, warranted by England, December 27, 1762; and new Lodges were constituted at Stade 1845, at Kassel 1849 and at Klauenthal 1851. New *Statutes* had been passed January 22, 1839.

At the death of William IV in 1837, Hanover became an independent kingdom and the Duke of Cumberland, Grand Master, succeeded to the vacant throne. He died in 1851 and was followed by his son, George V. In 1852—March 19—although not a Mason, George V assumed the patronage of the Craft and, in 1857, caused himself to be initiated in the Black Bear, as the representative of all the other Lodges in the kingdom, becoming thereby an active member of each one of them.

Von Hattorf had been elected Grand Master in 1851 and, at his death, July 29, 1854, was succeeded by Count Bentinck, February 1, 1855. In 1857, however, the King expressed his intention of assuming the Grand Mastership upon the condition that the Hanoverian Lodges under foreign Jurisdictions should join the Grand Lodge of Hanover and that the *Statutes* should be so altered as to exclude Jews from initiation. The latter condition was sorrowfully complied with; the former was only opposed by the Zinnendorff Lodge erected at Stade in 1777, which preferred dissolution.

In the following years new Lodges were constituted—1857, at Verden; 1858, Harburg; 1859, Leer; 1860, Ulzen. In 1861 the number of Lodges was 22, with 2,187 members. The last Lodge was warranted in 1863 at Hameln.

In the Austro-Prussian conflict of 1866 Hanover unfortunately espoused the losing side and suffered by annexation to Prussia. Now, inasmuch as the edict of 1798 only acknowledges three Grand Lodges in Prussia and no other Lodges but those dependent upon these three, extinction stared the Grand Lodge of Hanover in the face. Nevertheless had it at once applied for permission to rank as a fourth Grand Lodge and, had the Grand Master himself resigned, there is reason to believe that the prayer might have been granted. Hamburg and Frankfort are now Prussian, but the edict of 1798 was not enforced in their case in 1870. But resignation

formed no part of the late King's intentions ; there is every cause to conjecture that, on the contrary, the position of Grand Master entered into his political calculations.

The Deputy Grand Master Krüger endeavoured to get Hanover constituted a fourth Grand Lodge. King George thereupon tried to impeach him in Grand Lodge—by which body resolutions were passed—December 8—approving the step taken by the Deputy, but setting a limit to his future activity. Krüger resigned, as did his successor, Bödeker. The King then appointed Bokelberg. On April 17, 1867, the Grand Lodge resolved to petition the King to retire, upon which his agent, the Deputy Grand Master Bokelberg, resigned. The Grand Lodge then took matters into its own hands, and—June 6—17 Lodges elected Krüger Grand Master. But it was too late. On September 30 the Minister of Justice and of the Interior closed the Grand Lodge of Hanover by virtue of the edict of 1798 and nothing remained for the subordinate Lodges but to choose their new superiors. Velzen, Goslar and Osnabrück joined the Three Globes ; Bückeberg, the Grand Lodge of Hamburg ; Walsrode dissolved ; Cedar, in Hanover, joined the National Grand Lodge ; the other 17 Lodges affiliated with the Grand Lodge Royal York and were of material weight in carrying the more liberal *Constitutions* of that Grand Lodge in 1872.

II. MOTHER-LODGE OF SILESIA IN GLOGAU

This was a Grand Lodge under the Strict Observance. On May 20, 1765, von Hund constituted a Mother-Lodge at Nistitz, with the name of Celestial Sphere of Gold. It was removed in 1772 to Gross-Osten and warranted in 1772 a Lodge at Glogau. In 1779 the Mother-Lodge removed to Glogau as the Grand Lodge of Silesia. It constituted some other Lodges, but both the Grand Lodge and its daughters closed on June 24, 1794, after the downfall of the Strict Observance and the death of Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick.

III. MOTHER-LODGE FOR THE PROVINCES OF EAST AND WEST PRUSSIA AND LITHUANIA AT KÖNIGSBERG

This also was a Strict Observance Grand Lodge. The oldest Lodge in Königsberg, the Three Anchors, was constituted September 12, 1746, dissolved in 1760 and immediately reconstituted by the Three Globes, June 10, 1760, as the Three Crowns. In 1769 it joined the Strict Observance and was raised to the rank of a Provincial Grand Lodge, as above, in which capacity it warranted several Lodges. In consequence of the Prussian Edict of 1798 recognizing only three Grand Lodges in that kingdom, it subsided into its former position of a daughter Lodge of the Three Globes in 1799. The Lodge is still active. In 1863 it numbered 262 ; in 1885, 312 ; and to-day (1930), 459 members.

IV. GRAND LODGE OF THE THREE KEYS AT RATISBON

This was in its time an important Grand Lodge, remarkable for having successfully resisted the blandishments of the Strict Observance. Its influence extended over a very large circle. In 1765 a Prince of Thurn and Taxis founded in Ratisbon a Lodge St. Charles of Constancy, which he himself dissolved in 1774. But, during those nine years, it had given birth to a second Lodge, Crescent of the Three Keys, constituted May 1, 1767. The Master of that Lodge, Schkler, who had been initiated in Amsterdam, obtained—July 1, 1768—from Grand Master Von Botzelaar of the Netherlands, a Warrant of Constitution and immediately assumed for the Lodge the prerogatives of a Grand Lodge. It worked the Degrees of the Craft, with those of a Scots Lodge superadded, in 1770; the latter were, however, suppressed in 1784, so that—considering the times—the Lodge kept itself remarkably pure. In 1771 it warranted its first daughter, Hope, in Vienna and, during the next twenty years, Lodges in Marktseft on the Main, Munich, Passau, Ulm, Baitsch, Neusohl in Hungary, Hermannstadt in Siebenbürgen, (a second) in Vienna, Görlitz, Dresden and Hanover—in all twelve. Schkler was Grand Master from 1771 to 1777, when he resigned; and the second Grand Master, the Prince of Thurn and Taxis, was elected in 1799. It is probable that this long interregnum was due to the ravages committed in every direction by the Strict Observance. From 1793 to 1799 the Lodge was perfectly dormant, owing to the disturbing effects of the Revolution. But it resumed activity with the new Grand Master, who, June 6, 1806, obtained a patent from England. In this he is styled “Provincial Grand Master for Bavaria,” an excusable error, Ratisbon being one of the recent acquisitions of that State; and it is indeed surprising that the Grand Lodge did not take the place now occupied by the Sun of Bayreuth. The Lodge also changed its name to Karl of the Three Keys and constituted several Lodges, for instance, Leipzig and Heidelberg. In the first decade of last century the Grand Lodge had lost all her daughters through death or desertion, but was itself strong and much respected throughout the Continent; with Sweden especially it stood on the most intimate terms from 1801 to 1823. It gradually fell into decay, but once more, about 1830, flickered up under Von Stachelhausen. On his departure from Ratisbon the Lodge died out altogether, *circa* 1840. A detailed account of this Lodge will be found in *Latomia*, vol. xxii, 1863, pp. 322–30.

V. ENGLISH PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE FOR BRUNSWICK AT BRUNSWICK

This Grand Lodge can hardly be said to have existed, but its short history exemplifies the unsettled state of the Craft at this period. In 1744—February 12—the Lodge Jonathan was founded and opened by the Grand Lodge of Hamburg; and, on December 27, its founder, Kisseleben, was appointed Permanent Deputy Grand Master. In 1762 the Lodge superadded the Rosa-Clermont Chapter; and, in 1764, the Master, Von Lestwitz, was appointed by England Provincial Grand Master for Brunswick (*Constitutions*, 1767, p. 365; Preston, 1812, p. 261). But

whilst the Warrant was on the road, Lestwitz and the Lodge had both deserted to the Strict Observance, so that the Provincial Grand Lodge was never erected. A minority of the Lodge, however, continued the old Lodge Jonathan; and, in the same year, Le Boeuf, in his quality of a Scots Master, established a French Lodge. These three quarrelled, so that the Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick closed them all and founded two new ones, one working in French as a Mother-Lodge, St. Charles of Concord and a German Lodge Jonathan. This he did by virtue of a Provincial patent granted to him by England, July 5, 1768. The Lodges were constituted on October 10 and 11, 1770. But before the end of the year Ferdinand had signed the Act of Strict Observance and that was the end of the second Provincial Grand Lodge of Brunswick. St. Charles of Concord was granted a place in the English registry as No. 400 in 1770 and continued on the roll until 1813 (as No. 259)—one of many proofs that the Grand Lodge of England knew little and cared less concerning foreign affairs.

VI. BODE'S UNION OF GERMAN FREEMASONS

In 1788—March 1—the Directoral Lodge of the Eclectic Union at Frankfort resumed its former position as a Provincial Grand Lodge under England. This seems to have given umbrage to the Compass Lodge in Gotha, who feared or pretended to fear, that the perfect equality among the Eclectic Lodges would be violated. Their chief adviser was Bode. As he was a convert to the Illuminati and Frankfort had declared itself adverse to that sect, this circumstance may have also contributed to the ensuing events. Certain it is that the Gotha Lodge issued a circular to all German Lodges—November 24, 1790—signed by nine Masters “acting under the advice of a highly instructed Mason” (Bode) calling upon all Lodges to aid in forming a general Union of German Lodges on the real Eclectic principles. The Gotha Lodge was erased and that of the Three Arrows at Nuremberg took its part so warmly as to provoke a like result. These were the only two Eclectic Lodges that joined Bode's Union, which in all never numbered more than ten Lodges. Bode died in 1793 and, with him, the projected union and Grand Lodge after a precarious existence of three years. The movement is of interest, as the last effort of a man who was made a Hamburg Mason in 1761, dubbed a Templar Knight in 1764, who, in 1782, first took up the idea that the Jesuits were at the bottom of all the High Degrees and finished by joining the Illuminati.

VII. GRAND ORIENT OF BADEN AT MANNHEIM

In 1778 Mannheim belonged to Bavaria and the Lodge Karl of Unity was constituted in that city—November 28—by the Grand Lodge Royal York. In 1783 it joined the Eclectic Union and, in 1785, was closed together with all other Bavarian Lodges. In 1803 Mannheim was made over to the Grand Duchy of Baden and, in 1805, the Lodge reopened under Karl von Dalberg. In 1806 it received a Warrant from the Grand Orient of France, accepted the modern French Rite and

changed its name to Charles of Concord. Its Chapter then declared itself a Grand Orient for the Duchy of Baden and was acknowledged as such by France on June 25, 1807.

In 1808 it was joined by the Lodge Karl of Good Hope, Heidelberg, warranted in 1807 by the Grand Lodge of Ratisbon—which it deserted, but rejoined, in the same year. In 1809 it constituted the Lodges Temple of Patriotic Light at Bruchsal and Karl and Stephanie at Mannheim; so that in all the Grand Orient extended its jurisdiction over three Lodges. Its Grand Master was Karl, Prince of Ysenburg. The Grand Duke, Karl Friedrich, being dead, his successor, Karl Ludwig Friedrich, issued—February 16, 1813 and March 7, 1814—decrees suppressing secret societies and, with them, Freemasonry throughout his dominions. All Lodges in Baden then closed and the Craft was not allowed to reassert itself until 1845; but there is no longer a Grand Lodge for Baden.

VIII. GRAND NATIONAL UNION OF BADEN LODGES AT CARLSRUHE

This Union was contemporary with the foregoing. The Karl of Unity at Carlsruhe was warranted by the Eclectic Union in 1786, closed during the Revolution from 1791 onwards and reopened in 1808. The Lodge Noble Prospect at Freiburg was warranted by the Provincial Grand Lodge for Austria at Vienna in 1784, joined the Eclectic Union in 1785 and was also dormant from 1793 to 1808. The Karl of Good Hope at Heidelberg was warranted by Ratisbon in 1807, joined the Grand Orient of Baden 1808 and rejoined Ratisbon the same year.

These three Lodges—May 23, 1809—erected the Grand National Union of Lodges, to be governed, not by a Grand, but by a Directoral Lodge, the Lodge exercising this function to change every three years. Lodges of each and every Ritual were eligible for the Union, except those working the French Modern Rite—which was ceded to the Grand Orient of Baden. These two Grand Bodies subsisted side by side in perfect amity. The Heidelberg Lodge threw off a shoot in 1809, which was constituted by the Eclectic Union and joined the Baden Union without apparently deserting Frankfort. In like manner the original Heidelberg Lodge appears to have belonged to the Ratisbon Grand Lodge and the Baden Union. In 1809 the Bruchsal Lodge also joined it without deserting its Grand Orient and there is a further though somewhat undefined allusion to a Minerva Lodge at Mannheim. Its Grand Masters were successively K. F. Schilling von Canstadt and Hemeling. The Directory remained at Carlsruhe until July 1, 1812, when it was removed to Freiburg, but in 1813-14 the same fate of course overtook this Union, which crushed the Grand Orient of Baden.

IX. GRAND ORIENT OF WESTPHALIA IN CASSEL

An English Provincial Grand Master, described in the *Constitutions* (1767, p. 365) as George Augustus, Baron of Hammerstein, was appointed by Earl Ferrers—1762-4—for Westphalia, but he does not appear to have exerted himself to any purpose, for nothing more is known of him.

In the electorate of Hesse-Cassel the first Lodge was constituted at Marburg in 1743 and others soon followed. The Strict Observance in due course swamped the Craft and, on its subsidence, the preponderating influence was that of the Grand Lodge Royal York. In 1794, however, the Elector suppressed all the Lodges in his dominions.

In 1807 the Electorate and the city of Cassel became the centre of Napoleon's kingdom of Westphalia, at the head of which he placed his brother Jérôme.

The first Lodge to revive, Frederick of Friendship, took the name of Jérôme Napoleon of Fidelity and, in order to avoid falling under a French Jurisdiction, erected a Grand Orient of the Kingdom of Westphalia, February 10, 1808. This was done at the instigation of Count Siméon, Jérôme's chief minister, himself an assistant Grand Master of the Grand Orient of France. The king was Grand Master and Simeon his Deputy; but all the other officers were Germans. The utmost toleration prevailed and Lodges under other Jurisdictions were not compelled to affiliate; any Ritual was permitted and Lodges enjoyed complete freedom from interference in their private affairs. Three new Lodges appear to have been constituted in Cassel (1808-13), and the following joined:—Münden, Alfeld, Hildesheim, Einbeck, Goslar, Osterode, Heiligenstadt, Eschwege, Göttingen, Nordhausen, Celle, Marburg, Hanover (a new French one), Helmstedt, Magdeburg, etc. In 1813 the kingdom of Westphalia disappeared and with it the Grand Orient.

X. GRAND LODGE OF HESSE-CASSEL IN CASSEL

The Elector having been restored, the old edict of 1794 suppressing the Craft was revived. Von Bardeleben succeeded in obtaining a repeal of this obnoxious decree, but only on the condition that the Lodges would submit to the Grand Lodge Royal York, under an intermediate Provincial Grand Lodge for the Electorate, with Bardeleben as the Provincial Grand Master. Accordingly two Lodges at Cassel and one at Eschwege constituted—May 26, 1814—the Provincial Grand Lodge desired by the Elector and placed themselves under the Royal York of Berlin. In 1817, however, this Provincial Grand Lodge declared its independence under the title of Mother Grand Lodge of the Electorate of Hesse and the Elector William II on his accession, promised it his protection. Besides the three already mentioned, the following at Marburg, Rinteln, Hanau, Ziegenhain, Hersfeld, Neutershausen; in all, nine Lodges formed part of this Jurisdiction. But, on July 19, 1824, an edict of the Elector once more suppressed and interdicted the Lodges and, in spite of all petitions to the contrary, they remained forbidden and closed until the events of 1866 caused the Electorate to be incorporated with Prussia.

OTHER MASONIC UNIONS NOT CLASSED AS GRAND LODGES

I. GRAND UNION OF FREEMASONS (FESSLER'S)

It will be remembered that in 1799 and 1800 both Fessler and Schroeder visited Hanover and, about the same time, these two ardent reformers made each other's acquaintance. Early in 1801 Fessler attempted to strengthen the hands of

the leading supporters of pure Freemasonry by drawing closer the bonds of union between the Provincial Grand Lodges for Hamburg and Hanover and the Grand Lodge Royal York of Berlin. On August 20, 1801, a tripartite treaty was concluded between these bodies, entitled *Magnum Foedus Latomorum*, providing for mutual representation, communication of all Minutes and for a select circle in each Grand Lodge for the free imparting to one another of all ritualistic and historic knowledge. Resolutions were adopted against the use of any of the old-fashioned High Degrees and provision was made for the admission to the Union of other Grand Lodges. Frankfort was invited to join the Union. But at this time the Provincial Grand Lodge was dormant and wished to refer the matter to England before deciding. Deceived by this condition of affairs, the Royal York warranted a Lodge—Socrates—in Frankfort, December 4, 1801 and to the friction to which this gave rise, the absence of a reply from London and the renewed dormancy of the Provincial Grand Lodge for Frankfort in 1803-5, must be ascribed the failure on the latter's part to affiliate with the Union. Following this came the French occupation of Berlin and Hanover, thus the Union gradually lost its hold on the Lodges and is now confined to a mutual representation in Grand Lodge, which, however, has extended to all the other Grand Lodges of Germany.

II. THE CORRESPONDENCE BUREAU

In most German Lodges two secretaries divide the work between them, one attending to the Minutes and records, the other conducting the correspondence, both with members and with the Lodges in fraternal alliance. It is usual for the latter to forward, in the summer, to every member and allied Lodge a so-called St. John's letter, detailing the events of the past twelve months, giving a list of present members. In some cases allied Lodges undertake a regular exchange of their respective Minutes. As the parties to these arrangements increased in number, the work became more onerous and Dr. Lechner of the Baldwin Lodge, Leipzig, formed a plan to facilitate matters, which was communicated to the Lodges by circular in 1831. According to this scheme the Baldwin Lodge was to act as a central point under a special officer charged to receive proceedings from all quarters, and to distribute them to all corresponding members. Forty-two Lodges joined the Association at the outset.

III. UNION OF THE THREE GRAND LODGES OF BERLIN

A Union, composed of the Grand and Deputy Grand Masters of these three Grand Lodges, was founded in 1810 to deliberate on matters of common interest. It had been preceded by a joint monthly committee meeting, established in 1807. Unfortunately in 1823 the Grand Lodge of Hamburg and the National Grand Lodge quarrelled about the Lodge at Rostock. Hamburg brought its case before the Union through the good offices of the Grand Lodge Royal York. This produced very strained relations and the Union—by common consent—quietly came to an end.

IV. PRUSSIAN GRAND MASTERS' UNION

About the year 1830 the three Berlin Grand Lodges had, in a great measure, forgotten their quarrels and lived together in peace and amity. To ensure a continuance of this happy state of affairs, the Union of Prussian Grand Masters was established December 28, 1839. On that day the following officers met together—Von Donnersmark and Selapinsky, the Grand Master and Deputy Grand Master of the National Grand Lodge, Link and Bever, the Grand Master and Deputy of the Royal York; O'Etzel and Schmückert, filling similar offices in the Three Globes; and the three Grand Secretaries. The object of this Union was to take counsel in common on important Masonic matters and to strengthen the bonds of friendship between the Grand Lodges. The Union might propose Masonic principles for acceptance, but was powerless to force their adoption on the individual Grand Lodges.

One of the first acts of this Union was an important one. At a meeting held May 18, 1840, at the premises of the Royal York, Von Donnersmark informed the Grand Masters that Prince William of Prussia, afterwards German Emperor, had obtained his father's permission to join the Craft, provided he could be made in the name of all three Grand Lodges and belong to them conjointly; further, that in that case he would assume the Protectorate of the entire Craft in Prussia. For such a purpose the Union was exactly fitted, and—May 22, 1840—the Prince was initiated. Donnersmark, his old companion in arms, presided at a Common Prussian Grand Lodge and, on the right and left, were the other Grand Masters. The Masters of the fifteen Berlin Lodges were also present. The National Grand Lodge lent its premises for the occasion. The Prince swore truth and silence to all three Grand Masters and then, in his capacity of Protector, received their vows of fealty in return.

V. GRAND MASTERS' DIET

This may be considered as an extension of the Grand Masters' Union, applied to all Germany. In 1868 Warnatz, Grand Master of Saxony, invited the other Grand Masters of Germany with their Deputies to meet him in conference. The first meeting was held May 3, 1868, at Berlin. Every Grand Lodge, except the Sun of Bayreuth, was represented by its Grand Master; and in some instances by the Deputy Grand Masters or their substitutes. An idea of the scope of this association may be gathered from the proceedings of the Third Annual Diet, held June 5, 1870, when it was agreed to accept the *Old English Charges* as the basis and landmarks of Freemasonry. At the fourth Diet at Frankfort in 1871, the formation of a Union of German Grand Lodges was mooted and Grand Master Warnatz was deputed to draw up a draft code of By-laws for the same. These were duly approved and, as a consequence, the fifth and last Diet of 1872 at Berlin became the first meeting of the



A Master with Apron, the Insignia of His Lodge About His Neck; on His Left Side Is the Insignia of the Oath of Secrecy.

VI. GERMAN GRAND LODGES' UNION

This Union worked to great advantage for the Craft and, in the absence of an impossible General Grand Lodge, served to maintain a close bond between every system in the Fatherland and to preserve or inaugurate a common line of conduct in external affairs.

VII. UNION OF GERMAN FREEMASONS

This was a purely deliberative and literary society, composed of individual Masons meeting yearly at various cities. It was founded in 1861 and at first met with strenuous opposition from some of the Grand Lodges, so that in 1867 it only numbered 309 members. It has, however, formed a valuable library and museum at Leipzig and its official organ is the Leipzig *Baubütte*. Its influence has grown yearly and, in 1878, it numbered 1,509 active and 31 corresponding, members.

Although the exigencies of space forbid more than a passing allusion to many subjects of deep interest to our antiquaries, but lying on the extreme border line of history, there is one upon which—at this stage of our inquiry—some general observations will not be out of place.

Germany (including Austria and Switzerland) excels all other countries, both in the affluence of its Masonic literature and in the profundity of research which has characterized the labours of so many gifted historians of the Craft. The earliest efforts of German Masonic writers—translations of the English *Constitutions*, orations and didactic pieces—evinced both diligence and accuracy. Thence, by a gradual transition—the publication of the *Constitutions* of many other Grand (and private) Lodges, of songs and poems remarkable for beauty of thought and diction—we are brought to a higher sphere of intellectual labour and find in the literature of the Craft, the noblest moral teaching, accompanied by very learned and ingenious reflections on both the origin and objects of our Society.

Lessing—"the father of German criticism"—known to Masonic readers by his *Ernest and Falk*, 1778 and *Nathan the Wise*, 1779—a noble plea for toleration and a rational religion—was followed by Vogel, *Letters on Freemasonry*, 1783-5; Albrecht, *Materials for a Critical History*, 1792; Schroeder, *Materials for the Engbund*, 1802; Schneider, *Constitutions of Archimedes*, etc., 1803; Fessler, *Attempts at a Critical History*, etc., 1801-7; Krause, *The Three Oldest Masonic Documents*, 1810; Mossdorf, *Addresses to Thoughtful Masons*, 1818; Heldmann, *The Three Oldest Historical Documents of German Masonry*, 1819; Nettleblatt, *History of Masonic Systems, circa 1836*; O'Etzel, *History of the Three Globes*, 1840; Kloss, *Annals of the Eclectic Union*, 1842—*Freemasonry in its True Significance*, 1846—*Freemasonry in Great Britain*, 1848—and in *France*, 1852; Fallou, *The Mysteries of Freemasonry*, 1848; Winzer, *The German Brotherhoods*, 1859; Keller, *History of the Eclectic Union*, 1857—*Of Masonry in Germany*, 1859; Findel, *History of Freemasonry*, 1861-2; and Paul,

History of the Eclectic Union, 1883. The list might be extended and both Herder and Goethe are to be classed among "writers of the Craft."

German periodical literature devoted to the Craft began in 1776-9 with Bode's *Almanach*, subsequently there appeared (*inter alia*) the *Freemasons' Library*, 1778-1803; *Vienna Journal for Masons*, 1784-6; *Kothener Annual*, 1798-1805; Meissner's *Pocket-Book*, 1801-17; *Altenburg Journal*, 1804, continued as Fisher's *Zeitschrift* and *Neueste Zeitschrift*; Nettleblatt's *Calendars for the Provincial Grand Lodge of Mecklenburg*, 1821-46; but above all, the matchless *Latomia*, commenced by Meissner and Merzdorf in 1842, continued to 1873. The most prominent Masonic journal in Germany at the present date is the *Bauhütte*, begun in 1858. Works of especial merit are Gädicke's *Lexicon*, 1818 but chiefly on account of its being the first of its kind; Kloss's *Bibliography*, 1844, a monument of research; and the *Handbook* 1863-79—or the second edition of Lenning's *Encyclopædia*, edited by Mossdorf in 1822-8. No other Masonic work of a similar character can pretend to rival the *Handbuch der Freimaurerei* in the extent, variety and accuracy of its information.

In 1931 there were in Germany nine Grand Lodges: 1. The Sun at Bayreuth, with 45 Lodges and 4,000 Brethren, Hermann Kölbein, Grand Master. 2. The Grand National Mother-Lodge at Berlin, 179 Lodges, 21,300 Brethren, Dr. Karl Habicht, Grand Master. 3. The Grand Landesloge of Germany in Berlin, with 54 St. Andrew's and 177 St. John's Lodges, 21,005 Brethren, Dr. Eugen Müllendorff, Grand Master. 4. The Grand Lodge of Prussia in Berlin, 108 Lodges, 11,422 Brethren, Dr. Otto Zimmer, Grand Master. 5. The Grand Lodge Zur Eintracht in Darmstadt, 10 Lodges, 896 Brethren, Karl Kahlert, Grand Master. 6. Grand Lodge of Saxony in Dresden, 45 Lodges, 7,344 Brethren, Gotthold Anders, Grand Master. 7. Grand Mother-Lodge of the Eclectic Union at Frankfort, 26 Lodges, 3,200 Brethren, Ludwig Riess, Grand Master. 8. Grand Lodge of Hamburg, 54 Lodges, 5,000 Brethren, Richard Bröse, Grand Master. 9. Grand Lodge of German Brotherhood at Leipzig, 10 Lodges, 1,935 Brethren, Paul Mensdorf, Grand Master.

A further Grand Lodge—the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Germany—was founded at Hamburg, on July 27, 1930, by eight Lodges. This Grand Lodge was brought into being by the Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Rite. It claims to have been founded in accordance with the basic principles laid down by the Grand Lodge of England.

In 1932, the Hitler government suppressed all Masonic activity in Germany, and all Lodges and Grand Lodges either ceased to exist or else divested themselves of Masonic characteristics and activity.

CHAPTER IV

FREEMASONRY IN AUSTRIA AND HUNGARY

[The leading authority on the history of the Craft in these countries is Dr. L. Lewis's *Geschichte der Freimaurerei in Oesterreich*, etc., Vienna, 1861, supplemented by references to Beigel's *Verfassung der Provincial und Gr. Loge von Oesterreich*, 1784, Vienna, 1877; the various articles in the *Allgemeines Handbuch*; but, particularly, the detailed articles in vols. iv to ix of the *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, in "A Sketch of the Earlier History of Freemasonry in Austria and Hungary," by Ladislav de Malczovitch.]

THE history of Freemasonry in Austria—its traces in the Austrian Netherlands have already been referred to in connexion with Belgium—may be said to commence with the initiation of the Duke of Lorraine.

Francis Stephen was born at Nancy, December 8, 1708 and succeeded his father, Leopold Joseph Charles, as Duke of Lorraine on March 27, 1709. In 1731 a special Lodge was held at the Hague under Dr. J. T. Desaguliers, as Master; John Stanhope and John Holzendorff, as Wardens; the Earl of Chesterfield, with others, in order to initiate and pass the Duke, who was afterwards made a Master Mason in England in the same year. On that occasion the Grand Master of England, Lord Lovel, afterwards Earl of Leicester, summoned an Emergency Lodge to be held at Houghton Hall, Norfolk, the country seat of Robert Walpole, Earl of Oxford, where the Duke was raised to the Master's Degree, together with Thomas Pelham, Duke of Newcastle. From that time the Duke of Lorraine took a very keen interest in Masonic matters and was always mentioned with distinction in Grand and private Lodges, an official toast even being drunk in his honour in the Austrian Lodges. In the year following his initiation, 1732, a Lodge was founded in London bearing his name, but it was not, as has sometimes been claimed, established by him. In 1735 he renounced Lorraine by the Treaty of Vienna and, in 1736, he married Maria Theresa, daughter and heiress of Charles V of Austria and, on the death of Gaston de Médicis, in 1737, he succeeded to the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, when he proclaimed himself the protector of the persecuted Freemasons, who had been arrested at the instigation of the Inquisition, which had been established in Tuscany as the outcome of the prohibition against Freemasonry issued by Gaston de Médicis shortly before his death. Francis would not permit the promulgation of Pope Clement's Bull of April 28, 1738, within the kingdom of Austria and he ordered that all Freemasons who had been arrested at the command of the Inquisition were to be set at liberty and their trials to be suspended.

Francis Stephen was the first prince of any European country to join the Masonic Order, but his example was quickly followed by a number of august

personages, who also emulated him in the powerful protection he gave to the Order against Roman and, especially, Jesuit attacks and intrigues. "It was not long before an opportunity for doing so arose," says Lad. de Malczovitch, "for no sooner had the Roman Catholic Church obtained knowledge of the existence of the new cosmopolitan Order, whose progressive and enlightened tendencies were somewhat opposed to its own, than it proclaimed a war of extermination against the Craft. Pulpit and confessional were the chief strongholds from which the combat was fought, yet unsuccessfully. Nay, just these attacks were of eminent service to the Order. The young sect was but strengthened by the wild primeval storms. The Roman Church had long ago lost its absolute influence on the mass of the educated classes. Since the Reformation it had, instead of setting itself at the head of and marching with the progress of civilization, combated continually the spirit of the age and every new and liberal idea which made its appearance on the stage of political and social life."

On the death of her father, in 1740, Maria Theresa succeeded to the imperial diadem of Austria and appointed her husband as Regent. The Empress, personally, was not favourably disposed towards the Craft and her consort was able to secure for it only a certain amount of tolerance in the long run, being powerless to prevent occasional outbursts of persecution. In those early days Freemasons existed in the Austrian dominions in considerable numbers, but, as yet, there was no Lodge, which may also account, in part, for the fact of the non-publication of the Papal Bull in 1738.

In 1742, on September 17, the first Vienna Lodge of the Three Firing Glasses was constituted by the Lodge of the Three Skeletons of Breslau, its name afterwards being changed to the "Three Cannons." Its first Master was that curious character, Albrecht Josef Count de Hodiz, who, in the earlier part of the year, had ruled over the Lodge of the Three Skeletons, which he had joined in 1741 and permitted its meetings to be held in his palace. The Minutes of this first meeting, which are reproduced by Lad. de Malczovitch, are as follows :

Vienne ce 17 7-bre, 1742.

La Très-Vénérable Société des Fr-Maçons.

De la Très-Respectable Gr. Loge s'est assemblée aujourd'hui 17-me 7-bre auprès du T. R. Gr. Maître Frère Hodiz.

Sous la domination des frères cy-dessous nommés Hoditz = Cp. Maître, Wallenstein, Gilgens = Surveillants. Colmann = Trésorier, Czernichew = Secrétaire. Assistents—Duni, Michna, Blair = Compagnons. Arnaud = Apprentif, 2 Portiers, 6 frères, Servant.

Reçus : Doria, Hamilton, Joerger, Gondola, Zinzendorf, Tinti, Camellern, Schram, Eigel, Benedetto Testa.

Et comme le T. R. et Ds. Ms. se sont unies d'établir une Gr. Loge ici ; c'est aujourd'hui qu'on en a fait l'ouverture, par la reception des frères cy-dessous nommés, les quels ont été reçu avec toutes les formalités requises et qu'ils se sont soumis a toutes les Loix de la T. V. Société avec la meilleure grâce su Monde.

The proceedings of the Lodge, it should be mentioned, were conducted in French, which will account for the Minutes being written in that language.

It will be observed that, on its formation, the Lodge of the Three Firing Glasses assumed the title of Grand Lodge which de Malczovitch thinks was in anticipation that the Duke of Tuscany would consent to take office at the head of an Austrian Masonic Constitution as Grand Master. Finding that there was no hope of this, the prefix of "Grand" in connexion with the Lodge was dropped two months after the foundation, concurrent with the change of name from the Three Firing Glasses to the Three Cannons, but the prefix was still retained in the description of the Officers of the Lodge. The year 1743 was an important one in the history of the Lodge, for many candidates of distinction sought and obtained initiation. At the end of January, however, Count Charles Francis Sales de Grossa, who had succeeded Count Hodiz in the Chair (the period of the Master's office seems to have been a quarterly one), laid down the gavel, possibly because of his election to the Mastership of the Breslau Lodge.

On March 7, 1743, the Lodge was, without warning, closed by the military, at the command of the Empress and eighteen members, chiefly of the nobility, were taken prisoners. Tradition has it that Francis himself had considerable difficulty in escaping by the back stairs, but there is no evidence that he ever attended the meetings of this Lodge, certainly none that he was ever Master of it, as has sometimes been asserted. Nevertheless, after his death, he was referred to as the "Grand Master of the Old Lodge" and statements appeared in the *Journal der Freymaurer* (Vienna, 1784) which seem to confirm the rumour then current that Masonic Lodges were held in the Imperial Palace. Lad. de Malczovitch says of him :

Although he did not do a great deal for the propagation of the Order, still he did not lack goodwill, but his position and the special conditions prevailing at the Vienna Court must account for his not entering much into the activity of Lodge working. Under such circumstances his chief services consisted in predisposing his august consort and her counsellors, who, for the most part, belonged to the clerical party, in favour of the Order, in protecting, if necessary, any threatened member of it. No doubt, however, the mere fact of the sovereign being generally known to be a member and protector of the Order, was of great advantage to the Craft. Nor did the Brethren throughout Germany omit any fit occasion for exhibiting their gratitude. Francis was elected Emperor of Germany in 1745. The Lodges at Hamburg held, on motion of the Deputy Provincial Grand Master, von Bönigk, a festival meeting at the Town Hall, at which more than a hundred persons of both sexes were present, on which occasion a poem by Wordach, the Secretary and Orator of Lodge Absalom, in praise of the Emperor, was read. A copy printed on satin was sent to the Emperor and the poet was rewarded.

The Secretary of the Embassy, du Vigneau, who was present at the suppressed meeting as a visitor, made a report of the occurrence to his Lodge, Absalom, at Hamburg, on August 5, 1743, but made no mention of the presence of Francis at that meeting, although, of course, it is not possible for any deduction to be made from that fact. His report, which is of interest, was as follows :

The Queen, having received certain intelligence of a Society of Freemasons, sent a detachment of soldiers in order to invade the Lodge. The Commanding Officer called upon those present in the name of the Queen, to deliver up their swords, which were delivered up by all her subjects to the Master, who gave them to the officer, so as to show their obedience to the Queen. The following things were found at the foot of the throne: a pair of compasses, a square, a cord, a gavel, a half rough stone (ashlar), a sword, a bag filled with sand, two bags filled with ivory marks, which were partly of globular and partly of triangular shape, as well as a number of aprons. On the approach of the watch a Brother, directed by the Master, carried away the Palladium of the Order. Persons of any quality were brought to the Rumorhaus [police building]. The princes and foreigners were set free at once and other persons of rank received private confinement. But on her son's birthday [March 19] the Queen forgave them all, but forbade them very severely to meet again. This persecution was occasioned by the clergy and most likely by the Jesuits, who had great influence with Maria Theresa.

Colour is lent to the suggestion that this raid was undertaken at the instigation of the clergy, by the fact that some of the arrested Brethren were imprisoned in the Archbishop's palace.

On March 19, 1743, the Freemasons who had been arrested twelve days previously were released, in honour of the festivities arranged for the birthday of the young Crown Prince and there is documentary evidence that the Lodge continued to hold its meetings in secret. The Minutes of the Lodge afterwards came into the possession of Lodge Frederick of the White Horse at Hanover. Membership of the Lodge of the Three Firing Glasses was not a necessary accompaniment of initiation within its walls, but a separate ceremony.

On December 9, 1743, a Lodge was opened at Halle by Samuel von Bruckenthal, who had been initiated in the Vienna Lodge on March 2 of that year. He obtained a Warrant from the Three Globes Lodge at Berlin and the Lodge conducted its proceedings in the French language, as the Vienna Lodge did. Von Bruckenthal was appointed Deputy Master of the new Lodge and, afterwards, Deputy Grand Master of the Mother Lodge, which, after 1744, became a Grand Lodge. The Halle Lodge, which was called The Three Golden Keys, made rapid progress, for, within a year of its formation, it numbered forty members and a medal was afterwards struck in honour of its founder.

The Bull of Benedict in 1751, issued, it is said, under pressure of the Jesuits, because of the opinion, even amongst Catholics, that the previous Bull had lost its validity by the death of Pope Clement XII, gave fresh courage to the clergy surrounding the Austrian throne and renewed efforts to suppress Freemasonry were made. The Empress, however, held her hand and, according to legend, visited the Lodge in company with one of her ladies, both disguised as men, in order to assure herself that none of her sex were admitted to the mysteries. Having satisfied herself on this point she retired. As this legend, however, derives no support from "inherent probability," not even can the Italian maxim, *Se non è vero, è ben trovato*, be applied to it.

Lad. de Malczovitch says that there was an opinion that this visit was the outcome of Jesuit insinuations of matrimonial unfaithfulness on the part of the Emperor. It may be said, in passing, that Benedict XIV was a great scholar and a devoted friend of science and art ; he is credited with being secretly in favour, or, at any rate, not opposed to Freemasonry and even to have become a member of the Order. In 1751—May 22—the Lodge Frederick of Hanover warranted a branch Lodge, Frederick, at Vienna ; in 1764 the Strict Observance began to constitute Lodges in the Austrian dominions ; and, in the same year, a decree was issued suppressing Freemasonry altogether in the hereditary countries, but it was never seriously carried into effect.

In 1760 there was a Lodge working in Vienna which was known as Loge der Freigibigen, or Lodge of the Generous. It was also known as Loge Royale Militaire de Vienna and is believed to have worked under a French Warrant. It worked a system of High Degrees similar to the Clermont Rite, but they were different in number and denomination. The founder of the system is believed to have been Count John Ferdinand Kuffstein, a friend of Abbé Geloni, the magician. Kuffstein is said to have been created a Grand Master of the VIIIth Templar Province. The High Degrees were worked under the High Chapter of St. Polten (Hippolytus) and the Degrees worked included Scotch Master, Grand Scotch of the Vault of James VI, Rose Croix, Sublime Commander of the Temple, Knight of the Sun, Prince Elu and the Knight of the Orient.

Francis passed away suddenly, through a fit of apoplexy, at Innsbruck, on August 18, 1765, in his fifty-seventh year. Much could be written concerning him, for he left behind him the reputation of being a wise, enlightened and beneficent prince. His wife, being jealous of her power as ruler, he was prevented from interfering in the affairs of government and he devoted himself to commerce and banking, amassing large sums of money, at his death he left twenty million florins in specie and paper in two chests. He was, however, no miser, for he distributed large sums in alleviation of distress. He was extremely fond of natural philosophy, occult science and alchemy, continually employing chemists to search for the philosopher's stone. He patronized men of letters and, to his care and foresight, the Austrian capital owes a cabinet as rich in collection of medals and exhibits in connexion with natural history and natural philosophy as any European city can display. He was more inclined to toleration than was his Consort and always recommended, in matters of religion, persuasion and argument rather than violence and persecution. His love of the occult induced him to join the Rosicrucian and other hermetic Orders and Degrees, particularly that of the Most Perfect Master, or Knight of the Eagle, which Degree had its original seat at Lyons, where it was worked by a Chapter, in which, it is said, "he worked with true zeal unto his very end." He introduced this Degree into Vienna and, amongst the members, was the State surgeon, Fischer, who afterwards joined the Lodge of the Crowned Hope.

Francis was succeeded as Emperor by his son, Joseph II, whom the Empress made Co-Regent (with herself) of Austria. Although not a Freemason, he, on more

than one occasion, expressed a favourable opinion of the Craft. Ernst Denis, in *La Bohème depuis la Montagne Blanc*, says that Joseph II was a philosophical monarch and

reduced the clergy to the state of functionaries, secretly protected Freemasons and flattered himself that he had convinced his subjects that to be good Catholics they had no need to be Romans ; yet he circuitously reinstated the old demands of Rome, the blind submission of the subject, with the remarkable difference that the creed was changed and the discipline henceforth guided, not by the Church, but by the Catechism of the Encyclopædists.

The ten years of the rule of Joseph II were very important and fertile for the growth of Freemasonry in Austrian and Hungarian lands. At this period the Jesuits were straining every nerve to avert their own extinction and the Fraternity of Masons therefore obtained a little breathing time. Lodges began to multiply. In 1771 the Strict Observance founded one—The Three Eagles—in Vienna ; and Zinnendorff followed the lead by erecting two others in the same city, 1771 and 1775. In 1776 Prague already possessed four Lodges and, in 1777, Zinnendorff's National Grand Lodge at Berlin established a Provincial Grand Lodge of Austria at Vienna.

By the death of Maria Theresa—November 19, 1780—the Emperor Joseph II became Emperor of Austria also and the Craft continued to prosper. The greater part of the new Lodges were constituted by Zinnendorff or by the Provincial Grand Lodge at Vienna of the same system ; and in 1784 there were no fewer than 45 Lodges in the various Provinces of the Austrian Empire (8 being in Vienna alone) under the following Provincial Grand Lodges : Austria proper (Vienna), 17 ; Bohemia, 7 ; Hungary, 12 ; Siebenburgen, 3 ; Galicia, 4 ; and Lombardy, 2.

Freemasonry is generally believed to have been introduced into Hungary by the formation of Lodges at Nagy-Szeben, or Hermannstadt, in 1767, or at Eperjes in 1769, but M. de Malczovitch, in *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. vii, p. 184, is of opinion that it was introduced into the country by Albert Casimir, Prince of Poland and Duke of Saxony and Teschen, born 1743, who was initiated at Dresden in 1764 and who lived in Hungary from 1766 to 1780. He was a son of August III, King of Poland and Elector of Saxony and, in 1766, married the Archduchess Maria Christina, the favourite daughter of Maria Theresa, when he received as dowry considerable estates in Hungary and the Dukedom of Teschen. Maria Theresa appointed him a General in the army and Governor of Hungary. He took up his residence at Pressburg in 1766 and, very shortly after that date, there are evidences of the working there of a Lodge named Taciturnas, which de Malczovitch thinks not improbable was founded in 1764 by the migration of Freemasons when the decree was issued for the suppression of the Craft. In 1773 Prince Albert joined the Strict Observance, and quickly became acknowledged as the Protector of the Masonic Order throughout Austria and Hungary. He was no mere figure-head, for he was a frequent visitor at Lodges, particularly those meeting

at Prague and Pressburg and he took an active part in their proceedings. De Malczovitch says that a number of his original letters, lengthy and full of detail, which have been preserved, prove him to have been a very diligent correspondent and his advice to have been thoughtful, prudent, conciliatory and fraternal. There is evidence of the existence of the Lodge Taciturnas in 1774, when it was the only Lodge meeting at Pressburg and it is known that, among its members, were Michael Király and Anthony Holzmann, both State officials; John von Kempel, Major-General and Knight of the Order of Maria Theresa and Captain Alexander von Einsiedl, afterwards Commander at Eperjes.

In 1768 a number of Polish patriotic noblemen had fled to Hungary, when their party was beaten in the war with the Muscovites. Many of them were Freemasons and obtained from the Grand Lodge of Poland at Warsaw a Warrant for a Lodge at Eperjes, one of their places of settlement, to be known as the Lodge of the Virtuous Traveller. The first Master was Isaac Bernhardi and its membership was composed of Polish and Hungarian nobles, gentlemen and other reputable inhabitants of Eperjes and neighbourhood. De Malczovitch says *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. vii, p. 187, that the Lodge meetings were held in the house of a Hungarian nobleman, named Gabriel Fejérvary. Writing in 1894, he said:

This house is said to contain even now a subterranean vault with walls painted blue, with the quarters of heaven marked and having a mosaic pavement. Tradition says "secret meetings" were held in it. Most probably, the meetings of the Lodge were really held there. As early as 1771, the Lodge seems to have met alternately at Eperjes and at Kerckrét and Girált, two small villages in the neighbourhood, most likely some members of the Lodge, landed gentry, resided there.

The Polish element seems to have withdrawn early from the Lodge, as a few years later we find almost exclusively Hungarian names on the roll.

On April 22, 1784, the Provincial Grand Lodges for Bohemia, Hungary, Siebenburgen and Austria met and formed a National Grand Lodge of the Austrian States, with Count Dietrichstein as Grand Master. Their intention was to declare themselves independent, but they met with such opposition from Berlin, that Dietrichstein was obliged to content himself with the position of a Provincial Grand Master under the National—i.e. Zinnendorff—Grand Lodge. In 1785, however, the Emperor ordered the latent Grand Lodge to assert its independence and Berlin was naturally obliged to give way. The other Provincial Grand Lodges appear to have joined the Union. Each Lodge had by its delegate one vote in the Provincial Lodges, which met every three months and each Provincial Grand Lodge had one vote at the half-yearly meeting of the National Grand Lodge (of the Austrian States), thus forming a perfect representative system.

Unfortunately at this time the Emperor interfered in the internal arrangements of the Craft, apparently at the instigation of Dietrichstein, Grand Master. The desire to suppress the Asiatic Brothers—at work in Austria since 1780—was not unconnected with these proceedings. An edict appeared on December 1, 1785,

restricting the number of Lodges in any city to three and ordering all those established in towns where there was no imperial court to close altogether. On the strength of this edict Dietrichstein caused the eight Vienna Lodges to reduce their number by amalgamation to two and greatly to curtail their membership. Each member had to submit to a fresh ballot and many were thereby prevented from taking any further part in the proceedings of the Craft. Several of the best Freemasons in Austria retired in disgust, numerous Lodges were closed by virtue of the edict, the spirit and independence of the Craft had flown and its best days vanished.

Joseph died in 1790 and Leopold II expressed himself as not unfriendly to the Fraternity; but his successor in 1792, Francis II, tried at the Ratisbon Diet to induce the German Princes to suppress Freemasonry throughout the Empire. In this he failed, but the Vienna Lodges, taking the cue, voluntarily closed in 1794 "until better times"; and, in 1795, an imperial edict suppressed the Craft and all secret societies throughout the States of Austria. A further edict of 1801 required all State officials to sign a paper affirming that they did not belong to any such society. Stillson and Hughan, in their *History of Freemasonry and Concordant Orders*, state that Francis II, influenced by the members of an anti-Masonic society, caused all the Lodges to be abolished and, to make his work complete, by a special enactment in 1801, it was provided that every civil officer should bind himself not to belong to, neither to visit, any secret society.

Freemasonry thus died out in Austria and did not revive until very recently, as will later be seen. During the French occupation, 1805-9, some ephemeral Lodges arose, even a short-lived Grand Orient under French jurisdiction; again in 1848 a former Vienna Lodge reopened October 5, but was closed on the 6th. All subsequent attempts proved fruitless as far as Austria is concerned until within the last decade, but Hungary rejoices in a better fate.

In 1861 Dr. Lewis made an attempt to revive the Craft in Hungary and founded a Lodge in Pesth, but it was quickly closed by the police. The political division of 1867, however, by which Austria and Hungary became separate kingdoms under one crown, opened the door to Hungarian Freemasonry, no Hungarian law existing to the contrary. The Government approved in October 1868 the statutes of Lewis' Lodge Unity and, in 1869, two other Lodges arose in Temesvar and Oedenburg. The Unity threw off shoots in Baja, Pressburg and Buda-Pesth, the Temesvar Lodge one in Arad. On January 30, 1870, these seven formed a Grand Lodge of Hungary and were strengthened in the same year by a new Lodge in Szegedin. These eight increased in 1871 to twelve. In 1872 the members already mustered 800 strong. The Grand Master was Franz Pulszky. But although prosperous in numbers, the organization, ritual and spirit of the new body left much to be desired and the Craft seemed destined to wreck on the lee-shore of its own unworthiness, when a judicious change of *personnel* in 1875 enabled it to make a good offing. The new *Constitutions* were approved February 24, 1876, providing a representative system of government and the new ritual came into force on July 1. The immediate consequence of this was the formation of four new Lodges before the end of the

year, since which date the National Grand Lodge of Hungary has proceeded on its way without much of importance to relate, save for its later amalgamation and afterwards suspension during the Great War.

Returning to 1869, we find that in that year several Freemasons who had been initiated abroad opened a Lodge (the proceedings being conducted in the Hungarian tongue) according to the A. and A.R. 33°, under the auspices of the Grand Orient of France. This was soon followed by a second, working in German. As one of the prime movers in this matter, the celebrated Hungarian patriot Klapka should be mentioned. In 1870 these two Lodges made honourable overtures to the Grand Lodge for a fusion of government combined with freedom of ritual. Unfortunately, as already seen in the History of French Freemasonry, such a fusion is difficult and it failed on this as on so many previous occasions. Thrown upon their own resources, the two Lodges constituted—on the part of the Grand Orient of France—further Rose Croix Lodges in Kaschau, Werschetz, Oravicza, Arad, Beregszasz and other towns; and, having instituted the necessary High Chapters, these Lodges in 1872 formed a Grand Orient of Hungary for the A. and A.R. 33°, under Grand Master George Joannovics. In 1875 this Grand Orient exercised jurisdiction over some 20 Lodges with 1,000 members. It has since lost much in importance. The two Grand bodies were on a perfectly friendly footing. The statistics of 1885 were: Grand Lodge in Buda-Pesth, founded January 30, 1870, 26 Lodges and 1,268 members; Grand Orient of Buda-Pesth, founded 1872, 12 Lodges and about 502 members.

In 1886 the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary was formed by the Union of the National Grand Lodge and of the Grand Orient, which latter also worked the Craft Degrees. It was agreed that the Council should consist of Grand Master, two Deputy Grand Masters, twelve Grand office-bearers and twenty-four elected members, this number afterwards being increased to thirty, whilst Honorary and Past Grand Masters ranked immediately after the Deputy Grand Masters. But in spite of the Act of Union, Lodges which formerly worked under the Symbolical Grand Lodge refused to acknowledge or recognize the Degrees of the Grand Orient, which its members were forbidden to take, though Lodges established after the Union were permitted to declare whether they would recognize or not the Degrees of the Ancient and Accepted Rite. It might, therefore, actually happen that the Grand Master was not a member of the Ancient and Accepted Rite and could not, in consequence, preside over the Supreme Council, in which case his place was taken by a subordinate officer possessing the requisite qualification.

In 1911 the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of its foundation, when the various meetings were attended by several hundreds of Brethren. Nine years later, however, all the Hungarian Lodges and Masonic bodies were placed under a ban and a report issued by the Delegates of the British Labour Party, who, in 1920, paid a visit to Hungary, clearly verified the news about the existence of a "white terror" in that country. Freemasons, who had taken no part in the establishment of Bolshevism, became the victims

of the reactionary reign. It became a crime to be a Freemason and the punishment consisted in the discharge of public servants, the internment and imprisonment of innocent individuals. Masonic Lodges were stigmatized as "immoral and unpatriotic secret societies." On April 25, 1920—more than a month before the official dissolution of the Masonic bodies, the "Awakening Hungarians," under the leadership of the President, Zsirkay János, entered by force the home of Lodge Arpad. They turned over the furniture, confiscated the documents and sealed up the library. This example soon found followers. Lodge Vilagossag in Ujpest was entered by force and the goods confiscated; the same thing happened in Nagykanizsa. In Budapest, on May 15, 1920, the headquarters of the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary, as well as the buildings of Lodges Galileo and Hajnal, were requisitioned by terrorist detachments, without any formal procedure. A fortnight later, the Hungarian Government gave its official sanction to these atrocities and dissolved all Masonic bodies.

This action was taken despite the fact that, during the war of 1914-1918 the Hungarian Lodges organized hospitals at Budapest; they rebuilt one of the villages which had been destroyed by the Russians; they procured situations for demobilized officers; they assisted soldiers who had returned from the front; and did all they could to obtain just and kindly treatment for their unhappy country. In addition Hungarian Masonry created a large number of social and beneficent societies, which occupied themselves with the protection and succour of men, women and children, of the sick, poor and abnormal, although such societies were not officially connected with the Craft, nor was its name advertised in connexion therewith. Thousands received free of charge supplies of milk and bread, grants of shoes and clothing, free medical treatment and were housed at a trivial cost. It was the love of neighbour as practised by the Freemason.

In Austria proper there sprang up many Masonic clubs, merely social clubs, composed exclusively of Freemasons, for, as Lodges, they were forbidden to meet. Vienna, however, being so near the Hungarian frontier, many of the clubs took a short railway trip in order to meet as Lodges. Thus, in Pressburg and Oedenburg, there were several Lodges whose members were all resident in Vienna. In other large towns of the Empire, not so fortunately situated, Freemasons had to remain content with meeting as a social club.

On December 8, 1918, the Grand Lodge of Vienna was founded on a Charter issued by the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary. The Constitution and Ritual are based fundamentally on the Ancient Charges and Landmarks of the Order. A belief in the Supreme Being is demanded from candidates, the Volume of the Sacred Law is present on the altar, there are three Degrees and the Temple legend is the basis of the ritual. Candidates must be above the age of twenty-four years; there must be an interval of one year between the first and second Degrees and two years between the second and third. Secrecy is required and no discussion of religion or politics is permitted. According to the latest returns available the Grand Lodge of Vienna has jurisdiction over twenty-five Lodges, with a

membership of between 1,600 and 1,700 and there is a steady progression. The Vienna Lodges are securing gradually members prominent in both social and intellectual rank. Politicians, men of science, famous artists and others are now numbered among Austrian Freemasons. The meetings reveal a very interesting selection of instructive lectures and the solemn initiations, embellished by the famous art of Vienna musicians, are festivals of memorable impression. Built up, since its beginnings, on the basis of impartial humanity, without any prejudices of theological or national character, Austrian Freemasonry has seen already its first and highest aim in moderating and reconciling all opposites of any kind among individuals, parties and nations. In consequence of these convictions, the Grand Lodge of Vienna, in 1922, declared "the promotion of inward and outward peace" to be its chief programme.

In May 1920 it addressed the following communication to several Grand Lodges, with the object of seeking recognition :

The Grand Lodge of Vienna, which has been founded on December 8, 1918, hereby applies to you with the fraternal request of recognition as a rightfully constituted Masonic Grand Lodge ; at the same time expressing the earnest desire of taking up the Brotherly relations with you, eventually the mutual appointment of representatives.

The Grand Lodge of Vienna comprises at present fourteen Lodges and, approximately, 1,100 members. In the former Austrian Empire, Masonry was prohibited and the work had to be performed on Hungarian territory, under the protection of the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary, while the official release and the formal recognition had to be postponed owing to the revolutionary occurrences in Hungary. They have now been carried through, in proof of which we enclose a copy of our Charter for your kind perusal.

