

Masonic Notes and Queries.

SO CALLED "ANCIENT LANDMARKS."

In my communication headed "Bro. Hughan's Old Charges," I hinted that Dr. Anderson first introduced "Ancient Landmarks" into the Masonic nomenclature. Since the above was mailed, I have reperused the pre-1717 MSS., and am now satisfied that my surmise was correct. I could not find the word "Landmarks" either in Halliwell, Matthew Cooke, Dowland, or any other of the early MSS. that have come under my notice; and what is more the brethren had no idea of Landmarks in olden time.

That the Operatives entertained no notion of Landmarks as far as their ritual was concerned, may be proved from the fact, that not only have they discarded "Moder Mary Bright" from the invocation, the legend of the four martyrs from their history, and substituted a new batch of legends unknown to the author of the Halliwell Poem, but they even substituted a new form of oath (Harleian MS. No. 1942). That they had no idea that Masonic laws, like those of "the Medes and Persians," were unalterable, can be equally proved from the language of the poem, thus: "They ordered their assembly to be held every year wheresoever they would, to amend the faults if anywhere found." Besides which, the constitution in Halliwell's MS. contains fifteen articles and fifteen points, while the constitution in Bro. Cooke's MS. has but nine of each, and all the subsequent constitutions differ more or less.

Supposing, now, for the sake of argument, that King Athelstan gave the Masons the first code of laws; I am, nevertheless, satisfied that all the laws in Halliwell's MS. could not have been sanctioned by Athelstan. For instance, King Athelstan was an *illegitimate*. The law in Halliwell "So that the prentes be of lawful blod," would have been a direct insult to the king's parentage, and he never would have sanctioned it.

That the Operatives changed and altered their charges and laws may be seen by comparing the 7th point in Halliwell's MS. with the 7th point in Matthew Cooke's. Thus, the former, after forbidding intercourse with the Master's wife, goes on—"Ny by thy fellows concubyne, no more than thou wouldst he dede by thyne;" while in Cooke's MS. the charges, "That he covet not the wife, nor the daughter of his master's, neither of his fellows, but if it be in marriage, nor hold concubines, for the discord that might fall amongst them." Writers who have painted "our ancient brethren" as superior in morals, will be rather shocked to learn that concubinage was common amongst them, and that the subsequent prohibition thereof, did not arise from higher motives of religion or morality, but on account of the jealousies and discord which the system engendered among the brotherhood. But I am not now treating of the morals of the Operatives, but of a superstition engrafted on modern Masonry, viz., "Landmarks," from which the the ancients were quite free.

I now come to the American *Landmark of Landmarks*, which, when abolished by the Grand Lodge of England in 1845, brought forth such a torrent of invectives from our jurisprudence landmark sticklers—I mean the law of "free born." Assuming, now, for the sake of argument, that King Athelstan gave the identical fifteen articles and fifteen points in Halliwell's MS. to the Masons in 926, and that those articles and points must for ever be regarded by Masons as equal to those recorded in Holy Writ, the question will then be, whether the compound word of "free-born" can be found in Halliwell's MS.? To this I answer in the negative. The poem merely says, "That he no bondman prentys make."

Two reasons are assigned for that law. The first reason is, because the owner of the bondman was entitled to take his bondman away wherever he found him; and he might even take him out of the lodge; and in that case the brethren might feel disposed to take sides with the unfortunate bondman, and would thus be

brought into collision with the law of the land. The second reason is based on the fable of the "Lord's children" that Euclid organized into the original fraternity. This, however, is too fanciful and frivolous to deserve notice. In Matthew Cooke's MS., written about a century after that of Halliwell, I find the phrase altered thus; "That no master, for no profit, take no apprentice for to be learned, that is born of bond blood." For which law, he gives substantially the same reasons as the Halliwell MS. To make this perfectly clear, I herewith give the whole paragraph from Matthew Cooke's MS.: "That no master, for no profit, take no apprentice, for to be learned, that is born of bond blood, for because of his lord, to whom he is bond, will take him as well he may from his heart and lead him with him out of the lodge, or out of his place that he worketh in; for his fellows per-adventure, would help him, and debate for him, and thereof manslaughter might arise—it is forbidden." Putting aside the second reason as worthless, it is evident that the *main reason* is not applicable to being born in bondage, but merely to the *condition of bondage at the period of his apprenticeship*. And as the author of Cooke's MS. furnishes no reason why he changed the phraseology, and admitting the theory of "irremovable Landmarks," he had no right to change the phrase under any circumstances. By substituting, therefore, the word "freemen" for "freeborn," the Grand Lodge of England very properly restored the legitimate Ancient Landmark, instead of removing one.

