



ANCIENT AND  
ACCEPTED  
SCOTTISH RITE OF  
FREEMASONRY



*The Morning Star, rising in the east  
is an emblem to us of the ever approaching  
dawn of Perfection and the Masonic Light*

## DID ÉCOSSAIS (EARLY 'HIGH') DEGREES ORIGINATE IN FRANCE?

*by Alain Bernheim*

In order to have a chance to understand why something unexpected happened in a specific place at a specific time, it appears logical to inquire into what happened there before and about that time in other parts of the world, and then try and find out whether some kind of relation may have existed at all between events which at first did not seem related to each other. A doctor wouldn't make a diagnosis, a tribunal wouldn't pass a sentence, before inquiring into the past of a patient (anamnesis) or of anybody charged with a serious offense.

Although this approach appears reasonable, many masonic historians follow a different one. They start with a preconceived opinion, consider it a fact from which they draw conclusions and mix the result with a few sentences culled from their predecessors who used the same method, hardly mentioning at all whatever they borrowed. Having brewed thus a cocktail of their own, they write it down, call it a research paper or a new book, and sign it with their name.

Did *Écossais* (early 'high') degrees originate in France ? Most masonic authors answer that question with an emphatic yes, yet I am far from certain that they are right. The assertion appears to have originated thus: anti-masonic writers followed by French romantic historians ascribed a French origin to high degrees. Their assertion was repeated from one book to the next without control. Then, in 1877, the French Grand Orient was excluded from the masonic community for well-known reasons. In a situation opposing a deviationist, French-speaking Freemasonry to a Landmark-respecting, English-speaking one, one more sin didn't matter much. On the contrary, since 'pure and ancient Freemasonry' was defined as consisting of three degrees only, including the Royal Arch, it was not inconvenient to adopt the opinion that from the start - since the first half of the 18th century - French Freemasonry deviated from the pure and ancient line.



About that time, the English authentic school of research was born. One would not expect members of *Quatuor Coronati* Lodge to admit an unproven theory. Yet, they did it from the start in other domains of fundamental masonic research, such as that of the origins of Freemasonry:

The founders of the Lodge coined the phrase 'authentic or scientific school' of Masonic research, which after one hundred years begs the question of whether they lived up to their claim. In their voracious appetite for searching out evidence the answer is yes. In their treatment of that evidence I think that the answer can only be a very qualified yes, particularly in their work on the origins of Freemasonry. They examined, found wanting and rejected many of the odder theories of our existence and similarly treated the evidence provided by Anderson. They did not, however, examine the basic premise from Anderson that Freemasonry developed directly out of operative masonry. This they appear to have accepted without question and, like Darwin, spent much time searching for missing links between operative masonry and the evidence they were bringing to light about non-operative masonry. In this they were behaving most unscientifically, seeking for evidence to prove their theory rather than seeking evidence and analysing it to see what could be deduced from it. (John Hamill, *AQC* 99, 1986, p. 4)

Seeking for evidence in order to prove a theory amounts to pick and choose facts, and results in isolating events from their environment, which the authentic school did <sup>1</sup> and keeps on doing.

Freemasonry of the 18th century was not the national-centralized organization it was to become. It developed and changed through the influence of Brethren who traveled from one country, from one part of the world, to another, bringing with them customs and innovations from wherever they came, and communicating them wherever they arrived. National Grand Lodges - no Supreme Councils or similar bodies existed then - had little actual influence upon the individual actions of their members. The rules of the game were different ones.

Analyzing masonic historical and ritual developments outside that international context, approaching them with our present rules in mind, is likely one of the reasons why historians of the masonic 18th century are confronted - and confront their readers - with unexplained and unexplainable situations ; for such a technique makes nonsense.

Worse still. For more than hundred years, Craft and additional degrees are studied in separate books - or in distinct chapters of masonic books - as if they belonged to world apart universes with no mutual feedback.<sup>2</sup> Such was not

<sup>1</sup> « *The authentic school was [...] inclined to regard masonic developments in each country in isolation* » (Douglas Knoop and G. P. Jones *The Genesis of Freemasonry*, 1947, p. 16).

<sup>2</sup> The idea seems at first to be supported by the *Circular* approved by the Supreme Council of the United States in Charleston, December 4, 1802 (Walgren Nr. 15, *Heredom* vol. 3, p. 69). It included a *Report* written by three members of the Council, Frederick Dalcho, Isaac Auld and Emanuel De La Motta, which asserted: « *Although many of the Sublime degrees are, in fact, a continuation of the Blue degrees, yet there is no interference between the two bodies* ». When the *Circular* was reprinted a few months later in Charleston (*Oration delivered, March 21, 1803, by Frederick Dalcho in the Sublime Grand Lodge of South-Carolina, Charleston*. Charleston [1803]. Walgren Nr. 22, *ibid.*, p. 72), the paragraph including the above words became an illuminating foot-note (Appendix, p. 64) which Emanuel De La Motta thought important enough to reproduce in his 'Rejoinder' issued in New York, September 5, 1814, in the name of his Supreme Council: « *Although the Sublime Masons have not, in this country, initiated any in the Blue degrees, yet their Councils possess the indefeasible right, of granting Warrants for that purpose. It is common on the Continent of Europe, and may be the case here, should circumstances render the exercise of this power, necessary. The legality of this right is derived from the highest Masonic authority in the world, and can be demonstrated to the perfect satisfaction of every Masonic, Judicial or Legislative body. [...]* ». La Motta's 'Rejoinder' or response to Cerneau's Rejoinder (Walgren Nr. 36, *ibid.*, p. 80-81) is reproduced in full in a few relatively scarce books: Joseph M'Cosh, *Documents upon Sublime Free-Masonry in the United States of America [...]*, Charleston 1823 (Walgren Nr. 55, *ibid.*, p. 90), above quote, p. 62 ; Robert B. Folger, *The Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, in Thirty-three degrees [...]*, New York 1862, above quote in Appendix, p. 155 ; [Charles S. Lobingier], *The Supreme Council, 33°*, Louisville, Ky., 1931, above quote, p. 112.



the case along the 18th century, for instance in Ireland. Irish historians stress the fact that Warrants issued by their Grand Lodge

provided the Lodges of the Irish jurisdiction with certain powers whereby they considered they had full authority to work any Masonic degree under their Warrant—a power which they exercised as occasion arose. The only limit to the practice required the presence of some Brother competent to work the ceremonies [...] Accordingly the Irish warranted Lodges, at home and abroad, conferred any degree they wished, with the full knowledge and approval of G. L.<sup>3</sup> [...] It is hard to realise that all Degrees were once given under the sole sanction and authority of the Craft Warrant. Prior to the formation of Grand Chapter and the Supreme Grand Encampment in the eighteen-thirties no other Warrant was known. And so in our old Minute Books we find the higher Degrees and other long-forgotten side Degrees conferred on Brethren usually at the modest fee of 5/5d. Irish or 5/- English. Each Lodge had separate seals for these Degrees.<sup>4</sup>

