

THE CLIMATE OF EUROPEAN FREEMASONRY 1750-1810

BY BROS. PAUL TUNBRIDGE and C. N. BATHAM*

ALTHOUGH the latter half of the 18th century has been dealt with by numerous Masonic historians, a mass of detail and perhaps irrelevant matter obscures the overall picture of the effect of Freemasonry on the intellectual and social developments in Europe during this period.

It has been seen that the Craft extended its influence throughout the Continent so that in the early decades of the 18th century there were lodges in Hamburg, Paris, The Hague, Geneva and other European cities. It would be impossible in a paper of this size to review in detail all the incidents which brought Freemasonry to that stage of development which it had reached in Europe by the middle of the 18th century. But to form an appreciation of the course of events over the period covered by this review it is necessary to consider, albeit somewhat briefly, the situation in each of the countries in question.

In France the Craft had flourished until by 1742 in Paris alone there were twenty-two lodges, while for the rest of the country there were no fewer than two-hundred.¹ Although the Bull of Excommunication against the Craft had been canonically promulgated on 4th May, 1738 it received such slight attention by those for whom it was intended that it was claimed at the death of Clement XII that it had lapsed.² The Pope's influence at this time should not be overestimated. The French Ambassador to the Holy See from 1731 to 1741 was informed by the French Government that although Clement XII had great qualities he unfortunately "gives way too easily to advice from minor figures who . . . involve him through hasty and ill-considered steps, in considerable embarrassment".³ In fact, it is the opinion of Bro. Mellor that Freemasonry was not persecuted in France in the eighteenth century, thanks entirely to the Bull of Clement XII and its dire penalties for Freemasons.⁴ Despite this, however, the Bishop of Marseilles in 1742 warned his parishioners against remaining or becoming members of the movement.⁵ Three years later the police of Paris renewed the prohibition of assemblies of Masons in inns and hosteleries against payment of a fine of 3,000 francs.⁶ These measures had little if any effect upon the Craft despite efforts by the police to enforce their enactments.⁷

In Germany the course of events had been similar to that in France and on 24th June, 1737, all the members of a lodge meeting at Mannheim were imprisoned under an order prohibiting such assemblies.⁸ Since the consecration of the first German lodge in Hamburg in 1733, and the initiation of the Prince Royal (later King of Prussia), in 1738, the Craft had emerged from the period of repression it had suffered at the hands of his father, Frederick I of Prussia. The older lodges such as those in Hamburg, Brunswick, Berlin and Frankfurt, created as a result of British influence and working British rituals were, as in France, wholly ignored by the mother Grand Lodge of England.⁹

The rituals and instructions were transmitted solely by word of mouth and as a result underwent considerable modifications. Customs were adapted to local conditions and gradually

* At Bro. Tunbridge's invitation, Bro. Batham has contributed the notes on Russia and Poland, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Spain and Portugal, Gibraltar, Minorca and Malta, and Belgium, in addition to his comments on the Paper generally.

¹ Thory, *Acta Latomorum*, Paris, 1815, vol. I, p. 50.

² Alec Mellor, *Our Separated Brethren the Freemasons*, London, 1964, p. 165.

³ *ibid.*, p. 152.

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 181.

⁵ Thory, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 50.

⁶ *ibid.*, pp. 55, 56.

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 57.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 35.

⁹ Henri Boos, *Manuel de la F. M.*, Aarau, 1894, pp. 166/7.

the English influence was to be superseded by that of the French for whose culture the Germans had considerable respect. The French language had become a necessity for those who wished to play a role in the society of that time and it became a duty to undertake travel in France.¹

Frederick William II, as Master in the Chair, had initiated both his brothers in 1740 and several other distinguished noblemen.² Even with such royal encouragement, in Vienna three years later, thirty Freemasons were imprisoned for several months for meeting in defiance of government decrees.³ In 1760, not 1755 as stated by Thory,⁴ a French Lodge was founded in Berlin as an offspring of the famous *Three Globes Lodge*. In the following year, it obtained a new warrant making it an independent Lodge and in 1764, it obtained a Scots patent to enable it to work other than the Craft degrees. On 27th July, 1765, H.R.H. Edward Augustus, brother of George III, was initiated in this Lodge, after which it took the name of *Royale-York de l'Amitié*.

In Holland although nothing had been found to the detriment of the Craft, it had become necessary to legislate against the movement. Despite such measures the distinguished citizens, members of a lodge meeting in Amsterdam in 1737, had been arrested and were brought before the magistrates. They there defended the order with such moderation and ability that the oppressive legislation was rescinded and in addition the Craft was accorded the protection of the court.⁵

Three years later, Freemason members of the Roman Catholic Church in Holland encountered difficulties from the Clergy who wished to exclude them from Mass. The offending priests were forbidden by the government to question their church members attending confession regarding Freemasonry and other such subjects which were not related to religion.⁶

Until 1756 the lodges in Holland had existed as independent units holding their warrants from France, England, or Germany, but on 27th December of that year a Grand Lodge was formed presided over by Baron Van Aerssen Beijeren, the first national Grand Master.⁷

In Switzerland, following the prohibitions against meetings of Freemasons in Geneva⁸ (1738), and in Berne⁹ (1743), development had been rapid. In Geneva alone, by 1744, there were six Lodges.¹⁰ As in other countries, the effect of the prohibition was to render the proceedings, now held in secret, more attractive and, as a result, by 1745 a further four lodges had begun working in Geneva.¹¹ Although according to Henri Boos, all the lodges in the Canton of Berne were officially closed until 1764, there is no doubt that they continued to hold their meetings. The Freemasons of Berne had published in Frankfurt and Leipzig in 1746 a justification of the Craft having as title *Le Franc-Maçon dans la République ou Réflexions apolo-giques sur les persécutions de F.M. par un membre de l'Ordre*.¹² In Geneva, however, new lodges were formed and these remained attached, although perhaps nominally, to England until the constitution of the Grand Lodge of Geneva in 1769. By 1774 there were 18 lodges in Geneva, which for a population of some 30,000 persons, was an unusually large number in comparison with today, when with ten times the population there are only eight lodges.¹³

PROVINCIAL GRAND MASTER FOR FOREIGN LODGES (1768-1779)

The divisions in English Freemasonry, accentuated by the growth of the "Antients" in the second half of the 18th century led to a weakening of the prestige of the premier Grand Lodge in the eyes of the Continental lodges. With two English Grand Lodges, both commanding a considerable following of distinguished members, it is no small wonder that the European lodges would have experienced embarrassment, if nothing more, at the state of open conflict between their English brethren, whose members were not even on visiting terms with each other. By about 1770, a custom seems to have grown up in "Antients" lodges (particularly abroad) of

¹ Booz, op. cit., p. 167.

² Thory, op. cit., p. 46.

³ *ibid.*, p. 53 (*Der Signastern*, etc., p. 75, cited by Thory).

⁴ Thory op. cit., pp. 65, 66.

⁵ *ibid.*, pp. 54, 55 (Laurie, *The History of Freemasonry*, 1804, p. 120, cited by Thory).

⁶ Thory, op. cit., pp. 54, 55.

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 46.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 39 (*Acta Hist. eccl.* 2 App., p. 105, cited by Thory).

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 54.

¹⁰ Fontaine-Borgel, *Relation historique sur l'établissement des premières loges maçonniques à Genève et leur dissolution* (1736-1796), Geneva, 1874, p. 17.

¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 17.

¹² *A.Q.C.*, vol. 81, p. 109.

¹³ François Ruchon, *Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie à Genève*, Geneva, 1935, p. 30.

holding a second Warrant from the "Moderns" Grand Lodge, perhaps as a guarantee of their respectability, especially for visiting Brethren.¹

This gradual decline in prestige and authority of the premier Grand Lodge was probably hastened by the appointment in 1768² of Jean de Vignoles as "Provincial Grand Master for the Foreign Lodges" who became responsible for all correspondence with foreign Masonic bodies. The unsavoury career of De Vignoles has been dealt with at some length by Bro. Wonnacott³ and Bro. Count Goblet d'Alviella⁴ who leave us in no doubt as to the harmful influence exerted by this disreputable character in the conduct of Grand Lodge relations with other Grand Lodges abroad. As an agent in the secret service of the Austrian Netherlands from 1766 until his dismissal from that service in 1769, and in his mismanagement of sums contributed by Belgium Lodges towards the Hall Fund in London which failed to reach their destination, De Vignoles undoubtedly did harm to the good name of English Freemasonry.

His reputation was equally suspect in England where as a founder-member of a French speaking Lodge *L'Immortalité de l'Ordre* his dishonest activities led to his displacement as Master and subsequently his resignation. This Lodge, more usually known as the *Lodge of Immortality*, was warranted on 16th June, 1766 by Lord Blayney, Grand Master. It met at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand⁵ where the Grand Lodge of the "Moderns" held its Quarterly Communications over a number of years prior to the completion of Freemasons' Hall (referred to above). There were ten members of this Lodge whose main object was to provide a meeting place for foreign Masons in London. The working language of the Lodge was French. The first Master in the Chair was De Vignoles who held this office until June, 1769 when he was finally displaced. During his three years of Mastership, no accounts were presented to the Lodge, which had in fact run into debt and at a later date he was virtually charged with misappropriation of Lodge funds. Supported by several of his cronies, he presented a Petition to the Grand Master in 1771 bringing various charges against his Lodge. The Petition was dismissed, but in spite of the now obvious shortcomings of the Provincial Grand Master of Foreign Lodges no action was taken to relieve him of this important office. Even as late as 26th September, 1774 the Deputy Grand Master, Rowland Holt, was writing to enquire "what has been done with de Vignoles? it is high time that was finished . . .". One month later he referred to the scandalous manner in which de Vignoles had behaved and that he intended to report to the Grand Master:—

" . . . to declare the culprit no longer a Provincial, of which I shall order you to give notice to all the foreign Lodges, that he may no longer impose upon them by false pretensions, whether he chuses to resign his Patent or not . . ."

According to Bro. Wonnacott, it would appear that De Vignoles was deliberately causing trouble on the Continent by distorting the official communications which passed through his hands and even spreading untruths to suit his own ends. In his recent paper, *The Relations between Dutch and English Freemasonry*, Bro. Dr. Bocrenbeker has given an interesting account of the activities of De Vignoles in Holland. In Rotterdam at least the "brethren placed no great trust in De Vignoles . . . to whom they ascribed a great predilection for introducing innovations".⁶

The Grand Lodge proceedings show that De Vignoles was present in his capacity as Provincial Grand Master for Foreign Lodges on the following occasions:—

27th October, 1769
7th February, 1770
25th April, 1770
6th February, 1771
26th November, 1771.

Even as late as 1776 he continued to act in this exalted capacity for in a letter to Bro. de Lalande (who was in 1766 the first Master of the famous French Lodge *Les Neuf Soeurs*) Bro. Heseltine, the Grand Secretary, wrote:—

¹ Gilbert W. Daynes, *Birth and Growth of the Grand Lodge of England*, p. 59.

² W. Wonnacott, *A.Q.C.* XXXIV, p. 133 states, without quoting any authority, "At the time the Lodge of Immortality was founded (i.e. in 1766) John de Vignoles held the appointment of and signed himself as "Provincial Grand Master for Foreign Lodges". But see comment by R.W. Bro. J. W. Stubbs, below.

³ *ibid.*, pp. 132-169.

⁴ *A.Q.C.* XXV, pp. 39-68.

⁵ It was constituted there on 8th September, 1766.

⁶ Vaillant, *A.Q.C.* II, p. 100.

"M. de Vignoles has still the regulation of our correspondence with the Foreign Lodges and his letter to the Lodge of Lyons contains the true sentiments of our Grand Lodge with respect to the reformed Lodges of Germany".

Bro. Heseltine added, however, that every letter drafted by De Vignoles was inspected by him before it was dispatched! It was only in 1779 that Bro. Heseltine wrote to the Marquis de Gages informing him that De Vignoles was no longer Provincial Grand Master of Foreign Lodges and no longer resided in London!¹ It is somewhat surprising that Bro. Heseltine who had held office as Grand Secretary since 1769, and who was to be Grand Treasurer from 1785 to 1804, was apparently blind to the shortcomings of De Vignoles.

It is now necessary to examine the further development of the Craft on the Continent in greater detail.

