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Abstract

Following the appointment of its first aristocratic Grand Masters in the 1720s and in the wake of its connections to the scientific Enlightenment, ‘Free and Accepted’ Masonry rapidly became part of Britain’s national profile and the largest and arguably the most influential of Britain’s extensive clubs and societies. The new organisation did not evolve naturally from the mediaeval guilds and religious orders that pre-dated it, but was reconfigured radically by a largely self-appointed inner core. Freemasonry became a vehicle for the expression and transmission of the political and religious views of those at its centre, and for the scientific Enlightenment concepts that they championed. The ‘Craft’ also offered a channel through which many sought to realise personal aspirations: social, intellectual and financial.

Through an examination of relevant primary and secondary documentary evidence, this thesis seeks to contribute to a broader understanding of contemporary English political and social culture, and to explore the manner in which Freemasonry became a mechanism that promoted the interests of the Hanoverian establishment and connected and bound a number of élite metropolitan and provincial figures. A range of networks centred on the aristocracy, parliament, the magistracy and the learned and professional societies are studied, and key individuals instrumental in spreading and consolidating the Masonic message identified. The thesis also explores the role of Freemasonry in the development of the scientific Enlightenment.

The evidence suggests that Freemasonry should be recognised not only as the most prominent of the many eighteenth century fraternal organisations, but also as a significant cultural vector and a compelling component of the social, economic, scientific and political transformation then in progress.
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Introduction

When this thesis was first developed in concept, it had been expected that the evidence would lead to a narrow focus on a relatively small group of ‘architects’ at the helm of the new Grand Lodge of England and to their relationships and networks within a number of learned and professional societies and, in particular, the Royal Society. Instead, an evaluation of relevant primary source material has directed analysis to a far more diverse group of Masonic ‘movers and shakers’, and to the identification of new networks and channels through which Freemasonry expanded from its London hub. Moreover, although an initial working assumption had been that the early noble Grand Masters, the first aristocrats to head Grand Lodge, would be revealed as simple figureheads, primary source material, including correspondence and contemporary press reports, suggests that a small number including, in particular, Charles Lennox, 2nd Duke of Richmond, were active Masonic proselytisers and that their Freemasonry also served a political purpose.

In The Craft, Hamill argued that the prevailing historical methodology, which posited ‘a direct descent from operative to speculative masonry through a transitional phase’, was without substance. Despite nearly three centuries of currency, Hamill suggested that there was no firm historical evidence to support the established thesis of a gradual shift from the mediaeval working masons’ guilds to the more gentlemanly and ‘spiritual’ form of masonic lodge of the

---

1 The word ‘freemason’ can be dated back to the early twelfth century. Until the early eighteenth century, a freemason could be defined as a skilled and non-indentured stonemason. However, common usage of the term within England was extended in the seventeenth century to include non-working or honorary members of a masonic guild or lodge. By the mid-eighteenth century, its meaning had altered and the word referred principally to non-working ‘Free and Accepted’ Masons, later known as ‘speculative’ freemasons, whose use of masonic tools was allegorical. Prior to this time, ‘speculative’ freemasonry meant the theoretical, geometrical or mathematical aspects of operative masonry, and did not have any necessarily spiritual or allegorical connotations.

eighteenth century. However, as Snoek subsequently commented\(^3\), although Hamill may have queried the thesis, he did not provide an alternative hypothesis.

The absence of a robust counter argument suggested the need for a detailed examination of the economic, social/political and intellectual background to the establishment of modern English Freemasonry, and for the subject to be placed in a broader historical context. It also put forward the implication that English Freemasonry at each stage in its development would reflect the social make-up of those who populated its ranks, and the composition and characteristics of those who led its numbers. The material that has been identified and evaluated within this thesis provides the foundations for a fresh interpretation of the development in the 1720s of what is commonly regarded as the modern form of English Freemasonry, and an alternative hypothesis to the gradualist approach to Masonic development.

Whereas it should be clear intuitively that any study of Freemasonry cannot be separated from its contemporary context, certain academic Masonic historians have considered the interaction little more than a tangential or ‘fringe’ issue.\(^4\) In contrast, this thesis contends that a comprehensive analysis requires an understanding of the interplay between Freemasonry and the relevant economic, intellectual, political and religious milieus. It is argued that these factors are at the core of historical analysis. Indeed, the evidence presented below suggests that Freemasonry was both a product of its environment and that it exercised a reciprocal influence upon it, particularly with respect to the dissemination of ideas associated with the scientific Enlightenment.

The principal vectors through which such influence was effected included the individuals who controlled and moulded English Freemasonry after the formation of its new ‘Grand Lodge’ in 1717. These architects of modern Freemasonry designed and created an organisation that was radically different from that from which it had nominally descended. The new structure reflected the intellectual - political, philosophical, scientific and religious - dynamics that drove the

leadership. And it echoed their idiosyncrasies and desire for personal advancement.

On a national scale, Freemasonry developed rapidly over a short two decades from its re-launch in the early 1720s to become, as Peter Clark acknowledged, the most prominent of the many eighteenth century fraternal organisations, with a uniquely large provincial network.\(^5\) It also grew internationally, where it tracked British trade routes and colonial expansion.\(^6\) The movement was replicated elsewhere, and complementary and sometimes competing Grand Lodges were established in Ireland, Scotland, France, the Netherlands, Sweden, Germany and Russia, where Freemasonry gained a following among the aristocracy, within the military, and among the intellectual and political classes. Aspects of Masonry’s moral and philosophical tenets, and its ersatz historical antecedents and Enlightenment substance, had resonance. And both within Britain and, more particularly, within Continental Europe, Masonic lodges created a ‘public sphere’ for intellectual debate that was elsewhere more circumscribed.\(^7\) Beaurepaire has commented on academic research into this relational Masonic space within Europe\(^8\) and noted, in particular, academic work by Margaret Jacob and others that placed ‘Masonic lodges ... at the heart of their studies of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century sociability’.\(^9\)

However, with regard to studies of early eighteenth century English Freemasonry, many of the factors that are fundamental to an understanding of its development have often been ignored or skirted. Such issues include the Protestant succession, the Huguenot Diaspora, the struggle for political and religious power, and the economic, financial and intellectual footfall of the Enlightenment. Of course, there have been partial exceptions, for example, Knoop and Jones in the 1930s and early 1940s, examined Freemasonry through a predominantly economic

---

\(^7\) Jürgen Habermas, transl. Thomas Burger, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society (Cambridge, 1989).
\(^9\) Ibid, 407.
lens. And, more recently, Jacob, Stevenson, Prescott and Harland-Jacobs, among others, have explored alternative determinants, certain of which are considered and discussed in the chapters below. Stevenson’s powerful examination of the origins of Scottish Freemasonry set a high academic standard. However, his widely-accepted theory that English Freemasonry had its roots in William Schaw’s administrative re-organisation of Scottish operative masonry in 1598-99, failed to give sufficient weight to independent developments in England, ignored the contribution of England’s multiplicity of ‘Ancient Charges’, and largely disregarded economic and social factors south of the border. Indeed, Stevenson himself subsequently confirmed that The Origins was not designed to present an analysis of Freemasonry as a whole, but rather to evaluate that of Scottish Freemasonry alone. Pre-dating and later running alongside Stevenson’s studies, Jacob’s pioneering academic work concentrated principally on European Freemasonry and on the Low Countries in particular. Although her research has significant materiality and, more recently, she has sought to explore the origins of Freemasonry in greater depth, her focus remains that of Continental Europe and her observations have not always been relevant or specific to developments in England. Stevenson has been more critical, describing The Origins as ‘incoherent’ and ‘plain inaccurate’, and commenting that ‘Jacob’s knowledge of British masonry is limited’. Prescott examined certain of the economic factors underlying Freemasonry’s development in England in a series of lectures and articles, and recognised a

10 Cf. Douglas Knoop & G.P. Jones, Genesis of Freemasonry (Manchester, 1947), and Knoop & Jones The Mediaeval Mason (Manchester, 1933).
11 Cf. Bibliography for a selection of relevant secondary source material.
13 William Schaw was Master of the King’s Works in Scotland, 1583-1602. At the end of the sixteenth century, Schaw instigated a new formal administrative structure for Scottish operative freemasonry.
requirement to ‘establish a framework of interpretation’.\textsuperscript{18} He also noted in passing the political, scientific and aesthetic features of Freemasonry. However, his conclusion, that Freemasonry ‘sits most comfortably [within] the history of religion’, narrows rather than broadens an historical analysis.\textsuperscript{19} And Harland-Jacobs’ contribution to the historical research of Freemasonry has been connected to its cultural role within the context of imperialism, with a principal focus on developments from the mid-eighteenth century to the early twentieth, rather than its earlier formative period.

This thesis concentrates on early modern English Freemasonry and its re-engineering over a period of less than two decades from 1720-1740. It argues that Freemasonry’s development mirrored the impact of economic, political, religious and intellectual forces, and suggests that in the 1720s and early 1730s, Freemasonry was part of the process of change. In short, it seeks to illuminate the inter-relationship between Freemasonry and contemporary English society, and to examine certain of the focal points and catalysts.

Given the almost vertiginous growth of Freemasonry in the eighteenth century, two fundamental questions are ‘how?’ and ‘why?’ An analysis of key protagonists within Grand Lodge and its senior constituent lodges, such as the Horn Tavern in Westminster, the Bedford Head in Covent Garden, and the Rummer at Charing Cross, reveals a diverse range of interconnected individuals and political, social and professional networks through which influence was exercised. Only certain of these have previously been identified and examined.

Although sharing nomenclature with the earlier stonemasons’ guilds and the London Company of Masons, the new Freemasonry deployed ideas complementary to and linked with the scientific Enlightenment. The primary evidence suggests that the creation of English Grand Lodge was not another step in an unbroken and ongoing evolutionary flow, as Anderson pronounced\textsuperscript{20} and many subsequent Masonic historians stated for almost three hundred years, but

\textsuperscript{18} Cf., for example, Andrew Prescott, ‘A History of British Freemasonry, 1425-2000’, \textit{CRFF Working Paper Series, No. 1} (2008), 1-29; the quote is from 3.
\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Ibid}, 29.
\textsuperscript{20} James Anderson, \textit{The constitutions of the Freemasons ...} (London, 1723) (the “1723 Constitutions”).
rather a step change that reflected principally the actions, and philosophical and political input of Jean Theophilus Desaguliers and a core group of associates.

Unfortunately, contemporary correspondence and records concerning early modern English Freemasonry and its protagonists are, perhaps unsurprisingly, relatively sparse. Despite a willingness to publicise its new *Constitutions*, lodge meetings, the eminence of those connected to the organisation and their philanthropic endeavours, Freemasonry was initially a relatively loosely organised and semi-secret society. Consequently, there is only a limited corpus of written lodge records, of which much is formulaic in style, and a similar quantum of relevant personal correspondence. Indeed, the contrast with record keeping in Scotland following the centralising influence of William Schaw is marked. As a consequence, many of the personal links and Masonic relationships posited within this thesis are based on the balance of probability and the accretion of evidence rather than on hard primary proof.

Before outlining the structure of this thesis, it is important to note what it does not contain. There has been no attempt to provide an analysis of and comparison with Scottish Freemasonry, nor to examine Schaw’s Scottish ordinances and administrative changes. In contrast to preceding, parallel and subsequent developments in England, these are areas that are not under-researched and have received comprehensive academic attention. For the same reason, Continental European Masonry has not been considered other than in a few instances where specific events are considered to be directly derivative of or relevant to English Grand Lodge, for example, through the involvement of Desaguliers and/or Charles Lennox. As with Scotland, broader developments in Continental Europe have been researched by a number of organisations and academics, both Masonic and otherwise.21 Finally, this thesis has also bypassed a detailed examination of Masonic ritual and its ‘spiritual’ and quasi-religious components, and has omitted other factors that have been explored relatively extensively elsewhere, including the limited role of women in Freemasonry, or developed only later in the eighteenth century, such as Freemasonry’s connection with international trade.

---

21 Snoek, ‘Researching Freemasonry. Where Are We?’, 5-9, provides a comprehensive summary of developments in the field.
The thesis is divided into six chapters. Each explores complementary aspects of what should be regarded as a holistic episode. The first chapter proposes an alternative, economic and social perspective to English Freemasonry’s mediaeval and post-mediaeval development. It reinforces the arguments against modern Freemasonry forming part of an evolutionary continuum of ritual and association dating from the mediaeval period, or the ‘time immemorial’ referred to in Freemasonry’s traditional history. Instead, possible economic and socio-political determinants are examined, beginning with the outbreak of plague in the mid-fourteenth century.

The second chapter focuses on Desaguliers, arguably the most important individual among the core group that directed Grand Lodge and reconfigured English Freemasonry. His émigré Huguenot background and other factors that moulded his character and outlook, including his Newtonian education and position within the Royal Society, are outlined and discussed.

Chapter three examines George Payne, Charles Delafaye, William Cowper, Nathaniel Blackerby and others who can be regarded as among Desaguliers’ principal Masonic colleagues and collaborators. The chapter explores the extensive network of personal and political relationships centred on the London magistracy and, in particular, among senior members of the Middlesex and Westminster benches. It develops the thesis that political involvement in Freemasonry went beyond simple government acquiescence, and raises the argument that Freemasonry in London and elsewhere became associated with the apparatus of state. The reasoning is examined further in chapter five in connection with the role of the aristocracy within Freemasonry.

Chapter four evaluates parallel social networks based on the learned and professional societies, including the Royal Society, the Spalding Society and the Society of Antiquarians, and comments on the contribution of Martin Folkes and William Stukeley, among others. Members of two lodges are investigated: those at the Bedford Head in Covent Garden; and at the Horn, Westminster. Folkes’ relationships with the Dukes of Montagu and Richmond provide a bridge to the fifth chapter, which explores the influence of the first aristocrats to head Grand

Lodge and what became ‘national’ Freemasonry. These were the ‘noble Grand Masters’ who took the titular or, occasionally, actual helm of Grand Lodge, Freemasonry’s largely self-appointed governing body. The chapter considers the impact of their involvement on Freemasonry’s public persona, and outlines the extensive press coverage that Freemasonry achieved after 1720. It also touches on the personal relationships and networks of relevant members of the aristocracy with respect to the military, the government, and the patriotic opposition allied to Frederick, Prince of Wales.

Lastly, chapter six considers Freemasonry’s connections with the scientific Enlightenment. The chapter outlines and reviews how Desaguliers’ Masonic ideology was disseminated alongside the popularisation of Newton’s scientific theories, principally through public lectures and demonstrations, and explores the attraction that the Masonic lodge held as a forum for entertainment and education, as well as commercial and personal advancement. And in combination with the popularisation of Newtonian scientific theories, it considers in brief Freemasonry’s role as a political vehicle within Continental Europe.

Four appendices follow the Conclusion. The first sets out for reference purposes the names of Grand Lodge Officers during the period. The second provides a succinct analysis of the derivation and text of the Charges and Regulations, the core of the 1723 Constitutions and an avenue through which Grand Lodge exercised authority and secured control over English Freemasonry. The third provides a detailed register of Irish and British military lodges. And the fourth records the names of probable and possible Masonic members of two of the professional societies discussed in chapter four: the Royal College of Physicians and the Society of Apothecaries.

If correct, the argument that Desaguliers and others within the upper circles of English Grand Lodge appropriated Freemasonry, and that it subsequently became a vehicle for the expression and transmission of their ideas and ideals, has significant implications both for the history of Freemasonry and for an analysis of contemporary English political and social culture. This thesis seeks to identify certain of the key architects of change. It also examines a number of the threads that connected and attracted a nascent membership to Freemasonry including its
pro-Hanoverian and pro-establishment stance; strong association with the Newtonian scientific Enlightenment; the social imprimatur of an elite and celebrity aristocratic leadership; potential financial and educational benefits; and the unusually egalitarian and fraternal socialising that it offered.

However, despite their importance, it is acknowledged that Desaguliers’ and his fellow architects’ influence was not indelible. By the late 1730s and 1740s, their authority had begun to wane, as age and death reduced both their influence and number. Subsequently, as different élites emerged at the helm of English Grand Lodge, the movement began to reflect the altered political, commercial and social mores of its new masters.23 The Masonic superstructure established by Desaguliers and his circle would remain in situ, as would its structural divorce from its mediaeval religious and operative incarnations. However, English Freemasonry’s profile and purpose would subsequently be altered materially by successive leaders to the point where it could be argued that the organisation’s principal concerns became divorced from those of its founders.

23 Arguably as a function of the policies adopted by the Grand Lodge of England in the 1740s, a major schism in English Freemasonry occurred in the latter part of that decade which led to the founding of the rival Ancient Grand Lodge of England in 1751. The division persisted until 1813, when the original Grand Lodge of England, which had pejoratively been termed the ‘Moderns’, merged with the newer and rival ‘Ancients’ to form the present United Grand Lodge of England.
Chapter One

English Freemasonry before the formation of Grand Lodge

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a short historical perspective to the formation of English Grand Lodge in 1717 and to the construction in the 1720s of what can be recognised as ‘modern’ English Freemasonry. The chapter seeks to build on work by Prescott and others, and to extend the alternative analyses to the once conventional view that the development of what emerged as ‘Free and Accepted’ Masonry in the third decade of the eighteenth century formed part of an unbroken evolutionary continuum dating back to the mediaeval or pre-mediaeval period.¹ The chapter focuses on two aspects of change. First, the economic transformation that followed the outbreak of plague in 1348 and the consequential shift in the standing of the guilds from what had been predominantly religious orders into what became embryonic collective bargaining organisations; and second, the process of integration whereby the guilds were absorbed into local and metropolitan social, economic and political structures. The chapter examines and reinterprets conventional source material, and identifies and considers data not previously evaluated.

Medieval English Freemasonry: an Economic Imperative

Prescott has commented forcefully that the search for a single point of origin for English Freemasonry should be regarded as academically unproductive.² Although this position may be correct, it would be wrong to ignore the tectonic shift in the economic and social environment, and the consequential financial dynamics, that accompanied the Black Death in the mid-fourteenth century. Market dislocation and soaring mortality followed the outbreak of plague in 1348,

¹ The gradualist or evolutionary argument has been sustained in a number of recent academic works including David Harrison, The Genesis of Freemasonry (Hersham, 2009) and Peter Kebbell, The Changing Face of Freemasonry, 1640-1740 (University of Bristol: unpublished PhD thesis, 2009).
and widespread labour shortages caused pay rates to accelerate rapidly.\(^3\) Although labour guilds had been in existence for several centuries, principally as quasi-religious orders\(^4\), many underwent transformation during subsequent decades as a reaction to ordinances and legislation that responded to rising wage rates by attempting to depress labour costs by statute.\(^5\)

Passed in 1349, Edward III’s *Ordinance of Labourers* sought to reduce wages to the levels that had applied in 1346 before the Black Death. The *Statute of Labourers*, enacted by Parliament in 1351, reinforced the legislation and imposed wage rates in relation to specific occupations for both piecework and on a daily basis. In 1368, legislative enforcement was incorporated by statute into the duties of the Justices of the Peace; and by 1390, Justices were empowered to determine at their discretion what they considered reasonable maximum wage rates for their districts. Additional legislation restricted labour mobility and improved terms of contracts in favour of employers.\(^6\)

The Parliament that enacted this legislation encompassed principally landowners with a vested interest in ensuring that inexpensive labour was available for their estates. Such landowners, the gentry, and others from their political and social circles, also served as local magistrates and were responsible for law enforcement. The inherent friction between the interests of agricultural capital and labour was clear; and it endured in the wake of successive outbreaks of plague in the 1360s and 1370s. Catalysed by the imposition of higher taxes through the Poll Tax, labour disquiet culminated in the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381.\(^7\) A similar pattern of disruption, disorder and legislative intervention in labour

---


\(^6\) Cf. Chris Given-Wilson, *Service, Serfdom and English Labour Legislation, 1350-1500*, in Anne Curry and Elizabeth Matthew (eds.), *Concepts and Patterns of Service in the later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 21-37, for a detailed overview of the relevant labour legislation.

markets was repeated over the next two and a half centuries, as successive outbreaks of pneumonic and bubonic plague reoccurred, and price inflation took hold.\(^8\)

Phelps Brown and Hopkins calculated that as a function of plague-related labour shortages, and notwithstanding legislation to the contrary, the daily nominal cash wages of skilled building workers in southern England rose by two thirds over the second half of the century: from \(3d\) per day in the mid-1340s, to \(5d\) per day in the 1390s. During the same period, the wages of unskilled labourers doubled, from around \(1\frac{1}{2}d\) to \(3d\) per day.\(^9\) Phelps Brown and Hopkins concluded that real wages for artisans rose by around 45\% in the half century to 1390, with those of unskilled workers up to 60\% higher.

In contrast, real wages generally declined across most of England during the late fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as prices increased more than six-fold and wages failed to maintain parity.\(^10\) Inflation was a function of the unprecedented expansion of money supply linked to the flow of New World bullion to Europe, large-scale silver production in central Europe\(^11\), and English currency debasement.\(^12\) In a labour market still characterised by hostile legislation and with judicial sanction threatening local pay negotiations, stonemasons and other workers experienced earnings volatility on a scale not previously encountered. And in this context, the guilds gradually became a more visible part of a process by which craftsmen combined for their mutual economic benefit and protection.\(^13\)


\(^13\) However, William Kerrish, ‘Practical Aspects of Mediæval Guilds’, *The Irish Monthly*, 63.746 (1935), 504-12, offers a wholly contrasting viewpoint.
These changes were reflected in the scope and content of what are now termed the *Old Charges*: the first written evidence of English Freemasonry. Skilled artisans from many trades, including stonemasons and other construction workers, established and operated closed shops designed principally to create or maintain local monopolies. Through their guilds, using the justification of providing appropriate training and quality control, as well as contract enforcement and other arguments, groups of skilled workers imposed and operated restrictive employment practices. Craft membership was controlled by rationing the number of apprenticeships, and by establishing a minimum period for such apprenticeships. In broad terms, the guilds set or supported prices; protected their members’ proprietary skills from counterfeit by outsiders - the un-apprenticed and ‘cowans’; and levied fines for infraction. Although they also provided an important framework for mutual assistance in periods of unemployment, and offered help with rudimentary healthcare, funeral expenses and basic education, these aspects can be regarded as secondary to the guilds’ principal economic functions: influencing prices; protecting their members’ rights and privileges; and, most importantly, maintaining their earning capacity. In his *History of British Freemasonry*, Prescott correctly termed this process the ‘syndicalist phase’.

Having been admitted to a Masonic guild, a member would progress through three stages: from initial acceptance or initiation as an apprentice, usually at the age of 14; through to ‘craftsman’ or ‘journeyman’; and finally to master mason.

---

14 The contextual development of these documents is discussed in Appendix 2.
16 It is important to emphasise that this chapter does not pretend to present a complete or detailed history and analysis of the activities, rise and fall of the mediaeval guilds. The Bibliography contains a short section dedicated to additional secondary source material not footnoted herein.
17 A ‘cowan’ was a stonemason who had not served a regular apprenticeship. In modern Masonic usage, it describes someone who wishes to learn the ‘secrets’ of a master mason without having passed through the intermediate stages of apprentice and fellowcraft.
19 However, cf. Gervase Rosser, ‘Crafts, Guilds and the Negotiation of Work in the Medieval Town’, *Past & Present*, 154 (1997), 3-31, which offers a more complete and complex overview of the shifting arrangements surrounding craft guild structures.
The training process would endure for a minimum of seven years. The speed of progress to craftsman or journeyman would have been a function not only of tradition, but also of individual skill and economic conditions more generally: there would have been little point in allowing an apprentice to advance too rapidly if there was insufficient work. Upon initiation into the guild and at each stage of the progression from apprentice to fellowcraft, and from fellowcraft to master mason, the aspiring candidate would swear an oath to keep private the craft’s operational methodology. And at each such stage, he would be entrusted with the secrets appropriate to his new rank.

The stonemasons’ architectural and engineering skills were fundamental to the creation of the visible symbols of authority and power of both church and state in the construction of abbeys, cathedrals, churches, castles and city walls: what might be regarded as the commanding (religious and political) heights of medieval society. Unlike certain other craftsmen and a majority of agricultural labourers who were restricted in their movements, stonemasons had the flexibility to travel to work at different construction sites. Tangentially, it has been argued that such relative autonomy provided the origin of the term ‘freemason’. However, there are two alternative and more robust explanations. The first is the derivation from ‘freestone’ mason: a stone that is fine-grained and ‘soft’, such that it can be carved or sculpted without shattering or splitting. The second, proposed by Knoop and Jones, is that the word ‘free’ was derived from ‘noble’ or ‘superior’, that is, a skilled worker able to command a premium above rough masons and journeymen employed in less expert work. In the same vein, the term ‘lodge’ may have originated in the ‘loggia’ or temporary shelter created at a construction site for masons working on that project.

---

21 The minimum age for a master mason was 21, the legal age of maturity.
24 Evidence for the latter explanation appears in records dating back to the thirteenth century. Corroboratory data is found readily in contemporary records and is discussed in more detail below. Cf. Knoop & Jones, The Mediaeval Mason, pp. 86–9, esp. p. 88, fn. 5.
25 Ibid., pp. 56–62.
Despite the dissolution of the monasteries and the introduction of brickwork, the guilds developed over time to become influential economic units. And they gradually became integrated into civic leadership structures, particularly in London and other prominent cities, including Chester and York. In addition to nominating members to the city council, strong social, financial and political connections emerged that tied the guilds closely to the municipal authorities and vice versa. Over time, guild membership increasingly became dominated by the more affluent artisans and master builders who, as master masons, employed journeymen and apprentices as construction workers on a piecework basis or a daily or weekly wage. Such men had a similar social standing to the local civic burghers and other freemen of the city, and possessed comparable economic and political interests. Indeed, Swanson, commenting on and extending Dobb’s analysis, has argued that the local merchant and artisan oligarchy controlling provincial towns and cities manipulated the guild system in order to advance their own self-interested political and financial purposes. As Dobb had noted, the prevailing condition of relatively inefficient and parochial markets encouraged exploitation:

Monopoly was of the essence of economic life in this epoch ... since the municipal authority had the right to make regulations as to who should trade and when they should trade, it possessed a considerable power of turning the balance of trade in [its own] favour.

The degree of interdependence between the guilds and the municipalities was cemented further as guilds came to recognise the value of admitting and promoting local dignitaries to their ranks. The benefits were palpable: the local Justices’ authority extended to setting wage rates; and the local politicians, aldermen, sheriffs and mayors, were responsible for granting guild charters and commissioning civic building works. Evidence for such a quasi-deterministic interpretation can be found even among traditional Masonic scholars. Referring to ‘a very old MS’, William Preston noted that:

When the Master and Wardens met in a lodge, if need be, the sheriff of the county, or the mayor of the city, or alderman of the town, in which the congregation is held, should be made fellow and sociate to the Master, in help of him against rebels.\textsuperscript{31}

In short, there were clear economic benefits to both sides. Albeit a simplification, the municipalities received fees, taxes and a share of fines for granting the guilds the privilege of operating quasi monopolies, and the guilds gained the remit to control the availability and, to a certain extent, the price of labour and output. Members of the local oligarchy were present in and eventually dominated both sets of organisations.\textsuperscript{32} The inter-relationship endured and only came under sustained economic and political attack from the late seventeenth century, when changes to working practices combined with political disquiet at the guilds’ innate conservatism and what was viewed as their unenlightened opposition to innovation and free trade, caused them to be perceived as holding back economic progress and industrial development.\textsuperscript{33}

Despite such changes to their form and function, the stonemasons’ guilds, in common with other guilds, retained elements of their traditional ritual, including the passwords and non-verbal signs of recognition. They also preserved their traditional histories and nominal codes of conduct set out in their \textit{Old Charges}. However, it is probable that over time such features became more important for their outward appearance rather than for any substance, as lodges reflected the altered composition and elevated status of their new entrants, and adopted attributes that were more social than ‘working’.

The admission of known gentlemen to stonemason’s lodges has been used by Masonic historians as evidence of the beginnings of a ‘spiritual’, later termed

\textsuperscript{31} W. Preston, \textit{Illustrations of Masonry} (London, 1796), p. 184. Chap. 6 below references Desaguliers’ visit to Edinburgh in 1721, his work on the Comiston aqueduct, and the concomitant admission of several of Edinburgh’s civic burghers to the lodge.


‘speculative’, interest in Freemasonry. Indeed, certain non-operative Masons, such as Elias Ashmole and other antiquaries and scholars, may well have been motivated, at least in part, by a desire to study the esoteric aspects of lodge traditions. However, others are likely to have had different motives. Certain of the gentry entering the lodge may have acted principally as local benefactors, attending only rarely and in the same manner as the aristocracy and gentry had acted as patrons to earlier religious orders. But for many, if not most, it would be a reasonable conjecture that social, business and local political networking, accompanied by periodic dining and drinking, would have been a principal rationale.

Rosser has commented that ‘feasting and drinking were in the Middle Ages regarded as [the] defining activities of the guilds’. He quoted a thirteenth century clerical opponent of fraternities who claimed, perhaps somewhat ironically, that ‘if it were not for the feasting, few or none would come’. Rosser also noted the ritualistic and charitable aspects of the annual feast, and its function in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as a means whereby ‘links of solidarity and patronage could be forged’. There is little reason to believe that the position was fundamentally different in the seventeenth century. In short, it is likely that many gentlemen and other non-masons entered the lodge for reasons that had little to do with any deemed spiritual characteristics.

However, whatever the reason for their membership, guilds that admitted affluent non-operative masons benefitted from the additional subscriptions and social and political gravitas that such members brought. And it is apparent that a number of lodges, including those in Warrington and York, evolved to comprise

---

35 *ibid*, 431.
36 *ibid*, esp. 433-438, quote from 438.
37 Kebbell, *The Changing Face of Freemasonry*, pp. 13-15, argues (possibly incorrectly) that the ‘elite science’ of Freemasonry had an intellectual attraction for an ‘Enlightened’ seventeenth century audience. In contrast, this thesis argues that such interest did not develop materially until the 1720s, and that it was principally a function of Desaguliers and his colleagues’ intellectual input. Cf. chapters 2 and 6.
38 Cf. Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 38-40; her example of a Dundee operative Masonic guild which provided non-Masons or ‘strangers’ with the benefit of ‘freedom’ of the guild for £10, is a clear instance of the principle of admitting non-Masons to alleviate financial problems, albeit that the example refers to a Scottish lodge. The admittance of non-Masons in Chester, London, Warrington and York is discussed below.
a majority of non-operative masons. Surviving lodge membership data suggest that prominent members perpetuated their influence through invitations to friends and successive generations of family to the extent that such lodges became predominantly non-working social and political clubs, where dining and networking took precedence.  

Barker-Cryer has reflected on the civic importance of Randle Holme III, his father, grandfather, and other members of the masonic lodge at Chester, including Thomas Chaloner. In *York Mysteries Revealed*, he noted that, in the 1660s, the lodge at Chester was ‘made up largely of the City fathers’. Lewis and Thacker’s *History of the County of Chester* made a similar point:

Chaloner was a deputy herald, whose widow married Randle Holme I. Holme and his son, Randle II, both served as churchwardens at St. Mary’s, aldermen of the company of Painters, Glaziers, Embroiderers, and Stationers, deputy heralds, and mayors; industrious and accurate, they amassed large collections from the city records, monumental inscriptions, genealogies, and gentlemen’s papers.

Barker-Cryer also commented on lodge membership in York. Despite favouring a gradualist approach to Freemasonic development, his analysis provides further support for the ‘social transition’ argument detailed above. Commenting on the membership records for York in 1705, among the earliest extant, Barker-Cryer noted the presence of the city’s first families and the ‘support and patronage of significant Yorkshire gentry’. In summary, he observed that the lodge had created a ‘notable niche for itself socially’.

---

39 R.F. Gould, *The History of Freemasonry: Its Antiquities, Symbols, Constitutions, Customs, Etc.* (Whitefish, 2003), part 2, pp. 141-2, provides such an analysis of the lodge meeting at Warrington in 1646. This reprint was published by the Kessinger Publishing Co. of Whitefish, Montana. The original was published London, 1885.


Non-Operative Masonry prior to the formation of Grand Lodge

As discussed above, modern English Freemasonry was until relatively recently viewed by most Masonic scholars as the product of a process of transition over a period of centuries from working or ‘operative’ English Freemasonry to the notionally ‘speculative’ or spiritual ‘Free and Accepted Masonry’ that emerged in the second quarter of the eighteenth century. However, in addition to the arguments advanced by Hamill and others, it can be suggested that this viewpoint is based on a misinterpretation of only limited evidence.

An inclusive set of relevant source material would comprise newspapers, ecclesiastical records, pamphlets and books, together with the extant records of the ‘Acception’, an inner circle of the London Company of Masons, the Old Charges themselves, and State and Parliamentary records. However, many scholars of Freemasonry have relied only on a sparse collection of sixteenth and (principally) seventeenth century sources. Despite the availability of additional information, academic and Masonic attention has focused generally on the same assemblage of material: two extracts from Elias Ashmole’s Memoirs; Richard Rawlinson’s Preface to Ashmole’s Antiquities of Berkshire; Robert Plot’s Natural History of Staffordshire; Randle Holme’s Academie of Armoury; and John Aubrey’s references to Sir William Dugdale’s comments in Aubrey’s Natural History of Wiltshire.

It is rarely mentioned by scholars that all of the above figures were connected: Ashmole, Aubrey and Plot were contemporaries at both Oxford and the Royal Society; Ashmole, Dugdale, Holme and Plot were colleagues at the College of Arms; and all shared an interest in antiquarianism, alchemy and the esoteric. Dugdale and Ashmole were also related by marriage: Ashmole became Dugdale’s

44 Spelt variously and interchangeably as ‘Accepcon’, ‘Acepcion’, ‘Accepcion’ etc.
45 The position can be contrasted to the torrent of written and artistic references to Freemasonry that followed the appointment of the first noble Grand Master in 1720.
46 Elias Ashmole, Memoirs of the life of that learned antiquary, Elias Ashmole, Esq; drawn up by himself by way of diary (London, 1717).
49 Randle Holme III, An Academie of Armorie, or, A storehouse of Armory and Blazon (Chester, 1688).
son-in-law. Moreover, the most commonly cited Masonic contribution from Rawlinson, his Preface to the Antiquities of Berkshire, appears to be derived entirely from later versions of Ashmole and Aubrey’s writings. These were re-published by Edmund Curll in the second decade of the eighteenth century and Rawlinson’s jobbing Preface was written possibly a decade before he became a Freemason. The subject is discussed in more detail below.

However, despite what might be viewed as the possible ‘contamination’ of evidence from such associated parties, other seventeenth century sources provide a measure of validation. Locke’s letter of 6 May 1696 to the 8th Earl of Pembroke, a past President of the Royal Society (1689-90), if genuine, could offer an example of an antiquarian interest in Freemasonry. Locke, referring to a Masonic manuscript uncovered at the Bodleian earlier that year, wrote to Pembroke:

I know not what effect the sight of this old paper may have upon your lordship; but for my own part I cannot deny, that it has so much raised my curiosity, as to induce me to enter myself into the Fraternity, which I am determined to do (if I may be admitted) the next time I go to London, and that will be shortly.

However, perhaps with greater reliability, Charles II’s State Papers also contain a previously unidentified reference to Freemasonry. Given its potential importance, the relevant quotation is given in full:

---

51 Rawlinson was similarly an Oxford graduate and FRS, albeit some decades later.
52 Thomas Herbert, 8th Earl of Pembroke, a friend of Locke, was in 1696 Lord Privy Seal. He was a moderate and later pro-Hanoverian Tory, with a reputation as an antiquary, collector and patron of the arts and sciences. Cf. O. Bucholz, ‘Herbert, Thomas, eighth earl of Pembroke and fifth earl of Montgomery (1656/7–1733)’, ODNB (Oxford, online edn., May 2009). His son, Henry Herbert, the 9th Earl, was later a prominent Freemason.
53 A number of scholars (including Esmond Samuel de Beer, who edited Locke’s letters, and Andrew Prescott), have stated that they consider the letter and the attached MS a probable fabrication. The letter was first printed in the Gentleman’s Magazine in the mid-eighteenth century.
April 4, 1682

*Secretary Jenkins to Mr. Chetwynd.* I did not think Mr. Palmer’s business to be ripe enough to trouble you, but intended to have recourse to you, when a just occasion should present itself, but now there is an incident in that affair of Mr. P.’s that I must acquaint you with.

Last night Mr. Leveson Gower came and desired me to help him to make a full vindication of himself against a calumny that made him a partaker, as he said, in the society of Freemasons. I never heard he was one of them, only Mr. P. intimated that he had many arms in his house. Mr. L. G. hereon charged Mr. P. of having accused him of being of this fraternity and that he had told a friend of his (Mr. L. G.) that he had given me advertisement of his so being. I told Mr. L. G. that I had notice by several letters of that brotherhood in Staffordshire but that I had not heard he was one, and this I said very truly, for Mr. P.’s accusation was that he had arms in his house.

*Secretary Jenkins to Mr. Palmer.* Mr. Leveson Gower desires to have the liberty of the law against you for accusing him as having part in the fraternity of Freemasons. He came to me last night with that complaint and desire, but I, not remembering anything of his being a Freemason in the notices given me, answered that no such charge was come to me and that, if any came, I would take his Majesty’s pleasure in it, wherewith he went away seemingly satisfied. I did not mention the charge of having arms in his house, it being his Lord Lieutenant’s business to look after that, nor did he complain of any other charge. I desire you therefore to take your measures with Mr. Chetwynd, to whom I have written.55


56 William Gower was the second son of Sir Thomas Gower and Frances Leveson. He adopted the name Leveson-Gower in 1668 when he inherited the Tretham and Lilleshall estates of Sir Richard Leveson, who had adopted him as his sole heir. Gower married Lady Jane Granville, the eldest daughter of the 1st Earl of Bath, and served as MP for Newcastle-under-Lyme virtually uninterrupted from 1675 until his death. His older brother predeceased him and he succeeded to his father’s baronetcy in 1689. The Leveson-Gower family became an economic and political force in Staffordshire, and later nationally. Certain Leveson-Gowers were connected to senior Freemasons and may themselves have been Masons. However, there is no direct evidence to support this contention.
To place the extract in context, the late 1670s and early 1680s were marked by a political division that created the foundations for the establishment of the Whig and Tory factions in Parliament. The Whigs opposed the hereditary accession as monarch of the Catholic Duke of York, favouring his exclusion; whereas Charles II and the (anti-exclusion) Tories supported the Duke’s succession to the throne as James II. In this context, the episode described in Charles II’s State Papers is potentially politically significant. Leveson-Gower was a Whig and a Protestant, married to Jane Grenville, the daughter of John Grenville, the Royalist 1st Earl of Bath. The extract provides support for three propositions: first, that membership of the Freemasons could be and was viewed pejoratively, at least by some; second, that ‘the brotherhood’ was active in Staffordshire in the latter part of the seventeenth century; and third, that the Freemasons were monitored by the government, after all, Secretary Jenkins ‘had notice by several letters’.

There were various reasons why Freemasonry might have been perceived negatively, and why membership of the society might be politically sensitive. At the time, membership of any supposedly secret society, no matter how banal, could be viewed as potentially treasonous and certainly suspicious by a nervous establishment; and any such suspicion could serve as a justification for possible government action. Following the 1679-1681 Exclusion Bill crisis, the 1683 Rye House Plot, an attempt to assassinate Charles and James, provided confirmation that not all establishment fears were baseless. And in the wake of the Rye House Plot, the Whigs were virtually excluded from government and a number of prominent Whig politicians exiled.

Less damning, but nonetheless important, being ‘a partaker’ in a Masonic lodge in the seventeenth century may also have been shorthand for drunkenness. In Rosser’s words, ‘even the smallest clubs consumed significant quantities of ale’. Indeed, the practice continued into the following century and internationally:

---

60 Rosser, ‘Going to the Fraternity Feast’, 446.
We have about 30 or 40 Free Masons they have a fine Supper every Saturday night and often 2 or 3 in the week besides; where such an Expence can be born I am at a Loss to know. One night amongst other Disorders they went to the Guard cut the Capt. down the Head and disarmed the rest carrying the Arms away. When they came to reflect on it on the morrow, to make things up they call’d a Lodge at night and admitted Gough the Capt. a Free Mason, so I suppose the thing dropt.  

Hogarth’s Night, the final print in his series Four Times of the Day, with its drunken Master, Thomas de Veil, staggering back from a London lodge meeting, also provides another (albeit later) pejorative example. Viewed through such prisms, Leveson-Gower’s alleged patronage of Freemasonry could be seen, at least in some eyes, as both politically damaging and socially unwise.

However, such negative themes are not apparent in other sources. Ashmole, Aubrey and Plot also wrote of Masonic activity in Staffordshire. In each case, their writings underscore simply the presence of gentlemen and non-operative ‘Freemasons’ within the lodge. Superficially, this appears to support the argument that there was in the seventeenth century a move towards ‘spiritual’ or ‘speculative’ masonry. However, the use of the specific term ‘Freemason’, as opposed to ‘Mason’ or ‘mason’, and the presence of gentlemen within a lodge per se, did not indicate and does not prove the conventional contention that seventeenth century English Freemasonry had moved to a spiritual or speculative form. It can be regarded only as evidence of the existence of operative lodges with a leavening of the gentry. This had been the position for some time and is not contentious. Moreover, the use of the word ‘spiritual’ is also confusing. As Churton has commented, in seventeenth century Britain, everything had a spiritual dimension.

---

61 ‘Mr. Robert Parker to the Trustees, Dec. 1734’: The Egmont (Sir John Perceval) Papers: letters from Georgia, June 1732-June 1735, p. 158. The original papers are in the BL: Add. MSS. Perceval Family, 46920-47213.
62 Cf. respectively, Ashmole, Memoirs; Aubrey, Natural History of Wiltshire; and Plot, The Natural History of Staffordshire.
It is also important to understand how language was used contemporarily, if any analysis of how the word ‘Freemason’ was deployed is to be meaningful.64 Prior to the 1720s, ‘Freemason’ and its variants were applied virtually synonymously to mean a stonemason of the first rank. Examples of this usage both in England and across Europe date from before the thirteenth century and extend through to the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.65 They include, for example, Henry VIII’s papers for 30 September 1526, which set out the detailed building accounts for Cardinals’ College, Oxford: ‘to the master masons, 12d a day each; to the wardens, masons, and setters, 3s 8d a week; and to every other free mason, 3s 4d’.66 Another example from the following year also refers to wage rates in the same vein: ‘a fre mason ... shall take but 3d a day mete and drinke from ester to Michelmas’.67

Similar instances can be found across numerous parish records, wills and coroners’ rolls, as well as in contemporary books and pamphlets. In the sixteenth century, examples include volumes by John Foxe68 and Raphael Hollinshead.69 And in the seventeenth century one can point to John Stow’s eponymous Survey of London70; Alexander Brome’s comedy The Cunning Lovers71; and Thomas Blount’s Glossographia, where ‘Lapicide (lapicida)’ is defined as ‘a digger or hewer of stones; a Stone-cutter or Freemason’.72 Other examples from the second half of the seventeenth century include Howell’s Londinopolis, which referred to ‘the

64 The first recorded use of the term ‘speculative’, that is, symbolic or spiritual as opposed to operative Freemasonry, was in the latter part of the eighteenth century. In chap. 7 of Knoop & Jones, The Genesis of Freemasonry (Manchester, 1947), titled ‘The Era of Accepted Masonry’, the authors note a letter written by Dr. Thomas Manningham on 12 July 1767 to ‘Bro. Sauer’ at The Hague: ‘in antient time the Dignity of Knighthood flourish’d amongst Free Masons; whose Lodges heretofore consisted of Operative, not Speculative Masons.’ Manningham was formerly the Deputy Grand Master of the ‘Moderns’; he was the son of Sir Richard Manningham, a senior Freemason and a member of the Horn tavern lodge.
72 Thomas Blount, Glossographia, or, A Dictionary (London, 1661).
company of Masons, otherwise call’d Free Masons, and Babington’s Notice to Grand Jurors, which set out a schedule of current wage rates, including that for ‘Free Masons’.

In the press, the Tatler wrote of ‘Freemasons’ with the epithet: ‘like they had some secret intimation of each other like the Freemasons’. Interestingly, the identical phrase was used a few years later by Richard Steele. And Knoop and Jones, in their Early Masonic Pamphlets, pointed to other early references to ‘Freemasonry’, including the satirical description of the ‘Company of Accepted Masons’ in Poor Robin’s Intelligence:

These are to give notice, that the Modern Green-ribbon’d Caball, together with the Ancient Brotherhood of the Rosy-Cross; the Hermetick Adepti, and the Company of Accepted Masons, intend all to Dine together on the 31st of November next, at the Flying-Bull in Wind-Mill-Crown-Street; having already given order for great store of Black-Swan Pies, Poached Phoenixes Eggs, Haunches of Unicorns.

The phrase ‘Mason’s Word’ also appeared in Marvell’s The Rehearsal Transprosed: ‘those that have the Masons Word, secretly discern one another’, and in A new dictionary of the canting crew. The dictionary definition provides an element of support for Aubrey’s and Plot’s observations, discussed below. However, it is also an allusion to the tradition of mutual assistance practiced among working masons:

‘Masons-Word’: who ever has it, shall never want, there being a Bank at a certain Lodge in Scotland for their Relief. ‘Tis communicated with a strict Oath, and much Ceremony, (too tedious to insert) and if it be sent to any of the Society, he must, (nay will) come immediately, tho’ very Busy, or at great Distance.

The definition refers implicitly to the Masonic admission ceremony in Scotland at which the ‘Mason Word’ was imparted. However, based on Aubrey and Plot’s

---

73 James Howell, Londinopolis (London, 1657), p. 44.
74 Zachary Babington, Notice to Grand Jurors in Cases of Blood (London, 1677).
75 The Tatler, 7-9 June 1709 and 29 April - 2 May 1710; the quote is from the latter.
77 Douglas Knoop & G.P. Jones, Early Masonic Pamphlets (Manchester, 1945).
78 Poor Robin’s Intelligence, 10 October 1676.
80 B.E. (compiler, known only by his initials), A New Dictionary of the Terms Ancient and Modern of the Canting Crew (London, c. 1699).
comments below, it seems unlikely that the Mason’s Word was restricted to Scotland or would have been used by Scottish masons alone.\textsuperscript{81}

Overall, each reference or quotation provides evidence of or underpins the conventional and long-established association between working masons and their deemed trade secrets, or refers to the mutual assistance offered by the guild or lodge. None points unequivocally to the existence of a form of ‘spiritual’ Freemasonry as it developed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{82} In short, there was nothing remarkable in the use of the word ‘Freemason’ prior to the 1720s, nor in Masonic mutual assistance, and neither provides evidence of a form of spiritual Freemasonry. Moreover, late eighteenth and nineteenth century ‘speculative’ Freemasonry was quite distinct from the stirrings of any semi-scholarly interest in the ‘mysteries’ of the Craft in the seventeenth century. The works of Randle Holme III (1627-1700), and Thomas Tryon (1634-1703), underline the point.

\textbf{Randle Holme III and Thomas Tryon}

Randle Holme III’s \textit{Academie of Armory} invited its readers to enquire into the arts and sciences, and offered to assist them. The book suggests that at least certain elements of the gentry had begun to develop an interest in how things work:

\begin{quote}
Now for the better understanding ... I shall in two examples, set forth all their words of Art, used about them: by which any Gentleman may be able to discourse [with] a Freemason, or other workman, in his own terms.\textsuperscript{83}
\end{quote}

Holme’s objectives were explicit. The book sought to provide a guide to

the instruments used in all trades and sciences, together with their terms of art: also the etymologies, definitions, and historical observations on the same, explicated and explained according to our modern language: very usefel [sic]

\textsuperscript{81} But cf. Knoop & Jones, \textit{The Scottish mason and the Mason Word} (Manchester, 1939).
\textsuperscript{82} The lodge at Alnwick, Northumberland, the only English masonic lodge of the pre-1720 period for which relatively comprehensive documentation is extant, was at the time also a working or ‘operative’ lodge. However, the lodge should not be viewed as a reliable guide to what was occurring elsewhere in England. Being only thirty miles south of the Scottish border, the lodge followed Scottish customs. Cf. William James Hughan, \textit{The Alnwick MS, No. E 10} (Newcastle, 1895).
\textsuperscript{83} Holme, \textit{Academie of Armorie}, p. LXVI.
for all gentlemen ... and all such as desire any knowledge in arts and sciences'.

However, it would be wrong to base any argument too firmly on Holme. Contemporary demand for Holme’s *Academie* was insufficient to warrant the publication of volumes three and four. Moreover, Holme’s pedestrian approach to his subject matter cannot be characterised easily as an awakening of scientific Enlightenment thought. His catalogue style illuminates the argument:

The *Pedestall*, that is the Foot or Bottom of a Pillar, whither it be round or Square.
The *Pillar*, is the Body or middle part between the Head and Foot, be it round or Square.
The *Capitall*, is the Top of the Pillar, or Head, on which the round Ball stands.
The *Chapiter*, is the Ball or any other kind of work that is made to adorne the Capitall, is a Chapiter of such and such a thing.

There are other terms used for the several Mouldings about Pillars, Columns, and Pillasters; which I shall in numb. 66 67. at the end of this Plate shew and further describe unto you.

Thomas Tryon’s *Letters* ‘written both at the Request of divers Friends and Country-men at home, as well as of some Strangers from abroad’ fulfilled a similar purpose: ‘necessary and practical Truths cannot be too often taught and repeated, till they are well understood, learned and distinguished’. However, Tryon’s work was not oriented to a readership seeking a better understanding of the theoretical mathematics and geometry of masonry: combining operative knowledge of the ‘arts’ with the theoretical speculation of the ‘sciences’. It was rather a series of basic texts, leavened with faux philosophy, ranging from *The Sense of Hearing* and *The Nature of Smells* to *Bricks, and various sorts of Earths* and *Perpetual Motion*.

---

85 Holme printed the first two books in 1688 at his own expense. He was unable to finance the publication of any additional volumes. They were later published by the bibliophile Roxburchge Club, printed from BL: Harleian MSS. 1920-2180: I.H. Jeayes (ed.), *The Academy of Armory, or a Storehouse of Armory and Blazon* (London, 1905).
86 Holme, *Academie of Armorie*, p. 459. However, Barker-Cryer in *The Restoration Lodge of Chester* argued that at least part of Holme’s *Academie* can be regarded as allegorical.
87 Thomas Tryon, *Tryon’s letters upon several occasions* (London, 1700). The book was also published as *The merchant, citizen and country-man’s Instructor* (London, 1701).
88 The terms are included in E. Chambers, *Cyclopædia: or, an universal dictionary of arts and sciences* (London, 1728), vol. 1, pp. 143-4, and vol. 2, pp. 32-3.
Tryon was a successful merchant rather than a philosopher. And although his early writings on Pythagoras and Letters and Memoirs indicate an interest in mysticism and in the esoteric, his ‘necessary and practical Truths’ were at the core of his writing.

But notwithstanding Holme and Tryon, the most frequently cited evidence of non-operative or ‘speculative’ seventeenth century Freemasonry is that linked to the antiquary, Elias Ashmole (1617-1692).

**Elias Ashmole**

Ashmole’s autobiographical Memoirs document two Masonic events: his initiation on 16 October 1646 in Warrington, then in Lancashire; and his attendance at a London lodge meeting at Masons’ Hall on 11 March 1682. The diary entries have been interpreted previously as providing confirmation that gentlemen who, using William Stukeley’s words, were ‘interested in the mysteries of the Ancients’, were members of operative lodges in the mid-seventeenth century. In Gould’s words, ‘it is obvious that symbolical masonry must have existed in Lancashire for some time before the admission of Ashmole and Mainwaring’. However, an alternative analysis of the text and circumstances suggests that Ashmole’s interest in Freemasonry was partly socially motivated rather than purely alchemical or solely a function of antiquarian interest.

In his first diary entry concerning the matter, Ashmole recorded that he:

was made a Freemason at Warrington in Lancashire with Coll. Henry Mainwaring of Kerthingham in Cheshire, the names of those that were then at

---

89 Unusually for the period, Tryon was also a (far less successful) animal rights campaigner: ‘it is not said that the Lord made all Creatures for Man to Eat ... [but] for his own Glory’; Thomas Tryon, Heath’s Grand Preservative (London, 1682), chap. 2, Of Flesh.

90 Thomas Tryon, Some memoirs of the life of Mr Tho. Tryon (London, 1705).

91 Thomas Tryon, Pythagoras; His Mystick Philosophy Reviv’d (London, 1691).


the Lodge, Mr Richard Penkett Warden, Mr James Collier, Mr Richard Sankey, Henry Littler, John Ellam, Richard Ellam, and Hugh Brewer.  

His entry for 10 March 1682 stated that:

About 5 Hor. post merid. I received a Summons to appear at a Lodge to be held the next Day at Masons Hall in London.  

And the entry for 11 March set out the events that followed:

Accordingly I went, and about Noon were admitted into the Fellowship of Freemasons, Sir William Wilson, Knight, Capt. Richard Borthwick, Mr William Woodman, Mr William Grey, Mr Samuel Taylour, and Mr William Wise. I was the Senior Fellow among them (it being 35 Years since I was admitted) there were present beside myself the Fellows after named ...

We all dined at the Half-Moon-Tavern in Cheapside, at a Noble Dinner prepared at the Charge of the new accepted Masons.  

Ashmole’s Memoirs comprise a series of brief notes that suggest draft material prepared for an unwritten biography. The entry for 16 October 1646 is significant mainly because it is the first contemporary record of the admittance of a non-operative Freemason in England, although the persons noted as present by Ashmole would already have been admitted Masons. The details of this first recorded initiation are non-existent but may have involved elements of traditional guild ritual: an enjoinder to secrecy; the reading of the Charge; and the disclosure of an identifying pass grip and password – a sign and token.  

Rylands’ analysis of those named as present confirmed that the lodge consisted substantially of non-working masons. Writing in the Masonic Magazine, Rylands...
established the evidence and set out the conclusion that few or none of those attending the lodge were stonemasons. In a comment on Rylands’ article, Gould noted that it was significant that both Ashmole and Mainwaring were admitted as Freemasons in the same lodge: Ashmole had been an ardent Royalist and Mainwaring a Parliamentarian.\textsuperscript{100} From this, Gould extrapolated and inferred that Freemasonry was at the time free of political affiliation.\textsuperscript{101} However, it is difficult to substantiate such a generalisation from one instance at a single lodge. Indeed, given the Leveson-Gower correspondence, the inference was probably inaccurate. Moreover, Kebbell’s observation that Ashmole’s connection with Mainwaring, a relation of Ashmole’s father-in-law, Peter Mainwaring, was more extensive and of greater longevity than previously recognised, further undermines Gould’s contention.\textsuperscript{102}

Churton also analysed those present.\textsuperscript{103} He concluded that the lodge was ‘largely made up of landed gentry from Cheshire and from that county’s border with south Lancashire’, and commented on the ‘repeated connection between gentleman landowners and the monastic and confraternal system’.\textsuperscript{104} Although the commercial and financial connections between those present were not explored, Churton’s analysis confirms clearly the predominantly social aspect of lodge membership.

Bereseiner, in an article in \textit{MQ Magazine}, queried why there was no mention of Freemasonry in Ashmole’s memoirs other than on the two occasions detailed above.\textsuperscript{105} His analysis, that ‘seventeenth century’ Freemasonry was not an organisation of consequence’, and that ‘Ashmole’ ‘may well have found nothing of consequence’, has an element of possibility. The suppositions are also supported by the limited amount of contemporary documentation, albeit not by the circumstances of Leveson-Gower’s complaint to Secretary Jenkins. However, there is one other aspect to the Warrington meeting that is rarely remarked: its location.

\textsuperscript{100} Gould, \textit{The History of Freemasonry}, pp. 183-8.
\textsuperscript{101} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{102} Kebbell, \textit{The Changing Face of Freemasonry}, pp. 23-5.
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid, p. 273
Warrington was described in 1673 as ‘a very fine and large town, which hath a considerable market on Wednesdays for linen cloth, corn, cattle, provisions, and fish, being much resorted to by the Welshmen’, but it could be regarded as being on a par with many other county towns with a similar size population of c. 2-3,000. That relatively non-descript Warrington was home to a Masonic lodge suggests the possibility that such lodges may have been more widespread than has been generally recognised. It may also be significant that the town was predominantly Royalist. Of course, an alternative conclusion is that a majority of the remaining pockets of English Freemasonry outside of London were located in relatively few regions and, in particular, in the Midlands.

Ashmole’s summons to attend a lodge at the London Masons’ Company in 1682 and his short note describing the meeting, supports the view that the invitation was to an exclusive inner lodge within the larger setting of the operative Masons’ Company. This was probably the inner circle of the Company: the Acception.

The Acception

... about Noon were admitted into the Fellowship of Freemasons, Sir William Wilson, Knight, Capt. Richard Borthwick, Mr William Woodman, Mr William Grey, Mr Samuel Taylour, and Mr William Wise ...

There were present beside myself ...
Mr Thomas Wise, Master of the Masons Company this present Year; Mr Thomas Shorthose, Mr Thomas Shadbolt, - Waindsfford, Esq.; Mr Nicholas Young, Mr John Shorthose, Mr William Hamon, Mr John Thompson, and Mr William Stanton.

Eight of the nine named in the second paragraph were already members of the Company, as was Sir William Wilson (1641-1710) and William Woodman. This suggests not that the Acception was a ‘speculative’ lodge open to non-operative men such as Ashmole, but rather that it was an inner circle of élite or senior working masons who could also be regarded as ‘gentlemen’.

---

Thomas Wise, the Master of the Masons Company, was supported at the meeting by the two Wardens of the Company, John Shorthose and William Stanton, an indication that the meeting had formal sanction. Prescott has noted that the names of those members of the Masons’ Company who were members of the Acception were recorded publicly on panels in the Company’s livery hall and that the Acception paraded under its own banner. Three of the new initiates, William Grey, Samuel Taylour and William Wise (the son of the Master), were also members of the Company, and Thomas Wise, an eminent mason, had worked for and had been paid directly by Sir Christopher Wren, receiving over £500 for his work on the construction of Chelsea Hospital. Supportively, a short note relating to Wilson in the records of the Wren Society also refers to this entry in Ashmole’s Memoirs. The note states ‘it will be noticed that the Fellows last recited are nearly all Masons employed by Sir Christopher Wren, whose names have already appeared, particularly in Wren Society, Vol. X’.

Sir William Wilson’s admittance into this select inner lodge was the probable catalyst for Ashmole’s attendance. Wilson was a stonemason of some stature. He had married into the local gentry and been knighted in 1681, possibly because of his then future wife’s connections rather than through any political affiliation. Wilson worked principally in the Midlands, and in Lichfield and Sutton Coldfield in particular, and in 1669 had sculpted the statue of Charles II erected at Lichfield cathedral. Ashmole had been born in Lichfield and had studied there as a cathedral chorister. He was a benefactor of the cathedral and had presented new service books in 1662. Ashmole preserved a relationship with the city, including seeking election (unsuccessfully) as its parliamentary candidate.

---

113 George T. Noszlopy and Fiona Waterhouse, Public Sculpture of Staffordshire and the Black Country (Liverpool, 2005), illustrated edn., p. 273. Jane Pudsey, William Wilson’s wife, whom he had met when commissioned to sculpt a memorial to her late husband, may have been unwilling to marry her social inferior. A knighthood provided the required social elevation.
Although it is impossible to determine with certainty, Ashmole’s summons to attend the lodge at the Masons’ Hall implies that his Freemasonry was known to those involved, most particularly to Wilson and others within the Staffordshire gentry. However, beyond his relationship with Wilson, with Lichfield and its cathedral, Ashmole’s public standing and wealth may have been another contributory factor in his invitation to attend the Acception. Ashmole’s Royalist loyalties had been rewarded after the Restoration. In 1660, he had been appointed Comptroller of the Excise and, in 1668, Accountant General. The positions were well remunerated and, in addition, Ashmole had relatively wide authority to exercise patronage via the Excise. He had also been appointed to the senior office of Windsor Herald at the College of Arms in 1660, a role he held until his resignation in 1675. Moreover, alongside Sir Robert Moray, another Freemason, Ashmole had status as an original fellow of the ‘Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge’, which had been formed in 1660 and whose Royal Charter had been granted on 15 July 1662. He was also the founder and benefactor of Oxford’s Ashmolean (1682).

In short, the most probable explanation for the Acception’s purpose is that it comprised an élite inner grouping of the Masons’ Company, each member of which had attained sufficient social and financial stature to be deemed a ‘gentleman’. Moreover, rather than being a gathering for spiritual or ‘speculative’ purposes, the Acception’s own records suggest that their social and dining arrangements comprised a central element of their meetings.

Scanlan has argued against this viewpoint. In a reference to an earlier meeting of the Acception in 1638 which was recorded in the Renter Warden’s Accounts of
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116 Ashmole had been associated previously with the Excise as Commissioner at Lichfield (1644) and Commissioner at Worcester (1644-1646). His patron, James Pagitt, a relation through his mother, was Baron of the Exchequer.
117 ‘An account by Elias Ashmole, then Windsor Herald, of the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, and a transcription of the Greek and Latin inscription on a medal struck by the Emperor Heraclius’: London: Lambeth Palace Library: MS 929, 1611-1723, 43, 2 ff.
118 Sir Robert Moray had been initiated into Freemasonry in May 1641, five years before Ashmole. Moray was then serving with the Scottish forces besieging Newcastle-upon-Tyne and on 20 May 1641 recorded his admittance into St Mary’s Chapel Lodge of Edinburgh. Cf. David Allan, ‘Sir Robert Moray (1608/9?–1673)’, ODNB (Oxford, Sept 2004; online edn., Oct 2007).
the Company of Masons, Scanlan noted that five masons were ‘taken into the Accepcon’, each paying a fee of ten shillings:

Pd wch the accompt layd out wch was more than he received of them wch were taken into the Accepcon whereof Xs is to be paid by Mr Nicholas Stone, Mr Edmund Kinsman, Mr John Smith, Mr William Millis, Mr John Colles.

The quantum of fees paid is a strong indication that membership of the Acception was not open to the average mason: 10 shillings amounted to around four weeks’ wages at a time when a stone mason might earn 4d - 6d per day.

Nicholas Stone (1586-1647) is an important figure in this extract. He was more than well qualified as a stonemason, having been selected to be Master Mason at Windsor Castle in 1626 and appointed the King’s Master Mason in 1632. That year and the following year, Stone served as Master of the London Company of Masons. He had previously served twice as Warden. Stone was regarded by his contemporaries as one of the most eminent sculptors and architect/builders in London. However, notwithstanding his operative eminence, he was only ‘taken into the Accepcon’ in 1638, by which date he had become relatively wealthy, his affluence enhanced by private commissions for clients and patrons including the Countess of Middlesex, Viscount Dorchester, the Goldsmiths Company, the Earl of Danby, and Sir Christopher Hatton. Scanlan noted that the other Masons cited in the Renter Warden’s Accounts were also members of the London Company of Masons, and that each had worked with Nicholas Stone.

Additional support for a social dimension to the Acception is provided by Knoop and Jones’ analysis that admission to the inner ranks of the Acception was quite
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121 Scanlan, ‘Nicholas Stone and the Mystery of the Acception’.
122 Daily pay rates as per Babington, Notice to Grand Jurors.
124 Ibid.
125 Maidstone: Centre for Kentish Studies: U269/A462/5: 1639.
126 London: Society of Antiquaries: SAL/MS/263.
128 Ibid.
129 White, ‘Nicholas Stone’, ODNB.
distinct from other ceremonies of admission to the Company at large. They observed that the surviving Masons’ Company Accounts mention the Acception throughout the seventeenth century. Significantly, most entries related to expenses: the records and statements detail the sums spent on the Acception dinners and list the balances owed by members.

In common with the passage quoted by Scanlan, a number of entries cited by Knoop and Jones also itemise the names of those admitted members. One such entry, for 1649/50, listed six new members, of whom four were members of the Company. The two non-members were noted as having paid an acceptance fee of 40s, a rate double that paid by working members of the Company. The differential suggests that selected non-working masons were invited to join as a form of subsidy, a common practice among guilds as a whole mentioned above. Moreover, the description of the admission process resonates with Ashmole’s record of the lodge meeting in March 1682, particularly the observation, in each instance, that dinner was ‘prepared at the Charge of the new accepted Masons’. Once again, the inference is to an inner cabal and to an élite social assembly, as opposed to either a speculative or an operative lodge. And on each occasion, the new members financed the evening.

Tangentially, the argument that the existence of the Acception pointed to a ‘speculative’ inner circle within the Company of Masons is also contradicted by an analysis of the later Grand Lodge membership rolls. Only a few members of the Acception joined Desaguliers’ Free and Accepted Masonry. Woodman became a member of the lodge meeting at the Horn, Westminster (he appears in both the 1723 and 1725 lists); and Stanton a member of the lodge at the Queen’s Arms in Newgate Street. A William Woodman, possibly the same person, was also later a member of the Carpenters’ Company; the Minute Book of Courts and Committees described him as ‘William Woodman Citizen and Mason made Free’. However, although a Thomas Wise was a member of the King’s Arms in

---

132 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 158.
New Bond Street in the 1730 list of members, the fifty-year gap suggests that this was not same person as the 1682 Master of the Masons Company.

**John Aubrey and William Dugdale**

Ashmole had a close connection with John Aubrey (1626-1697), whose references to Freemasonry and to ‘Accepted Free Masons’ in his *Natural History of Wiltshire*, have been cited as evidence of Masonry’s transition from the guilds of the medieval period through to the modern era, albeit that Gould’s later editors, and other historians, have adopted a more critical view.\(^{134}\) Aubrey’s work was written in the ten years to 1685. He was unable to procure finance for its publication and the book remained in manuscript form. In 1690, the Royal Society ordered a copy to be made at their expense in order that Fellows would not have to travel to Oxford to consult the document.\(^{135}\) The copy was finished in 1691. It is held in the Royal Society’s archives (Misc. MS. 92), and contains Aubrey’s additions and amendments to the original text. These were written to the left of each page of the original; the pages had been left blank in Aubrey’s first manuscript. The version of Aubrey’s manuscript held at the Bodleian and quoted varies slightly in text and spelling as compared to the version held at the Royal Society, although the content is substantially the same.

Aubrey was a somewhat dysfunctional peripatetic scholar whose family wealth had been dissipated in a series of personal lawsuits over a period of some twenty years.\(^{136}\) A keen amateur scientist, antiquarian and natural historian, Aubrey was elected FRS in 1663. He was an active member and presented several papers to the Society.\(^{137}\)

In his first reference to Freemasonry, Aubrey recorded a conversation with the eminent antiquary and scholar, Sir William Dugdale (1605-1686):

---


45 | P a g e
Sir William Dugdale told me, many years since, that about Henry the Third’s time the Pope gave a bull or patents to a company of Italian Freemasons to travel up and down over all Europe to build churches. From those are derived the fraternity of adopted Masons. They are known to one another by certain signs and watch-words: it continues to this day. They have several lodges in several counties for their reception, and when any of them fall into decay the brotherhood is to relieve him, &c. The manner of their adoption is very formal, and with an oath of secrecy.  

There is considerable archival material relating to Sir William Dugdale including over 100 entries referenced in the Access to Archives database, the majority linked to his heraldic and antiquarian activities, and c. twenty MS references at the BL. However, none of these nor any published correspondence and diaries offer any obvious evidence that he was a Freemason, notwithstanding that Dugdale knew and was on good terms with the Leveson-Gower family. Although the absence of data is not proof, if he was not a Mason himself, the information Dugdale provided to Aubrey would have been at best second hand, rather than from any direct experience.

Dugdale and Ashmole shared a strong interest in heraldry and antiquities. They were both Royalists, and each had robust links to Staffordshire: Ashmole had been born in Lichfield and his family lived in the city; Dugdale’s connections to Staffordshire were via his mother, Elizabeth Swynfen, and his wife, Margery Huntbach. Ashmole and Dugdale had met in the mid-1650s when Ashmole began his research into the Order of the Garter and, in 1660, Ashmole became a fellow member of the College of Heralds. Dugdale served as Chester Herald from 1644 until 1660. He was thereafter promoted Norroy King of Arms (1660-1677). Probably with Ashmole’s support, Dugdale was, in 1677, appointed to the most senior role of Garter King of Arms and knighted, with an increase in salary from £40 to £100 per annum.

Ashmole had a successful professional and personal relationship with Dugdale. The two travelled together on several industrious fact-finding heraldic expeditions.

138 Ibid, 85, 194.
139 Stafford: Staffordshire Record Office: D868/5/12b: 21 November 1657.
141 Ibid.
across provincial England\textsuperscript{143}, and Ashmole frequently stayed at Blyth Hall, Dugdale's country house.\textsuperscript{144} Cementing the connection further, after the death of Ashmole's third wife on 1 April 1668, Ashmole married Elizabeth, (1632–1701), one of Dugdale's nine daughters, on 3 November of the same year.\textsuperscript{145}

**Aubrey and the Wren Controversy**

In a second reference to Freemasonry wholly separate from his reported conversation with Dugdale, Aubrey referred to the initiation of Christopher Wren in an addendum to his original manuscript:

1691. Memorandum, this day (May the eighteenth being Monday after Rogation Sunday) is a great Convention at St Paul's church of the Fraternity of the Accepted Free Masons where Sir Christopher Wren is to be adopted a Brother: and Sir Henry Goodric\textsuperscript{146} ... of y' Tower and divers others - There have been kings that have been of this Sodalitie.\textsuperscript{147}

The entry has caused controversy. Gould and subsequent scholars have argued against its validity as an accurate record of events; others have argued in its favour.\textsuperscript{148} Perhaps it is significant that an analysis of contemporary newspapers in the *Burney Collection* for the years 1691 and 1692 reveal no references to any ‘Convention’ at St Paul’s. Neither does *Burney* contain any contemporary references to either Christopher Wren or Henry Goodric (or Goodricke) in connection with any ‘acceptance’ or ‘adoption’ by the Company of Masons or ‘Accepted Free Masons’. Additionally, on-line searches of the National Archive’s Access to Archives database, the *Burney Collection*, *ECCO* and *EEBO\textsuperscript{149}* each for the decade 1690-1700, are also devoid of any mention of Wren in connection with Freemasonry. In short, there appears to be no third party evidence of a ‘great

---


\textsuperscript{144} Parry, ‘Sir William Dugdale’, *ODNB*, mentions a visit by Ashmole at Christmas 1656.

\textsuperscript{145} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{146} A diplomat, soldier and MP, Sir Henry Goodricke was later Lieutenant-General of the Ordnance, stationed at the Tower of London. Cf. J.D. Davies, ‘Sir Henry Goodricke, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baronet (1642–1705)’, *ODNB* (Oxford, Sept 2004; online edn., Jan 2008).

\textsuperscript{147} Aubrey, *Natural History of Wiltshire*.


Convention at St Paul’s church’, whether of ‘the Fraternity of the Accepted Free Masons’, or otherwise.

The proposition of a smooth transition from the medieval guild to modern Freemasonry via a seventeenth century blend of operative and gentlemen’s lodge is not supported by Ashmole’s diary entries, nor Holme’s *Academie*, and is inadequately sustained by Aubrey’s comments. To take the point further, arguing against Wren having been made a ‘speculative’ Mason, Gould and others have stated the improbability of early eighteenth century Masonic luminaries such as Desaguliers, Martin Folkes, Martin Clare and Richard Rawlinson, all FRS and leaders of ‘the Society of Free and Accepted Masons’, being unaware of Wren having been made a Freemason in 1691. It is argued that had it been the case, it would be reasonable to presume that the event would have been worthy of note in the 1723 *Constitutions*, notwithstanding that Wren was not a Whig.

Indeed, the 1723 *Constitutions* provides a long list of alleged gentlemen Freemasons and, in this context, the omission of Wren, mentioned only as ‘the King’s Architect’, is significant. Similarly, with one possible exception, Wren is not identified as a ‘Free and Accepted’ Mason in any book, Masonic or otherwise, or in any other document, until the publication of Anderson’s semi-fictional history of Freemasonry in the 1738 *Constitutions*. The potential exception is the reference in the *Post Boy* on 2 March 1723, just over a week after Wren’s death. The text was reprinted in the *British Journal* the following week, but not in any other newspaper: ‘This evening the Corpse of that Worthy FREE MASON Sir Christopher Wren, Knight, is to be interred under the Dome of St Paul’s Cathedral’.

This was the third time Wren’s death had been mentioned by the *Post Boy*. However, Wren had not been described as a Freemason in either of the paper’s two earlier obituaries nor in any of the many other obituaries published at the same time. At issue is the significance of the change to Wren’s description. On a

---

150 James Anderson, *The new book of constitutions of the antient and honourable fraternity of free and accepted masons. Containing their history, charges, regulations, etc.* (London, 1738) (the “1738 *Constitutions*”).
151 *British Journal*, 9 March 1723.
152 *Post Boy*, 2 March 1723. The description was capitalised in the original.
superficial level, it can be argued that the *Post Boy’s* use of ‘Freemason’ was simply an obvious description of Wren in a conventional sense as a skilled architect and stonemason. Local archive records hold numerous examples of the term being used in this manner during 1720-30, including a petition supporting a Richard Hardwick of Shepton Mallet, who had been indicted for working as a ‘freemason’ when qualified only as a ‘rough mason’.153 In this sense, to have declared the fact in an obituary would have stated the obvious.

However, it can also be acknowledged that the term could have been used to connect Wren, obliquely or overtly, with Desaguliers’ ‘Society of Free and Accepted Masons’. A cynic might have observed that it was not coincidental that the announcement of Wren’s burial arrangement beneath the dome of St Paul’s Cathedral and his ostensible connection with the new Freemasonry occurred at precisely the time the 1723 *Constitutions* was published, and prominent classified advertisements for its sale were placed in the *Post Boy* and other newspapers.

The first advertisement for the *Constitutions* appeared in the *Post Boy* on 26 February 1723. Wren’s death ‘on Monday last’ was recorded on the same day and on the same page. His obituary noted that ‘he was deservedly one of the greatest Architects in Europe; and was lately elected Vice President of the Corporation of Clergymen’s sons’. No mention was made of any connection to ‘Freemasonry’ until a week later.

Although of interest, for the purpose of this thesis, Wren’s Masonic ‘status’, as opposed to his position as one of the period’s principal architects and geometricians, and his ‘adoption [as] a Brother’, is tangential. Were it to be accepted that Wren had been made a Freemason, within the Acceptation or otherwise, what is of significance is that this was not deemed worthy of mention in the three decades prior to his death, nor in the majority of published obituaries (fifteen of sixteen). And his standing as a deemed ‘speculative’ Freemason, as recorded in Anderson’s 1738 *Constitutions*154, may have been either another Anderson inaccuracy, an embroidery of his operative role or, more probably, an

---


intentional blurring of the line between pre-and post 1720s Freemasonry in order to emphasise the antiquity of the Craft.

However, were it to be established that Wren *had* been admitted to the Acception, there is an explanation for the lack of publicity given to Wren’s Masonic position that would be consistent with the events that followed. Had Wren and Goodricke been made members of the Acception, Desaguliers, Anderson and their contemporaries may have wished to gloss over the matter. Any such involvement with the Acception, and therefore with the London Company of Masons, could have undermined the *bona fides* of Desaguliers’ new Grand Lodge and recently reinvented English Freemasonry. Indeed, a publicised and formal recognition of the precedence of the Acception could have led to a dispute as to whether the Company of Masons had jurisdiction over ‘Free and Accepted’ Masonry. For this reason, rather than potentially undermine the authority and diminish the attraction of Grand Lodge, it may have been considered more appropriate broadly to ignore the Company of Masons.

The argument is reinforced by a reference in Leapman’s *Inigo: The Troubled Life of Inigo Jones, Architect of the English Renaissance*. Leapman noted that Nicholas Stone wrote that Inigo Jones ‘was Grand Master of the Freemasons from 1607 until 1618, and again from 1636 until his death in 1652’. He continued, writing that ‘the relevant document is believed to have been destroyed in 1720.’ The *1738 Constitutions* make the same point: ‘several very valuable Manuscripts ... one writ by Mr Nicholas Stone ... were too hastily burnt’. Assuming that the document had existed and that it had disappeared in 1720, its destruction would provide anecdotal evidence of a strong desire to reinforce the distance and distinction between ‘Free and Accepted Masonry’ and its relatively recent past. This construction is supported further by there being only a single reference to the Company of Masons in the *1723 Constitutions*, and that was almost by way of an aside:

---


156 *1723 Constitutions*, p. 82.
To fill up this Page, it is thought not amiss to insert here a Paragraph from an old Record of Masons, viz. *The Company of Masons, being otherwise termed Free Masons; of ancient Standing and good Reckoning, by means of affable and kind Meetings divers Tymes, and as a loving Brotherhoo'd should use to doe, did frequent this mutual Assembly in the Tyme of King Henry V. the 12th Year of his most gracious Reign. And the said Record describing a Coat of Arms, much the same with That of the London Company of Free-men Masons, it is generally believed that the said Company is descended of the ancient Fraternity; and that in former Times no Man was made Free of that Company until he was instal'd in some Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons, as a necessary Qualification. But that laudable Practice seems to have been long in Disuse. The Brethren in foreign Parts have also discover'd that several noble and ancient Societies and Orders of Men have derived their Charges and Regulations from the Free Masons, (which are now the most ancient Order upon Earth) and perhaps were originally all Members too of the said ancient and worshipful Fraternity. But this will more fully appear in due time.

It is interesting to ask why this paragraph was included in the Constitutions. Perhaps the answer lies in the observation that 'no Man was made Free of that Company until he was installed in some Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons, as a necessary Qualification'. The words support the view that Desaguliers, Anderson and Grand Lodge were striving for historical legitimacy; the reference to 'that laudable Practice' long in disuse served the same purpose.

Prescott has suggested that 'it is tempting to assume that... the formation of a Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons was in effect a revival of the Acception'. However, this is not supported by the evidence. The Acception ceased to exist after the formal incorporation of the London Company in 1677. This followed the demise of the Company's monopoly under Charles II, and the restrictions placed on the City livery companies more generally by James II. Although there are elements of merit and elegance in Prescott's observation, particularly if the Acception is considered principally as an élite social, as opposed to operative assembly, the obvious dissimilarities between the two organisations tend to undermine the argument that one could be viewed as a natural extension of the other.

---

157 Prescott, 'The Old Charges Revisited'.
Robert Plot (1640-1696)

Robert Plot’s accounts of Freemasonry have been utilised in the same cause as Wren’s alleged initiation into speculative Freemasonry: to substantiate an argument in favour of a Masonic transition from the medieval working guilds to the eighteenth century ‘gentlemen’s lodge’.¹⁵⁹ Plot studied at Oxford and later taught there. He was appointed Professor of Chemistry, and was the first Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum from 1683 until 1690, approved by Ashmole and supervised by him in that role.¹⁶⁰ Plot was also linked to the Royal Society. Elected FRS in 1677, he became the Society’s second secretary, editor of its Philosophical Transactions from 1682 until 1684, and was a regular attendee at meetings of the Council.¹⁶¹

Following the success of his Natural History of Oxfordshire¹⁶², Plot completed his Natural History of Staffordshire in 1686. His references to Freemasonry mirror those of Aubrey but provide more detail. However, given his multi-faceted relationship with Ashmole and Dugdale, and in the absence of any evidence that Plot was a Freemason himself, it is hard to accept his observations as those of an independent commentator. Although Plot had access to a copy of the Old Charges and his appraisal of the ‘York legend’ suggests that he was prepared to be critical in his evaluation¹⁶³, Plot also had close links to Ashmole. These were based not only on their association at the Ashmolean and the Royal Society; both were also keen astrologers, alchemists and antiquaries. In addition, between 1688 and 1694, Plot worked with Dugdale at the College of Arms as Register of the Court of Chivalry and Historiographer Royal.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ Sackler Archives; also Turner, Robert Plot, ODNB.
¹⁶³ Plot, Natural History of Staffordshire, pp. 316-7.
Plot’s description of Freemasonry over some four paragraphs (of which two are summarised below), contains substantially more information than either Ashmole’s Memoirs or Aubrey’s earlier reported conversation with Dugdale:

To these add the Customs relating to the County, whereof they have one, of admitting Men into the Society of Freemasons, that in the moorlands ... seems to be of greater request, than anywhere else, though I find the Custom spread more or less over the Nation; for here I found persons of the most eminent quality, that did not disdain to be of this Fellowship. Nor indeed need they, were of it that Antiquity and honour, that is pretended in a large parchment volume they have amongst them, containing the History and Rules of the craft of masonry ... 

Into which Society when any are admitted, they call a meeting (or Lodg as they term it in some place) which must consist of at least 5 or 6 of the Ancients of the Order, whom the candidates present with gloves and so likewise to their wives ad entertain with a collation according to the Custom of the place. This ended, they proceed to the admission of them, which chiefly consists in the communication of certain secret signs, whereby they are known to one another over the Nation, by which means they have maintenance whither ever they travel: for if any man appear though altogether unknown that can shew any of these signs to a Fellow of the Society, whom they call an accepted mason, he is obliged presently to come to him ... to know his pleasure and assist him.  

It can be deduced from Plot’s comments that membership of Freemasonry across the Midlands by ‘persons of ... quality’ was not uncommon; that the Old Charges, described as ‘large parchment volumes’, were in regular use; and that Masonic ritual and benevolence were practiced. Faced with the detail given by Plot, later editions of Gould’s History queried the extent to which a strong reliance could be placed on his comments, and offered a number of derogatory comments in support of the point based on the relatively poor regard in which Plot was held by certain of his contemporaries. However, it is difficult to consider this an effective argument. It is more reasonable to conclude that Plot’s descriptions did not necessarily originate from his own experience, but were based on third party reports including, possibly, those of Ashmole, for whom Plot’s observations may have mirrored his direct experience.

165 Plot, Natural History of Staffordshire, chap. VIII, pp. 316-7, paragraphs 85-88. In The Changing Face of Freemasonry, pp. 28-34, Kebbell suggests that the charitable assistance and mutual support offered by Freemasons to one another was the most significant aspect of the organisation during this period. He also argues that the ‘sole purpose’ of lodge meetings was to initiate new members. The social and economic aspects are ignored.

166 Gould, The History of Freemasonry, chap. XIV.
Apparently confirmatory evidence of the accuracy of Plot’s account of seventeenth century Masonic practices appeared thirty years later in an article in the Whiggish Post Man and the Historical Account quoting inter alia from an Assembly ‘held in 1663’.

In the 9 August 1722 edition of the paper, following a précis of the Old Charges, the newspaper printed The Conclusion of the History of the Society of Freemasons and the Apprentices’ Charge. The piece is one of three detailed articles that featured in the Post Man at around the time the 1723 Constitutions were published and, perhaps, should be viewed in that related context. The three articles reflect and support many of Plot’s observations in his Natural History of Staffordshire.