The Grand Lodge of Vienna has been constituted on the basis of the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary, with but few modifications, occasioned by the circumstances. We are working at the completion of our definite Constitution.

The Grand Lodge of Vienna is already in fraternal correspondence with several Grand Lodges in Germany, with the Swiss Grand Lodge Alpina, with the Grand Orient of the Netherlands, with the Grand Lodges of Italy, Denmark and Portugal, as also with a considerable number of various Lodges in the countries named. A great many of these have given high-minded proof of their fraternal sentiments by the transmission of copious gifts for our suffering population.

During 1929 the revision of the *Constitutions* was completed as well as the ritual of the First Degree. A voluntary group of competent and interested Brethren worked out a *Merkblatt für Suchende* ("Notes for Seekers"), giving the necessary instructions concerning the objects and aims of the Craft and the laws and constitutions of the Grand Lodge of Vienna. The same group arranged three evenings of instruction for the neophytes of all Lodges, when competent and experienced speakers imparted useful information concerning the ritual, the symbolism and history of the Craft and Masonic law. The adolescent sons of Masons have formed

an association, called *Die Kette* ("The Chain") for the promotion of social union, study and the cultivation of the spirit of Brotherhood. The Lodges continue to give financial support to humanitarian, benevolent and educational organizations, and have united in supplying a substantial subvention to the local Committee for the erection of a Lessing monument in Vienna. One zealous Brother, who has repeatedly given money for humanitarian purposes, has placed at the disposal of the Grand Lodge a considerable sum to be devoted to the promotion of peace within the Republic of Austria, whose existence was threatened in 1929.

The Grand Lodge of Vienna was recognized by the United Grand Lodge of England at its Quarterly Communication in December, 1930.

CHAPTER V

FREEMASONRY IN RUSSIA

ACCORDING to Russian tradition, Freemasonry in that country even precedes the era of the Grand Lodge of England (1717), for it is gravely asserted that Peter the Great was initiated by Sir Christopher Wren and that, before the close of the seventeenth century, there existed a Lodge in Petersburg, with General Lefort as Master, General Patrick Gordon and Peter himself as Senior and Junior Wardens respectively, Lefort and Gordon being intimate friends and counsellors of Peter the Great. This claim need only be recorded and not discussed seriously. In 1731, on January 24, Captain John Phillips was, according to the Archives of the Grand Lodge of England, appointed Provincial Grand Master for Russia and Germany, but there is no record that he ever exercised any Masonic functions and his appointment does not necessarily imply that there were any Lodges then existing in Russia. On the other hand, according to *Latomia*, there appears some reason to believe that in 1732 or 1734, General James Keith, who had entered the Russian service in 1728, was Master of a Lodge at Leningrad, then, of course, Petersburg. According to p. 333 of the 1756 edition of the *Constitutions*, Keith was appointed Provincial Grand Master for Russia in 1740 by his kinsman, John Keith, Earl of Kintore, Grand Master of England in that year. He appears to have met with greater success than Phillips, for the writer in *Latomia* (vol. xxi, p. 115) confirms on fresh documentary evidence Nettlesblad's previous assertions that, in 1750, the Lodge of Silence was at work in Petersburg and a second Lodge, named North Star, in Riga. These were followed by others, the traces of which are lost. A subsequent Grand Master, Böber, however, informs us, that all operations were conducted in the greatest secrecy, "in the loft of some out-of-the-way, retired house," which may account for the curious fact that the existence of these Lodges was never transmitted to the Grand Lodge of England. It must also be borne in mind that, with very rare exceptions, English Provincial Grand Masters on the Continent and in foreign lands seldom kept their superiors fully informed with regard to the state of Freemasonry in the districts under their charge, often granting Warrants for Lodges without reference to the chief authority.

Keith is often referred to as "Lord" James Keith and the Earl of Kintore as his brother. Both are errors. James Keith was the brother of John Keith, tenth Earl Marischal of Scotland, cousin of the John Keith, Earl of Kintore, who was Grand Master of Scotland in 1738 and Grand Master of England in 1740, in which year he was appointed Provincial Grand Master for Russia. He was the

son of William, ninth Earl Marischal and his wife, Lady Mary Drummond, daughter of the fourth Earl of Perth, Lord Chancellor of Scotland. A great affection existed between James and his brother, the tenth Earl; both had been forced to flee from Britain, because of their participation in the Rebellion, for which their estates were attainted. On September 20, 1715, they, at the Cross of Aberdeen, had proclaimed James VIII as king, but, although they served through the Rebellion, they were, apparently, only half-hearted adherents of the Pretender's cause. Unfortunately the *Memoirs of Field-Marshal James Keith*, written by himself, extend only from 1714 to 1734, when they are brought to a sudden and unfinished conclusion and they contain no allusions or references to Freemasonry. Carlyle's *Frederick the Great* has many references to James Keith. When he fled from Britain he entered the service of the Spanish king, but had eventually to quit that service because he (Keith) was a staunch Protestant and his religion was an invincible obstacle. The King of Spain, who greatly appreciated his services, recommended him to Peter II of Russia and presented him with a thousand crowns when he left Spain. He also begged him to return to Spain should he find it possible to conform to the Roman Catholic faith. In February 1740 Keith revisited London, when, according to Buchan's *Account of the Keith Family*, he was presented to George II, whom he acknowledged as his lawful sovereign, a proof that he was no longer an advocate of the claims of the Pretender and his followers; Buchan says that he was received "as a great general and the minister of a great power." He was present at the Communication of the Grand Lodge of England held on March 28, 1740, when the Earl of Kintore, who had been granted the estates of the Earl Marischal, was elected as Grand Master of England. The name is recorded in the Minutes as "James Keith, Esq.; Lieutenant-General in the Service of Russia" (quoted from Entick's *Constitutions*, 5757-1757). The exact date when Keith left London for Russia is not known, but it was certainly not before May 1740.

Under his rule as Provincial Grand Master, Russian Freemasonry seems at once to have acquired fame. Before his time it was almost entirely confined to foreign merchants. In 1756, says Boris Telepneff, in his pamphlet on *Russian Masons*, a report was made to the Empress Elizabeth concerning a Lodge in Petersburg, which consisted of about thirty-five members, among whom were some of the most talented representatives of the newer generation of Petersburg society. The names included A. P. Sumarokov, a noted writer; Prince Scherbatov and Boltin, future historians of considerable ability; F. Mamonov, of literary fame; and others, in addition to prominent men, such as Roman Voronzov, Prince Golitzine, Prince Troubetzkoy.

In the same year, states Puipin, in *Russian Masonry in the Eighteenth Century*, the Secret Chancellery of the Empire made an inquiry into the "Masonic Sect" which did not reveal anything dangerous, and Masonry was allowed to continue, but under police supervision. The register of Freemasons which is appended to the report contains the names of some very renowned Russians in social life, in addition to prominent musicians and merchants.

Dr. Ernest Friedrichs, in *Freemasonry in Russia and Poland*, states that John Eugene Schwarz is commonly regarded as being the "Father" of Russian Freemasonry, but there is no evidence that he was ever a member of the Masonic Order, although he appears to have belonged to a society which claimed to be Rosicrucian. If it was really Rosicrucian then he must have been a Freemason, since only Masons were admitted to the Rosicrucian Order. Petroff, in his *History of Russian Literature*, refers to him as follows :

Russian Masonry trained many enlightened and noble men who proved themselves in the highest degree to be useful collaborators in the various branches of the Russian administration ; it declared war against the philosophy of the Encyclopædists and that corruption of morals which that philosophy had provoked in Russian society. At the time of the mighty spreading and the prosperous position of Masonry in Russia Schwarz was at its head. At first he taught German and, later, Philosophy at the University of Moscow. In so doing he imbued the young students with the thought that knowledge has no meaning if it leads to atheism and immorality. All his lectures were directed against the scepticism and the materialism of the Encyclopædists. In order to infuse into the young people a real love of knowledge, he founded learned societies, which helped him in his endeavour to spread scientific enlightenment. He won the great sympathy and the profound gratefulness of both the higher and the lower classes in Moscow. The foundation of schools, the publication of manuals and of books of a moral and religious tendency, the opening of printing-offices and bookshops, the training of teachers, the sending of them abroad with the view of completing their education, the founding of hospitals and chemists' shops—these are the characteristics of Schwarz's enlightened activity and of the blessings it produced.

This philanthropic work was also undertaken by Nikolai Ivanovitch Novikov (1744-1818), upon whom the mantle of Schwarz is said to have fallen, but who seems to have hovered between Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism. He was the founder of the *Utrenni Svet*, the first Russian monthly periodical and the editor of the *Moscow Gazette*, by means of which, as well as in independent publications, he worked indefatigably and undauntedly for the enlightenment and the moral betterment of the people. He founded a number of schools and established printing offices in which the manuals for these schools were printed. He also erected hospitals and established chemists' shops, where medicines were dispensed gratuitously to the needy. Novikov was initiated in 1775 in Petersburg at a time when he was on the cross roads of scepticism and faith and he joined the Craft on the understanding that he would leave it immediately should he find in it anything against his conscience. Later, although he says he "obtained *four* English Degrees" (Telepneff, *op. cit.*, p. 15), he pursued his investigations and joined other Rites, including the Swedish, eventually becoming a really convinced Rosicrucian. Freemasonry was always regarded in Russia as a preparatory school for Rosicrucianism. Freemasons, not satisfied with the usual Masonic tenets, endeavoured to penetrate the mysteries of nature and science in the higher Rosicrucian Degrees in which they studied the various so-called secret sciences. Of Novikov Petroff wrote :

The secret character of the Masonic society to which Novikov belonged, its secret rites, its enormous wealth in material possessions and its widespread charities, aroused the discontentedness of outsiders with him and his companions. With them even many well-educated persons became discontented because the Masons, in their endeavours to penetrate all the secrets of Nature, would not study Nature *per se* by means of scientific experiments ; they declined to accept the results obtained by the natural sciences, believed in various so-called secret sciences, e.g. alchemy, magic and the Cabala. Although the philanthropic activity of the Masons ought to have attracted the sympathy of the Church, the latter was dissatisfied with them on account of their arbitrary interpretation of the Holy Scriptures and on account of their mingling pure Christian teaching with ancient heathenism and with modern Judaism. Novikov had also taken the field in earnest against the Jesuits who just at that time enjoyed to the full the protection and sympathy of the empress.

Fisher, also, in his work *Masonry in the Orient of Russia during the reign of Catherine II*, referring to the establishment of one of Novikov's printing-offices, says :

When this establishment was as yet scarcely half-finished, it was unexpectedly destroyed along with its founders. It is well known that from the earliest times a strong antipathy had prevailed between the rich Moscovite nobles, who were fond of living in independence ; and the court nobles of Petersburg ; the sovereigns had also found it more politic to attract the Moscovite magnates to their persons and weaken and leave desolate the ancient capital of the empire. This alliance of well-to-do men could not fail to create a sensation at court. In particular, its members were suspected of being Freemasons and, before long, a considerable number of heavy charges were brought against them. It was declared that they promoted an enlightenment which was contrary to all the principles of a monarchical state ; that they endeavoured to secure the favour of the people by the distribution of victuals and medicines and that they had an arsenal hidden away in their cellars for the equipment of an army. And now the die was cast. The prefect of police received orders to set a watch all round the Institute, to seal everything and to search for arms. They found neither cannon nor a large provision of gunpowder, but a considerable number of pistols and rifles, not hidden away, but quite conspicuous in the houses of several rich officials who were enthusiastic sportsmen.

The charge was, of course, a false one ; and Lopukhin, a prominent Freemason, was the author of a work in support of monarchy. The real accusation, however, was that of being in league with Paul I, who was opposed to Catherine.

In 1792, according to Dr. A. S. Rappaport, Novikov was arrested at the instigation of Catherine II and confined at Schlüsselburg, his printing houses closed and all his enterprises ruined. He was not released until November 1796.

This is anticipating the chronological order of events, but it must be pointed out that Freemasonry, as practised in Russia, was in opposition to the French system, in that it demanded from its candidates a belief in the existence of a Supreme Being and, while inculcating brotherly love, forbade participation in any revolutionary movements and enjoined a faithful recognition of the supremacy of the State,

making its ideals the fostering of the arts and sciences, the improvement of health and the education of the people.

In point of fact, Catherine II, at the commencement of her long reign in 1762, was not opposed to Freemasonry and, the necessity for secrecy no longer existing, the position of the Craft improved. It may be presumed that the Society hitherto had been more or less under English influence, but about this time great innovations forced themselves into favour. The earliest of all appears to have been of purely Russian origin. Count Melesino, although a Russian officer, was a Greek by birth and Master of the Lodge of Silence in Petersburg. He was a Lieutenant-General in the Imperial army and is said to have been a man of talent, able to conduct the affairs of a Lodge in four different languages with equal fluency. The Rite named after him consisted of seven Degrees, the first three of which were the three Degrees of Craft Masonry and the remainder were : 4, The Dark Vault ; 5, The Scotch Master and Knight's Degrees ; 6, The Philosopher's Degree ; and 7, the Grand Priest of the Temple or the Spiritual Knighthood. In Lodge Silence this Rite—which spread throughout the empire, even beyond its borders—was perfected, probably by the talented Master himself. It superimposed four Degrees on the Craft and it is not improbable that in the 7^o, *Magnus Sacerdos Templariorum*, Starck found the inspiration for his Clerical Rite. In April 1782 Melesino retired from Masonry and to Moscow, alleging political motives as his reason ; whilst, on the other hand, Nettlebladt thinks he acted from prudence, fearing that the Grand Lodge would ultimately overshadow and destroy his Rite and preferring to suppress it himself. In either case, it ceased with his absence from the scene.

Melesino, says Telepneff, used to combine the Templar Rituals and Starck's semi-Catholic Church ceremonies with mystical teachings which, in later days, developed under the auspices of the Rosy Cross, and met with conspicuous success in Russia. Meetings of the members of the Seventh Degree could only take place in a church or a specially dedicated chapel. A mass was usually said first and a solemn rite of benediction of rose-oil celebrated. Their meetings were described as "Assemblies of true disciples of ancient wise teachers of the world now called Brethren of the Rosy Cross and Clerics," but they did not identify themselves with the German Rosicrucians, although they were also studying subjects connected with occult chemistry, the Cabala, etc. Their belief of the real aim of Freemasonry was "to attain true Wisdom."

In 1765 the Strict Observance made its entry into Russia. The first Lodge under this system was founded by the Lodge at Wismar (Starck's) and soon after a Chapter was erected at Petersburg, with Lüder as Grand Master. Members, whose names will occur hereafter, were Professor Böber, Count Bruce, Prince Dolgoruky, Prince Gagarin, Prince Kurakin, etc. In Courland and Riga there were other Chapters. The gorgeous ceremonies and high sounding Degrees in this system attracted Russian noblemen, but the Rite of Strict Observance never played any really important part in Russian Freemasonry.

In 1768 Starck, accompanied by Von Prangen, came to Petersburg for the

second time ; and on June 23 formed a secular Chapter there, Phœnix, of the Strict Observance, adding thereto—September 20, 1768—a Clerical Chapter, possibly based on the Melesino Rite, with which Starck may have become acquainted during his former residence in 1763-65. Disputes, however, arose—October 22—and, on November 17, Starck was excluded. In the following year—November 16, 1769—the Lax Observance Lodge, Constancy, went over to the Strict Observance Rite, uniting with the Phœnix and no more is heard of the Clerical Chapter after December 12, 1769. Starck shortly after left Russia and the Clerics were retransferred to Wismar. But the Strict Observance still remained strongly represented among the Russian Rites.

The Emperor Peter III (1762) is said to have presented Lodge Constancy with a house and himself to have conducted the Masonic work at Oranienbum.

In 1771 the Zinnendorff system obtained a footing in Russia. Zinnendorff had procured—by somewhat irregular means—a part of the Swedish Ritual and, seceding from the Strict Observance, had established a new rite in Germany. George von Reichel and George Rosenberg were the introducers of the rite into Petersburg. Reichel came first and established the Lodges Apollo in Petersburg, March 27, 1771 ; Isis at Revel ; Harpocrates, of which Prince Nikolai Troubetzkoy became the Master, at Petersburg, 1772 ; and a military Lodge in 1773. Reichel was head of the scientific section of the National Military School for the sons of nobles. He had been a member of the Lodge of the Three Golden Keys in Berlin, on which system he founded the Apollo Lodge. Rosenberg, a former Prussian captain of horse, joined him in 1774, bringing, without Zinnendorff's knowledge, the complete Rituals, etc. ; revived the Apollo, which had become dormant ; founded another, Horus and, in 1776, Latona and Nemesis. In addition a Lodge Apollo was founded at Riga and a Lodge Isis at Revel. In these proceedings they were assisted by their brothers Charles Reichel and William Rosenberg (see *Latomia*, vol. xxi, pp. 117-19). Friedrichs says that George Reichel had a strong supporter in Count Panin, one of Catherine's ministers, who stood high in her favour and who, as ambassador in Sweden, had become very much attached to the Swedish system.

Reichel, who had been attached to the house of the Prince of Braunschweig, had received personal instructions from Zinnendorff before leaving Berlin to do everything possible for the glory and increase of the Zinnendorff Rite in Russia. Telepneff (*Russian Masons*, p. 9) quotes the following letter, dated October 15, 1771, addressed by Zinnendorff to Yelaguin :

With the purpose of strengthening as much as possible friendship and accord among your Brethren, I considered it my duty to inform you thereof [of the fact of the foundation of the Apollo Lodge] and to recommend Bro. Reichel as well as Lodges [i.e. those established in Russia according to the Zinnendorff Rite] to your protection, confidence and benevolence.

It was about this time that there came about an intimate connexion between Russia and the Knights of Malta. Waliszewski tells the story in his life of *Paul the First of Russia* (pp. 238-40) in the following words :

The relations of Russia with the Knights of Malta began about the end of the seventeenth century, when the Field-Marshal Boris Chérémétief, while on a mission from Peter the Great to the Levant, visited the island and received a welcome which inaugurated a period of continuous friendship. Catherine's enterprising policy tended to strengthen these bonds. Bailiffs and commanders of the Order took service in the Russian navy ; Russian officers went to Malta to finish their nautical education. Diplomatic representations were exchanged and Cavalcho, Catherine's clever agent, strove not unsuccessfully to create a Russian party in the island. In 1770 the Empress went so far as to treat with Ximenes, who was then Grand Master, with a view to common action against the Turks. It was only the opposition of France which prevented these engagements from being carried out. Catherine also favoured the Order in the matter of the Volhynian estate of Ostrog, which the Order was ultimately to inherit and, in 1775, a Grand Priory was established in Poland under the guarantee of the three courts of Petersburg, Vienna and Berlin, with an assured annuity of 120,000 florins.

Meanwhile the Craft had also been at work under the tutelage of the Grand Lodge of England. Of this period there is fortunately an almost contemporary account in the *Freemasons' Calendars* of 1777 and 1778. In June 1771 some English merchants in Petersburg erected the Lodge of Perfect Unity, which was numbered 414 and dated June 1, 1771, in the Engraved Lists.

This Lodge is referred to in the *Freemasons' Calendar* for 1777 in the following words :

The first regular Lodge which was established in the vast empire of Russia was the Lodge of Perfect Unity, constituted June 1771, in Petersburg. The chairman and most of the members were English merchants residing there, who conducted this new institution with great regularity and activity. As many Russian nobles were Masons at the period of the establishment of this Lodge, at their request they received from the Grand Lodge of England in 1772 a Warrant for his Excellency John Yelaguin (Senator) to become Provincial Grand Master in the Russian Empire. This gentleman exercised his office with such success that many excellent Lodges were erected in Petersburg and other places.

An official copy of its Minute-book from June 13, 1771, to May 30, 1772, made for the perusal of the Grand Master of England, is preserved in the archives of that Grand Lodge and plainly shows that the Lodge was at work before receiving its Warrant ; that although composed largely of English Masons it recognized and granted the following additional degrees : Scots Master, Elu and Philosopher ; and that, although a warranted Lodge, it admitted visitors of unchartered Lodges under certain restrictions. It contains also the copy of a letter from Grand Secretary Heseltine, February 29, 1772, presented by Louquin, announcing the appointment of Yelaguin as Provincial Grand Master and resolutions to honour him as Grand Master of all future Lodges, but to refuse him any authority over themselves. In the midst of the quarrel which ensued, this interesting book breaks off. But the

Minutes of the Committee of Charity, October 28, 1772, inform us that the Lodge was directed to submit. The *Freemasons' Calendar* terms this the first *regular* Lodge, and speaks of the number of Russian nobles who were at that time Masons. One of them, Senator John Yelaguin, had made fruitless efforts to procure a patent of Grand Master in Berlin and Hamburg and, in 1772, sent Louquin to England on a similar mission, as stated above (*Latomia*, vol. xxi, p. 307). Friedrichs spells the name Elagin and describes him as a "Privy Councillor, Senator and member of the Imperial Cabinet." The Duke of Beaufort, Grand Master, had granted him a patent as Provincial Grand Master for all the Russias and this resulted in the formation of the following Lodges:—No. 466, Nine Muses; No. 467, Urania; No. 468, Bellona—all in Petersburg; Mars, No. 469, Clio (of which the Empress Catherine is said to have been the patroness), No. 470, at Jassy and Moscow respectively, all in the year 1774. The Patent to Yelaguin was granted by the Grand Lodge of England on February 28, 1772, but the Minutes of the Atholl Grand Lodge (Ancients) for June 30, 1773, contains the following entry:

"Heard a letter from G. Sec. M'Dougall, setting forth that an application had been made to the G. Lodge of Scotland for them to confer a Masonical mark of distinction on his Excellency the Senator Yellegan (*sic*), Grand Master of Russia, requesting the opinion of this Grand Lodge to be transmitted, with any Forms they may have made use of on the like occasions." Resolved, that the Grand Lodge of Scotland had power to confer such distinction.

Yelaguin—whose full name in Russian was Ivan Perfilievich Yelaguin—belonged to an ancient family of Russian noblemen and, for many years, enjoyed the friendship and confidence of the Empress Catherine. He was the founder of the Russian theatre and an author of no little renown. He states in his *Memoirs* (Russian Archives, 1864, vol. i, p. 591) that he was led to join Freemasonry from curiosity and vanity, being attracted by the mystery of Masonic proceedings and by the possibility of association with men much higher in rank, character and decorations than himself. Telepneff (*Russian Masons*, p. 8) claims that the principal part in the healthy development of Russian Masonry was played by Yelaguin. After a period of Masonic doubt, through steady work, discussions with experienced Masons and the study of works on Masonry, he devoted his energies "to the discovery of Masonic wisdom," which, generally speaking, was the sole or principal object of those Russians who entered the Higher Degrees. He became one of its greatest lovers and his labours placed him as an acknowledged authority at the head of his Russian Brethren. He was content with the three Symbolic Degrees, which he held were sufficient and affirmed that he had "not given to anybody even the Fourth Degree," but what he meant by that expression is not known, since Symbolic Masonry consisted of but three Degrees. Yelaguin spent a considerable sum of money in the purchase of Masonic manuscripts, plans and Rituals, for

he considered that, in his position as Provincial Grand Master, he should know all there was to be known. His system followed the English rule, but admitted none but Christians, hence the exclusion of the Jews from Russian Freemasonry.

Lodge Mars, as befits its name, was a military Lodge, composed exclusively of soldiers serving in the field, where it carried out its operations during the Turco-Russian War.

Friedrichs says that the Grand Lodge of England sent to the Grand Lodge in Berlin a protest against the establishment of Lodges by that body, declaring that "the London Grand Lodge has the exclusive right of constituting other Lodges in the whole world," but added that it did not intend to found any Lodges within the German empire if the full right was allowed it to do so in Russia. Putting on one side the Strict Observance and Melesino's Lodges, we thus find two distinct Rites in use at the same time—Zinnendorff's and the English. Yelaguin, however, wanted a Ritual and, as England had never furnished copies of its ceremonies, he applied to Reichel and Rosenberg. Now, although these Masons hailed from the Grand National Lodge at Berlin, they must have been desirous of closer relations with Sweden, the original fount, for they advised Yelaguin to apply to Stockholm. It is probable that Yelaguin's high position impressed the Grand Lodge of Sweden with the idea that the only chance for its system to survive was under *his* protection; at any rate, in 1775, it counselled Reichel and Rosenberg to effect a fusion and to acknowledge the Senator as Provincial Grand Master. The result was that Yelaguin abandoned the English system, accepted the Swedish Ritual and Reichel called upon his Lodges to join with those of the Senator. Harpocrates, Horus, Latona and Nemesis (1776) agreed and, on September 3, 1776 (Polick, in his *History of Russian Freemasonry*, erroneously gives the year as 1783 and Findel follows him), a National Grand Lodge of Russia, under Yelaguin, was erected. Melesino took office in this Grand Lodge, which, as well as Yelaguin's original Lodge, Nine Muses, met in the Senator's own house on the island Yelaguin. But differences soon arose. George Rosenberg and his Lodge Apollo never joined the Grand Lodge; Reichel, who had quarrelled with Rosenberg, withdrew from Freemasonry altogether; Prince Trubezkoy, who had previously applied in vain to the Grand National (or Zinnendorff) Lodge for a Grand Master's patent, jealous of Yelaguin's preferment, retired to Moscow with the Lodges Osiris (composed, in the main, of Russian princes), Isis and Latona. Among the notabilities who here gathered round him may be mentioned, as of future interest, the Princes Dolgoruky and Gagarin (*Latomia*, vol. xxi, p. 310). We thus see that Yelaguin's governing body had little chance of permanent success; nevertheless, in the following years, two more Russian Lodges were added to the English roll—those of Liebau, Courland, No. 524, 1780; and Astrea at Riga, No. 504, 1787, constituted by Yelaguin, January 4, 1785, confirmed by the Grand Lodge of England, August 21, 1787.

Telepneff (*Russian Masons*, p. 11) says that there were eighteen Lodges which formed the National Grand Lodge of Russia, which he specifies as follows:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--------------------|
| 1. Harpocrates, Petersburg | } | founded according to the Zinnendorff system. | | |
| 2. Isis, Revel | | | | |
| 3. Horus, Petersburg | | | | |
| 4. Oatona, Petersburg | | | | |
| 5. Nemesis, Petersburg | | | | |
| 6. Perfect Unity, Petersburg | | | | |
| 7. Nine Muses, Petersburg | | | } | Yelaguin's Lodges. |
| 8. Urania, Petersburg | | | | |
| 9. Bellona, Petersburg | | | | |
| 10. Clio, Moscow. | | | | |
| 11. Silence (Discretion), Petersburg; successively under the Strict Observance, Melesino and Zinnendorff systems. | | | | |
| 12. St. Catherine of the Three Pillars, Archangel; system unknown. | | | | |
| 13. Perseverance, Moscow; first under Strict Observance, then under Zinnendorff systems. | | | | |
| 14. Minerva, Military Lodge in Sagondy, Moldavia; a Yelaguin Lodge. | | | | |
| 15. Thalia, Polotzk; a Yelaguin system Lodge. | | | | |
| 16. Equality, Petersburg. | | | | |
| 17. Candour, Moscow; Strict Observance. | | | | |
| 18. Charity, Petersburg. | | | | |

This want of consistency gave rise to fresh complications. Sweden, at that time, was still ambitious of retrieving its place as a great power, which it had lost on the death of Charles XII. In 1777 Gustavus III of Sweden, himself a Mason, visited Petersburg in the company of the Duke of Sudermania and a Grand festival was held in Rosenberg's independent Lodge (Apollo) on June 26 and 27, on which occasions the Masonic supremacy of Sweden was announced as desirable (*Latomia*, vol. xxi, p. 311). The Russian ambassador at Stockholm, Prince Kurakin, in alliance with George Rosenberg strove for the same object. William Rosenberg was Secretary to the Russian Embassy and in communication with his brother and Prince Gagarin. Kurakin was admitted to the highest Degrees of the Swedish Rite and promised by Karl of Sudermania a patent for a national Grand Lodge, Swedish Rite, provided he could induce a sufficiency of Lodges to concur in the project.

In 1777, says Friedrichs, there were eighteen Lodges working under the Provincial Lodge of Petersburg, according to the Swedo-Berlin system, among which were ten in Petersburg alone, three at Moscow, one at Revel, one at Archangel, one at Polots in the Government of Witebsk, one Field Lodge at Kagodury in Moldavia. Members, as well as the highest officials, among whom, besides Yelaguin, were Count Panin and Prince Gabriel Gagarin, together with Melesino, who, as soon as Masonic Lodges had been established, had given up his own system, which was an imitation of the Strict Observance, all worked with ardour and devotedness at the task which now fell to their lot, and the single or private Lodges, as well as the Provincial Grand Lodge, showed signs of power and prosperity. Above all, adds Friedrichs, they considered it to be their duty to appear

before the world as the backbone of the nation and, therefore, kept everyone most carefully at a distance whose course of life and position did not bear looking at with a magnifying glass.

In 1777 also Kurakin returned, raised Gagarin, Melesino and others to the highest Swedish Degrees and seduced many of Yelaguin's Lodges towards the end of 1778. Böber also, as a deputy of Rosenberg, founded a new Lodge in Revel. The consent of Karl of Sudermania having been obtained, these steps were followed—May 25, 1779—by the erection of a Swedish Provincial Grand Lodge for Russia, with Prince Gagarin as Grand Master; also of a Grand Chapter—December 24, 1779. The new Lodge also assumed the same title as Yelaguin's, i.e. National Grand Lodge. The Swedish system was favoured because it was a Christian system and Freemasonry in Russia has always been Christian.

The following is a copy of the Patent granted on May 7, 1779, by the Grand Lodge of Sweden to Prince G. P. Gagarin, taken, with permission, from a copy in the possession of Boris Telepneff:

To the Glory of the Most High, in Holy Trinity One Great Architect of the Universe.

We, Karl, by the Grace of God Hereditary Prince of Sweden, of Goths and Vandals, Duke of Sudermania, Heir-Apparent to Norway, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein and Stormar, Count of Oldenburg and Delmenhorst, Illuminated Magister and the Wisest Vicar of Solomon for the Northern Province, formed of Swedish and Gothic Kingdoms, of the Grand Dukedom of Finland and of the Russian Empire, Prefect and Supreme Chief of all Lodges of St. Andrew and St. John, legally constituted and regularly working in these districts.

Do hereby wish to all Most Illuminated and Illuminated, Most Enlightened and Enlightened, Most Worshipful, Worshipful, Diligent and Zealous Brethren, Knight-Freemasons, to all Grand Provincial Masters, Members of the Supreme Council of the Order, Grand Officers, Commanders, Knights of Temple Ribbon, Knights, Favourites of Solomon and Knights Stewards, Masters in the Chair of lower Lodges, Deputy Masters, Wardens and other Lodge Officers, Scottish Masters, Brethren Elect, St. John's Masters, Fellow Craftsmen and Apprentices—Peace, Unity, Salvation and Blessings in the Sacred Numbers of 3, 7, and 9 in all Mercies bestowed on us by God, One in Trinity, the Most High Builder of the Universe and Preserver of Our Order.

Inasmuch as our Brother the Most Illuminated Mason and Knight of Purple Ribbon, Prince Gavril Gagarin, was dutifully and obediently performing Our commands, decreed by Us to the glory, sustenance and blossoming of the Order and inasmuch as We had always recognized him to be zealous, persevering, honest, faithful and obedient, on the examination of his work, We found the above-mentioned Prince perfectly acquainted with the Royal Art of Freemasons, in consideration of this and, in order to signify Our most sincere friendship towards him, We entrust this luminous Prince with the Supreme Government under Our Direction over all Lodges of Russia, acknowledged by Us and appoint him Grand Master.

Therefore, We command all Our Brethren and Knight-Freemasons belonging

to the Union of the Provincial Lodge of Russia, Ruling Masters and their Deputies, Wardens and Officers, also Scottish Masters and all Masters-elect, St. John's Masters, Fellow-Craftsmen and Apprentices, to obey the above-mentioned Prince, otherwise they will break the Knight-Mason's oath given by them of their own free will and accord and will expose themselves to accusation and punishment according to that oath.

This is given in witness of Our decision to all Brethren, Knight-Freemasons, present or absent, wherever dispersed over the surface of the Earth and We recommend them all jointly with the said Prince to the protection and mercy of the Most High Builder, the great Lord God.

To confirm the above, this patent is signed with Our Own Hand and Our Seal is affixed thereto.

Given in the East of Stockholm, in the seat of Our Government, at the place where the splendour of Light illumines the work and banishes darkness, on the 7th day of the 5th Month in the Year of Grace 1779.

The patent is signed by Karl, Supreme Chief and the Wisest Vicarius Salomonis and the other signatories include Count Horn, Deputy Provincial Grand Master; Count Nils Bjelke, High Chancellor; V. Stenhagen, Grand Orator; Baron Paul Pfeif, Grand Inquisitor; Count E. v. Stockenet, First Grand Inspector; Count S. Levenhaupt, Second Grand Inspector; Baron S. v. Leionholm, Third Grand Inspector; Baron S. A. Vachtmeister, First Grand Warden; Count A. N. Stenbock, Second Grand Warden; S. v. Blumenfeldt, Grand Treasurer; Baron Fr. Spappe, Grand Almoner; Baron S. G. Osensterna, Grand Director of Ceremonies; and Karl Fredenheim, for Grand Secretary.

On May 9, 1780, says Telepneff (*History of Swedish Freemasonry in Russia*), a detailed instruction was issued by Karl, Duke of Sudermania, which began as follows:

We, Karl, by the Grace of God, Hereditary Prince of Sweden, of Goths and Vandals, Duke of Sudermania, Heir-Apparent to Norway, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein, Stormar, Ditmar, Count of Oldenburg and Delmenhorst, Grand Admiral of Sweden, Perpetual Inspector of General and Master of Heraldry of the Holy Order of the Temple at Jerusalem, Grand Provincial Master of VII and IX Provinces i.e. Sweden and Russia known in this Order as Knight and Brother of the life-giving Sun, do hereby declare:

Taking into consideration the laudable and most especial attachment and zeal towards the good of Our Holy Order shown by Brethren of the Most Worshipful Chapter founded by Us in Petersburg at the time of Our decision to kindle Light therein, taking also into consideration the extent of the Russian Empire requiring a special vigilance over orderliness of proceedings and strict maintenance of the laws of Our Holy Order, to prevent and to correct promptly any misdeeds and disorders which might occur in Masonic Lodges and Chapters, which are or may be formed in this Empire at any future date, we find it necessary to establish according to the second clause of the Covenant of the 10th of April, 1778, a Directory in Petersburg which shall not only watch over the execution of laws, statutes and Rituals of the Holy Order, but also judge and decide all disagreements which may arise among

Brethren both Masons and Templars, who are working with the purpose of disseminating and preserving Light and, therefore, should not be controlled by profane judges, the latter not being qualified to judge all these.

For such purpose We desire to give to those Most Worshipful Brethren who will form the said Directory an Instruction which, being founded on ancient laws and customs, from olden times accepted and established in Our Holy Order, will serve them as a Constitution; following the latter they shall in future rule over all business relating to the Holy Order of the Temple of Jerusalem in all parts of the Russian Empire.

We trust that the said worthy Brethren through their obedience and strictness in the fulfilment of the classes of the Instruction will entirely justify Our expectations, and the tender confidence We feel towards their zeal.

According to Telepneff (*History of Swedish Freemasonry in Russia*), the Swedish system affirmed that it owed its origin to the Order of Knights Templar, the mysteries of which it professed to possess. The organization of this System was characterized by a strictly defined hierarchy of grades and rank. Autocratic in its direction, with unchangeable high officials, the System insisted on a complete obedience of Brethren of lower Degrees to their superiors of higher rank. Telepneff states that it consisted of the following ten Degrees :

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Apprentice | } | first class, St. John's Lodges. |
| 2. Fellow-Craft | | |
| 3. Master | | |
| 4. Scottish Apprentice-Fellow | } | second class (St. Andrew's Degrees). St. Andrew's or Scottish Lodges. |
| 5. Scottish Master | | |
| 6. Steward Brethren or Knights of East and Jerusalem | } | third class (Knightly Degrees Chapters). |
| 7. Brethren Elect of King Solomon or Knights of the Temple, also called Knights of the West or of the Key | | |
| 8. Confidants of St. John or Brethren of White Ribbon | | |
| 9. Confidants of St. Andrew or Brethren of Purple Ribbon | | |
| 10. Brethren of the Rosy Cross | | |

Adepts of the tenth Degree were subdivided into three further classes :

1. Members of the Ruling Chapter not occupying any office therein ;
2. Grand Officers of the Chapter ;
3. The Grand Ruling Master, who was the King of Sweden.

For the establishment of a Chapter in some districts it was deemed necessary to have three working or St. John's Lodges and one Scottish Lodge. The Chapter

was "legal" if twenty-seven Knights were present; "ordinary" if forty-nine Knights were present; and "perfect" if, without counting the President and Chaplains, eighty-one Knights were assembled. Thus, possessors of the honours of the tenth Degree formed the Illuminated Chapter, offices in which could be accepted only by members of the high nobility, who were required to prove not fewer than four ancestors belonging to that rank.

At the head of the Russian Strict Observance at this time was Count Alexander Moussin-Pouschkin-Bruce.

In 1781, says Telepneff (*Freemasonry in Russia*, p. 14), some zealous Freemasons, remembering Reichel's advice: "If you want to study true Masonry, you must have a concealed Lodge of a very small number of members, but discreet and constant and practise in secret," founded a Lodge which they named Harmony. It had for its object the investigation of science and the study of Masonry. Apparently no Masonic Degrees were conferred, but the meetings were devoted to lectures and debates. It consisted of eight members only, viz. Prince Troubetzkoy (one of the leaders of the Swedish system), Heraskov, Prince Cherkussky, Prince Engalychev, T. P. Turgenev, A. M. Kutusov (followers of Reichel), Schwarz and Novikov.

The erection of Gagarin's Grand Lodge was followed by a circular from Grand Secretary Böber—June 26, 1779—directed to all Lodges except Melesino's, threatening to place them under a ban unless they joined within six weeks. The real object of the circular was the extinction of the former Zinnendorff Lodges. It must be remembered that at this time Sweden had disclaimed all knowledge of Zinnendorff. The result was not as complete as was desired. With the exception of Böber's own Lodge, all the German-speaking Lodges of the eastern seaboard remained true to Yelaguin, whilst those of the Strict Observance refrained from joining the new power. It consisted of 11 Lodges—6 in St. Petersburg, 3 in Moscow, 1 in Revel and 1 (military) in Kinburn. The Grand National Lodge of Gagarin might, however, have ultimately obtained complete success, but for two reasons. Rosenberg and Gagarin quarrelled and, on March 15, 1780, Karl of Sudermania was created Vicarius Salomonis of the IXth Templar Province, which, according to Swedish pretensions, included Denmark and Russia. This attempt at political supremacy, through the instrumentality of the Craft, which had already alarmed the Lodges of Denmark and Germany, produced the same effect in Russia. The bodies acting under Yelaguin and Gagarin respectively, were alike unanimous in protesting; and the latter, thoroughly discouraged, betook himself to Moscow November 10, 1781. This caused the downfall of the Gagarin Grand Lodge, which then dissolved and disappeared from the scene.

In 1781 Novikov and Schwarz founded the Friendly Learned Society for the purpose of spreading instruction and sound knowledge among the ignorant masses of Russian people. From this grew three printing establishments, two of which were devoted to the production of books of general instruction, one to the production of Rosicrucian literature.

In 1782, writes Telepneff (*Russian Masons*, p. 19), the Wilhelmsbad Masonic Convention was held. The Rite of Strict Observance was radically changed and its close connexion with the Templar Order discarded, to the great joy of Novikov (who disliked the gorgeous ceremonies and extravagant claims of the Strict Observance and viewed all Templar Degrees with great misgivings) and his followers. Altogether nine Provinces were established: Lower Germany, Overnia, Oxitania, Italy, Burgundy, Higher Germany, Austria, Russia, with one vacancy, in the event of Sweden joining the Order. A Provincial Chapter and a Directory were established in Moscow for the purpose of governing ordinary or Symbolic Masonic Lodges. Four Lodges, viz. Three Banners (A. Tatischev); Osiris (Prince N. N. Troubetzkoy); Latona (Novikov); and Sphinx (Prince Gagarin), became Mother Lodges and received the right of warranting new Lodges. Novikov became Chairman of the Executive Board for Russia. The ensuing history is best related in Telepneff's own words:

The number of Moscow Lodges ruled in this manner rapidly increased. The new organization spread also in Petersburg and even in remote Provinces.

As already mentioned, the influence of the Rosy Cross was paramount, though the Order worked in "peace and concealment." Gradually, not only Knights' Chapters were abolished, but all Templar Degrees fell into disuse: in the end the connexion with the Duke of Braunschweig was severed; leaders of Russian Masonry left the Order of Templars and Beneficent Knights and, instead, openly chose the Order of the Rosy Cross under Woellner. At that time Woellner himself was in disagreement with the circle of the Duke of Braunschweig.

Moscow Masons worked with zeal and animation. Besides ordinary Masonic Lodges, the membership of which was considered by Rosicrucians in Russia as the first indispensable qualification for the admission to their Order, the Rosicrucian centre itself was now properly organized. Rosicrucians looked upon Masonic Lodges as their "outer circle" where necessary moral precepts were imparted to those who later would aspire to Rosicrucian mysteries. Schwarz, assisted by Novikov and other Masonic leaders, was the main inspirer of the whole movement.

In February 1784 Schwarz died. His death dismayed all Rosicrucians and was undoubtedly a great loss to them. His successor, Baron Schroeder, appointed by Teden, did not possess any of the high qualities of the deceased Brother; probably he belonged to the type of Masonic and occult adventurers already referred to.

In 1784 "silanum" was proclaimed by the Rosicrucian Order, that is to say, such a period when no new members were admitted into the Order and the usual work was suspended. In spite of silanum, Russian Rosicrucians continued their studies and enlarged their influence by opening new Masonic Lodges.

In 1785 full Rosicrucian activities were apparently resumed. But already, in 1786, the Empress Catherine began to view these activities with suspicion; the unfortunate dependence of Moscow Rosicrucians upon their Prussian chiefs was disagreeable to the Empress, an arch-enemy of Prussia, and their association with the heir-apparent, Grand Duke Paul, an open adversary of Catherine's government, seemed to her highly suspicious; criticisms of the loose morals of the Imperial Court irritated her; their strict adherence to Russian traditions and the Orthodox

Church were against her temporary, but strong, leanings towards French customs and Jesuitism. Hence the Empress's animosity.

Investigations were carried on through the police, but nothing could be proved against the Rosicrucians. Nevertheless some of their leaders were ordered to leave Moscow; in 1792 Novikov was thrown into the dreary dungeons of the Schlüsselburg fortress. His relations with the Grand Duke Paul seem to have been the only reason for this harsh measure.

When Schwarz died a Board for the direction of Masonic business was constituted, which at first consisted (*Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. xxxv, p. 276) of Tatischev, Novikov and Prince N. N. Troubetskoy, with Lopukhin and Baron Schroeder as Wardens. The last named was described by Lopukhin (famous Masonic mystic) as "an emigrant and vagabond quite recently unknown to anybody in Moscow."

The arrest of Novikov was preceded by the suppression of the Printing Company at the instigation of General Prosorovsky, who undertook to suppress entirely all Masonic activities.

In April 1782 secret societies were forbidden throughout Russia; the Freemasons were not included, but Melesino, foreseeing the probable victory of Yelaguin's Grand Lodge, now left almost supreme, took advantage of the edict gracefully to withdraw from the contest and retired to Moscow, directing his Lodges to close their doors, in obedience to the law.

As a curiosity, the following two versions of an occurrence in 1784 are extracted without comment, the first from Lawrie's *History* (edit. 1804, p. 235) and the second from Thory (*Acta Lat.*, vol. i, p. 159):

A petition was received from several Scottish Masons who had been commissioned by the Empress of all the Russias to settle in her capital, requesting a charter of erection for a Lodge at St. Petersburg, under the name of the Imperial Scottish Lodge of St. Petersburg, which was unanimously granted.

The Empress of all the Russias invites the Grand Lodge of Scotland to send deputies to St. Petersburg in order to establish there a Scotch Lodge under the name of Imperial Lodge. Grand Lodge hastens to defer to the wishes of this sovereign. Constitutions are accorded.

In 1786 Freemasons were deprived of the control of the schools and hospitals which they had founded and Masonic books were declared to be more dangerous than the productions of the French Encyclopædists. This, in spite of the fact that 461 books seized in a raid made by the police on Novikov's book-shop had been declared by the highest dignitary of the Russian Church to be faithful in every respect to Orthodox teachings. Yet when, in 1787, a terrible famine broke out in Russia, the Freemasons organized the most effectual help for the stricken population and Novikov was the prime mover in the formation of the society which accomplished this beneficent aim.

Telepneff points out (*Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. xxxv, p. 275) that, in spite of the many changes of system, Russian Freemasonry, in regard to politics, still retained Yelaguin's doctrine. Russian Freemasons, as well as the whole of Orthodox Freemasons, were unconditionally against the French revolutionary teachings. In Russia emphasis was laid on the teaching and practice of loyalty to the Sovereign and morality and belief in God.

This opinion will also explain Rembeck's statement in his *Bemerkungen*, published in 1805, when he says that Freemasonry in Russia :

rose to a fullness of splendour, only attained in England and Sweden. There was a building erected entirely according to Masonic views ; the existence of the Lodges was generally known ; institutions in their name were everywhere established ; indeed, one Brother was buried with Masonic honours. When King Gustavus III of Sweden was present, something very nearly resembling public festivals was arranged, which the King and several of his suite attended. That Catherine did not distrust this society is apparent from all this occurring in her immediate neighbourhood without her seeming to take any particular notice of it.

What then was the reason for the change of front on the part of the Empress ? Findel states that the many adverse controversial writings published at this time upon Freemasonry attracted the attention of the Empress and she considered it advisable to make known to those around her that she did not approve of Masonic meetings. Upon this, although no express prohibition emanated from her, the Lodges were closed but, with the privity of the police, an administrative power was appointed, as it was hoped all the time that the ill-will manifested would not be of long duration. The Apollo Lodge in Petersburg worked on in silence until 1797 and afterwards united her members twice a year—at the feast of St. John and at the anniversary of their erection. The Lodge of Charity, afterwards called the Crowned Pelican, likewise arranged meetings among its members, without working regularly.

This statement is in opposition to Friedrichs, who says :

All Lodges were closed. At the beginning of the year 1794 went forth Catherine's "wish" for a dissolution and, in the course of a few months, even in the remotest corners of Russia, no more Lodges were to be found.

Bergmann, attorney-general at Riga, gave the following explanation of the edict :

In Russia, especially at St. Petersburg, affairs were in a most wretched state. It was a strange medley of men from all parts of the world—men who knew nothing of either Order or Obedience, in fact, so-called Masons, who had not the slightest idea what they were to understand by Masonry ; for England and France had sent their wares to market ; ignorant travellers had brought them to St. Petersburg ; and what had escaped their memory was supplied by their impudence. England and France endeavoured to populate the imperial capital and, at last, the Freemasons became so numerous that coachmen and lackeys erected Lodges and made

proselytes. No one in my time troubled himself about the object in view ; the secrets were always represented in pictures and were, at length, in the highest Melesino Degree, left to the reflection of those new members who could rack their brains in counsel with their Master. In my time at St. Petersburg the worst was that, with the strange systems and developments, morality with all social virtues was neglected.

This must not be accepted as an accurate description of Russian Freemasonry in general. The statement applies only to one or two Lodges, which Yelaguin himself had referred to with contempt.

Another explanation given by Telepneff (*Russian Masons*, p. 14) is that the ban was caused through the introduction of the Swedish System. The implicit obedience demanded by this system from Brethren to their superiors meant a complete dependence of Russian Freemasons upon their Stockholm chiefs :

This naturally caused anxiety and doubts in the Russian government circles. Catherine commanded Yelaguin to take measures to have Gagarin's Lodges closed. Gagarin left Petersburg and went to Moscow, where he continued to work in secret, but the rôle of Swedish Masonry was practically terminated and the rôle of Petersburg Masonry also. The predominance in the direction of Russian Masonry was now in the hands of Moscow Brethren, where most of the earnest and zealous Masonic leaders gathered at that time.

This explanation is supplemented by Friedrichs, which, though lengthy, is necessary for a complete understanding of the situation :

These disagreeable circumstances were crowned by a special scandal, the swindle affair of Cagliostro. It is scarcely credible that this man was able to gain a following out of the most fashionable and best educated classes and that not in Russia alone. What did he tell about himself? He said that for life he was indebted to the love of an angel for an earthly woman and that he was the direct messenger of the prophet Elijah, called to lead the faithful to a higher perfection through a physical and moral new birth. He, the anointed of God, was able, he said, to perform all kinds of miracles and knew all secrets which were revealed only to the most intimate of the celestial glory. Through him the inner soul of the finite creature could unite with the omnipotence of the infinite. And what did the police report of his native town Palermo say of him? That he had been punished for brawling, pimping and forgery.

At Mitau a temple was erected by Count Cagliostro, or, as his real, less euphonious, name was: Joseph Balsamo. There he carried on "Egyptian Masonry" and everything that took place there was obscure, fantastic and mysterious. Quite new for Russia was the fact that he admitted ladies to the work, at the head of whom stood his wife, the beautiful Lorenza. It is true that she played an even greater rôle in the gentlemen's Lodges, where she conjured up spirits for large sums of money and sold tinctures of life and universal panaceas and, when this failed to draw, she was not ashamed to call into requisition the charms of her

own person. And what did her Joseph do? He kept up a strange intercourse with the ladies with a view to the improvement of the human race.

This then was a serious matter—so serious that Catherine herself was aroused. We have already stated that Catherine's enthusiasm for Masonry had died down; in a word she had become indifferent to it. How was it possible that this woman of a strong will and a quick eye and conscious of the aim she had in view should continue to take pleasure in this society which was divided against itself, was rent by feuds and constantly changed from one system to another? What could she do with a retinue of Masonic "coachmen and valets"? Such people were ignored by her. But now affairs had come to a pretty pass and the lioness suddenly roused herself from her sleep. For a time, however, she played with her victim and then she destroyed him.

She played with her victim, i.e. she poured out the cup of her irony and her sarcasm over Cagliostro's victims. In her three satirical comedies—*The Siberian Conjuror*, *The Deceiver* and *The Infatuated One*, she lashed the "Deceiver" and his "Infatuated Ones" most unmercifully. Unfortunately, whether intentionally or not, she confused "Egyptian Masonry" and Freemasonry in general. That she thereby was unjust to Freemasonry in general and that, in spite of its very many imperfections and weak points, all the good in it had not been destroyed, may be proved by quoting the testimony of Petroff:

"Several plays were written by Catherine against Freemasonry. In these plays she represents the Freemasons as deceivers or as deceived, as people who made gold and sold the elixir of life, as alchemists and as ghost-seers. When developing the fundamental idea of the Comedy *The Siberian Conjuror*, she wrote to Baron Grimm: *The Siberian Conjuror* is that Theosophist who produces all the charlatanry of Paracelsus. In the comedy *The Deceiver* we have that notorious Cagliostro, who transforms small diamonds into large ones, who knows remedies for all diseases, who has the power in himself to conjure up spirits and to whom, but a short time before, Alexander of Macedonia had appeared." Thereby, however, she only presents to the world the bad side of Freemasonry, basing her narration on stories which were current in society at the time; but its humanitarian and moral side she passes over altogether.

Those were heavy blows for Masonry and worse ones were still to come. The French Revolution broke out, which, if dangerous for Freemasonry in Germany, was mortal for Russian Masonry. "The Freemasons have made the Revolution!" This cry was heard in both France and Germany and was heard louder and more vehemently in Russia; loudest of all, of course, where its source has always been sought for, viz. in old Polots, the headquarters of the Jesuits, who felt themselves so much at home in that country. Catherine was a shrewd and cautious woman and, whether there was any truth in this cry or not, she obviated the danger. She had already raised her hand, as we know, in consequence of other disagreeable incidents and now she struck a blow which, of course, was a mortal one.

The performances of *The Deceiver* and *The Infatuated One*, says Waliszewski, in *The Romance of an Empress*, had a prodigious success, the most amusing part being that at the first performance there were cries of "Author!" who, however, kept completely incognito, despite the huge success. Each of the pieces, he adds, brought ten thousand roubles to the management at Moscow.

Catherine died in 1796 and was followed by Paul I, said by some writers to have been a Mason ; indeed, it is even asserted that Catherine herself witnessed his initiation. The hopes which the Craft had placed in his presumed goodwill to Freemasonry were destined to be overthrown. Through the Marshal von Medem he had intimated his approbation of the Lodges in Courland.

Waliszewski says definitely (*Paul the First of Russia*, p. 38) that Paul had become directly connected with the Masonic Order.

The Grand Master of the Masonic centre at Moscow, Prince Gabriel Galitzine, was among his warmest partizans and correspondence seized by Catherine showed that he was in close relations with Novikov and the other Masons in the Second Capital of the Empire and even in a fair way to be elected Grand Master of the Order. Already portraits of him had been circulated representing him wearing Masonic emblems.

As usual, the police reports exaggerated and distorted the facts. Novikov and his friends were no regicides, but they were attached on the one hand to the critics of the Catherine regime and, on the other, they were entangled in certain foreign relationships which were not entirely non-political. There was reason for some anxiety on Catherine's part ; for too many Russian princes, in correspondence with the sectaries of Schwarz and Saint-Martin in Russia, were showing a suspicious eagerness to put Paul at their head.

She cut the matter short by the prosecution which sent Novikov to the fortress of Schlüsselburg in 1792 and which does her no credit. Paul, however, was screened by some of his friends and did not hesitate to disavow the others and he was untouched by the storm. He was left free even to continue in the tendencies and the practices which had provoked the Empress's severity.

He kept about him Vassili Ivanovitch Bajénof, the celebrated Moscovite architect, who had been his intermediary in dealing with the Lodges. He continued to correspond with Lavater and even with Saint-Martin, who had been a habitué of Montbéliard and, in later days, when he had abandoned Freemasonry so entirely as to insult and scoff at it, he retained its impress ; there was always a tendency to exaltation in the sincerely religious sentiments which he professed.

This information and opinion receive confirmation from Telepneff, who, in *Russian Masons*, says, pp. 24-5 :

Most of Paul's adherents during his difficult life before ascending the Russian throne were Freemasons. His teacher and intimate friend, Count Nikita Panin, a prominent statesman, was an earnest Mason. Prince Nicholas Repnin, one of the greatest generals of his time, was another friend and also a zealous Mason. Prince G. P. Gagarin and Prince A. B. Kurakin, a playmate and bosom friend of Paul, were both well-known Masonic names. During his journey abroad as Grand Duke, Paul met Frederick the Great and other prominent Prussian Masons. His reception by them is said to have been extraordinarily friendly, and great honours were accorded to him at the Prussian Court. Prince Kurakin was chiefly instrumental in the introduction of the then Russian heir-apparent to Masonic mysteries.

