


James Anderson: Man & Mason

David Stevenson

AMES ANDERSON is a figure of central significance in the new, expansive phase of Freemasonry which began with the founding of the first Grand Lodge, in London in 1717. His importance lies in his authorship of the first and second editions of *The Constitutions of the Free-Masons*, and especially in his providing a history stressing the antiquity and importance of “the Craft,” in his recording of the early history of Grand Lodge itself, and in his efforts to define the attitude of Freemasonry to religion. His works were given the formal approbation of Grand Lodge, which insisted that all lodges adhere to them. They were to set the standards of British Freemasonry for nearly a century, and even when they were superseded later standards were based on his work. Yet when in the late nineteenth century masonic historians began to dissect his work, it soon became common to deride him, with writers practically queuing up to add denunciations. His version of the history of Masonry contained a great deal of invention—and was badly written. His definitions at critical points were ambiguous. Even over events of his own time he was inaccurate—sometimes deliberately so. All this is true. Anderson’s status dwindled, and indignation at his failings grew. Was he just incompetent—or deliberately fraudulent?

Anderson was guilty as accused, and once failings were unearthed in his works, which had guided Freemasonry for so long, by the new “scientific” approach to historical research, the language that has sometimes been used to describe the man and his work becomes extreme. Why was this? There was

resentment and embarrassment at the idea that Anderson had tricked Freemasons for generations with false history. There was a judging of him on the basis of late-nineteenth-century and twentieth-century English assumptions, especially about Freemasonry, with little attempt to understand his own age—and indeed what the *Constitutions* were intended to do. There was also, it may be suspected, a determination to prove how “scientific” the standards of masonic history had become, after past laxity, with harshness of judgment taken to be a measure of good scholarship. Finally, there seem sometimes to have been in attacks on Anderson’s character, a response to the fact that he was vulnerable, a man “historians” found it easy to attack without feeling they were attacking early Grand Lodge Freemasonry itself. He was an “outsider” in three ways. He was a Non-Conformist minister, he was a Scot, and he was poor. For a Scot to have been given the task of compiling the standards for English Freemasonry was an embarrassment. That Anderson was poor becomes evidence that he had base motives, cynically using Freemasonry to make money. His interest in Freemasonry “was that of a discoverer of a remunerative field for literary employment.” When he attended Grand Lodge in the 1730s this was only “to get authority for his literary work or to obtain patronage for his publications.”¹ The fact that he held the copyright of both editions of the *Constitutions* is taken to prove the point, and serves to “prove” a further point, that the *Constitutions* were a private venture, not an “official” masonic publication. In the light of Grand Lodge’s approbations (1723 and 1738) of his work this is ludicrous, but it meant that Anderson could be denounced without that reflecting badly on Grand Lodge itself.² The shabby little Non-Conformist Scottish money-grubber can be disowned. This essay does not seek not to white-wash Anderson, but to wash off the mud that has been thrown at him.

The starting-point in seeking to explain Anderson’s interest in and expertise in Freemasonry is his father, another James. The elder James was for many years a leading member of the Lodge of Aberdeen. He compiled the elaborate “Mark Book” of the lodge while he was serving as its secretary, and in the 1690s he had served as its Master. As late as 1719 he served as its keymaster.³ It has been argued that there is no evidence that the younger Anderson’s masonic knowledge was based on his experience of Scottish Freemasonry, and indeed that he might not even have been aware of his father’s masonic links. R. F. Gould was more flexible. He accepted that it was “in the highest degree probable” that Anderson had been initiated in Scotland and bought to England “a stock of Masonic knowledge equal to that of any English brother,” and indeed that some might go fur-

ther and see Grand Lodge's mandate to him as "a recognition of his supremacy as a votive of the royal art" [Masonry].⁴ Definite evidence that Anderson knew of and valued his father's masonic career has now emerged to support Gould. A personal seal used by Anderson displays, as a crest surmounting a family coat of arms, the mason mark used by his father.⁵

The younger James Anderson was born in 1679 in Aberdeen, the son of a glazier, and his childhood experiences may well have shaped his later distaste for religious strife. In his early years he was brought up in a Church of Scotland which was Episcopalian, and Aberdeen was a stronghold of support for bishops. But the revolution of 1688–89 transformed the situation. James II was expelled from the throne, and William and Mary were declared joint sovereigns. The revolution and the settlement that followed were designed to secure Britain from the threats of Catholicism and absolutism that James had posed. Protestantism was to be secured, and in England this was done by confirming the existing Episcopalian church establishment, but this proved impossible in Scotland for political reasons. None of the Scottish bishops would countenance the new regime, and the Presbyterians were insistent on gaining the reward due for their support of the revolution. In 1690 therefore the king was forced into accepting Presbyterian government for the Church of Scotland. As most parish ministers remained committed to Episcopacy, bitter conflict was inevitable. Many remained in office, in the short term at least, simply because the Presbyterians could not produce the hundreds of new ministers needed to replace them overnight.

This was the religious climate in which Anderson grew up, and he could not help being aware of the ferocity of the mutual denunciations which were being exchanged between the warring parties. Indeed when he became a student at Marischal College in Aberdeen the chair of divinity was officially vacant as its Episcopalian holder had been deposed, and a Presbyterian replacement was not established until 1697. At college, discussions of the denominational issue must have been heated—and one led to a case in which Anderson was called as a witness. A visiting minister, who found it hard to accept the new regime, abused another minister and stated "that the way to be a Presbyterian minister was to speak nonsense with confidence." In the course of the dispute a woman present asked in bewilderment "what difference there was between Presbytery and Prelacy."⁶ It was a good question, and Anderson, though committed to Presbyterianism, was to show in his later life that such sectarian differences, though they seemed irreconcilable to some, were not in his mind deep enough to justify conflict. Anderson may have learnt his distaste for sectarian squabbling in

Aberdeen, and the Lodge of Aberdeen itself might also have influenced him, directly (if he was a member, which cannot be proved), or indirectly, through his father's reflection of its attitudes, for the lodge's membership demonstrates its tolerance. Several of its members were Quakers (one of whom, by emigrating, became the first known Freemason to reach the American colonies).⁷

Anderson graduated from Marischal College in Aberdeen as a Master of Arts in 1698 and was then granted a bursary for four years to study theology, an indication that he intended to make a career as a parish minister in Scotland. After completing his studies in 1702 Anderson vanishes from sight for some years. It is a reasonable assumption that, like other candidates for the ministry, he gained a license to preach and began searching for a vacant parish ready to accept him as its minister. He failed to find one, but found a job as a chaplain with an unidentified nobleman. This was probably what brought him to London, as the 1707 parliamentary union brought many Scots nobles south, some to sit in the new British house of lords. In London he met and married "an English widow" who had some money, and with this he was able to set up as a Presbyterian minister in London. In 1709 he was preaching to a Dissenting congregation in Glasshouse Street, and the following year he moved to a former French Huguenot chapel in Swallow Street, Westminster, where he established a Presbyterian congregation.⁸ The English Toleration Act of 1689 allowed most non-conformists to organize and worship, though many restrictions on them remained. In England he was thus free to find his own congregation, without waiting for acceptance to fill a parish vacancy in an established church, and he received ordination from dissenter ministers there.⁹ Ironically, Presbyterian Scotland had denied Anderson the opportunity to be a Presbyterian minister, but Episcopalian England allowed him to become one.

In some respects Anderson's timing looked good. His congregation soon became known as the Scots Church, and many Scots were being drawn to London to attend the union parliament. But he soon got a taste of the limits of tolerance in practice. Dissenters were seen as a threat to the Church of England, and in 1710 the "High Church" preacher Henry Sacheverell was tried for sedition after making an inflammatory sermon about the dangers of the Non-Conformists. His supporters responded with fierce riots. Six of the leading Dissenting chapels in London were wrecked by the mob,¹⁰ but Swallow Street was spared through its obscurity.

All that is known of Anderson's ministry is what is revealed in a handful of published sermons. They are, overall, conventional, but it is notable that he con-

sciously sought to avoid getting involved in the bitter conflicts that engaged the more extreme Anglicans and Dissenters, Tories and Whigs, over politics and religion. He proved ready to defend Presbyterianism when need be, but preferred to keep a low profile and avoid giving gratuitous offence to other denominations. There were limits, however. He was a firm revolution-man (after all, it was post-revolution tolerance that enabled him to preach in London), and this meant hostility to Roman Catholics, regarded as politically subversive through their support for the Jacobite cause which sought to overthrow the revolution. Moreover, the radical sects among the Non-Conformists, who challenged basic traditional Christian beliefs, were beyond Anderson's courtesy.

The first of the sermons, delivered in 1712, well illustrates his attitudes. He spoke of how the country was blessed by having a good Protestant sovereign and a happy constitution, having been delivered from the jaws of "Popery and Slavery" by the revolution. But dangers threatened. The growth of popery was alarming, for by their principles Catholics recognized a foreigner—the Jacobite pretender—as rightful king. Moreover there was the danger of the "Contagion of Scepticism and Deism." There were "too many, that either think God is an idle Spectator of the Affairs of the World, and will allow him no further Superintendency over it than a Clockmaker or an Architect."¹¹ Thus Anderson denounced the tendency, following on the increasing emphasis on explaining the functioning of the world in terms of fixed natural laws, to see God as a figure distant from daily life, the clockmaker who has set the machine in motion, or the architect who has worked out his mathematical destiny for the universe and left it to its own devices. He might accept the metaphor which described of God as "great architect of the universe" in the traditional sense that had depicted Him in this way since the Middle Ages, but he was hostile to interpretations of the phrase that lent support to Deism.

The second of Anderson's sermons to survive was preached on January 30, 1715, the anniversary of the execution of Charles I in 1649, and it is his only sermon to have a message that was bound to be seen as unacceptable to many revolution supporters, for its intent was to prove that Scots Presbyterians had not been responsible (as many in England claimed) for the king's death. Anderson records that he had been reluctant to preach on political matters, but he had been persuaded to do so by members of his congregation. He had not wished to publish the piece, but had been forced to do so to refute misrepresentations ("which is the common Lot, of all those call'd Presbyterians") of what he had actually said, for he had "studied to avoid giving Offence." But it is not surpris-

ing, even reading Anderson's authorized text, that offence had been taken. Anderson had not been content to deny Presbyterian guilt, but had taken the offensive with a bold and radical Whig line argument justifying the right of resistance to sovereigns in certain circumstances. However, having done his duty by Presbyterianism, Anderson had urged restraint, and that due respect be paid to Church of England clergy and laity. It was the present that mattered. Instead of indulging in controversy on a long past civil war, men should celebrate loyalty to King George I and "to our happy Constitution." and strive to transmit British liberties and privileges to their successors.¹²

Anderson's desire to avoid inter-denominational conflict became visible again in 1718. He twice preached a sermon which touched on issues of what congregations should do when they were divided over the choice of new ministers. But he refused to print the sermon, as the subject was one causing much controversy in the Church of England "with whom I had no business." In other words, he would not intervene, or seem to intervene, in another denomination's squabbles. Only after he had preached the sermon a third time, in 1720, did he judge that controversy on the matter had died down sufficiently for him to publish the sermon without seeming provocative.¹³

It even seems that Anderson was prepared to go beyond the discouraging of sectarian bickering to the far more positive act of making positive gestures towards the Church of England. On the death of the Bishop of London in 1713 "J. Anderson" published a sheet of Latin verses on his death. The deaths of Archbishops of York (1724) and Canterbury (1737) were to be marked in the same way (along with the death of George I in 1727).¹⁴ These signs of respect for clerical leaders of a different denomination seem to have aroused no comment. Probably most Presbyterians were appalled at such laxity, many Anglicans infuriated at the presumption of this petty Dissenter. His publishing of his 1715 sermon on Charles I's death had not answered his critics but, predictably, enraged them, and a pamphlet, *No king-sellers: or, a brief detection of the vanity and villainy in a sermon entitul'd, No king-killers. Preached by the Scotch-Presbyterian of Swallow-Street, Picadilly* had poured torrents of abuse on "Poor Jammy"—"This Diminutive in Divinity, this little white-liver'd, red-headed Scot," "the fraud of this Prig," "this Pimp of a Presbyter." All this, however, was mild compared to the attack which was launched in satirical verses published in about 1720, claiming to be a response to an earlier work, *Priaepeia Presbyteriana, or the Presbyterian peezele*. This may never have existed, for no copies survive, but the mock answer, *Anti-Priaepeia*, claims to be the lament of the Church of Scotland

on news that its representative in London, James Anderson, had been diagnosed as suffering from venereal disease, and it makes a great play of Anderson's supposed disgrace.¹⁵ The satire is in all probability a baseless attempt to discredit him. The message could be taken literally—Anderson was a Libertine. But the more sophisticated would enjoy the verses as metaphor. Presbyterian ministers were introducers of corruption, here presented in sexual terms. The verses also stigmatized Anderson as a foreign agent, a minister of the Church of Scotland, seeking to advance an alien religion in England, and answerable to an alien authority, the general assembly of that church. In fact there is no evidence that the assembly regarded itself as having authority over Anderson, and any such attempt by a foreign religious jurisdiction to exercise power in England would have been hugely controversial. The obscenity of the verses must have stung Anderson, but such coarse satire was a commonplace of the age.