FRANCE

In France, Louis de Bourbon Condé, Count de Clermont, was elected Grand Master in 1743, but unfortunately he did not take his duties seriously. In the same year the Grand Lodge took the title of *Grande Loge Anglaise de France*, which it retained until 1756 when it declared its independence from England and took the name *Grande Loge de France*.²

Two years previously the so-called *Chapitre de Clermont* had been established, a system which originally consisted of three degrees: *Chevalier de'Aigle* (or *Maitre Elu*); *Chevalier illustre* (or *Templier*); *Sublime Chevalier illustre*.³ This new system, which practised only the higher grades, and had been set up in opposition to the Grand Lodge was only short lived. According to Fessler (*Versuch einer Kritischen Geschichte der Fm.* — cited by Thory; p. 300), these grades were devised by the Jesuits. At about the same date, the rite of *élus Coëns* was introduced by Martinez de Pasqually in the South of France. This rite was based on so-called magical operations which ranged from "straightforward" ritual workings against demons to those for the calling forth of the Holy Spirit!⁴

Thory lists some *hundreds* of rites, secret societies and quasi-masonic bodies which came into being during the latter half of the 18th century. Many of the Masters of the French lodges considered themselves as quite independent of any Grand Lodges, and delivered by their own authority the necessary Warrants to other Masters of lodges in Paris and in the Provinces which, in opposition to the Grande Loge de France, grouped themselves into *Chapitres*, *Collèges*, *Conseils* and *Tribunaux*. These self-governing irregular bodies in turn permitted further lodges to be formed which gave rise to considerable confusion regarding the true governing body in France.⁵

Under the inefficient leadership of the Count de Clermont, who was little more than a figurehead, the number of degrees increased and those having least claim to them became the recipients of Masonic honours. A certain Monsieur Lacorne, a dancing teacher by profession, was appointed by the Count de Clermont to act as his representative. Thory is particularly severe on Lacorne,⁶ but his charges have never been substantiated. There were certainly two factions in the Grand Lodge, but no evidence that Lacorne was behind either of them. Their quarrels culminated in a riotous meeting on 4th February, 1767, when certain excluded brethren tried to enter by force. As a result, a Decree of State was enacted, forbidding the Grand Lodge to meet and it remained closed for four years.

Thory is wrong when he says that the two letters addressed to the Grand Lodge of England in 1768, and referred to by Preston in his *Illustrations of Masonry*, did not originate from the Grande Loge de France but from Lacorne's supporters who had written in the name of the Grande Loge de France which body they claimed to represent.⁷

In 1771 the Duke de Chartres — the future Philippe Egalité, Duc d'Orleans, cousin of the King — was elected Grand Master. In the circular to French lodges announcing the installation of the Duke as Grand Master, reference was made to a project for compiling a general history of Freemasonry in France, unfortunately this task was never undertaken.⁸

¹ Comment by Bro. Count Goblet d'Alviella on Bro. Wonnacott's paper, *A.Q.C.* vol. 34, p. 168.

² Thory, op. cit., pp. 53, 70.

³ *ibid.*, p. 300.

⁴ Paul Naudon, *La Franc-Maçonnerie*, Paris, 1967, p. 109.

⁵ Thory, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 70, 71.

⁶ Thory, op. cit., p. 90 (Lacorne's supporters were the authors and distributors of libellous matter directed against the Grande Loge as a result of which they were excluded by Grande Loge from any of its masonic associations).

⁷ Thory, op. cit., pp. 91, 92.

⁸ *ibid.*, pp. 98, 99.

The Grande Loge de France had been accused by the irregular brethren referred to above (and who had been excluded from the Grande Loge by the Count de Clermont) of abuse of their powers, and even misappropriation of funds. Eight members of a commission set up by the Grande Loge were called upon to investigate and report upon these charges. These members were however brought under the influence of the excluded brethren and a plan was conceived to overthrow the Grande Loge de France.¹ On 24th December, 1771, the Grande Loge was formally dissolved to be replaced by the *Grand Orient de France* which was formed on 22nd October, 1772. The Duc de Chartres was installed as its Grand Master on 28th October, 1773.²

On 17th June, 1773, the Grande Loge de France met and declared the new Masonic body set up the previous year as irregular. The eight members of the commission that had been called upon to draft a report to the Grande Loge were deprived of all Masonic privileges as having betrayed the interests of the Grande Loge de France. The latter Grand Lodge refused to consider itself as dissolved and for twenty years, until after the Revolution, there was a rivalry between the Grand Orient and the Grande Loge de France which can only be likened to that existing in England between the "Antients" and "Moderns".

For the first time since his installation, the Duc de Chartres presided over the Grand Orient de France on 3rd July, 1777. The Grand Orient now included about 300 lodges. On the same day it was decided that the minimum ages for the three degrees should be: Apprentice — 21 years; Fellowcraft — 23 years; Master — 25 years. It was decided on 21st November by the Grand Orient that henceforth no meetings were to be held on the premises of inns or taverns.³

A sketch of Freemasonry in France, however short, would not be complete without a mention of the initiation of Voltaire who at the age of eighty-eight was received in the Lodge *Les Neuf Soeurs* which barely two years before had been formed by eminent men of letters in Paris. This Lodge numbered among its members such distinguished persons as Franklin,⁴ Court de Gebelin, La Dixmerie, De Lalande, and Abbé Cordier. On 7th April, 1778, Voltaire presented by the Abbé Cordier de Saint-Firmin, was conducted into the Temple. Assisted by Franklin and Court de Gebelin, Voltaire was admitted to the accompaniment of orchestral music. After receiving the signs, words and grips, Voltaire was duly placed in the East at the side of the Master De Lalande, the famous Astronomer, who presented him with the apron and jewels of Bro. Helvétius. In the course of his address, De Lalande reminded those present that Voltaire had raised a temple to the Eternal and that he had been a Freemason before he had been accorded that title and had discharged the duties even before he had taken the obligation at their hands. De Lalande referred to the square as the symbol of rectitude of their actions, their white gloves representing innocence and purity, and the trowel as serving to hide the defects of the brethren.

Following this ceremony, Court de Gebelin handed over to the lodge his newly published work *le Monde primitif* from which he selected a passage dealing with the ancient Eleusinian mysteries to read aloud to the members. In the course of the proceedings Bro. Monet, painter to the King, drew the portrait of Voltaire. When the various speeches had been completed the members withdrew to the banqueting hall and the first toasts were offered, but at this stage their distinguished visitor asked to be excused and withdrew from the lodge.

Before the close of the year the Lodge again met but this time to mark the passing of Voltaire. The work had begun in the morning with the affiliation of several distinguished Masons including Prince Emanuel de Salm Salm, and comte de Milly of the Académie des Sciences. After the initiation of M. Greuze, painter to the King, the Lodge mourned the loss of their most distinguished member. Wreaths were laid at the foot of Voltaire's picture by De Lalande, Greuze and Franklin. At the banquet which followed there were 200 Masons present who drank to the thirteen United States represented at the festive board by Bro. Franklin.⁵

During the years immediately preceding the Revolution, the power and influence of the Grand Orient steadily increased while that of the Grande Loge de France continued to lose

¹ Thory, op. cit., p. 102.

² *ibid.*, p. 107.

³ Thory, op. cit., p. 127. This prohibition had of course been decreed by the police of Paris as far back as 1737.

⁴ Benjamin Franklin was a visitor, but later became a Joining Member, and was Master from 1779 to 1781.

⁵ Baron de Grimm, *Correspondance Littéraire*, Vol. 4, pp. 323-354.

ground. The Terror was to bring Freemasonry, like so many other useful institutions, to the verge of annihilation. In 1791 the Grand Lodge ceased working but the Grand Orient maintained a nominal existence until August, 1793 when its last circular was issued. The Grand Orient resumed its labours in 1795, followed one year later by the Grande Loge de France. Three years later their formal union was to be declared.¹

By 1790 the Craft in France was in decline due to the fact that the Brethren were prevented by "official business" from attending the meetings.² In 1792 the administration and work of the Grand Orient had been interrupted by "civil strife".³ Despite the closing of French lodges, several officers of the Grand Orient carried on their work as far as circumstances would allow this. Thory cites Monsieur Dubin de Saint-Léonard as one of these stalwarts who kept the flag flying during the difficult years 1793 and 1794.⁴ On 22nd February, 1793 the Duke of Orleans, Grand Master in France had inserted in the *Journal de Paris* (No. 55, supplement) a letter in which he stated that as he was not aware of how the Grand Orient was composed, and as moreover he did not consider that there should be any mystery or secret meeting in a republic, particularly at the beginning of such an era, he no longer wished to associate himself with the Grand Orient or with meetings of Freemasons.⁵ These unmasonic sentiments, however, did not save him from being guillotined on 6th November, 1793. The Grand Orient did not begin real work until 17th June, 1796 when it constituted a Lodge *Des Amis Sincères* at Geneva. At this juncture, according to Thory, there were only eighteen lodges operative in the whole of France. These were situated as follows: three in Paris; two in Perpignan; seven in Rouen; four at Le Havre; one at Melun and one at La Rochelle.⁶ During the same year, a Committee was entrusted with making the necessary arrangements for commemorating the memory of those Brethren who had perished during the revolutionary fury.⁷

Towards the end of the year the small number of members of the Grande Loge de France, which was still in existence, recommenced their work which had been suspended since 1792. On 27th December, Grand Officers were appointed and administrative work was resumed. On 28th September, 1798 the Minister of Police, in response to a question submitted to him concerning the legality of meetings held by Freemasons in Lille, gave as the official ruling that since such meetings were not prohibited by any law he authorized their continuance.⁸

During the same year, the first steps were taken to bring about a reconciliation between the Grande Loge de France and the Grand Orient and to seal the differences that had existed between these two Grand Lodges for nearly thirty years.⁹ The apparently impossible was achieved on 22nd June, 1799 when the formal union of the *Grande Loge de France* and the *Grand Orient* took place in the presence of some 300 masons and the title *Grand Orient de France* was adopted for the united body.¹⁰

On 12th November, 1802, an order was circulated declaring as irregular the lodges that were in association with those practising Rites that were not officially recognized by the *Grand Orient*.¹¹ On 1st August, 1804, a circular issued by the *Grand Orient* drew attention to the existence of certain Masons who printed and sold Masonic degree certificates publicly. On 19th December the Grand Orient declared that henceforth it would recognize all Rites provided that their principles were in harmony with the general system of the order.¹²

Towards the end of 1804 the *Suprême Conseil du Rite Ecossais de France* concluded with the irregular Grand Orient (according to its Grand Master Richard Dupuy in a speech of 6th November, 1804, the only "symbolic power in France at this juncture") an agreement, known as the "Concordat of 1804", by which the *Suprême Conseil* undertook to refrain from exercising authority over the three Craft Degrees, and to delegate to the Grand Orient the right to confer up to the 18th Degree in the Rite Ecossais.¹³

This separation of powers which left the *Supreme Council* to direct the working of the 19th to 33rd Degrees, seemed quite straightforward and had been approved by Napoleon himself.

¹ Paul Naudon, *La Franc-Maçonnerie*, Paris, 1963, p. 192.

² Thory, op. cit., vol. 1 p. 184.

³ *ibid.*, p. 190.

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 192.

⁵ *Histoire de la Fondation du G. O. de France*, p. 76, note, cited by Thory, p. 192.

⁶ *Etat du Grand Orient*, Reprise, p. 151, (cited by Thory).

⁷ Thory, op. cit., p. 197.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 200.

⁹ Thory op. cit., pp. 200, 201.

¹⁰ *idem*, p. 204.

¹¹ *idem*, p. 211.

¹² *idem*, p. 220.

¹³ J. A. Faucher, A. Ricker, *Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie en France*, Paris, 1967, p. 234.

According to the authors of a recent history of French Freemasonry¹ there is no doubt that de Grasse-Tilly and his friends continued to act outside the authority of the Grand Orient. Bro. de Grasse-Tilly who had been held prisoner by the English in Jamaica had recently been liberated and he had returned to France claiming title to four documents:—

- a copy of the warrant delivered to Stephen Morin in 1761;
- a Constitution drawn up in Bordeaux in 1762;
- a Constitution attributed to Frederick II and dated 1786;
- a patent delivered in 1802 to Bro. de Grasse-Tilly by the Supreme Council of Charleston.

There is some doubt regarding the authenticity of these documents and according to Bro. Corneloup,² it is clear that de Grasse-Tilly had no authority for constituting any Lodge whatsoever in France. It was he, however, who on 27th August, 1804 had founded the Grande Loge Ecossaise de France, and within the framework of this Grand Lodge had been created the Supreme Council for administering the Additional Rites and Degrees.