The following passage has particular significance:

Additional Orders and Constitutions made and agreed upon at a General Assembly held at ____, the 8th Day of December, 1663

I. That no Person, of what Degree soever, be accepted a Free Mason, unless he shall have a Lodge of five Free Masons at the least, whereof one must be a Master or Warden of that Limit or Division where such Lodge shall be kept, and another to be a Workman of the Trade of Free Masonry.

II. That no Person hereafter shall be accepted a Freemason, but such as are able Body, honest Parentage, good Reputation, and Observers of the Laws of the Land.

III. That no Person hereafter, which shall be accepted a Free Mason, shall be admitted into any Lodge or Assembly, until he hath brought a Certificate of the Time and Place of his Acception from the Lodge that accepted him.

The first point, that at least one of the Freemasons at an ‘acceptance’ must be ‘a Workman of the Trade of Freemasonry’, was a record of a practice current through to the eighteenth century. As an example, the custom was maintained even within the membership of the Horn Tavern, the most influential and least operative of the four lodges that were later named as those founding Grand Lodge, where the (albeit gentlemanly) stonemason, William Woodman, was among the members. The second point summarised the Charges, which were set

167 Post Man and the Historical Account, 9 August 1722.
168 The other two articles were published in the Post Man and the Historical Account on 31 July and 4 August 1722, respectively.
out in full in the article; and the items that followed, four through seven, were similarly uncontentious. However, there was one exception:

That for the future the said Society, Company and Fraternity of Freemasons shall be regulated and governed by one Master and as many Wardens as the sad Company shall think fit to chuse at every yearly General Assembly.

The words ‘for the future’ suggest that the section was a more contemporary insertion. Although there was no national organisation for Freemasons in the seventeenth century, it was likely to have been an objective of Desaguliers, Payne and Folkes, that English Grand Lodge be established ‘for the future’ as Freemasonry’s sole governing body. Similarly, the statement of practice that permitted the selection of ‘as many Wardens as the said Company shall think fit to chuse’, provided a justification for extending patronage. And it would have been of assistance for Desaguliers and his colleagues within the new Grand Lodge to have been able to refer to a published precedent that indicated that the position had been such since the prior century. It is possible therefore, to view the section as a probable modification of the Additional Orders and the Apprentices’ Charge which otherwise retained many commonalities with the Old Charges. If correct, the purpose of the insertion, and the publication of the articles as a whole, would have been to achieve greater historical legitimacy and to draw attention to the new Free and Accepted Masonry.169

It is useful to speculate as to how the articles came to appear in the Post Man and the manner in which their placement may have been encouraged. Although we cannot be certain, a little can be inferred from the background to that paper’s establishment and its pro-Whig bias. The Post Man had been spun out of Richard Baldwin’s Whig Post Boy; and its editor and principal writer had been John (Jean Lespinasse) de Fonvive, a Huguenot émigré and one of the best known and most popular and successful newspapermen of the period170: ‘as his News is early and good, so his style is excellent. ... his remarks witness he knows how to soar to a pitch of fineness when he pleases ... In a word, The Post-Man ... out-fies The Post-

---

169 The argument is supported by the content and tone of later press articles concerning Freemasonry. Cf. chap. 5.
170 The Post Man was reputed to earn Fonvive £600 per year (cf. The Spectator, 1 March 1711).
Fonvive was naturalised in 1702. He had settled in London after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and was an integral part of the Huguenot community. Elected a church elder at Hungerford Market, Fonvive later became a trustee of the French Hospital, *La Providence*, and well known as a philanthropist. He was close to the political establishment who were eager to adopt him more formally, and he was offered the position of editor of the official *London Gazette*, a role equivalent to head of the government’s propaganda machine. Fonvive ultimately rejected the position because it paid insufficiently compared with his newspaper publishing and, perhaps, carried less prestige. As the Whiggist John Dunton (1659-1732) noted, ‘Fonvive is so wise and knowing that a man would think Nature had made all the rest of mankind in jest’. Moreover, although ‘the *Postboy* is best for the English and Spanish news, the *Daily Courant* is the best critic, the *English Post* is the best collector, the *London Gazette* has the best authority ... the *Postman* is the best for everything’.

Fonvive’s editorials allowed him a platform to become a representative for the Huguenot community. Raban noted that he frequently ‘commented on the Huguenots’ continuing loyalty to the “legal” king of France, the criteria for citizenship in society, and the proper relations between ruler and citizen’. Fonvive’s perspective was important politically, and not simply from a Whig standpoint. His views and the way in which he expressed them also had influence within the large Huguenot community. And his ideas and comments raised issues that were integral to the newly established Society of Free and Accepted Masons, and to the new *Charges and Regulations* written in the early 1720s and published in the *1723 Constitutions*. Although Fonvive had retired from an active editorial

---

172 Although the BL MSS catalogue contains three references to Fonvive, none are linked to Freemasonry.
173 William and Susan Minet (eds.), *Register of the Church of Hungerford Market* (London, 1928), vol. XXXI.
role by 1721, the *Post Man* could still be regarded as a natural outlet for the placement of such an article.

There is no record of Fonvive being linked directly to Freemasonry, although this does not mean he was not a Mason. However, Fonvive and Desaguliers were likely to have known each other. Both were prominent in the Huguenot community and each shared a connection to the French church at Hungerford Market where Fonvive was an ‘elder’. The church was one of the four West End churches that had formed an operational union in the 1690s, and Hungerford Market had been served by a small pool of clergy that included Desaguliers’ father.\(^\text{177}\)

**Richard Rawlinson (1690-1755)**

 Freemasonry and its philosophical and moral ideals were discussed at some length in Richard Rawlinson’s *Preface* to the 1719 and later editions of Ashmole’s *Antiquities of Berkshire*. Rawlinson was an Oxford-educated antiquary, scholar and Nonjuring cleric.\(^\text{178}\) Although closely associated with Freemasonry, not least through his collection of Masonic miscellanea, now part of the Rawlinson Manuscripts collection at the Bodleian\(^\text{179}\), it is probable that he became a Freemason only around a decade later in or around 1727, following his return from his studies and travels on the continent.\(^\text{180}\)

Once initiated, Rawlinson took the Craft sufficiently seriously that by the 1730s he was Master of the lodge meeting at the Oxford Arms in Ludgate Street; Warden of a second; and a member of two more (respectively, the Rose Tavern in Cheapside, Three Kings in Spitalfields and St Paul’s Head in Ludgate Street).\(^\text{181}\) With such a

---


\(^\text{178}\) Rawlinson was ordained a priest in the Nonjuring Church of England in 1716; he was consecrated a bishop in 1728.

\(^\text{179}\) Bodleian: MSS. Rawlinson, 5122. The Rawlinson collection was donated both during his lifetime and as a bequest after his death.

\(^\text{180}\) Rawlinson travelled in Europe between 1719-26, visiting France, the Low Countries, Italy, Sicily and Malta. He studied at Utrecht (1719), Leiden (1719) and Padua (1722).

\(^\text{181}\) *Grand Lodge Minutes*, pp. 164, 167 and 191.
powerful level of Masonic commitment and his connections to Desaguliers, it was probably not coincidental that he was appointed a Grand Steward in 1734.

Rawlinson’s ODNB entry notes his editorship of several books, including Aubrey’s *Natural History and Antiquities of Surrey* and Ashmole’s *Memoirs*, in editions published and sold by Edmund Curll (16.?-1743). Rawlinson’s ODNB entry notes his editorship of several books, including Aubrey’s *Natural History and Antiquities of Surrey* and Ashmole’s *Memoirs*, in editions published and sold by Edmund Curll (16.?-1743). Curll, a controversial bookseller, was fully aware of the commercial value of topicality and notoriety.

Rawlinson’s *Preface* described Ashmole’s life, and noted and commented on his initiation in Warrington. And in his subsequent discussion of Freemasonry, Rawlinson wrote that:

> Kings themselves have not disdain’d to enter themselves into this Society, the original Foundation of which is said to be as high as the reign of King Henry III, when the Pope granted a Bull Patent, or Diploma, to a particular Company of Italian Masons and architects to travel all over Europe.

The comment is a virtual repetition of Aubrey’s earlier assertion, quoting William Dugdale, on the origins of Freemasonry. In addition, Rawlinson’s observation on Masonic mutual assistance was probably obtained from the same Curll-derived source: ‘Certain Signales and watch Words known to them alone ... when any of the fall into Decay, the Brotherhood is to relieve him’. It is impossible to view either statement, or the *Preface* as a whole, as an original contribution to Masonic research.

Rawlinson became an avid collector of Masonic miscellanea only in his later years, and any original contribution to Masonic research as early as 1719 can be regarded as improbable. In addition to a reliance on Ashmole’s and Aubrey’s books, Rawlinson’s Masonic references in the *Preface* could have been instigated and encouraged by Curll himself (seeking topicality), and/or may have

---

185 He was elected FSA in 1727, proposed by William Jones, the mathematician, and John Harwood.
186 Clapinson, *ODNB*, refers to Rawlinson having edited Edmund Curll’s 1719 publication of Aubrey’s *Natural History*. 
been linked to Rawlinson’s association with Desaguliers, Folkes, and other members of Freemasonry’s inner circle at the Royal Society.

Rawlinson, Desaguliers and Folkes were all elected FRS in 1714. Rawlinson had earlier studied at Oxford and at Leiden (1719-22), home to Willem-Jacob s’Gravesande, appointed Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy in 1717, who had boarded with Desaguliers in 1715 and to whom Desaguliers had acted as doctoral adviser. Rawlinson had displayed an interest in antiquarianism since at least 1712. However, it was only in 1727 when he returned to London that he was elected to the Society of Antiquaries. And it was here and at the Royal Society that he mingled with William Stukeley, the Duke of Montagu, the Duke of Richmond and Lord Coleraine (like Rawlinson, also a member of the Spalding Society), all leading Freemasons and FSAs.

Although Rawlinson probably had latent Jacobite sympathies and his Nonjurist beliefs eventually led to a breach with colleagues at both the Royal Society and Society of Antiquaries, his Masonic life was largely unimpaired. Indeed, until the late 1730s, his Masonic career represented a practical example of Masonic latitudinarianism: ‘to oblige them to that Religion in which all Men agree, leaving their particular Opinions to themselves ... to be Good men and True, or Men of Honor and Honesty, by whatever Denomination or Persuasion they may be distinguished’.

Randle Holme and Chester Freemasonry

Randle Holme III’s *Academie of Armorie* and his ‘observations’ on Freemasonry were discussed above. The Holme family had been integrated into Chester’s civic establishment for several generations, and Holme’s father and grandfather had

---

187 Rawlinson was proposed FRS by William Jones; he was elected in July 1714, the same time as Desaguliers and Martin Folkes. Cf. *Sackler Archives*.
188 Rawlinson matriculated at St John’s College in 1708. He was awarded a BA in 1711, MA in 1713 and DCL in 1719 (by diploma).
189 *Sackler Archives*.
190 Clapinson, ‘Rawlinson’, *ODNB*.
191 Cf. chap. 4 below.
192 *1723 Constitutions*, p. 50, the *First Charge*.
both been Aldermen and Mayors of the city.  They also served as Justices of the Peace and Deputy Heralds to the College of Arms in Lancashire. In addition, his father had been Clerk to the Stationers’ Company, and family influence would have smoothed Holme’s appointment as Steward to the Stationers in 1656 and his election as Alderman in 1659.

Like his father, Holme was a Royalist. His loyalty was rewarded with a sinecure from Charles II in 1664 that exempted him from arrest, but also precluded his holding the office of Sheriff or Mayor. The sinecure was the probable reason Holme failed to follow his father and grandfather into these offices. Holme worked principally as a heraldic painter. However, he was unlicensed and his work could be deemed unlawful. The contravention led to Holme being sued by Dugdale in his capacity of Norroy King of Arms. Dugdale’s suit succeeded. However, the two were later reconciled and Holme subsequently worked under Dugdale at the College of Arms.

In an early section of the Academie, Holme defined what he meant by a guild and set out how the organisation was structured:

A Fraternity, or Society, or Brotherhood, or Company: are such in a Corporation, that are of one and the same trade, or occupation, who being joyned together by oath and covenant, do follow such orders and rules, as are made, or to be made for the good order, rule, and support, of such and every of their occupations. These several Fraternities are generally governed by one or two Masters, and two Wardens, but most Companies with us by two

---

194 His heraldic work for the Garrard family in 1672 is referred to in the Hertfordshire Archives, Hertford: DE/Gd/27286.
195 J.P. Earwaker, The four Randle Holmes of Chester, antiquaries, heraldists and genealogists, c. 1571 to 1707 (Chester, 1892), pp. 113–70.
196 ‘Parliamentary Ordinance 1 October 1646 removing Holme and others from their offices and assemblies on political grounds’: Cheshire and Chester Archives: ZA/B/2/76.
198 The archival records of the Home family are held at the Cheshire and Chester Archives. See Bibliography for detailed references.
Aldermen, and two Stewards, the later, being to receive and pay what concerns them.  

Unsurprisingly, given the strong links between the guilds and Chester’s civic establishment, Holme, like his father before him, was a member of the local lodge. He recorded this en passant in a section of the Academie entitled ‘Masons Tools’:

I Cannot but Honor the Fellowship of the Masons because of its Antiquity; and the more, as being a Member of that Society, called Freemasons: In being conversant amongst them I have observed the use of these several Tools following, some whereof I have seen born in coats Armour.

In keeping with his fondness for lists, the Academie set out a detailed description of the various Masonic tools and their operative uses. However, this has no bearing on any speculative or allegorical use to which Freemasonry might be put. The section is virtually indistinguishable in form and substance from those that precede and follow, covering ‘Husbandry Instruments’ and ‘Slaters’ Tools’, respectively. Any scholarly emphasis on the Academie as a work that provides evidence of speculative or spiritual Freemasonry in Chester would be misplaced. Holme makes no overt mention of any allegorical elements in either Freemasonry or its working tools. And on this basis, it would be difficult to argue that the Academie is a book that proves their symbolic use.

Masonic historians who have cited the existence of various versions of the Old Charges in Chester as ‘proof’ that speculative Freemasonry was present in the city may also be basing their analysis on a misinterpretation. There is no evidence of a spiritual form of Masonic association in Chester in the Academie or otherwise. Although Chester’s Masonic guild had non-operative Masons among its members, their presence is suggestive of a transition from a working guild to a mixed, and largely non-operative, social and dining club, in the words of Lewis and Thacker, for ‘well-off employers, notably in the building trades’ and for the

200 Holme, An Academie of Armorie, p. 61.
201 Ibid, p. 393.
Indeed, the social aspect of Freemasonry became so popular in Chester that by the 1720s there were three lodges, more than any other provincial city, with extensive cross membership between Freemasonry, the city corporation, the local garrison and the church. Alfred Ingham’s observation that Chester’s lodge membership was generally of a high social standing, comprising country gentlemen, the urban élite, and officers from the city garrison, provides an accurate indication of its principal function.

Tangentially, Chester’s civic authorities were, from the late 1660s, increasingly interventionist in guild affairs: settling differences; ensuring an adequate enrolment of apprentices; and judging demarcation disputes. These issues also arose elsewhere in the country as a function of post civil war expansion in the construction industry and other trades. Chester’s corporation ruled against the formation of new guilds on several occasions including, in c. 1691, a petition from six master stonemasons for a new guild charter. The masons were instead placed into the Carpenters’ Company. That they had left and had no wish to re-join the original Chester Company of Masons may suggest that the lodge had developed into something rather different from an operative guild managing local employment issues. It also highlights the city corporation’s influence over the formation and regulation of guilds, and underlines the political and administrative dimensions of civic control of the guilds mentioned earlier in this chapter.

The Ancient Lodge at York

The records of the ‘Ancient Lodge at York’, also known as the Grand Lodge at York, similarly suggest a membership that included a high proportion of gentlemen and, like Chester, that its leadership was closely linked to the city corporation and political élites. A list of Past Grand Masters of York was set out

---

205 *Grand Lodge Minutes*, pp. 38-9, contain the membership lists for the lodges meeting at the Sun tavern, Spread Eagle, and Castle and Falcon in Chester.
in a letter in 1778 from the then Grand Secretary of York to the Lodge of Antiquity in London:

In compliance with your request to be satisfied of the existence of a Grand Lodge at York previous to the establishment of that at London, I have inspected an Original Minute Book of this Grand Lodge beginning at 1705 and ending in 1734 from which I have extracted the names of the Grand Masters during that period as follows.\(^{209}\)

Eighteenth century Yorkshire Freemasonry was based on a long and relatively unbroken tradition reaching back to a medieval past. Had Desaguliers and his colleagues’ actions in and leadership of English Grand Lodge been trivial in their impact and un-related to their political, military and professional connections, the later-named ‘Grand Lodge’ at York could have been a valid contender for Masonic leadership in England. However, notwithstanding its longevity and the political weight of York and the Yorkshire county constituencies, there were several probable reasons why York Masonry lacked the motivation, resonance and national influence of the Grand Lodge of England.

A number of factors can be proposed. First, Yorkshire Masonry was largely disassociated from the scientific Enlightenment epitomised by Desaguliers, Folkes, Clare and others, and the public and private influence and authority that such an intellectual association was able to exert. Second, Yorkshire Masonry was led by provincial politicians and local worthies, some Catholic, whose Tory politics was generally anti-Walpole and, although in some instances not always overtly anti-Hanoverian, had only a limited (and negative) influence on the national stage. In contrast, English Grand Lodge benefited from the presence of senior aristocrats at its titular head who were close to the government and the Crown. Third, York’s distance from the Court and the principal seats of political power may have reduced its weight, most particularly since its leaders did not hold national office. As Schwartz commented, ‘nobody aspiring to national influence could stay away from [London] for too long’.\(^{210}\) Fourth, and possibly the key factor, was that Yorkshire’s leaders were bound to the past in terms of their view of Freemasonry as a predominantly social club. In contrast, Desaguliers, Folkes, Payne, Cowper,


and others at Grand Lodge in London, had the vision to perceive it as a vehicle for the transmission of new ideas, particularly those linked to the scientific Enlightenment, and the discipline and determination to pursue their objectives. Finally, alongside the aristocratic figureheads, Grand Lodge in London and senior lodges such as the Horn in Westminster and Rummer at Charing Cross were populated by officials with political influence and government connections. These included men such as Alexander Chocke, William Cowper and Charles Delafaye. They are discussed in detail in chapter three.

One of the most prominent of York’s early eighteenth century ‘Grand Masters’ was Robert Benson (1676-1731), GMY 1707, who provides an elegant illustration of the contention that York lacked effective influence after the Hanoverian succession. Benson’s principal links to aristocratic society were through his stepfather, Sir Henry Belasyse, and through his marriage to the eldest daughter of Heneage Finch (1649–1719), who had been made Baron Guernsey by Queen Anne and was later created 1st Earl of Aylseford. Benson was Tory MP for Thetford (1702), and later York (1705-13), and appointed to the Treasury under Harley. He was promoted to Chancellor of the Exchequer (1711-13), and made a Privy Councillor when Harley became Earl of Oxford. Created Baron Bingley in 1713, Benson was disliked by many of his fellow peers, lost office after the Hanoverian succession, and was subsequently out of favour as an opponent to Walpole’s ministry. He returned to office only briefly in 1730, having spoken in favour of the Treaty of Seville, and was appointed Treasurer to the Household. A search of published data within the National Archives Access to Archives database failed to reveal any documentation linking Benson with Yorkshire Freemasonry in the local archives of York City, West Yorkshire and the

211 The term ‘Grand Master’ came into being in York in c. 1725 following the formation of the Grand Lodge of England. The term previously adopted was ‘President’.
212 Despite Marlborough’s advice to the contrary, Belasyse was subject to court martial and cashiered over the sacking of Puerto Santa Maria in February 1703: cf. John Childs, ‘Sir Henry Belasyse’, ODNB (Oxford, Sept 2004; online edn., May 2006).
213 Stuart Handley, ‘Robert Benson, Baron Bingley’, ODNB (Oxford, Sept 2004; online edn., Jan 2008). Benson was an initial director of the South Sea Company and lost heavily when the share price plunged.
214 The Treaty of Seville, between Britain, France and Spain, concluded the Anglo-Spanish war and paved the way for Treaty of Vienna the following year.
215 The position of Treasurer to the Household was a sinecure appointed by Royal Warrant and paying c. £1,200 per annum.
East Riding of Yorkshire. The BL MSS collection contains three references, none of which are relevant.

Benson was succeeded by Sir William Robinson (1655-1736), GMY 1708–10, a prosperous local silk merchant. Two members of his family had served as MPs twice in the seventeenth century and twice in the sixteenth. In keeping with his position as a local dignitary, Robinson was appointed High Sheriff of Yorkshire in 1689. His baronetcy, which had lapsed at the death of his uncle, Sir Thomas Robinson, was revived in 1690. Robinson was appointed Lord Mayor in 1700, and sat uncontested as Tory MP for Northallerton (1689-95) and for the City of York (1698-1722). Between 1705 and 1713, his fellow MP was Robert Benson. Robinson married the wealthy Mary Aislabie of Studley Park; his brother-in-law, John Aislabie, was Tory MP for Ripon and, in 1718, Chancellor of the Exchequer. The York City and East Riding archives contain principally conveyances, leases and other estate papers, with no relevant personal family correspondence.

Robinson’s successor was Sir Walter Hawksworth, GMY 1711-12, Tory MP for York in 1714, and High Sheriff in 1721, who was succeeded by Sir George Tempest of Tong Hall, GMY, 1713, then Charles Fairfax, GMY 1714–19, a Jacobite sympathiser. While President of the lodge at York, Fairfax was one of several leading Catholics summoned by the Mayor and city aldermen and asked to make a declaration of loyalty in favour of the Hanoverian succession and to give up their horses and any arms in their household. Others similarly summoned included Benson and at least eight other Catholic families connected to York Freemasonry. Fairfax refused the request. He was fined and imprisoned, and released only in November 1715, after the Jacobites’ unconditional surrender. Perhaps pointedly, his political allegiance met with local Masonic approval and he remained GMY for a further four years.

---

216 York: York City Archives: ACC M31. The papers are principally concerned with the Robinson family estates in and around York; they contain only limited personal correspondence.
218 The relevant Yorkshire archives contain no information regarding the Masonic activities of the GMYs. The absence of information reinforces the view that Yorkshire Freemasonry was at the time predominantly social in nature and largely the preserve of ‘gentlemen of the first families’. Cf. http://www.rgle.org.uk/RGLE_Mother_Grand_Lodge_York.htm (website accessed 1 June 2010).
Fairfax was replaced by Hawksworth, who was reappointed from 1720 until 1723, and who was succeeded in 1724 by Charles Bathurst, a landowner and Tory MP for Richmond. Bathurst, also GMY 1726-28, was appointed High Sheriff of Yorkshire in 1727. Edward Thompson, GMY 1729–32, a merchant and a Commissioner of Land Revenue for Ireland, served as a Tory MP for York from 1722-42.  

The contrast with the politically well connected, affluent and influential pro-Hanoverian Whig aristocrats who provided the nominal leadership at the summit of the Grand Lodge of England, and their coterie of supporters from the Royal Society, the judiciary, the military, and the upper ranks of the London professions, is apparent. As with the Chester lodges, York Freemasonry represents principally an example of local fraternal networking and dining clubs. Functionally, Yorkshire Masonry did not break new ground, and there was an apparent absence of any overt philosophical agenda. A press report in the *Leeds Mercury* for 16 January 1721, quoted by Barker-Cryer, which described a Masonic meeting in Pontefract, underlines the point:

> the Lodge consisting of about thirty persons in Number walk’d to several of their Brothers’ Houses, having on white Gloves and Aprons, Music before them etc ... Afterwards returning to the Gallery of the Lodge Room, they drank ... loyal Healths. Money was thrown to the Crowd by Handfuls and the Night concluded with Illuminations.  

In this sense, the Ancient Lodge at York stood in contrast to the emergent Grand Lodge of England and to the new London-based Free and Accepted Masonry, whose reputation and ritual was developed in fundamentally new directions under the aegis of its new management team. Indeed, the Grand Lodge at York acknowledges the fact directly on its website, in which it details its development from 1705:

> the new organization in the South ... under the denomination of The Grand Lodge of England ... on account of its situation, being encouraged by some of

---

the principal nobility, soon acquired consequence and reputation; while [York] ... seemed gradually to decline. 222

Late Seventeenth Century London Freemasonry

Explaining and excusing the virtual absence of speculative Masonic lodges in London in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Anderson noted that ‘in the South the Lodges were more and more disused ... and the annual Assembly ... not duly attended’. 223 However, Anderson qualified his comment slightly: although ‘particular lodges were not so frequent and mostly occasional in the South’, the exception were those located ‘in or near the Places where great Works were carried on’. 224

That London Freemasonry had become moribund appears to be substantiated by the absence of any meaningful documentary evidence to the contrary. However, notwithstanding Anderson’s assertion, there is no independent evidence that there were any material exceptions. In particular, there are no contemporary records that suggest that a speculative London lodge, ostensibly established by the Whig banker and politician Sir Robert Clayton (1629-1707), existed at St Thomas’s Hospital ‘to advise the Governours about the best Design of rebuilding that Hospital’. 225 Nor is there evidence that other ‘speculative’ (as opposed to working) lodges operated ‘in Piccadilly over against St. James’s Church, one near Westminster Abby, another near Covent-Garden, one in Holborn, one on Tower-Hill’, or elsewhere. 226 In the same vein, despite Andersen’s statement, there is a similar absence of evidence that ‘the king [William of Orange] was privately made a Free Mason’, or that he ‘approved’ of the choice of Wren as ‘Grand Master’.

In itself, this would not normally be a substantial matter. Anderson’s ‘history’ and record of Masonic events was embroidered for a purpose. However, a number of academics have taken Anderson’s comments at face value. Jacob, for example, has declared that ‘even the official histories of speculative Freemasonry

223 1738 Constitutions, p. 108
224 Ibid, p. 106.
225 Robert Clayton was president of St Thomas’s Hospital and responsible for its rebuilding. Thomas Cartwright (1635-1703), the architect, was employed by Clayton.
acknowledge that the earliest known lodge in London, of a totally speculative variety, was headed in the 1690s by ... Clayton’. The comment was made in support of her argument that ‘the transformation of operative Masonry into speculative may have been one of the by-products of the Whig exclusionists search for artisan allies after 1679’. However, her analysis is probably over complex.227 A more probable route by which ‘speculative’ Freemasonry developed is discussed in the following chapters.

Summary

This chapter has sought to provide a short review of the historical context from which ‘modern’ eighteenth century English Freemasonry developed. Attention has focused on the economic and social changes that followed the outbreak of plague in 1348, and the transformation of the guilds from quasi-religious orders to embryonic collective bargaining organisations. Thereafter, the guilds evolved to become more socially based organisations that were gradually absorbed into the provincial social and civic structures. The evidence suggests that academic analysis should not concentrate on whether operative and non-operative Freemasonry co-existed before the formation of the Grand Lodge of England; they did, albeit to a more limited extent and effect that many (Masonic) historians might believe. However, it is important to emphasise that this was principally within the relatively uncomplicated context of provincial networking, politicking and dining. Although some antiquaries may have been attracted to Freemasonry by its medieval Old Charges and oral ritual, this did not necessarily create a ‘speculative’ form of Freemasonry.

There was no unique thread that joined pre-mediaeval and mediaeval Freemasonry to what was to develop in the eighteenth century. And if there was no ‘continuum’ underlying Masonic development, there is a requirement to analyse the determinants and catalysts that caused English Freemasonry to develop so radically and so significantly in the 1720s: to ask what were the factors that created virtually a mass movement among the gentry and influential professional classes. The next chapters explore the politics, philosophy, governance and public profile of the Grand Lodge of England and English

227 Jacob, The Radical Enlightenment, p. 88.
Freemasonry. They examine the impact of Desaguliers and his fellow protagonists on the Masonic stage, the influence they wielded, and the manner in which such influence was exercised.
Chapter Two

John Theophilus Desaguliers: *Homo Masonicus*

This thesis argues that John Theophilus Desaguliers (1683-1744), jointly with colleagues within the orbit of Grand Lodge, fundamentally altered English Freemasonry to produce an organisation that reflected and reinforced the intellectual and economic transformations then in progress within eighteenth century English society. The organisation and its ethos were promoted actively, and this was rewarded with extensive press coverage. Principally as a function of its Whig and aristocratic imprimatur, fraternalism and embroidered faux history, and its credentials as a partial derivative of the scientific Enlightenment, Freemasonry became fashionable. By the mid-1720s, its membership included aristocrats, politicians, soldiers, lawyers and other professionals, and a substantial proportion of London’s scientific and antiquary communities.

The number of lodges within the jurisdiction of Grand Lodge increased almost vertiginously, from the founding four in 1717, to over 60 in 1725 and to more than 100 in 1730. Although certain lodges failed to survive for more than a few years, by the late 1730s, the Grand Lodge of England had extended its reach from the eastern seaboard of the Americas to India - from Boston and Savannah to Bengal. And by the end of the century, the number of lodges that acknowledged London’s authority had expanded to around 500\(^1\), a figure exclusive of derivative and competing Masonic lodges formed under the jurisdiction of Irish, Scottish, French, German, Dutch, Swedish, and other national governing bodies established in the wake of the Grand Lodge of England.

This chapter presents a short biography of Desaguliers and charts the background and provides a structure to his influence as one of the pivotal figures within the brief period that marked the early development of eighteenth century English Freemasonry.\(^2\) In this chapter, we examine Desaguliers’ formative years: the flight

---

1 Lane, *Masonic Records*.
2 Desaguliers was elected the third Grand Master of Grand Lodge in 1719 and appointed Deputy Grand Master in 1722, 1723 and 1725; he was Master and/or a member of several influential Masonic lodges, including the Horn, Bear & Harrow, and the ‘French lodge’.
from persecution in France; his childhood in London among the émigré Huguenot community; and, within this context, the probable influence of the Huguenots’ self-preserving support for the Hanoverian status quo, their belief in education and their promotion of latitudinarian religious tolerance. Desaguliers’ Oxford education, introduction to Newtonian science and subsequent return to London are evaluated, as is his fellowship of the Royal Society, subsequent work as its Curator and Demonstrator and, perhaps most importantly, his position as one of Newton’s most effective proselytisers and acolytes.

The chapter discusses how Desaguliers financed himself and his family through scientific commissions from wealthy patrons, particularly James Brydges, Duke of Chandos, and via public scientific lectures. It considers how both opened avenues for Masonic proselytising and also spoke to his financial insecurity. As a whole, the chapter explains and examines why and how ‘Free and Accepted’ Masonry was embraced by Desaguliers as a means by which his various philosophical, political and personal objectives could be advanced.

Although this thesis argues that an analysis of eighteenth century English Freemasonry should not be divorced from the contemporary macro environment of economic, political, religious and social change, to the extent that Freemasonry’s transformation can be viewed as having been substantially influenced by Desaguliers, it is constructive to explore the factors that may have moulded him.

**Displacement and Poverty: an Insecure Childhood**

they make it a point of Religion to destroy Protestants, over whom that Church pretends to have a sovereign and absolute Dominion; ... thousands of French Protestants now in England confirm the Truth [and] are fled from thence to avoid the ... insupportable violence.³

---

Desaguliers was born on 12 March 1683 at Aytré, a village near La Rochelle. His father, also named Jean (‘Jean Desaguliers’), had served as Aytré’s Pasteur. He was forced to flee France in late 1682: a sermon he had preached to his congregation had been reported to the Catholic authorities as being in contravention of the law. Jean Desaguliers journeyed to London and, on 8 November 1682, was ordained an Anglican deacon at Fulham Palace by Henry Compton (1631–1713), the politically connected and robustly Protestant Bishop of London. Jean Desaguliers remained in London only briefly and in December, the Bishop of Winchester, George Morley (1598–1684), granted him a licence to serve on Guernsey.

There appears to be no record of his having obtained a living on the island, but a note of his presence at Guernsey’s Ecclesiastical Court on 16 May 1683 in a session devoted to the abjuration of priests is extant. Huguenots had been escaping to the Channel Islands for many years and St. Peter Port, Guernsey’s capital, housed Huguenot families who had settled as early as the mid-sixteenth century. However, for most Huguenots, as for the Desaguliers family, the town would represent only a relatively temporary home before they moved on. With its French-speaking Protestant merchants and solid trade routes, the island offered an effective escape route to England, the Low Countries and the New World.

Jean Desaguliers’ wife, Marguerite Thomas la Chapelle, left France with her young son at some time between 1683 and 1684 to join her husband in Guernsey. The date is earlier than many scholars have appreciated and pre-dated the Revocation

---

4 Rev. David C.A. Agnew, *French Protestant Exiles* (London, 1871), vol. II, p. 89, refers to a French family bible in which both father and son entered domestic events and names. Although referred to by other sources, the bible appears no longer to be extant.
5 The last entry in the Aytré church register referring to Jean Desaguliers was recorded on 24 August 1682.
7 Bishop Compton was the youngest son of the 2nd Earl of Northampton; he played a leading role in seeking to unite Protestant dissenters with the established church.
10 Agnew, *French Protestant Exiles*, p. 89, recorded a daughter who had died in 1678.
of the Edict of Nantes.11 They may have remained on the island for several years, probably close to penury, until leaving for the mainland after 1690, and thereafter arrived in London. A return to France was not feasible. Despite the privations and risks involved, the Revocation had triggered a Huguenot exodus, with around 200,000 fleeing France.12 Contemporary literature illustrated the imperatives that drove them: religious, ‘que l’on a trainé par force au catéchisme’13; and physical, ‘being accused, with some neighbours of his of having had [Divine Service] in his country house; he was condemned to be hanged and his house demolished, and his woods destroyed’.14

Having already been ordained in the Church of England, Jean Desaguliers obtained an appointment in 1692, as one of five deacons practicing at the French Anglican church in Swallow Street.15 The four conformist French churches of Hungerford Market, Soho Square, Jewin Street and St. James/Swallow Street had two years earlier agreed to cooperate and pool their ministers, paying them from a common fund. Consequently, Jean Desaguliers16 served concurrently at La Patente church in Soho and at Le Carré in Berwick Street.

The ministers and deacons at the four churches received a small, even nominal, stipend. Their pay was supplemented by the congregation in return for their services at baptisms and marriages. Without this, poverty knocked. However, work was limited, and Jean Desaguliers officiated on only three occasions at the

16 The name was also written in church records as ‘Desagulier’ and ‘Desagulliers’. 
former church, and on merely a single occasion at the latter.\textsuperscript{17} Supplementary employment was also scant at Swallow Street and although he officiated at a baptism on 12 September 1692\textsuperscript{18}, and succeeded Jérémie Majou as Lecteur in April 1693\textsuperscript{19}, Jean Desaguliers had only seven engagements from some thirty-seven marriages and baptisms in the four years to 1696, the last being 7 June 1696.\textsuperscript{20} With such a meagre level of activity, it is improbable that the four churches were able to provide much more than a subsistence wage. Indeed, the Swallow Street church regularly had to find additional funds to supplement the income of their ministers. As an example, on one occasion, the four ministers were given £10 to compensate for the absence of regular pay: ‘de trouver quelque rafraîchissement qu’il est juste de donner à Messieurs les Pasteurs de cette Eglise qui n’ont rien receu depuis plus de six mois’.\textsuperscript{21}

As a child, Desaguliers may have felt such financial insecurity acutely and been aware of the poverty of many others in the Huguenot community. Around 50,000 refugees had fled to England in the years immediately after the Revocation, of which some 30-40,000 had settled in London, representing around 6\% of the population and a higher proportion of the labour force. Notwithstanding that London had been devastated by plague two decades earlier, the Huguenot influx placed considerable downward pressure on labour rates, and many refugees found it difficult to obtain reasonably paid work. The consequential strain on the churches and their relatively sparse funds, and the extent and nature of Huguenot poverty, is set out clearly in church records and in the contemporary press:

For tho’ the Lamentations, and Sighs of the Refugees throughout all Europe, has in a great Measure made us sensible of their sufferings, yet this is not sufficient to preserve it in memory.\textsuperscript{22}


\textsuperscript{18} Minet & Minet, \textit{The Register of the French Churches of Le Carre and Berwick Street}, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{19} William & Susan Minet, \textit{The Register of the French Churches of St Martin Ongars & Swallow St} (London, 1935), vol. XXXVII, p. xxxii.

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Ibid}, pp. 15-17.

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Ibid}, p. xxx.

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Athenian Gazette or Casuistical Mercury}, 10 October 1693: editorial and review of the first volume of John Dunton’s, \textit{The French Book of Martyrs, or the History of the Edict of Nantes} (London, 1693). Dunton was also publisher and editor of the \textit{Athenian Gazette}. 
In the years following the Glorious Revolution, the English establishment sought to ensure that Huguenot refugees received tangible financial support. This was expressed through general parish and other collections across the country. Over £90,000 was donated nationally from collection plates and through contributions from the crown, aristocracy and parliament, including £39,000 donated from the Civil List, among other large individual donations. To place such numbers in perspective, Deane and Cole indicated that, in 1688, average annual income was less than £10 per person, aggregate government expenditure was around £3 million, and national expenditure on the Poor Rate was only c. £600,000 in total.

It is likely that poverty was a genuine and enduring issue for the Desaguilers family. The accounts of the Royal Bounty Fund, published periodically from 1705, record ‘Sara Desaiguillers’ receiving £9 0s 0d in 1705 and £10 0s 0d in 1707; and Marguerite Ferrier, the daughter of Henry Ferrier and ‘Marguerite Desaiguillers’, a ‘minister’s widow’, receiving £6 6s 6d in 1705, £2 9s 0d in 1707 and 17s in 1722.

Parish collections and parliamentary support were insufficient to provide effective and universal support to the thousands of refugees entering England. Many émigrés also turned to their local communities and to the numerous charity committees and special collections established by the churches. And as a frontline deacon, Jean Desaguilers, perhaps with his son alongside him, would have taken an active part in the process of raising charitable funding, and in the allocation and weekly distribution of grants and pensions within the parish quartier to which he would have been assigned.

Despite the level of poverty, the rise in the number of Huguenots settling in Leicester Fields and Soho in the decade after the Revocation was matched by an increase in the number of competing places of worship. By 1700, fourteen French churches had been consecrated: seven conformist, including the popular Des Grecs in Hog Lane, and seven non-conformist. Perhaps as a result, the attraction of the church in Swallow Street declined. Indeed, the area was noted as ‘a part of the town where Dissenters are very little in fashion’.29

Swallow Street had faced severe financial difficulties as early as 1696 and ‘la Compagnie considérant que cette Eglise déchoit sensiblement tous les jours’ and whether the church ‘est chargée de debtes considérables dont elle paye un gros interest’.30 Although the church’s Minute books record nothing after September 1696, it was probably the prospect of further financial deterioration, combined with four years of low earnings, that encouraged or obliged Jean Desaguliers to leave to establish his ‘French School’ in Islington. Indeed, the church at Swallow Street subsequently declined further and, in 1709, the building was acquired by a congregation of Presbyterians. Coincidentally, their minister was the Rev. James Anderson.31

The move to Islington would have been more than a geographic shift across London for Jean Desaguliers and his family. London’s Huguenots were divided into conformist Anglican and non-conformist French Protestant communities centred on the Savoy and Threadneedle Street churches, respectively. Although anglicised ritual might not have had an immediate or obvious appeal to the Huguenot émigrés, the West End churches that used it had the arguable advantage of being better connected to the establishment through Compton and other prominent members of the aristocracy who provided funding. These included Atholl, Derby, Devonshire, Newcastle, Ormonde, Ossory and Stafford.32

---

However, despite their differences in ritual and occasional clerical schisms, both Huguenot communities shared a common anxiety: a profound sense of political and religious insecurity.

Given the tensions with France and the relative insularity of their communities, the Huguenot churches, both east and west, made overt protestations of allegiance to the Crown. These were both genuine and also born of insecurity. The government’s ‘Eminent Zeal for the Protestant Religion, and the tender Compassion and Charity ... shewn to multitudes of French Refugiez, of all Ranks and Degrees, who have been forced to fly hither for ... Protection and Relief’, was neither perfect nor permanent. Moreover, the ‘astonishing Barbarity [with which] the formerly Flourishing Churches of France have been ruined and destroyed’ such that ‘many ... miserable Innocents [had to] run to find Sanctuary’ remained a constant threat and present danger.

The negotiations preceding the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 had aroused some hope among the Huguenot émigrés that the Protestant powers might exert influence on Louis XIV to roll back religious persecution, even if recognition of their faith was not an option. Henri de Mirmand, a leading Swiss Huguenot, acted as their advocate. Mirmand was unsuccessful: he wrote to London’s French churches on 2 June 1713 to tell them of his failure and to recommend patience. However, matters deteriorated and eighteen months later, in 1715, the Huguenot community again came under threat with what de Ruvigny, Lord Galway, termed ‘de l’invasion d’un prétendant papist’: the Jacobite Rising. In a letter to the West Street Church, Lord Galway queried ‘combien il y aurait de gens de votre église capables de prendre les armes en cas de nécessité?’.

Both the Hanoverian and the Huguenot establishment took the threat seriously. Concerned about the possibility of Jacobite spies, London’s French churches were instructed to monitor and report any non-Huguenot members admitted to their

---

33 Elie Benoist (English trans.), *The History of the famous Edict of Nantes* (London, 1694), Cooke’s *Dedication*.
34 *Ibid*.
congregation. Religious and political insecurity remained a constant theme: notwithstanding their setback in 1715, four years later, the Jacobites found a new ally in Count Giulio Alberoni, a cardinal and a favourite of and leading minister to Philip V of Spain. Such Jacobite and Catholic threats, repeated over the years, wove fear into the Huguenot psyche and underpinned their self-interested loyalty to the Hanoverian Crown and its Protestant government. The position remained unvarying over the next three decades. Robin Gwynn, referring to the Jacobite rising of 1745, noted that the City of London’s leading citizens in a demonstration of fidelity to the Crown, offered upwards of 2,000 men to fight the Jacobite threat. Notably, a majority of the names were Huguenot: ‘In all some three-fifths of those who promised men had foreign names, and they promised about twice as many men as the English manufacturers signing the same declaration’.

Oxford University, John Keill, and a Newtonian Education

In common with other émigré influxes over the centuries, the Huguenot community was motivated and entrepreneurial. Hard work and a drive to succeed and to influence were key attributes that the Huguenots instilled in their children. Desaguliers was no exception: studying with his father; assisting him at his French School; and after his father’s death in 1699, continuing his education at Bishop Vesey’s school in Sutton Coldfield. An obviously intelligent student, Desaguliers was admitted in 1705 as a servitor scholar to Christ Church College, Oxford, to read divinity and experimental natural philosophy. He probably benefited from the patronage of John Wilkins, a trustee of Bishop Vesey’s school, whose son also attended Christ Church, albeit as a gentleman scholar.

---

36 Ibid, p. xvi.
38 Cf. Agnew, French Protestant Exiles; also Mike Chrimes & A.W. Skempton (eds.), A Biographical Dictionary of Civil Engineers in Great Britain and Ireland: 1500 to 1830 (London, 2002), p. 177. Jean Desaguliers’ burial was recorded in 1699 in the register of the Anglican Church of St Mary, Islington.
39 Although many sources refer to Desaguliers being tutored by a ‘Mr Sanders’ at Sutton Coldfield, he was more probably educated at Bishop Vesey’s Free Grammar School, founded in 1527, where an unpublished history of the school referred to Desaguliers being a student. Source: verbal communication from Bishop Vesey’s School June, 2008.
40 Christ Church, the largest college in Oxford, was High Church Anglican; the college chapel also served as cathedral for the diocese.
41 I am grateful to Audrey Carpenter for this reference.
At Oxford, Desaguliers studied under John Keill (1671-1721), a 34 year-old Episcopalian from Presbyterian Scotland and, like Desaguliers, something of an Oxford outsider. Keill had read mathematics and natural philosophy at Edinburgh under David Gregory (1661–1708), an early Newtonian, and had followed Gregory to Balliol when the latter took the Savilian Chair of Astronomy in 1691. Incorporated MA in 1694, Keill was subsequently appointed lecturer in experimental philosophy at Hart Hall.

At Oxford, Keill taught one of the earliest courses on Newton’s natural philosophy and developed an innovative method of presenting and demonstrating Newton’s theories using practical experiments and scientific apparatus, rather than pure mathematics. However, despite his intellectual brilliance, Keill was unable to obtain academic preferment. Although he had deputised for Sir Thomas Millington (1628–1704), had his Newtonian lecture course published, been elected FRS, and was a regular contributor to the Society’s Philosophical Transactions, Keill had not been chosen to succeed Millington to the Sedleian chair. And four years later, in 1708, he was again overlooked, on this occasion for the Savilian chair following Gregory’s death. The effect on Desaguliers of his mentor’s lack of academic preferment is not known but, perhaps, presented him with a tangible example of academic - and financial - insecurity.

Frustrated at his lack of progress, Keill sought alternative positions outside Oxford. He eventually received assistance from Robert Harley (1661-1724), whose political career culminated in his elevation, in 1711, as Earl of Oxford and
Mortimer, and appointment as Lord Treasurer. With Harley’s help, Keill was appointed treasurer of a government fund to support German Palatine refugees. And at the beginning of 1711, after Keill’s return from North America, to where he had accompanied a group of Palatine émigrés, rather than return to academia, he was appointed a government decipherer, or code breaker, again through Harley’s offices.\textsuperscript{48} However, with Newton’s intercession, Keill was subsequently elected to the Savilian chair, following the death of Caswell, Gregory’s successor in 1712. Newton’s support for Keill at the Royal Society and in the wider academic world (he was awarded a further doctorate in 1713 by public act), mirrored his self-promotional support for other acolytes. And Newton’s support was requited: Keill’s research papers, lectures and growing academic standing, provided a muscular buttress for Newton’s own academic reputation.

While Keill had shepherded refugees from the German Palatine to the colonies in New England, Desaguliers had substituted for him as lecturer at Hart Hall. Desaguliers emulated and enhanced Keill’s methodology, using experiments rather than mathematics to demonstrate the validity of Newton’s scientific principles. Desaguliers’ natural philosophy, based on observation and calculation, augmented his Protestant teaching; for Desaguliers as for others, there was no perceived contradiction or threat (to the Anglican Church or otherwise) from the new scientific Enlightenment.

\textbf{London, Again}

Desaguliers obtained his BA in 1709 and was ordained a deacon the following year.\textsuperscript{49} He received his MA in 1712 and, in 1713, following his marriage to Joanna Pudsey\textsuperscript{50}, returned to London. He may have been driven by financial ambition or by a desire to move away from what he may have perceived as an increasingly antipathetic Tory Oxford, or both.\textsuperscript{51} Little is known of his wife other than that she


\textsuperscript{49} Like his father, Desaguliers was ordained by Bishop Compton at Fulham.

\textsuperscript{50} The ceremony was held at St Paul’s, Shadwell, known as the ‘Church of the Sea Captains’, an Anglican church originally built in c. 1657 and rebuilt in 1669.

\textsuperscript{51} Desaguliers retained his connection with Oxford and returned periodically to lecture. He was awarded a doctorate in 1719, which he incorporated LLD at Cambridge in 1726.
was born in Kidlington, Oxfordshire, to a middle ranking family. Of greater significance is that she was not a Huguenot: to marry outside of the Huguenot community was relatively uncommon until much later in the eighteenth century, and it is possible to view the marriage as an early indication of Desaguliers’ aspiration to assimilate into English society and, perhaps, in his eyes, advance himself socially.

Desaguliers initially took lodgings in the City, in Plough Yard, Fetter Lane, close to the Royal Society’s rooms which were located a few steps away in Crane Court. His address was recorded in the register of the local church, St Andrew’s, Holborn, where his son was baptised on 14 March 1715. Later that year, Desaguliers moved to Channel Row, Westminster, a narrow lane running parallel to the Thames from the back of Richmond Terrace to Bridge Street. The Westminster Rate Book indicates that Desaguliers paid a Poor Rate of just over £30 per annum from 1715 to 1735, when the rate was reduced to c. £25. His name remained in the Rate Book until 1741, the year that the house was demolished with others to clear a way for the newly constructed Westminster Bridge. The relatively high Poor Rate suggests that Desaguliers had one of the larger properties in Channel Row, a supposition supported by the scale of lectures given there and the number of lodgers and students that periodically took rooms. Desaguliers also hosted private tutorials at the house.

Channel Row was the location of the Rummer & Grapes, John Strype’s ‘Rhenish Wine House of good resort’ that at the time hosted an exclusive Masonic lodge. And it was close to New Palace Yard, which housed many of those who later

54 Guildhall Library: St Andrew’s, Holborn, Register, MS 6667/7.
55 London: City of Westminster Archives: ‘Assessment made on Inhabitants of the Parish of St Margaret’s Westminster in the County of Middlesex for and towards the Relief of the Poor’, E330–E363. The rates were reduced from £30 7s 6d to £24 9s 0d.
56 ‘Desaguliers to Lady Cowper, 1 August 1716’. Hertford: Hertfordshire Archives: A-K DE/P/F203 1708 – 1723, a letter regarding a visit to Desaguliers’ house at Channel Row to view Venus through a telescope.
became Desaguliers’ key Masonic allies and colleagues in Grand Lodge. New Palace Yard was also the location of the Horn, to which tavern the lodge at the Rummer later transferred its residence.

Desaguliers supported his wife, their four sons and three daughters and, for a period, his mother and mother-in-law, through a combination of his work for the Royal Society, private commissions, and by giving lectures on mechanical and experimental philosophy, both at his house in Channel Row and to the paying public more widely. His lectures became fashionable and achieved some financial success: science was emerging into popular culture and interest in Newton’s theories had spread beyond the confines of Oxbridge, the Royal Society and aristocratic cliques, to London’s coffee houses and taverns.

In this approach, Desaguliers followed others. His predecessors included John Harris (1666-1719), who had lectured on mathematics at the Marine Coffee House in Birchin Lane in 1702-3, and had published his *Lexicon technicum* in 1704; Francis Hauksbee (1660-1713), who had been lauded by Harris as one of six ‘ingenious and industrious artificers’; and the controversial, theologically unorthodox William Whiston (1667-1752). However, unlike such predecessors, Desaguliers, intentionally and astutely, emphasised showmanship. His experiments were designed to entertain as well as inform:

---

58 Two sons and all three daughters died in infancy.
59 Marguerite Desaguliers was buried at St Margaret’s in March 1722; his mother-in-law was buried there in November 1732. City of Westminster Archives: Registers of St Margaret’s Church, Westminster.
60 The main lecture room was ‘30 foot long, 18 wide and 15 high’: *Post Man and the Historical Account*, 28 February 1716.
61 Lectures on natural philosophy were given at a variety of coffee houses across London, including Garraway’s in Exchange Alley, the Grecian in the Strand, Child’s by St Paul’s, and Man’s at Charing Cross.
63 Hauksbee’s election as FRS in December 1703, the first meeting under Newton’s presidency, is an example of Newton’s support for an acolyte whose advancement was a function of his utility. Newton exploited Hauksbee, whose discoveries populated the *Philosophical Transactions*: he presided over Hauksbee’s weekly experiments at the Society and took credit for his research into light, magnetism and optics. Hauksbee later self-published his RS papers: Francis Hauksbee, *Physico-Mechanical Experiments on Various Subjects* (London, 1709). Notably, the book was dedicated to Lord Sommers, the former President of the Royal Society and a member of the Privy Council. A 2nd edn. was published after Hauksbee’s death (probably more profitably) by John Senex (London, 1719).
65 Whiston was expelled from Cambridge University for religious heterodoxy.
a great many Persons get a considerable Knowledge of Natural Philosophy by Way of Amusement; and some are so well pleas’d with what they learn that Way, as to be induc’d to study Mathematicks, by which they at last become eminent Philosophers.66

Scientific demonstrations and scientific entertainment developed in tandem.67 As with Hauksbee, Newton’s original demonstrator, Desaguliers’ experiments and demonstrations were given weekly at the Royal Society.68 However, they were also offered to a wider public audience69, and the effects of electricity, the physical properties of gases, the gravitational pull of the moon, and the orbits of the planets, were demonstrated and explained with a mixture of novel devices, including Desaguliers’ new ‘planetarium’.70 Indeed, as Plumb noted, albeit of a slightly later period:

Public demonstrations of the powers of electricity became exceedingly popular and profitable. To see brandy ignited by a spark shooting from a man’s finger became one of the wonders of the age.71

Wigelsworth has commented on the financial returns to be made from popular demonstrations of Newtonian science. He characterised the public lecture circuit as an opportunity ‘to make money in early eighteenth century London’, and noted the disputes and squabbles that arose as a result.72 But even before he succeeded Hauksbee as Newton’s principal demonstrator, Desaguliers had been presenting his lectures and displays on a regular basis in London’s coffee houses.73 His

---

enthusiastic showmanship ensured an attentive and appreciative audience. And he sought to harness the press, which could be effusive in its praise:

That so much Dexterity was necessary to make the experiments ... that even Monsieur Mariotte who had such a Genius for Experiments and had been so successful on many other Subjects, yet even He miscarried when he undertook to separate the Rays of Light.

Among the many Newtonian demonstrators and lecturers that emerged to create a public lecture circuit in London and the provincial cities, Desaguliers can be regarded as pre-eminent. Science and commerce had become integral to each other’s success: no more ‘vain hypotheses’ but, in Hauksbee’s words, ‘experiments judiciously and accurately made’. Desaguliers recognised that personal and commercial success lay in the application of natural philosophy to engineering and to the solution of practical commercial problems. Experiments and demonstrations under the auspices of the Royal Society and otherwise were part of a process of the commercialisation of science. As Stewart noted, for active natural philosophers such as Desaguliers, the world of mechanics was full of opportunities to develop essentially economic principles of work and force.

The gentlemen and affluent artisans and tradesmen who subscribed to Desaguliers’ works and attended his lecture courses had utilitarian concerns. In Pumfrey’s words, natural philosophy was ‘infiltrated by the values of trade, the market place and the monied interest’. Science had become more empirical, wider ranging and recognised by many as being of potentially considerable

---

74 Stewart, The rise of public science, esp. chap.s 7 and 8.
77 Hauksbee, Physico-Mechanical Experiments, Preface.
79 Ibid, 269.
80 Stewart, ‘Public Lectures and Private Patronage’, esp. 52-4.
commercial use. Construction, farming, mining and navigation, were among many areas that benefited from the implementation of new scientific ideas and practical machines, and as productivity advanced, both entrepreneurs and the economy benefited.

A widespread view among historians of science perceives the eighteenth century as relatively devoid of new scientific theories and inventions as compared to the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. However, such a perspective fails to recognise the application of scientific innovation that underpinned commercial and military expansionism. Desaguliers was at the core of the movement:

Natural Philosophy is that Science which gives the Reasons and Causes of the Effects and Changes which naturally happens in Bodies ... We ought to call into question all such things as have an appearance of falsehood, that by a new Examen we may be led to the Truth.

Having returned to London, Desaguliers was introduced, probably by Keill, to Isaac Newton, President of the Royal Society, who both dominated the Society and would utilise and exploit Desaguliers much as he had Hauksbee; and to the Duke of Chandos, one of England’s wealthiest men and a fellow member of the Society’s Council. The combined result was a substantial boost to Desaguliers’ career. Newton’s sponsorship and Desaguliers’ subsequent election as FRS reinforced and provided a more secure foundation for his scientific credibility. And in Chandos, Desaguliers gained a wealthy, high profile, connected and entrepreneurial patron.

These platforms and, later, that of English Grand Lodge, gave Desaguliers a network of contacts and relationships which he used effectively, something seen clearly in the godparents he provided for his children. The role of those willing to fulfil the responsibility tracked Desaguliers’ social, scientific and Masonic standing over the next decade. And his children’s baptisms at St. Andrew's, Holborn, and
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83 I am grateful to Patricia Fara for this observation, made in a private conversation.
84 J.T. Desaguliers, Lectures in Mechanical and Experimental Philosophy (London, 1717), Foreword.
85 Newton was President of the Royal Society from 1703 to his death.
St. Margaret’s, Westminster, once again demonstrated a desire for social assimilation and advancement: both churches were High Church Anglican.86 Desaguliers’ first two children, born in 1715 and 1718, had modest godparents: his brother and sister-in-law; Mary Hauksbee, the daughter of Francis Hauksbee, whose wife had allowed Desaguliers to use her address to advertise his early lectures87 and had hosted at least one lecture course in 171488; and local neighbours. The godparents of his next four children, born between 1719 and 1724 when Desaguliers was at his Masonic apogee, were more influential and aristocratic. The group included John Brydges, the Marquis of Carnarvon89, second and surviving son of the Duke of Chandos, Desaguliers’ principal sponsor, and Cassandra, the Duchess of Chandos, the Duke’s second wife, who was wealthy in her own right. Thomas Parker, 1st Earl of Macclesfield, a keen mathematician, later Lord High Chancellor90; Archibald Campbell, Earl of Islay and 3rd Duke of Argyll, later Privy Seal, an influential Scottish politician and a government adviser and intermediary on Scottish affairs91; and Theodosia, 10th Baroness Clifton, the daughter of Viscount Clarendon, who was married to Edward Bligh, Earl of Darnley92, also consented. As did Countess de la Lippe, whose husband, the Count, was also a member of the Horn93; and the Duchess of Richmond, the wife of the 2nd Duke and later Grand Master of Grand Lodge.94 The roll also comprised two influential non-aristocrats: Sir Isaac Newton himself, who was godfather to the Desaguliers’ second son; and Lady Hewet, the wife of Sir Thomas Hewet95, Surveyor General to George I, who was retained in that role by George II.

86 Although both could be regarded as his ‘local’ churches, Desaguliers had the choice of several other churches within a relatively short distance. The closest conformist French churches were located, respectively, at the Savoy in the Strand, and at Spring Gardens, Westminster. Each would have been only a few hundred yards from Desaguliers’ lodgings. 87 Guardian, 5 May 1713. 88 Desaguliers’ lecture course was advertised as being ‘at the widow Hawksbee’s in Mind Court, Fleet Street’: Daily Courant, 16 March 1714. 89 Carnarvon became Grand Master in 1738. 90 Thomas Parker, proposed by Newton and elected in 1712, was (possibly) a member of the lodge meeting at the Crown & Harp, St Martin’s Lane. 91 Campbell was another Freemason with a keen interest in science. Cf. below. 92 Darnley became Grand Master in 1737. 93 Written ‘Count La Lippe’ in Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 23. 94 The Duke of Richmond was Grand Master in 1725; before and after he was WM of the Horn and of other lodges in England (e.g., Chichester) and France (e.g., Aubigny and Paris). 95 Also written as ‘Hewitt’.
The Earls of Macclesfield and Islay were godfathers to Thomas Desaguliers (1721-80). Thomas joined the Royal Regiment of Artillery as a cadet in 1740, fought at Fontenoy, and returned to England in 1748, promoted Captain. He subsequently became Chief Firemaster at Woolwich, where he was responsible for improving English gunnery, a position he held until his death. His success led to promotion as Colonel Commandant, Major General (1772) and Lieutenant General (1777). He was also elected FRS in 1763. It is possible that his initial preferment was linked, at least in part, to his connection through his father to the Duke of Montagu, the first noble Grand Master of Grand Lodge (in 1721), who had been appointed head of the Ordnance at Woolwich in 1740, with responsibility for developing the artillery.

However, by the time the family’s seventh child was baptised in 1727, Desaguliers’ status had passed its zenith. Albeit that they had political influence, Desaguliers’ final collection of godparents was non-aristocratic and linked to the non-aristocratic second tier of Grand Lodge. The latter group included William Cowper, the past Grand Secretary and Deputy Grand Master of Grand Lodge, Clerk of the Parliaments, Chairman of the Westminster magistrates’ bench and a nephew of Lord Cowper; and Alexander Chocke, another Westminster justice and senior civil servant who succeeded Cowper as Deputy Grand Master. Other godparents were Chocke’s wife; and the wife of Francis Sorrel, a senior official at the Taxes Office, a Westminster justice and a former Grand Warden at Grand Lodge.

An Appliance of Science

Desaguliers’ self-promotion and Newtonian proselytising found expression in prolific authorship, particularly after he was elected FRS, with a torrent of publications alongside his lectures and experiments given at the Royal Society and
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97 Cowper was Clerk to the Parliaments and Chairman of the Westminster Bench; Chocke, Clerk of the Debentures at the Treasury and a Westminster JP; and Sorrel, Secretary to the Taxes Office and also a Westminster & Middlesex JP. Cf. chap. 3 below.
elsewhere. In 1711, while still at Oxford, Desaguliers had translated Ozanam’s six-part *Treatise of Fortification*. The book was dedicated to the Hon. John Richmond Webb (1667-1724), a popular military hero of the War of Spanish Succession. This was succeeded the following year with a translation of Ozanam’s *Treatise of Gnomonicks or Dialling*. However, Desaguliers’ work rate increased once he had established himself in London. His first major publication was a translation in 1715 of Nicolas Gauger’s *Treatise on the Construction of Chimneys*. The book was dedicated to the Earl of Cholmondeley, Treasurer to the Royal Household, whose younger brother, George, was elected FRS in June of the same year.

It was unlikely to have been a coincidence that George Cholmondeley, among other appointments, Colonel of the 1st Troop of Horse Guards, was proposed FRS by Desaguliers. His election would have reflected positively on Desaguliers, and been welcomed by the Earl, one of Desaguliers’ patrons. Cholmondeley was a staunch Whig with strong political connections. He was also associated with the Sun Inn and Cheshire Freemasonry, and the patron of Roger

---

99 Desaguliers’ public stature and financial rewards were in contrast to those of ‘Orator’ John Henley, a contemporary and, later, also a Freemason. Henley’s satirical commentaries and eccentric lecture courses were far less successful than those of Desaguliers. Cf. Graham Midgley, ‘John Henley (1692–1756)’, *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004; online edn., Jan 2008); also, Peter Farmer, *A New Model for the Rebuilding Masonry on a Stronger Basis than the former* (London, 1730), a book dedicated to Henley.


101 Webb was promoted Major General in 1709 and Lieutenant General in 1712. He served as Colonel of the 8th Regiment of Foot (1695-1715), and Governor of the Isle of Wight (1710-15); he also sat as Tory MP for Ludgershall in Wiltshire, the family estate. Cf. John B. Hattendorf, ‘John Richmond Webb’, *ODNB* (Oxford, 2008).


105 George Cholmondeley was a distinctly pro-Huguenot Whig aristocrat. His father-in-law was the Governor of Sas van Ghent, van Ruytenburgh, and his mother-in-law the daughter of the officer commanding the army of the States General. Cf. Henderson, ‘George Cholmondeley, second earl of Cholmondeley’, *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004). Between 1725 and 1733, Cholmondeley was Lord Lieutenant for Cheshire; he may also have been a member of the Chester lodge under Col. Francis Columbine.

106 Sackler Archive.

107 Henderson, ‘Hugh Cholmondeley’, *ODNB*. Cf. also, Shrewsbury: Shropshire Archives: 1536/8/1, *No date [early C18]*: MS notes regarding Desaguliers’ lectures on mechanics, including the eclipse of the moon, gravity, hydraulics and the laws of motion.

Comberbach\textsuperscript{109}, a Chester Mason, later Provincial Senior Grand Warden, who maintained a direct relationship with Desaguliers and Grand Lodge.\textsuperscript{110} Cheshire Freemasonry was important to Grand Lodge and the relationship was supported by other Chester natives, including William Cowper, the Grand Secretary, whose successful visit to the city was recorded in \textit{Grand Lodge Minutes}\textsuperscript{111}, and George Payne, twice Grand Master and another of Desaguliers’ key allies, whose family came from Chester. Both are discussed in chapter three.

Desaguliers’ translation of the \textit{Treatise on Chimneys} was published by John Senex (c. 1678-1740), later the co-publisher of the 1723 \textit{Constitutions}, who became one of Desaguliers most important literary collaborators. The book reinforced Desaguliers’ scientific status and reputation. It also provides an indication of his self-confidence:

\begin{quote}
The usefulness of the Book has induced me to give it to the World in English ... I have omitted whatever I thought superfluous in the Author, to make way for some Observations of my own ... He has considered only the improvement of wood fires, but I have shown how Turf or Coal may be burnt.\textsuperscript{112}
\end{quote}

Moreover, the recommendation and advertisement placed near the head of the book\textsuperscript{113} underlines both Desaguliers’ financial naivety and his opportunism:

\textbf{A D V E R T I S E M E N T.}

\begin{quote}
THE best Workmen that I know for curing the smoaking Chimneys, and performing what is directed in this Book, most effectually, and at the most reasonable Rates, are Henry Hathwel, Bricklayer; living over against the George Inn in Hedge-Lane, near Leicesters-fields; and William Drean, who may also be heard of there: Having try'd them several times with good Success.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{109} Comberbach obtained various posts through Cholmondeley’s influence, including Controller of the Chester Customs and Clerk of the Crown for Cheshire and Flintshire. He was also a Justice of the Peace and the Recorder and a Justice of North Wales. Cheshire and Chester Archives: ZA/B/3/228v-230, 22nd December 1715. Cf. also, DCH/L/62, 1720, for additional information on the relationship between Cholmondeley and Comberbach.

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Grand Lodge Minutes}, pp. 39, 73-4.

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Ibid}, pp. 73-4.

\textsuperscript{112} Desaguliers, \textit{Fires improv’d}, Preface.

\textsuperscript{113} \textit{Ibid}, p. 6.
The publication brought Desaguliers’ skills to the attention of a broader audience and, with John Rowley (c. 1668–1728), George I’s ‘Master of Mechanics’\textsuperscript{114}, the ‘ingenious’ Desaguliers was later commanded to ‘remedy the defective atmosphere’ of the Houses of Parliament\textsuperscript{115}:

Ordered, That Mr. Desaguliers do view the Chimney in this House, and consider how the same may be made more useful; and report what is proper to be done therein to the Lords Committees, appointed to review the Repairs of The Parliament-office; whose Lordships are hereby empowered to receive the said Report on Friday next.\textsuperscript{116}

Completed in around 1723, his work was reported to have ‘succeeded in a tolerable degree’.\textsuperscript{117} Desaguliers had been employed for the same purpose by his principal patron, the Duke of Chandos, at his mansion, Cannons\textsuperscript{118}, and Chandos may have helped Desaguliers to obtain the parliamentary commission alongside the far better-known Rowley. It is reasonable to assume that William Cowper, then Clerk to the Parliaments and a fellow member of the lodge at the Horn, was also likely to have been involved in Desaguliers’ appointment.\textsuperscript{119}

A year after having published simultaneously in English and French his \textit{Leçons physico-méchaniques}\textsuperscript{120}, Desaguliers translated Marriotte’s \textit{Treatise of Hydrostaticks}, printed by Senex and with a dedication to Chandos.\textsuperscript{121} The \textit{Preface} gave Desaguliers another canvas for self-acclaim. He used it. Desaguliers stated that Marriotte had given him ‘the Liberty of changing, or leaving out what I should think fit’. Moreover, despite the book being largely as in the original, Desaguliers wrote conspicuously that ‘if [he] had undertaken to have altered anything, it should have been with the Advice of the whole [French] Academy’\textsuperscript{122}, an

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{115} David Boswell Reid, \textit{Ventilation in American Dwellings} (New York, 1858), p. X.
\item\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Journal of the House of Lords}, vol. 21, pp. 35-43, 7 January 1719.
\item\textsuperscript{117} \textit{Ibid}.
\item\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Letters of James Brydges, Earl of Carnarvon and later Duke of Chandos, to John Theophilus Desaguliers} (Pasadena, CA, USA: The Huntington Library: Stowe MS Collection), ST 57, vol. 17, p. 11. The references are as per the UCL website (accessed 2-5 March 2010) which contains a detailed transcription of relevant correspondence: \url{http://www.ucl.ac.uk/~ucypa/Ddesaguliersletters.htm}, accessed 5-6 May 2010.
\item\textsuperscript{119} Cf. chap. 3.
\item\textsuperscript{120} Desaguliers, \textit{Leçons physico-méchaniques} (London, 1717).
\item\textsuperscript{121} Desaguliers, \textit{The Motion of Water and Other Fluids} (London, 1718).
\item\textsuperscript{122} \textit{Ibid}, Preface.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
organisation which then benefited from an arguably exaggerated reputation for the practical application of new scientific techniques.  

Desaguliers compiled his lecture courses into a number of books including *Lectures of Experimental Philosophy*; *A System of Experimental Philosophy*; and *An Experimental Course of Astronomy*. And he used the works to enlarge upon and explain the principles of mechanics, hydrostatics and optics. Desaguliers’ translation of an *Introduction to Sir Isaac Newton’s Philosophy* was a particular success, with a print run of seven editions, and his growing reputation, assisted by assiduous image-management and self-promotion, led to several commissions in ventures ranging from brewing to mining.

Desaguliers’ proposers for his Fellowship of the Royal Society in July 1714 included the two most prominent members of the Council: Newton and Hans Sloane (1660-1753). At Newton’s instigation, the Society’s entrance and annual fees were waived: ‘in consideration of his great usefulness to the Royal Society as Curator and Operator of Experiments he be excused from paying his Admission money, signing the usual bond and Obligation and paying the weekly contributions.’

However, although many FRS were affluent and aristocratic, Desaguliers was not unique in being ‘excused from paying his Admission money’. Other useful or reasonably well connected Fellows of modest means were similarly exempted from the annual fees of some £2 12s.
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128 Fara, *Newton, the Making of Genius*, pp. 94-5.
129 Sloane was Secretary from 1693-1713, Vice President in 1713, and President after Newton’s death in 1727.
131 The equivalent of c. £500 today: a multiple of c. 200-300 reflects the rise in average earnings over the period using the National Archives’ Currency Converter. Other indices, for example, those based on consumer prices, give substantially different conversion multiples.
William Cheselden (1688-1752), one of Sloane’s close colleagues, was waived at the same Council meeting that approved Desaguliers’ election. Nonetheless, Desaguliers’ concurrent appointments as Curator and Operator were exceptional. The positions provided Desaguliers with a base level of income and, as a *quid pro quo*, ensured that Newton’s reputation would continue to be burnished. Retrospectively, his selection by Newton can be considered as inspired since Desaguliers became probably his most successful proselytiser.

During his thirty years at the Royal Society, Desaguliers was paid predominantly on a piecework basis and, in addition to his weekly demonstrations and experiments, published around sixty papers and compilations of his lectures. As Curator of the Royal Society, he received around £30-40 a year, equivalent to a figure of perhaps c. £6-8,000 today. Desaguliers’ income was supplemented by periodic grants: a Minute from the Council recorded that ‘Mr Desaguliers be allowed five pounds on account of the Experiment he shew’d before the Society on the fifth of December’, which may have been, in part, to cover the cost of the equipment.

Mason has suggested that Desaguliers’ experimental demonstrations at meetings of the Society were, over time, provided with increasing reluctance, with his motivation later linked mainly to monetary rewards from the Copley bequest which had been established in 1709 to encourage new experimental studies. However, although it would be correct to state that Desaguliers was able to earn significantly greater returns from his public lectures, the Royal Society’s imprimatur and his designation as an ‘FRS’ underpinned his external earnings capability.

133 Cf. for example, J.A. Lohne, ‘Experimentum Crucis’, *RS Notes and Records*, 23.2 (1968).
134 Desaguliers was paid £30 per annum 1714–17; £35 in 1718 to January 1719; and £20 for the rest of 1719; he earned £40 in each of 1721 and 1722: *RS Books of Accounts, 1683–1722*.
135 National Archives’ Currency Converter.
Desaguliers’ income from the Society was nonetheless insufficient to support his family and his business and Masonic interests, and the inadequacy of his financial resources was a continuing issue for him. Money was needed to fund new patent applications, an ongoing requirement for bespoke scientific equipment for demonstrations and research; book publications; and an escalating level of Masonic commitments. Consequently, Desaguliers continued to lecture widely, demonstrating Newton’s *mechanicks, hydrostaticks and opticks* across the country. He also took up private commissions from Chandos and other patrons, designed to improve their estates or advise them on commercial projects.

Desaguliers’ mounting reputation among the aristocracy, embryonic industrialists and the professional classes, and his ability to network, brought him assignments from many sources. They included an invitation to advise Edinburgh council on its water supply, a commission that followed an introduction to John Campbell, Edinburgh’s Provost, at a dinner hosted by Chandos at Cannons in July 1721. Desaguliers was at the time engaged in designing and installing a piped water system at Cannons. And within a few weeks, Desaguliers was on his way to offer advice on improving the flow rate of the water in Edinburgh’s three-mile Comiston aqueduct.

Desaguliers’ scientific expertise was held in high regard and it is likely that his skills were authentic and capable of solving practical engineering problems. An early example was his work with Henry Beighton (1687-1764), with whom he co-operated in 1711 to make improvements to steam engine design. And having worked together successfully, Desaguliers later proposed Beighton for election as FRS.

Desaguliers’ formal scientific approval even became something of an imprimatur. A letter from Edward Trelawney to Joshua Howell of Trebursye regarding

138 In 1720, for example, Desaguliers, with Daniel Niblet and William Vream, was granted a patent for a steam powered drying machine: Larry Stewart, ‘The Selling of Newton: Science and Technology in Early Eighteenth-Century England’, *Journal of British Studies*, 25.2 (1986), 185.
142 He was proposed FRS in 1720.
Desaguliers’ good opinion of Howell’s cousin led directly to the latter’s appointment as a schoolmaster ‘as soon as possible’ as one qualified to teach mathematics.\textsuperscript{143} Desaguliers’ explanations of natural phenomena were circulated in the provinces.\textsuperscript{144} And even Parliament sought his services, requesting that Desaguliers ‘examine and prove the dimensions and contents of the standard coal bushel’ used as a standard by the Exchequer.\textsuperscript{145}

Desaguliers’ approach to problem solving hinged on a combination of theoretical analysis and hands-on experimentation. The scientific and practical problems he tackled ranged across the engineering spectrum from major hydraulic projects, to assessing the relative utility of different wheel sizes against different obstacles and inclines\textsuperscript{146}, to measuring the relative muscular strength of William Joy, a well-known Kentish strongman.\textsuperscript{147} However, there were, at least later, those who dissented:

I believe the difference between me and Ferguson\textsuperscript{148} consists in this that he never has had any opportunity of observing what is actually done where a pumping is obliged to be continued incessantly for the whole 24 hours for a week together: from observations of this kind I don't find that the ordinary labourers of Yorkshire will come up to half of Desaguliers’ maximum of an hogshead 10 foot per minute to one man: and even then will require some spare men to relieve them.\textsuperscript{149}

Desaguliers enjoyed a reputation as a scientist who could explain and readily demonstrate Newton’s largely impenetrable theories. He was also a FRS, one of Newton’s leading protégés and a scientific entertainer. The combination virtually

\textsuperscript{143} Truro: Cornwall Record Office: HL/2/189 16 September 1736, and HL/2/190 1736.
\textsuperscript{144} Desaguliers, ‘The Phenomenon of the Horizontal Moon appearing bigger that when elevated many degrees above the Horizon’. Beverley: East Riding of Yorkshire Archives and Record Service: DDGR/38/157, undated MS: eighteenth century.
\textsuperscript{145} Desaguliers was given the task jointly with Edmund Halley, the Astronomer Royal, and James Hodgson, Master of the Royal Mathematical School at Christ’s Hospital: William A. Shaw (ed.), Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers: 4 August 1730 (London, 1897), vol. 1, p. 429.
\textsuperscript{146} Stewart, ‘A Meaning for Machines’.
\textsuperscript{148} Adam Ferguson (1723-1816), was Professor of Philosophy at Edinburgh University.
\textsuperscript{149} ‘Letter from John Smeaton (1724-92), civil engineer, to Sir George Savile (1726-84), MP for Yorkshire’. Nottingham: Nottinghamshire Record Office: DD/FJ/11/1/7/234 31 January 1768.
ensured that he would be brought to the attention of the Court and, in 1717, he was invited to show his experiments before George I:

His Majesty and the Royal Family continue in perfect heath at Hampton Court; where, among others, the ingenious Mr. Desaguliers, FRS, has the Honour to divert them with several curious Performances upon the Globes, and other Philosophical Experiments; for which Purpose, he has a Lodging allow’d him in one of the Pavilions of the Garden.\(^{150}\)

George I’s command of English was rudimentary, and it is not known whether Desaguliers gave his lectures in French or Latin, or a combination of languages.\(^ {151}\) However, he was rewarded with the living of Bridgham in Norfolk, worth £70 per annum. In 1727, following Desaguliers’ demonstrations to George II and the royal family earlier that year, Bridgham was replaced with the higher yielding Little Warley in Essex. He was also appointed chaplain to Frederick, Prince of Wales, a position of which he was particularly proud and which he publicised extensively\(^ {152}\), notwithstanding the role was probably unsalaried and that other clerics enjoyed the same title.\(^ {153}\) And as one of his final sinecures, Desaguliers was made chaplain to the 12\(^{th}\) Regiment of Dragoons (the Prince of Wales's) in 1738.\(^ {154}\) These latter positions may have been linked to the Whiggish patriotic opposition that centred on the Prince of Wales. However, Grand Lodge had representatives in both the pro- and anti-Walpole Whig camps. William O’Brien, the 4\(^{th}\) Earl of Inchiquin, and Thomas Coke, Lord Lovel, Grand Masters in 1727 and 1731, respectively, could both be characterised as Walpole’s men, while others, such as the Marquis of Carnarvon, later 2\(^{nd}\) Duke of Chandos, could be regarded as being allied to the patriotic opposition.

Desaguliers’ lectures were not confined to London. Provincial taverns and societies also hosted talks and demonstrations designed to show the practical relevance of and improvements that had been made to steam and water

\(^{150}\) Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 14 September 1717.
\(^{151}\) The Evening Post, 16 April 1717 confirmed that Desaguliers’ lectures were given in French, Latin or English as ‘the Gentlemen present shall desire’.
\(^{152}\) Cf. in particular, the frontispiece to post-1727 editions of Desaguliers’ A Course of Mechanical and Experimental Philosophy.
\(^{154}\) Whitehall Evening Post, 22 June 1738: ‘the Rev. Dr Desaguliers is made Chaplain to Brigadier General Bowle’s Regiment of Dragoons in Ireland’.
technology, and to optics. Schaffer noted, ‘the aim of demonstration was to make a specific doctrinal interpretation of these devices’ performance seem inevitable and authoritative’.\[155\] Certainly, Desaguliers’ combination of entertainment and experimental philosophy provided a means by which the practical commercial application of the underlying theories might be established. His apparatus and machines might not necessarily have proved a proposition with scientific rigor, but they illustrated it successfully and to a practical purpose, and they engaged the audience. Stewart documented the links between Desaguliers and other lecturers’ popularisation of Newton’s natural philosophy and the process of industrial development. His association with Chandos, in particular, spanned a spectrum of commercial applications from steam pumps and water drainage from mines, to improvements in land irrigation.\[156\]

Desaguliers expressed his objective succinctly: that there should be no difference between the ‘Notions of Theory and Practice’.\[157\] His work on steam engines, hydraulics and other projects, demonstrates that there was only the narrowest of gaps between Desaguliers’ role as a natural scientist and that of a consulting or practical engineer. A review of Desaguliers’ lectures and papers given before the Royal Society reinforces the point.\[158\] And his lectures served to advertise his skills, and his availability for private commissions and consultancy services.\[159\]

The commercial importance of Desaguliers’ work was understood by his audience and by potential financiers, with the new technology he outlined providing what was seen as a firm basis for financial speculation and investment. Desaguliers’ debunking of scientific myths, including that of perpetual motion, was of similar importance.\[160\] The growth in public lecturing over the next several decades provides a compelling illustration of the links between science, commerce, finance – and Freemasonry. The relationship is discussed in chapter six.

\[156\] Stewart, The Rise of Public Science.
\[158\] Royal Society Publishing has a complete list of papers: www.royalsocietypublishing.org.
\[159\] Lincoln: Lincolnshire Archives: Spalding Sewers/451/4, p. 9 1733-76. Grundy’s plans for improved drainage at Moulton were approved by Desaguliers.
Entrepreneurs were to be found on both sides of the lectern in the early eighteenth century. One such commercially minded lecturer was Thomas Watts (16.?-1742), another Freemason, with whom Desaguliers gave a joint lecture course in 1719 at Richard Steele’s ‘Censorium’ at the York Buildings, near the Strand. Steele had recognised as early as 1712 the entertainment value and profitability of scientific lectures: ‘All works of Invention, All the Sciences, as well as mechanick Arts will have their turn in entertaining this Society.’

Like Desaguliers, Watts was also funded by Chandos, for whom he may have provided insider stock market intelligence. Wallis has suggested that Watts acted as Chandos’ agent in the takeover of the Sun Fire insurance company. Clearly, Watts was closely involved: he became its secretary from 1727 until 1734, and its cashier from 1734 until his retirement in 1741; his brother, William, succeeded him as secretary. Watts’ penchant for nepotism was also reflected in his Freemasonry. He was a member of the lodge that met at the Ship behind the Royal Exchange, and married Susannah Gascoyne, the sister of another member. Her brothers, John and Crisp, the latter later Lord Mayor, were also employed by him at Sun Fire.

Chandos had appointed Desaguliers as his chaplain in 1714 and, having taken priestly orders two years later from the Bishop of Ely, Desaguliers was made Rector of St Lawrence’s church in Stanmore and, subsequently, presented with the living of the Parish of Whitchurch. Desaguliers delegated the majority of his parish work to curates. Although this allowed him to concentrate on his commercial, scientific and Masonic projects, it also led to an ongoing dispute with Chandos over the efficacy or otherwise with which his role was fulfilled. Chandos’s letter to Desaguliers of 20 March 1739 illustrates the point:

Sir, I find by the Church Wardens that ever since the 6th day of Nov’r there has been no settled Minister to officiate in the Parish in so much that the Inhabitants & Officers of it have been forced to go a begging to other Ministers to bury their dead; This is a very shameful neglect of what I have more than

164 Ibid.
once complained to you of. Your saying that you have appointed a Curate and
made him a handsome allowance is no excuse; it is your duty to see he does
his, and if he neglects it, rather than let the Parish suffer to do it yourself.\(^{165}\)

Chandos was curious about new scientific developments, noting in his diary on
one occasion that he had viewed ‘an anatomical dissection after a public
execution, saw the circulation of blood in a cat, and talked with the Archbishop of
Canterbury about the plantations and the new discoveries that might be made’.\(^ {166}\)
He was also eager to use scientific inventions and theories profitably in his
financial and commercial speculations. Desaguliers was employed accordingly:

I desire you will let me know what Strength is usually allowed for the Boyler of
the Fire Engine, which it is to force water up to the height of about 140 Feet at
a Mile & an half or two Miles Distance.\(^ {167}\)

Indeed, Chandos could be insistent:

you will inform me, whether you have yet spoken to Mr Niblet about the
Copper Pipe of 7 Inches Bore and 200 Yards in length which I design to lay in
the Garden at Cannons ... you will discourse with him about it and agree upon
the Price at the easiest rate you can.\(^ {168}\)

The correspondence between Chandos and Desaguliers suggests that their
relationship was exclusively non-Masonic and that Desaguliers was engaged, first,
as a scientific advisor to assist Chandos to benefit financially from the practical
application of the new experimental philosophy and, only a distant second, in a
religious role as a *bona fide* chaplain. There is no evidence that Chandos was
enamoured of the supposed glamour of association with a senior Freemason and,
unlike the Marquis of Carnarvon, his son, no evidence that Chandos became a
Freemason himself. For Chandos, only the utilitarian aspects of Desaguliers’
scientific knowledge were valuable.\(^ {169}\)

\(^{166}\) Stewart, ‘Public Lectures and Private Patronage’, 47.
\(^{169}\) Jacob confuses Chandos with his son when she refers to the former’s Masonic
interests: *The Radical Enlightenment*, p. 92. A further error is her statement that English
and Scottish lodges were ‘united’: they were and remain separate.
Despite his fees from the Royal Society, modest awards and prize money from the Copley bequest, and his chaplaincies, lectures and other business ventures, Desaguliers continued to suffer from a sense of financial insecurity. Probably both real and imagined, his insecurity was compounded by an apparent inability to manage his financial affairs. Contemporary correspondence suggests that the inadequacy of his financial resources was a permanent presence in Desaguliers’ mind. There are many instances. On 15 January 1729, for example, Desaguliers wrote a poignant letter to Dr John Scheuchzer at the Royal Society, one of Sloane’s protégés, Sloane being ill, regarding the non-payment of his fees:

I must beg of you to be my advocate to Sir Hans to desire him ... to be so good as to settle my last year’s salary in the next council ... This would be [of] great service to me at present, because I am entirely out of money, and have pressing occasion for it.  

