MR. ANTHONY SAYER: GENTLEMAN. FIRST GRAND MASTER OF MASONS, 1717

BY BRO. J. WALTER HOBBS, I'M.

FOKEWOKD.

HE most elusive Brother among Masons is no doubt the first Grand Master whose election in 1717 was the outcome of the desire among the Masons of London and Westminster of that time to have a central controlling Body, for some reason other than that alleged by the Master of Imagination, Dr. James Anderson, twenty-one years later.

It was in the early part of the year 1916 in a conversation with the late Bro. Levander (at that time the W.M. of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge) and Bro. Songhurst, its Secretary, upon the subject

of a Pedigree enquiry upon which I was then engaged, that they suggested

I should at the same time "keep my eye open" for any traces of  $\operatorname{Bro}$ . Anthony

Sayer. I agreed to do this, and  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{Bro}}$  . Levander kindly placed at  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{my}}$  disposal

the few items about a Sayer family which he had discovered. We all agreed

that it meant a search at large, for no one could give any idea of who and what

Bro. Sayer was, where he came from or his connections, or his position in life,

and what special claims, if any, he had on the Brethren of that day to the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{E}}$ 

position into which he was afterwards elevated. I was then optimistic, but must

confess that often during the succeeding years I did not remain so, and had it

not been for the encouragement and kindness of Bro. Songhurst arid other

Brethren of the Q.C. Lodge, I should have given up the task; and even so the

result of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  endeavours spread over the succeeding years has certainly not

resulted in a complete success.

I have dealt with the subject under several heads in order to make a more coherent story than by merely stating the results of my enquiries, and in

Appendices have set out fully the information I have thus obtained. I have

noted the names of many Brethren to whom I have been indebted for help,

and I regret that to some of them I am not now able to express  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{m}} \ensuremath{\mathsf{y}}$  thanks

personally, and cannot do more than record my thanks here.

I should like to add that among the many proofs of the value of the Q.C. Lodge to the Craft, and the promotion of knowledge of its history and

work, is the outstanding fact that the Members of the Lodge without exception

have been, and are, willing to place at the disposal of the real enquirer any

information they have on the subject enquired about. To this spirit and the

help so freely given I am much indebted, and can only hope, in return, to act

in like manner.

J. Walter Hobbs.

Mr. Anthony Sayer: Gentleman. 219

PART I.

#### ANTHONY SAYER. WAS HE A "GENTLEMAN"?

To answer this question satisfactorily involves the knowledge of his ancestry, life and works, and his personal character. The very object of my

researches has been to find out something on these points, but it will have to

be discussed on the known materials, and this can, I think, be done with some

amount of certainty.

As a preliminary, one should take a short survey of the state of the Craft prior to the movement for a Grand Lodge, and for this purpose I disregard

the historical allegations of Dr. Anderson, whose inaccuracies and actions have

been shown to justify at least a hostile opinion. Equally do I disregard the  $\,$ 

modern theories of the Revival of the Craft for the purpose of Jacobinism or  $\,$ 

any other "ism." These are creations of modern writers arguing, in my judgment, from very doubtful facts and equally doubtful inferences.

It cannot, however, be denied that Anderson's account of the proceedings,

and parties to the Grand Lodge formation are correct, for his publication of it

took place in the lifetime of some of the principal actors, who would have  ${\tt known}$ 

if the facts were not correctly stated. By this I mean the actual happenings,

and not, for instance, the assumption that the old Brethren felt themselves

neglected by Sir Christopher Wren, for had he really been the  $\operatorname{Grand}$   $\operatorname{Master}$ 

as suggested the proper course would have been to have first removed  $\mathop{\text{\rm him}}\nolimits$  from

his office before electing another to take the post. Indeed, there would have

been in these circumstances, if true, ample justification for acting on the  $19\mathrm{th}$ 

of the Old Regulations of 1723 and 1738, had they existed previously to 1717.

Let us take the actual facts as stated by Anderson and see how far they carry us.

We have statements in the History contained in the 1723 Constitutions, which while they refer to Wren as an "ingenious Architect" do not claim him

as a Grand Master, or even a member, of the Craft. But Anderson deals with

the then state of the Craft as follows: - •

" And now the Freeborn BRITISH NATIONS disentangled from foreign and civil wars, and enjoying the good Fruits of Peace and Liberty, having of late much indulg'd their happy Genius for Masonry of every sort, and reviv'd the drooping Lodges of London, this fair Metropolis flourisheth, as well as other Parts, with several worthy particular Lodges, that have a quarterly Communication and an Annual Grand Assembly, wherein the Forms and Usages of the most ancient and worshipful Fraternity are wisely, and the Royal Art duly cultivated, and the Cement of the Brotherhood preserv'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 having frankly join'd and submitted to take the Charges, and to wear the Badges of a Free and Accepted Mason, under our present worthy Grand-Master, the most noble PRINCE John Fluke of MONTAGUE."

It will be observed that Anderson does not here describe the position as

more than a revival of interest consequent on the cessation of National troubles.

Incidentally this paragraph places those who refer to the formation (it never  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

was more than a " revival " of the Annual Assembly however) of Grand Lodge

as caused by the support of the Stuart cause, in a quandary unless they can  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

explain away Anderson's statement above quoted.

Let us proceed to compare the statements in the 1738 Constitutions first

remembering that circumstances had then considerably altered, and that at this

time Anderson had very different reasons for his actions (see Bro. Vibert's

Introduction to the Bi-centenary Facsimile of the Constitutions of 1723).

220 Transactions of the Quatuor Coronuti Lodge.

There are many alterations in the two Editions, indeed Anderson seemed

unable to re-issue his Constitutions, or the Historical portion, without making

many trivial as well as serious variations. The chief of these for the present

purpose are those relating to Wren and the origin of Grand Lodge, the record

of Grand Lodge proceedings and the variation in the 1st Charge about religion.

Wren first appears as the first named Grand Warden about 1660-3, and then later appears as Deputy, then D.G.M. — Grand Master Wren (probably an

anticipatory statement of a later event) but in 1685 as being elected on the

death of Lord Arlington, the Grand Master. In 1695 - without any reference

to Anderson's favourite expression, " demitting " - we find it alleged that the

Duke of Richmond was chosen Grand Master and Wren appointed D.G.M. These are set out in bold distinctive type with Grand Wardens, but curiously

enough we find tucked in without any such aids to the eye, or methods of

attraction, the bald statement " and was again chosen Grand Master A.D. 1698."

Apparently no new Grand Wardens were appointed, possibly the old ones were

continued, but there is no statement of whether it was at the Annual Feast, or  $\,$ 

that any of the usual circumstances occurred. It looks as if on reading over  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

his MS. or the Proofs, he noticed that his last statement as to the G.M. referred

to the Duke, so he slipped in a few words to enable him to tack on his later

allegations. We find (Q.C'.A. vii., p. 106) that Wren while carrying on St.

Paul's annually met the Brethren "to keep up good old usages." In the 19th

Old Regulations of 1723 we find Anderson saying " hitherto the Ancient Fraternity have had no occasion for it, their former G and G Masters having all

behaved themselves worthy of that honorable office," and we find him fifteen

years later (1738) saying instead  $^{\prime\prime}$  Because hitherto the Ancient Fraternity

have had no occasion for it " and as a New Regulation 19 that " The Freemasons

firmly hope that there never will be any occasion for such a New Regulation."

Yet at this same time he imports such a neglect of duty by Wren as to cause

the four Old Lodges to think fit to cement under a Grand Master "finding

themselves neglected by Sir Christopher Wren." Now this is clearly an

tion for purposes of the Author and I do not further discuss it here as the

subject is fully dealt with by Bro. Lionel Vibert before the Q.C. Lodge, and in

his Introduction to the Bi-centenary Facsimile of the Constitutions of 1723

It is sufficient for the purpose of this paper to realise that Anderson's 1723

statements are at variance with those made by him in 1738. At the former

date there were too many persons alive who participated in the formation of

Grand Lodge — Wren himself died in 1723, and the needs of the Author had

considerably altered by 1738.

To resume the comparison of the 1738 historical account with that of 1723

already given. We have in the former the following under the heading of:  $-\$ 

SAXON Kings of Great-Britain.

- " 1. King George I. entered London most magnificently on 20 Sept. 1714, and after the Rebellion was over A.D. 1716. the few Lodges at London finding themselves neglected by Sir Christopher Wren, thought fit to cement under a Grand Master as the Center of Union and Harmony, viz. the Lodges that met.
- 1. At the Goose and Gridiron Ale-house in St. Paid's Church-yard .
- 2. At the Grown Ale-house in Parker's Lane near Brnry-Lane.
- 3. At the Apple-Tree Tavern in Charles-Street, Covent -Garden.
- 4. At the Rummer and Grapes Tavern in Channel-Bow, Westminster. They and some old Brothers met at the said Apple-Tree, and

having put into the Chair the oldest Master Mason (now the Master of a Tjodge) they constituted themselves a GRAND LODGE pro Tempore in Due Form, and forthwith revived the Quarterly Communication of the Officers of Lodges (call'd the Grand Lodge) resolv'd to hold the Annual Assembly and Feast, and then to chuse

- I ' Mr. Anthony Sai/er: Gentleman. 221
- 1 a GRAND MASTER from among themselves, till they should have the Honour of a Noble Brother at their Head.

Accordingly

On St. John Baptist's Day in the 3d Year of King George I.  $^{\star}\blacksquare$  , A.D. 1717. the ASSEMBLY and Feast of the Free and accepted

Mason\* was held at the foresaid Goose and Gridiron Ale-house.

Before Dinner, the oldest Master Mason (now the Master of a . ' Lodge) in the Chair, proposed a List of proper Candidates; and the

Brethren by a Majority of Hands elected

Mr. ANTONY SAYER Gentleman, Grand Master of Masons,

who being forthwith (Capt. Joseph Elliot. ) Grand

invested with the (Mr. Jacob Lambcdl, Carpenter,) Wardens.

Badges of Office and Power by the said oldest Master, and install'd, was duly congratulated by the Assembly who pay'd him the Homage.

SAYER Grand Master commanded the Masters and "Wardens of

Lodges to meet the Grand Officers every Quarter in Communication,

j ' at the place that he should appoint in his Summons sent by the
i Tyler."

Here then we see that a new reason is given for forming a Grand Lodge, which in 1723 was a revival of interest, and the existence of Grand Lodge is

to be there inferred from, or indicated by, the words "that have a Quarterly

Communication and an Annual Grand Assembly." The Quarterly Communication does not appear on Anderson's own showing till St. John Evangelist's Day

(27th December) 1720, nor doss any regular sequence of such appear till after  $\,$ 

the Duke of Montagu's accession. So that his 1723 statement on the subject is

of a then recent occurrence. The idea seems clearly to have been to put down to

the Duke all that Freemasonry then was. This was unnecessary in 1738 wlien it

appeared more desirable to the Author to revise his history, to give a more

continuous account down to the then date, and to justify the formation of

Grand Lodge, then suffering from attacks, exposures and the like; so that an  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{L}}$ 

appearance of unbroken antiquity might be given to that body.