A document preserved in the Imperial archives of the Ministry of Police states quite unequivocally that Grand Duke Paul was secretly initiated by I. P. Yelaguin himself (*Minowshie gody*, 1807, vol. ii, p. 71).

Unfortunately, Paul's abnormal and humiliating position during his mother's life was gradually spoiling his character. He grew suspicious and irritable, even somewhat unbalanced.

As soon as he ascended the throne, Paul showed marks of high favour to Masons, especially to those who had suffered during the previous reign. Soon, however, the now capricious ruler of Russia cooled considerably towards his Masonic friends who bravely considered it their duty to tell the Monarch perfect truth and give him honest advice. He decided to postpone the opening of Masonic Lodges, but visited an assembly of their leaders and, while all agreed to defer awhile the opening of Lodges, the Emperor shook hands with everyone and said: "If you want anything, write to me plainly as a Brother without any compliments."

The *Ruskaia Starina*, 1874, also states :

The Grand Duke Paul Petrovich belonged to Novikov's Society. When this nobleman-bookseller was arrested and brought with all his papers to Petersburg, a committee was formed to make an inquiry into his case. Prince Gregory Alexeevich Dolgorouky, a civil servant of small rank, was appointed one of the clerks of the committee; he either belonged to Novikov's Society or, in any case, shared his views and loved the Grand Duke. When looking through Novikov's papers, Prince Dologorouky found a list of members of Novikov's Society: there was a page on which the Grand Duke himself had signed his name. Dologorouky took the book aside, tore out the incriminating page, chewed and swallowed it.

Rembeck, who travelled in Russia and published his *Bemerkungen* in 1805, gives the following account. Paul called a meeting of well-known Brothers to decide whether the Lodges should be reopened or not. The project was opposed by some few influential members and statesmen (including W. von Ungern Sternberg, the Deputy Provincial Grand Master) and it was decided to wait awhile. Then appeared on the scene the Maltese Knight Count Litta and persuaded the Emperor to favour the Maltese Order at the expense of the Craft. The result was, that an edict appeared in 1797 forbidding secret meetings and, although Freemasonry was not specifically mentioned, Paul caused all the Masters of Lodges known to him to give their hand and word that they would open no Lodges. These were in return made Knights of Malta and, on December 16, 1798, Paul declared himself Grand Master of that Order. It must be remembered that as the Zinnendorff, Swedish and Strict Observance Systems each professed to be a continuation of the Order of the Temple, the Maltese Knights were in some degree justified in looking upon the Craft as being in organized rivalry with their own Order.

Under Rastoptchine's influence, says Waliszewski, in *Paul the First of Russia*, Paul soon repudiated his former sympathies with Freemasonry and Martinism. He dismissed Novikov from Petersburg and placed him again under police supervision. Year by year he became more uncompromising. In January 1801

Schirmer, a Prussian merchant, was arrested, kept on bread and water for a month and, finally, sent back to his own country for projecting the organization of a literary and artistic club. Anyone who was opposed to Paul was considered an enemy of the State.

At the accession of Paul, says Waliszewski also (*Paul the First of Russia*, p. 239), the Order, having lost most of its property owing to the Revolution, was working for compensation in Russia.

It was this that brought the Bailiff Giulio Litta to St. Petersburg, where the presence of his brother, the Nuncio Lorenzo, afterwards Cardinal, assured him of a strong backing. His mission was merely to press the claims of the Order to their inheritance of Ostrog, which had been appropriated by collaterals, but he succeeded beyond his hopes. In January 1797 Paul signed a convention whereby the Volyhnian estate was exchanged for an assured [increased] annual revenue of 300,000 florins for the maintenance of a Russian Grand Priory. The agreement was ratified in August by Ferdinand de Hompesch, the Grand Master, who had just succeeded Emmanuel de Rohan and the first Grand Prior was the Prince de Condé.

There was nothing in this which could offend anybody, and Cobenzl and Serracapriola, the Neapolitan envoy, expressed their approval. But, after spending a few months at Malta, Litta returned to Russia and presented Paul with the cross which had been worn by La Valette, the most illustrious of the Grand Masters, offering him at the same time the protectorate of the Order. At a solemn audience, at which the Court and many dignitaries of the Orthodox Church were present, the Czar accepted both the gift and the functions proposed to him.

In 1801 the liberal-minded Alexander ascended the throne, but here again the expectations of the Craft were disappointed, for he renewed the decree against secret societies. Thory's romantic account of his conversion and initiation by Böber in 1803 (*Acta Lat.*, vol. i, p. 218) need not be accepted, as it would be unwise to depend upon theory in the absence of corroboration; but it is evident that some time before 1804 Alexander had let it be understood that he would not interfere with the meetings of the Craft; for in that year, according to the *Freiburger Taschenbuch* of 1816-17, the members of the former Pelican, in 1808, reconstituted their Lodge under the title of Alexander of the Crowned Pelican; and many other Lodges followed their example. It was in that Lodge that Count Moussin-Pouschkin was initiated. The Pelican increased to such an extent that, in 1809, it was divided into three Lodges, known as Crown Pelican; Elisabeth, the Patroness of Virtue; and Peter, the Patron of Truth, working respectively in Russian, German and French, according to the Swedish Rite. These three then formed a Grand Directoral Lodge, known as the Wladimir or Order, were joined in 1811 and 1812 by two French Lodges in Petersburg and, in 1813, by the Lodges in Revel and Cronstadt. This Grand Directory was composed in part of the holders of the superior Degrees, partly of the Lodge representatives. Böber was its Grand Master from 1811 to 1814 and was followed, in 1815, by Count Basil Moussin-Pouschkin-Bruce—not to be confounded with Count Alexander of the same name

the former head of the Russian Strict Observance. From the composition of this Grand Lodge, it might have been foreseen that the simple Masters would soon fall out with the *High Degree* Masons. About this time Fessler, who had already so powerfully contributed to lead back German Freemasonry to its English origin and simplicity, arrived in Petersburg and many Lodges reverted to the ceremonies of the Craft.

It must be pointed out that Melgunov and Sidorov in *Masonry*; the *Russkaia Starina*, 1874; and Tira Sokolovskaia, in *Russian Masonry*, all affirm that Alexander was initiated into Freemasonry, but do not give the date or the name of the Lodge in which the ceremony took place. The *Handbuch* for 1865 states that Alexander was initiated along with his younger brother, Konstantin Pavlovich, but gives no particulars.

Fessler, who is mentioned above, was a remarkable character, and the following particulars of his interesting career are given by Telepneff in *Some Aspects of Russian Freemasonry during the reign of the Emperor Alexander I*, based upon information in the *Handbuch*, pp. 329-39; Mackey's *Encyclopædia*, vol. i, pp. 262-4; Melgunov and Sidorov, *Masonry*, vol. i, pp. 108-9; vol. ii, pp. 174-5; Puipin, *Social Movement*, pp. 303, 307-8; and Sokolovskaia, *Russian Masonry*, p. 391:

Ignaz Aurelius Fessler was born at Czyrendorf, in Hungary, in 1756. The beginning of his career was somewhat stormy. He was educated in a Jesuit School and, in 1773, joined the Capuchin Order. Monastic abuses soon disgusted him, so that he deemed it his duty to expose them to the Emperor Joseph II; as a result, he incurred the persecutions of the Superiors of the Roman Church. A fanatical monk, Sergius, tried to stab him, but Fessler luckily escaped the knife of Father Sergius and was taken by the Emperor under his own protection. The Emperor appointed Fessler an ex-professor of Oriental languages in the University of Lemberg. His mind, tinged with mysticism in his early youth, now became sceptical and he decided to leave the Capuchin Order. Fessler's changed views aroused against him such a storm of hatred from the Roman clergy that he was obliged once again to run for his life and arrived in Breslau in 1788. He was appointed the tutor of the son of the Prince of Schœnaich-Carolath and subsequently left Breslau for Wallisfurth. To this period of Fessler's life belongs the establishment of a secret Order called the Evergreen, which had a certain similarity to Masonry in its organization and had for its purpose general moral reforms: it was dissolved in 1793. In 1791 he embraced the Lutheran faith; in 1792 he married, but his married life was as stormy as his public activities and was dissolved in 1802. From Carolath he moved to Berlin, where he remained until 1806 as a Superintendent of Schools. As with religious beliefs, so with his family life—Fessler seemed always to be in search of new vistas: he soon married again. In Berlin he took part in Masonic activities, but became rapidly disappointed in the behaviour of Masons whom he met and nearly left the Order. But his undoubted, though somewhat erratic, zeal and sincerity procured him a place on the Supreme Masonic Council and he began to work for the reformation of Masonry, trying to liberate Lodges from "deceptive High Degrees, false secretiveness and superfluous mysteries." This work created again a number of enemies and bitter attacks.

Still he strove to continue his task of Masonic reformer and writer. Fessler's pecuniary position was precarious till, in January, 1809, he was invited to Petersburg by the Emperor's Liberal Counsellor, M. Speransky. Here he obtained the position of a professor of Hebrew and, later, of Philosophy in the Petersburg Ecclesiastical Academy. His Liberal views caused his removal from the Academy. He was appointed Superintendent of the Evangelical community in nine districts of Russia and resided in Saratov. He came back to Petersburg in 1827, became Ecclesiastical Counsellor and there died in 1839.

In 1811, writes de Sanglen, in his *Memoirs*, published at Stuttgart, under the title *Aus Jacob Iovanowitsch de Sanglens Dekwürdigkeiten*, he (de Sanglen) had an interview with the Emperor, who, after a long interrogative conversation (*Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. x, p. 73), handed him the following letter to pass on to Beber (Böber):

I presume that the object of the Lodge is a noble one and tends to virtue, that the means to this end are founded on morality and that every political tendency is strictly forbidden. If this be the case, then the Lodge will enjoy the goodwill which, in accordance with the dictates of my heart, I extend to all true and trusty subjects who are faithful to God, the State and myself. But, in order to ascertain whether the Society of Masons follows the objects which I have assumed, I ordain that the business and minutes of every Lodge are to be submitted to me, in order that I may obtain the necessary light respecting their legislation, the maintenance of good order and the conduct of their business. In case of anything wrong, I must know with whom I have to account.

As the outcome of this official recognition and permission, a great impetus was given to the Order, not only in Petersburg and Moscow, but also in the Provinces as far away as the Crimea. During the Napoleonic wars many military Lodges were formed. Telepneff says (*Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. xxxv, p. 280) that the most prominent men of the period were members of the Order and he instances Michael Speransky, one of the ablest of Russian legislators; Benkendorf, the Emperor's personal friend; Rasumovsky and Balashov, Cabinet ministers; Prince Lobanov; Prince Alexander Ipslanti; and Prince Hohenloe.

According also to Telepneff (*Russian Masons*, pp. 27-8) the organization of Freemasonry was on the following lines:

The autocratic Emperor of Russia; the Ministry of Police, responsible to the Emperor; an autocratic ruler of Masonry under the title of "The Wisest of the Wise"—this place was filled by I. Böber, who seems to have convinced Alexander I of the high ideals and usefulness of Freemasonry—irresponsible to Brethren but responsible to the Ministry of Police; two Councils of Adepts of Higher Degrees (those Superiors who were very often unknown to ordinary Brethren); an open Grand Lodge, called the Grand Directorial Lodge Wladimir, entirely denominated by the Grand Master (which rank was bestowed upon The Wisest of the Wise); and by Adepts of Higher Degrees (mostly members of the two aforesaid Councils); and ordinary Lodges.

This peculiarly constituted Masonry, controlled by the Ministry of Police and used largely for a very laudable object of supporting the existing government, but a political object all the same, was hardly Masonry as understood in England. However, the movement became quite fashionable and large numbers of new members began to swell its ranks. Apparently, no great discrimination was made among candidates and many unworthy initiates were enjoying Masonic privileges.

In March 1815 the Directory unanimously resolved to acknowledge all Rites which were recognized anywhere by a regular Grand Lodge—a tremendous blow for the partisans of the Swedish Rite ; but when in June it proceeded with a revision of its *Statutes*, the impossibility of reconciling opposite views of Craft government became apparent. The result was the dissolution of the Directory and that, on August 30, 1815, four Lodges erected the Grand Lodge Astrea. Its organization was similar to the English Grand Lodge and needs no description : it will only be necessary to remark that—confining its attention exclusively to the Craft—it agreed to leave every Lodge free to adopt such Degrees beyond the Master's as it might prefer. Count Moussin-Pouschkin-Bruce was elected Grand Master. It almost immediately afterwards warranted a new Lodge and, in October, was joined by the most important Lodge of all, the Pelican. By 1817 Astrea numbered twelve daughter Lodges and, by 1819, twenty-three Lodges. Under the Grand Lodge Astrea all systems were tolerated and, so far as working was concerned, each Lodge was a law unto itself, the only condition being that the government must not disapprove of any new system introduced into Russian Masonry, for which the Grand Master was held responsible to the government. The Lodges, however, agreed not to follow the rules of the so-called Illuminati and Mystics, or the Alchemists, nor to attempt to revise the ancient Orders of Knighthood and to avoid all purposes not in correspondence with natural and positive laws.

According to a certificate reproduced in *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. viii, p. 231, Moussin-Pouschkin-Bruce was Master of La Loge Les Amis Reunis in 1813, a Lodge which worked in the French language, although the majority of the signatories to the document were undoubtedly Russian. This certificate was granted to Louis Regnaud Carcas, a native of Malta.

In *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. xv, p. 161, there was also reproduced a Patent granted by Lodge Astrea in 1818, creating Böber an Honorary Member of that Lodge, in virtue of his forty years' zeal for Masonry and his four years' service as Grand Master of the Ancient Grand Lodge Wladimir. This Patent was signed by Basil Comte Moussin-Pouschkin-Bruce as Grand Master, Alexander Labanoff de Rostoff, Deputy Grand Master ; F. F. Schubert, Frederic de Scholer and Aug. de Lerche, Grand Wardens ; Frederic Wolborth, Grand Orator ; C. G. Ritter, Grand Treasurer ; Chs. de Valz, Grand Almoner ; Comte Theodor Tolstoy, Master of Ceremonies ; and E. Collins, Grand Secretary for Correspondence.

From the remains of the Directory, two dissenting Lodges erected in 1815 a Swedish Provincial Grand Lodge of Russia, but in 1819 this body could only count 6 subordinate Lodges, whereas at the same date the Grand Lodge Astrea

ruled over 24. Of these 24, however, 7 worked according to Schroeder's Ritual (the Hamburg modification of the English ceremonial), 2 according to Yelaguin's (Zinnendorff), 6 by the rectified Strict Observance, 8 by the Swedish Ritual, and 1 according to Fessler's modified English rite. In 1818 a Grand Chapter was established, to control the working of the entire set of Degrees of all these Rites, beyond that of Master Mason. The Swedish Rite, however, again became the predominant Rite, to which, in 1822, the Grand Lodge Astrea reverted, the reason being that the Swedish Rite was essentially Christian.

In 1820 Kuschelev was elected Deputy Grand Master, to whose subsequent course of action the ingratitude of the viper in the fable—towards the countryman who had nurtured it in his bosom—has been quoted as the fittest parallel. He was, however, only opposed to political Masonry and he addressed a paper to the Emperor showing the danger to the State, of the Craft as then constituted and maintaining the necessity either of its suppression or of such modifications as would have entirely deprived it of its chief characteristics. The Czar Alexander chose the former alternative and issued a ukase—August 1, 1822—closing all Lodges and forbidding them at any future time to reopen. The Fraternity obeyed without a murmur, the decree was renewed by his successor, Nicholas I, on April 21, 1826. The *Russkaia Starina* of 1907 states that there are documents in existence proving that secret Masonic gatherings continued until 1830.

Egor Andrevich Kushelev, Lieutenant-General and Senator, was, says Telepneff, in *Some Aspects of Russian Freemasonry*:

A Mason of a very old School and in politics an extreme Conservative; also he was a very religious man. His Masonic ideal was the Swedish system, as originally introduced into Russia in the eighteenth century and then restored to its former splendour by the Grand Directorial Lodge Wladimir. But not only did Kushelev disapprove of Masonic innovations as destroying true Masonic doctrines; he also saw the danger of the Lodges becoming nests of the Illuminati with revolutionary political views. He was set against all division of Masonic authority and deplored the lack of unity among the Masons of later days. When elected in 1820 Deputy Grand Master of Astrea, Kushelev decided to restore the old rules and doctrines as he understood them, but his intentions were opposed by members holding Masonic and political views widely different from his own creed; he then decided to bring the matter before the Emperor; he considered this his duty towards the Government and Freemasonry itself. Accordingly he wrote a report in which he related the past of Russian Masonry, shewed that, in his view, its position was a very dangerous one and offered his advice upon the measures necessary to improve its condition. The high social position of Kushelev and his close relations to Freemasonry must have given some weight to his opinions in the mind of the Emperor (who was then surrounded by extreme reactionaries, headed by Prince Metternich), swinging from indecisive Liberal ideas to the reaction which characterized the latter period of his reign. The Emperor must have been in a receptive mood for such a communication, for he was deeply impressed by the dangerous unrest in Europe, due, apparently, to activities of secret societies with political aims.

The rescript issued by the Minister of the Interior ordered the closing of all secret Societies, Masonic and otherwise and prohibited their future establishment. Existing members were called upon to pledge themselves that they would conform to the edict, a declaration was required from all ranks of the army and from the civil service, that the members would not henceforth belong to any such organizations and, ran the edict, "If any person refuses to make such a pledge, he shall no longer remain in the service."

The letter issued by the Minister of the Interior was, says *Russkaia Starina*, 1877, worded as follows :

Disorders and scandals caused in other countries by the existence of different secret societies, of which some under the name of Masonic Lodges had at first Charity as their object, but later applied themselves to political aims and destruction of the tranquillity of States, made it imperative in several countries to prohibit such secret societies.

Our Emperor, ever watchful to guard against all that may injure his Empire, especially at the present juncture when mental speculations bring forth such sad occurrences as have been witnessed in other countries, has deemed it good to decree :

(1) All secret societies under whatever denomination, Masonic Lodges or others, shall be closed and in future not allowed to be established ;

(2) This to be communicated to all members of the said societies and such members to give a written undertaking that they will not in future constitute under any disguise, Masonic or secret societies, either in the Empire or abroad.

I inform you of the above Imperial decision and humbly request your Highness (Excellency) to co-operate in its execution and as Grand Master of the Grand Lodge Astrea (Provincial) to instruct all subordinate Lodges to cease their work, to close their meetings and to obtain written undertakings from all Brethren belonging thereto not to establish any such in future.

Your Highness (Excellency) will greatly oblige me if you will inform me in due time regarding the success of your dispositions in respect of the said objects and, also, deliver at the same time, all written undertakings given on this occasion by Brother-Masons.

Both the Grand Lodge Astrea and the Provincial Grand Lodge ceased to exist and a report was sent to the Emperor by the Military Governor of Petersburg, Miloradovich, in the following words :

On August 11 I was informed by Count Pouschkin that the Grand Lodge Astrea and eight subordinate Lodges were closed. State Councillor Sergei Stepanovich Lansky, Deputy Grand Master of the Provincial Lodge, showed great grief and discontent. However, everything proceeded peacefully. Those assembled parted with mutual assurances of eternal friendship.

Danilevski, commenting on the order, said :

As far as I know Masonry had no other object in Russia beyond benevolence and providing an agreeable way of passing time. The closing of the Lodges

deprived us of the only places where we assembled for anything else besides card-playing, for we have no society where cards do not constitute the principal or, rather, the only occupation. We are as yet so unversed in political matters that it is absurd for the government to fear that such subjects would furnish conversation at the Masonic Lodges. With us, notable persons have rarely been Masons; at least, none such have visited our Lodge, which is usually full of people of middle class, officers, civil service employees, artists, a very few merchants and a large percentage of literary men.

Danilevski, however, had but a limited knowledge and knew nothing of Russian Freemasonry as a whole.

In the opinion of Telepneff, the blow was to a certain degree provoked by members who deplored its lamentable condition and this was the only real cause of its disappearance from Russia. He asserts that the three great dangers which brought the downfall of Russian Freemasonry were :

1. The introduction into Masonry of political aims or objects ;
2. The admittance into Masonic mysteries of persons unworthy to appreciate true Masonic aims and ideals ; and
3. An attempt to combine various systems, all Masonic in name, but widely divergent in ideals, bringing discord and not unity.

CHAPTER VI

FREEMASONRY IN DENMARK AND HOLLAND

DENMARK

THERE are available four accounts of the progress of the Craft in Denmark, which all agree very remarkably ; but in truth there is very little to narrate. These four accounts are to be found in the *Handbuch* under Danemark ; Findel's *History* ; *Latomia*, vol. xxiii, Leipzig, 1864 ; and Heldmann, *Die 3 Ältesten Gesch. Denkmak*, etc., 1819.

The first Lodge in Copenhagen was erected by Baron G. O. von Münnich, November 11, 1743, which, January 13, 1745, took the name of St. Martin. Münnich was a member of the Three Globes at Berlin, but does not seem to have possessed any authority for his acts. Unless, indeed, the following passage from the *Laws and Constitutions of the Grand Lodge of Scotland*, 1836 (Introduction, pp. iv, v), refers to this Lodge. "The Lodge was raised to the dignity of G. Lodge of Denmark, having been erected in 1743 under the auspices of the G. L. of Scotland." But if Münnich's Lodge was warranted by Scotland, why did it apply to England in 1749 ? The supposition—an echo of Lawrie, who probably derived it from Smith (*The Use and Abuse of Freemasonry*, p. 199)—would also conflict with the former's statement respecting "le petit nombre." Findel says that he claimed to have received a Warrant from a Lodge in Berlin (presumably the Three Globes), that he assumed the office of Chairman, that his first work was the initiation of T. A. Korff, afterwards to be mentioned, in whose house the work of the Lodge was for a long time carried on.

The Lodge applied for, and was granted, a Warrant by the Grand Lodge of England, October 9, 1749, as No. 204 and first appears in the Engraved List for 1750. In 1756 it is shown as St. Martin's Lodge, No. 139, but was not brought forward at the next change of numbers in 1770.

Hardly was it established when three members resigned and erected a second Lodge, Zerobabel, on May 26, 1744. One of the three was G. Nielsen, ecclesiastical counsellor, who was, at that time, governor of the pages to the Crown Prince. They forthwith applied to England for a Warrant, but impatient of delay, betook themselves to Lüttmann in Hamburg, the English Provincial Grand Master for Lower Saxony. As he also was too dilatory for them, they once more applied to England. Soon afterwards Lüttmann forwarded a dispensation and, on October 25, 1745, Lord Cranstoun signed their Warrant. This was the New Lodge, Copenhagen, No. 197, in the Engraved List for 1750, No. 130 in 1756, which also drops out in 1770.

On October 2, 1747, a Danish brother, von Dall, received a Patent from the Scots Lodge, founded on the Three Globes, to open a Scots Lodge in Copenhagen. This is probably the Lodge Le Petit Nombre, which, in 1753, applied to the Grand Lodge of Scotland for a Charter as a Grand Lodge, with the privilege of electing their own Grand Master. A *Provincial* commission was granted, the holder of which and all Lodges erected by him, were required to acknowledge the Grand Lodge of Scotland as their paramount superior. The Lodge then acted as a Grand Lodge for some time, but died out. On February 10, 1750, Lord Byron granted a patent to Count Christian Conrad Danneskiold Laurvig, an Admiral in the Danish Navy, as Provincial Grand Master for Denmark and Norway, when a Provincial Grand Lodge was erected, the Deputy Grand Master being the Russian Ambassador, Baron Korff. One or two other Lodges were probably instituted throughout the country and we hear of a new one in Copenhagen in 1753, the Three Ardent Hearts, constituted by the Three Globes of Berlin. That the Degrees of the Clermont Chapter made some little way in the following years, is to be gathered from the fact that at Johnston's first Strict Observance Convent at Altenberg in 1764, von Prangen appeared as a deputy from a Kiel Lodge. In 1765 the Strict Observance missionary, Schubart, appeared in Copenhagen and managed to obtain Danish signatures to the act of Unquestioning Obedience. The Provincial Lodge of Denmark at Copenhagen then took the rank and title of Prefectory Binin, under the immediate jurisdiction of Duke Ferdinand and the special protection of the Landgrave Karl of Hesse. From that date the History of Freemasonry in Denmark is practically that of the Strict Observance; but some few details may be cited. In 1767 the first two Lodges, St. Martin and Zerubbabel, through the influence of Tullman, united to form one—Zerobabel of the North Star—working alternately in Danish and German; but on November 18, 1778, a purely German Lodge was opened, Frederick of the Crowned Hope and Zerobabel confined itself to the Danish language. Both Lodges performed their work in the same room and, at first, worked the English ritual. In 1785 the modified Strict Observance, or the Rite of the Beneficent Knights of the Holy City, was introduced in accordance with the resolutions of the Wilhelmsbad Convent; the first three Degrees becoming once more almost purely English. The highest Degrees, those of the Scots Directory, were not, however, established until 1819 and created so much opposition that the Altona Lodge erected a private Directory of its own. The Lodges at that time appear to have been practically independent of any real governing body.

In 1792 Duke Ferdinand died and the Landgrave Karl became the sole head of the Danish Lodges. This event was succeeded on November 2, 1792, by a Cabinet decree of King Christian VII, officially recognizing Freemasonry in his dominions on the sole condition that every Lodge should acknowledge Prince Karl as the Grand Master of the Craft.

Curiously enough, in the following year—February 6, 1793—a Patent was signed by the Prince of Wales, appointing the same personage "*Provincial* Grand Master for Denmark and Norway; his Danish Majesty's German Dominions;

also of such Lodges as had been under the immediate direction of Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick.”

On Karl's death in 1836 the Crown Prince, subsequently Christian VIII, assumed the Protectorate and under his rule the Craft prospered exceedingly. In 1841 the Crown Prince, afterwards Frederick VII, was initiated in the Odensee Lodge, Mary of the Three Hearts and, on his father's death in 1848, became Grand Master of the Danish Craft.

In 1853 the Brethren at Helsingör and Altona introduced the Swedish Rite into their Lodges and, in 1855—January 6—a decree of the Royal Grand Master made this Rite incumbent on all Danish Lodges. In the same year the two Copenhagen Lodges were fused into one, called Zerobabel and Frederick of the Crowned Hope. In 1857 the second grade, or the St. Andrew Lodge, was instituted, first at Helsingör, then at Copenhagen; and in 1859 the organization was crowned by the constitution of the High Chapter at the castle of Frederiksborg, conferring only the seventh and two following Degrees. This completed the formation of the Grand Lodge of the VIIIth Province of the Temple, i.e. Denmark.

In 1866, by the surrender of the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein to Prussia, Denmark lost the Lodge at Altona; in like manner it had in 1814 lost the Norwegian Lodges; but it has since warranted three new Lodges, one at Aarhus and two in Copenhagen.

At the head of the Craft is H.M. King Christian X as Grand Master; H.R.H. Prince Harold of Denmark is Stadtholder. Abroad the Grand Lodge of Denmark has no daughters; the Lodges in the Danish colonies of St. Thomas and St. Croix being under the English, French and Scottish jurisdictions.


In 1932 there was organised “The Grand Lodge of Denmark of Ancient, Free and Accepted Masons.” The origins are not stated, but it is supposed that this was organised for the purpose of making possible the admission of numbers of men who would not be eligible to admission to Lodges under the Strict Observance system, which, under royal patronage, is the accepted system of the older Freemasonry in Denmark.

HOLLAND

The first appearance of the Craft in Holland was of a momentous nature, being no less than the admission into the Fraternity of Francis, Duke of Lorraine, subsequently Grand Duke of Tuscany and Francis I, Co-Emperor of Austria and Emperor of Germany. Lord Lovell, Grand Master of England, deputed, in 1731, Dr. Desaguliers as Master, John Stanhope and John Holtzendorff, Esqs., as Wardens; the Earl of Chesterfield, Ambassador at the Hague; and three other Brethren to hold a special Lodge at the Hague, in order to confer the first two Degrees on the Royal candidate. It is noteworthy that among these there is only one Dutch Mason, which will tend to disprove certain random statements, that several French and English Lodges already existed at that date in Holland.

The first authentic record of a Dutch Lodge is the meeting on September 30, 1734, of the *Loge du Grand Maître des Provinces réunis et du ressort de la généralité*, with Count Vincent de la Chapelle as Master, at the Hague. This title, Lodge of the Grand Master, is remarkable, for it is difficult to understand whence any Grand Master of that date derived his authority. The mystery is increased by the next notice, a paragraph in the Amsterdam *Saturdagsche Courant* of November 3, 1735, announcing that a second Lodge had been held at the Hague on October 24, 1735, in the Hotel *Nieuwen Doelen*, in the presence of the Grand Master Rademacher and of the Deputy Grand Master Kuenen. It was apparently called *Le Véritable Zèle*. Maarschalk, in his *History of the Order of Freemasons in the Netherlands* (p. 16), says that the first Lodge was opened at the Hague on November 8, 1734, after which François Liegois went to London and received at his request a Charter from the English Grand Lodge on behalf of the Dutch Freemasons. Mention is made in the Lists 1736-9 of a Charter for a Lodge in Holland as No. 131, which became 116 in 1740, 71 in 1756 and disappeared in the List of 1770.

One can only suppose that the titles of Grand Master and Deputy were self-assumed. Rademacher—Treasurer to the Prince of Orange—was cited before the courts on December 9-12, 1735 and constrained to promise never more to frequent Masonic assemblies. Kuenen translated Anderson's *Constitutions* into French (published at the Hague, 1736 and 1741) and German (published at Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1741, 1743 and 1744). The *Handbuch* asserts that these two were Provincial and Deputy Provincial Grand Masters of the English Lodges in Holland. If so, both the *Constitutions* and Preston fail to notice the appointments and it would be difficult to name many English Lodges as existing in Holland at that time, as the only one on our roll, previous to 1749, appears in the List of 1736, as constituted in 1735 under the No. 131. This may be the latter of the two cited above and, perhaps, its Warrant was granted to Rademacher. The two Lodges, however, soon closed and did not reopen till 1744. On October 16, 1735, a Lodge, composed chiefly of Englishmen, held at Amsterdam, was pillaged by a mob, which occasioned a riot. This Lodge is also absent from the English Lodge lists, but the occurrence, together with the newspaper paragraph above referred to, caused the Government to issue a commission to inquire into the whole matter of Freemasonry. Their study of the *Book of Constitutions* appears to have been most minute, but their report, published November 30, 1735, was unfavourable and a magisterial order was promulgated December 2, 1735, forbidding assemblies of the Craft. Lawrie (*History of Freemasonry*, 1859, p. 61) says that the States General were alarmed at the rapid increase of Freemasons, who held their meetings in every town under their government; and as they could not believe that architecture and brotherly love were their only objects, they resolved to discountenance their proceedings. In consequence of this determination, an edict was issued by Government, stating that, though they had discovered nothing in the practices of the Fraternity either injurious to the interests of the Republic or contrary to the character of good citizens, yet, in order to prevent any bad consequences which might ensue from such associations, they deemed it prudent to abolish their assemblies.



Headquarters of the Grand East of the Netherlands, at The Hague.

In spite of this order a Lodge meeting was held at Rotterdam on December 10 and the members were promptly brought to book. Lawrie gives a very touching account of the noble refusal of the Brethren to unveil their secrets, also of their counter-proposal to initiate one of the magistrates, which being effected, the whole bench joined the Fraternity and became zealous members. The facts apparently are, that out of respect for one of the chief members, himself a magistrate and from the well-known integrity of the other members, together with the weighty consideration that the Emperor was himself a Freemason, the matter was quietly hushed up.

Lawrie, using almost the same words as Findel, however, says (*ibid.*, p. 62) that the meeting was held at Amsterdam, not at Rotterdam and that all the members were arrested and brought to the Court of Justice. Before this tribunal, in the presence of all the magistrates of the city, the Master and Wardens ably defended themselves, and declared upon oath that they were loyal subjects, faithful to their religion and zealous for the interests of their country; that Freemasonry was an institution venerable in itself and useful to society; that though they could not reveal its secrets and ceremonies, they would assure them that they were contrary neither to the laws of God nor man; that they would willingly admit into the Order any one of their number, from whom they might receive such information as would satisfy any reasonable mind. In consequence of these statements, the Brethren were dismissed and the Town Secretary requested to become a member of the Fraternity. After initiation he returned to the Court of Justice and gave such a favourable account of the principles and practices of the Order, that all the magistrates became Brethren and patrons of the Fraternity. This story, in slightly varied forms, has done duty on so many occasions that little, if any credence, can be placed in it. The theory of F. J. W. Crowe (*Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. iii, p. 84) and Findel (*History*, p. 313) that the States General did not at first favour the Order because the staunchest friends of the Prince of Orange were amongst its members and rulers is undoubtedly the correct one. However this may be, the prohibition of the Craft was soon withdrawn, for, in 1740, the magistrates took its part against the intolerance of the clergy, who had long persecuted the Order and in that year (Findel, p. 314) refused absolution to those who had joined the Society. The State then signified to the priests that they were not to reject any Freemason if in other respects an honest man.

In 1744 the Hague Lodges reopened and, in 1749, the *Loge du Grand Maître* changed its title to the Union Mother-Lodge. In the same year (1749) we find from the Engraved List for 1750—those for 1746-9 are unfortunately missing—that a Lodge was warranted at Rotterdam, the Lodge of Orange, No. 202.

In *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. ii, p. 96, J. P. Vaillant, then Grand Secretary of the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands, reproduced a letter, dated December 16, 1768, from L. E. Hake, Worshipful Master, *pro tem.*, of the Lodge La Victoire, in which he says that the Lodge of Orange had ceased to exist for a dozen years or more and that the first cause of its decadence was national jealousy, "for after the

departure of its chief and founder, Brother Schomberg, no agreement could be come to as to his successor, the said Lodge being then very strong and composed of Englishmen, Scots, Hollanders, French and German. The greater number of the Scots were the first to secede and establish themselves *without a Constitution*, but it was not for long. At the same time the Lodge declined more and more, and on my return home from a journey which I had undertaken, I learnt its complete dissolution. Brother Van der Velde was its last Master: as far as I have heard, he retained in his possession all the effects of the said Lodge and its reassembly was never mooted."

The next Lodges of English origin were constituted at the Hague (probably the Royal), No. 223, in 1752; at Amsterdam, No. 234, November 30, 1753, probably La Bien Aimée, which, however, claims to date from 1735 and is possibly the Lodge connected with Lawrie's romance; and at the same place the Lodge of Charity, No. 265, June 24, 1755; and the Lodge of Peace, No. 215, September 23, 1756. In Amsterdam there also existed a fourth Lodge, founded by the Grand Lodge of Scotland, Concordia Vincit Animos, July 13, 1755, the only Lodge of Scottish origin ever warranted in Holland. This accounts for at most eight Lodges—three at the Hague, one at Rotterdam, four in Amsterdam.

On November 8, 1756, the Deputy Grand Master, Lewis Dagan, of the Union Mother-Lodge at the Hague, issued invitations to thirteen other Lodges to constitute a Grand Lodge of Holland. We are therefore forced to conclude that the Union had warranted at least five Lodges and that its designation of Mother was no empty title.

The fourteen Lodges met December 25, 1756, under the presidency of Dagan and on the 27th constituted the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands, electing Baron Aerssen-Beyeren as Grand Master and Baron von Boetzelaar of Hogerheide as Deputy Grand Master, but this National Grand Lodge was not acknowledged by England until 1770, though Crowe says (*Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. iii, p. 84) that it was considered as an English Provincial Grand Lodge and its Grand Master as a Provincial Deputy Grand Master of England.

In 1757 the former Mother-Lodge and the Royal Lodge at the Hague amalgamated under the title Royal Union, which is still the foremost Lodge in Holland.

The same year witnessed an unsuccessful attempt to erect a Scots Lodge at the Hague and the constitution by England of the Lodge of Regularity, No. 228, at Amsterdam on November 21.

On December 18, 1757, the Grand Master issued a Declaration that no other Degrees were acknowledged or admitted other than the three Symbolic Craft Degrees. This Declaration was repeated on March 19, 1780. Yet it is beyond all doubt that, as early as 1750, a Rose Croix Chapter was held at the Hague and that, at an even earlier period, the Degrees of Elu and Ecossais were practised by several Brethren.

In 1758—August 6—Count Christian F. von Bentinck was elected the second Grand Master and under his rule the English *Constitutions* were reprinted. He



Lodge Room at Copenhagen, Denmark.

was succeeded—June 24, 1759—by the third Grand Master, Baron Carl von Boetzelaar, who held the office for thirty-nine years. Up to this date the regulations of the Grand Lodge were probably the English *Book of Constitutions*; but on July 27, 1760, new *Statutes* were approved and published in 1762, in which year also the Atholl Grand Lodge constituted a Lodge in Amsterdam. Findel says that a French translation of the English *Book of Constitutions* appeared in Holland in 1736 and that the new *Book of Constitutions* published during von Boetzelaar's administration materially assisted in consolidating Freemasonry in the Netherlands.

Resuming the examination of the English Lists, we find that in 1762 the following Lodges were warranted:—Royal Frederick, No. 271, Rotterdam, January 25; United Brothers, No. 284, Amsterdam, June 16; Virtutis et Artis Amici, Amsterdam, No. 288, September 16. Also in 1765, Perseverance, No. 359, Amsterdam; 1767, British Union, No. 400, Rotterdam, August 1; Three Pillars No. 402, Rotterdam, August 21; 1768, Victory, No. 419, Rotterdam, March 17; and, in 1769, the Sun Lodge, No. 436, Flushing, February 3. From the date last given, no English Lodge has been constituted in Holland. A lengthy inquiry on the spot would probably be necessary to determine whether these Lodges were constituted in the first instance by the Grand Lodge of Holland and merely *joined*, i.e. were absorbed and legitimated by that of England; or whether they were totally independent of Baron Boetzelaar. Being in seaports only, one inclines towards the latter alternative and is strengthened in that conclusion by the following evidence. In the letter from J. E. Hake, already cited, he says:

F. Bruyer took measures to revise the Order in the city and succeeded in establishing the Lodge Royal Frederick. His first plan was to admit only Frenchmen to membership.

This plan recalled to my mind the fall of the Lodge d'Orange and appeared to me to owe its inspiration to a lively recollection of the same circumstances. After talking the matter with some Germans we conceived the idea of founding a German Lodge under a *Constitution* from one of the Provincial Grand Lodges of that country. The resolution being taken, I wrote to that effect to Berlin, but not being known there as a Mason, Lodge Royal Frederick granted me a certificate on the strength of which a *Constitution* was forwarded to me under date February 6, 1764, by which I was authorized to establish a Lodge with the name Concorde Prussienne, giving it as distinctive colours celestial blue. On May 26, 1764, my said Lodge was solemnly inaugurated by the Lodge Royal Frederick at the express request of the Grand Lodge of the Three Globes at Berlin.

With regard to the formation of three of the other Lodges, i.e. British Union, Three Pillars, and Victory, Hake contributes the following information:

A man of easy means and debauched, called Van Dijek, was a frequenter of a tavern, of which the proprietor, George Alsop, gives himself out for a Mason and, as a matter of fact, does own a certificate from the Grand Lodge of London. This George Alsop, desirous of profiting by the circumstances, proposed that the said Van Dijek that he would allow himself to be made a Mason in his house and

invited several Brethren, novices or uninstructed in the Order to be present and assist. As soon as I heard of it I warned them on no account to do so and even warned Van Dijek of the irregularity of the proposed proceedings and of the consequences. But George Alsop, reluctant to lose so good a bit, contrived to gather a few people, almost unknown, calling themselves Superior Brother Masters or Masons, of whom one is called . . . Mitault and one . . . Cooper and the job was done as decided upon. Nevertheless, the said Van Dijek, having heard speak of *Constitutions*, ordered one to be procured at his expense, which was done, and there you have the origin of the Lodge L'Union Britannique, 400, 1767.

Hake then adds :

The said Mitault and Cooper are members of the Lodge : they prefer carrying on their particular traffic by imposing on the credulity and pocketing the ducats. Cooper has even had the impudence to procure from London a batch of certificates in order to sell them here to who will buy, for which purpose the names are left blank, to be inserted by him. The facilities with which these certificates were granted at London would be most astonishing if said Cooper had not pretended that they were required for the members of the British Union Lodge, but the consequences of this distribution are none the less great.

Even so, but as G. W. Speth has commented : " If this is to be credited it reveals a most unusual proceeding on the part of the London authorities and it is the only hint of such that has come under our notice."

With regard to the Three Pillars Lodge, No. 402, Rotterdam, 1767, Hake says :

A wig-maker having been initiated under the condition that he is not to seek to join the Lodge as a member, foregathered with others and the resolve was taken to form a Lodge of artisans. A Warrant was petitioned for and granted, and there you have the Lodge of the Three Pillars.

As to Victory Lodge, No. 419, 1768, he says :

Millaut continuing his practice of making Masons and having initiated a certain number, they demanded of him a Warrant to constitute themselves into a Lodge, which he promised them, but took no further steps in the matter. Tired at length of waiting, some of them resolved to proceed and chose a certain Duchan for their Master. They procured a *Constitution* in which Duchan is termed Master and there you have the Lodge Victory.

This Lodge met on the first and third Sundays of each month, between six and seven o'clock in the evening.

On April 25, 1770 (*Constitutions*, 1784, p. 297)

the Provincial Master for foreign Lodges acquainted the Grand Lodge of England that he had lately received a letter from Charles Baron de Boetzelaar, Grand Master of the National Grand Lodge of the United Provinces of Holland, requesting to be

acknowledged as such by the Grand Lodge of England, whose superiority he acknowledged; and promising, that on condition the Grand Lodge of England did not in future constitute any new Lodge within its jurisdiction, the Grand Lodge of Holland should observe the same restriction with respect to all parts of the world where Lodges were established under the patronage of England; and concluding by requesting a firm alliance and annual correspondence. The request was acceded to. This certainly looks as if the numerous Lodges so lately warranted by England had somewhat alarmed our Dutch Brethren and will account for the sudden cessation of England's activity in the Low Countries. Many of those English Lodges were not renumbered in the 1770 List and we may presume that they immediately joined the Grand Lodge at the Hague; but, on the other hand, five Lodges in Holland at Rotterdam and Flushing were retained on our roll until 1813, from which we may conclude that they preferred working under their English Charters and that at this early date England initiated the policy in these matters—ever since maintained by her—which was the cause of querulous complaint on the part of the Grand Lodge of Quebec.

The Act defining the jurisdictions of the Grand Lodges of England and Holland and undertaking mutual respect provided that the Lodges under English Warrants "shall have full and perfect liberty to remain under the jurisdiction to our Provincial Grand Master for foreign Lodges or to join the National Grand Lodge of Holland." They chose the latter course, possibly, Vaillant thinks, because they disliked de Vignoles, the Provincial Grand Master in question, to whom they ascribed a great predilection for introducing innovations. The Lodges referred to were the Royal Frederick, British Union, Three Pillars, Victory and Sun, all meeting at Rotterdam. These Lodges, says Vaillant (*Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. ii, p. 98) had, *circa* 1769, directed a letter to the Grand Master of England, as follows:

We, underwritten Masters, officers and members of Lodges established in the United Provinces under the Constitution of the respectable Grand Lodge of Great Britain very desirous to establish a National Grand Lodge in this country, to keep the old *Constitutions* and *Statutes* of our royal Order in their original purity against the grave innovations introduced in these Provinces. For these reasons we beg our Right Worshipful Grand Master to constitute a National Grand Lodge with all the privileges and prerogatives annexed to the same. . . .

We have unanimously elected for our National Grand Master the Worshipful Brother Arnout Leers, lord of the manor of Ameyde, Alderman of the city of Rotterdam. . . .

We shall always acknowledge the respectable Grand Lodge of Great Britain to be the first and original Grand Lodge and we shall take good care to contribute yearly to the general fund of charity, according to our funds and to the number of Constitutions we shall give.

Vaillant says he cannot find that any reply was sent to this communication.

German authorities maintain that the compact with England was ratified May 16, 1770, by the English Provincial Grand Master. This, however, seems to be incorrect, as we do not know of any such individual, unless, indeed, Rademacher had really been appointed to the office in 1735 and was still living. In all probability the ratification emanated from the Provincial Grand Master for foreign Lodges, a functionary under the Grand Lodge of England, first appointed about this time.

In 1778 Prince George Karl of Hesse-Darmstadt pointed out to Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick the advisability of gaining over Holland to the Strict Observance. That country was still remarkably free from all perversions of Freemasonry, although, of course, individual members had been admitted to the various Rites during their foreign travels. Many were also members of the Knightly degrees of the Strict Observance, which had made its appearance in Holland about 1770, into which the Grand Master and some of the Grand Officers had been admitted. In 1776, also, the Grand Lodge of Elu and Ecossais Degrees had been created by van Boetzelaar, who, four years previously, had declared that true Freemasonry consisted only of the Symbolic Degrees. (See *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. iv, p. 157.)

In 1888 W. D. J. Bromver, a member of the Historical Committee of the Grand Chapter of the High Degrees, published a pamphlet entitled *Beknopt Historisch Overzicht der Hooge Graden in Nederland*—"A Compendious Historical View of the High Degrees in the Netherlands." The salient points of this pamphlet were translated in 1892 by J. D. Oortman-Gerlings, then Grand Master of the High Degrees in the Netherlands and published by him in the *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. v, p. 158, from which translation the following extract has been made :

The High Degrees of the Netherlands, also called Red Masonry, acquired their name in 1803 and were constituted from out the Grand Scots Lodge working at the Hague in the Degrees of Elu and Ecossais and a Chapter at Amsterdam of the Sovereign Princes Rose Croix called *Credentes Vivent Ab Illo*. The Grand Scots Lodge was erected April 27, 1760, with fourteen Lodges represented and Baron von Boetzelaar was elected Grand Master National. The second Grand Scots Lodge was held on May 19, 1777, when seventeen Lodges were represented. At the Grand Communication held on May 18, 1778, protests were received from several Lodges, stating that they had worked the Scots Degrees for years previously and, therefore, objected to making payment for a new Warrant under the new rules. It was then resolved that seven Lodges, viz. *Le Profond Silence*, *Les Cœurs Unis*, *La Vertu*, *L'Indissoluble*, *L'Amore*, *De Edelmædigheid* and *La Concorda*, should receive Letters of Constitution without payment.

In a very short time overtures were made from Germany with the result that the Grand Scots Lodge established fraternal relations with the Provincial Grand Master Termin of Stuttgart, with the Brethren in Hamburg and, in 1779, with the Grand Easts of Germany, Sweden and Denmark, with Prince Frederick of Hesse-Cassel.

No Grand Lodge was held from 1779 until June 5, 1786, when a committee was elected to consider (1) what means should be taken to increase the stability

of the Scots Grand Lodge and (2) to procure more uniformity in working. The next meeting was held on April 10, 1801, summoned by the Scots Lodge Frederick Royal of Rotterdam, at which a committee was formed which presented its report in due course. On June 7, 1802, all the Brethren working in the High Degrees were summoned by Is. van Teylinghen, Grand Master National, when the government was elected and a committee appointed to organize the Rite. This committee reported in the following May, and advised the following scheme :

First Degree	Elu or Elected Master.
Second Degree	The three Scots Grades.
Third Degree	Knight of the Sword or of the East.
Fourth Degree	Sovereign Prince Rose Croix.

The first three Degrees were to be worked, but the last one was to be communicated. This report was accepted in a general Grand Lodge of the High Degrees held on October 15, 1803, when new *Statutes* were submitted and adopted and rituals agreed upon. The dates of the erection of the following Chapters are known : 1755, La Bien Aimée, Concordia Vincit Animos and La Charité at Amsterdam ; 1768, La Paix, Amsterdam ; 1777, L'Amore, Brielle ; La Vertur, Leyden ; La Philanthrope and La Companie Durable, Middelburg ; La Profonde Silence, Kampen ; and L'Union Provinciale, Groningen ; 1779, L'Union Royale, The Hague ; 1785, De Eendracht, Rotterdam ; 1789, Les Vrais Bataves, The Hague ; 1791, La Parfaite Union, Dordrecht and 1800, L'Astre de l'Orient, Flushing.

The constitution of the first Lodge was obtained from Dublin on December 26, 1755 and was signed by C. Walgrave, S.M. ; James Pitt Lithelier and W. Caxton Williams. It is worded as follows :

Our Grand Master, Substitute of the very illustrious and very worshipful Grand Master of Great Britain, do hereby declare and attest that by letters dated 10th December, 1755, it has been given to us to know that several of our Brethren (who, for the greater spread of our effulgent lustre, had travelled abroad) had, in the month of December at the Hague in Holland, received Peter Bucherius Bunel, calling himself Grand Master of a certain Lodge in Amsterdam, La Bien Aimée, with full ceremonial into the true secrets of Ecossais and Elus [it has already been pointed out that the title "Grand Master" was the usual title in many continental countries for the W.M. of a Lodge and does not represent, except when specially applied, the ruler of a Jurisdiction].

Therefore we do so acknowledge him and, moreover, as he is highly recommended by our very excellent Brethren in the letter above named, we do empower him, as Grand Master, to work in the Scots and Select Lodge and to instruct other Brethren in the mysteries of Ecossais and Elus and even, in urgent cases, without full ceremonial : nevertheless, not otherwise than is set out in his secret instructions.

Further, we do confer upon him the special privilege that he may appoint Brethren belonging to our assemblies to be Grand Masters of other Lodges now existing, or to be erected hereafter, throughout the cities and lands under the jurisdiction of the honourable States General of the United Netherlands.

Nevertheless, he shall be careful not to appoint himself or others to the dignity of Grand Master in foreign lands, unless he be himself resident there.

Given in Dublin in our Lodge the 26th day of December, 1755, under our hand and seal.

The foregoing letter was written in Latin on parchment.

The Lodge La Bien Aimée was constituted on Sunday, February 8, 1756, by Bunel and the Minutes run from that date to Tuesday, December 23, 1800.

It is also evident from other sources that the Higher Degrees had been known in Holland for at least twenty years. In 1756 or 1757 a letter was sent to Dr. Thomas Manningham, the Deputy Grand Master of England from 1752 to 1756, the original of which is not available, but the following reply, found in the archives of the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands in 1868, was published in the *Vrijmetselaars Jaarboekje*, and afterwards in Findel's *History of Freemasonry*. The reply is dated July 12, 1757.

SIR AND BROTHER,

I am quite ashamed that your obliging letter should lay by me so long unanswered, but I hope you will excuse me. I assure you it was not owing to neglect or disrespect, but of opportunity to satisfy myself on some points relating to the variety of Masonry and you mention the name of Scotch Masonry.

I was determined to consult our Brethren in Scotland, particularly our Brother, Lord Aberdour, who is son and heir of the Earl of Morton and an exceeding good Mason, as such he has filled the chair in Scotland, and his lordship is now elected Grand Master in England, on the Marquess of Carnarvon's resignation.

Lord Aberdour and all the Scotch Masons (or, rather, the Scotch gentlemen that are Masons) that I have conversed with—and I have made it my business to consult many—are entirely unacquainted with the form and titles you mention, and which you justly call the charlatanery of Masonry. Amongst some of our least Brethren I have met with and frequently heard of such irregularities—irregularities I justly call them, because they deviate so much from our usual ceremonies and are so full of innovations, that in process of time the ancient landmarks will be destroyed by the fertile genius of Brethren who will improve or alter, if only to give specimen of their abilities and imaginary consequence, so that in a few years it will be as difficult to understand Masonry as to distinguish the points or the accents of the Hebrew or Greek language, now almost obscured by the industry of critics and commentators.

Three foreign gentlemen and Masons lately visited the Lodge I belong to and were introduced by me to the Grand Lodge and the Grand East: by discoursing with these gentlemen, I find that in Germany, Holland, Switzerland and in some other places, they have orders of Masons unknown to us, viz. Knights of the Sword, Knights of the Eagle, Knights of the Holy Land, with a long train of *et ceteras*. Surely these points of Masonry must be wonderful, I am certain they are very new; besides these dignified and distinguished Orders, I find, have signs, tokens, etc., peculiar to their respective dignities, and adorn themselves with different coloured ribbons.

I should be glad, with your assistance and the assistance of the Brethren in Holland, to settle these intricate and confused points and wish to know (especially from the Brethren who distinguish themselves by the denomination of Scotch

Masons), from whence they derive their constitution ; the Grand Master of Scotland, whom, I presume, they acknowledge head of their society, being entirely unacquainted with their Order. To Lord Aberdour and several other Scotch noblemen and gentlemen that are good Masons, I have to communicate your letter, likewise the opinion I received from those foreign Brethren, one of whom was an officer in the Dutch service ; but from the strictest enquiries I can make, can only say they have racked their genius and endeavours to make Masonry unintelligible and useless.

These innovations are of very late years, and I believe the Brethren will find a difficulty to produce a Mason acquainted with any such forms, twenty, nay, ten years. My own father has been a Mason these fifty years and had been at Lodges in Holland, France, and England. He knows none of these ceremonies. Grand Master Payne, who succeeded Sir Christopher Wren, is a stranger to them, as is likewise one old Brother of ninety, who I conversed with lately. This Brother assures me he was made a Mason in his youth and has constantly frequented Lodges till rendered incapable by his advanced age and never heard, or knew, any other ceremonies or words than those used in general amongst us ; such forms were delivered to him and those he has retained. As to Knights of the Sword, Knights of the Eagle, etc., the knowledge of them never reached his ears till I informed him of them. The only orders that were known are three—Masters, Fellow-crafts, and Apprentices—and none of them ever arrive at the honour of knighthood by Masonry ; and I believe you can scarcely imagine that in ancient time the dignity of knighthood flourished amongst Freemasons, whose Lodges heretofore consisted of Operative, not Speculative Masons. Knights of the Eagle, Knights of the Sword, I have read in romance ; the great Don Quixote himself was Knight of the Brazen Helmet, when he had vanquished the barber. Knights of the Holy Land, Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, Knights Templars, etc., have existed and I believe now exist in the Knights of Malta, but what is that to Masonry ? I never heard if these Orders or honours were obtained by skill in Masonry, or that they belonged to the Fraternity of Freemasons, wherewith members of their Order and honour, but imagine that they did not think such titles obtained by Masonry alone.

As universal benevolence, brotherly love, friendship and truth, acting by the square and living within compass, are, or ought to be, the tenets of Masonry, a rule and guide to our actions. Let us be good Masons ; we may look with scorn on other honours or titles. It is at all times in our power to be good Masons and I think we ought to be contented and not search the ærial field of romance for additional titles. Use your utmost endeavour, dear Brother, to prevent a really valuable society from degenerating and becoming lost in obscurity, by aiming at titles, to which the very end of our society cannot give us a claim.

The only distinction of ribbons or jewels that we make in our Lodges you will find in our *Book of Constitutions*, viz. Grand Officers wear their jewels gilt, pendant on blue ribbons and their aprons lined with blue ; those Brethren that have served the office of Steward at our grand feast (from which number all Grand Officers except the Grand Master must be elected) wear their jewels of silver on red ribbons and line their aprons with red ; all other Brethren wear white aprons and their jewels pendant on white ribbons, neither are they suffered to wear other jewels than the square, level and plumb, the compass belonging only to the Grand Master.