In fact, as Stewart has commented, Desaguliers continually pressed Sloane for payment of his fees. Similar concerns remained even in the 1740s. On 13 December 1743, Desaguliers wrote from his lodgings at the Bedford Coffee House to Martin Folkes, then President of the Royal Society, requesting that the Society purchase the second book of his latest two-volume publication, offering the incentive of acquiring the first volume free of charge.

Stewart has noted correspondence between Brydges and Desaguliers regarding Desaguliers’ failure to account for money allocated to the local parish school. The Duke’s letter dated 14 June 1739 stated that:

I am sorry to write you upon the occasion I do, but as it is a matter that has been represented to me by the Church Wardens & Overseers of the Parish of Whitechurch I cannot forbear it. They tell me that of the 20£ a year I paid for

---

170 M. Yakup Bektas and Maurice Crosland, ‘The Copley Medal: The Establishment of a Reward System in the Royal Society, 1731-1839’, RS Notes and Records, 46.1 (1992), 43-76, esp. 45-6. The financial prize associated with the Copley Medal was £5. However, awards were also made from the Copley bequest to cover the cost of experiments.

171 Dr John Gaspar Scheuchzer (1702-1729), a Swiss Huguenot, was Sloane’s protégé and librarian; elected FRS in 1724, Scheuchzer was a physician, antiquary and natural historian. He died aged 27, and was buried in the churchyard at Sloane’s Chelsea estate. Cf. Andrea Rusnock, ‘John Scheuchzer’, ODNB (Oxford: online edn, Sept 2004).


173 RS Archives, London: MS 250, fo. 4.25, 13 December 1743.


Rent for the Freeschool Fields, there is £5 a year of it which you have not accounted for three years & a half past, by which means they have not been able to put out any boy apprentice for this last year & half, tho' there have been sev'l ready for it, & even the Masters of the two boys who were bound out the two preceeding years have not been able to get the money agreed to be given with them, but are every now & then levying & dunning the vestry for it. This is really an abuse which I cannot suffer, & as the principle care of this Charity rests upon me, I am obliged to see that it is not any ways diverted from answering the Intention of the Founder. I must therefore desire you will forthwith pay the money due to the respective Masters of the two Boys, or give them such Security for it as shall satisfy them so as to discharge the Charity from any demand of theirs on that Head, & likewise that you'll have the rem'r of the money ready to pay to the Master of the Boy now going to be bound out Apprentice.

There is no record of Desaguliers’ reply. Stewart has suggested that this was the last recorded letter between the two. This is incorrect. There were at least two subsequent letters from Chandos to Desaguliers dated 25 October 1740 (referring inter alia to a gift of Newton’s works to an Oxford College) and 28 August 1741 (declining an unspecified request). Given the continuing correspondence, it may be more reasonable to interpret the incident as evidence of Desaguliers’ inability to grasp the intricacies of financial management, rather than of any misappropriation of funds.

Scientifically, Desaguliers continued to be well regarded and his lectures well attended. In his later years, he was recognised by the Royal Society as a scientist in his own right rather than as a mere demonstrator, and was awarded the Copley Medal in 1734, 1736 and 1741. Nonetheless, his skills as a demonstrator continued to be respected: ‘Yesterday the Prince of Modena was elected a fellow of the Royal Society, and Dr Desaguliers showed his highness several experiments’.

Desaguliers’ services as a firework impresario similarly remained in demand. He had honed his skills at Cannons where he ‘play’d off a very handsome Firework at Night to conclude the rejoining [of the proclamation of George II as king]. And

---

177 The Copley Medal was first awarded in 1731. The first recipient, Stephen Gray, had been tutored by Desaguliers. Gray also received the medal the following year. No award was made in 1733 or 1735.
178 Grub Street Journal, 13 November 1735.
179 Daily Journal, 8 July 1717.
Desaguliers was called upon by the Mayor and Corporation of Bristol as late as 1738 ‘to entertain their Royal Highnesses’ on the visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales to the city.\textsuperscript{180} His expertise was passed down in part to his son, Thomas, then an artillery officer, who created the firework display that accompanied Handel’s \textit{Music for the Royal Fireworks} performed in 1749.\textsuperscript{181}

In a letter dated 6 March 1741, the Prussian Ambassador commented that he attended Desaguliers’ lectures twice a week and that ‘we pay him generously [and] he in return spares no pain to entertain us and to discover to us all the hidden springs of nature’.\textsuperscript{182} The same letter described Desaguliers’ planetarium and the theatricality of the presentation, and observed that Desaguliers’ machine, constructed by ‘Mr Graham, the most able and celebrated watchmaker’, had cost ‘more than one thousand pounds sterling’. Even if the figure was somewhat exaggerated, it underlines the proposition that Desaguliers had substantial financial outgoings and that the success of his lectures came at a price. However, science was only one of several key threads in Desaguliers’ life. A connected and, perhaps, equally important interest was Freemasonry.

\textbf{Matters Masonic}

Desaguliers’ introduction to London Freemasonry, most probably by George Payne, is discussed in chapter three. Desaguliers clearly found the milieu attractive. He became a member of several lodges including that in Channel Row, the Rummer & Grapes, which later transferred to the Horn. He was also a member of the Duke of Montagu’s lodge and the University lodge, both of which met at the Bear and Harrow; and the French Lodge at the Dolphin tavern in Tower Street, later the Swan in Long Acre, Covent Garden.

As one of the most senior members of the newly formed Grand Lodge, Desaguliers became a pivotal figure in English Freemasonry. He co-directed and promoted what became a uniquely prominent organisation, supportive of the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{180} \textit{Daily Post}, 14 November 1738.
\textsuperscript{181} Thomas Desaguliers’ fireworks caused part of the temporary pavilion that had been erected in Green Park to catch fire. Nonetheless, the general view of the press was that the fireworks ‘were mighty fine and gave more than a general satisfaction’: \textit{Old England}, 29 April 1749.
\textsuperscript{182} Agnew, \textit{French Protestant Exiles}, p. 92.
\end{flushright}
establishment and its Hanoverian centre. Desaguliers’ status within Grand Lodge and as a member and Master of a number of influential constituent lodges gave him influence in areas that were fundamental to Masonic development. Desaguliers re-worked Masonic ritual; had co-authorship and oversight of the Charges and Regulations; and participated in developing the novel federal Masonic governance structure; introducing lectures at lodge meetings; reviving the ‘ancient toasts’ at lodge dinners; and in the promotion and distribution of Masonic charity or ‘benevolence’. The latter issues received considerable press publicity, and are discussed below. Jointly with a core group of similarly minded colleagues within Grand Lodge and its inner circles, Desaguliers created a structure that combined latitudinarian religious tolerance with support for the parliamentary establishment, sociability and entertainment, and the quest for and disbursement of scientific and general knowledge: ideas that can be considered to be at the core of the English Enlightenment.\footnote{Cécile Révauger, ‘Anderson’s Freemasonry: The true daughter of the British Enlightenment’, Cercles, 18 (2008), 1-9.}

Given the myriad insecurities of his Huguenot childhood and upbringing, it is also reasonable to consider Desaguliers’ personal use of Freemasonry as a vehicle to promote and support his own social advance and financial well-being. His actions within Grand Lodge and elsewhere within Freemasonry were complementary to his networking at the Royal Society, and mirrored a pattern of self-promotion that found expression in his publications, lectures and engineering undertakings.\footnote{Desaguliers used the installation of his patent fireplace at the Royal Society’s Crane Court building and his work for Brydges at Cannons as endorsements of the efficacy of his invention. The examples appeared in several classified advertisements.}

**Through the Eyes of Others**

Despite his social and scientific position, Desaguliers was probably regarded with some ambivalence by his immediate circle. Although well regarded as a scientist, Desaguliers was also a jobbing engineer and a mere servant of the Royal Society. Despite his success and popularity as speaker who had lectured in London, The Hague and Paris, he was also a foreigner and a Huguenot. This uncertainty of perception among those of the establishment who knew him was encapsulated by
Hogarth (1697-1764) with his mildly ironic mocking of Desaguliers’ sermonising and lecturing in the *Sleeping Congregation* (1736).

In this etching, Hogarth depicted Desaguliers as a short-sighted minister whose boring sermon has gone on for far too long and driven the majority of the congregation to sleep. But Hogarth’s satire was moderate and witty; it was far removed from the incisive moralising of the *Rake’s Progress*, engraved the previous year, or the incisive bite of Alexander Pope. Although the various and precise meanings that are attributed to Hogarth’s imagery are often disputed, there can be little doubt that the main aspect of the picture is humorous. Indeed, a principal aspect of his life that Desaguliers was known not to favour was that of his clerical duties.

This tongue-in-cheek depiction of Desaguliers is in a similar vein to Hogarth’s representation of him in *The Indian Emperor, or The Conquest of Mexico* (c. 1732), where Desaguliers is shown with his back to the audience acting as a prompter to the child actors on stage. And although the portrayal of Desaguliers in *The Mystery of Masonry Brought to Light by the Gormogons*, completed in 1724, probably before Hogarth became a Freemason, may have been modestly off-

---

188 Hogarth’s picture is of a children’s production of Dryden’s *The Indian Emperor* at John Conduitt’s house in Hanover Square. Conduitt and his wife appear as portraits above their guests. Roubillac’s bust of Newton, whom Conduitt succeeded at the Mint, is resplendent on the mantelpiece. Three royal children are on stage, William, Duke of Cumberland, and Mary and Louisa, his sisters, together with Catherine, Conduitt’s daughter. Mary, Lady Delorraine, is in the small audience. On her left is the Duchess of Richmond. Her husband is shown leaning on the back of her chair. Behind him, Thomas Fermor, the Earl of Pomfret, speaks with Thomas Hill, Richmond’s confidant and friend, then Secretary to the Board of Trade; the Duke of Montagu is also part of this group. Conduitt, Montagu, Richmond, Hill, Delorraine and Desaguliers were all Freemasons. Plays performed by family members were popular with Richmond and other members of the aristocracy. Cf. Chichester: West Sussex Record Office: Goodwood/140: 1721-1732, verses, prologues and epilogues performed by the Duke’s family and friends; and Goodwood 141: 1730-1742, ditto.
189 Although no date has been established for Hogarth’s initiation, Mulvey-Roberts noted that ‘it is traditionally accepted that he was made a Mason at the Hand and Apple Tree in
putting, Hogarth’s later characterisations were more entertaining than offensive, and were unlikely to have had any materially negative impact on Desaguliers.

Hogarth was himself recorded in the 1729 Grand Lodge lists as a member of the small lodge meeting at the Hand and Apple Tree and, subsequently, of the more prestigious Bear & Harrow lodge in Butcher Row. He was appointed a Grand Steward in 1734, nominated by Thomas Slaughter. Sir James Thornhill, Hogarth’s father-in-law (after 23 March 1729) and early mentor, was Master of the lodge at the Swan, Greenwich, and was appointed Senior Grand Warden in December 1728. With such relatively substantial Masonic connections, Hogarth’s occasional representation of Freemasons and Freemasonry danced the line between irony, satire and ridicule, possibly with an eye on future commissions from affluent Masonic clients such as Conduitt (1688-1737), Master of the Mint; the actor/manager, David Garrick (1717-1779); and the scientist, antiquary and Masonic luminary, Martin Folkes, all of whom became patrons.

Hogarth’s pre-eminent Masonic works were Night, the last painting in his Four Times of the Day, completed in 1736 and later reproduced as a series of engravings, and The Mystery of Masonry Brought to Light by the Gormogons. These and other allusions to Freemasonry, such as in The Four Stages of Cruelty (1751), have been examined in depth elsewhere. Hogarth’s comments on his Masonic contemporaries such as Colley Cibber (1671-1757), Barton Booth (1681-1733) and Robert Wilks (c. 1665-1732) (cf. A Just View of the British Stage, 1724); and John Heidegger (1659-1749) (cf. Masquerades and Operas, 1724), have also been analysed at length and in detail and are not considered here.

Nonetheless, it is also possible to portray Hogarth’s later view of Desaguliers (and, by extension, Freemasonry) as a minor part of a more negative reaction to Freemasonry that developed in the later 1730s. In part, this may have echoed

Little Queen Street, Holborn, between 1725 and 1728’. He joined the Bear & Harrow in 1730: Mulvey-Roberts, ‘Hogarth on the Square’, quote from 251.

190 Grand Lodge Minutes p. 43.
191 Ibid, p. 177.
193 Ibid, p. 96.
political and religious disquiet in Continental Europe. In 1736, Frederick I of Sweden prohibited Freemasons from meeting under penalty of death. Masonic assemblies were abolished in France the following year, and the Inquisition closed the English lodge meeting in Rome. In 1738, Pope Clement XII’s Papal Bull against Freemasonry was published. The same year, Charles VI issued an edict prohibiting Masonry in the Austrian Netherlands. Poland followed, in 1739, when Augustus III (1696-1763) proscribed Masonic meetings. And in 1740, Philip V of Spain (1683-1746) issued a decree against Freemasonry, with those deemed Masons condemned to the galleys. But notwithstanding Mulvey-Roberts’ probably accurate assessment of a ‘Masonic malaise’ between the 1730s and 1760s, the position in England was less extreme, and any modest negativity was tinged with satire. As Horace Walpole, himself a Freemason, noted ironically in his letter of 4 May 1743 to Sir Horace Mann: ‘the Freemasons are in so low repute now in England, that one has scarce heard the proceedings at Vienna against them mentioned. I believe nothing but a persecution could bring them into vogue here again’.

Desaguliers’ influence on Freemasonry was marked for over two decades by the ripples originating from the fundamental changes – in part, arguably, moral and intellectual engineering - that he, with colleagues, instigated in the early 1720s. However, by the late 1730s and 1740s, his authority and influence had waned. Moreover, there is some evidence that the erstwhile ‘grave’ Desaguliers became more manipulated than manipulator in his later years. The apparently spontaneous initiation of Robert Webber in 1734 at a house party at the Duke of Montagu’s estate at Thames Ditton, was an act Desaguliers might once have regarded as quite inappropriate. The event was reported in a letter to the Duke of Richmond by Broughton, his secretary:

On Sunday night at a Lodge in the Library, St. John, Albemarle, and Russell made chapters, and Bob admitted Apprentice; the Dr. [Desaguliers] being very

---

196 Augustus III was also the Elector of Saxony, Frederick Augustus II and Grand Duke of Lithuania.
198 Mulvey-Roberts, ‘Hogarth on the Square’.
hardly persuaded to the Latter, by reason of Bob’s tender years and want of Aprons. 200

The political profile of certain Grand Masters and other senior Grand Officers and Freemasons, also suggests that Freemasonry became more overtly a political creature in the later 1730s, with a number of senior figures affiliated to the patriotic opposition allied to Frederick, Prince of Wales, initiated by Desaguliers in 1737. Edward Bligh, 2nd Earl of Darnley (Grand Master, 1737), was a Whig opponent of Walpole and one of Frederick’s Gentleman of the Bedchamber. Henry Brydges, 2nd Duke of Chandos (Grand Master, 1738), MP for Hereford (1727-34) and Steyning (1734-41), was the Master of the Horse to the Prince (1729-35). And Charles Calvert, 5th Lord Baltimore, MP for St Germans (1734-41), was a member of the patriotic opposition and one of the Prince’s Gentlemen of the Bedchamber. 201 A similar political attitude was reflected elsewhere by others such as Sir Cecil Wray (DGM 1732-3), and John Ward (DGM 1733-7). Freemasonry’s connection with politics and to the patriotic opposition allied to the Prince of Wales is discussed in more detail in chapters three and five.

Perhaps because of his poor health or, possibly, his waning influence, Desaguliers attended Grand Lodge on only two occasions after 1740: the Quarterly Communication of 19 March 1741; and that of 8 February 1743. 19 March 1741 saw the installation of the Earl of Morton as Grand Master. A notably large number of foreign dignitaries were recorded present in Grand Lodge Minutes:

H.E. Major General Count Trouches de Waldburg, Minister Plenipotentiary from the King of Prussia202;
Monsieur Andrié, Envoy from the King of Prussia;
Baron Wassenberg, Envoy from the King of Sweden;


201 Charles Calvert (1699-1751), 5th Lord Baltimore. The Calvert family was the proprietary owner of (and provided the Governors for) the colony of Maryland. Charles Calvert was a Gentleman of the Bedchamber to Frederick, Prince of Wales from 1731-47. He was MP for St Germans between 1734 and 1741, then MP for Surrey (1741-51). He was elected FRS in 1731. Calvert married (in 1730) the daughter of Sir Theodore Janssen, a Huguenot. Janssen had been a director of the South Sea Company and although not wholly at fault, was damaged by the scandal.

202 Count Truchsess von Waldburg, the principal Prussian envoy to London, had arrived in London in January of that year: Daily Gazetteer, 19 January 1741.
Monsieur Bielfield, Secretary to the Prussian Embassy; [and] Count Harrach. ²⁰³

The Prussian connection is significant, not only because it provides further evidence of the cross-over between science and Freemasonry demonstrated by the attendance of the Prussian ambassador at Desaguliers’ lectures the same month, but also with respect to the interest in Freemasonry shown by many in Prussia’s aristocratic, intellectual and military circles, including Frederick the Great himself. ²⁰⁴ The connection to the Austrian Netherlands is also important given the (relatively ineffectual) edict against Freemasonry that had been issued there only three years earlier.

Desaguliers’ final appearance in Grand Lodge on 8 February 1743 was at the Quarterly Communication at the Devil’s Tavern. He was not recorded as having spoken. His death in 1744 received no mention within Grand Lodge Minutes and only limited press coverage. However, the commonly quoted obituary in James Cawthorn’s poem, the Vanity of Human Enjoyments, is unsatisfactory, and its substance exaggerated to the point of absurdity:

How poor, neglected Desaguliers fell;  
How he who taught two gracious kings to view  
All Boyle ennobled and all Bacon knew,  
Died, in a cell without a friend to save.  
Without a guinea, and without a grave. ²⁰⁵

Desaguliers may not have been wealthy, but he had more than a ‘guinea’ at his death. His will, dated 29 November 1743 and proved at probate on 1 March 1744, settled ‘what it has been pleased God to bless me withal’. ²⁰⁶ After covering his debts, Desaguliers bequeathed his estate to his elder son, John. Thomas, his second son, by now a relatively successful soldier, he considered ‘sufficiently provided for’, not least perhaps through his association with the Duke of Montagu at the Ordnance. Although there is no record in probate of the value of the

---

²⁰³ Grand Lodge Minutes, 1740-58, p. 10. ‘Count Harrach’ was Count Friedrich August von Harrach-Rohrau (1696-1749), interim governor of the Austrian Netherlands 1741-4.
²⁰⁴ He was initiated at Brunswick on 14 August 1738 when Crown Prince.
²⁰⁵ A counterweight to Cawthorn was provided by the Gentleman’s Magazine, 29 February 1744, which described Desaguliers as ‘a gentleman universally known and felt’.
²⁰⁶ The will was proved at the Prerogative Court of Canterbury: NA: PROB 11/732, 1 March 1744.
estate, the inference from the will is that Desaguliers was conferring a relatively meaningful inheritance.\footnote{Cf. Fara, ‘Desaguliers’, ODNB, and W.J. Williams, ‘Notes & Queries’, AQC Transactions, 40 (1927), 170.} Nothing was left to his wife, Joanna. Her absence may have been because she had inherited a legacy from her own family, but may also imply that husband and wife had become estranged. Carpenter has suggested that this occurred in 1741, consequent upon the move from Channel Row.

Desaguliers had occupied a prominent role within English society as an eminent scientist, popular lecturer and senior Freemason. However, it is hard to argue that as an outsider he was fully part of that society, whether as a servitor scholar at Oxford, a paid demonstrator at the Royal Society, or as a kept chaplain and scientific adviser to his aristocratic masters. Despite his numerous connections within the professional and scientific communities, at the Royal Society and at Court, references in paintings and print suggest that he was also viewed as a slightly absurd figure who took life somewhat too seriously. In Freemasonry, and in the public and private lecture theatres, Desaguliers found settings that allowed him to shine. However, even within Masonry, it was necessary for him to stand behind the facade of Grand Lodge’s aristocratic leadership and to combine his efforts with those of well-connected colleagues, such as Martin Folkes and William Cowper. His genius lay, in part, in recognising the necessity of such support, and in using it successfully.

Desaguliers’ outlook was shaped by the financial, social and political insecurities of his Huguenot upbringing and reinforced by his Newtonian education. The Newtonian system of belief that the universe was governed by rational and comprehensible natural laws, and open to logical observation and mathematical dissection, provided a tangible underpinning for religious tolerance and the natural hierarchy of a constitutional monarch and parliamentary élite atop a stable and prosperous country. The concept was expressed succinctly in his poem, *The Newtonian System of the World*, in which the political system would mirror the Newtonian world.\footnote{Cf. in particular, Richard Striner, ‘Political Newtonianism: The Cosmic Model of Politics in Europe and America’, William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, 52.4 (1995), 583-608.} In a simplistic sense, Newton’s theories thus gave the lie to Catholicism’s central thesis that the only way to salvation was through the Catholic Church, and provided the foundation for the argument that divine
providence coexisted with Natural Law. As Pope noted, ‘safe in the hand of one disposing Pow’r ... one truth is clear, whatever is, is right’. Under Desaguliers and his colleagues in Grand Lodge and at the Horn, the Rummer, the Bedford Head, the King’s Arms, and other leading lodges, Freemasonry provided a structure committed to Whig ideology, the distribution of Newtonian natural philosophy and a practical and pragmatic approach to science. These themes are discussed in the following chapters.

Summary

This chapter has sought to outline certain of the key factors that shaped Desaguliers, and discuss their impact. Like many refugees before and since, Desaguliers, in common with many of his fellow Huguenots, was driven and moulded by a spectrum of political, religious and financial insecurities. The Hanoverian succession and religious tolerance were central to Huguenot protection in England and it is unsurprising that, under Desaguliers, English Freemasonry became a component of an intellectual and moral structure that was pro-establishment and promoted latitudinarianism. Jacob has described what she has termed this ‘mentality of official masonry’ as the ‘taste for science ... craving for order and stability ... worldly mysticism [and] rituals, passwords and mythology’ and a ‘religious devotion to higher powers, be they the Grand Architect, the king or the Grand Master’. Although perhaps over-simplistic, certain of these factors would have had resonance with Desaguliers as he sought to assimilate into and find his niche within English society.

Desaguliers was one of Newton’s most successful and entrepreneurial proselytisers. For Desaguliers, Newton’s theories demonstrated not only scientific and physical truths, but also revealed a deeper moral truth. In this perspective, we can accept that Desaguliers’ new Freemasonry’s was built in part on the intellectual foundations of freedom of the person, property and constitutional government: themes that were embraced and reinforced by the Whig aristocrats, magistracy and learned professionals at the helm of Grand Lodge. Each of these overlapping networks is discussed in the following chapters.

210 Jacob, The Radical Enlightenment, p. 102.
Desaguliers’ epitaph is not known but a phrase from John Gay epitomises his self-reliance and a determination to succeed despite, indeed, perhaps because of, his origins: ‘there is no dependence that can be sure, but a dependence upon one’s self’. 211

Chapter Three

Grand Lodge: The Inner Workings

This chapter explores key connections among the operational management at Grand Lodge. It advances the argument that James Anderson’s importance to the creation of the new Grand Lodge and eighteenth century English Freemasonry has been substantially over-stated by many Masonic historians. Indeed, an analysis of other senior Freemasons during the formative period 1720 to 1730 suggests that their influence may have been of equal or, more probably, of greater importance. Within this chapter it is argued that Desaguliers’ relationship with Anderson was not the only or even the principal fulcrum on which Grand Lodge turned. In terms of strategic and tactical management, the key protagonists at Grand Lodge included George Payne, Martin Folkes and William Cowper, and the lesser known Alexander Chocke, Nathaniel Blackerby and John Beale.¹ Together with other Grand Officers and influential Freemasons, such as George Carpenter and Charles Delafaye, these central characters were connected through three major and partly over-lapping political, social and professional networks to which Anderson was at best only loosely connected: the Middlesex and Westminster benches; the Royal Society and other learned and professional associations; and the government, military and civil service. Within each ran the threads of pro-Hanoverian politics, a belief in the rights and power of the establishment, and a commitment to the scientific Enlightenment. The different associations and networks were exploited effectively by Desaguliers and his colleagues. And like-minded individuals drawn to Freemasonry reinforced and widened the paths cut by the protagonists.

Rather than a simple single association with Anderson, Desaguliers’ connections with George Payne and Martin Folkes are likely to have been the twin foundations of a number of key Masonic alliances which provided the principal vectors for change and influence over the next two decades. Within this chapter, we explore the relationships between Desaguliers and Payne, Cowper, and others selected for

¹ John Beale died on 20 June 1724 at his Berkshire home. He had been appointed DGM in 1721. He was elected FRS the same year, proposed by Edmund Halley and William Stukeley, whose Masonic initiation he had attended. Together with Desaguliers, Beale was responsible formally for reviewing the proposed content of the 1723 Constitutions.
or sitting on the Middlesex and Westminster magistrates’ bench. Many of such men were at the helm of Freemasonry’s organisational transformation: managing the introduction of new Regulations and Charges; introducing a patronage structure; establishing and running the Charity Bank; and, perhaps most importantly, policing Freemasonry and connecting it with the Hanoverian and Whig political establishment.

In the following two chapters, the analysis is extended to Masonic alliances based on the Royal Society and other learned and professional societies, including the Society of Antiquarians and Royal College of Physicians, and to other individuals whose social prominence, political power and/or court positions influenced Freemasonry’s development and its political and public persona. These associations are tracked in relation to specific individuals and with respect to four of the more prominent lodges: the Horn at Westminster; the Rummer at Charing Cross; the Bedford Head, Covent Garden; and the King’s Arms in the Stand.

**James Anderson and the authorship of the 1723 Constitutions**

David Stephenson’s classic analysis of Anderson and his influence on eighteenth century English Freemasonry is based, in part, on Anderson’s own account of events that he set out in the 1738 Constitutions.² In the absence of other records, the 1738 Constitutions has provided the principal source of information on the creation of Grand Lodge, the selection of the early Grand Masters and the adoption of the new Charges and Regulations.³ Stephenson argued that Anderson’s fundamental importance lies in his authorship of the first two editions of the Constitutions, the provision of a Masonic history emphasising the Craft’s antiquity and, inter alia, his record of Grand Lodge’s early history.

Stephenson’s views are shared by other Masonic historians who have similarly emphasised Anderson’s strong relationship with Desaguliers, both of whom were members of the Horn and the French lodge, ‘Solomon’s Temple’.⁴ There is a broad acceptance that Anderson through his authorship of the 1723 and 1738

---

² Stephenson, ‘James Anderson: Man & Mason’.
⁴ James Anderson’s name is written as ‘Jaques Anderson’: Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 42.
Constitutions, laid the principal foundations of the new Freemasonry; indeed, Stephenson has stated that Anderson’s works ‘set the standards of British Freemasonry for nearly a century’.

However, part of the content of Anderson’s Constitutions can be regarded as more self-serving than analytical or descriptive, and his record of certain events at Grand Lodge may have been as patchily inaccurate as his lengthy Masonic history. Anderson’s account of his professed role as a Grand Warden in 1723, a position to which he states he was appointed by Wharton, rather than William Hawkins, is illustrative. The issue was evaluated critically and forensically by Songhurst in his editor’s Notes to the QCA transcription of Grand Lodge Minutes:

In regard to the words added by Anderson in the List of Grand Officers at the end of Minute Book 1, I need only point out that in the list preserved by the Lodge of Antiquity, there is no mention of his Wardenship, and that it is not until the 3 December 1731 (Book 2) that we find him actually described in the Minutes as “formerly Grand Warden”.

Songhurst commented that he had no doubt that the Minutes describing Anderson’s replacement of Hawkins, ‘who demitted, as always out of town’, were altered to exaggerate, perhaps falsify, Anderson’s own position, and that the relevant words were inserted by Anderson himself.

In the 1738 Constitutions, Anderson wrote that the Old Charges had been found ‘wanting’; and Grand Lodge, for which we might substitute Desaguliers and his cohort, ‘finding fault with all the copies of the Gothic Constitutions order’d Brother James Anderson A.M. to digest the same in a new and better method’. However, the 1723 Constitutions did not provide an updated or modernised version of the Old Charges. They did far more, setting the parameters for a new operating structure for English Freemasonry and establishing the foundations of what would rapidly become a national organisation. This is discussed in Appendix Two, which sets out in brief a comparative analysis of the Regulations and Charges as published in the 1723 Constitutions.

---

5 1738 Constitutions, p. 115.
7 Grand Lodge Minutes, 1723-39, p. 196, note (d); see also p. 49, note (a).
8 1738 Constitutions, p. 113.
Under the aegis and control of Desaguliers and his colleagues, Grand Lodge provided the impetus for the inclusion of scientific Enlightenment themes and lectures at lodge meetings. These were complemented by quasi-religious ritual and initiation ceremonies based on historic practices; and dining, toasting and singing, all of which emphasised and maintained fraternal bonding. The assertion that Desaguliers had been attracted to Freemasonry by its ‘ethos of education and religious tolerance’, as Harrison has argued⁹, appears incorrect. Such concepts were not inherited from some sylvan past; they were rather central components of the form of Freemasonry that had newly been instigated by Desaguliers, Payne, Folkes, and their colleagues.

Stephenson and others have attributed sole authorship of the 1723 Constitutions to Anderson. Although the faux history of the Freemasons was probably ‘compiled and digested’ by Anderson, identified as ‘the author of this book’ in a description virtually hidden on page 74 in the middle of the second page of the Approbations, this component, although numerically the major part of the book, should be viewed as of secondary importance. In common with similar historical passages in the Old Charges, Anderson’s artificial history was designed to set a literary context for Freemasonry. By positioning it as an ancient institution, the narrative afforded the Craft legitimacy and provided an antiquarian status. It gave it an aura and attraction that a more recently formed organisation would have found difficult to equal.¹⁰ As in previous centuries, Freemasonry’s perceived temporal longevity offered an element of protection in a society that remained heavily tradition-based. Few would have taken Anderson’s history as a literal and truthful record of events. It should instead be viewed within the framework of a tradition of legend and literary hyperbole.

Leaving the ‘history’ to one side, the key ‘constitutional’ features of the book were the reworked Charges and Regulations. The Charges occupy seven pages (pp. 49-56); and the Regulations, compiled by Payne, fourteen pages (pp. 58-72): in total, 21 out of 100 pages (and an even smaller proportion of the 1738

---

⁹ Harrison, The Genesis of Freemasonry, p. 126.
¹⁰ The subsequent dismissive categorisation of the first Grand Lodge of England as the ‘Moderns’, and the adoption in 1751 of the title ‘Ancients’ by a rival London Grand Lodge, underlines the point.
Constitutions, with its much extended history and length of 244 pages). In contrast to the laboured literary style of the history, the clear writing and unambiguous content of the Charges and Regulations suggest that these sections were either co-written by Desaguliers (with Payne), or edited by Desaguliers. Indeed, they may have been written solely by him, although there is no direct evidence for this.

The 1723 Constitutions was dedicated by Desaguliers to the Duke of Montagu, Desaguliers writing that he was dedicating the Constitutions to the past Grand Master: ‘I humbly dedicate’, and not that this was a dedication by or on behalf of any others. Although it can and has been argued that this was simply convention, within the dedication Desaguliers refers to the author having ‘accurately ... compared and made everything agreeable to History and Chronology’. In this context, the absence of any explicit reference to the authorship of the Charges and Regulations is significant and, by implication, these sections are unlikely to have been of Anderson’s design or authorship. It has also been argued that the content of the Charges stood uneasily with Anderson’s Presbyterian Calvinist beliefs. However, this can be regarded as unproven and, perhaps, of limited significance, particularly if Anderson is regarded as a ‘hired pen’, a role suggested by Prescott in a recent paper. Prescott emphasised the role of the co-publishers, Senex and Hooke, in the financing of the 1723 Constitutions and their prominence on the frontispiece. Senex’s subsequent promotion to Grand Warden later that year lends weight to Prescott’s argument. In short, had Anderson had a substantive rather than subservient role, it would have been more conventional for him to receive recognition in a more prominent manner, with his name on the first page and/or a reference by name in the Introduction.

Anderson’s subsequent role and rank within Grand Lodge are also inconsistent with the status that would have been granted to the sole author of the

---

13 John Senex was allied closely with Desaguliers and others at the Royal Society and in the scientific community whose works he published. Probably not coincidentally, he was elected FRS in 1728. Senex had previously been a surveyor and geographer to Queen Anne. He was a recognised engraver and scientific instrument maker and the RS Archives contain a number of his astronomical models.
Constitutions. According to Anderson’s own record, on 29 September 1721, he was instructed by ‘His Grace and Grand Lodge’ to ‘digest the Gothic Constitutions’ and, at the desire of the lodge, a committee was appointed to examine the manuscript, following which, on 22 March 1722, after some amendments, the book was approved. The Approbation stated that Anderson submitted his draft for ‘perusal and corrections’ by the past and current Deputy Grand Masters, that is, Beale and Desaguliers, ‘and of other learned brethren’, and only then did he present the document to Montagu for formal approval. However, the list of those described as having approved the book is simply a record of the officers and Masters of the constituent lodges falling within the orbit of Grand Lodge. Indeed, Anderson’s name also appears in the list, described as ‘the Master of lodge number XVII’.

It can be argued that the list is not a catalogue of those who did the work and those who provided their formal consent, so much as a record of the ranking officers of the constituent lodges. In this sense, it can be interpreted as having a political rather than a functional purpose: the named lodges, Masters and Wardens being drawn in to the approval process in order to forestall any subsequent dissent. Beale was also likely to have taken a relatively junior role to Desaguliers in any extended ‘perusal and correction’ of the draft Constitutions. Although a senior Freemason and Master of the lodge that met at the Crown & Anchor near St Clements Church, he was also an active and eminent physician and male mid-wife.

Had Anderson acted as sole or principal author of what was arguably the most significant contemporary Masonic publication, it would have been reasonable for him to have attended Grand Lodge with some frequency and indulged in the prestige his position would have warranted. As it was, although Anderson
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14 1738 Constitutions, p. 113.
15 1738 Constitutions, p. 114.
16 1723 Constitutions, pp. 73-4.
17 The 1698 Church of England subscription of conformity and certificate permitting John Beale of Lambourne, Berkshire, to practice as a surgeon is at the Wiltshire and Swindon Archives: D/1/14/2/1 1674-1708.
attended Grand Lodge on 24 June 1723, he did not attend again for over seven years until the quarterly meeting held on 28 August 1730.\footnote{Anderson attended Grand Lodge on a regular basis only after 1730. He was recorded as present on thirteen occasions between 1731 and 1738.}

In considering the question of authorship, it is useful to determine whether there was any rationale for Anderson to have been chosen or hired to write the Masonic history and compile the Constitutions; and why he might have accepted the task. Although we cannot know for certain, several factors may have been involved. He may have had a financial motivation. Anderson is believed to have lost money in the collapse of the South Sea Company in 1720\footnote{Cf. Walter Wilson, The History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches and Meeting Houses in London (London, 1814), vol. IV, p. 34; and David Stevenson, ‘James Anderson: Man & Mason’, Heredom, 10 (2002), 93-138.}, and he was unlikely to have made a satisfactory living from his Swallow Street congregation\footnote{The building was described in 1729 as being ‘much out of repair’: quoted in F.H.W. Sheppard (gen. ed.), Survey of London (London, 1963), vol. 31, pp. 57-67.}, a church that had failed to provide a meaningful income to Desaguliers’ father and others. As a Minister, he was both literate and familiar with history, and had published a number of his sermons\footnote{James Anderson, A sermon preached in Swallow street, St. James’s ... on Wednesday January 16\textsuperscript{th} 1711/12 (London, 1712); No king-killers. A sermon preach’d in Swallow-street, St. James’s, on January 30\textsuperscript{th} 1714/15 (London, 1715); Contend earnestly for the faith. A sermon preach’d to a religious society in Goodman’s Fields. On Monday, 1\textsuperscript{st} August, 1720 (London, 1720); and The happy death. A sermon occasion’d by the death of the Reverend William Lorimer (London, 1724).}. Finally, he was a Freemason.\footnote{Anderson’s father was a Scottish Mason and Anderson may have been initiated into a Scottish lodge. Cf. A.L. Miller ‘The Connection of Dr James Anderson of the Constitutions with Aberdeen and Aberdeen University’, AQC, XXXVI (1923). However, there is no evidence that Scottish ritual was incorporated into the Charges or Regulations.} In short, Anderson offered Desaguliers, Grand Lodge, and Senex and Hooke, as publishers, a combination of broadly relevant historical knowledge, familiarity with publishing, and a willingness (in return for what may have been a modest fee and, perhaps, a royalty) to invest his time and effort.

Such an analysis may help to shed light on Anderson’s unhappiness at the later pirating of the 1723 Constitutions and his suggestion in 1735 that a revised edition be issued; an act that may have been designed to render redundant any pirated versions (which would not have paid Anderson a royalty). It would also explain the inconsistencies between the earlier, 1723, and later, 1738, versions of the Constitutions.
Having made a complaint to Grand Lodge on 24 February 1735 that the 1723 Constitutions had been much plagiarised, and having advised Grand Lodge that there were only few copies of the original remaining, Anderson was asked to organise the printing of a new edition of the Constitutions, containing a list of all Grand Officers and Stewards. The new edition was published in 1738. In contrast to the 1723 publication, the style and format (and the manner of the Dedication) suggests that Anderson predominantly worked alone. Although Grand Lodge had requested a straightforward re-print, the 1738 Constitutions differed substantially from the 1723 edition and set out the Regulations in a format that complicated and confused the text with notes and amendments. The style tends to prevent a clear understanding as to which rules were in force, and suggests an absence of input and rigor from any third party into either presentation or editing.

The Influence of Others

The 1723 Constitutions contain virtually no mention of the events that preceded and followed the formation of Grand Lodge. And the absence of contemporary press coverage and correspondence limits any independent verification of Anderson’s account and knowledge of the episode more generally. The difficulty is compounded by the lack of any Grand Lodge Minutes prior to 24 June 1723, when William Cowper was appointed Grand Secretary. Nonetheless, we can presuppose that in the first few years after Grand Lodge was established, today’s monolithic organisation with its rigid set of rules and practices had yet to emerge. Instead, a small group of individuals taking their first steps shaped both Grand Lodge and Freemasonry during what was a relatively short formative process. The character of the new ‘Free and Accepted Masonry’ combining a revised ritual and novel structure based on the new Grand Lodge, developed as a direct function of the input of the figures who controlled the organisation, and not as a product of any set of regulations or precedents imposed by any predecessor body or external third party. Initially limited to the lodges within the

---

23 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 251.
24 1723 Constitutions, pp. 47-8; 1738 Constitutions, pp. 109-12. Given that the 1723 Constitutions, unlike those produced by Anderson in 1738, were supposedly closely scrutinised, the absence of pertinent information may have particular relevance.
25 1723 Constitutions, p. 49.
area of the Bills of Mortality, principally the cities of London and Westminster\textsuperscript{26}, the jurisdiction of Grand Lodge was extended over the next decade to cover England and Wales.

The following Table details the Grand Lodge Officers who stood behind the often-passive aristocrats at the titular helm of Grand Lodge. Of the more important Officers (shown in bold), only one, Sir Thomas Prendergast\textsuperscript{27}, was likely to have been appointed at the behest of his patron, Charles Lennox, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Duke of Richmond, rather than at the suggestion of Desaguliers, Payne, Cowper, Blackerby, Chocke or Folkes, in their capacity as Deputy Grand Masters.

\textbf{Table 1: Grand Lodge Officers, 1718-30}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grand Offices</th>
<th>Network/Lodge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Payne</td>
<td>GM 1718 &amp; 1720; GW, 1724; DGM 1735</td>
<td>JP, Gov., Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Beale\textsuperscript{28}</td>
<td>DGM 1721</td>
<td>JP, FRS, Crown &amp; Anchor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T. Desaguliers</td>
<td>GM 1719; DGM 1722/23, 1725</td>
<td>FRS, Hug., Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Folkes</td>
<td>DGM 1724</td>
<td>FRS, Bedford Head, Sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cowper</td>
<td>DGM 1726; GS 1723-7</td>
<td>JP, Gov., Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Chocke</td>
<td>DGM 1727; GW 1726</td>
<td>JP, Gov., Horn, Sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Blackerby</td>
<td>DGM 1728/9; GW 1727; GTr 1731</td>
<td>JP, Gov., Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Batson</td>
<td>DGM 1730/4; GW 1729</td>
<td>Horn, Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josias Villeneau\textsuperscript{29}</td>
<td>GW 1721</td>
<td>Hug., Goose &amp; Gridiron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{26} The Bills of Mortality also covered Lambeth, Southwark and Bermondsey, and an area to the east and north of the City of London including \textit{inter alia} Spitalfields, Bow and Wapping. \textsuperscript{27} Prendergast was appointed SGW of the Grand Lodge of Ireland the same year. Cf. West Sussex Record Office: Goodwood/42,43 12 September 1737, for relevant correspondence with the Duke of Richmond. Cf. also, Richmond, \textit{A Duke and His Friends}, pp. 206-7, 323-9. \textsuperscript{28} Beale, ‘a surgeon’, appears in the WSes Papers, JWP for 12 January 1714: LMA: LM/SP 1714. He may also have been appointed a Justice for the City of London (St Dunstan West Ward): LMA: CLSes, SP, JWP, 7 January 1723. \textsuperscript{29} Villeneau, a Huguenot émigré, was a member of lodges in St Paul’s and Southwark; he was later Master of the Bull’s Head, Southwark. The borough had several other Masonic connections including Leonard Streate (also written as ‘Street’ or ‘Streete’), a member of the Horn and a senior JP, who was Steward of the Southwark Borough Court; and Sir
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>England 1 Known</th>
<th>England 2 Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Morris</td>
<td>1718/9, 1721</td>
<td>Hug., Goose &amp; Gridiron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Timson</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hawkins</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Sorrel</td>
<td>1723-24</td>
<td>JP, Gov., Hug., Horn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Senex</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>FRS, Hug., Fleece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Daniel Houghton</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>JP, Sq., Rummer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Prendergast</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Duke of Richmond, Horn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Burdon</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>JP, Sq., Horn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Highmore</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>JP, Gov., Swan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir James Thornhill</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>JP, FRS, Swan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin O’Connor</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Red Lyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. George Carpenter</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>JP, FRS, Horn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
- **JP** = Justice of the Peace for Westminster and/or Middlesex  
- **Gov.** = Holder of a salaried government office  
- **Hug.** = Huguenot  
- **Sq.** = ‘Squire’ to a Knight of the Bath at the installation of the Order

### George Payne – A Known Unknown

The following section examines the influence of George Payne (1685?-1757), his connections to Chester and the upper reaches of the London magistracy, and the wider impact of the latter on English Freemasonry. Payne has attracted limited academic and Masonic interest, and only minimal information regarding his

---

Charles Cox, a member of the Bedford Head lodge and a Southwark brewer (and later Streat's father-in-law), who was Southwark's Whig MP from 1695-1712.  
30 'Morris' was also written as 'Morrice' and 'Morice'; each is an Anglicisation of the French 'Maurice'. He was a member of lodges in St Paul’s and Southwark.  
31 An artisan member of one of the four founding lodges; cf. 1738 Constitutions, p. 114.  
33 The Sackler Archives record an alternative spelling of ‘Senez’, a Huguenot form.  
34 Burdon and Chocke were joint ‘esquires’ to Sir William Morgan at the Installation of the Knights of the Bath. William Burdon is noted as a JP in the MSes, SP, JWP: LMA: MS/SP 1725-34. He was, possibly, Capt. William Burdon, author of The Gentleman’s Pocket Farrier.
personal and professional life has hitherto been identified. From a Masonic perspective he was, uniquely, the second and fourth Grand Master of Grand Lodge, in 1718 and 1720, respectively; Senior Grand Warden in 1724; and Deputy Grand Master in 1735. Within Freemasonry outside of Grand Lodge, Payne was noted in the 1723 Constitutions as the Master of lodge IV, the Horn Tavern; and in 1749, he became Master of the influential Old King's Arms Lodge. However, this only touches the surface of a Masonic career that was as active and arguably as important as that of Desaguliers, and one that lasted some ten years longer.

Evidence of Payne's commitment to Freemasonry was apparent throughout his Masonic life, and not just in his willingness to compile the General Regulations in 1720 and as one of the earliest Grand Masters and Grand Officers. His attendance and participation in meetings at Grand Lodge from the 1720s through to the late 1750s is well documented in Grand Lodge Minutes. However, the records indicate more than this. They also provide evidence that Payne was regarded highly by his colleagues throughout his Masonic career, perhaps to an even greater extent than Desaguliers. Successive examples include Payne being chosen in 1725 to inspect the Philo-Musicae et Architecture Societas-Apollini; his appointment to the Grand Lodge Charity committee in June 1727; invitation to act

---

35 1723 Constitutions, p. 74.
36 1723 Constitutions, p. 58. Payne had been asked to collate the relevant documents. Stukeley noted in his Diaries that Payne had access to at least one copy of the ‘Ancient Charges’, possibly the Cooke MS that had been in use at Chester.
37 Cf. Index, Grand Lodge Minutes, 1723-39, p. 350, and Grand Lodge Minutes, 1740-58, p. 130, respectively.
38 The society ‘of true lovers of music and architecture’ which had been formed by and comprised a number of prominent Freemasons, had established an ‘irregular’ custom of initiating and raising members. Payne’s visit to the society in September 1725 was followed by a cease and desist letter from Richmond, then Grand Master. The society’s Minutes for 16 December 1725 recorded the receipt of Richmond’s letter and noted that Richmond ‘erroneously insists and assumes to himself a Pretended Authority to call our Right Worshipful and Highly Esteemed Society to account for making Masons irregularly’. The society subsequently ignored the letter and Grand Lodge also took the matter no further. Although Philo-Musicae et Architecture continued to make Masons, it was wound up the following year. Cf. Albert F. Calvert, ‘George Payne, 2nd Grand Master’, AQCTransactions, 30 (1917), 258-62. Calvert did not explore why the society was left to its own devices but the answer probably lay in the composition of its membership, which included well-connected Masons such as William Jones, the mathematician, a friend of Martin Folkes, who had been made a Mason by Richmond himself the previous year on 22 December 1724. Richmond was at the time also Master of the Queen’s Head, Hollis Street. Its members included Charles Cotton and Papillon Ball, who were at the same time members of Philo-Musicae: Churton, Freemasonry: The Reality, p. 313. The implication is that Masonic ‘irregularity’ was less important than personal and social connection.
as Grand Master in 1735 in Viscount Weymouth’s absence; appointment to the Grand Lodge committee on the Calcutta lodge in 1741; and selection for the committee appointed to revise Freemasonry’s Constitutions in 1754. His admission to the Old King’s Arms on 5 May 1747, unusually (in the light of the early history of that lodge) with the ‘unanimous consent’ of its members, was within a month of the temporary erasure of the Horn from the approved list for that lodge’s failure to attend Grand Lodge for over two years. And the Horn’s subsequent reinstatement by Grand Lodge on 4 April 1751 was later described as being due largely to Payne’s influence. Entick’s slightly over-used comment regarding ‘the fervency and zeal of GM Payne’ appears apposite. And his opinion is substantiated by press reports of Payne’s activities within Grand Lodge recorded in the 1740s and 1750s.

However, despite his Masonic eminence, Payne had a relatively low public profile and, in contrast to Desaguliers, does not appear to have been an active self-promoter. Consequently, his life remains largely unrecorded. There is no mention of Payne in the ODNB, there are no significant biographies and there have been no articles in scholarly journals. A review of contemporary eighteenth century publications in ECCO and elsewhere discloses few references, other than those contained in digests of the 1723 and 1738 Constitutions. QC, the principal lodge for Masonic research, with the exception of Calvert’s short piece in Notes & Queries in 1917, has not produced a single dedicated paper on
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39 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 259.
40 OKA Minutes.
41 Grand Lodge Minutes, 1740-58, p. 43.
42 Grand Lodge Minutes, 1740-58, p. 57.
43 John Entick was the editor of the revised 1756 Constitutions. He used the identical expression on three occasions in his Pocket Companion (London, 1759), 2nd ed., pp. 284, 297 and 325.
44 Calvert, ‘George Payne’.
45 For example, London Evening Post, 24 February 1741; and General evening Post, 22 March 1743.
46 JSTOR contains a number of irrelevant references, for example, cf. J.J.L. Ratton, ‘Origin and Progress of Freemasonry’, Irish Monthly, 41.478 (1905), 175-82; and ‘Origin and Progress of Freemasonry Ill’, Irish Monthly, 41.479 (1913), 257-62.
Payne.\textsuperscript{49} And Masonic encyclopaedias have sparse or incomplete data.\textsuperscript{50} In short, an absence of information and analysis has led to Payne being regarded as subordinate to Desaguliers and an adjunct to Anderson. However, an analysis of material held in the Cheshire and Chester archives, contemporary press reports, government and Parliamentary papers, and an evaluation of Payne’s professional and social networks, suggests that such an interpretation would be false.

Payne was born in Chester, the son of Samuel Payne and Frances Kendrick.\textsuperscript{51} His mother had two unmarried sisters, Mary and Elizabeth; Payne later acted as an executor in relation to their respective estates.\textsuperscript{52} The family’s assets at that time included ‘barns, stables, yards, meadows and pasture’, and appear relatively substantial.\textsuperscript{53} The supposition is supported by Payne’s younger brother, Thomas (1689-1744), being admitted to Christ Church, Oxford. He later became Canon of Windsor, a Chaplain to the King, and Prebendary of Wells.\textsuperscript{54} However, there is no evidence that Payne attended university himself, and this may have been a consequence of his family’s earlier indebtedness and the legal action taken against his father in 1703-4 for debt and damages.\textsuperscript{55}

Payne moved from Chester to London in or before 1711\textsuperscript{56}, in which year he was employed as a clerical officer in the Leather Office in St. Martin’s Lane\textsuperscript{57}, a role he may have obtained through family connections. Payne’s name and office address were published in a series of classified advertisements as one of a small number

\textsuperscript{49} R.F. Gould, \textit{History of Freemasonry Throughout the World} (New York, 1936), vol. II, p. 5, referred to an article by Calvert in \textit{Masonic News}, 14 April 1928, but this was based largely on Calvert’s earlier piece in \textit{AQC Transactions}.
\textsuperscript{50} For example, Mackey, \textit{Encyclopaedia of Freemasonry}, part II, p. 757.
\textsuperscript{51} Cf. Neville Barker-Cryer, \textit{The Restoration Lodge of Chester} (London, 2002). The Payne family history is also mentioned online at www.thepeerage.com/p2423.html#i24228.
\textsuperscript{52} Cheshire and Chester archives: DBW/M/D/A/2.
\textsuperscript{53} Cheshire and Chester archives: DBW/L/F/11 and DBW/M/J/39, 42, 43 & 44.
\textsuperscript{55} ‘Draft writ of fieri facias seeking an appearance before the Barons of the Exchequer to show cause why there should not be execution against Samuel Payne for debts’: Cheshire and Chester archives: ZS/D/3/10 MSS.
of locations where Desaguliers’ ‘catalogue of experiments’ might be purchased and information on his lectures obtained. The date, 1713, suggests the probability that Desaguliers and Payne had been introduced and became friends before Desaguliers moved to London, rather than through common membership of the lodge at the Rummer and Grapes in Channel Row. As noted, Desaguliers had previously lived in Holborn, close to the Royal Society’s rooms at Crane Court. Perhaps it was not a coincidence that Desaguliers later found a house in Channel Row. Payne’s rooms at New Palace Yard were only a few steps away.

Payne was employed in various divisions of the Taxes Office for over forty years, where he was promoted gradually, principally via seniority. In 1713, he was recorded as one of two assistants to the Accomptant General, earning £50 per annum. By 1716, Payne had been promoted to become the senior of two clerks at the Taxes Office, at an annual salary of £60. Two years later, he had been promoted again to Clerk’s Assistant, working directly with Francis Sorrel, whose subordinate he would remain for the next twenty-five years. Payne’s salary was then noted as £80 per annum, although later records indicate a lower level of £60. Over time, he collected additional jobs and sinecures, including that of ‘carrying Treasury warrants for taking Receivers General’s securities to the King’s Remembrancer’s Office’. The Treasury Papers hold four references to Payne in the 1730s and 1740s and confirm that he succeeded Sorrel as Secretary to the Tax

58 For example, Guardian and Post Boy, 5 May 1713. Desaguliers’ lectures were priced at ‘one Guinea at the time of Subscription, and one Guinea ... the third night after the Course is begun’.
59 William Morgan, Morgan’s map of the whole of London in 1682 (London, 1682), sheets 9 and 13. Two future noble Grand Masters also had properties nearby: the Duke of Montagu at Montagu House, 1-6 Whitehall Gardens; and Montagu’s close friend, the Duke of Richmond, at Richmond House, Richmond Terrace.
60 London Chronicle, 24 February 1757.
63 Payne was reported as earning £60 as First Clerk and Assistant to Sorrel. When he succeeded Sorrel as Secretary to the Commissioners of Taxes, his salary was increased to £90, the same level as that earned by Sorrel. The role of Secretary was one of the more senior administrative functions at the Excise. Cf. Court and City Register (London, 1757), 3rd edn., p. 109; also Weekly Miscellany, 19 January 1734.
Commissioners in 1743, at an annual salary of £90. The Burney Collection and British Periodicals include around forty other references between 1721 and his death in 1757, and various articles and notices mark his official work at the Taxes Office, Lottery Office, and as a Commissioner of the Peace on the Westminster bench.

The press also recorded Payne’s other paid appointments: as a commissioner for the construction of the Westminster Bridge, with which many other Freemasons were involved; as one of the managers for the Westminster Bridge lottery; and his selection by the Treasury as a Lottery Commissioner in 1743 and reappointment in subsequent years. By the late 1740s, Payne was of sufficient social standing to be mentioned in the gossip columns in connection with the marriage of two of his nieces: Frances, to the Hon. George Compton in 1748; and Catherine, to the Very Rev. Lord Francis Seymour, fifth son of the 8th Duke of Somerset, in 1749. Payne was by now regarded as a member of the gentry, and was described as such in a list of those polling in Westminster. Within Grand Lodge Minutes, he had been accorded the title ‘esquire’ since 1725.

The circumstances and timing of Payne’s appointment as a magistrate are not known, but could have been connected to the recommendation of Charles Delafaye, a fellow magistrate and a member of the Horn. Payne was first listed as a Westminster Justice in 1715. He may have sat on the bench for thirty-five years: the Westminster Sessions Papers, Justices’ Working Documents include a

---


\(^{67}\) London Gazette, 19 October 1745.

\(^{68}\) London Evening Post, 18 March 1736.


\(^{70}\) London Evening Post, 22 March 1743.

\(^{71}\) Daily Advertiser, 23 May 1744 and London Evening Post, 30 July 1747.

\(^{72}\) Whitehall Evening Post or London Intelligencer, 5 March 1748. Compton was MP for Northampton; he succeeded as 6th Earl of Northampton in 1754.

\(^{73}\) General Advertiser, 23 November 1749. Also Account of the Proceedings at the Late Election for the City and Liberty or Westminster (London, 1749), p. 16.

\(^{74}\) His title changes as between the 1723 and 1725 lists of members of the Horn; cf. also his description in Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 58 (1724) and p. 62 (1725).

\(^{75}\) There is a reference to Payne’s activities as a magistrate at the LMA: WSes: SP, JWP, 20 April 1715. Others who are mentioned alongside Payne on that date included Charles Delafaye and George Carpenter.
record of him sitting in 1750. William Cowper, later chair of the Westminster bench; Alexander Chocke, a fellow civil servant at the Exchequer; and Sorrel, Payne’s superior at the Leather Office, were similarly active and senior JPs. All three were neighbours at New Palace Yard and fellow members of the Horn. Their inter-relationship is discussed below.

Mackechnie-Jarvis has commented that Desaguliers may have been introduced to Payne by his brother, the Rev. Thomas Payne, when both were at Christ Church. This has the ring of probability. The academic community at Christ Church was relatively small, and both men were servitor scholars and later became ordained ministers, Thomas Payne initially at New College. Although there is no evidence other than circumstantial, it is possible, perhaps even probable, that either George or Thomas Payne introduced Desaguliers to Freemasonry. Given their background, both were likely to have been a member of or at least familiar with Chester Freemasonry. However, the more probable connection was George Payne. Prior Masonic expertise would assist to explain Payne’s seniority at the Horn; provide a rationale for him being selected as Grand Master before Desaguliers; and explain why he was appointed Richmond’s Deputy at the Horn and recorded as Master in his absence.

It is interesting to speculate why Payne and Desaguliers collaborated on the reformation of Freemasonry. Perhaps Desaguliers saw in Payne a potential colleague and as someone who already had a position in London Freemasonry and within the civil service, a catalyst for his own advancement. And perhaps Payne saw in Desaguliers a potential collaborator and an effective and erudite public speaker, willing and able to act as a driver and public face of change. Regardless, they supported each other at Grand Lodge for over twenty-five years: writing the 1723 Constitutions; introducing new ritual; networking to bring their associates

---

76 Read’s Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 13 July 1751, confirms that Payne had been made a JP many years earlier. The LMA refer to Payne in WSes, SP, JWP as late as 1 April 1748 and 1 January 1750.
79 I am grateful to Judith Curthoys, Archivist, Christ Church, Oxford, for this reference.
80 Although the absence of data is never conclusive evidence, there is no record in the membership lists of Grand Lodge of Thomas Payne having been a Freemason.
into the Craft and, more particularly, into Grand Lodge\textsuperscript{81}; and jointly with others, managing the development of English Freemasonry.

Although Desaguliers became the more visibly influential of the two, perhaps as a function of his skills at self-promotion, public speaking and avid networking at the Royal Society and fringes of the Court, Payne and Desaguliers were equally senior within Grand Lodge. And their collaboration was effective: Payne’s return as Grand Master in 1720 can be explained by the need for a trusted and competent colleague to hold the Chair while awaiting an answer from the Duke of Montagu as to whether he would become the Society’s first aristocratic Grand Master. Payne and Desaguliers could rely upon each other to install Montagu with appropriate ceremony, and with the development of Freemasonry itself. It may also have been important politically for Desaguliers not to be perceived as the principal driving force behind the changes to Freemasonry but rather as one of several instigators. And in this, Payne (and Folkes) proved ideal partners.

However, in addition to Payne’s reciprocated support for Desaguliers within Grand Lodge, his other main contribution to the development of Freemasonry may have been in his network of relationships within Westminster and the civil service, which was complementary to those of Desaguliers and Folkes within the Royal Society and among sections of the Whig aristocracy. One of Payne’s central and more important connections was with William Cowper, the Clerk to the Parliaments and later Chairman of the Westminster and Middlesex bench.\textsuperscript{82} Both were members of the Horn and, in 1723, Cowper was appointed Grand Secretary and, subsequently, Deputy Grand Master of Grand Lodge. Payne and Cowper each had family connections in and with Chester, lived at New Palace Yard, and were among the numerically small community of government officials based in and around Westminster.


\textsuperscript{82} Cowper was appointed Clerk to the Parliaments in c. 1715. Cf. The Humble Address Of the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal In Parliament Assembled, Presented To His Majesty, On Munday the Twentieth Day of February 1715 (London, 1715), Preface.
Given the closeness of the government and judicial circles in which Payne and Cowper moved, it is probable that many senior Freemasons, including Sorrel, Blackerby and Chocke, and other civil servants and JPs who shared similar political and philosophical views, were introduced to Freemasonry not by Desaguliers but, directly or indirectly, by Payne. These could have included those such as Charles Delafaye, Charles and Thomas Medlicott, Capt. Edward Ridley, Leonard Streate and Col. George Carpenter, all of whom were members of the Horn. Indeed, around twenty members of the Horn, representing about a third of the lodge, sat as London magistrates.

Payne died on 23 February 1757. He had no descendants and the bequests and legacies in his will were principally to his brother’s children. His death merited brief obituaries in the press which referred, in particular, to his years of service at the Taxes Office. Payne’s will was proved in London on 9 March 1757. His wife, Anne Martha Payne, was the sole executor. Payne’s estate was bequeathed to his wife, with £2,000 to be distributed to the children and grandchildren of ‘my late beloved brother, Rev. Thomas Payne’. His nephew, also Rev. Thomas Payne, received £200, as did his nieces: Francis, Countess of Northampton; Catherine, Lady Frances Seymour; and Sarah Way (the wife of Lewis Way). Another niece, Mary Payne, a spinster, was given £500. The loans that had been made by George Payne to another nephew, the Rev. Joseph Payne, were forgiven, and Payne’s grand nieces, Joseph Payne’s daughters, were willed £100 each. Amelia (Polly) Hammond Payne, who had been living with George and Anne Payne, received £500. Payne also bequeathed legacies of £10 each to the Earl & Countess of Northampton; Lord & Lady Frances Seymour; Lewis and Sarah Way; Rev. Joseph Payne & his wife; Hugh Watson of the Temple, his attorney; and James and Edward Batson (his wife’s nephews). In this latter regard, it was probably not coincidental that Thomas Batson, a barrister and almost certainly Payne’s brother-in-law, was appointed JGW in 1730 and was an active and influential DGM from 1730 until 1732.

---

83 Interchangeably written as ‘Street’ or ‘Streete’.
84 LMA: MSes, SP, JWP, 1715-1735.
85 For example, Public Advertiser, 24 February 1757; London Chronicle, 26 February 1757; and Gentleman’s Magazine, 26 February 1757.
86 Batson was described as ‘a councillor-at-law’.
Unlike Desaguliers, Payne had not been a member of any of the learned societies. And the absence of a substantial public persona suggests a relatively self-effacing rather than self-promoting character. However, the prominence of government officials and members of the Westminster and Middlesex magistrates’ bench among Freemasonry’s ranks suggests that Payne was nonetheless an effective networker.

**The Westminster and Middlesex Bench: a New Connection**

It is known that the Royal Society provided a fundamental connection among the aristocratic Grand Masters at the titular head of Grand Lodge, and among many of the scientists and others who later populated its ranks and those of other lodges. The relationship has been explored relatively extensively and is summarised and analysed in the following chapter. But the influence and sheer number of Commissioners of the Peace for the Liberty of Westminster and County of Middlesex who were or later became Freemasons has not been noted, and this nexus may have been as important as that of the Royal Society, particularly during the early years of English Grand Lodge and among its senior but non-aristocratic Grand Officers.

The relationship between the Middlesex and Westminster benches and Grand Lodge and London Freemasonry more widely remains to be researched in detail, but a first brief attempt is made below. The absence of any records for lodge membership before 1723 precludes a definitive analysis, as do variations in the spelling of the names of many of those involved. However, it would be a reasonable conjecture that certain members of the Middlesex and Westminster benches may have been assiduous in inviting colleagues to join Freemasonry. Senior magistrates, such as William Cowper, Nathaniel Blackerby, Charles Delafaye, George Carpenter and Alexander Chocke, who were at the same time senior Freemasons, would also have set a positive and public example to their judicial colleagues. Moreover, the wide public influence and power of the magistracy, whose role went beyond law enforcement to incorporate ‘the preservation of the king’s peace and justice’[^87], tax assessment, licensing and the classification and determination of the legal seriousness of offences brought before them, which upon conviction, would determine the level of fine or punishment.

[^87]: Justices had considerable discretion and were, *inter alia*, responsibility for the classification and determination of the legal seriousness of offences brought before them, which upon conviction, would determine the level of fine or punishment.
administration of the poor laws, would have cast an influential and positive judicial imprimatur upon the Craft.

Munsche was correct in noting that the Justice of the Peace ‘occupied a pivotal position in eighteenth century England’. Indeed, it is feasible to go further. The London magistracy was regarded as a principal line of defence against the London mob, and the Grand Jury at the Middlesex Quarter Sessions pronounced on allegations of all offenses, including treason. Given its status as such and the explicit political remodelling of the bench following the Hanoverian succession, it is probable that the presence of so many Freemasons on the Westminster and Middlesex benches would have required, at a minimum, the acquiescence of the Whig government and, more probably, its approval.

There are several important instances where English Freemasonry received official sanction and support. Moreover, at least two of Walpole’s most prolific press apologists, James Pitt, who wrote for the London Journal and later the Daily Gazetteer, and Raphael Courteville, who contributed to the Daily Courant and later edited the Daily Gazetteer, were Freemasons. And Pitt and Courteville were not alone. Other prominent writers in the government sponsored press who were Masons included Lord Hervey, Horatio Walpole and Theobald Cibber. Indeed, James Pitt’s phraseology and philosophy had a close commonality with the new Masonic liturgy: ‘every created Being must fall infinitely short of the Perfection of an infinite Being; for whatever is Created must be Finite, and limited in all its Powers; and therefore necessarily subject to, or capable of Error and Irregularity’.

90 Prominent examples would include the raising of the Duke of Lorraine and the initiation of the Duke of Newcastle at Houghton Hall in 1731, and Walpole’s initiation by Lord Lovel.
91 ‘Mr Pitt’ was a member of Folkes’ Bedford Head lodge in Southampton Street. The inn was only a short walk from James Pitt’s London house in Essex Street, and Folkes and Pitt were both Norfolk men.
92 Raphael Courteville was a member of the lodge at the George, Charing Cross.
The tacit and possibly active encouragement and acceptance of Freemasonry by the Whig government was almost certainly a product of Grand Lodge’s overt pro-Hanoverian stance and of the positive social and political functions that it fulfilled. The pro-establishment character of those on the bench, particularly figures such as the Huguenots Delafaye and De Veil, reinforced the relationship, as did the broader social arc from which the magistracy was beginning to be selected.

Norma Landau has emphasised the overtly political nature of appointments to the magistrates’ bench and its personification of the ‘might of party’. The substantive changes made to the composition of the bench from 1714 onward reflected the ascendancy of the Whigs and the pro-Hanoverian political schematic adopted at a national level. Albeit that central government influence over provincial local government remained relatively circumscribed when compared to that of London, Landau has demonstrated that successive Hanoverian Lord Chancellors sought to appoint dependable political allies and remove potential opposition Tories and Jacobite sympathisers. This was above all the case in the politically sensitive areas of Westminster and Middlesex, where the bench was explicitly supportive of the Hanoverian regime and its political, religious and economic objectives. In Landau’s words: ‘fidelity to the Hanoverian [government was] a touchstone for fitness’.

Corroborating this view, but not mentioned by Landau and others, is the evidence that the three key early Hanoverian Lord Chancellors - William Cowper, 1st Earl Cowper, (1714-18); Thomas Parker, 1st Earl of Macclesfield, (1718-25); and Peter King, 1st Baron King of Ockham, (1725-33) – each had powerful family connections with Freemasonry. Earl Cowper’s nephews included William Cowper, the pivotal Grand Secretary of Grand Lodge and later Deputy Grand Master, and his brother, the Rev. John Cowper, a fellow member of the Horn. The Earl of Macclesfield’s son, George Parker (1697-1764), the 2nd Earl of Macclesfield, was a Freemason, a member of the Swan in Chichester, as was William Jones, the mathematician.

George’s tutor and a close family friend, who was a member of the Queen’s Head, Hollis Street. And King’s son, John King (1706-40), 2nd Baron Ockham, was probably the John King appointed a Grand Steward in 1731 and a member of the Lodge of Antiquity in 1736.

Parker and King were also closely connected to Folkes, Desaguliers and other Freemasons within the Royal Society’s circle. Parker was elected FRS in 1722. He was a Teller of the Exchequer (1719-64) and MP for Wallingford (1722-7); he succeeded his father in 1732. King was elected FRS in 1735, the year that he succeeded his father; he sat as MP for Exeter (1734-5), having previously represented Launceston, Cornwall (1727-34).

Charles Delafaye, loyalty personified

Hail Masonry! Thou Craft divine!
Glory of Earth! From Heav’n reveal’d;
Which dost with Jewels precious shine,
From all but Masons Eyes conceal’d.

Freemasonry’s association with pro-establishment government office holders and supporters on the Westminster and Middlesex benches may have been typified by men such as Cowper, Blackerby and Chocke, but it can be argued that it reached an apogee in Charles Delafaye (1677-1762). Delafaye, a member of Richmond’s Horn Tavern, is best known as the author of the Fellow Craft’s Song and other Masonic verse. However, his influence would have been far more important than such relatively trivial contributions would suggest. Delafaye’s presence reinforced Freemasonry’s pro-Hanoverian public profile, and provided confirmation to the government that Freemasonry could and should be regarded as a politically steadfast and dependable organisation.

98 Jones may also have been a member of the Vine Tavern, Holborn: Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 168.
99 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 142, fn. (a).
100 Cf. chap. four.
101 King was also awarded the royal sinecure of ‘Out Ranger of Windsor Forest’, which he held from 1726 until his death.
102 Charles Delafaye, The Fellowcraft’s Song, printed in the 1723 Constitutions, p. 83.
104 For example, a classified advertisement for a theatrical presentation of Oedipus preceded by a Delafaye composition, appeared in the Country Journal or The Craftsman, 17 November 1733.
A Huguenot émigré, Delafaye graduated from Oxford in 1696 and joined the diplomatic service. He was appointed secretary to Sir Joseph Williamson, English ambassador to the United Provinces; and following Williamson’s return to London, Delafaye obtained employment in the office of the Southern Department. He served under successive Secretaries of State, starting as a clerk under James Vernon, Secretary for the South, whose son, also James, would similarly become a Freemason. Delafaye was promoted to Chief Clerk in December 1706 and worked under Sunderland from December 1706 until June 1710, and Dartmouth from June 1710 until August 1713. From 1702 to 1727, he was also a writer for the official London Gazette and between 1707 and 1710 assisted Richard Steel during the latter’s editorship of the paper. They remained close friends. Delafaye subsequently took up an appointment as private secretary to Shrewsbury when the latter was made Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and was appointed Secretary to the Justices in Ireland in 1715. He returned to London in April 1717, as Sunderland’s Under Secretary at the Northern Department.

Delafaye’s political reliability had such renown within the government that he was provided with a seat in the Irish House of Commons in order to add weight to the pro-government faction; he remained one of the members for Belturbet, County Cavan, until 1727. He was also appointed a Justice of the Peace for Westminster in or before 1715, a position he held for around twenty years. One of his first published court reports in 1717, concerned his committal of a Jacobite sympathiser ‘for publicly affirming in St James’s Park that the Pretender was the only rightful and lawful King’. Press coverage of his decisions, investigations and examinations continued through to 1736, when he was reported as having investigated a printer suspected of ‘printing the libels dispersed in Westminster

---

105 James Vernon, a Commissioner for Excise (1710 until his death) and a Clerk of the Council in Ordinary (1715 until his death), was a member of Folkes’ Bedford Head lodge. Vernon was closely involved with Masonic philanthropy, including the establishment and operation of the Georgia colony, co-funded by Freemasons.
106 Cf. Rae Blanchard, ‘Was Sir Richard Steele a Freemason?’, PMLA, 63.3 (1948), 903-17.
107 Cf. for example, Post Boy, 30 April 1717.
108 His name is recorded inter alia in the MSes, SP, JWP, for April 1715: LMA: MJ/SP 1715.
109 Original Weekly Journal, 31 August 1717.
Hall’. His judicial decisions and loyal approach were such that it cannot have been coincidental that many of the cases he adjudicated were politically linked. After serving under Sunderland between April 1717 and March 1718, Delafaye worked as Under Secretary to Stanhope (from March 1718 until February 1721) and then Townshend, providing an uncommon level of permanency and stability at the Northern Department. In April 1724, he transferred to the Southern Department to work for Newcastle and remained in that role until stepping down in July 1734. However, he retained the position of Deputy Secretary of State for Scotland until his resignation in 1739, an appointment that would have kept him close to the centre of any potential Jacobite threat. Indeed, his usefulness was such that he preserved an informal connection with government business until at least the 1750s.

Furbank and Owens have commented on Daniel Defoe’s letters to Delafaye that were originally uncovered by William Lee. Regardless of whether the content was true, fabricated, or both, it is an indication of the regard in which Delafaye was held by the British government, and by Harley, that he was trusted with such communications. A multitude of other examples of Delafaye’s activities and of his diplomatic and political correspondence has been noted by historians including McNally; Holmes; Haffenden, who wrote that ‘he was the main channel through much of the pressure directed at Newcastle passed’; Downie;

110 Old Whig or The Consistent Protestant, 29 July 1736.
111 Cf. among many reported examples is Country Journal or The Craftsman, 17 November 1733.
113 Cf., for example, Read’s Weekly Journal Or British Gazetteer, 21 April 1739.
120 J.A. Downie, ‘Swift and Jacobitism’, ELH, 64.4 (1997), 887-901, esp. 892.
Fritz’s comment that ‘Charles Delafaye was one of the most highly trusted members of the English Government, especially in all matters involving Jacobites’ was correct, and it is important to recognise Delafaye’s central position as Under Secretary and his trusted role in collating domestic espionage and collecting foreign intelligence.

Delafaye was rewarded generously by the government, being granted sinecures as a Gentleman Sewer to His Majesty (1717) and Clerk of the Signet under the Lord Privy Seal (1728). In May of the same year, he was awarded a doctorate of law from Cambridge University. This would have been a particular tribute in that it was conferred by the King personally, and Delafaye was granted the honour alongside a barrage of eminent peers and politicians including the Dukes of Dorset, Grafton, Ancaster, Newcastle and Manchester, and Sir Robert Walpole himself. Delafaye was elected FRS in November 1725, proposed by Sir Francis Nicholson (1655-1728), previously Governor of the South Carolina colony, with whom Delafaye had corresponded professionally. One of his last government appointments, in 1750, was conferred by the Lords of the Treasury, who assigned him the sinecure of Wine Taster at Dublin.

---

124 For example, Raymond Turner, ‘The Excise Scheme of 1733’, *EHR*, 42.165 (1927), 34-57, esp. 36-7, 40-4. Cf. also Bibliography, below.
126 *Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer*, 2 November 1717.
127 Cf. for example, *Daily Post*, 9 January 1728 and *London Evening Post*, 16 May 1728.
129 A ‘Mr Nicholson’ was a member of the Baptist Head lodge in Chancery Lane. It is possible that the two were the same person.
131 Derbyshire Record Office: D3155/C1185: October 1750.
Delafaye’s Masonic verses reveal an almost religious attachment to both Freemasonry (‘thou Craft divine’ ... Sweet Fellowship, from Envy free’), and a close affiliation with the science it embodied, a subject Delafaye referred to as his ‘Inclination to Mechanicks’. However, although Delafaye may be regarded as one of the best examples of a pro-establishment Freemason and Justice of the Peace, there were many others. Over sixty magistrates died or retired from the bench in the four years to 1727, and other sizeable groups were excluded for political reasons. Consequently, the Westminster and Middlesex benches were populated by a significant number of new entrants. Although the hand written records of London’s magistrates held at the LMA are somewhat hard to decipher, contemporary newspaper reports allow for an analysis of four relatively large sets of appointees to the bench: in April 1719; June 1721; August 1724; and November 1727.

William Cowper and the 1719 Intake

The 1719 intake of 41 commissioners of the peace included four later eminent Grand Officers: James Hamilton, Lord Paisley (Grand Master, 1725); William Cowper (GS, DGM); Nathaniel Blackerby (GTr, DGM); the Hon. George Carpenter (GW); and a further eight probable Freemasons.

William Cowper (16..?-1739), was probably one of the most influential of the 1719 intake. The eldest surviving son of the Hon. Spencer Cowper (1669-1728), Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Attorney General to the Prince of Wales, and Chief Justice of Chester, Cowper had been Clerk of the Parliaments for almost four years when appointed to the Westminster bench. The position of Clerk had been held formerly by Sir William Cowper, his uncle, a lawyer and Whig MP

---

132 Delafaye, *Fellowcraft’s Song*.  
134 12 exclusions were reported alongside the 1719 intake, and 11 alongside that for 1721.  
136 Interestingly, the new entrants included several Huguenots (Corbiére, Dubois, Floyer and Leroche), who could also be expected to be pro-Hanoverian. Cf. for example, *Weekly Journal or Saturday’s Post*, 25 April 1724.  
for Hertford Borough (1679-81 and 1688-1700). Cowper acquired the reversionary interest in 1715.

The Clerk of the Parliaments was regarded as a senior office. Although the office holder received only a low base salary of £40 per annum, this was supplemented by substantial fees for ancillary services. For example, in 1717-8, Cowper received a further £279 for ‘delivering to the Chancery and Rolls Chapel several Acts of Parliament’\(^{138}\), and similar fees in relation to the passage of private bills.\(^{139}\) The Clerk was also responsible for the allocation of subordinate appointments and sinecures within the Palace of Westminster and, in accordance with custom, would have received appropriate recompense from those he selected.\(^{140}\) Since two of such appointments were reported to have annual salaries of £400 and £300, respectively, Cowper’s aggregate remuneration may have been of a substantially higher magnitude.\(^{141}\)

However, although Cowper earned and inherited sufficient funds to become a small-scale philanthropist\(^{142}\), he was financially distressed towards the end of his life. His financial reverse stemmed from lengthy and costly litigation, eventually settled, over his uncle’s estate.\(^{143}\) Consequently, in the late 1730s, Cowper was sued for unpaid debts and forced to sell his properties in Lincoln’s Inn Fields.\(^{144}\)

---

139 Hertfordshire Archives: Chancery Administration, misc. items: DE/P/F165, 1714-1717.
140 Hertfordshire Archives: re. the office of Clerk of the Parliaments: DE/P/F220, c. 1723.
141 Cf. General Evening Post, 24 May 1735; Daily Post, 16 September 1736; and Daily Gazetteer, 15 January 1737. In 1735, Cowper appointed Joseph Wight as one of his assistants at a salary of £400 p.a.; in 1736, he appointed John Wight as Reading Clerk to the House of Lords at a salary of £300 p.a. Coincidentally or otherwise, an Edward Wight was at the time a member of the popular lodge at the Rainbow Coffee House, York Buildings.
142 Cowper’s donation of £100 towards a new town hall in Hertford where he had his country home, received some publicity: cf. London Evening Post, 27 August 1737.
143 On the 1st Earl’s death in 1723, Spencer Cowper, his brother, entered a claim on the estate which led to a long and complex dispute in Chancery involving *inter alia* the late Earl’s will and that of his Countess, who died shortly after him. The claim was pursued by William Cowper after his father’s death. The assets involved in the dispute included property in Westmorland and London, and a large amount of money. The case ended in 1739. Cf. Hertfordshire Archives: DE/P/T1220 and 1221; and DE/P/F212-218 c. 1724-39.
144 Hertfordshire Archives: Miscellaneous papers: DE/P/F17 c. 1720-50.
Prior to this, Cowper held several pivotal positions within the London magistracy. He was chosen as chair of the City of Westminster bench in 1723\textsuperscript{145}, a post he held until his resignation in December 1727\textsuperscript{146}; and was appointed Chairman of the Middlesex County bench in 1729\textsuperscript{147} and reappointed the following year. And although he again stepped down from the role of Chairman in 1731, Cowper remained a senior Justice on the bench.\textsuperscript{148} Moreover, he continued to be favoured. Just over a month later, Cowper was appointed Patentee to the Commission of Bankrupts, a position described by the press as ‘very valuable’.\textsuperscript{149} Cowper was re-elected chair of the Middlesex bench in 1733\textsuperscript{150}, and later the same year appointed one of several senior commissioners charged with a review of the Courts of Justice to ‘enquire into their fees’.

Cowper was central to Freemasonry’s development. He was selected as the first Grand Secretary, holding the office from 1723 until 1727 and creating what became a pivotal position. Cowper was also a trusted Grand Officer, succeeding Desaguliers as DGM in 1726. Alongside his brother, the Rev. John Cowper, he was a member of the Horn, as were several of his colleagues on the Westminster bench. Indeed, as noted above, around a third or so of the Horn’s membership comprised JPs. After Cowper’s death, his Parliamentary office was inherited first by Ashley Cowper, his brother, then by his son.\textsuperscript{151}

Cowper’s \textit{Charge} to the Grand Jury of Middlesex, delivered on 9 January 1723, provides a particularly apposite example of a loyal Hanoverian address:

\textit{It ought always to be a Matter of particular Distinction ... that Justices would be vigilant to detect and produce to Punishment all those who ... attempt the Subversion of the Great basis upon which stands all that is or can be dear to England and Protestants ... It is ... for our Religion, our Liberty and our Property.}\textsuperscript{152}

\textsuperscript{146} \textit{London Evening Post}, 16 December 1727.
\textsuperscript{147} \textit{Flying Post or The Weekly Medley}, 8 March 1729.
\textsuperscript{148} \textit{London Evening Post}, 25 February 1731.
\textsuperscript{149} \textit{London Evening Post}, 27 April 1731.
\textsuperscript{150} \textit{St. James’s Evening Post}, 31 March 1733.
\textsuperscript{151} \textit{Daily Gazetteer}, 23 May 1739.
\textsuperscript{152} \textit{Pasquin}, 17 January 1723.
The address delivered on 30 June 1727 to the newly invested George II and reported verbatim\(^ {153}\), was similarly clear as to the magistrates’ objectives: ‘to preserve our current constitution in Church and State’. And the Charge Cowper gave to his fellow magistrates three years later was analogous:

The Magistrate ... is trusted to uphold the Honour, the Dignity, and the Majesty of the State; to see that Order is observed; that equal Right be done according to known and approved Law; ... and ever to bear in Mind the high Nature, and vast importance of this Trust; and whoever assumes ... such Powers upon any other Principle, is, and should be treated as, a Subverter of Peace, Order, and good Government, of the world, and an Enemy to human Society.\(^ {154}\)

The parallels with Payne’s Charges are evident. Not only was a Mason ‘a peaceable Subject to the Civil Powers ... never to be concerned in Plots and Conspiracies against the Peace and Welfare of the Nation’\(^ {155}\), but each Freemason agreed specifically to be:

a good man and true, and strictly to obey the moral law ... to be a peaceable subject, and cheerfully to conform to the laws of the country in which [he] reside[d] ... not to be concerned in plots and conspiracies against government [and] patiently ... submit to the decisions of the supreme legislature [and] ... the civil magistrate.