I have already pointed out the possibility that Anderson's statements of

fact from 1717 may be correct. As to those in question here, we have

additional evidence of the 1st Minute Book of Grand Lodge 1723-1731 (Q.C.A. x.,

196) where the names entered therein of the  ${\tt G.M.'s}$ , Deputies and Wardens

I agree with those stated in Anderson's account in his  $1738\ \mathrm{History}$  (I except

 $^{\mbox{\tiny I}}$  the entries referring to himself which are notoriously fabrications by  $\mbox{\scriptsize him})\,.$ 

We then have the incontestible fact that Bro. Anthony Sayer was elected

"by a Majority of Hands" Grand Master of Masons. We may accept the fact

that the voting was in his favour as against other candidates — and probably at

later elections the names were written on papers as the votes were then  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$ 

"gather'd."

Taking, then, the plain facts as to the formation of Grand Lodge we find

the following to be the state of affairs.

Four Old Lodges in London and Westminster, and some old Brothers,

meet together. Anderson in the 1738 Constitutions, however, states (ch. 3,

p. 107) there were Lodges at Southwark, St. Paul's and elsewhere, making seven

or more in existence shortly prior to 1717. The Four Old Lodges we know, but

 $\mid$  . who were the Old Brethren present and which of them first put forward the

 ${\tt J}$  proposal ? Who took the Chair at the meetings ? We can only with certainty

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{J}}$  say that there were three Brethren known by name to us. What were the

negotiations, if any, which took place between the first meeting and the day of

the election ? Who were the other candidates for election and were unsuccessful  $\boldsymbol{1}$ 

 $\$  Is it likely that any Brother would have commanded the suffrages of the

Brethren of four Lodges and some unattached Brethren, who had no standing or

position in ordinary life ? Indeed, would the idea come from any but a  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{man}}$  of

affairs possessed of some education and vision ? It is not unknown at the present

222 Transactions of the Quatuor Goronati Lodge.

time that a member of any Body who proposes some new scheme or departure  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

from precedent, is put into the place of responsibility for working out the scheme.

I cannot understand why the possibility is ignored of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Bro}}\xspace.$  Anthony Sayer having

been if not the originator of the new departure, at least being a prime mover in

it. In any case it needs no stretch of the imagination to assume that he was.

Even if not, it would suggest still more that he was a man of position (as we

should say, a big man), for it would be futile to suppose that anyone but a man  $\$ 

who commanded respect and confidence would have been selected for the head of

the new venture. This becomes the more certain if we have to assume that there

may have been a compromise between two classes of Craftsmen, Operative and

Speculative, which may be a fair assumption in view of the fact that some of the

early Grand Wardens were respectively of those classes. The first two appear

to be Speculatives, however. — A Captain and a Carpenter, the latter could only

have been a Speculative as a Mason. — In such a case the need for a  $\operatorname{\mathsf{man}}$  of

of standing looked up to by both sides was a sine qua nou . If  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  views so far

are accepted we start with the proved need of a man above the ordinary  $\operatorname{rank}$ 

and file. Such a man, I submit, was the one actually elected, Anthony Sayer  $\,$ 

Gent-., and I will now proceed to show my reasons for the statement.

Throughout we must bear in mind that we do not with certainty know anything about Bro. Anthony Sayer's position in life at that time. What

happened to him later is another matter, not affecting this question, except that

if he was a bad man then, he was perchance a bad man in 1717, but the assumption that his actions in 1730 were vicious or even wrong may be quite

unfounded, for not only were those actions largely condoned, but they may have

had quite a different and justifiable origin.

I should here mention the idea that Bro. Anthony Sayer's Petition in 1724, which was read and recommended by the then G.M. (the Duke of Richmond) to Grand Lodge, was for the purpose of charity (G.L. Minutes in

Q.C.A. x., p. 9). No record appears to have been made on the subject of the

Petition. If it was for charity one would have expected some reference to it,

or to what was done, as was the case in regard to Henry Prichard earlier in

the same year where particulars of the actual sums collected are stated and the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

receipt for the payment over of the total was copied into the book. I incline

to the opinion that it had some other object. There was an interval of  $\operatorname{\mathtt{six}}$ 

years before Bro. Anthony Sayer's financial position was desperate. In con-

nection with all Bro. Anthony Sayer's history 1717-1740 it would be well to

consider Bro. J. E. Shum Tuckett's tentative suggestions in regard to  $\mbox{\tt "Dr.}$ 

Anderson's First Charge" (Trans, of the Manchester Assocn. for Mas: Research

1921-2; pp. 61-88). The views put forward are well worthy of serious considera-

tion and I should not be surprised if Bro. Anthony Sayer's Petition of 1724

had reference to those circumstances which Stukeley refers to as causing

Freemasonry to take a run and running " itself out of breath thro' the folly of

the members," or to the growing innovations, giving rise to, or consequent

upon, the early unrest in the Craft; or more likely to the alteration created

by the First Charge of 1723 itself. I cannot bring myself to believe that  $\mbox{Bro.}$ 

Anthony Sayer viewed without alarm, or allowed without protest, the alterations

brought about in the original plan by those who pushed him aside and ran the  $\ensuremath{\text{c}}$ 

Craft on other lines than probably both he and others who at first participated

had contemplated. His actions in 1730 may have had the same purpose.  $\ensuremath{\text{Tn}}$ 

any case, however, I take it that he was in 1717 a man of good character.

It has been said that he was an Operative Mason, but this really means not a workman, but a Brother initiated in and member of an Operative Lodge.

It has yet to be shown that the Lodge held at the Queen's Head in Knaves  $\mbox{Acre}$ 

was in 1717 wholly or mainly a Lodge of actual Operative Masons.

It has been also said that he was a Clerk in the Treasury. This was told

to Bro. Levander and the statement put him in the way of a search in

Treasury Records, but it then appeared that the statement referred to a Sayer  $\,$ 

of much later date.

Mr. Anthony Sayer: Gentleman. 223

I have also heard it said that he was one of the clerks in Wren's drawing

office, but no information on the point has been forthcoming or discovered by

me. Even if he were a Drawing Office clerk he would be, one may suppose,

( ' a person of some education and ability.

Again, I have seen it stated that Sayer was a Painter, which may be —  $\bullet$  another name for an Artist like Bro. Highmore, Bro. Hogarth, or Bro. Sir

James Thornhill and others. But it may be another misstatement. I have found no evidence either way.

The assumption seems fairly general that he was a man of humble origin,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

' $\blacksquare$  but if you know anything at all as to the man's origin, it is quite as reasonable

I to assume he was a man of good position. The more so if the  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{circumstances}}$ 

require such an one, and I have already shown that this was the case. » What, then, can be said on the point: — Was he a Gentleman?

, We have first the statement by Anderson that " Mr. Anthony Sayer

Gent." was elected. Now while one may rightly be suspicious of the accuracy

of Anderson's History, it is hardly to be expected that he would make a wilful

misstatement, either way, about a man who was at that moment a person of some  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

eminence in the Craft.

In Anderson's Constitutions of 1723 we find in his list of Lodges (Masters

 $^{\prime}$  and Wardens) who signed or approved the Constitutions (Bi-centenary Facsimile,

p. 74):-

III. John Turner -, Master.

Anthony Sayer [ Wardens

Edward Cale > Wardens.

1-'

IV. Mr. George Payne -, Master.

Stephen Hall M.D. \ Francis Sorell Esq.

Wardens.

V. Mr. Math. Birkhead -i Master.

Wardens.

I here contrast the calling of Bro. George Payne as "Mr." with that of Bro. Matthew Birkhead as such — and with the former's Junior Warden, Francis

Sorell "Esq." Now elsewhere there appears (p. 58) in the heading to the

General Regulations "compiled first by Mr. George Payne Anno 1720," etc.

The description of Mr. cannot be said to indicate that Bro. George Payne was  $\ \ \,$ 

not a man of position and influence.

The statement "Mr. Anthony Sayer," for instance, in the Grand Lodge Minute Book No. 1 of 1723-31 (Q.C.A. x., p. 196) is not contrary to the state-

ment he was a " Gentleman," for notice the " Mr. John Beal M.D.," a position

in life which could not be regarded as obscure. I regard this as evidence to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

be relied on.

Thei we have the engraved portrait of Sayer painted by Bro. Highmore (who was a Grand Officer in the year 1727) and engraved by Faber. The date

of the portrait is not certain, but if it was painted by order of the person

represented and engraved at his cost he was not so badly off, although no doubt

the Artists then did not get such fees as they do now. If the painting was

later in date the statement had some authority for it. He is stated on the

engraving to be a  $\operatorname{Gent}$  : . Who is in a position to say, much more to prove,

that Highmore and Faber were both parties to a distinct misrepresentation of

fact. If they knew that  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Bro}}$  . Anthony Sayer was a person of low birth and

position it is quite unlikely they would have been parties to such a statement.

It is far more reasonable to suppose that the statement on the engraving is

This is the more likely, from the fact that at that time the true social

position of people was a matter of far greater care than now. We have now no

hesitation in describing any man as " Esquire " who has no real right to such

224 Transactions of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge.

an appellation. In those days it was not legal to describe a man but by his

proper designation. Heralds Visitations were by no means extinct. The tarm

" Gentleman " was then used in regard to one who was of the upper middle class,

i.e., between a Yeoman (a good and substantial class in those days) and the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{C}}$ 

Nobility, but more loosely it meant one who was a Landowner and  $\operatorname{did}$  not work

for his living. Esquire then had its proper place as a designation, and the  $\mbox{men}$ 

who by that time had by reason of the then late Civil War and other  $\operatorname{National}$ 

misfortunes, as well as the increase of Overseas venture, taken up  ${\tt Trade,\ Com-}$ 

merce and so forth had no scruples in putting, and indeed were proud to put,

their actual profession or business description after their names as they were obliged to do.

Just look at Anderson's Constitutions of 1738 (Q.C.A. vii.) and see the

care used in this respect, I refer to the  $\operatorname{Grand}$   $\operatorname{Masters}$  and  $\operatorname{Wardens}$  and to

the D.G.M. when or where named: -

1717. Mr. Antony Sayer Gentleman. Capt. Joseph Elliott

Mr. Jacob Lamball Carpenter.

1718. George Payne Esq.

Mr. John Cordwell City Carpenter.

Mr. Thomas Morrice Stone Cutter.

1719. John Theophilus Desagulier L.L.D. and F.E.S.

Mr. Antony Sayer foresaid.

Mr. Tho. Morrice foresaid.

1720. George Payne Esq.

Mr. Thomas Hobby Stonecutter.

Mr. Richard Ware Mathematician.

1721. John Montagu Duke of Montagu

John Beal M.D. (Deputy G.M.).

Mr. Josiah Villeneau (he was an Upholder).

Mr. Thomas Morrice

1722. Philip Wharton Duke of Wharton (Irregular).

Mr. Joshua Timson Blacksmith.

Mr. William Hawkins Mason.

1723. Philip Duke of Wharton (Regular). Dr. Desaguliers (D.G.M.). Joshua Timson foresaid.

James Anderson A.M. (Altered by him).