The plain matter of fact, however, is, the Operative Masons had no notion of Landmarks. This, and many other notions, have been fastened on modern Masonry by learned dreamers, who, believing in Anderson's history of Freemasonry, and being puzzled about some phrases, forms, and usages retained or introduced by Anderson into his constitution, history, or ritual, set themselves to work to solve those riddles; and imagining that the man in the moon wore a white apron and gloves on St. John's eve, the lunars were of course Masonized. This may be deemed by my reader a little too far fetched, but in reality it is not more ridiculous than many other theories. Thus, Oliver seriously assures us that "God Himself communicated the secrets of Masonry to Adam in Paradise." Such being his belief, he began to seek for the early history of Freemasonry in the land of Shinar, the Egyptian Pyramids, the Old Dispensation, the New Dispensation, and in every other kind of dispensation. Thus he and his like rambled among the Pagan mysteries, Christian mysteries, Templar mysteries, alchemists mysteries, and all other kind of imaginary mysteries; in short, they sought for information anywhere and everywhere, except in the right place. And being puzzled about the origin and reason of the law of "freeborn," instead of seeking for information in the old Masonic MSS., they rushed to Cruden's Concordance and finding there a reference to a passage, namely, "send away the bondwoman and her son," they exclaimed, "Aha! here we have it, *freeborn*, is certainly a Masonic Landmark, because *Grand Master Abraham* was commanded to send away the bondwoman" etc. With such dreamers for our guides, it is not surprising that our fraternity is placed in a ridiculous position. Instead of transmitting a true history, and a consistent system of Masonic philosophy, our historians were justly denounced by Hallam as *mendacious*. And as to our philosophy, what is it? If Masons may lay claim to the idea of Landmarks, *Universality* ought to be deemed the landmark of Landmarks! This universality is clearly defined in the earliest constitutions of modern Masonry, thus: "Masons are now *only* charged to adhere to that religion in which all men agree (leaving each brother to his own particular opinions), that is, to be good men and true, men of honour and honesty, by whatever religious persuasion they may be distinguished." But Masons now pretend to be more holy than their brethren, not because they are more honest, or more honourable, but because they are Knight Templars, and are illumined by

higher degrees, Christian degrees, and what not.*

The principle of Masonic *universality* is further enjoined, thus: "we are of all nations, tongues, kindreds, and languages." Thus teaching us to divest ourselves of the vanity and conceit of race or country. But learned English brethren now set themselves to work to prove that the Anglo-Saxon race stands in higher favour with the G.A.O.T.U. than the Celtic and other races, because, Isaiah said something, and Micah something, and these somethings and other somethings prove to their satisfaction that the Anglo-Saxons descended from the ten tribes of Israel! Now I want to know how all this is compatible with our boasted universality? What has Masonry to do with Knight Templars, or Christian degrees? Or what difference does it make to us, as Masons, whether a brother is a descendant of Shem, Ham, or Japhet; no rational man will undertake to maintain that *Celtic*, Scotch and French intellect, has not conduced its share towards the advancement of science, art, and philosophy. Why! the very origin of modern Masonry is mainly indebted to men of Celtic birth. Anderson and Dessaguliers, the authors of the earliest constitutions of the Grand Lodge of England, were both of Celtic descent. But anyhow, Masonry deals not with races or religionists, but with the characteristics of individuals. As long as a candidate believes in the universal religion—the religion in which all agree—and is a good man, and true, a man of honour and honesty, let his religion be what it may, let him be descended from any race or kindred, he is nevertheless fully entitled to receive the treatment of an equal and brother. To bolster up the superiority of certain religionists, nationalities, or races, over others, is certainly tending to sap the foundation of the whole Masonic system. Those brethren, therefore, who propagate notions tending to bring Masonry into conflict with religionists or races, are furthering *anti-Masonic* doctrines. And this brings me to another illustration of the result of those false teachings.

In my review of Bro. William Sewell Gardner's address on Henry Price, (*Freemason*, August 17th and 24th.) I proved that in 1733 Price established an illegal lodge in Boston; and that in 1752 some clandestine Masons established another lodge in Boston. Those lodges were subsequently legalized; the former by the appointment of Tomlinson by the G.M. of England in 1736, and the latter by a charter from the G.L. of Scotland in 1756. In 1784, Prince Hall, and other coloured Masons, petitioned for, and obtained from the G.L. of England a charter for the "African Lodge." No one then objected to the right of the G.L. of England to grant the said charter. The Masons of English origin had at that time taken no steps to declare themselves independent, and I have indubitable proof that the African Lodge was then repeatedly visited by white brethren. In 1792, the white Masons of English and Scotch origin united and formed the present G.L. of Massachusetts, of which no formal notice was given to the G.L. of England. After that event, the African Lodge (whose origin was certainly more legitimate than that of either of the whites) was *tabooed* by the white lords. After the death of Prince Hall, the Africans imitated the example of the Caucasians, that is, they set up a G.L. of their own. Many attempts have, however, been made by the coloured Masons to unite with the white, without avail. When the anti-slavery feeling began to gain strength in the Northern States, enquiries began to be made in some of the Grand Lodges as to the origin and legality of the Negro organizations, and committees were appointed to investigate; the result was, in one quarter, it was reported, that the Negroes did receive a charter at one time from the G.L. of England, but that the G.L. of Massachusetts afterwards cheated the Negroes out of it. Another report was circulated, that the Grand Lodge