**Nathaniel Blackerby**

Another 1719 appointee to the bench, Nathaniel Blackerby (16..?-1742), worked at the Exchequer as Clerk of the Patent. Tangentially, Alexander Chocke, a fellow Freemason and JP, was Clerk of the Registers in the same department.\(^ {156}\)

Blackerby was in early 1722 also appointed Treasurer to the Commission for Building Fifty Churches. The position was one of considerable financial responsibility. An indication of the quantum of money processed by the Commission is set out in papers held at Lambeth Palace Library that provide details of both receipt and expenditure warrants, and of the payments and

\(^{153}\) London Gazette, 1 July 1727.


\(^{155}\) 1723 Constitutions, Charges, p. 50.

reimbursement of expenses received by Blackerby himself. These included a gratuity of £50 on 28 June 1725; and the reimbursement of extensive personal expenses of £83 8s 10d on 25 August 1727, £134 18s 0d on 29 March 1728, £75 10s 6d on 6 February 1731, £31 6s 4d on 7 April 1733 and £62 3s 9d on 2 May 1740. And these were among the smaller sums: in January 1729, the press recorded his receipt of £1,000 ‘to be distributed by him among the Workmen employed in building the said Churches’. The Lambeth Palace archives reveal the nature of the work involved and the multiple accounts and records generated. Although it is difficult to determine whether the work involved was particularly onerous, Blackerby and others petitioned that their salaries, previously reduced, be restored to their prior levels.

As Treasurer to the Commission, Blackerby worked closely with Nicholas Hawksmoor (1662-1736), the Principal Surveyor. The two were responsible jointly for signing completion certificates for each of the works undertaken. Perhaps not coincidentally, Hawksmoor was also a Freemason, as was John James, the Second Surveyor. Blackerby and Hawksmoor’s relationship functioned on both a professional and a personal level. They toured England together in the early 1730s on a journey that included Blenheim, on which Hawksmoor had worked with Edward Strong Jr., a member of the lodge at the Swan at Greenwich; and Castle Howard, where Hawksmoor had worked with Vanbrugh. In 1735, Blackerby married Hawksmoor’s daughter, Elizabeth, and when Hawksmoor died in March the following year, Blackerby wrote his obituary.

In 1726, in addition to his positions at the Treasury and the Commission, Blackerby was appointed, probably by Cowper, to the position of Housekeeper in

---

158 Lambeth Palace Library: MS 2706, 1716-48, items 267, 275, 313, 337 and 361.
159 *Country Journal or The Craftsman*, 11 January 1729, is one of several press reports.
160 Lambeth Palace Library: MS 2725, 1721-59.
161 Lambeth Palace Library: MS 2726, 1713-42 (ff.87v-88).
162 Lambeth Palace Library: MS 2724, 1711-34.
163 Hawksmoor (written in *Grand Lodge Minutes* as ‘Hawkesmoor’) was a member of the Oxford Arms, Ludgate Street, of which Richard Rawlinson was also a member.
164 John James, the second Surveyor at the Commission and a close colleague of Hawksmoor, was a member of the Swan in East Street, Greenwich, of which Sir James Thornhill was WM. The Swan was close to Greenwich Hospital where James had been the Assistant Clerk of Works and Hawksmoor the Deputy Surveyor.
165 *Read’s Weekly Journal*, 27 March 1736. Elizabeth and Nathaniel Blackerby jointly inherited her father’s substantial wealth.
Ordinary at Westminster Palace. He was apparently unhappy with the level of salary and later petitioned for a fresh grant. Like Cowper, Blackerby was also a member of the pivotal Horn Tavern lodge. He was subsequently invited to join Grand Lodge, where he served as Grand Warden in 1727 and DGM in each of the following two years. Like Delafaye, he also actively proselytised Freemasonry within the arts and in 1729, and again in 1730, wrote the prologue and epilogue for plays performed at the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane in front of a largely Masonic audience:

The Grand Master, Wardens, and most of the gentlemen present, took tickets to appear in white gloves at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane ... where the Play of Henry IV, Part II was enacted for their Entertainment.

While DGM, Blackerby was appointed to the key position of Grand Treasurer, and he remained in that role until his resignation in 1738. This followed a request from Grand Lodge that the Treasurer post security for monies held on behalf of the Bank of Charity. Although there was no accusation or evidence of financial impropriety, and ‘several of the Brethren ... acquainted the Lodge that they had not the least intention of offering any Indignity ... to the Treasurer’, Blackerby regarded the demand as a slur and commented that:

he could not be insensible of the Indignity offered him in the above Resolutions & the ill treatment he had met in the Debate & that he resented the same in the highest manner.

The Minutes continue:

[He] then resigned his Office of Treasurer & promised to send the next morning to the GS a Draught [sic] on the Bank for the Balance in his hands.

Grand Lodge’s anxiety for the security of its charitable funds was understandable. And their concerns may have been instigated or heightened by Blackerby’s

---

167 CUL: Department of Manuscripts and University Archives, Ch(h), Political Papers, 80, 105 undated.
168 The prologue and epilogue are at the UGLE Library, London: 737 BLA Fo. Cf. Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 4 January 1729 and 31 January 1730, with respect to the relevant performances held at the Theatre Royal.
169 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 299.
170 Ibid.
involvement with the Charitable Corporation, which organisation had collapsed in 1731 following embezzlement and fraud by George Robinson, a stockbroker, and John Thomason, an employee of the Corporation. 171

Within the Middlesex and Westminster magistracy, following Cowper’s resignation as chair of the Westminster bench in 1727, Blackerby was nominated as Cowper’s successor. However, ‘after a Letter ... intimating his Desire of being excused the chair’, Leonard Street, another of the 1719 intake and also a member of the Horn 172, was ‘unanimously chose’. 173 Street had last chaired the Westminster bench in 1725. 174 He was the Steward of the Borough Court, Southwark 175, and a barrister in the Middle Temple. 176 In 1725, he had been appointed one of the commissioners nominated to enforce the bankruptcy laws 177 and he was later made a deputy commissioner in the Alienation Office. 178 Street had been chair of the Middlesex bench before, in 1722, but had stood down and been replaced by Cowper the following year, perhaps as a consequence of his forthcoming marriage. 179 The East Sussex and Hertfordshire archives contain the record of the 1723 marriage settlement between Leonard Street ‘of St Clement Danes, Middx.’ and Sir Charles Cox, with respect to Gratiana, one of Cox’s daughters. 180 Cox, his father-in-law, was MP for Southwark, where he also owned a brewery and had extensive property interests. Cox was also a leading member of the lodge at the Bedford Head.

Although there were relatively few press reports of judicial cases heard by Street 181, his obituary published in 1729 referred to him as ‘an excellent

171 The report of the gentlemen appointed by the General Court of the Charitable Corporation ... (London, 1732), p. 9.
172 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 5, 23.
173 London Evening Post, 16 December 1727.
174 LMA: WSe, SP, JWP 1 February 1725.
176 East Sussex Record Office: SAS-H/362: 12 June 1719. Streate’s position as a barrister may suggest a connection to the jurist, Sir Thomas Street (1625-96); he was, possibly, a son or grandson.
177 A True and Exact List ... (London, 1725) pp. 48-9; also Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 30 January 1725.
180 East Sussex Record Office: AMS2241: 15 & 16 May 1723; also Hertfordshire Archives: DE/Ru/74463: 16 May 1723.
181 For example, Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 4 December 1725 and 9 April 1726.
Magistrate, using no mean Artifices to draw Business, never making Justice a Trade’. The LMA also holds numerous records of his judicial activities between 1721 and 1726, and confirm that he sat at the Middlesex, Westminster and City of London Sessions. His proposed re-appointment as chair of the bench in 1727 was well publicised, with articles in the London Evening Post, Evening Journal, Daily Journal, British Journal, and in other newspapers in late November and December 1727. However, on 30 December 1727, a note in the Daily Journal indicated that Street had declined the position. The paper gave no explanation and Street continued to serve as a magistrate, albeit less actively. Poor health may have been the cause of his demurring; Street died just over twelve months later.

In contrast to Street, Blackerby’s activities on the bench were reported extensively in the press, with several hundred articles during his career on the bench. The LMA also holds around 200 separate archival records. Newspaper comments date from 1721 and suggest that he was regarded as a rigorous jurist. He continued a family tradition: The Justice of the Peace – a Companion, published by Blackerby and widely promoted in the classified advertisements, was a legal digest first compiled by his father, Samuel, a barrister at Gray’s Inn.

In common with many other Freemasons, including Henry Herbert, the 9th Earl of Pembroke, Payne, Desaguliers and Charles Labelye (1705-81), one of Desaguliers’
several protégés, Blackerby was closely involved with the re-building of Westminster Bridge. He was appointed treasurer to the commission overseeing the project and was involved actively with arranging the finance for its construction.\textsuperscript{188} Blackerby was also a trustee for the new colony of Georgia, another semi-Masonic project.\textsuperscript{189} At around the same time, he became a Deputy Lord Lieutenant for Middlesex\textsuperscript{190} and, in 1738, Blackerby agreed to accept the chair of the Westminster bench.\textsuperscript{191}

Blackerby’s speech to the Westminster Justices that year followed the passage of the controversial Gin Act of 1736 and other legislation against ‘spiritous liquors’. It was similar in tone to Cowper’s \textit{Charges}, and he reminded his audience that duty, liberty and property were fundamental to good society:

\begin{quote}
the Cause you are engaged in, is the Cause of your God, your King and your Country ... consider the Duty you owe as Subjects to your King, under whose mild Government, and wise Administration, every Man enjoys the Fruits of his Labour, his Liberty, his Property.\textsuperscript{192}
\end{quote}

Blackerby’s desire for order and his respect for property rights were matched by other colleagues on the bench. The Hon. Colonel George Carpenter (c. 1694-1749), later 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Carpenter of Killaghy, MP for Morpeth (1717–27) and Weobley (1741), and Lt. Col. of the 1\textsuperscript{st} Foot Guards, was another (probably a re-appointee) from the 1719 intake of commissioners of the peace.\textsuperscript{193} Carpenter, perhaps best known for his introduction of a private bill to rectify his marriage settlement\textsuperscript{194}, was appointed Grand Warden in 1729. Another member of the Horn, he was a Whig whose appointment to the bench was in keeping with his family’s pro-Hanoverian politics\textsuperscript{195} and strong religious beliefs.\textsuperscript{196} Like his father, Richard Walker, ‘Freemasonry and Neo-Palladianism’, \textit{The Burlington Magazine}, 125.969 (1983), 746.


\textit{Daily Gazetteer}, 6 April 1738.


As noted above, George Carpenter appeared in a list of magistrates in 1715: LMA: M Ses, SP, JWP, 22 April 1715. His father ‘Geo. Carpenter gen’ (see fn. 190 below) was also listed.

London: Parliamentary Archives: HL/PO/JO/10/6/351: 22 February - 7 March 1726; and HL/PO/PB/1/1725/12G1n34: Private Act, 12 George 1, c.9.

Carpenter’s family were staunchly pro-Hanoverian. Carpenter’s father, also George (1657-1732), had been nominated by Stanhope as Ambassador to Vienna but following


\textsuperscript{189} Trustees for establishing the Colony of Georgia, \textit{The General Account} (London, 1733), pp. 7, 17.

\textsuperscript{190} Chamberlayne, \textit{Magnae Britanniae} (1736), p. 160.

\textsuperscript{191} \textit{Daily Gazetteer}, 6 April 1738.

\textsuperscript{192} Nathaniel Blackerby, \textit{The Speech of Nathanial Blackerby} (London, 1738), p. 18.

\textsuperscript{193} As noted above, George Carpenter appeared in a list of magistrates in 1715: LMA: M Ses, SP, JWP, 22 April 1715. His father ‘Geo. Carpenter gen’ (see fn. 190 below) was also listed.

\textsuperscript{194} London: Parliamentary Archives: HL/PO/JO/10/6/351: 22 February - 7 March 1726; and HL/PO/PB/1/1725/12G1n34: Private Act, 12 George 1, c.9.

\textsuperscript{195} Carpenter’s family were staunchly pro-Hanoverian. Carpenter’s father, also George (1657-1732), had been nominated by Stanhope as Ambassador to Vienna but following
Carpenter was a devout Protestant and a churchwarden at St George’s, Hanover Square. Coincidentally, Sir Cecil Wray, later Master of the Old King’s Arms Lodge and DGM, was a fellow churchwarden.

Carpenter’s father, the 1st Baron, had been part of the 1st Duke of Montagu’s household when the latter served as Ambassador in Paris. Carpenter, who had been Lt. Col. of the 1st Foot Guards in 1715, later became Lt. Col. of the 1st Life Guards, the regiment of which the 2nd Duke of Montagu had been Colonel from 1715 until 1721. In addition to being an MP, Carpenter was also a member of the Council of the Georgia Society. Freemasons funded around a tenth of the cost of establishing the colony through lodge collections and donations. Thomas Batson, Payne’s brother-in-law, as DGM and as a fellow Georgia commissioner, led the fund raising process through Grand Lodge:

Then the Deputy Grand Master opened to the Lodge the Affairs of Planting the new Colony of Georgia in America ... and informed the Grand Lodge that the Trustees had to Nathaniel Blackerby Esq. and to himself Commissions under their Common Seal to collect the Charity of this Society towards establishing the Trustees to send distressed Brethren to Georgia where they may be comfortably provided for.

Proposed: that it be strenuously recommended by Masters and Wardens of regular lodges to make a generous collection among all their members for that purpose.

Which being seconded by Br Rogers Holland Esq. (one of the said Trustees) who opened the Nature of the Settlement), and by Sir William Keith Bt., who was many years Governor of Pennsylvania, by Dr Desaguliers, Lord Southwell, Br. Blackerby and many other worthy brethren, it was recommended accordingly.

the 1715 uprising, was appointed to command British forces in northern England against the Jacobites. He was made commander-in-chief in Scotland in 1716. He served as MP for Whitchurch (1715–22) and for Westminster (1722–27).

A copy of Carpenter’s Sacrament Certificate is held in Winchester by the Hampshire Record Office: Q25/2/22/32 undated.

Churchwardens’ accounts for the Parish Church of St George, Hanover Square: City of Westminster Archives: C756 1725-62. The record contains his and his father’s accounts.

Letters Patent creating George Carpenter esq. Baron Carpenter of Killagy, co. Wexford, Ireland: Northallerton: North Yorkshire County Record Office: ZBL VIII/2/1/1 29 May 1719. The Carpenter family papers at the North Yorkshire County Record Office hold only limited records from the eighteenth century and nothing in relation to Freemasonry.


The balance was largely funded by Parliament.

Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 235.
The charitable contributions to co-finance Georgia probably represent the first occasion on which Freemasons supported, as Freemasons, a non-Masonic charity. The colony was principally an attempt to secure a buffer area between the Spanish in Florida and the valuable Carolina colonies. The venture was led by James Oglethorpe who, although not appearing on any list of Freemasons held at Grand Lodge, co-founded the first Masonic lodge at Savannah in 1734, within a year of the first settlement.202

In addition to Carpenter, who sat on the bench until 1747203, others in the 1719 intake of new magistrates included Robert Viner (or Vyner), a member of the lodge meeting at the Rummer, Charing Cross; Thomas Moor, a Grand Steward in 1731; Thomas Cook, a Warden at the King’s Head, Seven Dials; Alexander Strahan, another member of the Rummer; and John Collins, a member of the Baptist’s Head in Chancery Lane.204 Further ‘possibles’ include Raphael Dubois (a Rev Mr Dubois was a member of the Horn); William Booth (a ‘Mr. Booth’ was a member of the Masons’ Arms in Fulham); and William Lloyd, a member of the influential lodge at the Nag’s Head and Star in Carmarthenshire.

Given the relatively aristocratic and affluent membership of the Rummer, Robert Vyner was probably ‘Robert Vyner of Swakely, Middlesex’, who had received a bond of £10,000 from John Lansdell of the Tower of London for the repayment of £5,250 in 1720.205 Thomas Vyner, his father, held extensive property assets in Uxbridge and Ickenham206, and these were later inherited by his son.207 He was only moderately active as a magistrate, and the LMA (MSes, Justices’ Working Documents) contain fewer than ten mentions of his activity as a magistrate between 1724 and 1730.

---

202 Now known as Solomon’s Lodge, No. 1, Savannah. Cf. W.B. Clarke, _Early and Historic Freemasonry of Georgia, 1733/4-1800_ (Georgia, 1924).
203 LMA: MSes, SP, JWP 16 November 1747.
204 _Flying Post or The Post Master_, 9 April 1719.
207 LMA: ACC/85/350 & 377 31 July 1741.
The June 1721 Intake

Around a third of the thirty-seven Justices of the Peace appointed in June 1721 subsequently appeared in the Grand Lodge lists of members, the majority having senior positions in their lodges, including two with Grand Rank:

- Sir George Markham  Warden, Sun, Southside, St Paul’s
- Grantham Andrews  Member, Old Devil, Temple Bar
- Alexander Chocke  DGM, 1727; Grand Warden, 1726; Warden, Horn; Member, Swan, Greenwich
- Christian Cole  Member, Red Lyon, Richmond; and/or Master, Vine Tavern, Holborn
- Samuel Edwards  Warden, Horn
- Richard Gifford  Warden, Castle Tavern, St. Giles
- John Hedges  Member, Bedford Head, Covent Garden
- Samuel Horsey  Member, Horn
- John Rotheram  Warden, Anchor, Duchy Lane, the Strand
- Joseph Rouse  Member, Bear & Harrow, Butcher Row
- Francis Sorrel  Grand Warden (1723 & 1724), Horn
- Henry Turner  Member, Vine Tavern, Holborn
- George Watkins  Member, Rummer, Charing Cross

In addition to Edward Wilson, Payne’s fellow assistant at the Leather Office in 1712, Francis Sorrel, his superior, was another colleague that Payne may have introduced to the Horn and to Freemasonry. Sorrel became a Grand Warden in 1723-4. He may have been a second-generation Huguenot émigré and, like Desaguliers, had become anglicised: in March 1729, Sorrel was recorded as one of the Gentleman of the Vestry at the new church of St John the Evangelist in Horseferry Road in Westminster. By the 1730s, Sorrel had semi-retired.

---

208 A full list of appointees to the Bench was given in the *Evening Post*, 10 June 1721, *Daily Post*, 12 June 1721, and other newspapers printed that month.

209 Colonel Watkins was a member of the Rummer in 1723 and 1725.


211 *Daily Journal*, 13 March 1729.
Lodge Minutes for 28 August 1730 indicate that he was frequently in the country and unable to attend meetings of the Charity Committee. Consequently, Payne assumed much of his workload. Sorrel died at his house in New Palace Yard, Westminster on 7 April 1743. 212

Alexander Chocke (16.? -1737) 213, reappointed a magistrate in 1721, became a Grand Warden in 1726 and DGM in 1727. 214 Chocke held the government post of Clerk of the Debentures at the Exchequer, a lucrative role yielding some £300 - £400 per annum. The position was in the gift of the Earl of Halifax, who held the title of Auditor of the Exchequer. Chocke had been in the post since around 1720 215, having been promoted from Clerk of the Registers in the same department. 216 He had served in the civil service since the turn of the century: his obituary in the Daily Gazetteer in 1737 recorded ‘near forty years’ of service. 217

In August 1709, Chocke had been selected as chief clerk to the commissioners ‘appointed to state the debts of his late Majesty King Wm. Ill’. 218 Treasury papers record his receipt of a warrant for £230 11s 4½d for expenses and £150 for his and his co-clerk’s salaries. He was mentioned again in 1717, ‘praying payment of £330 for 2¼ years’ salary from midsummer 1708 to Michelmas 1711’ 219, an annual salary rate of £120. Chocke featured in Parliamentary committees and in Treasury correspondence throughout the 1720s and 1730s, and his letters appeared regularly in the Official Gazette. 220

Chocke’s court cases in Middlesex and Westminster were reported extensively and suggest that he was a solidly loyal jurist. He was one of a number of JPs,

including Blackerby, who were sued by the collectors of the Westminster turnpike seeking compensation from the magistrates over their alleged false jurisdiction. The turnpike collectors lost their action, but similar legal actions were a common problem for the more active magistrates, and explain why many chose relative inactivity.

Chocke was particularly active in London Freemasonry. He was a member of three lodges: the Horn in Westminster, close to his home at New Palace Yard; the Swan at Greenwich, where Thornhill and Highmore were also members; and, with Blackerby, the Castle in Highgate. Within Grand Lodge he was recorded in the Minutes as having ‘waited on Dalkeith’ at the time of his appointment as Grand Master, and provided the thanks of Grand Lodge for his ‘consents’. Chocke was Grand Warden under Lord Inchiquin, with Cowper as Deputy Grand Master; and DGM himself under Coleraine, with Blackerby and Highmore as his Wardens. He was also a frequent attendee as a past Grand Officer.

With William Burdon, his fellow Grand Warden in 1726 and another Middlesex and Westminster magistrate, Chocke acted as a squire to Sir William Morgan at his investiture as a Knight of the Bath in June 1725, presumably at the invitation of Earl Halifax, Morgan’s brother-in-law and Chocke’s patron at the Exchequer. A substantial minority of attendees at the investiture were Freemasons. Investees included the Duke of Montagu (the Grand Master of the Order), the Duke of Richmond, the Earl of Deloraine and the Earl of Inchiquin. And in addition to Chocke and Burdon, those appointed squires embraced, among other Freemasons, Martin Folkes and Thomas Hill (attending the Duke of Richmond), Col. Francis Columbine (attending Lord Malpas), Robert Barry (Lord Inchiquin), John James (Viscount Tyrconnel), and Daniel Houghton (the Earl of Suffolk).

221 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 61.
222 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 71-6, 80-5, 88, 90-3, 103, 186, 197 and 204.
223 Cf. LMA: MSes, SP, JWP, 1 September 1725; WSES, SP, JWP, 1 October 1726.
224 John Pine, The procession and ceremonies observed ... at the installation ... of the Knights of the Bath (London, 1734). The details were widely reported in the press. Cf. for example, Daily Journal, 22 June 1725.
225 Several other squires were ‘possible/probable’ Freemasons, with the same name as those recorded in the membership lists provided to Grand Lodge.
Perhaps not coincidentally, given Montagu’s position as Grand Master of the Order, Joseph Highmore (1692-1780), was selected to paint the Knights of the Bath in their regalia.\textsuperscript{226} Highmore, a Member of the Swan at Greenwich and later a Grand Warden, was a lawyer turned society painter. He had sought to emulate his uncle, Thomas Highmore, Serjeant-Painter to the King, to whom Sir James Thornhill, Grand Warden in 1728, had been apprenticed, and whom Thornhill succeeded in 1720.\textsuperscript{227}

Portraiture and art more generally, played a largely positive role as a means of enhancing and reinforcing the status of Freemasonry’s central figures, and of Freemasonry itself. And despite occasional Tory sniping\textsuperscript{228}, Freemasonry was on balance also depicted positively in the press, at least through to the mid-1730s. One exception was the coverage given to the Gormogons, an organisation associated with the Duke of Wharton, created after his departure from Grand Lodge and discussed in chapter five.

Hogarth’s works have been discussed above. Other artists, including Highmore, Thornhill and Cary Creed, whose etchings of Earl Pembroke’s ‘marble antiquities’ were widely advertised from 1730 to 1732\textsuperscript{229}, also benefited from commissions from affluent fellow Freemasons. And the same was true for many theatrical performers and musicians. As a consequence, such artists had a motive to join Freemasonry in order to be close to potential patrons, and they would have been encouraged, at least implicitly, to offer a positive view of the Craft. The membership list of the Bear and Harrow lodge in the 1730s, with its combination of aristocrats, affluent professionals and theatrical artists and painters, supports

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{226}] Highmore worked with Thornhill at the Royal Naval Hospital and attended his St Martin’s Lane Art Academy alongside Hogarth. All three donated paintings to the Foundling Hospital; Highmore’s \textit{Hagar and Ishmael} decorated the Court Room.
\item[\textsuperscript{227}] Thornhill was Master of the lodge at the Swan.
\item[\textsuperscript{228}] There were relatively few negative reports in the Tory press. An online search of \textit{Fog’s Weekly Journal} and \textit{Mist’s Weekly Journal} in \textit{Burney} for the decade 1721-31 using the search terms ‘Freemason’ and ‘Free and Accepted Mason’ revealed only five news stories, none of which were pejorative.
\item[\textsuperscript{229}] Cary Creed (1708-1775), Robert West, and other artists, were members of the Old King’s Arms lodge.
\end{itemize}
the argument; and a similar argument has been advanced by John Lord in relation to the membership of the Spalding Society.

Biographical information from local archives and contemporary press reports of other JPs from the 1721 intake, confirm the conservative and pro-establishment nature of the Masonic members of the bench. Sir George Markham, the Warden at the Sun by St Paul’s, was a barrister and member of the Middle Temple. Grantham Andrews was the second son of the affluent Sir Jonathan Andrews of Kempton Park. And Christian Cole had been a diplomat and the Secretary Resident in Venice until 1715. He later worked for the controversial York Buildings Company.

Samuel Edwards was one of the Deputy Tellers at the Exchequer and an MP for Great Wenlock, Shropshire. He was appointed Constable to the Tower of London in 1725. John Hedges, another MP, represented St Michael, Cornwall. He was appointed envoy to Sardinia in 1726 and, in 1728, became Treasurer to the Prince of Wales, to whom he was close. The position was ‘computed worth £4,000 per annum’.

Colonel Samuel Horsey had been a trustee and provisional governor of the South Carolina colony; he was made governor in 1738. He had previously served as

---

230 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 177-8.
232 Cambridge: Cambridgeshire County Record Office: CON/3/1/3/10, 11, 16 & 17 12 May 1731.
233 Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 14 February 1719; and London Evening Post, 25 March 1736.
236 Daily Journal, 30 September 1723; and Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 5 October 1723.
237 Evening Post, 19 February 1726.
238 '[12 February, 1728], Requiring by virtue of general letters of Privy Seal of 1727, June 26, the issue of 3,000l. to John Hedges, Esq., Treasurer or Receiver General to Frederick, Prince of Wales, for the Prince’s disposal.’: William A. Shaw (ed.), Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers - King’s Warrant Book XXIX (London, 1897), vol. 1, p. 271; also, British Journal or The Censor, 14 December 1728.
239 William A. Shaw (ed.), Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers (London, 1897), vol. 1, p. 120.
a director of the York Buildings Company.\textsuperscript{241} And Colonel George Watkins had been a Major in Sir Robert Rich’s regiment of Foot.\textsuperscript{242} He was later appointed Governor of South Sea Castle\textsuperscript{243}, Henry VIII’s fort at the mouth of the Solent.

Joseph Haynes, a member of the Ship without Temple Bar, was another probable JP. Although not listed in the 1719 or 1721 intake, a ‘Joseph Hayne’ appears in the Middlesex Sessions, General Orders of the Court, for 7 December 1722. Hayne(s) was one of several magistrates (including Street, Cowper, Blackerby, Sorrel and Delafaye), appointed to inquire into the collection of the municipal rates and the ‘great Sumes of money on pretence of cleaning the Streets’ by the Burgesses within the Liberty of Westminster.\textsuperscript{244} ‘Gwin Vaughan’, another magistrate in the same list, may have been the William Vaughan who was a member of the Rummer in Queen Street, Cheapside and a Grand Warden in 1739.

The August 1724 Intake

Among the 54 appointees to the Westminster bench listed on 25 August 1724 were up to 14 Freemasons, including the Hon. Col. Daniel Houghton, then a company commander in the 1\textsuperscript{st} Foot Guards, later Grand Warden (1725) and an appointee to Grand Lodge’s Charity Committee.\textsuperscript{245} The Masonic intake comprised:

- Col. Daniel Houghton        GW, 1725; Master, Rummer, Charing Cross
- Joseph Gascoigne           Warden, Rummer, Henrietta Street and/or Member, Ship, Royal Exchange
- Robert Jackson             Member, King’s Arms, St Paul’s; and/or Member, One Tun, Noble Street; and/or Member, St Paul’s Head, Ludgate Street;
- William Jones              Warden, Queens Head, Hollis Street
- John Nichols               Member, Crown, Royal Exchange

\textsuperscript{241} Shaw, \textit{Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers}, vol. 1, p. 486.
\textsuperscript{244} LMA: MJ/SP/1722.
\textsuperscript{245} \textit{Evening Post}, 25 August 1724.
• Francis Reynolds  Member, Rrummer, Charing Cross
• Col. Edward Ridley  Member, Horn Tavern
• John Smith  Member, Queen’s Head, Knaves Acre and/or Member, Vine, Holborn; or Castle & Leg, Holborn
• Bowater Vernon  Member, Bedford Head, Covent Garden

And other ‘possible’ Freemasons included:

• Edward Harrison  Black Posts, Great Wild Street
• Thomas Jackson  Nag’s Head, Princes Street, and/or King’s Arms, St Paul’s
• Ralph Radcliff  Ship without Temple Bar
• John Kirby  Black Posts, Great Wild Street
• Simon Mitchel  Horn, Westminster

Not within the above list, but recorded as a magistrate in 1723, was Stephen Hall. This was probably Dr Stephen Hall, the Master of the Ship, Bartholomew Lane, and the Master of the Globe, Moorgate, who later deputised as Grand Warden for Sir Thomas Prendergast (1702-60).

The November 1727 Intake

The 22 November 1727 intake represented one of the largest groups of new appointees. Headed by Charles Lennox, 2nd Duke of Richmond, Grand Master in 1725, the list contained around 130 names. Clearly identifiable Freemasons comprise a relatively small percentage of the total number relative to previous years. However, the following definite, probable or possible members can be noted:

• Sir William Billers  Rrummer, Charing Cross
• Sir George Cook  Rrummer, Charing Cross
• James Cook  Rrummer, Charing Cross, and/or Swan Tavern, Fish Street Hill

---
246 Daily Courant, 4 April 1724.
247 Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 27 July 1723.
248 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 13 (Bartholomew Lane); p. 30 (Globe); and p. 70 (GW).
249 Evening Journal, 4 December 1727.
- John Cress
  Warden, Coach & Horses, Maddox Street
- Ambrose Dickens
  Vine Tavern, Holborn
- Charles Hayes\textsuperscript{250}
  Rummer, Charing Cross
- John Hicks
  Mitre, Reading
- Samuel Lambert
  Green Lettice, Brownlow Street, and/or Swan Tavern, Fish Street Hill, and/or King’s Head, Pall Mall
- William Lock
  Queens Arms, Newgate Street
- Richard Makdowal\textsuperscript{251}
  King’s Arms, St Paul’s
- Thomas Medlicott\textsuperscript{252}
  Horn, Westminster
- James Naish
  Steward, lodge unknown
- Henry Norris
  Cheshire Cheese, Arundel Street
- John Oakley\textsuperscript{253}
  Bedford Head, Covent Garden
- Andrew Osborn
  Swan on Fish Street Hill
- Col. Thomas Paget\textsuperscript{254}
  Horn, Westminster
- Richard Parsons\textsuperscript{255}
  Kings Arms, New Bond Street
- John Savage
  Goat at the Foot of the Haymarket
- Samuel Savill
  Cock & Bottle, Little Britain
- Barwell Smith
  Red Lyon, Richmond
- John Smith
  Griffin, Newgate Street, and/or other lodges
- William Thompson
  Mitre Tavern, Covent Garden
- Henry Vincent
  Bedford Head, Covent Garden
  Street Hill and/or Three Tuns & Bull’s Head

The two names that head the list once again demonstrate the political and social characteristics of those made magistrates. Sir William Billers (1689-1745), was

\textsuperscript{250} Charles Hayes (1676-1760), was elected a member of the Court of Assistants for the Royal African Company in 1721. A traveller and geographer, he became Deputy Governor in 1733 and remained such until the dissolution of the company in 1752. The company was involved in the slave trade until 1731 when it diversified to trade ivory and gold. Hayes was a mathematician and a member of Gray’s Inn. He wrote the \textit{Treatise of Fluxions, An Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy} (London, 1704), one of the first books to explain Newton’s calculus.

\textsuperscript{251} Written as ‘Macdoughell’ in the Grand Lodge lists.

\textsuperscript{252} Thomas Medlicott was a member of the Commission for Building Fifty Churches. He was also a Commissioner of the Revenue in Ireland, appointed 31 May 1716, and a Knight of the Shire (for Milborne Port, Somerset) in the first parliament of George II.

\textsuperscript{253} Written as ‘Oakey’ in the \textit{Evening Journal}.

\textsuperscript{254} Written as ‘Pagett’ in the Grand Lodge lists.

\textsuperscript{255} Possibly the son of Richard Parsons (1642-1711), an ecclesiastical judge and antiquary.
depicted by Rogers as a member of the ‘big bourgeoisie of Hanoverian London’.\textsuperscript{256} A stalwart of the Haberdashers’ company, a City Sheriff in 1721 and an Alderman in 1722, Billers became Lord Mayor in 1734.\textsuperscript{257} He commanded the Honourable Artillery Company, the oldest regiment in the British army, considered a bulwark against the London mob\textsuperscript{258}, and the ‘Blue regiment of Train’d-Bands’, one of six such regiments in the London militia under the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor. Billers was also sworn a Privy Councillor. His robust judicial approach is detailed in around 700 press reports of court cases between 1727 and his death in 1745.\textsuperscript{259}

Sir George Cook held a substantial estate at Uxbridge and owned a town house at Lincoln Inn Fields. He held office as Chief Prothonotary of the Common Pleas, the chief administrator of the Civil Division of the Court of Common Pleas.\textsuperscript{260} Cook was subsequently recommended (albeit unsuccessfully) as a knight of the shire for the county of Middlesex by the Duke of Newcastle.\textsuperscript{261}

It would be unjustifiable to claim that the relationship between Freemasonry and the Middlesex and Westminster benches was wholly interdependent. However, it is reasonable to draw the inference that many London Freemasons represented precisely the type of men the Whig government would have favoured on the bench as conformist and conventional upholders of the status quo. Cowper and Delafaye are pre-eminent examples.

A limitation of space has precluded an analysis of each and every magistrate identifiable as a Freemason. However, among those who were, Henry Norris (c. 1671-1762) should be singled out as the author of the eponymous ‘Justicing Notebook’.\textsuperscript{262} Ruth Paley’s comment on Norris provides an indication of his personal and political motivation, and it is useful to quote at length:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{257} John Noorthouck, \textit{A New History of London} (London, 1773), pp. 889-93.
\textsuperscript{258} \textit{Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer}, 25 February 1727.
\textsuperscript{259} On-line search of the Burney Collection, 20 June 2010.
\textsuperscript{260} ‘Proceeding of the Old Bailey’, 16 April 1740. The \textit{Proceedings} are available online. This reference is at: http://www.oldbaileyonline.org/images.jsp?doc=174004160035, and was accessed 6 March 2010.
\textsuperscript{261} \textit{Evening Post}, 8 March 1722.
\end{flushright}
Norris [like his father and grandfather] became a merchant; in addition to his Hackney property, he also held lands in Southwark and the City. We know little of his character and personal life, although his justicing activities certainly suggest a man of somewhat harsh and authoritarian views. He was a fervent supporter of the Whig government of the day: so much so that in 1731 he (along with Samuel Tyssen) was chosen to sit as a member of the notoriously packed jury that convicted Richard Francklin, publisher of the opposition journal, the Craftsman ... Becoming an active justice clearly gave Norris much power in the community [and] resolved all doubts about his social status. His conduct as a justice (which was, by contemporary standards, impeccable) enhanced his claim to gentry status still further, and one suspects that his reputation for integrity was just as important a part of his legacy to his descendants as his house and fortune. When in 1739 a list of 'Chief Gentlemen of the Parish' was drawn up, Henry Norris's name topped the list.263

Among Norris' contemporaries on the bench, Paley identified six ‘exceptionally active’ fellow magistrates in Middlesex. The six (of 78 in 1732) were responsible for just under half of the c. 2,000 recognizances returned to the general and quarter sessions that year. To put this figure into perspective, the majority of Justices, over 70%, returned less than 25 each. The ‘active’ magistrates singled out by Paley comprised [Richard] Gifford264; [Valentine] Hilder265; [Richard] Manley266; [Colonel John] Mercer267; [Clifford William] Philips; and [Thomas] Robe.268 At least three of the six were actual or probable Freemasons: Richard Gifford was Warden of the Castle Tavern, St Giles; ‘Mr Manley’ a member of the Bedford Head, Covent Garden; and William Philips a member, later Warden, of the Rose & Crown, King Street, Westminster. It has not been possible to determine whether the others were also linked to Freemasonry.

In addition to Norris, Sir Thomas de Veil is also particularly notable as the subject of Hogarth’s Night, the final print in the series Four Times of the Day.269 He was appointed to the Middlesex and Westminster bench in 1729 and was one of the

263 Ibid, pp. IX-XXXIII.
264 Richard Gifford was part of the 1721 intake: Post Boy, 10 June 1721. However, this may have been a reappointment, cf. LMA: MSes, SP, JWP, 14 March 1715 and passim.
265 Valentine Hilder had been appointed a magistrate in 1727. Cf. British Journal, 9 December 1727. Cf. also, LMA, MSes & Wses, SP, JWP, 22 November 1727 and passim.
266 Possibly Richard Manley of Early Court, Reading, a JP for Middlesex and the City of London. Manley also had estates near Chester and (unsuccessfully) contested the seat for Chester City against the Grosvenor interest.
267 John Mercer, later a Colonel in the militia, was a member of the 1719 intake. Cf. Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 18 April 1719.
268 Thomas Robe’s appointment dated from the June 1721 intake of Commissioners: cf. for example, Post Boy, 10 June 1721.
first magistrates to sit at Bow Street. Contemporary press reports record that he sat alongside Blackerby and prosecuted many of the drink-related cases that followed passage of the Gin Act in 1736, the principal theme explored by Hogarth in Night. He was also the author of a guide for magistrates, published in 1747 but previously circulated in manuscript form.

Sugen in his ODNB entry for de Veil commented that his zeal was such ‘that the government turned to de Veil whenever it needed a magistrate’s services’. The government rewarded him accordingly: ‘for his extraordinary services in trying etc. at the Old Bailey, felons from Middlesex, Westminster and London - £100 by Mr Lowther’. De Veil later acquired government grants, an appointment as Inspector General of exports and imports at a salary of £500 per annum and, in 1744, he was granted a knighthood.

Finally, Martin Clare (16.? -1751), ‘one of his Majesty’s Justices of the Peace, and the Master of the Academy in [Soho] Square’ was a member of the Middlesex bench until just before his death. He was an influential member of the Old King’s Arms lodge, a Grand Steward in 1734, JGW in 1735 and DGM in 1741. An examination of Grand Lodge Minutes and of those of his lodge supports the analysis that Clare was one of the most important Freemasons in the decade 1733-43. He is discussed in chapter six.

**The Bench and the General Bank of Charity**

The significance of the Westminster and Middlesex bench to the operation of Grand Lodge is underscored by an analysis of the establishment and composition of the General Bank of Charity. Having put down the foundations for a new

---

270 The Bow Street Court opened in 1739-40.
272 Sugen, ‘Sir Thomas de Veil’, *ODNB*.
274 For example, £438 6s 6d on 8 May 1744: *King’s Warrant Book XXXV* p. 422; quoted in William A. Shaw (ed.), *Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers* (London, 1903), vol. 5, pp. 611-20.
275 ‘Warrant, dated 14 February 1738’ in *Customs Book XIV* pp. 262-3; quoted in William A. Shaw (ed.), *Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers* (London, 1900), vol. 3, pp. 623-34. It was also reported in the press, e.g., *Daily Gazette*, 6 April 1738.
276 *General Evening Post*, 18 May 1751.
277 LMA: MSes, SP, JWP, 27 January 1751.
The idea of a Charity Bank was proposed formally by Earl Dalkeith in November 1724, following a petition from Anthony Sayer, whether at his own instigation or otherwise. A committee was chosen by the Duke of Richmond at the next quarterly meeting of Grand Lodge in March 1725 to investigate and report. The key figures at the meeting, which took place at the Bell Tavern in Westminster, were Richmond as Grand Master, Folkes, his Deputy, and Sorrel and Payne, the Grand Wardens. The composition of those selected for the committee reflect in microcosm the combination of aristocrats, professionals and others who respectively headed and/or were senior members of London Freemasonry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Committee</th>
<th>Lodge</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Montagu</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>FRS, JP, SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Dalkeith</td>
<td>Rumer</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>FRS, Spalding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Paisley</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>FRS, JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T. Desaguliers</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>GM, DGM</td>
<td>FRS, Spalding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cowper</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>DGM, GS</td>
<td>JP, SA, Spalding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Prendergast</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Charles Lennox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Taylor</td>
<td>Bedford Head</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>FRS, Bridewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Daniel Houghton</td>
<td>Rumer</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>JP, SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Alexander Harding(^{279})</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Edwards(^{280})</td>
<td>Horn/Crown</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Taylor(^{281})</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>JP, Bridewell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{278}\) Member of the Court of Governors of Bridewell Royal Hospital.

\(^{279}\) Also written as ‘Alexander Hardine’. LMA: WSES, SP, 1 June 1717; MSES, SP 6 June 1719, 1 February 1722; and MSES, GO: 1 March 1722. Harding temporarily served as WM of the Horn while Richmond was Grand Master.

\(^{280}\) The National Archives Access to Archives database contains over 500 references to different ‘Thomas Edwards’ for the relevant period. However, by restricting the data to London and to ‘gentlemen’, it is probable that Thomas Edwards was either a barrister at Lincoln’s Inn (LMA: ACC/0891/02/01/0137-0138 27/28 Jan 1723) or at the Middle Temple (Lambeth Palace Library: AA/V/H/79/32/1-3 1721).

\(^{281}\) The LMA contain a record of a Giles Taylor being briefed to defend an action brought by the Earl of Uxbridge in the Court of Common Pleas: ACC/0539/122 29 January 1732.
Montagu, Dalkeith and Paisley, as past and prospective Grand Masters, endowed the committee with aristocratic credentials and the prospect of financial credibility. Each was associated with Desaguliers through the Royal Society, common membership of the Horn and shared antiquarian interests. Although not a member of the Society of Antiquaries, Dalkeith was prominent in the Spalding Society, where Desaguliers was a corresponding member and had lectured. His compliant relationship with Desaguliers is discussed in chapter five. All had worked with Desaguliers and Folkes in developing the new Masonic ritual and governance structures. In short, they were known and reliable. A possible exception among the aristocratic members was Sir Thomas Prendergast (bap. 1702, d. 1760): a young lawyer recently admitted to the Inner Temple and a cousin through marriage to Richmond, the then Grand Master. Prendergast had pressurised Richmond into providing him with patronage, and this was initially Masonic.²⁸⁴

The non-aristocratic section of the committee comprised those within Folkes, Desaguliers and Payne’s spheres of influence. Brook Taylor, the mathematician and physicist, was a colleague at the Royal Society who had served on the

---

²⁸² Other LMA records refer to Giles Taylor of Lyons Inn, Middx., Gent.: JER/HBY/53/6 24 May 1732 and ACC/1045/114 1750. The Daily Courant, 22 May 1725 and other press reports confirm that Taylor practiced at Lyon’s Inn, Inner Temple. That he was a JP is indicated by LMA: MSeS, JWP, MS/SP 2 March 1727. Giles Taylor and Brook Taylor were both Governors of the Bridewell Royal Hospital.

²⁸³ Possibly William Richardson (1698–1775), an antiquary, curate of St Olave’s Southwark (1723-6), and a member of the lodge at the Bull’s Head, Southwark. Cf. Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 28.

committee tasked with adjudicating between Newton and Leibnitz.\textsuperscript{285} Taylor had worked with Desaguliers at the Royal Society; he was close to Keill, Desaguliers’ mentor at Oxford\textsuperscript{286} and, alongside Folkes, was one of several FRS who were members of the Bedford Head, Covent Garden. Cowper and Houghton were both JPs on the Westminster bench. And with Dalkeith, Houghton was a member of the Rumber, Charing Cross, and Master in 1723. Houghton and Prendergast had been appointed Grand Wardens by Paisley. They had previously worked alongside Desaguliers, who was Paisley’s DGM. Houghton was an officer in the 1\textsuperscript{st} Foot Guards, appointed its second Major in 1724.\textsuperscript{287} He served alongside George Carpenter, who commanded another company in the same regiment. Harding, another army officer, was attached to Sir Charles Hotham’s Regiment of Foot.\textsuperscript{288}

The remaining members of the committee were Masters of their respective lodges: Giles Taylor, the long-standing Master of the Bell in Westminster; Thomas Edwards of the Horn and Crown, Acton; and William Petty and William Richardson, Masters of the Swan and Dolphin, respectively. Taylor and Richardson were also members of the Society of Antiquaries. The quorum was agreed at seven, perhaps allowing for the non-attendance of its aristocratic members; Cowper was appointed to the Chair.

Although formal Minutes can never give a complete picture of past events, the early \textit{Minutes} of Grand Lodge provide a strong flavour. The Charity Committee reported in November 1725 and outlined its proposals regarding accountability, control and fund distribution. Three propositions were made. First, a voluntary quarterly contribution would be made by each constituent lodge. Second, each charity distribution would be determined by a Grand Lodge standing committee and limited to members of ‘regular’ lodges, that is, only to those coming under the authority of Grand Lodge. Third, disbursements would be made only to

\textsuperscript{285} Sackler Archives; also Lenore Feigenbaum, ‘Brook Taylor’, \textit{ODNB} (Oxford, 2004; online edn., Jan 2008). Taylor was a brilliant mathematician and scientist; his published works arguably provided stronger support for Newton’s calculus than that provided by Newton himself. Cf. Brook Taylor, \textit{Methodus incrementorum directa et inversa} (London, 1715).
\textsuperscript{286} Sackler Archives.
\textsuperscript{287} \textit{Evening Post}, 4 July 1724.
\textsuperscript{288} An advertisement seeking the return of deserters was published in the \textit{Daily Courant} successively on 4, 5 and 6 August 1720.
members of at least five years standing, with payments of up to £3 each to be sanctioned by a standing committee without the approval of Grand Lodge.

Bureaucratically and politically, the key to management control of the committee would be the composition of the standing committee. It was suggested that its membership should comprise the Grand Master, his Deputy, the two Grand Wardens, and three other members of Grand Lodge nominated by the Grand Master. A Treasurer would also be appointed and regular accounts produced. An inner cabal of Payne, Folkes and Sorrel were nominated members, with Blackerby proposed as Treasurer. The apparent intention was to cement further the influence of Grand Lodge and, in particular, that of its inner core. That the composition of the committee was contentious was made clear in *Grand Lodge Minutes* of 21 April 1730 when Desaguliers:

> seconded the Deputy Grand Master in recommending the General Charity and made some proposals for the better regulation thereof but several Disputes arising thereupon, particularly concerning the Establishment of the Committee: Bro Cowper moved that the Original Report of the Committee might be read and ... after several debates it was resolved that the Committee of Charity should stand as at first agreed.²⁸⁹

Although accepted, the proposed composition proved impractical. Blackerby admitted that the absence of committee members meant that a ‘quorum can seldom be had for half a year and ... the timely relief of distressed brethren is thereby greatly obstructed’.²⁹⁰ Desaguliers agreed. Grand Lodge subsequently approved a new motion whereby twelve Masters of lodges contributing to the Charity be co-opted quarterly according to lodge seniority, ‘every Master of a Lodge to take the said Office in his turn for one quarter’, and that the required quorum be reduced to five, to include one Grand Officer. Specific beneficiaries of the Charity included several past Grand Officers - Sayer, Morrice and Timson - among a range of petitioners, successful and otherwise.

Over time, alongside the Grand Feasts and the regulation of subordinate lodges, the collection, administration and distribution of Masonic charity came to dominate the activities of Grand Lodge and, much as intended, became a principal

²⁸⁹ *Grand Lodge Minutes*, p. 121.
²⁹⁰ *Grand Lodge Minutes*, p. 129.
component of influence wielded. A letter from William Reid dated 2 December 1732 to Edward Entwistle of Bolton Le Moors, Lancashire, provides primary evidence of the importance of philanthropy within Grand Lodge.

I received your request and showed it to the Deputy Grand Master [Thomas Batson] who told me that he will never excuse any lodge after this from payment of the two Guineas to the Charity Box But however says that he will not press hard until you are in better circumstances for there is likely to be an order of the Grand Lodge that every new lodge shall pay five Guineas.  

The press recorded, probably accurately, the probable intentions of the founders in this respect:

Many people are in great Hopes that this mysterious Society that is honoured with several persons of high Rank as Members thereof having made a very laudable beginning will soon vie with those Societies that are at present the most famous for Charitable Deeds.

The role of the Charity Committee grew after May 1733, when Grand Lodge determined that an item of non-charity related business should also be delegated to the Committee for their determination:

A dispute arising between the Master, Wardens and some of the Brethren of the Lodge held at the Coach and Horses in Maddox Street ... was referred (nemine contradicente) to the next Committee for disposal of the General Charity.

And in December of that year, since ‘Business usually brought before a Quarterly Communication is increased to so great a Degree that it is almost impossible to go through with it in One Night’, it was proposed formally that:

all such Business which cannot conveniently be dispatched by the Quarterly Communication shall be referred to the Committee of Charity.

With this act, the power of the Committee was sealed. Unfortunately, no Minutes of its subsequent meetings are extant.

---

292 Daily Post, 2 January 1730.
293 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 227.
294 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 233-5.
Summary - Power and Patronage

The manner in which Masonic patronage was distributed to favoured members of the aristocracy, and to close colleagues of Desaguliers and Payne such as Blackerby, Cowper and others within their respective circles, suggests that Grand Lodge was controlled by a relatively small core of inter-connected individuals who were instrumental in devising and imposing a fundamentally new form of Freemasonry. The argument is supported by the Grand Lodge Minutes, and reflected in the new Regulations and Charges and Masonic governance structure.

This analysis largely displaces the conventional view that Desaguliers’ relationship with Anderson was the most important axis on which Grand Lodge turned. Instead, it is suggested, Desaguliers’ pivotal relationships were with other key figures within Freemasonry’s inner circle. This cohort shared with Desaguliers similar intellectual and political interests, including a powerful pro-Hanoverian attachment. And through their respective networks, they ensured that Freemasonry would receive support from the upper elements of society, the most overt application of this policy being those chosen to preside over Grand Lodge as its noble Grand Masters.

The aggregate number of Freemasons sitting on the Middlesex and Westminster benches has not been established and given the partial data available, and that Grand Lodge membership lists were themselves less than two-thirds complete, may never be clarified in full. Nevertheless, the presence of so many key figures from the magistrates’ bench, and the confirmation that contemporary Justices’ Working Documents record many sitting as colleagues both on the bench and on judicial committees, reviewing and determining the same cases, suggest that the influence of this network may be second in importance only to that of the Royal Society. In the light of their Masonic ranks and roles, the magistracy can be argued to have exerted a quasi-dominant influence on Grand Lodge from shortly after its inception until at least the mid- to late 1730s. It can also be argued that the pro-Hanoverian political characteristic of English Freemasonry and of Grand Lodge was fundamental to its success: demonstrating to the government that Freemasons were reliable partners in the promotion of the Hanoverian succession and safeguarding of its Whig administration.
There were, of course, other networks that influenced Freemasonry: those based on common membership of the professional and learned societies and of individual lodges, such as the Horn and the Bedford Head. A key relationship was that shared by Desaguliers with Martin Folkes, whose aristocratic and scientific connections were critical to the building of the new Masonic edifice. These themes are discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter Four

Martin Folkes and the Professional Nexus

This chapter explores the influence of Martin Folkes and other members of the professional, intellectual and social networks based on the Royal Society and other learned societies and professional organisations. It seeks to demonstrate that Freemasonry had a formidable and possibly unrivalled professional and social nexus and, intentionally or otherwise, captured many of the commanding heights of English society. The set of relationships was appreciated clearly at the time. As Bramston commented ironically:

Next Lodge I’ll be Freemason, nothing less,
Unless I happen to be FRS. ¹

The chapter does not focus on the ‘non-professional’ clubs and societies in which, in Kebbell’s words, ‘London was awash’.² As Clark has noted, a large proportion of such organisations were informal and short-lived, and membership data is therefore sparse. The area has also been the subject of considerable research in comparison with that of the professional and learned societies.⁴

Folkes and the lodge at the Bedford Head

Unlike Desaguliers, a Huguenot and a servant of the Royal Society paid on a piece-work basis, who, as Pumfrey noted, could be rebuked by the Council for any real or imagined disregard of his duties, Martin Folkes (1690-1754), was a privately wealthy and clubbable intellectual. The well-connected eldest son of an eminent Gray’s Inn bencher (also named Martin, a former Solicitor General and later Attorney General to Queen Catherine), Folkes was educated privately before being admitted to Clare College, Cambridge. His father’s death, when Folkes was

---

³ Clark, British Clubs and Societies, p.9.
fifteen, brought an inheritance, estimated by Stukeley at around £3,000, which permitted Folkes the luxury of leisured study and, in October 1714, marriage to Lucretia Bradshawe, an actress.  

Folkes’ intellectual abilities, particularly in philosophy and mathematics, led to his election as FRS in July 1714: ‘the progress he made … after he left the University, in all parts of Learning, & particularly Mathematical & Philosophical, distinguish’d him’7, and his sociability would not have hindered his selection for the Society’s Council to which he was elected in 1716. Folkes progressed rapidly and in January 1723, was made a Vice President under Newton, with whom he developed a close relationship and in whose place he presided when Newton was unable to attend Council meetings.8

James Jurin (1684-1750), believed that Newton had ‘singled [Folkes] out to fill the chair’.9 However, Folkes lost the succession to his fellow Vice President, Hans Sloane, the former Secretary, in a contentious election in 1727 that led to a temporary rift between the two. Later reconciled, Folkes was reappointed to the Council in 1729; he became one of Sloane’s VPs in 1732 and succeeded him on his retirement.

The club-like atmosphere of the Royal Society and of other professional and scholarly bodies provided a perfect milieu for the intellectual and amiable Folkes, who was also elected to the Society of Antiquaries in 1719 and later became a member of the Spalding Society. Members and colleagues at all three organisations joined Folkes within the Craft, where he was a leading member of lodges at the Bedford Head in Covent Garden10, and the Maid’s Head, Norwich.11

---

6 David Boyd Haycock, ‘Martin Folkes’, ODNB. Haycock mentions inter alia that Folkes’s uncle later became Archbishop of Canterbury.
7 Quoted by Haycock, Ibid.
8 Sackler Archives.
9 The quote is attributed to Dr James Jurin, Secretary of the Royal Society (1721-7): Dudley Wright, England’s Masonic Pioneers (Whitefish, 2003), p. 98. Jurin dedicated the 34th volume of the RS Transactions to Folkes. They were close friends. Folkes had originally proposed Jurin FRS in November 1717 and both were Council members: Jurin, 1718, 1720-26; Folkes, 1716, 1718-26.
10 The full name of the tavern was the Duke of Bedford’s Head.
11 The Maid’s Head tavern was close to Folkes’ Hillington Hall estate, acquired in around 1678 when his father had married the daughter of Sir William Hovell. Norwich: Norfolk
When his intimate friend the Duke of Richmond became Grand Master in June 1724, Folkes became his Deputy, succeeding Desaguliers in the post. And just over a year later, Folkes was nominated to serve on the politically important and highly visible committee for managing the ‘Bank of Charity’. 12

Folkes’ attendance at Grand Lodge in the 1730s was sparse, partly because of his European travels and antiquarian studies, and he was present only on 14 May 1731 and 2 March 1732. 13 Folkes attended with similarly infrequency in the 1740s: on 22 April 1740, at the installation of the Rt. Hon. John, Earl of Kintore as Grand Master; 19 March 1741, at the installation of the Earl of Morton; and 23 March 1741, at the naming of the Rt. Hon. John, Lord Ward, Baron of Birmingham as the next Grand Master. On the last of these occasions Folkes was described in the Minutes as ‘PRS’, President of the Royal Society, a position to which he had been elected unanimously that year.

However, although not often at Grand Lodge, Folkes was an effective proselytiser for Freemasonry and actively worked his social and scientific connections. Although there is only limited primary evidence relating to his Freemasonry, archival data suggests that Folkes’ strong interpersonal relationships facilitated his reach:

1725. Thursday, 11th March. When we were at dinner the Duke of Richmond and Mr. Foulkes [came in] ... The Duke of Richmond was very merry and good company; Mr. Foulkes just mentioned my having found out shorthand, but nothing more was said on it then. I came to the Society in the coach with the Duke of Richmond, Mr. Foulkes, and Mr. Sloan and we talked about Masonry and Shorthand. 14

1725. Tuesday, 6th April ... to Paul’s Church Yard, where Mr. Leycester and I went, Mr. Graham, Foulkes, Sloan, Glover, Montagu ... There was a Lodge of Freemasons in the room over us, where Mr. Foulkes, who is Deputy Grand Master, was till he came to us. 15

Record Office: MC 50. The lodge was later the setting for the raising of Francis, Duke of Lorraine, at a meeting convened at Walpole’s Houghton Hall. 12 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 74.
13 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 204, 213; Grand Lodge Minutes 1740-58, pp. 3, 10, 17.
14 John Byrom, The Private Journal and Literary Remains of John Byrom (Whitefish, 2009). The journals were originally published in parts by the Chetham Society as Chetham Society Papers (Old Series), OS 32, OS 34, OS 40 and OS 44 (Manchester, 1854-7).
15 Ibid.
Charles Richmond, in his edited *Life and Letters* of the 2nd Duke published in 1911, described his forebear as ‘Martin [Folkes]’s greatest friend’. Indeed, the 2nd Duke expressed his affection and opinion of Folkes clearly and often. In one letter, Folkes was described as ‘one of my most intimate friends ... a gentleman of very good family, and one of the leading Savants of this kingdom’. And in another, the Duke wrote that:

this letter will be attended with one agreeable circumstance ... of introducing one of the most learned and at the same time most agreeable men in Europe to you, besides this he is one of the most intimate and dearest friends I have in the world, which I am vain enough to hope will not lessen him in your Excellency’s esteem. His name is Mr. Folkes: he is a member of our Royal Society and has been a great while our Vice-President, he was an intimate acquaintance of the great Sir Isaac Newton, for whose memory, as every man of learning must, he has the utmost veneration.

Letters from the Duke’s personal correspondence with Folkes also illuminate the proximity of their personal relationship:

Nothing but your goodness can excuse my laziness ...
To _Chanter vos Louanges_, Dear Foulks, is a very easy thing ...
The Duke of Montagu and all our friends here are very well.
I received two letters from you from Holland and Venice ... and I would beg you would continue writing to me now and then, and

for your absence, I do assure you, can never in the least diminish the sincere love and value, I ever had, have, & ever shall have for you’.  

Their friendship extended to their respective families:

You’ll give the Duchess of Richmond leave to bring Miss Folkes with her, if you allow her to dine at Claremount herself on Sunday. I shall have nobody else with me to trouble you with, and

---

16 Richmond, *A Duke and His Friends*, p. 252.
Mrs Folkes had been a distinguished actress ... she was one of the greatest and most promising geniuses of her time, and that Martin took her off the stage for her exemplary and prudent conduct. She was handsome as well.22

The Goodwood archives at the West Sussex Record Office contain other examples of correspondence between Folkes and his ‘most faithful and affectionate friend’. Similar material is found in the Royal Society’s archives.23

Folkes was integral to Freemasonry’s development in the 1720s and supportive of Desaguliers and Payne’s achievements within Grand Lodge.24 Jointly with Richmond, he promoted the Craft actively at the Royal Society, proposing at least eleven Freemasons as FRS. He may also have recruited up to ten FRS to join the Bedford Head lodge out of some 40 members, including John Arbuthnot, the physician, mathematician and author, whose circle of friends extended from Alexander Pope to Philip Dormer Stanhope, 4th Earl of Chesterfield.25

The Bedford Head mixed Fellows of the Royal Society with other establishment figures such as the Hon. Mr. Cornwallis; Sir Thomas Jones, JP; and Sir Charles Cox, MP for Southwark and Sheriff of Surrey (1717). And the lodge contained a relatively large proportion of other (probably affluent) financiers and merchants, including Messrs. Cantillon26, Varenne, Desbrostes and Botelcy.27

Despite having inherited the title in 172228, the Hon. Mr Cornwallis was most probably Charles Cornwallis (1700-62), 5th Baron Cornwallis, later 1st Earl, whose wife, Elizabeth Townshend, was the daughter of Charles, 2nd Viscount Townshend, the Whig Secretary of State for the Northern Department (1721-1730).29 Cornwallis’s brother-in-law, also Charles, was MP for Yarmouth, and a member of the lodges at the Devil Tavern at Temple Bar and the Fleece in Fleet Street. He

---

22 Richmond, A Duke and His Friends, p. 254.
23 See also, for example, ‘Part of a Letter from His Grace the Duke of Richmond, Lennox and Aubigne, FRS to M. Folkes, Esq’, RS Philosophical Transactions, 42 (1742-3), 510-3.
24 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 26, 37, 58, 62-3, 68, 74, 197, 204 and 213.
25 Data sourced principally from the Sackler Archives.
26 Possibly Richard Cantillon (1680-1734), a banker, investor and economist.
27 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 27. Note the Huguenot names.
28 The membership list of the Bedford Head was compiled in or shortly before 1725.
29 It is also possible but less likely that ‘the Hon. Mr Cornwallis’ refers to the Hon. Thomas Cornwallis, a commissioner for the national lottery.
was sponsored in the Lords in 1723 by Cornwallis, with the title Lord Lyn.\textsuperscript{30}
Charles Townshend became a Lord of the Bedchamber (1723–7), was appointed
Master of the jewel House (1730–39), and made Lord Lieutenant of Norfolk
(1730–38); he succeeded his father as 3\textsuperscript{rd} Viscount in 1738.\textsuperscript{31}

Sir Thomas Jones (16.?–1731) was appointed a Justice of the Peace for Middlesex
and Westminster in September 1722.\textsuperscript{32} There were three appointees on that
occasion, the second being Sir Henry Bateman, a fellow Freemason and a member
of the Rummer Tavern at Charing Cross. Jones, a barrister at Lincoln’s Inn, lived in
Boswell Court, fifty yards east of Southampton Row and a short walk to the
Bedford Head.\textsuperscript{33} He chaired the bench in 1724.\textsuperscript{34} He was also appointed Register
of the County of Middlesex: ‘a position worth £1,000 per annum ... in the gift of ...
the Master of the Rolls’.\textsuperscript{35} A Welshman by birth, Jones was the first treasurer and
secretary of the Society of Antient Britons, London’s first Welsh expatriates’ club.
His loyal address to George I on its behalf was rewarded with a knighthood in
1715.

Charles Cox (1660–1729), a brewer with substantial property holdings in
Southwark, combined commercial proficiency and political intelligence with
philanthropy and an interest in experimental science. Philanthropically, he had
been involved in supporting the Palatine émigrés travelling from London to the
American Colonies\textsuperscript{36}, where the government deployed them as a buffer between
the French to the north and the British to the south, and to Ireland, to bolster the
Protestant position in that country.\textsuperscript{37} He had also financed John Harris’s
mathematical lectures at the Marine Coffee House, Birchin Lane.\textsuperscript{38} Cox’s political
and commercial interests in Southwark, and their mutual Freemasonry, may also

\textsuperscript{30} Evening Post, 23 May 1723.
\textsuperscript{31} Linda and Marsha Frey, ‘Charles Townshend, third Viscount Townshend (1700–1764)’,
\textsuperscript{32} London Journal, 15 September 1722.
\textsuperscript{33} Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 15 September 1722.
\textsuperscript{34} Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 4 April 1724.
\textsuperscript{35} Daily Courant, 12 January 1731.
\textsuperscript{36} Cox would have known Keill in connection with the Palatine resettlement in America.
\textsuperscript{37} Of the 13,000 or more refugees that arrived in London, many (c. 6,500) were billeted at
Blackheath and in the naval ropeyard at Deptford. Cox sheltered around 1,400 others in
his warehouses at his own expense.
\textsuperscript{38} John Harris, Lexicon Technicum, 2 volumes (London, 1704 & 1710).
have given rise to his connection with Leonard Street, his future son-in-law, mentioned in chapter three.\(^{39}\)

A relatively large number of taverns and coffee houses in Covent Garden hosted Masonic lodge meetings. These included the Two Black Posts and Lebeck’s Head, both in Maiden Lane; the Mitre and the Globe, both in Globe Lane; the Cross Keys in Henrietta Street; the Apple Tree, Charles Street; and the Bedford Arms. Others included Bury’s Coffee House and the Theatre Coffee House, both in Bridges Street; the Shakespeare’s Head to the north east of Covent Garden; and its neighbour, the Bedford Coffee House, where Desaguliers lodged after leaving Channel Row.

Sharing a similar name, the Bedford Head in Southampton Street was to the south of Covent Garden. The tavern had a reputation as a ‘luxurious refactory’, and was celebrated for its food and gaming.\(^{40}\) In his imitation of Horace’s second satire written in 1733, Alexander Pope’s Oldfield, a notorious glutton who exhausted a fortune of £1,500 a year in the ‘simple luxury of good eating’ declared: ‘Let me extol a Cat, on oysters fed, I'll have a party at the Bedfordhead’.\(^{41}\) And in a later poem, Pope enquired: ‘when sharp with hunger, scorn you to be fed, except on pea-chicks at the Bedford-head?‘\(^{42}\) Horace Walpole also referred to the tavern, remarking in a letter to Sir Thomas Mann that eight gentlemen having enjoyed a jaunt in Covent Garden ’retired to a great supper prepared for them at the Bedford Head’.\(^{43}\)

---

\(^{39}\) There are two records of a marriage settlement between Sir Charles Cox, Gratiana Cox, one of his daughters, and ‘Leonard Streate of St Clemet Danes, Middx.’ held at East Sussex Record Office: AMS2241 15 & 16 May 1723, and Hertfordshire Archives: DE/Ru/74463 16 May 1723, respectively. ‘Street’ or ‘Streate’ was a member of the Horn, and a barrister at the Middle Temple (East Sussex Record Office: SAS-H/362 12 June 1719); he was also deputy to a commissioner in the Alienation Office (William A. Shaw (ed.) Calendar of Treasury Books (London, 1952), vol. 21, pp. 299-300. Cox lost several thousand pounds in a fire at his warehouses in 1714 and petitioned the Lords of the Treasury for relief: Joseph Redington (ed.), Calendar of Treasury Papers, 1714-19 (London, 1883), vol. 5, p. 20.


\(^{42}\) Alexander Pope, Sober Advice from Horace (London, 1737).

Such a culinary reputation, if borne out by fact, would have commended the tavern to Folkes, whose interest in dining was renowned and captured effectively in Hogarth’s 1741 portrait. However, belying its otherwise hedonistic reputation, the tavern was also the location for scientific lectures given by Desaguliers and James Stirling (1692-1770), among others.44

Certain of the connections between the members of the Bedford Head recorded in the 1725 Grand Lodge membership list are displayed in the following Table. Data has been sourced from the ODNB, Sackler Archives, and the membership rolls of the Royal College of Physicians and the Society of Antiquaries.

**Table 3: The Bedford Head Lodge - selected members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Titles and Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brook Taylor (1685-1731)</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Mathematician, Bridewell, Newtonian, Barrister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Pellet (1671-1744)</td>
<td>1712, FRCP</td>
<td>Mathematician, Newtonian, Physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Folkes (1690-1754)</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Mathematician, Newtonian, Antiquarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Machin (1686-1751)</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Mathematician, Bridewell, Newtonian, Astronomer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Arbuthnot (1667-1735)</td>
<td>1704, FRCP</td>
<td>Mathematician, St Thomas, Newtonian, Physician</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44 James Stirling (FRS, 1726, proposed by John Arbuthnot), was from 1725 until 1735 a lecturer, then a partner, at Watt’s Academy in Little Tower Street, Covent Garden.
45 Brook Taylor (1685-1731), the mathematician and barrister. Taylor was a member of the Royal Society’s Council (1714-7, 1721, 1723 and 1725), and preceded Machin as Secretary (1714-1718). Taylor was proposed FRS in 1712 by Keill; he subsequently worked closely with both Hauksbee and Desaguliers.
46 A Governor of the Royal Bridewell Hospital.
47 He was also a member of the committee appointed by the Royal Society to ‘adjudicate’ between Newton and Leibnitz over the invention of calculus.
48 Thomas Pellet(t) was a Council member of the Royal Society (1713, 1715-6, 1719, 1724 and 1726). He was proposed FRS by William Jones. Elected FRCP in 1716, Pellet was President of the RCP from 1735-9. He co-edited (with Folkes) Newton’s The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms (London, 1728).
49 Folkes was a Royal Society Council member (1716, 1718-26, 1729-30), Vice President (1722-3) and President (1741-52). He was elected to the French Academy (in 1742), and to the Society of Antiquaries (in 1720), and was its President from 1750-4.
50 John Machin, Professor of Astronomy at Gresham College from 1713-1751, was Secretary of the Royal Society from 1718-1747, a Council member from 1717-1730, and a VP from 1741. He was also appointed to the committee to ‘adjudicate’ between Newton and Leibnitz.
51 Arbuthnot was a Council member in 1706, 1708-14, 1716 and 1726-7.
52 A Governor of St Thomas’s Hospital.
Folkes and Desaguliers were each elected to the Royal Society in 1714. Their relationship and their mining of friends and colleagues both within the Royal Society and among the antiquarian community was in parallel to the activities of Cowper, Blackerby and Payne with respect to the Middlesex and Westminster bench discussed in chapter three above.

The Royal Society and the Horn Tavern

The number and proportion of those members of the Bedford Head who were FRS was second only to that of the Horn, where Desaguliers was a member alongside Richmond and Montagu, both of whom were friends of Folkes, and with whom they maintained an active scientific and social correspondence. In the 1720s, at

William Rutty (1687-1730)\textsuperscript{53} FRS 1720, FRCP Physician, Barrister
George Pile (16.?-1753) \textsuperscript{54} FRCP Physician
James Vernon (1677-1756) \textsuperscript{54} FRS 1702 Commissioner for Excise, Clerk of Council, JP
Hewer E. Hewer (1692-1728) \textsuperscript{55} FRS 1723 Antiquarian
Hon. John Trevor (1692-1753) \textsuperscript{56} FRS 1728 Barrister (KC, Judge), JP
Sir Thomas Jones (16.?-1731) Barrister, JP
Robert Gray (16.?-1731) \textsuperscript{57} FRS 1728 Hon East India Co., MP
Benjamin Holloway (1691-1759) \textsuperscript{58} FRS 1723 Cleric

\textsuperscript{53} William Rutty was proposed FRS by Pellet and Stukeley. He became the RS’s second Secretary in 1727.
\textsuperscript{54} MP for Cricklade (1708-10). He was the son of James Vernon, formerly the Secretary of State for the Southern Department. A ‘James Vernon’ is listed as a JP in LMA: MS/SP JWP 1 October 1714, 4 April 1715 and 11 October 1716.
\textsuperscript{55} Hewer Edgeley-Hewer was proposed FRS by Folkes. Born Hewer Edgeley, he was the godson of William Hewer, Pepys’ assistant, and heir to his fortune.
\textsuperscript{56} Proposed FRS by William Rutty; Trevor, a barrister, later inherited his father’s title, becoming 2\textsuperscript{nd} Lord Trevor.
\textsuperscript{57} Robert Gray died at Fort St George, Madras, India. He had been proposed FRS by three fellow Freemasons: George Parker, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Macclesfield; William Jones, who had been the Earl’s mathematics tutor and became a close friend; and John Georges, a member of the King’s Arms, St Paul’s. He was also a member (and SW) of the King’s Arms, St Paul’s Churchyard.
\textsuperscript{58} Appears as ‘Mr Holloway’ in the membership list. Possibly proposed FRS by Hans Sloane. If a member of the Bedford Head, his attendance would have been infrequent given that he lived and worked some distance from London in Buckinghamshire.
\textsuperscript{59} Folkes proposed Richmond for Fellowship of the Society of Antiquaries in 1736; in 1750, Richmond succeeded Folkes as President.
least 13 members of the Horn were FRS. Given that the lodge did not submit a membership return in 1730, the actual number may have been higher.60

In addition to Desaguliers, Richmond and Montagu, members of the Horn elected FRS included:

- the Hon. George Carpenter, proposed FRS in 1729 by Desaguliers, Folkes and Sloane;
- botanist and cashier-general of the East India Company, Charles Du Bois (1656-1740);
- Jean Erdman, Baron Dieskau (1701-67), French soldier and diplomat;
- Charles Du Fay (1698-1739), member of the French Royal Academy of Science, proposed by Richmond, Folkes and Sloane;
- Nathan Hickman (1695-1746), physician, elected FRS in 1725;
- Richard Manningham (1690-1759), physician and midwife, proposed FRS by Sloane in 1720;
- James Hamilton, Lord Paisley (1686-1744), proposed by Sloane in 1715 and subsequently a member of the Society’s Council;
- Charles Douglas, 3rd Duke of Queensberry (1698-1778), inter alia Lord of the Bedchamber to George I (1720-7), Vice-Admiral of Scotland (1722-1729), Privy Councillor (1726-8) and Gentleman of the Bedchamber to Frederick, Prince of Wales (1733-51); and
- George Stanley (?-1734), a merchant; he married Hans Sloane’s daughter, Sarah, and was proposed FRS by Folkes in 1719.63

Although no direct evidence has been located, Desaguliers and Folkes probably also persuaded and encouraged a succession of aristocrats to join Freemasonry.  

60 J.R. Clarke’s analysis of members of Masonic lodges who were FRS omits certain Fellows: Clarke, ‘The Royal Society and Early Grand Lodge Freemasonry’, AQC Transactions, 80, Supplement (1967). Cf. also Bruce Hogg (compiler), Freemasons and the Royal Society, an Alphabetical List of Fellows of the Royal Society who were Freemasons (London, 2010).
61 Also written as ‘Dieskaw’ and/or ‘Diescau’. Col. Dieskau was wounded fighting against the British colonial forces in Canada in 1755. He was captured and eventually repatriated, but later died of his wounds.
62 The Duke of Queensberry, who quarrelled with George II in the late 1720s, was among five of the Prince of Wales’s Gentlemen of the Bedchamber who were Masons. The others were Carnarvon, Baltimore, Darnley and Inchiquin.
63 Data sourced principally from the Sackler Archives.
Notably, four of the first five aristocratic Grand Masters were FRS: Montagu, appointed in 1721 (elected FRS in 1718); Dalkeith, appointed 1723 (elected FRS in 1724); Richmond, appointed 1724 (elected FRS in 1724)\textsuperscript{64}; and Paisley, appointed in 1725 (elected FRS in 1715). Maintaining the connection, many later GMs through to the late 1730s were also Fellows, including Coleraine, Lovell, Strathmore, Crawford, Loudoun, Darnley and Raymond.

\textit{Table 4: The Noble Grand Masters}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Masters</th>
<th>Birth/Death</th>
<th>Installed</th>
<th>Elected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Montagu, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Duke of Montagu</td>
<td>1690 - 1749</td>
<td>GM 1721</td>
<td>FRS 1718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Wharton, 1\textsuperscript{st} Duke of Wharton</td>
<td>1698 - 1731</td>
<td>GM 1722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Scott, 5\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Dalkeith\textsuperscript{65}</td>
<td>1695 - 1751</td>
<td>GM 1723</td>
<td>FRS 1724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lennox, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Duke of Richmond</td>
<td>1701 - 1750</td>
<td>GM 1724/5</td>
<td>FRS 1724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hamilton, Lord Paisley\textsuperscript{66}</td>
<td>1686 - 1744</td>
<td>GM 1726</td>
<td>FRS 1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William O’Brien, 4\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Inchiquin</td>
<td>1694 - 1777</td>
<td>GM 1727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Hare, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Baron Coleraine\textsuperscript{67}</td>
<td>1693 - 1749</td>
<td>GM 1728</td>
<td>FRS 1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James King, 4\textsuperscript{th} Baron Kingston\textsuperscript{68}</td>
<td>1693 - 1761</td>
<td>GM 1729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Howard, 8\textsuperscript{th} Duke of Norfolk</td>
<td>1683 - 1732</td>
<td>GM 1730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Coke, Lord Lovell\textsuperscript{69}</td>
<td>1697 - 1759</td>
<td>GM 1731</td>
<td>FRS 1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Browne, 7\textsuperscript{th} Viscount Montagu</td>
<td>1686 - 1767</td>
<td>GM 1732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Strathmore, 7\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Strathmore</td>
<td>1702 - 1735</td>
<td>GM 1733</td>
<td>FRS 1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lindsay, 20\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Crawford\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>1702 - 1749</td>
<td>GM 1734</td>
<td>FRS 1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Viscount Weymouth</td>
<td>1710 - 1750</td>
<td>GM 1735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Campbell, 4\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Loudoun\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>1705 - 1782</td>
<td>GM 1736</td>
<td>FRS 1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Bligh, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Darnley</td>
<td>1715 - 1747</td>
<td>GM 1737</td>
<td>FRS 1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Brydges, Marquis of Carnarvon\textsuperscript{70}</td>
<td>1708 - 1771</td>
<td>GM 1738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Raymond, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Lord Raymond</td>
<td>1717 - 1756</td>
<td>GM 1739</td>
<td>FRS 1740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{64} Richmond had a close relationship with several non aristocratic FRS. They included Folkes; Desaguliers, who later accompanied him to France and Holland; and William Stukeley.

\textsuperscript{65} Later 2\textsuperscript{nd} Duke of Buccleuch.

\textsuperscript{66} Later 7\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Abercorn.

\textsuperscript{67} Proposed FRS by Hans Sloane, Roger Gale and Desaguliers.

\textsuperscript{68} Grand Master of Grand Lodge of Ireland (1731 & 1735).

\textsuperscript{69} Later Viscount Coke and 1\textsuperscript{st} Earl of Leicester.

\textsuperscript{70} Later 2\textsuperscript{nd} Duke of Chandos.
Freemasonry’s ranks both within and without Grand Lodge were substantially populated with Fellows of the Royal Society. The flow went in both directions, with FRS becoming Freemasons and Freemasons being invited to join the Royal Society. Although the evidence is anecdotal rather than incontrovertible, Desaguliers, Folkes, and others within the Royal Society, could well have used the prospect of being elected to the prestigious Royal Society as a reward for suitable Masonic (and other) acolytes. In addition to John Beale (DGM 1721, FRS 1721), several other early Grand Officers and Fellows of the Royal Society could be placed into this category. They include John Senex (1678-1740), Desaguliers’ long standing Masonic and scientific publisher, and a renowned map and globe maker, elected FRS in 1728. Sir James Thornhill (1675-1755), appointed Serjeant Painter to the King and knighted in 1720, elected FRS in 1723, proposed by William Jones and Brook Taylor. The Hon. George Carpenter, elected FRS 1729. Dr George Douglas (..?-1737), appointed Grand Steward in 1731 and elected FRS in 1733, proposed by Sloane and others. And William Graeme (1700-55), the physician, elected FRS in 1730, proposed by Folkes and others. William Graeme and Martin Clare, FRS 1735, also later served as Deputy Grand Masters.

Other influential Freemasons also held senior office at the Royal Society. George Parker, 2nd Earl of Macclesfield, the astronomer and mathematician, was elected FRS in 1722. He served on the Council from 1723-4, and succeeded Folkes as President from 1752-64. Like Desaguliers and his fellow Freemason, Lord Chesterfield, Parker was a vocal proponent of the adoption of the Gregorian

---

71 Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Scotland (1738-9).
72 KT, 1738; Grand Master of Scottish Grand Lodge (1739-40); later, PRS (1764-8) and VPRS (1763-4).
* = Scottish Representative Peer
73 Parker studied with both Abraham de Moivre (FRS 1697) and William Jones (FRS 1711). He held the title Viscount Parker from 1721 until 1732, when he succeeded as Earl of Macclesfield. A loyal Hanoverian, he had been appointed Teller of the Exchequer (1719-death), where he would have met Blackerby, Chocke and Payne. He was MP for Wallingford (1722-7).
calendar, something Desaguliers had long-advocated, which was finally agreed by Parliament in 1752.\(^\text{74}\)

John Machin and William Rutty both served as Council members and successive Secretaries to the Royal Society. Machin was a Council member from 1717-30, and Secretary from 1718-47; he was Vice President from 1741. Rutty was joint Secretary from 1727-30, and a Council member from 1727-9. Brook Taylor preceded Machin as Secretary, serving from 1714-8; he was a member of the Council in 1714-7, 1721, 1723 and 1725. Taylor was also appointed to Grand Lodge’s key Charity Committee in March 1724.

Other Masonic office holders at the Royal Society include John Browne (16.?-1735), the chemist, elected FRS in 1721, proposed by Folkes and fellow physician James Jurin, a Council member in 1723 and 1725; and James Douglas (1675-1742), the physician, proposed by Sloane, and elected to the Council in 1714-5, 1717-8, 1720, 1724, 1726-8. William Jones was also a member of the Council (in 1717-8, 1721, 1723, 1725-6, 1728 and 1730), and Vice President in 1749; as was Sir George Markham (1666-1736), the barrister, proposed by Sloane in 1708 and elected to the Council in 1719. Erstwhile Council members included William Sloane (d. 1767)\(^\text{75}\), Hans Sloane’s nephew, proposed by his uncle and William Stukeley, and elected to the Council in 1725 and 1729; and Alexander Stuart (1673-1742)\(^\text{76}\), the physician and physiologist, proposed by Sloane in 1714 and elected a member of the Council in 1726 and 1730.\(^\text{77}\)

In short, Freemasons occupied the key position of Secretary of the Royal Society from 1714-1747, held the office of President from 1741-1768, and had a substantial presence on the Council and in the Vice Presidency without a gap throughout the period 1714-1770. The only person not acknowledged as a


\(^{75}\) William Sloane was a member of the lodge meeting at the Dolphin in Tower Street. His relationship with Hans Sloane was particularly strong given that Hans Sloane’s own son had died in infancy. He was married to the daughter of John Fuller, the Whig MP for Sussex, who was also proposed FRS by Hans Sloane. Fuller’s wife was Hans Sloane’s stepdaughter.

\(^{76}\) Stuart was physician to Westminster Hospital (1719-1733), to St George’s Hospital (1733-1736), and to the Queen. He won a prize from the Academie Royale des Sciences for his work on muscular motion in 1738; he was awarded the Copley Medal in 1740.