1724. Francis Scot Earl of Dalkeith

Dr. Desaguliers (D.G.M.).

Prancis Sorell Esq.

John Senex Bookseller.

There is no need to extend this list, but it may be well to refer to: -

1727. Henry Hare Lord Colerane.

Alexander Choke Esq. (D.G.M.).

Nathaniel Blackerby Esq.

Mr. Joseph Highmore Painter.

In the Grand Lodge Minute Book No. 1, p. 103 (in the Q.C.A. x., p. 82),

the description of Bro. Highmore is given as Joseph Highmore Esq., while at

page 107 (85) he is described as " Gent," On pages 110 and 115 (88 and 93)

as "Mr. Joseph Highmore." Now Bro. Highmore was not a "Painter" in the sense we regard the term to-day, but an Artist — pupil of Sir James

Thornhill - both being members of the same Lodge.

У

Mr. Anthony Sayer: Gentleman. 225

The Grand Lodge Minutes may be taken as not giving any trade descriptions, but only those of quality, profession and distinction. Anderson, however,

gives trades, for we have Carpenter; City Carpenter; Stone cutter (two);

Mathematician; Blacksmith; Mason; Bookseller; Painter. Compare these with

Gentleman; Captain; Esq. (five); L.L.D. and F.K.S.; M.D.; and his own description A.M. It appears clear, therefore, that Anderson contrasted what

may be termed  $\mbox{Trade}$  descriptions, with those of quality, profession or distinction

so that had  $\operatorname{Bro}\nolimits.$  Anthony Sayer been a person of corresponding position to that

of, say, Jacob Lamball, Carpenter, we should expect to find the description of

Bro. Anthony Sayer of some other character than that of " Gentleman."

The foregoing extracts give further point to my previous observations on

the use of the term "  $\operatorname{Mr."}$  in the Grand Lodge Minute Book, List of  $\operatorname{Grand}$ 

Masters, etc., because taking Bro. Highmore's case we find Anderson calls  $\mathop{\text{him}}$ 

"  $\operatorname{Mr.}$ " and "  $\operatorname{Painter}$ ," while  $\operatorname{Grand}$   $\operatorname{Lodge}$   $\operatorname{Minutes}$   $\operatorname{refer}$  to  $\operatorname{him}$   $\operatorname{variously}$  as

"Esq.," "Gent." and "Mr." Now Bro. Highmore would no doubt be much more entitled as an Artist to be called Esq. or Gent, than as a mere Painter.

It is my opinion that Anderson in his account of Grand Lodge prior to

Minute Books was really using the Trade descriptions with the view of belittling

that class of persons to exalt those of the high class socially, and that he was  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

telling the truth when he called Bro. Anthony Sayer a " Gentleman." Moreover,

Bro. Highmore was, the Grand Lodge Minutes state (they are fraternally silent

as to Trade descriptions) an Esq. or a Gent. ; and as such, or by his professional

standing, and presumed knowledge of the etiquette as to titles and descriptions,  $\$ 

he must have known whether he was right in permitting the engraving of his

portrait of Bro. Anthony Sayer to describe him as a " Gentleman " or whether

he was not. I, of course, refer to the latter's status at the time of his election  $\ \ \,$ 

and for some years onwards prior to 1730, as I think was the intention of those  $\ \ \,$ 

responsible for the Portrait and statement on the Engraving.

Let us consider a few facts about Bro. Highmore and his portrait of our

Anthony Sayer. Bromley's "Catalogue of Engraved British Portraits" gives

the Sayer engraving as 1750, but gives no authority for the statement. Bro.

Highmore was born 1692 and died 1780. He commenced painting in 1715. He

appears in Grand Lodge Minutes as a member of the Lodge at the Swan in East Street, Greenwich, in the list of 1723. He ceased painting in 1762, and

was said to be able to " take a likeness by memory as well as by a sitting."

Mention may be made of Bro. Faber, the Engraver, who was Grand Steward for the Festival of May, 1739 - probably died 1756. If we assume the portrait

was painted and engraved at any time after 1730, the fact that it depicts an

apparently elderly man may support this, but on the dates our Anthony Sayer  $\,$ 

was not less than forty-five in 1717 or fifty-eight in 1730, either age being

doubtless sufficient to justify the appearance in the portrait. If Bromley's date

is accepted, our Anthony Sayer would have been dead eight years, and the

portrait was the effort of Highmore's memory. Still, if his memory was sufficient

for that purpose it was sufficiently good to enable him to describe his sitter's

social status correctly. One would like to know when and where our Anthony

Sayer and Bro. Highmore last met, but, of course, this would only go to the

support or otherwise of the accuracy of Bro. Highmore's memory. In this case

also, who commissioned the painting and the engraving ? If it was a speculation

on the part of the Artist and Engraver, our Brother Anthony Sayer's original  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

reputation survived his poverty and death. I. cannot at present bring myself to

the view that for long prior to 1730 he was in a state of poverty or misfortune,

as it is clear he had become when petitioning Grand Lodge in that year.

Some evidence of a remote character may be fairly inferred from the report of Bro. Sayer's death and burial, as given in the newspaper of the time.

The London Evening Po-H of 16th-19th January, 1742.

A few days since died, aged about 70 years, Mr. Anthony Sayer, who was Grand-Master of the most Ancient and Honorable Society of Free and Accepted Masons in 1717, His corpse was followed by

226 Transactions of the Quatuor Coron-ati Lodge.

a great number of Gentlemen of that Honorable Society of the best Quality, from the Shakespear's Head Tavern in the Piazza in Covent Garden, and decently interred in Covent Garden Church.

The foregoing is taken from the Note by Bro. Songhurst in his transcript

of the Grand Lodge Minute Book No. 1 (A.Q.A. x., p. 59), but the italics are mine

It seems to me that, if Bro. Sayer had been a disreputable old man of no

original family position and substance, his interment would not have been

attended (even giving credit for much fraternal good feeling) by " a great number

of Gentlemen of that Honorable Society " of any rank, much less by a great

number of Brethren "of the best Quality." He must in any case have been

remembered with some amount of esteem and honour, notwithstanding his  $\min_{s=1}^{s}$ 

fortune and poverty, and this act of respect to departed merit must,  ${\tt I}$  think, be

regarded as not rendered on that account only, but as shown by "  $\mbox{\it a}$  great number

of Gentlemen of the best Quality  $^{\prime}$  ' to one who had once been '' of the best

Quality " like themselves.

In the wide range over which my searches and enquiries have extended during the past seven years or more, it is true I have not discovered our Brother

himself, or his parentage. In the circumstances detailed later, however, sufficient

reasons appear for this result. I here admit that I am to a large extent about  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

to reason by inference or deduction or perhaps also from some expectation, but

it must be borne in mind that during all the long time of my search, labour

and investigation into the persons, property, position and the facts as to many

Sayer families, I have accumulated much that has led me to a frame of  $\min d$ 

which any reader of these lines cannot appreciate who has not had the same

experience and matters before him. In the course of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  former long profes-

sional career I have found that in pedigree matters, especially inregard to

persons and events during troublous and disturbed times, it is necessary and

even justifiably possible, to presume the existence of persons and their relations  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

from very scanty evidence of a positive character. Then, too, one must have

regard to, and rely upon, circumstances and possibilities small and insignificant

in themselves, valueless in the face of clearly proved facts, but valuable in their

absence so long as not inconsistent with what is really known. Such  $\operatorname{\textsc{circum-}}$ 

stances may relate to usages in families, the transmission of some Christian name

to elder sons (a very well-known practice, especially in former days and in families

of position and standing) or the like, although any inference or deduction there-

from may be displaced or destroyed upon the discovery or production of more

definite proof ; but in the absence of such definite proof the inference or deduc-

tion remains the best evidence available. I have kept these and similar points

in mind in arriving at my opinions herein expressed.

What, then, has been the result achieved by my long, laborious, often tedious, but all the same interesting research on this subject?

- (a) In the first place our Bro. Anthony Sayer has not yet been found.
- (b) The really startling circumstance, and for reasons which will appear

later, almost conclusive result on direct proof, is that there is in all

the Sayer families dealt with only one in which the Christian name Anthony appears, but in which it is perpetuated through four generations covering the material period of time involved in the enquiry.

- (c) The source from which this Christian name was derived has been conclusively ascertained, viz., from one Anthony Pyseley the Godfather of the first Anthony Sayers whose family is referred to in (b).
- (d) Our Anthony Sayer died in 1742 being about seventy years old, which would give the date of his birth as approximately 1670-1672. There is direct evidence that one Joseph Sayer married on the 25th December, 1665, Mary Pyseley a descendant or connection of the above-named

Mr. Anthony Sayer: Gentleman. 227

Anthony Pyseley. My opinion is (having due regard to all the circumstances and considerations, for and against) that our Anthony Sayer was a child of this marriage.

- (e) These Sayers (and many others) and Pyseleys were all located within  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($
- a limited area in Berkshire and an adjacent part of Oxfordshire, which I have sketched on the Map referred to later on and which I have described as the "Berkshire area."
- (f) The above were of the class we should term Landed Gentry. There is direct evidence that the Anthony Sayer family (b) and the Pyseley family (c) and (d) owned considerable properties in the Berkshire area, and it is not an unimportant circumstance (it is proved beyond question) that these properties as a whole, or the major part of them, were sold in 1727 to Robert Hucks of St. Giles, London, an ancestor of the present R.W. Bro. Lord Aldenham, in whose possession they still are. If, then, one may assume that our Anthony Sayer stood in the line of succession to some or all of these, or possibly other lands which were then or thereabouts sold by a person having prior rights, this may well have been one of the contributory causes to his poverty in 1730.
- (g) It is clear that members of the Anthony Sayer family and other Sayers of the Berkshire area were settled in London and elsewhere during the material period of the enquiry, were in good positions in life, and some Masonic connections can be traced.
- (h) There is a curious confusion of the names Sayer and Sawyer, and while I have already referred to the sole family of Anthony Sayers, the only family of Sawyers found with that Christian name first imported the name Anthony circa 1713 from an entirely different source, viz., from the marriage of John Sawyer of Haywood with Anna, daughter of Anthony Duncombe (Earl of Feversham, later). Haywood is near Maidenhead, and not in the Berkshire area although in that County.
- (i) Many of the Sayers of the Berkshire area as well as those located elsewhere are shown to be well connected, leading men in professions of the Law, the Church, the Army, Navy, East Indian ventures and other positions of note. I admit that unless our Anthony Sayer can

be in fact connected with some or one of these it does not carry us home, but it shows that the Sayer families were very largely of good position and fortune. If there had been none such, but only men of lowly birth and status the argument against my view would be of weight; as it is, the inference can only be in favour of my opinion.

(j) Localities in London now of no pretensions or social importance, were

in the early eighteenth century of much higher class, and more patronised as residential districts by the better class. Great Queen Street and Lincolns Inn Fields now share with St. Martin's, St. Giles' and Soho the decadence consequent upon the shifting class of residents and the general trend of higher Society to the Westward.