The decision taken by the Grand Orient to constitute a Directoire des Rites was considered by de Grasse Tilly and his friends as a breach of the *Concordat* and on 6th September, 1805 the ruling officers of the Rite Ecossais issued the following declaration:—

Article I: The Ancien Rite Ecossais is no longer united with the Grand Orient and the *Concordat* of 3rd October, 1804 is regarded as null and void;

Article II: The Grande Loge Ecossaise is re-established.³

It is here that we must discontinue the history of Freemasonry in France which becomes even more tangled upon the downfall of Napoleon and the Restoration; those details must be considered elsewhere.

NAPOLÉON BONAPARTE AND FREEMASONRY

It cannot be said with certainty that Napoleon was a Freemason. The subject has been examined by a number of authors who have put forward seemingly convincing theories but from the Craft point of view the only thing that really matters is that he "favoured" Freemasonry. Napoleon would say that he sometimes believed in God:—

"The greatest minds have believed, not merely Bossuet, whose business it was, but Newton and Leibnitz, who had no interest involved".

He was tolerant of all religions, Man had no need of the supernatural, he said — "better find it in religion than go looking for it in a Cagliostro".⁴

Boos in his *Manuel de la Franc-Maçonnerie* (Aarau, 1894, p. 383), had no doubt that Napoleon was a Mason, but that he exploited Masonry to suit his own political ends. He was supposed to have laughed heartily when told that Cambacérès conducted his Masonic meetings with as much dignity and solemnity as though he presided over the Council of State. It is clear, however, that Napoleon was fully acquainted with the nature, aims and organization of the Craft in France and Europe. His aversion to secret societies was, according to Thory, well known to everyone. In his letter of 16th March, 1818,⁵ Thory recounts how Napoleon had called for a report on the objects and principles of the Craft prior to his nomination of his brother Joseph as Grand Master of the Grand Orient of France in 1804. Napoleon apparently directed his generals, members of his court and all public officers to join Lodges. Thory concludes his letter by explaining that he had not revealed the reasons that had led Napoleon to favouring the Craft as he felt that they should not be made public in the Lodges. For this reason he had not referred to them in his book *Acta Latomorum* published in Paris in 1815.

"Everyone who wished to please the Emperor," writes Gould, "became a Freemason and the highest officials were soon made members and officers of the Grand Orient".⁶

In 1805 the Empress Josephine, who belonged to a *Lodge of Adoption* in Paris, presided over the *Francs Chevaliers* whose "Grand Mistress" was the wife of the Mayor of the town. The majority of Napoleon's Marshals and Generals were Freemasons and Marshal Ney, the future

¹ *ibid.*, p. 236.

² *Bulletin de Documentation du Grand Orient de France*, 1957.

³ Faucher, *op. cit.*, pp. 239, 242.

⁴ H. Butterfield, *Napoleon*, p. 136.

⁵ Bro. G. W. Speth, *A.Q.C.* vol. viii, p. 188 (cited by Bro. J. E. S. Tuckett in his paper "Napoleon I and Freemasonry" in *A.Q.C.* vol. 27, pp. 96-141).

⁶ Tuckett, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

Prince of the Moskawa "the bravest of the brave" was initiated at Nancy in 1801 at the Lodge Saint-Jean de Jérusalem.¹

Of the 818 Lodges in the Grand Orient in 1812, no fewer than 70 were military and practically every corps had its Lodge.² Napoleon's brothers, the Princes Joseph, Lucien, Louis, and Jérôme were all Masons, and also his step-son Eugène de Beauharnais, his brother-in-law Murat, and his nephew Jerome. Their respective offices are given by Tuckett in his paper (p. 98) referred to above:—

- Joseph (1768-1844), *King of Naples* (1806-8). *King of Spain* (1808-13). Nominated by Napoleon as Grand Master of the G.O. of France in 1804.
- Louis (1778-1846), *King of Holland* (1806-10). Deputy Grand Master of the G.O. of France in 1804.
- Jérôme (1784-1860), *King of Westphalia* (1807-13). Grand Master of the G.O. of Westphalia — his son Jérôme was also a Freemason.
- Lucien (1775-1840), a member of the G.O. of France.
- Joachim Murat (1771-1815), *King of Naples* (1805). Senior Grand Warden of the G.O. (1803). Grand Master of the G.L. of Naples (1808). Grand Master of the Order of St. Joachim (1806).
- Eugène Beauharnais (1781-1824). *Viceroy of Italy* (1805-14) Grand Master of Italy and Grand Master of the G.O. "de la division militaire" at Milan (1805).

SWITZERLAND

As in France where English influence had been most marked at the beginning of the 18th century, so in Switzerland considerable interest was shown in English literature and philosophy. Since the introduction of Freemasonry by Hamilton in Geneva, the Craft had made rapid progress in Switzerland. Despite the resistance of the Clergy and magistrates in Calvinistic Geneva, by 1749 there is evidence of the constitution of a new Lodge under the Mastership of Leonard Bourdillon.

As already mentioned, a National Grand Lodge³ was formed in 1769 by nine Genevese lodges, including the recently formed *Union des Coeurs*. Until this date these Lodges had been nominally responsible to the Grand Lodge of England. According to Galiffe, the constitution of this Genevese Grand Lodge was the result of a proposal of Alexander Girard who had recently returned from England.⁴ All other lodges were declared irregular, and in consequence ten other lodges, including the *Discretion* in Zurich, decided to seek admittance to this Grande Loge Nationale de Genève as it was called.⁵

The political troubles which came to a head in Geneva in 1781, and the military regime set up the following year, resulted in the suspension of all Masonic activities. It was not until 1786 that Masonic activities again became possible when the *Grand Orient de Genève*, grouping eight Lodges, was constituted in secret under the Grand Mastership of Sigismond Vernet.⁶

The tide of revolution made itself felt, however, even in peaceful Switzerland. Nearly thirty years afterwards the Duke of Kent, who had been initiated in Geneva in the *Union Lodge* on 5th August, 1789, recalled how he had stood beside the Captain of the Geneva Garrison when the latter had had the top of his skull removed by a rebel's bullet. At that time, the officer concerned, Captain Jean-François Fatio had been Junior Warden in the *Union*. In June that year, the members of the Lodge had formed a committee for the purpose of distributing bread and rice to the poor of Geneva. The committee held a meeting every evening, and a charity committee under General Baron le Fort was set up the same month to give assistance to distressed citizens. The orator of the lodge during the Duke of Kent's membership was Isaac Bourdillon who in 1794 was elected a member of the revolutionary tribunal in Geneva. In his capacity as Judge — in which he was called upon to try several members of his own lodge — he is considered to have exercised a moderating influence upon his more bloodthirsty and ferocious colleagues.⁷ In later years he was reproached for having participated in the events leading up to the insurrection of 1794. In his defence he declared that although he had accepted the terrible

¹ Jean Palou, *La Franc-Maçonnerie*, Paris, 1964, pp. 22, 223.

² Jean Boisson, *Napoléon était-il franc-maçon*, 1967, p. 27.

³ *Grande-Loge Nationale de Genève*.

⁴ J. B. G. Galiffe, *La Chaîne Symbolique*, Geneva, 1852, p. 417.

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 418.

⁶ Prof. André Gür, *Revue Suisse d'histoire*, vol. 17, 1967, pp. 216-217.

⁷ It is of interest that in the *Union des Coeurs* lodge in Geneva, which has just celebrated its bi-centenary, the candle holders in use are those presented by Bourdillon to the *Union Lodge*.

function of Judge, he had done so solely with the aim of preventing even greater disasters and to restore some sort of order from a chaos whose consequences could not have been foreseen. Fifteen members of the *Union* received sentences involving terms of imprisonment or banishment and loss of all civil rights.¹

A friend of the Duke of Kent, François Butini, became a member of the Administrative Committee set up in December, 1792 to replace the lawful government in Geneva. The son of a prominent lawyer, he is believed to have acted for the royalist supporters in spite of his apparent sympathy for the revolutionary movement. As a lieutenant in the Swiss Regiment Lullin de Chateauvieux he had served the King in France until the disbanding of the Swiss Regiments in 1792. He continued to hold office in the revolutionary government in Geneva until 1798 when he rejoined the French royalists.^{2 3}

Among the Lodges under the Grand Orient de Genève there were several in France, including *La Triple Unité* in Annecy and two military lodges. This Grand Lodge was in regular contact with the National Grand Lodges of Germany, Brunswick-Hanover and Holland. With the annexation of Geneva by France in 1798, a number of French officers became members of Genevese Lodges.

In Lausanne, Masonic development had been equally rapid. The Magistrate in Lausanne, Rhymer, had reported on the Craft in a noncommittal fashion in 1744:—

“It would certainly be better not to have Freemasons, but since this is now the fashion throughout Europe, one should not be surprized to find them in this city where there are so many idle individuals who do not know what to do with themselves. All that will pass”.⁴

The Lausanne Lodges whose activities had been banned, were — according to Thory (vol. 1, p. 85) — able to resume normal working only in 1764. In 1770, however, there were further persecutions by Swiss magistrates in several Cantons who placed a prohibition on Masonic meetings (p. 97). A new Lodge was formed in 1776, however, and in the following year a Lodge of Higher Degrees under a Frenchman, named Sidrac, which was closed in 1779.⁵ In that year it was decided that the Masonic jurisdiction in Switzerland should be divided between the *Directoire* of Zurich under Dr. Diethelm Lavater, and the *Directoire helvétique* roman in Lausanne under Dr. W. Verdeil.⁶

According to Boos (p. 376), the Lodge in Lausanne had received its Warrant and Rituals from England in 1780. The latter is hardly likely since apart from exposures such as *J. & B.*, etc. there were no printed rituals in existence. It was not long, however, before they wished to obtain the rituals of the *Strict Observance* “provided that this would not incur too much expense and that they would not be exposed to foreign domination”. In 1789 an agreement was signed between the *Directoire helvétique* roman and the *Grand Lodge of England*.⁷ Following the death of the Grand Secretary of the D.H.R. that year, part of the Masonic archives were burnt but fortunately a large part survived.⁸

Freemasonry in German-speaking Switzerland was concentrated in Basel and Zurich. The first Lodge to be constituted in Zurich was the *Concord* in 1740 which probably only survived until 1745.⁹ Following the prohibition in 1745 the Lodges in the Canton of Bern had been obliged to close and officially they ceased activities until 1765, although Boos remarks that there is little doubt they continued to meet in secret. On 22nd July, 1764, the Council in Bern ordered an investigation into Freemasonry, and at a secret session a week later, it was decided that all Masonic activity was to be suppressed under the terms of the 1745 Edict.¹⁰ These efforts did not succeed in stamping out the Craft and this in spite of a further prohibition promulgated by the Bernese government in 1772.¹¹

¹ *Rélation des faits accomplis par les révolutionnaires Genevois, de 1794 à 1796*, Geneva, 1850, pp. 268, 269.

² Albert Choisy, *Notice généalogique et historique sur la famille Mallet de Genève*, Geneva, 1930.

³ *Rélation des faits* . . . (op. cit.).

⁴ *La Franc Maçonnerie en Suisse*, Zurich, 1944, pp. 46-47.

⁵ Boos, op. cit., p. 346.

⁶ *La F.M. en Suisse*, op. cit., p. 51.

⁷ Galiffe, op. cit., p. 422.

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ *La F.M. en Suisse*, op. cit., p. 57.

¹⁰ Boos, op. cit., pp. 341, 342.

¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 346.