As well as being attacked by enemies of Presbyterianism, Anderson was regarded with hostility by some of his own denomination because of his tolerance. On a copy of his 1712 sermon a contemporary has written under the author's name "a Little prig of a Mass John."¹⁶ The word "prig" was often used at the time as a vague term indicating dislike or disrespect, and here it is evidently used by a zealous Scots Presbyterian to denounce Anderson as insufficiently rigorous in his attitude toward Episcopalians: he is no better than a "mass John," a contemptuous term for a priest. Another epithet Anderson bore (according to a source written long after his death) was also probably bestowed by those disillusioned by his lack of zeal for sectarian strife: he was "well known in those days among people of that persuasion [Presbyterianism] as Bishop Anderson."¹⁷

Of Anderson's personal life, little is known, not even the name of his wife. The couple had a son and a daughter, the former being born about 1717. It is said that his wife's dowry was mostly lost in the South Sea Bubble, the great orgy of speculation that collapsed in 1720 and ruined thousands. But the suggestion that he may have been imprisoned for debt and that poverty drove him to volunteer to write the *Constitutions*¹⁸ rests on prejudice rather than evidence. Probably in these years he was already engaged in the antiquarian researches that were to busy him for the rest of his life, and that this included masonic research may be deduced from the short time between his being commissioned to write the *Constitutions* and his producing his manuscript.

The English Grand Lodge formed in 1717 had modest beginnings, being formed by a mere four London lodges, made up of London craftsmen (employers rather than "hand on") and merchants, none of them men of very high

standing. The fashion for clubs was growing fast in London, basically groups of friends meeting for social pleasure, with drink and song prominent in their activities. Some liked to add ritual and initiation to their activities, ranging from the ludicrous to serious exercises in bonding based on claims to links with the distant past. Traditions of the special importance of the stonemasons trade had survived from the Middle Ages, and some clubs adapted these older traditions to the new world of London clubs. In 1717 some of these masonic theme clubs decided to come together, have an annual joint feast, and achieve a degree of coherence and recognition for Freemasonry, electing a Grand Master. Symbolism based on the tools of the mason trade—square, compasses and so on—was well established, and tradition was called on to extol the masonic virtues of brotherhood and harmony—and secrecy.

Already by this time there were emerging conventions in clubs aimed at avoiding dispute. Some matters should not be discussed as they were likely to lead to argument, and destroy the social pleasure men had met to enjoy. Religion and politics were the obvious topics for such bans, and this ethos was doubtless already present in the London lodges.

The new Grand Lodge was small in scale, but it was ambitious from the first, for it resolved “to chuse a Grand Master from among themselves, till they should have the Honour of a Noble Brother at their Head.”¹⁹ Their beliefs in the importance of Masonry made a noble Master appropriate, and such exalted patronage would bring Masonry the respect it deserved. Anthony Sayer, elected as first Grand Master, had the bare status of gentleman—and he was to prove so obscure that nothing about him except for his connection with Freemasonry is known. In social status he was the best the London masons could provide. The next year they did a little better finding an “esquire” to be Grand Master, George Payne. He took the first step towards attaining another goal, providing Freemasonry with agreed standards and rules. The “masonic” traditions of the lodges were based on the recollections of old men who had had connections with working stonemasons and their traditions, and on the various copies of the late Medieval documents known as the “Old Constitutions” or “Old Charges,” which survived. Both oral tradition and *Old Constitutions* varied from version to version—and in any case they related to attempts to regulate the lives of stonemasons, not sociable London citizens. There was a need for standardization and up-dating if Freemasonry was to be a coherent product attractive to new—and socially superior—members. In 1718 George Payne desired any brother who could do so to produce old writings or records concerning Freemasonry. This

resulted in several copies of the *Old Constitutions* being produced.²⁰ In his second term of office, 1720–1, Payne renewed interest in the issue, and more old manuscripts were collected. He then produced *General Regulations*, which were approved by Grand Lodge on June 24, 1721. These dealt with fairly mundane (if essential) matters of administration and procedures,²¹ and evidently Payne and his colleagues felt unable to provide themselves any more comprehensive account of the Craft, and turned to Anderson to fill the gap.

There is no direct evidence as to how they learned of the expertise of this obscure man. It is possible that he had approached Grand Lodge and offered his services,²² equally possible that he was already a member of a London lodge and his antiquarian interests had become known. But a previously neglected chronological conjunction may provide a clue as to why Grand Lodge decided that a Scot was the man for the job in hand.

John Theophilus Desaguliers stands beside, or indeed a step or two ahead, of Anderson as a crucial founding figure of Grand Lodge Freemasonry, and he had served as third Grand Master (1719–20). He was a minor celebrity in London through the popular lectures he gave on Newtonian science, and through his position as a fellow of the Royal Society, and the society's curator and demonstrator, he had links with eminent scientists and noblemen. It was probably these contacts that enabled the Grand Lodge to achieve one of its core ambitions—having a noble Grand Master, to demonstrate the Craft's position in society. In 1721 the duke of Montagu (FRS) became the first noble Grand Master. Desaguliers was a Church of England minister, chaplain, and (more informally) consulting engineer to the duke of Chandos (FRS). In July 1721 Desaguliers dined with the duke at his great house of Canons on a day when a number of leading Scots were present, including John Campbell, the provost (mayor) of Edinburgh.²³ A month later Desaguliers was in Edinburgh, advising the burgh council on its water supply. As Desaguliers had been supervising the installation of a piped water system at Canons, it is likely that it was at the dinner at Canons that Campbell and Desaguliers had met and the latter had been commissioned to go to Edinburgh. Previously, he had no known contact with Scotland or Scottish Freemasonry. But once in Edinburgh Desaguliers approached Edinburgh Lodge (Mary's Chapel). "Being in toun" he was "desirous to have a conference" with the officers of the lodge. They agreed, and on August 24, 1721, "Finding him duely qualified in all the points of Measonry, They received him as a Brother into their societie." Thus the Scottish masons were careful to check the validity of the masonic credentials of an English Past Grand Master before admitting

him to their lodge. In the days that followed, Desaguliers was present when Provost Campbell and a number of other leading Edinburgh officials and worthies were admitted to the lodge.²⁴ The Edinburgh lodge at this time consisted largely of stonemasons and their employers, but Desaguliers seems to have persuaded it that it should now copy London (and indeed some other Scottish) lodges in seeking to recruit from the higher ranks of society. And the burgh élite apparently was ready to embrace Freemasonry, now so fashionable in England.

A month after Desaguliers' introduction to Scottish Freemasonry, the Scot Anderson was commissioned by Grand Lodge to provide revised constitutions for English Freemasonry. It is very tempting to conclude that the two events are linked, that Desaguliers had hastened back to London and persuaded Grand Lodge that Scottish expertise was needed. Desaguliers would have found that the Edinburgh lodge had continuous minutes going back for over a century, and that several other lodges were known to have existed that long—and doubtless boasts were made of lodge histories stretching much further back than that. He had found Scots Freemasonry similar enough to English for Scots masons to admit him, and perhaps a degree of knowledge about Freemasonry that impressed him.²⁵ If a link between Desaguliers' Edinburgh visit and Anderson is accepted, another question remains unanswerable. Was Desaguliers told of Anderson's expertise, or did he already know Anderson and now accept that the Scots mason had knowledge useful to English ones? There is no hard evidence to show that Anderson had been an English (or indeed a Scottish) Freemason for any significant length of time, but there is a hint that he may have been known as one by 1715. The pamphlet denouncing his Charles I sermon hurled at him charges of being "a fraudulent Brother" and a master of fraud "or a Crafts Master."²⁶ These may just be random items in the indiscriminate litany of abuse and therefore cannot be taken as conclusive, but they may indicate Anderson was active as a mason before Grand Lodge was formed.

On September 29, 1721, Grand Master Montagu and Grand Lodge, having found fault with all the copies of the "old Gothic Constitutions," commissioned Anderson "to digest the same in a new and better Method." At the next meeting of Grand Lodge, December 27, he presented his work. Fourteen "learned Brothers" were appointed "to examine Brother Anderson's Manuscript, and to make report." In March 1722 the committee reported "that they had perused Brother Anderson's Manuscript, viz. the History, Charges, Regulations, and Master's Song, and after some Amendments had approv'd of it: Upon which the Lodge desir'd the Grand Master to order it to be printed."²⁷ The new constitutions made fast

progress: they had been commissioned, written, revised and approved for publication in a period of six months. With a noble Grand Master providing publicity and numbers of lodges and masons growing rapidly, it seems that the need for a published summary of the non-secret aspects of Freemasonry was seen as a priority. But ten further months were to be passed before they were actually published. The reason for the delay was probably a crisis that threatened to undermine and even destroy the movement. The strains which emerged can be put down to several forces—unease caused by fast expansion and attempts to increase Grand Lodge's authority, political insensitivity, and personal ambition.

Grand Lodge Freemasonry was noted for its ban on the discussion of politics, yet in a very basic way the movement was profoundly political. It was committed to the revolution settlement, based on acceptance of the Protestant succession and limited monarchy. Indeed, though there is a lack of direct evidence as to why Grand Lodge was formed, it may well be that political motivation was involved—belief that it would be useful, indeed that it was necessary, to provide a forum in which all varieties of supporters of the revolution could meet in friendship. They might not discuss politics in the lodge but, hopefully, having found that brotherhood was possible in spite of political differences, their relationships outside the masonic context would become less confrontational.

By 1717 the 1688 revolution had survived for over a generation, but threats to it were constant. The Jacobite rising of 1715–16 had only just been defeated, and a Spanish-backed new attempt was already looming on the horizon, though it was to prove abortive (1719). Self-preservation seemed to require that revolution-men unite against the Jacobite threat, but instead they were locked in fierce factional conflict. Whigs and most Tories, Non-Conformists, and the great majority of the Church of England supported the revolution, but they often seemed to put far more energy into fighting among themselves than in facing the threats to the revolution. Such disunity might prove fatal, giving foreign-backed Stuarts a chance to regain their thrones.

The accession of George I in 1714, though it secured the key to the revolution, the Protestant succession, greatly increased internal divisions. His predecessors had employed both Whigs and Tories as ministers in government, producing some division of spoils among factions. King George, convinced that at heart all Tories were Jacobites and thus his enemies, excluded them from power locally and nationally. The result, predictably, was to embitter them and make many question their allegiance, for politically there seemed no hope for them in the future under the Hanoverians.

The timing of the creation of Grand Lodge may therefore have involved a desire to provide a forum which would show the unity of revolution men in the face of the Jacobite threat, and to reverse the tendency for Tories to swing sharply towards Jacobitism by offering them a role in an inclusive organization and ideology. However, it soon became clear that the leadership of Grand Lodge was dominated by Whigs. Desaguliers' sympathies clearly lay with the Whigs and he relied on a Whig grandee (Chandos) as patron. Anderson was staunchly Whig. The duke of Montagu was a leading Whig courtier. Yet Toryism was strong in London, and from what happened in 1722 it seems it was well represented in masonic lodges. Perhaps the election of so prominent a Whig as Montagu was seen as provocative.

They had accepted Freemasonry as beyond political faction, but Grand Lodge was shaping a public image for itself that was so blatantly Whig that Tories were bound to find it offensive. There may too have been a wider objection from ordinary masons to what was happening. Had they, in Grand Lodge, created an organization that instead of serving them was taking them over? Not all were happy at the move towards standardization. Moves towards promoting Freemasonry's public image jarred with the quiet, semi-private Masonry of small groups of friends who had perhaps savored obscurity as being related to their treasured secrecy.

The annual feast or assembly at which Montagu was installed in office in June 1721 was far more ambitious than its predecessors, in that for the first time masons marched in a public procession to their assembly, and for the first time it was held in a public building, Stationers Hall, rather than in an ale house. In May 1722 Freemasons went a step further, and perhaps a step too far, too soon, in their self-publicity by organizing a ceremony that amounted to a claim to an active role in public affairs. "With a great deal of ceremony by the society of Free-Masons," a foundation stone was laid for the new church of St. Martin in the Fields.²⁸ The Freemasons were, in effect, claiming that, as masons (architects) they had a role in the dedication of public buildings. In any circumstances such an intrusion would have been presumptuous. The fact that another foundation stone had been laid two months previously by the bishop of Salisbury, in name of the king himself, made the matter potentially even more controversial. Laying a new stone, without permission, could be seen as an insult not only to the bishop and his church but to the king himself. That the new stone lay exactly over the original one, but twelve feet above it, might seem to suggest symbolically that the first stone was being superseded. The masons had trumped the king.