[* We beg to differ from our worthy Brother, as we have not been able to discover any evidence of such questionable distinction on the part of Masonic Knights. —ED. F.]

of England itself cheated the Negroes out of the said charter; and since which time they worked under a copy *only* of the original, and were therefore illegal. In 1869 I published in the *American Freemason*, that I saw the African Lodge charter, and pronounced it genuine. Subsequently a Committee of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts confirmed my statement, but quibbles and dodges were used to defeat union or acknowledgment. Among the objections raised was, a doubt whether Prince Hall and his associates were legally made Masons when they received their charter. Again, it was urged what right had the Grand Lodge of England to encroach on the Massachusetts jurisdiction in 1784? The charter was, therefore, illegal, and every one made under it was clandestine. And still again, what right had the Africans to secede from the Grand Lodge of England? And still again, what right had one Lodge to form a Grand Lodge when all the jurisprudence luminaries declare, that the Ancient Landmark requires three Lodges to form a Grand Lodge? All these objections have been met one by one. The jurisprudence-mongers have been driven from all their lines of defence, so that the old arguments are no longer repeated. But now they have entrenched themselves within their last fortification—the Landmark of Landmarks, namely, “freeborn.” They claim now that their *tender conscience* alone debars them from doing justice to the coloured Masons. “What will become of Masonry,” say they, “if we suffer the Landmark of *freeborn* to be trifled with” etc.?

I therefore hope that this communication will not only serve to dispel a number of errors and superstitions that have unfortunately crept into Masonry, but that it will also tend to remove unfounded scruples from the minds of those conscientious worthies. I trust, they will be satisfied now, that a good man and true, a man of honour and honesty, whose skin is a few shades darker than their own, may be acknowledged as a brother Mason, without the least fear of violating any Landmark whatever.

Respectfully and Fraternally yours,

JACOB NORTON.

Boston, U.S. September 26th, 1872.

[We have inserted Bro. Norton's letter with pleasure, and beg to assure our American friends that as far as possible we are anxious to place the columns of the *Freemason* at their service. We publish not for England alone, but for the world, and the more cosmopolitan its articles the better.—ED. F.]

MASONRY A NEED OF MANKIND.

By WILLIAM ROUNSEVILLE.

We confidently state it as an axiom, that no great social or co-operative association was ever successful and permanent unless it was imperiously demanded by the wants and necessities of mankind, in the place where and the time when it originated. Allowing this to be true, we prove the necessity of Masonry as a social and co-operative society at once, for it has, by its success and permanence, proved its claim to that appellation.

But it may not be amiss to examine the subject more in detail. When a man is about to traverse a dangerous route which is beset by robbers and assassins, he seeks to associate with him such other persons as may have the journey to perform, and in whom he may confide, that the combined strength of all may be sufficient to meet and overcome the dangers and difficulties that may be met by the way. The circumstances demand such an association of power, and it springs into existence. The dangerous pathway becomes safe—the object of the association is gained—the necessity is supplied—the society has been successful.

In this world, men are the travellers on that dangerous route. The evils and obstacles which they encounter are the robbers and assassins by which it is beset. These are such that a single individual, unaided and alone, must succumb to their overwhelming force. Many are the places on his life journey that he cannot defend himself with his own right arm alone. He needs the assistance of others, and this he must have or miserably fail. He can no more safely travel the journey of life alone,

than the traveller over the dangerous, robber-frequented, lonely road can pass his enemies unscathed.

Mankind are selfish. Each individual cares more for himself than for his neighbour; in fact, it may be said he cares all for himself and none for his neighbour. This is emphatically the case in the earlier stages of society. It would scarcely be too strong an expression to call them all Ishmaelites, and to say of each, “his hand is against every man, and every man's hand is against him.” But even Ishmaelites may combine their strength for common safety. That very selfishness that possesses the human mind indicates the benefit of social organization, and leads to a concentration of individual power. In the light of these facts, we can realize how, in the dim ages of a remote antiquity, such an association as that now called Masonry could spring into existence. It was a union of strength, social influence, and fraternal assistance for the benefit of the members, which should, while it did no man injustice, give aid and support to all those who had given their promise to be faithful to the laws of the institution; which should enable those within its circle to avail themselves of the power and influence of all to overcome the difficulties that they might meet in their life journey; which should give to one the strength of all, and to all the influence of every individual member.

It was one of the most natural things in life that such an institution should be established, for it was a necessity to mankind. It would have been much more wonderful had not that want of man culminated in an organization to meet it. Man needed Masonry, therefore Masonry was created. It has been successful, and permanent. It has been successful, for it now prevails over every port and in every division and country of the globe. On Masonry the sun never sets. An institution established in all climes, and possessing members under all governments, could hardly be called a failure. It is permanent. History does not record when the corner-stone of the first Masonic Lodge was laid. But away back in the dim and darkening aisles of the past, history speaks of it as existing—then an ancient society, and wielding an influence that was respected by Popes and potentates.