The prohibitions did not receive much publicity. A Dr. Knecht, who had been initiated at the age of 16 in 1750 in a Neuchâtel lodge, in a letter of 7th August, 1767, wrote that he had only recently seen the Edict of 1745 during the course of his stay in Berlin.¹

In 1772 the *Strict Observance* system, that had made rapid progress in Germany, found favour in a number of Swiss Lodges.² For some lodges, however, the *Strict Observance* savoured too much of Roman Catholicism and was not welcomed.³ It was at the Convent of Lyon in 1778 that the *Rectified Rite* took its rise. Essentially Christian in form, the *Code maçonnique des Loges rectifiées* was drawn up and approved at Lyon. Later, at Wilhelmsbad in 1782 a set of Masonic Rules (*Règle maçonnique*) were approved containing nine articles for the use of lodges attached to the *Rectified Rite*.⁴ The *Rectified Rite* was adopted on a large scale in France, particularly in the South and in Switzerland where, according to Galiffe, all the Lodges that had belonged to the *Strict Observance* adopted the new reform. In Germany, however, the revisions were not generally adopted by the majority of the lodges.⁵

The multiplicity of degrees and obediences was a cause for considerable confusion among the Masons in Switzerland. In 1787 Cagliostro resided for a time in Basel where the "magical" workings of his *Egyptian Rite* found some favour among the more superstitious and gullible of Swiss Masons. At that time in Switzerland there were 72 Lodges.⁶

A new Lodge *Die vollkommene Freundschaft* was constituted in 1778 under the *Grande loge écossaise de Zurich* by Pierre Burckhardt, a close friend of the historian, and Freemason, Edward Gibbon, who resided in Lausanne for many years.⁷ The Lodge *Zur Hoffnung* was constituted in Bern under the *Grand Orient* of France on 3rd July, 1803 (Boos, p. 567) but in 1818 it was granted a Warrant by the United Grand Lodge of England. Bro. P. L. de Tavel was Provincial Grand Master until 1822 when the first Swiss National Grand Lodge was formed.⁸

SCANDINAVIA

It has already been seen that Freemasonry spread from Britain to the Continent where it developed in various forms. In his paper on Scandinavian Freemasonry (*A.Q.C. LXXII*), Bro. Bertram Jacobs gives a succinct account of the rise of Freemasonry in Sweden and it is his view that many Swedes who had been initiated in France and Germany constituted lodges on their return home, which, in the absence of set forms and rituals, resulted in utter chaos.

According to Thory, on 21st October, 1738, Frederick 1st, King of Sweden, issued a decree prohibiting meetings of Freemasons.⁹ This is supported by Gould who states that "there is conclusive proof that Freemasonry was not introduced into Sweden until after 1731, at the earliest date; and that it was forbidden throughout the country on pain of death in 1738".¹⁰

The first Lodge in Sweden had been constituted in 1735 by Count Axel Wrede Sparre. This Lodge which was the first Lodge of St. John in Stockholm later assumed the name *Den Nordiska Första* (the First Northern). Sparre, who had been initiated in Paris in 1731 and had been passed and raised before returning to Sweden, was duly authorized to operate the three degrees. A Charter was subsequently granted by Derwentwater in 1737 to Count C. F. Scheffer, who had likewise been initiated in Paris, to constitute lodges in Sweden. The situation was complicated by the fact that General James Keith had obtained from his "cousin" the G.M. in England (Earl of Kintore) in 1740 the necessary authority to hold Lodges under the English Constitution wherever he might be. He exercised this right in Sweden until 1744.¹¹

By 1746 Wrede Sparre's lodge was in difficulties and Scheffer attempted to remedy the situation by lending his authority to the opening of the St. John's Lodge. *St. Jean Auxiliaire*, to which on 2nd January 1752 many of the members of Wrede Sparre's Lodge belonged.

¹ Boos, op. cit., p. 334.

² *ibid.*, p. 350.

³ *F.M. en Suisse*, op. cit.

⁴ Galiffe, op. cit., pp. 397-402.

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 402.

⁶ Thory, Vol. I, p. 177.

⁷ *F.M. en Suisse*, op. cit. p. 63.

⁸ *ibid.*, pp. 67, 70.

⁹ Thory, op. cit., p. 39 (Thory cites *Das Ganze aller geh. Verb.*, etc., p. 140).

¹⁰ Gould's *History*, (Poole's edition), vol. IV, p. 250 (cited by Bro. Carr in discussion on Bro. Jacobs's paper).

¹¹ Jacobs, *A.Q.C.*, Vol. 72, p. 77.

St. Jean Auxiliare became the parent of many more St. John's Lodges under Scheffer's Patent. Clandestine Lodges were regularized or closed down, their members joining regular lodges, and initiations increased considerably.¹

On the occasion of the birth of the Prince Royal, in 1746 the Freemasons of Stockholm had a special medal struck in his honour.² The Duc de Luynes in his well-known *Mémoires*, in November, 1753, writes that Count Scheffer had participated at the foundation of a home for orphans in Stockholm, which had been made possible by the efforts of Swedish Lodges. The Duc de Luynes adds the comment that the English would be jealous to see that this order, which owes only its origin to the English, had made such a contribution to the good name of Sweden.³ An annual concert was arranged for the benefit of this institution which met with considerable success. In 1767, Bro. Boham, a member of the Grand Lodge contributed a large sum of money to this fund. The Queen of Sweden on 27th July, 1778, gave orders for an annual contribution to be paid for this cause.

In the meantime, the Grand Lodge of England, whose connections with Continental Freemasonry had been all too loose, decided in 1765 to send out a Masonic representative with warrant of appointment as Provincial Grand Master of Sweden. This Mason by the name of Tullman (correctly Charles Fullman), had been a Secretary at the Legation in Denmark. This warrant also accorded him wide powers over all Scandinavia since there were already lodges working in Norway and Denmark under the Swedish Constitution. After strong representations by the Swedish Masons a letter was sent by Scheffer to the Grand Lodge of England, after which formal recognition was granted to the Grand Lodge of Sweden, which had been founded on 27th December, 1761 by Lodges holding Warrants from the Grand Lodge of England. Tullman, however, had already started two lodges in Stockholm and one in Gothenburg. The thirteen lodges which formed this Grand Lodge did not include those founded by Tullman.

With the initiation in 1770 of the King of Sweden, Gustavus III, and his two brothers Freemasonry in Sweden commenced a new period in its history. One of the brothers, the Duke Charles of Sudermania (afterwards King Charles XIII), was to devote his whole life to Swedish Masonry. It was thanks to his efforts that a system of Freemasonry was evolved in Sweden and not, as Bro. Jacob's points out in his paper, just a collection of degrees. He created a system in which each degree led directly to the next up to the highest degree of all. As King Charles, he continued to rule the Craft.⁴ The initiation of King Gustavus IV on 22nd March, 1793 in Stockholm marked the continued success of the order in Sweden.⁵

On 9th March, 1803, Gustavus IV, issued an ordinance requiring all members of Orders and Societies in Sweden to furnish not only the form of obligation used but also details of the various duties they undertook to observe and the aims of their association. The Freemasons alone were declared exempt from the King's order in view of the fact that they were "under our immediate protection".⁶

Before concluding this account of Freemasonry in Sweden, reference must be made to the Field Lodge, the *Lodge of the Swedish Army*, founded at Greifswald, Pomerania on 10th January, 1761.⁷ During the Seven Years War, it moved with the Swedish Army, but in peacetime it was centred in Stockholm. It formed three Daughter Lodges of which little is known (though they probably became extinct with the cessation of hostilities) *Carl of the Three Griffins* at Greifswald, *Gustavus Adolphus of the Three Rays* at Stralsund and *Concord* at Christianstad. Several members of the Swedish nobility were members and at one time Prince Frederick Adolphe, brother of the King, was Worshipful Master. The Lodge ceased to function in 1781.

There is little to relate as far as the rest of Scandinavia is concerned. Count Christian Laurvig was appointed by the Grand Lodge of England in 1749 as Provincial Grand Master for Denmark and Norway, but it is reported that he had only two Lodges under his supervision.⁸ There are vague references to the founding of other Lodges in Norway, but such as there were came under the jurisdiction of the Swedish Grand Lodge when the two Kingdoms were united, and their immediate future soon came within the domain of the Strict Observance Rite.

¹ Bro. Jacobs, op. cit., pp. 76, 77.

² Thory op. cit., p. 59 (Thory cites *Journal für Frey-Maurer*, vol. 2, fig. 3, p. 21.

³ *Mémoires du Duc de Luynes sur la Cour de Louis XV*, Paris 1863.

⁴ Bro. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 78.

⁵ Thory, op. cit., p. 193.

⁶ Thory, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 89, 90.

⁷ R. F. Gould, *History of Freemasonry*, London, 1885-7. Vol. III, p. 405.

⁸ *Grand Lodge. 1717-1967*. Oxford, 1967. p. 226.

In Denmark, the position is somewhat clearer. The first Lodge was founded in Copenhagen in 1743 by Baron von Munnich of the *Three Globes Lodge*, Berlin, though his authority for so doing seems to have been very much open to question.¹ A second Lodge followed quickly in 1744, and in 1745, in response to a request submitted by twenty brethren of the Lodge, a Warrant was issued to it by Lord Cranstoun, Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of England, 1745-47.² Four years later, his successor, Lord Byron issued a Warrant to the earlier Lodge, *St. Martin*.

In 1747, a third Lodge, a Scots Lodge, was opened in Copenhagen on the basis of a patent from the Scots Lodge of the *Three Globes*. It was probably this Lodge, known as *Le Petit Nombre*, that applied to the Grand Lodge of Scotland in 1753 for a Charter to operate as a Grand Lodge. It received a Commission but only as a Provincial Grand Lodge, though it took upon itself the functions of a Grand Lodge. It could well have been this that led Thory³ into the error of asserting that a *Grand Lodge of Denmark* had been formed in Copenhagen under the Scottish Constitution, though he was also incorrect in the date, which he gave as 1742.

By a Decree of 2nd November, 1792 King Christian VII gave official recognition to Freemasonry, but for a number of years Danish Masonry was largely that of the Strict Observance and it was not until 6th January, 1858 that the present National Grand Lodge of Denmark was founded.

THE NETHERLANDS

The first recorded lodge meeting in the Netherlands was held at the Hague, in 1731, under the Mastership of Dr. J. T. Desaguliers, when Francis, Duke of Lorraine was "made an *Enter'd Prentice* and *Fellow Craft*," but the first meeting of a Dutch Lodge was on 30th September, 1734, also at the Hague, under Vincent de la Chapelle.⁴

Following an article in an Amsterdam newspaper in 1735 which referred to the constitution of a Freemasons' Lodge, the Magistrates afraid of the reactions of the Clergy and possible political consequences banned all meetings. This was in fact the first act of persecution against modern Freemasonry. The Master and his Wardens, however extended an offer of initiation to the Magistrates and, according to Galiffe, one town official who accepted to become a member rendered such a favourable report on the Craft that all the Magistrates expressed their desire to be initiated.⁴

Further persecutions took place in 1739 and 1740 in the Catholic provinces following the Bull of Excommunication of Clement XII. In consequence of the action by priests in refusing Confession, the Freemasons were accorded the protection of the Government against such acts of ecclesiastical censure.⁵

A general meeting of Lodges in Holland (given by Thory as thirteen) was called by the *Royal Union Lodge* on 26th December, 1756, to constitute a Grand Lodge. This meeting was presided over by Louis Dagrán. The Baron Van Aerssen was elected Grand Master. Until that date the Lodges had held their Warrants from France, England and Germany,⁶ although from 1749 the *Royal Union* had been known as the *Mother Lodge of the United Provinces* (i.e. the Netherlands).⁷

Count von Bentinck was elected Grand Master in 1758 and was succeeded in 1759 by Baron von Boetzelaar who held the position until 1798.⁸ The independence of the National Grand Lodge of the Netherlands was formally recognized on 2nd March, 1770 by the English Grand Lodge.⁹

Following the explosion in 1807 of a boat containing gunpowder which destroyed a large part of Leyden, the four Lodges in Amsterdam collected 5,000 florins by way of relief. Two years later they founded a magnificent institute for the blind. According to Galiffe, whose

¹ J. G. Findel, *History of Freemasonry*. London, 1866. p. 319.

² *ibid.*, p. 320.

³ Thory, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 50.

⁴ Galiffe, *op. cit.*, pp. 338, 339.

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ Thory, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 72.

⁷ Galiffe, *op. cit.*, p. 338.

⁸ Thory, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

⁹ *A.Q.C.* Vol. 83, p. 4.

book was published in 1852, the Netherlands Lodges over a period of 50 years had collected one million francs in the cause of charity. The same author remarks that the Lodges had remained faithful to the English system of Freemasonry but that eventually the four degrees of "red Freemasonry" of French origin were adopted, with a preference for the *Perfection* rite and that known as "Eccossais primitif".¹

It is known, thanks to Bro. Dr. Boerenbeker's paper "Dutch and English Freemasonry" (*A.Q.C.* 83) that the leadership displayed by the English Grand Lodge — due mainly to its own internal difficulties — had been weak and ineffective and that the delicate relations between the two countries was only restored to normality by the Pact of 1770.