You mention your design of electing a noble Grand Master amongst yourselves. I have communicated that part of your letter to our Grand Lodge; they have no objection to such election, but seem pleased with your intention; neither will they claim more than brotherly love and friendly correspondence from your Grand Master and will use their utmost endeavour to settle everything on a proper basis and be cautious how they interfere or grant constitutions for Holland. The constitution already granted by us, I presume, your Grand Master will not disapprove: their titles and places of meeting our Constitution Book will inform you. Our Grand Master commands me to inform you that he is desirous of a correspondence with your Grand Master when elected and we will use our endeavours that it be properly maintained by the respective deputies or grand secretaries, as we cannot expect Grand Masters, either in England or Holland, to give themselves such trouble at all times; and I hope you will find future Deputies more alert in their correspondence than I have been to you, for which I sincerely ask your pardon and forgiveness.

The Marquess of Carnarvon has resigned the chair to Lord Aberdour, who is now Grand Master and our worthy Brother Revis, Deputy Grand Master, but I have promised to sign this letter as Deputy Grand Master and, if you favour us with a line, take the same method, as before by Mr. Hopp's secretary, who will convey your commands to me and I will take great care they are properly honoured.

One point in this letter merits special attention, that is the studied omission of the name of Anthony Sayer, concerning whose Grand Mastership there is no dispute and the pointed reference to the Grand Mastership of Sir Christopher Wren, which is in dispute to the present day.

The result of the negotiations between Prince George Karl of Hesse-Darmstadt and Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick was, that in 1779 a pact of unity was concluded between the Directory in Brunswick and one formed at the Hague, that on March 18, 1780, a National Chapter of the Strict Observance of Holland was constituted with Prince Frederick of Hesse-Cassel and Grand Master von Boetzelaar as Protector and Superior respectively.

The Dutch Craft was not, however, overridden as in other countries; the Grand Lodge at the Hague still retained its full power; the National Chapter was merely an accessory. What the consequences might have been it is difficult to say; but the Strict Observance was already on the wane. It will be remembered that on September 19, 1780, Ferdinand had issued a circular seriously questioning the very grounds of the whole movement. As a result, although Schwarz represented this Chapter at the Wilhelmsbad Convent, the system never made much progress in the Netherlands and soon died out. Pure English Freemasonry thus once more assumed an undisputed supremacy.

On November 15, 1784, Grand Master von Boetzelaar celebrated the twenty-fifth year of his Grand Mastership and, in 1798—May 28—his rearrangement of the *Statutes* was approved and accepted. He died a few weeks afterwards and in the same year—June 24—was succeeded by Baron Teylingen as fourth Grand Master, who in turn was followed by Bijleveld, the fifth holder of that office, May 29, 1805.



Masonic Temple, Amsterdam—Master's Chair and Dais.

At last, in 1807, the High Degrees obtained a firm footing in Holland and a code of laws was issued for their governance. The Rite chosen was the French or modern Rite of four extra Degrees, of the Grand Orient of France. This is not to be wondered at, when we consider that Holland had submitted to France in 1795, when the Batavian Republic was established and that, in 1806, the bonds were drawn still closer by the appointment of Louis Bonaparte to the throne of Holland. Rather should we marvel that an oasis of good sense had so long resisted the Saharan sands of the fanciful High Degrees, which had encroached on the Craft elsewhere in Europe. The French aberration—Ladies' Lodges—had also found an entrance in 1801, but was peremptorily prohibited on June 10, 1810.

In the year last named—June 24—Bousquet was elected sixth Grand Master. Louis abdicated the throne and Holland became an integral portion of the French empire. This led to complications. The Grand Orient of France always maintained that only one supreme Masonic body could exist in each state and some Lodges established by it in Amsterdam conceived themselves justified in refusing to acknowledge the Dutch Lodges until they were rectified by the Grand Orient. Meanwhile—June 24, 1812—W. P. Barnaart was elected seventh Grand Master and the dispute was brought to a climax by a circular of the Grand Order—February 17, 1813—ordering the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands to submit and dissolve. This being met by a flat refusal—March 21, 1813—the Grand Orient immediately retaliated by warranting a number of Lodges in various cities of Holland, the membership of which consisted chiefly of French officials. The strain was, however, suddenly eased by the French reverses of 1814: Holland reacquired independence, the French Lodges were weakened by the withdrawal of the French officials and on May 29, 1814, the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands called upon these Lodges to come in and accept Dutch Warrants. Some complied, the others died out. The same year is marked by the commencement of troubles of which the High Degrees were the cause. The Chapter was independent of the Grand Lodge, though composed chiefly of the same members and had a Grand Master of its own. It occupied much the same position as the English Royal Arch Chapter does towards the Grand Lodge and its meetings were always held on the days succeeding Grand Lodge Communications. In 1814 Bijleveld, who had presided over the Grand Lodge, 1805–10, was Master of the Grand Chapter. On May 30 violent disputes arose over some contemplated changes in these Degrees, into the details of which we need not enter.

On March 30, 1815, the Austrian (French) Netherlands, or Belgium, became an integral portion of the kingdom of Holland; and—May 30—Reepmacher was elected eighth Grand Master. In the previous March the king had expressed a wish that the Lodges in both divisions of his territory should be gathered under one Grand Lodge and this question was discussed at the meeting of May 30, but delayed and postponed for many months.

Prince Fredrik Wilhelm Karl, of the Netherlands, Duke of Ursel, second son of William I, was initiated at Berlin in June 20, 1816, by a Deputation from the

Grand Lodge of the Three Globes, with de Guionneau, Grand Master, at its head. A Lodge, *Union Frédéric*, was then formed at the Hague, with the prince as a member, which applied to the Grand Lodge—June 2, 1816—for a Warrant of Constitution. This was not only granted, but the prince was unanimously elected ninth Grand Master, on the proposition of Bijleveld. On June 3, 1816, the Grand Chapter for the Higher Degrees, of which Bijleveld was also Grand Master, also elected Prince Fredrik as Grand Master, and the letter offering him the Mastership of both sections was addressed to him by the Grand Lodge, with the assent of the Grand Chapter for the Higher Degrees. He accepted the high positions offered him and was installed on October 13, 1816, as Grand Master of the Symbolic or Craft Degrees and, on the following day, as Grand Master of the Higher Degrees. These dates are given on the authority of the usually accurate *Handbuch* which, as it repeats the leading ones in a further article devoted to the Prince, forbids the idea of their being simply a printer's error. O'Etzel, in *Gesch. der Grossen Nat-Mutter Loge*, Berlin, 1875, p. 138, says he was "made" in June 1817 and passed and raised there in the course of the next few months, which would of course render the above occurrences impossible. The main facts appear to be correct, but the dates require investigation. The *Cosmopolitan Calendar* for 1871 states he was installed October 18 (?), 1817. If this be accurate, then we may arrive at a conclusion which is quite possible, viz. that the prince was elected in 1816 (being at that time a non-Mason), procured initiation at Berlin in 1817, passed through all the Degrees there during the same summer and was finally installed at the Hague in the ensuing autumn, viz. October 1817. In the same year he was elected Grand Master of the Chapter; but events close at hand show how little of profit he was able to perceive in the High Degrees.

Scarcely was the Grand Master installed before he received the mysterious packet containing the so-called Cologne Charter. As this subject has already been fully treated, any further reference to it here will be unnecessary. Attempts were also made in this year to incorporate the Belgian Lodges with those of Holland, but the former were desirous of obtaining a separate Grand Lodge; and, after the Prince of Orange, Frederick's elder brother, had been initiated in 1817 in the Hope Lodge, Brussels, they proposed to him to become their Grand Master, an offer which he declined on May 7. Two days before—May 5—the Grand Master, seeing the difficulty of a complete fusion, proposed in a circular the formation of two administrative (Grand) bodies—one for the northern, the other for the southern, Provinces, with a single legislative (Grand) body—composed of an equal number from each side—for both. A newly formed Grand Lodge of Belgium met for the first time—June 24, 1817—and elected Prince Frederick as their Grand Master. On August 30 a commission was appointed, at the prince's request, to arrange a *modus vivendi* between the two Grand Lodges, of each of which he was Grand Master.

It executed its mandate after four sittings and reported September 20. The project was approved almost unanimously in Belgium, but only passed by 77 to 20 votes in Holland. The arrangements were finally concluded on December 11.

Considering the extreme importance and difficulties of the matter, this promptitude speaks well for the business-like habits of our Dutch Brethren. The common supreme body was by these statutes entitled "Grand Orient" and was composed of the officers of each Grand Lodge, which were to assume the titles of Grand Administrative Lodges; of 28 Lodge Masters, 14 from the northern, 14 from the southern, Provinces. It was to be summoned when necessary by the Grand Master and to meet alternately at Brussels and the Hague—but, as a matter of fact, it never met at all. The Belgian Grand Administration was formally inaugurated in the Lodge of Hope, Brussels, April 11, 1818; that of Holland, at the Hague, May 10 following.

In 1819 the prince's action—however well intentioned—gave rise to an acrimonious strife in the Craft, which disturbed its peace for several years. Thoroughly imbued with the uselessness of the High Degrees, he proposed—April 25—to abrogate them entirely and to substitute two steps or courses of instruction beyond the degree of Master Mason. These were not to be Degrees, they were to entail no distinction beyond a small silver medal and were to be denominated Select Master and Super-Select Master (*uitverkoren* and *opper-uitverkoren*). This would have created a third constituent, which was to have its supreme ruler, who was to be called Chairman. It was also to have its separate government, laws and administration. The proposition was received with avidity by the Grand Lodge, but rejected indignantly by the Grand Chapter. At the meeting of the latter—May 31—Frederick provisionally resigned his office and declared his intention of abstaining in future from any participation in the High Degrees. He then asked for a commission to examine his project and, when it reported unfavourably upon his proposed Divisions of the Master's Degree, but favourably as to the High Degrees, sent in his final resignation. The Chapter—May 22, 1820—placed the Mastership in commission *ad interim* and, at the next meeting, the commission proposed a revision of the Degrees. A committee appointed for this purpose handed in a report on July 11, 1821, counselling great modifications, in order to bring the Chapter more into conformity with the principles of the Lodge. But the passions of the High Degree members were by this time so aroused, that the report was not acted upon until eight years afterwards. The Grand Mastership was offered by the Chapter—May 19, 1823—to the Prince of Orange and, on his refusal, Joachim Nuhout van der Veen was elected and filled the office from July 1, 1824 to 1834, during which long period a ceaseless strife and bitterness of spirit reigned in the Fraternity.

The Grand Lodge meanwhile sanctioned the proposed additional steps to the Master's Degree and added a governing body to administer them. The object of their foundation was the instruction of Master Masons in the history and *arcana* of the superior Degrees of every Rite, so as to place them on a footing of equality with ALL Masons, without, however, according to such Degrees either approbation or support. The two *steps* were called *Divisions* (or *Sections*) of the Master's Degree—although the *third* Degree remained intact—and a better title would have been *additions* or *supplements*.

In 1830 Belgium obtained its independence, but the Grand Lodge of Holland did not at once resume its former position and still continued to style itself the Grand Administration for the Northern Provinces. In 1833 signals of peace were held out by Frederick, who proposed in Grand Lodge to appoint a committee to deliberate upon the means of reuniting the Brotherhood. The committee reported on May 18, 1834, that, since 1819, the unanimity was disturbed and that the best remedy would be to restrict the working of the Order to the three Craft Degrees, but, as the time had not yet arrived to bring the Order back to the three Symbolic Degrees, the Commission proposed to confer the Grand Mastership of the whole Order on Prince Frederick and to give the different heads an independent and lawful sphere of action. For this purpose it had drafted nine articles, which were submitted for the prince's judgment and further action. After the report had been submitted to the three different Grand bodies, a fresh committee was appointed consisting of three members from each Grand body, which issued its report in favour of the scheme on February 17, 1835. The report was accepted by Grand Lodge on May 10 and by the two other bodies shortly afterwards. According to the treaty, the prince once more became Grand Master of all three bodies, who were to work side by side in amity. No Rite was to be admitted into Holland, except the Symbolic Degrees, working under their Statutes of 1798; the Modern Rite or High Degrees (Statutes of 1807) and the Divisions of the Master's Degree as settled in 1819. The Grand Master was to appoint a Deputy in each body, but as he did not himself attend High Degree meetings, he was to appoint one of two candidates proposed by the Chapter.

In 1837 a certain feeling of soreness existing between Belgium and Holland was allayed and, as a sign that Holland disclaimed any further supremacy over the Belgian Lodges, the Grand Administration for the Northern Provinces resumed its title of Grand Lodge of the Netherlands. Since that time Freemasonry in Holland has enjoyed quiet and prosperity; no changes of organization have been introduced and few facts of first moment remain to be recorded.

On June 6, 1841, Grand Lodge celebrated the completion of the Grand Master's twenty-fifth year of office. Prince Frederick on this occasion paid into the hands of the Grand Treasurer 9,000 florins for charitable purposes.

In 1847 several Amsterdam Brethren petitioned for a Warrant to constitute a Lodge called *Post Nubila Lux*. They declared their adhesion to ten fundamental axioms, of which only a few have been made known. In these one cannot perceive anything dangerous or un-Masonic, but the Grand Lodge thought otherwise, and refused the Warrant. Their reasons are unknown—the sixth axiom, “futility of all High Degrees,” could hardly have influenced them, because no Lodge is bound to work these—but the petitioners having waited patiently, for three years, at last established the Lodge—May 26, 1850—“by virtue of their inherent power.” It is still working and even flourishing, but never having been recognized by the Grand Lodge, is of course outside the pale of the Craft and irregular.



Masonic Temple, Amsterdam—West End.

The year 1851 witnessed the birth of Alexander, Prince of the Netherlands, the second son of King William III, grandson of that Prince of Orange to whom reference has already been made, who had meanwhile reigned as William II from 1840 to 1849. He was initiated—July 26, 1876—in the Lodge Royal Union, at the Hague and became Prince of Orange on the death of his elder brother in 1879.

In 1836 an Amsterdam Lodge protested in a very dignified manner, on account of a refusal to admit some of its members as visitors, by reason of their Jewish faith. The Lodge disclaimed any intention of dictating to the Grand Lodge respecting its choice of members, but insisted that a man, once made a Mason, should be treated as a Brother and that the Grand Lodge was incompetent to go behind his certificate and inquire into his religious belief. The protest, however, produced no immediate effect.

On May 19, 1856, the Grand Lodge celebrated its centenary of constitution and, in 1866, the jubilee of Frederick's Grand Mastership. On this occasion the munificent prince presented, for the use of the Brethren, the superb Masonic library of the late Dr. Kloss, which—at a cost of £3,000—he had purchased entire. This was a truly royal gift! The Brethren marked their sense of the event by founding an orphanage—their Blind Asylum at Amsterdam, established in 1806, would be of itself creditable to the Craft in any country—for Freemasons' children. It was opened in 1869 and the prince presented them for the purpose with a house and appurtenances of his own at the Hague. In 1876 his sixtieth year of office was celebrated and he died in 1881 at the age of eighty-four. He was succeeded as Grand Master by his grand-nephew Alexander, Prince of Orange—June 1882—who unfortunately died in June 1884, at the early age of thirty-three.

As Prince Alexander, however, was in possession of neither the Rose Croix nor the Elected Master's Degree, he was unable to become a ruler of Masonry beyond the three Degrees, unless he allowed himself to be further initiated, which he declined. The result was the selection of a Grand Master for each and, since 1882, the Higher Degrees have been entirely separated from the Grand Orient.

The most striking feature in the history of Dutch Freemasonry is thus its stability and simplicity. Until 1807 it was comparatively free from (so-called) High Degrees; in that year it accepted the simplest and least pretentious of all supplementary Rites and even this is largely replaced by the still simpler additions to the Master's Degree (1819). But these innovations have never been allowed to assert or exercise any superiority over or in the Craft; English Masonry has ever been considered the essence of the organization. We find no rival Grand Lodges springing up, no conflicts of jurisdiction, very few Lodges dying out, but a gradual and steady increase of numbers and in 130 years only ten Grand Masters.

Article 4 of the General Law of the Order of Freemasons under the Grand East of the Netherlands reads: "No Masonic Rites are acknowledged, except those which are now accepted and in vogue in the Order, namely, the Symbolic Degrees, the Higher Degrees and the Division of the Master's Degree." Dr. H. W. Dipereink,

writing in *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. iv, p. 24, says that the three Craft Degrees are worked under the administration of the Grand East of the Netherlands; the Degrees of Elu Ecosais, Knight of the East, Knight of the Sword and Supreme Prince Rose Croix under the Grand Chapter of the Higher Degrees; while the Degrees of Elected Master and Sublime Elected Master, now combined in one Degree, are worked under the Chamber of Administration for the Division of the Master's Degree." When Prince Frederick of the Netherlands was Grand Master National from 1816 to 1881, he was at the head of all three systems. Since his death, however, different Brethren have been placed at the heads of the three different systems of Dutch Freemasonry, two being styled Grand Masters and the third "President of the Chamber of Administration of Sublime Elected Master Masons."

The present constitution of the Grand Orient of the Netherlands consists of: Grand Master, Deputy Grand Master for the Symbolic Degrees; District or Deputy Grand Masters for the East and West Divisions of the Dutch East Indies, Surinam, Curacao and the islands adjacent thereto; and for South Africa and adjoining country; two Grand Overseers; Grand Orator; Grand Secretary; Grand Treasurer and Almoner; Grand Librarian; Grand Master of the Ceremonies; Grand Examiner; Grand Steward; and Assistant Grand Secretary, the seat of government being at the Hague. The clothing of the Grand Officers consists of apron and collar only. The apron is of white silk, bordered with blue and fringed with gold, having the square and compasses embroidered upon it in gold. The collar is of bright light blue silk ribbon, with an acacia branch embroidered in gold, to which the jewels are suspended. Every private Lodge has its own colour, which is expressly laid down in its Warrant of Constitution and this colour is used in the ribbon of its seal, the borders of its members' aprons and the furniture of the Lodge. The aprons are of white leather, edged with the proper colour, but every member is at liberty to ornament his apron as much as he likes and considerable use is made of this permission. Candidates are admitted at the age of twenty-three (the Dutch age of majority) or earlier if married as, according to Dutch law, a man obtains his majority on marriage. One month must elapse between the first and second Degrees, twelve months between the second and third Degrees. A Fellow Craft cannot apply for the Degree of Master Mason. This can only be given after a resolution of the Master Masons of his Lodge, when they consider him worthy to receive it. No fees are taken for the Degree. Paper certificates are granted for the first and second Degrees, but the Master's certificate is issued by the Grand Secretary and is countersigned by the officers of the Lodge, who attach to it the seal and ribbon of the Lodge. A member may be elected to the Master's chair without having previously served any office and there is no limit to the time he may occupy the chair.

CHAPTER VII

FREEMASONRY IN SWEDEN, NORWAY AND FINLAND

SWEDEN AND NORWAY

THE history of Freemasonry in Sweden possesses an interest peculiar to itself. The Swedes appear to have fallen away from the simple teachings of the Craft as easily and early as the other nationalities of Europe, but with this difference, that instead of flitting from one Rite to another, constantly seeking variety, they have remained steadfast to their first heresy and still work the same ceremonies that originally riveted their attention about 1760. These ceremonies are in great part their own invention, although based—not improbably—upon the Degrees of the Clermont Chapter; and, as they have only been adopted by one Grand Body in Prussia and by Denmark, Sweden has ever since been practically outside the circle of Freemasonry—a distant connexion only of the great Masonic family. This want of *intimate* Masonic intercourse, combined with a marked absence of indigenous Masonic literature, is the reason that any history of Swedish Freemasonry can be no more than a sketch. The two best attempts at a history hitherto published (*viz.* *Allgemeines Handbuch*, s.v. Schweden; and Findel's *History of Freemasonry*) are merely reproductions, as regards early facts, of Thory's *Acta Latomorum* and agree so closely with respect to later occurrences, as to warrant the conviction that they are either based on the same original, or copied one from the other. This account will, therefore, present little or no novelty. Considering the peculiar position of the Craft in Scandinavia, this paucity of material is somewhat vexatious.

Among the many Swedes who were admitted to the Fraternity in England and France may be mentioned Count Axel Eric Wrede Sparre, who was initiated at Paris May 4, 1731, afterwards visiting Lodges in Italy and, on his return to Sweden, is asserted to have founded a Lodge at Stockholm. Of this Lodge nothing further definitely is known and it is presumed that it disappeared in consequence of a royal edict of October 21, 1738, forbidding Freemasonry in Sweden on pain of death. The Sparre family, it may be mentioned, had, for five centuries, been accounted one of the most illustrious in Scandinavia.

The *Handbuch* informs us, quoting from Noorthouck's *Constitutions*, but a reference which has defied detection, that, in 1736, Count Carl Fredrik Scheffer was appointed Provincial Grand Master for Sweden, but little is known of this worthy, until later and it can only be inferred that the decree of 1738 may possibly have put a stop to his activity. The edict, however, was withdrawn in the same year and in 1740-5 we become aware of further traces of Freemasonry. In 1746 a Lodge existed at Stockholm, called St. Jean Auxiliare, which C. Kupferschmidt

(*Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. i, p. 202) claims to be the Lodge founded by Count Axel Eric Wrede Sparre, in which year, on the birth of Gustavus III and, again in 1753, on that of the Princess Sophie, it struck commemorative medals. From that date we may look upon the Craft as firmly established in the country, although the Lodge in question—generally considered the Mother-Lodge of Sweden—was not regularly constituted until January 2, 1752, under Count Karl Knutson Porse. Even at this early period the Fraternity was strong enough to found an orphanage (1753), in Stockholm, which, without any assistance from the State, was built by the voluntary contributions of the Brethren, has since grown to a prosperous institution, the just pride of the Swedish Craft and has always been the principal channel into which Swedish Masonic beneficence flows. In addition, a vaccination hospital was shortly afterwards built by Lodge Salomon at Gothenburg.

In 1753, also, King Adolf Fredrik himself founded and presided over a second Lodge in Stockholm, which bore his own name. Other Lodges were also constituted—Lodge Salomon, just mentioned, at Gothenburg, on November 30, 1754; Lodge St. Augustin, at Helsingfors, founded on June 24, 1756, by John Jennings, who had been initiated on June 30, 1753, in Lodge St. Jean Auxiliare; Lodge St. Erick, founded November 30, 1756, at Stockholm by Israel Torpadius; Lodge St. Edvard, constituted at Stockholm on June 15, 1757, by Edvard Corleson; Lodge St. Andrew L'Innocente, which, though founded at Stockholm on November 30, 1756, did not begin its regular meetings until 1758; and Lodge L'Union, founded at Stockholm on June 15, 1759, by General Count Fredrik Horn. The Swedish metropolis was next invaded by a Scots Lodge—1758—and, in the following year, there was a further addition to its roll—the Lodge Union—which conducted its proceedings in the French language. So that at this important date (1759) there were at least eight Lodges at work in the country.

According to Lawrie, "the first Lodge in Sweden was erected at Stockholm in 1754, under a patent from Scotland." Here, however, he apparently only follows Smith (*The Use and Abuse of Freemasonry*, 1783, p. 199), from whose pages he copied very freely. Smith, it may be observed, goes a step further and states that the Lodge of 1754 was, in 1783, the Grand Lodge of Sweden. But as in the same work he observes, with regard to some Lodges at Prague in Bohemia, that "they are all under the Constitution of Scotland, or at least, they call themselves Scotch Masons" (*ibid.*, p. 221), the light thus shed upon his method of research will justify our believing, that in the Scots Lodge of 1758 we have the *fons et origo* of the alleged Scottish Lodge of 1754. To this it may be added, that the first foreign Lodge on the roll of the Grand Lodge of Scotland, was the "St. Andrew's," chartered at Boston (U.S.A.) in 1756.

In 1759 a Grand Lodge of Sweden was formed, of which Count Karl Fredrik Eckleff—who had travelled far and wide—appears to have been the chief instigator and first Grand Master. He was supported by Fredrik de Stenhagen, Patrick Alströmer, Anders Lidberg, Israel Torpadius and fifteen other Brethren who were in possession of the Higher Degrees. Eckleff, says Kupferschmidt, had



Freemasons' Hall, Oslo, Norway.
Headquarters of the Grand Lodge of Norway.

travelled very much in Europe and had thus acquired a thorough knowledge of the then existing systems of Freemasonry in various countries. With the aid of the materials thus collected he set to work on his return to Sweden in 1750 and, within the following nine years, seems to have compiled a Ritual founded principally on the French Higher Degrees, which ultimately became the basis of the present Swedish system. This Grand Lodge was formally inaugurated on December 25, 1759. As regards the presidency of Count Eckleff, the facts are somewhat in dispute, it being variously maintained that he only gave way in 1773 to the Duke of Sudermania; that he merely exercised the office for a few years; and even that he was never Grand Master of the Craft at all, but simply "Head Master" of the Scots Lodge. One must regret the inability to reconcile, or decide between, these discrepant statements, which, as we shall presently see, are of great importance in relation to Zinnendorff's proceedings in Germany. It is further asserted, with much probability, that Eckleff was a member of the Chapter of Clermont; that he modified the Degrees of that body; and that he gradually introduced them into Sweden—thus forming the Swedish Rite. At that date, however, there is no indication of High Degrees beyond one Scots Lodge and the High Chapter was not erected until subsequently. Meanwhile we find traces of a very few Lodges in Norway, erected by the English Provincial Grand Lodge of Denmark. At the formal union of the two kingdoms, such of these as survived, came under the rule of the Swedish Grand Lodge.

In 1760, the first signs of the Clermont Degrees making a distinct advance are to be observed. It does not appear, however, that the new Rite made any immediate progress, as in 1763 official documents still only speak of Freemasons and make no mention of Knights.

In 1762—December 7—King Adolf Fredrik wrote to Baron Saltza, announcing that he assumed the title of Protector and that he was ready to bear a part in the expense of organizing the Order. Because the King addressed Saltza as "Grand Master" it has been assumed that he was the head of the Grand Lodge. Such is not the case. He was the Master of the *Zu den drei Greifen* or the Swedish Army Lodge. The courtesy title of Lodge Masters in those days was "Grand Master," but the Grand Master of Swedish Freemasonry in 1762 was Count Carl Fredrik Scheffer, who seems to have occupied that position until 1773, when he was succeeded by the Duke of Sudermania. R. Nisbet Bain, in *Gustavus III and His Contemporaries*, vol. i, p. 22, says that Scheffer was an able diplomatist, a man of brilliant parts and upright character, but with an admiration of everything French which almost amounted to mania.

It is curious to record, that in spite of the existence of this Grand Lodge, the Grand Lodge of England, under Lord Blaney—April 10, 1765—issued a Warrant to Charles Tullman as Provincial Grand Master for Sweden—but at all times English Masons have troubled themselves very little with what was going on abroad. It is, of course, possible that the Patent was granted at the request of Brethren who were dissatisfied with the new Rite. Our records, however, are silent on this point.

Kupferschmidt (*Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. i) is of opinion that some of the Brethren were dissatisfied with the Continental system introduced into Sweden and preferred to adhere to the English way of working and probably applied through the influence of Sir John Goodricke to the Grand Lodge of England to establish a Provincial Grand Lodge in Sweden. At any rate, the result of the appointment was not great. In the Lodge List of 1770 there appear under Numbers 385 to 387 what are denominated as Lodges 1 to 3 in Sweden, all constituted in 1769. No names are given and they are carried forward, still without names, in 1792 as Numbers 250 to 252; they remained on the list until the Union of 1813, when they disappear. There is, however, a letter in the archives of the Grand Lodge of England (Kupferschmidt, *ibid.*) which states that Lodge 385 (No. 1) was called Britannia and was constituted at Stockholm on August 7, 1765, met on the first Saturday of every month and had Sir John Goodricke, Bart., as Master; that Lodge 386 (No. 2) was called Phoenix, was constituted on November 9, 1767, met at Stockholm on the first Wednesday of every month and that its first Master was Dr. Odelius, a Doctor of Medicine; that Lodge 387 (No. 3) was constituted at Gothenburg in August 1768, under the name of St. George, met on the first Thursday of every month and that its first Master was Cahmius (?), an eminent merchant at Gothenburg.

Some particulars beyond the bare mention must be given of the Master of the first Lodge. Sir John Goodricke was the fifth Baronet and was born at Ribston, Yorkshire, on May 20, 1708. He was appointed Resident at the Court of Brussels on August 18, 1750 and Envoy Extraordinary to the Court of Stockholm on March 14, 1758, which office he held for at least thirteen years. R. Nisbet Bain, in the work already quoted, says that Sir John Goodricke (name spelt by him Goodrich) was by common consent the most quick-witted and keen-sighted of the whole diplomatic corps. He was afterwards M.P. for Ripon and Privy Councillor to George III. On September 28, 1731, at Hendon, Middlesex, he married Mary, the illegitimate daughter of Robert Benson, Baron Bingley, of whose career details are given in the chapter devoted to Freemasonry in York. Lord Bingley was cousin to Sir John Goodricke, his mother being Dorothy, daughter of Tobias Jenkyns, half-sister to Mary, Lady Goodricke, mother of Sir John Goodricke. For his services to the State, Lord Bingley obtained from the Crown an extensive tract of land called Bramham Moor, in Yorkshire, where he erected a magnificent mansion called Bramham Park, the grounds being laid out in the Italian style. This property was bequeathed to Mary, the wife of Sir John Goodricke and is now in the possession of G. R. Lane-Fox, whose ancestor, George Fox, sometime M.P. for York, married Harriet, the (legitimate) daughter and sole heiress of Robert Benson, Baron Bingley.

Tullman had been Secretary to the Swedish Ambassador at Copenhagen, where he had been instrumental in settling a dispute concerning the Lodge of the Three Ardent Hearts immediately before his appointment to Sweden.

About this time also (1765), Schubart came to Sweden to introduce the system

of the Strict Observance, in which he was unsuccessful. The Swedish Rite rather aimed at a spiritual revival of the Order of the Temple, the German at its material restoration.

It has been asserted that the influence of Swedenborg's writings was very powerful in moulding the doctrines of the Swedish Rite, which was remodelled and rearranged in 1766 in the following manner :

It consisted of 9 Degrees : 1°, 2°, and 3°, the true Craft grades ; 4°, Scots Apprentices and Fellows ; 5°, Scots Masters ; 6°, Knights of the East and Jerusalem ; 7°, Knights of the West, Templars ; 8°, Knights of the South, Master of the Temple ; 9°, Vicarius Salomonis. It is, however, doubtful whether the 9th Degree existed before 1780. In the 8th Degree the Templar legend is communicated :—" Shortly before his death Molay discovered to his nephew Beaujeu all the rituals, treasures, etc., of the Order of the Temple. With the assistance of nine Templars Beaujeu disinterred the corpse of the G.M. and, being disguised as Masons, they removed the remains in their aprons. Subsequently they adopted the apron as a distinguishing badge of their new organization and sought refuge amongst the fraternity of stone-masons."

It is, of course, quite possible to consider this crystallization of the Clermont ideas as the result of Schubart's mission, although it scarcely took the form intended by him.

In these circumstances, i.e. possessing a special Rite of its own, only lately established, it is somewhat surprising, that, in 1770, the Grand Lodge of Sweden applied to that of England for formal recognition, acknowledging the illegality of its French Charters and that it was recognized as a Grand Lodge with power to constitute Lodges in Sweden only. Possibly this step was the result of Tullman's exertions as English Provincial Grand Master and the three Swedish Lodges which obtained English numbers in 1770 may have been three of the already existing Lodges at Stockholm. It is certain, however, that the incident produced no retarding effect upon the propagation of the Swedish Rite.

Findel says (*History*, p. 528) that the Grand Lodge of Sweden did not, at any time, assume any special rights to itself to erect any new Lodges, inasmuch as she recognized the Grand Lodge of England as the representative of genuine Freemasonry. In 1769 Tullman appears to have come into conflict with the Grand Lodge of Sweden and he wrote to the Grand Lodge in London not to admit into its Assemblies any Mason coming from Sweden without a certificate from the three English Lodges or signed by himself. The incident of the presence of Baron de Nolcken, Swedish Minister, at the Grand Festival in London in 1770, may not be unconnected with the submission that took place that year. Kupferschmidt is of opinion that the Grand Lodge of Sweden was acknowledged only as an English Provincial unit. There is no reference in the Minutes of the Grand Lodge of England to the occurrence, but, in 1784, the name of Count Carl Fredrik Scheffer is given as Provincial Grand Master for Sweden. G. A. C. Kupferschmidt (*Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. i. p. 207) thinks that an explanation of these administration varia-

tions may be found in the assumption that Tullman had proved a thorn in the side of the established Grand Lodge in Sweden, which may, in 1770, have applied to London for recognition as a Grand Lodge, but only obtained the appointment of Scheffer as English Provincial Grand Master for Sweden and that this appointment, after having effected the desired object of deposing Tullman, was never acted upon in Sweden. Count Scheffer remained as before Grand Master of Sweden and, as such, he is named in the *Hamburg New Gazette*, in 1771, when on December 29, 1770, he visited the Lodge of the Three Roses at Hamburg.

In 1771 Adolf Fredrik died and was succeeded by Gustavus III, whose brother Karl, Duke of Sudermania, became Grand Master in 1773 (in succession to Count Scheffer), being installed in 1775, in which year, on July 14, Lane says (*Masonic Records*) that a Lodge to meet in a private room in the city of Stockholm was warranted by the Atholl Grand Lodge, it being constituted at the Globe Tavern, Fleet Street, in the City of London. Lane adds that there are no records of this Lodge after 1790.

In 1775 the King entered Grand Lodge as a member. His exact position is not easily defined, inasmuch as he was superior in dignity to the G.M., although the term Vicarius Salomonis was not yet in use. In Sweden the Grand Master is head of the Symbolic Lodges only, i.e. what is known as Craft Masonry, or the first three Degrees. The head of the Order is known as Vicarius Salomonis, but the two offices may be held by the one person. It is probable that, under the name of Protector, he exercised the highest control; and that this title, towards 1780, was merged in that of Vicar. Gustavus III is charged with having made use of Freemasonry for political purposes, employing it—as a counterpoise to the influence and power of the nobility—to bring into prominence and power talented men of humbler birth who were devoted to their Grand Master. However this may be, it is not to be disputed that in no other country has the Craft been so intimately controlled and directed by the Royal Family, that it soon acquired the aspect of a State institution, a character which it now possesses in the highest degree. The events of 1776–81, during which for a time the Duke of Sudermania occupied the post left vacant in Germany by the death of Von Hund, have already been narrated. The fears of the Landgrave Karl, that political motives lay at the bottom of the movement, were probably not unfounded.

In 1777 the Grand Chapter was formed and Gustavus became Vicarius Salomonis, thus putting the Cape-stone on the edifice of the Swedish Rite. In the same year Zinnendorff's acts in Germany were repudiated, of which more hereafter. On December 11, 1778, the Duke of Sudermania was installed (through Baron von Leyonhufvud, acting as proxy) as head of the Strict Observance.

On March 22, 1778, the first Provincial Grand Lodge was erected—for the Provinces of Schonen, Halland and Blekinge; and on July 16, 1779, a second for Gothenburg. The third body of the kind under the Grand Lodge of Sweden was instituted at Linköping in 1813.

The Lodge of St. Magnus, No. 199, Gothenburg, was chartered by the Grand Lodge of Scotland, November 6, 1780.

In 1780 the Rite was rearranged and divided into three classes. I.—St. John's Lodges, comprising the Craft. II.—St. Andrew's Lodges, the Scots Degrees, 4°, Elects or Scots Apprentices and Fellows; 5°, Scots Master or Grand Scots Elect; 6°, Stuart Brothers or Knights of the East and Princes of Jerusalem. III.—Chapter, 7°, Confidants of Solomon, formerly Knights of the West; 8°, Confidants of St. John; 9°, Confidants of St. Andrew. Beyond this is a sort of 10°, composed of three steps of honour, Knights and Commanders of the Red Cross and the Vicar of Solomon. Owing to the Christian colour of Freemasonry in Sweden, Solomon throughout is but a type of Christ and his Vicar consequently becomes Christ's Vicar, a species of Protestant Pope. That the office is now always held by the King of the country is, therefore, only natural. The Rite having been remodelled, the King and upwards of 400 Brethren met on the Stockholm Exchange, on March 15, 1780 and, with great pomp and solemnity, invested the Duke of Sudermania with the attributes of Vicar and Grand Master conjoined, when the King himself, assisted by the Bishop of Gothenburg, after promising the Craft his protection, clothed the G.M. with a splendid mantle of blue satin, embroidered with golden stars and bordered with ermine, with a hat to match, as his robe of office.

The following were the officers appointed: H.M. the King, Protector of the Order; H.R.H. the Duke of Sudermania, Vicarius Salomonis; H.R.H. the Duke of Ostgothland, National Grand Master; Bishop Wingard, Prelate; General Count F. Horn, Deputy National Grand Master; H.E. Senator Count Nils Bjelke, G. Chancellor; Senator von Stenhagen, G. Orator; Bishop von Troil, G. Chaplain; Colonel Baron Carl Pfeiff, G. Inquisitor; H.E. Senator Count Eric von Stockenström, G. Conservator; Colonel Baron C. A. Wachtmeister, G. Senior Warden; Colonel Count Ad. Lewenhaupt, G. Junior Warden; H.E. Senator Baron Fred Sparre, G. Treasurer; Colonel Count J. G. Oxenstierna, G. Master of Ceremonies; Chamberlain Baron Barnekow, G. Introducer; General C. G. Sinklair, G. Intendant; Major Baron C. Björnberg, G. Senior Deacon; Colonel Baron E. Ruuth, G. Junior Deacon; C. F. Fredenheim, G. Secretary (*Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. i, p. 206).

The intimation of the organization of this new Masonic unit was communicated to the Grand Lodge of England by the Grand Secretary, C. F. Fredenheim, in a letter dated May 26, 1784, but there is no mention of its receipt in the Minutes of Grand Lodge and the renewal of correspondence and representations between the two Grand Lodges did not take place until 1799.

Thus the Grand Lodge of Sweden as it exists to-day came into being. Everyone present at this function received a silver commemorative medal. On April 10, 1781, the Duke of Sudermania, in a long declaration, resigned the office of Head of the Strict Observance.

The basis of the Swedenborg Rite is unmistakably French, but was, doubtless, the work, directly or indirectly, of Gustavus III. He was not the possessor of a

strong character, but this defect was due, in a great measure, to his early education, or, rather, to the lack of proper training and to the fact that his home influences were inimical to the development of a manly disposition. This will also account, in part, at any rate, for his falling a ready prey to charlatans and swindlers, such as Björnram, a disciple of Cagliostro; Haledin, another follower of Cagliostro, who had been sentenced to death for high treason, but who obtained ready audience of Gustavus (who was instrumental in securing his release), because he explained mesmerism in the light of the Swedenborgian philosophy; Ulfenklovs—astrologer, chiromancer, geomancer, hydromancer and spiritist; Palmstrich, “the true Theosophist by the grace of God” and alchemist, who lived in the perpetual hope of discovering the philosopher’s stone; and Nordenskjöld, who actually persuaded the king to fit up a laboratory near Drottningholm, for the making of gold. R. Nisbet Bain, in *Gustavus III and His Contemporaries*, vol. i, pp. 228–9, has given us the record by an eye-witness of a dark seance held in a cathedral and of the trickery performed in connexion therewith. There was also Boheman who, for a short time, exerted an inimical influence upon both Gustavus III and the Duke of Sudermania. Count Oxenstjerna says that the King “seldom attended the meetings of Grand Lodge, but remained alone in his silent abode, where, unnoticed, he employed himself in the study of his secret art and very rarely did he confide even to his intimate friends the result of his investigations, agitating, as he did, questions beyond the sphere of natural philosophy and coming into the regions of the occult sciences.”

The record of the Duke of Sudermania is not very much higher. Bain points out that, prior to his marriage, which took place in 1773, the year in which he became Grand Master, he was a very poor creature indeed—a grovelling sensualist, obsessed with an idiotic superstitiousness; but, after his marriage, he seems to have become an entirely different character and, in his first battle, he displayed an imperturbable sang-froid. When officers by his side were struck down, when the cabin near which he was standing was carried away by a cannon ball, when his own cocked hat was pierced by a shot, he never moved a muscle of his face and remained on deck throughout the action.

These particulars may help to explain much in connexion with the Ritual and organization of the Rite. Samuel Beswick, in a volume published in 1870, entitled *Swedenborg and Phremasonry*, claims that Swedenborg was initiated into Freemasonry at Lunden, in 1707, when he was a student at the University of Lund, taking the Chapter Degrees in the Scottish Rite and affiliating with the Stockholm Chapter on his return home. There are many difficulties in the way of accepting this statement, not the least being that there does not appear to be any record that Swedenborg (or Svedborg, as his name then was) was ever a student at the University of Lund. He received the greater part of his early education at the University of Upsala, where he took his Degree as Doctor of Philosophy in 1709, at the age of twenty-two years. In the following year he commenced a course of travel, coming first to London, spending a year in London and Oxford, then went on to the Continent, living for more than three years in France, Holland and other countries,

returning home in 1715. His biographers say nothing about any Masonic experiences. Apparently it was not until 1716 that he went to Lund with Polheim, to meet Karl XII, who had just escaped from Stralsund, where it is said he enjoyed much intercourse with the King, who wished him to succeed Polheim as Counsellor of Commerce. As a preliminary step Karl appointed him Assessor of the Board of Mines.

Beswick adds that from the time of his initiation and his receiving the other Degrees of the Order, the records of the Swedish Masonic Lodges show that he was a constant visitor to the Chapters of Lunden, Stockholm, Stralsund and Christianstadt, his visits to these Lodges having been traced through a period of about thirty years, up to 1740. It would certainly be interesting if proof could be given of these statements, because at present there appears to be no authentication of any Lodges in Sweden prior to 1732, or thereabouts, while the Higher Degrees do not seem to have been introduced into the country until, at least, twenty-five years afterwards. There are so many points at variance between Beswick and Masonic historians and the biographers of the great religious teacher that there is little benefit in detailing them. An article summarizing Beswick's statements appeared in *The Freemason* of September 20, 1924 and other articles in refutation of Beswick in the same periodical of September 12 and October 3, 1925.

The government of the Order in Sweden is entrusted to nine Architects or Knights and Commanders of the Tenth Degree, who are known as: 1, Grand Guardian of the Crown; 2, Grand Guardian of the Lamp; 3, Grand Guardian of the Sword; 4, Grand Guardian of the Square; 5 and 6, Grand Guardians of the Temple; 7, Grand Guardian of the Standards; 8, Grand Chancellor; and 9, Grand Treasurer. Admission into this Degree, says Fessler, can only take place at midnight on a Friday. Those privileged to enter undertake to wear upon their breasts, throughout their lives, the Red Cross of the Templars; to recite every evening the prayer of St. Bernard: "Oh, Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon me"; to fast until sunset every Good Friday, breaking the fast by eating three pieces of bread dipped in oil with salt, but not partaking of lamb or pigeon at the ordinary evening meal and never to permit the least infringement of the laws, customs, or ceremonies of the Order.

In 1781 Karl resigned the Provincial Grand Mastership of Germany and in 1792 Gustavus III was assassinated, his son, a minor, Gustavus IV, next ascending the throne. Being only twelve years old, his uncle Karl, the Vicar and Grand Master, was regent of the kingdom until 1796. Gustavus was initiated by him in 1793, but even after commencing to reign independently, he made no effort to assume the direction of Masonic affairs. Indeed, he never took any prominent part in Freemasonry, possibly owing to his aversion to his uncle, beyond in 1796 decreeing that in future all Swedish Princes were by birthright Freemasons.

On January 24, 1798, the Duke of Sudermania wrote a long letter to the Grand Lodge of England, praying for a regular intercourse and mutual representation. This was presented in Quarterly Communication by the Baron de Silverhjelm,

Swedish Ambassador, April 10, 1799—and replied to by the Grand Master of England, George, Prince of Wales, on May 8, 1799. In spite of the great difference in ritual, the two Grand Lodges have ever since been in fraternal communion.

On March 26, 1803, the King issued a strict prohibition against the existence of all secret societies, from which, however, Masons were specially excepted. On March 13, 1809, he was dethroned, retired in exile to St. Gall and died in 1837. He was succeeded by his uncle, Karl XIII (Duke of Sudermania), Grand Master and Vicarius Salomonis. Karl completed the Masonic political edifice by instituting—May 27, 1811—the Civil Order of Karl XIII, to be conferred on thirty members only, besides princes, of the Tenth Degree of the Swedish Rite, whereof 27 must be laymen and 3 in holy orders, which is now, of course, the highest Degree in Swedish Masonry. The King himself is always to be the Master of the Order. The insignia are a red enamelled cross, bound in gold, surmounted by a royal crown, worn on a red ribbon as a collar round the neck and a smaller but similar cross, minus the crown, on the left breast. He then resigned the Grand Mastership in favour of his adopted son and heir, Bernadotte (Karl XIV), retaining, however, the office of Vicarius, which he held until his death in 1818. About this time, many complaints were made against Swedish Masons, for refusing to recognize Brethren of German jurisdictions, except those of Zinnendorff's Grand Lodge. The Grand Lodge, Royal York of Berlin, formally but unavailingly, protested in 1814; and it was not until 1863 that this intolerance was put an end to, by the action of the Grand Lodge of the Three Globes. In 1818 Karl (Duke of Sudermania) died and was succeeded by Karl XIV (Jean Bernadotte), who assumed the title of Vicar and appointed his son Prince Oscar to the Grand Mastership, which he had himself previously held from 1811. In the same year the Grand National Lodge of Berlin (Zinnendorff's) was supplied with the complete Ritual, which it had never hitherto possessed and mutual representatives were appointed. From that time their work and organization became identical.

Little remains to be narrated. In 1844 Karl XIV was succeeded by his son, Oscar I, who, already Grand Master, assumed the office of Vicar and combined both dignities until his death in 1859. His son, Karl XV, then became Vicar and appointed his brother, Prince Oscar Fredrik, the heir-apparent, Grand Master. In 1868 H.R.H. the Prince of Wales (afterwards Grand Master of England and King Edward VII) was initiated by the latter (assisted by Karl XV), who, mounting the throne as Oscar II in 1872, became Vicar of Solomon. His admission into the Fraternity had taken place in 1848. When on a visit to England, the rank of Past Grand Master was conferred upon him by the Grand Lodge of England on June 6, 1888. The Grand Masters since then have been Count Sten Lewenhaupt, who was succeeded by Magnus Huss, the latter by the Crown Prince Oscar Gustaf Adolf—initiated January 13, 1877—now reigning as Gustav V, who succeeded to the throne on December 8, 1907. The latest returns comprise 5 Provincial Grand Lodges, 11 St. Andrew and 25 other Lodges.

FINLAND

The first Masonic Lodge in Finland was founded in 1756, under the Grand Lodge of Sweden; it existed until 1809, when it was dissolved by order of the Russian Emperor. This Lodge, the St. Augustin, was revived under the Grand Lodge of Sweden on April 3, 1923. In 1919, however, there were some Finns living in Helsinki (Helsingfors), who had been initiated into Freemasonry when resident in the United States, mostly in Lodges under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York. They, therefore, presented a petition to that Grand Lodge for a Warrant for a Lodge to be held in Helsinki, which was readily granted. Arthur S. Tompkins, then Grand Master, accompanied by the Grand Secretary, R. J. Kenworthy (Past Grand Master) and Ossian Lang (Grand Historian) journeyed to Finland and, in the Old Parliament House at Helsinki, consecrated Lodge Suomi, No. 1. and installed Axel Solitander, formerly Consul-General of Finland to New York, but then holding a Finnish Government appointment in Helsinki, as the first Master. The inconvenience and, perhaps, the prejudice of a European Lodge being under American jurisdiction was felt in Finland and readily recognized by New York and it was explained that, as soon as the Finns could muster three Lodges, the necessary assistance in the formation of an independent Grand Lodge would be given. It must also be pointed out that, of the three-and-a-half million population, contained in an area of 150,222 square miles—half as much again as that of Great Britain—89 per cent. are Finnish-speaking and only 11 per cent. Swedish-speaking, while the latter are rapidly diminishing. Protestants (Lutherans) form 97.3 of the population.

On August 2, 1923, Kenworthy and Ossian Lang, when on a visit to Finland, consecrated Tammer Lodge, No. 2, at Tampere and, on the following day, Lodge Phœnix, No. 3, at Turku. Toviio H. Nekto, of Brooklyn, remained in Finland until the autumn of 1924, supervising the work of the three Lodges. In 1923, the ritual, as used in Lodges under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York was translated into Swedish. Lodge Suomi conducts its proceedings alternately in Swedish and Finnish. Lodge Tammer has adopted the Finnish and Lodge Phœnix the Swedish language.

In the spring of 1924, as the outcome of a conference held by the representatives of the three Lodges in the Masonic Temple at Helsinki, it was decided to petition the Grand Lodge of the State of New York for a Charter authorizing them to form an independent Grand Lodge for Finland, which petition was unanimously granted at the 1924 Annual Communication of the Grand Lodge, on the motion of Ossian Lang. A temporary Warrant for the formation of the new Grand Lodge was signed by William A. Rowan, Grand Master and, on this authority, the representatives of the three Finnish Lodges met, on August 9, 1924, at the Masonic Temple at Helsinki, and adopted a Grand Constitution, by which they subscribed to and undertook to maintain the Constitution, Old Charges and Ancient Landmarks, as promulgated by the Grand Lodge of the State of New York. On September 8 of the

same year, Arthur S. Tompkins arrived at Helsinki, bringing with him the Charter for the Grand Lodge of Finland, which, to-day, occupies a prominent position on the walls of the Masonic Temple in Helsinki. On the following day the Grand Lodge of Finland was constituted in regular form and Axel Solitander was installed as Grand Master.

Every candidate, on his initiation into a Finnish Lodge, is given a pass-key into the Masonic Temple in Helsinki, which building cannot be entered by anyone not in possession of such a key, unless he be in the company of a Finnish Mason. The building consists of the offices of the Grand Lodge, the Temple proper and a Masonic Club.

CHAPTER VIII

FREEMASONRY IN SWITZERLAND


IN 1736 some English Freemasons established a Lodge in Geneva, a resident and naturalized Scot, named George Hamilton, being installed as Master. On March 5 of the same year, however, he was forbidden by the Republic to initiate native citizens, a decree which appears to have been systematically violated and, in 1737, he was appointed by the Grand Lodge of England Provincial Grand Master for all Lodges in the State. Even in those few months many had been established. To attempt to follow their history would be impossible. Throughout Switzerland Lodges were like mushrooms, they sprang up in a night and disappeared as quickly, leaving, in many instances, nothing but a name behind. In 1744 the archives of the Town Council make mention only of three Lodges. These—February 13—the priests placed under a ban which, however, did not prevent the Provincial Grand Lodge, under Lord Malpas, from holding a public festival on June 24. In 1745—when six Lodges are mentioned—the Council renewed its edict which, however, was allowed to lapse. This was the last obstacle thrown in the way of the Craft in this territory. For the next fifteen years little is known of Freemasonry in Geneva, except that Lodges were formed, existed for a time and died out. The history of this period is involved in much confusion. In 1768—February 7—the Union of Hearts was established. This is the first Lodge which kept Minutes and its so-called Golden Book is full of interesting notes on Swiss Masonry. At this time Alexander Gerard returned from England and set to work to reduce the existing chaos to order. At his instigation ten Geneva Lodges met on June 1, 1769 and, on the 24th, erected the Independent Grand Lodge of Geneva—working pure English Masonry. In the same year eight other Lodges united with this body, some being in France, composed of members averse to the High Degrees. There was also one in Zurich and another in Constantinople. Before 1773 ten more had joined. This Grand Lodge was therefore of some importance, but towards 1782, the political ferment in France had extended to Geneva and the State was placed under military government. For the next four years the Craft was almost extinct.

In 1786 it reawoke and many Lodges joined the Grand Orient of France; but, on March 22, eight Lodges reconstituted the Grand Lodge under the new title of the Grand Orient of Geneva. It had much success; in the same year ten Lodges joined the original eight and warranted a Lodge at Smyrna in 1787. The Grand Orient of France also extended its operations and a Zurich paper of 1787 alludes to there being seventy-two Lodges in Geneva. The Lodges were, however, continu-

ally shifting their allegiance from one Grand Orient to the other. In 1790—February 10—the Lodge Union of Hearts initiated H.R.H. the late Duke of Kent, father of Queen Victoria. In 1792–3, during the reign of terror, the Grand Orient barely existed, almost all the Lodges dissolved or declared themselves dormant and very few professed to work on undismayed. In 1795—June 21—the Grand Orient reopened under Louis Rivale, Grand Master and, for the next few years, both the French and the native Grand Orient were fully employed in constituting and resuscitating Lodges. In 1798 Geneva was annexed to France and the Paris Grand Orient began to obtain the upper hand. English Freemasonry also lost ground and the French Rites were substituted. In 1801 the Grand Orient of France revised its statutes and the Grand Orient of Geneva lost its independence, being made a Provincial Grand Lodge under Paris. In this capacity it ruled twelve Lodges in 1802, at which time there also existed a Geneva Lodge under the Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Rite at Paris. In 1809 the Provincial Grand Lodge was dissolved in conformity with the centralizing policy of the Grand Orient and the Geneva Lodges came under the immediate rule of Paris.

VAUD

In 1739—February 2—some English noblemen in Lausanne were warranted as the Perfect Union of Strangers, No. 187, on the roll of England and declared themselves a Directing or *quasi* Grand Lodge under the name National Grand Directory of French Helvetia. Other Lodges were formed, but on March 3, 1745, the authorities at Berne issued stringent decrees against the Craft and the Lodges were closed. Although the Swiss Fraternity published a strong protest in Frankfort and Leipzig, Freemasonry became obliterated throughout Switzerland proper for quite fifteen years. In 1761 the Perfect Union reopened. It had gone over to the Strict Observance and now called itself the Scots Directory for French Helvetia; it belonged to the Vth Province, Burgundy. Other Lodges also reopened; and, in 1772, the Lodges even appeared in a public manner, throwing open their halls to the large influx of foreign Masons attracted to Lausanne by the wedding of the Princess Carignan. When the guests, however, had left, the authorities requested the Scots Directory to close its doors and were obeyed. In 1775 for some unknown reasons Berne suddenly withdrew all its edicts against Freemasonry, several new Lodges were warranted in 1776–8 and the Directory reconstituted. In 1782, on account of some students' follies, Berne renewed its decrees and the Lodges closed. As, however, fourteen Lodges in Piedmont and Savoy were dependent on Lausanne, three Directors were appointed to control external affairs. Gradually the State authorities relaxed their severity and the Lodges resumed work; new ones even were constituted in 1786. In 1787 the number of Vaud Lodges was stated at twenty-four. 1788 witnessed two fresh Lodges, 1789 an alliance with England. Then came the French troubles and, in 1792–3, the Directors resigned their functions and all the Lodges closed. Several Lodges reopened in 1795, but no Grand Lodge; and, in 1798, the Grand Orient at Paris commenced to constitute Lodges. In



A Rare Swiss Jewel of the Second Degree.