However two steps, both taken in England, led to the present separation between Craft and other degrees. Firstly, the wording of Article II of the *Articles of Union* ratified by both English Grand Lodges in 1813 (« *It is declared and pronounced, that pure Ancient Masonry consists of three degrees, and no more; viz. those of the Entered Apprentice, the Fellow Craft, and the Master Mason, including the Supreme Order of the Holy Royal Arch. [...]* »). Secondly, the fifth of the *Basic Principles*, accepted by the United Grand Lodge of England, September 4, 1929. The former document put an end to the negative consequences of a strictly English masonic situation, namely the existence of two rival Grand Lodges in England and its colonies for the past sixty years. The latter one expressed the English appreciation of the European masonic situation between both World Wars.<sup>5</sup>

## 1. SOME REMARKS ABOUT HIRAM'S DEATH

Before considering whether *Ecoissais* degrees originated in France, let us take one look first at the old question of original degrees and of their themes, since the contents of a degree is often more revealing than the name or number ascribed to it.

Historians of English-speaking Freemasonry admit a lack of manuscript or printed evidence showing the evolution of degrees in England between 1730 (*Masonry Dissected*) and 1760 (*Three Distinct Knocks*), a lack for which Harry Carr coined the expression 'the thirty-year gap'. They are faced with the following uncomfortable situation:

- a first series of 'catechisms' and exposures issued between 1723 and 1730, said to be incomplete because « *it contains [...] no reference to a prayer or to a charge to newly admitted brethren* » (Knoop, Jones and Hamer, *Early Masonic Catechisms*, 1947, 2d ed. [1963], p. 21 - Same idea in Carr, *AQC* 94, 1981, p. 117).

<sup>3</sup> William Jenkinson, 'Two Hundred Years of Masonry in the City of Armagh', *The Lodge of Research, No CC, Ireland. Transactions for the Year 1925* (printed 1933), p. 107 Jenkinson became a member of *Quatuor Coronati* Lodge in 1934. Died 1956.

<sup>4</sup> Jenkinson, 'In the Days of our Forefathers: Old Customs of the Irish Craft', *The Lodge of Research, No CC, Ireland. Transactions for the Years 1939-46* (printed 1948), pp. 35-36.

<sup>5</sup> The time when the *Basic Principles* were adopted was unfortunate. It resulted in giving support two years later to German Grand Lodges which tried to cope with Hitler and eventually expressed their agreement with him, and in refusing to recognize the new Symbolical Grand Lodge of Germany, founded in 1930, which opposed Hitler from the start.



- the 'thirty-year gap' from 1730 to 1760, during which « *a certain development [has] taken place* », a mild understatement from John Hamill (*The Craft*, 1986, p. 65).
- a second series of English exposures, beginning with *Three Distinct Knocks* (1760) and *Jachin and Boaz* (1762).<sup>6</sup>

However, analyzing in 1980 the first two English exposures of the second series, Harry Carr asked a question which appears a little odd in view of the above: « *Why did he [the author of *Jachin and Boaz*] use the opening narrative section containing practices that were foreign to English procedures ?* ».<sup>7</sup> In other words: Carr admits the lack of elements allowing to follow the evolution of English ritual after 1730, but does not hesitate to declare certain ritual practices from 1762 as *foreign to English procedures*.<sup>8</sup> Rather illogical, Isn't it ?<sup>9</sup>

Why *Écossais* or early 'high' degrees came to be invented and worked may well be related to two questions. When did the legend involved in our present third degree become a part of Craft Freemasonry ? Which was the evolution of the legend in different parts of the world ? One well-known piece of evidence is that the architect's murder made its first *printed* appearance in Prichard's *Masonry Dissected*, issued in London, October 1730 (see Appendix 1). Another one is that three distinct degrees - we ignore their thematic substance - were worked in London in May 1725 (Charles Cotton was « *made a Mason* », December 22, 1724 ; sometimes later « *A Lodge was held Consisting of Masters Sufficient for that Purpose In Order to Pass Charles Cotton, Esqr. Mr. Papillon Ball and Mr. Thomas Marshall Fellow Crafts* » ; on May 12, 1725, « *Brother Charles Cotton Esqe | Brothr Papillon Ball | Were regularly passed Masters* »).<sup>10</sup> One further clue has been apparently hitherto overlooked. It is included in *A Dialogue Between Simon and Philip*.

#### **a). *A Dialogue between Simon And Philip***

About 1943, the transcription of an undated document - the original manuscript was then considered as lost - entitled *A Dialogue Between Simon, A Town Mason, & Philip, A Travelling Mason*, was brought to the attention of Douglas Knoop who published it in the first edition (1943) of *Early Masonic Catechisms (EMC)*. At that time, Knoop, Jones and Hamer ascribed a c. 1740 date to the document. After the *Dialogue* was submitted and discussed in *Quatuor Coronati* Lodge, January 7, 1944, Knoop changed his mind and admitted that it might have been written as early as c. 1725. Fortunately, in 1945, a set of photographs reproducing the original MS was discovered in the Grand Lodge Library in London (AQC 57, 1946, p. 21). The second edition (1963) of *EMC* however mentions neither the suggested change of dating (on the contrary, its *Preface* repeats the c. 1740 one) nor a few differences between the transcript and the original document which included two essential sketches with the following captions: '*This is the form of the old Lodges*' and '*This Lodge is the new Lodge under Desaguliers Regulation*'.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>6</sup> The authenticity of the ritual printed in *Jachin and Boaz* was established beyond doubt by Paul Tunbridge in his paper about Emanuel Zimmermann (AQC 79, 1966).

<sup>7</sup> *Three Distinct Knocks and Jachin and Boaz, with an Introduction and Commentary by Harry Carr*, The Masonic Book Club, Vol. 12, 1981, p. [181].

<sup>8</sup> See Henri Amblaine [= Alain Bernheim], 'Masonic Catechisms and Exposures', AQC 106, 1993, pp. 150-151.

<sup>9</sup> Being illogical is described as a common British characteristic by Knoop and Jones: « *For good or evil, the freemasonry of London and Westminster in the age of Walpole showed what are regarded as common British characteristics. First, there may be noted a reluctance or incapacity to follow an argument to the end, and a disposition to be satisfied with a somewhat illogical position* » (AQC 56, 1943, p. 48).

<sup>10</sup> Minutes of the *Philo Musicae et Architecturae Societas Apollini*, quoted by Gould, AQC 16, 1903, pp. 113-114.