By 1808 the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands had become a powerful influence on the Continent. This fact is well evidenced by the G.L. decision that year that the officers of the Royal Union Lodge were to be expelled from the Craft, and other members excluded for a period of three years for having met female members of the "Lodge of Adoption."²

GERMANY

As in France, the simplicity of the English ceremonies proved no longer sufficient for the Masons in Germany whose rituals were augmented accordingly. It was not long before new degrees were introduced with extravagant distinguishing jewels and titles.³ It was thus that in 1756 the Baron Hund introduced the *Strict Observance* system and in the course of the ensuing years all kinds of other Masonic systems were introduced in German Lodges.⁴

On 3rd October 1763, an edict was issued by the Magistrates of Danzig prohibiting meetings of Masons. This edict which is reproduced in full by Thory (Vol. II, pp. 81-84, *Acta Latomorum*) refers to those citizens who, under the pretext of charity, were endeavouring to undermine the Christian religion by encouraging a spirit of indifference towards it. The old bogey of the terrible obligation required of Candidates was attacked and also their ridiculous ceremonies. (p. 77).

A NUMBER OF GERMAN GRAND LODGES

On 5th July, 1772, the Duke of Brunswick was appointed Grand Master of the Grand National Mother Lodge of the Prussian States⁵ known as "The Three Globes". Other Lodges, however, had come into being and the situation in Germany was a very complicated one.

There were other Grand Lodges of varying importance, including the *Grand Lodge of Prussia*, *Royal York of Friendship* and the *National Grand Lodge of All German Freemasons*. The latter Grand Lodge had been founded in 1770 by Johann Wilhelm Kellner von Zinnendorf,⁶ a Surgeon-General in the Prussian Army and a leading figure in the *Strict Observance*. By 1773, this Grand Lodge comprised eighteen Lodges.⁷ The Prince de Hesse-Darmstadt was elected Grand Master on 11th August, 1772 and Zinnendorf was chosen as Deputy Grand Master. Three years later the Duke Ernest de Saxe-Gotha was appointed Grand Master.⁸ Zinnendorf had in fact obtained from a Swedish Mason Friedrich von Eckleff the rituals and instructions on the basis of which he instituted the system to which he gave his name.⁹ Thory records that recognition was not accorded to the Zinnendorf System by the Grand Lodge of England. The Grand Lodge of Sweden on 29th July, 1777 disavowed the Warrant claimed to have been received by Zinnendorf declaring that they had never issued such a document.

The third Berlin Grand Lodge "Royal York of Friendship" came into being in 1798 as a result of action by French Freemasons resident in the capital of Prussia. These three Grand Lodges were in possession of royal patents.

¹ *ibid.*, p. 2 (Bro. Boerenbeker gives further details of French influence).

² Thory, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 239.

³ Boos, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

⁴ Thory, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 70: The *Strict Observance* was so named in opposition to the "Large Observance", i.e. all the lodges not attached to the *S.O.*

⁵ Thory, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 88.

⁶ Eugen Lennhoff, *The Freemasons*, London, 193-4, p. 110. Thory, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 88.

⁷ Galiffe, *op. cit.*, p. 373.

⁸ Thory, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁹ Lennhoff, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

A Convent was held at Brunswick on 22nd May, 1777 for the 23 *loges écossaises* which existed at that time on the Continent to bring about a reconciliation between the different groups within the *Strict Observance*. There were no positive results from this Convent which did not end until 6th July, that year. The main outcome was however that from this point the Lodges of the *Strict Observance* assumed the name of United Lodges of Germany (*Loges réunies d'Allemagne*).¹

In his *Correspondance Littéraire* (Paris, 1813, Vol. 5), Grimm writes in January 1790 that the author of a recently published book on the subject of the *Illuminés* was quite unable to distinguish this sect from other Masonic orders.² It was in 1767 that Adam Weishaupt, Professor of Law at the University of Ingolstadt in Bavaria had formed the plan to create a secret society whose members would be submitted to a blind obedience. According to J. J. Mounier this society was modelled on that of the Jesuits with its own laws, records and systems of punishments. Weishaupt communicated his plans to only a few of his confidants or *aréopagites* as they were known and wished to remain anonymous to the other members of the society.

The *Illuminés* were few in number for several years and the first *aréopagites* were students of his University until Weishaupt became acquainted with a Hanoverian, the notorious Baron de Knigge who for some considerable time practised his charlatanism at the expense of the Freemasons.³ The main objective of the *Illuminés* was to attract to their order eminent persons in society, court circles and in particular Freemasons' Lodges.⁴

The Elector of Bavaria issued an edict on 2nd March, 1785 under the terms of which it was emphasized that the different Lodges of so-called Freemasons and *Illuminés* had not respected his general prohibition of the previous June which made the holding of any secret meeting illegal. He considered that the movement constituted a danger both politically and for religion.

In his order of 1st December, 1785, circulated to the Governors of the various Provinces, the Emperor Joseph II, referred to the fact that there was hardly a provincial town without its Lodge. Although personally unacquainted with the mysteries of the Craft he was satisfied that Masons always acted for the common good, and in addition to helping the poor assisted and encouraged the arts. Notwithstanding this, however, he decreed that there should be only one or two Lodges, or at the most three, in the larger towns only. The lists of all the Lodges together with the names of members were to be submitted to the Government and the meeting days were also to be declared. All admissions and withdrawals from Lodges were to be listed in a three-monthly return. Under these conditions, the Freemasons were accorded full permission to hold their Lodges without interference. "In this manner", concluded the Emperor Joseph, "the Order of Freemasons which is made up of honest men, who are known to me, will be beneficial to the State".⁵

Thory says⁶ it was at this time that Frederick II, King of Prussia, revised the "higher degrees" and added 8 degrees to the existing 25 of the Rite of Perfection, thereby forming the Ancient and Accepted Rite of 33 degrees and founding the Supreme Council, but this claim has since been shown to be quite untrue.⁷

Jean André De Luc,⁸ a Genevese, Reader to Queen Charlotte the wife of George III, had been sent on a diplomatic mission to Germany in 1792 and his correspondence reveals something of the activities of the *Illuminés*. Although the importance of this group should not be over-

¹ Galiffe, op. cit., p. 386, Thory, op. cit., vol. I, p. 117.

² The title of this book is given by Grimm as *Essai sur la secte des Illuminés* (Marquis de Luchet).

³ J. J. Mounier, *De l'influence attribuée aux Philosophes aux Francs-Maçons et aux Illuminés sur la Révolution de France*, Tübingen, 1801, p. 136.

⁴ Thory, *Histoire de la Fondation du Grand Orient de France*, Paris, pp. 253-270.

⁵ Thory, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 86, 87.

⁶ Thory, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 172: *Abrégé histoire de l'organisation en France des 33 degrés du Rite écossais ancien et accepté*, p. 12.

⁷ e.g. J. Fairburn Smith, *The Rise of the Ecossais Degrees*, Dayton, 1965 and R. S. Lindsay, *The Scottish Rite for Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1958, pp. 15-33.

⁸ Paul Tunbridge, "Jean André de Luc, F.R.S.", *Notes and Records*, The Royal Society, London, June 1971.

estimated, it is of interest that De Luc took it upon himself to bring to the attention of George III the designs of these "*Illuminators*" whose aim was to destroy established religion and governments so as to set themselves up as the legislative power. One of these letters from De Luc enclosed a copy of a letter from Dr. Zimmermann dated 2nd November, 1792, which was "not to be brought to the attention of our Sovereign *which would only cause him suffering*", asserted that the Hanoverian Secretaries of State were *Illuminés* or had been influenced by them.¹

The King of Prussia shortly after his accession to the throne on 7th December, 1797, was presented by the Grand Lodge Royal York at Berlin with a copy of their statutes and an extract from their ritual requesting the protection of the King. The King's reply of 29th December pointed out that as was a known fact he had not been initiated into Freemasonry. Provided that an assurance was given to him of the loyalty of Freemasons to the State and to the Constitution — to the exclusion of any political activity — he was disposed to favour their Lodge with his protection, and likewise any other Lodge in his States that was not suspect.²

In October of the following year, however, the King of Prussia published an edict banning all participation in secret societies. He exempted from the terms of this prohibition the three Mother Lodges of Berlin:—

The Three Globes Lodge;
The National Grand Lodge of Germany;
The Grand Lodge Royal York;

and also their daughter Lodges. Any other Lodge was to be considered illegal and would not be tolerated.

On 19th October, 1801, the King found it necessary to warn the Grand Lodge Royal York in Berlin that it must avoid giving any grounds for the slightest suspicion of charlatanism by any trafficking whatsoever in the so-called mysteries (*trafic de mystères*).³

The progress of German Freemasonry was momentarily halted by the Napoleonic conquests, and the central authorities of several countries such as those of the Grand Duchy of Baden and of the Kingdom of Westphalia transformed themselves into *Grand-Orients*, "more or less subject" to the Grand Orient of France.⁴

According to Galiffe, it was at this juncture that in the other parts of Germany, in particular in Prussia, that secret and patriotic societies were set up whose object was to bring about a continuation of the struggle and to organize aid for those persons that had been ruined by the French invasion. In response to repeated demands by France, the Prussian Government took, or pretended to take, the necessary steps to dissolve such bodies. Freemasonry, however, was officially excepted from such legislation and Galiffe states that from this point German Freemasonry continued to make progress in the *Royal Art*.⁵

THE MYSTICISTS

By about 1780 there were innumerable secret societies in Europe, frequented by "adepts" of all classes and opinions. In addition to the orthodox branches of Freemasonry, there were various sects — some claiming affiliation with the regular Lodges — of mysticists and occultists, and in addition those groups which were politically motivated. This was the epoch of Cagliostro, Mesmer, Fabre d'Olivet and Claude de Saint-Martin, the famous "Unknown Philosopher" who influenced such persons as Joseph de Maistre. Swedenborg had died in 1772 and the writings of the "sublime shoemaker" Jacob Boehme of the previous century had begun to be translated into French and other languages.⁶

In 1797 Saint-Martin wrote that during the tragic days of the Revolution that for one in his position there were many reasons for suspicion and possible arrest. An order for his arrest had apparently been issued but did not reach him until a month after the fall of Robespierre who was the originator of the order. Bro. Lafontaine writes that in 1790 Saint-Martin had requested that his name be removed from all Masonic registers and lists in which he had been inscribed since 1785, on the grounds that his heart had never been in his Masonic activities.⁷

¹ *Royal Archives*: R.A. 6982, 6983, 6978, 6984, 6985.

² Thory, *Acta Latomorum*, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 198, 199.

³ *ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 72-78.

⁴ Galiffe, op. cit., p. 409.

⁵ *ibid.*, 410-412.

⁶ Joseph de Maistre, *La Franc Maçonnerie Mémoire inédit au Duc de Brunswick*, (1782), published with introduction by Eimiel Dermenghem, Paris 1925.

⁷ *A.Q.C.* Vol. 37, pp. 262-290, Bro. H. C. de Lafontaine, "The Unknown Philosopher".

The influence of these sects upon the growth of the Craft was almost negligible and with one or two exceptions the progress of regular Freemasonry proceeded unhindered.

* * * * *

From about 1760 onwards, the Rose-Croix, alchemists and others found some measure of acceptance by the more credulous particularly as such movements apparently linked their beliefs with the principles of Masonic idealism. People such as Mesmer, Cagliostro and many others were not slow to take advantage of Freemasonry by adopting it and using it for their own profit. Under the Duc de Chartres, the Craft in France flourished and up to the Revolution the power and influence of the Grand Orient steadily increased.