To sum up this portion of my narrative, I say without hesitation that upon the fullest, consideration of all the facts and circumstances herein set forth

(not alone in this part of my story) I am fully and decidedly of opinion that

Pro. Anthony Sayer was properly described, and in fact was, at his election as

First Grand Master of Masons, a Gentleman. This point will be further discussed

in other parts of my story upon other facts and circumstances related therein,

but this further discussion only goes to amplify my views as here stated.

228 Transactions of the Quatuor Coronuti Lodge.

PART II.

(A). THE SAYERS OF THE BERKSHIRE AREA.

The Anthony Sayer Family.

It is a remarkable thing that of all the Sayer families whose pedigree

been more or less investigated there is only one family in which the Christian

name Anthony appears, and this is the more remarkable because during the  $\ensuremath{^{\text{the}}}$ 

course of these investigations the name of over 508 Sayers have been discovered.

Now this family which I term the Anthony Sayer family were located in the

valley of the Thames between the bend of the river from Moulsford to  $\mathtt{Oxford}\ -$ 

they were found scattered along the Northern side of the Berkshire Downs

between Reading and Newbury, and their relationship extended across the river

into Oxfordshire, chiefly in the Parish of Clifton Hampden. (See Map.)

first of this family was Nicholas Sayer of East Hagbourne, who died 1566,

succeeded by Nicholas Sayer of Long Wittenham 1596, from whom came so far

as I can judge Nicholas Sayer, who died prior to 1642. Now this Nicholas Sayer  $\,$ 

left a son John Sayer, and it was his eldest son, born 1616, who imported the

Christian name of Anthony. This appears from (Appendix E.) 1 where in a

deed dated 4th September 1624, Anthony Pyseley of Clifton, in consideration of

his natural love and affection for the said Anthony Sayer, who was his godchild,

settled lands on Anthony and his heirs male. This Anthony Sayer (the first)

was married and left a large family and died in 1663 at Clifton Hampden: his

eldest son Anthony (the second) born 1658, married Sarah Pyseley also born 1658,

the date of the marriage being 1680. This Anthony died 1692 (B., p. 31) and

his widow Sarah in 1723. The eldest son of this marriage also called Anthony

(the third) was born 1683, married Mary Barnes 1711 and died 1740. On the  $\,$ 

occasion of this marriage Anthony's mother Sarah settled property consisting of,

leasehold, a malthouse and lands subject to paying thereout to Sarah the  $\operatorname{sum}$ 

of £500 — this land must have been valuable in order to provide the widow's

portion and leave a sufficient estate for the benefit of Anthony under- the settle-  $\,$ 

ment, and this appears to be likely because in 1701 Sarah acquired for the sum

of £360 then paid a lease of part of the property, and from another source she

acquired a lease of other property for £140, which two sums correspond with

the amount paid to Sarah in 1711 by the Trustees of her son Anthony on his

marriage to Mary Barnes. The marriage of Anthony (the third) and Mary resulted in a large family, the first of whom was a son Anthony (the fourth)

born 1715. This Anthony married about 1740 and had three children, Mary,

John and Francis: this pedigree (F., No. 1) therefore has now reached a period

beyond which it is not needful to pursue it.

The connection between the Sayers and the Pyseleys is abundantly clear,  $\ensuremath{\text{clear}}$ 

and there is but little doubt that the Pyseley family were wealthy. If reference

be made to the Pyseley pedigree (F., No. 2) and from the deeds, particulars of  $\ \ \,$ 

which can be referred to (E.) it will be seen that on the 12th January 1727.

Anthony Pyseley of Oxford sold to Robert Hucks of St. Giles, London, the

impropriation of Clifton with all tithes and lands held therewith and lands in  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

Clifton in the occupation of Anthony Sayer. These lands, tithes, etc., so sold

to Robert Hucks of St. Giles, London, are now the property of R.W.  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Bro.}}$  Lord

Aldenham, and I must express my gratitude to our R.W. Bro. for his kindness

in referring to the ancient muniments relating to his estate for these periods,

and thus assisting to clear up the mystery of the Anthony Sayer family. So

far we have no suggestion as to our Anthony Sayer, Gentleman, but from the

particulars already given it is clear he is one of a branch of the Sayer family

that must be looked for elsewhere. A probable line of family where he might

be found, indeed, I think it certain such a line would be derived, from the  $\ensuremath{\text{0}}$ 

1 The letters and figures in brackets which follow refer to the  $\mbox{\it Appendices.}$ 

### Mr. Anthony Sayer: Gentleman. 229

marriage of Joseph Sayer and Mary Pyseley at Clifton Hampden on the  $25 \, \mathrm{th}$ 

December 1665 (C, p. 3), but, so far, I have not been able to trace any

descendants of this marriage. I will discuss this point further in dealing with

the various Joseph Sayers I have discovered, but it will be well to mention here  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

the fact that the later Pyseley family, other than the earlier Pyseleys, were chiefly

located at Little Wittenham on the Berkshire side of the river opposite Clifton

Hampden, and as will be seen (C.) the registers of the Church there for the time

in question are now non-existent, although there may be some chance that a  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

visitation copy may be in existence at Salisbury, in which Diocese Little Witten-

ham was situated at the period in question. The fact that Mary Pyseley was a

member of a family in which the name of Anthony was perpetuated not only in

the Pyseley family but in the Sayer family already dealt with, appears to give

good ground to infer that if these parties had a son born about 1670 the

probabilities are that the Christian name Anthony would be adopted and that

the dates would be sufficiently near to justify the assumption that such a son  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

was our Anthony Sayer, Gentleman, who at his death in 1742 was taken to be

about seventy years old.

Let me summarise conclusions in regard to the Anthony Sayer and

Pyseley families. It cannot be doubted from the contents of deeds (E.) and

wills and other testamentary documents (B.) and to some extent from other  $% \left( B_{\ast }\right) =0$ 

facts apparent to me throughout my research, that these families were of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{good}}$ 

standing, indeed if not exactly County families, at least Landed Gentry;

ultimately in cases diverging towards  $\mbox{\it Trade}$  and  $\mbox{\it Commerce,}$  as well as following

learned professions, as regards collaterals at least. If one has regard to the  $\,$ 

values of money two and a half centuries ago, as compared with the values

pre-war or to-day even, it cannot be doubted that these families were of the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{L}}$ 

class of substantial people who formed, then and afterwards, the backbone of the  $\,$ 

English people, although a century earlier they descended from the  $\operatorname{\mathsf{good}}$  old

yeoman class. If, therefore, we are able correctly to infer from all the

circumstances that our Anthony Sayer was a scion of the Sayer and Pyseley

families already dealt with it would not be straining the case to say that he

came of a family entitled to be called " Gentle."

John Sayer, Citizen of London.

The first Anthony Sayer had a brother John, born 1622 (F., Nos. 1 and 3).

During the course of my investigations I found several John Sayers but the one

nearest and most likely to be the John Sayer brother of the first Anthony is

John Sayer, Citizen and Fishmonger of London. He died 20th July 1687, and

owned property in the Counties of Oxford, Berks and in the City of London and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

its suburbs and in several other places. It is the ownership of propery in the

neighbourhood of Clifton Hampden and other places in the Berkshire area which,  $\,$ 

in the main, leads me to believe that he was the brother of Anthony Sayer (the first).

Amongst the property owned by this John Sayer was " The Rose and Crown " in New King Street, Westminster, as to which law proceedings at the

instance of this John were brought in 1654 (D., p. 9). At this " Rose and

Crown '' it appears there was held a Masonic Lodge which is referred to in the

Grand Lodge Minute Book No. 1, Q.C.A. x., pp. 7 (1723), 9 (1725), and does

not, apparently, appear later. It is to be noticed that one member of this

Lodge at the latter date is Henry Prichard, presumably the Bro. whose case

arising from his assault upon a traducer of the Craft was dealt with by  $\operatorname{Grand}$ 

Lodge on 19th February, 1724, raising a subscription to recoup him the damages

and costs he had to pay. The Lodge at the "Rose and Crown" contributed  ${\tt £1}$  Is. Od.

By the will of this John (B., p. 19) it appears that he had a somewhat large family, and included in the gifts made by his will one to his sister Marv (F., No. 1.).

230 Transactions of the Qiiatuor Coroiuiti Lodge.

From his will John Sayer appears to have been extremely wealthy because

the legacies given by him amount to £4,350, and he directed £150 to be spent

on his funeral.

One son of this John was Thomas Sayer who was entered in 1669 at Oxford University and ultimately became Fellow of St. John's, Vicar of various

places, Archdeacon of Surrey and Canon of Winchester. (See B., p. 57; D., 34;

and G., No. 1). He became a D.D. in 1691, and died in 1710.

John Sayer or St. Martins in the Fields.

Another John Sayer disclosed during the investigations and partly from information obtained by the late Bro. Levander and placed by him at my disposal was Master Cook to Charles the Second. He died 1683, and from his

will (B., p. 15) he was extremely wealthy and owned properties at Berkhamsted

included " my hon. good friends Sir Stephen Fox, Kt. Sir Robert Sawyer, Kt.

H.M. Atty. General (F., 12) and my loving kinsman Mr. Joseph Sayer, Clerk, Rector of Berkhamsted St. Mary." It will be seen by the pedigree (F.,

No. 4) that this John had a son Edward, and this Edward died shortly before

1726 and owned the Manor of Chilton, near Didcot, Berkshire, and other

properties in

the Berkshire area (B., 76). This Edward had three daughters, Mary who died

in 1728, Sarah who died 1729, and Judith who married Peter St. Eloy of Doctors

Commons, who was a Lawyer and Notary Public. From the very unusual nature of this name I think there is no doubt that this person was the same as

the Peter St. Eloy who is recorded in the Grand Lodge Minute Book No.  $^{\rm 1}$ 

(Q.C.A. x., p. 35) as a member of the Lodge held at the Devil Tavern, Temple Bar (1725).

For some references to above see (B., pp. 70, 75 and 76). I am inclined

to think that as this John Sayer, who by the way was an " Armiger," see his

will and (G., No. 9), being not only kinsman to Joseph Sayer of Berkhamsted,

who came from Yattenden, Berks., but had (at least his son Edward had) lands

in the Berkshire area, would prove to be a collateral to the Anthony Sayer family.

Edward Sayer, the son referred to above, was a Lawyer, and published an Abridgement of the Common Law in 1709 (see lawsuit about this, D., p. 31,

and other lawsuits, D., pp. 22 and 28). The late Bro. Hextall kindly told me

of this publication.

John Sayer op St. James's, Piccadilly.

Still another John Sayer (F., No. 5); he appears to have been a comparatively young man as in his will dated 1707 (B., p. 50) he refers to a

Brother and Sister who had not attained twenty-one. He died in 1708, and is

described as a " Sopemaker." He was evidently wealthy, for he owned land

in Albemarle Fields, St. James's, Piccadilly, and at Swanscombe, Kent; also

lands at Hagbourne in the Berkshire area. His executor was his Uncle John

Cholmeley, described as an "Armiger." This possession of lands in the Berkshire area suggests a collateral relationship to the Sayers there - if not a

direct descent. His lands in Albemarle Fields and St. James's were dealt with

(G., No. 4). The relatives of this John Sayer migrated to Guildford, but the

family history does not assist the subject of this enquiry.