There is no direct evidence that the incident caused controversy, but the circumstantial evidence is suggestive. Anderson in the 1738 edition of the *Constitutions*, was to reduce two foundation stones and two ceremonies to one. There had been “a solemn Procession” to the church “with many Free Masons,” to level the foundation stone at the south east corner by giving it “3 great Knocks with a Mallet.”²⁹ History had been rewritten, the masonic foundation stone’s intrusion suppressed. However, the stone may help explain an incident that followed. The masons were due to hold their annual feast soon after their St. Martin’s ceremony and “a select Body of the Society of Free Masons” felt it was necessary to wait on Lord Townsend, one of the secretaries of state, to notify him that their annual assembly was approaching and to urge that “they hoped the Administration would take no Umbrage at that Convocation, as they were all zealously affected to his Majesty’s Person and Government.” Was it felt that presumption at St. Martin’s made a reassurance necessary? Townsend condescendingly gave government consent to masonic activity, but added a sneer at their supposed secrets. They “need not be apprehensive of any molestation” from the government “so long as they went on doing nothing more dangerous than the ancient Secrets of the Society; which must be of a very harmless Nature, because, as much as Mankind love Mischief, no Body ever betray’d them.”³⁰ The cynical politician could not believe anything could be kept secret for long if it was important.

However, if one motive for the nervous masonic delegation to Townsend was fear that the foundation stone had been a blunder, another was probably fear that the Tories within Freemasonry were ready to challenge Whig domination, and that this might raise suspicions as to the movement’s loyalty. The situation was exploited by the maverick duke of Wharton. Born in 1698, the young Wharton was talented and ambitious but unscrupulous and wildly inconsistent. He had swerved into ardent Jacobitism, then into active support for the Whig regime, then into vocal denunciation of government corruption, associating himself with the Tories. In 1721 he was involved in the blasphemous, though obscure, “Hell-Fire” clubs that were denounced by the government, and in the same year he became a Freemason, typically drawing public attention to the fact by walking home from his initiation wearing his white leather masonic apron.³¹ At the end of the year he appears to have veered back into support for the government, then almost immediately doubled back to the Tories.³² Given his energy, it is no surprise that Wharton threw himself into Freemasonry with enthusiasm, and in June 1722 he took over the grandmastership by a *coup d’état*,

out-witting Grand Lodge. The “official” masonic account of what happened comes from Anderson and, as in the matter of St. Martin’s, distorts events.

According to Anderson, “the better Sort” of masons had wanted Montagu to continue in office as Grand Master for a second year “and therefore they delay’d to prepare the Feast.” The lack of logic of the “therefore” is obvious, and luckily Anderson’s version of events can be corrected by reference to a press report. From this, it emerges that it had been decided to organize the feast for June 25, not the traditional June 24 (St. John the Baptist’s day). The reason for this is unknown but quite possibly was mundane: June 24 was a Monday, and the feast was moved forward a day to avoid the necessity of making preparations on the Sabbath. But Wharton “being ambitious of the Chair,” according to Anderson, got a number of masons to meet him at Stationers Hall on the 24th. He probably found it easy to whip up indignation at Grand Lodge overturning tradition by moving the feast, playing on suspicions that a second term of office for Montagu meant that the Whig clique running Grand Lodge was monopolizing office, riding rough-shod over the rights of individual lodges and masons.

The masons who met on June 24, with no Grand Lodge officials present, proclaimed Wharton Grand Master. For months thereafter, according to Anderson, Freemasons were split in their allegiance. “The noble Brothers and all those who would not countenance irregularities” disowned Wharton. But Montagu eventually healed the breach. Acting as though he was still Grand Master, he summoned a meeting of Grand Lodge in January 1723. On Wharton then “promising to be True and Faithful” he was accepted as Grand Master. But though a Tory had been accepted in the office, this was apparently the result of a compromise, for Desaguliers became his Deputy and Anderson one of the Grand Wardens, replacing William Hawkins who was “always out of Town.”³³

That is Anderson’s version of events. But the press tells a different story. They make no mention of the Monday, June 24, *coup* but describe the June 25 feast (which Anderson fails to mention at all). Wharton was chosen as Grand Master, and Desaguliers as his Deputy. Several nobles were present. Thus if (as seems likely) Wharton had indeed organized an unofficial meeting of masons on June 24 which agreed that he should become Grand Master in place of official Grand Lodge candidate, Montagu, this had been accepted by most masons by the following day in order to preserve unity at the feast. But compromise was present from the start, with the unstable Tory Wharton holding the honorary position as head of the movement, but reliable Whig Desaguliers preserving continuity as Deputy.³⁴ Anderson’s account of Wharton’s recognition as Master

being delayed for six months presumably represents the view of a minority of masons, presumably including Anderson himself, who refused to accept Wharton's *coup* in June but were reconciled to it in January. But a dispute over one of the Grand Wardens posts remained. Anderson's account of the January 1723 meeting (at which, incidentally, his *Constitutions* were finally approved), maintained that he had then replaced William Hawkins, evidently a supporter of Wharton, as a Grand Warden. But Grand Lodge, for the moment, thought otherwise. A list of Grand Wardens mentions Hawkins, and Anderson's name does not appear at all. But at some time Anderson himself has added to the list a note that Hawkins had demitted office in his favor. Moreover, the earliest minute of Grand Lodge (June 24, 1723) stated that at the meeting that day Anderson merely acted as a Grand Warden for Hawkins, who was absent. But subsequently the words that indicated that he had only been acting for Hawkins have been erased. The incident has been much discussed, but almost entirely in terms of Anderson's unscrupulousness and attempt at self-aggrandizement. It is far more plausible to see it as part of the continuing factional battle within Grand Lodge. Some claimed in January to June 1723 Anderson had been Grand Warden, others that if he officiated it was only as a stand-in for Hawkins. It seems rather petty, but it is part of the Whig versus Tory muscle-flexing going on in Wharton's year as Grand Master. Whigs prevailed in the long-term, and Anderson triumphed in official history. Within a few years his status as a former Grand Warden was fully accepted—and eventually poor Hawkins disappears from lists of past officials altogether.³⁵ As usual the victors wrote the history.

In 1722–23 Grand Lodge Freemasonry avoided political schism by accepting the need for a degree of political diversity among masons in appointments to office—even though politics could not be discussed. But though harmony was maintained, if the satirical account of the 1722 feast at which Wharton became Grand Master is to be believed, political tensions did surface. It was a good dinner, Robert Samber (who was present) allows, though how “demolishing huge Walls of Venison Pastry” “after a very disedifying Manner” contributed to “building up a Spiritual House” he did not know. Politics and religion were not discussed, as the masons seemed to be following the advice of “that Author” (a reference to Anderson, whose *Constitutions* had been published by the time Samber wrote). But at one point the band had begun to play “Let the King enjoy his own again,” a popular Jacobite (and thus seditious) tune. The Tories were getting cheeky—talking politics might be banned, but music could make a political point. The band was “immediately reprimanded by a Person of great

Gravity and Science,” which surely means Desaguliers. After that, Hanoverian decorum was restored—and indeed emphasized. The bottle went merrily about and toasts were made to king, royal family, and the established “Churches” (thus carefully maintaining a British dimension by recognizing that England and Scotland had different establishments). Other toasts were drunk to prosperity to Old England “under the present Administration”, and “Love, Liberty, and Science,” an interesting trio.³⁶

Harmony might have been preserved outwardly, but Wharton’s holding of office became an increasing embarrassment as the year passed, for he took a leading role in Tory, even crypto-Jacobite, activity. The political situation was even more tense than usual. In 1722 a Jacobite plot for the overthrow of King George was discovered, and the government decided to use this as a pretext for action against “the idol of the country clergy, the Pretender’s most formidable supporter in England,”³⁷ Francis Atterbury, bishop of Rochester. His political views had long been known, and though evidence of involvement in the plot was weak it was decided to use it to destroy him and thus frighten other Jacobite-inclined Tories into submission. During the case, Wharton emerged as a leading supporter of the bishop, giving, on May 15, 1723, what was regarded as an outstanding speech denouncing the proceedings against him.³⁸ After Atterbury was sentenced to perpetual banishment, Wharton accompanied him to the ship taking him into exile, gave him a sword, and took the bishop’s former chaplain into his own employment.³⁹

With the June 24, 1723, feast just weeks away there must have been much apprehension at the possible consequences of the Grand Master’s political stance. Freemasonry was very much in the news. Shortly before *Constitutions* were published in February, *The Free-masons: A Hudibrastick Poem* was published, mocking the movement. In April it was reported that the masons “are determined (we hear) to use all the Methods in their Power to raise their Reputation among the People,” and suppress false reports about their movement. Feelings were running high. A mason was prosecuted for breaking the head of a man who had been offensive in his mockery of the Freemasonry, but was let off with a fine as he had been under “very great Provocation.”⁴⁰

On the morning of the 1723 feast Wharton made things worse, appearing at hustings to speak in support of two Tory crypto-Jacobites standing for election as sheriffs of London. Again, however, it emerged that a compromise had been arranged. Wharton had agreed at a meeting in April (at which Anderson had acted as Secretary) that he should be succeeded in office by the earl of Dalkeith

(the son of the duke of Buccleuch).⁴¹ Montagu and Wharton, the first noble Grand Masters, had been chosen as great men with high public profiles. This had satisfied masonic vanity but caused discord through their active identification with political factions. It therefore made sense to aim rather lower—as Grand Masters nobles of distinguished blood but relatively inactive politically, though soundly Hanoverian.

Nonetheless, the June 1723 feast was stormy. Grand Lodge's approval of Anderson's *Constitutions* was accepted, though there are signs of unease about changes to "ancient" traditions. Then Wharton refused to nominate a successor. Dalkeith, whom he was supposed to nominate, was absent in Scotland, but he had agreed to serve as Grand Master. In spite of Wharton's silence Dalkeith was agreed on as next Grand Master, but when it emerged that he had nominated Desaguliers as his Deputy Wharton objected. Perhaps he felt that if the mastership went to a Whig the Deputyship should go to a Tory. The feast then took place, but once it was over Wharton tried to insist on a new vote, declaring that he had doubts about the accuracy of the first one. On this being refused he withdrew with his supporters. They soon returned but, Wharton later "went away from the Hall without Ceremony," after his conduct was denounced as "unprecedented, unwarrantable, and irregular, and tending to introduce into the Society a Breach of Harmony, with the utmost Disorder and confusion."⁴² When Wharton had been accepted as Grand Master in 1722 this had been done in order to preserve harmony, but now it seemed that he was ready to destroy it.

Anderson's official account makes no mention of the dispute over the Deputy, though he indicates some conflict, saying some proposed that as Dalkeith was not present a different Grand Master should be chosen.⁴³ Whatever bitter disputes took place in these muddled months of 1722–23, Anderson as official historian later put a brave face on them. Wharton had been a good Grand Master, very assiduous in visiting lodges and creating new ones, pleasing Freemasons by his "affable and clever Conversation."⁴⁴ Preserving the appearance of harmony was a priority—and Grand Masters, almost by definition, are above reproach. In a private letter to Montagu, who had not been present at the 1723 feast, Anderson was more forthcoming. Wharton had "endeavoured to divide us" against Desaguliers, having met with other masons in the morning whom he had persuaded to support him.⁴⁵ As before the 1722 feast, Wharton had organized his faction in advance. Neither officially nor unofficially does Anderson record how relieved masons must have been that Wharton had severed his contacts with their movement, for shortly thereafter the duke left the country, and

declared himself both a Jacobite and a Roman Catholic. Internal dispute rumbled on for a time, however. In November 1723 Grand Lodge deposed the Master of a lodge who had made unsubstantiated charges against Desaguliers.⁴⁶

It was during this time of turmoil in Freemasonry that Anderson's *Constitutions* were finalized and published. Anderson had produced his book "now in Print" before Grand Lodge, presided over by Wharton, at the January 17, 1723, meeting at which (according to Anderson at least) Wharton's appointment was regularized, and he himself became a Grand Warden. The book "was again approv'd, with the Addition of the ancient Manner of Constituting a Lodge"⁴⁷ written by Wharton as a postscript. Final additions to Anderson's earlier draft were three new songs, a dedication to Montagu (written by Desaguliers on Wharton's orders) and an official approbation of the work, the signatories being Wharton, Desaguliers as his Deputy, the Grand Wardens, and the Masters and Wardens of twenty lodges.⁴⁸ One of the Masters was Anderson himself, who added to his name "The Author of this Book."⁴⁹ As his name did not appear on the title page, this is the only place he is identified in the 1723 edition. The book was ordered to "be receiv'd in every particular Lodge under our Cognizance, as the Only Constitutions of Free and Accepted Masons amongst us." They were to be studied by candidates, read at their admissions—and whenever else the Master of a lodge thought fit.⁵⁰ In order, no doubt, to persuade those who might be tempted to reject Anderson's new-fangled work and stick to the *Old Constitutions*, the latter were denounced with fury as "much interpolated, mangled, and miserably corrupted, not only with false Spelling, but even with many false Facts and gross Errors of History and Chronology, through Length of Time, and the ignorance of Transcribers, in the dark illiterate Ages."⁵¹ At last, late in February 1723, the *Constitutions* were published, advertised as "Order'd to be publish'd and recommended to the Brethren by the Grand Master and his Deputy."⁵²

The work had, according to the approbation "fully answered the End proposed" retaining what was valuable from older documents, correcting errors in history and chronology, all being "digested in a new and better Method." Thus, whatever faults later generations have found, the book satisfied those who had commissioned it. Over half of it, the History, describes the Craft's ancient and exalted past. Taken as history as judged by modern scholarly standards, Anderson's account is clearly absurd, but in some respects the abuse heaped on it, and therefore on Anderson himself, is unjustified. There is little point in raging against him for starting with Adam and then wending his way through the Old

Testament, for in his time that was the conventional mainstream of the past, not a bizarre aberration. Moreover beginning the story of Masonry with Adam was to be expected. Everything started with the Creation, so a history naturally started there. To do otherwise would have been unsatisfactory, a starting in the middle of a subject. Masonry should be traced back to Adam, just as dynastic history traced royal families and national histories their origins to Adam.