Up to about 1770, the Grand Lodge of England (i.e. "Moderns") seems to have retained some degree of authority over foreign Masonic bodies. But, in 1769, after the constitution of the Grande-Loge Nationale of Geneva, and in 1770 by the recognition of the sovereignty of the Grand Lodge of Holland, it became clear that the purely tutelary role of English Freemasonry had ended. Jean de Vignoles was active in this respect as the Provincial Grand Master for Foreign Lodges. In 1766 it had been agreed between England and France that the former would not constitute Lodges in France, while for her part France would not form new Lodges outside French territorial possessions. Following, however, the creation of a second Grand Lodge in France, it fell to De Vignoles in 1776 to inform the Grand Orient that England's relationship with France must be that of Mother and Daughter!¹

The Bull issued by Pope Clement XII in 1738, which condemnation was repeated by Pope Benedict XIV in 1751, had not the slightest effect on the Craft, whose members continued to defy both governments and the Church. In 1798, in France alone, there were 688 lodges of which apparently only 59 were not active. Of these lodges, no fewer than 27 were under the supervision of Masters who were members of the Clergy. Following the Revolution, however, the Craft had been reduced to 18 Lodges, but under the beneficent influence of Napoleon by 1812 the Grand Orient counted about a thousand Lodges and Chapters under its jurisdiction in France.²

With the removal of Napoleon's patronage, Pius VII saw fit in 1814 to reopen the persecutions against the Craft. His edict of 15th August, 1814 was followed in 1821 by his *Ecclesiam*. According to Galiffe, the Grand Lodge of Spain which in 1809 had been allowed to occupy *the same building as the Inquisition* (the italics are Galiffe's who drily remarks "chose curieuse!"), found in 1814, by a decree of Ferdinand VII on 24th May, that all its Lodges were ordered to be closed. The many Freemasons arrested included General Alava, the Adjutant-General of the Duke of Wellington.³

While the additional rites and degrees, and the pseudo-Masonic societies found some favour, the Craft degrees despite the delaying effects of the Revolution in Europe continued virtually unharmed.

The second half of the 18th century which must be considered as a severe testing time for Freemasonry, marked the beginning of a new era when from the boiling pot of revolutionary intrigue, newly invented rites, and superstitions, there emerged a stronger and purified moral order which played no small part in the rebuilding of Europe in the century to come.

RUSSIA AND POLAND

Freemasonry did not reach Finland until after the period covered by this paper, but it arrived early in Russia and Findel⁴ records the appointment by England in 1731 of Captain John Phillips as Provincial Grand Master, followed in 1740 by General James Keith, who is said to have been Master of a Lodge in St. Petersburg some seven or eight years prior to this.

Eventually a *National Grand Lodge of Russia* was formed in 1776, but there was much internal strife, due to supporters of four different Rites struggling for supremacy. Eventually, in 1794, in deference to the wishes of the Empress Catherine II, all the Lodges closed down and although she died two years later, Paul I maintained the ban.

Under the more liberal Alexander, Masonry revived. A Grand Directory of the Strict Observance was founded in 1809, a Grand Lodge with the distinctive name *Astrea* in 1815 and a Grand Chapter to work the "additional" degrees in 1818.

¹ Jean Baylot, *Dossier Français de la Franc-Maçonnerie Régulière*, Paris, 1965, p. 90.

² J. A. Fauchier, op. cit., pp. 34, 44. Galiffe, op. cit., p. 308.

³ Galiffe, op. cit., pp. 318-321.

⁴ Findel, op. cit., p. 324.

Tragedy lay ahead, however, and from an unexpected source. The Grand Master, Kuschelerv advised the Emperor that Freemasonry would become a danger to the State unless it were drastically revised, but Alexander chose a different course and on 1st August, 1822, issued a Decree banning Freemasonry.

There are stories of doubtful authenticity about Masonry continuing as an underground movement and, indeed, it did emerge for a few months after the first World War, under the White Russians, but it was immediately stamped out by the Bolsheviks and is unlikely to arise again.

This Decree came only a year after a similar one affecting Poland, which country, as Findel says¹ "in great measure made so unhappy through the fault of her own people, did not succeed any better in Freemasonry than in other things."

Masonry was first practised about 1736 and after a temporary set-back following the Papal Bull of 1738, several Lodges were opened. These were closed and re-opened at various times as a result of political struggles but in 1769 a Grand Lodge was founded, with Bro. Moszynski as Grand Master, only to become an English Provincial Grand Lodge in the following year, with Moszynski as Provincial Grand Master.

The partitioning of the country in 1772 and 1792 created further havoc and in 1794 Poland disappeared entirely. In 1806 there was a revival of Freemasonry in the Grand Duchy of Warsaw created by Napoleon, but this was allotted to Russia in 1815, following which it is thought that Polish Freemasons became involved in intrigues of a revolutionary nature. As a result of these suspicions, Alexander issued a Decree suppressing Freemasonry in 1821 and it could have been this experience that led him to issue the Decree in Russia the following year, to which reference has just been made.

AUSTRIA—HUNGARY

Austria has been dealt with to some extent under Germany, and in the section dealing with the Netherlands, reference will be made to the initiation of Francis, Duke of Lorraine, which, in effect, was the beginning of Freemasonry in the Holy Roman Empire.

Francis married the future Empress, Maria Theresa and although she was not well inclined towards the Craft, her husband was able to control her anti-masonic activities at least to some extent. The Catholic Clergy were of course, always trying to have the Craft declared illegal and in 1751, The Empress issued a Decree to this effect but her husband, who was at that time Worshipful Master of the Viennese Lodge, *The Three Firing Glasses*, was influential enough to see that it was not acted upon.

When Francis died in 1765, his son, Joseph II was elected Holy Roman Emperor and became co-Regent of Austria with his Mother. He was not a Mason, but possibly because of his father's influence, he always favoured the Craft and under him it made considerable progress. In 1784, for example, when the Provincial Grand Lodges of Austria, Hungary, Bohemia and Siebenburgen formed an Austrian Grand Lodge and Berlin vetoed it, Joseph ordered them to assert their independence and Berlin gracefully withdrew its opposition.

Following the two-year reign of Leopold II, however, Francis II ascended the throne and at once caused all the Lodges in Austria and Hungary to be closed.² There was a revival in Hungary in 1867, then a separate kingdom, but it was many more years before another Austrian Lodge came into existence.

ITALY

As might be expected, Freemasonry experienced many difficulties in the country now known as Italy. As Findel says³ "Freemasonry . . . did not strike root in Italy before 1733, neither has it, since then, been able to fix itself firmly in the soil".

Although information is scanty, it would seem that the first Lodge was founded in Florence in 1733 by Charles Sackville, later Duke of Dorset, who is thought to have been an Irish Mason. This is the Lodge for which the famous Sackville medal was struck by Lorenz Natter, a medal that was once thought even by Gould⁴ to be no more than a myth, or possibly a forgery, though of recent years several examples have come to light, two being in the Grand Lodge Museum.

¹ *ibid.*, p. 321.

² Findel, *op. cit.*, p. 512.

³ Findel, *op. cit.*, p. 341.

⁴ Gould, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

A Lodge in Rome¹ closed down in 1737, a year before Pope Clement's famous Bull put an end to Masonry in the Italian States. Despite the Bull, however, Lodges began to appear in Milan, Venice, Padua and Verona in the late 18th century.

The whole story of Freemasonry in Italy, in fact, is of one long struggle by Masonry in different forms and rites, striving to establish itself and surviving for two or three years, or perhaps longer, and then being crushed by edicts of Church or State.

The extent to which agents of the former would go cannot be better illustrated than by an event recorded by Gould and Findel² that when the blood of St. Januarius refused to liquefy in 1776, as was expected at the Saint's Festival, it was given out that the Saint had refused to work the miracle because Freemasonry was rampant in the city and a violent persecution of Masons followed. They were imprisoned, their houses were ransacked and they were only saved from execution by the intervention of Queen Caroline of Naples, a daughter of the Emperor Francis.

Lodges continued to be established, however, in different parts and under different Obediences, England, France and Holland. Two Lodges under England are said to have been founded in Naples in 1751 and 1754, two each by the "Moderns" and the "Antients" in Leghorn in 1771, others by the "Moderns" in Venice and Verona in 1772 and others in Genoa (1782), Cremona (1784) and Milan (1784). All these Lodges were extinct by 1795, however, and it was not until 1862 that the Grand Orient of Italy came into existence and Masonry was placed on a more or less permanent basis.

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

After Italy, Spain and Portugal vie with one another for the reputation of being the country in which Masonry has been most intensely persecuted, though through sheer chance, it was in Spain that the Grand Lodge of England warranted its first Lodge in a foreign land. It was on 15th February, 1728 that the Duke of Wharton, Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of England, 1722/3, founded a Lodge in Madrid, subsequently acknowledged by Grand Lodge and given the number 50. It was erased in 1768.

In spite of oppressive measures introduced following the first Papal Bull, Lodges continued to meet in both countries and it is reported that in 1751 there were 97 Lodges in Spain. This information according to Findel³ was provided by a Jesuit priest, Father Torrubia, who, having first obtained Papal absolution from the oath of secrecy he would have to take, was initiated under an assumed name, obtained all the information about Masonry that he required and then appeared at all the highest tribunals of the Inquisition in Madrid for the trials of many hundreds of Masons.

In 1767, it was even possible for a Spanish Grand Lodge to be established, but Decrees of State in 1814 and again in 1824 outlawed Freemasonry and in 1825, seven brethren caught practising Masonry in Granada were hanged the same day without trial.

The earliest Lodge in Portugal of which there is any record is at Lisbon in 1736 and in spite of all the persecution, there are records during the remainder of this century of many other Lodges and Chapters in different rites being formed, though naturally, any continuity is lacking.

It has been said that "the gallows or the dungeon was the fate of anyone known to be a Mason" but the only item worth recording during this period is the arrest and trial by the Inquisition of John Coustos, which has been very fully dealt with by Bro. Dr. S. Vatcher in *A.Q.C.* Vol. 81, pp. 9 et seq.

GIBRALTAR, MINORCA & MALTA

The Lodge of St. John of Jerusalem was constituted in Gibraltar by the Grand Lodge of England as early as 1728 and as is to be expected of a territory belonging to England, Freemasonry flourished, especially as far as Military Lodges were concerned.

There were also Lodges in the island of Minorca in the latter part of the 18th century, but little is known of them.

¹ A Lodge, working in English, was opened on 16th August, 1735 under a Master named J. Colton, but closed on 20th August, 1737. (Vide Gould, op. cit., p. 299).

² Gould, op. cit., p. 298. Findel, op. cit., p. 345.

³ Findel, op. cit., p. 347.

There are references to Lodges in Malta from early in the same century, but nothing definite is known until a Lodge was constituted by England in 1789, only to disappear a few years later. It was whilst he was at Valetta en route for Egypt, that Napoleon was said to have been initiated into the Craft, but there is no proof of this and it is extremely unlikely that it has any basis in fact.

It was not until Malta came under British protection in the 19th century that Freemasonry became established there.

BELGIUM

For the period covered by this paper, the history is that of the Austrian Netherlands, for which in 1770, the Marquis de Gages was appointed Provincial Grand Master by the "Moderns" Grand Lodge.¹ His patent was endorsed by de Vignoles, to whose unsavoury character reference has already been made, to the effect that he resigned his authority over this district for as long as Bro. de Gages carried out his duties satisfactorily!

Findel states² that in spite of the difficulties with which Masonry had to contend, sixteen Lodges were working under the Provincial Grand Lodge in 1785, which had remained independent of the Vienna Grand Lodge. However, a suspicion grew that the Emperor, Joseph II, wished to make use of Freemasonry in an attempt to Germanize the Netherlands, as a result of which, many withdrew and in May 1786, the Emperor abolished all but three Lodges.

Any account of Masonry in this country would be incomplete without reference to the famous Lodge at Mons, *La Parfaite Union*, said to have been founded in 1721. As Bro. Jottrand explains in his interesting account of this Lodge³ such claim, if accepted, would make it the oldest Lodge in Europe.

Many other Lodges were constituted during the 18th century particularly after the establishment of the English Provincial Grand Lodge, but in 1795 the country came under the control of France and as the Lodges then came under the jurisdiction of the Grand Orient of France, the first era of Belgian Masonry came to an end.

[Editorial Note:—

Comments were invited and received from a number of Brethren. We are indebted to Bros. G. S. Draffen, A. J. B. Milborne and J. W. Stubbs for a number of corrections of fact (dates, titles etc.) which have already been put right in the text of the Paper. Those "correction-comments" are therefore not printed here.]

R.W. Bro. J. W. STUBBS writes:—

DE VIGNOLES' CHARACTER. Bro. Heseltine was no fool and he probably used the least unsatisfactory of the tools that came to his hand: one doubts whether anyone else's efforts, whether for good or for ill, would have produced any substantially different results. There is some doubt as to De Vignoles' dates. The first intimation of his appointment I have derives from attendance at Grand Lodge in April, 1769. If Bro. Tunbridge can ante-date this I shall be very glad to have the information for insertion of the correct date in the new edition of the Historical Supplement.