At no time does the memory of man run to the contrary of the existence of Masonry. It is now acknowledged to be the oldest human organization on the globe. It ante-dates the Germans' reformation—the Christian religion itself—the great improvements in architecture of the middle ages—in fact, all other institutions known to man. China and Japan, Greece and Egypt, may not boast of existing institutions of as high antiquity. During all this time it has stood calm and unshaken; sometimes the pet and favourite of imperial power and religious favour, and at others the butt and target for priestly anathema and kingly edict. We may positively claim for it permanency. Thus it has the two elements which prove it to be a want—a necessity—of the human race.

There are those who are willing to admit that in past ages Masonry was a necessity, who will not concede the point that is now needed. Now we have religion of a more practical character—one that is made up to a more practical pattern than when Masonry first existed: there are other social enterprises, founded on liberal principles, that ought to supersede Masonry. So these opponents of the institution argue. But do these do away with selfishness? do they possess a superior influence to Masonry in making men virtuous and charitable? and do not these objectors know that Masonry has often wrested the sword of persecution from the red hand of professed Christianity, and saved the lives which that sword was raised to destroy? Do they not realize that Masonry has softened the asperities of religious enthusiasm, and that even Christianity owes something of a spirit of mildness and toleration which happily now prevails to the benign influence of an institution that teaches that virtue and justice are the only true criterions of merit, and that he is a brother who has charity for all mankind.

Masonry will be a need of mankind as long as selfishness prevails—as long as other instrumentalities fail to influence communities to a perfect and practical morality—as long as religionists are intolerant, society exclusive, and the poor and weak are unprotected. As it is a need of this age as well as of those which have preceded it, we have no fears of its demolition by the puny arms of superstition, fanaticism, and intolerance that are raised against it. It has met and withstood heavier shocks than these. When it is no longer needed—when its work is done—whether that period comes in ten or ten thousand years, Masonry, honoured in life and crowned with glory for its noble charities in death, will sink calmly to rest. Then, and not until then! And no effort of intolerant priest or ignorant layman will hasten the period by a single hour.—*Trowel.*

PROVINCIAL GRAND LODGE OF MARK MASTER MASONS FOR CUMBERLAND & WESTMORELAND.

Thursday, the 7th November, 1872, will be long remembered as a “Red Letter Day” in the annals of Freemasonry in the above Province, the occasion being the Inauguration of the newly formed Province of Mark Masters, and the Installation of its highly respected and popular Chief as Provincial Grand Master.

The ceremony was performed by the Right Worshipful P.G.M.M. Mason for Lancashire, Wm. Romaine Callender; assisted by the R.W.P.G.M.M. Mason for Aberdeenshire, Capt. Hunter; Very Worshipful Bro. C. F. Matier, G.J. Warden; Worshipful Bro. James Porter, G.S. Deacon; Worshipful Bro. Thomas Hargreaves, G.J. Deacon; Jno. Chadwick, Prov. G. Sec., Lancashire; W. O. Walker, P.G. Prov. M.M.O., Lancashire; Prince, P.P.G.S. Bearer; W. Roberts, P.P.G.S.O., Lancashire; T. Walker, Prov. G.D.C.; J. Whitwell, *M.P.*, D.P.G.M.M. Mason; George Galloway, Prov. G.J. Warden, Lancashire; F. W. Hayward, P.G.S. Deacon; G. G. Hayward, P.G. Purst.; T. Blacklock, P.G.S. Warden; Rev. W. Cockett; Edward Busher, P.G.S. Bearer, W.M. 60, Court S.W. 60; Pratchitt, J.W. 60; J. A. Wheatley, M.O. 60; D. Bell; J. R. Tickle, 151; Jos. Nicholson, W.M. 151; Carter; Rev. Rutherford, Chaplain, 147; G. Horder, *M.D.*; W. Henry, *M.D.*, Whitehaven; Geo. Carrick; Geo. Shannon, *M.D.*, Wigton; W. Thornton; W. B. Abrahams, T. B. Arnison, Barnes, Bewes, Fearon, etc., etc., etc.

The meeting was held under the auspices of the “Cumberland Lodge, No. 60,” Carlisle.

The Lodge was opened at high twelve, when Bros. Lord Bective, P.G. Master-elect, and Whitwell, D.P.G. Master-elect, were installed Worshipful Masters by special dispensation from the Grand Master.

Grand Lodge was opened at one o'clock by Bro. Callender as Grand Master; Capt. Hunter, Grand Senior Warden; George Galloway, Grand Junior Warden; and the rest of the offices by the Provincial Grand Lodge Officers of Lancashire.

The Right Worshipful Bro. the Earl of Bective was then announced, and having been admitted, the patent of his appointment from the Grand Master was read. He was then presented by V.W. Bros. Capt. Hunter, and C. F. Matier to the acting Grand Master, and by him installed and invested and proclaimed, with Grand Honours, Provincial Grand Master for Cumberland and Westmoreland. The Earl of Bective then appointed his officers as follows:—

John Whitwell, 60, *M.P.* D.P.G.M.M.
Edward Busher, P.G.S.B., 60 P.G.S.W.