Even if this is allowed, at first reading Anderson's History may seem totally ludicrous, for great figures throughout the ages are described as Masons, Master Masons, and Grand Masters. But there is in fact a logic to what he is doing, based on the ambitious claims that were made for what "Masonry" was. Masonry to Freemasons did not just mean building, for buildings were only the physical expression of the skills of the architect, and in turn the architect worked according to the rules of geometry. The claim that geometry/architecture was the queen of the arts was an old one, but it seemed of particular relevance and importance in the age in which Anderson was writing. Mathematics was increasingly seen as the key to understanding the world, with the work of Sir Isaac Newton an awesome demonstration of its power. The boasted claims for Masonry were thus not just based on a bizarre inflated opinion of stonemasons. They were claims that Masonry was central to intellectual life. Therefore men who had promoted architecture/geometry/building in the past might justly be called masons, and this included not only practitioners but the rulers who had ordered the construction of great buildings. And, a distinctly dubious further step onwards in this logic, groups of masons formed (or were known as) lodges, therefore past masons must have had lodges.

If this seems grotesque, an analogy may be useful. English-speaking historians tend to call rulers in the past, from many different cultures "kings" or "princes." This is not a claim that they were actually known as kings in their own day, but a matter of translation and of standardization, to aid comprehension of what these people were. Past rulers had had dozens of different titles legitimizing their rule, but their function—that they ruled—give them enough in common to make it useful to categorize them as "kings." Great rulers are generally called "emperors" in English, and groups which advised them described as "councils." What is so different in using such categorizing-words for men involved in the function of "Masonry" in the past? They were "Master Masons" because of one of their functions, and if they excelled at it, they were "Grand Masters."

Adam, created in the image of God, "the great Architect of the Universe," "must have had" the liberal sciences, particularly geometry, written on his heart,

for ever since the creation of man the principles of geometry have been “in the Hearts of his Offspring.”⁵³ Here, as in a number of places, Anderson makes it clear that he is deducing without direct evidence. Mankind used these innate skills in the mechanical arts, and only later reduced some of them to the abstract rules of geometry. In this lies the foundation of all the arts based on geometry, particularly masonry and architecture. “No doubt” Adam taught his sons geometry. Anderson is making the stride from geometry to buildings as the outstanding examples of geometry in action. “At length the Royal Art was carry’d to Greece” and the 47th proposition of the first book of Euclid is highlighted for “if duly observ’d, [it] is the Foundation of all Masonry, sacred, civil and military.”⁵⁴ This is the proposition that demonstrates that in a right-angled triangle the square of the length of the side opposite the right-angle is equal to the sum of the squares of the lengths of the two other sides. The importance of the proposition to Freemasons is again emphasized by the frontispiece of the *Constitutions*, for a diagram illustrating it stands beneath the scroll which represents Anderson’s work. That the right angle or square also lies at the heart of Freemasonry’s symbolism and rituals is not even mentioned, for Anderson’s task is to trace the outward history of Freemasonry, not to reveal its secrets.

Attention now switches to Rome, where “it is rationally believ’d” the Emperor Augustus became Grand Master of the Lodge at Rome. As Augustus was Vitruvius’s patron and many great buildings had been constructed in his reign “the Remains of which are the Pattern and Standard of true Masonry in all future Times,” his qualifications for the designation are clear. Architecture/ masonry has reached its peak as regards style, and “we are now only endeavouring to imitate, and have not yet arriv’d to its Perfection.”⁵⁵ At this point Anderson diverges from his narrative to write about lodges. “Old Records” (by which he no doubt meant the *Old Constitutions*) gave “large Hints” that lodges had existed from the beginning of the world, especially “in Times of Peace, and when the Civil Powers, abhorring Tyranny and Slavery, gave due Scope to the bright and free Genius of their happy Subjects.” In such times masons above all artists were the “Favourites of the Eminent.”⁵⁶ This is a theme that has been hinted at before (an ambiguous passage can be read as saying King David was not considered a mason as he had been a “Man of Blood”): Masonry is associated with peace and civil liberty, and thrives best under them. Masonry is possible under other conditions, but unlikely to flourish. And linked with this is a moral element. David was to be blamed for bloodshed, and Sampson is condemned as one who cannot be regarded as a mason because he showed weakness by betraying secrets.⁵⁷

Thus to the geometry/architecture/buildings/stonemasons complex forming “Masonry” are added issues of character or morality and a declaration of political preferences. Different political message emerges when, eventually, the seventeenth century is reached. English Freemasonry, in decline, was revived when King James VI, the mason king of Scotland, inherited the English throne. Thus commitment to the united kingdom of Great Britain is shown by demonstrating that it was advantageous to Masonry—and this also gave Anderson an opportunity to stress the significance of his own, Scottish masonic heritage, though writing for English masons. Under James II the London lodges go into a severe decline. No explanation is offered, but the reader again is expected to see a political message. James had been Catholic and absolutist, so of course Masonry had not flourished under him. But with the coming of King William in the 1688–89 revolution Masonry revived, went from strength to strength, and was reinforced when the coming of peace is added to civil liberty (the end of the war of the Spanish succession in 1713, the defeat of the Jacobites in 1715–16). The triumph of Masonry is to be seen all around. It is peace and liberty, it is the dominant style of architecture in which England is being rebuilt (the Roman or Augustan), superior to all others, it is growth in numbers (and social standing) of Freemasons and lodges. Anderson builds up to a climactic conclusion. London lodges thrive and have quarterly meetings and annual assemblies, “the Royal Art” (so called because practiced by kings) is cultivated “and the Cement of the Brotherhood prerserv’d; so that the whole Body resembles a well built Arch; several Noblemen and Gentlemen of the best rank, with Clergymen and learned Scholars of most Professions and Denominations” have joined, under the Grand Master, the duke of Montagu. The lack of a mention of his successor, Wharton, might be explained by the fact that the History had been completed before Wharton became Grand Master, but the failure to use the term “Grand Lodge” is harder to explain. That some lodges had joined to hold quarterly meetings and an annual assembly is described, but perhaps some masons were still suspicious of the name “Grand Lodge,” fearing that it indicated an unwelcome claim to power over their lodges.

As “history” as now understood by its academic practitioners, Anderson’s History of Masonry is worthless. But much of what he writes reflects conventional historical concepts of his age applied to a specialist account of the masonic past. The modern ideal of “objectivity” would have seemed alien. History was invariably used to serve a purpose. This was taken for granted. Anderson’s purpose was to glorify Masonry, and provide Grand Lodge Freemasonry

with a past that would prove its outstanding importance. That Anderson occasionally makes it clear that he has no direct evidence for something, and sometimes admits to uncertainty about a fact, may seem to modern eyes a sign that there were glimmerings of a modern attitude to use of evidence in him, but at the time they probably looked like weaknesses, for hesitation was not called for in maintaining a cause.

In producing his account of the masonic past Anderson is at his most confident where he has the basis of the Old Testament and the *Old Constitutions* to work on, and he is therefore weakest in dealing with the centuries linking his own time with the Middle Ages. Ironically, considering how often he has been denounced for invention and fantasy, when originality in inventing the past is most called for, he falters. Scrappy and unconvincing notes fail to provide a coherent narrative as he traverses the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with only his own creativity to guide him. But criticism of his style is due not only here but throughout the History. Anderson's central antiquarian interest, as was to emerge in later years, was genealogy, and this approach dominates his masonic History, and genealogies do not make for easy reading or lend themselves to displays of literary style. At the end he has a few flourishes on the triumph of Masonry, but much of the rest of his narrative is clumsy, and can descend to little more than lists of the names of great men—though in extenuation there were many “histories” published in his age with the same faults.

Some of the History's weaknesses of presentation may well be due to the committee of fourteen which revised the text. One footnote was referred to at the time as being by Desaguliers (who may be assumed to have been a member of the committee),⁵⁸ and there must be a strong suspicion that another, listing ancient scientists, is also his work, for it includes the obscure “Ktesibius . . . the Inventor of Pumps.”⁵⁹ Developing water pumps lay at the center of Desaguliers' engineering activities. In other instances, too, it may be suspected that the committee, when it wanted to add to or amend Anderson's draft of the History, left his text unchanged but added footnotes, falling over themselves to display their erudition. The result is many long footnotes, sometimes of marginal relevance, occasionally contradicting the main text. An already untalented work (in literary terms) seems to have been strangled in verbiage by committee.

The *Constitutions* have been called “an extraordinary example of political propaganda,”⁶⁰ but though there is certainly a strong political message in the work, its prevailingly prosaic language make it remarkably low-key—even incompetent—propaganda, with occasional flashes of politics buried in masses

of the mundane and irrelevant. But, without seeking to excuse Anderson's failings as a writer by presenting them as deliberate, this in all probability was what Grand Lodge wanted.

It was not the time or place for a stirring manifesto. Freemasonry was seeking to promote harmony and unity, and this meant avoiding any sign of seeking to inflame and stir up activism. It wished to show that it was solid and unthreatening. Its ideology was based on persuading men to come together, bonding in traditions and rituals and in relaxed social interaction. In the second edition of his work Anderson was to depict men of all sorts turning to Freemasonry as "a safe and pleasant Relaxation from Intense Study or the Hurry of Business, without Politicks or Party."⁶¹ What Grand Lodge wanted from Anderson was not a call to arms, but presentation of Freemasonry as an escape from competitive pressures and rivalries into brotherhood, with the legitimacy of having been highly respected from ancient times.

Thus his History makes commitment to the revolution settlement clear, but in a fairly muted way. There is no attempt to accompany support for it with furious denunciation of its enemies. This is particularly clear where religion is concerned. It was suggested earlier that Anderson's specialist history of "Masonry" was on the whole conventional in the framework it adopted, and in some respects his occasional fantasies are less striking than how closely he stuck to the mainstream of historical development and avoided diverging into the extravagant. Hermeticism and the Rosicrucians had been linked with Freemasonry in the minds of some well before Anderson's time. After him, masons on the wilder shores of Freemasonry were to invent fantasies about the Royal Arch, the Knights Templar, Druids, and much else. Anderson's restraint stands in contrast. But in his restraint about religion he does diverge sharply from the mainstream. Religion (and especially conflicts about religion) was important in most histories, central to many.

Anderson's History, however, never mentions the Reformation, or Roman Catholics, or Protestants. Even Christ only gets a passing mention, a reference to the Emperor Augustus being followed by "(in whose Reign was born God's Messiah, the great Architect of the Church)."⁶² Christ's life, a central event in most western versions of history, is dismissed in one short sentence. Moreover, he is simply called Messiah. The term was commonly used for Christ, and in general usage it was taken for granted that it was a word that accepted his divinity, that he was the Son of God. But strictly the word means the anointed one or deliverer. It is very hard to believe that the *Constitutions'* use of it is accidental. Both

Anderson and Desaguliers were trained in theology, and not likely to be casual in how they referred to Christ. Thus, tucked away in parentheses, is an implicit acceptance that all Freemasons might not regard Christ as divine, part of the Holy Trinity. He may be accepted instead as a deliverer sent by God.

The width of Freemasonry's willingness to be inclusive becomes evident, for not only all varieties of mainstream Trinitarian Christians but Deists and Unitarians could be embraced within such a view of Christ. It is hardly necessary to say that Anderson, as a Presbyterian minister, did not approve of such people. He denounced them in sermons, both before and after 1723, but there he was acting in his professional capacity. In the lodge he—and of course the Freemasonry which accepted his *Constitutions*—were willing to put such arguments aside.

That was a large part of what Freemasonry was for. It provided a special world in which it was legitimate, in the name of brotherhood and some undefined underlying common beliefs, to ignore differences in dogma which it was legitimate, even necessary, to dispute over in the ordinary world beyond. Though such masonic attitudes were combined with full acceptance of denominational religion, nonetheless traditional views of religion were being directly challenged, for they claimed that their religious beliefs should be reflected in all aspects of life, all the time. Freemasonry argued that there should be the possibility of a part-time opt-out from denominational religion, cooling-off periods for turning one's back on denominational differences. The implications were revolutionary, a step toward secular societies in which religion tends to be seen as one compartment of life rather than its essence.

Freemasonry was serious in intent, its rituals solemn, but it was largely relaxed and light hearted in its activities. Anderson's prose History may often be turgid, but he provided jovial alternatives. His "Master's Song" appended to the *Constitutions* is subtitled "The History of Masonry," while his "Warden's Song" is "Another History of Masonry." Having written a "scholarly" history of Masonry, he seems to be mocking the idea of writing definitive history: it is something flexible that can be presented in alternative versions according to context. Between the various parts of the Master's Song, toasts are to be drunk.

This may seem disconcerting. The staid prose History fits much better with stereotypes of Presbyterian ministers as being stern and humorless. But Anderson like other Freemasons saw the jolly socializing as being as central to the ideology and usefulness of "the Craft" as ritual.