"THE CLIMATE OF EUROPEAN FREEMASONRY, 1750-1810" as a title reminds me that though the expression "Wind of Change" had not been invented in the 18th century the concept may well have been in existence: Bro. Tunbridge hardly gives credit for the possibility that the Mother Grand Lodge preferred to let her adolescent offspring go, and would not have regarded it as a loss or defeat when a new Grand Lodge was formed. At very much the period which Bro. Tunbridge is describing, Edmund Burke used these words:—

Through a wise and salutary neglect (of the colonies), a generous nature has been suffered to take her own way to perfection; when I reflect upon these effects, when I see how profitable they have been to us, I feel all the pride of power sink and all presumption in the wisdom of human contrivances melt and die away within me. My rigour relents. I pardon something to the spirit of liberty.

¹ *Grand Lodge. 1717-1967.* op. cit., p. 226.

² Findel, op. cit., p. 546.

³ Jottrand, *Loge La Parfaite Union at Mons.* A.Q.C. Vol. X. pp. 46 et seq.

The sense of this can well be transferred from the political British Empire to the hold maintained at first, and later so readily loosed, by the Premier Grand Lodge over its Lodges outside England.

It is probably true to say that in this respect Masonry at the stage described by Bro. Tunbridge was a Microcosm of Empire, but that by and large its devolution into independencies was achieved more peacefully.

Bro. A. R. HEWITT writes:—

I have read Bro. Tunbridge's paper with interest, and congratulate him on the conciseness of his coverage.

In his opening paragraphs he quotes Boos *Manuel de la F.M.*, 1894, for the assertion that the older lodges (of which he gives examples) were wholly ignored by the mother Grand Lodge of England. It is difficult to understand on what authority Boos could have based such an assertion. Masonic sources of the period in this country are scanty enough and I cannot believe that more (if as much) exists or did exist on the continent. The fact that the early Grand Lodge archives contain but few references to overseas lodges does not necessarily indicate that such lodges were "wholly ignored"; at least we should give our predecessors the benefit of the doubt.

Bro. Tunbridge suggests that rituals and instruction were transmitted *solely by word of mouth*. He does not indicate exactly to which period he refers but French brethren probably used the early "exposures" as *aides-mémoire*, as was the case in England.

In his conclusions the Author states that "up to about 1770, the Grand Lodge of England (i.e. the Moderns) seems to have retained some degree of authority over foreign Masonic bodies" and "in 1770 by the recognition of the sovereignty of the Grand Lodge of Holland, it became clear that the purely tutelary role of English Freemasonry had ended". If this was the case would the Grand Lodge of England have continued to appoint Provincial Grand Masters in continental countries — from 1770 to 1818 no fewer than 15 such appointments (listed in the *M.Y.B. Hist. Supp.*) were made. Not all, surely, were nominal.

Bro. ALEC MELLOR writes:—

I have read Bro. Paul Tunbridge's paper with great interest and would only like to add a brief comment on what he says concerning Voltaire.

It is a fact that Voltaire had all his life been a foe of religion. For the simple reason that he had decided to become a Mason, spurious anti-religious French Masonries in the 19th and 20th centuries have claimed him as a kind of patron.

Such a pretension is absolutely wrong. Voltaire joined the Craft a month before his death and his personal prejudices had no connection at all with Masonry. One must even add that the spirit of French 18th century lodges was not in the least impressed by the "Encyclopaedists" and their circles. When Bro. de la Dixmerie pronounced Voltaire's funeral eulogy in lodge, he did not allude in a single word to the great man's philosophical works, but was satisfied to exalt his purely literary works, including even *La Henriade*, an epic poem which nobody reads nowadays.

Of course, Voltaire's influence on the political ideas which led to the Revolution of 1789 was great, but although he was a Freemason for the last weeks of his life, it was not through the channel of the lodges that Voltaire's influence made itself felt.

Bro. J. R. CLARKE writes:—

I am still of the opinion that the 1738 Papal Bull had a political motive against England, having regard to the activities of the Pretender and the antipathy of the Vatican to this country at the time of its issue. Hitherto I have understood that it was not "canonically promulgated" in France, i.e. read in the churches there, because the King was sufficiently powerful not to need it. He could deal with Freemasonry in his own way, if he wished. The hint of his disapproval, given by his minister Fleury, to the Chevalier Ramsay was enough to end his masonic activities. It is remarkable that the confirmatory Bull was issued by Benedict XIV in 1751, when the last hope of the Jacobites after the 1745 rebellion had disappeared. It is possible, of course, that it might be said of him also "he gives way too easily to advice from minor figures", but if this were true of two Popes in thirteen years, so much the worse for the Papacy at that time.

If these Bulls had had an exclusively religious purpose it is unlikely that Lord Petre, who was then the principal layman of the Roman Catholic church in England, would have been Grand Master from 1772 to 1776; and the Craft would have lost a good Master. Moreover, the anti-masonic Papal edicts after the Napoleonic wars may have been the result of the failure of the Vatican's political schemes. When spiritualities and temporalities are as inextricably mixed as they have been for centuries at the Vatican, it is not safe to assume that any Papal pronouncement has an exclusively religious import. To quote Mellor, who writes with *arrière pensée* and not objectively, is not argument for his statements unless there is fresh evidence to support them.

Passing to the section FRANCE, I find it strange that some higher grades should have been said to have been devised by the Jesuits, so soon after the Bulls; and I would be interested to know the evidence on which Fessler — or Thory — bases his statement. Of course it is known that in spite of the objection of the Roman church to our "secret obligation" there is even today an organization, limited to Roman Catholics, with an obligation, equally "secret", part of which is revoltingly anti-masonic. Thus I do not doubt but that the Jesuits devised such societies two hundred years ago, but I should like the evidence. In paragraph 9 of the section GERMANY the Jesuits are said to be involved in the establishment of the *Illuminés*. Under the head *Illuminati*, Mackey's *Encyclopaedia of Freemasonry* says:—

"Weishaupt . . . had originally been a Jesuit; and he employed, therefore, in the construction of his association, the shrewdness and subtlety which distinguished the disciples of Loyola."

He gives a full account of the Order and then:

"Illuminism came directly and professedly in conflict with the Jesuits . . . (and in 1784 the Elector of Bavaria issued an edict for its suppression.)"

Mackey is not always reliable but his account of the *Illuminati* is confirmed by other Encyclopaedias, Pick and Knight, Hawkins, and Waite, all of whom refer to the Order as *Illuminati* and agree that in 1784 its principal members were imprisoned or exiled. In addition, Waite (Revised edition. Vol. I) has an article on "The Illuminati of Avignon", in which he states that a Polish noble, Count Grabianka, founded a *Société des Illuminés d'Avignon* in 1787 which was still in existence in 1812. Since Bro. Tunbridge does not mention Grabianka, I assume that his *Illuminés* are the same people as the *Illuminati* of the others and that therefore they were not founded by the Jesuits but in the words of Hawkins "The primary object of the Order was to combat the Jesuits", which appears to be contrary to Thory's statement.

Bro. ERIC WARD writes:—

In his climatal study, Bro. Tunbridge has succeeded in reducing to moderate proportions a Continental atmospheric phenomenon which to some of us is largely obscured by bewildering clouds of unknowing. But if we are to unravel problems of the broader development of Masonry in the United Kingdom, we cannot overlook such dividends as have accrued from our original investments on the Continent. And since in England the Royal Arch was at one time defined as part of pure ancient Masonry, we should not in any consideration of early developments in France omit the part played by that country in its gestation. I therefore hope that Bro. Tunbridge will be able to give us the results of his researches on the development of the Continental branch of the R.A. for if anything epitomises the vagaries of the Masonic climate in the early 18th century it surely is this.

On a much narrower plane, I have two questions arising out of a particular interest, namely early Masonry depicted in graphic art. In 1745 there were produced in France the well-known prints purporting to show conferment of the apprentice and master mason degrees. They were dedicated to Leonard Gabanon, said to be the author of the *Catéchisme des Francs-Maçons* and although none carry the signature of the artist these prints are usually attributed to the celebrated engraver Jacques Philip le Bas (1707-1783). Thus the first question is whether anything is known of Le Bas himself being a member of the Craft etc?

The second question also arises out of these prints, one of which illustrates the apprentice kneeling before the "Grand Master" (W.M.) surrounded by brethren holding swords. Since this custom was being publicised in 1745, presumably it was known in Paris and possibly elsewhere at some earlier date. Is there any documentary evidence, direct or otherwise, which could assist in establishing how and when the practice originated?

Lastly, the information which Bro. Tunbridge gives about De Lalande's symbolic trowel at the initiation of Voltaire is of much interest, new to me, and no doubt to all who normally look upon that emblem as serving another purpose in a later degree. One realizes what a wealth of material was drawn upon as the explanations of working tools took shape and ultimately became formalized.

Bro. CAYWOOD writes:—

Bro. Tunbridge has succeeded in simplifying a complicated and obscure subject that will undoubtedly be helpful to the student who finds the entangled European systems difficult to understand. The concise overall picture that he presents is most useful.

I do not think that it can be denied that the many innovations which were introduced into the Masonic ceremonies on the continent of Europe, by the many groups and individuals, did more harm than good. It would seem that the innovators certainly succeeded in complicating and obscuring true Freemasonry — the essence of which they appear to have lost on the way.

Would Bro. Tunbridge agree that Manningham's prophecy, contained in his letter to Bro. Sauer (dated 12th July, 1757) had materialized? It is my opinion that the passage which I quote below foretells exactly what has happened with European Freemasonry:—

"... because they [the continental ceremonies] deviate so much from our usual ceremonies, and are so full of innovations, that in time our 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 difficult to understand Masonry as to distinguish the points and accents of the Hebrew and Greek languages now almost obscured by the industry of critics and commentators".

The mention of Voltaire in Masonic literature has always tormented me a little. *The Lodge of Nine Sisters* was composed of "members of superior intellectual attainments".¹ It is not surprising therefore to find Voltaire associated with such a group, especially if intellect was the yardstick for acceptance. It is surprising that Voltaire ever became a Mason at all, and more surprising that we as Freemasons eagerly claim him as a famous member of our Fraternity. Are we not claiming Voltaire the philosopher and writer rather than Voltaire the E.A.? Had he become a Mason earlier in life I would have no reason to raise this point — trivial though it is. But it does seem odd that we should claim a man who for so many years before taking the f.r.s. in Freemasonry, directed so much of his satirical writing against the Craft.

Bro. ALEX HORNE writes:—

The paper by Bro. Tunbridge illuminates a period in Masonic history that by all counts is filled with intense interest for all students, and the author is once again to be congratulated, for this follow-up of his previous paper. But, as the author himself indicates, "it would be impossible in a paper of this size" to do such a broad subject adequate justice. And anyone offering to fill in any additional details, to round out the account, will necessarily limit himself to those that are of paramount interest primarily to himself. I find myself in this very predicament, in the hopes, perhaps, that this discussion may be of sufficient interest to some others as well.

A prime example is the reference to King Frederick of Prussia, Frederick the Great, who is alleged by Thory to have had such a formative influence on the development of what has come to be known as the Ancient and Accepted [Scottish] Rite. The author here quotes from Thory to the effect that the King, by means of his 1786 Articles of Constitution, created a Supreme Council for a Rite of Thirty-Three Degrees out of what had up to that time consisted of only twenty-five. This, of course, is the accepted *credo* of Albert Pike and his Mother Supreme Council of the World, that of the Southern Jurisdiction of the U.S.A., of which he had been the Sovereign Grand Commander for some thirty years. Unfortunately, no authenticated set of these Constitutions, signed by the King — or, in fact, any other recognized authority — is known to exist, and all that the late Bro. Ray Baker Harris had been able to produce, in his monumental *History of the Supreme Council*, 33°, 1801 to 1861,² is a copy of these Constitutions, undated, unsigned and of no known and accepted origin. Albert Pike, however, in his capacity as lawyer and Masonic historian, satisfied himself as to the authenticity of the claim,

¹ J. G. Findel: *The History of Freemasonry*. London, 1865. p. 233.

² Washington, D.C., 1964.

and, in his *A Historical Inquiry in regard to the Grand Constitutions of 1786*, gave his reasons therefore. Gould, on the other hand, denied this authenticity,¹ and the German historian J. G. Findel, who had no sympathy for the so-called "Higher Degrees", and who was geographically closer to the alleged events, has raised some uncomfortable questions.² One can therefore hardly escape the fervent wish that some more recently-discovered documentation could have been found to throw further light on this troublesome episode. But where is the Gould, or the Pike, to take the time, and make the effort, to sift through the old records, in the libraries and archives of France and Germany?