<sup>11</sup> Facsimiles of both sketches are reproduced in AQC 57, 1946, between pp. 10 and 11.



**The *Dialogue* includes the following words:**

*And the Junior Prentice takes you by the hand and knocks three times at the Door. The Master asks who's there. And the Prentice answers. One that has a desire to be made a Mason. The Master reply's Bring him in.*

*N.B. The reason of those three Knocks is not known to Prentices but to the Master, which is from HIRAM the Grand Master in SOLOMON'S TEMPLE. Being murdered by his three Prentices and was dispatch'd by the third Blow the last Prentice gave him and this because he would not discover the secrets to them.<sup>12</sup>*

Hiram said to have been murdered *by his three Prentices* represents, I think, an interesting clue for a tentative dating of the *Dialogue*, as well as for the degree-system's state of development at the time it was put down on paper. It suggests the following possibilities.

- A 'system' comprising two degrees only: the 'Prentice' degree followed by a degree including the murder of Hiram. In which case its dating might well be earlier than the year (c. 1725) suggested by Knoop on second thoughts.
- A three-degree system in which the legend of our present third degree belonged to the then second degree, the theme of the third one being unknown, but possibly including elements known later as belonging to the Royal Arch. Such a possibility was expounded by Philip Crossle, an excellent Irish scholar, fourteen years before the *Dialogue* was re-discovered.

**b) Philip Crossle's Irish Rite**

In 1927, Philip Crossle described what the thematic contents of the indigenous three-degree system might have included from the start in Ireland.

**First Period.** [...]

Possibly the very same practice, described by Pennell (1730):

1. Apprentice, or Brother
2. Fellow Craft
3. Master's part (M.M.), not confined to the Chair.

[...]

**Second Period.**

According as conversion in Royal Archism took place, the precise date of which it is impossible to give, the above three degrees were maintained; but the names were changed. [...]

1. Entered Prentice and Fellow Craft (one degree), more often referred to as "Entered and Crafted."
2. Master Mason.
3. Royal Arch.

Here we have a system of three degrees only. No. 1, Pennell's "Apprentice," became known by a composite name. His "Fellow Craft" having lost its former significance, ceased to represent a specific degree. The name, only, was

<sup>12</sup> AQC 57, 1946, p. 9. Text corrected by J. H. Lepper after the photographs of the original MS (*ibid.*, footnote 1, p. 7).



joined to the first degree, merely to preserve it from extinction. No. 2, Pennell's "Fellow Craft," was re-christened "Master Mason." It is important to keep this in mind. No. 3, Pennell's "Master's part" (M.M.), was re-christened "Royal Arch". [...] The purport of the degree which we, in Ireland, now call "Installed Master" must have been a portion only of Pennell's Master's part, and appears to have been merged in the ceremonies known by the general name of "Royal Arch" of the Second Period.<sup>13</sup> [...] The Second Period introduces us to the words "Royal Arch." In my opinion, our conception of the degree bearing that name was not an invention—rather, it was Pennell's "Master's part" (M.M.) clothed with a new name.<sup>14</sup>

### c). Some Ideas of Robert J. Meekren 15

R. J. Meekren followed a more conservative track. However his experience of various rituals in different parts of the world let him study the M. M. ritual with the comparative approach recommended by Douglas Knoop (*The Genesis of Freemasonry*, p. 16). The following quotes from papers Meekren wrote and from comments he made upon papers from other scholars open interesting prospects.

Incidentally, there is one grand mystery that is, or seems to be, insoluble from sheer lack of evidence or even hint concerning it; and that is when, and how, did the Elu motif get included in the third degree as worked in English-speaking countries. There is no trace of this in any form of the M.M. degree as worked in Continental Europe. This must have occurred before 1760, and (as it would seem) later than 1730. (AQC 68, 1956, p. 109)

There is nothing in Prichard or in *Le Secret* about seeking the Word in the grave of H.A.B.; on the other hand, it is said in Prichard that the Word was lost, and it is also said that it "is now found". In the versions current in France - and which almost certainly reflect the forms then favoured in Grand Lodge circles in England - the Word is not lost at all. Those who were sent to search for H.A.B. knew what it was, but agreed to change it for reasons given. The only form of the Hiram legend in which the Word is said to be sought for is that of the York rite in America, which descends from the ritual of the "Ancients". In this the searchers are charged to "observe whether the Master's Word or a key to it was to be found on or about the body". This appears to me to be a survival of a still earlier tradition, as the account in Prichard would indicate, for nothing whatever is made of it, nor is it indeed mentioned again. I think that the French version may well have been one of the things that the "Ancients" objected to in the ritual of the self-styled "Moderns". (AQC 72, 1960, p. 50)

In the York Rite, which is almost universal in the United States and which is the ritual of the "Ancients" somewhat elaborated, the rather fantastic idea that those Fellow Crafts who discovered the body of the missing Master became automatically Master Masons through their exclamation at the grave is fully avoided. The gist of the story is that the two Kings and Hiram Abif formed the first Masters' Lodge, and the Craftsmen had been promised that when the Temple was completed they (i. e. all who were judged faithful and, I suppose, competent) would receive Master's secrets as a reward. As the three had agreed or obligated themselves not to communicate these secrets which they

<sup>13</sup> Philip Crossle, 'The Irish Rite', Address to The Manchester Association for Masonic Research, March 31, 1927. Reprinted in *The Lodge of Research, No CC, Ireland. Transactions for the Year 1923* (printed 1929), pp. 155-275. Present quote: pp. 160-161.

<sup>14</sup> Crossle, *ibid.*, p. 193. Richard E. Parkinson, in the second volume of *The History of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Ireland* (1957) remarked, p. 321: « *The mass of evidence he [Philip Crossle] has adduced is weighty, but it must be admitted that his theory, attractive as it is, has not yet obtained the support of Masonic scholars outside Ireland* ».

<sup>15</sup> Robert James Meekren (London, 1876 - 1963) spent most of his life in Canada. He was Editor of *The Builder* from 1925 to 1930 (according to Wallace McLeod, quoted by Art deHoyos) and became a member of *Quatuor Coronati* Lodge in 1949.



had adopted except when all three of them were present, the position was that when one of them was missing, this could not be done. The same situation appears in the Graham MS. with the two brothers of King Alboyne. So, though the two Kings knew what the original secrets were, they could not communicate them, and thus they were lost to those who had been expecting to receive them. In consequence, King Solomon, who attends at the grave when Hiram's body is raised, announces that though the signs and word originally adopted by the three original Masters (called Grand Masters) are effectively lost, he will substitute others in their stead, so that the worthy craftsmen will receive the status of Masters, though not with the word originally intended. The word is specially emphasized, though signs are also mentioned.