One letter survives which gives a hint of Anderson as a sociable, even witty man, who would fit into boisterous lodge expressions of brotherhood through

drinking and singing. It dates from 1732, and Anderson was writing to a fellow mason, Samuel Gale, forwarding a letter from the Warden of Horn Lodge (Anderson's own lodge). The Warden's letter recommended its bearer "who is also a Mason true" to Gale, asking him to use his influence with his brother, a commissioner of excise, to get him a job as an excise man. Anderson adds his own recommendation: "I am well informed of his moral character that it is very good; and you know we Presbyterians will not own those of an ill character, far less recommend them." Anderson is indicating that his recommendation is based on knowledge, but the way he puts it seems to contain a good-natured jibe at Gale's Anglicanism: You have to come to Presbyterians to get trustworthy references. But it is the postscript to Anderson's letter that is most revealing of the man behind it. "O my dull memory! I had also forgot to tell you that I long much to laugh half an hour with you, my worshippingfull brother; and pray let me know when and where I can wait on you for that laudable purpose."⁶³ The Anderson of his sermons and most of the *Constitutions* is formal and serious. The man of the masonic songs and this letter enjoys good-fellowship and laughter.

In the *Constitutions* the History is followed by the Charges, supposedly injunctions extracted from the records of ancient lodges in Britain and beyond the seas, the main object being to instruct masons on how to behave towards each other and non-masons, concluding that "Brotherly-Love" is both the foundation stone and the capstone of the movement. Metaphorically, it is the cement that holds the edifice together.⁶⁴ But the charges begin with the Charge "Concerning God and Religion," a paragraph that has proved the most controversial item in Anderson's work. A mason is obliged "to obey the moral Law; and if he rightly understands the Art, he will never be a stupid Atheist, nor an irreligious Libertine." (*Stupid* is to be taken here not as crude insult but in the sense of "having one's senses deadened.") In ancient times masons had been charged in every country to follow it's religion,

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 distinguish'd; whereby Masonry becomes the Center of Union, and the means of conciliating true friendship among Persons that must have remain'd at a perpetual Distance.⁶⁵

The fierce words of the opening sentence seem to contrast with the spirit of the rest of the paragraph, and it is possible that they are part of the committee

of fourteen's revision of the text, indicating that it was felt that though Freemasonry was elastic some limits had to be laid down to prevent scandal. But even the message on Atheists and Libertines can be interpreted as ambiguous. It does not say they will be refused admission to the Craft, or expelled from it, but that they will not hold these beliefs if they "rightly understand" Freemasonry. Moreover, just as the History had Christ without acknowledgement of his divinity, the Charges have religion and moral law, and a denunciation of Atheists, without (except in the heading) specific mention of God. This vagueness, if not ambiguity, has exasperated generations of masonic historians, who have generally attributed it to Anderson's incompetence, but again this ignores the context. His task was to provide a broad framework, not lay down a new dogma for a new denomination. Freemasonry existed as an escape from denominational and factional constraints into a sphere into which men concentrated on what bound them together, not what divided them. In not defining the "Religion in which all Men agree" Anderson is being evasive in one sense, but is also appealing to an ideal. Vagueness becomes a virtue, for any attempt at precise definition would have been destructive. His ambiguity should perhaps be seen as masterly.

The search for what unites instead of what divides was of course not exclusive to Freemasonry. Endless attempts to force all men into a single denomination had failed dramatically in the generations since Reformation, causing vast suffering without bringing unity any nearer. The English Toleration Act had resulted as much from exhaustion and expediency as from principle, but the search was widespread to establish principles on which the acceptance of diversity could be based. The idea of some common underlying agreement on essentials which underlay denominational variety in worship, dogma, and church government generally involved invoking morality as the key, and then brotherhood or neighborly love as the key to morality itself.

To take just one example (though a highly relevant one, given the veneration in which Desaguliers held him), in unpublished notes Isaac Newton pondered "the essential part of religion" binding on all nations and "of an immutable nature because grounded upon immutable reason." Love of God and neighbors were the essentials, so "This religion may therefore be called the Moral Law of all nations."⁶⁶ Even within Freemasonry Anderson was not the first to search for something common to religions. That ideas of this sort imbued Freemasonry before the publication of the *Constitutions* is shown by Robert Samber, writing in 1722. Masons avoided religion and politics in discussion but had a religion, and indeed "the Religion we profess ... is the best that ever was, or will or can

be ... for it is the Law of Nature, which is the Law of God, for God is Nature. It is to love God above all things, and our Neighbor as our self; this is the true, primitive, Catholic and universal Religion, agreed to be so in all times, and confirmed by our Lord and Master Jesus Christ.”⁶⁷ The dedication of one of Anderson’s sermons, preached in the same year as the *Constitutions* was published shows him trying to express the same sort of concept in the context of his own denomination. The dedication is addressed to the earl of Buchan (one of the Scottish representative peers sitting in parliament), for whom Anderson was acting as chaplain, and Anderson commends the earl—and by implication himself—for their zeal for the Church of Scotland “and for our zeal for *serious* Religion and *true* Christianity in general, which is more to be regarded than any Denomination or Party of Christians under Heaven.”⁶⁸ Underlying his own church there was *serious* religion and *true* Christianity, beyond sectarian strife. It is a remarkable statement for a Presbyterian minister.

In the Charge on Religion, Freemasonry avoided precision of definition because that would immediately begin to build barriers, and the intention was inclusiveness. “God” in the title of the charge indicates a limitation to monotheism, but this was not something that, in terms of the British society that Anderson was assuming as his context, was deliberately introduced as a barrier to membership. All the rival religious grouping in Britain were monotheists. Indeed the only significant religious group that was not Christian (or closely derived from Christianity, like the Unitarians and Deists) was the Jews. They were an increasingly accepted presence in London society, worship by them having been sanctioned in 1698. By 1721, the year in which Anderson’s *Constitutions* were commissioned, two Jewish masons can be identified in London lodges, and by 1730 one was a Master.⁶⁹ Jews were playing an increasing role in public life. A Portuguese and Spanish synagogue was built in London in 1701, and one for Germans and Poles in 1722. The Charge on Religion dealt with the British situation: it was only as Empire expanded that Freemasonry had to consider its attitudes to other faiths.⁷⁰

When they turn to relations to civil power, the Charges are at first crisp and direct. A mason is a peaceable subject to civil powers. They are known for their loyalty and thrive in times of peace. That the state need have no fears about Freemasonry’s growth is the clear message. But then complications set in. A mason who is a rebel against the state cannot be “countenanc’d” in his rebellion, though he may be pitied as an unhappy man. But though his rebellion is to be disowned and Freemasonry must give the government of the time no ground for political

jealousy, the mason-rebel cannot be expelled from his lodge if he has committed no other crime, for his relationship to his lodge “remains indefeasible.” Part of the message seems straightforward. Brotherhood is a relationship that is irreversible. A sibling cannot become a non-sibling. But then there is the qualification. This applies to rebels, but not to those who commit other crimes. Presumably other crimes carried out in pursuance of rebellion is meant. Again the obscurity is likely to be deliberate, and the meaning when decoded, it may be suggested, is that a brother may be a rebel “in principle” in that he does not recognize the lawfulness of the government, but so long as he does not commit further “crimes” by acting on his belief he is still acceptable as a mason. Action would be treason. If this is the charge’s intention, it means a man who was Jacobite at heart but had no intention of actively furthering the Jacobite cause could be a Freemason. Such a hint at the extent of masonic political inclusiveness would need to be swathed in obscurity if it was not to cause alarm. The later charge which rules against discussion of religion and politics in lodges both reflects genuine masonic ideology and gives added reassurance that masons should not be seen as a threat, and is also the occasion for the first mention in the *Constitutions* of the Reformation. Not discussing such matters, it is claimed, has always been the rule for masons, but it was especially necessary to observe it in Britain since that “Dissent and Secession of these Nations from the Communion of Rome.”⁷¹ Reformation had led to denominational diversity and political splits had followed, and in one sense Freemasonry was trying to create a dimension of unity in society which would heal that breach.

The publication of the *Constitutions* aroused no discernible public interest. Few non-masons would have bothered reading it, fewer still with the attention needed to detect the radical points buried deep within it and concealed by careful wording. Within the masonic movement there are clear signs of unease, but these concentrated on the General Regulations which sought to define how Grand Lodge and ordinary lodges should be organized and the relations between them. There is evidence of objections being made to some Regulations, and Grand Lodge made several changes to them.⁷² A masonic reviewer took exception to parts of the History, but he accepted that Adam was the first mason, for this was something that was “universally agreed.” But he pointed out that Anderson expressed uncertainty as to whether Charles II and William III had been masons, noting that this raised doubts as to how well informed his more ancient history was. It was a fair point. But overall the reviewer, far from blaming Anderson for credulity, tended to rebuke him for not making even

larger historical claims for Masonry.⁷³ On the wider issues of Freemasonry's attitude to religion, the reviewer notes the obligation to obey moral law, and that even rebels against government cannot be expelled, but no comment is made on these controversial matters.⁷⁴ Another writer observed that there "are Schisms and Fractions, more than enough, in our most Excellent Religion" so Freemasons should not add to their number,⁷⁵ missing the point that Masonry made no claim to be a "fraction" claiming to be beyond such things. In all, the lack of attack on the radical attitude of Freemasonry to denominational religion expressed in the *Constitutions* is remarkable.⁷⁶ A 1737 satirical denunciation of Freemasonry said the *Constitutions* "contain nothing but what is perfectly innocent, and proves [masons] to be rather a whimsical than a dangerous and formidable Sect. But I must observe that this book seems design'd to amuse rather than inform the World" as it did not reveal masonic secrets.⁷⁷ If designed not to alarm, Anderson's work served its purpose admirably.

Anderson's *Constitutions* were to be of central importance to Freemasonry, supplying a foundation and agreed traditions and regulations as a basis for expansion based on Grand Lodge. There was a good deal in it that was new in detail, but Anderson's work of compilation did not involve any major innovation or attempt to take Freemasonry in fresh directions. He had been commissioned to build on medieval traditions and provide for the reincarnated Freemasonry of his own day, based on London club-lodges, what the *Old Constitutions* had provided for stonemasons centuries before. For these stonemasons, religious unity was taken for granted, and celebrated in an invocation to God at the beginning of many copies of their constitutions. The eighteenth-century world of denominations and factions was very different, and unity had to be based on a studied vagueness about religion. There has been much discussion of exactly how far the religious inclusiveness of Masonry as set out in the *Constitutions* was meant to stretch, but Anderson and the Grand Lodge that approved his work did not want to attempt to answer such questions. The assumption of monotheism and the condemning of Atheists and Libertines were their only concessions to definition. And, in practice, even the last two of these three restrictions were irrelevant. Lodges initiated whoever they wanted, including Libertines and men who came very close to Atheism. William Stukeley (FRS), who became a mason in 1721, was closely associated with a number of those whose beliefs brought about the denunciation in that year of hell-fire clubs, though he attended church himself (and was laughed at for it, for he was a physician, and physicians were expected to be godless). Later Stukeley became a Church of England minister

and critical of his old friends. Martin Folkes (FRS, Deputy Grand Master 1724–25) was according to Stukeley in religion “an errant infidel and loud scoffer” who believed “nothing of a future state, of the Scriptures, of revelation.” He had organized an infidel club in London in 1720 and “perverted” Montagu (Grand Master 1721–22), Richmond (Grand Master 1724–25) and other nobles. This “has done an infinite prejudice to Religion in general, made the nobility throw off the mask, and openly deride and discountenance even the appearance of religion.”⁷⁸ Stukeley had striven to persuade Montagu to take religion seriously, but the company of Folkes and other “irreligious” people prevailed.