1803 Napoleon reconstructed the Swiss Confederation and absolved Vaud from its subjection to Berne, creating it an independent Canton. For the next few years French influence and French ritual were uppermost. In 1810 Maurice Glaire, a former minister of King Stanislaus of Poland, revived the Scots Directory in Lausanne, called seven Lodges together on October 15, 1810 and erected a National Grand Orient of French Helvetia, with Bergier as *ad interim* Grand Master. The Scots Directory was superior to this Grand Orient in matters of Ritual and Dogma only. Existing Lodges might use their own Ritual, new ones were to accept Glaire's own version of the Rectified system of the Strict Observance. Having thus made several innovations, it ceased to be a part of the Vth Province and formed a system of its own known as the Helvetic Rite. In 1811—March 1—these *Statutes* were approved and Glaire, then 67 years old, elected Grand Master; in 1813 he was reappointed for life. The Grand Orient prospered fairly well, but, after the battle of Leipzig and the entry of the allies into Switzerland, Glaire closed the Lodges *pro tem*.

BERNE

The State Archives mention a Lodge as existing here prior to the year 1745, which, however, must have succumbed to the edict mentioned. In 1802, on September 14, the Lodge Hope was warranted by the Grand Orient of France and, in 1804, a Rose Croix Chapter was added, of which Tavel was the Master. From its earliest days this Lodge was devoted to the task of forming one sole Masonic authority for Switzerland which should be independent, the Scots Directories being of course only partly so, as they were subordinated to the Provincial Grand Master of the Vth Province, i.e. Cambacères. It even received encouragement from the Grand Orient of France to assume itself this rôle, but refused the offer from a fear lest its intentions might be misconstrued as a usurpation. This Lodge has ever since been one of the first in the Confederation and, in 1813, had the honour of initiating Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg Gotha, subsequently first King of the Belgians. In 1817 the Hope, finding itself severed from its mother, the Grand Orient of France, made proposals to Ott, the Grand Master of the Directory, but without results. In search of a new parent and, having fully made up its mind to dispense in future with all High Degrees, it applied in 1818 to the Grand Lodge of England for a Constitution. The Duke of Sussex not only granted this request, but raised the Lodge (No. 706) to the position of a Provincial Grand Lodge, under Tavel, Grand Master. This unlooked-for favour was hardly welcome, as it scarcely allowed the Lodge to take up its former independent position in proposing a National Grand Lodge. However, the Lodge accepted the patent, based its *Constitutions* on the work of Dr. Anderson (1723) and, unable to obtain a written Ritual from London, adopted that of Schroeder. The Provincial Grand Lodge was inaugurated June 24, 1819 and all the nineteen Lodges of Switzerland, without regard to divergence of ritual and procedure, were invited to attend. In 1821 it constituted its first daughter in Neufchatel and asked the Lausanne Grand Orient to unite with it in forming a National Grand Lodge—but the time for this had not yet arrived.

ZURICH

In 1740 a Lodge, Concordia, was warranted by a Swiss regiment in the Dutch service, but was closed by the authorities. Again in 1769 a Lodge, Discretion, was formed by Geneva residents and warranted by the Grand Lodge of Geneva, but appears to have died out almost immediately. In 1771, on August 13, some officers who had seen foreign service opened a second Lodge, Discretion, according to the French Rite, but this was won over to the Strict Observance by Diethelm Lavater in 1772. Helvetia was a Sub-Priory of the Vth Province and a Chapter was established with Lavater as Sub-Prior. The Lodges closed in 1786 and the Scots Directory in 1792. On March 4, 1810, a formed Strict Observance Lodge was opened by the Directory at Basle.

BASLE

In 1744 a Lodge is mentioned and disappears in 1745. In 1765 the Strict Observance Lodge Libertas was opened and, in 1769, a second. A congress of the Vth Province Burgundy was held here in 1779, but the Lodges were closed by superior authority in 1785. In 1807 a Lodge under the Grand Orient of France was opened here. In 1809 Burkhard reintroduced the former Rectified Strict Observance, won over the Lodge, re-erected the Priory and applied to Cambacères, at that time head of all the various Rites in France, for a patent. Having given the assurance that the former Grand Prior, Lavater, had resigned, he was appointed to the office and the archives, closed in 1793, were transferred from Zurich to Basle. We have thus once more a Scots Templar Directory of the Vth Province at Basle, but this time for all Switzerland—that at Lausanne having struck out a path of its own.

FREIBURG

Gottreau de Trefaje opened a Lodge in 1761, but, in 1763, the Lodge was closed and Gottreau handed over to justice. In 1764 he was condemned to be burned, a punishment at that time reserved for sorcerers, but escaped with exile owing to the influence of his relatives.

In 1778 therefore we have Strict Observance Lodges in Vaud, Zurich and Basle : no others in Switzerland proper. In that year Lausanne and Zurich agreed to divide the country between them accordingly as the Cantons spoke German or French. The French Scots Directory at Lausanne, the German Scots Directory at Zurich, under their respective Grand Masters were to be subordinate to Lavater as Sub-Prior. These two Directories attended the Convent de Gaules at Lyons in 1778, where the Strict Observance system was modified. Both were then raised to the rank of Sub-Priorities, Helvetia to that of a Prior of the Vth Province, with Lavater as Grand Prior.

NEUFCHATEL

The Grand Lodge of the Three Globes (Berlin) warranted the Three Flaming Stars here on June 6, 1743 ; the Lodge is known to have existed in 1750, but must

have died out soon afterwards. Another Lodge was warranted by the Grand Lodge of France at Locle—May 22, 1770—of which nothing more is known. Also, in 1791, on December 27, the Three Globes constituted the Frederick William of Good Harmony Lodge at Neufchatel. In 1806, Neufchatel was annexed to France and the Lodge reconstituted by the Grand Orient of France.

SOLEURE

In 1809, this Canton was first opened to the Craft by the constitution of a Lodge under the Grand Orient of France.

AARGAU

Heldmann, Zschokke and others opened a Lodge in 1810 at Aarau. They were obliged to apply to Basle for a Constitution, as they did not wish to become subservient to a foreign Jurisdiction, but they firmly rejected, from the outset, High Degrees, Templarism and Unknown Superiors, together with other innovations of a like character, working in the three Degrees only according to Schroeder's Ritual.

From 1795 to 1813 Switzerland, therefore, was divided between the Grand Orient of France and the Scots Directories of the Vth Province. The German Cantons possessed only a few Lodges, which were more numerous in the French provinces and at Geneva. There was much confusion, the most hopeful signs being the existence of the two new Lodges in Aarau and Berne.

With Napoleon's fall and the Congress of Vienna the Confederation was remodelled. Vaud and Aargau were confirmed as independent Cantons; Neufchatel and Geneva were added in the same capacity. This was not accomplished without much internal friction and, during the troubled years, 1813-16, Masonry may be looked upon once more as dormant in Switzerland.

With the resumption of Masonic activity in 1816 it is not necessary to consider the subject under the heading of the different Cantons, but confine the attention to the fortunes of the various systems, that is, the Grand Orients of France, of the Helvetic Rite in Lausanne, the Directory of the Rectified Strict Observance, with the Lodge of Hope at Berne.

THE GRAND ORIENT OF FRANCE may soon be dismissed. It gradually lost its Lodges throughout the country, chiefly through its own unworthiness. Those that still remained true to it were practically left to their own devices; of the others some joined the Directory and others the Grand Orient of Lausanne. Many died out altogether.

THE DIRECTORY OF THE RECTIFIED RITE (Strict Observance).—This fell into a state of decay and, in 1817, the Grand Master, Burkhard, dying, was replaced by Kaspar Ott of Zurich. As a consequence the archives and Directory were transferred from Basle to Zurich. The system was strengthened by the adhesion of

some Geneva Lodges in 1816 and by two new Lodges in St. Gall and Chur (Brisons), thus opening up two fresh Cantons to the Craft. In 1820 Grand Master Ott died at a time when Freemasonry was undergoing a series of virulent attacks and it was thought advisable not to attract attention by a new election. A namesake, though not a relative, of the last Grand Master, one Hans Caspar Ott, was, therefore, entrusted with the direction of affairs. In 1821 a new Lodge at Winterthur, in the Canton of Zurich, was warranted and, in 1823, the Lodges in Locle and Neuchâtel, under the Grand Orient of France, joined the Rectified Rite. This made nine Lodges of this system, which had now reached its culminating point, but still persisted in its refusal to aid in forming a National Grand Lodge, otherwise than by absorbing all others within itself. It was, however, virtually the National Grand Lodge for the German Cantons but, unfortunately, its conduct of affairs did not equal its strength in Lodges.

GRAND ORIENT OF THE HELVETIC RITE.—This body reopened on March 9, 1816, with nine Lodges. Grand Master Glaire resigned on account of old age (died March 26, 1820) and was replaced by Verdeil. The system was strengthened by some Geneva Lodges and a few new ones and, in 1820, Bergier d'Illens succeeded Verdeil as Grand Master. Various proposals from Berne to join the Hope Lodge in forming a National Grand Lodge, had been refused by the Committee of Grand Officers; but the idea was taking root gradually among the rank and file of the private Lodges. Events within this Grand body brought about the desired result. The brothers Bedarride arrived in Switzerland to establish their Rite of Misraim. After much ill success they formed two Lodges at Lausanne and won over the Grand Master Bergier to their cause. It was arranged that the Lodges should submit to the Grand Lodge so far as concerned the first three Degrees, but the High Degrees were to be worked under Bedarride. Bergier attempted to carry out this project at a Grand Lodge held in 1821, but was opposed by the majority at the meeting and by his Deputy, Mieville. He finally resigned and left the Lodge. Mieville's party then agreed to effect a fusion with the English Provincial Grand Lodge at Berne. On October 23, 1821, the Sublime Chapter met under Bergier and dissolved the Grand Lodge, which held from them, resolving to resume sole control of affairs. The Chapter, however, did not follow up this step and became practically dormant. The members of the defunct Grand Orient entrusted their power of attorney to the former College of Grand Officers. The Provincial Grand Lodge for Berne addressed a circular to each of the private Lodges and not, as formerly, to the Grand Lodge. The Committee of Grand Officers replied on behalf of the Lodges to these overtures and a meeting was held at Berne on April 29, 1822—between the deputies of the two Berne and of five Vaud Lodges. It was decided to form a Grand Lodge on the English system; to *recognize* three Degrees only, but to *tolerate* any others as a refuge for the play of fancy; to allow the constituent Lodges to preserve their own Rituals, but to require new Lodges to use the Schroeder version. The Lausanne Grand Lodge dissolved, May 18, 1822, and, exactly a week later, the English Provincial Grand Lodge followed suit. A National Grand Lodge of Switzerland was

then constituted by the Masters and Wardens of the seven Lodges. The Hope Lodge resumed its place as a private Lodge under this Grand Lodge; an eighth Lodge at Geneva immediately proffered its allegiance. The Grand Lodge was inaugurated June 24, when Tavel was elected Grand Master and two more Geneva Lodges joined. The Grand Lodge entered upon a prosperous career, receiving adhesions from all parts and, in the course of a few years, its daughter Lodges had ceased to work any High Degrees and had all adopted the Schroeder Ritual.

RECTIFIED RITE.—Left face to face with a single rival, this body bethought itself to put its house in order. The first step was to fill the vacant Grand Mastership and Sarasin, of Basle, was elected to that office. All the Lodges of the system were invited to his installation (1823)—nine in all; while various attempts were made to bring the system and Rite more into harmony with the spirit of the times. But the close of this, the third period of Swiss Masonry, presents to us two Grand Bodies, one—on the wane—the antiquated Templar system, the other—older still—an offshoot of the pure English Craft, lusty as a young giant, prepared to run his race—and confident of victory.

The fourth period therefore opens with the National Grand Lodge of Berne and the Grand Directory of the Rectified Rite at Basle only in the field; for the Helvetic Rite, which still pretended to exist, for very many years resembled a general without an army, or a head without a body.

In 1828 the Rectified Grand Lodge was so dull and lifeless that Sarasin resigned and it was not until 1829 that Von Escher, of Zurich, was elected in his stead. The Lodges themselves were induced to take part in festivals and meetings of the National Grand Lodge and, individually, were not averse from a fusion, though unprepared to take active steps from an honourable feeling of loyalty towards their Grand Officers. Only one Lodge, that at Locle, deserted to the National Grand Lodge.

In 1830—June 19—Tavel, Grand Master of the National Grand Lodge, died. The new election was delayed in order to make a further attempt at a fusion. The Lodge of Hope once more took the matter in hand. But the July Revolution in Paris had raised an echo in the Cantons where the still somewhat patrician style of government was in course of being overthrown. Under these circumstances the Grand Directory—Rectified Rite—thought the moment not a propitious one for attracting public attention to the Fraternity, but admitted its inability to cope with the spirit of the times, declaring it would not attempt to prevent its daughters seceding, nor feel hurt at their desertion. As already related, a sentimental feeling prevented this and, as the effort was evidently not destined to succeed, the National Grand Lodge contented itself with making friends quietly in all directions. Shortly afterwards the Duke Charles of Hesse Cassel, Grand Master of the Rectified system, died; the Provinces of the Order had all ceased to exist except Burgundy, represented by the Directory in Switzerland and half a Lodge in Besançon, which professed to be the Provincial Chapter and thus, in 1844, it became possible, with the tacit consent of the almost defunct Directory, to appoint a commission to draw up the Constitutions of the proposed Sole Grand Lodge. This Constitution was finally

approved at Zurich, July 22, 1844, by fourteen Lodges present on the occasion. The following day Hottinger was elected Grand Master, the two Grand Lodges previously existing made over to him all their rights and duties and dissolved, new Grand Officers were appointed and, on July 24, 1844, the Grand Lodge Alpina, of Switzerland, met for the first time. Only six Lodges refused to join; one of these was dormant, the others were in Geneva; one persisted in retaining the Rectified system and hung on to the shadow of a Chapter at Besançon; three still owned the sway of the Grand Orient of France and one, that of the Supreme Council of the same country. So that the close of the fourth period leaves us with practically a united Craft in Switzerland under the Grand Lodge Alpina. There is no necessity to describe its Constitutions at length; they are almost identical with those of England both in spirit and machinery.

The fifth period extends to the present time. The Constitution had enacted six years as the term of office for the Grand Master. Hottinger, therefore, retired in 1850 and was succeeded by Jung. The last Provincial Grand Chapter of the Rectified Rite at Besançon having died out in 1845, the only remaining Lodge of this system (Geneva) joined the Grand Lodge Alpina in 1851; and the same course was pursued by the Geneva Lodge working under the Ancient and Accepted Rite at Paris. Two of the three Geneva Lodges under the Grand Orient of France also affiliated in course of time, thus leaving only one foreign Lodge in the Confederation.

But the extinct or rather dormant Supreme Chapter of the old Helvetic Rite at Lausanne made periodical efforts to recover control of the Lodges, though it only so far succeeded as to graft Rose Croix Chapters on some few French Lodges and to sow dissension in the French Cantons. On the other hand, some old High Degree Masons of the Rectified Rite followed a similar plan in the German Cantons and the Knightly Degrees were worked until 1862 and, possibly, later. The system is now extinct.

The exclusion of the Ancient and Accepted Rite Masons produced great irritation and the Supreme Council revenged itself by warranting Craft Lodges to the number of six. After many years of strife an arrangement was come to in 1876, whereby the excluded Brethren were reinstated and the Supreme Council undertook to leave the Lodges alone, confining its attention to the additional Degrees. It still exists on friendly terms with the Grand Lodge. Five of its six Lodges joined the Alpina, and the sixth amalgamated with a neighbouring Lodge.

According to the latest return (1930) there are thirty-nine Lodges under the jurisdiction of the Swiss Grand Lodge Alpina with an aggregate membership of 4,974.



Heinrich Zschokke.
Grand Master, Grand Lodge Swiss-Alpina, 1844.

CHAPTER IX

FREEMASONRY IN ITALY

FREEMASONRY is said to have been introduced into Italy by Lord George Sackville in 1733 and, in 1735, the Grand Duke Francis being then initiated, a great impetus was given to the Craft, Lodges being established in Milan, Verona, Padua, Vicenza, Venice and Naples. Findel (*History of Freemasonry*, ed. 1865, p. 341) says that, at first, the Fraternity was known as the *Compania della Cucchiara* (Company of the Trowel) but, afterwards, they assumed the appellation of *Franchi Muratori*. In 1737, John Gasto, the last Grand Duke of the House of Medicis, published an edict against the Freemasons, but the ban was of short-lived duration as he died shortly afterwards. The liberty to resume work was also short, for, in 1738, the Vatican withdrew its patronage and assistance and commenced issuing Bulls against the Order, which caused the Lodges generally to close. Findel states the cause for the issue of the first Bull in the following words:

Livorno, being a free port, the Lodge there was composed of the population of the place, consisting of Roman Catholics, Protestants and Jews, which excited the suspicions of the Holy See, who feared lest unbelief would be aided and abetted by them. The Congregation of the Holy Office, therefore, instituted a strict inquiry, the result of which was, as already mentioned, that Pope Clement XII issued the well-known Bull against the Fraternity in 1738. When the government at Florence received this, it was immediately despatched to the Grand Duke at Vienna, to obtain instructions how to act. Francis wrote back that, in order not to offend the Papal See, they were to accept the Bull but not to carry it into execution and, in case of necessity, to decline acknowledging the Pope's right to interfere at all. Every Lodge which conducted itself quietly and with propriety should remain perfectly unnoticed by the government. Notwithstanding this, the clergy in Florence succeeded afterwards, by their various intrigues, in obtaining an order to commence judicial proceedings according to the very letter of the Papal Bull. In consequence, on May 19, 1739, Crudelli, a member of the Order, was unexpectedly attacked in his own house, seized and taken to the prison of the Holy Office [Inquisition]. Happily, an influential Brother had carried off his Masonic papers to a place of safety in good time. Besides this Brother, many others were arrested and, in all haste, before the Grand Duke could be made acquainted with the state of affairs, the torture was applied to extract their secret from them. But all in vain: the prisoners were set at liberty and, once more, the Inquisition was disappointed in its design of extirpating the Order.

Until 1859-60 Italy was merely a geographical expression, so that to obtain any clearness in a description of the Craft in that country, it becomes essential to treat the various states separately.

THE TWO SICILIES (Naples and Sicily), 1717-1860.—In 1717 the kingdom was a portion of the Austrian Empire; in 1733 it was ceded to Spain; in 1759 under Ferdinand IV it passed as an independent kingdom to the younger branch of the Royal House of Spain; in 1805 Naples—but not Sicily—was annexed to France; in 1806 Joseph Buonaparte was made King of Naples and was followed in 1808 by Joachim Murat; in 1815 the two Sicilies were reunited under Ferdinand; and, in 1860, Garibaldi incorporated them with the recently formed kingdom of Italy.

It would appear that about 1750 a Greek established a Lodge in Naples, that on July 10, 1751, Charles III of Spain, influenced by the Bull of Benedict IV, prohibited Freemasonry throughout his dominions, but so soon changed his views that, in the following year, he entrusted his son's education to a Mason and priest, whom he also appointed his own confessor.

Read's Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer of Saturday, August 10, 1751, published the following:

From Naples they write that, some of their clergy having, for some months past, vehemently declaimed from the pulpit against the Freemasons and the charges brought against that Fraternity having remained unanswered, on account of the mysterious and inviolable Secrecy observed amongst them, the King judges that such a Society might be capable of occasioning Disorders in the State and introducing dangerous Tenets in Religion; wherefore, to guard against such possible Evils, his Sicilian Majesty has issued an Edict, interdicting, under heavy Penalties, the holding of Free Mason Lodges or any other sort of clandestine Meetings whatsoever; and orders such to be prosecuted with all the Rigour of the Law, who shall get themselves enrolled in the Lodges. To which End he has appointed Judges for the different Ranks of People, viz. the Duke of Miranda, for trying such of the Nobility as have Posts at Court; the Duke de Castro Pinhano, for the Gentlemen of the Army; the President of the Council, for the Barristers and other Lawyers; the Prince de Centola, for the Nobility and Gentry; and the Lord Almoner, for the Clergy.

In 1754 we hear of another Lodge working under the Mother-Lodge at Marseilles, which, in 1760, placed itself under the Grand Lodge of Holland and, in 1762, transferred its allegiance to England. Our Lodge Lists show no evidence of this transaction but, perhaps, the appointment of Don Nicholas Manuzzi by Lord Blaney (1764-7), as Provincial Grand Master for Italy, may tend to support the assertion (see *Constitutions*, 1767, p. 365 *et seq.*).

On February 27, 1764, however, the Freemasons of Naples and Sicily convened a General Assembly, when a National Grand Lodge was erected, with Prince di Caramanica as Grand Master. The ground for this action was that "it was no longer suitable" that, in that free nation, they should work under foreign superintendence; that, moreover, the English Brethren did not conduct themselves "as good and true superiors should." The Grand Lodge was named del Zelo. Eight Lodges joined in this venture, four working in Naples and one each in

Messina, Caltagirone, Catania and Gaeta. One Lodge working under the Grand Orient of France and two Lodges under the Grand Lodge of England were pronounced clandestine. The latter are evidently those which appear in the Engraved List for 1769 as No. 433, "in his Sicilian Majesty's regiment of Foot" and No. 444, Well Chosen Lodge. The Warrant for this latter Lodge was granted to Prince Caramanica and others in Naples on April 26, 1769. Prince Caramanica's leaning to the Strict Observance and the isolated position of the two English Lodges, probably led to the appointment by Lord Beaufort, Grand Master in 1770, of a Provincial Grand Master for Naples and Sicily, "the most noble Cæsar Pignatelli, Duke della Rocca" (see *Grand Lodge Minutes*, April 25, 1770).

The Craft at this period was making great progress in the two Sicilies and the names of the principal statesmen were to be found on the membership roll.

Meanwhile, in 1767, Ferdinand IV assumed the government at the close of his minority and his minister, Tanucci—an unscrupulous and inveterate enemy of the Craft—at last induced him—September 12, 1775—to suppress Freemasonry. The Lodges closed, but Tanucci, by means of *agents provocateurs*, induced some Masons to meet, who were duly arrested. Again, on the day of St. Januarius, 1776, the saint's blood refused to liquefy in the customary manner, which the agents of Tanucci attributed to the machinations of the Masons and a regular persecution ensued. The Grand Master forbade all work and, in an official address delivered on December 6, 1776, he spoke as follows :

This adverse fate has not been induced by a single inadvertence on the part of our true Brethren but, more probably, by the imprudent and offensive conduct of those schismatics who, having been seduced from their allegiance by the Duke della Roca and the Prince di Ottojani, do most foolishly and reprehensibly work according to the English Constitution. We, on the contrary, having profited by this emergency to arrange our legitimate work with greater accuracy, have yielded implicit obedience to the Royal command, believing this to be the most favourable opportunity for removing from our society all such elements as we consider prejudicial to the practice of those virtues required of a genuine Freemason.

For a time the persecutions continued. Attempts were made to demolish the dwellings of the Freemasons. One of their number, named Liroy, wrote a pamphlet in defence of the Craft, which was couched in such violent terms that it was burned by the public executioner and Liroy, himself, was banished from Naples.

But Ferdinand's wife, Queen Caroline—daughter of the Emperor Francis of Lorraine (who was, of course, a Freemason)—"loved Masons well." Owing to her advocacy the edict was revoked and Tanucci dismissed. Diego Naselli was elected Grand Master, in succession to Caramanica. The Parisian Lodges sent the Queen an address of thanks and her name was celebrated in all the Lodges. Four new Lodges were warranted and the two English Lodges affiliated with the National Grand Lodge.

In 1777 Weiler came to Naples. This emissary of the Strict Observance had succeeded in erecting Italy into the VIIIth Province, with a Provincial Grand Chapter at Turin; and, as the National Grand Lodge of Sicily had, from its earliest days, been on cordial terms with the German Lodges of Prince Ferdinand, he experienced no difficulty in converting it into a Chapter and Sub-Priory of the Strict Observance, with Naselli as Sub-Prior. That this perversion displeased some of the Fraternity and caused them to apply to England for relief, cannot positively be affirmed; but it is, at least, certain that the following Lodges were constituted almost immediately afterwards under English Charters—No. 510 at Messina (May 12, 1778); No. 525 at Naples (March 6, 1780); No. 440 at Naples (1781). The name of the Duke de Sandemetrio Pignatelli appears as Provincial Grand Master for Naples and Sicily in the *Freemasons' Calendar* for 1779 and only disappears in the edition for 1833.

In 1781 Ferdinand IV once more placed the Craft under an interdict; in 1783 he cancelled all former inhibitions, but subjected the meetings to strict judicial control (see *Acta Latomorum*, pp. 150, 158). Their independence and privacy being thus endangered the Lodges gradually dwindled and died out and Masonry ceased to exist in the two kingdoms. Tanucci, says Findel (*op. cit.*, p. 346):

had, himself, to inform the President of the Junta that the King had issued an order commanding the examination of the accused persons to be abandoned and they themselves set free, but with this addition: "That, as the sect of Freemasons might become suspicious to the State and prejudicial to religion, the Junta should keep a strict and vigilant watch over anything that might occur referring to so momentous a matter and report accordingly.

In 1804 the French entered Naples and the Royal Family took refuge in Sicily under the protection of Nelson and the Fleet. In Naples a Grand Orient was established in 1804 by the French army of Italy, with General Lechi as Grand Master, which, in 1805, amalgamated with the Grand Orient of Italy at Milan.

In 1809—June 11—Murat being King of Naples, a Supreme Council 33° was established in that city and, on June 24 of the same year a Grand Orient, of which Murat allowed himself to be proclaimed Grand Master. In October 1812 he was appointed Sovereign Grand Commander of the 33°. But, on the fall of Napoleon in 1815, Murat was driven out and a law of 1816—August 8—prohibited Freemasonry under pain of the galleys. Nevertheless it dragged on a fitful existence and the Grand Orient of France, in its list for 1820, still makes mention of three Lodges and one Chapter at Messina. This was followed by a new decree in 1821, upon which the Grand Orient for the two Sicilies declared itself dissolved. In the revolutionary year 1848 a Lodge existed—but for a few months only—in Palermo. This was the last effort of the Craft in the kingdom of the two Sicilies.

THE PAPAL STATES.—Freemasonry was early introduced into Rome. On August 16, 1735, a Lodge was opened there under J. Colton. It worked in English but, under the Earl of Wintoun in 1737, the Inquisition seized its Serving Brothers

and, on August 20, it closed (see *Freemasons' Quarterly Review*, 1842, p. 393 *et seq.*). The Bull of Clement XII was published in 1738 and confirmed—January 14, 1739—by a further edict forbidding Freemasonry throughout the Papal States under pain of death and confiscation of worldly goods. The burning by the public executioner in the same year—February 25—of the *Relation Apologétique*, wrongly attributed to Ramsay, took place. Nevertheless there is evidence to show that the foreign Masons then residing at Rome continued to meet from time to time. In 1742 they even issued a medal in honour of Martin Folkes, Deputy Grand Master of England, 1724–5. A Lodge was again established at Rome in 1787, but was surprised by the Inquisition, December 27, 1789; the Brethren escaped, though the property and archives were seized. On the same day the Inquisition captured the charlatan Cagliostro, whose evil repute had acted most prejudicially upon Freemasonry. The Lodges in Lombardy issued a manifesto—which was brought up by the College of Cardinals—disclaiming all connexion with him and defending the Craft from papal aspersions (*Acta Latomorum*, pp. 183–7). This writing, says Findel (*op. cit.*, p. 580):

soon reached a fourth edition and was disseminated throughout the whole of Italy, producing a powerful impression upon men's minds, especially in Rome. As the Conclave could make no reply to it, the clergy were obliged to content themselves with buying up the copies as fast as they appeared.

In 1809 the Papal States were incorporated with France and Rome was declared the second capital of the empire. Under French rule several Lodges were established but, on the return of Pope Pius VII in 1814, the Craft was once more effectually suppressed. It was not until 1861 that a new Lodge opened, in which year one was formed under the Grand Orient of Turin. We may now leave these States until 1870, when the Franco-Prussian war permitted Victor Emmanuel to unite the ancient capital to his kingdom of Italy.

TUSCANY—FLORENCE.—On the extinction of the Medici family in 1737, Francis of Lorraine received this Grand Duchy in exchange for Lorraine, which had been conquered by Louis XIV of France and presented to his father-in-law Stanislaus, ex-King of Poland. When Francis was elected German Emperor in 1745, the Duchy was vested in the junior branch of the Austrian family but, in 1790, reverted to the imperial crown under Leopold when his elder brother Joseph II died childless. As Francis of Lorraine was Grand Duke from 1737 to 1765, it is somewhat surprising the Craft should have prospered so little in Tuscany during that period; for the only Lodge of which we hear, supposed to have been founded in 1733 by Lord George Sackville and closed under the persecutions of the Inquisition in 1739, probably never existed at all. Its existence has only been inferred on the authority of a medal claimed to have been struck by Lorenz Natter dated 1733, which medal is almost certainly a fraud perpetrated at a much later date in the interests of the Strict Observance (see an interesting discussion extending from January to November 1883 in *The Freemason*). From this supposititious

Lodge, however, both the Swedish system and the Strict Observance have professed to receive that light denied to England in 1717; but, whether this legendary transmission inspired the medal, or whether the medal gave rise to the legend, it would not profit much to inquire. Beyond this apocryphal Lodge we have only general accounts of Freemasonry in Tuscany until June 24, 1763, when a Lodge—No. 117—was established at Leghorn by the Schismatic G.L. of England (*Antients*). This was followed by a second—No. 138—in 1765 (under the same sanction), also at Leghorn, where, in 1771, two further Lodges—of Perfect Union, No. 410; and of Sincere Brotherly Love, No. 412—were constituted by the older (or legitimate) Grand Lodge of England. In the *Masonic Magazine*, July 1876, vol. iv, p. 421, there is reproduced a letter which appeared in the *St. James's Evening Post* dated from Florence, May 24, 1738, which runs:

The Freemasons' Lodges, which had been interdicted here during the life of the great Duke, are now held again with all the liberty and freedom imaginable and without any dread of the Inquisition, which has no right to attack a society of which the new sovereign Francis of Lorraine is a member. The Freemasons of Leghorn have also reopened their Lodges.

It should be added that, under the beneficent sway of the Medici, religion was established at Leghorn and we know from Boswell's *Account of Corsica* (1768, preface, p. xiv) there was a British factory in that city, to which an English chaplain was appointed.

Troops were quartered in the Duchy by the French in 1796–7 and we again hear of Lodges at Leghorn, which, however, were closed by the Grand Duke in 1800. But he was himself driven out by the French and his Duchy transformed into an Etruscan Republic, then into a kingdom of Tuscany and, finally, annexed to France, with Napoleon's sister, the Duchess of Lucca, as Grand Duchess. Consequently, from 1807 to 1809, we find Lodges erected both at Florence and Leghorn, hailing either from the Grand Orient of France or of Italy (at Milan). But, with the return of the (Austrian) Grand Duke Ferdinand in 1814, all Masonry once more died out and was not revived until, in 1859, Tuscany became a part of the kingdom of Italy.

GENOA.—The old British and Ligurian Lodge, No. 444, was warranted here by the Grand Lodge of England in 1782. As Thory relates (*Acta Latomorum*, p. 217) that several Masons were imprisoned here in consequence of the Senate's edict of March 26, 1803, it is possible that this Lodge was then still in existence. This was under Napoleon's Ligurian Republic, finally established in 1802 after the Austrians had held the town for two years. In 1805 the State was annexed to France and two Lodges were established under the Grand Orient of France, 1805–7; a third but earlier one is also mentioned. In 1814 Genoa was handed over to Sardinia, and Freemasonry there ceased to exist.

LOMBARDY, MILAN.—We have already seen that in 1784, when the National Grand Lodge of Austria was formed, a Provincial Grand Lodge existed in this

province of the Austrian dominions, with two daughters, at Cremona and Milan respectively. Both of these Lodges, says Findel (*op. cit.*, p. 579) had to cease working, in consequence of commands to that effect from the superior authorities. Other Lodges in Lombardy had, between the years 1780-9, formed an independent Lombardian Directory of the Rectified Scottish Rite but which, likewise, had to suspend its operations in 1788. In 1805, from a Warrant granted by de Grasse-Tilly, Pyron, Renier and Vidal, a Supreme Council was organized in Milan for the kingdom of Italy, mention of which is made later.

VENETIA.—The Grand Lodge of England granted Warrants on November 27, 1772, to the Union Lodge, No. 438, at Venice; and, on the 28th, to a Lodge, No. 439, at Verona. Nothing further is known of their history, but they are supposed to have continued in existence till 1785. In Padua, in 1781, there existed a Prefectory and Chapter of the Strict Observance under the Grand Priory of the VIIIth Province, in Turin, which, after 1782, was changed to the IVth; this Chapter presided over a Strict Observance Lodge in Vicenza, of which there were notices in 1784-5. All these Lodges and any others which may have existed were suppressed by a decree of the Venetian Senate in May 1785. By the peace of Campo-Formio in 1797, Venetia was divided, part going to Austria—where Freemasonry was already under a ban—and part to the Cisalpine Republic.

CISALPINE REPUBLIC.—This, formed in 1797 of Milan, Modena, Mantua, Bologna, Ferrara, Romagno, part of Venetia, etc., was called, in 1801, the Italian Republic, with Napoleon as President and, in 1805, became the kingdom of Italy, with Buonaparte as King and Eugene Beauharnais as Viceroy.

On December 26, 1801, the French Grand Orient erected at Milan the first Lodge in this new State. In 1805 the Ancient and Accepted Rite founded a Supreme Council 33° at Milan, which constituted a Grand Orient for the kingdom of Italy, by, as stated, authority from Count de Grasse-Tilly. Prince Eugene, Viceroy of Italy, was elected Sovereign Grand Commander and Grand Master of the Grand Orient of Italy, which amalgamated with the Supreme Council. Under French occupation the Craft enjoyed every liberty and received much encouragement. Murat, King of Naples, assisted at the consecration of the Grand Orient of Naples, which was opened with great splendour and ceremony on June 24, 1809, and was at once recognized as an independent Grand Orient by the Grand Orient at Paris. Many Lodges were constituted in the kingdom, two at Milan itself, 1807-10, but the whole system was suppressed when, in 1814, the kingdom was broken up, Parma and Modena becoming separate States and the greater part of the remainder falling to Austria, forming, with the previously acquired portion of Venetia, the Austrian Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. Freemasonry, therefore, ceased to exist here until in 1860 Lombardy and, in 1866, Venetia, were incorporated with the present kingdom of Italy.

SARDINIA (PIEDMONT AND SAVOY).—The first notice of the Craft in this kingdom is the appointment by Lord Raymond, Grand Master of England, of the Marquis des Marches as Provincial Grand Master for Savoy and Piedmont in 1739 (see

Constitutions, 1756, p. 333). Beyond this bare record nothing is known. The next notice is the existence in Piedmont (Turin), in 1774, of a Grand Lodge called *La Mystérieuse*, working a Rite of its own, consisting of the three Degrees and of 4° Elect Grand Master, 5° Perfect Irish Master, 6° Grand Scot, 7° Knight of the East, 8° Holy Kadosch and 9° Rose Croix. This was transformed by Weiler in 1775 into the Great Priory of Italy (VIIIth Province) or Bailiwick of Lombardy at Turin, with Weiler himself as Grand Prior and, after him, Count de Bernez. In the *Engraved List* for 1773 and, subsequently, in the *Freemasons' Calendar*, until 1804, Count de Bernez appears as English Provincial Grand Master for Piedmont in Italy. It had three subordinate Prefectories—at Naples, Turin and Padua—and a score or more of Lodges. In the same year—March 25, 1775—an English Lodge, *St. Jean de Nouvelle Espérance*, No. 479, was constituted at Turin, of whose subsequent history nothing appears to be known.

Savoy, in 1778, joined the Rectified Scots Rite of the Strict Observance, with a Directory—*La Sincérité*—of the IIInd Province (Auvergne), at Chambery. The Grand Orient of France had, however, also constituted Lodges there from 1770 onwards, of which one—*The Three Mortars*—claimed to be a Grand Orient of Sardinia—a claim rejected by the Grand Orient of France in 1790—and even warranted a Lodge as far off as Dresden. In 1782 also, as already seen, no fewer than fourteen Lodges existed in Piedmont and Savoy dependent upon the Scots Directory for French Helvetia in Lausanne. In 1788 the King of Sardinia, Victor Amadeus III, ordered the Strict Observance Grand Priory in Turin to dissolve and transfer its powers to the Scots Directory at Chambery, which thus became the recognized Grand Lodge of the kingdom. But, on January 11, 1790, this Grand Lodge was also dissolved by the King (though Freemasonry was not otherwise interfered with) and the Lodges transferred their allegiance—as the Craft itself was not placed under an interdict—to the Grand Orients of France and Geneva, or to the Directory at Lausanne. In 1792 Savoy was ceded to France and the Craft there revived under the Grand Orient of the latter country. Two years later—May 20, 1794—Victor Amadeus III issued an edict totally suppressing Masonry throughout the remainder of his dominions. In 1798, however, his sovereignty was restricted to the Island of Sardinia. The French occupied Piedmont, lost it temporarily in 1799, converted it into a Republic in 1802 and annexed it to France a few months later. Under French rule a Lodge was warranted in Turin and, probably, others under the Grand Orient of Italy at Milan, but they were all short-lived, for, in 1814, the King of Sardinia re-obtained possession of Piedmont (enlarged) and of Savoy, besides acquiring Genoa and, in 1814—May 20—renewed the edict of 1794 rigidly suppressing Freemasonry. This edict remained in force until shortly before the dawn of Italian freedom in 1859, so that from 1821 (see under *The Two Sicilies*) until 1856, not a Lodge existed in any part of what is now the kingdom of Italy.

THE KINGDOM OF ITALY.—In 1859, Victor Emmanuel of Sardinia acquired all northern Italy except Venetia, but lost Savoy, which was ceded to France; in 1860 Naples and Sicily were gained for him by Garibaldi; in 1866 he obtained

Venetia by treaty and, in 1870, the city of Rome. The year 1859 forms, therefore, a perfectly fresh starting-point, although the Grand Orient of France had warranted a Lodge at Genoa in 1856.

In 1859 several Masons constituted themselves into a Lodge at Turin working the so-called modern Italian Rite of three Degrees—in other words, pure English Masonry. Their example was soon followed by the erection of numerous other Lodges in Genoa, Milan, Pisa, Florence, Leghorn, Rome and other places. These Lodges adopted measures to form a Grand Lodge and, by general correspondence, agreed upon a provisional Constitution, Ritual, etc. The Chevalier Nigra, Ambassador at Paris, was elected Grand Master provisionally. To this there was no opposition, but some few Lodges having given a silent vote, Nigra declined the nomination—November 22, 1861—in order to allow the proposed constituent assembly perfect liberty. This assembly met at Turin December 26, 1861 and sat daily until January 1, 1862. Twenty-two Lodges in all were represented. On January 1, 1862, the Grand Orient of Italy at Turin was proclaimed, with Nigra as Grand Master and Garibaldi (founder of the Grand Orient of Palermo) as Hon. Past Grand Master. The yearly assembly was declared movable from city to city. The Lodges not only restricted themselves to the three Degrees, but agreed to refuse fellowship to those working any others. In most respects the organization of the Grand Lodge followed the arrangements of the Grand Lodge of England. This was not accomplished without protest.

In 1860 some Masons established a Supreme Council Ancient and Accepted Rite 33° for Naples and Sicily and professed to consider themselves a revival of the Supreme Council 33° established at Naples in 1809 and suppressed in 1821. Many Lodges sprang up and adhered to this organization.

About the same time other Lodges in Sicily also working the Ancient and Accepted Rite 33° met and established a Grand Orient of that Rite at Palermo, with Garibaldi as Grand Master.

Also at Turin there existed a Consistory of the 32°, likewise warranting Lodges and assuming all the rights of a Supreme Council until the time arrived when they might be strong enough to form a Grand Orient of the Scots Rite in the capital of Italy—at that time Turin.

Further, about 1861, it would appear as if a similar Consistory existed at Leghorn for Tuscany.


The chief protests against the Grand Orient of Italy at Turin came from the Supreme Council at Naples. We thus see that not only was Italy divided in its views as to Masonic ceremonial, but also that the old territorial divisions showed a tendency to assert themselves in spite of Italian unity. The Grand Orient was not only opposed by these four Scots Councils, but unfortunately failed to secure any external support beyond that of Belgium and France, because it very openly interfered in the politics of the day, domestic and foreign. Under these circumstances Nigra resigned—March 1, 1863—and Cordova was elected by the small majority of fifteen to thirteen over Garibaldi. Matters, however, did not improve under the new Grand

Master ; England especially withheld its recognition. The Grand Orient in 1862 unwisely adopted very strong measures with regard to a Turin Lodge addicted to the High Degrees and general discontent prevailed. Nevertheless, in July 1863 the Grand Orient had no fewer than sixty-eight Lodges on its roll, including daughters at Alexandria, Cairo, Constantinople, Lima and elsewhere.

On August 1, 1863, at a general assembly held in Florence, the troubles reached a climax. The Grand Officers, with one exception, resigned ; and an interim committee of five was appointed to draw up a new Constitution. These were all Ancient and Accepted Rite Masons.

This committee having concluded its labours, called a meeting at Florence, May 21-4, 1864. *Latomia* of the same year states that only some thirty Lodges of the Italian (i.e. English) Rite and a few of the Scots were represented, whilst the *Handbuch* of 1867 speaks of seventy Lodges and five Grand Lodges being present. This shows the difficulty of advancing anything of a positive character respecting this troubled period of Italian Freemasonry. On May 22 a new Grand Orient of Italy, consisting of forty members, was proclaimed. The chief seat of this body was Turin, but sections were appointed for Florence, Naples and Palermo. The Lodges were allowed to work in either Rite ; but it is evident that the Ancient and Accepted Rite had gained a victory. On the 23rd Garibaldi was elected Grand Master and Luca, President of the Grand Council 33°. The Supreme Councils of Naples, Leghorn and Turin appear to have concurred, for of these we hear nothing more ; that of Palermo, under Garibaldi, stood out from the arrangement ; Garibaldi himself speedily resigned ; and, on September 15, 1864, Luca was elected in his stead. But Garibaldi's Supreme Council had also to contend with a rival in Palermo itself, a so-called Central Supreme Council under Prince Sant' Elia. Whether this was an offshoot from Garibaldi's Council, or had spontaneously sprung up some few years previously, cannot be ascertained. A further complication arose from the action of eleven Lodges working the Italian Rite of three Degrees, who, dissatisfied with the May meeting at Florence and its results, met at Milan July 1-5, 1864 and erected a Grand Lodge, under the name of a Grand Council, to sit at Turin, with Franchi as President or Grand Master. In 1865 the Grand Orient of Italy (mixed Rites) was transferred to the new capital, Florence and the Grand Council (Craft only) from Turin to Milan. From 1864 to 1867 we have thus four Grand Bodies in Italy, whose strength in 1867 was about as follows :

- I. Grand Orient of Italy at Florence (Composite), about 150 Lodges ; Luca, Grand Master.
- II. Supreme Council at Palermo (Ancient and Accepted Rite), about 39 Lodges ; Garibaldi, Grand Master.
- III. Grand Council at Milan (Craft), 7-8 Lodges ; Franchi, Grand Master, who, on July 15, 1867, was succeeded by Guastalla.
- IV. Supreme Central Council at Palermo (Ancient and Accepted Rite), number of Lodges unknown ; Sant' Elia, Grand Master.



Grand Master Giuseppe Garibaldi, of the Supreme Council of Palermo, 1864.

Garibaldi himself was the first to take steps to put an end to this disastrous conflict of Jurisdictions. He issued invitations to a congress of all Italian Lodges, which resulted in a meeting at Naples of Deputies from his own Lodges and those under the Florence Grand Orient on June 21, 1867. Luca presided. The Supreme Council of Palermo became merged in the Grand Orient, the four sections at Florence, Turin, Naples and Palermo were abolished, Cordova was elected Grand Master, Garibaldi Hon. Grand Master for life and Luca Hon. Grand Master for a year. Cordova soon resigned on account of bad health and was succeeded by Frapolli. Garibaldi's Supreme Council did not approve of the fusion, but elected Campanella as Grand Master and essayed to maintain its position. It became even more careless than before in its choice of candidates and warranted sixteen Lodges (one at Smyrna) in 1868. But this was an expiring effort. Its Lodges died out or joined the Grand Orient and, towards the end of the year, the Supreme Council was practically extinct.

At this time the Grand Lodge at Milan, finding itself unable to make any progress, so far modified its views as to acknowledge that Lodges under the Scots Rite might be legitimate; thus a fusion was easily arranged on March 4, 1868, at Milan, between the Grand Orient of Italy at Florence and the Grand (Craft) Lodge at Milan. The amalgamation was effected April 1. This left only the Grand Orient of Italy—the title adopted by the parties to the fusion last referred to—and the Central Supreme Council of Palermo, in the field. In the next year or two Grand Master Frapolli succeeded in great measure in banishing religion and politics from Lodge discussions and, at the annual meeting in Florence in 1869, no fewer than 150 Lodges were represented. But, as a general rule, there was little stability amongst Italian Lodges, they sprang up in a night and died at noontide. In June 1870 Frapolli retired and Mazzoni was elected and, towards the end of the year, the Grand Orient was transferred to the newly acquired capital, Rome.

In 1872—April 25—new Constitutions were accepted and, at last, in 1873, the Supreme Council at Palermo amalgamated with the Grand Orient, which became the sole Grand, or Governing Masonic Body in Italy. Under Mazzoni the quality of Italian Masonry improved, at the expense of its quantity. Unworthy members and disreputable Lodges were relentlessly weeded out. As seen, in 1869 there were over 150 Lodges but, in 1877, there remained only 134 and, in 1878, only 109—with a membership of 12,053, or an average of 110 per Lodge—whilst, in 1885, the number had once more increased to 146. Besides these there were 57 Lodges scattered throughout Rumania, Egypt—one, at Alexandria, composed of Germans only—the Levant and South America. The cities containing the greatest number of Lodges were Naples, with 10; Leghorn and Genoa, 5; Palermo and Rome, 4; Messina, Milan and Florence, 3; and Venice, 2 each.

Until June 1908, Italian Masonry consisted of two Rites—the Ancient and Accepted and what was called the Italian Symbolic Rite, which united in the formation of the one governing body, the Grand Orient. By slow degrees this body usurped a certain control over the Ancient and Accepted Rite, but limited to the issuing of certain general regulations, each being governed by its own Council and

Constitutions. Entering, however, into the arena of politics, the Grand Orient exacted from its Brethren an implicit obedience and wielded the power thus gained to achieve objects entirely contrary to the ideals of Freemasonry.

According to the original *Constitutions*, the Supreme Council of members of the 33° should have exercised sovereign control over the Ancient and Accepted Rite, whose members should have owed allegiance to that body alone. A meeting of the Supreme Council was called for February 23, 1908 and the loyal Brethren were surprised to find upon the agenda a motion for the Unification of the Rites. This, plainly interpreted, meant the abolition of the Ancient and Accepted Rite and the final degradation of Masonry in Italy into a political body. The motion was rejected and the Sovereign Grand Commander, with whom the motion had originated, resigned. After much internal trouble the Masonic loyalists prevailed and tranquillity was restored.

The position in 1918, at the conclusion of the Great War, will be appreciated best by the citation of the following letter, addressed in that year to the Grand Lodge of Alabama by the International Bureau for Masonic Affairs at Neuchâtel :

There exist in Italy the following regular and recognized bodies : the Grand Orient of Italy, with its headquarters at Palazzo Gisutiniiani ; the Supreme Council, at the same address ; the Grand Lodge of the Symbolic Rite, also at the same address. Besides these regular bodies, there are several Grand Lodges, not recognized by any Jurisdiction of other countries. The Grand Orient of Italy is dedicated to the Grand Architect of the Universe and has for its motto, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. The Supreme Grand Council disclaims, in favour of the Grand Orient and the Symbolic Grand Lodge, all jurisdiction and control over the first three Degrees and restricts itself to the fourth to the thirty-third Degrees of the Scottish Rite. The Grand Orient of Italy cannot issue a Charter for a Lodge without the approval of the Sovereign Grand Commander of one of the Supreme Councils of the Scottish Rite or, in certain cases, the approval of the President of the Council of the Italian Rite. The General Assembly is the legislative body for the Lodges ; it also elects the Grand Master. Its members include, not only the delegates from the Lodges but ten delegates from the Scottish Rite Supreme Council, ten from the Grand Council of the Italian Rite, the Presidents of the Chapters and Councils of Kadosh of the Scottish Rite and the Presidents of the District Councils of the Italian Rite.

The Grand Lodge of Alabama refused to recognize the Grand Lodge of Italy as an independent governing body of Symbolic Masonry on the ground that it was under the control of the governing bodies and authorities of the Scottish and Italian Rites.

In 1920 a communication sent from the Grand Orient of Italy to the Grand Lodge of Alabama stated that it had 470 Lodges and about 25,000 members under its jurisdiction. There was also the following reference to the Fera schism.

In 1908 a schism began in the bosom of the Supreme Council. At the head of the secessionists was the late Rev. Savorio Fera, an Evangelical pastor. From this schism resulted the National Grand Lodge, having its headquarters at Piazza del Gesu in Rome.

This body is alluded to in the Alabama Report thus :

A number of Lodges, headed by Savorio Fera, withdrew from the Grand Lodge of Italy and proceeded to organize another Supreme Council and, appendant thereto, the Grand Lodge of Italy for the Ancient and Accepted Rite ; this was, in due course, created by the said Supreme Council into The Most Serene National Italian Grand Lodge, by which name it is now known. Its first meeting as an Independent Grand Lodge was held in March 1919. . . . This Grand Lodge is completely independent of any superior governing power. It restricts its activities to the three Symbolic Degrees, leaving all other higher grades to other systems. A belief in the Deity is exacted and the Bible is displayed on the altar. The National Grand Lodge now has 500 Lodges and more than 60,000 Masons and is increasing rapidly in numbers.

Raoul V. Palermi, the Grand Master of that National Grand Lodge, in 1921, attended the biennial session of the Supreme Council for the Southern Jurisdictions of the United States of America, when, in the course of an address he then delivered, he said :

I am the interpreter here of the Supreme Council of Italy, but I speak also for myself, because I had the privilege of inducing the Italian Masons to proceed in accordance with the rules of the Ancient and Accepted Rite. All religions are alike to us, but we do not admit in our body anyone who denies the existence of The Great Architect and the immortality of the soul. Moreover, we do not permit a Masonic Order to become the instrument of any political party.

The Grand Lodge of New York refused, in 1922, to accord the National Grand Lodge of Italy official recognition on the ground that the Grand Orient of Italy was the lawful Masonic authority, although official recognition had been accorded by the Grand Lodge of the State of Columbia.

In March 1922, negotiations were started for the purpose of uniting the Lodges at the obedience of the Grand Orient with those at the obedience of the National Grand Lodge into one body. These negotiations, however, failed. In the meanwhile, Palermi transferred all the powers of the National Grand Lodge of Italy, of which he was the Grand Master, to the Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, of which he was Sovereign Grand Commander. For this act he was deposed and expelled by the National Grand Lodge.

There the matter stands, for, in the early days of his power, Mussolini publicly excommunicated all Italian Freemasonry, although the Fascisti, generally, do not appear to have been hostile to the National Grand Lodge, which rigidly excluded anything of a political nature from its Lodges. The Grand Fascisti Council, however, decreed (1) that no Fascist shall become a member of a Masonic Order, (2) that those who are members shall leave Freemasonry immediately, (3) that Fascists shall consider themselves bound to give information to the government of any intrigues, movements or agitations of Freemasonry against the Fascist government of which they have knowledge.

In his report of these proceedings, the Rome correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* of August 6, 1924, said :

In approving this resolution, Signor Mussolini declared that, in his estimation, both branches of Italian Freemasonry, that which has its headquarters in the Palazzo Giustiniana and that which has its centre in the Piazza Gesu, are composed of elements who, by their mentality, their origin and their doctrines, are necessarily anti-Fascist. They are, he said, in complete antithesis to the spirit, faith, theory and practice of Fascism.

As a comment upon the attitude of Signor Mussolini, attention may be drawn to the fact that Italian subjects in England have his permission to enrol themselves as members of Lodges under the Constitution of the United Grand Lodge of England.

CHAPTER X

FREEMASONRY IN BELGIUM

THE history of Freemasonry in that part of Europe now known as the kingdom of Belgium may be divided into four well-defined periods, every political change of status producing a transfer of Masonic jurisdiction. From the Peace of Utrecht (1714) to the French Revolution we have to deal with the Austrian Netherlands ; from thence to 1814, with a French Province under the Masonic control of the Grand Orient ; from 1814 to 1830 Belgium was merged in the kingdom of Holland ; and from 1830 Belgium must be treated as a separate and independent kingdom, under its own Grand Orient. The annals of the Belgian Craft are consequently far from exhibiting the stability so noticeable in those of the United Provinces of Holland and its earliest history is very obscure. It is true that the accounts presented by Findel and the *Handbuch* are delightfully simple and concise and, at a first glance, appear to present no difficulty of any kind. But this effect is produced by treating all statements as well-known facts, by dwelling on no questions and by avoiding any hint at a *crux*. A critical study of the subject, however, brings us face to face with many and grave difficulties. Yet how dexterously Findel's opening sentence evades them :

Although oppressed and much harassed, Freemasonry in the Austrian Netherlands had, with varied fortune, preserved its existence, so that in 1785 sixteen daughter Lodges—one at Antwerp, four at Brussels, and three at Ghent [and apparently eight others elsewhere]—were working under the United Provincial Lodge, which refused to join the Grand Lodge at Vienna.

Our author never even suggests that it might be difficult to show where, when, how and by whose authority this Provincial Lodge took its existence. Neither does he inform us who constituted these sixteen Lodges, nor what became of them. It is possible that a prolonged search in Belgium itself might clear up many matters, though it is hardly creditable to our own Masonic rulers that the means of doing so are not nearer at hand. England undoubtedly had much to do with Freemasonry in the Low Countries and had the Grand Lodge in earlier days been more diligent in insisting upon their responsibility to the home authorities, probably all the information needed would be found in official documents at Freemasons' Hall. But, alas, the archives of the oldest (and richest) Grand Lodge in the world, the virtual parent of every Freemason in existence, the most stable Grand Body of the Craft, which has never been disturbed by internal convulsions, political revolutions, or

military invasions, afford us scarcely a scintilla of evidence with regard to the proceedings of its offshoots beyond the seas.

All historians inform us, on the authority of a document printed in the *Annales Maçoniques des Pays-Bas*, that a Lodge called the *Parfaite Union de Mons* was warranted at Mons on June 21, 1721, by Grand Master Lord Montague, but owed its foundation to the Duke of Wharton. The English *Constitutions* and early writers, however, ignore the occurrence. Rebold (*Hist. des trois Grandes Loges*, p. 627) goes even further and assures us that the Lodge in question developed into an English Provincial Lodge for the Austrian Netherlands. It may be so; but our early writers know nothing of a Provincial Grand Master before 1770.