\(^{77}\) Data sourced from Sackler Archives and Grand Lodge Minutes.
Freemason, and who served as President after Newton, was Hans Sloane, whose view of Freemasonry was positive, who personally owned copies of the *Old Charges*, and whose much-supported nephew, William, was an active Freemason.\(^78\)

The Masonic connection descended from the Council through the ranks of the Royal Society and included other less prominent but still influential members. By the late 1720s and throughout the 1730s, FRS featured prominently across London’s Masonic lodges. J.R. Clarke in a forensic analysis identified twenty-four FRS who appeared in the 1723 Grand Lodge lists which, as noted, were less than two thirds complete, and a further sixteen FRS who later became Freemasons.\(^79\) He identified a further twenty-seven FRS in the 1725 lists, sixteen who were FRS at the time and a further eleven subsequently elected. In aggregate, just under half of the 200 or so London-based Fellows are identifiable as actual or probable Freemasons in the two decades to 1750.

As a function of his methodology, J.R. Clarke ‘disallowed’ those FRS whose later membership was not recorded by their lodges. He estimated that, by 1730, there were around 35 Fellows who were Freemasons out of a total of some 250, or c. 15%, down from c. 20% some five years earlier. However, not all lodges provided a list of members each year (including the Horn in 1730), and the actual number and percentage may have been greater than Clarke allows. Indeed, if the thirteen members of the Horn known to be FRS are added to Clarke’s total, the figure rises to c. 20%, and the probable proportion is likely to have been even higher, perhaps at c. 30%.\(^80\) Interestingly, Peter Clark, in his detailed study of English clubs and societies, estimated that up to 45% of Fellows were Freemasons.\(^81\)

Trevor Stewart devoted five pages to describing the importance of the Royal Society to Freemasonry in his Prestonian Lecture, reprinted in *AQC Transactions*.\(^82\)

---

\(^78\) It has been argued that Sloane was a Mason. However, even if correct, there is currently no evidence to support the statement.


\(^81\) Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, p. 448.

interests, but also points to a spectrum of personal relationships and mutual patronage, with Masons proposing fellow Masons for membership of the Royal Society and *vice versa*. In Appendix III of his paper, Stewart detailed thirty-nine FRS proposed for election by Freemasons during the period 1711-54. Although perhaps not exhaustive, the list underlines the number of Freemasons who joined the Royal Society. Stewart also commented that between 1723 and 1730, Fellows of the Royal Society were members of at least 29 different lodges.

A list of the proposers/co-proposers is detailed below. The number of Masonic candidates proposed for election by Sloane, in his formal capacity as Vice President and subsequently President of the Society but, possibly, at the request of Desaguliers, Folkes and/or other Freemasons, has not been considered.

*Table 5: Freemasons Proposing Freemasons as FRS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Lodge(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Folkes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1719-42</td>
<td>Bedford Head; Maid’s Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jones</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1711-40</td>
<td>Queen’s Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Stukeley</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1718-52</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Machin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1730-41</td>
<td>Bedford Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Pellet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1733-40</td>
<td>Bedford Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T. Desaguliers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1728-35</td>
<td>Horn; Univ.; Bear &amp; Harrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Rutty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Bedford Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Stuart</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1730-42</td>
<td>Rumer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraim Chambers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Douglas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>St Paul’s Head, Ludgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Georges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>King’s Arms, St Paul’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Queen’s Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lennox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Dick’s Coffee House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Manningham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Martin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Golden Lion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Montagu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Bear &amp; Harrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Nicholls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>King’s Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Rawlinson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Three Kings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
William Jones and William Stukeley

After Folkes, the two most prominent members of the above list are William Jones (1675-1749) and William Stukeley (1687-1765). Born in Wales, Jones, a brilliant mathematician, had the good fortune to become tutor to Philip Yorke, 1st Earl of Hardwicke, who later became Lord Chancellor. Through Yorke’s introduction to Thomas Parker, the 1st Earl of Macclesfield, Jones became tutor to Hon. George Parker, later the 2nd Earl, with whom he maintained a long and successful association. Having lodged with John Harris in the early 1700s when he first arrived in London, and embraced and expounded upon Newton’s theories, Jones was elected FRS in 1711. He was proposed by Halley. The following year, Jones was appointed by Newton to the committee tasked with ‘investigating’ the invention of calculus.

Jones, a member of the Queen’s Head in Hollis Street, was initiated a Freemason in 1724 or earlier. He was popular and enjoyed a wide circle of colleagues at the Royal Society, where he proposed or co-proposed around thirty Fellows. It is unlikely to have been a coincidence that among the many FRS who were or later became Freemasons, Jones was associated with a large number. These included James Cavendish (FRS 1719); Ephraim Chambers (FRS 1729); Robert Gray (FRS 1728); John Hope, 2nd Earl of Hopetoun (FRS 1728); George Parker (FRS 1722); Thomas Pellet (FRS 1712); Richard Rawlinson (FRS 1714); and Sir James Thornhill (FRS 1723).83 Jones was also a member of Folkes’ ‘Infidel Club’, derided by Stukeley in his Memoirs84, notwithstanding an invitation to membership, and more recently described by Force as group of ‘radical deists clustered around Martin Folkes’.85

---

83 Sackler Archives. Jones proposed or co-proposed over 30 FRS in total.
Although he studied medicine at Cambridge, Stukeley was principally a natural philosopher and a prominent antiquary with ‘a passionate Love for Antiquitys’. He later wrote that his ‘curiosity’ concerning Freemasonry was linked to his interest in ‘the mysteries of the ancients’, by which he meant the perceived antiquity of Freemasonry and its ‘pristine’ theology and ritual. However, his attachment to Masonry may also have been a function of his association with and wish to emulate Montagu and others at the Royal Society:

Providence brought me to an intimacy with the Duke of Montagu, who tho’ no scholar himself, had a fine genius and entertain’d the greatest opinion of me in the world.

Stukeley was made FRS in 1718, proposed by Edmund Halley and supported by Newton, with whom he was personally on good terms:

30 June. Went with Sir Isaac Newton to see the Coinage in the Tower. He set his hand in my Album;

25 Nov. I din’d with Sir Isaac Newton where we audited the RS Accounts;

13 Feb. Sir Isaac Newton presented me with the new edition of his optics. We discoursed about muscular motion.

Stukeley was elected a council member in 1719-20 and again in 1725. His interest in antiquarianism led to his co-founding and becoming the first secretary of the Society of Antiquaries in 1718, a role he held for nine years. In 1720, he was also elected FRCP, where he later gave the Goulstonian lecture.

Each of the Royal Society, Society of Antiquaries and the Royal College of Physicians offered avenues for Masonic proselytising and provided a reservoir of new initiates over the next several decades. The process would not have been compromised by the visibility of Montagu, Richmond and other aristocratic Freemasons who were or later became senior members of each organisation, and by the crossover of membership from one organisation to another. Stukeley’s

---

86 Stukeley, *Family Memoirs*, vol. 1, p. 32.
89 *Ibid*, vol. 1, pp. 60, 62 and 63, respectively.
90 William Stukeley, *Of the Spleen, its Description and History, Uses and Diseases* (London, 1722).
Society of Antiquaries, for example, met at the Mitre Tavern in the Strand ‘after the Royal Society had broke up’. 91 Held on a Thursday, the meeting was timed to accommodate the society’s many members who were also FRS.

Stukeley recorded in his diary entry for 6 January 1721 that he: ‘was made a Freemason at the Salutation Tav., Tavistock Street, with Mr. Collins, Capt. Rowe, who made the famous diving Engine’. 92 He was also present at George Payne’s Grand Feast in June 1721 when Montagu was chosen Grand Master. 93 Stukeley became Master of his own Lodge in December of that year. He recorded the event in his entry for 27 December: ‘We met at the Fountain Tav. Strand & by consent of Grand M[aste]r present, Dr. Beal, constituted a new Lodge there, where I was chose M[aste]r’. 94 An ironic entry for 14 January 1722 was also linked to Freemasonry: ‘At a qu’ly meeting where Bro. Topping repeated 30 incoherent words either forwards or backwards or by stops after once hearing them’.

Stukeley’s interest in Masonry endured. A diary entry in June 1726 documented his journey to Grantham where he ‘set up a lodge of freemasons, which lasted all the time I lived there’ 95; and in a letter to Samuel Gale, a fellow antiquary, dated Grantham, 6 February 1726, he recorded that he had ‘likewise erected a small but well-disciplined Lodge of Masons’. 96

Samuel Gale, and his brother Roger, have generally not been among those considered to have been Freemasons. 97 However, in addition to Folkes’

---

93 Stukeley Family Memoirs, vol. 1, p. 64.
94 Ibid, vol. 1, pp. 66, 133. The lodge records, if any, have not been preserved and no membership lists are extant.
97 Samuel Gale was Comptroller of Customs and a fellow member of the Spalding Society. Roger Gale was FRS (1717) and a member of both the Society of Antiquaries and the Spalding Society. He was MP for Northallerton (1705-13); Commissioner of Stamp Duties (1714-1715); and Commissioner of Excise (1715-35). He was also Treasurer of the Royal Society (1728-36), a Vice President from 1728, and a Council member (1718, 1720, 1722, 1724, 1726-1730). Stukeley later became the Gales’ brother-in-law, having married their
correspondence with Samuel Gale, a letter from James Anderson to Gale dated 26 February 1731 is also notable for its references to Masonic issues:

The inclosed is from Counsellor Edwards, of Lincoln’s Inne, the worthy warden of Horn Lodge, of which the Duke of Richmond is master. It is to get the bearer, (who is also a mason true), made a sound excise-man by your benign influence with your brother the commissioner. I am well informed of his moral character that it is very good.98

The letter was signed by Anderson as ‘your affectionate Brother’. Despite his absence from any extant membership records, the two letters suggest the probability that Gale was a fellow Freemason. If he was not, they underline that Free- Masonry enjoyed a widespread currency and positive reputation.

Stukeley’s decision to become a Freemason and his multitude of commitments to his various learned societies, provides an unambiguous example of eighteenth century networking. Having initially studied law, Stukeley turned to medicine and practiced as a physician in Boston, Lincolnshire. There he joined the Spalding Society and became friendly with Maurice Johnson (1688–1755), another lawyer and the Spalding Society’s founder.99 Johnson characterised the purpose of the antiquarian and literary Spalding Society succinctly: ‘we deal in all arts and sciences, and exclude nothing from our conversation but politics’.100

Stukeley subsequently returned to London. His interests in natural philosophy and antiquarianism led to introductions to Sloane, Samuel and Roger Gale, and ‘my good friend’ Folkes101, all of whom also joined the Spalding Society. He was also introduced to Edmund Halley, who proposed Stukeley for election to the Royal Society and supported his ballot to the Council, as did Newton, with whom had a close rapport.102 Among those later proposed or co-proposed as FRS by

only sister, Elizabeth, in 1739. It was his second marriage, his first wife having died in 1737.

99 Hewitt has put forward circumstantial evidence that suggests that Johnson was also a Freemason: A.R. Hewitt, ‘A Lincolnshire Notable and the Old Lodge at Spalding’, AQC Transactions, 83 (1970), 96-101.
100 J. Nichols, Literary anecdotes of the eighteenth century (New York, 1966), vol. 6, pp. 6-7. This version is a facsimile; the series was originally published London, 1812-6.
102 Haycock, ‘Martin Folkes’, ODNB; also Sackler Archives.
Stukeley were John Beale (FRS 1721); William Beckett (FRS 1718); William Rutty (FRS 1720); and William Sloane (FRS 1722).

Stukeley shared membership of the Spalding Society, the Royal Society, and the Royal College of Physicians with Richard Manningham (1690-1759), a fellow Freemason and member of the Horn. Like Stukeley, Manningham had read law at Cambridge and only later took up medicine. He was elected FRS in 1720 and FRCP later the same year.103 Manningham, an eminent obstetrician or ‘man mid-wife’, was knighted in 1721; the Princess of Wales was among his patients. He was an avid exponent of practical philanthropy and established a lying-in hospital next door to his house in St James’s, the precursor of the dedicated maternity unit and the first of its kind in Britain.104

Other Learned Societies

By the late 1720s, Masonic lodges had become popular meeting places and served as crossing points for contacts and relationships across a range of social and professional networks. Clark has confirmed that Masonic membership was spread far more broadly (numerically and socially) than any other early eighteenth century club105, and London’s Freemasons included scientists and intellectuals, and others from across the professional classes with shared membership of diverse learned and professional organisations. Such networks became self-reinforcing, as shared interests, friendship and patronage begat common lodge membership, and vice versa. Later examples of similar clubs or societies would include Lord Sandwich’s Egyptian Society, founded in 1741, among whose

103 Sackler Archives.
104 George W. Lowis et al (eds.), Midwifery and the Medicalization of Childbirth: Comparative Perspectives (Waltham, 2004), p. 103. Manningham was one of several doctors who investigated Mary Toft, ‘the Rabbit Woman of Godalming’, who alleged she had given birth to a litter of rabbits. The claim was exposed by Manningham and others as a hoax, but not before Manningham and the medical profession had been lampooned by Hogarth in his engraving Cunicularii, or the Wise Men of Godliman in Consultation (1726). Alexander Pope with William Pulteney also commented on the matter in Much Ado about Nothing: or, A Plain Refutation of all that has been Written or Said concerning the Rabbit-Woman of Godalming (London, 1727). Cf. also Sackler Archives.
105 Clark, British Clubs and Societies.
members were Montagu, Richmond, Stukeley and Folkes\textsuperscript{106}, and the Society of Dilettanti, formally established in 1734.\textsuperscript{107}

Freemasonry had adherents in many of the learned societies, with shared interests often providing a powerful common nexus. In this section, we consider in brief four such bodies: the Royal College of Physicians; the Society of Apothecaries; the Society of Antiquaries; and the Spalding Society, to which particular attention has been given. A reinforcing connection in each case was provided by the Huguenots, whose presence both in Freemasonry and in many professions was disproportionately influential. The influence of the Huguenots within Freemasonry and among the learned societies was considerable. However, although it should be acknowledged as important, the network is not discussed in detail herein.

**The Royal College of Physicians**

Freemasonry’s credibility within the Royal College of Physicians, and its intellectual attraction for physicians, would not have been harmed by the like of Thomas Pellet, William Rutty, Stukeley and Manningham, all of whom were prominent physicians and Freemasons, and by the presence of the Dukes of Montagu and Richmond, Grand Masters and Fellows of the Royal College. Cross-referencing the membership records of the College\textsuperscript{108} with those of Grand Lodge indicates that of around 210 FRCPs whose fellowship commenced in the period 1690-1740\textsuperscript{109}, around 60, or approximately one quarter, can be identified as possible, probable or actual members of Masonic lodges\textsuperscript{110}. Since only around two thirds of lodges reported the names of their members, and a proportion of FRCPs lived in the provinces, the actual proportion of London-based FRCPs who were Masons is likely to have been significantly higher.

\textsuperscript{106} Stukeley, *Family Memoirs*, vol. 1, p. 326.

\textsuperscript{107} Horace Walpole commented that although the nominal rationale for membership was having visited Italy on the Grand Tour, the real reason was to get drunk. Cf. Jeremy Black, *The British Abroad: The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (Stroud, 2003), paperback ed., p. 224. The book was first published in 1992.

\textsuperscript{108} William Munk, *Lives of the Fellows of the Royal College of Physicians* (London, 1861), vol. II.

\textsuperscript{109} There were 130 Fellows whose fellowship commenced within the period 1690-1740; a further 80 Fellows have no recorded commencement date but a recorded ‘end date’ between 1725 and 1780.

\textsuperscript{110} Freemasons were, of course, a smaller percentage of the total number of FRCPs. Those admitted before 1690 have been excluded from this analysis on grounds of age.
Identifiable FRCPs appear to have been members of around thirty different lodges. Among the most popular were the Crown behind the Royal Exchange; the Swan in Ludgate Street; the Ship behind the Royal Exchange; and the Griffin in Newgate Street. FRCPs sat as Master or Warden in at least eleven lodges and two served as Master of two lodges simultaneously: Thomas Hodgson, the Master of the Anchor & Baptist’s Head and the Sun, Fleet Street; and Stephen Hall, the Master of the Ship in Bartholomew’s Lane and the Globe Tavern, Moorgate. Cf. Appendix 3 for additional data.

**The Society of Apothecaries**

The Society of Apothecaries’ unpublished membership records suggest that by the 1730s, Freemasonry had become embedded within that organisation to the extent that some 102 probable and possible Freemasons can be identified in Grand Lodge lists from the 540 members of the Society admitted between 1700 and 1730: around 19% of the membership. Extending the data range to members of the Society admitted between 1700 and 1740, alters the percentage of probable and possible Masons to c. 17%, or around 120 out of just over 700 members. As with the Royal College of Physicians, since not all apothecaries lived in London, and not all lodges reported their membership, the actual percentage of London-based members may have been higher.

Certain lodges were particularly popular, including the Bell Tavern, Westminster; the Crown, behind the Royal Exchange; the Vine Tavern and the Queen’s Head, both in Holborn; the St Paul’s Head, Ludgate Street; the Ship behind the Royal Exchange; the King’s arms, St Paul’s; and the Griffin in Newgate Street, where apothecaries had sat as Master and Warden. Sixteen apothecaries were recorded as Masters or Wardens of twelve separate lodges. Identified ‘possible’ and ‘probable’ apothecaries were members of c. 40 different lodges. Appendix 3 contains a list of relevant names and lodges.

---


112 It should be noted in all cases that the misspelling of names, the absence or abbreviation of forenames, members sharing the same name, and the absence of corroboratory evidence, makes absolute identification wholly uncertain.
The Society of Antiquaries

Antiquary interest in Masonic ritual and its actual or faux origins, may have acted as a spur to Masonic membership, and each of the Society of Antiquaries and the Spalding Gentlemen’s Society included members who were prominent Freemasons. Within the Society of Antiquaries, Stukeley, the founding Secretary, was joined by three Grand Masters: Coleraine, who was also a vice president; Montagu; and Richmond. William Cowper, Grand Secretary and later DGM, was also a member, as was William Richardson, Master of the lodge at the Dolphin in Tower Street and, possibly, a member of a further three lodges. So was John Johnson, Master of the lodge at the King’s Head in Ivy Lane and a possible member of other lodges. In aggregate, around 40 antiquaries can be identified as actual, probable or possible Freemasons. This represents just over 16% of the total membership. Unfortunately, given the many variations in the spelling of surnames, the figure is not precise and may be either an over- or under-estimate. The following Table sets out the probable/possible Masonic members of the Society of Antiquaries and their respective lodge memberships.

Table 6: The Society of Antiquaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Masonic Rank</th>
<th>Lodge(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Anderson</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Horn, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Anstis</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Beckett</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Swan Ludgate Street; and/or Three Tuns, Newgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrine Bertie</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Rainbow Coffee House, York Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Booth</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Greyhound, Fleet Street; and The Blue Posts, Devereaux Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bridges</td>
<td>Grand Steward</td>
<td>Bear &amp; Harrow, Butcher’s Row; and The Castle, Highgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bryan</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ship Without Temple Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Busby</td>
<td>Grand Steward</td>
<td>The Rose Tavern w’out Temple Bar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

113 Anstis (also written as ‘Antis’), was Garter King of Arms.
114 Possibly Peregrine Bertie (1686-1742), 2nd Duke of Ancaster and Kesteven, or his son of the same name, (1714-1778), later the 3rd Duke. There was also a cousin and godson of the Duke with the same name who later married a Miss Payne of Chancery Lane, ‘a young Lady of considerable fortune’. Cf. Daily Journal, 26 November 1734; London Evening Post, 21 December 1736; and Daily Journal, 24 December 1736.
Thomas Clark          Cardigan, Charing Cross; and Queen’s Head, Bath
John Cole             Master              Vine Tavern, Holborn; and/or Red Lion, Richmond
Robert Cornwall       Wool Pack, Warwick; and King’s Arms, Strand (possible)
William Cowper        GS, DGM              Horn, Westminster
John Creek            King’s Head, Pall Mall
William Dawson        Crown & Anchor, St Clement’s Church
Francis Drake         JGW, GM (York)       Grand Lodge at York
Thomas Edwards        Warden              Horn, Westminster
Martin Folkes         DGM                 Bedford Head, Covent Garden; & Maid’s Head, Norwich
Alexander Geekie      Master              Cardigan, Charing Cross
Alexander Gordon      GM                  Queen’s Head, Great Queen Street
Henry Hare            GM                  Swan, Tottenham High Cross
John Hare             King Henry’s Head, Seven Dials
Charles Hayes         GW, Warden          Rummer, Charing Cross
Richard Hollings      The Rose Tavern w’out Temple Bar
Daniel Houghton       GW, Warden          Rummer, Charing Cross
John Johnson          Master              King’s Head, Ivy Lane; and/or King Henry’s Head, Seven Dials Coach & Horses, Maddox Street Red Lion, Tottenham Court Road Swan Tavern, Fish Street Hill
Charles Lennox        GM                  Horn, Westminster
John Montagu          GM                  Bear & Harrow, Butcher’s Row
John Nichols          GM                  Crown, behind the Royal Exchange
John Palmer           GM                  King’s Arms, St Paul’s; and/or Green Lettuce, Brownlow Street
Edmund Prideaux       Master              Maid’s Head, Norwich
William Primate       GM                  Swan, Tottenham High Cross
Benjamin Radcliffe    Master              The Ship Without Temple Bar
Richard Rawlinson     Warden              Rose, Cheapside; and/or Three Kings, Spitalfields;

115 Charles Hayes (1678-1760), the geographer and mathematician.
116 Col. Daniel Houghton.
117 Probably John Johnson, the barrister.
Richard Richardson\textsuperscript{118}  Warden  Dick’s Coffee House, Strand; and King’s Arms, Ludgate Hill
William Richardson  Master  Dolphin, Tower Street; and/or Swan, East Street, Greenwich; Bull’s Head, Southwark; Ship behind the Royal Exchange
Christopher Robinson  Master  The Ship, Fish Street Hill; and/or St Paul’s Head, Ludgate Street; King’s Arms, Careton Street
George Shelvocke\textsuperscript{119}  Horn, Westminster
Alexander Stuart  Rumer, Charing Cross
William Stukeley  Master  Fountain, Strand
Sir James Thornhill  GW, DGM  Swan, East Street, Greenwich
Samuel Tuffnall  Warden  Bell, Westminster; and/or Crown, Acton
John Ward\textsuperscript{120}  Anchor & Crown, Short Gardens
John Woodward\textsuperscript{121}  Crown behind the Exchange

**The Spalding Society**

The Spalding Society had been founded in 1710 by Maurice Johnson in Spalding, Lincolnshire. It was one of the earliest provincial societies for antiquaries, and its lectures and discussions later expanded to include the liberal sciences and education more generally. The membership was divided principally between those who were local and Lincolnshire-based, those living elsewhere, mainly in London, and honorary members, often from London, to whom membership was granted in return for corresponding with the society.

Over the thirty-year period from its founding through to 1740, the Spalding Society had approximately 250 members. Of these, just under a fifth can be categorised as probable or actual Freemasons. However, the proportion of those

\textsuperscript{118} Richard Richardson (1663-1741), botanist and physician. He was elected FRS in 1712.
\textsuperscript{119} Shelvocke was appointed Secretary to the Post Office.
\textsuperscript{120} John Ward (c. 1679-1758). Ward was Professor of Rhetoric at Gresham College (1720), elected FRS in 1723, and a member of the Spalding Society. Not the John Ward who was later a Grand Steward, GW, DGM and, as Viscount Ward, Grand Master. Cf. chap. 6.
\textsuperscript{121} John Woodward (1668-1728), the physician and natural historian. He was elected FRS in 1703.
members based in London was over half. Once again, the variant name spellings and duplication of names prevents the percentage figure from being determined with precision, and the above analysis may be an over- or under-estimate.\textsuperscript{122}

The following Table sets out the probable/possible Masonic members of the Spalding Society and their respective lodge memberships. It can be noted that among the London-based members who were Masons were Henry Hare, Lord Coleraine; Desaguliers; Folkes; Manningham; Stukeley; and Francis Scott, Earl Dalkeith.

**Table 7: The Gentlemen’s Society of Spalding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Lodge(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Anstis</td>
<td></td>
<td>University, Butcher’s Row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrine Bertie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rainbow Coffee House, York Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Churchill\textsuperscript{123}</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rummer, Charing Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Collins\textsuperscript{124}</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Boar, Fleet Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T. Desaguliers</td>
<td>GM, DGM</td>
<td>Horn, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Dodd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Horn, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Edwards\textsuperscript{125}</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>Horn, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ellis\textsuperscript{126}</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ship behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Folkes</td>
<td>DGM</td>
<td>Bedford Head, Covent Garden; and Maid’s Head, Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maid’s Head, Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen’s Head, Great Queen Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Grano\textsuperscript{127}</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swan, East Street, Greenwich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{123} The Hon. Colonel (later General) Churchill.

\textsuperscript{124} Viscount Falkland; d. 1732.

\textsuperscript{125} George Edwards - a ‘possible’ rather than a certainty.

\textsuperscript{126} Richard Ellis, MP for Boston.

\textsuperscript{127} John Grano, Handel’s trumpeter and a composer in his own right.
John Green\textsuperscript{128} Half Moon, Strand
William Green Cheshire Cheese, Arundel Street
Henry Hare GM Swan, Tottenham High Cross
John Jackson Warden Horn & Feathers, Wood Street
John Johnson Master King’s Head, Ivy Lane (and cf. above)
John King\textsuperscript{129} Master Rumer, Henrietta St., possibly also Antiquity and/or Red Lion, Richmond; King’s Head in Fleet Street
Jacques Leblon\textsuperscript{130} Crown & Sceptre, St Martin’s Lane
John Lodge The Ship, Bartholomew’s Lane and/or The Globe, Moorgate
John Lynwood\textsuperscript{131} The Ship without Temple Bar
Richard Manningham Horn, Westminster
George Markham Sun, south of St Paul’s
Thomas Mills, Jr. Not known
John Mitchell Ship on Fish Street Hill
Michael Mitchell\textsuperscript{132} Horn, Westminster
John Morton\textsuperscript{133} White Bear, King’s Street, Golden Sq.
John Perry\textsuperscript{134} Bear & Harrow, Butcher’s Row
John Roberts\textsuperscript{135} Mount Coffee House, Grosvenor St.
Francis Scott GM Rumer, Charing Cross
George Shelvocke Horn, Westminster
Edmund Stevens\textsuperscript{136} Master Mitre, Covent Garden
Alexander Stuart Rumer, Charing Cross
William Stukeley Master Fountain, Strand
John Tatham\textsuperscript{137} Queen’s Head, Knave’s Acre
John Taylor Warden Coach & Horses, Maddox Street
John Thomas\textsuperscript{138} Devil within Temple Bar

\textsuperscript{128} John Green, a physician (FRCP) and secretary of the Spalding Society.
\textsuperscript{129} Probably John King, later 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron Ockham. Another ‘John King’ was a physician and classicist.
\textsuperscript{130} Jacques Leblon, a well-known painter.
\textsuperscript{131} John Lynwood, a London merchant and vintner.
\textsuperscript{132} Michael Mitchell, a physician; a ‘possible’ Freemason.
\textsuperscript{133} John Morton, a cleric; another ‘possible’.
\textsuperscript{134} John Perry, an engineer.
\textsuperscript{135} John Roberts, a surgeon.
\textsuperscript{136} Stevens, a London merchant; Vice President of the Spalding Society; a ‘possible’.
\textsuperscript{137} John Tatham, a cleric; a ‘possible’.
\textsuperscript{138} ‘John Thomas’, a ‘possible’ member of three other lodges.
Charles Townshend  
Robert Vyner  
John Ward  
James Weeks¹³⁹  
Adam Williamson¹⁴⁰  
John Wilson¹⁴¹

Summary

This chapter has sought to provide a high-level view of the range of connections developed and maintained through different learned and professional societies. As in many organisations, the influence of key figures, such as Martin Folkes, William Stukeley and Richard Manningham, can be identified, and were probably at the core of the different sets of overlapping personal and professional associations.

The Masonic network based on the Royal Society has been explored in detail elsewhere and is covered only briefly. Those present in other professional organisations and clubs offer an opportunity for further research. Nonetheless, the networks and connections that have been exposed suggest that Freemasonry may have benefited from a unique and formidable professional and social nexus.

The identified relationships would have been enhanced by the crossover of fashionable and newsworthy aristocrats from the learned and professional societies into Freemasonry, and vice versa, particularly at the level of the noble Grand Masters at the head of Grand Lodge. The subject is discussed in chapter five below.

¹³⁹ James Weeks, an artist.
¹⁴⁰ Colonel Williamson, Deputy Lieutenant at the Tower of London.
¹⁴¹ John Wilson, probably the barrister; another ‘possible’.
Chapter Five

The Rise of the First Noble Grand Masters

This chapter analyses principally the influence of the first aristocratic Grand Masters to take the chair at Grand Lodge. It is argued that their titular leadership and well-publicised presence at lodge meetings and elsewhere acted as a spur to the expansion of Freemasonry into the professional societies, the military and other élite and aspirational groups in London and the provinces. With the active support of the Duke of Montagu and, in particular, the Duke of Richmond, Desaguliers and Folkes were instrumental in persuading and encouraging a succession of relatively prominent Whig aristocrats to join Freemasonry and head Grand Lodge. The move catapulted Freemasonry into London’s political and social consciousness and created what quickly became a fashionable club whose aspiring members could consider, correctly, that they were on the inside of one of the sets that mattered.

The chapter begins with a review of the role of the press in promoting Freemasonry and considers the importance of what might be termed celebrity aristocratic involvement in generating public interest. This section is followed by an appraisal of the first noble Grand Master, John, 2nd Duke of Montagu, which examines his Whig politics, affiliation with the Hanoverian court and potential influence on the military. Montagu’s immediate successors as Grand Master, the Duke of Wharton and the Earl of Dalkeith, are evaluated successively. Wharton’s inconvenient political sympathies and rebellious nature were at odds with those of Desaguliers and his pro-Hanoverian colleagues, and their reaction and the effective expulsion of Wharton from Grand Lodge underscored the otherwise generally pro-government nature of Freemasonry, and of Grand Lodge in particular. In contrast, Wharton’s successor, the Earl of Dalkeith, was wholly dissimilar: malleable and loyal.

The fourth noble Grand Master of Grand Lodge, Charles Lennox, the popular 2nd Duke of Richmond, set a pro-Hanoverian seal on early eighteenth century Freemasonry. Richmond’s political connections included the Duke of Newcastle.
and Robert Walpole. Moreover, his close friendship with Folkes and extensive cooperation with Desaguliers, together with his influence in Continental Europe, were significant factors in the development of Freemasonry as a political tool and its embrace by the Whig establishment.

Richmond’s successors, from James Hamilton, Lord Paisley, to Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, and beyond, are considered only briefly. However, although such successor Grand Masters can be regarded as having consolidated further Freemasonry’s public profile, they also speak to the increasing politicisation of the organisation.

Aristocratic Patronage

We make for Five guineas, the price is but small,
And then Lords and Dukes, you your Brothers may call,
Have gloves, a White Apron, get drunk and that’s all

The Song on Freemasons included in Love’s last shift: or, the mason disappointed, captured some of the fundamental components of the new Freemasonry that would have appealed to many potential members: an association with celebrated members of the aristocracy; apparent exclusivity; and clubbable, genial drinking. In contrast, Long Livers, a semi-scientific book dedicated to the ‘Grand Master, Masters, Wardens and Brethren of the Most Ancient and most Honourable Fraternity of the Free Masons of Great Britain and Ireland’, published in 1722, extolled the spirit of scientific research. The themes were often complementary, and many lodge members enjoyed scientific lectures as part of the drive for self-improving education that had become a prominent characteristic of contemporary culture. Freemasonry’s connection with this aspect of the scientific Enlightenment is explored in detail in chapter six.

Desaguliers and Folkes used their direct and indirect influence effectively, at the Royal Society and elsewhere. A succession of generally affluent, fashionable and influential aristocrats was encouraged to enter Freemasonry, and a momentum

---

1 A Gentleman, Love’s last shift: or, the mason disappointed ... (London, c. 1720). Note: Although 1720 is the generally assumed publication date, the content suggests that it was written and published later, probably c. 1722.
2 Harcouët de Longeville, Long livers: a curious history of such persons of both sexes who have liv’d several ages, and grown young again (London, 1722).
developed. Following Montagu’s agreement to become Grand Master and in the wake of Wharton’s departure, Freemasonry began a lengthy period of public association with the Whig aristocracy. Successive aristocrats invited their friends to join, and set an example that encouraged others to do so. By the mid-1720s, Freemasonry was marked out by its conspicuous aristocratic and military patronage, with its implicit political protection, and by the novelty of an elected leadership that included prominent intellectuals and eminent professionals.

Masonry offered its members an intriguing mix. Its constitution supported the state and its legitimate authority and, at the same time, encouraged, if not demanded, religious tolerance and moral integrity. Masonic meetings combined a genial social setting in which to network, a much-publicised emphasis on toasting and dining, and an opportunity to benefit from often-advantageous educational lectures. The positive press comment produced as a consequence of Grand Lodge’s aristocratic leaders, and their ‘quarterly communications’, feasts, processions and later theatrical and musical extravaganzas, was reinforced by an affirmative self-image generated by Masonic philanthropy. English Freemasonry was designed to be above political and social censure, admitting only ‘good and true Men, free-born, and of mature and discreet Age, no Bondmen, no Women, no immoral or scandalous men, but of good Report’. And in the second and third decades of the eighteenth century it may substantially have succeeded.

An inner core of Freemasons was instrumental in designing and developing this milieu. The combination of latitudinarianism, scientific Enlightenment philosophy, self-promotion and entertainment, incorporated the practical religious tolerance and political orientation that both the Whigs and Desaguliers and other Huguenots desired, and reflected an approach that had found expression in Desaguliers’ popular scientific lectures and public demonstrations. Freemasonry under the new Grand Lodge of England was a proselytising force. And it was more. Given Desaguliers’ influence, it was unlikely to have been a coincidence that the first Masonic Charge mirrored the objectives sought by London’s Huguenot community in the years preceding the Treaty of Utrecht, when they had

---

attempted unsuccessfully to persuade the Protestant powers to press Louis XIV to ease religious persecution.

Anderson’s *1738 Constitutions* stated that Grand Lodge was formed on 24 June 1717. The members of four lodges had convened at the Apple Tree tavern, each being known by the name of the tavern at which it met: the Apple Tree in Charles Street, Covent Garden; the Goose & Gridiron in St. Paul’s Churchyard; the Crown in Parker’s Lane, near Drury Lane; and the Rummer & Grapes in Channel Row, Westminster. Anderson wrote that these founding lodges resolved to choose a Grand Master from their own number ‘until they should have the Honour of a noble brother at their Head’. Given Montagu’s acceptance of the role in 1721, Anderson’s account may be correct; equally, his record of events may have offered a retrospective rationale and justification for Desaguliers and Folkes having persuaded Montagu to take the position.

The establishment of Grand Lodge, the election of the Duke of Montagu as its first aristocratic Grand Master and the later publication of the *1723 Constitutions*, did more than develop the concept of what it meant to be a ‘Free and Accepted Mason’. The combination built an unprecedented level of public and political interest in the newly reinvented structure and philosophy of Freemasonry, and produced a mechanism that gave magnitude and direction to its carriage across London, provincial England and Continental Europe.

**A Positive Press Personified**

Freemasonry’s public profile altered fundamentally from the early 1720s, principally because of the press coverage generated by its aristocratic leadership. Arguably, this became a catalyst for change in its own right. The publicity created aspirant interest across London and the provinces and produced the foundations of what became almost a mass movement among the gentry, wealthy merchants and tradesmen, and the professional classes.

---

4 *1738 Constitutions*, p. 109. It is not possible to verify the statement independently. However, there is no obvious reason for Anderson to have lied over a matter that would have been within the relatively recent experience of many in the relevant lodges. Nonetheless, other (albeit limited) contemporary records, for example, Stukeley, *Family Memoirs*, are silent on the issue.
An analysis of the number of instances in which English newspapers used the term ‘Freemason’ or ‘Free and Accepted Mason’ pre- and post-1721 reinforces the argument. Whereas the Burney Collection contains only a short handful of press reports alluding to or regarding Freemasonry in the period before 1720, mention of ‘The Society of Freemasons’, ‘Freemasons’ and ‘Free and Accepted Masons’ between 1720-35 is compelling, with over 900 news items and classified advertisements. Certain of the earliest press reports and articles are worth quoting at length, for example, in 1721, John Applebee (1690–1750), the newspaper publisher, noted that:

The following Gentlemen were made and created Free and Accepted Masons, at a Lodge held at the Cheshire Cheese in Arundel Street by Dr Beal, Deputy to his Grace John Duke of Montague, Grand Master of that Fraternity ... all which Gentlemen went Home in their white Aprons very well satisfied, and according to the ancient Institution of that noble and advantageous Brotherhood.

And a second item on the same day recorded:

We hear that Mr Innys, the Bookseller, and Mr Cousins, the Grocer, both topping Tradesmen in St Paul’s Churchyard, have lately been admitted into the Society of Freemasons, and have accordingly been invested with the Leathern Apron, one of the Ensigns of the Society.

Applebee would have been conscious of his readers’ interest in the aristocracy and in their engagements and activities. And the newspaper’s focus on Freemasonry would have been inspired and stimulated by the agreement of the Duke of Montagu, a prominent and newsworthy aristocrat, to become the Society’s Grand Master. Montagu was appointed in June 1721 at ‘a Meeting at Stationers’ Hall of between two and three hundred of the Ancient Fraternity’ attended by ‘Several Noblemen and Gentlemen’. And Montagu was not alone. A second expression of aristocratic interest had been reported a month earlier in connection with another gossip-worthy aristocrat:

---

5 An on-line search of the Burney Collection on 4 January 2010 utilising the search terms ‘Freemason’, ‘Free and Accepted’ and Accepted Mason with both upper and lower case first letters, and variations on the spelling of ‘free’ and ‘mason’, generated 931 references, albeit that some were repetitious; extending the search terms to include ‘Fre Mafon(s), ‘Acepcion’ and ‘Acepted’ provided further results.
6 Applebee’s Original Weekly Journal, 9 September 1721.
7 Ibid.
8 Weekly Journal or Saturday’s Post, 1 July 1721.
Last week his Grace the Duke of Wharton was admitted into the Society of Freemasons; the Ceremonies being performed at the King’s Arms Tavern in St Paul’s Churchyard, and his Grace came home to his House in the Pall Mall in a white leathern Apron.9

Nevertheless, Freemasonry had its detractors and provoked some opposition from Tory-leaning opposition newspapers that was directed both at the organisation and at one of its more prominent non-aristocratic leaders: Desaguliers. Although his position at the Royal Society, as an ordained minister, and as one of Newton’s prominent acolytes, gave him respectability, it did not protect Desaguliers from personal satire. However, in general, Masonry avoided serious criticism, perhaps shielded by the presence of so many of its members among the aristocracy, parliament and the professions.

The majority of assaults on Freemasonry were mild and largely inconsequential. An early example appeared in the London Journal on 15 February 1722: ‘a treatise is likely soon to appear ... to prove, that the Gypsies are a Society of much longer standing than that of the Freemasons’. However, a few, including the anonymous Hudibrastick Poem, were more pointed in their criticism.

The Preface to the Hudibrastick Poem set a vituperative rather than an ironic tone:

Having had the Honour, not long since, when I was admitted into the Society of Masons, of Kissing your Posteriors, (an Honour Superior to Kissing the Pope’s Toe) ...

And I take it that Court Politicians and free Masons are oftentimes ally’d; for it is possible the one may build Castles in the Air as well as the other.10

And the poem itself was similarly offensive:

They have no Trowels, nor yet Lines,  
But still retain their Marks and Signs,  
And Tools they’ve got which always fit,  
A Lady, Duchess, or a Cit.11

---

9 Applebee’s Original Weekly Journal, 5 August 1721. The same item appeared on the same date in the Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer.

His Breeches low pulls down, and shows,
His Arse, this all must here expose,
Which the new Mason close salutes,
For none here durst to hold Disputes;
And when he thus the Bum has slabber’d,
And put his Sword up his Scabbard,
A learned Speech is then held forth
Upon the Breech, and Mason’s worth;
And he’s Install’d at last compleat,
And let down to his Mason’s seat.¹²

The following year, a substantially incorrect exposé of Masonic catechisms was published in The Flying Post¹³ to coincide broadly with the publication of the 1723 Constitutions. Additional attacks and exposures appeared in subsequent years, including the anonymously written Grand Mystery of Freemasons Discovered¹⁴ and A Seasonal Apology for Mr Heidegger¹⁵; Briscoe’s Secret History of the Freemasons, with over forty pages of parody¹⁶; and Samuel Prichard’s Masonry Dissected.¹⁷ However, the impact of such literary assaults was relatively trivial, and none was able to prevent or materially disrupt the growth in Masonic membership and the adoption of the movement by a large component of the establishment. Indeed, the substantial majority of newspapers were uncritically supportive:

On Monday the ancient Society of Free and Accepted Masons met according to annual Custom to elect a new Grand Master. They assembled to the Number of about 600 at Merchant Taylor’s Hall, where they unanimously chose the Right Honourable Earl of Dalkeith ... There was a noble feast ... and handsome Entertainment.¹⁸

And although certain press reports may have been droll, or even satirical, ‘there is not Mystery sufficient in the whole of my Narrative to furnish out one branch of

¹³ The Flying Post, 11 April 1723.
¹⁵ Anon, A Seasonal Apology for Mr Heidegger (London, 1724).
¹⁷ Samuel Prichard, Masonry Dissected (London, 1730).
¹⁸ Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 29 June 1723.
the Occult Science, nor make even so much as a Freemason’, they were also largely positive. Two representative examples are outline below.

Last Friday night at a certain tavern, not far from the Royal-Exchange, there was a Lodge of Freemasons for accepting some new members when an unlucky accident happen’d which had like to have discover’d the grand Secret: for one of the Noviciates was so surpriz’d when they pull’d of his hat and periwig, unbutton’d his collar and sleeves, took out his shoe-buckles, and stripp’d him to his shirt, that he thought they are going to castrate or circumcise him, and fearing to be made either an eunuch or a Jew, he watch’d his opportunity, upon seeing the door of the room half open, and ran out into the street: But was pursued by his Fraternity, who perswaded him with good words to return back to the Lodge, and comply with the rest of the ceremonies of the Installation.  

And,

We hear that the poor unfortunate Gentleman who sent the Letter to the Post Man on Tuesday ... is confined to a Dark Room ... being Confident he could not only find out the Philosophers Stone, but also the Secret of the Accepted Masons.

The publication in the Post Man of a nearly full-page riposte to a letter criticising Freemasonry demonstrates the passion the subject aroused, at least among its adherents, and offers an indication of the space afforded by Whig-supporting papers to its promotion and defence. Referring to the earlier ‘scurrilous’ and derogatory letter, and ‘by way of Justice to the injur’d Fame of the Society’, the anonymous author assured the Post Man’s readership of the:

solid merit of the Worthy Society, whose Original is venerably Ancient, their Continuance inevitably Constant, notwithstanding their interposing Circumstances as Men of Labour and Art.

The letter continued. It pointed out

a most valuable piece of Antiquity: the Original Draught [sic] of the Sacred Foundations on which the Brotherly Fidelity of the said Society so many years ago was first founded, and has been to this Day preserved ... a valuable Secret

---

19 Harry Wildair, The Sermon Taster: or Church Rambler (London, 1723).
20 The Flying-Post, 28 December 1728.
21 That is, the Post Man and the Historical Account.
22 Daily Journal, 13 July 1722.
23 Post Man and the Historical Account, 31 July 1722.
form’d for the good of Mankind, and made Sacred by the most solemn Appeal to Heaven.24

Probably not coincidentally, a few days later, a ‘Continuation of the History of the Society of Masons’ was published in the *Post Man*25, and ‘The Conclusion of the History’ followed on its heels.26 The semi-cosseted status of the organisation may have had everything to do with its new and titled principals and their high level political connections: the noble Grand Masters at the helm of Grand Lodge.

**John, 2nd Duke of Montagu, (1690-1749)**

It was almost certainly a testament to the example set by its first noble Grand Master that a significant number of members of the aristocracy were prepared to join Freemasonry, and a proportion willing to provide its titular leadership. Montagu’s installation marked a turning point in the Craft’s ability to attract new members, and in the capacity of Grand Lodge to exercise authority over the rising number of ‘regularly constituted’ lodges in London and the provinces. Prior to Montagu’s appointment, the annual Grand Feast took place above a tavern, the Goose and Gridiron. With Montagu in the chair, the location was moved to Stationers’ Hall, with some several hundred present. The publication of a standard set of *Regulations* and *Charges* in 1723, the provision of positions at Grand Lodge to which Masonic patronage could be applied, and the formation of a lauded philanthropic Charity Bank, acted as building blocks in what developed into a neo-federal infrastructure. However, none of these factors would have been as potent had Freemasonry’s aristocratic imprimatur been absent.

The *1723 Constitutions* recorded that: ‘Several Noblemen and gentlemen of the best rank, with Clergymen and learned scholars of most professions and denominations ... joined and submitted to take the charges ... under our present worthy Grand Master, the most noble Prince, John, Duke of Montagu’.27 This was the crux. Montagu demonstrated that Freemasonry was acceptable morally, intellectually and politically, and that it could be fashionable and fun. The combination provided sufficient reason for ‘Noblemen and gentlemen of the best

---

25 *Post Man and the Historical Account*, 4 August 1722.
26 *Post Man and the Historical Account*, 9 August 1722.
27 *1723 Constitutions*, p. 48.
rank ... Clergymen and learned scholars of most professions and denominations’
to join its ranks.

It can be argued that over the next two decades, an inner cohort orchestrated and
influenced the appointment of successive Grand Masters and Grand Officers. The
strategy of persuading and encouraging a number of young and in some cases
probably impressionable, members of the aristocracy not just to join Freemasonry
but to lead it publicly, acted as a catalyst in its development and led to its
metamorphosis into a fashionable, cutting-edge organisation.

An examination of Montagu’s family background and social and political position
may explain how he was persuaded to become Masonry’s first aristocratic Grand
Master, and illuminates why he agreed. Unfortunately, Montagu’s personal
correspondence and papers lack specific mention of Freemasonry. However, the
range of his correspondents indicates a network of personal relationships with
many who were or later became Freemasons. In this context, his friendship with
the Duke of Richmond was significant; as was his relationship with Philip
Stanhope, Lord Chesterfield, who also attended his installation as Grand Master.

Montagu was proposed as Grand Master on Lady Day, 25 March 1721: ‘Grand
Master Payne proposed for his successor our Most Noble Brother John, Duke of
Montagu, Master of a Lodge, who being present was forthwith saluted as Grand
Master Elect and his health drank in due form’. The announcement that he had
been chosen Grand Master of Grand Lodge appeared in the Post Boy. The paper
reported that ‘Noblemen and Gentlemen’ were present at the meeting at
Stationers’ Hall and that ‘the Reverend Dr. Desaguliers made a speech suitable to
the occasion’. Montagu had been made a Mason earlier, possibly in 1720, and
probably by Richmond and Desaguliers, perhaps at the Duke of Richmond’s lodge

28 The National Archives Access to Archives database contains no evidence of
correspondence or papers regarding Montagu’s association with Grand Lodge or
otherwise directly in connection with Freemasonry. Montagu’s correspondence held at
the Northamptonshire Record Office, Northampton; the British Library, London
(Marlborough collection Add. MSS 61450-1); CUL (letters to Robert Walpole); and at
Boughton House, Northamptonshire (Buccleuch MSS), also appears not to contain any
materially relevant papers.
29 1738 Constitutions, p. 112.
30 1738 Constitutions, p. 111.
31 The Post Boy, 27 June 1721. The report also appeared in the Weekly Journal or
Saturday’s Post, 1 July 1721, and in other newspapers.
at the Horn or, privately, at a lodge formed for that purpose, as was later the case with Frederick, Prince of Wales.\textsuperscript{32}

Montagu was intelligent, wealthy and well-connected, the only surviving son of Ralph Montagu, the 1\textsuperscript{st} Duke, and Elizabeth Wriothesley, daughter of the 4\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Southampton, Lord High Treasurer under Charles II, and Rachel de Massue, a Huguenot aristocrat. The 1\textsuperscript{st} Duke had been described by John Macky as ‘a great supporter of the French and other Protestants [driven] to England by the tyranny of their princes, [and] an admirer of learning and learned men’.\textsuperscript{33} John Montagu was not dissimilar: pro-Huguenot and with a comparable interest in the sciences. Books dedicated to Montagu included those on chronic diseases\textsuperscript{34}, modern history and geography\textsuperscript{35}, and pollution\textsuperscript{36}, as well as Quincy’s medical \textit{Lexicon physico-medicum}\textsuperscript{37}.

Montagu would have been recognised by Desaguliers and Folkes as an ideal candidate for any club or society seeking to advance its status. With his consent, Montagu was propelled to the position of Grand Master with the probable intention that his wealth, social standing, Court connections and military rank, would act as a beacon to attract others from his circles – and it did.

Montagu was regarded as one of the richest men in England with an annual income that may have exceeded £20,000 from property rents alone.\textsuperscript{38} The dowry he gave his youngest daughter, Mary, on her marriage to Lord Brudenel, the son of the Earl of Cardigan, was reported to be £25,000.\textsuperscript{39} However, perhaps one of the most powerful indicators of his affluence was his willingness and ability to

\textsuperscript{32} The 1723 Constitutions are silent about Montagu’s initiation into Masonry, but the 1738 Constitutions, p. 110, mentions that in 1719/20, ‘some Noblemen were also made brothers’. It is possible that this could be an oblique reference to Montagu.
\textsuperscript{33} Ralph Montagu had been Ambassador to Louis XIV of France and had witnessed the persecution of the Huguenots. Cf. also, John Macky, \textit{Memoirs of the secret services ... during the reigns of King William, Queen Anne, and King George I} (London, 1733), 2\textsuperscript{nd} edn., pp. 43-4.
\textsuperscript{34} John Wynter, \textit{Cyclus metasyncriticus: or, an essay on chronical diseases} (Bath & London, 1725).
\textsuperscript{35} Francis Moore, \textit{Travels into the inland parts of Africa} (London, 1738).
\textsuperscript{36} Richard Boulton, \textit{Some thoughts concerning the unusual qualities of the air} (London, 1724).
\textsuperscript{37} John Quincy, \textit{Lexicon physico-medicum} (London, 1719).
\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Universal Spectator and Weekly Journal}, 20 June 1730.
finance an abortive attempt to colonise St Lucia and St Vincent in the West Indies, following the grant of the territories by the Crown in January 1722.\textsuperscript{40} The exercise was frustrated by French action compounded by poor preparation. It cost Montagu an estimated £40,000. Probably not coincidentally, one of the largest of the seven ships in the flotilla sent to the Caribbean was named the \textit{Charles and Freemason}.\textsuperscript{41}

Montagu was socially prominent and his activities and those of his family were described regularly in the metropolitan press. Representative examples of over 280 news items published between 1721 and 1735 include publication of his loyal address as Lord Lieutenant of Northamptonshire to George I\textsuperscript{42}; his role as chief mourner at the funeral of his father-in-law, the Duke of Marlborough, an iconic figure in the Whig pantheon\textsuperscript{43}; and his eldest daughter’s wedding to William, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Duke of Manchester.\textsuperscript{44} However, even a minor excursion by river along the Thames in a ‘large flat bottom boat’ was considered worthy of mention\textsuperscript{45}; and his appointment as Lord Proprietor and Captain General of St Lucia and St Vincent was described as far away as Boston, in the colony of Massachusetts.\textsuperscript{46} Like his father, Montagu was associated closely with the royal household. He succeeded his father as Master of the Great Wardrobe (from 1709 until his death), a sinecure that paid over £3,000 a year; officiated as Lord High Constable at George I’s 1714 coronation; and carried the sceptre at the coronation of George II in 1727.\textsuperscript{47} Montagu served as Lord Lieutenant of Northamptonshire, where his father had been an MP, and of Warwickshire, in both cases from 1715 until his death.\textsuperscript{48} He became Master Forester and Warden of Rockingham the same year.\textsuperscript{49}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{41} Nathaniel Uring, \textit{A Relation of the late Intended Settlement of the Islands of St Luc\textit{i}a and St Vincent in America} (London, 1725), pp. 4, 95, 112.
\bibitem{42} \textit{Daily Courant}, 28 July 1722.
\bibitem{43} His role as chief mourner was endorsed by his mother-in-law, Lady Churchill. Cf. \textit{Daily Journal}, 13 August 1722.
\bibitem{44} \textit{Freeholder’s Journal}, 13 February 1723.
\bibitem{45} \textit{Universal Spectator and Weekly Journal}, 19 June 1731.
\bibitem{46} \textit{New England Courant}, 17 September 1722.
\bibitem{48} \textit{London Gazette}, 2 July 1715.
\end{thebibliography}
Montagu also held a number of prominent military positions. These were not only honorific or a consequence of his position as Marlborough’s son-in-law. Montagu politicked actively to be appointed to the right roles. In a reference to his request for the Governorship of the Isle of Wight, he commented that ‘I then again may be a military Man, that being a Military Post’. He raised and financed a regiment of Horse and a regiment of Foot; and he was later Captain and Colonel of His Majesty’s Own Troop of Horse Guards, later the 1st Life Guards, the premier cavalry regiment. Montagu was subsequently promoted Major General (1735); Lieutenant General (1739); Colonel of the 3rd Regiment of Horse; and, most significantly, held the influential position of Master General of the Ordnance from 1740 until his death, a Cabinet position, establishing a link with Thomas Desaguliers who joined the Royal Artillery as a cadet on 1 January 1740, possibly as a consequence of Montagu’s patronage.

Montagu, Freemasonry and the Military

Although we cannot be certain, it is likely that Montagu’s prominence and well-publicised Masonic activities set an example to other military figures, a factor that may have been instrumental in promoting and developing an interest in Freemasonry among the military’s higher ranks. Two well-known career soldiers and politicians provide compelling examples. Both were members of the Duke of Richmond’s Horn lodge at Westminster: Sir Adolphus Oughton (1684-1736), and Sir Robert Rich (1685–1768).

Oughton, later MP for Coventry, had served with Marlborough, and was commissioned Captain and Lieutenant Colonel in the 1st Foot. He returned to England on the accession of George I and was appointed Groom of the Bedchamber to the Prince of Wales. In 1715, he was promoted Colonel and appointed the first Major of the Coldstream Guards. He became Lieutenant

---

49 London Gazette, 19 February 1715.
50 Montagu was married in 1705 to Mary Churchill, the youngest daughter and co-heir of the 1st Duke of Marlborough.
52 Thomas was Desaguliers’ second surviving son and fifth child. Cf. chap. 2.
54 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 5, 23.
Colonel of the regiment two years later. His political proximity to the Crown and to Walpole, despite his abstention on the contentious Excise Bill\textsuperscript{55}, brought promotion to Brigadier in 1735, and the colonelcy of the 8\textsuperscript{th} Dragoon Guards from 1733 to 1736. Oughton was also close to Frederick, Prince of Wales, and his example may have been a factor in the latter’s decision to become a Mason.

Like Oughton, Robert Rich, successively MP for Dunwich (1715-22), Bere Alston (1724-27) and St Ives (1727-41), was also a political supporter of Walpole, and gained preferment accordingly. He was appointed Groom of the Bedchamber to the Prince of Wales in 1718, and retained the position when the Prince succeeded as George II. Rich was promoted Colonel and given command in sequence of the 13\textsuperscript{th} Hussars (1722-25); 8\textsuperscript{th} Light Dragoons (1725-31); and the King’s Regiment of Carabiniers (1731-33), where he succeeded his fellow Freemason, Lord Delorraine. He also commanded the 1\textsuperscript{st} Troop Horse Grenadier Guards (1733-35), officers of which regiment were members of the lodge meeting at the Mitre in Reading, the first Masonic lodge known to have been formed in Berkshire. Rich was promoted Brigadier (1727), Major General (1735) and Lieutenant General (1739). In 1757, he was appointed commander-in-chief of the British Army and Field Marshall.

Rich’s formidable Masonic and military connections were maintained by his son, James, who commanded the 37\textsuperscript{th} Foot at Minden in 1759. James was active in both English and Scottish Freemasonry. He became Provincial Grand Master of Minorca (English Constitution) in 1752 when stationed on the island, and he joined Canongate Kilwinning lodge in Edinburgh in 1754 after his transfer to Scotland. And at the same time as serving as Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Scotland, from 1769 until 1771, he was also commander-in-chief of British forces stationed there.

Notwithstanding what was later an extensive presence, there are relatively few academic studies of the impact and extent of Freemasonry within the British

\textsuperscript{55} Tangentially, there is an interestingly ironic Masonic reference to the Excise Bill in A Candid Answer to A Letter from a Member of Parliament to his Friends in the Country, concerning the Duties on Wine and Tobacco (London, 1730), p. v. Commenting on prior correspondence, the author noted: ‘I should think him a Freemason of the lowest Order ... he seems to write not so much for Bread as for good Drink’.
military. One of the principal secondary sources is Gould’s *Military Lodges*, which comprises a substantial data resource. Non-academic papers from Masonic antiquarians, such as Lloyd Wilkerson’s *History of Military Lodges in Freemasonry*7, Sutherland’s *Military Lodges*58, and Ripley’s paper of the same name59, are relatively superficial and based predominantly on secondary material. And popular but not always completely accurate books, such as *The Temple and the Lodge*60, have made only a limited contribution to academic analysis.

Clark, in *British Clubs and Societies*, dealt with the military aspects of Freemasonry only in passing: ‘for the middle ranks [on leave in London], a large array of military lodges appeared from the 1750s to keep tedium at bay’. Nonetheless, Clark recognised the important contribution of colonial Freemasonry in particular, and noted that ‘many military lodges played a significant role in the colonies by admitting local civilians to the order’. Among more recent work, Harland-Jacobs’ research has focused on the interplay between Freemasonry and colonialism.63 *Builders of Empire*, based on her doctoral work, is a solid analysis of this aspect of British imperialism. Nonetheless, the impact of Freemasonry on the military and the manner in which it was used for political and strategic objectives has generally been considered only tangentially, and the origins and impact of the Masonic/military nexus remain relatively unexplored.

Three key issues require analysis: the motivation of those military officers who joined Freemasonry; the extent to which Masonry became pervasive within the regiments; and the wider effect, if any. Within this thesis, the first two questions are touched upon briefly.

61 Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, pp. 139, 310, 332, 340, 348 and 442. The quotation is from p. 127.
62 *ibid*, p. 345.
64 Harland-Jacobs, *Builders of Empire*. 
A reasonable starting point is the assumption that the principal attraction of Freemasonry to the military in the eighteenth century would have been broadly similar to that which applied in other fields: the success and sanction of senior figures within the profession. Leading aristocratic and military figures who had publicly embraced Freemasonry were role models and set an example to be followed. The subsequent advance of the Craft within the army was also likely to have been a function of social convention as Freemasonry became part of the mainstream activities of the gentry and professional classes, and of the army’s regimental structure, which encouraged emulation by junior officers. However, the expansion of Freemasonry also had a political and diplomatic dimension that only became more fully apparent in the later eighteenth and nineteenth century.\(^{65}\)

Harland-Jacobs commented correctly that British regimental lodges (and trade) carried Freemasonry across the globe, from the North American colonies and the Caribbean to the Indian sub-continent, Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere. She noted that it was the decision of the Grand Lodge of Ireland to issue ‘travelling warrants’ that instigated the trend.\(^{66}\) However, this was only the proximate cause or a means; it was not at root. Although Clark argued that up to the grant of travelling warrants, lodges were situated at particular locations, the statement is not wholly accurate. Many previously existing lodges were peripatetic, moving from tavern to tavern and therefore from one location to another. The Grand Lodge of Ireland did not add geographic flexibility as a new dimension to Freemasonry; it rather extended, albeit materially, a process that was already in place.

In the 1720s and thereafter, English Grand Lodge would grant a warrant to an existing lodge seeking to become ‘regular’\(^{67}\), or to the prospective founders of a new lodge. In each case, the warrant was held by the Master of the lodge and his successors on behalf of lodge members. The 1723 Constitutions was clear:

\(^{67}\) That is, a lodge within the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of England.
A lodge is a place where Masons assemble and work: hence that assembly, or duly organized Society of Masons, is called a lodge, and every Brother ought to belong to one, and to be subject to its By-Laws and the General Regulations. It is either particular or general.\(^\text{58}\)

Although a lodge may have been known by its location, its authorisation was by means of a warrant granted to individuals. The Grand Lodge of Ireland under Lord Kingston, a former Grand Master of England\(^\text{69}\), broadened the interpretation by granting regimental ‘travelling’ warrants, but the principle remained the same, and the warrant was generally granted to the commanding officer or another officer on behalf of the regiment concerned.

The membership lists of the Horn and of other well-connected lodges date the link between Freemasonry and the military to before 1723. However, the presence of Freemasonry within the army more broadly only became widespread once Freemasonry’s cachet had been consolidated and reinforced by subsequent Grand Masters such as Richmond, Crawford, Loudoun and Norfolk, and by the decision of other prominent figures, such as the Prince of Wales, the Dukes of Lorraine and Newcastle, and Walpole, to join the Craft.\(^\text{70}\)

Freemasonry’s appeal to a relatively wide audience within London and the provinces had its parallel in the military. And it is a reasonable conjecture that the promotion of active Freemasons to more senior military rank over succeeding decades reinforced their influence and the desire of subordinates to follow their superiors. The closed regimental system provided a fertile environment for Freemasonry to develop and, once it had established a presence, it became largely self-reinforcing.

\(^{58}\) 1723 Constitutions, p. 51: Of Lodges.

\(^{69}\) James O’Brien, Lord Kingston, was Grand Master England in 1728 and Grand Master Ireland in 1729-30. The cross over between the home nations’ jurisdictions was relatively common: Sir Thomas Prendergast was JGW in England and SGW in Ireland; James Douglas, 14th Earl of Morton, was Grand Master Scotland from 1739-40 and Grand Master England 1741-42; and Earl Crawford (Grand Master England 1734) was a member of both English and Scottish Grand Lodges.

\(^{70}\) Jacob suggests that Walpole ‘allowed himself to be painted wearing the insignia of the Master of the Grand Stewards’ Lodge’: The Radical Enlightenment, p. 97. Although Walpole was made a Mason, there is no evidence that he became a Steward; Colin Dyer in his The Grand Stewards and Their Lodge (London, 1985), p. 44, suggests that the relevant portrait by J.B. Vanloo was not of Walpole.
A significant number of Grand Masters and senior army officers provided powerful military paradigms. Within the 3,000 or so members’ names recorded by Grand Lodge between 1723 and 1735, the army was represented by over 100 ranking officers, including two later Field Marshalls, twenty-three colonels, eight majors and fifty-six captains. The figure is exclusive of the more than sixty Dukes, Earls, Lords, Barons and Baronets, who commanded their own regiments or otherwise held field rank, and of those Freemasons in Grand Lodge’s records whose military rank was not recorded.

Certain soldiers, such as Jeffrey Amherst (1717–97), who was in 1778 appointed Commander-in-Chief, were especially proactive in promoting the Craft. Amherst established and encouraged the formation of field lodges in almost all of the units under his command. Of the nineteen regiments that served under him in North America in 1758, thirteen had field lodges, of which ten had been warranted by the Grand Lodge of Ireland. And with one exception, each of the other six regiments had lodges in place by the end of the decade.

Military lodges became a focal point for the regiment:

the time passes very wearily when the calendar does not furnish us with a loyal excuse for assembling in the evening, we have recourse to a Freemasons Lodge;

and for the local community:

we have about 30 or 40 Freemasons they have a fine Supper every Saturday night and often two or three in the week besides.

---

71 The estimate includes those whose rank was specified in the Grand Lodge Minutes or is otherwise known.
72 Viscount Cobham (appointed 1742, a member of the Queen’s Head, Bath) and Sir Robert Rich (1757). The position of Field Marshall, the most senior army rank, was created in 1736. There is anecdotal evidence that Sir John Ligonier (later C-in-C and Field Marshall, 1757-9, and Amherst’s mentor), was also a Freemason. However, there is currently no definitive proof.
75 The exception was the 44th Foot; the regiment did not have a lodge until 1784 (Lodge No. 467, English, Moderns).
Minden Lodge, No. 63, in the 20th Regiment of Foot, given as an example by Harland-Jacobs, demonstrates how a travelling military lodge could affect a succession of communities. Minden’s original warrant was issued by the Grand Lodge of Ireland in 1736/7. The lodge’s name was adopted after the battle of Minden in 1759. The regiment was posted to Quebec in 1775, returned to Britain in 1783, and was sent back to North America in 1789, where it was based at Halifax, Nova Scotia, until 1792. Harland-Jacobs commented that the lodge ‘exposed [different] host communities to Freemasonry’s practices, charity, and even buildings’, and ‘military lodges did more than give Freemasonry a fleeting presence in the empire’s colonies; they were also responsible for the permanent establishment of the brotherhood.

In total, the number of military lodges operating under the jurisdiction of the ‘home’ Grand Lodges of England (Modern and Ancient), Ireland and Scotland, grew from 13 Irish-warranted regimental lodges in the 1730s, to 70 (58 Irish, 8 Scottish and 4 English lodges) in 1760. For reference purposes, a complete list of military lodges is set out in Appendix 3.

The membership of the Sun Inn at Chester provides an important example of provincial military Freemasonry. The Master of the lodge was Francis Columbine, commanding officer of the 7th Foot and PGM for Cheshire. And the lodge’s membership list for 1725 indicates that at least 10 of the 28 members of the Sun were soldiers. They included Colonel Herbert Laurence and Captain Hugh Warburton, respectively Senior and Junior Wardens; Lieutenant Colonel John Lee; Captains Charles Crosby, John Vanberg and Robert Frazier; Lieutenant William Tong; Ensign Charles Gordon; and Cornet-of-Horse Walter Warburton. Captain Warburton succeeded Columbine in 1727; he became PGM of North Wales the same year, appointed by Lord Inchiquin.

77 The Egmont Papers.
79 A duplicate warrant was issued in 1748.
80 The Duke of Brunswick commanded the Allied forces at Minden; he had been initiated into Freemasonry in Berlin in 1740, cf. Gould, Military Lodges p. 130; the Colonel of the 20th Foot, Major General William Kingsley, was also a Freemason: cf. p. 108.
82 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 38-9.
Other military-connected lodges followed a similar pattern of an amalgam of senior and junior ranks. At least 5 of the 19 members of the Mitre at Reading were military officers. Three were in the 1st Troop of Horse Grenadier Guards: Major William Godolphin, the senior ranking Major, also a member of the Rummer, Charing Cross; Captain John Nangle, Adjutant; and Captain John Duvernett, a Huguenot and the senior Captain-of-Horse. The others were Captain Andrew Corner, an officer in the 7th Hussars, and Captain John Knight, whose regiment is not known. And 6 of the 21 members of the Wool Pack in Warwick were from the military: Colonel William Townsend; Captains William Tench, Robert Cornwal and Anthony Rankine; Lieutenant Thomas Dunning; and Cornet William Chaworth, representing a cascade of military rank.

However, it is important to note that the development of British regimental Freemasonry was not related exclusively to the presence of senior Freemasons at the head of the regiment. Although Grand Master Loudoun’s 30th Foot received a Masonic warrant in 1738, and the Black Watch in 1747, his 60th Foot did not do so until 1764, and his 3rd Foot only in 1771. Grand Master Crawford’s Scots Greys, the 2nd Dragoons, established their first lodge in 1747, and his 25th Foot in 1749. However, Montagu’s 1st and 2nd Battalions, Royal Artillery, did not obtain a Masonic warrant until 1764 and 1767, respectively.
A Politically Convenient Grand Master

Although not political in the recognised sense, Montagu was a safe Whig, loyal to the Hanoverians and to the Court, without necessarily being a man of party.\textsuperscript{87} His (and his successor Grand Masters’) political loyalties were central to Freemasonry’s pro-Hanoverian position. Montagu was rewarded by the Crown accordingly, being appointed a Knight of the Garter in 1718\textsuperscript{88}, made Grand Master of the newly formed Order of the Bath (1725 until his death), and in 1736, raised to the Privy Council.

However, despite his wealth, position and intelligence, Montagu’s occasionally juvenile behaviour was well known\textsuperscript{89} and pointedly described in negative terms by his mother-in-law, Sarah Churchill:

\begin{quote}
All his talents lie in things only natural in boys of fifteen years old, and he is about two and fifty to get people into his garden and wet them with squirts, and to invite people to his country houses, and put things into their beds to make them itch, and twenty such pretty fancies like these.\textsuperscript{90}
\end{quote}

In common with other aristocratic Grand Masters in Grand Lodge’s formative years, Montagu was relatively young, only 31 at his installation, and arguably open to a degree of manipulation. However, he was not as young as a number of those that succeeded him. The unstable Duke of Wharton was 24 when installed as Grand Master; the Earl of Dalkeith, 28; the Duke of Richmond, 23; Viscount Weymouth, 25; and the Earl of Darnley, 22.

Although Desaguliers would have known Montagu through the Royal Society, and both were friendly with Newton, Folkes, and other prominent FRS, Folkes’ personal relationship with Montagu (and Richmond) probably held the key to Montagu agreeing to serve as Grand Master. Stukeley considered Folkes’ influence to be considerable. Indeed, Folkes was later described by Stukeley as

\begin{flushright}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textsuperscript{87} Post Man and the Historical Account, 31 July 1714. \\
\textsuperscript{88} London Gazette, 29 March 1718. \\
\end{tabular}
\end{flushright}
‘an errant infidel’ who had perverted Montagu, Richmond and other nobles, and had done ‘an infinite prejudice to religion’:

When I lived in Ormond Street in 1720 he set up an infidel Club at his house on Sunday evenings, where Will Jones, the mathematician, & others of the heathen stamp, assembled ... From that time he has been propagating the infidel System with great assiduity, & made it even fashionable in the Royal Society, so that when any mention is made of Moses, the deluge, of religion, Scriptures, &c., it is generally received with a loud laugh.

Other factors may also have influenced Montagu. Significantly, he had deep-seated Huguenot connections that may have set a context for his willingness to work with Desaguliers. Montagu’s father, Ralph, the 1st Duke, was a Francophile, and had maintained a network of relationships with prominent Huguenots. His circle included the diplomat and soldier, Henri de Massue, Marquis de Ruvigny (1648-1720), created 1st Earl of Galway in 1697 and appointed Lord Justice in Ireland; and the scholar, scientist and bibliophile, Henri Justel (1620-1693), elected FRS in 1681 and appointed Keeper of the King’s Library at St James’s Palace. Others known to have been associated with the Duke included Michael Le Vassor (1646-1718), the historian and clergyman, elected FRS in 1702; and Charles Saint-Evremond (1610-1703), the soldier, essayist and poet. The Duke’s extensive patronage of Huguenot artisans and artists, particularly at Boughton House, are mentioned extensively in the relevant account books. And in addition to these associations, Montagu’s grandmother, Rachel de Massue, had been a Huguenot aristocrat; the Marquis of Ruvigny, Earl of Galway, was Montagu’s second cousin; and Montagu’s friend and personal tutor from 1702

---

91 Stukeley, Family Memoirs, vol. 1, pp. 100, 114. Stukeley may have written these comments in around 1751; in the 1720s, his relationship with Folkes was far less antagonistic. Cf. also, David Boyd Haycock, William Stukeley: Science, Religion and Archaeology in Eighteenth-Century England (Woodbridge, 2002), chap. 9.
92 William Jones, FRS, a member of the Queens Head. See chap. 4 above.
96 Bedford: Bedfordshire and Luton Archives and Record Service: X800, Antonie family of Colworth. (Marc Antonie was Steward to the 1st Duke.)
was Pierre Sylvestre, another Huguenot, with whom he travelled on his Grand Tour to France and Italy.\footnote{Metzger, ‘2nd Duke of Montagu’, ODNB.}

The emphasis placed on Freemasonry’s ‘distinguishing characteristics of ... Virtue, Honour and Mercy’\footnote{Emulation Ritual (Hersham, 2003), pp. 249-50, Explanation of the First Tracing Board.} were also potentially attractive moral principles for Montagu, an argument supported by the recreation of the chivalric Order of the Bath on 18 May 1725, notwithstanding that the Order, like those of the Garter and the Thistle, was used for political patronage by the Walpole ministry. And Montagu’s dalliance with science\footnote{Montagu was admitted a doctor of physic at Cambridge University in 1717 and, at his own request, was elected FRCP the same year.} and matters intellectual played strongly to both Desaguliers’ and Folkes’ strengths.\footnote{In common with many aristocrats and gentlemen of the period, Montagu’s book subscriptions included many scientific works, for example, John Senex, A New General Atlas (London, 1721); Henry Pemberton, A View of Sir Isaac Newton’s Philosophy (London, 1728); and Engelbert Kaemper, A History of Japan (London, 1728).}

Montagu’s installation as Grand Master in 1721 was preceded by a ceremonial public procession to Stationers’ Hall. This was the first occasion on which the Freemasons had held a public procession under the leadership of their Grand Master, and the first at which the installation took place at a livery hall rather than a tavern. The event was designed to attract public interest. Anderson’s 

\textit{1738 Constitutions} recorded his impression of the event:

Payne, Grand Master, with his Grand Wardens, the former Grand Officers, and the Master and Wardens of 12 Lodges, met the Grand Master Elect in a Grand Lodge at the King’s Arms Tavern, St. Paul’s Church-yard, in the Morning; and having forthwith recognized their Choice of Brother Montagu they made some new Brothers, particularly the noble Philip, Lord Stanhope, now Earl of Chesterfield; and from thence they marched on Foot to the Hall in proper Clothing and due Form; where they were joyfully received by about 150 true and faithful, all clothed.\footnote{1738 Constitutions, p. 112.}

Montagu and his retinue, all in Masonic clothing, would have been a focus for attention, a detail that Desaguliers and his colleagues would have anticipated and welcomed. The annual installation procession was in subsequent years even more elaborate. Dalkeith’s in 1723 was a spectacle of ‘many Brothers duly
clothed [proceeding] in Coaches from the West to the East.\textsuperscript{102} That of Norfolk, in 1730, commenced with Lord Kingston, the outgoing Grand Master, attending ‘with ceremony’ the Duke’s London residence in St James’s ‘where he was met by a vast Number of Brothers duly clothed’. And from St James’s Square they processed to the Merchant Taylor’s hall preceded by:

Brother Johnson to clear the way, six Stewards ... clothed proper with their Badges and White Rods, two in each Chariot, [and coaches containing] ... noble and eminent Brethren ... former Grand Officers ... former noble Grand Officers ... the Secretary alone with his Badge and Bag ... the two Grand Wardens ... the Deputy Grand Master ... and in the final coach, Kingston, Grand Master, and Norfolk, Grand Master Elect, clothed only as a Mason.\textsuperscript{103}

It is probable that the processions were orchestrated for optimum effect:

the Stewards halted at Charing Cross until the messenger brought orders to move on slowly.

The spectacle was repeated annually. Crawford’s procession in 1734 included:

trumpets, hautboys, kettle drums and French-horns, to lead the van and play at the gate till all arrive.\textsuperscript{104}

And that of Loudoun, in 1736, was even more elaborate:

being in a Chariot richly carved and gilt drawn by six beautiful Grey Horses [with three] Sets of Musick ... consisting of a pair of kettle drums, four trumpets and four French horns, the others of a pair of kettle drums, two trumpets and two French horns.\textsuperscript{105}

Earl Darnley’s parade the following year followed a similar pattern and received widespread publicity:

about One o’Clock they proceeded in Coaches and Charriots; attended by Kettle-Drums, Trumpets etc. through the City to Fishmongers’ Hall; the Procession being clos’d by the Great Officers, and the earl of Darnley in a fine, rich, gilt Charriot, drawn by six Long Tail Grey Horses, with fine Morocco Harness and Green Silk Reins, and several servants in rich Liveries. The Dinner

\textsuperscript{102} 1738 Constitutions, p. 117.
\textsuperscript{103} 1738 Constitutions, pp. 124-6. Anderson’s implicit contrast between Norfolk’s modest dress as Grand Master elect with his ceremonial office as Earl Marshall may have been for poetic effect in order to emphasise his ‘humility’ in accepting the position.
\textsuperscript{104} 1738 Constitutions, p. 132.
\textsuperscript{105} Grand Lodge Minutes, 28 April 1737, p. 286.
was exceedingly elegant, and the Collection for the Relief of distress’d Brethren very considerable. 106

A number of Montagu’s friends from Court and Parliament attended his installation at which: ‘Brother Payne, the old Grand Master, made the first Procession round the Hall and ... proclaimed aloud, the most noble Prince and our Brother, John Montagu, Duke of Montagu, Grand Master of Masons! ... while the Assembly owned the Duke’s Authority with due Homage and joyful Congratulations.’ 107 Those present included Philip, Duke of Wharton108, and Henry Herbert, later 9th Earl of Pembroke, a Lord of the Bedchamber to the Prince of Wales and Montagu’s successor in 1721 as Captain and Colonel of the 1st Troop of Horse Guards. 109 Also in attendance was Lord Hinchingbrook, the Whig MP for Huntingdon, and Philip Stanhope, later 4th Earl of Chesterfield, the Whig MP for St Germans.110

Such invitations were continued by Montagu’s successor Grand Masters. The intentional result of Montagu’s acceptance of the responsibility of Grand Master was that it became correspondingly easy to persuade other aristocrats such as Earl Dalkeith and the Duke of Richmond, Montagu’s close friend and Westminster neighbour, to assume the role. 111 Indeed, Wharton may have been so enamoured of the possibilities afforded by the potential standing of the position of Grand Master that he did not need to be convinced by anyone, but grabbed the position directly, a subject discussed below.

The majority of Montagu’s successors through to the late 1730s provided Freemasonry with relatively affluent, politically well-connected and generally

106 London Evening Post, 28 April 1737. The Daily Advertiser, 29 April 1737, referred to ‘upwards of a hundred coaches’ and noted the cost of his Lordship’s pre-installation breakfast at £200. Press coverage (the event was described in seven or more different newspapers) differed from paper to paper, indicating that several ‘reporters’ attended rather than that the material was plagiarised – a common means of reportage.
107 1738 Constitutions, p. 113, and Stukeley, Family Memoirs, vol. 1, p. 64.
108 See below.
109 Lord Herbert inherited as 9th Earl of Pembroke in 1733. Herbert was a noted antiquary and had a particular interest in architecture, working with both Colen Campbell and Roger Morris, Campbell’s assistant. He was later responsible with Charles Labelye for overseeing construction of the new Westminster Bridge. Cf. T.P. Connor, ‘Henry Herbert’, ODNB (Oxford, Sept, 2004, online edn. May 2009).
111 Richmond’s father, the 1st Duke, was also reputed to have been a Freemason; his uncle, the Duke of St Albans, was Master of the Queen’s Head lodge in Bath in 1725.
popular figureheads. However, probably only Montagu and Richmond supplied relatively active leadership. Under Montagu’s auspices, Desaguliers orchestrated the formal adoption of the new Charges and Regulations that cemented the foundations for Freemasonry’s central structure; and under Richmond’s aegis, the Grand Charity was established and lodges formed at Paris and The Hague.

Montagu’s formal tenure as Grand Master ended somewhat irregularly with an unplanned handover to Wharton, albeit that the event was marked by Desaguliers’ appointment as Wharton’s Deputy, something upon which Montagu may have insisted. It is plausible that Desaguliers had expected Montagu to continue as Grand Master for some years, but Wharton’s impromptu seizure of the position may have led to Montagu relinquishing the role and to it becoming an annual appointment. Regardless, Montagu continued to be closely associated with Freemasonry, both within Grand Lodge and outside, at the lodge at the Bear & Harrow and elsewhere. His relationship with the Craft gave it public prominence and afforded it protection, and his wealth remained at its disposal in subsequent years.  

Philip, Duke of Wharton, (1698-1731)

The frontispiece that illustrated the 1723 Constitutions was designed to impress. It shows Montagu wearing the robes of the Order of the Garter, presenting the Constitutional scroll and a set of compasses to Wharton, dressed in his ducal robes. Each is supported by his respective Deputy Grand Master and Grand Wardens: John Beale, Josias Villeneau and Thomas Morrice are to the left, with white aprons and gloves; and William Hawkins and Joshua Timson, stand next to Desaguliers, dressed in clerical robes, on the far right.

Detailed between the two groups is Euclid’s 47th Proposition. A colonnade of pillars representing the different architectural orders is shown in perspective, framing the transfer of power and authority from Montagu to Wharton, governing Grand Lodge under the kingdom of Heaven. However, this picture of a seamless transfer of power was a fiction.
Wharton had been made a Freemason at the age of 22, only a few months after Montagu was installed as Grand Master:

the Ceremonies being performed at the King's Arms Tavern ... His Grace came Home to his House in the Pall-Mall in a white Leathern Apron.\footnote{\textit{Applebee's Original Weekly Journal}, 5 August 1721.}

Wharton was in many ways an archetypical rebellious youth. However, his mutinous nature and mercurial approach to life lasted into adulthood. His father had been a leading supporter of William of Orange\footnote{Thomas Wharton MP had been a leading opponent to King James II’s government. Following William & Mary’s accession, he was made a Privy Councillor and Comptroller of the Household. He was also created Earl of Wharton and Viscount Wichendon (1706), and served as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1708-10), Lord Lieutenant of Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire, and Lord Privy Seal. In 1715, shortly before his death, he was created Marquess of Catherlough, Earl of Rathfarnam, and Baron Trim in the Irish Peerage, and Marquess of Wharton and Marquess of Malmesbury in the English.}, and his parents provided him with both a substantial inheritance and exceptional royal and political connections. Wharton’s godparents included King William III, the Duke of Shrewsbury and Princess (later Queen) Anne. And he inherited six titles in the
English and Irish Peerage on his father’s death in 1715, shortly after a marriage made against his father’s wishes.\footnote{Disquiet at his son’s marriage was understood to have been a contributory factor to Thomas Wharton’s early death.}

Wharton’s father had sought to dominate and control his son. And Wharton rebelled. On his Grand Tour in 1716, Wharton was accompanied by a Huguenot teacher on a journey designed to satisfy an obligation in his father’s will that he visit Geneva to continue his religious education. However, the tutor was abandoned in Switzerland and Wharton travelled to Paris. He wrote to and then visited James Stuart, the Old Pretender, at Avignon, presented him with the gift of a horse and was invested with the title of Duke of Northumberland. Wharton also corresponded with the exiled Duke of Mar, John Erskine. Such potentially treasonable behaviour could have been disastrous; but it was overlooked, regarded only as a youthful misdemeanour.

Wharton was only 17 and on his return to Britain he was allowed to sit in the Irish Parliament, despite not having the required age, and was sworn a Privy Councillor in September 1717. As a further incentive to good behavior he was created Duke on 28 January 1718.\footnote{Lawrence B. Smith, ‘Philip Wharton, Duke of Wharton and Jacobite Duke of Northumberland’, *ODNB* (Oxford, Sept 2004; online edn., Jan 2008).} The letters patent announced ‘as it is to the honour of subjects who are descended from an illustrious family to imitate the great example of their ancestors, we esteem it no less a glory as a King, after the example of our ancestors, to dignify eminent virtues by similar rewards’.