F. W. Hayward, P.G.S.D., 60	P.J.W.
Rev. J. Simpson, 60, L.L.D.	P.G. Chap.
Rev. Wm. Cockett, 60	Asst. G.C.
Joseph Nicholson, 151	P.G. Treas.
P. de Eggesfield Collin, 151	P.G. Regis.
James Porter, G.S.D., 60	P.G. Sec.
George Carrick, 60	Assistant Sec.
Wm. Pratchitt, 60	Prov. G.M.O.
E. W. Henry, 151, M.D.	Prov. G.S.O.
Jas. A. Wheatley, 60	Prov. G.J.O.
E. H. Fairclough, 147	P.G.S. Deacon
George Shannon, 147, M.D.	P.G.J. Deacon
John R. Tickle, 151	P.G. Dir. Cers.
T. B. Arnison, 60	P.G. Asst. Cers.
John Wood, 147	P.G. I of Wks.
William Thornton, 147	P.G.S. Bearer
Edward Fearon, 151	P.G. Stnd. B.
G. P. Abrahams, 147	P.G. Organist
James Robertson, 60	P.G. Purst.
John Barnes, 60	P.G. Tyler
William Court, 60	} P.G. Stewards
Thos. McMechan, 60	
James Gardiner, 151	

The Secretary next stated that he had received letters, expressive of regret, from Bros. the Earl of Carnarvon, Prov. G.M.M.; Lord Skelmersdale, D. Prov. G.M.M. Lancashire; Banister, P.G.M.O., England, and others.

It was then proposed by Bro. Busher, S.W., and seconded by Bro. Whitwell, D.P.G.M.M., and carried by acclamation, that the heartiest thanks of this Provincial Grand Lodge be accorded to the Right W.P.G.M.M. Mason, William Romaine Callender and his Provincial Grand Officers for their presence and assistance on this occasion, and the same was ordered to be recorded on the minutes of the Provincial Grand Lodge.

The whole of the business being finished, and hearty good wishes having been given, the lodge was duly and solemnly closed according to ancient custom, at two o'clock, p.m.

The whole of the brethren then adjourned to an excellent Banquet, prepared under the auspices of Bro. F. W. Hayward, at the "Crown and Mitre" Hotel, and gave the greatest satisfaction.

The Earl of Bective, M.P., presided, and was supported right and left by Bros. Capt. Hunter, W. Romaine Callender, John Whitwell, Chadwick, etc. The Vice-chair was occupied by Bro. Busher, supported by Bros. Dr. Henry, Dr. Shannon, Dr. Horder, Porter, Galloway, etc., etc.

The usual loyal and Masonic toasts followed, and a most successful, numerous, and influential gathering was brought to a close at six o'clock p.m.

We feel convinced that under such an auspicious beginning Mark Masonry in this province will soon rank second to none.

GRAND LODGE OF CANADA.
ANCIENT FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS.

To all to whom these Presents shall come:
Greeting

WHEREAS, official information has this day been received that, at the last Annual Communication of the Grand Lodge of the State of Vermont, the following resolution was adopted, viz. :-

"Whereas, The Grand Lodge of Canada still refuses recognition of the Grand Lodge of Quebec, and is asserting jurisdiction over lodges located in the Province of Quebec; and

"Whereas, Such assertion of jurisdiction violates the well-settled principles of Masonic law, applicable to such cases; therefore,

"Resolved, That the Grand Master is hereby instructed (unless the Grand Lodge of Canada at its next session withdraws from and ceases to assert any jurisdiction over any lodge or Masons in the Province of Quebec) to issue circulars to the different Grand Lodges, as well as to the

subordinate lodges of this State, that the Grand Lodge of Vermont and its subordinates have suspended all Masonic intercourse with the Grand Lodge of Canada and Masons under its jurisdiction until the wrong is made right."

AND WHEREAS, the Grand Lodge of Canada, since its establishment in October, 1855, has claimed and exercised exclusive Masonic jurisdiction and authority over the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which claims to masonic SOVEREIGNTY have been recognized and admitted, not only by the Masons of Quebec and the Grand Lodge of VERMONT, but also by Grand Lodges in every quarter of the globe; and

WHEREAS, While we readily admit the right which our sister Grand Lodges have (in accordance with their knowledge of the facts and of Masonic law) to recognize and to establish friendly relations with any body of Masons whom they may deem worthy of that honour, WE, at the same time, most emphatically deny the right of any Grand Lodge to dictate to us as to the course we are to follow in such cases; and we therefore at once indignantly repel the attempt thus made by the Grand Lodge of Vermont to coerce this Grand Body into the recognition of a body of Masons who, without the assent of this Grand Lodge, and in contempt of all Masonic law and precedent, have thus attempted to wrest from us a portion of our lawful territory and authority. The Grand Lodge of Canada, while jealous of her own honour, and careful at all times not to encroach upon the rights or prerogatives of others, will permit no INTERFERENCE, and will submit to no DICTATION from any quarter whatever.