Of course, the effect of the English version is very much the same. But in France the story is radically different. There was no agreement such as is related in the English and American stories, and there were evidently more than three Masters, for the finders of the body, in many instances, are said to be Masters, nine of them in one version, who, fearing that the three murderers might have obtained the word (evidently regarded as merely a password), agree to change it, and in relating this, what the original word was supposed to have been is openly told to the candidate. There was substitution, but no loss - it was the Master who was lost. And while in modern French and other European rituals this idea has been somewhat evolved, it has remained essentially the same from the very first, for it appears, as Bro. Ward points out, in the earliest French documents. (AQC 75, 1962, p. 172)

In order to let readers realize the implications of R. J. Meekren's remarks, a few relevant texts are transcribed in Appendixes 2 - 4 of this paper. They include:

- Parts of John Coustos' testimony made before the Portuguese Inquisition at Lisbon in March 1743, under the threat of torture.<sup>16</sup> In 1982, Father José A. Ferrer Benimeli, s.j., transcribed and issued the original minutes of the Inquisition and other documents pertaining to Coustos' arrest.<sup>17</sup> One sentence, « *He further said that he, the prisoner, learned all the matter above explained in the Kingdom of England* », is of the highest interest in relation with one ritual element mentioned by Coustos: « *when the destruction of the famous Temple of Solomon took place there was found below the first stone a Tablet of bronze upon which was engraved the following word, Jehova, which means God* ».
- Excerpts from two French exposures, *Catechisme des Franc-Maçons* (1744) and *L'Ordre des Francs-Maçons Trahi et le Secret des Mopses Revelé* (1745) where they appear in nearly identical words.
- Parallel excerpts from *The Master's Part* included in *Three Distinct Knocks* (1760) and in *Jachin and Boaz* (1762). In both, the three murderers are sentenced and executed.

<sup>16</sup> Coustos was born 1702 or 1703 in Bern (Switzerland) and his parents went to England. His name is listed in 1730 as a member of the lodge meeting at the Rainbow Coffee House in London. Then he belonged to a new London lodge, warranted August 17, 1732 under Nr. 98, meeting at Prince Eugene's Coffee House, which was to take the name Union French Lodge in 1739. He moved to France about 1736 and was the Master of a Lodge in Paris, the extant Minutes of which go from December 18, 1736, to July 17, 1737. Coustos left France for Portugal in 1741 and founded a lodge in Lisbon. He was arrested by the Inquisition March 14, 1743, and remained in prison fifteen months during which he was interrogated several times and tortured thrice. The minutes of the interrogations, translated into English, were issued in AQC 66 (1956) and 81 (1968). They give highly interesting information about masonic ritual practice. Wallace McLeod devoted two papers to Coustos and his Lodges (AQC 92 and 95, 1979 and 1982) and wrote the Introduction to the reprint of *The Sufferings of John Coustos*, advertised for sale in London, January 31, 1746 (vol. 10 of The Masonic Book Club, Bloomington, 1979).

<sup>17</sup> José A. Ferrer Benimeli, *Masoneria, Iglesia e Ilustracion*, Madrid 1982, vol. II., pp. 440-468, Apendices n° 45 A - 45 X.



#### d). Dr. Pott's Remarks

In a remarkable paper translated from the Dutch which appeared in *Le Symbolisme* (May-June 1964, N° 365), Dr. P. H. Pott summarized the consequences of the myth of Hiram's death and their possible influence upon *Écossais* degrees' themes.

'Blue' Freemasonry of the symbolical degrees takes its source in given elements related to the building of King Solomon's Temple. In the degrees of E. A. and F. C., they are presented under an utmost undifferentiated aspect, namely as a general abstract concerned with the building of a temple, considered from a symbolical point of view. In the M. M.'s degree however, these elements become more precisely delineated through the myth. The point is not any more that of building abstractly in general, but concerns a tragic event which takes place inside the symbolical semblance of an edifice considered as a whole.

[...]

Going further, one may say that the event which happens in the M. M.'s degree carries specific consequences which remain uncompleted:

a) the murder of H. A. upsets the order of things: It implies putting an end to an abnormal situation and, accordingly, arresting and punishing the culprits for their crime, that is in short, exercising a justified vengeance upon them;

b) the death of H. A. results in bringing the works to a stop. Accordingly it becomes necessary to find a new architect, as competent as possible, who will be able to proceed with the works and achieve the building in the best possible way;

c) because of H. A.'s assassination, the Master-Word got lost and every effort must be made to recover it.

From the moment one feels an urge to give a sequel to the Craft degrees, an opportunity to do so might be found in one of the consequences mentioned above. And this is what indeed happened.

## 2. EARLIEST EVIDENCE OF *ÉCOSSAIS*, 'SCOTCH' OR 'HIGH' DEGREES

Let us now consider the evidence about the earliest apparition of *Écossais*, 'Scotch' or 'high' degrees in different parts of Europe.

### A. THE IRISH LODGE AT LISBON - August 1738

Philip Crossle, whose ideas about the Irish Rite were mentioned above, would have been interested to read a statement made before the Inquisition in Lisbon on August 1, 1738, by Hugo O'Kelly, then Master of a local Lodge, which began working about 1733, and was then mainly composed of Irish Brethren. This is likely Lodge Nr. 135, warranted April 17, 1735 by the premier Grand Lodge of England, which was founded by a Scotch mathematician named George Gordon.<sup>18</sup>

The first papal Bull against Freemasons, *In Eminenti*, was issued April 28, 1738, promulgated in Portugal in June, and its text was affixed on church doors in Lisbon soon afterwards. Called as a witness, O'Kelly stated « *that as soon as he heard that the Holy Father [...] had prohibited such meetings, he immediately wrote to all the members of his Lodge [and] gave orders that there should be no more such meetings [...]* ». In the course of his testimony - contrary to Coustos five years later, he was not threatened with torture and made his deposition of his own free will - Hugo

<sup>18</sup>

See Minutes of the Premier Grand Lodge from April 17, 1735, *Quatuor Coronatorum Antigrapha*, vol. X (1913), p. 254.



O'Kelly said he was made a Mason in Ireland before arriving in Portugal about 1734-1735. He described the signs made 'with the right hand' which belonged to the three classes of Masons, and added: « *and there are two more classes which they call Excellent Masons, and Grand Mason, which are above all others and superior to that which he, the witness, exercised* ». <sup>19</sup>

## B. ENGLAND

During the last hundred years, the English authentic school discovered many facts which did not fit in the theory of the French birth of *Ecosais* degrees, but its members were so convinced of its truth that they do not seem to have ever contemplated 'an agonizing reappraisal' of the evidence. No attempt was made to investigate whether such facts were part of a general situation in England. Nothing in terms of ritual or contents of the degrees thereafter mentioned is apparently extant.