Wharton took his seat in the House of Lords on his majority on 21 December 1719.\footnote{Ibid.} He attracted considerable press interest and comment\footnote{*Burney* contains approximately 500 newspaper references over the period 1718-24 that describe his social and political activities. Online search, 8 May 2009.}, and appeared to have matured. His speeches were pro-government to the extent that the Buckinghamshire archives hold an invitation to Wharton to attend a meeting of ‘Gentlemen of the Whigg [sic] interest’ at Aylesbury, at the George Inn.\footnote{Aylesbury: The Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies: D-LE/A/2/4/j, 29 November 1721.} Indeed, there had probably been a belief within the establishment that a Dukedom was a necessary price to ensure the loyalty of the unpredictable but potentially
influential Wharton. However, it became clear that Wharton’s principal focus was self-interest. His politics were about ambition, power and influence; sometimes principles, but never party. Predictable only in his unpredictability, Wharton rebelled and launched an effective attack on the government over the South Sea Company, condemning it as ‘dangerous bait which might decoy unwary people to their ruin’. This may not have been an entirely altruistic analysis: he was reported to have speculated and lost £120,000, and the loss may have spurred his eloquence.

**An Inconvenience Incarnate**

Handsome, intelligent and rich, Wharton was both eccentric and a classic rake. His interests outside of Parliament revolved around whoring, gambling and drinking. He was a founder of the first Hell Fire Club and, in 1721, was proscribed for blasphemy by the Lord Chancellor, a charge he denied.

Wharton had sought to usurp rather than succeed Montagu and to commandeer what he may have perceived as a potentially influential organisation, or he may have wished simply to cause a nuisance:

> Philip, Duke of Wharton lately made a Brother, tho’ not the Master of a Lodge, being ambitious of the Chair, got a number of others to meet him at Stationers Hall 24 June 1722. And having no Grand officers, they put in the Chair the oldest Master Mason ... and without the usual decent Ceremonials, the said oldest Mason proclaimed aloud Philip, Duke of Wharton, Grand Master of Masons ... but his Grace appointed no Deputy nor was the Lodge opened and closed in due Form. Therefore the noble Brothers and all those that would not countenance irregularities disowned Wharton’s Authority, till worthy Brother Montagu heal’d the Breach of Harmony, by summoning the Grand Lodge to meet 17 January 1723 at the King’s Arms aforesaid, where the Duke of Wharton promising to be True and Faithful, Deputy Grand Master Beale proclaimed aloud the most noble Prince and our Brother Philip Duke of Wharton, Grand Master of Masons, who appointed Dr Desaguliers the Deputy Grand Master and Joshua Timson and James Anderson Grand Wardens.

---

Notwithstanding Anderson's somewhat biased record of these events, evidence that Wharton was accepted as Grand Master in June 1722, reluctantly, temporarily, or otherwise, can be inferred from contemporary reports of the 25 June dinner that marked his installation as Grand Master, at which Desaguliers and other pro-Whig and Montagu-supporting Masons were present.\(^{123}\)

However, at least one account confirms that Wharton's appointment was regarded as divisive, and noted that the musicians played the Jacobite song ‘Let the King enjoy his own again’ during the evening, presumably with Wharton's encouragement.\(^{124}\) Indeed, Smith, in his biographical entry for the ODNB, suggests that Wharton sang the song rather than simply allowed it to be played.\(^{125}\) Regardless, by condoning, encouraging or participating in what was an anti-Hanoverian display, Wharton was making an unacceptable political point in an offensive manner.\(^{126}\) Stevenson noted that the musicians and Wharton (implicitly, if not explicitly), were ‘immediately reprimanded by a Person of great Gravity and Science’, without doubt, Desaguliers.\(^{127}\) Thereafter, in Stevenson’s words, ‘Hanoverian decorum was restored, and ... toasts were drunk to prosperity under the present Administration, and to Love, Liberty, and Science’.\(^{128}\)

Anderson represented the Grand Lodge meeting of January 1723 as having healed the schism between the two Masonic factions, as ‘loyal’ Montagu formally gave way to the mercurial Wharton, but this depiction was over-simplistic and almost certainly incorrect. Although it could be reasonable to view the episode as a relatively petty squabble between two factions, and Anderson had a stake in depicting the events as such, it was also a skirmish in the struggle for political influence, with the government and its supporters on one side, and opposition

---

\(^{123}\) Wharton’s installation was reported in the *Compleat Set of St James's Journals*, 28 June 1722, and in near identical terms in the *St. James's Journal*, 28 June 1722. It was also carried in the *London Journal*, 30 June 1722, which remarked that membership of the Society was some 4,000; the *Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer*, 30 June 1722; and the *Weekly Journal or Saturday's Post*, 30 June 1722.

\(^{124}\) *Then let us rejoice, With heart and voice, There doth one Stuart still remain; And all sing the tune, On the tenth day of June, That the King shall enjoy his own again.*

\(^{125}\) Smith, ‘Duke of Wharton’, ODNB.

\(^{126}\) *A fool, with more of wit than half mankind, Too rash for thought, for action too refined: Alexander Pope, Epistle to Cobham: Of the Knowledge and Characters of Men* (London, January 1734).


Whigs, Tories and independents on the other. This conflict ran across a broad political canvas of which Freemasonry was an important if minor part.\(^{129}\)

Wharton’s June 1723 exodus from Grand Lodge can be categorised as a key event that cemented the pro-Hanoverian and pro-Whig nature of the Craft under Desaguliers and his colleagues’ influence. It is notable that it occurred within a week of Wharton’s defence of Atterbury, the Jacobite Bishop of Rochester, against the charge of treason. In a boorish gesture both to the government and the Crown, Wharton accompanied Atterbury for part of his journey into exile and ostentatiously gave him an engraved sword as a gift.\(^{130}\) He also appointed Atterbury’s secretary and chaplain, the Rev. Moore, as his own.\(^{131}\)

This was not an image that Desaguliers, Payne, Cowper, Delafaye or Folkes would have desired to project in connection with Freemasonry, nor one with which they and many others wished to be associated. The flourish with which Desaguliers signed the Minute Book, which recorded Wharton’s departure ‘without ceremony’ from Grand Lodge, may provide an indication of the emotions at the time.\(^{132}\)

Wharton had waived his right to name a successor, leaving Grand Lodge to make its own choice, possibly in the conviction that his friends might move his re-election. But Grand Lodge instead chose narrowly in favour of the young Earl of Dalkeith, a course that had probably been foreseen by Desaguliers, given that he may have arranged for Dalkeith to name himself as Dalkeith’s Deputy, and the loyal Sorrel and Senex as his Wardens. The Minutes, written contemporaneously by the new Grand Secretary, William Cowper, in 1723, detail a last attempt by Wharton to undermine and displace Desaguliers, and Desaguliers’ successful resistance:

\(^{129}\) For example, the concurrent election of the Sheriffs in the City of London: cf. *British Journal*, 29 June 1723.

\(^{130}\) *Weekly Journal or Saturday’s Post*, 22 June 1723.

\(^{131}\) *British Journal*, 29 June 1723; and *London Journal*, 29 June 1723.

\(^{132}\) *Grand Lodge Minutes* were usually signed by the Grand Master (in this case Dalkeith) at the next regular meeting of Grand Lodge. On this occasion they were signed in Dalkeith’s absence by Desaguliers.
Brother Robinson producing a written authority from the Earl [Dalkeith] for that purpose, did declare in his Name, That his Worship ... did appoint Dr. Desaguliers his Deputy, and Brothers Sorrel and Senex Grand Wardens; and also Brother Robinson did in his said Worship’s Name and [on] behalf of the whole Fraternity, protest against the above proceedings of the late Grand Master [Wharton] in first putting the question of Approbation, and what followed thereon as unprecedented, unwarrantable and irregular, and tending to introduce into the Society a Breach of Harmony, with the utmost disorder and Confusion.\textsuperscript{133}

The depicted ‘irregularity’, ‘Breach of Harmony’ and ‘utmost disorder and Confusion’ would have been anathema to the orderly Desaguliers, much as ‘dullness’ was to Pope. Desaguliers’ antipathy to ‘jarring Parties’ and ‘jarring Motions’, and his ideal of ‘the Almighty Architect’s unaltered Laws’ and ‘Harmony and mutual Love’, were set out clearly in his poem, ‘The Newtonian System of the World’, and mirrored in the new Masonic liturgy.\textsuperscript{134} This Enlightenment ideal encapsulated his beliefs and represented the ethos he, Cowper, Folkes, and others within Freemasonry, wished to project.

Wharton was not content to let matters pass; rather than acquiesce with Dalkeith’s choice of Desaguliers, a man with whom Wharton had nothing in common and whom he would have disliked intensely as a result of the reprimand at his installation, Wharton insisted that a vote be held to approve ‘the Deputy nominated by the Earl of Dalkeith’. The motion was declared narrowly in Desaguliers’ favour, by forty-three to forty-two. However, Wharton, after ‘some of the regular Healths’ had been drunk, repeated his objection and queried the accuracy of the count and the veracity of the tellers. He insisted that the vote be held again, and on being voted down again, departed:

Then the said late Grand Master and those who withdrew with him on being returned in the Hall and acquainted with the aforesaid Declaration of Brother Robinson ... went away from the Hall without any Ceremony. After other regular Healths drank, the Lodge adjourned.\textsuperscript{135}

Wharton’s unsuccessful exploits prompted Desaguliers to act. By the time Dalkeith was installed formally, Desaguliers had instigated changes to prevent, or

\textsuperscript{133} Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 52-3.
\textsuperscript{135} Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 53.
at least forestall, any future substantive alterations to the new model Freemasonry. Grand Lodge accepted formally the new Constitutions in January 1723, and the appointment of Cowper as Grand Secretary allowed control of the Minutes to pass to a loyal Whig and fellow member of the Horn. An additional resolution was passed in January which confirmed that ‘it was not in the power of any body of men to make any Alteration or Innovation in the body of Masonry without the consent first obtained of the Annual Grand Lodge’. And the following June, it was agreed that the Grand Master at installation ‘shall next nominate and appoint his Deputy Grand Master’. The amendments were of fundamental importance: in practice, the Deputy Grand Master exercised authority within Grand Lodge in the name of the aristocratic figurehead.

Wharton’s brief reign as Grand Master would have been nightmarish for those seeking to establish Freemasonry’s political bona fides. Alongside the Atterbury Plot, 1722 had been marked by the possibility of another Jacobite rising and heightened security and surveillance across London, with troops recalled from Ireland and encamped in Hyde Park as a show of force and insurance against any insurrection. With the government legitimately suspicious of any secret gatherings and societies, the embryonic Grand Lodge duly sent a deputation to Townshend to obtain his formal consent for the June meeting:

A select body of the Society of Freemasons waited on the Rt. Hon. the Lord Viscount Townshend, one of his Principal Secretaries of State, to signify to his Lordship, that being obliged by their Constitutions to hold a General Meeting now at Midsummer, according to ancient custom, they hoped the Administration would take no umbrage at their convention as they were all zealously affected to His Majesty’s Person and Government.136

Townshend’s consent was forthcoming. It was probably inevitable given that his eldest son, Charles (1700-64), was a member of the lodge at the Old Devil, Temple Bar, and Whig MP for Great Yarmouth137, and Charles Delafaye, Townshend’s loyal Under Secretary of State and a central figure in the government’s anti-Jacobite spy network, was a leading Freemason and a member of the Horn.

---

136 London Journal, 16 June 1722. A reference to the meeting in State Papers Domestic has not been located. Given the relationship between the parties, it is possible that the meeting did not take place in a formal sense, or at all.

137 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 20.
Simultaneously, Wharton honed his anti-Walpole and anti-Hanoverian rhetoric and reputation, defended Atterbury and established the anti-Walpole journal *The True Briton*. Uncomfortable with his enforced departure from Grand Lodge, Wharton founded an alternative society in 1724, the Gormogons, which was satirised by Hogarth in his painting *Masonry Brought to Light by the Gormogons*.

The first reference to Wharton’s Gormogons appeared in the *Daily Post*; this was followed by an anti-Masonic article in the *Plain Dealer*, and a subsequent mention in the *British Journal*:

> We hear that a Peer of the first Rank, a noted Member of the Society of Freemasons, hath suffered himself to be degraded as a Member of that Society, and his Leather Apron and Gloves to be burnt, and thereupon enter’d himself a Member of the Society of Gormogons, at the Castle-Tavern in Fleet Street.

It is a gauge of the interest generated by Wharton and Freemasonry that the press took up the affair; and that Hogarth believed the public’s curiosity and interest to be sufficient to justify the production of a print. However, apart from Hogarth, little more was heard of the Gormogons. A reference appeared in the *Grub Street Journal* on 16 April 1730, where the paper recorded that ‘Mr Dennis the famous Poet and Critic’ [John Dennis, 1657-1734] ‘was admitted a free and accepted Mason ... having renounc’d the Society of Gormogons of which he had been a member many years’. Classified advertisements for meetings of the Gormogons, usually at the Castle Tavern, Fleet Street, by ‘Command of the Volgi’, were also published periodically in 1729 and 1730. However, these were publicity generators, most probably linked to a ‘Pantomime Interlude’ - the *Harlequin Grand Volgi* - staged at the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, which featured a ‘Mandarin-Gormogon’ played by a ‘Mr Thurmond’. The pantomime was staged by Cibber, himself a Freemason. Tangentially, Cibber later helped to organise a theatrical benefit evening for John Dennis.

---

139 *Daily Post*, 3 September 1724.
140 *Plain Dealer*, 14 September 1724.
141 *British Journal*, 12 December 1724.
Wharton’s attention was quickly captured by other interests. He formed a second society the same year, the Schemers, which met at Lord Hillborough’s London home ‘for the advancement of that branch of happiness which the vulgar call whoring’\[^{143}\]:

Twenty very pretty fellows (the Duke of Wharton being president and chief director) have formed themselves into a committee of gallantry, who call themselves Schemers; and meet regularly three times a week to consult on gallant schemes.\[^{144}\]

Wharton’s financial profligacy obliged him to sell his remaining assets and to compound for his debts in Chancery, where his pro-Jacobite politics and dissolute lifestyle afforded limited political, public or judicial support. He departed England for the continent in June, 1725. After a short stay in Paris\[^{145}\] he left for Madrid, where he enlisted in the Spanish Army and later appeared against the British at Gibraltar. Despite this, Wharton petitioned Grand Lodge in 1728, by which date the conflict was over, to form a lodge in Madrid. The petition was granted and the lodge established by Charles Labelye, one of Desaguliers’ acolytes, who became its first Master. Given his reduced circumstances, Wharton’s continuing interest in Freemasonry is perhaps understandable: its growing reputation was such that it probably offered some influence and prestige, even in Catholic Spain. It was also a useful political tool. Moreover, at that point, Wharton was still a Duke. The lodge that Wharton co-founded is now known as La Matritense, and is recorded as Lodge No. 1 on the register of the Grand Orient of Spain, itself founded in 1817.

Wharton died a pauper in 1731 at the age of 32 at the monastery at Poblet, Spain. He had been outlawed by resolution of Parliament on the 3 April 1729 for failing to appear to answer the charge of treason. Wharton’s titles and remaining property were declared forfeit.

\[^{145}\] Tangentially, a letter to a ‘Madam Gell’ held in the Derbyshire Record Office: D258/38/6/28 1726, recorded intelligence from Rome that Wharton was to be governor to the Pretender’s son.
The Earl of Dalkeith, (1695-1751)

Francis Scott, 5th Earl of Dalkeith and 2nd Duke of Buccleuch (he succeeded in 1724), was 28 when elected Grand Master. The son of Sir James Scott, Earl of Dalkeith, and the grandson of James Scott, the 1st Duke of Monmouth, the eldest illegitimate son of Charles II beheaded by James II, Dalkeith was wealthy, well-connected and, unlike Wharton, an ardent pro-Hanoverian. He was sworn a member of the Privy Council and invested KT, one of only sixteen knights granted Scotland’s premier chivalric order, in 1725.

Despite maintaining a large London house at Albemarle Street and later Grosvenor Street, Dalkeith was essentially a Scottish peer and lived principally at his estate surrounding the town of Dalkeith, southeast of Edinburgh. He married Lady Jane Douglas, the daughter of the 2nd Duke of Queensberry, on 5 April 1720 in London. An anecdote concerning his wedding supports the suggestion that he was unusually compliant.

In March 1720, a marriage had been announced between Dalkeith and Lady Jane Douglas, the only sister of the Duke of Douglas. Lady Jane was considered beautiful, intelligent and highly eligible; she lived close to Dalkeith at Merchiston Castle, Edinburgh, with her widowed mother, Lady Mary Kerr. However, in an extraordinary sequence of events, Lady Kerr broke off the engagement within a few days of the marriage being announced and instead arranged for Dalkeith to marry another Scottish aristocrat. The wedding took place less than a month later. The aborted first engagement led to a duel between Dalkeith and the Duke of Douglas on 25 March, fought behind Montagu House in Westminster;

---

146 James Scott was styled as ‘Earl of Doncaster’ (1674-85), and ‘Earl of Dalkeith’ (1685-1705).
147 In addition to his own assets, he inherited an income of £12,000 per year on the death of his mother in 1724: Parker’s London News or the Impartial Intelligencer, 13 April 1724.
148 For example, Weekly Packet, 19 March 1720.
149 Rosalind K. Marshall, ‘Lady Jane Douglas (1698–1753)’, ODNB (Oxford, 2004), has stated that Dalkeith’s wife, Lady Jane Douglas (1701-29) was Lady Mary Kerr’s sister-in-law. A review of The Peerage does not appear to substantiate this. None of Lady Mary Kerr’s three brothers (Charles Kerr, Lord of Cramond; Sir William Kerr, 2nd Marquess of Lothian; and General Mark Kerr) was related through marriage to Lady Jane Douglas. Similarly, neither Kerr’s husband stepbrother nor stepsister (Lady Margaret Douglas and Archibald Douglas, 1st Earl of Forfar) appear to be related to Lady Jane Douglas. However, both were members of the extended Douglas clan.
150 Ibid.
both were wounded. The quarrel was resolved through the offices of the Duke of Argyll two weeks later. Dalkeith’s replacement bride was also called Lady Jane Douglas. Ironically, given what had occurred the previous month, the marriage brought Dalkeith the estates, albeit not the titles, of the Douglas clan.

Notwithstanding his absence in Scotland, Dalkeith was declared Grand Master in June 1723 at a meeting at which Desaguliers, as DGM, presided:

The Ancient Society of Free and Accepted Masons ... assembled to thye Number of about 600 at Merchant Taylors’ Hall where they unanimously chose the Earl of Dalkeith their Grand Master for the year ensuing.

However, Dalkeith was present at each subsequent meeting of Grand Lodge during his year in office: on 25 November 1723; 19 February 1724; and 28 April the same year, at which meeting Richmond, his cousin, was declared his successor. Dalkeith also attended the subsequent lodge meeting on 24 June, at which Richmond was installed.

The date of Dalkeith’s initiation as a Freemason is not known, but certainly pre-dated 3 November 1723, on which occasion Stukeley recorded his attendance at the Fountain Tavern in the Strand. Dalkeith was also recorded in the 1723 Constitutions as the Master of the Rummer, Charing Cross, lodge number ‘XI’ in Anderson’s list in the Constitutions, and may have been initiated in that lodge a year or more earlier. Dalkeith’s conduct while Grand Master suggests that he was influenced strongly by Desaguliers. Indeed, his actions as prospective Grand Master, with the appointment of Desaguliers as his Deputy, and Francis Sorrel and John Senex as his Wardens, both of whom were strong supporters of Desaguliers, reinforces the assessment. It is also possible, but not certain, that Desaguliers promoted Dalkeith’s election as FRS in March 1724 as a way of thanking him for his support.

---

151 Evening Post, 26 March 1720; Weekly Packet, 26 March 1720; and Original Weekly Journal, 2 April 1720.
152 Original Weekly Journal, 9 April 1720.
153 This Lady Jane Douglas was also the sister of the 3rd Duke of Queensbury. Cf. Post Boy, 5 April 1720.
154 Dalkeith had five children, the first of which was born the following year: Weekly Packet, 18 February 1721. The Duchess of Dalkeith died of smallpox in 1729, aged 28.
155 Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 29 June 1723.
The Lincolnshire archives contain around twenty references to Dalkeith, both as Earl of Dalkeith and Duke of Buccleuch. Unfortunately, none refers to his Freemasonry or to his activities within Grand Lodge or at the Rummer. However, there is extensive miscellaneous correspondence with others who were Freemasons, including the Dukes of Montagu, Richmond and Newcastle, which confirm the social and political bonds which existed. Richmond took a particular interest in Dalkeith’s son, also Francis (1721-1750), who was described in a letter to Newcastle ‘as honest of any of us and vastly desirous to be in Parliament ... it would be a credit to a ministry to bring him in’. 

Dalkeith provided stability after Wharton’s short and disruptive tenure. His first act was to reassert the Grand Master’s right to appoint his Deputy, a significant gesture that reinforced Desaguliers’ authority. His second was to expel ‘Brother Huddleston of the King’s Head lodge in Ivy Lane’ for casting unsubstantiated aspersions on the character of the Deputy Grand Master, that is, Desaguliers, and to appoint a new and presumably more loyal Master to that lodge. Under Dalkeith’s nominal auspices, the Grand Lodge Minutes provide evidence of Desaguliers’ drive to centralise and control Freemasonry: no new lodge, nor its Master and Wardens, would be recognised unless such a lodge was ‘regularly constituted’ by Grand Lodge. And ‘no Brother belonging to any lodge within the Bills of Mortality [would] be admitted to any lodge as a Visitor unless he be known to ... that lodge ... and ... no Strange Brother, however Skilled in Masonry [would] be admitted without taking the Obligation over again’.

---

157 The Dalkeith family papers are held at the Lincolnshire Archives.
158 ‘Richmond to Newcastle, 9 March 1745’: McCann, The Correspondence of the Dukes of Richmond and Newcastle, p. 209.
159 Grand Lodge Minutes, 25 November 1723, p. 54.
160 Desaguliers’ impositions were a constant theme at Grand Lodge: the Minutes of 17 March 1731, for example, recorded that: ‘Dr. Desaguliers taking Notice of some Irregularities in wearing the Marks of Distinction ... proposed that none but the Grand Master, his Deputy and Wardens shall wear their jewels in Gold or Gilt pendant to blue Ribbons about their Necks and white Leather Aprons lined with blue Silk; that all those who have served any of the three Grand Offices shall wear the like Aprons lined with blue Silk in all Lodges and assemblies of Masons when they appear clothed; that those Brethren that are Steward shall wear their aprons lined with red Silk and their proper Jewels pendant to red Ribbons ... and not otherwise’. Cf. Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 146; also pp. 91, 102, 105, 128 and 134.
Dalkeith attended Grand Lodge on several occasions after stepping down as Grand Master and it is notable and probably not a coincidence that Desaguliers accompanied him on each such instance. The gathering on November 1724 was the first quarterly communication at which past GMs were permitted to attend. And it was at this meeting and most probably at Desaguliers’ instigation, although there is no direct evidence to support the contention, that Dalkeith recommended the establishment of the Grand Charity. Dalkeith also attended Kingston’s procession and installation in January 1730, and the February 1735 meeting of Grand Lodge. On the latter occasion, he was recorded in the Minutes as the Duke of Buccleuch, and donated £27 10s to the General Charity with a recommendation that charitable assistance be given to a member of the Rummer. The payment was later provided by Grand Lodge on Desaguliers’ proposition. Dalkeith also visited the Horn during Richmond’s tenure as Grand Master where he was present at the lodge meetings in March and November 1724, again with Desaguliers at his side.161

Charles Lennox, 2nd Duke of Richmond & Lennox, (1701–1750)

Dalkeith was succeeded as Grand Master by Charles Lennox, 2nd Duke of Richmond. Richmond was 23. He appointed Folkes, one of his closest friends, as his DGM, and Sorrel and Payne as Grand Wardens. Payne was later mentioned by Richmond in correspondence with Newcastle regarding with his application as a Commissioner for the Lottery: ‘I have always recommended one Mr George Payne, an old acquaintance of mine in Westminster, for whom as yet I have always succeeded’.162 Cowper retained his position as Grand Secretary. All four were members of Richmond’s lodge at the Horn. The installation took place at the capacious Merchant Taylor’s Hall on 24 June 1724. The occasion was described at length in Anderson’s 1738 Constitutions.163 The ‘persons of distinction’, processions, orations, Masonic music and songs at the installation were designed to make an impact within and without Freemasonry, and to maintain and enhance fraternal bonding within the Craft. They succeeded, and

161 British Journal, 28 March 1724; and Daily Post, 23 November 1724.
162 ‘Richmond to Newcastle, 28 November 1742’: McCann, The Correspondence of the Dukes of Richmond and Newcastle, pp. 91-2.
the new ‘regular’ Freemasonry continued to gain popularity both in London and across the provinces.\textsuperscript{164}

London’s population in the mid-late 1720s was around 600,000. Of this number, perhaps around 2-3\% could be termed members of the social, political and financial elite, including aristocrats, wealthy gentry, and successful bankers and merchants, with a further 10-15\% or so being of the upper middling sort, comprising lawyers, physicians, apothecaries, military officers, traders and large-scale shopkeepers etc. In this context, Freemasonry’s London membership of c. 4-5,000 represented up to 20\% of this section of the adult male population.\textsuperscript{165}

Richmond, the only son of the 1\textsuperscript{st} Duke, another illegitimate son of Charles II\textsuperscript{166}, was born at the family’s Goodwood estate on 18 May 1701. He married at The Hague in December 1719 to satisfy a gambling debt incurred by his father and, without his young wife, immediately afterwards left for the Grand Tour. On his return in 1722, Richmond purchased a commission as Captain in the Horse Guards. He was also elected MP for Chichester, the family seat. On his father’s death the following year, Richmond succeeded to his titles and left the House of Commons accordingly.\textsuperscript{167}

In common with Montagu, a close friend, Richmond was a loyal Whig. Newcastle described him as ‘the most solid support of the Whig interest in Chichester’, and the two became political allies.\textsuperscript{168} McCann noted that with Newcastle’s backing, Sussex returned, unopposed, two government supporters to Parliament throughout Richmond’s life.\textsuperscript{169} Richmond was rewarded accordingly: appointed Aide de Camp to George I in 1724, and reappointed in the same role by George II;
and installed a Knight of the Bath in 1725 and a Knight of the Garter in 1726. Early sinecures included those of Lord High Constable of England and a Lord of the Bedchamber (appointed 1727), and Master of the Horse (from 1735 until 1750). He was also appointed a Privy Councillor in 1735.

Militarily, Richmond had only a brief service career. However, it was not insignificant. He was, in McCann’s words, ‘a conscientious officer’\(^{170}\), and he served as Aide-de-Camp to George I and remained in the role under George II. Richmond was promoted Brigadier General in 1739, Major General in 1742, Lieutenant General in 1745 and full General later the same year.\(^{171}\) His political loyalty and personal connections to Walpole\(^{172}\), and his ‘staunch defence of the Whig party and Hanoverian succession’\(^{173}\), led to his appointment as a Lord Justice of the Realm (1740) and to quasi-diplomatic missions in France, described below, a role assisted considerably by his French title.

In November 1734, on the death of his grandmother, Richmond succeeded to the Dukedom of Aubigny. He travelled to France the following year to claim his inheritance, granted by Charles VII in recognition of assistance given by John Stewart, Lord Darnley, against the English army in 1421.\(^{174}\) Darnley had been granted the title in perpetuity and as duc d’Aubigny, Richmond was a legitimate member of the French nobility.\(^{175}\) Desaguliers accompanied Richmond to France and they established a Masonic lodge at Richmond’s estate upon their arrival.\(^\text{176}\)

Following a formal ex post request ‘to hold a lodge at his castle d’Aubigny’, Grand Lodge granted Richmond a warrant the following year. The lodge, number 133, remained on Grand Lodge’s lists until 1768.

\(^{170}\) Ibid, p. xxxi.

\(^{171}\) McCann, ‘2nd Duke of Richmond’, ODNB.

\(^{172}\) ‘Note from Walpole appointing Richmond to vote as his proxy at the General Court of the Royal Academy of Music, 4 December 1727’: West Sussex Record Office: Goodwood/142-145, 1727-1735. Cf. also, ‘Letters from Walpole to Richmond regarding the Shoreham election’: West Sussex Record Office: Goodwood/1961.

\(^{173}\) McCann, ‘2nd Duke of Richmond’, ODNB.

\(^{174}\) Ibid.

\(^{175}\) Haycock, ‘Martin Folkes’, ODNB.

\(^{176}\) Although extremely cordial, Desaguliers’ personal relationship with Richmond also reflected their relative status. Cf. ‘Letter in verse to Richmond from ‘JTD’’: West Sussex Record Office: Goodwood 110 D Correspondents, November 1721 – December 1749. Their relationship and relative status was in clear contrast to that of Folkes/Richmond.
Freemasonry in France has often been associated with Jacobitism. However, certain French Freemasons were anglophiles who favoured the ‘natural liberties’ and philosophical ideas associated with the scientific Enlightenment, Parliamentary politics and English culture. Three Parisian lodges, Louis d’Argent, Coustos-Villeroy and Bussy-Aumont, are believed to have used ritual and enjoyed scientific and other lectures similar to those in English lodges. With the election of members and officers, and byelaws enacted based on majority vote, a radical concept in France, such lodges may have set a modest challenge to the monarch-centred institutions that characterised Louis XV’s reign. Moreover, from a British standpoint, the (albeit small) group of aristocrats and intellectuals attracted to such ‘regular’ Freemasonry formed a faction that might be exploited for political gain.

Daniel Ligou, in his ‘Structures et Symbolisme Maçonniques’, and James Franklin, have suggested that English Freemasonry in Paris created some tension between Masonic constitutional self-government and religious tolerance on one side, and France’s absolutist regime and Catholic dogma on the other. However, it would be wrong to assert that this undermined in any material way the political and religious order. This interpretation is substantiated by the relatively modest police actions against France’s Masonic lodges, and by an initial indifference to Pope Clement XII’s Bull of 28 April 1738, which condemned and prohibited ‘these ... Francs Massons’.

Louis XV’s concerns about Freemasonry led to an order to Rene Hérault, his chief of police, to investigate possible sedition. However, although Hérault raided Ambassador Waldegrave’s residence in Paris in 1738, Freemasonry was permitted to continue. Indeed, Jérôme Lalande, the French astronomer, mathematician

---

184 Weisberger, ‘Parisian Masonry, the Lodge of the Nine Sisters’, p. 161.
and later Master of the Lodge of the Nine Muses, commented that lodge Louis d’Argent attracted up to six hundred members in the late 1730s.\textsuperscript{185}

Richmond’s engagement with Freemasonry in France and in the Netherlands was both social and political, a motive given weight by Richmond’s relationship with Newcastle, Secretary of State for the Southern Department from 1724-48\textsuperscript{186}, and with Charles Delafaye, Under Secretary of State, government spymaster and a member of Richmond’s Horn lodge since at least 1723.

However, Richmond was exporting Freemasonry to France even before he succeeded as duc d’Aubigny. In September 1734, the London papers reported that a lodge had been held at the Duchess of Portsmouth, his grandmother’s house in Paris where:

the Duke of Richmond assisted by another English nobleman of distinction there, President Montesquieu, Brigadier Churchill\textsuperscript{187}, Ed. Yonge Esq.\textsuperscript{188} and Walter Strickland, admitted several persons of distinction into that most ancient and honourable society.\textsuperscript{189}

Among those admitted Freemasons by Richmond were Marquis Brancas\textsuperscript{190}, General Skelton\textsuperscript{191} and President Montesquieu’s son.\textsuperscript{192}

A previously unremarked letter from Thomas Hill to the Duke of Richmond dated 23 August 1734 discussed the establishment of the Duke’s lodge at Aubigny. The letter provides important primary source material. Hill, the Duke’s former tutor,


\textsuperscript{187} The Hon. George Churchill was a member of the Rummer, Charing Cross.

\textsuperscript{188} Edward Young was the Registrar of the Order of the Bath. \textit{Cf. London Evening Post}, 5 September 1734.

\textsuperscript{189} \textit{St James’s Evening Post}, 7 September 1734.

\textsuperscript{190} Louis de Brancas de Forcalquier (1672-1750), Marquis de Brancas, was a French aristocrat. He was appointed a Chevalier de la Toison d’Or in 1713, served as French Ambassador to Madrid, and was made a Marshal of France in 1740. He also held office as governor of Provence.

\textsuperscript{191} Major General Lord Skelton, who died two years later in May 1736, ‘followed the fortunes of the later King James II’: \textit{Weekly Miscellany}, 29 May 1736. He was buried ‘without ceremony’ at St Sulpice in Paris: \textit{Daily Gazetteer}, 27 May 1736.

\textsuperscript{192} \textit{Daily Courant}, 6 September 1734. Montesquieu’s son was Jean Baptiste Secondat de Montesquieu. \textit{Cf. below}.  

and by then a friend and member of his household, was a frequent correspondent.\textsuperscript{193} His observations offer a window on Desaguliers’ methodology and motives, and provide evidence of a willingness to use artifice and literary embroidery ‘in order to give his style the greater air of antiquity and consequently make it more venerable’ if the ‘further propagation of masonry’ would result. An extract from the letter is quoted below:

I have communicated to the new, if I am not mistaken, right worshipful ... Dr J. Theophilus Desaguliers, your Grace’s command relating to the brotherhood of Aubigny sur Nere. I need not tell you how pleased he is with the further propagation of masonry ... When I mentioned the diploma [warrant], he immediately asked me if I had not \textit{Amadis de Gaula}\textsuperscript{194}, or some of the other romances. I was something surprised at his question, and began to think, as the house was tiled\textsuperscript{195}, our brother had a mind to crack a joke. But it turned out quite otherwise. He only wanted to get a little of the vieux Gaulois\textsuperscript{196} in order to give his style the greater air of antiquity and consequently make it more venerable to the new lodge. He went from me fully intent on getting that or some other such book. What the production will be you may expect to see soon.

Among other [subjects] we had, he asked me if I intended going over to Holland. I told him it was very probable I might, if nothing fell to hinder me. Why, said the Dr., I might care if I go too, and when we return we shall have brethren anew to make a lodge. It will be very pretty to have one of His Majesty’s yachts a lodge ...\textsuperscript{197}

It subsequently became the custom for Richmond to travel to Aubigny each autumn. In September 1735, the \textit{St James’s Evening Post} reported that Richmond and Desaguliers had formed a lodge at the Hotel Bussy in Rue Bussy where:

His Grace the Duke of Richmond and the Rev Dr Desaguliers ... authorised by the present Grand Master ... having called a lodge at the Hotel Bussy ... his Excellency the Earl of Waldegrave, his Majesty’s Ambassador to the French King, the Right Hon. the President Montesquieu, the Marquis de Lomaría, Lord Dursley, son of the Earl of Berkley ... and several other persons, both French

\textsuperscript{193} Hill was later appointed Secretary to the Council of Trade and Plantations (the Board of Trade); he held the office from 19 October 1737 - 20 September 1758. Cf. J.C. Sainty, \textit{Office-Holders in Modern Britain} (London, 1974), vol. 3, pp. 28-37.

\textsuperscript{194} \textit{Amadis de Gaula} is a sixteenth century Spanish tale of knight errantry. It was the subject of an opera by Handel in 1715: \textit{Amadigi di Gaula}.

\textsuperscript{195} ‘Tyled’ – the reference is to a closed and guarded Masonic lodge.

\textsuperscript{196} Literally the ‘Old Gaul’, perhaps ‘ancient or historical French’.

\textsuperscript{197} A copy of the letter is at the UGLE Library: HC/8/F/3. It provides tangential evidence of Desaguliers’ attendance at The Hague in 1734 in connection with the establishment of La Chapelle’s lodge. Cf. below. Richmond is also known to have visited The Hague in May and September/October 1734.
and English, were present; and the following noblemen and gentlemen were admitted to the Order: namely, His Grace the Duke of Kingston, the Hon. Count de St Florentin, Secretary of State to his most Christian Majesty; the Right Hon. The Lord Chewton, son to the Earl of Waldegrave; Mr Pelham, Mr Armiger, Mr Colton and Mr Clement ... After which, the new Brethren gave a handsome Entertainment to all the Company'.

Ambassador Waldegrave, the 1st Earl Waldegrave (1684-1741), had been a Freemason for at least twelve years; his name appears in the 1723 list of members at the Horn. A grandson of James II, he was a convert to Anglicanism from Catholicism and, having rejected Jacobitism, was held in royal favour: appointed a Lord of the Bedchamber in 1723 and again, unsolicited, in 1730 until his death. Waldegrave had been Ambassador to Austria from 1728 until 1730; he was subsequently appointed Ambassador to France. In common with Philip Stanhope, Lord Chesterfield, a friend and fellow ambassador at The Hague, he was a prominent Freemason and prepared to use his ambassadorial offices to promote the Craft.

Charles Louis de Secondat (1689-1755), the Baron Montesquieu, was President de le Parlement de Bourdeaux, a hereditary legal office, and a member of the French Academy of Sciences (1728). He had accompanied Waldegrave on the greater part of his journey to Vienna in 1728, and Waldegrave had subsequently introduced Montesquieu to Chesterfield, then at The Hague. Chesterfield invited Montesquieu to London in 1729 and presented him at Court. Montesquieu stayed in London for two years during which he was proposed FRS (in 1730) by Hans Sloane, fellow physician George Teissier, and the Huguenot soldier, rake and author, Paul de St. Hyacinthe, who had co-founded the Journal litteraire with ‘sGravesande in 1713.

---

199 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 6 & 24.
201 The position was reportedly equivalent to that of principal judge or magistrate in the court of appeal.
202 He was physician to George I and George II, and to Chelsea and St George’s Hospitals.
203 Cf. Sackler Archives.
Montesquieu’s family had been courtiers for over a century, having originally served the Huguenot Henry of Navarre, and Montesquieu had himself married a Protestant. He was initiated into Freemasonry at the Horn in 1730, although his name is not recorded in the members’ lists submitted to Grand Lodge.204 His political and social views, his authorship of the satirical Lettres Persanes in 1721, and his stance on the separation of powers within government, would have marked him as a useful political ally. The framework of a Masonic lodge provided a discrete forum (or private ‘public sphere’) for Montesquieu and others to discuss philosophy and science free of political and religious censure. Interestingly, his son, Jean Baptiste Secondat de Montesquieu, had been initiated a Freemason in Paris by Richmond and Desaguliers at the lodge that had met a year earlier in September 1734 at the Duchess of Portsmouth’s house.205 Jean Baptiste Secondat was later elected FRS (1744), and succeeded to the post of President of the Bordeaux Parliament on his father’s death.

Montesquieu’s correspondence with Richmond was published in Robert Shackleton, ‘Montesquieu’s Correspondence’, French Studies, XII.4 (1958), 324-45. The originals are held at the Goodwood archives at the West Sussex County Record Office. The letters reveal a solid personal relationship between the two men who had met one another during Montesquieu’s visit to London, and Montesquieu’s familiarity with both Montagu and Folkes. Desaguliers is also mentioned as ‘le docteur Desaguliers, la première colonne de la maçonnerie’. And Montesquieu continued, ‘Je ne doute pas que sur cette nouvelle tout ce qui reste encore à recevoir en France de gens de mérite ne se fasse maçon.’206 Interestingly, John Misaubin, a London-based Huguenot physician and Freemason was also known to Montesquieu (and to Richmond).207

However, the most important initiate at the Rue Bussy lodge meeting was Louis Phélypeaux (1705–77), Comte de Saint-Florentin, Marquis (1725) and, later, duc

205 Whitehall Evening Post, 5 September 1734.
de La Vrillière (1770), who was in 1735 Secretary of State to Louis XV, and a senior adviser and courtier. He was also the Minister with responsibility for the Huguenots in France. Phélypeaux would have been an appropriate man to cultivate and his initiation as a Mason was unlikely to have been accidental. The choice would have been guided by Waldegrave and, perhaps, approved by Walpole. The concurrent initiation of the Duke of Kingston\(^\text{208}\) and of Earl Waldegrave’s son, Lord Chewton, may have been designed to flatter Phélypeaux in the same manner as the parallel initiation of the Duke of Newcastle alongside the raising of Francis, Duke of Lorraine, at Houghton Hall in 1731.

The Duke of Lorraine’s initiation had taken place at The Hague under Desaguliers’ auspices at a lodge at the home of Lord Chesterfield, the British Ambassador to the Low Countries, which had been formed specifically for the purpose earlier in that year.\(^\text{209}\) Desaguliers had been engaged on a course of scientific lectures in the Low Countries, and Lorraine had attended at The Hague:

> The learned and renowned Dr Desaguliers is now presenting a complete course of lectures on Mechanical and Experimental Philosophy which has been attended not only by persons of the first rank, but which has also been honoured on several occasions by the presence of the Duke of Lorraine.\(^\text{210}\)

Kwaadgras has suggested that Lorraine’s meeting with Chesterfield had been intended to discuss his forthcoming diplomatic visit to London.\(^\text{211}\) Certainly,

---

\(^\text{208}\) Evelyn Pierrepont, 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) Duke of Kingston (1711-73), succeeded to his grandfather’s title in 1726. He opened the batting for Eton against an All England eleven in 1725, which may suggest how he was known to Richmond, who was a cricket fanatic. Kingston spent ten years on the Grand Tour where he was known for what may be politely termed his ‘loose living’. He was a loyal Hanoverian and later played an active role in the 1745, raising and becoming Colonel of his own Regiment, ‘Kingston’s Light Horse’, which fought against the Jacobites at Culloden.


\(^\text{211}\) Evert Kwaadgras, Masonry with a Message and a Mission: an address to Internet Lodge, Kingston-Upon-Hull, 8 August 2002. Carpenter has stated that the lecture course Desaguliers gave in Rotterdam prior to his visiting The Hague was given in French and Latin, from 07.30 in the morning until 4.00 in the afternoon. Carpenter, p. 51.
Lorraine’s Masonic initiation was probably as much, if not more, political as fraternal: the 2nd Treaty of Vienna had led to the collapse of the Anglo-French alliance and made Austria an appealing ally.212

Tangentially, Anderson, in his report of the meeting in the 1738 Constitutions, noted that a ‘Hollandish Brother’ also attended Lorraine’s initiation. Although Kwaadgras suggests that this was Vincent La Chapelle, it is difficult to imagine La Chapelle, previously a London-based French Huguenot, being described as such.213 La Chapelle was a member of the Huguenot-dominated lodge at Prince Eugene’s Head Coffee House in St Alban’s Street.214 He had travelled to the Netherlands with Chesterfield (he was employed as his principal chef), and remained in the Low Countries in 1732 after Chesterfield’s return to England.

On 30 September 1734, with the assistance of Desaguliers and Richmond, La Chapelle founded a permanent lodge in The Hague.215 The lodge was warranted by Grand Lodge in 1735.216 Gould noted a second meeting at The Hague the following year.217 On this occasion, the attendees included the politically important Jacob Cornelis Rademacher (1700-48), Treasurer General to the Prince of Orange, noted as ‘Grand Master’, and his Deputy, Kuenen, the Dutch translator and publisher of the 1723 Constitutions.218

---

213 La Chapelle (also written ‘Chappelle’) was a celebrated if peripatetic professional chef. In 1731, he was Chesterfield’s master chef de cuisine at The Hague. He later became head chef to the Prince of Orange, having held the same position with the Count of Montijo, at that time an envoy to England from Spain. La Chapelle was subsequently principal chef to Madame Pompadour. It is possible that Richmond recommended him for the position with Chesterfield. Chesterfield had sought his advice some three years earlier: Cf. ‘Letter from Chesterfield to Richmond (undated)’: A Duke and his Friends, pp. 157-8.
214 La Roche, another member of the Prince Eugene’s Head lodge and a fellow Huguenot, spied for the government and corresponded directly with Robert Walpole. Cf. CUL: Manuscripts and Archives, Ch(H), Correspondence, 1, 1178, 1371 (Horace Walpole), 1454, 1864.
215 The Duke and Duchess had friends and family at The Hague and were frequent visitors. Cf. Richmond, A Duke and his Friends, pp. 34-5, 46-7, 50-1, 60-2, 64, 75-6, 142, 154, 162, 282.
216 The ‘Hague Lodge in Holland for Constitution’: Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 262. Cf. also, Lane, Masonic Records.
217 Saturdaghe Courant (Amsterdam), 3 November 1734: quoted by Gould, History of Freemasonry Throughout the World, p. 204.
218 Ibid, p. 203.
La Chapelle’s lodge at The Hague was dominated by Huguenot émigrés and others with Orangist politics. Jacob has suggested that the lodge’s establishment (and, by inference, that of other Dutch lodges) was politically motivated\textsuperscript{219}, and it is hard to disagree. The involvement of Richmond and Desaguliers supports the view, and the establishment of the lodges could be seen as a parallel move to the institution of similar ‘regular’ lodges in Paris. Although Dutch Freemasons were later ‘instructed to cease their assemblies’ and between 1735 and 1737 Dutch Freemasonry was declared illegal, the prohibition was largely ineffective and Masonry burgeoned after the repeal of the magistrates’ edict of suppression.\textsuperscript{220}

Following his initiation and during his visit to England later the same year, Lorraine was invited to attend an ‘occasional’ lodge at Walpole’s country house, Houghton Hall, in Norfolk. There, in the presence of Newcastle, General Churchill, Lord Burlington\textsuperscript{221}, William Capell\textsuperscript{222}, and others, he was raised to become a Master Mason. The ceremony was followed ‘in the proper manner’ by a banquet, and fraternal toasts and song.

Freemasonry’s clubbable fraternalism was fundamental to its social success and was assumed with good natured ease by Richmond. He was held in high regard by his contemporaries. Lord Hervey, a friend, considered that ‘there never lived a man of more amiable composition ... thoroughly noble in his way of acting, talking and thinking’\textsuperscript{223}; and Henry Fielding described him as ‘excellent’, and as ‘one of the worthiest of Magistrates, as well as the best of men’.\textsuperscript{224}

In common with Montagu, Richmond’s life and celebrity status was the subject of considerable public interest. The Burney Collection contains over 600 press articles concerning the Duke over the ten-year period from his father’s death in May 1723 to June 1733, and more than 2,300 additional entries in subsequent

\textsuperscript{219} Jacob, The Radical Enlightenment, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{220} Coincidentally or otherwise, Jacob commented that ‘prominent Masons played central roles in the restoration of the stadholderate’: ibid, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{222} The Earl of Essex, a senior courtier and first Gentleman of the Bedchamber in Prince George’s household.
\textsuperscript{224} Henry Fielding, An Enquiry into the Causes of the late increase in Robbers (London, 1751), 2\textsuperscript{nd} edn., p. 107.
years. Although he ranked well below Montagu in terms of wealth, and his projects at Goodwood proved a constant and draining expense, he was an eminent and popular member of the aristocracy and, within Sussex, a prominent and politically valuable politician.

The publication in the press of Richmond’s social and Masonic diary added to the regard in which Masonry had begun to be held, and embedded in the public consciousness what were now perceived as its relatively accessible yet exclusive characteristics:

Last Saturday his Grace the Duke of Richmond, accompanied by the Rt Hon the Lord Dalkeith, Sir Thomas Macworth, Dr Desaguliers and other Gentlemen, went to the lodge at Richmond, and made John Rily of the Middle Temple, Esq., and another Gentleman Freemasons. After Dinner his Grace returned to Town, and being Grand Master of that Society, presided at their quarterly meeting that was held that night.

Among the attendees, Sir Thomas Mackworth (1678-1745), the 4th baronet, was an MP for Rutland (1694-5, 1701-8 and 1721-7) and Portsmouth (1713-15). The family had substantial estates within Rutland, and his father, the 3rd baronet, had served similarly as MP for Rutland (1679, 1680-1 and 1685-94). Sir Thomas was appointed a knight of the shire in 1721, to the General Court of the Charitable Corporation in 1726, and was later elected Deputy Governor of the Mine Adventure Corporation. He had a strong interest in practical science, evidence for which was expressed *inter alia* in a ‘very advantageous Proposal’ made before the General Court of the Society of the City of London ‘for making and manufacturing Copper, Brass, etc. at Mitcham Taplow and Temple Mills’. Masonically, Mackworth was Warden of the King’s Arms lodge at St Paul’s and a member of the Red Lyon, Surrey.
Before becoming Grand Master, Richmond had been Master of his own lodge at the Rummer and Grapes, later the Horn. It is possible that his father, the 1st Duke, had also been a gentleman Freemason. The Minutes of Grand Lodge for 2 March 1732 record that Edward Hall, a member of the Swan in Chichester, appeared before the Grand Lodge with a charity petition declaring that ‘he was made a Mason by the late Duke of Richmond six and thirty years ago.’

Unlike the majority of his fellow noble Grand Masters, principally figureheads for Grand Lodge, Richmond’s interest in and commitment to Freemasonry may have been more profound. This was articulated not only through the frequency of his attendance at Grand Lodge, and at his own lodges in London and France, but also in his assiduity in inviting colleagues from the Royal Society, the Society of Antiquaries, and elsewhere from within his circles to join him in the Craft. The press recorded a succession of friends and fellow aristocrats who joined the Horn and other lodges with which he was associated, and his initiations were a constant feature in newspaper reports throughout the 1720s and 1730s.

Under Richmond’s Mastership, and probably with Payne and Desaguliers’ active assistance, the Horn became a focal point for ‘gentlemanly’ Freemasonry, and virtually a feeder organisation for Grand Lodge. The Horn’s membership included men from the senior ranks of the Middlesex and Westminster bench and civil service, and a mixture of influential aristocrats, army officers, parliamentarians, diplomats and professional men. The authority exercised by the lodge was deep-seated, and the number and nature of its members, set out in the 1723 and 1725 membership lists submitted to Grand Lodge, emphasise its numerical and social dominance over the three other founding lodges.

The Horn was the largest of the original founding lodges, with over 70 members. In contrast, the lodge at the Goose and Gridiron in St. Paul’s Churchyard had 22

---

234 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 216, 2 March 1732. Questions were put to Hall and, after discussion, it was resolved that he be awarded six guineas ‘for his present subsistence’.

235 Grand Lodge Minutes: pp. 54-8 elected and presides at Grand Lodge; p. 60, orders lodges to consider proposals for a General Charity; p. 62, term of office extended by 6 months; p. 63, proposes Paisley as his successor; pp. 64-8, report of committee re General Charity; p. 72, proposes that Past Grand Wardens be admitted members of Grand Lodge; pp. 116, 119, 114, 197, 213, 216, 217, 229, 241, 251, 263, 264, 271, 286, 300: present in Grand Lodge; p. 218, dines at Hampstead.

236 For example, the initiation of the Earl of Sunderland: London Journal, 3 January 1730.
members; the lodge at the Queen’s Head in Knave’s Acre, formerly the Apple Tree Tavern, Covent Garden, had 21; and the Queen’s Head in Holborn, formerly the Crown Ale House, Parkers Lane, had 14. Moreover, unlike the three other founding lodges where not a single member had sufficient social status to be titled ‘esquire’, the Horn’s members comprised thirteen English and continental aristocrats. These included Charles Douglas (1698-1778), 3rd Duke of Queensberry and 2nd Duke of Dover, a Whig peer and Vice Admiral of Scotland; and Lord Waldegrave (1684-1741), later ambassador to France. James Hamilton, Lord Paisley (1661-1734), Grand Master in 1725; and Henry Scott (1676-1730), 1st Earl of Deloraine, the second son of the Duke of Monmouth, Colonel of the 2nd Troop of Horse Guards and of his own Regiment of Foot, were also members. The lodge’s parliamentary connections were similarly distinguished. Many of the lodge’s aristocratic members were MPs or, like Richmond, had influence over who would be selected for seats within their jurisdiction. The Horn also had influence within the army. Its members included two general officers, ten colonels and other officers below field rank.

In common with many other aristocrats and, in particular, the Duke of Montagu, Richmond had strong scientific and antiquarian interests. He was elected FRS in 1722 (as Earl March) and again in 1724 (as Duke of Richmond)\footnote{Sackler Archives.}, in both cases proposed by Hans Sloane\footnote{Sackler Archives.}; and in September 1728, was invited to attend a meeting of the Académie Royale des Sciences in Paris.\footnote{Cf. ‘Letter from Richmond to Folkes, Aubigny, 3 October 1728’: ‘I was the other day at the Academie Royale des Sciences at Paris; where I am persuaded there is not much more real learning, but I’ll venture to say there is much more dignity kept up there than at our Society, they have given me some hopes of admitting me, when there is a vacancy among the ignorant ones that they call honorary Fellows; which number is fix’d to ten’. Desaguliers was a corresponding member of the Academie. Richmond, A Duke and his Friends, pp. 154-6.} Richmond obtained a doctorate in law at Cambridge in 1728 and requested election as a FRCP the same year. His interest in medicine was genuine, and he was one of the earliest inoculators in Sussex. He also collected information on the Chichester smallpox epidemic in 1739, from which he had suffered in 1724/5; and observed and reported on Abraham Trembley’s zoological experiments.\footnote{Abraham Trembley (1710-1784), the Swiss naturalist, was later appointed by the Duke to tutor his son; he also accompanied him on the Grand Tour. Trembley was awarded the Royal Society’s Copley Medal in 1743.} Richmond was
elected to the Society of Antiquaries in 1736 on Folkes’ recommendation, and was an active supporter. In March 1750, he became its President.

The small group that ran Grand Lodge under Richmond’s leadership was particularly intimate. Indeed, Desaguliers’ tight connections to the five principal Grand Officers is likely to have been a key factor in their agreeing at their next quarterly meeting that ‘all who have been or at any time hereafter be Grand Masters of this Society may be present and have a vote at all Quarterly meetings and Grand Meetings.’

They also continued to crack down on ‘irregularity’, resolving that:

if any Brethren shall meet irregularly and make Masons at any place within ten miles of London the persons present at the making ... shall not be admitted even as Visitors into any Regular Lodge whatsoever unless they come and make such submission to the Grand Master and Grand Lodge as they shall think fit to impose.

In the light of his extensive Masonic activities within Grand Lodge and as Master of lodges at the Horn, Aubigny and Chichester, the Duke’s extensive personal papers at the West Sussex Record Office and published letters contain multiple references to his Freemasonry, although his correspondence with the Duke of Newcastle is relatively silent on the subject. A range of examples was reproduced in Earl March’s A Duke and His Friends, where several of the ‘many letters’ written to Martin Folkes are quoted. March commented that ‘[the Duke] wrote copiously and amusingly to his brother Mason on several occasions’. Desaguliers is mentioned in a number of instances and is referred to with a degree of humour. In a letter to Folkes, for example, apologising for his remiss in thanking him for visiting and dated Goodwood, 27 June 1725, Richmond wrote ironically:

I wish it lay in my power to show you in a more essential way how great a value and friendship I have for you. I have been guilty of such an omission that nobody less than the Deputy Grand Master of Masonry can make up for me.

---

241 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 58-9
242 Ibid.
243 Richmond, A Duke and His Friends, pp. 120-1. Cf. also, pp. 119-20, 156, 180, 188, 215, 218, 253, 255-6, 258-60, 295-6, 302, 349.
244 Ibid., pp. 119-20. Desaguliers was DGM in 1725.
And in a second example, referring to Robert Webber’s initiation at Montagu’s riverside house at Thames Ditton in 1734, Desaguliers is again described satirically as ‘some great Mason ... wanting to initiate Bob Webber’.245 As noted in chapter two above, the opposite was more probably the case.

Nonetheless, Richmond took his Freemasonry seriously. He was far from well for part of his term in office and it was agreed that he would retire in December 1724, rather than June of that year. However, the underlying justification for the extension to Richmond’s tenure was most probably not his illness; after all, other Grand Masters were away from London and Grand Lodge for even longer periods. The true rationale was more probably the need to agree the controversial issue of an operating structure for the proposed Grand Charity.

At Dalkeith’s recommendation following Anthony Sayer’s petition, the formation of a Grand Charity had been proposed ‘to promote the Charitable Disposition of the Society of Free Masons’, and it was resolved that ‘a monthly collection be made in each lodge according to the quality and number of the said lodge’ and that a Treasurer be appointed.246 The relevant Grand Lodge Minutes set out in detail over four pages the various constraints under which it was proposed the charity should operate, and these were not contentious.247 Arguably, for the same reason, the incoming Grand Master, Lord Paisley, re-appointed Desaguliers as his own Deputy on 27 December 1725 intending that the proposed charity be guided to a successful conclusion.248 Philanthropy had become a key raison d’être for Freemasonry and part of its public persona; and establishing an optimum structure for the Charity Bank and maintaining control of its disbursements was viewed, probably correctly, as being of particular significance.

The Successor Grand Masters

Richmond’s immediate successors, James Hamilton, Lord Paisley, (1686-1744); William O’Brian, 4th Earl of Inchiquin, (1700-77); Henry Hare, 3rd Baron Coleraine, (1684-1749); James King, 4th Baron Kingston (1693-1761); and Thomas Howard, 8th

---

245 Ibid, pp. 295-6, regarding Webber’s initiation.
246 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 59-60.
247 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 64-8.
248 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 69.
Duke of Norfolk (1683-1732), continued to keep Freemasonry’s profile in the public domain, albeit that not every Grand Master succeeded to the same degree.

Paisley’s installation in 1725, for example, was extensively reported.\textsuperscript{249} As a published amateur scientist\textsuperscript{250} and FRS (1715), he lay within Desaguliers and Folkes’ circle of contacts at the Royal Society and at the Horn. Unfortunately, however, Paisley spent much of his time away from London. And although Desaguliers, as DGM, took advantage and ‘duly visited the Lodges till [Lord Paisley] came to town’\textsuperscript{251}, Paisley’s absence from the capital, and the failure of Grand Lodge to convene between February and December 1726, resulted in a much reduced level of press coverage in comparison to prior years. The experience underlined clearly the importance of an aristocratic name in Masonic promotion, and Desaguliers’ (or any non-aristocrat’s) difficulty in doing so alone.

The appointment of one of Britain’s leading Catholics, the Duke of Norfolk, Earl Marshal, as Grand Master, allowed the Craft to emphasize that it could be considered non-denominational and unaffiliated with the Church of England. However, probably of greater import was the Duke’s close connection with the Royal Family and leading Whig peers. His accession as Grand Master was described extensively in the press. Norfolk was nominated to succeed Kingston in December 1729 and installed in January the following year. Unfortunately, neither the National Archives nor those at Arundel appear to contain any relevant correspondence.\textsuperscript{252}

Norfolk had been made a Mason by the Duke of Richmond at the Horn less than twelve months earlier:

\begin{quote}
On Thursday night his Grace the Duke of Norfolk, the Rt Hon the Lord Devlin, and several other persons of distinction, are received into the most ancient
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{249} Cf. for example, the \textit{Daily Post}, 28 December 1725; and the \textit{Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer}, 1 January 1726.
\textsuperscript{250} James Hamilton, \textit{Calculations and Tables on the Attractive Power of Lodestones, that is, Magnetism} (London, 1729). He also translated a work on harmony by the German-born composer and founder of London’s Academy of Ancient Music, Johann Christoph Pepusch.\textsuperscript{251} 1738 \textit{Constitutions}, p. 120.
\textsuperscript{252} The National Archives Access to Archives database contains over 180 published entries for the Duke of Norfolk for the period 1729-30. None relate specifically to his Freemasonry, and no relevant documents have been located elsewhere.
Society of Free and Accepted Masons at the lodge held at the Horn Tavern in Westminster of which his Grace the Duke of Richmond is Master ... there were present the Rt Hon the Lord Kingston, Grand Master, with his Grand Officers, the Rt Hon the Earl of Inchiquin, the Lord Paisley, Lord Kinsale, and many other persons of note.

The choice was popular. So many tickets were sold for the Grand Feast that it had to be relocated to the Merchant Taylors’ Hall, the Stationers’ being ‘too small to entertain so numerous’. The Duke’s quarterly communications at Grand Lodge were similarly well attended: on 21 April 1730, 75 representatives from 31 lodges were present in person and over £31 raised for the General Charity; and at the 28 August meeting, 86 representatives from 34 lodges attended. The appointment of Blackerby as DGM, and Carpenter and Batson as Grand Wardens, once again kept operational control of Grand Lodge within the inner cabal of the Horn, of which all three were members. And Norfolk, through Blackerby, helped to ensure that the Grand Charity and Charity Committee would continue to be central to lodge activity, and that any Masonic outriders would be pursued:

The Deputy Grand Master seconded [Desaguliers’ resolution] and proposed several Rules to be observed ... for their Security against all open and secret enemies to the Craft.

Mr Richard Hutton ... charged Mr Lily (who keeps the Rainbow Coffee House in York Buildings) with having made it his business to ridicule Masonry ... notwithstanding ... the honour of having a lodge constituted at his house and he being also a Mason [and] Mr Lily [was] summoned to appear at the next Quarterly Communication to answer the said charge.

Norfolk’s public duties were reported comprehensively as were the most mundane of his private activities. He promoted Freemasonry actively, and his involvement was recorded in around 100 newspaper reports during his term in office. Events that received particular press attention included his attendance at

---

253 London Evening Post, 6 February 1729.
254 Daily Post, 22 January 1730.
255 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 128.
256 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 128.
257 Cf. for example, Flying Post or The Weekly Medley, 11 January 1729; and the Daily Journal, 19 February 1729. Norfolk featured in over 440 press articles between 1720 and his death in 1732.
258 Cf. for example, a report of his journey to Bath and his return with his wife, a journey of limited interest: Daily Post, 24 November 1729.
the consecration of new lodges at the Prince William Tavern\textsuperscript{259} at Charing Cross and the Bear and Harrow\textsuperscript{260}, the admission of new members\textsuperscript{261}, and his donations to the Charity Bank.\textsuperscript{262} Charity had become integral to Freemasonry’s positive public image, a position reinforced by the many Masons who acted as Governors of Coram’s Foundling Hospital, were attached to analogous institutions, or were responsible for other charitable acts:

a good number of Free and Accepted Masons have within these few days been discharged out of several prisons for debt by the charity of their brethren collected at several lodges.\textsuperscript{263}

Another matter that attracted public interest, and which was covered by the press throughout late December 1730 and into early January 1731, was Norfolk’s donation to Grand Lodge of a sword originally made for Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden. Norfolk ordered that the sword be ‘richly embellished’ with his Arms, and that it serve as the Grand Master’s Sword of State.\textsuperscript{264} He also presented to Grand Lodge ‘a Large Folio Book of the finest writing Paper for the Records of Grand Lodge, most richly bound in Turkey and guilded [sic], and on the Frontispiece in Vellum, the Arms of Norfolk amply displayed with a Latin inscription of his noble Titles’.\textsuperscript{265}

From France, Norfolk suggested that either Charles Spencer, 5\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Sunderland (1706-58), or Charles Colyear, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Portmore (1700-85), should succeed him as Grand Master. However, having been deputed to enquire on Norfolk’s behalf, Thomas Batson, Norfolk’s DGM, reported that ‘My Lord Sunderland excused himself on Account on his being to go abroad’ and ‘My Lord Portmore had

\textsuperscript{259} London Evening Post, 3 March 1730.  
\textsuperscript{260} London Evening Post, 12 March 1730.  
\textsuperscript{261} The London Evening Post, 3 March 1730, recorded twelve Masons being admitted to the lodge at the Prince William Tavern in the presence of Norfolk, Lord Kingston, Sir William Saunderson, Sir William Young, Nathaniel Blackerby, Col. Carpenter and others. The same report was carried elsewhere, including the Daily Post, 5 March 1730, and the Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer and the British Journal, both on 7 March 1730.  
\textsuperscript{262} Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 140.  
\textsuperscript{263} London Evening Post, 21 May 1730.  
\textsuperscript{264} The engraving was undertaken by George Moody, Master of the lodge at the Devil Tavern and Sword Cutler to the royal household. Moody was later appointed Grand Sword Bearer. The sword remains in use today.  
\textsuperscript{265} 1738 Constitutions, p. 127.
declined accepting the Office’. Instead, Thomas Coke, later Lord Lovel (1697–1759), one of the richest men in England with an annual income exceeding £10,000, agreed to succeed Norfolk. He had probably been made a Mason in the 1720s and, as Grand Master, continued and reinforced the Masonic association with Walpole’s ministry. Coke was part of Richmond’s Masonic set. A newspaper Letter dated 24 April 1728 from Portsmouth reported his visit to the city’s docks in the company of Montagu, Richmond and Lord Baltimore, all of whom were staying at Goodwood. Tangentially, two years later, Baltimore was initiated a Freemason by Richmond at his Sussex lodge.

As Thomas Coke, Lovel was elected a knight of the shire for Norfolk in 1722. He was one of Walpole more active and loyal supporters. And in common with Lord Inchiquin, he was honoured accordingly: appointed KB when the Order was established in 1725 and sworn a Privy Councillor. Government patronage also brought appointment as joint Postmaster General, with an annual stipend of £1,000 and control of local patronage throughout the country. Coke was rewarded with a peerage in 1729, when he was created Lord Lovel. He was selected Captain of the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners in 1733, and received an Earldom in 1744.

Lovel’s appointment and actions as Grand Master were reported almost as extensively as those of Norfolk. He continued to support the Masonically-linked plays and musical evenings that his predecessor, Lord Kingston, had encouraged, and that had achieved some success in promoting Freemasonry amongst the public:
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266 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 142.
267 Also written as ‘Lovell’.
269 British Journal or The Censor, 27 April 1728. Also, London Journal, 27 April 1728.
270 Baltimore was initiated in 1730 by Richmond and Montagu at a lodge near the Goodwood estate. Cf. London Evening Post, 7 April 1730; also Sackler Archives.
271 London Gazette, 17 April 1722.
272 Weekly Journal or British Gazeteeer, 29 May 1725.
273 A.A. Hanham, ‘Thomas Coke’, ODNB.
274 Cf. for example, London Evening Post, 15 May 1731; Daily Post, 17 May 1731; and Daily Post, 14 June 1731.
We hear the Opera of the Generous Free Mason having given such Universal Satisfaction at Bartholomew Fair, Mr Oates and Mr Fielding are resolved to perform the same at Southwark Fair, in order to give equal satisfaction to that part of the Town.\textsuperscript{275}

Lovel’s initiation of Walpole, his Norfolk neighbour, and his raising of the Duke of Lorraine may indicate that he that he was attuned to the potential importance of Freemasonry to the government, and to its political utility in Europe.\textsuperscript{276} Alternatively and possibly more prosaically, they also suggest a willingness to act in accordance with Walpole’s bidding.

The Political Dimension

By the mid-1730s, Freemasonry had cemented its links with the aristocracy, the upper reaches of Hanoverian society and a broad section of the government and patriotic opposition. A press report of the Grand Feast and Crawford’s selection of Viscount Weymouth as his successor Grand Master provides an illustration:

at the Grand Feast of the Free and Accepted Masons held at Mercer’s Hall, the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crawford, late Grand Master, chose the Rt. Hon. Thomas, Lord Viscount Weymouth Grand Master … There were present above three hundred brethren among whom were the Dukes of Richmond and Athol; the Marquis Beaumont Earl Kerr; the Earls of Winchelsea and Nottingham, Balcarras and Wemyss; Lord Colville and Lord Carpenter; Alexander Brodie Esq., Lord Lyon, King of Arms in Scotland\textsuperscript{277}; Sir Cecil Wray, Sir Arthur Aitchison, … Sir Robert Lawley … and several other persons of distinction … a very elegant Entertainment, and everything was conducted with the greatest Unanimity and Decency.\textsuperscript{278}

\textsuperscript{275} \textit{London Evening Post}, 3 September 1730. An early (and possibly the first) modern Masonically linked play post-1720, was Charles Johnson’s, ‘Love in a Forest, a comedy acted at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane, by His Majesty’s Servants’ (London, 1723). Cf. UGLE Library: BE 737 JOH. The dedication, ‘To The Worshipful Society of Freemasons’, reflected the image Freemasonry most wished to project: ‘encouraging and being instructed in useful Arts … [and] all the social Virtues which raise and improve the Mind of Man’. Freemasonry’s association with the ‘useful Arts’ is discussed in chapter 6.

\textsuperscript{276} \textit{London Evening Post}, 25 November 1731; and \textit{Grub Street Journal}, 2 December 1731.

\textsuperscript{277} Alexander Brodie (1679-1754), was a government loyalist; he was rewarded in July 1727 with appointment as Lord Lyon, King of Arms, at an annual salary of £300. The position had previously been known as a ‘centre of Jacobite sympathies’ in Scotland. He is discussed below. Cf. Andrew M. Lang, ‘Alexander Brodie of Brodie’, \textit{ODNB} (Oxford, Sept 2004; online edn., Oct 2009). Brodie was affiliated politically with Walpole’s close associate, Lord Islay; he sat as MP for Elginshire from 1720 until 1741.

\textsuperscript{278} This was reported in many newspapers, cf. for example, \textit{General Evening Post}, 17 April 1735.
The aristocrats and politicians present combined government loyalists with pro-Hanoverian members of the patriotic opposition to Walpole. The group embraced a quarter of Scotland’s sixteen representative peers: the outgoing Grand Master, John Lindsay, 20th Earl of Crawford (1702-49); Lindsay’s future father-in-law, James Murray, the 2nd Duke of Atholl (1690-1764); Sir William Kerr, 3rd Marquess of Lothian (1690-1767); and Alexander Lindsay, the 4th Earl of Balcarres, (16.?-.1736). Murray and Kerr had both been invested KT in 1734. The Order had been revived by James II in 1687 and was in the gift of the Crown. Other eminent KT’s included Francis Scott, Earl of Dalkeith, Grand Master in 1723; and James Douglas, 14th Earl of Morton, KT 1738, Grand Master 1740/1 and Grand Master for Scotland in 1739/40.

Lindsay, 20th Earl of Crawford, served as a representative peer from 1732 until 1749. He was appointed a Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the Prince of Wales in 1733. A successful soldier, he held a commission in the Foot Guards and in 1735, received permission to serve under Prince Eugene in the Imperial Army, where he distinguished himself in battle at Clausen. He subsequently took a cavalry command in the Russian army with the rank of General. Loudon returned to England in 1739 and became Colonel of the newly established 43rd Regiment of Foot, the Black Watch. Lindsay’s Memoirs refer in detail to his military campaigns but are silent on his connection to Freemasonry.

Before acceding to the title, James Murray had represented Perthshire as a Whig MP from 1715 until 1724. His accession as Duke resulted from his brother’s attainder for supporting the Jacobites. Murray’s loyalty to the Hanoverians was rewarded with appointment as Keeper of the Privy Seal in Scotland (1733-63); he later succeeded Lord Islay, Walpole’s election manager in the north. Maxtone Graham noted an event at the Duke’s seat at Dunkeld in Perthshire following the birth of a son and heir in March 1735:

---


The neighbouring Lairds write to the Duke a round robin congratulating him on
the ‘thumping boy’. Dunkeld was illuminated, and a Procession of Freemasons
celebrated the event ‘the fraternity in their aprons made a circle about the
Bonfire, crosst arms, shook hands, repeated healths, and a Marquess for
ever’.

Sir William Kerr represented Scotland from 1730 until 1761. At the time of the
Grand Feast, Kerr held the largely ceremonial but politically significant position of
Lord High Commissioner of the General Assembly of Scotland, the Sovereign’s
representative to the Church of Scotland. ‘Balcarras and Wemys’, Alexander
Lindsay, the 4th Earl of Balcarres, sat as a Scottish representative peer from 1734
until his death two years later. ‘Lord Colville’ was John Colville, 6th Lord Colville
and Culross (1690-1740), a loyal Scottish peer who had also supported the
Hanoverians during the Jacobite uprising.

Although not technically a member of the Scottish aristocracy, Alexander Brodie
(1679-1754), 19th chief of clan Brodie, was a Hanoverian loyalist, allied to
Archibald Campbell, Earl of Islay. Campbell was one of Walpole’s principal
channels for Scottish political intelligence and, among other offices, Lord Justice
General (1710-1761). Brodie had been rewarded with appointment as Lord
Lyon, King of Arms, in 1727, where he oversaw state ceremonies and was the
ultimate authority for heraldry in Scotland, and an officer of the Order of the
Thistle. The position carried a relatively modest annual salary of £300 but had
considerable authority. Brodie held the position until his death in 1754. The
role of Lord Lyon had previously been described as the ‘centre of Jacobite
sympathies’ in Scotland, and Brodie’s appointment was designed to forestall
any reoccurrence. He sat as a Whig MP for Elginshire from 1720 until 1741, and
served as Lord Lieutenant for Murray, appointed 1725.

Among the English aristocracy and gentry represented at the Grand Feast at the
Mercers’ Hall was Thomas Thynne, 2nd Viscount Weymouth (1710-51), the

---

283 He held the position from 1732 until 1738.
284 And one of Desaguliers’ children’s godparents, see chap. 2 above.
285 The appointment was reported widely: cf. for example, Whitehall Evening Post, 5 October 1727.
286 Cf. Lang, ‘Alexander Brodie of Brodie’, ODNB.
287 London Gazette, 12 June 1725.
incoming Grand Master, who had inherited Longleat at the age of four, together with titles and estates in Dorset, Wiltshire and Gloucestershire. Following the death of his first wife in 1729, he married Lady Louisa Carteret in 1733, the daughter of John Carteret, later 2nd Earl Granville. Carteret, a patriotic opponent to Walpole in the Lords, drew Thynne in to his political camp. In 1734, they jointly (and unsuccessfully) fought the election at Hindon against Henry Fox, Walpole’s candidate; and in 1737, both were signatories to a petition to George II in favour of an increase in the Prince’s annual allowance to £100,000. Weymouth was subsequently appointed to the sinecures of Keeper of the Mall, Keeper of Hyde Park and Ranger of St James’s Park; all were held from 1739 until his death. The appointments were regarded as a testament to the work he had commissioned at Longleat rather than as a purely political reward. ²⁸⁸

Several other English aristocrats had also served as Whig Members of Parliament: before succeeding as the 2nd Baron Carpenter in 1732, the former Hon. Col. George Carpenter had been a Whig MP for Morpeth (1717-27) and later represented Weobley (1741-7). Carpenter was appointed Grand Warden in 1729, elected FRS the same year and to the Society’s Council in 1730.²⁸⁹ Daniel Finch, the 8th Earl of Winchilsea and 3rd Earl of Nottingham (1689-1769), had been MP for Rutland between 1710 and 1730, sitting alongside Sir Thomas Mackworth from 1721 until 1727. He served as Comptroller of the Household from 1725 until 1730. Finch’s father, the 2nd Earl, a moderate Tory, had been in favour of the Protestant succession; he was appointed Secretary of State under William III and Lord President of the Council at George I’s accession, serving until his resignation in 1716. Although initially pro-Walpole, Finch later aligned himself with Carteret and the patriotic opposition.²⁹⁰

‘Sir Arthur Aitchison’ was Sir Arthur Acheson, the 5th Baronet (1688-1748). MP for Mullingar (Westmeath) in the Irish Parliament (1727-48), he was appointed High

²⁸⁹ George Carpenter’s election as FRS was proposed by Jones, Desaguliers, Folkes and Sloane.
Sheriff of Armagh in 1728. Despite his personal and literary connections with Jonathan Swift, he was not a ‘professed Jacobite’, but rather part of the Anglo-Irish land gentry.

Not Parliamentarians but with significant influence within their counties, were Sir Cecil Wray and Sir Robert Lawley. Wray, formerly a Captain in General Farrington’s regiment, had served under his older brother, the 10th Baronet, and had fought in Flanders, Spain and Portugal. Following his brother’s death in 1710, he inherited estates and political influence in both Lincolnshire, where he was later Sheriff, and Yorkshire. Wray had previously served as Deputy Grand Master of Grand Lodge. He was also Master of the influential Cross Keys lodge, which subsequently moved to the King’s Arms in the Stand. The contribution of the King’s Arms lodge to the scientific Enlightenment is discussed in the following chapter.

Sir Robert Lawley, 4th Baronet, of Canwell Hall, Staffordshire (17..? -1779), was later appointed High Sheriff of the county (1744). He had succeeded to the title and estates in 1730. His prior marriage, in 1726, to Elizabeth, the daughter of Sir Lambert Blackwell, with its £30,000 dowry, was featured in many newspaper articles. Lawley had political ambitions but failed in 1734 in a bid to become MP for Bridgenorth. His father had represented Wenlock and his son later sat as MP for Warwickshire. Lawley was also a member of Wray’s aristocratic Cross Keys lodge. He was appointed a Grand Steward in 1734 and was subsequently Master of the Stewards’ Lodge. An avid attendee at Grand Lodge, Lawley held the office of Senior Grand Warden from 1736 to 1738. In 1742, he was made Deputy Grand Master by the then Grand Master, Viscount Ward.

Despite a hiatus in the late 1740s and 1750s, other prominent aristocrats would follow. By the end of the eighteenth century and in the nineteenth, Freemasonry...

---

292 Ibid, 134.
293 *Daily Post*, 2 January 1730.
294 Cf. for example, *British Journal*, 11 June 1726.
would have the British Crown at its titular head. In 1766, Lord Blaney, as Grand Master, would raise the Duke of Gloucester; the following year, John Salter, Deputy Grand Master, would raise the Duke of Cumberland; and, in 1787, the then Prince of Wales would be made a Mason by the Duke of Cumberland, his brother.

Summary

This chapter has considered briefly the social and political influence of the early aristocratic Grand Masters selected as the titular leaders of English Freemasonry. The presence of senior members of the aristocracy within the Craft received widespread press coverage and public exposure, spurred the expansion of the organisation across the upper and middle strata of London and provincial society, and afforded it political protection and influence.

With the imprimatur bestowed by its aristocratic Whig members, Freemasonry became a fashionable club that attracted an aspiring membership from amongst the gentry, the professional classes and the military. The potentially wider political significance of Freemasonry was underlined by Wharton’s desire to secure the role of Grand Master for himself, but more so by the diplomatic use of Freemasonry in a British and European political context, and its extensive role in colonial expansion in the Americas, the Caribbean and India.

295 The illegitimate descendants of Charles II had been present within Desaguliers’ new ‘regular’ Freemasonry virtually since its inception: the Duke of Richmond; the Duke of St Albans; and the Earls of Dalkeith, Delorraine and Lichfield.
Chapter Six

Freemasonry, the ‘Public Sphere’ and the Scientific Enlightenment

By the 1730s, Freemasonry had developed into a recognized facet of the upper strata of London and provincial society. And although it was not omnipresent, Freemasonry had by then also become a fixture within Britain’s learned societies, the army and government. By 1740, around 180 lodges had been established across England, with outposts in Western Europe, the Caribbean, North America and India.\(^1\) Indeed, Freemasonry was so integral to London life that Hogarth, who later became a Freemason himself, featured Masonic allusions and prominent Masons in some of his more popular engravings, certain in the knowledge that they would be understood, and that they would sell.\(^2\)

The previous chapters argued that the rise of the noble Grand Masters, and the network of relationships and imprimatur of the major professional associations and the magistracy, were central to Freemasonry’s metropolitan success. They endowed the organisation with the aspirational characteristics, political protection and connections, and burgeoning financial strength, that provided the foundations necessary for it to achieve national and, later, international recognition. However, although decidedly important, aristocratic and judicial imprimatur alone may have been insufficient to sustain its increasing appeal to a broad spectrum of members and potential recruits.

There were, of course, many powerful and complementary dynamics which for different prospective members, may have been of equal, greater or lesser importance; and it would be a statement of the obvious to say that Freemasonry would have been attractive to different people for varied and often contrasting reasons. It is not feasible to comment on or consider every variant in detail. Nonetheless, we can mention a few of these drivers. A principal and acknowledged motive was that Freemasonry provided a forum for social,

---

\(^1\) Lane, *Masonic Records.*

\(^2\) For example: *The Mystery of Masonry brought to Light by the Gormogons* (1724); *A Midnight Modern Conversation* (1732); *The Sleeping Congregation* (1736); and *Night - The Four Times of the Day* (1738).
commercial and political networking on both a national and international level\(^3\), something that craft lodges and guilds had accomplished on a local scale throughout preceding centuries. The inter-denominational character of its membership was another factor that encouraged some to join who may have been unwilling or unable to join other societies or clubs. Freemasonry also publicised both its Masonic and non-Masonic philanthropic activities, not least through its co-funding of the establishment of the colony of Georgia. And its position in popular art and culture; association with Palladian architecture; elevation of ritual to an almost religious status; and role of the Huguenots, who represented a disproportionately large and highly active number of those who joined the Craft, represent additional factors that should not be discounted.

This chapter suggests that the eighteenth century’s fascination with Freemasonry had another essential foundation, and that it was propagated and disseminated by other means. Within the chapter, we examine and assess how Desaguliers and others associated Freemasonry with the scientific Enlightenment and led the metamorphosis of Masonic lodge meetings to include self-improving lectures and topical discussion. Other prominent Freemasons are considered: John Ward, a Midlands landowner and politician; Charles Labelye, a leading engineer; and George Gordon, a popular scientific lecturer; and attention is given to the small number of Masonic lodges whose early Minutes are extant or reports of which survive.

‘Through the paths of heavenly science’\(^4\)

Desaguliers combined his public lectures with unconcealed Masonic proselytising, carrying Freemasonry in concept and practice from London to provincial England, and extending its intellectual, moral and political radius to Continental Europe where he presided over and attended lodges at The Hague and Paris.\(^5\) His scientific lectures were designed to educate, elucidate and entertain an intellectually curious, commercially minded and financially aware audience. The

\(^3\) Cf. for example, Harland-Jacobs, ‘Hands across the Sea’.

\(^4\) The full quotation is from The Third Degree: ‘To contemplate the intellectual faculty and to trace it from its development, through the paths of heavenly science’. Emulation Ritual (London, 1996), p. 175.

\(^5\) Desaguliers visited the Low Countries on lecture tours in 1729, 1731, 1732 and 1734, and was in France in 1732, 1734 and 1735. It is likely that lodge meetings held in both countries were at least partly politically motivated. See chap. 5 above.
subjects were topical and often commercial: a discussion of recent improvements to the Savery and Newcomen engines, ‘of the greatest Use for draining Mines, supplying Towns with Water, and Gentlemen’s Houses’; an introduction to ‘new machines contrived by Dr Desaguliers’; and practical applications and explanations of the latest scientific principles. The Chandos view, that Desaguliers was ‘the best mechanic in Europe’, may not have been accurate, but it was a laudable testament to Desaguliers’ effective manipulation and presentation of his public persona.