NOW THEREFORE, for the reasons above stated, and by virtue of the powers vested in us as Grand Master, WE do hereby order and direct that all official correspondence and communication between this Grand Lodge and the Grand Lodge of the State of Vermont shall now cease and terminate; and we do hereby charge and command all our worshipful and loving Brethren within our jurisdiction to refuse admission into our Lodges, and to hold no Masonic communication with any Mason hailing from the jurisdiction of the said Grand Lodge of Vermont. WE also further order and direct that this Edict shall remain in full force and effect until the Grand Lodge of Vermont shall rescind the unfriendly and unjustifiable resolution above recited.

Done and passed at the Office of the Grand Master, at Simcoe, this twenty-fourth day of October, A.D. 1872, A.L. 5872.

WM. M. WILSON, Grand Master.

SOUTHAMPTON.

THE NEW MAYOR.—The dignity of chief magistrate was on Saturday last, November 9th, unanimously conferred by the Town Council, upon Bro. Alderman Wm. Hickman, one of our most worthy and enterprising townsmen. Bro. Hickman was born on the 9th November, 1824, and is the second son of Mr. John Hickman, of Nottingham. He has been a resident in Southampton since 1831, and commenced his professional career in the office of the well-known solicitor of this town, Mr. Charles Davies, who was for several years a member of our Corporation. Having been admitted as an attorney in 1854, a partnership was effected with Mr. Davies, now long since dead, and for many years subsequently Bro. Hickman had the sole direction of what is well-known as one of the most distinguished legal firms. He has held many legal appointments, including that of solicitor to the Pier and Harbour Board, to which he was appointed in 1859; honorary solicitor and clerk to Bishop's Charity; honorary solicitor to the Ragged School since its formation; and has been twice under-sheriff, being appointed to that position by the late Mr. John Carter and Mr. G. S. Brinton. But though his professional engagements have been so numerous Bro. Hickman has never lost an opportunity by his presence and aid of promoting every object for the good of his fellow men. The Friendly Societies have found in him a warm and active supporter; and no movement has ever been originated

for succouring the poor in a time of prevailing distress, for carrying out objects for the general good, or for recognizing praiseworthy efforts in a right direction that Bro. Hickman has not been the first to countenance, both by generous assistance and by the wisest counsel. He has been a vice-president of the Polytechnic Institution for many years, and as to Freemasonry, the positions he has occupied shows the high estimation in which he is held by those with whom he is thus actively associated. He is Past Officer of the Grand Lodge of England and Past Senior Grand Warden of the Province of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight; Past Grand Principal of Royal Arch Masons of the same province; W. Master of the Royal Gloucester and Southampton Lodges (the latter two years successively); First Principal of the Royal Gloucester Chapter (two years following), and of the Chapters of Concord and New Forest; a member of the 30th degree of the Ancient and Accepted Rite, and the Sovereign of the "Canute" Rose Croix Chapter 18th, which was principally established by his exertions in Southampton; Commander of Knight Templars Encampment in the same town, and Master of the St. Andrew's Mark Lodge; and he has undertaken the duties of steward to the three great Masonic Charities for Girls, Boys, and the Aged and Decayed, and is himself a Life Governor of each Institution. His political opinions have always been pronounced and unmistakable; he was the agent of Mr. Moffat, one of the Liberal candidates at the last election, and has been one of the recognized leaders of the Liberal party. In that capacity he has fought many a good fight in contesting the various wards in the Liberal interest, and though for a time unsuccessful, the advancing waves of progress and enlightenment at length swept back the obstructiveness of Toryism, and he was chosen with but faint signs of opposition for the ward of St. Mary, which he continued to represent till an opportunity was afforded for bestowing upon him, in recognition of past services, the honour of the Aldermanic gown. At the last election of the School Board he was the selected champion of the Liberal Association of St. Mary, and gaining a seat in that important Board he has been a member of it ever since its formation. He was also recently unanimously elected chairman of the Hartley Council. In every public capacity his career has been marked by untiring industry, enlightened convictions, and indomitable perseverance, and we predict that under his rule our good old town will find that the character which it has achieved for public spirit and hospitality will be maintained, and that it possesses in its chief magistrate one who will preserve the dignity of the chair, and efficiently perform the high and important duties devolving on the occupant of that honourable position.

(To the Editor of the Freemason.)

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—

In your report of the Third Anniversary Banquet of the Star Lodge of Instruction (No. 1275), held on Tuesday, the 29th ult., at Bro. Hobson's, New Cross-road, Bro. R. W. Little is therein stated to have returned thanks on behalf of the Grand Officers, which, if allowed to pass unnoticed, might possibly put him in a wrong position with the Craft.

The speech made by Bro. Little was in acknowledgment of the compliment paid to him by the W.M. but disclaiming all right thereto, he being only an Officer of Grand Lodge.

While writing, allow me also to correct the figures which I am reported to have given as to the strength of the lodge, &c., instead of 600 members on the books say 300. The joining members last year were only 65 and not 200, and the average attendances 22 weekly.

The lodge has been so prosperous, that I feel we may rest perfectly satisfied with the facts as they stand.

I am, dear Sir and Brother,
Yours very fraternally,
CHAS. J. DAVIDGE.

Hon. Sec. to Star Lodge of
Instruction (No. 1275).