The Joseph Sayer Families.

I have mentioned already the Joseph Sayer who married Mary Pyseley in 1665. There appear particulars of pedigrees (F., No. 6) of the Joseph

Sayers whom I have been able to discover so far.

Foremost of these is the Rev. Joseph Sayer of Newbury and afterwards of Berkhamsted mentioned as the Executor of John Sayer, the King's Master  ${\sf Master}$ 

Cook. This Joseph was son of Francis Sayer of Yattenden, matriculated at

the University of Oxford (G., No. 1) in 1647, and obtained his B.D. 1670,

Mr. Anthony Sayer; Gentleman. 229

marriage of Joseph Sayer and Mary Pyseley at Clifton Hampden on the  $25 \, \mathrm{th}$ 

December 1665 (C, p. 3), but, so far, I have not been able to trace any

descendants of this marriage. I will discuss this point further in dealing with

the various Joseph Sayers I have discovered, but it will be well to mention here

the fact that the later Pyseley family, other than the earlier Pyseleys, were chiefly

located at Little Wifctenham on the Berkshire side of the river opposite Clifton

Hampden, and as will be seen (C.) the registers of the Church there for the time  $\ \ \,$ 

in question are now non-existent, although there may be some chance that a  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

visitation copy may be in existence at Salisbury, in which Diocese Little Witten-

ham was situated at the period in question. The fact that Mary Pyseley was a

member of a family in which the name of Anthony was perpetuated not only in

the Pyseley family but in the Sayer family already dealt with, appears to give

good ground to infer that if these parties had a son born about 1670 the

probabilities are that the Christian name Anthony would be adopted and that

the dates would be sufficiently near to justify the assumption that such a son  $\ \ \,$ 

was our Anthony Sayer, Gentleman, who at his death in 1742 was taken to be

about seventy years old.

Let me summarise conclusions in regard to the Anthony Sayer and Pyseley families. It cannot be doubted from the contents of deeds (E.) and

wills and other testamentary documents (B.) and to some extent from other  $\ensuremath{\text{\text{o}}}$ 

facts apparent to me throughout my research, that these families were of good

standing, indeed if not exactly County families, at least Landed Gentry;

ultimately in cases diverging towards Trade and Commerce, as well as following

learned professions, as regards collaterals at least. If one has regard to the  $\,$ 

values of money two and a half centuries ago, as compared with the values

pre-war or to-day even, it cannot be doubted that these families were of the

class of substantial people who formed, then and afterwards, the backbone of the  $\,$ 

English people, although a century earlier they descended from the  $\operatorname{\mathsf{good}}$  old

yeoman class. If, therefore, we are able correctly to infer from all the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{L}}$ 

circumstances that our Anthony Sayer was a scion of the Sayer and Pvselev

families already dealt with it would not be straining the case to say that he

came of a family entitled to be called " Gentle."

John Sayer, Citizen of London.

The first Anthony Sayer had a brother John, born 1622 (F., Nos. 1 and 3).

During the course of my investigations I found several John Sayersi but the one

nearest and most likely to be the John Sayer brother of the first Anthony is

John Sayer, Citizen and Fishmonger of London. He died 20th July 1687, and

owned property in the Counties of Oxford, Berks and in the City of London and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

its suburbs and in several other places. It is the ownership of propery in the  $\,$ 

neighbourhood of Clifton Hampden and other places in the Berkshire area which,

in the main, leads me to believe that he was the brother of Anthony Sayer (the first).

Amongst the property owned by this John Sayer was " The Rose and Crown " in New King Street, Westminster, as to which law proceedings at the

instance of this John were brought in 1654 (D., p. 9). At this "  $\mbox{Rose}$  and

Crown " it appears there was held a Masonic Lodge which is referred to in the  $\,$ 

Grand Lodge Minute Book No. 1, Q.C'.A. x., pp. 7 (1723), 9 (1725), and does

not, apparently, appear later. It is to be noticed that one member of this

Lodge at the latter date is Henry Prichard, presumably the Bro. whose case

arising from his assault upon a traducer of the Craft was dealt with by  $\operatorname{Grand}$ 

Lodge on 19th February, 1724, raising a subscription to recoup him the damages

and costs he had to pay. The Lodge at the "  $\mbox{\sc Rose}$  and  $\mbox{\sc Crown}$  "  $\mbox{\sc contributed}$ 

£1 Is. Od.

By the will of this John (B., p. 19) it appears that lie had a somewhat

large family, and included in the gifts made by his will one to his sister Marv (F., No. 1.).

230 Transactions of the Quatuor C'oroiuiti Lodge.

From his will John Sayer appears to have been extremely wealthy because

the legacies given by him amount to £4,350, and he directed £150 to be spent

on his funeral.

One son of this John was Thomas Sayer who was entered in 1669 at

Oxford University and ultimately became Fellow of St. John's, Vicar of various

places, Archdeacon of Surrey and Canon of Winchester. (See B., p. 57; D., 34;

and G., No. 1). He became a D.D. in 1691, and died in 1710.

John Sayer of St. Martins in the Fields.

Another John Sayer disclosed during the investigations and partly from information obtained by the late Bro. Levander and placed by him at my disposal was Master Cook to Charles the Second. He died 1683, and from his

will (B., p. 15) he was extremely wealthy and owned properties at Berkhamsted

and had rights over the Manors of Berkhamsted and Hertford and his executors  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{E}}$ 

included " my lion, good friends Sir Stephen Fox, Kt. Sir Robert Sawyer, Kt.

H.M. Atty. General (F., 12) and my loving kinsman Mr. Joseph Sayer, Clerk,

Rector of Berkhamsted St. Mary." It will be seen by the pedigree (F., No. 4)

that this John had a son Edward, and this Edward died shortly before  $1726 \ \mathrm{and}$ 

owned the Manor of Chilton, near Didcot, Berkshire, and other properties in

the Berkshire area (B., 76). This Edward had three daughters, Mary who died

in 1728, Sarah who died 1729, and Judith who married Peter St. Eloy of Doctors  $\,$ 

Commons, who was a Lawyer and Notary Public. From the very unusual nature of this name I think there is no doubt that this person was the same as

the Peter St. Eloy who is recorded in the Grand Lodge Minute Book No.  $\ensuremath{^{1}}$ 

(Q.G.A. x., p. 35) as a member of the Lodge held at the Devil Tavern, Temple

Bar (1725).

For some references to above see (B., pp. 70, 75 and 76). I am inclined

to think that as this John Sayer, who by the way was an " Armiger," see his

will and (G., No. 9), being not only kinsman to Joseph Sayer of Berkhamsted,

who came from Yattenden, Berks., but had (at least his son Edward had) lands

in the Berkshire area, would prove to be a collateral to the Anthony Sayer family.

Edward Sayer, the son referred to above, was a Lawyer, and published an Abridgement of the Common Law in 1709 (see. lawsuit about this, D., p. 31,

and other lawsuits, D., pp. 22 and 28). The late Bro. Hextall kindly told  $\ensuremath{\text{me}}$ 

of this publication.

John Sayer of St. James's, Piccadilly.

Still another John Sayer (F., No. 5); he appears to have been a com-

paratively young man as in his will dated 1707 (B., p. 50) he refers to a

Brother and Sister who had not attained twenty-one. He died in 1708, and is

described as a " Sopemaker." He was evidently wealthy, for he owned land

in Albemarle Fields, St. James's, Piccadilly, and at Swanscombe, Kent; also

lands at Hagbourne in the Berkshire area. His executor was his Uncle John

Cholmeley, described as an "Armiger." This possession of lands in the Berkshire area suggests a collateral relationship to the Sayers there - if not a

direct descent. His lands in Albemarle Fields and St. James's were dealt with

(G., No. 4). The relatives of this John Sayer migrated to Guildford, but the

family history does not assist the subject of this enquiry.

The Joseph Sayer Families.

I have mentioned already the Joseph Sayer who married Mary Pyseley in 1665. There appear particulars of pedigrees (F., No. 6) of the Joseph

Sayers whom I have been able to discover so far.

Foremost of these is the Rev. Joseph Sayer of Newbury and afterwards of Berkhamsted mentioned as the Executor of John Sayer, the King's Master

Cook. This Joseph was son of Francis Sayer of Yattenden, matriculated at

the University of Oxford (G., No. 1) in 1647, and obtained his B.D. 1670,

Mr. Anthony Sayer: Gentleman. 231

and was successively Rector of Yattenden 1656, Newbury 1663, Sulham 1674,

Berkhamsted 1675 and Canon of Salisbury and Archdeacon of Lewes. He

1694, and under his will (B., p. 88) he left a small sum for the poor of

Yattenden. Bro. Hextall kindly referred me to a report of a sermon preached

by this Joseph Sayer at the opening of the Assizes at Reading in 1673, which

gave me a clue to his identity and resulted in the above information about  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{him}}$ .

None of the enquiries about the Joseph Sayers have so far led to any information bearing directly on the subject of my searches.

The Sayers of Yattenden.

Mention may also be made of the family of Sayers of Yattenden, of which

the Rev. Joseph Sayer before referred to was a member (F., 14). The recurrence of the surname Francis creates some confusion as there were two

families in which this surname appeared living in the same district, but as the

connection of the Anthony Sayer family appears to be somewhat distant this is

not material for the present purpose; the point of the matter is, that in the

Yattenden family there were several clergy and others whose position as well to

do and highly educated persons cannot be doubted (G., No. 1). Connected with  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right)$ 

this family were the Sayers of Wallingford, particulars of whom appear in

described as Gentlemen.

Jonathan Sayer of Henley, one of this family (F., No. 8). His will (B., 82) shows that he was well to do, and oddly enough states his desire

to be buried at midnight. The reference to some of the legal proceedings

(Nos. 21 and 23) also shows that they were people of substance and position.

Strangely enough a branch of the family of Jonathan Sayer were concerned

, with one Anthonio Leaver, Junior, possibly related to Elizabeth Leaver the  $\,$ 

person named in the Registers of Clifton Hampden by her having written in

them (C, p. 4). It is quite possible that there was some connection with the  $\,$ 

Sayer families as he was one of the Executors of Peter Sayer — the others being

William Button and Jonathan Sayer (B., 28), both described as Uncles.

Anthonio suggests the Christian surname of Anthony at least (see also D., No. 21).

This same Jonathan was grandson of Richard Sayer of East Hagbourne in the Berkshire area, where he was the owner of lands as appears by his will  $(B.,\ 16)$ .

Several of this family were Alumni of Oxford (G., 1).

Othek Sayer Families of the Locality.

Of course, ether families have been found, but not to assist in clearing

up the mystery of our Anthony Sayer. Of those in the locality of the Berkshire

area, or located in it, mention may be made of the following, although not

exhausting those discovered and noted in the Appendices : -

Sayers of Aston Tirrold. — Of this family John Sayer was a Trustee of the Anthony Sayer settlement of 1711 (E.) with Edward Pyseley, and may therefore be a Brother of that Anthony or a collateral connection. This family

were landowners of some value (D., 39).