Nicholas Hans has suggested that Desaguliers may have given over 100 public lectures consisting of some 300 separate experiments. However, this was probably a material under-estimate. Desaguliers’ ‘300 experiments’ were mentioned in classified advertisements for his lectures as early as 1721. Desaguliers started lecturing in 1713. He was well established by 1717 and, despite severe gout, only stopped shortly before his death in 1744. His lecture courses often ran daily or weekly for months at a time. For example, the lecture course he gave at Channel Row at the end of 1721/early 1722 was advertised consistently from October 1721 – April 1722, as were similar lecture courses given in 1722/23 and 1723/24. Even if Desaguliers gave as few as two lectures a week for only six months of each year, an improbably low figure given that lecturing was one of his principal sources of income, he would have given in excess of 1,500 over his working life. And an average audience of only ten or twelve, a number readily accommodated in his ‘30 foot long, 18 wide and 15 high’ lecture room at Channel Row, would suggest that a significant proportion of
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6 *The Weekly-Journal or Saturday's-Post*, 10 January 1719.
7 *Evening Post*, 13 January 1719.
11 Cf. for example: the *Post Boy*, 10 October 1721; *Post Boy*, 17 October 1721; *Daily Courant*, 20 October 1721; *Daily Courant*, 15 January 1722; *Daily Courant*, 11 April 1722; *Daily Courant*, 13 April 1722; *Daily Courant*, 17 April 1722; and *Post Boy*, 19 April 1722.
12 Cf. for example, the *Daily Courant*, 18 October 1723; *Daily Post*, 4 January 1724; and *Daily Courant*, 9 March 1724.
13 *Post Man and the Historical Account*, 28 February 1716.
educated metropolitan society attended, albeit that some would have been present on more than one occasion.

Scientific lectures were fashionable. In Morton’s words, they ‘rapidly outstripped parallel developments in universities’; and they were a powerful draw to the gentry and the mercantile middling classes, who were prepared to pay. The fee that Desaguliers received for his lectures at Bath in May 1724 underlines this: 3 guineas per head from an audience of some thirty to forty attendees. Schaffer’s designation of the activity as ‘theatre of the upper classes’ is an appropriate description but perhaps underemphasises the utilitarian, as opposed to the cultural and entertainment, value of such occasions. Now at peace, Britain prospered. The bourgeoning, increasingly money and trade-centred, economy was based on the foundations of acquired and inherited wealth, rather than predominantly inherited wealth alone. Practical natural philosophers, such as Desaguliers, described by Stewart as ‘arguably the most successful scientific lecturer of the century’, who could apply science to resolve commercial problems and develop realistic ideas to generate income for their audiences, were integral to the process of wealth creation and the accelerating momentum of industrialisation.

John Ward, (1704-74)

Among a number of provincial and metropolitan figures, John Ward provides an example of a senior Freemason whose Masonic pursuits were likely to have been bound up, at least in part, with political, economic and financial self-interest. Ward held a unique combination of Masonic positions: a Grand Steward in 1732; Junior Grand Warden, then Senior Grand Warden, from 1732-4; Deputy Grand Master from 1735-7; and following his succession to the title of 11th Baron Ward

---

15 British Journal, 9 May 1724.
18 Weymouth did not attend Grand Lodge as Grand Master other than at his installation. As DGM, John Ward deputised throughout 1735.
of Birmingham in 1740, he was selected as Grand Master of Grand Lodge in 1742. Ward was also a founder and the first Master of Staffordshire’s earliest recorded lodge, the Bell and Raven in Rotton Row, Wolverhampton, constituted on 28 March 1732 where, Gould noted, he had also acted as lodge secretary. And he was a similarly prominent member of the Bear and Harrow lodge in London in 1730.

Ward’s political and commercial activities were intertwined. He inherited estates in Sedgley and Willingworth, Staffordshire, north-west of central Birmingham, to which was added an entailed estate at Dudley, inherited, alongside his first title, Lord Ward, on the death of his cousin. In 1727, at the age of 23, Ward was elected a Member of Parliament for Newcastle under Lyme; he sat alongside the Hon. Baptist Leveson-Gower until losing the seat in 1734. Ward’s father, William (1677-1720), had also been MP for Staffordshire: from 1710 to 1713 and, again, in 1715 until his death.

In common with many in the upper ranks of Freemasonry, Ward was a magistrate, appointed in 1729:

On Monday last, John Ward, Esq., a near relation to the Rt. Hon. The Lord Dudley and Ward, Esq., and Member of Parliament for Newcastle in Staffordshire, took the Oath at Hick’s Hall, to qualify himself to act as a justice of the Peace for the said county. He is a gentleman of so general a good Character, and known Honour, that there is no Doubt to be made but that he will execute his office (agreeable to all other Acts of his Life) with the strictest regard to Justice and Impartiality.

His selection was followed in December of the same year with appointment as Sheriff for Northampton, and he was subsequently appointed Lord Warden of Birmingham, Recorder for Worcester, and sworn a Privy Counsellor. Ward was a

---

19 Lane, *Masonic Records*. No data is extant other than the list of lodges held at Grand Lodge; the lodge was erased in 1754.
21 He was recorded as ‘John Ward of Newcastle’.
22 He was granted the title Viscount Dudley and Ward in 1763.
23 Leveson-Gower remained an MP until 1761. As noted in chap. 1, the family was a dominant influence in local Staffordshire politics.
24 *Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer*, 17 February 1728.
25 *Flying Post or The Weekly Medley*, 12 July 1729.
26 *London Gazette*, 20 January 1730.
27 *Annual Register for the Year 1774* (London, 1801), 6th edn., p. 192.
Country Whig, and later a Patriotic Whig, allied to William Pitt. His political and judicial activities reflected his affluence and self-interest, and he appears to have been relatively unconcerned with the larger affairs of state. The House of Commons Parliamentary Papers mention him once, on 18 May 1733, and only then in connection with his own estates:

A Complaint being made to the House, That Jonah Persehouse, of Wolverhampton, in the County of Stafford, John Green, William Mason, Daniel Mason, Thomas Mason, William Goston, Samuel Mason and Benjamin Whitehouse, of Sedgeley, in the said County, having sunk a Coal pit adjoining to the Estate of John Ward, Esquire, a member of this House, have entered upon his said Estate, and taken Coals therefrom; in Breach of the Privilege of this House.

Although it was his son from his first marriage, also John, the 2nd Viscount Dudley and Ward, who was the more celebrated industrialist and politician, Ward was aware of the commercial value of his inheritance, which included one of the most significant holdings of coal and iron in the county. He pursued and safeguarded his commercial interests in the Lords, where he was a prominent supporter and promoter of road construction.

Ward may have had many motives for becoming a Freemason. However, it would have been reasonable for him to connect Freemasonry with his commercial interests. Desaguliers was, after all, one of the foremost exponents of the practical application of science, most particularly in hydraulics and mining. Moreover, among other prominent Freemasons were eminent members of the Royal Society and leading engineers.

30 Ward was married twice: in December 1723, to Anna Maria Bourchier, who died in 1725; and in January 1745, to Mary Carver, a Jamaican heiress. Cf. among several reports, Universal Spectator and Weekly Journal, 5 January 1745.
32 Unfortunately, the Dudley and Ward archives held at Stafford and Stoke-on-Trent archive centres contain only limited personal archival records.
Although perhaps more tenuous as evidence, his son continued the connection with both politics and Freemasonry. Brown, in his ODNB entry for the 2nd Viscount, commented that he became ‘one of the leading aristocratic entrepreneurs’ and deployed ‘parliamentary, proprietorial, and masonic influence ... to secure beneficial legislation to develop his estate’. Enclosure Acts allowed the estates to be consolidated; canals and turnpikes were built that gave access to the Severn and to Birmingham; and coal pits and ironworks were developed using the latest technology. In a review of Raybould’s Economic Emergence of the Black Country, George Barnsby commented with regard to the Enclosure Acts initiated by the 2nd Viscount. He noted that ‘the Commissioners were Midland men sympathetic to the Dudley interests; [their] secretaries ... were in every case employees of Lord Dudley; [and] the final award of each Act covered a larger area than originally laid down.’

Ward’s principal properties were in Himley where, in 1740, he began the construction of a large Palladian mansion, and at Upper Brook Street, Mayfair, from which he left in procession to Haberdashers’ Hall on 27 April 1742 for his installation as Grand Master. Ward was also present with Desaguliers at the Bear in Bath in 1738, during the Prince’s visit to the city, and his attendance at both provincial and metropolitan lodges, and at Grand Lodge, suggests a conscientious commitment.

Tangentially, Sir Robert Lawley, the 4th baronet, who succeeded Ward as Senior Grand Warden and became Deputy Grand Master in 1740, also came from the industrialising Midlands. His estates were in Canwell, Staffordshire, on the northern edge of Sutton Coldfield. In contrast to both Ward and to his father (Sir Thomas Lawley, MP for Wenlock, 1685-9), and son, (also Robert, MP for

36 The second Viscount later employed Capability Brown to design the surrounding 180 acres of parkland.
37 London Evening Post, 31 October 1738.
Warwickshire, 1780-93\textsuperscript{38}, Lawley failed to enter Parliament. Nonetheless, his political loyalty resulted in his being sworn a member of the Privy Council in 1735, and appointment as Sheriff for Staffordshire in 1743.\textsuperscript{39}

Ward’s Masonic activities after 1740 fall beyond the scope of this paper. However, schisms in Freemasonry were beginning to develop, with ‘irregularities in the making of Masons ... and other Indecencies’ reported to Grand Lodge on 23 July 1740. The beginnings of dissension and division over the control of ritual, membership and patronage, is identifiable in \textit{Grand Lodge Minutes}, and in the relative apathy of certain later Grand Masters, including Weymouth. Gould’s comment that ‘the authority of Grand Lodge was in no wise menaced between 1740 and 1749\textsuperscript{40} appears disingenuous given the establishment in 1751 of a rival London Grand Lodge: the Ancients. The boundaries of this paper preclude speculation as to whether Desaguliers’ death in 1744, Folkes’ failing heath, and the decline and demise of other founding Freemasons and scientists, were at the root of these changes or simply a significant contributory factor.

\textbf{Science and Self-Improvement within the Lodge}

It was accepted that knowledge of natural science was fundamental to both intellectual and financial self-improvement. The Masonic message that Desaguliers carried with him was bound up with and part of the intellectual package that was on offer. The scientific Enlightenment sub-text of Masonic ritual and liturgy, and the Masonic sub-text of his lectures, would have been understood by many in his audience and cannot be disregarded as part of Freemasonry’s appeal:

\begin{quote}
As Men from Brutes distinguished are,  
A Mason other men excels;  
For what’s in Knowledge choice and rare  
But in his Breast securely dwells?\textsuperscript{41}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{39} Lawley (17.?-79), was a member of the Cross Keys lodge in Henrietta Street (later the Old King’s Arms lodge); like Ward, he had previously served as a Steward for the Grand Feast (in 1734).

\textsuperscript{40} Gould, \textit{History of Freemasonry}, pp. 94-6.

\textsuperscript{41} Delafaye, ‘The Fellowcraft’s Song’.
Desaguliers used the opportunities provided by his engineering consultancies and scientific lectures accordingly. His journey to Edinburgh to offer advice on the Comiston aqueduct was simultaneously an opportunity to attend the Lodge of Edinburgh on the 25 and 28 August 1721. And it is unlikely to have been a coincidence that John Campbell, the Provost responsible for Desaguliers’ commission to advise the city, and other connected Edinburgh dignitaries 42, were admitted members of the lodge during his stay. Similarly, Desaguliers’ visits to consult and lecture in Bath, including that on behalf of the Royal Society to report on the eclipse of 9 May 1724, incorporated a visit to a lodge meeting at the Queen’s Head, where the Whig politician and Court favourite, John, Lord Hervey (1696–1743)43, was made a Mason44:

Dr Desaguliers, from Five this afternoon to the Time of the most Eclipse, read a lecture on this occasion ... the Gentlemen, between 30 and 40, giving him three Guineas each to hear him, and he gave those ingenious and learned gentlemen great satisfaction for their money. This night at the Queen’s Head Dr Desaguliers is to admit into the Society of free and accepted Freemasons several fresh members, among them are Lord Cobham, Lord Harvey, Mr Nash and Mr Mee, with many others. The Duke of St Albans and Lord Salisbury are here and about 10 other Lords English and Irish.45

The same pattern was repeated in Desaguliers’ visit to Bath in 1737; and the following year, in a visit to Bristol in July, where he attended a lodge meeting at the Rummer Tavern, and at Bath in October. The latter lodge meeting was
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42 In addition to Campbell, George Preston, Hugh Hathorn, James Nimmo and William Livingston were admitted Freemasons on 25 August, and Sir Duncan Campbell of Lochnell, Robert Wightman, George Drummond, Archibald McAulay and Patrick Lindsay on 28 August. The names are given by Trevor Stewart in AQC Transactions, 113 (2000), 81-4, and by Gould in History of Freemasonry throughout the World, vol. II, p. 6. Each was a prominent dignitary in Edinburgh: Preston and Hathorn were Baillies (or Aldermen); Nimmo, Treasurer, and later Receiver-General of Excise for Scotland; Livingston, Dean Convener of Trades; Irving, Clerk to the Dean of the Guild Court; Wightman, Dean of the Guild; Drummond, past Treasurer; and McAulay, an Alderman. Sir Duncan Campbell was a baronet, and Lindsay a prominent merchant.

43 His name was written as ‘Harvey’ in Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 37.


arranged to coincide with (and benefit from) the Prince and Princess of Wales’s excursion to the city. Desaguliers took advantage of the visit’s high profile to organise a meeting at the Bear.\footnote{The lodge had relocated from the Queen’s Head in the intervening years. Cf. R. William Weisberger, \textit{AQ	extsc{c} Transactions}, 113 (2000), 65-96, esp. 74.}

The Rt Hon the Earl of Darnley, late Grand Master, John Ward Esq., Deputy Grand Master, Sir Edward Mansel, Bt., Dr Desaguliers, and several other brethren of the Society of Free and Accepted Masons, held an extraordinary Lodge at the Bear Tavern in Honour of the Day, and in respect to his Royal Highness, who is a brother Mason.\footnote{\textit{London Evening Post}, 31 October 1738.}

The attendance of Edward Bligh, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl of Darnley, at this lodge meeting was unremarkable. Bligh was a prominent member of the patriotic opposition linked with the Prince of Wales.\footnote{Cf. for example, \textit{Daily Journal}, 27 May 1734, re. Darnley ‘waiting on their Majesties at Richmond, and met with a gracious Reception’. The National Archives Access to Archives service contains no relevant Masonic references to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl Darnley and no relevant correspondence has been located elsewhere.} He was also an active Freemason outside of Grand Lodge and, in 1737, a member of the Gun Tavern lodge in Jermyn Street and, subsequently, of the Lodge of Felicity, No. 58.\footnote{\textit{London Evening Post}, 11 February 1738.} However, the presence in Bath of Sir Edward Mansel (1686-1754), was in some ways more noteworthy and invites comment.

The Mansel Baronets of Trimsaran, together with the Mansels of Margam, Glamorganshire, and the Mansels of Muddlescombe, Carmarthenshire, were established members of the South Wales gentry. The \textit{London Evening Post} described the family as ‘one of the most honourable and antient ... since the Normans and foreigners invaded the Rights and Properties of the antient Britains’.\footnote{\textit{London Evening Post}, 31 October 1738.} Sir Edward Mansel, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baronet, had been High Sheriff for Carmarthenshire in 1728-9. Within Wales, he was a member (and Master) of the first and pre-eminent Welsh lodge, the Nag’s Head and Star, Carmarthen, founded in 1726.\footnote{The Nag’s Head popularised its own idiosyncratic versions of the standard Masonic songs. Cf. in particular, \textit{A Curious Collection of the Most Celebrated Songs in Honour of Masonry} (London, 1731), pp. 3-15.} Nationally, Mansel had been appointed a Grand Steward and Junior
Grand Warden in 1733, then Senior Grand Warden in 1734. He was also Provincial Grand Master for South Wales.\footnote{Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 45, 199 and 231-2; cf. also, Philip Jenkins, ‘Jacobites and Freemasons in eighteenth century Wales’, Welsh History Review, 9.4 (1979), 391-406.}

In common with Freemasonry in London, the social composition of Welsh and West Country Freemasonry was relatively elitist; as an aside, five of the members of the Queen’s Head lodge in Bath later became mayors of the city.\footnote{G. Norman, ‘Early Freemasonry at Bath, Bristol and Exeter’, AQC Transactions, XL (1927), 244.} However, its political composition differed, with many Welsh Masons having strong Tory politics. Philip Jenkins has gone further and has argued with respect to Welsh Freemasonry that ‘it was virtually impossible to distinguish between Jacobite secret societies and Masonic lodges’.\footnote{Jenkins, ‘Jacobites and Freemasons’; cf. also, Jenkins, ‘Tory Industrialism and Town Politics: Swansea in the Eighteenth Century’, Historical Journal, 28.1 (1985), 103-23.} His analysis was based on the characteristics of the Society of Sea Serjeants in South Wales, an organisation in existence from 1722 or so until the 1760s, with a membership that partly overlapped that of the two South Wales lodges. Jenkins saw the Sea Serjeants as overtly political and harbouring Jacobites and, significantly, commented that their Jacobite political sympathies were reflected in Welsh Freemasonry. His view has been supported or reiterated by Harland-Jacobs, among others.\footnote{Cf. Harland-Jacobs, Builders of Empire, pp. 103-11.}

Jenkins correctly characterised early eighteenth century Welsh politics as being dominated by fiefdoms controlled, in his words, by a small number of ‘magnates’. Whereas ‘Sir John Philips “ruled” Pembrokeshire and Carmarthenshire; ... Cardiganshire fell to two gentry families, the Pryses of Gogerddan and the Powells of Nanteos’.\footnote{Jenkins, ‘Jacobites and Freemasons’, 393.} However, the domination of local politics and influence over the choice of those elected to sit in parliament was not peculiar to the Welsh gentry. And although a complex area, with attitudes and allegiances shifting over time, it is important to differentiate between the various shades of opposition politics and ‘dining room’ Jacobitism. Like many in the South Wales gentry, Mansel may have been a Tory, but London and Grand Lodge would not have regarded him as a Jacobite.
There are two other major fault lines running through Jenkins’ argument. First, the overlapping membership between Welsh Freemasonry and the Sea Serjeants was far less than complete; and second, that it would be difficult to categorise the Sea Serjeants as a principally political organisation. Indeed, with regard to the second point, there were relatively few Sea Serjeants in the vein of Sir John Philipps, later MP for Carmarthen, who was not only a staunch Tory but later described by Horace Walpole as a notorious Jacobite.  

Although an element of cross-over between the two membership sets is identifiable, for example, the Sea Serjeants’ included Emanuel Bowen, who was Master of the Nag’s Head in 1726, and Sir Edward Mansel, also later Master, it was far from comprehensive. Unlike the Sea Serjeants, Welsh Masonry contained both the leading gentry and an assortment of others. Within the thirty-three members of the lodge whose names were recorded and reported to Grand Lodge for 9 June 1726 were around twenty ‘gentlemen’, including three baronets: Sir Edward Mansel; Sir John Price; and Sir Seymour Pile. However, lodge membership also included Thomas Foy, a doctor; Richard Price, an apothecary; John Lewis, a bookseller; John Tindall, a painter; Thomas Bowen and William Samuell, both glovers; David Davis, a brazier; and William Griffiths, a merchant.  

The contrast with the Sea Serjeants was revealed clearly by Francis Jones, Carmarthenshire’s county archivist, in his study of its members’ portraits. The portraits, executed in 1748 and on display at the Taliaris estate, were catalogued and assessed by Jones. His descriptions underline that the Society of Sea Serjeants was dominated by inter-married and inter-generational members of the same group of Carmarthenshire and Pembrokeshire families. And unlike Welsh Freemasonry more generally, there was little room for anyone outside of the gentry. Membership was also restricted numerically: the Sea Serjeants, ‘who met once a year for a week’ comprised ‘a President, Chaplain, Treasurer or Secretary,  

---

58 Pile would have been an improbable Jacobite: he was commissioned Lieutenant, then Captain, in the Royal Regiment of Dragoons: *Monthly Chronicle*, October 1731; and *Weekly Miscellany*, 25 November 1737.  
24 Serjeants, and Probationers, from whom they elected to supply the 24 in case of death ... the Serjeants wore a Star, with a Dolphin on the left side, and the Probationers on the right. The Society’s first President was George Barlow; the second, Richard Gwynne; and on Gwynne’s death, the third was Sir John Philips.

If the Sea Serjeants were, in Jenkins’ words, a ‘Jacobite secret society’ and a political organisation, they were, at the least, unusual. The Sea Serjeants met annually for a week, often at a seaside town in west Wales. Their meetings were publicised, with advertisements in the press. And the Sea Serjeants sponsored race meetings, at Haverford West, among other courses. It was neither secret nor exclusively political:

On Saturday, the 10th Day of June next will be the Annual Meeting of the Society of Sea Serjeants, at Tenby in the County of Pembroke, when the Brethren are all desired to attend; And on Monday the 19th following, the Contribution Purse of the said Society amounting to about Thirty Pounds, will be run for on Portfield, near Haverford-West in the said County, by any Horse, Mare or Gelding, carrying eleven Stone, the best of three Heats.

It is probable that Jenkins’ statement that ‘by the 1750s, the Sea Serjeants were a dining club with a Lady Patroness, and Sir John Philipps was anxious to rebut charges that it was a Jacobite group’ could have been applied to the Society some two decades earlier. The Sea Serjeants neither led nor participated in any uprising in Wales in either 1715 or 1745, and politically they, like much of Wales, could be considered conservative, albeit that they were probably not, in Peter Thomas’ characterisation, ‘torpid’. As Thomas commented: although ‘residual sympathy for the former royal house of Stuart manifested itself in Jacobitism’, the Sea Serjeants may have ‘owed more to masculine clubbability and the contemporary fashion for secret societies than ... political fervour’.

---

60 Ibid.
61 For example, London Evening Post, 11 May 1732; 24 April 1735; and 28 April 1737.
62 London Evening Post, 11 May 1732.
65 Ibid.
If this were the position, even in part, other apolitical factors can be examined as potential drivers for Freemasonry in South Wales. Edward Oakley (...?-1765), a founder and Warden at the Nag’s Head, and Warden and later Master of the Three Compasses in Silver Street, London, provides a possible indication. Oakley, an architect, argued that ‘proper Lectures’ should be available within the lodge and, given his seniority, it is a credible assumption that such lectures would have been given at the Nag’s Head. A speech Oakley gave at the Three Compasses on 31 December 1728 urged Freemasons to study and to disseminate their knowledge. The text of his speech was incorporated into the second edition of the Constitutions. And it may provide a guide to the motives of at least some members:

Those of the Brotherhood whose Genius is not adapted to Building, I hope will be industrious to improve in, or at least to love, and encourage some Part of the seven Liberal Sciences ... it is necessary for the Improvement of Members of a Lodge, that such Instruments and Books be provided, as be convenient and useful in the exercise, and for the Advancement of this Divine Science of Masonry, and that proper Lectures be constantly read in such of the Sciences, as shall be thought to be most agreeable to the Society, and to the honour and Instruction of the Craft.

Oakley’s views are unlikely to have been shared by all Freemasons. His words were perhaps designed to offer support to Freemasonry’s ‘dutiful and obedient’ members, and to encourage others to benefit from the ‘Intent and Constitution of the Sciences’ and to focus less on Masonry’s ‘merry songs [and] loose diversions’. However, in this regard, Oakley was part of the mainstream. Advertisements for and reports of ‘academical’ and scientific experiments, lectures and demonstrations, including those given at the Royal Society, populated the classified and news sections of the daily and weekly press, together with printers’ notices announcing the publication of corresponding books and treatises: more than 1,000 in aggregate in the decade from 1725.

In a study of eighteenth century industrialisation in South Wales and, perhaps, in contradiction to his views on the Sea Serjeants, Jenkins commented that political loyalties in the South West and South Wales were less important than economic

---

66 The Ancient Constitutions of the Free and Accepted Masons (London, 1731), 2nd edn., pp. 25-34.
self-interest: ‘industrialization in this area was to a remarkable degree a Tory monopoly’. He argued that it was largely irrelevant that the key local magnates were Catholics, Jacobites or Nonjurors; what was important was that they had the support of the local professional and commercial classes. This resulted from their ‘strong associations with economic progress’. With respect to Freemasonry, one could go further. In addition to the general desire to imitate London society, the interest in Freemasonry of the Welsh and South West gentry and professional classes, can also be attributed to its associations with antiquarianism, agricultural improvement and the scientific Enlightenment. As Gwyn Williams’ commented: a section of the South Wales gentry ‘prepared their lands for the advance of industry ... abandoned the romantic Jacobitism of their forebears and embraced a Whig Great Britain [and] ... commercial imperialism’. He continued: ‘the lodges of Freemasonry were its breeding-grounds’.

A parallel can be drawn with the industrialising north east of England where Sir Walter Calverley (1707-77), (from 1734, Sir Walter Blackett), of Wallington Hall, a (coal and lead) mine owner, magistrate, Sheriff of Northumberland, Tory MP from 1734 until 1777, and five times Lord Mayor of Newcastle, was for many years a dominant figure in local Freemasonry. His Masonic colleague, Matthew Ridley (1716-1778), the first Provincial Grand Master of Northumberland, appointed in 1734, was also elected Lord Mayor of Newcastle (on four occasions), and similarly represented the city as MP between 1747 and 1774. Ridley was later

70 Ibid, pp. 118-20.
71 In 1734, a Bill was enacted ‘to enable Walter Calverley Esq., now called Walter Blackett Esq., and his Issue Male, to take and use the Surname of Blackett only, pursuant to the Will of Sir William Blackett Bt, deceased’. Journal of the House of Lords, vol. 24, 21 March 1734. Calverley had married Sir William Blackett’s daughter in 1729.
72 Calverley-Blackett was elected Mayor in 1735, 1748, 1756, 1764 and 1771.
73 John Money, ‘The Masonic Moment; Or, Ritual, Replica, and Credit: John Wilkes, the Macaroni Parson, and the Making of the Middle-Class Mind’, Journal of British Studies, 32.4 (1993), 358-95, esp. 363. The papers held at the West Yorkshire Archive Service, Leeds (WYLS00); Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Leeds (DD12); Northumberland Record Office, (NRO 324, 672, 712, 2762, 5327); and Northumberland Collections Service, Morpeth (NRA 42305 Blackett), contain no material related to Freemasonry, apart from a (possibly connected) file of tavern bills held at the Yorkshire Archaeological Society: DD12/I/28.
Governor of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Company of Merchant Adventurers, which organisation had a local monopoly with respect to cloth, silk and corn trading.\footnote{E. Mackenzie, \textit{A Descriptive and Historical Account of the Town and County of Newcastle-upon-Tyne} (Newcastle, 1827), vol. 1, pp. 663-70, esp., pp. 669-70.}

As in South Wales and the West Country, Newcastle and Northumberland Freemasonry comprised an ‘abundance of gentlemen’\footnote{Weekly Journal (Newcastle), 6 June 1730.} and ‘the principal inhabitants of the town and country’.\footnote{St James Evening Post, 28 December 1734.} And as in Wales, Northumberland Freemasonry was probably less concerned with political opposition than economic self-interest. In the rapidly industrialising north of England, scientific lecturers met with such financial success that Desaguliers reportedly considered travelling to Newcastle himself to gives lectures to ‘Gentlemen concerned in Collieries [about] an infallible Method to clear Coal Pits of Damp’.\footnote{Stewart, ‘The Selling of Newton’. The quotation from the \textit{Newcastle Courant} (1741) is on p. 182.}

Nevertheless, political opposition came in a variety of guises, including Masonic. The Prince of Wales had been initiated a Freemason barely twelve months before Darnley, Ward, Mansel, Desaguliers and others met at the Bear to celebrate his visit to Bath. The event had taken place at an ‘occasional’ lodge in Kew in 1737:

\begin{quotation}
we hear that on Saturday last was held at Kew a Lodge of Freemasons at which Dr Desaguliers presided, when there were admitted several Persons of high Distinction as Brethren of that Order.\footnote{London Evening Post, 5 November 1737. Cf. also \textit{London Spy Revived}, 9 November 1737.}
\end{quotation}

The Prince was the first legitimately born member of the royal family to become a Freemason. The \textit{1738 Constitutions} were dedicated to him as Prince Royal, and as a fellow Freemason. Frederick’s reasons for joining Freemasonry and its timing may have been derived in part from an alignment of interest with the patriotic opposition. And at least one such opposition politician who was also a Freemason, Lord Baltimore, attended his initiation at the lodge at Kew.\footnote{Anderson noted that the Charles Calvert, Earl of Baltimore, the Hon. Col. James Lumley, and the Hon. Major Madden attended Frederick’s installation. Calvert was a friend of the Prince and a Gentleman of his Bedchamber; and as MP for St Germans, he supported the Prince’s faction in Parliament. The Hon. Col. John Lumley was brother to the Earl of Scarborough and commanded the company of grenadiers in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Regiment of Foot} Others
within the Prince’s immediate retinue who were also Masons included the Marquis of Carnarvon, appointed Gentlemen of the Bed Chamber in 1729 and selected as Grand Master in 1738, and the Hon. William Hawley, his Gentleman Usher, who had been initiated into Freemasonry only two months earlier.\textsuperscript{80}

The initiation of the Prince could be viewed as an attempt by members of Grand Lodge to have a foot in each of the pro- and anti-Walpole Whig camps, and a means of securing insurance for themselves and Freemasonry against any difficulties that might arise on the succession and from the formation of a new government. However, this may be to read too much into the event. Regardless of the political rationale, Freemasonry benefited from the kudos associated with Frederick having become a ‘Brother Mason’. \textsuperscript{81}

Further prestige was associated with Freemasonry’s connection to the scientific Enlightenment, both within and without the lodge, and this also largely transcended national politics. Given the prevailing social aspiration for self-improvement, and the role and influence on Freemasonry of Desaguliers and other scientists and natural philosophers from the Royal Society and elsewhere, it is unsurprising that Masonic lodge meetings included talks and lectures designed to educate, inform and entertain those present. The comment at a lodge meeting

---

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Daily Gazetteer}, 13 September 1737

\textsuperscript{81} \textit{London Evening Post}, 31 October 1738.
in York in 1726 that ‘in most lodges in London, and several other parts of this Kingdom, a lecture on some point of geometry or architecture is given at every meeting’\(^{82}\) may have been an exaggeration. Nonetheless, there is evidence that lodges offered lectures on a regular basis and on a range of subjects from anatomy, chemistry, education and experimental science, to architecture and the liberal arts.\(^{83}\)

Despite Martin Clare’s *Discourse*, repeated before Grand Lodge on 11 December 1735 at Sir Robert Lawley’s request\(^{84}\), there does not appear to have been any ‘general rule’ that obliged lodges to provide lectures. What lectures were presented and by whom would have been dependent on the character of the lodge. This would have varied lodge by lodge as a function of the leadership, encouragement and professional contacts of the Master and members, and of the members’ ability and willingness to contribute.

**Martin Clare and the Old King’s Arms lodge**

The limited number of extant lodge histories and Minutes that date back to the early eighteenth century suggest that it may have been the custom for professional members of lodges, such as architects, lawyers and physicians, and members with particular hobbies, such as antiquarianism or art, to give lectures on such matters. To repeat Oakley’s words: ‘proper Lectures ... in such of the Sciences, as shall be thought to be most agreeable to the Society’.

One of the most unambiguous examples of Martin Clare’s ‘good conversation and the consequent improvements’ is that of the King’s Arms lodge in the Strand, now commonly known as the Old King’s Arms (or OKA).\(^{85}\) The OKA was renowned for

---


\(^{84}\) *Grand Lodge Minutes*, p. 260.

\(^{85}\) The early OKA Minute books are held at the UGLE Library. The first volume is one of the oldest extant Minute books of any London lodge and provides a detailed record of meetings from 1734 onwards. The author would like to thank the Master, Secretary and members of the OKA for permission to access its records.
its lectures and for ‘promoting the grand design in a general conversation’. The first extant OKA Minute Book from 1733 to 1756, records thirty-six lectures in the decade from 1733 until 1743. Seven concerned human physiology, some of which included dissections; six were on ethics; five, architecture; and three described ‘industrial processes’. Nine lectures examined different scientific inventions, techniques and apparatus; others explored various topics within art, history and mathematics.

The lectures include one by Robert West, a portraitist, on ‘some evident faults in the Cartoons of Raphael’, and another on Andrea Palladio by Isaac Ware (1704-66), the architect, Secretary of the Board of Works, and a member of James Thornhill’s St Martin’s Lane Academy, re-founded by Hogarth in 1735. The latter lecture was given immediately after Ware’s initiation. It is clear from the OKA Minutes that its purpose mirrored that of Desaguliers: to combine entertainment with self-improvement.

Prominent intellectuals who were members of the lodge included the educator and mathematician, Martin Clare (1690-1751); William Graeme (1700-1745), a leading surgeon; and the physicians Edward Hody (1698-1759) and James Douglas (1675-1742). All were Fellows of the Royal Society and most had been proposed FRS by other Freemasons. Clare (also FSA) was proposed FRS in 1735 jointly by Desaguliers and Manningham, both members of the Horn, and

86 OKA Minutes, 6 August 1733. The OKA had a second claim to renown: its Tyler was Anthony Sayer, Grand Master in 1717. Sayer petitioned the OKA for aid in 1736 and 1740; he petitioned Grand Lodge for charity in 1724, 1730 and 1741.
87 That is, after its move to the King’s Arms tavern in the Strand; the lodge originally met at the Freemasons’ Coffee House, near Long Acre (until 1728), and thereafter (from 1731) at the Cross Keys in Henrietta Street. The lodge was established in 1725.
89 Ibid, pp. 24-5.
90 Ibid, p. 10.
91 Clare served as a Grand Steward in 1734; he was appointed a GW in 1735 and DGM in 1741. He was the author, among other works, of A Defence of Masonry (London, 1730), a response to Samuel Prichard’s Masonry Dissected (London, 1730). It was reprinted in Read’s Weekly Journal, 24 October 1730.
92 Graeme served as a Grand Steward in 1734, as GW in 1735, 1736 and 1744, and as DGM in 1738 and 1739.
93 Hody served as a Grand Steward in 1735 and as a GW in 1740.
Alexander Stuart\textsuperscript{94}, a member of the Rummer, Charing Cross. Graeme was proposed FRS in 1730 by Folkes (Bedford Head) and Stuart (Rummer); and Hody was elected FRS in 1733, proposed by Thomas Pellet (also Bedford Head). Only Douglas, elected FRS in 1706, had been proposed by a non-Mason, Hans Sloane.\textsuperscript{95} Another member of the lodge, ‘Bro. Helot’, was probably Jean (John) Hellot (1685-1766), who had been elected FRS in 1740; his proposers included Richmond and Folkes.\textsuperscript{96}

The OKA Minutes indicate a significant groundswell of member-driven interest in ‘useful and entertaining conversation’.\textsuperscript{97} As Clare noted in his Discourse:

\begin{quote}
The chief pleasure of society – viz., good conversation and the consequent improvements – are rightly presumed ... to be the principal motive of our first entering into then propagating the Craft ... We are intimately related to those great and worthy spirits who have ever made it their business and aim to improve themselves and inform mankind. Let us then copy their example that we may also hope to attain a share in their praise.\textsuperscript{98}
\end{quote}

Sir Cecil Wray (16.?-1736), the 11th Baronet, was elected Master of the OKA in 1730.\textsuperscript{99} Later the same year he became the first Master of the Saracen’s Head lodge in Lincoln.\textsuperscript{100} Previously a Captain in his elder brother’s regiment\textsuperscript{101}, on becoming the 11th baronet in 1710 and as noted above, he inherited extensive land holdings and political influence in Yorkshire and Lincolnshire, where he was High Sheriff in 1715-1716.

\textsuperscript{94} Alexander Stuart (1673-1742), was physician to Westminster Hospital (1719-33), to St George's Hospital (1733-36), and to the Queen. He was elected FRS in 1714, the same year as Desaguliers and Folkes, and elected FRCP in 1728.
\textsuperscript{95} Sackler Archives.
\textsuperscript{96} A ‘John Helot’ was a member of the Horn, and a ‘Mr Helot’ a member of the Huguenot lodge meeting at Prince Eugene’s Head Coffee House in St Alban’s Street: Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 23, 193.
\textsuperscript{97} OKA Minutes, 6 August 1733.
\textsuperscript{98} The Discourse was given by Martin Clare to the Quarterly Communication of Grand Lodge on 11 December 1735.
\textsuperscript{99} Bernard Burke, A genealogical and heraldic history of the extinct and dormant baronetcies of England, Ireland and Scotland (London, 1844), 2\textsuperscript{nd} edn., p. 585.
\textsuperscript{100} Erased 1760 (Lane, Masonic Records). Members of the Old Lodge at Lincoln, considered a ‘sister’ lodge, were proposed for membership of the OKA, for example, John Beck, on 1 October 1733.
\textsuperscript{101} Lt. Col. Sir Christopher Wray, 10\textsuperscript{th} Baronet.
Wray was present at the installation of Lord Lovel as Grand Master in 1731 and, probably in recognition of his connections and influence, was appointed Deputy Grand Master in 1734 by the then Grand Master, Earl Crawford. Wray had agreed to become Master of what was then the lodge meeting at the Cross Keys in Henrietta Street on the basis that Clare would act as his Senior Warden and, in his absence from London, as Master in his stead. This he did, and it was probably Clare, a Huguenot and a passionate educator, who promoted further the practice of giving lectures within the lodge.

Clare had an important influence on eighteenth century education. His Soho Academy had opened in 1717 and his textbook, *Youth’s Introduction to Trade and Business*, published in 1720, ran to twelve editions through to 1791. He described his approach to education succinctly and with practicality, as one where ‘youth may ... be fitted for business’. The Soho Academy was considered one of London’s most successful boarding schools, and its emphasis on practical learning, as well as the social graces, set a template for education. The syllabus combined mathematics, geography, French, drawing, dancing and fencing, with weekly lectures on morality, religion and natural and experimental philosophy, ‘for the Explication of which, a large apparatus of machines and instruments [was] provided’. During Clare’s tenure at the OKA, lectures were given by both members and visitors. Topics included ‘an entertainment on the nature and force of the muscles’; the ‘history of automata: the origin of clockwork to the present day’; ‘the requisites of an architect’; and a popular talk on ‘fermentation’.
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102 For example, *Grub Street Journal*, 1 April 1731; also *Fog’s Weekly Journal*, 3 April 1731.
103 *Grand Lodge Minutes*, p. 240. The appointment was unusual in two respects: Wray had not served previously as a Grand Warden and only spent one year as DGM. He was succeeded by John Ward, who was a Steward and JGW in 1732, SGW in 1733 and DGM from 1733-7. Wray was reported as having been chosen by Weymouth to act as GW in 1734, but does not appear to have done so. Cf. for example, *Read’s Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer*, 1 March 1735.
104 *Grand Lodge Minutes*, p. 169.
105 In the past, Clare’s *Oration* was read annually in certain lodges: *OKA Minutes*. Cf. also, Mackey, *Encyclopedia of Freemasonry*, pt. 1, p. 209.
107 Martin Clare, *Youth’s introduction to trade and business* (London, 1720).
109 *OKA Minutes*, 6 August 1733.
110 *OKA Minutes*, 3 December 1733.
111 *OKA Minutes*, 13 February 1734.
The OKA Minutes draw a vivid picture of early eighteenth century life within the lodge, with its foibles and idiosyncrasies. Whether because of its lectures and lecturers, the scientific eminence and social status of its members, the quality of its dining, or otherwise, applications for membership became numerous. After a number of eminent prospective new joiners had embarrassingly been blackballed, the OKA attempted to create a structure that would allow ‘members of ability and consequence ... being generally acceptable to the lodge’\textsuperscript{112} to join with at least a reduced risk of being rejected. It was agreed accordingly that from March 1734, three blackballs would be required for exclusion.

At the following meeting, on 11 March, Viscounts Weymouth and Murray were admitted.\textsuperscript{113} Each gave six guineas to ‘defray the cost of the evening’.\textsuperscript{114} On 27 March, Lord Vere Bertie\textsuperscript{115} and William Todd Esq.\textsuperscript{116} were made members; the dinner provided by Todd was noted as having cost £5 for food and £3 4s 10d for drink.\textsuperscript{117} Membership fees were subsequently increased to five guineas for ‘gentlemen’, but left at three guineas for ‘artisans’, albeit that this would still have been a high price for many. The lodge also agreed somewhat inequitably that membership for a ‘gentleman’ would be granted with the approval of a simple majority, but that a two-thirds majority would be required for an ‘artisan’.\textsuperscript{118}

With its relatively exclusive membership and connections to Grand Lodge, and with Clare as acting Master and Senior Warden, the OKA cannot easily be considered representative of the average lodge. Nonetheless, the OKA Minutes provide an illustration of the broad pattern of an early eighteenth century lodge meeting, if not of the many variations that existed within individual lodges and

\textsuperscript{112} OKA Minutes, 4 March 1734.
\textsuperscript{113} Weymouth was appointed Grand Master the following year. ‘Murray’ was probably James Murray, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Duke of Atholl (1690-1764).
\textsuperscript{114} OKA Minutes, 11 March 1734.
\textsuperscript{115} The eldest son of Robert Bertie, 1\textsuperscript{st} Duke of Ancaster and Kesteven, and his second wife, Albinia Farington. Peregrine Bertie, the 1\textsuperscript{st} Duke’s son from his prior marriage to Jane Brownlow, inherited the title and his father’s office of Lord Great Chamberlain.
\textsuperscript{116} A ‘William Todd’ was nominated as Sheriff of Cheshire (London Journal, 11 November 1732) and appointed Keeper of the King’s Wine Cellar at St James’s (London Evening Post, 8 March 1740). A Mr Todd was also a member of the Rummer, Henrietta Street (Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 40).
\textsuperscript{117} OKA Minutes, 1 April 1734. The custom of new members paying for dinner and thereby defraying lodge costs was part of a tradition that dated back to the mediaeval guilds.
\textsuperscript{118} OKA Minutes, 5 May 1735. That the OKA rules contradicted Grand Lodge’s Regulation VI, which demanded the unanimous consent of ‘all the members of that lodge then present’, is self-evident.
across different regions of the country. The lodge would be opened, an extract from the by-laws or constitutions would be read, and any proposed new member or members announced. The main activity of the evening, a lecture or a less formal talk, would be followed by the initiation of the new apprentice(s), or the Masonic ‘examination’ of one or more lodge officers to demonstrate their command and knowledge of Masonic ritual. After copious Masonic toasts and songs, the lodge would then be closed. Other than at a feast, the evening would usually commence after dinner, perhaps around 6.00 p.m., and conclude at around 10-11.00 p.m. or, occasionally, later.119

Lectures Elsewhere

Other lodges are known to have had similar lectures to those presented to the OKA. Although only incomplete records remain extant, the Steward’s Lodge reportedly ‘entertained their visitors with a diversity of knowledge, [including] natural philosophy [and] dissertations on the laws and properties of Nature’.120 Clare’s lecture to the lodge was noted at Grand Lodge on 11 December 1735:

Sir Robert Lawley121, Master of the Steward’s Lodge reported that Br. Clare ... had been pleased to entertain the Steward’s Lodge on the first visiting Night with an excellent Discourse’.122

Lectures were held at the Lodge of Friendship, No. 4 in the 1729 list that in 1736 met at the Shakespeare’s Head in Little Marlborough Street. Clare spoke there in 1737, and eight lectures were given the following year on topics ranging from astronomy to optics. The Minutes record that two lectures were given in each year from 1739 until 1741.123

Clare also lectured at the Saracen’s Head in Lincoln, OKA’s sister lodge124; and Warrington’s Lodge of Lights, No. 352 in the 1755 list, certain of whose members

119 Eccleshall, A History of the Old King’s Arms Lodge, p. 24.
120 Anonymous, A Word to the Wise (London, 1795).
121 He was also a member of the OKA. Cf. Eccleshall, The Old King’s Arms Lodge, 1725-2000, Ibid, pp. 27, 153.
122 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 260.
124 OKA Minutes, 2 June 1735.
were later members of the local Dissenting Academy, formed in 1757\textsuperscript{125}, is believed to have hosted lectures. Other lodges can be regarded as ‘probables’. For example, the Swan and Rummer in Finch Lane, constituted in 1725 and whose surviving first Minute Book is the oldest extant, had as a leading member the Jewish physician Meyer Schomberg (1690-1761), who was elected FRS in 1726. Schomberg joined in 1730 and, in 1734, was appointed a Grand Steward. In later years, he reputedly commanded fees of around £4,000 per annum from his clients, at least some of whom are likely to have been Freemasons.\textsuperscript{126} Regarded as a self-promoter, it is plausible that he would have been willing to speak and lecture within the lodge. The lectures at the Nag’s Head in South Wales, and lodges in northern England, have been mentioned above. Continental lodge records also provide evidence, in Jacob’s words, of ‘Freemasonry as an educational force, particularly in mathematics’. Jacob commented that even in remote lodges ‘as far away as Sluis, in Zeeland in the southern Netherlands, members were instructed [in the] knowledge of geometry’.\textsuperscript{127}

Public scientific lecturing did not commence with Desaguliers. Harris, Hauksbee and Whiston\textsuperscript{128} had preceded him, and its popularity had roots in the philosophical and scientific Enlightenment of the latter part of the seventeenth century. However, Desaguliers had taken the concept to a new level, given it impetus and allied it with Freemasonry. The obligation on ‘new admitted brethren’ was underlined in the ‘General Heads of Duty’ set out in the \textit{Pocket Companion for Freemasons}:

\begin{quote}
[A Mason] is to be a Lover of the Arts and sciences, and to take all Opportunities of improving himself therein.\textsuperscript{129}
\end{quote}

Desaguliers’ promotion of Newtonian science through combining entertainment with practical experimentation was central to his popularity and success, as was his emphasis on the commercial application of science. Freemasonry, allied to the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Masonic Records}; cf. also \textit{The History of the Province of West Lancashire} (Liverpool, 2009).
\textsuperscript{127} Jacob, \textit{The Radical Enlightenment}, p. 96.
\textsuperscript{129} W. Smith, \textit{A Pocket Companion for Freemasons} (London, 1735), p. 45.
\end{flushright}
Newtonian scientific enlightenment, benefited in its wake. And other Masonic scientists and engineers followed where Desaguliers had led.

Charles Labelye and the lodge at Madrid

Born in Switzerland, Charles de Labelye (1705-62), a Huguenot, moved to London with his family in or after 1720. He studied with Desaguliers, became his assistant and, subsequently, his protégé. Labelye is best known as the architect and main engineer for the new bridge at Westminster. He was appointed by the bridge commissioners in 1738; the development was finally completed in 1750. The Masonic connection with the project has been noted before. The chair of the commission was Henry Herbert, 9th Earl of Pembroke, and Nathaniel Blackerby and George Payne were two of several commissioners who were well-known Freemasons.

Desaguliers initially relied on Labelye for basic scientific work. The description of Richard Newsham’s novel fire engine, a ‘water engine for quenching and extinguishing fires’, was based on measurements and drawings made ‘at my Desire, by Mr Charles Labelye, formerly my Disciple and Assistant’. Desaguliers also trusted Labelye in his analysis of the then novel method used to transport stone from quarries in Bath – possibly the first use of railways; and Desaguliers incorporated various pieces by Labelye in his Course of Experimental Philosophy.

Probably with Desaguliers’ encouragement, Labelye became a Freemason, joining the French lodge, Solomon’s Temple, where Desaguliers was a member and later Master. Labelye was also recorded in 1730 as Senior Warden of the White Bear in King Street, Golden Square. In common with Desaguliers and perhaps in emulation, Labelye mixed engineering with Freemasonry. He travelled extensively, both with Desaguliers and alone, in connection with his own engineering, hydraulic and other projects. During a visit to Spain in 1727, Labelye helped to establish the lodge at Madrid, the first in Spain, and became its first Master. The petition for its constitution was received and acceded to by Grand

---

Lodge in April 1728. And on his return to London that year, Labelye was thanked by Grand Lodge:

Mr Labelle the present Master of the Lodge held at Madrid in Spain stood up and confirm’d what was some time past delivered in a Letter from the said Lodge to the Grand Master and Grand Lodge in England (concerning their Regularity and submission to us etc.) and acquitted himself in a handsome manner like a Gentleman and a good Mason. Then the Health to the Brethren of the Madrid Lodge was propos’d and drank with three Huzzas.

And the following year, again in London, in March 1729:

The Master of the Lodge at Madrid stood up and represented, that his Lodge had never been regularly constituted by the Authority of the Grand Master, Deputy Grand Master and Grand Wardens in England and therefore humbly prayed a Deputation for that purpose.

Ordered:
That the Secretary do likewise prepare a Deputation to Impower Charles Labelle Master of the said Lodge to constitute them with such other Instructions as is likewise necessary for that purpose.

Then Br. Labelle's Health was drank, and after he drank the Grand Master's Health, Deputy Grand Master's and Grand Wardens with all the Brethrens present and prosperity to the Craft wheresoever dispersed.

Labelye’s extra-London Masonic activities were not limited to Spain. His visit to Exeter in 1732 involved attendance at the recently constituted St John the Baptist lodge at the New Inn, High Street, Exeter, where his ‘zealous endeavours to promote masonry’ were noted. And on a visit to Bath in 1733, Labelye was appointed Senior Warden at the recently constituted lodge at the Bear, albeit that he was shortly obliged to resign due to the pressure of work in London.

George Gordon and the lodge at Lisbon

George Gordon, another of Desaguliers’ students and subsequently a scientific lecturer in his own right, similarly combined his scientific work with Freemasonry.

---

133 Grand Lodge Minutes, pp. 84-5.
134 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 90, 26 November 1728.
136 Constituted 11 July 1732, No. 97 in the engraved list of 1734: Lane, Masonic Records.
137 Norman, ‘Early Freemasonry at Bath, Bristol and Exeter’, 244.
138 Cf. Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 228.
His name appears in advertisements for books ‘published by B. Creake’, which were incorporated within Creake’s 1731 second edition of the *Constitutions*, and in his *Curious Collection of the Most Celebrated Songs in Honour of Masonry*. In each case, Gordon’s *Compendium of Algebra* was advertised as having ‘so plain a Method, that anyone who understands Numbers may learn the solutions of the said Equations without a Master’. In addition to his own works, Gordon also revised and co-authored *The Young Mathematician’s Guide*.

Gordon was a member of the Queen’s Head in Knaves Acre. His course of ‘Universal Mathematicks’ was advertised in 1730 in the *Daily Journal* at a price of 1s per night. He also lectured at Windsor Town Hall ‘for the entertainment of the Nobility and Gentry’, and offered courses of ‘Philosophy, Astronomy and Geography’. Gordon was awarded an honorary Master of Arts degree from Aberdeen, ‘his Diploma ... to be sent to him in a very handsome manner’, perhaps indicating that the city was his original home. In common with Desaguliers, Gordon was also involved with private hydraulic projects. An example was his employment by Lord Malton at Wentworth Woodhouse in South Yorkshire, where he engineered a pump and pipes that raised water some 80 yards in height along a distance of 1,600 yards.

Gordon continued to lecture actively throughout the 1730s, with much of his repertoire based on lectures given previously by Desaguliers, including a course on ‘Opticks [explaining] Newton’s Theory of Light and Colours’. He had earlier written two works published in the 1720s, including an *Introduction to geography*,
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139 *The Ancient Constitutions of the Free and Accepted Masons* (London, 1731), 2nd ed., unnumbered pages.
142 *Daily Journal*, 20 January 1730. It is interesting to note that the price of his lectures was at a substantial discount to the level commanded by Desaguliers.
144 *Daily Journal*, 26 December 1730.
147 *London Evening Post*, 17 October 1732 and *Daily Post*, 19 October 1732.
astronomy, and dialling, published and printed by John Senex.149 This ran to several editions and was dedicated to Walpole: ‘a good statesman will not disdain those sciences as a Diversion’. Alongside Blackerby and other Freemasons, Gordon may also have been a member of the Charitable Corporation, although his relatively common name precludes the certainty of identification.150

Like Labeye, Gordon was also involved with constituting a lodge in the Iberian Peninsula. Gordon was appointed by Grand Lodge in April 1735 to take a warrant to a lodge in Lisbon following a petition from Portugal that a ‘Deputation might be granted ... for constituting them into a regular lodge’.151 This may have been the Protestant lodge founded by British merchants and recorded during the Inquisition as the ‘Lodge of Heretical Merchants’.152 A note of his success was reported in the press. The reference to the English fleet is perhaps significant:

They write from Lisbon, that by Authority of the Right Hon The Earl of Weymouth, the then Grand Master of all Mason Lodges, Mr George Gordon, Mathematician, has constituted a Lodge of free and accepted Masons in that City; and that a great many Merchants of the factory, and other people of distinction, have been received and regularly made Free Masons; that Lord George Graham153, Lord Forrester154, and a great many other gentlemen belonging to the English Fleet, being Brethren, were present at constituting the lodge; and ‘tis expected that in a short time it will be one of the greatest abroad.155

Gould, in his History of Freemasonry throughout the World, suggested that the lodge was a Catholic lodge: the Royal House of Lusitanian Freemasons.156 This seems unlikely. However, whether or not it was correct, and probably as a reward for services that were at least in part of potential diplomatic value, Gordon was

151 Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 254.
153 Lord George Graham was appointed a Grand Steward in 1734 but declined or was unable to attend, possibly because of his naval duties. He was appointed a GW in 1737.
154 Probably the pro-Hanoverian George Forrester, 6th Lord Forrester.
155 London Evening Post, 1 June 1736.
subsequently appointed to the sinecure of Page of the Backstairs to the Princess of Wales.  

Tangentially, a few years later in 1741, John Coustos, a diamond cutter and dealer, a member of the Huguenot lodge at Prince Eugene’s Head Coffee House in St Alban’s Street, founded a second lodge in Portugal. Accused of heresy and espionage by the Portuguese authorities, Coustos was arrested and tortured. Found guilty, he was sentenced to five years in the galleys. However, he was released after only four months after diplomatic pressure from the British government. Denslow, in his *10,000 Famous Freemasons*, recorded that ‘Admiral Matthews was ordered to anchor his fleet in the Tagas for twenty four hours, thus causing [his] release. However, Caulfield, in a rather prosaic but more probable comment, has suggested that Coustos’s brother, who was a member of Lord Harrington’s household, induced Harrington to speak with the Duke of Newcastle, and the Duke thereafter interceded on Coustos’s behalf through the British Embassy in Lisbon.

On his return to England, Coustos breached the non-disclosure agreement he had reached with the Portuguese and published a book setting out his experience at the hands of the Inquisition, ‘embellished with Copper Plates descriptive of the Tortures he endured’. Perhaps not coincidentally, the book was dedicated to the Secretaries of State: William Stanhope, Earl of Harrington; and Thomas Holles, Duke of Newcastle, whom had been petitioned for assistance. Whether in appreciation of Coustos’s services or in sympathy for his suffering, publication – in London and Dublin - was funded by subscriptions from the great and the good and ran to several editions. And three theatrical benefit evenings for Coustos were later held at the New Theatre, Haymarket.
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158 A Swiss Huguenot who had been born in Berne, Coustos was naturalized British in 1716 following his family’s resettlement in London.
161 John Coustos, *The sufferings of John Coustos, for Freemasonry, and for his refusing to turn Roman Catholic* (London, 1746). The quotation is from an advertisement in the *Daily Advertiser*, 15 March 1745.
162 The petition for assistance from Coustos to Newcastle is at BL. MS Add. 33054, f. 313.
163 *General Advertiser*, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31 May 1749.
Freemasonry’s Wider Connection with the Scientific Enlightenment

Stewart drew a detailed portrait of the interplay between Newtonian science, financial speculation, the Royal Society, and the coterie of wealthy aristocrats and merchants that provided patronage to Desaguliers and other lecturers, such as the physician and Newtonian mathematician, James Jurin, proposed FRS in 1717 by Folkes, and the apothecary, Peter Shaw (1694–1763).\textsuperscript{164} The large attendances, and the elevated fees that better-known lecturers were able to charge, testify to the social attraction and professed commercial value of such lecture courses in experimental philosophy.

Porter’s review of science in the provinces in the eighteenth century similarly illuminated the contribution of scientific lecturers to the dissemination of knowledge in Enlightenment England.\textsuperscript{165} His comment that ‘science became ... widely diffused through Georgian society via the ... entrepreneurship of knowledge and the rise of professional ... popularisers’, was accurate; and he noted the new scientific lecturers and the ‘experimental performances’ of Jurin, Hauksbee, Whiston, Desaguliers, and others, who lectured widely in the provinces. Porter argued that the attraction of science was bound up with cultural aspiration:

Knowledge is now become a fashionable thing, and philosophy is the science à la mode: hence, to cultivate this study, is only to be in taste, and politeness is an inseparable consequence.\textsuperscript{166}

Stukeley himself recorded the spread of scientific lectures to ‘every great town in our island’ in his diaries:

About the year 1720 ... Stephen Gray ... often shewed experiments ... at the Royal Society ... Dr Desaguliers continued these ... By this time courses of philosophical experiments with those of electricity began to be frequent in several places in London, and travelled down into the country to every great town in our island.\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{166} \textit{Ibid}, 28: Benjamin Martin, quoted by Porter.
Elliott and Daniels in a comprehensive paper claimed that Freemasonry was the ‘most widespread form of secular association in eighteenth century England’. Their paper examined cross membership with other societies, particularly the Royal Society and Society ofAntiquaries, and noted the influence of natural philosophy on Masonic development. They concluded that Newtonian science was one of several sources of Masonic inspiration and highlighted, in particular, the importance of antiquarianism. However, although it is accurate that many Freemasons were also antiquaries, it is less certain that antiquarianism was a principal driver behind the development of eighteenth century Freemasonry. Curiosity may have led Stukeley and other antiquaries into Freemasonry, but antiquarianism did not shape Masonry’s ersatz history, nor influence its political commitment to the Hanoverian status quo and religious latitudinarianism.

Although antiquaries such as Folkes and Stukeley may have influenced the later development of some of what became eighteenth century Freemasonry’s ‘ancient ritual’, it is hard to categorise antiquarianism, in Elliott and Daniels’ words, as a ‘primary inspiration’. In fact, it is easier to perceive the reverse: that there was a strong Masonic influence on antiquarian studies. Indeed, Elliott and Daniels confirmed as much themselves. In a comment on Thomas Wright (1711-86), an ‘enthusiastic Mason’ and one of the leading landscape gardeners and architects of the 1740s, Elliott and Daniels noted that his lectures and books were ‘imbued with his philosophical and Masonic theories’. They stated that Wright’s surviving architectural and astronomical manuscripts contain ‘many Masonic references and drawings’; and that Freemasonry’s Enlightenment characteristics and, most particularly, its commitment to self improvement, ‘promoted the value of both natural philosophy and antiquarian study’. Elliott and Daniels concluded that the spread of Freemasonry from London to the provinces, and thence to northern Continental Europe and the American colonies and Indian sub-continent, may have ‘mirrored and helped to shape the complex geography of British scientific culture’. This is more plausible. Freemasonry and eminent Masonic scientists such as Desaguliers were powerful facilitators of the dissemination of Newtonian natural philosophy.

---

As the first half of the eighteenth century evolved, scientific lectures, books and apparatus, coffee house philosophy and self-improvement societies, became key characteristics of scientific Enlightenment England, the Dutch Republic and other countries within Europe. In their 1995 paper, Stewart and Wendling mapped out the particular importance of public demonstrations of natural science. They argued that the relative accessibility of such forums exerted a central influence and narrowed the divide between ‘gentlemanly theory’ and the practical application of science. Intellectual inclination, occupation, the potential practical application of science, and social fashion among the metropolitan and provincial élites, were among the many different motives driving public interest in science. This was reinforced by the national and local exposure accorded to popular lecturers, which had a substantially positive impact and elevated public attention. The role of the experimental natural philosopher was fundamental to the process, and attendance at lectures was exploited widely for both social and financial advantage.

Indeed, the public lecture forum provided potentially substantial benefits for both the lectured and the lecturer. Stephen Gray (1666-1736), originally a Kentish dyer, had been Desaguliers’ assistant and later his collaborator, from 1716 until 1719. However, from 1720, having obtained, through Sloane, a Charterhouse pension, he pursued independent and effective research into electricity. Despite not being elected FRS until 1732, the Royal Society used Gray’s innovative experiments as the principal ‘entertainment’ for a meeting of the Council with the Prince of Wales in 1731. The Society awarded Gray the Copley medal later that year and the following year in recognition of the effectiveness of his demonstrations. However, Gray, in Ben-Chaim’s words, ‘failed to acquire a clientele’, or to ‘draw the attention of the general public to his work’. In the public’s eye he was overshadowed by the better known Desaguliers and Willem-Jacob s’Gravesande, whose Physicae Elementa Mathematica offered a more conventional approach to understanding electricity.

170 Ben-Chaim, ‘Social Mobility and Scientific Change’; as noted above, Gray was the first person to be awarded the Copley medal.
171 ibid, 18.
Gray’s relatively poor public reputation suggests that effectively presented and well-publicised public experiments were critical to the dissemination and validation of scientific theories, and that the showmanship allowed by demonstrations of electrical conductivity became an effective mechanism for promoting public interest in both the theory and the theoretician.\textsuperscript{172} Judt’s comment is apposite: ‘for many centuries ... how well [one] expressed a position corresponded closely to the credibility of [the] argument’.\textsuperscript{173} In this analysis, less than first rate scientists and demonstrators such as Gordon, may have been imbued with influence principally because they were articulate and enjoyed the celebrity of the relatively well known. With Gray, the opposite was the case.

To the extent that eighteenth century Masonic lodge meetings included lectures provided by members and their guests, the presence of Fellows of the Royal Society, engineers, apothecaries, physicians, lawyers, and other professionals within Freemasonry, provided a powerful draw to new members. And for both gentlemen and artisan members, the potential commercial benefits were probably made more accessible and immediate by the attendance in lodge of county and municipal social and political élites, who, as in the past, provided an avenue to possible commissions.

Masonic lodge meetings in coffee houses and taverns continued and reinforced a tradition of coffee house science that dated from the late seventeenth century. Robert Hooke (1635–1703) had held meetings in the 1670s at Garraway’s and Joe’s Coffee Houses, in Change Alley and Mitre Court, respectively.\textsuperscript{174} Harris’s mathematical lectures at the Marine Coffee House, Birchin Lane, had commenced in 1698 and continued until 1704. And the Grecian Coffee House in Devereux Court became a fashionable venue for then-opposition Whigs and Fellows of the Royal Society, including Newton, Sloane and Halley. Coffee houses provided an informal setting where companionable men might share ideas. Indeed, Armytage noted that Buttons, in Russell Street, Covent Garden, a leading literary coffee

\textsuperscript{172} Cf. also, Simon Schaffer, ‘Experimenters’ Techniques, Dyers’ Hands, and the Electric Planetarium’, \textit{Isis}, 88.3 (1997), 456-83, for the skills developed by dyer’s used in electrical experimentation.


house, provided a ‘lion-headed post-box’ where information could be deposited for publication in Addison’s Guardian. Armytage also commented that Folkes, a Buttons’ habitué, subsequently arranged for the ‘post box’ to be moved to the Bedford Head.

The relationship between Freemasonry, the learned societies and scholarly publications, was discussed briefly by Bernard Faÿ in the 1930s. He commented on the influence that Freemasonry exerted, both directly and indirectly, via encyclopaedia, scientific lectures and treatises. Faÿ noted French Masonic involvement with the publication of the first French encyclopaedia in 1738. Probably of greater significance but not mentioned by Faÿ, was Masonic involvement in the publication in London more than a decade earlier of the first English language encyclopaedia. Ephraim Chambers’ Cyclopaedia included over thirty references to Newton. Jacob argued that the book, which was widely cited on the continent, was an important component in the spread of Newtonian science to a Continental European audience. A contemporary definition of Freemasonry was included within the second volume:

Free or Accepted Masons, a very ancient Society, or Body of Men ... They are now very considerable both for Numbers and Character; being found in every country in Europe, and consisting principally of Persons of merit and Consideration. As to Antiquity, they lay claim to a Standing of some thousand years.

Faÿ’s argument rested on the primary example of Benjamin Franklin (1706-90). Masonic influences were fundamental to many aspects of Franklin’s public life,

---

176 Armytage, ‘Coffee-Houses and Science’.
179 Ephraim Chambers (1680-1740), a Freemason, originally apprenticed to John Senex, published his Cyclopaedia, or, An universal dictionary of arts and sciences in two folio volumes (London, 1728). Chambers was elected FRS in 1729, proposed by William Jones and Hans Sloane.
180 Jacob, The Radical Enlightenment, p. 96.
182 Having probably been introduced to Freemasonry while in London in the 1720s, Franklin became a Mason in Philadelphia in 1731; he was elected Grand Master of Pennsylvania in 1734. When later in Paris, he became a member, then Master (1779-80), of Les Neuf Soeurs lodge: part Masonic lodge and part learned society. Les Neuf Soeurs was instrumental in organising support in France for American independence.
from his inventions that may have built on work by Desaguliers and Gray, to his founding of the American Philosophical Society and co-authorship of the US Constitution. However, it would be hard to establish Franklin, a uniquely intellectually formidable and entrepreneurial individual, as the basis of any wider paradigm. Jacob, writing of the new scientific ideology based on Newtonian principles\(^{183}\), identified two principal transmitters of Newtonian theory: Desaguliers in England, and Willem-Jacob s’Gravesande, professor of mathematics and astronomy at Leiden in the Netherlands.

**Willem-Jacob s’Gravesande, (1688-1742)**

s’Gravesande’s position at Leiden had been secured in 1717 with Newton’s assistance, and s’Gravesande later became one of the most influential scientists in Continental Europe, not least as editor of the *Journal Littéraire*.\(^{184}\) He had visited England in 1715, where he had lodged with Desaguliers who had acted as a doctoral adviser. s’Gravesande had been appointed secretary to a delegation sent to England from the United Provinces to congratulate George I on his accession. He remained in London for almost two years, gaining an introduction to Newton and Keill and attending Desaguliers’ lectures at the Royal Society. s’Gravesande became a firm Newtonian and it was perhaps not unrelated that he was later proposed and elected FRS.\(^{185}\)

s’Gravesande maintained an extensive correspondence with Keill and Desaguliers after his return to Leiden, and subsequently translated, edited and published scientific works by Keill and Newton. In London, Desaguliers reciprocated, translating and arranging the publication (by Senex) of s’Gravesande’s own two-volume work on Newton.\(^{186}\) Ironically, s’Gravesande’s refinements to Desaguliers’ and Keill’s lectures and experiments overshadowed and later supplanted many of

---

\(^{183}\) Jacob, *The Radical Enlightenment*.


\(^{185}\) s’Gravesande was elected FRS in June 1715. He was proposed by William Burnett, a well-connected and loyal Whig. Burnett had been born in The Hague, educated at Cambridge and Leiden, and was a godson of William III. Cf. John Collins, *Perpetual Motion; An Ancient Mystery Solved?* (Raleigh, N.C., 2006), pp. 93-4; and Mary Lou Lustig, ‘William Burnet, (1688–1729)’, *ODNB* (Oxford, Sept 2004; online edn., Jan 2008).

\(^{186}\) W.J. s’Gravesande, *Mathematical elements of natural philosophy* (Leiden, 1720). The commercial value of the published translation was such that Desaguliers was subjected to a sustained newspaper attack in 1719 and 1720 by rival publishers, Mears and Woodward.
their original demonstrations of Newton’s theories. In Continental Europe, s’Gravesande’s scientific reputation became such that even Voltaire, whose works deified Newton as ‘l’esprit createur’187, travelled to Leiden to seek s’Gravesande’s approval for his *Elémens de la philosophie de Newton*.188 In Stewart’s words, ‘Freemasonry seems now to be the vehicle by which the Newtonianism of Desaguliers and Folkes found its way to the Continent and to the radical circles of Holland’.189

Desaguliers’ intellectual authority, particularly within his immediate academic and scientific circle, was considerable. In addition to Labelye and Gordon, his boarders at Channel Row included several other influential scientists. Stephen Demainbray (1710-82), the natural scientist and astronomer, lodged with Desaguliers while studying at Westminster School and, perhaps not coincidentally, Demainbray later studied under s’Gravesande at Leiden.190 Isaac Greenwood (1702-45), the American mathematician, boarded with Desaguliers in 1725/6.191 Described as Desaguliers’ ‘disciple and sometime assistant’192, Greenwood was appointed the first Professor of Natural Philosophy at Harvard (1728-38), a chair sponsored by Thomas Hollis, a member of the lodge meeting at the Crown behind the Royal Exchange.193 Philippe Vayringe (1684-1745), instrument maker to the Duke of Lorraine and later Professor of Experimental Philosophy at Lunéville, stayed at Channel Row in 1721.194 Stephen Gray lodged with Desaguliers and served as his assistant for over three years, 1716–19. Indeed, Desaguliers later

---

189 Stewart, ‘Newtonians, Revolutionaries and Republicans’, 320.
boasted that ‘of the dozen experimental lecturers in the world, eight had been those whom he had taught’. 195

Many are known to have been or to have become Freemasons.196 Demainbray was a member of Desaguliers’ French lodge at the Swan in Long Acre; and s’Gravesande, a member of a lodge in the Netherlands.197 Voltaire, who became perhaps the most famous purveyor of Newtonian ideas in Continental Europe, also became a Freemason. However, his formal initiation, by Benjamin Franklin at Loge des Neuf Soeurs in Paris, occurred only shortly before his death in 1778.198 More probably consciously than otherwise, Desaguliers’ association with such scientists proved an effective means of extending the radius of his influence and, more particularly, of expediting the flow of Masonic ideals and of the Newtonian scientific Enlightenment.

However, the dissemination of Newton’s theories was not solely for academic and commercial purposes. It also served political and philosophical objectives. Desaguliers’ espousal of Newtonian theories in Britain and, more particularly, in Continental Europe, in the Low Countries and France, sought to displace Cartesian ideas, in Desaguliers’ words: ‘this Army of Goths and Vandals in the philosophical World’.199 Politically, Desaguliers’ lectures implicitly, if not explicitly, underlined the superiority of the Newtonian natural order: a mathematically rational world combined with social order and mercantile success that could be displayed as the products of a constitutional rather than absolutist monarchy. In Desaguliers’ phrase, the perfect political form was that

which does most nearly resemble the Natural Government of our System, according to the Laws settled by the All-wise and Almighty Architect of the Universe.200

195 Fara, Newton, the Making of Genius, pp. 95-6.
196 It has not been possible to determine conclusively whether Isaac Greenwood and/or Philip Vayringe were Freemasons. However, Hollis’s involvement with Greenwood, and the Duke of Lorraine’s employment of Vayringe, may indicate that they were.
198 Mackey, Encyclopaedia of Freemasonry, p. 374. The contention in Harrison’s Genesis of Freemasonry, p. 102, that Voltaire was a Mason when he attended Newton’s funeral in 1727 is surely in error.
199 Desaguliers, Course of Experimental Philosophy (London, 1734), Preface, p. 2.
He continued:

By his example, in their endless Race,
The Primaries lead their Satellites,
Who guided, not enslav’d, their Orbits run,
Attend their Chief, but still respect the Sun,
Salute him as they go, and his Dominion own. 201

The Parliamentary Imprimatur

The mercantile classes and gentry were not alone in the value they placed on expert opinion. Parliament also considered Desaguliers’ knowledge useful. In addition to his engineering advice on the construction of the proposed Westminster Bridge in the 1730s, Desaguliers had been asked to examine and comment on other matters over the past two decades. On 10 May 1716, Desaguliers, as an expert witness, gave his observations on remedies to stop the breach of the river wall at Dagenham. 202 His expertise as a hydraulic engineer was also requested in connection with improving London’s water supply. Parliament directed him to examine the potential effects of redirecting the rivers at Uxbridge to supply London with fresh water and Desaguliers was asked to appear before the Commons to speak on the proposal. His testimony may not have been wholly un-conflicted: Chandos, his patron, was a probable investor in the scheme and, if not in this, then in other similar schemes. 203 Parliamentary records for 24 April 1721 note that:

Dr Desaguliers ... had examined and tried the Quantity of Water, contained in the Cowley Stream ... one of the Streams that run by or near the said Village of Drayton; and that it was able to afford above Three times as much Water as the New River does; and that he had caused a level to be taken, by Persons very well skilled in that way ... who found, that some Part of the said Cowley Stream ... was high enough to have Water brought from thence to Marylebone Fields, and that a large reservoir may be there made; from which Hanover Square and above nine parts in ten of the houses of London and Westminster may be plentifully supplied with Water ... 204

201 Desaguliers, The Newtonian System of the World, p. 27.
Desaguliers appeared before Parliament again, on 5 March 1724, in connection with the ‘intended Canal from Denham Point’ where he commented that the canal could be constructed ‘with a moderate Cut, Six Inches Cut in a Mile’ since ‘he had known Water run in a Slough in a Coal-Mine, at Two Inches Fall in above Half a Mile’. And Desaguliers continued to be called as an expert as late as June 1738, when he was ‘examined upon Oath, as to the Balance engine at Manyfold Ditch, the Use thereof, and as to raising Water in the River Lee’.

Desaguliers’ work in connection with the ventilation of the House was mentioned in chapter two:

That Mr. Disaguliers do view the Chimney in this House, and consider how the same may be made more useful; and report what is proper to be done therein to the Lords Committees, appointed to review the Repairs of The Parliament Office; whose Lordships are hereby empowered to receive the said Report on Friday next.

Although perhaps not particularly remunerative, such official advisory work reinforced Desaguliers’ intellectual credibility and scientific standing, and may have had the consequential effect of adding to the attraction of Freemasonry. There were few places outside of the learned societies or paid lectures that permitted those interested in the practical application of science to enjoy the benefit of associating with scientists and professionals who advised parliament itself and, at the same time, to obtain access to opportunities to network - commercially, socially and politically. Importantly, such benefits and opportunities were provided under the aegis of an organisation that was self-evidently respectable, with the patronage of prominent, politically well-connected, Whig aristocrats. Indeed, the Crown itself was involved. Following the lease of Kew House to Frederick, Prince of Wales, during the winter of 1737-8:

Dr. Desaguliers read lectures on astronomy every day to the [Prince of Wales’s] household. His observatory was then described as a large room at the top of

206 *Journal of the House of Lords*, vol. 25 (1737-41), pp. 405-21, 7 June 1738.
the house, where he had all his mathematical and mechanical instruments at one end and a Planetarium at the other.208

Summary

This chapter has suggested that although Freemasonry’s aristocratic leadership, and the political and personal relationships of the magistrates’ bench and professional associations, were key to Freemasonry’s metropolitan and provincial success, its fascination also rested on other foundations and was propagated by other means.

Among these, Freemasonry’s association with the scientific Enlightenment may have been a powerful factor. Desaguliers’ association of Freemasonry with Newtonian science, a connection continued by Martin Clare, Charles Labelye, and other eminent and self-publicising scientists and lecturers, may have provided a rationale for many to join in a period when social and intellectual self-improvement, and financial gain, were viewed as complementary. And it may be this which helps to explain the presence of Tory supporting Freemasons in a largely Whig-dominated organisation, notwithstanding the more widely-publicised rationale that has tended to cite Freemasonry’s ‘spirit of toleration ... which should unite together in harmony those ... divided by religious and political schisms’.209 Indeed, it should also be noted that the relationship was a two-way street, and that the spread of scientific Enlightenment thought in Britain, Continental Europe and elsewhere was a partial function of the popularity and influence of Freemasonry.

Conclusion

English Freemasonry was transformed in the second and third decades of the eighteenth century. What previously could have been regarded justifiably as a largely moribund organisation, emerged in the 1720s as one of the more dynamic and attractive contemporary societies. The newly established Grand Lodge of England, which initially claimed jurisdiction only over the area covered by the Bills of Mortality, was at the vanguard of the conversion process. Led by a coterie of pro-Hanoverian, pro-establishment figures, among whose leading members were Desaguliers, Payne, Cowper and Folkes, Grand Lodge operated under the predominantly nominal leadership of relatively young Whig aristocrats who stimulated positive press coverage, provided protection through their proximity to political power, and acted as a beacon to aspirant members.

Via a combination of aristocratic, intellectual and political leadership, Desaguliers and his colleagues created a national, then international, organisation, which attracted a substantial segment of the gentry and professional and/or wealthy ‘middling’ classes. The changes instigated within Freemasonry both refracted and reflected the contemporary economic, intellectual, political and religious setting. They were also a function of the idiosyncrasies of the principals themselves, and of the relationships, networks and forums that they deployed. Although archival evidence is comparatively limited, correspondence between the protagonists, particularly that of the Duke of Richmond, demonstrates the strong relationships between them, albeit that relatively few letters refer specifically to Freemasonry, and provides an indication of the importance of the subject to them.

The background to the emergence of Grand Lodge and the transformation of eighteenth century English Freemasonry was rooted in the economic dislocation of the Black Death, which emerged in England in 1348. The plague instigated a process by which the Masonic guilds’ mediaeval roots as religious organisations shifted, as they became quasi trades unions in miniature. Despite legislation that sought to depress labour costs to pre-plague levels, elevated mortality rates and the consequential labour shortage resulted in an increase in real wages of around 50% during the second half of the fourteenth century. Although parliamentary
diktat was unsuccessful in turning back the economic tide, the trend was largely reversed by successive inflationary waves that commenced in the fifteenth century and extended through to the early seventeenth.1

Greater volatility in real earnings and less stable working conditions resulted in labour discontent. This found voice in the Old Charges, which referred to a faux golden Masonic age as a justification for labour agitation. And as labour guilds proliferated, the mutual protection and assistance they offered to craftsmen gradually became accepted, and the enforcement of local labour monopolies a relatively commonplace component of mainstream economic activity.

Over succeeding decades, the guilds evolved to become increasingly influential in and more closely integrated into English civic society, where they generated financial and political influence. The increase in non-working guild members was also marked. Indeed, since the local Justices’ statutory authority extended to setting wage rates, and local politicians and the gentry were responsible for granting guild charters and commissioning municipal and other building works, there were obvious advantages to having such men within the fold. However, the rationale for members of the gentry accepting membership of the lodge may have been more complex than simple flattery and the straightforward acceptance of an invitation.

By the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, guild membership was increasingly dominated by the more affluent master builders who, as employers themselves, had begun to achieve a similar social standing to the local civic dignitaries, and had comparable economic and political interests. Rather than a purely spiritual or ‘speculative’ motive, social, business and local political networking, and periodic dining and drinking, may have been the primary rationale to join a lodge. This appears to have been the case in both York and Chester, where extant membership records indicate a majority of non-working members. And where a lodge developed in this way, its members tended to propagate a pattern of non-working membership through invitations to friends and successive generations of

family. In such a context, the Masonic lodge became more of a club, and dining and socialising key functions.

The argument in favour of a purely ‘speculative’ or spiritual rationale for non-working membership of the lodge appears limited. The principal sources deployed to justify the case in favour of a widespread presence of spiritual Freemasonry prior to the eighteenth century are Ashmole’s *Memoirs*; Rawlinson’s *Preface* to Ashmole’s *Antiquities of Berkshire*; Plot’s *Natural History of Staffordshire*; Holme’s *Academie*; and Aubrey’s *Natural History of Wiltshire*. This thesis also identifies a key new example in Charles II’s State Papers for 4 April 1682. And Knoop and Jones, among others, have provided a further selection of possibly relevant material.

However, on analysis, each of these sources is ambivalent and the aggregate is far from conclusive. None provides firm evidence for any spiritual form of Freemasonry so much as a substantiation of the (uncontentious) mutual assistance offered by guilds, and the long-standing utilitarian connection between working masons and their trade secrets. Although in the light of Holme’s *Academie* and Tryon’s *Letters* it can be accepted that there were early stirrings of a semi-scholarly interest in Freemasonry towards the end of the seventeenth century, and possibly earlier, the available data does not support any further advance of the argument.

The Ancient Lodge at York provides a yardstick against which the success of the emergent Grand Lodge of England in London can be measured and compared. York was dominated by provincial Tory leaders located near the opposite end of the political spectrum to London’s Whig aristocrats. York was also lacking in connections to the scientific Enlightenment and to its key figures, such as Desaguliers and Folkes. Instead of providing a vehicle for the transmission of new ideas under the leadership of those with sufficient dynamism to pursue their objectives, the lodge at York ‘seemed gradually to decline’. The lack of intellectual leadership and ineffectual political influence were factors fundamental to York’s relative failure, and to London Freemasonry’s success in advancing its cause and capturing the heights of eighteenth century society.
Among those exercising influence in the formative years of Grand Lodge and in the development of modern Freemasonry, Desaguliers can probably be regarded as *primus inter pares*. His family’s flight from French persecution; childhood poverty within London’s émigré Huguenot community; Oxford education under Keill; introduction to Newton; appointment as a Fellow, Demonstrator and Curator of the Royal Society; and proximity to the Hanoverian Court and its Whig attendants, shaped his character, career and philosophical outlook.

Desaguliers was regarded correctly as one of the most effective proselytisers of Newtonian science. He was also one of the leading experts on hydraulics and an effective consulting engineer at a time when understanding the practical application of ‘natural philosophy’ was held to be fundamental to self-improvement and self-interest in both educational and financial terms. Consequently, Desaguliers was able to support himself, his family, and his scientific, publishing and other interests, through public lecturing and private commissions from affluent patrons, particularly the Duke of Chandos. Moreover, his connections at the Royal Society and within Freemasonry allowed him to develop a network of personal and professional relationships which he did not hesitate to utilise. The choice of godparents for his children is illustrative of the point.

Desaguliers’ approach to Freemasonry was bound up with his philosophical, political and personal objectives, and Grand Lodge and Freemasonry provided a principal means by which these could be advanced. His philosophical views were entwined with Newton’s scientific Enlightenment theories and, although perhaps to a lesser degree, the natural rights of John Locke. Desaguliers’ self-interested, pro-Hanoverian political views were shared by others within the Huguenot community and, more importantly, by many senior Whigs.

The reinvention of Freemasonry as a bulwark of the Hanoverian status quo led to its embrace by the Whig establishment and, later, by Walpole and other figures at the political core. However, Freemasonry’s position as a forum for self-improving lectures and discussion, and its effective combination of education with entertainment also resonated with its aspirant members. Indeed, under
Desaguliers’ aegis, the lodge meeting might almost have been regarded as an outpost of the scientific Enlightenment.

Although Desaguliers’ influence on Freemasonry was considerable, the totality of the modifications and changes that were introduced were the result of cooperation with others. George Payne, Martin Folkes, William Cowper, Nathaniel Blackerby, Charles Delafaye, and other senior and influential Masons, exploited their connections through a range of partly over-lapping political, social and professional networks. These included the magistracy, in particular, the Middlesex and Westminster benches, and the Royal Society, other learned societies and professional associations, and the civil and military services.

Among these, one of the most influential and previously overlooked networks was that of the magistracy. The political nature of appointments to the magistrates’ bench, and the manner in which they followed local and national politics, was important. As Landau noted, the composition of the post-Hanoverian bench reflected Whig ascendance, especially in London.²

Successive Lord Chancellors appointed dependable political allies and removed potential opposition Tories and Jacobite sympathisers. This was particularly significant in the most sensitive areas of central London: Westminster, Middlesex and Southwark, where the bench was overtly supportive both of the Hanoverians and of the government’s political, religious and economic objectives. In Landau’s words again, ‘fidelity to the Hanoverian [government was] a touchstone for fitness’.³ The public influence and authority of the magistracy went beyond law enforcement. It was a bulwark against the mob and potential treason. And it was not a coincidence that some of the most politically sensitive cases were handled by trusted loyalists, such as Delafaye and de Veil, both pro-Hanoverians and each a prominent Freemason. To extend Munsche’s phrase, magistrates ‘occupied a pivotal position in eighteenth century England⁴, and nowhere was this more the case than in London, where appointment to the bench generated special scrutiny.