As to the 1761 warrant said to have been delivered to Stephen Morin — and which effectively introduced the early Scottish Rite Degrees to the New World — a warrant which Bro. Tunbridge groups together with the 1786 Constitutions as having "some doubt regarding the authenticity of these documents," it is worthy of note that Gould, who had similar doubts regarding the 1786 Constitutions at least, says — after going into the documentation in his usually thorough manner — that:—

"although it must be distinctly understood that Morin's original patent has never been produced, I am by no means prepared to deny that it was really granted in 1761."³

Turning, now, to some other matters: Bro. Tunbridge refers to the statement of Boos to the effect that the Lodge in Lausanne, Switzerland, had received some Rituals from England in 1780, and makes the remark that it is "hardly likely since . . . there were no [authentic] printed rituals in existence" at that time. This, however, does not prevent some Rituals having existed in manuscript — like the famous Lancashire working, sometimes (rightly or wrongly) associated with the Lodge of Lights, and later found inscribed on paper with watermark 1799. It is not inconceivable that analogous workings, in manuscript, could have existed twenty years earlier. Furthermore, the 1760/2 printed exposures could also have been used, just as it is often said that Prichard's *Masonry Dissected* had previously been used for the same purpose, even in parts of England.

Another matter on which some comment could be made is with reference to the *Egyptian Rite* of Cagliostro, referred to by Bro. Tunbridge (on the authority of Thory, no doubt) as comprising so-called "magical" workings, for which reason it had "found some favour among the more superstitious and gullible of Swiss Masons". They must have been "superstitious and gullible", indeed, if they actually found anything "magical" in it. I have seen this working, and it is a most puerile and inconsequential production, and of no Masonic value whatever.

Finally, the statement that "the Bull issued by Pope Clement XII in 1738 . . . had not the slightest effect on the Craft" is perhaps too inclusive, in view of the experiences of John Coustos with the Portuguese Inquisition, so well documented in our *Transactions*.

Bro. BATHAM writes:—

As Bro. Tunbridge himself admits, he covers a tremendous amount of ground in this paper and restrictions of space prevent him from giving more than a brief account of the development of Masonry in each country. This is unfortunate as the value of this study would undoubtedly have been increased had he been able to spread it over two papers. However, one must be grateful for the fact that he has brought together so much information, though one must hope that his extensive reliance on Thory is justified.

I have not checked all these references, but I hope that Bro. Tunbridge has thoroughly satisfied himself on each point because Thory is not always reliable. As Bro. R. F. Gould said, Thory ". . . can be proved to have distorted historical facts, and misquoted documents to suit his own views" (*The History of Freemasonry*, Vol. III (1887), p. 137) and again ". . . having made up my mind never to depend upon (Thory) in the absence of corroboration" (*ibid.* p. 218).

It may be a minor point, but in referring to Holland, Thory mentions an incident in an Amsterdam Lodge in 1737, whereas Gould says it was on 10th December, 1735 and in Rotterdam. More serious is Thory's assertion that in 1756, the French Grand Lodge declared its independence from England when it dropped the word *Anglaise* from its title of *Grande Loge*

¹ R. F. Gould, *History of Freemasonry*, Yorston 1905 Edition, vol. iii, p. 383.

² J. G. Findel, *The History of Freemasonry*, 2nd Rev. Ed., 1869. London, pp. 698-700.

³ Gould, *op. cit.*, p. 379.

Anglaise de France. Gould who has gone into this matter very thoroughly, emphasizes that this word was never intended to imply subservience to England and says:—

“... but in order to support his assertions, he (Thory) has been disingenuous enough to invent an alleged correspondence with England, of which not a trace exists.”

Again Thory is at variance with all other writers in his account of the happenings from 1771 onwards. Admittedly the position is confused, but the *Grande Loge de France* certainly was not dissolved on 24th December, 1771, as it met at least five times in 1772 and issued several circulars. Its last recorded meeting was on 10th December of that year and it was definitely not replaced by the *Grand Orient de France*.

There were meetings of various groups in the following year and finally the *Grand Lodge of Paris Masters* emerged, claiming to be a revival of the *Grande Loge de France*, whose name it took when it reopened in 1796, after the Reign of Terror.

The majority of the brethren supported the rival body which, on 26th June, 1773, formed the *Grande Loge Nationale de France*, renamed six months later the *Grand Orient de France*. Both bodies regarded the Duc de Chartres as their Grand Master, but it seems that such support as he gave went to the Grand Orient. However, as Bro. Tunbridge later indicates, the two Grand Lodges united in 1799.

One has grave doubts also about the genuineness of Thory's letter of 16th March, 1818 to which Bro. Tunbridge refers in his section on Napoleon and this doubt is further enhanced by the fact that in this letter, reference is made to Joseph being King of Spain in 1804, an event that, as Bro. Tunbridge later indicates, did not take place until 1808.

Further, Thory is in error in stating that the King of Sweden, Gustavus III, was initiated in 1770, as he did not ascend the throne until 1771.

Again, Thory is completely confused about the *Grand Lodge of Prussia, Royal York of Friendship*. As is stated in the first section of the paper, the original Lodge was founded by Frenchmen in Berlin in 1760, but it was not Frenchmen who were instrumental in the Lodge declaring itself to be a Grand Lodge in 1798. The leading spirit was a former Jesuit priest from Hungary, Ignatius Fessler. This Lodge then became *The Grand Lodge of Prussia called Royal York of Friendship*. It should be emphasized that this unwieldy title does not indicate two separate bodies.

Finally, I wonder how Thory came to have such a poor opinion of Baron de Knigge? Gould describes him as a “Privy Councillor, a celebrated novelist and a lovable enthusiast” and Findel certainly has nothing ill to say of him. Incidentally, Weishaupt's Bavarian Society is referred to as the *Illuminati*, the term *Illuminés* refers to the Avignon Society founded by Count Grabianka.

Turning now to the problem of the unsavoury de Vignoles, it is not correct to say that the Grand Secretary, Bro. Heseltine, was blind to his shortcomings. As early as 1771 his patience with him was becoming exhausted as he had paid certain monies to Grand Lodge to avoid de Vignoles being disgraced and was finding it virtually impossible to obtain reimbursement. On 4th July, he wrote:—

“In short, Sir, ceremony on this occasion is unnecessary. I want the Money, and must beg you will fix a Day in the course of next week to pay it,” but this effort evidently failed, for on 18th November he wrote again

“... for I now find your promises mere matters of form; for were they otherwise in your own Ideas, you could not so long have trifled with me in a matter which being known, must at once destroy you in the Society of Freemasons.”

It is certainly surprising that de Vignoles was allowed to continue so long in office.

Bro. Tunbridge also refers to the initiation of Voltaire in the Lodge *Les Neuf Soeurs* on 7th April, 1778 and I have no wish to challenge what is an undoubted fact. I have, however, been endeavouring without success to find some evidence for the tradition that Voltaire was initiated in an English Lodge some fifty years previously, a tradition supported by two eminent Masonic friends of his, de Lalande (Master of the Lodge in 1778) and the Marquis de Villette and of which Bro. Tunbridge apparently, has also heard. I have been told that, on the subject of “Initiation”, Voltaire says in his *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, “Even today we poor Freemasons swear to speak not at all of our mysteries” but I cannot trace this passage in my copy of this work. I should be most grateful if anyone could assist me in these enquiries.

Bro. Tunbridge refers to the undertaking given by England in 1766 not to constitute any more Lodges in France, though for some reason unknown a Lodge was constituted in Grenoble on 18th March, 1767. Nothing is known of this Lodge and, in view of the length of time such things took in those days, it could well have been that an application for a Warrant had been

approved before the undertaking was given and that it went through officially, even though in practice no further action was taken.

Later on, after the death of the Duc de Clermont, when it was thought that the *Grande Loge de France* was extinct, England constituted another Lodge at Strasbourg, as is indicated in a letter from the Grand Secretary to Baron de Toussaint, Secretary General of the Grand Lodge of France, dated May, 1774.

Further, the "Antients", who were not party to the agreement, constituted a Lodge at Brest on 18th March, 1767.

In conclusion, I hope these comments will not give the impression that I am unappreciative of the great amount of work put in by Bro. Tunbridge, for such is far from being the case. I know only too well of the difficulties involved in trying to sort out the multitudinous contradictions of foreign Masonic writers and Bro. Tunbridge has thrown a considerable amount of light on matters that are always likely to be in the shadows. We are indebted to him for that.

[We are indebted to Bro. C. N. Batham for answers to questions raised in the comments on the Paper. Ed.]

Bro. BATHAM writes:—

Brother Clarke repeats his suggestion that the 1738 Papal Bull had a political motive against England and that its real purpose was to aid the cause of the Pretender, but he admits the weakness of his case when he says that the confirmatory Bull issued by Benedict XIV in 1751 was after all hope for the Jacobite cause had disappeared. Further, how does he explain that of the series of Bulls issued in the 19th century, directed against Freemasonry and other Societies, at least two specifically referred to the earlier Bulls?

Again, his reference to Lord Petre, "the principal layman of the Roman Catholic Church", as Grand Master from 1772 to 1776 does not support his case, as Brother Count Goblet d'Alviella has pointed out that the Roman Catholic Bishop Velbruck (Bishop from 1772 to 1784) was an enthusiastic Mason, as were many ecclesiastics under him, e.g. Canon de Geloës (Founder and first Master of *La Parfaite Intelligence* Lodge), Canon Devaux (Master of *La Parfaite Egalité* Lodge), and many others and whatever other motives the Bull may or may not have had, it certainly had a religious one.

The use of the expression "canonically promulgated" is perhaps unfortunate in this connection. The Bull was, quite obviously, circulated to the Catholic clergy and although some of them ignored it, as already explained, others allowed it to influence them, though juridically, it was ignored in France, where, in any case, Freemasonry had been outlawed the previous year.

Brother Clarke can, of course, quote Brother Alec Mellor in his support, as he expresses a similar opinion, not only in his book *Our Separated Brethren*, but again in a paper he delivered recently to *Phoenix* Lodge, Paris, the French Lodge of Masonic Research. Also, it must be admitted that even if the prime motive of the Bull were religious, as is generally believed, any political implications it might have would not be overlooked by the Papal hierarchy.

Passing now to the statement that some of the "higher" grades were invented by the Jesuits, I quite agree that this seems strange and it is indeed unlikely that reliable evidence to substantiate it will ever be forthcoming. Fessler, a former Jesuit priest, could have been attempting to involve the Jesuits for some reason best known to himself, or he could have been intending to imply that he had based certain degrees on Jesuit rituals, which indeed he had.

Brother Eric Ward quite rightly points out the importance of research into the development of Royal Arch Masonry in France and such research is being undertaken at the present time, but comment on it would be premature. However, some reference to it is made by Brother Paul Naudon in his recent book *La Franc-Maçonnerie Chrétienne*.

Regarding his further points, I know of no evidence that le Bas was a Mason and with regard to the ceremony of the swords, whilst it has always been held that this was a French innovation and was introduced from France into the Antient, Irish and Bristol rituals, I doubt again if reliable evidence will ever be forthcoming to support this.

However, I am making enquiries and will let Brother Ward know if I can produce anything of value.

Dealing with his final point about the trowel, this has always played an important part in Continental Craft Masonry, both in the first and the third degrees, and Craft Masonry has often been referred to both in France and Italy as *The Society of the Trowel*.

I agree with Brother Caywood that Brother Sauer's prophecy has been fulfilled in some ways, but on the other hand, there are Continental Obediences that observe the landmarks just as carefully as any others. I cannot agree with him, however, when he says that Voltaire directed so much of his satirical writing against the Craft. Against established religion, yes, but where is the evidence that he directed so much of it against the Craft?

Turning now to Brother Horne's comments on the Ancient and Accepted (Scottish) Rite, it is true that the "Thory" Version is the accepted *credo* of the Southern Jurisdiction of the U.S.A. though it seems to me that they put it forward nowadays with less assurance than of yore. I feel we should place it in the same category as the hypothetical Charter of King Athelstan and I would certainly place more reliance on Etienne (or Stephen) Morin's Warrant.

Finally, I agree that French Masons could well have used one or other of the exposures as *aides mémoire*, also that they used manuscript rituals. As a matter of fact, a Royal Arch manuscript ritual of about 1760 has been discovered and details of it are given in the book by Paul Naudon to which I have referred.