Another Lodge is stated to have existed at Ghent in 1730 and it is asserted that the Craft increased and multiplied so exceedingly in Belgium that, in 1736, the clergy induced the Emperor, Charles VI, to issue an edict of suppression throughout the Netherlands. As a consequence, the Fraternity were unable to meet openly. Even when Francis of Lorraine—the Imperial consort of Marie Theresa—began to rule in 1740, his influence was only sufficient to secure a bare toleration of Freemasonry; indeed, in 1764, a year before his death, an edict was issued suppressing the Craft throughout his entire dominions. But, although the only other Lodge to which any reference at this epoch is found, is one at Brussels, the Unity, 1757-94, this want of evidence may be attributed to the enforced reserve of the Fraternity. In all probability there was a considerable increase of Lodges; not because everybody says so—of itself a very poor reason—but because the war of the Spanish Succession, 1742-8 and the Seven Years' War, 1755-62, filled the Lowlands with British troops; it is at least a reasonable conjecture that the Masons among them may have held meetings, initiated the inhabitants, and left permanent Lodges behind them.

Count Goblet d'Alviella says that from 1740 up to the Revolution, something more than seventy-five Lodges were established in Belgium by the most diverse authorities. The Jurisdictions of England, Scotland, France and Holland, even that of Austria, sought to place and extend their influence in the Belgian Provinces. Some of those old Lodges still exist and, although in recent years there has been a departure from the foundation, all the Lodges formed during the period mentioned sprang, almost directly, from the Grand Lodge of England; all, at any rate, adopted its basis as regards beliefs and practices and, in great part, its manner of organization.

The Duke of Cumberland, who commanded at Fontenoy in 1745, is stated by *Multa Paucis* to have been initiated in 1743. But at last, in 1765, we gain solid ground. From the *Engraved Lists*, we find that an English Lodge, No. 341, was constituted at Alost in Flanders, June 5, 1765; another, No. 427, at Ghent, July 1768; and a third, No. 394, at Mons, January 20, 1770. There were, however, certain factors which militated against unity. Count Goblet d'Alviella specifies four particularly, viz. the absence of formal rules on the subject of territorial authority; the lack of fraternal agreement among the Lodges; the narrow individualistic spirit that dominated all views in the Austrian Netherlands; and the exist-



William, Duke of Cumberland, Second Son of George II.

ence of two rival Provincial Grand Lodges, both established at the Orient of Mons, one depending on the Grand Lodge of England, the other on the Grand Lodge of France. These Provincial Grand Lodges were composed, not of Lodge representatives but of individual Freemasons, who formed the bodies themselves, with but a vague allegiance to the sovereign bodies. They thus constituted an autocratic power, continuing only by their own consent, in an activity wherein the subordinate Lodges had no part.

Eventually, however, Francis Bonaventure, Joseph Dumont, Marquis de Gages, Provincial Grand Master for the Austrian Netherlands, one of the most eminent figures in Belgian Freemasonry, succeeded in ranging all the Lodges under the English banner. On January 22, 1770, he received a patent from the Grand Lodge of England, signed by the Duke of Beaufort as Grand Master, appointing him Provincial Grand Master for the Austrian Netherlands. The Lodge *La Parfaite Union*, at the Orient of Mons, was erected into a Provincial Grand Lodge, with jurisdiction over all the Austrian Netherlands.

That year marked the beginning of the development of Freemasonry in Belgium. Twenty-three Lodges are found on the lists from 1770 to 1786, most of which come under the designation of "Class Lodges," since several were military and one—*Les Amis Thérésiens*—was composed entirely of ecclesiastics. Other Lodges were composed, in large measure, of the nobility, magistrates, barristers and the clergy, including canons and monks. Among the names to be found on the registers at this period are those of the Prince-Bishop of Liège, Prince de Gavre, Prince d'Arenberg, Prince de Ligne, Duke of Ursel, Marquis de Chasteler, Marquis de Spotia, Comte de Duras, Count le Lichtervelde, Count d'Oultremont.

The Governor of the Austrian Netherlands was Charles of Lorraine, an ardent and devoted Freemason and Master of a Lodge. To him must be ascribed the fact that the authorized persecutions launched against members of the Craft became abortive. The Papal Bulls excommunicating Freemasons were non-effective in the Austrian Netherlands, since they were never published or promulgated there. As a measure of precaution, however, Masonic activity was confined to initiations, banquets and works of charity; while the members were careful to abstain from anything that might be construed into political propaganda.

Notwithstanding its official dependence upon the Grand Lodge of England, the Provincial Grand Lodge for the Austrian Netherlands gave countenance to such higher Degrees as the Elects of the IX and XVI, Knights of the Orient, Irish Knights, Scottish Knights, Knights Templar, Red Cross Knights and, although the Marquis de Gages made many attempts to bring order into these proceedings, he found it impossible.

There was one noted Lodge at the University of Louvain, formed by noblemen, abbés and students, which was dissolved by command of the Rector because of brawls which occurred between "town and gown" at the conclusion of some of the banquets and an appeal to the Empress Maria Theresa only resulted in a confirmation of the Rector's decision.

Maria Theresa died in 1780, when Joseph II commenced to reign as Emperor of Austria and Germany. He was the son of Francis of Lorraine and, though not himself a Freemason, granted the Fraternity at first, full and, afterwards, restricted liberty. Subsequent to the appointment of the Provincial Grand Master and, previous to Joseph's accession, many Lodges were erected; for instance, at Tournai 1770; two at Liège, 1775 and 1776; two at Spa, 1778; and at Namur—*De la Parfaite Union*—by the Grand Lodge of Scotland, February 9, 1770. The Charter of the last named was confirmed by the Provincial Grand Lodge for the Austrian Netherlands, August 28, 1777.

In 1784 there existed in each province of Austria a Provincial Grand Lodge, viz. Bohemia, Galicia, Lombardy, Austria proper, Siebenburgen, Hungary and the Netherlands. The first six of these formed a Grand National Lodge of Austria; the seventh did not join the association. But if it is borne in mind that the Lodges under the former were almost entirely devoted to the Zinnendorff or Swedish Rite (Grand National Lodge of Berlin), of which we meet with no trace in Belgium, it will be understood why the Low Countries did not join in the movement and conviction will be strengthened that the Provincial Grand Lodge of the Netherlands was an English offshoot. According to Findel its jurisdiction at this time extended over sixteen Lodges. But their membership had altered greatly. All the leaders of the national party were of the Fraternity and, so far from the clergy being averse to the Craft, at Liège the Bishop himself was a member in 1770, while the officers all belonged to the upper priesthood. The Lodge *L'Heureuse Rencontre* of Brussels in 1786 consisted of forty-two members, among whom were the Marquis de Chasteler, Van der Noot, the Dukes of Ursel and Arenberg, the Princes de Ligne and Gavre. The feeling in Masonry at this time was distinctly national and anti-Austrian.

The Emperor Joseph sought to make Masonry a part of his great scheme of unification—to create a State built on a uniform plan, to subject all his people, however diverse in history and habit, to the same national laws, to establish a national Church, independent of Rome. With this object in view and for the purpose of closing some irregular and clandestine Lodges which had sprung up, he, in December 1785, issued an edict restricting the Craft to three Lodges in each provincial capital of his empire and wholly forbidding it in cities where no provincial government existed. In consequence of this, eleven Lodges in Belgium had to close, although it is asserted that one Lodge each in Maestricht, Liège, Tournai and Spa continued to meet secretly. The edict was in no way intended to be oppressive; but in May 1786, the Emperor became alarmed at the national sentiments of the Craft in Belgium and closed all the Lodges—except three in Brussels. The Provincial Grand Lodge was forced to close down and it was replaced by a Central Committee, presided over by an Austrian Commander, Baron de Senkendorff, which took over the management of what remained of Belgian Masonry. In the following year, however, the Emperor resolved to close all Lodges and Freemasonry in the Austrian Netherlands fell entirely into abeyance. Thus ended the first period of Belgian Masonry.

The "Revival" took place in 1795, when Belgian Freemasonry came under the Grand Orient of France, when there were found to be five Lodges, one each at Namur, Tournai, Liège, Brussels and Ostend. In 1798 a military Lodge, *Les Amis Philanthropes*, with a certain proportion of citizens as members, was founded at Brussels, while the ancient Lodge *Les Vrais Amis de l'Union* was also revived. Between 1799 and 1813 the Grand Orient warranted no fewer than twenty-eight Lodges, of which twenty-two were active in 1814. It is noteworthy that in 1811, the Provincial Grand Lodge of Heredom in France (Royal Order of Scotland) constituted a Chapter at Brussels and that many of the French High Degrees were introduced. The French or modern Rite became so firmly established as to be still extensively worked. In all respects the Masonry of this period may be considered identical with that of France. Napoleon I is said to have been a member of the Order and, owing to his influence, Lodges were opened in all the principal centres of Belgium. Freemasonry, however, during this period, lost sight of its real purpose: its philosophy ceased to be studied and it became merely a social and convivial institution. There were constant disputes between the various Rites and various petty quarrellings.

At the opening of the third period—January 1, 1814—there were twenty-seven regular Lodges at work. Relieved of the supremacy of the Grand Orient of France, these Lodges felt the expediency of constituting a Grand Lodge of some kind but, apart from the inherent difficulty of reconciling so many Rites, there was also to be considered the future status of the country, which had not then been determined by the Congress of Vienna. Of course the Scots Lodges essayed to obtain the upper hand. A Council of the 25°—Sublime Princes of the Royal Secret—in the Lodge *Amis Philanthropiques* of Brussels announced itself—December 10, 1814—as the Supreme Authority, but its pretensions were put on one side. Then, in November 1815, three Brussels Lodges of the Rectified Strict Observance and two Scots Lodges of the same city met—appointed a committee of fifteen to prepare a scheme and, in 1816, four projects in all were reported upon. That of the *Amis Philanthropiques* was selected and all Belgian Lodges were summoned to consider it. They met on February 1 and March 15, 1817, in Brussels, but failed to agree. The Scots Masons alone knew their own minds and, consequently in 1817, the Lodges of the Strict Observance—Rectified Rite—erected a central body; and on March 1 of the same year a Supreme Council of the A. and A.R. 33° was formed. On May 5, 1817, the circular of Prince Frederick of the Netherlands was issued, which was followed by the institution of a temporary Grand Lodge, June 24; the appointment of a joint Belgian and Dutch committee, August 30; the report of this committee, September 20 and its adoption on December 11. In 1818, April 11, the Grand Lodge of Administration for the Southern Provinces (Belgium) was duly inaugurated. From twenty-seven the Lodges increased after April 11, 1818, to thirty and, on June 19, 1820, to thirty-three. Many, however, of the High Degree rites obtained a footing which was denied to them in Holland. Prince Frederick of Orange, second son of the King of the Netherlands, became Grand

Master of the Southern Netherlands, while his brother, Prince William of Orange, the hereditary prince, undertook the direction of the Grand Lodge of the Northern Netherlands. In vain did Holland attempt to limit Masonry in Belgium to the three Degrees of Apprentice, Companion and Master and to suppress all other Degrees.

In 1830, Belgium acquired its independence and, a few days after the defeat of the armies of Holland, which were commanded by Prince Frederick, he was, at a single sitting of the Lodge *Vrais Amis de l'Union*, at Brussels, without investigation, defence, or regular judgment, deposed from his position as Grand Master and expelled from Freemasonry. On December 16, 1832, the former Grand Lodge of Administration called upon the Belgian Lodges to rally round it as a Grand Lodge. The meeting took place February 25, 1833, but many Lodges must have meanwhile died out during the political disturbances, because of the thirty-three Lodges of 1820, only fifteen are accounted for. Of these only four appeared in answer to the call and constituted the Grand Orient of Belgium on May 23. It not being considered expedient to elect a Grand Master at the moment, J. de Freune was appointed to rule as Grand Warden. A carefully worded circular—April 1, 1833—secured the adherence to the Grand Orient of all the Lodges except nine, which were accordingly declared irregular, January 4, 1836. Some died out, four joined the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands, but returned to their previous allegiance, with the exception of one (at Ghent), which remained apart, under Dutch jurisdiction. The Grand Orient was then placed under the protection of King Leopold I, who had been initiated in the Lodge of Hope, Berne, in September 1813 and, though never present in Grand Lodge, took a warm interest in the Belgian Craft. On December 13, 1833, the Belgian Lodges were permitted to cumulate any or all Rites; that is to say, whilst remaining true to the Grand Orient, as far as related to the Craft, they were at liberty to apply to any or all of the other Grand bodies for Charters of Chapters, Councils, etc., which were then grafted on these Lodges. The result was curious. There were, for instance, Lodges in which were wrought not only the ceremonies of the Craft, but also the A. and A.R. 33°; the French Rite of seven Degrees; the Scots Philosophic Rite, long since extinct in France, its birthplace; and the Rite of Heredom or Royal Order of Scotland. Some, as in Brussels and Antwerp, brought into play more than one of these. The Rites of Memphis and Misraim also obtained a footing for a time, but died out. The Supreme Council 33°, however (established 1817), gradually acquired control over the supplementary Degrees and was acknowledged as the head of all those outside the Craft, so that, with many Rites, there were only two Grand bodies which existed side by side and worked together in perfect harmony, even occupying the same premises.

Baron von Stassart was elected Grand Master March 1, 1835 and installed on May 3 ensuing. In 1838—January 19—the *Statutes* of the Grand Orient (in 15 articles) were agreed to. They refer solely to the Craft and ignore all other (so-called) Degrees. The organization was very similar to that of the United Grand Lodge of England. On June 10, 1841, the Grand Master resigned, and—July 11,

1842—Defacqz d'Ath was appointed in his stead, with Verhaegen as Deputy. In 1854 d'Ath in turn resigned and was succeeded by Verhaegen.

Unfortunately, since Belgium became a kingdom, the Craft has been traduced and persecuted by the Ultramontane clergy of the country—which has resulted in a not unnatural but, nevertheless, wholly indefensible retaliation.

In 1854—June 24—Verhaegen made a speech, in which he attempted to show that the prohibition of political and religious discussion in Lodge was not a landmark of the Craft, but merely a Grand Lodge ordinance and, as such, could be repealed; and that as far as Belgium was concerned, should thenceforth cease to be enforced. The motion was carried by acclamation and the Belgian Craft has since then been marked by a strong anti-clerical, even anti-religious tendency. This led to the rupture of friendly relations with the Grand Lodges of Hamburg, December 16, 1854; Dresden, November 13; Three Globes of Berlin, December 7; the Sun at Bayreuth, January 24, 1855; the two other Berlin Grand Lodges, January 7; the Grand Lodge of Sweden, 1855; and England 1908. Even in Belgium it produced a breach, as many Lodges placed themselves under the sole authority of the Supreme Council, which had protested against the act. In 1860 no fewer than thirteen Lodges owned allegiance to the A. and A.R. 33°.

On December 8, 1862, Verhaegen died, Van Schoor being provisionally appointed and fully installed, as his successor in 1866. He was followed in 1869 by Van Humbeeck; in 1872 by August Couvreur; in 1875 by Henri Berger; and in 1878 by Couvreur once more. In 1874 the Grand Orient managed to explain its proceedings regarding religion and politics to the satisfaction of Germany and representatives were again exchanged. The Lodges must also have returned to their allegiance, because in 1879 the Grand Orient ruled over fourteen Lodges and the Supreme Council over none. But the latter had grafted Chapters, etc., on six of the Grand Orient Lodges and constituted one Chapter in Ghent without a Lodge basis.

In reviewing Belgian Masonry it is necessary to consider the peculiar circumstances of the country. Since 1830 it has been connected intimately with all the great progressive movements. The foundation of the Free University of Brussels originated at a Masonic meeting: this was the best attended and most prosperous of all the Belgian institutions of higher learning when the Great War of 1914 broke out. Belgian Freemasons secured the recognition of equality in matters of belief and decent burial for non-Catholics, whose remains had previously been interred in those parts of cemeteries reserved for suicides and atheists. It was Belgian Freemasonry also that secured the benefit of compulsory education and the amelioration of the condition of the labouring classes.

CHAPTER XI

FREEMASONRY IN SPAIN

SPAIN disputes with Portugal the sad distinction of having most persistently and relentlessly persecuted its own children on account of their attachment to the Craft; and, like Portugal, it is somewhat remarkable for practising Royal Arch Masonry. But unlike its sister kingdom, it has not succeeded in bringing its Lodges under one single Jurisdiction and it presents a picture of confusion in Craft matters unequalled elsewhere. It is much to be deplored that the partizans of the various Grand Lodges should have allowed their predilections to colour their historical statements. Indeed, to such a length has this been carried, that the later history of the Craft in Spain is more difficult to unravel than the earlier one; and, although no source of information has been overlooked, it is not possible to place on record the events without entertaining some misgivings as to the accuracy of the narrative. Masonic news from the Peninsula reaches us but rarely—in small and unsatisfactory quantities—and no two accounts are reconcilable with each other.

Before proceeding with the main subject it will be well to advert to two small territories, which, though forming a part of Spain—one geographically, the other politically—yet require separate mention, viz. Gibraltar and Minorca.

A Lodge—"of St. John of Jerusalem," No. 51—was constituted at Gibraltar by the Grand Lodge of England in 1727; three years later, Captain James Commerford was appointed Provincial Grand Master for Andalusia, which, as we learn from the terms of subsequent patents, comprised the Rock or fortress "and places adjacent." Commerford was succeeded by Colonel J. G. Montrèsor, 1752-3, Chief Engineer, one of the founders of No. 51—St. John—but who embarked in 1754 for America. Further Lodges were established under the same sanction, in 1762—Inhabitants; 1786—Hiram's; 1789—Calpean; and, in 1791, Friendship. The first Lodge under the Ancient Grand Lodge of England—No. 58—was formed in 1756, but was short-lived and, after this, we meet, in 1773, with the same quarrels between the so-called "Moderns" and "Ancients," as prevailed in the mother country of Freemasonry. The latter, however, were triumphant in the struggle which ensued and they established at Gibraltar Nos. 148—originally constituted in the Royal Artillery in 1767 (*now* St. John's); 202 (*now* Inhabitants), in 1777; and a Provincial Grand Lodge in 1786. The Lodges under the earlier sanction continued to be shown on the lists until 1813, but only one—apparently a union of the Calpean and Friendship—was carried forward at the Union. Prince Edward—afterwards Duke of Kent—was appointed Provincial Grand Master in 1790.

In 1792 there were no fewer than eleven Military Lodges at Gibraltar and the records mention three Lodges of the same character, as having recently left the garrison, besides a Warrant, "No. 61 (Irish) held by the Officers of the 32d Foot, but for neglect erased." Many Lodges were locally constituted by the Atholl Provincial Grand Lodge, of which no record has been preserved, but in 1804 there were at least nine holding Provincial warrants.

Two English Lodges—now both extinct—Ordnance and Calpean, were established in 1819 and 1822; and there were recently in existence three Lodges—St. John's, Inhabitants and Friendship—under the Grand Lodge of England; two under Scotland—St. Thomas (1876) and Al Moghreb al Aksa (1882); and one—No. 325 (1826)—under the Grand Lodge of Ireland.

The Masonic annals of Minorca afford an interesting study owing to the vicissitudes of warfare. In 1708 England took the island from Spain and held it until 1758, when it was taken by the French. England regained possession in 1763 but, in 1782, once more lost it—on this occasion to Spain. Again, from 1798 until the peace of Amiens, 1802, the English flag floated over the island. During the first of these three periods Lord Byron—Grand Master 1747-51—appointed Lieut.-Col. James Adolphus Oughton Provincial Grand Master for Minorca and the following four Lodges were constituted:—Nos. 213-15 in 1750, No. 216 in 1751. These Lodges were carried forward at the renumbering in 1756 but, dropping out in 1766, the places of original Nos. 213-15 (*then* 141-3) were assigned to three American Lodges in 1768. Again during the third British occupation, a "Lodge in the Island of Minorca," No. 586, was established in 1800. Turning to the Atholl Register, we find that Lodges Nos. 141 and 117, were erected on the island in 1766 and 1770 and a Provincial Grand Lodge in 1772. Even in recent times Minorca seems to have been regarded as "unoccupied country," for French Lodges were formed at Mahon by the A. and A.R. 33° in 1860 and 1870.

The first Lodge in Spain—the Lodge of the Lilies—was founded by the Duke of Wharton, Grand Master, 1722, in his own apartments in a French hotel at Madrid, on February 15, 1728. Two months later—April 17—this Lodge, through its Master, Ch. Labelye, informed the Grand Lodge of the fact, but applied nevertheless to the same body—March 29, 1729—to be properly constituted and the request was acceded to.

The following is extracted from the Minutes of Grand Lodge for April 17, 1728:

The Deputy Grand Master [Dr. J. T. Desaguliers] acquainted the Brethren that he had received a letter from several Masons at a Lodge at Madrid in Spain, which he read to them and the Grand Lodge unanimously agreed to what was prayed for in their letter, which is as followeth:

"Right Worshipful Master

"We here undersigned Masons, Free and Accepted, residing at present in Madrid and other places of the Kingdom of Spain, take the Liberty of this Letter, as our Duty obliged us, to acquaint our Most Right and Worshipful Grand Master,

his worthy Deputy, the Grand Wardens and all the Lodges of Masons now situated in England that, having been always very desirous to see our Ancient Society propagated, its true its virtuous Designs encouraged and the Craft flourish in every place where our affairs have called us ; Resolved accordingly to propagate it in this Kingdom whenever it can be done in a lawful manner and as we had some time agoe the Opportunity of the Presence of his Grace the Duke of Wharton, we petitioned him to constitute a Lodge in this town, the which he readily granted and executed and, after our Lodge was formed, we accepted and made Masons, three persons hereunder mentioned and just after it was Resolved unanimously to acquaint our President, the Grand Master and the General Officers in England, to all of which his Grace submits himself entirely having acted in this occasion as Second Deputy.

“Be pleased, therefore, to acquaint our Grand Master and all the Lodges in general at the next Quarterly Communication with the contents of this letter and we expect the favour to be inserted in the Book under the name of the Madrid Lodge and Meetings to be fixed at present on the first Sunday in every month. We hope to send at the next Quarterly Communication that shall be held about St. John Baptist’s Day of this present year a longer List of Members of our Lodge and a copy of such By-laws as we Resolved upon, as they are thought proper for the Country wherein we are at present for the Union amongst us and the Charity to the Poor shall be recommended and exercised in our Ancient Society, upon which in general, We pray God Almighty to shed His most precious favours and Blessings. We are,

“ Sir and Right Worshipful Master
Your most dutiful Brethren
and humble Servants

“ Dated in our Lodge at Madrid
this 15th february 1728, N.S.

By his Grace’s orders,

PHILIP, DUKE OF WHARTON, etc., Deputy Grand Master,
Sic Subscritum.

CHARLES DE LABELYE, Master. }

RICHARDS, Senr. Warden. }

THOMAS HATTON, Junr. Warden. }

ELDRIDGE DINSDALE.

ANDREW GALLWEY.”

Pro tempore.

Then the Grand Lodge drank prosperity to the Brethren of the Lodge at Madrid and desired the Grand Master to write them word of their being acknowledged and received as Brethren or in what manner he shall think proper.

The Lodge received the number 50 on the list of Lodges and was the first Lodge warranted in foreign lands by the Grand Lodge of England. At the Quarterly Communication held on March 27, 1729,

the Master of the Lodge at Madrid stood up and represented that his Lodge had never been regularly constituted by the authority of the Grand Master, the Deputy Grand Master and Grand Wardens in England and, therefore, humbly prayed a Deputation for that purpose.

Ordered, that the Secretary do likewise prepare a Deputation to Impower Charles Labelle (*sic*), Master of the said Lodge, to constitute them with such other instructions as is likewise necessary for that purpose.

It was erased in 1768, in company with the first Paris Lodge *Loui d'Argent* and the Duke of Richmond's Lodge at Aubigny (a notable trio), either for having ceased to meet or neglected to conform to the laws of the Society.

In 1739 a Deputation was granted by the Grand Lodge of England to Captain James Cummersford, as Provincial Grand Master for Andalusia with full powers to found Lodges in the south of Spain. This gave great umbrage to the clergy and monks and disquieted the secular power to a very great extent.

The next step introduces the first of the persecutions which Spanish Freemasons have suffered and, like their Portuguese Brethren, doggedly withstood. In 1740 King Philip V, approved the Papal Bull of 1738 and issued a confirmatory edict for his possessions. The Inquisition discovered a Lodge and eight of its members were condemned to the galleys (*Acta Latomorum*, vol. i, p. 47). Findel says that notwithstanding this, Freemasonry continued to exist and spread rapidly throughout the land. There are proofs that at Barcelona a German Chaplain visited a Lodge in 1743. Indeed the Lodges increased in spite of all difficulties and—July 2, 1751—Father Joseph Torrubia, a censor and revisor of the Inquisition, obtained from Ferdinand VI a further decree condemning Masons to death without the benefit of a trial of any kind, on the ground that Freemasonry was dangerous to religion and good government. It is affirmed that Torrubia traitorously caused himself to be initiated in order to betray every member's name to the Inquisitors and his report mentions at that date ninety-seven Lodges in Spain. This statement has a more solid basis than tradition or supposition. Professor von Sonnenfels, of Vienna, writing in the *Vienna Journal für Freimaurer*, 1784, states definitely that Torrubia obtained a dispensation from the Papal Grand Penitentiary permitting him to assume the name and character of a secular priest, to become an initiate into Freemasonry and to disregard the obligation of secrecy that would be demanded from him. This plan was duly carried out and he handed over to the Inquisitors a list of all the Lodges in Spain with, it is said, a complete list of the members, though this last statement is certainly doubtful.

Meetings nevertheless continued to be held, even at the house of the British Ambassador (1753) in Madrid and the *Freemasons' Calendar* of 1776 alludes to an independent Lodge in Spain. According to Don Rafael Sunyé, Spanish Freemasonry declared itself independent of England in 1767 and elected as Grand Master the Prime Minister of Charles III, Count d'Aranda, who had, in the spring of the year, procured the banishment of the Jesuits. This would provide a reason for the Madrid Lodge being struck off the roll in 1767 as mentioned above. In 1780 this Grand Lodge became permeated with French ideas and took the name of Grand Orient. In 1793, the Cardinal Vicar issued a decree of death against all Freemasons. Several Lodges continued to hold meetings and, under Joseph Napoleon,

all restrictions were removed. In 1795 Count d'Aranda having lost his liberty, his nominee, the Count de Montijo, was elected Grand Master. French ideas made further strides and, in 1806, the Royal Order of Scotland at Rouen was enabled to found a Spanish Grand Lodge of the Order at Xeres, with James Gordon as Grand Master, of which little more is known. This appears to have been followed by the erection of a real *Scottish* (not *Scots*) Lodge in 1807, the Desired Re-Union, No. 276, on the roll of the Grand Lodge of Scotland; and, in the same year, James Gordon was appointed Provincial Grand Master "over all the Lodges under that Jurisdiction," "east of Balbos in Andalusia" (Lawrie, 1859, p. 408). About this time appeared on the scene the Count de Tilly, brother of De Grasse-Tilly, a bitter enemy of Buonaparte, who made himself famous in the south of Spain under the name of Gusman. Like his brother, Tilly was a staunch adherent of the A. and A.R., and—December 17, 1808—assembled several Brothers at Aranjuez, where he constituted a Supreme Council of the 33° for Spain. At this time Freemasonry was openly practised in Spain without fear of persecution for, on the one hand, the Craft was protected by the French armies who had invaded the country, whilst, on the other hand, it enjoyed the goodwill of the British troops who were assisting the legitimate sovereign, Ferdinand VII. In Havana, out of courtesy to the foreign merchants there, says Findel, meetings of the Lodges were held without the slightest attempt at secrecy. On June 6, 1808, Joseph Napoleon was made King of Spain and Spanish Lodges under the Grand Orient of France increased daily. The first of these was established as early as January 22, 1807, at Cadiz.

In October 1809 a Grand Orient of Spain, dependent upon the Grand Orient at Paris, was erected in the very building at Madrid in which the Inquisition had held its meetings, under the auspices of King Joseph, to which was attached a Grand Tribunal of the 31°. The Grand Master was Azanza, a former Minister of State. Two years later—July 4, 1811—the Count de Grasse-Tilly founded a Supreme Council of the A. and A.R. 33° in opposition to that of his brother and in alliance with the last-formed Grand Orient, whose Grand Master, Azanza, also became Sovereign Grand Commander of the new Rite. At this epoch, therefore, we have four Grand Bodies: 1st, The Grand Lodge of 1767, converted in 1780 into a Grand Orient under Montijo; 2nd, the Supreme Council of 1808, under the younger Tilly; 3rd, the Grand Orient of 1809; and 4th, the Supreme Council of 1811, both under Azanza—who was succeeded as the head of the last two bodies by the celebrated patriot Arguëlles.

The return to power of Ferdinand VII inaugurated a fresh persecution of the Craft. In 1814—May 4—he abolished the constitution, re-established the Inquisition and declared Freemasons guilty of treason. This was followed in September by the arrest and imprisonment of twenty-five members of the Craft in Madrid, amongst whom may be mentioned General Alava, Wellington's aide-de-camp (*Acta Latomorum*, vol. i, p. 265). Although the plan followed of handing suspected persons over to the barbarous Inquisition is, of course indefensible, the attempted suppression of the Craft was only too well justified in those troublous times on

account of its unhappy interference with Spanish politics. To this admixture of politics and Freemasonry one is induced to ascribe the obstinacy with which the Fraternity resisted all attempts to stamp it out. Far from succumbing, it consolidated its position and, at its head, were always the liberal leaders of the day. Thus, in 1818, Arguëlles, Riego, the brothers San Miguel and others took part in important deliberations in Madrid, resulting in a fusion between the two Supreme Councils, Riego becoming Grand Master. This was followed by the popular movement in 1820, headed by Riego, which compelled the king—July 9—to regrant the liberal constitution, abolish the Inquisition, expel the Jesuits and set at liberty all Freemasons who had been imprisoned for their connexion with the Craft.

For three years Masonry flourished. (A Lodge, No. 750, at Lanzarote, was warranted by the Grand Lodge of England in 1822.) Then followed a curious state of affairs. Foreign intervention was sought by Ferdinand and, with the assistance of French troops—formerly such enthusiastic propagators of the Craft—the Brotherhood was suppressed. French bayonets re-established Ferdinand in his old prerogatives, Riego was shot and—August 1, 1824—the king issued a new edict, by which all Freemasons who failed to deliver up their papers and renounce the Society in thirty days, were to be, on discovery, hanged in the ensuing twenty-four hours—without trial of any kind. This sentence was actually put into execution. In pursuance thereof—September 9, 1825—a Lodge having been surprised at Granada, seven of its members were given a short shrift and gibbeted accordingly, whilst the candidate for admission was let off with five years of forced labour. Three years later, says Findel, this example was imitated by the Court of Justice in Granada, one of the Antilles, when the learned and philanthropic Marquis de Cavrilano was sentenced to the gallows and Ferdinand Alvarez de Soto Mayer to death, both because of their being suspected to be Freemasons. In 1828 the French troops evacuated Spain, but without having “stamped out” Freemasonry, for in 1829, fresh signs of its existence having been observed in Barcelona, Lieut.-Col. Galvez was hanged and two other members of the Craft were condemned to the galleys for life.

In spite of all this, however, the Craft continued to consolidate itself, although compelled to exercise the greatest secrecy in all its proceedings. Much which precedes and follows rests on the sole authority of Don Rafael Sunyé, 33°, whose sketch of Spanish Masonry in the *Monde Maçonique* has been reprinted with more or less exactitude by other journals of the Craft. Either the writer had access to archives hitherto preserved from public ken, or he has ingeniously dovetailed his account with the known facts. The position of the writer would, probably, give him access to much valuable evidence, dispersed throughout the documentary waifs and strays preserved in the jealously guarded Chancelleries of the so-called Higher Degrees. See *The Freemason*, April 3, May 8, and June 19, 1880 and the *Freemason's Chronicle*, August 30 and September 6, 1884.

One of the members of the United Supreme Council at this time was no less a personage than Don Francisco de Bourbon. We may also mention General San

Miguel, the minister Lopez, Magnan and others. In 1829 Don Francisco, having been elected Grand Master of the Grand Orient and Sovereign Commander of the A. and A.R. 33°—the earliest Grand Orient (1767) united with the one under his leadership and thus, for a time, formed one sole Jurisdiction in Spain, working the English, French and—so-called—Scottish Rites. The accession of Queen Isabella II in 1833 did not suffice to relieve the Craft from the necessity of secrecy, but nothing more of active persecution is heard. An anonymous Grand Orient of Spain announced its existence to the Grand Orient of France and sent in its *Statutes*—signed April 20, 1843—with a list of members all designated by pseudonyms. In 1848 it called itself the Grand Orient of Hesperique. A Lodge was established at Algeciras, No. 347, under the Grand Lodge of Ireland in 1843 and cancelled in 1858. Findel says that the Grand Orient of Hesperique acknowledged the A. and A. Rite of the 33°. But they likewise recognized the Lodges founded by other Grand Lodges in Spain and permitted to Brethren working under other systems entrance into their Lodges. The Grand Master was always styled Vallée Invisible. In the *Statutes* Spain was divided into districts, in each of which were three Provincial Lodges. The names of places where single Orients were established were Madrid, Burgos, Badajoz, Barcelona, Saragossa, Valencia, Corunna, Santander, Bilbao, Seville, Granada, Malaga; but the names of the members of the Grand Orient were feigned ones, to escape the persecution of the civil authorities. The assembling in large numbers was avoided, so as not to excite suspicion. No Lodge was permitted to possess any written documents, every six months a new password was selected and communicated to all the Lodges by the Grand Orient: visitors were admitted only if personally known to the Grand Master. The Grand Orient of France refused recognition to the Grand Orient of Hesperique on account of the secrecy in which it had shrouded itself and even founded a Lodge of its own at Barcelona, although her Constitution prohibited her from establishing Lodges in a foreign country where a Masonic Supreme Power already existed. In the same year the Grand Orient Hesperique suspended a French Lodge in Spain because political speeches had been delivered there. In 1852 there was a Lodge at Gijon in Asturia with a French Constitution, also one at Gracia, the Lodge of St. John of Spain, with Aurel Eybert at its head. This latter Lodge was betrayed by its Treasurer (he sought this means to escape the necessity of giving up his accounts for inspection) in conjunction with a man named Hirel from Chrisy and April 18, 1853, was dissolved by the Minister of Police, Serra Munchuz. The whole of the members were arrested and twelve of them were condemned to four years' rigorous imprisonment, the Grand Master Eybert to seven, but twelve who were not present when the police entered were permitted to go free. All were subsequently pardoned by Isabella II.

Meanwhile, in 1848 fresh persecutions had broken out during the administration of Marshal Narvaez. Don Francisco, excommunicated by the Pope, fled the country, delegating his authority to Charles Magnan. Under this administration the Lodges were neither more nor less than secret political associations, until

circa 1854, when the Craft once more obtained toleration. This is ascribed to the alleged fact that Don Francisco d'Assissi, the queen's consort, was the Master of a Lodge held in the palace itself. Of the succeeding period but little is really known, though there are notices on record of Lodges in various cities and of one founded by France in Minorca (1860), also of a Lodge composed exclusively of Englishmen in Madrid. A Lodge, No. 1024, Morality and Philanthropy, was formed at Cadiz under the Grand Lodge of England in 1857, the Warrant of which was returned in 1875. But the Grand Orients under Magnan and Calatrava respectively, if not absolutely dormant, exhibited few signs of life. It would almost appear as if toleration were only to be attained at the price of a total absence of self-assertion.

The revolution of September 28, 1868, which expelled Queen Isabella, opened the country to the free exercise of the Rites of Masonry but, in removing the necessity for union, has had the effect of dividing the Society into more cliques than can be distinctly described. The statements respecting the rise of these parties, their subsequent history and their recent state are so contradictory and vague that the student loses all feeling of certainty. As late as July 30, 1879, the United Grand Orient of the sister kingdom (Portugal) declared itself incapable of unravelling the tangled web of Spanish Freemasonry, or of discovering the most legitimate Grand Lodge, or the one likely to prove so in the long run (*Boletin Oficial*, 1880, p. 76). One fact alone stands out clearly, that the Grand Orient of Lusitania (Portugal) commenced to warrant Lodges in Spain.

The first step of importance appears to have been the revival of Calatrava's National Grand Orient of Spain in 1869. Contemporaneous with this was the revival under Magnan of his Grand Orient and Supreme Council. In 1870 he left for Santander and his office was therefore transferred to Ruiz Zorilla. For this purpose Zorilla had in four days been passed from the humble position of a candidate for initiation through all the thirty-three Degrees, one step—Knight of the East—having been conferred in the Iberian Grand Orient, a body which had been recently established in Spain by the Grand Orient of Portugal, a rival of the Grand Orient of Lusitania. Grand Master Zorilla was Prime Minister during the short reign of Amadeus of Savoy and, during his tenure of office, a treaty was entered into between the Grand Orients of Spain and Lusitania, granting a reciprocity of jurisdiction to the two contracting parties, February 12, 1872. On the abdication of Amadeus, Ruiz Zorilla voluntarily resigned and placed his powers at the disposal of the Craft, January 1, 1874. It was then agreed by some of the "Puissant" and "Illustrious" members of the 33° that Zorilla's reign should be considered as *non avenu*, null and void and that Magnan should resume command as though his rule had never suffered interruption. Magnan appointed Carvajal as Lieutenant Grand Commander and immediately resigned in his favour. Carvajal was succeeded in turn as Sovereign Grand Commander by Ferrer, Conder, Avalos, Oriero and Panzano y Almirall.

Some of the Brethren, however, objecting to this resumption by Magnan as *ultra vires*, seceded and elected as Sovereign Grand Commander, General La Somera

in succession to Zorilla. Somera resigned after a twelvemonth in favour of Sagasta, afterwards Prime Minister; the latter was followed by Antonio Romero Ortez, Governor of the Bank of Spain, who, dying early in 1884, was succeeded by Don Manuel Becerra. Under Somera, 1874-5, this Grand Lodge (it had dropped the title Orient) absorbed the Iberian Grand Orient mentioned above.

Besides these two Grand Orients there existed a National Grand Orient of Spain under the Marquis de Seoane. That National Grand Orient is Calatrava's Grand Orient of Hisperia, which is first heard of *circa* 1840-3. Calatrava must have considered himself at that date legitimately descended from the original Grand Lodge and the English Provincial Grand Lodge, for the official documents bear the following dates: Grand Lodge, 1728; Grand Orient, 1780; Supreme Council, 1808. Calatrava continued to be Grand Master until his death, February 28, 1876.

But these three bodies not being sufficient for the Spanish Brethren, a fresh schism arose in 1875. When Somera resigned—December 27, 1875—a certain Juan Antonio Perez, 30°, disapproving of Sagasta's election, induced a friend to pass him to the 33° and erected a Grand Orient—comprising a Supreme Council and Grand Lodge—of his own. By dint of self-assertion this Grand Orient would appear to have prospered fairly well, judging from observations in the *Boletin Oficial* of the U.G. Lusitanian Orient for 1880 and the recognition of its Grand Lodge by several governing Craft bodies in America.

On December 28, 1879, two Lodges withdrew from the Grand Lusitanian Orient in a perfectly legal manner and formed themselves into a Grand Central Masonic Consistory 32° at Malaga, with the professed intention of remaining independent for a time, eventually joining the Grand Orient.

With a similar intention thirteen Lodges of this same Grand Orient withdrew from its jurisdiction at about the same time, forming themselves into a Masonic Confederation of the Congress of Seville, extending their sway also to the 32° only. The modesty with which these two bodies refrained from establishing a Supreme Council 33° proves, at least, the sincerity of their protestations.

On February 7, 1881, the Confederation divested itself of all control over Freemasonry and declared in its very title that it had jurisdiction "over the 4th and 32nd Degrees" only. This at least was a wise step, in which it followed the example set in many other countries by bodies assuming the title of Supreme Council, A. and A.R. 33°.

As a result, on the same date, February 7, the members of the Craft erected a Grand Spanish Independent Symbolic Lodge, "with jurisdiction over the first three Degrees," at Seville, under Grand Master Castro, who was succeeded by Branlio Ruiz. In a circular of July 29, 1883, the number of subordinate Lodges under this Grand Body was stated to be twenty-one.

When the Iberian Grand Orient was absorbed in 1874 by Somera, some Lodges, nine in all, increased to twelve by three seceders from Somera's Grand Lodge, were dissatisfied with the arrangement and, dissenting from the majority, revived or continued the Iberian Grand Orient. In 1876 it reduced the thirty-three Degrees

to seven, condensing the pith of all the others, thus forming the Spanish reformed Rite.

All these Grand Bodies, with the exception of the one at Seville, worked the A. and A.R. 33°; that of Perez superadded the modern French Rite of seven Degrees. Of their strength it is impossible to present any statistics, Spanish Lodges being ephemeral in their nature. *The Freemason* of August 7, 1880, gave a list of the active Lodges under that Grand Master and, although the last number was 142, the total of Lodges only mounted up to forty-five, or about a third.

In 1881, after the revolution, Don Praxedes M. Sagasta, Sovereign Grand Commander and Grand Master of the Grand Orient, became the First Minister of the Crown. Two months previously, Spanish Freemasons were barely tolerated as individuals, while, collectively, their Lodges were liable to be broken open and the members arrested. Sagasta resigned immediately his Masonic appointments and Don Antonio Romero Ortiz, ex-Minister of State, Governor of the Bank of Spain, was installed in his stead. At that time there were 160 Craft Lodges within the Jurisdiction, many having a membership roll of over one hundred. Official recognition was accorded to the Grand Orient of Spain by the Grand Lodge of Italy, the Grand Orients of France, Mexico, Brazil, Buenos Ayres and Uruguay, representatives from each being present at the installation of Ortiz. In 1869 Ortiz, as Minister of State for Grace and Justice, authorized an Englishman, Lieutenant-Colonel George Fitch, who had long been resident at Madrid, to open the first Protestant church ever publicly and legally consecrated in Spain. He also brought in and successfully passed through the Cortes the well-known Article of Constitution, which gave freedom of conscience and freedom of public worship to every one in Spain. He was President of the Society of Spanish Authors and Artists, a well-known archæologist and his magnificent museum was one of the sights of Madrid.

Freemasonry in Spain to-day is under the control of the Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Rite. Membership in Spanish Lodges does not usually exceed 150, on account of the limitation of space in the Lodge rooms and in order to secure a rotation of officers. An applicant for initiation supplies his photograph to the Lodge, which, along with particulars of his name, address, occupation, etc., is posted in the ante-room for six months before he is accepted or rejected. Six months' interval must elapse between each Degree, so that no Spanish initiate becomes a fully-fledged Freemason until, at least, two years after he has made his first application.

It is, perhaps, not surprising to learn that the membership of the Masonic Lodges in Spain is composed mainly of Roman Catholics, in connexion with which fact, Demofilo de Buen, Grand Master, issued, in 1927, the following answer to the question: "Can Catholics be received into the ranks of Freemasonry?"

This is particularly interesting for Spanish Masons to determine from the point of view of the compatibility of Masonry and Catholicism. Many times during the

initiation ceremony have I seen a difficult situation arise when the candidate in answering that question, declared his religion as Catholic, not being aware of the position of Masonry in regard to that Church.

There are times when the person calling himself a Catholic is merely a fervent Christian and rejects the excommunications as contrary to his definition of religion ; or again, the practice of certain religious rites is only a custom or a conventionalism with him. In such and analogous cases our position toward a Mason who says that is his religion must be one of tolerance and respect, considering him a man of honour and faithful in the fulfilment of his Masonic obligation, if one of us, or capable of fulfilling them if admitted.

From the viewpoint of the Roman Catholic Church, Masonry is incompatible with that religion ; it is an organization against which pontiffs have issued many anathemas and excommunications. The Roman Catholic Clergy in general since the beginning have shown themselves bitterly opposed to our Order and Spanish Masonry well remembers its persecutions, a notable case being that of the friar José Torrubio, censor and revisor for the Holy See of the Inquisition in Madrid, whose fervour for militant Catholicism reached such a degree that, having previously secured the necessary licence from the Pope, he, in 1751, caused himself to be initiated into the mysteries of Freemasonry, learning their secret work, visiting the different Lodges, securing the names of the members and, later, denouncing Masonry as a most abominable institution.

Such being the criticism of the Church and the Spanish clergy, which never tires in its diatribes against Masons, considering them as the representatives of Satan, it appears at the least suspicious for one who believes in the mysteries, dogmas and doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church to be received among us. As a voluntary subject of the ecclesiastic hierarchy, we may not reject him as a Catholic, but must regard him as suspicious and insincere when he solicits admission to a Masonic Lodge. Especially does it appear impossible to admit a candidate who belongs to any association, fraternity or institution whose oath requires him to combat our fundamental principles ; he must choose between us and our enemies and can only be initiated into our Order when we reach full conviction of the sincerity and honour of his purpose.

There are to-day seventy-one Lodges under the Grand Orient of Spain in Seville with an approximate aggregate membership of 5,000. Under the Grand Lodge of Spain in Barcelona there are fifty-two Lodges with a total membership of 1,800.

With regard to the first paragraph of this manifesto, it should be explained that, in Spain, every candidate for initiation into Freemasonry has to declare in open Lodge to what religion he subscribes.

CHAPTER XII

FREEMASONRY IN PORTUGAL

IT is a well-known axiom with Freemasons, that their duty requires them to close their Lodges in the presence of a prohibition by the government of the day. We have seen this duty cheerfully submitted to in various countries, but Portugal forms an exception to the ordinary rule. In no country has the Craft been more persecuted—both by the Government and the Church—but it would appear as if the Fraternity had obstinately determined not to yield to any pressure from without. Once it had taken root, neither decrees of state nor tortures of the Inquisition ever succeeded in extirpating Freemasonry in Portugal and at no time did Lodges cease to exist in more or less secrecy. Whilst as a law-abiding Fraternity, we may lament this disobedience of our Portuguese Brethren—as admirers of devotion and courage, we may be permitted to appreciate their resolution and endurance. It, however, follows, as Professor E. B. Graïna has pointed out in his *Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie en Portugal*, that the history of Freemasonry in that country is really the history of the nation, for the men most prominent in the religious and political revolutions, as well as in the scientific and literary movements were, almost without exception, Freemasons, while among the Masonic members of the Royal Academy of Sciences and distinguished writers are to be found the names of the Abbé Correia Serra, Joseph Liberato Freire de Carvalho, Filinto Elisio, Almeida Garrett, Innocencia da Silva and Mendes Lial et Antonio Eneo, only to name a few prominent in Masonic annals. The Portuguese Grand Masters were conspicuous in the Revolutions of 1817, 1820, 1833, 1842, 1846, 1851, 1868 and 1898, their names including Gomes Freire, Fernandes Thomas, Borges Caneiro, Silva Carvalho, Dom Pierre IV, Passos Manuel, Costa Cabral, le Comte des Antas, le Duc de Loulé, Joseph Estevam de Magalhães, Joseph Elias Garcia, Alves da Veiga, etc. In the Revolution of October 5, 1910, nearly all the principal characters were Freemasons.

Clavel, in *Histoire Pittoresque de la Franc-Maçonnerie*, tells us that French Deputies founded Lodges in Portugal in 1727, but this statement lacks corroboration. Thanks, however, to the care taken by Pierre z'Avedo in preserving the documents relating to the Inquisition, which he found in the national archives of the Torre do Tombo, which are reproduced or summarized in Graïna's *Histoire*, there is certain evidence that Freemasonry was in existence in Portugal in 1733, that it was introduced into the country by a Scotsman named Gordon and that there were two Lodges, one composed of Catholics and the other of Protestants. The evidence given before the Inquisition by Hugo O'Kelly, who is described as "Grand Master"

of the Lodge that met in the rue de Remolares, the Catholic Lodge, declares that Freemasonry had been introduced into Portugal by Gordon, that he (O'Kelly) had, in 1738, been a member of it for two years; that the Lodge was known as the Royal House of Lusitanian Freemasons and was quite separate from the Protestant Lodge, of which he declared he knew nothing and had never visited; that the Catholic Lodge held their meetings on the first Wednesday of every month, that the subjects discussed were educational, economical and recreative. It was said that the Protestant Lodge had the smaller membership, but beyond this fact O'Kelly disclaimed any knowledge of its transactions. O'Kelly was an Irish colonel and, among the other members of the Lodge of which he was the Master were Denis Hogan, a lieutenant in the Alcantara cavalry; Thomas French, a merchant; Captain Patrick Brown; James O'Kelly, dancing instructor to the Royal Family; Michael O'Kelly, his brother, owner of a glass-works; Charles Caroll, a merchant; Sergeant-Major Charles Mardel, a German engineer; and three Dominican monks: Fathers Patrick O'Kellen (or Kinide), Tilan and Leynan. The principal witness against the Freemasons before the Inquisition was a Dominican named Charles O'Kelly, a professor of theology at the College of Corpo Santo, who said that the proprietor of the restaurant where the Lodge was held was an Irishman named Rice; that the Lodge was well attended; and that all the members appeared to be excellent Catholics, if judged by their regular attendance at the church of Corpo Santo. The result of the inquiry was that the Inquisition abandoned its proceedings against the Catholic Lodge and devoted its attention to the Protestant Lodge.

In the Minutes of the Grand Lodge of England, under date of April 17, 1735, we read:

A petition from several Brethren now residing in or about the City of Lisbon in Portugal, humbly praying that a Deputation may be granted to Mr. George Gordon for constituting them into a regular Lodge—the prayer of which petition was granted.

And in the *St. James' Evening Post*—letter from Lisbon, June 3, 1736:

By authority of the Right Honourable the Earl of Weymouth, the then Grand Master of all Mason's Lodges, Mr. George Gordon, Mathematician, has constituted a Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons in that City; and a great many merchants of the Factory and other people of distinction have been received and regularly made Freemasons. Lord George Graham, Lord Forrester and a great many gentlemen belonging to the English Fleet, being Brethren, were present at constituting the Lodge and it is expected that in a short time it will be one of the greatest abroad.

This early mention of the Fleet is notable, because in after times, during the Craft's darkest hour, foreign vessels in port were extensively used as safe meeting-places for the persecuted Lodges.

Freemasonry, however, from the very first, met, as already seen, with a determined enemy in the Church and the opposition of the Roman prelaty became more

pronounced after the issue of the famous Bull of Clement XII, April 27, 1738. At last, in 1743, King John V (1707-50) was persuaded by his *entourage* that the Freemasons were heretics and rebels and issued an edict of death against them.

The character of the Court of John V is described by V. de Bragança Cunha in *Eight Centuries of Portuguese Monarchy*, in the following words :

A profligate and bigoted Court . . . swarming with sharpers and courtesans, and with a nobility required to glitter at Court festivals and bull-fights rather than participate in the affairs of State. John V led a gay life that would have brought any Court into disrepute. His flirtations—we must use the term, for we know no better one—with the nuns of the Convent of Odivellas describe the sensuous nature of the Portuguese monarch. He not only squandered money on mistresses and begat bastards, but to atone for his sins devoutly threw away sums of money on the erection of monasteries and chapels.

As a reward for his religious zeal he received from the Pope in 1748 the title of “Most Faithful.”

The edict of King John V resulted in an era of persecution and torture at the hands of the Inquisition, the most prominent victim being Coustos. The full story, in the words of the victim, is related in Dudley Wright’s *Roman Catholicism and Freemasonry*, but briefly it is as follows :

Coustos—the son of a Swiss surgeon—was born at Berne, but emigrated, in 1716, with his father to England, where he followed the trade of a gem-cutter, and was admitted into the Fraternity. After spending twenty-two years in London he went to Lisbon with the intention of shipping for Brazil, but failing to obtain a permit from the government, settled down to his trade in the Portuguese capital. There, with two French jewellers—Monton and Braslé—he founded a Lodge, where they were surprised—March 14, 1743—by the familiars of the Inquisition. In order to wrest from him the secrets of a Freemason and a renunciation of his religion, Coustos was within the space of three months subjected nine times to the rack, scourged, branded and otherwise tortured, and—June 21, 1743—he figured as a principal personage at an *auto-da-fé* in the Church of the Dominicans. He was sentenced to four years at the galleys as a Protestant and *Freemason*—but his two companions, being Catholics, to five years exile only. Monton and Braslé were also tortured and the latter died in consequence of his sufferings. Coustos was claimed by the British Embassy as an English subject and, with Monton, arrived in London December 14, 1744, where they were well received and cared for by the Fraternity. Coustos’s narrative, together with a history of the Inquisition, was published in 1745 and a second edition in 1746. There is a copy of the very rare first edition in the Bodleian Library.

In July 1744, the year following the celebrated *auto-da-fé* at Lisbon, another Freemason, also a friend of Coustos, twenty-six years of age, who had been denounced to the Inquisition as a Freemason, renounced the Protestant religion in order to regain his liberty, which he succeeded in doing on payment of the costs of the proceedings. Among the names of Brethren denounced to the Inquisition at that

time were Britishers named Gordon, Fox, Ivens and Vendrevel; Frenchmen named Jean Piètre, Lambert Boulanger, Jean Ville Neuve, Felix, Julian and Carmon. Gordon and Fox were already initiates when they went to Portugal and it is not impossible that the first-named is identical with the Brother indicated by O'Kelly as having introduced Freemasonry into Portugal. In the same year the Madrid Inquisition sentenced to abjuration *de levi* and banishment from Spain, Don Francisco Aurion de Roscobel, Canon of Quintanar, for membership of the Masonic Order.

In 1750 John V was succeeded by his son, Joseph I (1750-77). Under this liberal-minded prince and his celebrated minister, Sebastian Joseph de Carvalho e Mello, who had been Ambassador at London and Vienna, who became known as the Marquis de Pombal, the clergy lost much of their influence and the Jesuits were banished from the kingdom in 1769. By that time, says George Young, in *Portugal Old and Young*, Pombal had succeeded in reducing the Inquisition to a mere ecclesiastical tribunal, conducting its proceedings with some semblance of judicial procedure and confining its sentences for the most part to imprisonment in a monastery. The secularization of education was also brought about, the national University of Coimbra was freed from priestly control and the colleges for the more wealthy founded by Jesuits and other Orders were taken over as government institutions. In the year of the expulsion of the Jesuits, Sebastian Joseph was created Marquis de Pombal. According to a book published in 1822, entitled *Cause des Moines et des Francs-Maçons au Tribunal de la Prudence*, de Pombal had been initiated into Freemasonry. During his rule Freemasons escaped persecution and there is no mention of any Brethren, either in the lists of those accused to the Inquisition or in the police reports; it is even the fact that Freemasonry developed in Portugal about that time, particularly in the army and among the educated and wealthy. Grainha says that this may be ascribed to the experience acquired by the Marquis in London, where he had observed that the Court officials and members of the highest ranks of Society were also members of the Craft. Only once, in 1770, did the Inquisition make an attempt to suppress the Craft: but these were two prisoners sent to Lisbon from Madeira by Sa Pereira, Governor of Funchal, the first, Dom Ayres de Ornellas Peraçao, in November 1770 and the second, Sergeant-Major François D'Alincourt, in December of the same year; both were released unconditionally after fourteen months' detention.