³ Landau, Justices of the Peace 1679-1760, p. 88.
With a strong belief in the rights and power of the establishment, it was indicative of their political loyalties that prominent Freemasons, such as Cowper, Streate and Blackerby, were proposed Chairmen of the bench. Such men would ensure that their fellow Justices would:

be vigilant to detect and produce to Punishment all those who ... attempt the Subversion of the Great basis upon which stands all that is or can be dear to England and Protestants ... It is ... for our Religion, our Liberty and our Property.5

In the absence of definitive Masonic membership records, it is not possible to establish accurately the number of Freemasons sitting on the Middlesex and Westminster benches. However, the substantial overlap among senior figures in both organisations, particularly in the 1720s, supports the proposition that an influential network existed, and that it had political importance. It is a reasonable inference that English Freemasonry and Grand Lodge were considered by the government to be reliable, and that the actions of senior Freemasons demonstrated what would have been viewed as laudable vigilance in safeguarding the Hanoverian succession and protecting its administration.

Away from the bench and among his other colleagues within Grand Lodge, Desaguliers’ relationship with Martin Folkes was a second pivot upon which ‘Free and Accepted Masonry’ turned. A wealthy, clubbable and well-connected intellectual, Folkes provided a personal bridge to Montagu, Richmond, and other aristocratic members of the Royal Society, and to the antiquarian community via the Society of Antiquaries and the Gentleman’s Society of Spalding. Folkes’ social position and relationships with his peers would have been quite different from that of Desaguliers, and decidedly complementary.

Folkes was relatively prominent Masonically, where he acted as Deputy Grand Master and was a leading figure at the Bedford Head lodge. However, his central positions within the leading learned societies, particularly the Royal Society, were the foundation of his influence. His intellectual and social capabilities and his personal closeness to Newton led to his election as a vice president of the Royal

5 Cowper, Charge to the Middlesex Grand Jury, 9 January 1723.
Society in 1723, and he eventually succeeded Sloane as President on the latter’s retirement in 1741. He was also elected President of the Society of Antiquaries.

Folkes was responsible for proposing directly eleven Masonic candidates as Fellows of the Royal Society; indeed, he and Desaguliers may also have persuaded Sloane, as Secretary, to propose others. And FRS comprised around a quarter of Folkes’ London lodge, the Bedford Head.

Peter Clark has estimated that up to 45% of Fellows of the Royal Society were Freemasons; Trevor Stewart’s evidence suggests a figure of around 30%. Whichever figure is correct, the Royal Society was permeated by Freemasons, many of whom held senior offices throughout the period and, like Folkes, were active in proposing their friends and fellow Masons for membership. William Stukeley fulfilled a similar function both at the Royal Society, where he proposed at least seven Masons as FRS, at the Society of Antiquaries, which he co-founded and where he was the first secretary, a role he held for nine years, and at the Royal College of Physicians. Each organisation provided a reservoir of initiates to Freemasonry over successive years. Stukeley’s commitment to Freemasonry is exemplified by his establishing a lodge in Grantham and, like Folkes and Richmond, features in his personal correspondence. 6

Although this thesis has considered only a small number of learned organisations and clubs: the Royal Society; Society of Antiquaries; Royal College of Physicians; the Society of Apothecaries; and the Spalding Society, it is likely that the pattern was repeated to a similar extent in other such organisations. Within the Royal College of Physicians, the Society of Apothecaries and the Spalding Society, the parallels are considerable, with an average of around 20% of members being identifiable, probable or possible Freemasons, with a significantly higher proportion among those resident in London.

However, despite the extensive network of relationships within the magistracy and the learned and professional societies, Freemasonry’s development as a popular movement in the early eighteenth century, and one of the most effective

---

means of encouraging and sustaining contemporary interest, was activated by the
enlistment of and press coverage generated by members of the Whig aristocracy.

The titular leadership of popular aristocrats, and the publicity that attended their
presence at lodge meetings and other Masonic events at the theatre and
elsewhere, spurred Freemasonry’s expansion into the gentry, the military, the
professional classes, and among other aspirational groups. Their presence placed
Freemasonry at a social and political centre, and underlined the credentials of
what had been positioned as a fashionable club of consequence.

Montagu, Richmond, and other popular aristocrats were a catalyst to the public
interest generated by the press in a period when the most irrelevant acts of the
peerage were recorded and remarked. And with such extensive press coverage,
Freemasonry’s public profile changed, creating the foundations of what later
could be characterised as a mass movement.

Access to aristocratic patronage was not without its risks. Montagu’s successor as
Grand Master, the Duke of Wharton, had both Jacobite political sympathies and
an immaturity and rebellious nature at odds with Desaguliers and many of his
colleagues within Grand Lodge. However, Wharton’s subsequent expulsion from
Grand Lodge demonstrated the willingness of the organisation to hold to a pro-
government stance. Other aristocrats were associated with other hazards. Lord
Paisley’s non-appearance at Masonic events while Grand Master, and Norfolk’s
failure to name (or persuade) a successor, both led to temporarily reduced press
coverage and a correspondingly moderated public interest.

However, most aristocratic Grand Masters were malleable and loyal. They were
willing to be positioned and to act as figureheads and sponsors, and largely to
leave operational management to Desaguliers, Payne, Cowper, and their non-
aristocratic colleagues. Richmond, probably more than any Grand Master, was
unusual in his willingness to go further. His activities as Grand Master and, in
particular, his hosting of lodges whose principal purpose appears to be the
initiation of other aristocrats and friends demonstrate a Masonic commitment
that may have been exceptional.
Later Grand Masters came from a different mould. And as Freemasonry grew more influential, it became more political, with closer ties both to Walpole and to the patriotic opposition. It would be reasonable to conclude that this was not accidental. Given the prominent role of the magistracy within Freemasonry, political involvement probably went beyond government acquiescence and, from time to time, Freemasonry became, willingly, an instrument through which state influence—and opposition—was exercised.

Within ten years of its first aristocratic Grand Master, Freemasonry was a facet of London’s upper strata and popular among provincial society. The organisation contained a substantial minority of the learned societies, and had a presence in both the army and government. Within twenty years of Montagu’s acceptance of the position of Grand Master, multiple lodges had been set up across England and Wales, and Freemasonry had been carried by the military, merchants and colonists to outposts in the Caribbean, North America and India. And other lodges answering to Grand Lodge in London, or to new Grand Lodges elsewhere, became established across Western Europe.

The adoption of noble Grand Masters and the network of relationships within the learned societies, professional associations and the magistracy were central to Freemasonry's metropolitan and provincial success. They endowed Freemasonry with the characteristics and connections necessary for national and international recognition. However, these factors alone may have been insufficient. Freemasonry's appeal to an increasingly broad spectrum of potential members was also a function of other dynamics. These were numerous and often contrasting. This thesis has not sought to comment on or consider every factor involved. Nevertheless, some of the more obvious have been enumerated. Freemasonry provided a forum for social, commercial and political networking, was generally inter-denominational and benefited from a public association with philanthropy. For some, Masonic ritual was elevated to a quasi-religious status. And the Huguenots and other ‘outsiders’ found the Craft a useful means of entering society, and represented a disproportionately large and active number of those who joined.
However, the eighteenth century’s fascination with Freemasonry was probably also underpinned by another important factor: its association with the scientific Enlightenment. Eighteenth century Masonic lodge meetings evolved to include education and entertainment: a successful combination of self-improving lectures, topical discussion, and drinking and dining. Freemasonry was connected closely with the Royal Society and other professional and learned societies. The organisation had proximity to Enlightenment figures such as Desaguliers, Folkes, Stukeley, Clare, Demainbray, ’sGravesande, Labelye, Gordon and other Newtonian scientists, natural philosophers and antiquaries regarded as at or close to the helm of the scientific Enlightenment. Consequently, it attracted self-interested men of all parties, particularly in the newly industrialising provinces of South Wales, the Midlands and North East England. And Freemasonry’s association with the scientific Enlightenment was not restricted to Britain. It extended elsewhere, to lodges in The Hague, Paris, Madrid, Lisbon and Berlin; and to Philadelphia and the American colonies.

This thesis suggests that Freemasonry should not be regarded merely as being among the most prominent of the many eighteenth century fraternal organisations. It should also be considered as a force that helped to shape the structure and development of the social, economic and political evolution that was then in progress. It was a function of its time, and of its leadership.
## Appendix 1: Grand Lodge of England, Grand Officers 1717–1740

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Masters</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Installed</th>
<th>FRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Sawyer</td>
<td>1672 - 1741</td>
<td>GM 1717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Payne</td>
<td>16… - 1757</td>
<td>GM 1718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T. Desaguliers</td>
<td>1683 - 1744</td>
<td>GM 1719</td>
<td>FRS 1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Payne</td>
<td>16… - 1757</td>
<td>GM 1720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Montagu, 2nd Duke of Montagu</td>
<td>1690 - 1749</td>
<td>GM 1721</td>
<td>FRS 1718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Wharton, 1st Duke of Wharton</td>
<td>1698 - 1731</td>
<td>GM 1722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Scott, 5th Earl of Dalkeith</td>
<td>1695 - 1751</td>
<td>GM 1723</td>
<td>FRS 1724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lennox, 2nd Duke of Richmond</td>
<td>1701 - 1750</td>
<td>GM 1724/5</td>
<td>FRS 1724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hamilton, Lord Paisley</td>
<td>1686 - 1744</td>
<td>GM 1726</td>
<td>FRS 1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William O’Brian, 4th Earl of Inchiquin</td>
<td>1694 - 1777</td>
<td>GM 1727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Hare, 3rd Baron Coleraine</td>
<td>1693 - 1749</td>
<td>GM 1728</td>
<td>FRS 1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James King, 4th Baron Kingston</td>
<td>1693 - 1761</td>
<td>GM 1729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Howard, 8th Duke of Norfolk</td>
<td>1683 - 1732</td>
<td>GM 1730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Coke, Lord Lovell</td>
<td>1697 - 1759</td>
<td>GM 1731</td>
<td>FRS 1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Browne, 7th Viscount Montagu</td>
<td>1686 - 1767</td>
<td>GM 1732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Strathmore, 7th Earl of Strathmore</td>
<td>1702 - 1735</td>
<td>GM 1733</td>
<td>FRS 1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lindsay, 20th Earl of Crawford</td>
<td>1702 - 1749</td>
<td>GM 1734</td>
<td>FRS 1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, 2nd Viscount Weymouth</td>
<td>1710 - 1750</td>
<td>GM 1735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Campbell, 4th Earl of Loudoun</td>
<td>1705 - 1782</td>
<td>GM 1736</td>
<td>FRS 1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Bligh, 2nd Earl of Darnley</td>
<td>1715 - 1747</td>
<td>GM 1737</td>
<td>FRS 1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Brydges, Marquis of Carnarvon</td>
<td>1708 - 1771</td>
<td>GM 1738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Raymond, 2nd Lord Raymond</td>
<td>1717 - 1756</td>
<td>GM 1739</td>
<td>FRS 1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Keith, 3rd Earl of Kintore</td>
<td>1699 - 1758</td>
<td>GM 1740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Douglas, 14th Earl of Morton</td>
<td>1702 - 1768</td>
<td>GM 1741</td>
<td>FRS 1733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Later 2nd Duke of Buccleuch  
2 Later 7th Earl of Abercorn  
3 Proposed FRS by Hans Sloane, Roger Gale and Desaguliers  
4 Grand Master of Grand Lodge of Ireland (1731 & 1735)  
5 Later Viscount Coke and 1st Earl of Leicester  
6 Later 2nd Duke of Chandos  
7 Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Scotland (1738-9).  
8 KT, 1738; Grand Master of Grand Lodge of Scotland (1739-40); later, PRS (1764-8) and VPRS (1763-4)  
* = Scottish Representative Peer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deputy Grand Masters</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Installed</th>
<th>FRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Beale</td>
<td>16... - 1724</td>
<td>DGM 1721</td>
<td>FRS 1721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T. Desaguliers</td>
<td>1683 - 1744</td>
<td>DGM 1722/3</td>
<td>FRS 1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Folkes(^9)</td>
<td>1690 - 1754</td>
<td>DGM 1724</td>
<td>FRS 1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T. Desaguliers</td>
<td>1683 - 1744</td>
<td>DGM 1725</td>
<td>FRS 1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cowper</td>
<td>16... - 1740</td>
<td>DGM 1726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Chocke</td>
<td>16... - 1737</td>
<td>DGM 1727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Blackerby</td>
<td>16... - 1742</td>
<td>DGM 1728/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Batson</td>
<td></td>
<td>DGM 1730/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Cecil Wray</td>
<td>16... - 17..</td>
<td>DGM 1733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ward(^10)</td>
<td>1704 - 1774</td>
<td>DGM 1733/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Graeme</td>
<td>1700 - 1745</td>
<td>DGM 1738/9</td>
<td>FRS 1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Clare</td>
<td>16... - 1750</td>
<td>DGM 1740</td>
<td>FRS 1735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Wardens</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Installed</th>
<th>FRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Lambell</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Elliot</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cordwell</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Sayer</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hobby</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josias Villenau</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Timson</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hawkins/James Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Sorrel</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Senex</td>
<td>c. 1678 – 1740</td>
<td>GW 1723</td>
<td>FRS 1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Sorrel</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Payne</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Daniel Houghton</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW 1725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9\) PRS, 1741  
\(^10\) Later Rt. Hon. Viscount Dudley & Ward, Grand Master, 1742
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Wardens</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Installed</th>
<th>FRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Prendergast</td>
<td>GW 1725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Chocke</td>
<td>GW 1726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Burden</td>
<td>GW 1726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Blackerby</td>
<td>1694 - 1742</td>
<td>GW 1727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Highmore</td>
<td>GW 1727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir James Thornhill</td>
<td>1675 – 1734</td>
<td>GW 1728</td>
<td>FRS 1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin O’Connor</td>
<td>GW 1728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Col. George Carpenter</td>
<td>1694 - 1749</td>
<td>GW 1729</td>
<td>FRS 1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Batson</td>
<td>GW 1729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr George Douglas</td>
<td>1694 – 1737</td>
<td>GW 1730</td>
<td>FRS 1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Chambers</td>
<td>GW 1730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Rooke</td>
<td>GW 1731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Smythe</td>
<td>GW 1731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Smythe</td>
<td>GW 1732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ward</td>
<td>1679 - 1758</td>
<td>GW 1732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ward</td>
<td>1679 - 1758</td>
<td>GW 1733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Edward Mansel</td>
<td>1686 - 1754</td>
<td>GW 1733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Edward Mansel</td>
<td>1686 - 1754</td>
<td>GW 1734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Clare</td>
<td>1694 - 1751</td>
<td>GW 1734</td>
<td>FRS 1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ward</td>
<td>1679 - 1758</td>
<td>GW 1735</td>
<td>FRS 1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Robert Lawley</td>
<td>GW 1735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Robert Lawley</td>
<td>GW 1736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr William Graeme</td>
<td>1700 – 1745</td>
<td>GW 1736</td>
<td>FRS 1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord George Graham</td>
<td>GW 1737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Robertson</td>
<td>GW 1737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harvey Thursby</td>
<td>GW 1738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Foy</td>
<td>GW 1738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ruck</td>
<td>GW 1739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Vaughan</td>
<td>GW 1739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Vaughan</td>
<td>GW 1740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Gascoyne</td>
<td>GW 1740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Secretaries</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Installed</td>
<td>FRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cowper</td>
<td>GS 1723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Reid</td>
<td>GS 1727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Graeme</td>
<td>1700 – 1745</td>
<td>GS 1735</td>
<td>FRS 1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Reyis</td>
<td>GS 1736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: The 1723 Constitutions – a comparative analysis

This Appendix considers the origins of Freemasonry’s Old Charges, and the substance and political and philosophical implications of the core non-historical content of the 1723 Constitutions: the Regulations and Charges.

The relationship between the Regulations and Charges and the mediaeval Old Charges is frequently argued in terms of antiquity and continuity: that the former was a development of, incorporated and followed from the latter. A recent study perpetuated this approach, commenting that ‘Freemasonry evolved into a society that combined ancient mysticism with the emerging Natural philosophy of the New Science’. Such an argument may be disingenuous. An analysis and comparison of the configuration of the ‘Laws, Charges, Orders, Regulations and Usages’ that were written from 1720 and published in 1723, suggests that although superficially important and providing a comforting, if largely false, historic context, maintaining a degree of continuity with earlier Masonic documents was not the main consideration. Although wording from older manuscripts was incorporated and a broad similarity of structure can be identified, it is important to focus on four factors: the newly introduced wording; that which was excluded; the possible reasons for such changes; and the contemporary context.

English Freemasonry had its nominal roots in the mediaeval religious guilds, evidence of which can be found across Europe from the early mediaeval period through to the eighteenth century. Similarly, the quasi-spiritual role of operative stonemasons’ tools can be dated back to Greek and Roman times, and they were and have been used allegorically by both Masonic and non-Masonic organisations. However, the conventional and, perhaps, simplistic view of English Freemasonry as a continuation of or evolution from the operative

---

1 Harrison, The Genesis of Freemasonry, p. 43.
mediaeval Masonic guilds, is largely undermined by the intellectual, political and structural characteristics of the eighteenth century model. Under its new Grand Officers at the head of an innovative federal structure, English Freemasonry became a focal point for ideas associated with the scientific Enlightenment, and attracted and promoted a predominantly pro-Hanoverian constituency.

It can be argued that such changes were designed by a cohort of Desaguliers, Payne, Folkes, and others among the senior ranks of English Freemasonry. Under their aegis, Freemasonry in the 1720s and 1730s became a vehicle for the dissemination of political and philosophical beliefs that were not part of any centuries’ long process of evolution but rather a reflection of contemporary eighteenth century society.

**The Old Charges**

Payne and Desaguliers’ *Regulations and Charges* were supposedly derived from mediaeval manuscripts: ‘I need not tell your Grace what Pains our learned author has taken in compiling and digesting this Book from the old Records … still preserving all that was truly ancient and authentic in the old ones’. This may be regarded, at least in part, as fictional. Prescott has suggested, convincingly, that different versions of the *Old Charges* were a product of their contemporary economic context. However, it can be argued that they represent more than this; they also hold a mirror to the religious, political and social environment. Since the late fourteenth century, the guilds had functioned as local economic pressure groups to support and increase pay rates by combining collective bargaining with restrictive labour practices. They also provided a social and religious function, most particularly in education and through the sponsorship of Mystery Plays and church livings. These were aspects of guild life that had been taken from and were a continuation of the guilds’ original religious foundations, and they continued to exist in Freemasonry. Moreover, given the contemporary

---

4 1723 Constitutions, p. 58.
5 For example, Prescott, ‘The Old Charges Revisited’ and ‘The Old Charges and the Origins of Freemasonry’.
7 Edwin R.A. Seligman, *Two Chapters on the Mediaeval Guilds of England*.
‘religious-political’ framework, the guilds were also necessarily supportive of Crown and Church. Protestations of faithfulness to God, fealty to the King and his lords, and loyalty to the religious authorities, formed the opening portion of each of the *Old Charges* sworn by the membership, even before the guilds were incorporated officially by charter. Acceptance of the religious, royal and feudal status quo was a *conditio sine qua non* of existence. A formal protestation of loyalty could not offer any legal protection to the guild. However, together with its faux history dating back to St Athelstan or St Alban, the *Old Charges* provided parameters and a framework in which technically illegal wage negotiation via collective bargaining could be justified morally (and politically). In this way, the *Old Charges* thus provided an attenuated form of theistic and political insurance to the guild’s membership.

The *Cooke Manuscript* was clear on the point:

> whosoever desires to become a mason, it behoves him before all things to [love] God and the holy Church and all the Saints; and his master and fellows as his own brothers;

and the *Watson* manuscript, written at York around a century later, contained similar obligations:

> The first Charge is that you be [a] true man to God, and the Holy Church, and that you use neither error nor heresy, according to your own understanding, and to discreet and wise-men’s teaching ... You shall be [a] true liegemen to the King of England without any treason or falsehood

The *Halliwell, or Regius*, manuscript is one of the earliest of the *Old Charges*. The manuscript has been dated to between c. 1390 and c. 1450. It takes the form

---

9 Matthew Cooke (ed.), *Cooke Manuscript* (London, 1861). The original is at BL: Additional MS 23,198.
10 G.W. Speth (trans.), *The Cooke Manuscript* (London, 1890) in *QCA Masonic Reprints*, vol. 2.
12 The *Regius MS* was acquired by the Royal Library, hence ‘*Regius*’, and donated to the British Museum in 1757. The *MS* was transcribed by James Halliwell in *The Early History of Freemasonry in England* (London, 1840). The original is at BL: Royal MS. 17 A.1.
of a 794 line epic poem written in metric verse. The poem begins with ‘constituciones artis gemetriae secundum Eucyldem’, that is, a history of the art of geometry according to Euclid, which states that the stone masons’ art can be traced back to Euclid, ‘the father of geometry’:

Bygan furst the craft of masonry, The clerk Euclyde on thys wyse hyt fonde, Thys craft of gemetry yn Egypte londe.

The Regius MS dated the arrival of Freemasonry in England to the time of King Athelstan:

thys craft com ynto Englond, as yow say, Yn tyme of good kynge Adelstonus day

and noted that it was held in high esteem by God:

Thys goode lorde loved thys craft ful wel.

The brief history of the craft is followed by ‘fyftene artyculs they ther sow[gon] and fyftene poyntys they wro[gon]’, or fifteen articles and fifteen points, that set out various rules designed to regulate stonemasons. For example, the manuscript detailed how apprentices and fellowcraft masons should be paid:

And pay thy felows after the coste, And when you pay your workers
As vytaylys goth thenne, wel thou woste; take into account the cost of food;
And pay them trwly, apon thy fay, you know that they deserve that you
What that they deserven may; should pay them fairly;

The manuscript also contained restrictions to prevent unacceptable business conduct, for example:

---

14 Euclid was born c. 300 BC and lived and worked in Alexandria. His Elements remained in use as a geometry textbook for nearly two millennia.
15 Regius, lines 55-6.
16 Ibid, lines 61-2.
17 Ibid, line 67.
18 Ibid, lines 85-6.
19 Ibid, lines 91-4.
20 Author’s translation, as are the paragraphs that follow.
That the mayster be both wyse and felle;
The master should be wise and true,
But he conne bothe hyt ende and make;
And not undertake work
And that hyt be to the lorde profyt also;\textsuperscript{21}

And the manuscript similarly contained strictures regarding personal conduct, for example:

No fals maintenans he take hym apon,
He should not lie,
Ny maynteine hys felows yn here synne,
Nor allow his colleagues to act sinfully,
For no good that he my\[g\]th wynne;
Regardless that this may be of benefit;
Ny no fals sware sofre hem to make,
Nor allow others to act falsely,
For drede of here sowles sake.\textsuperscript{22}

Moreover, among other constraints\textsuperscript{23}:

Thou schal not by thy maysters wyf ly,
Do not sleep with your master’s wife,
Ny by the felows, yn no maner wyse,
Nor with that of any colleague,
Lest the craft wolde the despyse;
For you would be scorned by the Craft;
Ny by the felows concubyne,
Nor with a colleague’s girlfriend,
No more thou woldest he dede by thyne.
For you would not wish to be treated as such by him.

The Regius MS established the principle that all masons were subject to the rules of the lodge and, \textit{inter alia}, enjoined that each mason should attend the annual meeting:

every mayster, that ys a mason,
Most ben at the generale congregacyon ...
[the] asemblé to be y-holde every [g]er,
whersever they wolde, to amende the defautes,
ef any where fonde amonge the craft
withynne the londe assemblies.\textsuperscript{24}

The balance of the poem, lines 497-794, is substantially religious in content and largely unrelated to masonry. The manuscript refers to ‘ars quatuor coronatorum’, the art of the Four Crowned Martyrs, and to the ‘syens seven’, the seven sciences:

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Ibid}, lines 194-7.  
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Ibid}, lines 256-8.  
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Ibid}, lines 324-8.  
\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Ibid}, lines 107-18.
Know that Grammar is the first science, know that Grammar is the first science, 
Dialect is the second, Dialect the second,
Rhetoric the third, without doubt, Rhetoric the third, without doubt,
Music the fourth, as I say, Music the fourth, as I say,
Astronomy the fifth, by my nose, Astronomy the fifth, by my nose,
Arithmetic the sixth, without doubt, Arithmetic the sixth, without doubt,
Geometry the seventh is the last. Geometry the seventh is the last.

The Regius MS concludes with a sermon on good behaviour in Church:

In holy church leave aside your
lewd words and unpleasant jokes,
and put away thoughts of yourself;
And say ‘our Father’ and ‘hail Mary’;
Be certain that you maintain respect
and concentrate on prayer,
and if you are not at prayer yourself,
Do not disturb others who are.

Although much of the poem’s phraseology is religious, a substantial component

Although much of the poem’s phraseology is religious, a substantial component
can be regarded as providing only slightly more than a contextual wrap around a
number of principally commercial points and practical instructions. However, as
Knoop and Jones noted, it is not clear whether such regulations and instructions
were rules to which Masons were expected to aspire, a reflection of existing
practice, or a combination of the two.27

The same or similar commercial and operative components are identifiable in
other versions of the Old Charges written in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.
Of these, the Cooke MS, dated to the period 1450-90, is considered to be one of
the more prominent. It is also regarded as the manuscript most likely to have
been used by Payne in his compilation of Charges.28 Cooke expanded the
historical antecedents of Freemasonry, and justified and substantiated
Freemasonry’s place in both a contemporary and historical context.

Cooke placed the origins of the Craft ‘seven generations’ after Adam:

25 ibid, lines 557-63.
26 ibid, lines 619-26.
Economic History Review, 3.3 (1932), 346-66.
before Noah’s flood, there was a man that was named Lamech ... he begat two sons ... The elder son, Jabal, he was the first man that ever found geometry and Masonry.\textsuperscript{29}

Cooke also advanced the date of introduction of Freemasonry to England to the time of St Alban\textsuperscript{30}, one of the earliest English Christian martyrs, noting that:

Saint Alban loved well masons, and he gave them first their charges and manners first in England.\textsuperscript{31}

The Cooke MS set out in detail the historical context that provided its contemporary readers and listeners with both a sociological and psychological justification for the Craft’s existence. Given the contemporary economic circumstances and, in particular, the statutory constraints that had been enacted, it was especially significant that Cooke stated that there were powerful historical precedents with regard to appropriate wage rates. Cooke declared that these had been dictated by King Athelstan and, equally importantly, that Athelstan had given his imprimatur to masonic guilds and lodge assemblies:

and he loved well masonry and masons. And he became a mason himself, and he gave them charges and names as it is now used in England, and in other countries. And he ordained that they should have reasonable pay and purchased a free patent of the king that they should make [an] assembly when they saw a reasonable time.\textsuperscript{32}

Cooke’s historical perspective validated and justified collective wage bargaining, and sanctioned the right to ‘reasonable pay’, notwithstanding a century of legislative restrictions. The words were not literary embroidery. In common with the Regius MS, Cooke’s principal role was to sanction the existence of the guild and legitimate its activities. Implicit was the long-standing rights of stonemasons to ‘make assembly’ and to enjoy an appropriate level of pay. Tangentially, the comparably artificial history written by Anderson two hundred and fifty years

\textsuperscript{29} Cooke, lines 160-80.
\textsuperscript{30} St Alban, a Christian convert, was martyred by the Romans at Verulamium (now known as St Albans). The precise date of death is not known.
\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Ibid}, lines 625-37.
later had a similar sub-text: to validate the newly created Grand Lodge and its new rulebook, and to place it within the context of a ‘tradition of many ages’.

In this analysis, the core components of the Regius, Cooke, and other Old Charges, were principally economic and financial. They were a response to the government’s continuing attempts to hold down wage rates and frustrate collective bargaining. In The Mediaeval Mason, Knoop and Jones noted the petition of the Commons against assemblies of Masons in the 1425 Parliament\(^3\), one of several petitions that related to Edward III’s Ordnance of Labourers and Statute of Labourers, passed in 1349 and 1351, respectively. The purpose, outlined in the (translated) text below, was clear:

The commons humbly request: whereas by annual meetings and confederacies held by masons in their general chapters and assemblies, the good intent and effect of the statutes of labourers have been publicly violated and broken, in subversion of the law, and the grievous damage of all the commons ... Such chapters and assemblies must not be held henceforth; and if any such are held, those who have caused these chapters and assemblies to be convened and held, if they are convicted of this will be adjudged as felons. And that all other masons who attend such chapters and assemblies will be punished by imprisonment of their bodies, and will make fine and ransom, at the king’s will.\(^4\)

In 1423, Parliament had confirmed:

the powers of justices to bring before them those suspected of receiving wages higher than those stipulated in the statute of labourers were ... confirmed up to the next parliament.\(^5\)

And in 1425, Parliament observed:

that the said justices of the peace, shall have the power to summon before them by attachment, masons, carpenters ... and all other labourers, and to examine them, and if they find by examination, or by other means, that any of the said persons has been paid contrary to the laws and ordinances made in

\(^3\) Knoop & Jones, The Mediaeval Mason, p. 183.
\(^4\) Chris Given-Wilson (gen. ed.), Parliament Rolls of Medieval England: Henry VI: 1422-1461 - April 1425 (London), item 43. This is a transcription of the original scrolls by the Institute of Historical Research. The original is at C 65/86; RP, IV.261-294; SR, II.227-8.
the past, that then he who is found receiving thus, should be imprisoned for one month.36

Parliament also ordained that the Justices should have the power to arraign any employers suspected of paying wages above those levels enacted by Statute:

And if it be founden by examination, or in other wise, that the seid maistres yeven more than accordyng to the seid ordinaunce, thanne ther seid maistres that yeven more, and iche of hem, payng to the kyng, for every salariie paiied to the servaunte, contrarie to the seid ordinaunce of Leycestre, the excesse; and the seid servauntz so takyng, and ther of atteint, by hir knoulich, or in other laufull wise, have imprisonment of a moneth, without bail or mainpris. And if any sheref, bailiff of fraunchise, gaoler, or any other, havynge keyng of prisons with inne fraunchise, or withoute, or any of here deputes, put any such persone to baill or mainpris, thanne lese to the kyng, for every suche man let to baill or mainpris, XXs.37

Translation:
And if it be found by examination or by other means that the said masters pay more than is stipulated by the said ordinance, that then the said masters who pay more ... shall be fined the excess by the Crown for every salary so paid to the servant contrary to the said ordinance of Leicester; and the said servants thus receiving, and convicted of this ... shall be imprisoned for a month without bail or mainprise.38 And if any sheriff, bailiff of a franchise, gaoler, or any other person in charge of prisons within or outside a franchise, or any of their deputies, put any such person on bail or mainprise, then they shall forfeit 20s to the crown for every such man allowed bail or mainprise.

The government was aware of the reaction to their legislation:

because of certain ordinances issued by the mayor and aldermen of London against the excessive wages taken by masons, carpenters, tilers, plasterers, and other labourers for their daily work and approved by the king's advice and that of his council, there were generated many grudges and seditious bills in the name of such labourers, threatening a rising of many thousands, and threatening the estates of the land.39

The Old Charges represented one element of the guilds' response to the pressures imposed by the ordinances and statutes. The Charges addressed the issue of pay

---

38 Mainprise = to release upon finding sureties or ‘mainpernors’.
specifically. They were directed at both the workers and those who employed them. As noted above, the first article in *Regius* dealt explicitly with the issue of applying fixed wages at a time of price inflation: ‘pay thy felows after the coste as vytaylys goth theyn ... and pay them trwly, apon thy fay, what that they deserve.’

Given the contemporary economic context, it is unsurprising that the *Cooke* MS contained similar wording:

> That every master of this art should be wise and true to the lord that he serveth, dispensing his goods truly as he would his own were dispensed, and not give more pay to no mason than he wot he may deserve, after the dearth of corn and victual in the country, no favour withstanding, for every man to be rewarded after his travail.

Labour conflict remained a visible thread running from the mid-fourteenth century, as artisans sought to gain more control over wage rates and unskilled workers to take advantage of the labour shortages that followed each recurrent outbreak of plague or other economic disruption. The *Ordinance of Labourers* was followed by others statutes setting wage rates and seeking to contain labour. The legislation was reinforced by Henry VI in 1424:

> whereas by the yearly congregations and confederacies made by the masons in their general chapiters and assemblies, the good course and effect of the statutes of labourers be openly violated and broken, in subversion of the law, and to the great damage of all the commons; our said lord the King willing in this case to provide remedy by the advice and assent aforesaid, and at the special request of the said commons, hath ordained and established, That such chapiters and congregations shall not be hereafter holden.

Restrictive legislation was only one of several factors that had an impact upon the mediaeval labour market. The principal features of the market were unpredictability and instability, with sporadic growth and decline periodically affecting different economic sectors and regions. Nonetheless, stonemasons, along with other skilled and unskilled labourers, generally benefited from market forces, as labour shortages improved their bargaining position across both urban

---

40 Author’s translation.
41 *Cooke*, lines 728-40.
and rural areas; the most important losers were the larger employers.\textsuperscript{45} And although Acts were passed successively in 1436, 1444, 1495 and 1514, in a sustained attempt to regulate away market forces, the attempt to set daily pay rates and prescribe maximum wages and, conversely, to open the labour markets by proscribing minimum work qualifications, were contentious and largely ineffective.\textsuperscript{46} Infractions by employers, labourers, and by officials tasked with policing and prosecuting the legislation were commonplace.\textsuperscript{47} During the early 1550s, inflation and the erosion of real wages resulted in strikes and riots in Coventry, London, York and elsewhere, and made clear to Elizabeth’s government that an alternative approach was required.

The Acts of 1495 and 1514 had imposed maximum daily rates of pay across diverse groups of workers but these had not been revised to take into account inflation and, by 1550, the stated wage rates were unrealistic and impractical. In York, in 1552, building workers went on strike and refused to work for the daily pay rate of 6d that had been determined in 1514. Their leaders were jailed but despite this, similar protests occurred in other towns in the North and Midlands, including Chester and Hull. The government was forced to adopt and maintain a more conciliatory approach closer to London, and in the Home Counties and south Midlands, for fear of popular insurrection.\textsuperscript{48} Eventually, Parliament responded and in 1563 passed the Statute of Artificers, which lay down a new framework for wage regulation and delegated the necessary powers to settle local wage rates to local Justices of the Peace, based on local market conditions and prices.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{46} Pickering, \textit{The Statutes at Large} (1763), book V, p. 313-47.

321 | P a g e
Woodward has demonstrated that for most labourers, employment was discontinuous and insecure and, for many, the cash wage was their primary source of income.\textsuperscript{50} That the guilds provided only limited support for wage rates in the mid- and late sixteenth century may reflect the manner in which, by this time, they had begun to represent the more entrepreneurial and successful master masons whose economic interests were not necessarily shared with the masons they employed. In contrast, Prescott has argued compellingly in \textit{The Old Charges Revisited} that it was no coincidence that the York manuscripts, written in the mid-sixteenth century, echoed contemporary labour discontent.\textsuperscript{51} He pointed out that the wages demanded by the striking craftsmen in 1552 were virtually identical to those set out in contemporary manuscripts that purported to refer to the rate of pay applicable at the time of St Alban, namely ‘2s6d a week for work and 3d a day for food’.\textsuperscript{52}

Setting aside the religious schematic, it can be argued that the central core of the \textit{Old Charges} was protectionist. The \textit{Charges} provided a justification to establish and maintain the structures necessary or beneficial to the support of local wage rates. They laid out an operational framework to restrict labour supply: limiting the admission of apprentices; setting minimum quality standards; enforcing action against ‘unqualified’ workers; and controlling and regulating operational issues through the lodge. In order to avoid the charge of sedition in what remained a strictly stratified society, the guilds simultaneously proclaimed their loyalty to the Crown and to the natural hierarchical order. However, the willingness to riot suggests that this may have been considered by some of those concerned as no more than a veneer. At the same time, the guild sought to bind its membership, both to one another and to the lodge, through oath-laden initiation ceremonies, ritual and dining/drinking. It can be argued that it was this aspect of Freemasonry that was later to attract the respective interest and patronage of scholars and the gentry.

The \textit{Dowland MS} (c. 1500), \textit{Lansdowne MS} (c. 1560), and \textit{York} manuscripts (c. 1600) are three of over 120 extant fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth century

\textsuperscript{50} Woodward, \textit{Men at Work}.
\textsuperscript{51} Prescott, ‘The Old Charges Revisited’.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
manuscripts held at the British Library, the library of the UGLE, that of the Grand Lodge at York, and in private Masonic lodges in England, Scotland and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{53} The manuscripts are generally known by the names of their owners, writers, publishers or printers, or similarity to another text. A few are named in honour of notable Freemasons.\textsuperscript{54} Despite being written over a period of a century and around 150 years after Regius and Cooke, each manuscript shares common components and follows the same broad pattern: a short prayer to the Trinity; a discourse on the seven liberal arts and sciences; an embroidered history of Masonry; and the kernel of the document, the \textit{Oath} and \textit{Charges}.

Each set of \textit{Charges} contains the same principal obligations: to be true to God and the Church; the King and the ‘natural’ social order - ‘true to the lord, or Master, that you serve ... that his profit and advantage be promoted’\textsuperscript{55}; and to other Masons. In this last respect, Masons were enjoined to secrecy, to ‘keep truly all the counsel of Lodge and Chamber, and all other counsel, that ought to be kept by way of Masonry’.\textsuperscript{56} As before, other individual \textit{Charges} were more mundane, and the texts contain restrictions against name-calling, adulterous and/or immoral behaviour and dishonesty. Craftsmen were obliged not to cheat: to ‘pay truly for your meat and drink where you go to table’; and to do nothing ‘whereby the Craft may be scandalised, or receive disgrace’. Other \textit{Charges} were concerned with the governance of the lodge and its operations and set out the then current working practices for operative stonemasons. It is significant that the \textit{Charges} were un-illuminated documents. This suggests that they were designed for regular use rather than for mere display.

By the beginning of the seventeenth century, Freemasons’ guilds, in common with other craft guilds, were governed by charters by which the guild was recognised and incorporated. The charter set out the structure, governance and operations of the guild; determined when the lodge would meet, usually up to four times a year, with the main meeting occurring on St John the Baptist’s day; and how the master, wardens and clerk would be chosen by the members, customarily on an

\textsuperscript{55} G.W. Speth and C.C. Howard, \textit{William Watson MS} in \textit{QCA Antigraphe}, 3.4 (1891). (The \textit{William Watson MS} was copied in York in 1687; it is held in London at the UGLE Library.)
\textsuperscript{56} G.W. Speth and C.C. Howard, \textit{Ibid}. 
annual basis by election. The charter also set out how apprentices were to be admitted and employed, the obligations and responsibilities of members, and operational ordinances, such as fines and stipends. In short, the guild charter combined a warrant, or permit, with articles of association, providing a constitutional framework and a set of regulations that governed day-to-day business.

Over time, the guilds gradually engaged in a process of becoming more firmly and commercially embedded into provincial and metropolitan society. In Newcastle, for example, a charter of 1 September 1581 constituted the Masons a body incorporated with perpetual succession. In return for their rights, the guild was obliged inter alia to meet annually, ‘choose two wardens, who might sue and be sued in the courts of Newcastle, make bye-laws’, and adopt a system of fines:

every absent brother to forfeit 2s. 6d.; no Scotsman should be taken apprentice, under a penalty of 40s. nor ever be admitted into the company on any account whatever; each brother to be sworn; that apprentices should serve seven years; ... that one half of their fines should go to the maintenance of the great bridge, and the other half to the said fellowship.57

However, by the end of the sixteenth century and into the seventeenth, the local guilds’ monopolies were under threat. Their ability to levy fines, operate a right of search, set prices, exclude ‘strangers’ and restrict apprenticeships, were beginning to be viewed as anachronistic at a time of burgeoning economic development and commercial trade. They were also subject to litigation and dispute, as Tudor labour regulations and the new Elizabethan Statutes enacted from 1563, began to fall into abeyance.58 But the retreat of the guild system was not uniform across the country. Pockets of influence survived. In 1713, a reform committee established in York had advised that all craft ordinances should be ‘brought in’ so that the committee might discover what tended to ‘limit and discourage trade and industry’.59 However, reform was not on the agenda. As a

testament to the particularly close relationship between the guilds and city authorities, York went against the recommendations of their own committee and against the general trend, and ‘free-working masons’ were given a new charter of incorporation in 1726. Other York guilds were similarly favoured by the city. Such a response was conspicuous at a time when guild influence was more often being accepted as harmful and placing unacceptable restrictions on the local economy. Indeed, a few years later, in 1736, York’s support for the guilds’ restrictive practices was condemned by one of their own, the antiquarian, scholar and York Freemason, Francis Drake (1696-1771)60. Drake noted what, in his view, was the main reason for there being so little manufacturing and an absence of employment for the poor:

Our magistrates have been too tenacious of their privileges, and have for many years last past, by virtue of their charters, as it were locked themselves up from the world, and wholly prevented any foreigner from settling any manufacture amongst them.61

Within London, the influx of provincial and continental stonemasons during the construction boom that followed the Great Fire62, rising municipal affluence and the widespread use of brick, had also combined to break down monopolistic barriers in the building trades. Charles II had granted a petition in November 1677 for a royal charter of incorporation for the Company of Masons:

to prevent the deceits and abuses ... lately observed to be too frequently practised by many of the same trade in and about London and Westminster,

60 Drake was elected FRS in June 1736. He was an antiquary and a member of Spalding Society; a historian, writing Eboracum or The History and Antiquities of the City of York from its Original to the Present Time in 1736; and a surgeon, becoming York City Surgeon in 1727. He joined the Grand Lodge at York in 1725 and the following year as Junior Grand Warden, gave a speech on the history of Freemasonry. This was later printed in York by Thomas Gent (1727) and reprinted in London in 1729. Drake was made Grand Master at York in 1761. In common with other York Masons, Drake was a probable Jacobite sympathiser. Sources: Sackler Archive; C. Bernard L. Barr, ‘Francis Drake’, ODNB (Oxford, 2004). Drake attended English Grand Lodge at the installation of the Viscount Montague on 19 April 1732: Grand Lodge Minutes, p. 217.
61 Tillott, A History of the County of York. The civic support for the guilds may also have been in part religious, given that a group of French Protestants was also refused admission to the city.
62 An immediate effect of the fire was to cause an unprecedented demand for builders, masons, carpenters and journeymen of all sorts ‘who put up their charges to a fantastic height.’ G.H. Gater and Walter H. Godfrey (gen. eds.), Survey of London: All Hallows, Barking-by-the-Tower, Pt II, Custom House Quay and the Old Custom House (London, 1934), vol. 15, pp. 31-43.
who refuse all manner of subjection to the good rules and orders made by the said Company.\textsuperscript{63}

However, the earlier suspension of the Company of Mason’s monopoly in 1666, which was later made permanent\textsuperscript{64}, had undermined the regulatory authority and economic purpose of the Company. It became one of the smaller London guilds, ranking only thirtieth in order of precedence, with around fifty members in 1677. And it has been estimated by the Company itself that at the end of the seventeenth century, the vast majority of London masons fell outside its jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{65}

By the beginning of the eighteenth century, with their principal economic function no longer an important justification for existence and with membership declining, traditional stone masons’ guilds were substantially irrelevant economically. In certain cases, their integrity had been compromised to the extent that a number merged with other construction trades.\textsuperscript{66} This may have represented an opportunity to Desaguliers and others seeking to establish a new regime. However, the re-working of the Old Charges and Regulations should be viewed not only within the context of the declining relevance of the trade guild. Other factors were also significant, including the political and religious struggles within Europe; the Hanoverian succession and its Whig ministry; the fragmentation of the mediaeval social and economic structures that had given the guild its consequence; and the presence of the gentry within Freemasonry.


\textsuperscript{64} The relevant section was: ‘That all Carpenters Bricklayers Masons Plaisterers Joyners and other Artificers Workemen and Labourers to be imployed in the said Buildings who are not Freemen of the said Citty shall for the space of seaven yeaeres next ensueng and for soe long time after as untill the said buildings shall be fully finished have and enjoy such and the same liberty of workeing and being sett to worke in the said building as the Freemen of the City of the same Trades and Professions have and ought to enjoy, Any Usage or Custome of the Citty to the contrary notwithstanding: And that such Artificers as aforesaid which for the space of seaven yeares shall have wrought in the rebuilding of the Citty in their respective Arts shall from and after the said seaven yeares have and enjoy the same Liberty to worke as Freemen of the said Citty for and dureing their naturall lives’. Source: John Raithby (ed.), \textit{Statutes of the Realm, Charles II, 1666: An Act for rebuilding the City of London} (London, 1819), vol. 5, pp. 603-12.

\textsuperscript{65} The Worshipful Company of Masons, London.

\textsuperscript{66} The Stonemasons and Carpenters companies were recorded as a single company in Lichfield in 1698: M.W. Greenslade (ed.), \textit{A History of the County of Stafford: Lichfield} (London, 1990), vol. 14, pp. 131-4.
The New Charges

Each version of the *Old Charges* followed a similar blueprint and contained the same segments. The legendary ‘history’ of Freemasonry dating back to biblical times, legitimised and provided a historical context for Masonic traditions. The *Regulations* dealt with both moral and, perhaps more importantly, issues of commerce and trade. They also covered the operational ‘working’ of the lodge, including oath taking, the annual assembly, the election of officers, the admission of apprentices, and the penalties and fines for any breach of the rules and regulations. Finally, there were the *Charges* themselves.

The *Charges* set out in the *1723 Constitutions* were distinctly different from those that had gone before. Grand Lodge sought to make certain that the new version was widely disseminated and that it was uniformly applied: ‘all the Tools used in working shall be approved by the Grand Lodge.’

For the first time, a Masonic charge – *Concerning God and Religion* - set out a key statement in favour of morality and religious tolerance, and not an obligation to follow the religion of the country or nation ‘whatever it was’:

A Mason is obliged ... to obey the Moral Law ... But tho in ancient times Masons were charged in every Country to be of the Religion of that Country or Nation, whatever it was, yet ‘tis now thought more expedient only to oblige them to that Religion in which all Men agree, leaving their particular Opinions to themselves; that is, to be good Men and true, or Men of Honour and Honesty, by whatever Denominations or Persuasions they may be distinguished; whereby Masonry become[s] the Centre and Union, and the means of conciliating true Friendship and Persons that must have remained at a perpetual Distance.

This was a fundamental modification that replaced the invocation of the Trinity and the traditional statement of Christian belief with an obligation only to ‘that Religion in which all Men agree’, albeit that there was a probable implicit assumption of the Christian faith. In essence, this was an affirmation of belief in an amorphous divine being, rather than in favour of a specific church or religious doctrine. Such a latitudinarian statement of religious tolerance was novel and,

---

67 *1723 Constitutions*, p. 53.
perhaps, dangerous; and it provided a basis for later attacks on Freemasonry, including that of the 1738 Papal encyclical.\textsuperscript{68}

In one sense, the Pope had little choice. Religious toleration explicitly undermined Catholic teaching: that the Catholic Church was the sole route to spiritual salvation. The Vatican thus came to view Freemasonry as seditious: undermining the Church’s spiritual and therefore its temporal authority. In this context, Papal condemnation was political as well as religious. However, latitudinarianism and the toleration of other faiths were central to Desaguliers’ and Folkes’ intellectual beliefs, a view shared by many Whigs. They became a core tenet of Masonic principles:

\begin{quote}
as Masons we only pursue the universal Religion or the Religion of Nature. This is the Cement which unites Men of the most different Principles in one sacred Band and brings together those who were most distant from one another.\textsuperscript{69}
\end{quote}

Interestingly, it is possible to see the foundations of this approach in Newton:

\begin{quote}
the essential part of religion [was] of an immutable nature because [it was] grounded upon immutable reason ... religion may therefore be called the Moral Law of all nations.\textsuperscript{70}
\end{quote}

Such a view could be regarded as central to an intellectual advance that sought to unite rational observation and analysis about the natural world. Other contemporary popular texts, such as \textit{Long Livers}, reflected a similar pantheistic approach: dedicated to the Freemasons and to ‘Men excellent in all kinds of Sciences’, \textit{Long Livers} proclaimed: ‘it is the Law of Nature which is the Law of God, for God is Nature’.\textsuperscript{71}

Desaguliers was not the only latitudinarian at Grand Lodge and it is possible to detect the influence of Folkes, who succeeded Desaguliers as Deputy Grand

\textsuperscript{68} Pope Clement XII, Papal Bull, \textit{In Eminenti}, 28 April 1738.
\textsuperscript{69} William Smith, \textit{A Pocket Companion for Freemasons} (London, 1735), pp. 43-5.
\textsuperscript{71} Eugenius Philalethes (probably Robert Samber), translated from the French of Harcouët de Longeville, \textit{Long livers: a curious history of such persons of both sexes who have liv’d several ages, and grown young again} (London, 1722), p. xvii.
Master in 1724 and was and remained a colleague at the Royal Society. Folkes was considered by some to be a Deist: ‘we are all citizens of the world, and see different customs and tastes without dislike or prejudice, as we do different names and colours’.72 As Wigelsworth noted, theology and natural philosophy were closely connected, and the ‘nature’ of God was one of the foundations on which natural philosophy and a rational interpretation of the natural world rested.73 In this sense, the inter-play between theology and natural philosophy was integral to contemporary political and theological debate.

The second Masonic charge - Of the Civil Magistrate Supreme and subordinate - addressed obliquely the political uncertainties that surrounded the Hanoverian succession and contemporary Jacobite threat:

A Mason is a peaceable Subject to the Civil Powers ... is never to be concerned in Plots and Conspiracies against the Peace and Welfare of the Nation ... if a Brother should be a Rebel against the State, he is not to be countenanced in his Rebellion, however he may be pitied as an unhappy Man; and, if convicted of no other Crime, though the loyal Brotherhood must and ought to disown his Rebellion, and give no Umbrage or Ground of political Jealousy to the Government for the time being; they cannot expel him from the Lodge, and his Relation to it remains indefeasible.

It was a novel concept that a Mason could be ‘a Rebel against the State’ and, notwithstanding that he might be ‘disowned’, that his rebellion would provide insufficient grounds for expulsion from the lodge. But the logic followed from the first Masonic charge whereby ‘Masonry [was] ... the means of conciliating ... persons that must have remained at a perpetual distance’. Once again, Long Livers reflected the same approach: ‘avoid politicks and religion: Have nothing to do with these’.74 Even so, the obligation to pay due obedience to the state was evident75; and in his formal welcome to the lodge as a newly made ‘Entered Apprentice’, the initiate was enjoined to:

72 Quoted Haycock, ‘Martin Folkes’, ODNB.
74 Philalethes, Long livers, p. xvi.
75 Smith, A Pocket Companion for Freemasons.
behave as a peaceable and dutiful Subject, conforming cheerfully to the Government under which he lives.\textsuperscript{76}

Given their substantial number within Freemasonry and Desaguliers' own background, it is possible that the second Charge was also addressed, in part, to the Huguenot émigré audience which populated so many lodges, and with an eye on the mollifying impact that such words might have on a nervous government. Nonetheless, although allegiance to the Crown – ‘to be a true liege man to the king’ - had historically been a specific oath required of operative masons, the 1723 Constitutions stated only that Freemasons should be ‘Subject to the Civil Powers’.

This contradicted prior English and Scottish Masonic ritual, which required the immediate reporting of any plot against the Crown.\textsuperscript{77} Unlike earlier ritual, the 1723 Constitutions did not oblige a lodge to take action against a seditious member. However, Desaguliers, Folkes and Payne were not advocates of Bishop George Berkeley’s (1685-1753) Passive Obedience\textsuperscript{78}, and the Constitutions were overtly not associated with such theories.\textsuperscript{79} They were rather a reflection of contemporary Whig and Lockeian views: insurrection could perhaps be regarded as philosophically acceptable if a King were in breach of his moral contract with those he governed. This was, after all, the philosophical and intellectual justification of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the replacement of James II by William and Mary.

The third Masonic charge – Of Lodges - reinforced the point that membership was open but, conversely, that the Society was relatively select:

The persons admitted Members of a Lodge must be good and true Men, free-born, and of mature and discreet Age, no Bondmen, no Women, no immoral or scandalous men, but of good Report.

\textsuperscript{76} Smith, A Pocket Companion for Freemasons, pp. 43-5, The Charge. The first (prior) date at which the ritual was first used is not known.

\textsuperscript{77} Cf. the discussion of Dumfries Lodge No. 4, MS (c. 1700/10) in David Stevenson, The Origins of Freemasonry: Scotland's Century, 1590-1710 (Cambridge, 1990), ill. edn., pp. 137-65.

\textsuperscript{78} George Berkeley, Passive Obedience (London, 1712).

\textsuperscript{79} Cf. also Révauger, ‘Anderson’s Freemasonry: the True Daughter of the British Enlightenment’. 
This was reinforced by the next Masonic charge – *Of Masters, Wardens, Fellows and Apprentices* - which offered a radical approach to preferment in an age when rank and precedence was fundamental to social order and promotion rarely based on merit:

All preferment among Masons is grounded upon real Worth and personal Merit only; that so the Lords may be well served, the Brethren not put to Shame, nor the Royal Craft despised ... no Master or Warden is chosen by Seniority, but for his Merit ...

The charge continued and emphasized that Freemasonry had its own route to preferment:

No Brother can be a Warden until he has passed the part of a Fellow-Craft; nor a Master until he has acted as a Warden, nor Grand Warden until he has been Master of a Lodge, nor Grand Master unless he has been a Fellow-Craft before his Election, who is also to be nobly born, or a Gentleman of the best Fashion, or some eminent Scholar, or some curious Architect, or other Artist, descended of honest Parents, and who is of similar great Merit in the Opinion of the Lodges. And for the better, and easier, and more honourable Discharge of his Office, the Grand-Master has a Power to choose his own Deputy Grand-Master, who must be then, or must have been formerly, the Master of a particular Lodge, and has the Privilege of acting whatever the Grand Master, his Principal, should act, unless the said Principal be present, or interpose his Authority by a Letter.

The power of the Grand Master to ‘choose his own Deputy Grand-Master, who must be then, or must have been formerly, the Master of a particular Lodge’ may have been inserted by Desaguliers as a specific reaction to the attempt by the Duke of Wharton to take control of Grand Lodge in 1722. The charge also obliged brethren to obey the rulers and governors of the Craft ‘in their respective Stations’, and thereby placed Masonic rank nominally in precedence over noble rank within the lodge.

The fifth Masonic charge – *Of the Management of the Craft* – was a continuation of the long-standing practice of substituting allegorical, or ‘speculative’, uses for operative Masonic tools. It later became a core aspect of post 1723 Freemasonry. In this charge, all tools used in Masonic working were to be ‘approved by Grand Lodge’ and:
no Labourer shall be employ’d in the proper Work of Masonry, nor shall Free Masons work with those that are not free, without an urgent necessity, nor shall they teach Labourers and Unaccepted Masons.

The references to ‘receiving their Wages justly’ and ‘receive their Wages without Murmuring or Mutiny’ were not used in a literal sense. They were given the caveat that the references were to ‘the Lord's Work’ and ‘for increasing and continuing ... Brotherly Love’.

The sixth charge – Of Behaviour – dealt with six issues: etiquette within the lodge; conduct once the lodge had concluded; meetings with fellow Masons outside of the lodge; meeting with non-Masons; behaviour at home and at work; and how one ‘proved’ a genuine brother. Desaguliers and his colleagues sought to ensure that Grand Lodge would become a focal point not only in the governance of the order but also with regard to its members more generally, as a means of settling external disputes. This may have been less naivety than an attempt to ensure that Freemasonry would be protected from external interference:

And if any of them do you Injury, you must apply to your own or his Lodge, and from thence you may appeal to the Grand Lodge, at the Quarterly Communication and from thence to the annual Grand Lodge at the Quarterly Communication, and from thence to the annual Grand Lodge ... never taking a legal Course but when the Case cannot be otherwise decided ... [in order that] all may see the benign Influence of Masonry.

A catechism was later added requiring affirmation from the Master Elect in each instance.80 The content and structure reinforces the arguments outlined above. In addition to its pro-establishment ethos, the ritual was designed to strengthen the Masonic and moral authority of Grand Lodge and its officers.

You agree to be a good man and true, and strictly to obey the moral law.

You agree to be a peaceable subject, and cheerfully to conform to the laws of the country in which you reside.

---

80 The catechism was in use in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Cf. William Preston, Illustrations of Masonry (London, 1775), 2nd edn., pp. 114-9. It is not known when it was first introduced.
You promise not to be concerned in plots and conspiracies against government, but patiently to submit to the decisions of the supreme legislature.

You agree to pay a proper respect to the civil magistrate, to work diligently, live creditably, and act honourably by all men.

You agree to hold in veneration the original rulers and patrons of the Order of Masonry, and their regular successors, supreme and subordinate, according to their stations; and to submit to the awards and resolutions of your brethren when convened, in every case consistent with the constitutions of the Order. You agree to avoid private piques and quarrels, and to guard against intemperance and excess.

You agree to be cautious in carriage and behaviour, courteous to your brethren, and faithful to your Lodge.

You promise to respect genuine brethren, and to discountenance impostors, and all dissenters from the original plan of Masonry.

You agree to promote the general good of society, to cultivate the social virtues, and to propagate the knowledge of the art.

You promise to pay homage to the Grand Master for the time being, and to his officers when duly installed; and strictly to conform to every edict of the Grand Lodge, or general assembly of Masons, that is not subversive of the principles and ground-work of Masonry.

You admit that it is not in the power of any man, or body of men, to make innovations in the body of Masonry.

You promise a regular attendance on the committees and communications of the Grand Lodge, on receiving proper notice, and to pay attention to all the duties of Masonry on convenient occasions.

You admit that no new Lodge shall be formed without permission of the Grand Lodge; and that no countenance be given to any irregular Lodge, or to any person clandestinely initiated therein, being contrary to the ancient charges of the Order.

You admit that no person can be regularly made a Mason in, or admitted a member of, any regular Lodge, without previous notice, and due inquiry into his character.

You agree that no visitors shall be received into your Lodge without due examination, and producing proper vouchers of their having been initiated in a regular Lodge.

Taken as a whole, the Charges can be regarded as having been designed to complement the revised set of Regulations compiled by Payne.
The Regulations

Payne, the second (and fourth) Grand Master of Grand Lodge, had been asked by Desaguliers and Grand Lodge to ‘compile’ the Regulations, and these were later incorporated into the 1723 Constitutions. As noted in chapter three, Payne and Desaguliers had known one another since at least 1712 when an advertisement for an early Desaguliers lecture course had appeared in the Evening Post on 30 December 1712 stating that any enquiries might be addressed, among three others, to ‘Mr Geo. Payne at the Leather Office in St Martin’s Lane’. Similar advertisements which also gave Payne’s office address appeared the following year in the Guardian and Post Boy.

The Cooke and other manuscripts were known to Payne when in his second term as Grand Master he produced the new Regulations. Payne was originally from Chester, home to several established Masonic lodges and according to Randle Holme, to at least one set of Old Charges. Stukeley also referred to a manuscript in his diary entry recording Montagu’s installation on 24 June 1721:

The Grand Master Mr. Pain produced an old MS. of the Constitutions which he got in the West of England, 500 years old.

However, whereas the previous Regulations were essentially working documents that governed the operations of the local trade, protected the local monopoly and provided the framework for running the lodge, Payne’s thirty-nine fresh Regulations were fundamentally different. Each focused specifically on the operation of Grand Lodge and its constituent lodges. None dealt with operative issues or matters of trade. Indeed, the operative regulations of the Cooke and other manuscripts had no place in Payne’s new Regulations. And given the significance of the new Regulations, and the level of detail they contained, it is not easy to conceive of Payne drafting them alone. They were not – as incorrectly advertised - a reduction of the ‘ancient Records and immemorial Usages of the

---

81 Evening Post, 30 December 1712.
82 Guardian and Post Boy, both 5 May 1713.
Fraternity’, but rather a new set of rules designed for a new organisation. And their style and content suggests a close collaboration between Payne and Desaguliers.

The *Regulations* and *Charges* introduced in the 1723 *Constitutions* underline that Freemasonry was pro-establishment and embedded Whiggish views. However, they were not slavish, and the newly published *Constitutions* incorporated the relatively radical concept of democratic accountability. Article 10 of the *Regulations* stated that a ‘majority of every particular Lodge, when congregated, shall have the privilege of giving instructions to their Master and Wardens ... because the Master and Wardens are their representatives’. And Article 6 required the unanimous consent of members prior to any new entrant to the lodge, notwithstanding that this was often more observed in the breach. Similarly, although the Grand Master had the right to nominate his successor, if that nominee were not approved unanimously, members would be balloted as specified in Articles 23 and 24.

In short, it was the *Charges* and *Regulations* that comprised the most important components of Desaguliers’ new *Constitutions* for Free and Accepted Masons, rather than the traditional history. Their primary purposes were to confirm Freemasonry’s support for the government and the Hanoverian succession; to instil into the membership the importance of Grand Lodge and its Rules; and to provide the Craft with a moral and social framework for ‘the general good of society’.

The political schematic of Grand Lodge and of ‘regular’ Freemasonry was pro-Hanoverian, and its intellectual approach as exemplified in the *Charges* and *Regulations*, represented in only a limited manner the continuation of the traditions of the mediaeval guilds. Under Desaguliers and his colleagues’ aegis, Freemasonry had changed to become a new organisation with its own character and dimension, and a focal point for concepts associated with the scientific
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86 Cf. chap. 6; also *OKA Minutes*.
87 *1723 Constitutions*, p. 69.
Enlightenment. Reasoned discussion was a hallmark of many lodge meetings; and intellectual self-improvement, scientific order, religious tolerance, relative egalitarianism, and support for elected self-government and constitutional monarchy, were ideas that permeated the organisation and were embraced by many of its members.
### Irish Military Lodges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lodge Numbers and Warrant Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARTILLERY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Battalion, Royal Artillery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 (1813-1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226 (1810-1825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Battalion, Royal Artillery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 (1823-1828)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Irish Artillery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374 (1761-1818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528 (1781-1787)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corps of Artillery Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 (1811, but not issued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAVALRY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st King’s Dragoon Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571 (1923-1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd The Queen’s Bays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960 (1805-1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Royal Irish Dragoon Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 (1757-1796)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th (Princess Charlotte of Wales) Dragoon Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277 (1757-1818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570 (1863-1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Dragoon Guards, the Carabiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577 (1780-1799)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exchanged for 876, (1799-1858)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th (Princess Royals) Dragoon Guards – the Black Horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exchanged for 7, (1817-1855)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st or Blue Irish Horse, later 4th Dragoon Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 (1758 - current)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd or Green Irish Horse, later 5th Dragoon Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277 (1757-1818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570 (1780-1824)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 re-issued (1863-1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd or Irish Horse, later 6th Dragoons Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577 (1780)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876 issued 1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in lieu of 577, lost 1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th or Black Irish Horse, later 7th Dragoon Guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 (1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exchanged for No. 7, 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Dragoons – Queen’s Own Hussars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 (1815)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exchanged for No. 4, 1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cancelled 1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Dragoons – Queen’s Own Hussars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 (1757-1796)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 (1758-1818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Royal Irish Lancers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595 (1914-1922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Dragoons – Kings Royal Irish Hussars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280 (1757-1815)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646 (1932-1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Dragoons – Queen’s Royal Lancers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 (1747-1815)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356 (1760-1818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12th Dragoons – Royal Lancers (Prince of Wales)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13th Dragoons – Hussars</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14th Dragoons – King’s Hussars</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16th Dragoons – Queen’s Lancers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17th Dragoons – Lancers (Duke of Cambridge Own)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18th Lord Drogheda’s Light Dragoons – 1st Squadron</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18th Lord Drogheda’s Light Dragoons – 2nd Squadron</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20th Jamaica Light Dragoons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23rd Light Dragoons (1794-1802)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23rd (26th) Light Dragoons (1802-1817)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LINE REGIMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Foot Royal Scots 1st Battalion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Foot Royal Scots 2nd Battalion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Foot Queen’s Royal Regiment (West Surrey)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th Foot King’s Own Royal Regiment (Lancaster)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5th Foot Royal Northumberland Fusiliers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6th Foot Royal Warwickshire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7th Foot Royal Fusiliers (City of London)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9th Foot Royal Norfolk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10th Foot Lincolnshire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11th Foot Devonshire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13th Foot Somerset Light Infantry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14th Foot West Yorkshire (Prince of Wales Own)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15th Foot East Yorkshire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16th Foot Bedfordshire &amp; Hertfordshire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17th Foot Leicestershire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot Royal Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot Green Howards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot Lancashire Fusiliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot Lancashire Fusiliers 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Foot Royal Scots Fusiliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Foot Cheshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Foot Royal Welsh Fusiliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot King’s Own Scottish Borderers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion, The Cameronians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion Worcestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion East Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion Duke of Cornwall’s Light Infantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion Duke of Wellington’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion Royal Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion South Staffordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion Dorsetshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Foot 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Battalion Prince of Wales Volunteers (S. Lancs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battalion Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd Foot 1st Battalion Black Watch (Royal Highlanders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th Foot 1st Battalion Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45th Foot 1st Battalion Sherwood Foresters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46th Foot 2nd Battalion Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47th Foot 1st Battalion The Loyal Regiment (North Lancs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th Foot 1st Battalion Northamptonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49th Foot 1st Battalion Royal Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th Foot 1st Battalion Queen's Own Royal West Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51st Foot 1st Battalion King's Own Yorkshire Light Infantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd Foot 2nd Battalion Oxford and Bucks. Light Infantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53rd Foot 1st Battalion King's Shropshire Light Infantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th Foot 2nd Battalion Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58th Foot 2nd Battalion Northamptonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59th Foot 2nd Battalion East Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62nd Foot 1st Battalion Wiltshire (Duke of Edinburgh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63rd Foot 1st Battalion Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64th Foot 1st Battalion North Staffordshire (Prince of Wales)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65th Foot 1st Battalion York and Lancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Foot 2nd Battalion Royal Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Foot 2nd Battalion Royal Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Foot 2nd Battalion Royal Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Foot 2nd Battalion Royal Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67th Foot 2nd Battalion Royal Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68th Foot 1st Battalion Durham Light Infantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69th Foot 2nd Battalion The Welsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70th Foot 2nd Battalion East Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71st Foot 1st Battalion Highland Light Infantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72nd Foot 1st Battalion Seaforth Highlanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th Foot 1st Battalion Gordon Highlanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76th Foot 2nd Battalion Gordon Highlanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77th Foot Atholl Highlanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82nd Foot 2nd Battalion Prince of Wales Volunteers, S. Lancers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83rd Foot 1st Battalion Royal Ulster Rifles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83rd Foot 16th Service Battalion Royal Irish Rifles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83rd Foot (1758 – 1763)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87th Foot 7th Service Battalion Royal Irish Fusiliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88th Foot 1st Battalion Connaught Rangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89th Foot 2nd Battalion Royal Irish Fusiliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92nd Foot Donegal Light Infantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96th/97th Foot Queen’s Germans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103rd Foot Bombay European Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th Foot Lord Donoughmore’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Foot Garrison Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Foot Garrison Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Foot Garrison Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Foot Garrison Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Foot Veteran Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissariat Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West India Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Pool’s Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Folliott’s Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Brigadier Guise’s Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Hamilton’s Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Lascelle’s Regiment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IRISH MILITIA REGIMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antrim</td>
<td>289 (1796-1856)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>888 (1800-1845)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlow</td>
<td>903 (1801-1816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavan</td>
<td>300 (1801-1816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cork</td>
<td>495 (1794-1815)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cork</td>
<td>741 (1806-1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donegal</td>
<td>865 (1798-1821)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downshire</td>
<td>212 (1795-1813)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Down</td>
<td>214 (1810-1815)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Dublin</td>
<td>62 (1810-1821)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fermanagh</td>
<td>864 (1798-1830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>66 (1810-1829)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kildare</td>
<td>847 (1797-1825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilkenny</td>
<td>855 (1797-1825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s County</td>
<td>948 (1804-1816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Number (Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leitrim</td>
<td>854 (1797-1868)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longford</td>
<td>304 (1807-1826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louth</td>
<td>10 (1809-1849)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayo South</td>
<td>79 (1810-1830) 81 (1812-1825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meath</td>
<td>50 (not Issued) 898 (1801-1849)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaghan</td>
<td>200 (1801-1816) 552 (1796-1816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s County</td>
<td>398 (1805-1810) 857 (1797-1832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roscommon</td>
<td>242 (1808-1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sligo</td>
<td>837 (1796-1835)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lincoln</td>
<td>867 (1799-1813)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipperary</td>
<td>856 (1797-1825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrone</td>
<td>225 (1808-1814) 562 (1797-1817) 846 (1796-1818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>961 (1805-1816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmeath</td>
<td>50, 791 (1793-1826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wexford</td>
<td>935 (1803-1824)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicklow</td>
<td>848 (1796-1815) 877 (1800-1818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Volunteer Lodge of Ireland in the Royal Independent Dublin Volunteers</td>
<td>620 (1783- current)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fencible Regiments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regiment</th>
<th>Number (Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Fencible Light Dragoons</td>
<td>384 (1799-1802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster Provincial Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>612 (1783-1783)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadalbane</td>
<td>907 (1801-1813)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>860 (1798-1813)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>852 (1796-1813)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>861 (1798-1804)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scottish Military Lodges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lodge</th>
<th>Regiment</th>
<th>Warrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodge Pittefrand(^{88})</td>
<td>55th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Norfolk’s Mason Lodge</td>
<td>12th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots Greys Kilwinning(^{89})</td>
<td>Royal North British Dragoons</td>
<td>1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Husk’s Regiment</td>
<td>23rd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White’s Lodge</td>
<td>32nd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince of Wales from Edinburgh</td>
<td>71st Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker St. John</td>
<td>70th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort George</td>
<td>31st Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George III</td>
<td>56th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Duke of York's Mason Lodge</td>
<td>64th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>31st Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union(^{90})</td>
<td>94th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moriah</td>
<td>22nd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Masons Lodge(^{91})</td>
<td>23rd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United(^{92})</td>
<td>4th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Patrick Royal Arch(^{93})</td>
<td>43rd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew Royal Arch(^{94})</td>
<td>Royal North British Dragoons</td>
<td>1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity(^{95})</td>
<td>17th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queen’s (7th) Dragoons</td>
<td>Queen’s (7th) Dragoons</td>
<td>1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew(^{96})</td>
<td>80th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. Scottish Lodge of St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Scots Greys (possibly)</td>
<td>1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Arch Union</td>
<td>3rd Regiment of Dragoons</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyllshire Military St. John</td>
<td>2nd Battalion, Argyllshire Fencibles</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Royal Arch</td>
<td>3rd Dragoons</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayr St. Paul</td>
<td>Ayr and Renfrew Militia.</td>
<td>1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Lodge(^{97})</td>
<td>51st Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{88}\) The Border Regiment, later the Essex.

\(^{89}\) The Scots Greys (Second Dragoons).

\(^{90}\) The Connaught Rangers.

\(^{91}\) Royal Welsh Fusiliers.

\(^{92}\) The King’s Own Royal Regiment.

\(^{93}\) The Oxfordshire & Buckinghamshire Light Infantry.

\(^{94}\) The Scots Greys.

\(^{95}\) The Leicestershire Regiment.

\(^{96}\) South Staffordshire Regiment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aboyne North British Militia</th>
<th>6th North British Militia</th>
<th>1799</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Thistle(^{98})</td>
<td>1st Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forfar and Kincardine</td>
<td>Forfar and Kincardine Militia</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew’s(^{99})</td>
<td>42nd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifeshire Militia</td>
<td>Fifeshire Militia</td>
<td>1811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cuthbert’s(^{100})</td>
<td>25th Durham Militia</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>Berwickshire Militia</td>
<td>1819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{97}\) King’s Own Yorkshire Light Infantry.
\(^{98}\) 4\(^{th}\) Battalion, Royal Scots.
\(^{99}\) The Black Watch.
\(^{100}\) Durham Light Infantry.
### Other British Military Lodges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regiment</th>
<th>Warrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Own Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt Bell's Troop, Lord Ancram's 11th Regiment of Dragoons</td>
<td>1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51st Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th Regiment of Foot (General Stuart's)</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Regiment of Inniskilling Horse</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Battalion, Royal Artillery, Fort George</td>
<td>1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Battalion Royal Artillery, Perth</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Regiment Yorkshire Militia</td>
<td>1772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt Webdell's Co., Regiment of Royal Artillery</td>
<td>1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Battalion Royal Artillery</td>
<td>1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Inniskilling Regiment of Dragoons</td>
<td>1777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Battalion Royal Artillery</td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regiment of Anholt-Zerbst</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Regiment of Dragoon Guards</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Regiment of Anspach Berauth</td>
<td>1781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Battalion Regiment of Royal Artillery</td>
<td>1781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Regiment of East Devon Militia</td>
<td>1781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Regiment</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76th Regiment</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd Regiment of Foot (Royal Welsh Fusiliers)</td>
<td>1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coldstream Guards</td>
<td>1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Regiment of Cheshire</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Regiment of Dragoons</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th Regiment Light Dragoons</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire Regiment of Militia</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Inniskilling Dragoons</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Regiment of Militia</td>
<td>1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Regiment of Fencible Light Dragoons</td>
<td>1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regiment of Loyal Surrey Rangers</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Battalion 52nd Regiment</td>
<td>1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire Regiment of Militia</td>
<td>1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78th Regiment</td>
<td>1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd regiment of Royal Lancashire Militia</td>
<td>1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Battalion 96th Regiment</td>
<td>1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92nd Regiment</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Battalion 58th Regiment</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Regiment of Dragoons</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th Royal Irish Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Reg. Of Cumberland Militia</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45th Regiment</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th Regiment</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Regiment Light Dragoons</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79th Regiment of Foot, later 1st Battalion, 91st Regiment</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Battalion 50th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Scots Regiment</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Battalion Royal Artillery</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68th Regiment</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Lodge</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Cornwall Regiment of Militia</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Regiment West York Militia</td>
<td>1811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Battalion Royal Artillery</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Battalion Royal Artillery</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Battalion Royal Artillery</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Regiment of Bengal Artillery</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Regiment of Dragoon Guards</td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51st Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46th Regiment</td>
<td>1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57th Regiment</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91st Regiment</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Regiment of Hussars</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Regiment Native Infantry</td>
<td>1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Battalion, Rifle Brigade</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Light Infantry (52nd Regiment)</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regiment/Military Unit</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th Regiment</td>
<td>1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honourable Artillery Company</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Battalion, 12th Regiment of Foot</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th Company Royal Engineers</td>
<td>1863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**

Grand Lodge of Ireland, *Register of Warranted Lodges*.
Grand Lodge of Scotland, *Register of Warranted Lodges*.
Lane’s *Masonic Records*.
### Appendix 4: Masonic Membership of Selected Professional Societies

#### The Royal Society of Apothecaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Masonic Office</th>
<th>Lodge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Aldridge</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Half Moon, Cheapside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Allen</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ship Behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Armstrong</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Steward</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Arnold</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>The Black Boy &amp; Sugar Loaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Ballard</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>The Bull’s Head, Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Barker</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Lion, Brewers Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Barker</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Rainbow Coffee House, York Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Barnard</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Queens Head Turnstile, Holborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Boswell</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td></td>
<td>The King’s Arms, Catenton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Boucher</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Horn Tavern, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppington Bracey</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td></td>
<td>White Heart without Bishopsgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Brown</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>The Griffin, Newgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Queens Head Turnstile, Holborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Browne</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Bell Tavern, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Bushell</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Queen’s Arms, Newgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Chapman</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Rummer, Henrietta Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Clark</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>The Queen’s Head, Knaves Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Clarke</td>
<td>1714/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben’s Coffee House, New Bond Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Clement</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Masons Arms, Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Clerk</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Crown at St Giles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Cole</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Vine Tavern, Holborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Collins</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Fountain Tavern, Strand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cook</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Rainbow Coffee House, York Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cooke</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Swan, Tottenham High Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Cox</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Queen’s Head, Hollis Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Crow</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Maid’s Head, Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Davis</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Crown Behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Davis</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Vine Tavern, Holborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Davis</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Crown Behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Devall</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ship on Fish Street Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Dobell</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Vine Tavern, Holborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Edwards</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Everard</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>The Bull’s Head, Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Field</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Griffin, Newgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Fletcher</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Vine Tavern, Holborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Freeman</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Rummer, Henrietta Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gardiner</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td></td>
<td>The King’s Arms, St Paul’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Goodard</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td></td>
<td>The King’s Head, Ivy Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hankin</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td></td>
<td>The St Paul’s Head, Ludgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Harris</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>The Swan, Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Harris</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td></td>
<td>The King’s Head, Fleet Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harrison</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lebecks Head, Maiden Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hay</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>The Rummer, Charing Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Heath</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>The Vine Tavern, Holborn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hill</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>The Sun, Southside, St Paul's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hill</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>The Queens Head Turnstile, Holborn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hoyles</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>The Oxford Arms, Ludgate Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hughes</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>The Globe Tavern, Moorgate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hull</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>The Queen's Arms, Newgate Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Hyde</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Black Boy &amp; Sugar Loaf, Stanhope Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Jackson</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>The King's Arms, St Paul's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Jackson</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>The Ship without Temple Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jackson</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Warden, The Horn &amp; Feathers, Wood Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John James</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>The Swan, East Street, Greenwich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William James</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>The Queen's Head, Hoxton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jephson</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>The Bedford Head, Covent Garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Johnson</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>The Castle Tavern, St Giles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Johnson</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>The Swan Tavern, Fish Street Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Jones</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>The Bell Tavern, Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jones</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>The Griffin, Newgate Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jones</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>The Rainbow Coffee House, York Buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jones</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Warden, The Vine Tavern, Holborn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Keck</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Warden, The Griffin, Newgate Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Kentish</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>The Castle &amp; Legg, Holborn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kindleside</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>The Dolphin, Tower Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kittelsey</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Warden, The Blew Posts, Holborn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Lane</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>The Ship on Fish Street Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Lewis</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Master, The Devil at Temple Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lucas</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>The Crown Behind the Royal Exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Manley</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>The Bedford Head, Covent Garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Manningham</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>The Horn Tavern, Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Martin</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>The King's Head, Fleet Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Martin</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Warden, The Golden Lion, Dean Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John May</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>The Black Posts, Great Wild Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Miles</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>The Crown, Acton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Mitchell</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>The Horn, Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Moor</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>The Ship Behind the Royal Exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Moore</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>The Rose Tavern without Temple Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Moore</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>The University Lodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Nicholls</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>King's Head, Pudding St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Nicholson</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>The Baptist Head, Chancery Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Parsons</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Ben's Coffee House, New Bond Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Payne</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>The Green Lattice, Brownlow Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Perkins</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Tom's Coffee House, Clare Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Perkins</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Peters</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>The Griffin, Newgate Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Pile</td>
<td>1731</td>
<td>The Bedford Head, Covent Garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Pitt</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>The Bedford Head, Covent Garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Prude</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>The Queens Head, Queen Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Radcliffe</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ship without Temple Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rawling</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>Freemasons Coffee House, New Belton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Read</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>The Swan, Long Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Reynolds</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Queens Head, Great Queen Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Riddle</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Castle Tavern, St Giles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Roberts</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Crown, St Giles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Roberts</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Crown Behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Row(e)</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td></td>
<td>The King’s Arms, St Paul’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Ryley</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Red Lyon, Richmond, Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Smith</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>The Mitre Tavern, Covent Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Springwell</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Swan Tavern, Fish Street Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poston Staye</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Three Tuns, Newgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Taylor</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Crown Behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Thomas</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Castle &amp; Legg, Holborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Thompson</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitre Tavern Covent Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thorpe</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Bell Tavern, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Tomlinson</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Swan Tavern, Fish Street Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Turner</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Bell Tavern, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Turner</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Vine Tavern, Holborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Vaughan</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Nag’s Head &amp; Star, Carmarthen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Watson</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Crown, Acton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Watson</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Queen’s Head, Knaves Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Weeks</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Bear &amp; Harrow, Butcher Row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wharton</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td></td>
<td>The King’s Arms, St Paul’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John White</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Vine Tavern, Holborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Willis</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Blue Posts, Holborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Winterbottom</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td></td>
<td>St Paul’s Head, Ludgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wood</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td></td>
<td>St Paul’s Head, Ludgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wright</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ship Behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wright</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td></td>
<td>King’s Arms, St Paul’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
Membership Lists of Royal Society of Apothecaries, unpublished.
Grand Lodge Minutes.

Disclaimer:
Given the duplication and misspelling of names, and the absence of corroborative evidence, the above list cannot be regarded as definitive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Masonic Rank</th>
<th>Lodge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Bedford's Head, Southampton Row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Black Boy &amp; Sugar Loaf, Stanhope Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Goat at the Foot of the Haymarket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Swan in East Street, Greenwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>The Griffin, Newgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Crown, St Giles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Buffaloe, Bloomsbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Greyhound, Fleet Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Three Kings In Spitalfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben's Coffee House, Bond Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Swan, Ludgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Cross Keys, Henrietta Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Bull's Head, Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Castle Tavern, St Giles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>Denmark's Head, Cavendish Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Half Moon, The Strand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>The Ship, Bartholomew's Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>The Swan, Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>The Anchor &amp; Baptists Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>GW, GS</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>The Swan, Ludgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>The Swan, Ludgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>The Crown, Behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>The Goose &amp; Grid Iron, St Pauls Church Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Star &amp; Garter, Covent Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>The Old Devil at Temple Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Coach &amp; Horses, Maddocks Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Horn, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Three Kings in Spitalfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Black Lyon In Jockey Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>GW, GS</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>The Bear &amp; Harrow, Covent Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Crown behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben's Coffee House, Bond Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Dep. GS</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>The Three Compasses, Silver Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ship Behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Queen's Head, Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>GM, Master</td>
<td>The Horn, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Crown without Cripplegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Queen's Arms In Newgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Name of Tavern and Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Schomberg</td>
<td>The Swan &amp; Rummer, Finch Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>The Wool Pack, Warwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Squire</td>
<td>The Dolphin, Tower Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>The Rumer, Charing Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>The Crown behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>The Ball Tavern, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Vaughan</td>
<td>The Rumer, Queen Street, Cheapside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>The Queen’s Head, Knaves Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>The Queen’s Head, Knaves acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Wharton</td>
<td>The Swan Tavern, Fish Street Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Whitehead</td>
<td>The White Bear, King Street, Golden Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>The Griffin, Newgate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Willis</td>
<td>The Blue Posts, Holborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Woodward</td>
<td>The Crown behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>The Ship Behind the Royal Exchange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
Grand Lodge Minutes.

Disclaimer:
Given the duplication and misspelling of names, and the absence of corroborative evidence, the above list cannot be regarded as definitive.
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