### a) Early lists of lodges, 1733 and 1734

In Rawlinson's manuscript list from the year 1733, Lodge N° 115 met at the Devil Tavern, Temple Bar, London, and was described as "a Scotch Masons' Lodge". In Pine's engraved list of 1734, the same lodge appeared as a "Scott's Masons Lodge". In June 1888, after having mentioned both lists and quoted Gould (« *The Scots degrees seem to have sprung up, about 1740, in all parts of France* »), John Lane asked a sound question:

Now, if "Scots" degrees, or "Scots" Lodges originated first in France, and that not until 1740, two questions naturally arise. (1) Where did our English brethren obtain the distinctive appellation of a "Scotch" or "Scott's Masons' Lodge" ? and (2) what constituted its peculiarity in 1733 ? Satisfactory answers to these enquiries would be very acceptable, but I cannot supply them. <sup>20</sup>

### b) The Lodge held at the Bear, Bath, 1735

« *On Oct. 28th 1735 The Lodge met Extraordinary when our Worthy Brother Dr. Kinneir was admitted and made a Mason. [...] On the same date Lodge of Masters met Extraordinary and our following Worthy Broths were made and admitted Scots Mastr Masons. [ten names]. Present. Hugh Kennedy S.M., David Threipland S.S.W.<sup>21</sup>, David Dappe S.J.W.* ».

Edward Armitage transcribed the above from the Minute-Book of the Lodge and commented:

Of these three Hugh Kennedy alone belonged to the Lodge of which he was Master when the Minutes commence, December, 1732, and when the Lodge was constituted into a regular Lodge May 18th, 1733, going out of Office on 27th December, 1733. I find David Threipland's name as a Member of the Lodge meeting at the Bear and Harrow in the Butcher Row in 1730. Of those who took the degree the last four were not members of the Lodge; Doctr. Toy was D.M. of Wales while Wm. Nisbett Esq. and Henry Balfour Esq. had the degree of Master conferred on them that day

<sup>19</sup> Vatcher, 'A Lodge of Irishmen at Lisbon, 1738', AQC 84, 1971, p. 88. Original minutes of Hugo O'Kelly's *Declaración*, Ferrer Benimeli, *op. cit.*, vol. I, Apendice N° 40 C, pp. 304-305: « [...] e há mais duas a que chamao Massones excelentes, e Masson grande, que he sobretodos, e mais superior a qual elle testemunha exercitava ».

<sup>20</sup> John Lane, AQC 1, 1886-1888, pp. 167 & 173. Also see John Lane, *A Handy Book...*, 1889, pp. 24-25, and W. J. Hughan, *The Engraved List of Regular Lodges from A.D. 1734*, 1889, p. 26.

<sup>21</sup> W. R. S. Bathurst (AQC 75, 1962, p. 168) suggested that David Threipland was either the 2nd Baronet of Fingask Castle, near Dundee, who joined the Earl of Mar in 1715 and died in 1746, or one of his sons.



apparently to enable them to proceed to the Degree of Scots Master. At the next meeting of the Lodge, November 17th, 1735, Hugh Kennedy, John Morris, B. Ford and David Threipland have the letters S.M. after their names.<sup>22</sup>

### c) Old Lodge No. 1, London, 1740

« 17 June 1740. | *The following Members of this Lodge | were this Evening made Scotch Master Masons by Bror. Humphry's of the Mourning Bush Aldersgte.* | [nine names follow] »

W. Harry Rylands transcribed the above from Minute-Book C of Old Lodge No. 1 which in 1717 met at the Goose and Gridiron in London, and wrote:

In the above minute the word "Master" is written over the word "Masons"; evidently he intended at first to write that the members were made "Scotch Masons", and corrected it into "Scotch Master Masons". It is worth noticing that only two of those present at the audit meeting were not made Scotch Master Masons: Richard Wotton and Richard Reddall, and unless it may be supposed that they were already possessed of the degree and assisted Humphreys, it must be concluded that the members of the Lodge were, as the Minutes state, "made Scotch Master Masons by Bror. Humphry's" alone. Also from the form of the entry and the fact that several, if not all, of those whose names are entered were already Master Masons, the degree of Scotch Master must have been something different from the degree they had already received in English Masonry. I am inclined to think that the degree given in the Lodge by Humphreys was not the foreign degree of the same name but the same as that given in the Scott's [Master] Masons' Lodges of 1733-34.<sup>23</sup>

### d) Lodge at the Rummer, Bristol, 1740

July 18, 1740: « *Order'd & agreed That Bro. Tomson & Bro. Watts [S.W. and J.W. p.t.] & any other member of this L. that are already Master Masons may be made Scotch Master...* ». August 15, 1740: « *Ordered - Bro. Byndloss be the next night Pass'd f.c. and that the Master Masons be made Scotch Masters and this L. to meet at 5 o'clock for that purpose* ». November 7, 1740: « *According to an order the [sic] 18th July 1740 Bro. Watts & Bro. Noble & Bro. Ramsay and Horwood & Morgan were raised Scotch Masters & at the same time Bro. Wickham and Bro. Pirkins were raised Masters* ».<sup>24</sup>

### e) The Scotch H-d-m, or Ancient and Honourable Order of K-n-g (1743 [1741 ?] - 1750)

On November 26, 1743, the following advertisement appeared in a London paper:

The Brethren of the Scotch H—d—m, or Ancient and Honourable Order of K—n—g, are desir'd to meet the Grand Master of the said Order, and the rest of his Grand Officers, at the sign of the Swan in Great Portland-street,

<sup>22</sup> Edward Armitage, AQC 32, 1919, pp. 40-41. January 8, 1746, two brethren « *were this day made Scotch Masters* ». Five « *were made Scotch Masons* » on November 27, 1754. On February 17, 1756, two brethren « *were duely raised Scotch Master Masons. At the same time Thomas Miller the Drawer of the Bear Inn and John Morris the Tyler both Servants of this Lodge were for the conveniency of the Business of this Lodge also raised Scotch Master Masons* ». On April 14, 1758, « *Lodge Met extra' to raise [nine names] Scotch Masons* ». (Minutes from the Lodge, quoted by Eric Ward, AQC 75, 1962, pp. 132-133).

<sup>23</sup> *Records of the Lodge Original, No. 1. Now the Lodge of Antiquity, No. 2.* Edited by W. Harry Rylands, privately printed 1911, pp. 105-106.