"ANCIENT YORK AND LONDON GRAND LODGES," BY BRO. LEON HYNEMAN.

A REVIEW BY BRO. W. J. HUGHAN, OF TRURO, CORNWALL.

We intend to write a review of Brother Hyneman's latest work in the same spirit that the author states actuated him, viz: "Plain, outspoken, and severe, which some may consider too much so; but, in our judgment, the subjects merited all and more than we have expressed. *The investigation we consider a duty,*" and although not a pleasant one, having the means at hand to answer many of Bro. Hyneman's reckless statements, we should be culpable if our respect and esteem for our brother's Masonic labours acted as a deterrent to exposing his errors; and moreover, we are persuaded that he would himself be the *last* to desire our silence, just as he will be the *first* to acknowledge the unfortunate blunders he has made in his great anxiety to uphold the pure and ancient Freemasonry which, like him, we strongly believe in, and in such alone.

We come fresh from the city wherein Freemasonry flourished during the last century, and which many in America are so proud—without the slightest reason—to be called after, namely, York. We have examined *all* the ancient records existing in the archives of the "York Lodge," (*now* the representative, it may be said, of the extinct "Grand Lodge of England,") and also those in the Grand Lodge, London, and have carefully transcribed from them everything of value to the present inquiry, and, therefore, we are in a position to speak positively on the subject, supported as we are by authentic documents, many of which are but little known, and some not at all, beyond the threshold of a few antiquaries in England.

Bro. Hyneman has written his work "in the interest of pure, legitimate Masonry, * * * not in the view of what Masonry is as expressed in these days, but *what it should be.*" We are sorry, however, to find that he considers the "popular Masonic writers of the past and present time have created, through their publications, a literature inimical to every feature and principle of legitimate Masonry, which, as historical, is mainly *mythical*; if traditional, *fabulous*; if symbolical, *sectarian*, and destructive of universal catholic Masonic principles." In some respects his sweeping censure has been merited, but surely not so of *all*, or even of the generality of our able historians.

"We are opposed," he says, "to all sectarian allusion or illustration in Masonry." So are we, excepting so far as such may truly be said to be an integral part of Freemasonry, and so we have been led to believe are many in Europe and America, whose sympathies are for *actual* Freemasonry. Bro. Hyneman states his "review does not take in the union of the two bodies of Masons, but reaches to the time when it was above being consummated." It is also "confined chiefly to Anderson's two Books of Constitutions and Preston's Illustrations." So much by the way of preface. We are glad to confirm the careful and exact quotations made by Bro. Hyneman, and can assure our readers the little book is worth more than its trifling cost, did it contain nothing else but these valuable extracts from works which few possess, excepting the author aforesaid, and others like ourselves, who are Masonic students. Now, then, to our task.

We cannot too strongly express our regret to find Bro. Hyneman, at the outset, stating so unequivocally "We affirm that Anderson is not to be credited. The Books of Constitutions were written purposely to deceive, to mislead, and misrepresent facts as they existed; and if his reports of Grand Lodge proceedings are true copies of Grand Lodge records, then the records were corrupted with the design to mislead the reader." (!!) The Rev. Dr. Anderson, (perhaps we had better omit the "Rev.," as

some have such strange antipathy to so honourable a title,) in his history of the Grand Lodge of England, (and also the Rev. Dr. Entick, and others who followed him,) mainly copied from the records of the Grand Lodge of England, which were written by the Grand Secretaries, *and duly confirmed by the members* as faithful narratives of the proceedings. Unless, indeed, we except the traditional histories prior to the last century, which usually were free renderings of the ancient MSS. that we have just published in our "Old Charges of British Freemasons," and which, in some instances, Dr. Anderson unwisely, we think, altered.

This being the case, we feel compelled to object most strongly to Bro. Hyneman's assertions, especially when his *ipse dixit* is, in the language of the *Keystone*, "strongly tinted with acerbity and personal rancour." We honour the author for his "bold advocacy of pure and unadulterated Freemasonry," and we gladly admit that he has done a good work for the Craft in publishing so many excellent and accurate reprints of our old and scarce Masonic volumes, which otherwise would have been but little known by thousands of our institution, who now read and study them with profit; but we must enter our protest against such wholesale denunciations and exposures of men who acted according to their knowledge, and did their best generally for the welfare of the society. We do not look upon Anderson's Constitutions "as of *divine* authority," and we make bold to say that, beyond the fancies so prolific in Brother Hyneman's brain, no one else ever has, or ever heard of anyone so doing; but we do say, that these Constitutions are our guides, if we wish to understand the past history of the Craft, and if not *all* that we wish, they are, at all events, most useful as illustrative of the proceedings of the early members of the first Grand Lodge in the world. "The 1717 movement was not a *revival*, as Anderson has it—*revolution* is the proper term." Suppose we grant the point, and call the doings of 1716-7 revolutionary, what then? We have still the ancient MSS. to light us in our explorations, and many pre-1717 records of Lodges are also in existence. In many respects the transactions of the second decade of the last century were masonically, *intensely*, and *expressly*, revolutionary; and *advisedly* so, for, without many radical alterations, there would have been no Freemasonry of to-day.