Sayers of Harwell were connections of the Anthony Sayers and John Sayer, Citizen of London (D., 53; O, 17). The Register book of this Parish

was sold to the Churchwardens by Anthony Pyseley of Oxford, 1688 (O, 17).

The Keat family mentioned (D., 53) as owners of Manors were related to the

Sayer families as is shown (C, 17).

Sayers of Didcot; East Hagbourne; and Costott. — From the materials available in the Appendices it could be shown that there was a family

relationship between these branches and the Anthony Sayer and other branches

in the Berkshire area and the County, but as no reference to another  $\mbox{\sc Anthony}$ 

232 Transactions of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge.

was found at all, which was the main object in view, this part of the enquiry

was not pursued although the original Nicholas Sayer, the common ancestor of

the Anthony Sayers and other families, was located in East Hagbourne in  $1566\,$ 

or earlier (E.).

We can now proceed to deal with some of the Sayer families outside the Berkshire area.

# (B.). OTHER SAYER FAMILIES.

The Sayers of Kent.

A family ultimately settled in Kent begins so far as we need regard it with Domina Katherine Sayer, Widow, of St. Martins in the Fields, who died

1702. The children of herself and deceased husband George Sayer, who was

apparently a Knight, were George described as an Armiger of Charing, died

1718, of whose marriage there was a son George, died 1733, whose descendants

owned large properties in the neighbourhood of Maidstone, some deeds relating

to which came before me and extracts are given (E., No. 2) from which it can

be seen that Mary Sayer (in the deed called Sawyer of Haywood in the County

of Berks.) settled certain property in the County of Hereford, and she was no

doubt an ancestor of the Sayers of Kent, and as she came from  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Berkshire}}$  it

will be found (F., No. 9) that the Sawyers of Haywood, as they finally became,

included Sir Edward Sawyer, H.M. Atty. General, named in the will of John

Sayer, H.M. Master Cook. I think it is quite possible that they were more

or less distantly related to the Sayers of the Berkshire area. It is in connec-

tion with the Sawyers that the only other instances of the Christian name of

Anthony occurs, namely, in the deed of 20th February, 1700 (E., 2), last

mentioned there is a reference to Anthony, Earl of Kent, while it is elsewhere

shown (F., No. 12) that Edward Sawyer of Haywood married a daughter of Anthony Buncombe (Earl of Feversham's family) and they had a son named Anthony, but these are merely incidental occurrences and have no bearing, on

the present subject. It will be convenient here to discuss the relation of the

name Sayer to the name Sawyer.

Reverting to the Sayers of the Berkshire area it appears that in the Clifton Hampden Registers (C, p. 1-8) the name variously appears as Sawyer -

Sayer — and various forms suggesting an attempt to spell Sayer by an illiterate  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2$ 

person. Clergymen in those days were not all literates, or a stranger acting

temporarily or the Sexton may have written phonetically. It also appears that

in the deeds belonging to Lord Aldenham the word Sayer is used in a  $\mbox{\ensuremath{\mbox{deed}}}$  of

8th June 1711, and Sarah Sayer, Widow, so described signed her name as Sarah  $\,$ 

Sayer, but her son, described as Anthony Sayer, signs Sawyer. Another instance

also appears of the word Sawyer being used for an individual who signs his will

Sayer (B., 81). Lord Aldenham explains as to this variation and other matters

in a letter to me that the pronounciation in the district of Sawyer, which is

pronounced Sair, although written Sawyer. I have added an extract from the

letter (G., No. 3). The instance of the will of Joseph Sawyer (B., 81) is

already given where he signs Sayer without any reference being made to the

apparent discrepancy in the official document. This largely supports the opinion

expressed by Bro. Songhurst in his notes to the Transcript of the Grand Lodge

Minute Book (Q.C.A. x., p. 196), where the name of our Anthony Sayer is

entered over an erasure, which discloses, in his opinion, the fact that the writer  ${}^{\prime}$ 

had originally written the name Sawyer and erased the word, substituting Sayer

for it. This to some extent corroborates my view that our  $\mbox{\sc Anthony}$  Saver was

a member of one of the families in the Berkshire area. I may add that, with

Bro. Songhurst's view in mind, I have throughout kept observation on all

entries relating to Sawyers, and had there been anything revelant to the present

question in such entries I should have noticed it for future investigation.

Mr. Anthony Sa>/er: Gentleman. 233

The Procurators General.

There was a Sayer family (F., 10) located at the time in question near London and in Doctors Commons beginning with John Sayer of St. Mary's, Islington, died 1690. His children and most of their male descendants were

Procurators General in the High Court of Admiralty, one was Counsel to the

East India Company and the later generation gave Exton Sayer, who was

man of great substance and position who died 1731 having been M.P. for Totnes,

Surveyor General of Lands, Chancellor of Durham, and was married to Agnes

Talbot, sister of the first Lord Talbot, who prior to his elevation to the Peerage

was a Lawyer of great eminence and Attorney General and afterwards  $\mathop{\mathtt{Lord}}$ 

Chancellor (G., 5). Everard Sayer also a Procurator General and of high

position and standing, was also wealthy, and the Rev. George Sayer, D.D., was

Vicar of Witham, Essex, 1722-1761, Prebendary, Canon, and Archdeacon, of

Durham and Rector of Booking, Essex, and died 1761. Incidentally it may be

mentioned that in this family various lawsuits supervened (D., 41, 45, 49, 52),

and one of them by reason of the loss of settlement money invested in the  $\,$ 

South Sea Company (D., 29). This family came from Yorkshire, the ancestral

home being at Croft, but it might be possible to ascertain some of the collateral

branches of this family and to find out whether they were connected with the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

Sayers of Berkshire area, owing to a similarity of Christian names. They owned

property also in Shoreditch, and St. Botolphs-without Aldgate (G., 4).

John Sayer of St. Pauls, Covent Garden.

Some particulars of John Sayer of St. Pauls, Covent Garden, died 1684, were discovered (F., 11; B., 16; D., 13 and 22), but all efforts to improve on

this came to nothing. It will be remembered that our Anthony Sayer was buried at St. Pauls, Covent Garden. Incidentally there is a reference to a

John Sayer, grandson to the John referred to above, who might be the John

Sayer who petitioned to be relieved by Grand Lodge in 1730, but, of course,

this is a mere guess, although if he was the John Sayer who was sued in 1709

as to a bet (D., 22), it may be he lived wildly.

Sayers of St. Martins in the Fields.

Several Sayer families were located here — the most notable were John Sayer, the Master Cook to King Charles II. already referred to. The most

notable were later: — The Sayers of Kent — who were related to an earlier branch

of Sayers of Bouchier Hall, Essex. The St. Martins\* family were derived from  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

Sir George Sayer and represented by his widow, described as Domina Catherine

Sayer, Widow, and her sons (B., 38-42-68; D., 6-9-14-54; \(\frac{\pmathbf{Y}}{.}\), 9). The Descendants of this family are referred to above as owning property at Maidstone

(E., 2), and a branch appears as Sayers of Petts (F., 9), all being well to do

and of high position, one being a Brigadier General in the Army. The complete

clearing up of these families was abandoned as there was no Anthony found.

William Sayer, of St. Martins, and some of his family appears (C, 15), while John Sayer, of St. Martins, was also apparently connected with St. Giles's

in the Fields (C, 14), as it would appear was also William Sayer. None of

these, however, give a clue to Anthony.

Other Sayer Families.

Mention may be made of some others, although not all who' can be found in the Appendices.

Sayers of Battersea — were a family who were at least property owners and

holding lands from the St. John (Bolingbroke) families of the time (B., 48;

D., 10-27-34). The St. Johns and Bolingbroke families are masonically perpetuated in the district now by Lodges named in some form after them.

234 Transactions of the, Quatuor Coronati Lodge.

Of other Sayer families it may be pointed out that some are seen resident  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

in Wapping, Stepney, Shoreditch and the like (B., 32-36-46 &c; D., 19-21;

G., 4). These and others were mostly seafaring people and owners of ships, and

Mercantile, East India adventurers, and Navy men.

The Sayer family of Westminster and later of Clerkenwell and Biddlestone,

Herts., was a well to do one, but it carries us no further on the subject of the

search. Sufficient to say particulars appear in (B., 17-63; D., 7) and elsewhere

in the Appendices.

We find other families of Sayer located in Hereford, Sussex, Norfolk, Middlesex, Oxford, Devon, Somerset, Bucks., Suffolk, Radnor, Surrey, and

nineteen names were found of those who died in Parts beyond the Seas. Some  ${\sf Some}$ 

particulars of these appear in the Appendices, but were only followed up where

any prospect of success appeared likely. In none of these cases was there any  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

reference to an Anthony.

Finally, there has been submitted to me the pedigree of W.Bro. F. P. Sayer, P.M. Borough of Camberwell Lodge, which is carried back conclusively

from the present time to Thomas Sayer, married at Hereford 1775, but the  $\ensuremath{\text{L}}$ 

intervening period 1742-75 has not yet been bridged over. The family were

located in Whitechapel (in the Timber trade), and a son of the above,  $\operatorname{viz}$ .,

Joseph Sayer 1796-1832, was a member of the Old Dundee Lodge, No. 18. The

gap would probably be filled up from the Hereford or Radnor Sayer families.

The Sayer families disclose members wealthy and connected with property,

and persons of good position. Many instances occur of Mariners, some being

owners of ships, others serving on East Indiamen, ships of the Navy, and so forth,  $\,$ 

which incidentally justify the view that the younger generation had developed a

taste for adventure in foreign parts, and although it may appear that some of

these Sayer families were not in what we should now call a good position, yet,

in those days a person who died leaving property for which a will was necessary

was not in any position of indigence but of comparative wealth. It must also

be remembered that at that time dispositions of land were largely by deed, and

that a will dealing with land exclusively did not require probate, the original

being accepted as evidence of disposition. Often a will dealing with money and  $\,$ 

personal property was made in addition, but at the time in question the practice  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

of a will being made dealing with both kinds of property had begun to be

common among persons who were not of the highest position, the point being

that poorer people although relatively well off avoided the making of two wills,

partly from the question of expense and partly to equalise or adjust the shares

of their children, hence it cannot be confidently inferred that because a will dealt

with but few matters of property that the testator was of necessity a poor  $\operatorname{man}$ .

To bring this portion of  $my\ story\ to\ a\ conclusion,\ I\ express the opinion$ 

definitely formed from a consideration of all the facts and circumstances noted  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

herein and in the Appendices, as well as from the conviction formed in reading

through the contents of wills, etc., not necessary to be noted, that there is no

reason to suppose that our Anthony Sayer was at the time he was elected  $\operatorname{Grand}$ 

Master a poor man or an operative worker or even a Clerk in Wren's office.

It is more reasonable to say notwithstanding the ill success in discovering his

actual family that he was a scion of the Sayer families of the Berkshire area.