Joseph was succeeded by his daughter, Maria, married to her uncle, Dom Pedro, Joseph's youngest brother. Pombal was dismissed and exiled and the clergy once more gained the upper hand. The most talented men of the kingdom, being Freemasons, only saved their lives by flight and the celebrated mathematician, Da Cunha, lay in the dungeons of the Inquisition from 1778 to 1788, when he, along with other college professors, was condemned in the *auto-da-fé* of the latter year. According to the records of the Inquisition of that time, Freemasonry was then established at Lisbon, Oporto and Coimbra. In 1792 Queen Maria was attacked by incurable melancholia and had to be placed under restraint; her son, who afterwards succeeded as John VI, was made Prince Regent. Matters then became

worse and, in the same year, the Governor of Madeira was ordered to deliver all Freemasons over to the Inquisition. A few only escaped to America and their vessel on entering New York harbour flew a flag with the inscription *Asylum Querimus*. Pina Manique, the Intendent of Police, who had been the right hand of the Marquis de Pombal, had changed front and become the right hand of the Prince Regent in the execution of his reactionary policy. During the quarter of a century of his regime, from 1780 to 1805, but particularly from 1788, Freemasons were constantly persecuted. He had an admirable coadjutor in General de la Contrabande, who was in charge of the Lisbon police and there is still in existence a letter from him, dated August 8, 1799, in which he said :

I have always repressed all clubs and all public and private societies which were not able to show the letter of permission from the Government. The Order and Society of Freemasons have always been the object of special interest. . . . The principal propagandists of the doctrines of the age there dissimulated their teachings and their arguments, which have caused an unhappy warfare of opinion in these times, have, assuredly, been taught in the Lodges. . . . Since 1788 I have vigorously attacked the establishment, on many occasions, of the Freemasons in this kingdom, originating, as they have always done, from France.

Yet Freemasonry was by no means exterminated. Apart from the Lodges at Lisbon, Oporto and Coimbra, others were held between 1796 and 1797 on board various ships then in port. The frigate *Phoenix* is specially mentioned in this connexion; it was on board that vessel, in 1797, that a Masonic conference was held, when there was formed the Lodge of Regeneration, which became the parent of five other Lodges. Three Lodges at Lisbon—Nos. 315, 319 and 330—are shown on the roll of the (Atholl) Grand Lodge of England, under the years 1798, 1799 and 1807-13 respectively. Numerous others doubtless penetrated into the kingdom with the British regiments to which they were attached. Brethren of the Sea and Land services appear to have worked together in great harmony and the records of the Grand Lodge last referred to, show that many seafaring men became members of Lodge No. 332, held in the 58th Foot, whilst that regiment was quartered at Lisbon in 1811.

As the outcome of the meeting on board the *Phoenix* a committee of six was appointed to act as a Grand Lodge. This body undertook the control of Freemasonry in Portugal and the members pledged themselves to employ all possible means for the relief and deliverance of any of their Brethren who might fall into the hands of the Inquisition. Great secrecy was observed; the places of meeting were continually changed and often, whilst some members worked in the upper story of a house, the remainder, with their wives and daughters, danced on the lower in order to deceive the police. G. W. Speth remembers taking part in Lodge work under exactly similar circumstances and surroundings (Lodge above, ball below) in 1870-71 in Havana, Cuba. In his case, however, although the consequences of detection would have inevitably been serious, at least no Inquisition

was to be feared. He pleads as an excuse for infringing the law that he was *very young*, both as a man and a Mason.

The appointment, by election, of the first Grand Master appears to have fallen to the lot of Sebastian Joseph de Sampaio e Mello Caistro e Luizignano, the brother of the Marquis de Pombal, whilst Joseph Liberato Freire de Carvalho, an Augustinian monk and a well-known litterateur, was elected Grand Orator.

This new Grand Lodge, acting through four Lodges (quoting from Grand Lodge Minutes and Preston's *Illustrations of Masonry*, 1812 edition)

empowered Dom Hypolite Joseph da Costa to act as their representative at the Grand Lodge of England and in their name to solicit a regular authority to practise the Rites of the Order under the English banner and protection. After mature deliberation it was determined that every encouragement should be given to the Brethren in Portugal; and a treaty was immediately entered into and signed by Da Costa and Heseltine—then Treasurer of the Grand Lodge and approved by the Grand Master, whereby it was agreed that as long as the Portuguese Lodges should conform to the ancient *Constitutions* of the Order they should be empowered to have a representative in the Grand Lodge of England, that the Grand Lodge of England should have a representative in the Grand Lodge of Portugal and that the Brethren belonging to each Grand Lodge should be equally entitled to the privileges of the other.

In 1802 an inquest was ordered against Freemasons in Portugal and all who were suspected were charged with conspiracy against the King and the Church and sentenced to the galleys for life. In 1805 there was, however, a Grand Orient at Lisbon, with a Grand Master named Egaz-Moniz, but its ramifications were not very extended.

In 1807 war broke out between France and Portugal, because the ports were not closed to the British fleet. On November 29 Prince John, the Regent, left for Brazil and the next day the French entered Lisbon under General Junot. With the presence of the French troops Freemasonry, of course, showed itself openly; but, in order to counteract the evident desire of the French to bring the National Grand Lodge under the control of the Grand Orient at Paris, the Grand Master closed the Grand Lodge *pro tem.* in 1808. The Junto, or Provisional Government, does not appear to have been inimical to Freemasonry after Junot's forced evacuation and the presence of the English troops could not fail to have been beneficial. Marshal Soult's invasion in 1809 was of too short duration to produce any effect but, after his departure a deplorable, though ridiculous, incident occurred. The English Masons assembled publicly and walked in procession with banners and emblems of the Society. This remarkable spectacle the Portuguese troops mistook—not unnaturally—for one of the pageants of the Romish Church and, therefore, turned out in order to render the usual military honours; but on discovering their error the soldiers—aided by the populace—maltreated the itinerant Craftsmen, which resulted in a fresh series of persecutions at the hands of the Inquisition. On Massena's arrival in 1810 the Craft was re-established, but his retreat was followed

by renewed persecutions, thirty at least of the foremost Freemasons of Lisbon being deported to the Azores in September of that year. But the Fraternity still persevered and, in 1812, there were no fewer than thirteen Lodges in Lisbon alone. Meanwhile, in 1809, the Grand Master Dom Sebastian—whose other names may with convenience be omitted—had been succeeded by Dom Fernando Romão d'Alaide Teive and the latter was followed in 1816 by General Gomez Freire d'Andrade. This Grand Master's fate was untoward; he lived at enmity with Lord Beresford and, having been accused of inciting a revolt against the English commander, was, with eleven co-conspirators, sentenced to death October 15, 1817. This was followed—March 30, 1818—by an edict of John VI—whose mother, the Queen Maria, had died March 20, 1816—dated from Rio de Janeiro, where he was in exile, threatening the Freemasons once more with death and divers other but minor terrors, which produced no effect whatever except a return to the most inviolable secrecy.

Beresford having left, there are to chronicle, a popular revolt in 1820; a Provisional Regency, the arrival from Brazil of the King and his acceptance of a constitution abolishing the Inquisition, establishing trial by jury, etc., in 1821. Naturally enough Freemasonry again emerged from concealment and, in 1822, the King's eldest son, Dom Pedro, having accepted the Grand Mastership of Brazil, the Lisbon Lodges, eight in number, elected João da Cunha Souto Major Grand Master for Portugal.

In 1823, however, a counter-revolution of Royalists triumphed and reinstated John VI in all his autocratic privileges; Freemasons were once more persecuted—by an edict of June 20, 1823—and his second son, Dom Miguel, headed a proclamation of April 30, 1824, with these words, "Long live the King! Long live Roman Catholicism! Death and Destruction to the sacrilegious Freemasons!" A proclamation by the Cardinal Archbishop Souza, published the same evening, so inflamed the minds of the rabble, that many people were murdered on the mere suspicion of being Freemasons. Under this second decree of John VI, the penalty was changed from capital punishment to five years' labours in the galleys in Africa. No proof beyond mere suspicion was necessary to cause the arrest of persons who, immediately, were punished under the penalties of these edicts. Foreigners, as well as natives, were proceeded against. Notwithstanding these interdicts, the Grand Orient of Lusitania was established as well as a Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite and, later, a Provincial Grand Lodge under the Grand Lodge of Ireland. According to its Constitution, Lusitanian Masonry was defined as "an association of free men which has for its aim the exercise of beneficence, the practice of all the virtues and the study of universal morality, sciences and arts."

In 1826 King John died and his eldest son Pedro disjoined the crowns of Brazil and Portugal—conferring the latter on his daughter Maria da Gloria, a minor, married to her uncle Dom Miguel. With the aid of the ultra Royalists, Miguel proclaimed himself king, so that, in 1831, Dom Pedro abdicated Brazil, returned to Portugal and, in 1834, defeated and banished the usurper, his brother and son-in-law.

Pedro himself died in September 1834 and the Cortes declared his daughter of full age. During all this troubled time the Lodges had been under a ban and the Brethren dispersed in all parts of Europe and Brazil. In these circumstances some had elected Da Silva Carvalho, others the Marquis Saldanha, as Grand Master, so that, on the return of the exiles in 1834, two Grand Lodges existed in Lisbon. To add to the confusion the Brethren in Oporto elected a third Grand Master, Manuel da Silva Passos. Carvalho left Portugal in 1836 and, although his Lodges, with the exception of those in the Azores, lay dormant for a while, yet the Grand Lodge was revived a few years afterwards in the person of Manuel Gonzalves da Miranda as Grand Master (1839-41). An attempt at fusion in 1837 failed and, unfortunately, politics were not kept out of sight in Craft matters. For un-Masonic conduct of this kind, Saldanha was deposed in 1837 and his place filled by Baron Vialla Nova da Foz-Côa in 1839; the Oporto Grand Lodge also elected a new Grand Master, Da Costa Cabal, in 1841. All these three Grand Lodges followed the modern French Rite of seven Degrees.

About this time a Rose Croix Chapter was established at Lisbon under the Grand Chapter of Prince Masons of Ireland. This, although not constituted as a Provincial Grand Orient, Chapter, or Lodge, apparently assumed, in some degree, the functions of such a body, since, by the authority last cited, Dom F. G. da Silva Pereira is described as having been its Grand Master.

In 1840, Carvalho—*ci-devant* Grand Master—returned from Brazil with a patent from the Supreme Council 33° in that empire; erected a Lodge and a consistory 32°, which, by a Brazilian patent of June 20, 1841, was—December 27—transformed into a Provincial Supreme Council of the 33° dependent on Brazil. This took the name of Grand Orient of Lusitania. It published its *Statutes* in 1843 and, in 1845, numbered no fewer than 17 Lodges.

To add to this multiplicity of Jurisdictions we find the Grand Lodge of Ireland warranting Lodges at Lisbon; Nos 338, in 1839; 339, 341 and 344 in 1842-4; ultimately a Provincial Grand Lodge was established (1856-72), making the fifth ruling body in Portugal. In 1848 we hear of a second Grand Orient of Lusitania asking for, but not obtaining recognition at Paris. Omitting this latter as an ephemeral appearance, we have in that year—I. A Grand Lodge at Lisbon (French Rite), under Carvalho in the first instance, afterwards Miranda as Grand Masters. II. A Grand Lodge also at Lisbon (French Rite), under Saldanha and Foz-Côa successively. III. A Grand Lodge at Oporto (French Rite), under Passos and Costa Cabal. IV. A Grand Orient of Lusitania (Ancient and Accepted Rite 33°) at Lisbon, under Carvalho, Grand Master, dependent upon Brazil. V. An Irish Provincial Grand Lodge—*de facto*, if not as yet *de jure*—under Frederico Guilheime de Silva Pereira at Lisbon.

In 1849 all these governing bodies, except that controlled by Pereira, united to form a Grand Orient of Portugal at Lisbon, with D'Oliveira as Grand Master. His successor, Alves de Mauro Contucho, unfortunately created dissatisfaction by his despotic rule and the Scots Grand Orient of Lusitania was revived—January 31,

1859—under Count Paraty, Grand Master. This Grand Orient proved itself very active, even beyond the borders, many of the Spanish Lodges owning its sway. In 1869, however, the two Grand Orients amalgamated under Paraty as the Grand Orient of Lusitania. In 1872 they were joined by the Irish Lodges, leaving thus only one Grand Body in Portugal. In 1873 this Grand Orient ruled over 48 Lodges (12 in Lisbon, 15 in Spain); in 1885, 70 Lodges, of which 22 were in Portugal, 7 in Portuguese colonies; 32 in Spain and 9 in Spanish colonies. Of the 22 Portuguese Lodges, 14 were in Lisbon. Later the Grand Orient comprised four subsections—a Symbolic Grand Lodge, under a President, for Lodges working Masonry only; a Supreme Council of the 33° for the Ancient and Accepted Rite; a Supreme Rose Croix Chapter for the French Rite and a Grand Chapter of Royal Arch Masons, the only one except in Spain and Rumania outside of Anglo-Saxon Masonry.

In 1881 occurred a movement of much significance. Five Lodges, possibly tired of the control, direct or indirect, exerted by the High Degrees, combined to erect a Grand Lodge of the Craft, totally independent of all other Degrees beyond the three of ancient Freemasonry. Count Paraty, the head of the Grand Orient, was called to preside also over the Grand Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, which was formed on the English model. The movement does not appear to have been of English origin—because in the first list of Grand Office-Bearers only one English name is to be found and that in a very subordinate position—but to have been purely national. Under Paraty's guidance, this Grand Lodge was brought back into the fold of the Grand Orient, which was subdivided into three Grand Bodies or Chambers, each having sole control over its own Rite—a Supreme Council 33° for the Scots, a Supreme Chapter Rose Croix for the French and a Sublime Chamber or Grand Lodge for the Craft. For matters of general interest these three Chambers were united in one assembly, of which the Presidency was confided to Mig. Bapt. Maciel, who, on Paraty's death, was appointed his successor as head of all three Chambers and Grand Master of the Grand Orient *ad interim*. An *Official Bulletin* states that on December 6, 1883, at a convention of thirteen Lodges—all, with two exceptions, meeting at Lisbon—a Grand Lodge, totally distinct from and independent of the Grand Orient, was organized and the following officers elected:—Dr. Jose Dias Ferreira, Grand Master; J. d'A. de Franco Netto, Deputy Grand Master; and Cæsar de Castello Bianco, Grand Secretary. There were thus in existence two Grand Lodges, one siding with and forming a Chamber of the Grand Orient, the other bearing the former title of "Grand Lodge of Antient Free and Accepted Masons, founded 1737, re-established 1881." The latter had an apparent following of 24 Lodges.

According to the last records of 1929 there are under the Grand Lodge of Lusitania and the Supreme Council of Portugal in Lisbon, four Consistories, six Areopagi, thirty-four Chapters and eighty Lodges, with a gross membership of about 3,000. The Grand Master at that time was Bernardino Machado, President of the Republic; and the Deputy, Antonio Maria de Silver, Minister for Mines and General Administrator of the Postal and Telegraph Departments.

CHAPTER XIII

FREEMASONRY IN MALTA

THIS small link in England's chain around the globe has never possessed a Grand Lodge of its own but has always been subordinate to the Grand Lodge of England. Prior to 1740, Masonry in Malta was governed by the Order of the Knights of Malta, but, in that year, "the Grand Master caused the Bull of Clement XII to be published in the island and forbade the meetings of the Freemasons" (Gourin, quoted by Richard Woof in *Sketch of the Knights Templar*, etc., 1865). Yet, in spite of the Papal anathema and the edict of the Grand Masters, Freemasonry continued to exist and to flourish, although several Knights of Malta were banished from the island in perpetuity for having been present at a Masonic meeting.

Modern Freemasonry in Malta begins its history with the appointment of Waller Rodwell Wright, British Consul in the Ionian Islands, as Provincial Grand Master for Malta and Gozo (the District afterwards included the whole of the Mediterranean, as it does to-day in the Mark Degree) in 1815, an office which he held for eleven years. He was well known in Masonic circles and is said to have been an intimate and personal friend of the Dukes of Kent and Sussex. His signature follows immediately after that of the Duke of Sussex as one of five signatories to the Articles of Union, dated December 1, 1813, under the Constitutions of England and he was present at the magnificent function of the first meeting of the United Grand Lodge of England held in December 27 of that same year. Previously—on July 19, 1813—he had admitted the Duke of Sussex to the novitiate of the Order of the Red Cross, of which he (Wright) had been elected Grand Master in 1804. When, in 1807, the Duke of Kent executed the Charter for the "revival" of the Order of Knights Templar, Waller Rodwell Wright was elected Grand Master and continued to hold that office until August 6, 1812, when he was succeeded by the Duke of Sussex. In 1812 he was appointed Provincial Grand Master of the Ionian Islands and, in 1814, he went to Malta to fill the important posts of President of the Court of Appeal and Senior Member of the Supreme Council of Justice in that island. We are indebted to Wright for the following account of the origin of Freemasonry in his District :

I have reason to believe that for a very considerable time after the settlement of the Knights of St. John in the Island, they continued to patronize the system of Freemasonry, which being, like all other sciences of that period, chiefly indebted to ecclesiastics, was looked upon with much favour and, perhaps I might add, held in high estimation by the most distinguished characters of the Roman Catholic

Church. I do not consider that the Order of Malta was necessarily connected with Freemasonry nor, indeed, had any further connexion with it than what was common to all the orders of chivalry, which, in their gradations and principles of union, bore such a striking resemblance to our Institution as, combined with the Oriental origin of those institutions, may fairly induce us to presume that they sprang originally from this root. I have no reason to believe that Masonry, either publicly or privately, formed any part of the initiation of the Knights of Malta. The only regular Lodge of which any memorial is preserved was established here by warrant from H.R.H. the late Duke of Cumberland, Grand Master of England 1782-1790, and upon it a very numerous and respectable Lodge was founded, almost exclusively confined to the Knights of the Order, who appear, however, to have adhered chiefly to the French ritual and whose lectures were delivered in that language. This Warrant is now in my possession, having been delivered to me with some MSS. of little value by the former secretary of the Lodge, who lately died at an advanced age. The meetings of the Lodge were not openly avowed, but were held without any precaution for concealment at a place called Sa Maison. The late G. M. Rohan, though not a member of the Lodge, was a Mason, but policy and the prejudices of the people prevented him from making a profession of it. Subsequently to the occupation of Malta by the English, a Lodge was established here by the French prisoners of war, in correspondence with the Grand Orient of Marseilles. The members of this Lodge were not well selected and, after suffering much . . . the few who continued requested and obtained an English Constitution about two years ago, under which they met till very lately; but I found myself under the necessity of allowing them to work in the Italian language, and on the ritual to which alone they were accustomed, observing the Constitutions of the Grand Lodge of England.

The first Lodge to which Waller Rodwell Wright refers was known as the St. John's Lodge of Secrecy and Harmony. It was constituted on March 30, 1789, being then numbered 539. At the alteration of numbers in 1792 it became 448, but it was not carried forward on the Roll at the Union in 1813 and there are no other details about this Lodge to be found in the archives of Grand Lodge. The second Lodge was Les Amis en Captivité, No. 717. It was chartered by the Grand Lodge of England in 1819 and duly appeared in the official *Calendars* from 1820 to 1823, but had dropped out in 1824. Neither Lodge ever made any returns to Grand Lodge. Some parchment certificates of the second Lodge are still in existence and are noteworthy specimens of Masonic design and elegant calligraphy.

As the outcome of a petition, dated February 1815, presented by twenty-five Brethren to Waller Rodwell Wright, a dispensation was granted by the Grand Lodge of England for the Lodge of St. John and St. Paul, which was formed on April 15 of that year. The petition was worded as follows :

La Valletta. We, the undersigned, having been respectively admitted into the Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons acting under the Grand Lodge of England, take the liberty of requesting you will lay before His Excellency the

Governor our desire that he may be pleased to grant us the permission of opening a Lodge here ; and, in the expectation of His Excellency acceding to our request, more especially as many of the British merchants and others in this Island are of the Fraternity, we have most respectfully to hope we may be allowed the assistance of your Masonic character and hope for the aid of those abilities which have been so long exerted for the benefit of Masonry in general and are so greatly esteemed by our Brethren throughout the world.

Joseph Slythe, Consul-General for Sardinia, was installed as the first Master, but he seems to have vacated the chair immediately for Waller Wright, who presided regularly at the meetings, which were held weekly. It was not long before the Roman Catholic Bishop of Malta made a protest to the Governor, for at the meeting on May 2 of that year :

the W.M. communicated to the Lodge the result of an interview he had held with the Right Honourable Sir Thomas Maitland, Governor of these Islands, on the subject of a remonstrance which had been made to his Excellency by the Bishop of Malta against the assembling of Freemasons within his jurisdiction. In this remonstrance the Bishop had stated that Masonry was not only subversive of the Catholic religion, but that it struck at the very root of Christianity itself. The W.M. then detailed the several representations that he had thought it necessary to make to His Excellency in reply to the remonstrance of the Bishop and in defence of Masonry in general, whereupon the Governor dismissed the complaint of the Bishop and declined all interference on the occasion.

There are many interesting features in connexion with this Lodge, which is still in existence as a flourishing unit. It appears to have been the custom on the occasion of the appointment and investiture of officers for each Warden to nominate his own Deacon. In May 1817, a Brother—Noble, by name—was elected Master by ballot, but resolutely declined the honour, whereupon the Provincial Grand Master granted a dispensation for a Master to be chosen from among the members, when Henry Harper, the first Secretary of the Lodge, was elected and installed on June 30 by the Provincial Grand Master. There are several instances in the Minutes of Brethren who attended to have their initiations “regularized.” They had received what purported to be Masonic signs, words, grips and various information from irregular or clandestine sources, under the belief that they were being initiated into regular Masonry.

For some reason not stated the meetings of the Lodge were suspended from August 19, 1820, until January 2, 1822, but, apparently, it was because of some recommendation or injunction by the local government for, on the latter date, a communication was received from the Chief Secretary authorizing the members to meet.

The Lodge attracted many prominent people to its ranks, and among the initiates and joining members in the earlier days of its history may be mentioned Sir Edward Stuart Baynes, afterwards Consul-General and Political Agent at Tunis ; the Hon. Gerald de Courcy ; Lieutenant H. D. Acland ; the Hon. Frederick

Spencer ; Viscount Mandeville (afterwards sixth Duke of Manchester) ; Lord J. Spencer Churchill, afterwards Senior Grand Warden of England ; the Right Hon. John Hookham Frere, formerly British Minister at Madrid ; the Hon. F. Gordon ; General the Hon. W. H. Gardner, R.A. ; Admiral the Hon. Sir Montagu Stopford, K.C.B. ; Colonel W. B. McLeod Moore ; Admiral Lord Edward Russell ; Lord Blayney ; Admiral Sir Thomas Fellowes ; Sir Godfrey Webster ; Admiral Sir Lucius Curtis, Bart. ; Archdeacon Burrows, Provincial Grand Master for Andalusia and afterwards Provincial Grand Master for Malta ; Lord John Thomas Browne ; Commander A. P. Eardley Wilmot ; Sir E. Thomas, Bart. ; Sir Henry Blackwood, Bart. ; Colonel Shadwell H. Clerke, afterwards Grand Secretary of England ; Admiral the Hon. Hobart Pasha ; the Hon. Fitzgerald A. Foley ; the Hon. Henry Baillie Hamilton ; Sir William Fairfax, Bart. ; Lieutenant-Colonel Sir George Robinson ; the Earl of Limerick, afterwards Provincial Grand Master for Bristol and Grand Mark Master of England ; Colonel Hope-Wingfield ; Lieutenant Annesley ; the Hon. John, afterwards Lord, Abercromby ; the Hon. E. C. Vaughan ; the Hon. C. North ; Earl de la Warr ; Dr. Willis, Howard Russell, correspondent of *The Times* ; and Baron Holtzendorff, whose initiation had to be repeated because of some irregularity.

Among the officers of the Lodge was one known as the Expert, whose duty it was to interview and to test all visitors. None was exempt, as may be gathered from the following Minute of June 20, 1828, when the Lodge was honoured with a visit from the Earl of Yarborough, then Provincial Grand Master for the Isle of Wight, afterwards Deputy Grand Master of England.

The proper officers were sent out to examine his Lordship and reported that he was not provided with his certificates and was apparently imperfect in the signs and words of the first two Degrees ; at the same time he was possessed of so much as gave every reason to believe that he had lawfully obtained such Degrees, upon which he was admitted.

During the first ten years of this Lodge's history, Waller Rodwell Wright never missed a single meeting. When he passed away on April 26, 1825, Freemasonry lost a zealous worker and a scholar, and this Lodge, in particular, a tried and trusted friend. He was buried in a picturesque spot in the Misida Bastion cemetery at Floriana, overlooking the Quarantine Harbour, where a Masonic memorial was erected to him by the members of the Lodge of St. John and St. Paul.

On October 27 the attention of the Lodge was called to an edict by the Bishop of Malta, directed against all secret societies "and, above all, the Freemasons." The seriousness of the position may, perhaps, be best judged by the reproduction of a letter addressed to the Grand Secretary of England by the Union of Malta Lodge, No. 407, against which the edict was especially directed :

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—The Right Reverend the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Rhodes and Bishop of Malta, Don Francis Scaverina Carnana, having recently issued a pastorale, the object of which was to prohibit and suppress the

meetings of Freemasons and other secret societies, which pastore is more particularly directed against the Union Lodge, 588, established at Senglea, one of the suburbs of Valletta, Malta, holding their Warrant from the United Grand Lodge in London.

A meeting of the Brothers was held at their Lodge on Monday, the 13th instant, when the following resolutions were unanimously passed.

1st. That in consequence of the publication of a pastore by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Malta on the 14th ultimo, tending to bring into disrespect the Masonic body and endeavour to suppress their meetings, it is imperiously necessary to appeal to the United Grand Lodge in London for such assistance and aid as the circumstances of the case may, in their opinion, call for.

2nd. That the original document, if procurable, together with a translation of the same, be forwarded to the Worshipful Pro Grand Master, for his perusal, with as little delay as possible.

3rd. That, knowing the feeling of Her Majesty's Judges to be opposed to the proceedings of Freemasons, no attempt at redress shall be sought in the Malta courts of law.

In pursuance of the above resolutions, we beg to forward for the perusal of the Worshipful Pro Grand Master copy of the original document and a translation of the same, praying that effectual assistance from him which the case so manifestly urges.

By order of the W.M. at the united request of the officers and Brethren of the Malta Union Lodge, No. 588.

E. GOODENOUGH, *Acting Secretary.*

At the same time two spirited letters were sent to the Grand Lodge of England and to the Chief Secretary of the Malta Government by W. Leonard, Treasurer, Secretary and Expert of the Lodge of St. John and St. Paul. To the latter he wrote :

We make our proceedings in this matter officially known to you, not as a fraternity of Freemasons, well knowing that as such we are not recognized by the government, but as British subjects entitled to be protected by the law from molestation.

Apparently these communications had the desired result, for, although no answers to them appear in the Minutes of either Lodge, Freemasonry seems to have pursued the even course afterwards.

The Union of Malta Lodge, now No. 407, was constituted in 1832, with eleven founders, eight English, two Irish and one Scotch. Although it cannot, perhaps, claim such a distinguished roll of members as the Lodge of St. John and St. Paul, it numbered several prominent people on its register, including Prince San Giuseppe, of Naples, afterwards Senator of Italy; the Hon. P. F. Pellew; the Marquis Domingo di Sanza, of the Brazilian Navy; the Earl of Rosslyn, afterwards Grand Master Mason of Scotland; Lord Leven; Augustus Cholmondeley, Lord Calthorpe; Colonel Edwyn Burnaby; Major Charles Napier Sturt; Lord Frederick G. Sutherland Leveson-Gower; Lieutenant-Colonel F. A. H. Bathurst,

M.P.; Colonel Henry W. J. Byng; General Seymour J. Blane; Hugh, Earl of Annesley; Major-General Arthur Harding; and General the Hon. Sir Percy Feilding, C.B.; most of these were officers in the Guards and, on their return to England, they sent to their Mother Lodge a beautifully bound Bible, having the Square and Compasses in silver attached to it and inscribed "The Union of Malta Lodge, No. 588. Presented by the Brigade of Guards who were initiated in this their Mother Lodge, March and April 1854." This Lodge was in the habit of conferring the P.M.'s Degree.

The Zetland Lodge, No. 515, was consecrated in 1846 and this Lodge also appears to have conferred the P.M.'s Degree. The members endeavoured, though in vain, to effect a union of the three Lodges under the English Constitution, a step which received the approval of Archdeacon Burrows, who had succeeded Waller Rodwell Wright as Provincial Grand Master. There is no record of any communication from the Grand Lodge of England on the subject. It was in this Lodge that Shadwell Henry Clerke, afterwards Grand Secretary of England, was initiated on April 27, 1856; he was admitted to the P.M.'s Degree also in this Lodge. The Minutes record an interesting statement made at the meeting on January 11, 1858, by a visitor named Tristram, a Past Master of the Atlantic Phoenix Lodge, No. 271 (now No. 224) of Bermuda.

He begged to call the attention of the Brethren to an event which had recently happened to himself, forcibly showing the general diffusion of Masonry and its benefits. In the south of the Djereed (south of the Tunisian frontier) his party was brought to a stand for the want of fresh camels as well as of provisions. This perplexity was increased by falling in with a hostile tribe and Bro. Tristram, on being conducted to the seat of the chief, perceiving the personal danger they were in, and finding all other means fail, tried to communicate with him by one of the higher Degrees of Masonry, which was immediately responded to and, although in their interchanges some differences were found, chiefly arising from the difficulty of language, yet sufficient was made known to engage the hospitality of the Arab Sheikh, who not only furnished them with the means of fresh transport, but entertained them for some days free of expense.

In 1851 the Leinster Lodge under the Irish Constitution, named after the Grand Master of Ireland at that time, was warranted and met for the first time on January 12, 1852. Until 1875 the Master held office for six months only. Shadwell Clerke became a joining member of this Lodge.

Other Lodges founded under the English Constitution are the United Brethren, No. 1923 and the Wayfarers, No. 1926, in 1881; the Waller Rodwell Wright, No. 2755, in 1899; and the Royal Naval, No. 2761, also in 1899.

The first Royal Arch Chapter in Malta was attached to the Lodge of St. John and St. Paul and its Charter is dated August 1, 1819. Broadley, in his *History of Freemasonry in Malta*, says that Waller Rodwell Wright was the first Grand Superintendent appointed, but, according to the *Masonic Year Book*, Archdeacon Burrows

was the first to hold that office, though the date of his appointment is not given. Wright was, however, the primus First Principal of the new Chapter. At that time the P.M.'s Degree, to which reference has been made, was regarded as a necessary preliminary to exaltation in a Royal Arch Chapter and, apparently, from the records of the various Lodges it was customary for candidates for the Royal Arch to be proposed in the Lodge. One curious Minute appears in the records of this Chapter under date of April 2, 1828, when it was resolved :

Whenever a member of the Lodge Des Amateurs de la Sagesse of Marseilles (with which the Lodge of St. John and St. Paul is affiliated) may present himself as a visitor when this Royal Arch Chapter is open, should he be found to have arrived at a Degree of Masonry that can be considered equal to our Sublime Degree of Royal Arch of Jerusalem, although not exactly conforming to it in all respects, that he shall be admitted upon undergoing the customary ceremonies and obligation as usual for candidates on exaltation, but exempt from fees and that this Chapter communicate this decision to the Lodge Des Amateurs de la Sagesse, at Marseilles and requests to be informed by them what Degree in their system of Masonry they consider to be equal to the Royal Arch of Jerusalem as worked in England and requests a similar indulgence from our affiliated Brethren.

This Chapter numbered many illustrious names among its exaltees, including the earlier editor of this *History*, Robert Freke Gould. An unusual ceremony was witnessed in this Chapter on December 22, 1860, when a Companion named Pulman was installed as First Principal of a Chapter to be attached to the Oriental Lodge at Constantinople. The action of this Chapter in deferring the installation of a First Principal on the ground that he was not a Past Master under the English Constitution, produced from the Grand Scribe E. of England the ruling :

That to render a Companion eligible to be elected a Principal under the English Constitution, he must be the actual Master or Past Master of a Craft Lodge under that Constitution.

On March 29, 1878, five members of the Ancient Carthage Lodge, No. 1717, at Tunis (now extinct) were exalted into Royal Arch Masonry, which enabled the members of that Lodge to form the Ancient Carthage Chapter some three months later. Two other Chapters in connexion with the Union of Malta and the Zetland Lodges were formed and lapsed, but they have since been revived under the respective names of William Kingston and Resurrection and these three Chapters now form the Royal Arch District of Malta.

A Royal Arch Chapter and a Lodge of Mark Master Masons were also formed in connexion with the Leinster Lodge under the Irish Constitution, both of which are still in existence.

The Mark Degree is very popular in the District and the extinct Zetland Chapter appears from its records to have practised the Mark Degree prior to the

creation of the Grand Mark Lodge of England, also to have issued parchment certificates of membership. Much of this popularity is due to the Leinster Lodge and Chapter as the Mark Degree forms an integral part of the Irish system. The Keystone Mark Lodge, No. 107, constituted on December 1, 1869, recommended the petition for the Kingston Lodge, No. 222, at Tunis, which was the first Charter granted by the Grand Mark Lodge of England for a Lodge outside British territory. Unhappily, like the Craft Lodge and Royal Arch Chapter at Tunis, the Mark Lodge has also suffered extinction. Tunis and Malta were formed into a Mark Province in 1879, with Alexander Meyrick Broadley as the first District Grand Master. On the day of his installation, September 11, 1879, he consecrated the Ramsay Mark Lodge, No. 248. In 1881 the name of the District was altered to Mediterranean. The District, as regards Craft, Royal Arch and Mark Masonry, was without a ruler from the demise of Colonel Henry Thomas Hughes-Hallett in 1909 until 1924, when Colonel Sir A. Henry M'Mahon was appointed to the triple office.

CHAPTER XIV

FREEMASONRY IN POLAND

THE clearest, fullest and best history of Freemasonry in Poland was contributed as long ago as 1818, by an anonymous Polish Freemason to the first edition of Lenning's *Cyclopædia*. The *Handbuch* (1868) was not able to add anything thereto, Findel avowedly has only condensed it and the only contribution of note to the Masonic History of Poland since that date has been the brochure of Dr. Ernst Friedrichs on *Freemasonry in Russia and Poland*.

It would appear that, previous to 1739, some nobles at the Court of King Frederick Augustus II had assembled as Masons, in Lodges at Warsaw, probably without regular *Constitutions* and that these Lodges were all closed in that year in consequence of the Bull of Clement XII.

A few years afterwards the Craft began to move once more. Lodges were established (still without known charters):—1742, at Volhynien; 1744, the Three Brothers, at Warsaw; 1747, at Lemberg; 1749, the Good Shepherd, at Warsaw—of which the Master, Jean de Thoux de Salverte, was commissioned by it to travel and open Lodges elsewhere. In 1755 General Le Fort held a Lodge at Dulko, which the *Handbuch* says was a Strict Observance Lodge. This, however, must be an error and it was probably a Lodge working the Templar Degrees of the Chapter of Clermont. The Lodge of the Three Brothers at Warsaw was in close touch with the Lodge of the Three Crowns at Königsberg. Two of its founders were Prince Stanislaus Lubomirski and Prince Adam Czartowski. The first-named was so generous a benefactor to Warsaw and did so much for its improvement, that the city had a medal struck in his honour, while the latter was regarded as a probable candidate for the throne of Poland. He founded the celebrated military school at Warsaw, where he had Kosciuosko, Poland's greatest national hero, who was the son of his farmer, educated at his own expense. Thoux de Salverte, who was a military engineer at Brünn, paid dearly for his devotion to Freemasonry. Solely for the offence of belonging to the Order he was sentenced to several years' imprisonment in the citadel of Spielberg, near Brünn, with final banishment from his country, at its completion. He then made his way to Poland, where he founded the Lodge of the Good Shepherd. Later he devoted five years to the study of alchemy and the Cabala, which teachings he introduced into the Lodges of the Three Brothers and the Good Shepherd, both of which, for a time, worked according to the Strict Observance.

Many of the Lodges formed erected others. In 1762 the Three Brothers Lodge was very powerful, but fell into decay. In 1764 Stanislaus Augustus ascended

the throne after a stormy interregnum and efforts were made to revive the Craft, which had suffered more from political disturbances in Poland than in any other country. The Three Brothers Lodge at Warsaw was resuscitated in August 1766 by Count Augustus Moszynski and closed in October by his successor, Count Frederick Aloys Brühl—in order to introduce new laws—but reopened on January 12, 1767, with the addition of a Chapter of High Degrees. Brühl returned to Dresden in 1768 and Moszynski resumed the lead. The Lodge was then—June 24, 1769—declared to be a Grand Lodge, with Moszynski as Grand Master. It was at Brühl's seat in Kohlo that the Strict Observance Convent of 1772 was held. The first step taken by the newly formed Grand Lodge was to declare itself independent of England and one of its first acts was to warrant a Lodge in Hungary. Its own members constituted themselves into two Lodges for Moscow, the Three Brothers and the Unity, working respectively in German and French. So far all was highly irregular, each movement being merely the arbitrary act of an unauthorized individual. Nevertheless, the Grand Lodge did its best to improve matters by communicating the results to foreign Lodges and, in 1770, received a letter from De Vignolles at the Hague, the Provincial Grand Master for foreign Lodges under the Grand Lodge of England, acknowledging Moszynski as Provincial Grand Master for Poland. As a Provincial Grand Lodge of England, the legality of its former proceedings was assured and, as such, it was proclaimed June 24, 1770. In the same year this Provincial Grand Lodge constituted four new Lodges.

Meanwhile, in 1770, Brühl had joined the Strict Observance and been made Prior of Poland and Lithuania, which district was declared to form a diocese of the Order of the Temple. Any strife between the two systems was, however, prevented by the unhappy political events immediately succeeding for, in 1772, took place the first partition of Poland and, not only did all Lodges there become dormant for the time, but the Provincial Grand Lodge closed never to reopen. This may be considered the end of the first epoch of Polish Freemasonry.

In order to find some exit and outlet for patriotic tendencies and the idealistic spirits of the better part of the fatherland-loving citizens, various societies, bearing the names of The Order of St. Charles, Experienced Friends, etc., were founded, which Andrez Mokronowski, who is sometimes credited with the introduction of Freemasonry into Poland, did not fail to imbue with Masonic ideals. Mokronowski was one of the founders of the Lodge of the Three Brothers, which attained a membership of seventy-five within a very short time of its formation.

In 1773 the Craft again revived, but a wonderful multiplicity of rites and systems ensued and continued for some years.

The first on the scene was Count Brühl, who, returning to Warsaw in 1773, introduced the Strict Observance in the former Warsaw Lodges, Three Brothers and Unity and constituted a third in the same city, January 29, 1774, which last threw out an offshoot—or fourth Lodge—in Krakaw in 1778. All these acknowledged the rule of Ferdinand of Brunswick, with Brühl as their intermediate superior.

On April 30, 1773, several Masons, among whom may be named Baron

Heyking, Count Hülsen and Thoux de Salverte, erected a *quasi*-Masonic body with mystical tendencies, which ultimately survived as the Lodge of the Good Shepherd and, February 6, 1780 (see *Hauptmomente der Geschichte der Grossen Loge von Preussen*, Royal York, Berlin, 1849, p. 73) was reconstituted as Catherine of the Pole Star, by the Mother Lodge, Royal York of Berlin, at that time a private Lodge under the English Constitution, but which had, by almost imperceptible degrees, taken up the position and, occasionally, assumed the style, of a Grand Lodge. Hülsen was its Master and its members formed themselves into a Scots Lodge and, as such, applied to the Grand Lodge of England, through the Royal York Lodge, for a Provincial Grand Lodge Charter. Baron Heyking had been appointed Deputy for Poland by the Royal York on November 24, 1779 and ordered to constitute Lodges wherever advisable and possible. The result of his efforts was three Lodges in Warsaw, one in Posen, three in Wilna, one in Dubno—all in 1780. The Rite in use at that time was practically the English one.

The third Masonic power on the scene was the Grand Orient of France, which—November 15, 1778—warranted a Warsaw Lodge, erected there by a French merchant in 1776.

An offshoot of Lodge Catherine, under the title of the Pole Star and the leadership of Prince Poninski, deserted to the Strict Observance in 1779. There were consequently, at this period, three systems at work—all struggling for the mastery.

Hülsen was succeeded in the chair of Catherine of the Pole Star—December 27, 1779—by Count Ignatius Potocki, who set himself to work to reduce this chaos into order. He circulated an invitation of the Royal York, acting in England's name, calling upon the Lodges to form a Grand Provincial Lodge of Poland and, in 1780, obtained the suffrages of the majority of Lodges. Ignatius Potocki was a man of great knowledge and sagacity, a sincere friend to his country and, in all respects, the opposite to his cousin Felix. Heyking was sent to the Grand Lodges of Germany and Le Doules to that of Russia to facilitate matters. The other systems represented in the country did their best to frustrate his efforts.

To this Lodge belonged King Stanislaus Augustus Poniatowski, who gave the Kingdom the Constitution of 1791, which won the enthusiastic commendation of Burke. Brühl especially raised the Warsaw Strict Observance Lodge Three Helmets to a Mother-Lodge and constituted three new ones; and, in 1781, the French Lodge announced itself as a Grand Lodge in virtue of a patent from the Grand Orient of France, dated May 14. This induced the Lodge, Catherine of the Pole Star, to divide its members into three Lodges for Craft purposes, but claiming to act as a Grand Lodge in its entirety under the guise of a Scots Lodge.

At length, in August 1781, Lodge Catherine received a London patent as a Provincial Grand Lodge, which had been signed by the Duke of Manchester, Grand Master, August 4, 1780. According to a MS. note in the *Engraved List* for 1772 in the Grand Lodge Library, the commission was dated April 4, not August 4, 1780. As Count Hülsen was therein named as Grand Master, Potocki

gave way for the time, but, on December 27, 1781, Ignatius Potocki was unanimously elected Grand Master.

This event was duly announced throughout the country and abroad and conduced, almost immediately, to the extinction of the Strict Observance Lodges. New statutes were submitted for approval—January 7, 1783; and conformed in all points with Anderson's *Constitutions*. Potocki's departure abroad delayed their ratification, but his deputy—Wilkorski—and the representatives of thirteen Lodges, worked steadily at the completion of the Masonic edifice. Meanwhile Heyking's efforts had procured directions from the Grand Orient of France—November 17, 1781—to its Lodges in Poland to join the Provincial Grand Lodge and the result was that—February 26, 1784—the Provincial Grand Lodge was converted into an independent Grand Orient for Poland and Lithuania, inaugurated as such on March 4 following. This Grand Orient collapsed soon after Potocki's departure to foreign countries. Among its members, says Friedrichs, were Stanislaus Potocki, brother of the Grand Master, well known as a general, as the founder of Warsaw University, as a minister of education and as the translator of Winckelmann's *On the Art of the Ancients*; Count Francis Xavier Woyné, the great connoisseur of music and translator of many theatrical pieces; the poet, Ignatius Tainski, whose daughter, Clementine Tainski-Hoffman, was Poland's greatest authoress; and Prince Michael Casimir Oginski, politician and economist, a candidate for the Polish throne in 1764, who began, at his own cost, the Oginski Canal, which unites the Niemen and the Dnieper.

It is rather curious that on February 8, 1784, the Provincial Grand Lodge and its twelve daughter Lodges affiliated with the Eclectic Union of Frankfort-on-the-Maine. This is, however, an indirect proof that the system of working was at that time essentially English.

The first Grand Master of the National Grand Orient was Andrew Mocranowski, installed March 18, 1784; and, in the same year, were constituted a Lodge in Constantinople, a Russian military Lodge at Kiow and various others, some of which were raised to the position of Provincial Grand Lodges. Unfortunately the Grand Master expired after a very few months' tenure of office and, in his place, was appointed—December 27, 1784—Count Felix Potocki, who was installed February 2, 1785, being thus the second of his family who officiated as Grand Master of Poland.

It will be unnecessary to follow in detail the progress of the Grand Orient, or to enumerate the Lodges and Provincial Grand Lodges which it warranted in the course of the next few years; it will suffice to state that they were numerous and that the Fraternity prospered exceedingly. A few salient data may be cited. A Grand Chapter, to rule the High Degrees, was erected February 19, 1785; and, on December 17, Potocki was re-elected Grand Master. During the night April 24-25, 1786, Freemasons' Hall in Warsaw was burnt to the ground, entailing great loss on the Brotherhood. January 4, 1787—Potocki was again elected and Stanislaus Potocki commissioned to place himself in correspondence with foreign Grand

Lodges, particularly those of England and France. January 24, 1788—Potocki was continued in the chair, although very negligent of his duties ; in the same year he resigned ; and—January 11, 1789—Prince Casimir Sapieha was chosen in his stead. But once more political events exerted a baneful influence over the Polish Craft and produced a state of coma. In 1792 Russia and Prussia effected a second partition of the unfortunate kingdom and, finally, in 1794, it was wholly dismembered. This occasioned the closing of the Grand Orient and of all Polish Lodges and we thus arrive at the end of the second distinct epoch in the history of Polish Freemasonry.

The Grand Orient for Poland and Lithuania had sanctioned the formation of a Ladies' Lodge, at the head of which was Theresa Tyskiewicz, who bore the title of Grand Mistress. Among the members were Princess Lubomirska and Princess Rzewuska, whose husbands were well-known Freemasons.

From 1794 to 1811, Poland, a part of which Napoleon, in 1806, formed into the Grand Duchy of Warsaw under the house of Saxony (Frederick Augustus, King of Saxony and Duke of Warsaw), was a veritable "Tom Tiddler's ground" for the three Prussian Grand Lodges, who constituted or reconstituted Lodges in number :—the Grand National Lodge, 6 ; the Three Globes, 9 ; and the Royal York 1. The Lodge of the Three Golden Candlesticks at Warsaw was the first to be opened. It began, in 1797, with fourteen members, which, in two years, increased to fifty and, in 1801, to seventy-two. In 1802, a second Lodge was formed out of the first, which also developed so rapidly that, within the ensuing three years, a third Lodge, the Temple of Wisdom, was formed. According to the following interesting account given by Friedrichs these Lodges were centres of culture :

It is worth while throwing some light on the way in which the young Prussian Lodges conceived their mission and on what they considered to be the chief object of their existence. An advance-post, as it were, in a country with a foreign language and a foreign civilization they wished to plant and propagate there German customs, German training and German culture. What was their best way to attain this object ? It did not suffice that they gave their members opportunities of absorbing Masonic knowledge with the accompanying instruction and edification ; they conceived rather a general scientific and artistic education. For this purpose a library was founded in connexion with a reading-union, in which Masonic books were also to be found, the stress, however, being laid on works treating of philosophical and æsthetic subjects in general. But this collection of books was not intended for the advantage and pleasure of members alone ; it was also to be of use to their relatives and friends and then to carry out its food to the common people who were yearning for knowledge, and thus to become a missionary of civilization. Was it not just the right moment for the satisfying of this yearning ? Was it not at this time that in the German poetic woods was heard a rustling which was able to breathe upon those who were longing for poetry and art, a new breath of life and a new power ?

The library, which was founded by the Warsaw Brethren, their friends and

their wives, contained a number of books which were very closely connected with Masonry, religious, philosophical and historical. It also found room for the intellectual geniuses of antiquity, for the works of Homer, Vergil, Livy and Tacitus. The principal place, however, was occupied by Modern German literature. We find there Matthias Claudius's *Wandsbecker Boten*, Jean Paul's novels, Herder's *Letters on the Improvement of Mankind* and his *Terpsichore*; further, Wieland and Eschenburg's translation of Shakespeare, a few of his dramas in the translation by Schlegel, which is still considered to be the best; Goethe's idyll, *Hermann und Dorothea*, which had just come out; Schiller's Ballads and Dramas—all creations of modern and of the latest times. Ought not this to be an indication for us as to how we should place ourselves in reference to our time with its modern authors? For were not Schiller and Goethe at that time just revolutionists in the field of poetry and art as our moderns are to-day and many an orthodox writer raised a hue and cry on their account, as is done on account of the writers of the present day. But the Warsaw Brethren stood on a higher level and believed in the power of the rising stars. Besides these books there was a collection of paintings, copper engravings, maps, plans, coins, instruments and, in short, everything and anything which could educate and rejoice the understanding and the sense of taste.

On October 4, 1804, the Three Globes erected at Plock a Provincial Grand Lodge and a Scots Directory for the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. On October 23, 1807, the Grand Orient of France entered into competition and—July 18, 1808—warranted a Lodge in Warsaw, known as De la Fraternité. The Napoleonic Invasion, however, had practically put an end to Masonic activity, although the Lodge of the Golden Candlesticks remained in existence until 1810, before it officially announced its dissolution. The French troops took possession of the Province acquired a short time before. Soon after Napoleon had held his triumphal procession into Berlin, his soldiers also garrisoned Warsaw. Lodge Frederick William of the Column, which was composed mainly of Prussian officers and officials, endeavoured to prolong its life by changing its name to Samaritan and admitting a number of Poles to whom they had previously given the cold shoulder, but, says Friedrichs, "soon there came so many gentle and broad hints from the minister that it, too, was obliged to close its doors." Lodge Temple of Wisdom met with a happier fate. It was known only by its Polish name—Swiatynia Madroschi. It worked in the Polish language and it consisted entirely of Poles in its membership. On its constitution, the National Grand Lodge of Berlin had given its assent to these details on condition that the Master should know the German language. The Lodge was closed in common with the other Lodges, but it was immediately reopened under the name of the Temple of Isis, when it made an immediate aim to bring Polish nationality into the foreground, and to revive the Polish Grand Orient.

In 1807 the Duchy fell under Saxon rule and a new state of affairs arose. Former Polish Lodges reopened successively in 1809 and following years and, among others, on March 22, 1810, the former Provincial Grand Lodge, Catherine of the North Star. Almost immediately afterwards the former Deputy Grand Master, Guttakowski (an eminent lawyer, President of the War Office, of the

Administrative Council and of the Senate, author of *Poland's Unhappy Fate*) declared the Grand Orient revived. Foreign Grand Lodges were informed of the fact and many of the Lodges constituted by them gave in their adhesion to the national authority. January 30, 1811—Guttakowski was elected Grand Master of the Grand Orient of Poland and—November 5—the few Lodges not acknowledging its authority were summoned for the last time to affiliate themselves. Guttakowski died December 1 and was replaced—March 1, 1812—by Count Stanislaus Potocki, the third Polish Grand Master of that family. Meanwhile, the one extraneous Grand Chapter (French) had amalgamated with the Polish Grand Chapter, so that on June 24, 1812, the Grand Orient was proclaimed as the sole supreme authority. As a matter of fact, however, there still remained aloof, the Provincial Grand Lodge—under the Three Globes—at Plock, with its daughters.

Once more, in consequence of political events, the Grand Orient and its daughter Lodges were closed—January 30, 1813—after a very prosperous but very brief career. But this time the sleep was not protracted for, in October, the Warsaw Lodges were again at work and the Grand Orient, being still dormant, the direction of affairs was undertaken by the Grand Chapter. The interval had witnessed Napoleon's crushing defeat at Leipsic, on which occasion the gallant Prince Poniatowski lost his life in the Elster—October 19. A solemn funeral Lodge was held in his honour, March 12, 1814, at which the portrait of the deceased was set up and some of his personal effects were exhibited. By a resolution of the Grand Lodge four thousand florins were distributed among the poor and wounded on the occasion. The discourse at the funeral service was delivered by Francis Morawski, who had been Poniatowski's commander-in-chief and a member of one of the Field Lodges formed during the war, which were joined by officers in large numbers. Poniatowski had been a member of the Lodge of United Brethren of Poland. Among the members who enrolled during the war was the Prince Bishop Puzina, renowned for his brilliant courage as well as for his freedom from prejudice.

The Grand Master resumed the gavel on his return—August 30, 1814—and was re-elected April 22, 1815. May 3, 1815—the former Grand Duchy of Warsaw was finally allotted to Russia. September 20—the Provincial Grand Lodge at Plock (under the Three Globes of Berlin), erected 1804 and its daughter Lodges joined the Grand Orient; and—November 13, 14, 1815—the exterior of Freemasons' Hall was splendidly illuminated to celebrate the visit of the new ruler of the country, the Czar Alexander of Russia, exhibiting a banner on which was the inscription *Recepto Casare Felices*.

Little remains to be narrated. Potocki was re-elected year after year and the Craft prospered, so that in 1818 the Grand Orient numbered on its roll 1 Sovereign Chapter, with 2 subordinate High and 8 subordinate Low, Chapters—these constituted the Inner Orient. There were also 17 Lodges directly dependent upon the Grand Orient and the Provincial Grand Lodges of Lithuania, Plock, and Volhynien, with 7, 3, and again 3 Lodges respectively—which, collectively, i.e. the 30 Lodges last enumerated, constituted the Outer Orient.

The Grand Orient enjoyed so great prosperity that it was able to devote 300,000 Polish florins to the erection of a new Grand Temple. Among its members, says Friedrichs, were Mianowski, the anatomist and physiologist; Professor Strumillo, the creator of the Botanical Gardens at Vilna; Professor Rustem of Vilna, the portrait painter; Chodzko, the Lithuanian writer of legendary history; Brodzinski, the poet; Huminiski, the dramatist; and the great philanthropists, Count Brzostowski and Dominic Moninszyko, who released the peasants from Robot, or statute labour and who established on their estates machine works, iron foundries, glass works and bead manufactories, created schools for boys and girls where, in addition to the ordinary subjects of education, instruction was given in gardening, the keeping of bees, forestry and hygiene.

A keen, *bona fide* interest was taken in Freemasonry by many of the clergy. The Prince Bishop Puzina, whose name has already been mentioned, became the Master of the Zealous Lithuanian Lodge of Vilna, which numbered many notable clerics among its members. It is also worthy of note that Loge Bouclier du Nord at Warsaw included eight Jews on its membership roll.

The Lodges in the Grand Duchy of Warsaw had an equally distinguished membership. Among the members mentioned by Friedrichs were Luszczewski, Minister of the Interior and of Public Worship; Dmuszewski, the poet and translator; Osinski, a well-known poet and translator of Corneille and Voltaire; Mattusiewicz, translator of Horace, but better known as Poland's Minister of Finance, who saved many millions to the State Treasury; Baron de Bignon, French Minister at Warsaw, a well-known publicist, to whom Napoleon bequeathed a considerable sum of money for the purpose of writing a History of French diplomacy, which task he fulfilled in his two works—*Histoire de France depuis le 18 Brumaire jusqu'à La Paix de Tilsit* and *Souvenirs d'un Diplomate : la Pologne, 1811-1813*; and Generals Count Tyskiewicz, Uminski and Dabrowski.