<sup>24</sup> The lodge was warranted under No. 137, November 12, 1735. Its first minute-book was purchased from private hands in 1924 (Cecil Powell, AQC 49, 1939, p. 160). Above extracts from that minute-book, quoted by Eric Ward, AQC 75, 1962, pp. 131-132.



near Oxford-Market, on Wednesday next, at Three o'Clock in the Afternoon precisely, to celebrate the Day. By Order of the Grand Master, E. W. , *Grand Sec.*<sup>25</sup>

Two weeks later, December 11, 1743, a Chapter of the Order was formed at the Golden Horseshoe, Cannon Street in Southwark, a London borough. It was the fifth Chapter belonging to the Order, but the first one showing when it was formed since the four previous ones claimed to be of Time Immemorial. Further advertisements concerning the Order appeared on August 1, 1750 (meeting of Grand Lodge and Grand Chapter, signed « *By Command of the P.G.M., N.B.L.T.Y. Grand Secretary* ») and on November 17, 1753 (meeting of the Grand Chapter of the Order H.R.D.M., signed as above).

In 1750, one William Mitchell from The Hague received various documents from the Order in London, among which a Patent appointing him « *Provincial Grand Master of the Order of the H.R.D.M. throughout the Seven United Provinces* ». In the body of the Patent, reference is made to « *the Right Honble and Right Worshipfl Prince and Supreme Ruler and Governor of the Great S.N.H.D.R.M. and Grand Master of the H.R.D.M. of K.L.W.N.N.G.* ». The Patent was delivered to Mitchell by « *SIR ROBERT R.L.F. Knight of the Order of the R.Y.C.S. Warder of the Tower of R.F.S.M.N.T. Presedent of the Judges and Council of the Great S.N.H.D.R.M. and Provincial Grand Master of the H.R.D.M. of K.L.W.N.N.G. in S.B.* » and dated thus: « *Given under my Hand and the | Seal of my Office at London | this twenty-second day of July | A.D. 1750, A.M.H. 5753 and in | the Ninth Year of my Provincial | Grand Mastership* ».

<sup>26</sup>

According to the last words, the Order must have existed in London at least since 1741. It may have existed earlier if *Sir Robert R.L.F.* was not its first London Provincial Grand Master.

### C. PRUSSIA - November 1742

The sixth edition (1903) of the history of the Grand National-Mother-Lodge of the Three Globes, in Berlin, includes the following:

On November 30, St. Andrews' Day, 1742, Brothers Fabris, Roman, Fromery, Finster, Perard and Robleau, members of the Lodge aux trois Globes, were authorized by it to establish a Scottish Lodge under the name of de l'Union "to let its younger Brethren aspire after the higher or so-called Scottish Masonry". This Scottish Lodge, composed of members of the St. John's Lodge, existed besides it, without exerting any kind of authority upon it nor interfering in any way with its administration, and had its own cash-box.<sup>27</sup>

Jacopo or Jacobus Fabris was to be elected Master of the Three Globes Lodge in Berlin, October 30, 1744. A painter, born about 1689 in Venice who died 1771 in Copenhagen (Denmark), he was made a Mason in the Union Lodge,

<sup>25</sup> F. W. Levander, 'The Collectanea of the Rev. Daniel Lysons, F.R.S., F.S.A.', AQC 29, 1916, p. 26. See R. S. Lindsay (edited by A. J. B. Milborne), *The Royal Order of Scotland*, 1972, p. 26.

<sup>26</sup> Quotes from Mitchell's Patent from Lindsay, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-41. Lindsay stated: « *the Order is Speculative and a stage beyond Craft Masonry [...] the Order was founded between 1725 and 1741 as a protest against the elimination of Christian elements from the three Degrees of Craft Masonry.* » (*op. cit.*, pp. 25-26).

<sup>27</sup> « *Am 30. November, dem St. Andreastage, 1742, stifteten die Brr. Fabris, Roman, Fromery, Finster, Perard und Robleau der Loge aux trois Globes mit deren Genehmigung "für das Emporstreben ihrer jüngeren Brr. zur höheren oder sogenannten schottischen Maurerei" eine Schottische Loge unter dem Namen de l'Union, welche dann neben der Johannisloge und aus Mitgliedern derselben fortbestand, ohne irgend eine Hoheit über diese auszuüben, sich auch in deren Verwaltung nicht einmischte, vielmehr ihre eigene Kasse hatte* ». *Geschichte der Grossen National-Mutterloge in den Preussischen Staaten genannt zu den drei Weltkugeln*, 6th ed., Berlin 1903, pp. 14-15.



London.<sup>28</sup> Philipp Friedrich Steinheil, Founder and first Master of the Union Lodge in Frankfurt am Main in 1742, had been a member of the same Lodge in London together with Fabris.<sup>29</sup> Neither names are extant on the early lists of members, included in the first two Minute-Books of the premier Grand Lodge of England, transcribed in *Quatuor Coronatorum Antigrapha*, vol. X (1913).

When Eric Ward mentioned the Berlin Union Lodge before *Quatuor Coronati* Lodge In 1962, he commented: « *the fact that "Scots" Lodges were set up in 1742 at Berlin, in 1744 at Hamburg and in 1747 at Leipzig, all of which were of French origin [?], makes it seem probable [!] that knowledge of the degree in its primitive form at London and Bath in 1735 was similarly derived from France* ». <sup>30</sup> To support the asserted *French origin* of these lodges, Ward referred in a foot-note to an English translation of Findel, originally written in 1866 ! Findel quoted Lachmann who asserted that « *Ramsay's Scots Degree arrived early in Germany, probably through Graf Schmettow* ». <sup>31</sup> Lachmann believed in the existence of the mythical *Ramsay's Scots Degree* and ignored that two distinct Freemasons were named Schmettow. There is no evidence that Baron Gottfried-Heinrich (1710-1762), made a Mason in the three Globes, September 13, 1740, ever had anything to do with Scots degrees in Berlin. His cousin, Graf Woldemar (Dresden, 1719 - Copenhagen, 1785), founded the first Scotch Lodge in Hamburg, 1744. After 1746, his military and masonic career took place in Denmark. <sup>32</sup>

#### D. FRANCE - December 1743

As far as I am aware, the earliest documentary reference to *Écossais* degrees in France is included in a set of General Regulations adopted by the Grand Lodge assembled in Paris, December 11, 1743, on the day when the comte de Clermont was elected Grand Master, two days after the death of his predecessor, the duc d'Antin. Its 20th and last article reads:

As it appears that lately (*depuis peu*) some brothers announce themselves as Scots Masters (*maîtres Écossais*), claiming prerogatives in private Lodges and asserting privileges of which no traces can be found in the ancient archives and usages of the Lodges spread over the globe, the Grand Lodge, in order to cement the unity and harmony which should reign amongst Freemasons, has decreed that these Scots Masters, unless they are Officers of Grand Lodge or of a private Lodge, shall not be more highly considered by the brothers than the other apprentices and fellows, and shall wear no sign of distinction whatever. <sup>33</sup>

<sup>28</sup> K. L. Bugge, *Det Danske Frimureriers Historie indtil Aar 1765*, vol. 1, Kjøbenhavn 1910, p. 47.