I have myself no doubt that having come to London, either as a result of

the general trend of society in those days to visit the Capital, where, if  ${\tt I}$  am

right about his connection with the Berkshire area, he would have had relations,

such as John Sayer, Citizen and Fishmonger or the more distant relative  ${\tt John}$ 

Sayer, Cook to Charles the Second, or even the John Sayer, the Sope Maker;

and that once he became connected with the London life, his interest in

Freemasonry was such that his position in life justified him being selected for

the important and honorable post of Grand Master. As I have discussed more

thoroughly under the heading of "Was he a Gentleman?" his subsequent  $\min$ -

fortune may, from this point of view, be disregarded - indeed, it was of natural

happening to many people at that time, expensive living, losses at gambling

which affected all ranks of society, and a possible gambling in South Sea shares,

# Mr. Anthony Sayer: Gentleman. 235

were causes which brought many formerly wealthy people of good position and

family to a state of abject poverty, and our Anthony would have been

than fortunate to have escaped such a fate. That he became poor is clear, but

his presence in the procession of Past Grand Masters at the installation of the  $\,$ 

Duke of Norfolk and the respect paid by Brethren of the best quality at his

funeral, show that his poverty and his possible Masonic irregularities, which have

never been properly explained, did not prevent the highest members of society

from recognising his original eminence.

#### PART III.

## (A.). WHAT HAS BEEN DONE.

It does not require much consideration to see that a search for particulars

of the family of an individual who comes on the stage without any known fact  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

relating to his ancestry, but merely as "Mr. Anthony Sayer, Gent.", must of

necessity be like the proverbial search for a needle in a haystack. I remember

very distinctly that when I left No. 27, Great Queen Street, at the close of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$ 

conversation with the late  $\mbox{\rm Bro.}$  Levander and with  $\mbox{\rm Bro.}$  Songhurst, at which  $\mbox{\rm I}$ 

undertook the search for Anthony Sayer's family, I stood on the doorstep and

wondered where I was to begin, whether I should step off to the left, which

would lead me to Public Record Office, or to the right, which would lead me  $\,$ 

to the Probate Registry at Somerset House. There was nothing to give me any  $\,$ 

clue, and I decided to go to the right, and in Somerset House I spent long hours  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

on many occasions before I found any reference to an Anthony Sayer. It was

this discovery that led me to work out the Sayers of the Berkshire area for the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{E}}$ 

Anthony Sayer whose name I found turned out to be Anthony Sayer the Second.

I need not detail all the searches which I made or caused to be made, nor give

any account of the many failures and hopeless positions which  $\ensuremath{\text{I}}$  encountered

except to say that had it not been for the kindness of Bro. Songhurst and his

helpful suggestions I should have abandoned the search in despair. I have set

out fully a list of all the searches which have been made, and their results will

be found in the relative Appendices. I may mention that particulars of the

searches which had been made up to a point where it seemed impossible to  ${\tt go}$ 

any further were submitted through Bro. Songhurst to the late Bro.  $\mbox{W}.$   $\mbox{H}.$ 

Rylands, whose knowledge of genealogy and similar matters was so  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{great}}$ , and

he expressed the opinion that everything that could be done had been done, and

except for some few suggestions that were followed up he could not indicate

any other enquiries which could be made. In Part B. I have suggested some

future searches or enquiries which can be made, or old lines of search continued,

and I feel that unless something can be done or discovered on these lines the  $\,$ 

subject is entirely exhausted; and we must resign ourselves to the conclusion

that the force of circumstances has operated to preclude the discovery of the

actual family of which our Anthony Sayer was a member. I shall continue

as far as possible, in view of my limited powers and opportunities, the search

on the lines indicated, and if any results are obtained, even although negative,

they will be added to this collection for the benefit of those who come after.

At the same time I do feel that a new mind brought to bear on the subject,

and by the aid of the materials here collected, a younger man with  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{more}}$ 

opportunities and energy than I now possess may light upon a clue which will

enable him to disentangle from the confused skein of material those facts which

would go to show that our First Grand Master was, in fact at the time of his

election, a gentleman of family and position and thereby qualified for his

selection to the post which has since been filled by Brethren of the greatest

eminence and station in the land.

## 236 Transactions of the Quatuor Coroliati Lodye.

Among the causes which have operated adversely to success are the fact that it is a search at large - no data to go upon - the loss or mutilation of

Registers — the confused state of Record keeping — the amazing number of classes

of Records and Record areas, both Civil and Ecclesiastical, and the alterations  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

of boundaries of Parishes, Archdeaconries, Dioceses and the like.

It may be convenient to sketch lightly circumstances which existed in the

Church as explaining the loss, or the badly kept Registers of that period. By

an Act of Queen Elizabeth the registration of all Marriages, Burials and Baptisms  $\,$ 

had to be kept by the Ministers of the Parishes under the jurisdiction of the

Church of England — the various penal and test  $\mbox{Acts}$  after giving rise to  $\mbox{non-}$ 

conformity and dissent also gave the opportunity for expelling dissenting clergy

from their benefices, and many Churches were left from this cause, as well as

by the evil of plural livings, either without a Clergyman or with one who was

careless or inattentive to his duties. It must also be remembered that Berkshire

had been very disturbed by several events which must have had for many years

a very bad effect on life in the Berkshire area. The Civil War before the end

of the year 1642 had been brought near Oxford by the fact that the  ${\tt King's}$ 

headquarters were constantly there and local fighting and turmoil was general.

The first battle of Newbury 20th September 1643, tEe second battle of Newbury

22 nd October 1644 and the later battle at Wallingford, the siege and ultimate

destruction of its Castle, one of the last strongholds which held out for the King,  $\,$ 

must have had a great and lasting effect on the neighbourhood of the Berkshire

area. The Commonwealth and the Restoration of the Stuarts 1660, the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{great}}$ 

Plague 1664 and the holding of Parliament at that time at Oxford, were all

contributory factors to unrest and neglect of social and Clerical functions in the  $\,$ 

scattered villages in the vicinity, accentuated by the  $\mbox{Act}$  of  $\mbox{Uniformity,}$ 

Ordination Act, Five Mile Act, Conventicle Act and other devices. The wonder

is not so much at the loss or mutilation of records, registers and the like, as

that so many such have been preserved and remain to this day. Further, the

division of Dioceses, Archdeaconries and the like all contributed to confusion,

and the lack of a central depository for national or even parochial records was

also a contributory factor to the confusion which undoubtedly reigned. Nor  $\,$ 

was this confusion limited to Church records, but those of the Law Courts were  $\,$ 

scattered through many offices and it is well known that many were badly stored  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

and much neglected.

The following details will be found to correspond with the relative Appendices, which are deposited in the Library of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge

for reference by any Brethren who may be interested.

#### APPENDIX A.

INDEXES TO' WILLS & ADMINISTRATIONS. 312 Names noted.

1. PREROGATIVE COURT OF

CANTERBURY ... 1355-1629 1678-1745

- 2. CONSISTORY COURT OF LONDON 1670-1751
- 3. COMMISSARY COURT OF LONDON 1697-1722
- 4. CALENDAR OF WESTMINSTER WILLS 1504-1858
- 5. CALENDAR OF WILLS. COURT OF

HUSTINGS, CITY OF LONDON 1299-1358-1688

6. MS. CALENDAR OF WESTERN

COUNTIES WILLS ... 1613-1749

7. MS. CALENDAR OF OXFORD WILLS 1643-1648

Mr. Anthony Sayer: Gentleman. 237

8. ARCHDEACONRY & CONSISTORY

COURTS OXFORD ... 1701-1734

9. ARCHDEACONRY OF BERKSHIRE... 1508-1652

1715-1768 1624-1676

10. COMMISSARY COURT OF LONDON,

ESSEX AND HERTS. ... 1660-1719

1696-1783

- 11. ARCHDEACONRY COURT OF DITTO 1708-1857
- 12. ARCHDEACONRY OF MIDDLESEX,

ESSEX AND HERTS. ... 1617-1711

1663-1721

Note. - Where various dates are given they refer to different classes of Registers.

APPENDIX B. 87 WILLS &c. read and noted.

WILLS AND ADMINISTRATIONS Selected from the entries found in the Appendix A. giving details of their contents.

```
2.
3.
1 • 4 -
1 5.
t ■ 6 -
1 7.
1 • 8.
i 9.
10.
APPENDIX C.
REGISTERS OF BIRTHS OR BAPTISMS, MARRIAGES & BURIALS.
98 Entries inspected and noted.
CLIFTON-HAMPDEN (Oxon.) ... 1571-1761
YATTENDEN (Berks.) ... 1661-1676 Bapts : only
HAGBOURNE ... 1665-1675 ditto
LITTLE WITTENHAM missing for the material period.
ASTON TIRROLD ditto
HARWELL ... 1564-1669 Marrs: only
ST. GILES in the FIELDS ... 1665-1676 Bapts: only
ST. MARTIN in the FIELDS ... 1665-1677 ditto
ST. PAULS CO-VENT GARDEN ... 1676-1742
ST. CHRISTOPHER le STOCKS ... 1659-1742
```

### APPENDIX D.

CHANCERY PROCEEDINGS. 72 Index entries noted.

92 Suits inspected and noted.

DETAILS of the nature and parties and family relationships given.

APPENDIX E.

EXTRACTS FROM TITLE DEEDS. 2 ESTATES.

15 DEEDS noted with parties and family particulars.

238

Transactions of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge.

APPENDIX F.

PEDIGREES CONSTRUCTED from materials available.

- 1. Pedigree of the ANTHONY SAYER FAMILY
- 2. ,, ",, ANTHONY PYSELEY,,
- 3. ,, ,, ,, JOHN SAYER Citizen of London
- 4. ,, ,, ,, JOHN SAYER the King's Master Cook
- 5. ,, ,, ,, JOHN SAYER of St, James's
- 6. ,, ,, " THE JOSEPH SAYER families
- 7. ,, ,, ,, SAYER of Wallingford
- 8. ,, ,, ,, PETER SAYER family of Henley
- 9. ,, ,, " SIR GEORGE SAYER of St. Martin's and Kent
- 10. ,, ,, " The PROCURATORS GENERAL
- 11. ,, ,, ,, JOHN SAYER of St. Paul's, Covent Garden
- 12. ,, ,, ,, SIR EDMUND SAWYER of Heywood
- 13. ,, ,, ,, SAYER of Cholsey families
- 14. ,, ,, ,, SAYER of Yattenden families

- 15. ,, ,, ,, SAYER families of Didcot and elsewhere
- 16. ,, ,, ,, Bro. F. P. SAYER family (modern)

APPENDIX G.

MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS.

- 14 Inspected.
- 98 Names noted.
- 1. FOSTER ALUMNI OXONIENSIS ... 1577-1762
- 2. MARRIAGE LICENCES ... 1676 et seq.
- 3. LORD ALDENHAM'S LETTER ... 20 April 1919
- 4. MIDDLESEX DEEDS REGISTRY ... 1709-1733
- 5. GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE ... 1731-1743
- 6. HERALDS VISITATIONS ... 1661 et seq.
- 7. BERRY'S COUNTY GENEALOGIES... 1837
- 8. MUSGRAVES OBITUARY ... 1717-1794
- 9. GRANTS OF ARMS ... 1615-1661
- 10. GENEALOGISTS SOCIETY CONSOLIDATED INDEX
- 11. ST. MARTINS IN FIELDS RATE BOOK 1730
- 12. CHANCERY AFFIDAVITS & RECORDS OF INNS OF COURT
- 13. SUBSIDY ROLLS (POLL AND HEARTH TAXES)
- 14. WATER'S GENEALOGICAL GLEANINGS 1653

In addition many books dealing with history and localities have been referred to,

but not noted.