Unfortunately the Fraternity either lent itself to political intrigues of a revolutionary tendency, or was at least suspected of so doing. In consequence the Tsar Alexander issued his rescript of suppression to the Minister of the Interior on August 12, 1821. This was promulgated by the Viceroy, November 6 and the further progress of Polish Freemasonry was thus suddenly arrested. We have already seen that barely a year elapsed before their Brethren in Russia suffered a similar fate.

There was a modest return to Freemasonry in 1909, when the Craft restarted its work, not only in spreading Masonic ideals but in actively supporting every effort to gain the lost independence.

The sudden outburst of the World War in 1914 put an unexpected end to those activities. The very few (their numbers did not exceed fifty) members of Symbolic Masonry took their part in the momentous events. At the termination of that epochal storm Freemasonry in Poland revived once more. The Grand National Lodge was organized in 1921, exactly one hundred years after the country had been placed under the rule of the Tsar. The first Lodge established in that year

was by the authority of the Grand Lodge of Italy. Six other Lodges were, in regular order, established and these seven formed the Grand Lodge of Poland, adopting the Scottish Rite system, as being in accord with the national characteristics and the psychology of the people. There are now thirteen Lodges, ten in Warsaw and three in other cities. The total membership is small, running below five hundred.

Exceeding care is exercised, writes John H. Cowles, who paid a visit to the country in 1928, in the selection of the members, for the position of Masonry is such that, if even one member should turn traitor, irreparable harm would come to the Order. At present the members of the Lodges meet in different places, often in the homes of some of their number.

The Grand Lodge is a sovereign and independent body, free from the control of any other Masonic power. The three Great Lights are the same as in English Lodges. The present Grand Master is Stanislaw Stempowski and the Grand Secretary is Zygmunt Dworzanczyk.

In 1922 the Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Rite was born, receiving its authority from the Supreme Council of Italy. The total membership does not exceed one hundred but the personnel is very high: practically every member is a man of note, the business, professional, scientific and official life of the country being represented. The Grand Commander is Andre Strug and the Grand Secretary is Stanislaw Stempowski.

CHAPTER XV

FREEMASONRY IN BOHEMIA AND CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

ALTHOUGH Freemasonry found its entrance into the more important monarchy of Austria-Hungary through the gateway of Bohemia, little or but slight mention is made of the latter country and the part it has played in Masonic history by any of the Masonic historians. The most informative account is to be found in the *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum* (vols. iv to ix) in the articles contributed by Ladislav de Malczovitch in his "Sketch of the Earlier History of Masonry in Austria and Hungary," from which this account, supplemented by the particulars given in the various histories of Bohemia and standard biographical encyclopædias, is taken.

The principal character in early Bohemian Masonic history was Count Francis Anthony de Spork, the son of Count John Spork, a general in the army, who was born at Westeriche and who died on August 6, 1679, at his castle at Hermann-Mestiz, in Bohemia. He was the descendant of a noble but impoverished family, many members of which had occupied high positions in the court of the Brunswicks. In view of the persecution afterwards endured by his son, mention must be made of the fact that, in the earlier half of the seventeenth century, Count John Spork was the subject of sundry attentions from the inquisitor, Anton Koniasch. The Count, says the author of *The Reformation and the Anti-Reformation in Bohemia*, kept a printing-office and an author [editor] in his castle; but his whole stock of books was confiscated through the influence of Koniasch, who also mutilated several thousands of Bohemian books with his own hand and struck out offending passages with ink. Spork served Austria with distinction in the Thirty Years War and in the war against the Turks, for which he was rewarded with a considerable sum of money.

Count Francis Anthony de Spork, son of the fore-mentioned, was born on March 9, 1662, at the castle of Hermann-Mestiz. He was educated from the age of eight years by the Jesuits at Kuttenberg and studied philosophy and law before he made a European tour lasting from 1680 to 1682. On returning to his domains on the attainment of his majority, he devoted himself to the efficient administration of his estates, giving the revenues to institutions of public and private utility. He founded three hospitals, gave a hundred thousand florins for the relief of the Turkish Christian captives, established three public libraries at Prague, Lissa and Koukous, caused to be translated from the French several works dealing with morals, which he distributed gratuitously. More than one hundred books were thus translated and distributed through his agency. He also introduced Italian opera into Bohemia

and built a theatre, to which he invited artists of all nationalities. His correspondence with the principal European scholars and artists of his time has been preserved in twenty volumes, for he gave up practically the whole of his life to the propagation of art and literature in Bohemia. He set aside a part of his income for the decoration of his magnificent palaces and residences and distinguished visitors, kings and princes even, from all parts of Europe accepted invitations for the brilliant parties which he organized. In 1695, when famine was at its height, he distributed corn and money with a princely hand. He founded the Society of St. Hubert, the active members of which devoted themselves to the care of the sick poor and of this society Emperor Charles VI of Bohemia and other European sovereigns became members. He set aside the total income from one of his estates for the upkeep of this society. He also gave large sums of money to the Brothers of Mercy and at his hospital at Koukous he made provision for the constant reception of one hundred patients, who not only paid nothing for their treatment, but also received from him a weekly allowance of money for any personal requirements.

This was the man, called by Michaud "the ornament of the Bohemian nobility," whom the Jesuits set out to crush. In his benefactions he had ignored that society; therefore they hated him, asserted that he was heretic and that his large and magnificent library contained a large number of dangerous works. Spork repulsed their attacks with a shower of satirical pamphlets. They retorted by succeeding, after long endeavours, in arousing suspicion concerning him in the mind of Charles VI, who had made him successively Chamberlain in 1690, Governor of Bohemia in 1691 and Privy Councillor in 1692. The Jesuits, however, accused him of working against both the Church and the State. Eventually Charles VI ordered an inquiry and the Count was arrested in the dead of night. His library was confiscated and the whole contents burned, without any attempt to examine or read the books. A charge of high treason was preferred in 1729, when the Count was sixty-seven years of age. The trial lasted for seven years and might have been protracted several years longer, had it not been for the intercession of the Duke of Lorraine, who had been initiated into Masonry in 1731. The Count's complete innocence was established, he was restored to all his former dignities, and his accusers were forced to make public amends. But the Count was a broken man—no apology, no recompense could restore to him the health of which his accusers had robbed him and, on March 30, 1738, he passed into eternal rest at his castle of Koukous, a martyr for spiritual light and liberty, his remains being deposited in the chapel he had prepared in his lifetime for their reception.

When Count Francis Anthony was initiated into Freemasonry is not known. One account says he was initiated by Anthony Sayer, the first Grand Master of England, in 1717; another that the initiation took place in Holland at a later date, but as he was the founder of the very first Lodge established in Bohemia, at Prague, in 1726, it is probable that his initiation took place in one or other of the countries mentioned. At the end of the seventeenth century there existed in Bohemia a society known as the Hackebrüderschaft, or the Brothers of the Hatchet. Each

member always wore its emblem—a small hatchet; the form of obligation on admission was “by the old hatchet” and one of the rules was that “no one should be admitted a member whose helve did not fit the old hatchet.” The society aimed at the exercise of a true, faithful, and sincere friendship. In all probability it was the remnant successor of two societies, one the Brotherhood of the Hoop and Mallet, which had existed in Bohemia in the fourteenth century, whose emblem was a hoop within which was a hanging mallet. Although it was a simple guild of Hoopers, it admitted nobles, knights and clergymen into its ranks and had King Wencelaus at its head. The principal objects appear to have been the exercise of works of charity and the erection and endowment of churches. The society became a victim to the Hussite wars. The second society was the Friends of the Cross, an offshoot of the Bohemian Brethren, whose correct title was “Brethren of the Law of Christ” and their aim was the spread of brotherly love among all mankind, assisting the poor and orphans and the publication of good books for the people. Side by side with these Friends of the Cross existed Lodges of Operative Masons. Count Francis Anthony de Spork was a member of the Society of the Friends of the Cross and, if his initiation into Masonry took place in Holland, the venue was clearly one of the Operative Lodges, since Speculative Masonry, as it was known after 1717 in England, was not then in existence in Holland.

The jewel of the Three Stars (Masonic) Lodge founded at Prague by the Count, of which he was the Master, is still in existence. It consists of a Maltese cross enamelled blue; the principal limb exhibits the figure 3; the centre the letter S; and the three other limbs cherubs' heads, each with four wings, all in silver. There also exists a medal struck in commemoration of the foundation of the Lodge, which has, on the obverse, a portrait of de Spork and on the reverse the New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse (square with twelve gates in the centre), a lamb on a mount and, above all, the name of God in Hebrew irradiated.

The members, writes Lad. de Malczovitch, consisted for the greater part, of members of the nobility and included Counts Wrbna, Paradis and Kaiserstein. Authors and scholars, who belonged to the upper commoners, were not excluded and amongst these was Gottwald F. Stillenau, Count Spork's private secretary, a very learned man, who afterwards went as Masonic delegate to Holland in order to secure a continuous intercourse between that country and the Prague Lodge. He was the author, under the pseudonym of Ferdinand von der Roixas, of a biography of Spork, in which he sharply castigates the Jesuits. The meetings of the Lodge were held in the Angelus Garden of one of Spork's palaces, the garden taking its name from Angelus de Florentia, an Italian physician to Emperor Charles IV of Bohemia, who lived there in the fourteenth century, where also was erected the first botanical garden in Europe. The Lodge suspended working on the arrest of Spork and did not resume its sittings until 1735, when it was known the trial would end favourably to the accused. Count Ferdinand Paradis, an earnest Mason, was then elected Master, but committed the blunder of permitting politics

to be discussed within the walls of the Lodge, the meetings of which were held in his palace. The members of the Lodge were divided into three political parties: Bavarians, to which Paradis belonged, which aimed at getting rid of the Austrian rule and placing Charles Albert, Elector of Bavaria, on the Bohemian throne; Austrians, who remained faithful to the Hapsburg dynasty; and Neutrals, who took neither side and disapproved of the introduction of political matters into a Masonic Lodge. The result was the secession, in 1738, of the Austrians, who formed a new Lodge and the Bavarians, who remained behind, changed the name of the Lodge from the Three Stars to the Bavarian, Count Paradis still remaining Master. The Lodge was frequently visited by General Count Frederick August Rutowsky, Grand Master of the Saxon Lodges, who endeavoured to spread Masonry in Bohemia by the establishment of new Lodges in various parts of the country, a start being made at Leitmeritz—the centre of what is known as the Bohemian Paradise—by the foundation of the Lodge Sincérité. Both the Prague and the Leitmeritz Lodges applied, in 1742, to Berlin for Warrants which were granted and which gave authority for the working of the fourth or Scotch Degree, in addition to the three Craft Degrees. The victorious advance of the Austrian troops, however, put an end to all Masonic activity and, when Prague was retaken in 1742, the Bavarians, Count Paradis among the number, had to take refuge in flight. Count Paradis and a colleague named Kaiserstein returned after some years and, by the intercession of Francis I, were pardoned and recovered their confiscated estates. Another prominent Freemason of that time, named David, was sentenced to death and the sentence was actually about to be carried out on June 28, 1743, when he received a reprieve on the scaffold, the sentence being commuted to imprisonment for life.

In 1741 the Austrian seceders from the Three Stars Lodge formed another Lodge, of which they elected Count Sebastian Francis Joseph Kinigl, then only twenty-one years of age, Master. As a reward for its loyalty, this Lodge is said to have been publicly recognized by an Act dated October 17, 1742. The Neutrals of the original Three Stars Lodge also established a separate Lodge in 1741 and, in accordance with the attitude they had before adopted, forbade the discussion of any political matters within the Lodge. In 1743 all three Lodges amalgamated as the Three Crowned Stars Lodge, with Count Kinigl, who had worked hard to bring about this amalgamation, as Master. The By-laws of this new Lodge put a ban upon politics, with the result that some of the Bavarians refused to join and founded a separate Lodge on their own account, which they called the Three Pillars. They numbered several noblemen among their members. The archives of the Three Crowned Stars Lodge (see *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, vol. v, p. 189) were afterwards taken to Hungary and are now kept at the Castle Dégh, Veezprém (a city once in Turkish possession, as a tall minaret there testifies); these prove that the Prague Brethren maintained a brisk correspondence with the Saxon Lodges, particularly with the Lodge of the Three Pomegranates at Dresden, from which the Lodge of the Three Crowned Stars sought in 1763 to obtain a Charter to work the Clermont

Degrees. The story summarized (it is told in detail in the *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*) is as follows :

On August 5, 1763, the Prague Brethren sent a formal application to the Mother-Lodge of the Three Pomegranates for the Clermont Warrant, the application being signed by, amongst others, Count Francis Charles Clary Aldringen ; Count Philip Clary Aldringen ; Count John Lützlow ; Count Francis Charles Martinitz, Inspector and Royal Chamberlain ; Baron Charles William Sköllen, a Saxon by birth and a Captain in the army ; John Francis de Goltz ; Baron John Charles Furttenburgh ; Lieutenant and Quarter-Master Leopold de Pracht, afterwards Colonel and Governor ; and Joseph Francis Martinelli. Among the other members of the Lodge, whose names do not appear in this application, were Lieutenant-Colonel Baron Charles Frederick Schmidburg ; Chamberlain and Colonel Count Joseph Thun, afterwards Major-General ; Count Caspar Herman Kinigl, son of Count Sebastian Kinigl, the first Master of the Three Crowned Stars Lodge ; and Baron James Brady, an Irishman by birth, a Captain in the Grenadiers, a valiant soldier, who afterwards became Colonel and Chamberlain and obtained the highest military distinction known in Austria, i.e. the Cross of Maria Theresa. He had been initiated in Vienna on June 18, 1762 and in the same year joined the Three Crowned Stars Lodge at Prague, in which he was raised on June 24, 1763 and received the Scotch Master's Degree on November 4, 1764. Barons Sköllen and Furttenburgh were despatched to Dresden to present the petition and to receive the Warrant, in which errand they were successful, after encountering many difficulties. In the end they not only obtained a patent for a Clermont Chapter to be attached to their Lodge, but they also secured a patent for the whole realm of Bohemia, authorizing them to establish Chapters and generally to act with the authority of a governing Jurisdiction. In consequence of the death of the Elector August, however, when no Saxons were allowed to leave Dresden, it was not possible for the new Chapter to be consecrated by the Dresden authorities, but in a letter dated November 25, 1763, the Prague Brethren received instructions to proceed with the work. The Chapter was duly established, but, beyond the Founders, only two Brethren appear to have been admitted to membership, viz. Lieutenant-Colonels Pracht and Schmidburg. The Founders wrote to Dresden that they were exercising caution and wanted to proceed slowly, but, as a matter of fact, they were prevented from making any progress, because neither of the two delegates who had journeyed to Dresden remembered the Clermont explanation of the Hiram legend and the Dresden Brethren were forbidden by their *Constitutions* from committing it to writing. About this time several Rosicrucians were arrested by order of the government and it was an open secret that some of the members of the Three Crowned Stars Lodge belonged also to that Order, the Black Rose being the name of the Prague Rosicrucian Circle. The greater number of the arrested Brethren were merely imprisoned for a few days, but the Secretary of the Circle, a man named Kozaro, had to stand in the pillory, not because he was a Rosicrucian, but for other offences he had committed. The confusion of Freemasonry with Rosicrucianism,

however, reflected on the Lodge and the outcome was the issue of an Imperial edict forbidding Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism alike. Many Freemasons in consequence gave instructions for their names to be expunged from the Lodge records, for fear of arrest and trial, but many others signed a declaration that they wished to be regarded as faithful members of the Lodge. These afterwards joined another Lodge, called Furttenburgh's Lodge, because it was established by him and notwithstanding the fact that he was known to be a member of the Black Rose Circle.

According to Lawrie, Freemasonry was introduced into the province of Bohemia (Prague) in 1749. He speaks of the members as *Scotch Masons*, and the probability is that they were "Scots Degree" Masons. Subsequent writers have, however, stated on the strength of this passage that the Grand Lodge of Scotland warranted a Lodge at Prague, a conclusion which is not supported by any evidence which has come under notice.

CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

Czecho-Slovakia is a republic, formed and proclaimed in 1918, from parts of former Austria-Hungary, comprising Bohemia, Moravia, Slovakia, autonomous Ruthenia, and most of Austrian Silesia, with small parts of German and other Austrian territory. Its population in 1910 was about 4,000,000.

TWO GRAND LODGES

In Czecho-Slovakia there are two distinct Grand Lodges. One of these is that called The Grand Lodge Lessing Zu den Drei Ringen (Lessing of the Three Rings), which has 20 Lodges and some 925 members. This is composed of a German membership. There are some three and a half million Germans in the population of the country, which will represent about one-fourth of the total population. This Grand Lodge is apparently quite regular.

Up to a very recent date, there has been much coldness between this Grand Lodge and the National Grand Lodge; but this has happily passed, and there is intervisitation.

A DESCRIPTION BY ONE WHO HAS MADE EXAMINATION

A very interesting account of Masonry in Czecho-Slovakia with particular reference to the National Grand Lodge, has been written by Past Grand Master John H. Cowles, Sovereign Grand Commander of the Scottish Rite, and is published in the December 1928 number of the *New Age Magazine*. From it we quote:

FREEMASONRY IN CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

In Bohemia, which is in the centre, and in Prague, the capital of Czecho-Slovakia, there have been for ages traditions of truth and brotherhood, and the principles that are the foundation of the Masonic fraternity have been known. Long ago they were exemplified in the lives and characters of the country's national heroes—John Hus, Christian martyr, and Jan Komensky, teacher

of nations. Therefore it would seem fertile soil for Freemasonry. The tradition is that Count Sporck obtained the degrees of Symbolic Masonry in England and secured a charter for a Lodge in Prague in 1726, which is only nine years after the Grand Lodge of England of to-day was founded. Other Lodges sprang from this one and soon there were five Lodges working, with a bright future for further progress. This was not to be, however, for Emperor Joseph II, a staunch friend of Freemasonry, died, and the institution was suppressed and prohibited in the Austrian Empire, of which Bohemia was a subject nation. Joseph II was the son of Francis I, who was a Mason and the husband of Maria Theresa, a loyal Catholic sovereign and bitter opponent of Masonry. Spasmodically a Lodge or two would have secret meetings and it is said that some few Masons continued to meet privately at homes, but after about sixty years the institution was no longer heard of. Still there were Bohemians who would, from time to time, become Masons in other lands, and in Prague there was a Lodge which had a charter from the Grand Lodge of Hungary working stealthily, the membership composed of Czechs and Germans.

On October 26, 1916, which was just two days previous to the country's gaining its independence, 15 of these Brethren met and decided to form a Czech Lodge in Prague. In May, 1919, seven of these Brethren proceeded to constitute provisionally a Lodge, to be named Jan Amos Komensky. About the same time, an official representative of the Grand Lodge of Italy aided in establishing a Lodge under the obedience of that Grand Lodge, naming it Narod (Nation) and of the date of June 20, 1920. On October 20, 1920, 28 Rijen (meaning 28th of October, day of Independence) Lodge was organised, and Dilo (Work) Lodge was organised on November 5, 1920, both under the Grand Lodge of Italy. On June 25, 1922, Joseph Dobravy Lodge began its career, and in Feb. 1923, the Czecho-Slovakian National Grand Lodge was organised, separate and independent of any other Masonic body and sovereign within itself. It adheres to the Ancient Landmarks, requires a belief in God, and the Bible is one of its Great Lights. Other Lodges have been chartered by this Grand Lodge until now there are nine, and one in process, with a total membership of about 400.

There is also a Grand Lodge working in the German language, which is also sovereign and independent and professes the principles and conforms to the same ideals and customs as all regular Grand Lodges.

These two Grand Lodges are on excellent terms and are working together for the general good. The German-speaking Grand Lodge has about 20 Lodges, with approximately 800 members, or about double the membership of the Czech Grand Lodge. If a German asks a Czech Lodge to receive his petition, he is directed to apply to one of the German-speaking Lodges, and vice versa. These two Grand Lodges set an example worthy of emulation and which others might follow with profit and honour.

The correct name of the German Grand Lodge is Grossloge Lessing drei Ringen, but I am unable to give the names of the officers and their addresses. In the Lodges of Czech Brethren, the time between the degrees is about a year, and the fee for degrees is not arbitrarily fixed. For instance, the fee may be said to be 600 kronen; however, after the petitioner is fully investigated, the Master of the Lodge knows all about his income and his obligations (the investigation is very thorough) and if, in the Master's judgment, he is not able to

pay that much, the candidate is so informed and the amount fixed at what he can pay without injury to himself or his family. On the other hand, if he is able to pay more than the 600 kronen, he does so, the amount being decided according to his ability to pay. The reason given for this unusual custom is that many of the college men, scientists, historians, teachers, professors, etc., who would make good Masons and whom they want to take in, receive scant compensation; while those who have fair returns for their services or from their businesses, are able to pay more and thus balance things up. It is claimed that this works well.

Masonry is young in this land, but the future is promising. Already two members of the Cabinet, four or five Foreign Ministers, five or six Consuls and other men of prominence in governmental, educational, and professional affairs are among the membership. They have no Masonic Temple, but expect some day to have one worthy of them. Their enthusiasm, devotion, and faith will surely bring about the realisation of this desire.

CHAPTER XVI

FREEMASONRY IN RUMANIA AND JUGO-SLAVIA

RUMANIA

WHILE much has been said and written about early Freemasons and alleged Masonic activities in Rumania as far back as the eighteenth century, there is no reliable evidence, writes Ossian Lang, the Grand Historian of the Grand Lodge of New York, that Masonic work got under way much before the second half of the nineteenth century.

In 1856 a Lodge was established at Bucharest by the Grand Orient of France under the name of *Steaua Dunarei*, "Star of the Danube." This Warrant was authorized by Prince Lucian Murat, then the Grand Master. The first enthusiasm having waned, the Lodge became negative and remained so from 1860 until its revival in 1863. Thenceforth it was known by the name of *Inteleptii de Heliopolis*, "Sages of Heliopolis." Soon other Lodges arose under Charters from other Grand Lodges; amongst these, the Grand Orient of France, the Grand Orient of Italy, the Symbolik Grand Lodge of Hungary and two of the Grand Lodges of Germany.

A little more than fifty years ago, wrote Ossian Lang in 1926, in his exhaustive survey of the subject, Freemasonry reached the summit of its earlier usefulness. Many of the leading men in the nation, in arts and literature, in education and in business, were identified with it. The people generally regarded it with respect. It was then that General Cotescu sought to unite the Lodges of all Jurisdictions in a National Grand Lodge, but failed to accomplish the object. Captain Constantin Moroiu, whose aid he had enlisted, now took the matter in hand himself. Moroiu had become a Master Mason in 1875, in his native city of Bucharest. He was then thirty-five years of age.

In 1880 twenty Lodges united in the formation of the National Grand Lodge of Rumania. Moroiu assumed the office of Grand Master and soon entangled the Craft in an amazing mesh of extravagances. In the course of his administration he grafted all sorts of Degrees upon the Fraternity. Starting, in 1881, with the Rite of Memphis, 95°, he formed next the Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, 33°. A Supreme Grand Chapter of Royal Arch Masons followed. The so-called Swedenborgian Rite was also added. Of all these creations he made himself and remained the titular head and virtually proprietor. He trafficked, besides, in occult Degrees, of one kind or another—anything and everything that appealed to mystery mongers and the petty ambitions and vanities of men, as impervious as himself appears to have been to the root principles of Freemasonry. In 1913 the National Grand Lodge was virtually dead, though Moroiu kept up the

pretence of an organization for some time longer. Finally, about 1913, he closed its doors. He died shortly afterwards.

Already, by the end of 1905, the Moroiu organization had become insignificant. While the impression was given abroad that from six to eight Lodges were in existence, with a membership of 300, there was only one Lodge of 29 adherents. This Lodge would meet alternately as *Steaua Dunarei* and *Propaganda lui Memphis*. In January 1906 twenty Masons of this group withdrew and constituted a Lodge which they called România, under a Warrant granted by the Grand Orient of Italy. In 1907 nine of the latter group demitted and formed a Circle or Club which, five years later, became Lodge *Unirea*, under a Charter from the Grand Orient of France.

At the beginning of the Great War in 1914, there were in Rumania only four active Lodges. Of these, three were constituted by the Grand Orient of France: *Les Disciples de Pythagoras*, at Galatz; *Le Phare Hospitalier*, at Bralla, both established in 1865; and *Unirea*, at Bucharest, established in 1912. The fourth Lodge, called *Sapientia*, worked at Bucharest under a Warrant from the German Grand Lodge *Eintracht* at Darmstadt. Only two of these Lodges survived the War; these were *Les Disciples de Pythagoras* (1865) at Galatz and *Unirea* (1912) at Bucharest.

In August 1919 Jean Pangal established the Supreme Council of Rumania, assuming the title of a Sovereign Grand Inspector-General. No record of his initiation exists. He appears to have had, as coadjutor, one Jean Pélissier, whose acquaintance he had made in Paris, when he was serving as secretary of the National Council of the Rumanian Unity. This new Council assumed the name of the "Organization of the Independent Rumanian Masonic Order" and was undoubtedly inaugurated in opposition to an alleged "American Grand Lodge of Rumania." In order to regularize his "Order," Pangal applied to the Grand Orient of France "for a General Deputation to regularize the Organization of the Independent National Rumanian Masonic Order." On December 18, 1921, the Council of the Grand Orient extended recognition to the Supreme Council of Rumania and authorized an exchange of representatives. Pangal now proclaimed his "Organization" to be the sole, rightful, independent, sovereign Masonic governing body in and for the Kingdom of Rumania, which he did in a memorial to the Masonic International Association, which was published in the *Official Bulletin* of that body in the number for July to September 1922. The Grand Lodge of New York, however, claimed that Pangal's body was irregular, that he had never been initiated into Masonry and that his sole claim rested upon the fact that he had purchased from Bibescu, 33°, son-in-law of Moroiu, the archives, seals and other objects of the former National Grand Lodge, when Bibescu was proclaimed Honorary Grand Master of the Pangal National Grand Lodge. One of Pangal's claims was that his Grand Lodge was "accomplished by virtue of a Deputation emanating from the Grand Lodge of Ukraine," but there was never such a body, according to these claims. Moreover, on further inquiry, the Grand Orient of France broke off all relations with the Pangal formation.

On December 16, 1922, through the instrumentality of an Armenian, named Norandunghian, a member of the 33rd Degree of Turkey, a patent was secured from

the Supreme Council of France authorizing the establishment of a Supreme Council for Rumania, on condition that the Norandunghian-Pangal organization would drop the Higher Degrees of the Grand Orient of France, though the Lodges might, if they chose, remain in fraternal relations with the latter body.

Later, on January 11, 1925, Pangal notified the Grand Orient of France that, thereafter, his Supreme Council would exercise exclusive control over all higher Degrees conferred in Rumania. He also withdrew the representation of the Supreme Council of Rumania near the Grand Orient of France, thus breaking off relations with the body that had given him his first endorsement.

With regard to the alleged "American Grand Lodge of Rumania" to which reference has been made; in August 1920, one Charles Blumenthal, claiming to represent an American Grand Orient of Universal Freemasonry, initiated nine candidates, conferred upon them the 33^o and formed them into a Jacob Schiff Lodge, No. 7. He is then said to have disappeared. One Bercovicz then appeared on the scene and offered to have Blumenthal's initiates regularized by an outstanding American Masonic authority, which turned out to be the spurious American Federation of Freemasonry, which had its headquarters at Salt Lake City, the founder and proprietor of which, McBlain Thompson, was, in 1922, convicted of fraud and sentenced by a United States District Court in Utah. Bercovicz, however, in December 1920, received the desired authorization and organized a Lodge, known as the McBlain Thompson Lodge, No. 1. This Lodge immediately transformed itself into the American Rumanian Grand Lodge of the Antient and Accepted Scottish Rite. Additions were made to the membership and, within a short time, a second Lodge was created, which took the name of Steaua Dunarei, in memory of the first Masonic Lodge in Rumania.

Early in 1922, the so-called American Grand Lodge of Rumania sought to obtain recognition from the various Grand Jurisdictions of the world, particularly those of the United States of America. The endeavour was, however, nipped in the bud by Robert Judson Kenworthy, Grand Secretary of New York, who informed the officers of the Rumanian organization that they had neither legal nor moral right to constitute themselves as a Masonic organization. Many Freemasons, who had been regularly and lawfully initiated, had joined the Rumanian body under a misapprehension and they appealed to the Grand Lodge of New York for a Constitution, which would regularize Rumanian Freemasonry. As the outcome of this appeal, a Lodge composed entirely of Master Masons, was formed at Bucharest in September 1922, under a special dispensation issued by Arthur S. Tompkins, Grand Master of New York. Three Lodges were then instituted in due form, viz. Romana, No. 1; Steaua Dunarei, No. 2; and Redesteptarea, No. 3. These received Charters from New York, which were issued under a prohibition that they must not form a Grand Lodge or join with others in such formation, without previous authorization from the Grand Lodge of New York. In 1925, four Warrants for new Lodges were granted by the New York Jurisdiction and approval was given for the formation of a District Grand Lodge

of Rumania, with General George Solacolu as District Grand Master and, at the same time, the prohibition against the formation of a Grand Lodge of Rumania was withdrawn.

In September of the same year, the Rumanian Lodges holding Charters from the Grand Orient of France united in the constitution of an independent and sovereign Grand Orient of Rumania and, in March 1926, this body adopted a Declaration of Principles, which fully met the requirements established by the Grand Lodge of New York as tests of the qualifications of a foreign sovereign and independent Masonic Grand Jurisdiction for fraternal recognition. Dr. Georges Gheorgian, the first Grand Master; General Georges Solacolu, District Grand Master and the appointed delegates met fully every test established by the Grand Lodge of New York for the determination of the qualification of a foreign sovereign and independent Grand Jurisdiction for fraternal recognition and the exchange of representatives. These include an unequivocal belief in the existence of God as the foundation of Freemasonry and the presence of the Three Great Lights in the Lodges while at work, chief among these being the Sacred Book of the Divine Law.

The last return available (1929) states that nine Lodges are working under the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Rumania with a total membership of 377 and other Lodges under the Grand Orient of Rumania; while there is also the National Grand Lodge of Rumania (reconstructed in 1923) with twenty-nine Lodges and 2,341 Brethren. Prince Georges-Valentin Bibesco is the Grand Master of the last-named.

In 1934 The Grand National Lodge of Rumania and the Grand Orient of Rumania formed the "Federation of Rumanian Masonry," which was duly recognised by the Grand Lodge of New York as satisfying its requirements.

JUGO-SLAVIA

Jugo-Slavia is a new geographical expression which has sprung into being since the Great War of 1914-18. It has been formed by the addition to Serbia of Slavonia and Croatia. It was, for a long time, part of the Empire of Austria but, previous to that, Serbia was a powerful independent nation and ruled over the whole of the Balkans.

It was in the second half of the eighteenth century that Freemasonry sprang into existence in that country. Among the foreign travellers to the Balkans were many Freemasons, who erected Lodges in Belgrade, Bucharest, Athens and Widdon. One of the most important members of the Belgrade Lodge was Mustapha Pasha, the Governor-General of Serbia, who was so humane to the depressed Serbs that he is cited in their national poems as "Mustapha Pasha, the parent of the Serbs." He was much hated by the despotic Janitschars, who were special favourites of the Sultan of Turkey, to whose people, the oppressors of the Serbs, nothing was sacred. Eventually he was foully murdered in Belgrade by a Janitschar, after Mustapha had assisted the Serbian insurgents against their oppressors.

There are, wrote Joy Aleksijevic, Master of the Pobratim Lodge, Belgrade, in 1911, some documents in existence, according to which, in 1848, there was a Turkish Lodge, named Alikotsch, in Belgrade, which counted a number of Serbians as its members and it was due to them that the antagonism was somewhat damped between the Serbs and the Turks. Then he continued (see *The Freemason*, December 30, 1911):

This Lodge followed its beneficent work up to 1862, when Prince Michael Obrenovitch became ruler of Serbia. Various signs give reason to believe that he himself was a Freemason. During his short reign he planned the distribution of European Turkey among the Serbs, Greeks, Rumanians and Montenegrins. This plan, which is noteworthy in the history of the Balkan Peninsula, is so much more so because it was the work of the Freemasons. Prince Michael Obrenovitch, a man of rare energy, patriot in the strictest sense of the word, was convinced that the liberation of the Christians from under the Turkish yoke could only be effected through a joint action of all nations interested in this liberation and he, therefore, obtained the consent of all the other rulers in the Balkans—i.e. of Montenegro, Rumania and Greece. Besides this, Prince Michael was in rather close connexion with those notable Freemasons, Garibaldi and Mazzini, who both considered this as a good idea and promised to assist Prince Michael with numerous volunteers. Not only his connexions with these well-known Freemasons, but also his generous actions show that he must have been a member of the Craft.

After the death of Prince Michael, the political circumstances in Serbia did not permit Masonic activity and, the Lodges being compelled to stop working, Freemasonry was abolished. Mention should, however, be made of two great Serbian writers of that period, who were members of the Masonic Order—Sima Milutinovitch Sarajlija, a great classical and patriotical poet; and Dositeje Orradovitch, the philosopher.

In 1876, through the initiation in Belgrade of the Italian Consul, Joanini, one Lodge, named the Balkan Light, was organized, which, in the wars of 1876–8 against the Turks, did good service in caring for the wounded. In 1881, the Serbian Federation League was founded: this counted among its members the best of Serbian intellectual society but, in 1883, on account of unforeseen political circumstances, this also was obliged to cease. After a pause of seven years, Freemasonry again became active and the Pobratim Lodge was established and started on its work on February 2, 1891, in a festive manner. This Lodge worked under the auspices of the Symbolic Grand Lodge of Hungary, in Budapest, until October 30, 1908, when, on the occasion of the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina through the Austrians, it declared its independence and was acknowledged by all Grand Lodges, under the name of the Independent Lodge of Serbian Pobratim in Orient, Belgrade.

Serbian Masonry called into life and organized a number of beneficial and patriotic associations. Foremost was the Serbian Patriotic Association, St. Sabbas, which has a fund of about a million francs and did much towards educating and

bringing up poor students of Serbian origin; the Association of King Stefan Detschanski, which had under its auspices the care and education of the deaf and dumb of the poor of Serbia; the Association for the Education and Care of Poor Children, which adopted the waifs of the poor, teaching them professions to make them independent for the future. They also organized the Association of Serbian Sisters, who, out of their own means, kept up a home for poor students, where the students received good food at a very low price. The Pobratim Lodge also organized, among its own members, a benevolent society, which distributed clothing and shoes to poor people. In addition to the Pobratim Lodge there were two other active Lodges in Belgrade, one under the auspices of the Grand Lodge of Hamburg, the other of the Grand Orient of France. Both were daughter Lodges of the Pobratim and in very close connexion with it.

Then, of course, came the hiatus caused by the Great War. Promptly upon the return of peace, however, the Masons of Jugo-Slavia took steps to place Freemasonry in their new kingdom upon a settled basis. Accordingly, on June 9, 1919, shortly after the formation of the new State of Jugo-Slavia, the Masonic Assembly was held with representatives from each of the six Symbolic Lodges in the kingdom and there was formed an independent Sovereign Grand Lodge under the name of the "Grand Lodge of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Jugo-Slavia" with headquarters at Belgrade. Of the six Lodges, four had been chartered by the Grand Lodge of Hungary, one by the Grand Lodge of Hamburg and one by the Grand Orient of Italy, all of which released the Lodges from their allegiance. The new Grand Lodge was formed on regular Masonic standards, recognizing the Supreme Being, Anderson's *Constitutions*, the Landmarks, the Old Charges and agreed to conform to the approved regulations of Freemasonry. Some of the Lodges forming the Grand Lodge had become identified with the Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Rite of Serbia and they were completely released by that body before participating in the Assembly and the Supreme Council agreed to restrict itself to all Degrees above the third.

There are now twenty-two Lodges in Jugo-Slavia, with a total membership of nearly 1,000. There must be twelve months' interval between each Degree. The Grand Master, George Weifert, one of the leading financiers of the country, had the Masonic Temple at Belgrade, which suffered severe damage during the bombardment, restored at his own expense.

There is also the Symbolic Grand Lodge Libertas, founded in 1927, which controls the work of three Lodges, Ljubav Bliznjega, founded in 1872; Prometej, founded in 1926; and Amicitia, founded in 1927.

CHAPTER XVII

FREEMASONRY IN TURKEY, GREECE, CYPRUS AND BULGARIA

TURKEY

“**B**EGINNING in 1820, a number of Masonic Lodges were organized from time to time in various parts of the Turkish territory, notably in Constantinople, in Macedonia, in Thrace, in Epirus, at Smyrna in Silicia, in Syria, in Palestine, in Mesopotamia and elsewhere, under Warrants from the United Grand Lodge of England and the Grand Orients of Italy, Spain, France and other Grand Bodies.” Thus wrote the compiler of the report of correspondence of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York for 1923. The writer goes on to say: “Few Turks were to be found in these Lodges; the great majority of members were foreigners, Christians and Jews, the latter predominating.”

Apparently, however, Freemasonry was known in Turkey a century before that date, for the writer of a letter which appeared in the *St. James's Evening Post* of May 24, 1738, says: “We hear from Constantinople that the Lodges of Smyrna and Aleppo are greatly increased and that several Turks of distinction have been admitted into them.”

It was not, however, until February 3, 1748, that the first Lodge under a recognized authority was established in Turkey, at Aleppo, either by or under the auspices of Alexander Drummond, which was the first foreign Lodge on the register of the Grand Lodge of Scotland. According to Lawrie's *History of Freemasonry*, 1804, p. 165, Drummond, before receiving his Provincial Commission from the Grand Lodge of Scotland, “had taken up his residence at Alexandretta, in Turkey, and erected several Mason Lodges in that part of the country.” The following appears in the minutes of Lodge Canongate, Kilwinning, Edinburgh, under date of April 8, 1752:

The Lodge being mett according to adjournment . . . at the same time a charter for constituting a Lodge at Alleppo was signed by the Most Worshipful Master and the other proper office-bearers of the Grand Lodge, also by the office-bearers of this Lodge.

An entry on June 24, 1760, in the same Minute-book, reads:

The R.W. Master Desired leave to resign that office, and having accordingly declared the Chair vacant, he proposed for his successor our R.W. Brother, Alexander Drummond, Esq., late His Majesty's Consul at Aleppo.

In 1762, Washington Shirley, Earl Ferrers, then Grand Master of England, appointed Dr. Dionysius Manasse as Provincial Grand Master “for all Armenia in

the East Indies" and his name remained in the official list until 1805. In 1769, the Grand Lodge of Geneva established a Lodge at Constantinople and, in 1787, another Lodge at Smyrna.

The Oriental Lodge, No. 687, under Charter from the United Grand Lodge of England, was founded as far back as 1856, and Alfred C. Silley, writing in *The Freemason* of October 1, 1921, says that, notwithstanding the many years of strife and trouble in the Near East, it has survived all other Lodges inaugurated since then. With the exception of the years of the Great War, it has continued working almost uninterruptedly during that long period and its meetings were resumed in the autumn of 1920. The Grand Lodge of Scotland, it may be pointed out, chartered two Lodges at Constantinople: Logos, No. 1083 and Paros, No. 1185, but, as there is no record of officers in the 1926 official list of Lodges, they have, evidently, ceased working.

In 1858, the Grand Orient of France established La Loge L'Étoile du Bosphore; in 1861, the Grand Lodge of Scotland established the Palestine Lodge, No. 415, at Beyrout; and, in 1865, the Grand Lodge of Ireland also set up a Lodge, No. 166, at Constantinople. Lodges were also established about this time by the Grand Orient of Italy.

On June 1, 1859, the Grand Lodge of England was informed by the President of the Board of General Purposes that a communication had been received from the Oriental Lodge, No. 988, at Constantinople, respecting the existence of irregular Lodges at Smyrna. The Board expressed the belief that the Lodges in question, named Ionic, Anatolia and Benzenzia, were irregular assemblies and that the so-called Grand Lodge of Turkey, formed of those three Lodges, was also an irregular body.

At the following meeting of Grand Lodge, held on June 23, the President of the Board called attention to what was called "The Grand Lodge of Turkey" and explained that it had been formed by a Brother who was at Smyrna at the end of the Crimean War and who, it was stated, although no proof had been brought forward, was in possession of an Irish Warrant. He stated that this Brother had made about twenty Masons, who had distributed themselves into three Lodges, which afterwards called themselves "The Grand Lodge of Turkey." He, therefore, moved "That the Masters of all regular Lodges be cautioned against receiving persons claiming admission, either as Visitors or Joining Members, on the ground of their having been initiated by such irregular Lodges in Smyrna," a resolution which was duly carried.

In 1861, the English Lodges were united in a District Grand Lodge under the British Ambassador, Sir Henry Bulwer, as District Grand Master, who was followed, in 1869, by John Porter Brown and, in 1873, by Stephen Scouloudi. There is now no District Grand Lodge under the English Jurisdiction.

From 1861 to 1869, a Scottish Rite Supreme Council for the Ottoman Empire, with its headquarters at Constantinople, was in existence, but in the latter year it became inoperative.

During the period 1865-77, there were a sufficient number of Freemasons

among Englishmen resident in Constantinople to keep several Lodges in existence and, in addition to the Oriental Lodge, referred to, there were the Bulwer Lodge (English), the Caledonian Lodge (Scottish) and the Leinster Lodge (Irish), in addition to the Bulwer Chapter of Royal Arch Masons. Unfortunately, the political troubles of Turkey and the resulting upset in finance following upon the Russo-Turkish War of 1876-8 affected trade to such an extent that many Englishmen were obliged to leave the country and, as a consequence, all the Lodges named, with the exception of the Oriental, closed down. It is gratifying, says Alfred C. Silley, to know that this, the oldest Lodge in Constantinople, managed to survive and is still working successfully, although the burden fell upon a membership never exceeding eighty, including country members.

After the Turkish Constitution was proclaimed, in 1908, the Grand Lodge of Scotland granted a Charter for the foundation of Lodge La Turquie, which was inaugurated in 1909, the membership of which was somewhat cosmopolitan, there being Englishmen, Turks, Syrians (both Arabs and Christians), Greeks, Armenians and Hebrews and the universality of Masonry was clearly depicted by the regular placing of the Bible on the pedestal and, on a small table close by, a Koran and the Talmud, upon which Mussulmans and Hebrews were respectively initiated and obligated. Unfortunately, the foundations of Lodge La Turquie were not "well and truly laid" and the Lodge is no longer in existence.

On July 13, 1909, a meeting was called, which was attended by the Masters of fourteen Lodges, then working in and near Constantinople, under Warrants from the Grand Orients of France, Italy and Spain, for the purpose of organizing the National Grand Orient of Turkey. Officers were elected at Constantinople on August 1, 1909, when Mehmed Talat, Vice-President of the Ottoman Parliament, was elected Grand Master. Eight Lodges joined in the constitution of the Grand Lodge, among them being one composed entirely of holders of the 33rd Degree of the Scottish Rite. Unhappily political agitation was introduced into the various units and the Grand Master became one of the leaders of the Young Turk revolutionary committee and assumed control of the Lodges, excluding all who were not in sympathy with the movement. After two years they released their stranglehold on the Lodges; Mehmed Talat resigned the office of Grand Master and Dr. Mehmed Ali Bey became his successor. Then came the Great War, when all Masonic activities of every description were suspended. At the conclusion of peace, they were resumed, Professor Bessim Eumer Pacha being elected to the position of Grand Master and, in 1923, the following declaration, in the name of the Grand Lodge, was issued:

The Grand Orient (Grand Lodge) of Turkey, which already has eliminated from its membership all undesirable elements and those which may compromise its character in any way whatever, promises on its part to examine in the spirit of conciliation all criticisms and objections which English Masonry may formulate, to the end that the foundations of a fraternal understanding may be established between their Jurisdiction and our own. The number of active Brethren in Con-

Constantinople is, approximately, 500. The Grand Lodge, which has been installed in its own quarters since May 1, 1922, is using every effort to attract to participation in its labours at present unaffiliated Masons in Constantinople and in the provinces, whose number amounts to several hundreds. It is firmly resolved, also, rigidly to exclude all about whose character and motives there is the least doubt.

The Grand Orient (Grand Lodge) forbids all political or sectarian discussions in its temples. Admission is granted only to regular Masons.

The Supreme Council is allied with the Grand Orient (Grand Lodge) of Turkey by a concordat, defining their respective powers and recognizing the Grand Orient or the Grand Lodge of Turkey as the sovereign legitimate and regular Symbolic authority for the whole Ottoman Empire in everything concerning the three Symbolic Degrees.

The membership of the Lodges is composed of almost all the ethnic elements of the country, whether native or immigrant, or merely sojourning—Turks, Greeks, Armenians, Jews, Arabs, Kurds, Albanians, French, English, Italians, Slavs, Austrians, Slovacs, Hungarians.

As recently as October 1920, an Armenian Lodge, the Highasdan—a word meaning Armenia—No. 1185, was founded under a Charter from the Grand Lodge of Scotland, but this is no longer in existence.

The Oriental Lodge has always worked up to the standard of the Lodges in England and the principles and tenets of the Order have been upheld and maintained, pure and unsullied, so much so that all Lodges in Constantinople, with whom they are in relation, always look up to the leaders of the Oriental Lodge for guidance in all cases of doubt or difficulty and, when speaking of that Lodge, generally refer to her with respect, as the Mother of Masonic Lodges in Constantinople. The Lodge is a regular contributor to the funds of the three central Masonic Institutions in England.

The Sultans of Turkey were invariably friendly towards Freemasonry—indeed, the late Sultan, Abdul Hamid, contributed almost annually the sum of one hundred Turkish Liras (approximately £91) to the charity funds of the Italian Lodge.

John H. Cowles, Sovereign Grand Commander of the Northern Jurisdiction of the United States of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, who visited Turkey in 1926, wrote the following account of his experiences there :

I was surprised to find so many Lodges in Turkey under different Masonic powers. There are Lodges in Constantinople working under the English and Scottish Constitutions and one under the Grand Orient of Greece. All exchange visits with each other, except those under the English Constitution. These Lodges existed and were working before the present Grand Orient of Turkey came into being. There is a Chapter of the Rose Croix also, which is under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Council of Greece. These bodies under Grecian authority have had heavy responsibilities on them, because of the refugees, which they have carried through manfully, though with the greatest sacrifice.

The Grand Orient—and, like others in this part of the world, they prefer the word Orient to that of Lodge—requires upon the altars of the Lodges the Volumes of the Sacred Law—Christian, Mohammedan and Buddhist—and, of course, the Square and Compasses. Belief in God is necessary though the name He is known by may be different in the religions of the various members. Two columns, one with “J” and the other with “B” marked on them, are in every Lodge room and the two kinds of ashlar as well. In fact, the Lodge room I saw was like those at home, with, perhaps, the additions of transparencies on the wall containing words peculiar to Masonry. An unusual custom is followed in every Lodge just before closing, when two collections are taken up, one for fraternal assistance and one for educating poor children.

There are now twenty-one active Lodges, with a membership of 2,000, under the Grand Orient of Turkey, which is a sovereign and independent body, free from control of any other Masonic power. The present Grand Master is Dr. Takiuddin Fikret.

There is also a Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite, with 250 members, which receives its members from the Lodges under the Grand Orient. The Supreme Council is a sovereign and independent body also, having control of the Degrees from the fourth to the thirty-third. There are three Chapters of the Rose Croix, one of which is in Smyrna.

The Grand Commander of the Supreme Council for several years past, Dr. Mehmed Aly, who has been a Mason for fifty-seven years, has just resigned on account of age and ill-health and has been succeeded by Dr. Takiuddin Fikret. Dr. J. Souhami is the Secretary-General.

According to the latest return there are 25 Lodges with an aggregate membership of 2,600. In April 1929 the new Temple acquired by the Grand Lodge of Turkey was inaugurated officially by the Grand Master, the Hon. Edib Servet, assisted by all the Grand Officers. A substantial collection by the Brethren was handed over to the Fund for the Protection of Infants.

Lodge Selamat (Security and Peace) of Constantinople, of which the distinguished bacteriologist, Dr. Nouredin Ramik, is the Master, continues its splendid work for aiding intelligent Turkish children of poor parents to obtain secondary and superior education at home and abroad. Grand Lodge has assumed the protectorate of this benevolence and has extended the scope so as to aid needy children generally to obtain schooling adapted to their qualifications.

GREECE

Freemasonry was late in obtaining a footing on the mainland of Greece, but some earlier accounts are extant from the Ionian Islands, which were once the prey of Naples, Genoa and Venice and were ceded to France in 1797. They were then successively taken possession of by Russia and Turkey in 1800, by France in 1807 and by England in 1809. In this last year the Grand Orient of France founded the Lodge St. Napoleon at Corfu and a second Lodge in 1810. In 1815 the islands were formed into the Ionian Republic, under the protection of England and Pythagoras Lodge, No. 654, to which a Royal Arch Chapter

was subsequently attached, was erected at Corfu in 1837. This was in active working, apparently, until 1894, when the Warrant was returned. About 1840 there was also a Grand Lodge at Corfu, with Angelo Calichiopulo as Grand Master. He died November 13, 1842, after which there is no further information concerning this Grand Lodge. From 1856 to 1860 the Lodge of Integrity, No. 771, met at the Citadel, Corfu. Another English Lodge, No. 1182, Star of the East, now No. 880, was established at Zante in 1862. This Lodge is still in active working under the jurisdiction of the United Grand Lodge of England.

On the mainland there was in existence in 1866 a Provincial Grand Lodge or Directory under the Grand Orient of Italy with eight subordinate Lodges at Syra, Athens, Piræus, Chalkis, Corfu, Patras, Lamia and Argos, dating from 1860 to 1866. In 1868 these eight Lodges, with the consent of the Grand Orient of Italy, formed themselves into the independent Grand Orient of Greece. To-day that Grand Orient consists of fifty-one Lodges with approximately 6,000 members. Nineteen of the Lodges meet at Athens, five at Salonika and the remainder in various other towns. The Grand Master is Militiade Pouris. This Jurisdiction is in communion with the Grand Lodge of England and with many of the European, American and Australian Grand Lodges. In 1872 a Supreme Council, in connexion with the Ancient and Accepted Rite, was formed, of which the present Supreme Grand Commander is Anastase Stoupis. This is entirely separate and distinct from the Grand Orient, although, of course, as in England, many Freemasons are members of both bodies.

CYPRUS

The introduction of Freemasonry into Cyprus is very recent, dating only from April 7, 1888, when an application for a Charter was made to the United Grand Lodge of England for St. Paul's Lodge, No. 2277, which application was granted on August 1, of the same year, the Lodge being constituted on November 1 following, at Limassol. There were twenty-seven Founders and H. Sylvester was installed as First Master. One of the earliest initiates was Dr. John Karageorghiades, who became an ardent Masonic missionary and was the prime mover in the establishment of a second Lodge, Zeno, composed entirely of Greeks, subject to the Grand Lodge of Greece. This Lodge was established by fourteen Founders on November 15, 1893. Previously, in 1891, a Royal Arch Chapter had been formed in connexion with St. Paul's Lodge. In 1915, St. George's Lodge, No. 3135, was established at Nikosia, under the Grand Lodge of England, whilst Mark Lodges and Chapters of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, the latter under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Council for Greece, have also been founded. Efforts are now being made to establish a Lodge in Kyrenia, the only one of the six towns on the island where a Lodge is not working. Christophorus G. Toraritis is Grand Inspector-General for the Island of Cyprus under the Grand Lodge of Greece, which is in communion with the United Grand Lodge of England and other Jurisdictions.

BULGARIA

We learn through the International Bureau for Masonic Affairs, Switzerland, that a so-called Grand Lodge of Bulgaria was formed at Sofia on November 27, 1917. This seems to have been the work of a single Lodge "Zaria" at Sofia. It claims jurisdiction over all the "Lodges, hearths and brethren of the First to the Third degree" throughout the kingdom. The Lodge "Zaria" was founded by the Grand Lodge of France and its action in setting up independently was with the approval of that Grand Body and, as claimed, "in perfect agreement with the brethren, members of the Masonic hearths dispersed over the different districts of the Bulgarian fatherland." The new body is dedicated "to the glory of the Grand Architect of the Universe," and pledges itself to follow "strictly" the "fundamental principles of Universal Freemasonry." In fact, no exception can be taken to its declaration of principles. It will use "the statutes, general rules, rituals and mementos," of the Grand Lodge of France until its own can be elaborated. It appeals for general recognition.

Bulgaria in the World War so discredited all things Bulgarian and it appearing that this so-called Grand Body has been formed by a single Lodge, we do not recommend its recognition.

Political upheavals in the Kingdom made desirable the temporary suspension of Work in the Lodges. Labour was later resumed.

The Grand Lodge of Bulgaria grew out of the Lodge Zara (transl. DAWN), which was instituted in 1914, under authorisation emanating from the Grand Lodge of France. Three years later the Grand Lodge of Bulgaria was established, and is the only independent and sovereign Masonic authority in the Kingdom. It is composed of six Lodges and five Circles which latter correspond approximately to authorised Masonic Clubs. The total number of members is slightly in excess of 350.

All candidates for initiation are required to express belief in the existence of a Supreme Being designated in the Ritual as the G. A. U., in whose Name all Lodge Communications are opened and conducted. The Bible is always opened and conspicuously displayed in the Lodges, while at work; it also occupies a prominent place in Grand Lodge, and is never removed from its position in front of the dais occupied by the Grand Master.

Sofia is the seat of the Grand Lodge.

PROMINENT CHURCHMEN

MEMBERS OF THE

MASONIC FRATERNITY

PROMINENT CHURCHMEN

MEMBERS OF THE MASONIC FRATERNITY



SAMUEL SEABURY

1729-1796

*First Bishop of the Episcopal Church
in America*

THOMAS CHURCH BROWNELL

1779-1865

Bishop of Connecticut

GREGORY T. BEDELL, SR.

1793-1834

*Rector of St. Andrew's Church,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*

JAMES E. FREEMAN

1759-1835

*First Unitarian Minister of King's
Chapel, Boston*

ALEXANDER V. GRISWOLD

1766-1843

*First and only Bishop of the
Eastern Diocese*

WILLIAM H. ODENHEIMER

1817-1879

Episcopal Bishop of New Jersey

HOSEA BALLOU

1771-1852

Universalist Clergyman

THOMAS CHALMERS

1780-1847

*Celebrated Scottish Divine of
Glasgow, Scotland*

PHILANDER CHASE

1775-1852

Episcopal Bishop

EDWARD BASS

1726-1803

First Bishop of Massachusetts

LEIGHTON COLEMAN

1837-1907

Bishop of Delaware

THOMAS STARR KING

1824-1864

Unitarian Clergyman


HENRY C. POTTER

1835-1908


Episcopal Bishop




SAMUEL SEABURY




GREGORY T. BEDELL, SR.



ALEXANDER V. GRISWOLD




HOSEA BALLOU




PHILANDER CHASE



THOMAS STARR KING




THOMAS CHURCH BROWNELL



THOMAS CHALMERS



EDWARD BASS



JAMES E. FREEMAN



WILLIAM H. ODENHEIMER



LEIGHTON COLEMAN



HENRY C. POTTER