<sup>29</sup> Georg Kloss, *Annalen der Loge zur Einigkeit*, 1842, p. 9. Alain Bernheim, *Les Débuts de la Franc-Maçonnerie à Genève et en Suisse*, 1994, pp. 67-68.

<sup>30</sup> Eric Ward, *AQC 75*, 1962, p. 160.

<sup>31</sup> Dr. Heinrich Lachmann, *Geschichte und Gebräuche der maurerischen Hochgrade und Hochgrad-Systeme*, Braunschweig 1866, p. 4.

<sup>32</sup> Matthias G., Graf von Schmettow, *Schmettau und Schmettow, Geschichte eines Geschlechts aus Schlesien* [Schmettau and Schmettow, Story of a family from Silesia], Büberich bei Düsseldorf, 1961. Bugge, *op. cit.*, p. 47. Bernheim, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>33</sup> The 20th article was known to Daruty (*Recherches sur le Rite Écossais Ancien Accepté*, 1879, p. 97) and to Gould (*History of Freemasonry*, vol. III, pp. 141-2). Both retranslated it from a German translation reproduced in Findel (3d German ed., 1870, p. 285), originally issued in '*Zeitschrift für Freimaurerei*' (Altenburg, 1836). After World War II, the original text of the General Regulations of 1743 was considered by French masonic historians as lost. I rediscovered it in the Library of the Grand East of the Netherlands, announced the discovery in *Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française*, and published it in 1974 (*Travaux de Villard de Honnecourt*, tome X).



The date, December 11, 1743, together with the words *depuis peu* (lately), should be kept in mind when asserting that 'high' degrees originated in France.

Gould who was a member of the committee appointed by the United Grand Lodge of England December 5, 1877, to consider the recent action of the Grand Orient de France, saw in the above article a sign of « *the first innovations in the ritual* » in France (*History of Freemasonry*, vol. III, 1886, p. 141). Eric Ward, although familiar with most of the English evidence quoted above, called to his rescue a work written in 1797 by John Robison, one of the earliest anti-masonic authors, in order to justify the opinion he expressed thus in his 1962 paper:

The wealth of references to Scots Masters in the literature of the Continent, compared with their paucity in England (and the total absence in Scotland), leads inevitably [*sic*] to the view that this was of French origin. John Robison [...] goes on to say: « It has accordingly happened that the homely Free Masonry imported from England has been totally changed in every country of Europe, either by the imposing ascendancy of French brethren . . . or by the importation of the doctrines, and ceremonies, of the Parisian Lodges. Even England, the birth-place of Masonry, has experienced the French innovations ; and all the repeated injunctions, admonitions, and reproofs of the old Lodges, cannot prevent those in different parts of the Kingdom from admitting the French novelties . . . » (*Proofs of a Conspiracy*, p. 9).<sup>34</sup>

### 3. CONCLUSION

Having put my information at the disposition of the reader, it is now up to him to decide whether *Écossais* (early 'high') degrees originated in France or somewhere else... for instance in Ireland or in England.

Should doubts still remain in his mind, may I remind him of a remark once made by Henry Sadler, an English historian whose common sense and sense of humor I much admire: « *This may be true or it may not, you must take it for what it is worth ; for my part I will tell you frankly that I do not swallow everything I read in Encyclopedias, either Masonic or otherwise* » (AQC 23, 1910, p. 327), words which, presumably, might well be applied to many masonic books too.

Alain Bernheim

---

<sup>34</sup> See note 30.



## APPENDIX

### 1.

#### *Masonry Dissected (1730)*<sup>35</sup>

- Ex. An Enter'd 'Prentice I presume you have been.  
R. *Jachin* and *Boaz* I have seen;  
A Master-Mason I was made most rare,  
With Diamond, Ashler and the Square.
- Ex. If a Master-Mason you would be,  
You must rightly understand the Rule of Three.  
And \*M.B. shall make you free: \*Machbenah  
And what you want in Masonry,  
Shall in this Lodge be shewn to thee.
- R. Good Masonry I understand;  
The Keys of all Lodges are all at my Command.
- Ex. You're an heroick Fellow; from whence came you ?  
R. From the East.
- Ex. Where are you a going ?  
R. To the West.
- Ex. What are you a going to do there ?  
R. To seek for that which was lost and is now found ?  
R. [sic] What was that which was lost and is now found ?  
R. The Master-Mason's Word.  
Ex. How was it lost ?  
R. By Three Great Knocks, or the Death of our Master *Hiram*.  
Ex. How came he by his Death ?  
R. In the Building of *Solomon's* Temple he was Master-Mason, and at high 12 at Noon, when the Men was gone to refresh themselves, as was his usual Custom, he came to survey the Works, and when he was enter'd into the Temple, there were Three Ruffians, suppos'd to be Three Fellow-Crafts, planted themselves at the Three Entrances of the Temple, and when he came out, one demanded the Master's Word of him [...]
- Ex. When was he miss'd ?  
R. The same Day.
- Ex. When was he found ?  
R. Fifteen Days afterwards.
- Ex. Who found him ?  
R. Fifteen Loving Brothers, by Order of King *Solomon*, went out of the West Door of the Temple, and divided themselves from Right to Left within Call of each other; and they agreed that if they did not find the Word in him or about him, the first Word should be the Master's Word; [...]
- Ex. Give me the Master's Word.  
R. Whispers him in the Ear, and supported by the Five Points of Fellowship before-mentioned, says *Macbenah*, which signifies *The Builder is smitten*.

<sup>35</sup>

Transcribed after the facsimile reproduction of a 1730 edition in *Harry Carr's World of Freemasonry* (1983).



-----  
2.

**Coustos' Testimony (1743)**

**a) 21 March 1743**<sup>36</sup>

[...] the signs of the Masters came from the time Solomon built his sumptuous Temple, whereby [...] he, Solomon, made the separation of signs above described, which were initiated by a Master named Hiram [...] to whom alone was revealed the Sign which pertained to him as Master [...] And some of the Fellow-Crafts or Apprentices perceiving this (*E querendo alguns dos Officiaes e aprendizes*) and desiring to learn the secret sign which he had, three of the said Fellow-Crafts arranged amongst themselves that [...] they would compel him to reveal the said Sign [...] he [Hiram] was first asked by the Fellow-Craft at one of the doors for the said Sign [...] After three days King Solomon [...] appointed fifteen of the said Fellow-Crafts [...] After fifteen days [...] one of the said Fellow-Crafts [...] discovered the body of the Master [...] On giving an account to King Solomon, he ordered that [...] they should go to the said place and disenter the body [...] they arranged between themselves that if on the body of the Master, or in his pockets (*ou nas suas algibeyras*), they did not find the means of ascertaining what the signs were [...] they would follow the course of using the first word and sign which they used to each other after they had used those normally employed as Fellow-Crafts and Apprentices ; and thus raising him upright, the first word which he who raised him uttered was in fact Mag, Binach which means in our language that it did stink; and so it came to pass that from that time onwards the sign of the Master was this last action of laying hold of the wrist, and the said words; [...]