Thus by its choice of its first noble Grand Master Freemasonry had agreed to be led by a man who outwardly conformed to the Church of England out of convenience but at heart was close to Atheism. In 1730 it elected its first (and only) Roman Catholic, and at heart Jacobite, Grand Master, the duke of Norfolk. His social status and willingness not to parade his beliefs publicly saved him from persecution. A satirical attack on Freemasonry noted that Grand Lodge’s ceremonial sword had been “presented to Them, as I am inform’d, by a great Roman Catholic Peer,” meaning Norfolk, and hinted that this showed that Masonry had military ambitions and was seditious. But there was no sign of public unease, though it may have been feared that there would be opposition within Masonry to Norfolk’s appointment. Nine out of eleven earlier Grand Masters were present at his installation in what looks like a deliberate display of how many senior masons supported the appointment, though it could also be regarded as a recognition that this was a particularly important appointment: masonic inclusiveness had taken a leap forward in looking beyond Protestantism for a leader.⁷⁹

Lack of lodge minutes means only occasional glimpses of Anderson’s masonic career after publication of the *Constitutions* are available. Which lodge he had been Master of when their approbation had been signed is unknown, but a 1723 list of lodge members reveals him as a member of the Horn Lodge, in which the élite (socially and intellectually) was concentrated, and two years later “Jacques Anderson Maitre [de] Arts” was also a member of the French Lodge (Solomon’s Head, Hemmings Row) which had Desaguliers as its Master.⁸⁰ In the 1730s (having been recognized as a former Grand Warden) he can occasionally be found attending Grand Lodge meetings. The compiling of the 1723 *Constitutions* seems to have whetted Anderson’s appetite for scholarly and literary work, though he still occasionally published sermons,⁸¹ and a treatise of 1733 demonstrated his continuing adherence to traditional Christian theology, being

devoted to supporting the doctrine of the Trinity against “Idolaters, Modern Jews and Anti-Trinitarians.”⁸² Increasingly, however, Anderson’s studies focused on genealogy, and in the mid 1720s he circulated a proposal for publishing by subscription a translation “from the High Dutch” of a work by Johann Hübner on the genealogy of emperors, kings and princes, with additions by Anderson himself.⁸³ The response must have been encouraging, because he immersed himself in his project. A taster for what was to come appeared as an appendix to a sermon in 1731, in the form of a genealogy of Christ, then the following year came *Royal Genealogies: or, the Genealogical Tables of Emperors, Kings, and Princes, from Adam to These Times* (London, 1732).⁸⁴ It is a huge work, and Anderson’s claim that it had taken him seven years of hard labor to compile it is easy to believe. Though based on Hübner’s work, Anderson had expanded the original vastly, rearranging it and attempting to make the work a history as well as a genealogy, by including brief summaries of events under each reign, much of the early material being quarried from Humphrey Prideaux’s *The Old and New Testaments Connected* (1716–18).⁸⁵ To help finance this massive work of reference, Anderson had obtained a glittering list of subscribers, including many nobles and masons—including Desaguliers. It was the most prestigious of Anderson’s publications, and it was probably it that brought him a gift of £200 from the queen in 1735.⁸⁶ He had also gained some academic recognition. In 1731 his university, Marischal College, Aberdeen, granted him the degree of doctor of divinity, he being (as a London newspaper reported) “a gentleman well known for his extensive learning.” In the years that followed he used his connections to persuade his old university to grant the same honor to several English Dissenting ministers, who were (like him) debarred from academic recognition by English universities. A further sign of his continuing links with the place of his birth is that he sent his son to Aberdeen Grammar School and then (1733) to Marischal.⁸⁷

The *Royal Genealogies* doubtless brought Anderson gratification, but it failed to make money, for sheets of the first edition, with a few extra pages, were re-issued as a second edition in 1736, and after his death the expense of the project was blamed for many of his difficulties. There were also problems in his career as a minister, and in 1734 he left the Swallow Street Chapel with part of his former congregation and became a preacher in Lisle Street, Leicester Square. In retrospect that his last published sermon was given to debtors from the Fleet Prison seems ominous, his sympathy for the debtors’ problems perhaps a reflection of his own worries.⁸⁸

By this time the first edition of the *Constitutions* had been sold out, and in 1735 William Smith's *Pocket Companion for Free-Masons* was published in Dublin as a substitute, using much material from Anderson's work. His response was to present a paper to Grand Lodge complaining that Smith "had without his privity or Consent pyrated a considerable part of the Constitutions," to Anderson's prejudice as it was his "sole property." A new edition of the *Constitutions*, was therefore needed, and he submitted his proposed text for one, with additions and alterations. Obviously Anderson must have been working on his updated edition long before Smith's book had been published, and though he held the copyright he wanted Grand Lodge approval for his project. Grand Lodge agreed to the new edition, and again a committee was appointed to consider his text.⁸⁹ That most of its members were also members of Anderson's own lodge, the Horn, was hardly surprising as it had a unique concentration of senior Freemasons, and doubtless Anderson had discussed his project informally with his brothers before he approached Grand Lodge. He had also attended Grand Lodge on a scattering of occasions in the 1730s,⁹⁰ indicating that he had remained near the center of masonic affairs even while devoting his scholarly attentions mainly to genealogy.

The revising committee having made some corrections, in January 1738 the Grand Lodge gave the text its approval and ordered that it be printed. The long delay between submission and approval may partly be explained by Grand Lodge's determination that the work be as full as possible. In March 1735 it had given orders that it include a list of all Grand Masters from the beginning of time.⁹¹ Far from it being the case that Anderson tricked gullible Freemasons with historical fantasies, in the eyes of his brethren he was too restrained in his scholarly inventions about the glories of the Craft's past. But Anderson got his reward for his extra work: the new edition was ordered to be "the only Book for the Use of the Lodges,"⁹² expanding its potential market.

The 1723 *Constitutions* had run to just 91 pages. The 1738 edition reached 231—and that in much smaller print. The History had grown vastly, Anderson modestly excusing his not citing his sources as "most of the Facts are generally well known" from other histories.⁹³ He was not claiming to be an original historian, but to be extracting the masonic theme from general history. Now, invention to boost the status of Masonry becomes blatant, and a long list of those now designated Grand Masters of England stretches far back into the Middle Ages to satisfy the orders of Grand Lodge. More convincingly, the vast expansion of Grand Lodge Freemasonry since 1723 is demonstrated by long

lists of English lodges and of deputations granted to lodges and provincial Grand Masters around the world—from Spain to Russia, from South America to New Jersey, from West Africa to the Leeward Islands—though of course many of these grandiose gestures meant little in practice. But there was some recognition of the limits of empire. Scotland, Ireland, France, and Italy were recognized as “affecting Independency,” by having their own Grand Masters.⁹⁴

To the later historian, however, by far the most valuable of the historical material in the 1738 *Constitutions* is the section which describes the origins of Grand Lodge. From 1717 to 1723 (when Grand Lodge began to keep minutes) Anderson is often the only source for events, and where his account can be checked it becomes clear that he is not to be trusted implicitly. He made errors, through carelessness or bad memory, and he was at times guilty of distortion, conscious, or not, tidying up the past to smooth over problematic events (as has been noted earlier over the St. Martin’s foundation stone and Wharton). That, after all, was what an official historian was for.

Turning to the General Regulations, those of 1723 are much revised in 1738, in the light of experience as Freemasonry had grown. But the printing of the old and new regulations side by side, which was doubtless intended to be of practical use to masons by making clear what changes had been made, proved disastrous in the long-term to Anderson’s reputation, for the “old” regulations as printed in 1738 vary in wording from those published in 1723. How can Anderson be trusted if he cannot even be relied on to copy accurately from his own work?⁹⁵ Anderson would probably have protested that the discrepancies are merely verbal,⁹⁶ but nonetheless the impression given is of slipshod work.

Anderson was now sick and in financial trouble, and this may have undermined the standard of his work, but one quite remarkable item in the 1738 *Constitutions* indicates eccentricity—and sneaks what could be seen as a factional political statement into an officially approved masonic publication. In 1736 Captain John Porteous of the Edinburgh Town Guard had been lynched by an Edinburgh mob, furious that he had been given a royal pardon after being condemned to death for ordering his men to fire into a crowd (causing several deaths) during a riot. The lynching caused a huge political row, as it was seen as a direct insult to the crown. An attack on Freemasonry published in the *Craftsman* in London in 1737 asserted that the lynching of Porteous “was concerted and executed with so much Unanimity and Secrecy, that none but a Mob of Free-Masons could be guilty of it,” no-one ever being charged with involvement in the crime. The charge was probably not meant seriously, but Anderson

included in one of the new songs he appended to the 1738 *Constitutions* an expression of contempt for the author of the attack on Masonry, adding a note that those who lynched Porteous were called masons “because they kept their own Secrets.”⁹⁷ Anderson may merely have meant that Porteous’s killers were referred to as masons metaphorically, as they were good at keeping secrets. But in agreeing that in a sense they *were* masons is there a hint of more? To many Scots, those who lynched Porteous were men who had administered justice when a corrupt, English-dominated government had failed to do so. The courts of Scotland had sentenced him to death but government had intervened to save him. Ordinary people had therefore intervened to execute justice. Is this, as well as secrecy, “Masonic,” in that it was an enforcement of moral law? It would perhaps be foolish to take a note to a song too seriously, but Anderson was a Scot and he could not fail to have been aware of the political side of the Porteous affair, with opposition politicians blaming the government for the debacle. Moreover the previous year Frederick, prince of Wales, who had become associated with opposition to the king’s ministers, had been initiated as a mason. Prince and Porteous may add up to a temporary lapse in masonic political impartiality. On the other hand, the increasingly unpopular Prime Minister, Sir Robert Walpole, had been a mason for years, so perhaps Frederick’s accession should be seen as restoring political balance.⁹⁸ But in later editions of the *Constitutions* the Porteous reference was dropped.

In the second as in the first edition of the *Constitutions* it is what is said about religion that has proved of most lasting interest. The references to Christ in the History, and the wording of the first charge, of the new edition are notably different from their predecessors, indicating that in spite of lack of public controversy some within Freemasonry had found the 1723 edition too radical. In the History Christ is now rescued from parenthetical obscurity. The much greater length of the new History allowed more detail, but more than this is suggested by the space now given to his birth. In him the Word was made flesh. He was the Lord Jesus Christ Immanuel, Great Architect or Grand Master of the Christian Church. He was crucified, he rose from the dead, for the justification “of all that believe in him.”⁹⁹ Yet even now that Christ’s significance is stressed, there seems to be compromise. Immanuel has been substituted for Messiah, but this makes little difference, for the name Immanuel was applied to Jesus in his role as Messiah. The statement that he was God or Son of God is still not made. Changes in the first charge point in the same direction, towards a degree of compromise. The assertion that in ancient times masons were charged “to be of the religion” of the

country they were in had, it would appear, been seen to carry the unacceptable implication that in the past Christian masons had, in non-Christian countries, been bound to conform to other religions. The Charge is therefore reworded to state that ancient Christian masons were charged to “comply with the Christian usages” of countries in which they travelled or worked. But as Masonry was now found in all countries “even of divers Religions” they were now only obliged to the religion on which all men agree. Thus “Christianity” now gains a specific mention in the Charge—but is only awarded a special place in Masonry in the distant past. A more significant change concerns the moral law. In 1723 there had been no attempt to define it, and while this aided inclusiveness it left unanswered the awkward question of where it could be found, but trying to define it in Christian terms was still regarded as unacceptably exclusive. By 1738 Anderson had found a useful new formula. A mason was obliged to obey moral law “as a true Noachida.” In the preceding History the “Noachidae” had also been mentioned, with a note that that was “the first name of Masons, according to some old traditions” (which had no doubt just been invented).¹⁰⁰

The Noachian or Noahide Laws were those regarded as having been given by God to Adam and Noah. As all men were descended from them, they were equally binding on all mankind (unlike the later Ten Commandments given to Moses, which God gave specifically to the Jews). Originally there were seven laws, but generations of scholars, with typical eagerness to complicate matters, had derived new ones from them until a total of thirty had been reached.¹⁰¹ Here, therefore, was a basis for moral law on which Christians, Jews, and hopefully others could agree. Even Deists and Atheists could be influenced by an appeal to the Noachian Laws, for whatever their religious standpoint they generally accepted the Old Testament’s/Talmud’s version of the early history of mankind. For practical purposes, however, defining masons as Noachida, while pleasingly erudite to the scholar like Anderson, did nothing to help ordinary masons understand what the moral law was. Very few would ever have heard of the Noachian Laws. It is tempting to think that the reference to them was put in as a sop to those who wanted some definition of moral law, but done in a deliberately obscure way. This impression is intensified when the revised charge goes on to state that the good men and true of all religions who come together as masons agreed on “the 3 great Articles of Noah.”¹⁰² These had previously been mentioned in the History, for after Anderson had mentioned the Zoroastrians he had indicated his wish to avoid religious controversy by saying, “They are here mention’d, not for their Religious Rites that are not the subject of this Book: for

we leave every Brother to Liberty of Conscience; but strictly charge him to maintain the Cement of the Lodge, and the 3 Articles of Noah.”¹⁰³ It sounds imposing, and doubtless Anderson knew which three Noachian Laws he was referring to. So, too, did other masons at the time. But modern Freemasons do not know for certain.¹⁰⁴ Sometimes too much secrecy is counter-productive.