There *never* was a Grand Lodge prior to 1716-7, and neither the York Grand Lodge, nor any other Grand Lodge, has "a record prior to 1717," although Bro. Hyneman says otherwise. *We challenge the production of any Lodge minute or record of any kind whatsoever, of a trustworthy character, which mentions the institution of a Grand Lodge antecedent to 1716-7.* Records of individual Lodges exist before then, but not of *Grand Lodges*. This should be always remembered in this inquiry. Bro. Hyneman proceeds to explain the motives which actuated Dr. Anderson and others in organizing the New Grand Lodge of 1717. These we will next notice. He states that prior to 1717 the "Craft in the south of England still held their relation to the York Grand Lodge;" that there were "Lodges in London and other parts of the south of England which did not join the revolutionists, but retained their connection with the Grand Lodge at York, and that ambitious Masons in London, effected "a long pre-entertained purpose" in thus organizing the Grand Lodge of 1717. "Hence the ignoring the existence of the York Grand Lodge, and their silence in regard to everything concerning the revolutionary movement." These assertions are *wholly untrue*, and opposed to every scrap of information preserved in this country, and especially antagonistic to *all the documents still in existence at York*. In the *first place*, there never was a Grand Lodge until 1716-7, so the Craft in the south of England could not be related to a Grand Lodge at York prior to 1717, for the "Grand Lodge of *all England*" held at York was not in existence until a few years later than that period, and never before. For information on this point,

we beg to refer our readers to our "Masonic Sketches and Reprints," published by the "Masonic Publishing Company," 626 Broadway, New York; also "History of Freemasonry at York," "Masonic Annual," M. C. Peck and Son, Hull, Yorkshire, wherein we have given quotations from the records of this Grand Lodge, and proved the early origin of a *Lodge in York*, and the modern character, so to speak, of the Grand Lodge. In proof also of our position, we may refer Brother Hyneman and others to the Master of York Lodge No 236, or to Bro. William Cowling, Past Master and Treasurer, who will be happy to confirm my extracts, as they were made in the presence of the latter accomplished Mason. Bros. the Rev. A. F. A. Woodford, *M.A.*, Past Grand Chaplain of England, (Swillington near Leeds,) and J. G. Findel, of Leipsic, have also made similar copies of these documents. The Grand Lodge of *all England*, held at York, never granted a warrant to any Lodge in London or the south of England until A.D. 1779, when the Lodge of Antiquity, in consequence of a dispute with the Grand Lodge of England, (styled by some the "Moderns,") left its first love and came under the York branch, as a "*Grand Lodge South of the River Trent*." It had, however, but a short history, authorized at least but two Lodges to work in London, and in the next decade of that century again joined its mother Grand Lodge. Soon after its secession there were thus *four* Grand Lodges at work in England, viz.: (a) the Grand Lodge of England, ("Moderns," so-called;) (b) Grand Lodge of *all England*, (York;) (c) the Grand Lodge of England according to the old Constitutions, (styled the "Ancients," and erroneously the York Masons, but they never had any connection with the Grand Lodge at York;) and (d) the Grand Lodge South of the Trent, (Lodge of Antiquity.)

We challenge Bro. Hyneman to produce one single document even in support of his affirmation of any long pre-arranged plan of reviving or revolutionizing Freemasonry A.D. 1717. It was the work mostly of Dr. Dessaguliers and Dr. Anderson, initiated early in the last century, and certainly nothing has yet been submitted at all indicative of any long pre-arranged plan of action by Masons to form the Grand Lodge of England. That being so, we are at a loss to know what justification there is for Bro. Hyneman's statement. Our brother does not like the allusion to the "old Lodge at York city" by Dr. Anderson; but, in all probability, that was all Bro. Anderson knew of it at the time. *It was but an old Lodge* until the 27th December, 1725, when Bro. Charles Bathurst was chosen Grand Master. The year 1725 to York was what the year 1717 was to London. Before these years neither had Grand Masters nor Grand Lodges, and York followed London some eight years after the former's revival or revolution, (*whatever term is preferred.*)

Before A.D. 1725, at York, the presiding officer was called President,* and the next in office Deputy President, and until August 10, 1725, the offices of *Master* and *Wardens* never once occur, so that it was but an old Lodge in York city for some time after the institution of the first Grand Lodge in London, A.D. 1716-7.

Bro. Hyneman remarks that the Masons at York considered as *foreign to Masonic propriety* "the use of printer's ink for the purpose of bringing the Fraternity prominently before the public." Whatever they may have *considered*, we know that, in the second year of their existence as a Grand Lodge, a speech by the Junior Warden *was printed*, viz., December 27, 1726, and that it went through several editions.

We are told that there is a "meanness in the intended inferences to be drawn in Anderson's Constitutions discreditable to the Masonic institution, and disreputable to the author and all who sanctioned the publication," (page 24.)

*So that all the brethren styled Grand Masters at York, prior to 1725, were simply described in the records as *Presidents*.

(To be Continued.)