He further said that he, the prisoner, learned all the matter above explained in the Kingdom of England [...].

**b) 26 March 1743**<sup>37</sup>

That the reason and foundation that the Masters of this Fraternity have for causing those who newly join to take the oath upon a Bible, or Book of the Gospels, at the place of that of St. John, is the following: - that when the destruction of the famous Temple of Solomon took place there was found below the first stone (*primeira pedra*) a Tablet (*Lamina*) of bronze upon which was engraved the following word, Jehova (*Geová*), which means God [...]

-----  
<sup>36</sup> English translation quoted from AQC 81, 1968, pp. 50-51. Original minutes in Portuguese in Benimeli, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 444-445.

<sup>37</sup> English translation from AQC 81, 1968, p. 52. Original minutes in Portuguese in Benimeli, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 446.



3.

***Catechisme des Franc-Maçons [1744]***

***L'Ordre des Francs-Maçons Trahi et le Secret des Mopses Revelé (1745)*** <sup>38</sup>

The Master had only a word to distinguish him from those I have been discussing, which was Jehova; but it was changed after the death of Adoniram. Three Fellows [...] hid themselves in the Temple [...] When Adoniram [...] came to the Door on the South side (*CAT: passa devant celle du Midi - TRA: voulant sortir par celle du Midi*), one of the three Fellows asked him the Master's word [...] Solomon having been seven days without seeing Adoniram, ordered (*only in CAT: on the seventh day*) nine Masters to go in search of him; [...] they discovered the body of Adoniram [...] and fearing that they [some Fellows] might have obtained the [Master's] word of him, they first resolved to change it, and to adopt the first word that any of them might utter while disinterring the Corpse. [...] he said Macbenac, which signifies, according to the Free-Masons, the flesh falls from the bone (*in TRA: the flesh falls from the bone, the body is corrupted*). They immediately agreed that henceforward this would be the Master's word. [...] (*only in TRA: there are some who hold that it was Solomon who thought of changing the Master's Word; while others assert that the Masters made the change without consulting him*).

4.

***Three Distinct Knocks (1760)***

***Jachin and Boaz (1762)***

***Three Distinct Knocks***

***Jachin and Boaz***

There were Fifteen Fellow-Crafts [...] they had not received the Master's Word [...]

Twelve of these Crafts recanted, and the other Three were resolv'd to carry it on; their Names were *Jubela, Jubelo and Jubelum*.

These Three Ruffians [...] placed themselves at the Three Entrances of the Temple [...]

So *Hiram* came to the East Door, and *Jubela* demanded the Master's Word; [...]

Our Master *Hiram* being missing, as he did not come to view the Work as usual, King *Solomon* made great Enquiry after him [...] The Twelve

There were originally Fifteen Fellow-Crafts [...] not having received the Master's Word [...] Twelve of them recanted; the other three were obstinate and determined to have it by Force if no other way could be found; their Names were *Jubela, Jubelo and Jubelum*.

[...] the three Assassins [...] placed themselves at the East, West, and South Doors of the Temple [...] *Hiram* having finished his Prayer to the Lord, came to the East Door, which he found guarded by *Jubela*, who demanded the Master's Grip [...]

Our Master *Hiram* not coming to view the Workmen as usual King *Solomon* caused great search to be made; [...] The Twelve Fellow-Crafts that recanted [...] went to *Solomon* [...] and offered their Assistance in

<sup>38</sup> *Catechisme des Franc-Maçons*, original 1744 ed., pp. 16-19. *L'Ordre des Francs-Maçons Trahi*, original 1745 ed., pp. 82-86. English translation from *The Early French Exposures*, Edited by Harry Carr, London 1971, respectively pp. 96-98 and 257-258.

<sup>39</sup> Transcribed after the first edition, London 1760, pp. 57-61.



Fellow-Crafts that had recanted [...] went and acquainted King Solomon [...] and King *Solomon* sent them in search of the Three Ruffians which had absconded: They divided into Four Parts [...] One of those Parts travell'd down to the Sea of *Joppa*; one of them sat down to rest by the Side of a Rock [...] he hearing a frightful Lamentation in a Cliff of the Rock [...]

This Brother [...] hailed the other Two, and they went into the Cliff of the Rock, and took them and bound them, and brought them before King *Solomon* [...] therefore *Solomon* order'd their own Sentences to be laid upon them [...]

After this King Solomon sent those 12 Crafts to raise their Master Hiram [...]

and *Solomon* told them, that if they could not find a Key-word in him, or about him, it was lost; for there were but Three in the World that knew it, and it never can be deliver'd without we Three are together; but now One is dead, therefore it is lost. But for the future, the first occasion'd Sign and Word that is spoke at his raising, shall be his ever after. So they went to raise him; and when they had clear'd the Rubbish, they saw their Master lie dead, in a bruised Condition; for he having already lain 15 Days, they lifted up both their Hands above their Heads in a great Surprise, and said, O Lord my God (which is the grand Sign of a Master-Mason).

[,,,] and whisper in his ear, and say MAHHABONE; that is, almost rotten to the Bone, which is the Master's Word.<sup>39</sup>

order to discover the three other Fellow-Crafts, who had absconded: They separated, and divided themselves into four Parties [...] As one of the twelve was travelling on the Sea-side, near *Joppa*, being fatigued, he sat down to refresh himself [...] but was soon alarmed by the following hideous Exclamation from the Cliff of a Rock [...]

The Fellow-Craft [...] went in Quest of his two Associates, and they entered the Cliff of the Rock, took and bound them fast, and brought them to King *Solomon* [...] The Sentence passed on them was the same as they expressed in their Lamentation [...]

When the Execution was over, King *Solomon* sent for the Twelve Crafts, and desired them to take the Body of *Hiram* up [...]

he also told them, that if they could not find a Key-Word about him, it was lost ; for there were only three in the World to whom it was known; and unless they were present, it could not be delivered. Hiram being dead, it consequently was lost.

However as *Solomon* ordered, they went and cleared the Rubbish, and found their Master in a mangled Condition, having lain fifteen Days; upon which they lifted up their Hands above their Heads in Astonishment, and said, O Lord my God ! This became the grand Sign of a Master Mason, and it is used at this Day in all the Lodges of Masters.

[Note] [...] you whisper in his Ear MAHHABONE, or, as in the Modern Lodges, MAC BENACK, which is the Master's Word.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>40</sup>

Transcribed after the first edition, London 1762, pp. 41-46.