A final difference between the two editions of the *Constitutions* is the status of Anderson himself. In the first edition he had been simply “the author,” identification of whom he squeezed into a list of officers of lodges. By 1738 however he was no longer the obscure antiquarian Dissenter of 1723. He was a recognized authority on matters masonic, a genealogist of some note and a doctor of divinity. These were petty claims to fame perhaps, but he was not the nonentity he had been, and could claim full credit for his work on the title page. He himself wrote the dedication, at the order of the officers of Grand Lodge, to the prince of Wales. And he was allowed room to address his readers directly “From my Study in Exeter-Court” in the Strand. Those who find his prose style too prolix for their tastes may smile at his proud boast that he has left out unnecessary material as “It is good to know what not to say!”—though this, as well as a pat on the back for himself, may be taken as a statement that he has been careful to observe masonic secrecy where appropriate.¹⁰⁵

Anderson’s note to readers in the new *Constitutions* is dated November 4, 1738, but by that time he had swung back to genealogical research. In April 1738 he had written to Lord Perceval (son of the Earl of Egmont) about research he was doing on his family,¹⁰⁶ and he was still busy in this field when he wrote his last known letter, from Exeter Court, to Sir Philip Parker à Morley Long, on May 15, 1739. It is a sad letter, ingratiatingly signed “your genealogist.” The bearer was Anderson’s daughter, who was delivering to Long an unfinished genealogical table for his “great book.” Then comes embarrassment. Anderson explained that he had been reduced to great weakness of body by a “complex of ailments” that now centered in a “dropsical humour.” He was hoping to go to the country for a few days to recover his health but long illness had left him out of pocket “and forceth me, against inclination, to request the favour [of] some more money.” He pleaded his merit in collating and collecting “which is the hardest work for a man’s brains.” He was not in the habit of asking for money before he had finished work, and begged ten thousand pardons from Long in “my present pinch.” A further note indicates the urgency of his need: “The bearer will bring safely what you send.” Could his daughter bring him the money immediately, in other words.¹⁰⁷

Anderson probably never got his days in the country, for he died at Exeter Court two weeks later, on May 28. The only assessment of his character to survive that was written in his own lifetime appears in an anonymous history of London Dissenting churches, evidently by a dissenter minister. Anderson is described as “a gentleman of learning, and of ready parts, but is of a lively brisk temper and has not the guard upon his conduct that serious Christians could wish, though it is hoped he is a good man, and [he] has been useful in his ministry to many persons” He lived in a part of London where dissenters were little in fashion, “yet has a pretty numerous congregation.”¹⁰⁸ Overall approval is thus indicated—a talented and learned man. But a bit too hot tempered, and sometimes in behavior not all that could be wished for—perhaps a reference to his readiness to mix with those of other beliefs.

The *Gentleman's Magazine* gave a brief note of the death of Anderson, “An eminent Dissenting Minister,” mentioning his authorship of the *Constitutions* and *Royal Genealogies*,¹⁰⁹ and a newspaper noted that he had been a person of great learning and abilities “and reckoned a very facetious [witty, jocular] Companion.”¹¹⁰ *The Scots Magazine* gave a much fuller obituary. Anderson had been “a Gentleman of uncommon abilities, and most facetious conversation: But, notwithstanding his great talents, and the useful application he made of them, being, by the prodigious expence attending the above mentioned work [the *Genealogies*], reduced to slender circumstances, he has, for some years, been exposed to misfortunes, above which the encouragement due to his merit would have easily raised him.—But the remembrance of his qualifications, and the many hardships under which he was *publicly known* to labour, will serve to shew succeeding generations . . . a Gentleman who, by more than *twenty years study*, gave the world a book of inconceivable labour, and universal use, was suffered to fall a victim to his attempts to *serve mankind*.” The writer, who surely had known Anderson personally, added bitterly that while the talented Anderson suffered, rich English patrons bestowed fortunes on Italian singers.¹¹¹ Another verdict, delivered much later, was that Anderson had been “a learned but imprudent man.”¹¹²

A newspaper account of Anderson's funeral on June 1 is dramatic, and perhaps exaggerated, but indicates that both the minister and the Freemason were recognized. He was buried in Bunhill Fields (the main burial ground for Dissenters in London) “in a very remarkable deep grave.” His coffin was carried to his grave by five fellow Dissenting ministers and his old friend John Desaguliers—who was of course a Church of England minister. About a dozen Free-

masons stood round the grave. Dr Earle (Jabez Earle, a well known London Dissenting minister with a Scottish doctorate) then spoke of the uncertainty of life, but “without [saying] one Word of the deceased.” Then in a “solemn dismal posture” the Freemasons lifted up their hands and struck their aprons three times in Anderson’s honor.¹¹³

Two posthumous works kept his memory alive for a few years. The first, appropriately enough, was *News from Elysium: or, Dialogues from the Dead* (1739). This featured pairs of great European sovereigns who had been rivals in life moralizing about the secret politics of their reigns, and discussing news reaching them from the world of the living.¹¹⁴ This was a new departure for Anderson, escaping from the previous restriction of his writings to religion, Masonry, and genealogy, perhaps spurred on by the hope that it would restore his fortunes. Had he lived, he would have been disappointed, for the dialogues have very little to offer, as either entertainment or instruction.

The appearance three years later of *A Genealogical History of the House of Yvery* brings Anderson’s voice from the grave, for the dedication to the earl of Egmont in the first volume is his work. It explains how, in compiling the Royal genealogies he had “made almost immense Collections” of material and then spent some time seeking to “methodise and arrange this indigested Mass.” Becoming interested in the house of Yvery (Egmont’s family) he had compiled this work. Anderson urged his own diligence: he had not relied on earlier pedigrees but worked from sources. With respect to integrity and truth, he asserted, he was not inferior to any writer—though he could not guarantee that there were absolutely no errors.¹¹⁵

That note of combined pride in his labors but caution about the possible limitations of the work seems a suitable point at which to leave Anderson. He was not a man of original ideas, his talents as a writer were limited, but though his works on Freemasonry were a mixture of compilation and fantasy, invention and manipulation, clarity and ambiguity—and indeed error—they were hugely formative for Grand Lodge Freemasonry in his own time and succeeding generations. What he gave Freemasons was acceptable to them. More recent masonic historians want different things, and have felt let down because Anderson failed to satisfy late-nineteenth- and twentieth-century standards of what history should be—and what they thought Freemasonry to be. Freemasonry, as an influential, publicly recognized movement, was just inventing itself, and in the process of invention it was necessary at times to diverge from tradition and innovate—but, as was commonplace, not admit change was being made. There

was a necessity for a degree of ingenuity and even fable that Anderson and his colleagues understood. It was an age in which credibility depended largely on claims to antiquity, and that Anderson provided copiously. History was the legend based on fact which gave masons a past on which to base their harmony and unity and their claims to glory. Masonry also claimed “scientific” validity, through its self-identification with geometry, and it assumed divine validation—though only in the widest terms to avoid denominationalism. To the wider world, Anderson was the spokesman of the early Grand Lodge, expounding the non-secret parts of the Craft. At the installation of Norfolk as Grand Master in 1730, the Master of the most senior lodge present had carried the *Constitutions* on a velvet cushion in front of Grand Master Lord Kingston.¹¹⁶ It was the clearest possible indication of the status Anderson’s work, for all its faults, had achieved.

Anderson died in genteel poverty. A man who had chosen to be a Non-Conformist minister and then specialized in genealogy was hardly making gaining worldly riches a priority in life. Yet allegations that he was only interested in Freemasonry to make money from writing about it and gaining subscriptions for other publications have been made,¹¹⁷ based on no discernible evidence—except that he was poor. Undoubtedly, Anderson would have liked to have made money from his books, but that is hardly a reason to denounce him as a cynical money-grubber. And of course, ironically, Anderson’s whole career shows him as a man who proved highly unsuccessful in the life-skills of finding patronage and making money. The research for the *Royal Genealogies* reduced him to poverty, and the second edition of the *Constitutions* was so far from being a best seller that unsold stock was re-issued with a new title-page in 1746. His work on the *Constitutions* and on genealogy suggest he pursued his own genuine intellectual interests at the expense of his pocket, though he hoped for better things. There is no plausible reason for casting doubt on the sincerity of this little red-headed Scots’ dedication to Freemasonry and the ideological conviction that some way ahead for society lay in inclusiveness.¹¹⁸

EDITOR’S NOTE: This article is reprinted from Freemasonry on Both Sides of the Atlantic, eds. R. W. Weisberger, W. McLeod, and S. B. Morris (Boulder: East European Monographs, 2002), © 2002 by R. William Weisberger. Used with permission.

NOTES

1. L. Edwards, "Anderson's Book of Constitutions of 1738," *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum. Being the Transactions of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge No. 2076, London* [AQC], vol. XLVI (1933), p. 363.

2. L. Vibert, "Anderson's Constitutions of 1723," AQC, vol. XXXVI (1923), p. 41; Edwards, "Anderson's Book," AQC, vol. XLVI (1933), pp. 408–9.

3. A. L. Miller, "The Connection of Dr. James Anderson of the 'Constitutions' with Aberdeen and Aberdeen University," AQC, vol. XXXVI (1923), p. 91. See also A. L. Miller, *Notes on the Early History and Records of the Lodge, Aberdeen* (Aberdeen: 1919); D. Stevenson, *The First Freemasons: Scotland's Early Lodges and Their Members* (Aberdeen: 1988), p. 126.

4. R. F. Gould, "Masonic celebrities, No. 5—The Rev. William Stukeley, M.D.," AQC, vol. VI (1893), p. 135.

5. British Library, Add MS 47013A, f.63r. For Anderson's father's mark see Miller, "Connection," AQC, vol. XXXVI (1923), p. 91 and Miller, *Notes*, opposite p.28.

6. A. L. Miller, "Connection," AQC, vol. XXXVI (1923), pp. 96–7. The accused minister was subsequently deposed for "false accusation, drunkenness, and obscene conversation, of which he had been guilty when in the North," *Fast Ecclesiae Scoticae*, 10 vols. (Edinburgh: 1915–81), vol. II, p. 154.

7. D. Stevenson, *The First Freemasons*, pp. 140, 145.

8. Miller, "Connection," AQC, vol. XXXVI (1923), pp. 94–6. The information on Anderson's move to London is drawn from *No king-sellers: or, a brief detection of the vanity and villany in a sermon entitul'd, No king-killers. Preached by the Scotch-Presbyterian of Swallow-Street, Picadilly* (London: 1715), p. 4. This pamphlet is furiously abusive about Anderson, but once stripped of invective the stray biographical details are probably reliable.

9. See the preface to Anderson's 1715 sermon, cited in W. J. C. Crawley, "The Rev. Dr Anderson's Non-Masonic Writings, 1712–1739," AQC, vol. XVIII (1905), p. 30. But the Church of Scotland has included Anderson in its fasti, *Fasti*, vol. VII, pp. 499–500, and though outside its jurisdiction Anderson regarded himself as an adherent of that church. As opponents pointed out, his calling his ministry Presbyterian was anomalous as there was no presbytery supervising him.

10. I. Gilmour, *Riot, Risings and Revolution. Government and Violence in Eighteenth-Century England* (London: 1992), pp. 48–52.

11. J. Anderson, *A sermon preach'd in Swallow-street, St James's, on Wednesday, Jan. 16. 1711/12. being the national fast-day* (London: 1712), pp. 5, 8, 9, 11.

12. J. Anderson, *No king killers. A sermon preached in Swallow-Street, St James, on*

January 30. 1714, 2 edns. (London: 1715).

13. J. Anderson, *Contend earnestly for the faith. A sermon preach'd to a religious society in Goodman's Fields. On Monday, 1 August 1720* (London: 1720).

14. D.F. Foxon, *English Verses 1701–1750. A Catalogue of Separately Printed Poems*, 2 vols., (Cambridge: 1975), vol. 1, p. 22, nos. A221—A 224. Foxon accepted that the James Anderson of these verses was the Swallow Street church Anderson, but cites no evidence.

15. *Anti-Priapeia: or, an answer to Priapeia Presbyterianiana, or the Presbyterian Peezle. In a letter from the General Assembly of Scotland, to their missionary at London, intercepted and paraphrased by Ille ego qui quondam* [London: 1720?]. The piece has been described as—“A satire on the Presbyterians, occasioned by the fact that James Anderson ... was known to have caught the Pox,” Foxon, *English Verses*, vol. 1, pp. 265–6, but no evidence to support the allegation that Anderson really had the pox is cited.

16. National Library of Scotland, 1.954(2), quoted Crawley, “Non-masonic writings,” *AQC*, vol. XVIII (1905), p. 29.

17. *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. LIII, Jan. 1783, pp. 41–2.

18. The only “evidence” produced to advance the idea that he was imprisoned is that many years later he gave a sermon to debtor-prisoners showing sympathy for their plight, A. Robbins, “Dr Anderson of the ‘Constitutions,’” *AQC*, vol. XXIII (1910), pp. 18–19. In other words, there is no evidence.

19. *Constitutions* (1738), p. 109. The two editions of the *Constitution*, 1723 and 1738, are cited from the facsimile reprints of 1923 (introduction by L. Vibert) and 1890 (introduction by W. J. Hugan). These were republished as a single volume in 1976 (introduction by E. Ward).

20. *Constitutions* (1738), p. 110.

21. *Constitutions* (1723), p. 58–72.

22. There is no evidence to support the confident statement that Anderson appeared before Grand Lodge and asked “permission” to write and publish a history of Freemasonry, J. R. Clarke, “The Change from Christianity to Deism in Freemasonry,” *AQC*, vol. LXXVIII (1965), p. 52.

23. C. H. C. Baker and M. I. Baker, *The life and Circumstances of James Brydges, First Duke of Chandos* (Oxford: 1949), p. 194.

24. *The Minutes of the Lodge of Edinburgh, Mary's Chapel, No. 1, 1598–1738*, ed. H. Carr, and J. R. Dashwood (London: Quatuor Coronatorum Antigrapha, Masonic Reprints of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge, vol. XIII, 1962), pp. 269–70.

25. For early Scottish Freemasonry see D. Stevenson, *The Origins of Freemasonry. Scotland's Century, 1590–1710* (Cambridge: 1988).

26. *No king-sellers*, pp. 10, 12.
27. *Constitutions* (1738), pp. 113–14.
28. A. F. Robbins, “The Earliest Years of English Organised Freemasonry,” *AQC*, vol. xxii (1909), p. 67. *Constitutions* (1723), 44–5 describes the laying of the first stone, March 19.
29. *Constitutions* (1738), pp. 120–1.
30. Robbins, “Earliest Years,” *AQC*, vol. xxii (1909), pp. 70–1.
31. Robbins, “Earliest Years,” *AQC*, vol. xxii (1909), p. 68. The name “hell fire” club later came to be regarded as referring to sexual activities, but it originally referred to groups regarded as blasphemous.
32. *Complete Peerage*, xii, part ii, p. 611.
33. *Constitutions* (1738), pp. 114–5.
34. Robbins, “Earliest Years,” *AQC*, vol. xxii (1909), pp. 71–72.
35. Edwards, “Anderson’s Book,” *AQC*, vol. xlvi (1933), p. 362.
36. R. Samber, *Ebrietatis ecomium* (1723), quoted in Robbins, “Earliest Years,” *AQC*, vol. xxii (1909), pp. 72–73.
37. B. Williams, *The Whig Supremacy, 1714–60* (Oxford: 1939), p. 175.
38. *Dictionary of National Biography*.
39. Robbins, “Earliest Years,” *AQC*, vol. xxii (1909), p. 77.
40. Robbins, “Earliest Years,” *AQC*, vol. xxii (1909), pp. 75–76.
41. *Constitutions* (1738), p. 115.
42. Robbins, “Earliest Years,” *AQC*, vol. xxii (1909), p. 7; R. F. Gould, “Masonic Celebrities. No. 6. The Duke of Wharton,” *AQC*, vol. viii (1895), pp. 121–2; *Minutes of the Grand Lodge of Freemasons of England, 1723–39*, ed. W. J. Songhurst, *Quatuor Coronati Anti-grapha*, Masonic Reprints of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge, vol. x (1913), pp. 50–53.
43. *Constitutions* (1738), p. 116.
44. *Constitutions* (1738), p. 115.
45. A. F. Robbins, “Earliest Years,” *AQC*, vol. xxii (1909), p. 75.
46. *Minutes of the Grand Lodge*, p. 46.
47. *Constitutions* (1738), pp. 114–5.
48. The approbation had been signed in advance, in Nov. or Dec. 1722, Vibert, “Anderson’s Constitutions of 1723,” *AQC*, vol. xxxvi (1923), p. 40—a time when, by Anderson’s later account, Wharton had not yet been officially accepted as Grand Master.

49. It has been pointed out in the Aberdeen Mark Book of “1670” Anderson’s father had similarly referred to himself, in a list of lodge members, as “Wreater of this book,” Miller, *Notes*, 20; Vibert, “Anderson’s Constitutions of 1723,” *AQC*, vol. xxxvi (1923), p. 51.

50. *Constitutions* (1723), pp. 73–74

51. *Constitutions* (1723), p. 73.

52. Vibert, “Introduction” to *Constitutions* (1723), p. viii.

53. *Constitutions* (1723), p. 1.

54. *Constitutions* (1723), pp. 19–21.

55. *Constitutions* (1723), pp. 25–5.

56. *Constitutions* (1723), pp. 26.

57. *Constitutions* (1723), pp. 9–10.

58. *Early Masonic Pamphlets*, ed. D. Knoop, G. P. Jones, and D. Hamer (Manchester: 1945), p. 122; *Constitutions* (1723), pp. 11–12n.

59. *Constitutions* (1723), p. 27n.

60. M. C. Jacob, *The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans* (London: 1981), p. 130.

61. *Constitutions* (1738), pp. 115.

62. *Constitutions* (1723), pp. 24–25.

63. *The Family Memoirs of the Rev. William Stukeley, M.D., and the Antiquarian and Other Correspondence of William Stukeley*, [ed. W.C. Lucis], 3 vols. (Surtees Society: 1882–7), vol. 1, p. 262.

64. *Constitutions* (1723), p. 56.

65. *Constitutions* (1723), p. 50.

66. H. Peters, “Sir Isaac Newton and the ‘Oldest Catholic Religion,’” *AQC*, vol. c (1987), pp. 193–94.

67. Eugenius Philalethes [R. Samber], *The Long Livers* (London: 1922), dedication, quoted in *Early Masonic Pamphlets*, p. 50 and J. R. Clarke, “The change from Christianity to Deism in Freemasonry,” *AQC*, vol. LXXVIII (1965), p. 49.

68. *The happy death. A sermon occasion’d by the death of the ... Reverend William Lorimer, A.M. minister of the Gospel, who died on the 27th of October, 1723. His funeral sermon having been accidentally omitted, this was preach’d, at the desire of some friends, to the Scots Church in Swallow-street, St. James’s, Westminster, on Lord’s Day, the 27th of October, 1723 ... and concluding in a brief account of Mr Lorimer’s life* (London: 1724.); J. T. Thorp,

“The Rev. James Anderson and the Earls of Buchan,” *AQC*, vol. xviii (1905), pp. 9–12.

69. E. Ward, “Anderson’s Freemasonry not Deistic,” *AQC*, vol. lxxx (1967), pp. 42, 271; J. M. Shaftesley, “Jews in English Freemasonry in the 18th and 19th Centuries,” *AQC*, vol. xcii (1979), p. 26.

70. Debate about whether Anderson’s Freemasonry was Deistic, and whether Freemasonry changed from Christian to Deist, has often been learned but equally often seems to miss the essential point. The move was not towards *being* Deist, but to being inclusive. See D. Knoop and G. P. Jones, “Freemasonry and the Idea of Natural Religion,” *AQC*, vol. lvi (1943), pp. 38–57; D. Knoop and G. P. Jones, *The Genesis of Freemasonry* (London: 1947), p. 187; J. R. Clarke, “The Change from Christianity to Deism,” *AQC*, vol. lxxviii (1965), pp. 49–73, and E. Ward, “Anderson’s Freemasonry Not Deistic,” *AQC*, vol. lxxx (1967), pp. 36–57.

71. *Constitutions* (1723), pp. 50, 54.

72. Knoop and Jones, *Genesis*, p. 197; Edwards, “Anderson’s Book,” *AQC*, vol. xlvii (1933), pp. 402–3; Vibert, “Anderson’s Constitutions of 1723,” *AQC*, vol. xxxii (1909), p. 61. 1721–22 of one lodge record a determination to keep a close eye on the revising of the *Constitution* to ensure that “no Variation be made in the Ancient Establishment. But the minutes in the form that they survive were written many years later, and confusion in their dating suggest that they were originally compiled after the event to justify resistance to change,” W. H. Rylands, *Records of the Lodge of Antiquity*, No 2, 2 vols. (London: 1726–8), vol. 1, pp. 7, 16.

73. *The secret history of the free-masons. Being an accidental discovery, of the ceremonies made use of in the several lodges . . . with some observations, reflections and critical remarks on the new constitution book of the free-masons, written by James Anderson, A.M. . . .* (London: [1724?]; 2nd edn 1725), reprinted in *Early Masonic Pamphlets*, pp. 120–5.

74. Knoop and Jones, *Genesis*, pp. 184–85.

75. *Early Masonic Pamphlets*, p. 139.

76. Knoop and Jones, *Genesis*, pp. 184–85.

77. W. J. C. Crawley, “Contemporary Comments on the Freemasonry of the Eighteenth Century,” *AQC*, vol. xviii (1905), p. 204.

78. *The Family Memoirs of the Rev. William Stukeley*, vol. 1, pp. 100, 114.

79. Crawley, “Contemporary Comments,” *AQC*, vol. xviii (1905), p. 204; *Grand Lodge, 1717–1967*, ed. A. S. Frere, (Oxford: 1967), p. 267. Norfolk’s sword is still used in the English Grand Lodge’s ceremonial today.

80. *Minutes of the Grand Lodge*, vol. xxiii (1910), p. 42.

81. J. Anderson, *The word made flesh, or, the logos incarnate. A sermon preached on*

Christmas Day, 1730. To the Scots Church ... Westminster ... to which is annexed, the genealogy and family of Jesus of Nazareth (London: 1731); *The Lord looseth the prisoners: a sermon preach'd in Prujean Court Old Bailey* (London: 1737).

82. *Unity in trinity, and trinity in unity* (London: 1733); Crawley, "Anderson's Non-Masonic Writings," *AQC*, vol. xviii (1905), pp. 33-34.

83. *Proposals for printing by subscription the translation of the genealogical tables of all the emperors, kings, and sovereign princes, collected by J. Huebner, with additions by James Anderson* (London: c. 1725), quoted in Crawley, "Non-Masonic Writings," *AQC*, vol. xviii (1905), pp. 31-32.

84. It is typical of the way in which sneering at Anderson becomes almost routine among masonic historians that whereas Hübner is praised for his "miracles of intelligent industry," Anderson's translation is simply said to follow the original with "more or less fidelity," Crawley, "Non-Masonic writings," *AQC*, vol. xviii (1905), pp. 32-33.

85. Vibert, "Anderson's Constitutions of 1723," *AQC*, vol. xxxvi (1923), p. 37.

86. *AQC*, vol. xxiii (1910), p. 17.; Edwards, "Anderson's Constitutions," *AQC*, vol. xlvI (1933), p. 359.

87. Miller, "Connection," *AQC*, vol. xxxvi (1923), pp. 98-101.

88. J. Anderson, *The Lord looseth the prisoners: a sermon preach'd in Prujean Court Old Bailey, London, on Sunday the 3d of July 1737. To the prisoners for debt that reside in the rules of the Fleet-Prison* (London: 1737). The debtors were assembled in Prujean Court (a place, not a court of law), and the following year Anderson addressed a letter "from my study in Prujean Court Old Bailey," British Library, Mss Add 47013A. f.62r.

89. Edwards, "Anderson's Constitutions," *AQC*, vol. xlvI (1933), p. 407; R. F. Gould, *History of Freemasonry*, ed. H. Poole, 4 vols. (London: 1951), vol. II, pp. 196-97.

90. Edwards, "Anderson's Constitutions," *AQC*, vol. xlvI (1933), p. 363.

91. Edwards, "Anderson's Constitutions," *AQC*, vol. xlvI (1933), pp. 407, 415-16.

92. Hughan, "Introduction" to *Constitutions* (1738), p. v; *Constitutions* (1738), pp. xi, 199.

93. *Constitutions* (1738), p. i. For a very full account of the new edition see Edwards, "Anderson's Constitutions," *AQC*, vol. xlvI (1933), pp. 357-430.

94. *Constitutions* (1738), pp. 184-98.

95. Knoop and Jones, *Genesis*, p. 166. For a list of the discrepancies see Edwards, "Anderson's Constitutions," *AQC*, vol. xlvI (1933), pp. 397-404, 417-18.

96. Hughan, "Introduction" to *Constitutions* (1738), p. v; *Constitutions* (1738), pp. 152-178.

97. Crawley, "Contemporary Comments," *AQC*, vol. xviii (1905), pp. 205–6; *Constitutions* (1738), p. 210.
98. A. Robbins, "Frederick, Prince of Wales, as a Freemason," *AQC*, vol. xxix (1916), pp. 326–29 and *AQC*, vol. xxxi (1918), pp. 61–2; *Constitutions* (1738), pp. 137, 207; A. Newman, "Politics and Freemasonry in the Eighteenth Century," *AQC*, vol. civ (1991), p. 36.
99. *Constitutions* (1738), pp. 41–2.
100. *Constitutions* (1738), p. 4.
101. *Constitutions* (1738), pp. 143–4: see also p. 227; E. Ward, "Anderson's Freemasonry Not Deistic," *AQC*, vol. 80 (1967), pp. 272–3.
102. *Constitutions* (1738), p. 144.
103. *Constitutions* (1738), p. 23; Edwards, "Anderson's Constitutions," *AQC*, vol. xlvi (1933), p. 361.
104. Edwards, "Anderson's Constitutions," *AQC*, vol. xlvi (1933), p. 405.
105. *Constitutions* (1738), p. x.
106. British Library, Mss Add 47013A. f.62–3.
107. British Library, Mss Add 47000, f.103.
108. Quoted in W. Wilson, *The History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches*, 4 vols. (London: 1808–14), pp. iv, 34.
109. *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. ix (1739), p. 327
110. R. T. Beck, "Anthony Sayer, Gentleman: The Truth at Last," *AQC*, vol. lxxxviii (1975), p. 68.
111. *Scots Magazine*, vol. i (1739), p. 236.
112. *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. liii, Jan. 1783, pp. 41–2, 321.
113. Beck, "Anthony Sayer," *AQC*, vol. lxxxviii (1975), p. 68.
114. Crawley, "Non-Masonic Writings," *AQC*, vol. xviii (1905), pp. 34–5.
115. J. Anderson, *A genealogical history of the house of Yvery, in its different branches of Yvery, Luvel, Perceval and Gournay*, 2 vols., (London: 1742).
116. *Minutes of the Grand Lodge*, pp. 117–18.
117. See Edwards, "Anderson's Book," *AQC*, vol. xlvi (1933), p. 363. The allegation was evidently first made by the German masonic historian W. Begemann.
118. The irony that this "inclusive" world was to be created through an "exclusive" organization is not lost on me.