Mr. Anthony Sayer: Gentleman. 239

B.- WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE.

It is difficult to say what can be done to further the searches, as the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

enquiry is one at large. The whole of the Records of England might be

exhausted without any hope of success. But the following suggestions  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{may}}$  be

of use to any subsequent explorer : -

1. Some of the searches already noted may be amplified by earlier or later  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

search (A., B., O, D., G.).

- 2. Enquiry at Salisbury and elsewhere for Visitation Copies of Church Registers missing or mutilated.
- 3. Inspection of Tombstones and Tablets in the Churches of the  $\operatorname{Berkshire}$

Area and elsewhere in that County might afford some help.

Bro. Dring kindly reminded me of 2 and 3 although I had not lost sight of them as they had proved of value to me in other cases.

4. Search at the Public Record Office for Enrolled Deeds, Grants, Recovery

Pines and the like.

5. Further search in Rate Books of St. Martin's and other adjacent Parishes.

It is to be remembered that unless the person searched for was a Householder his name is not likely to be found.

 $\ensuremath{\mathtt{c}}$  >. Search in the Records of the South Sea Proceedings at the Public Record

Office and elsewhere. But this is a hopeless task, as unless the name of the particular Company is known the search is one at large.

7. Search in the Records of the Admiralty, East India Company, Treasury,

and other Public Bodies might be useful but is again at large.

8. Searches in the books of City Companies, Freedoms, and the like. Also

in Rolls of Manors in the Berkshire Area and enquiry into Parish Books, Churchwardens' Accounts or Local Magistrates' proceedings.

I frankly admit that some of the foregoing are hopeless, but as the

desired can, I feel convinced, only be obtained by chance or accident, it might

be well to proceed further on the principle of the Forlorn Hope. In any case  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

I doubt of success, but do not on that account despair. How much, if anv,  $\ensuremath{\mathrm{I}}$ 

may still be able to do is uncertain, but Brethren in the neighbourhood of the  $\,$ 

Berkshire Area or the County might well assist by taking up the items  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{Nos.}}\xspace 2$ 

and 3, especially the latter, which is the most hopeful of results. Any such

might be communicated to Bro.  $\mbox{W. J.}$  Songhurst or myself for incorporation in

the materials given in the Appendices, which, with my original notes, will be, or

are, deposited in the Quatuor Coronati Lodge Library for future reference.

A vote of thanks to Bro. Hobbs was unanimously passed, and comments on the

interesting paper by Bros. Sir Alfred Robbins, J. Heron Lepper, Lionel Vibert, J. E. S.

Tuckett, R. H. Baxter, H. Poole, K. A. Ebblewhite, C. Walton Rippon, Geo. W.

Bullamore, Phillip Crossle, W. J. Williams, and W. L. Rind were read.

#### Brother J. Heron Lepper said: -

In seconding this vote of thanks to Brother Hobbs, which I do with a great deal of pleasure, I think I may voice the condolences of all the members  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

of this Lodge to our good Brother that his researches have not led to  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{more}}$ 

definite results.

240 Transactions of the. Quatuor Corovati Lortr/e..

On learning that Brother Hobbs had spent seven years in preparing this paper, at once there recurred to me the similar bad fortune of the Patriarch,

who served seven years for his wife, and in the end was cheated and received

a Leah instead of a Rachel. In fact, most of the results which Brother Hobbs

has established are of a negative character. We know now innumerable likely

places which have been searched for traces of Anthony Sayer, and searched in vain.

This is pure bad luck. I am sure there is not a Mason here to-night but

wishes with all his heart that Brother Hobbs had found what he was looking

for, for if ever a student deserved success it is he. But such luck is very

prevalent in the game of research; and most of us who play it have become

philosophical enough to swallow the tons of negatives that have had to be

chewed over in search of one affirmative fact.

And Brother Hobbs has had bad luck in another way. He has chosen a

very difficult path of research, one that has been trodden over by the surest

feet and scanned by the sharpest eyes of Masonic students. The very best

brains in our tribe have been employed for long years in seeking to know

everything there is to be known about the Grand Lodge of England and its

early members. We know that there is still something to be discovered in such

paths, but we also know that this 'something 'must be very well concealed or

it would have attracted the notice of such brilliant scholars as Gould, Speth,

and others still with us. The Mason who is not deterred by these considerations  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

but cheerfully goes forward to the hard task may not, probably will not, find

out all he wants; but if he finds out anything at all he will have accomplished

much more than any one of us who has had very few predecessors in his  $\operatorname{own}$ 

particular field of research.

With the question, Was or was not Anthony Sayer a gentleman ? I am not much concerned. Our old poet told us to mark the man that is most intent

on doing all the gentle deeds that he can and to take  $\mbox{him}$  for the finest

gentleman. They were certainly not gentlemen, in the usual acceptation of the

term, who formed the Grand Lodge of the Antients in 1751, yet we know what

they accomplished for Masonry: and I doubt if our Brethren of 1717 were of

much higher social status than Brothers Turner, Morgan and Co. some thirty-

four years later. Gentleman or not, Anthony Sayer will always have a claim

on our remembrance as the first  $\operatorname{Grand}$   $\operatorname{Master}$  of the Premier  $\operatorname{Grand}$   $\operatorname{Lodge}$  of

the world. No doubt he was a good Mason, which would account for his election, and that is quite enough for us.

I am more interested in Brother Hobbs' suggestion that Sayer may have been responsible for the scheme which brought the four old Lodges together to

that epoch-making meeting in 1717. My own notion is that in those days, as

in these, the real power behind the throne would have been the Secretary. But

I fear this fascinating question is likely to remain a mere matter of theory.

Finally, I think that the very fact of his misfortunes makes Anthony Sayer more vivid to us than most of the Grand Officers of those early days

It is pleasant to think that even in the youth of our Grand Lodge it looked after

the deserving Brother when old and fallen upon evil days. Sayer finds himself

in good company with two Grand Officers, Corker and Fowler, names which will

always be honoured in the annals of the Irish Craft, both of whom rendered

the Craft immense services when in their primes, and I am glad to say were  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

not forgotten when old and in necessity. We know that it is blessed to give,

but it surely is also blessed to receive from the hand of a Brother. It is

assuredly no blot on the noble roll of English Masonic Charity to find there

the name of our very first Grand Master; it is no blot on his memory that in

his distress he became a suppliant where he had been a ruler, and  $\mathop{\text{did}}\nolimits$  not

appeal in vain.

I think we may take it that Brother Hobbs has established the branch of

the Sayers to which our first Grand Master belonged. In having done so he

deserves our gratitude and praise. More than that, he has indicated further

#### Discussion. 241

directions in which further information might be discovered. I trust that

information will be discovered by only one Mason, and that he will not have to

wait a full further seven years for his Rachel.

# Bro. J. E. S. Tuckett writes: -

Probably all will agree that in this evening's paper Bro. Walter Hobbs has come very near to establishing his contention that Anthony Sayer

correctly described as '  $\mbox{Gentleman}$  ' and technically entitled to be styled '  $\mbox{Anthony}$ 

Sayer, Esquire.' For a long time, however, our first Grand Master has apparently

been regarded by Masonic students with disdain slightly tempered by a more or

less contemptuous pity. In The Four Old Lodges (1879) Bro. R. F. Gould says : -

Bro. Anthony Sayer . . . wielded no influence in Grand Lodge, having become, so early as in 1724, a suppliant for its bounty (p. 10).

There are two assumptions here neither of them supported by any evidence.

We do not know that Sayer 'wielded no influence' in G.L., and the fact that

he was chosen as its first ruler  $^{\prime}$  by a Majority of Hands,  $^{\prime}$  and other happenings

subsequently, suggest that he had a considerable and influential following.

Again we do not know that in 1724 he was a suppliant for G.L. bounty. His

' Peticon ' which ' was read and confirmed by the G.M.' (the Duke of Richmond)

on the 21st November, 1724, was not necessarily a request for charity, either for

his own benefit or for the benefit of anyone else; indeed, we do not know that

it referred to charity at all. Bro. Gould's second assumption was, however,

repeated in Q.C.A., vol. x. (1913), in the Index (p. 354), where the 'Peticon '

is described as a ' Petition for relief.' Bro. E. L. Hawkins, in his Concise

Cyclojxedia (1908) makes a further assumption: -

though indeed he (Sayer) was probably never in much affluence or position in the world (p. 217).

And Bro. Vibert, in The Story of the Craft, referring to Sayer, puts it in this form : -

an individual was elected as Grand Master who would seem to have been both obscure and of small means ... (p. 46).

Bro. Walter Hobbs has done good service in pointing out that the accepted

interpretation of the entry relating to the 'Peticon' of 21st November, 1724, is

an assumption which is not supported by such evidence as is available. That

Sayer's later years were clouded by financial troubles, so acute that he was

granted relief from the Grand Lodge Funds, is no guide as to his social standing

or solvency when he was chosen to preside over the newly-created central  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

governing body. If, in the days of his adversity, he was willing to accept a

humble but honourable office in the Craft for which he received payment, that

fact should but increase our esteem, and certainly cannot justly be counted to

his prejudice.

There is a point which Bro. Hobbs seems to have overlooked. The portrait, painted by Highmore and engraved by Faber, is no doubt an authentic

representation of the features of the first Grand Master. Without any claim

to be an expert, I give it as my opinion that the portrait is that of an educated.

cultured gentleman, with a dignified presence and bearing, one who may very

well have been in his time a 'personage.' Experts may not agree, but, whatever

their verdict may be, the portrait affords light upon the point raised by this

paper which should not be entirely ignored.

On 28th August, 1730, the Master and Wardens of Anthony Sayer's Lodge made a complaint against him in G.L. accusing him of 'great Irregularities.'

242 Transactions of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge.

On the 15th December following he attended to answer his accusers. Opinions

were divided as to his conduct : - •

some of the Brethren being of opinion that what he had done was clandestine; others that it was irregular: The Question was put whether what was done was clandestine or irregular only, and the Lodge was of opinion that it was irregular only. Whereupon the Deputy Grand Master told Br. Sayer that he was acquitted of the charge against him, and recommended him to do nothing so irregular for the future. (G.L.M. in Q.G.A. x., p. 137.)

We do not know what it was that ' was done ' by Bro. Sayer, but there is no

justification for the assumption that he was charged with, still less that he was

guilty of, any dishonesty in money matters. The general opinion (with which  $\ensuremath{\mathrm{I}}$ 

agree) is that Bro. Sayer had taken part in some Craft proceedings not authorised

by, or controlled by, the Grand Lodge. Of a Brother guilty of this today there

would be only one opinion possible. But in 1730 the circumstances were very

different, because there were then Lodges and Masons quite independent of the

Grand Lodge but whose existence was as legitimate as that of the Grand Lodge

itself. An unfavourable estimate of Anthony Sayer's moral character should

rest upon a surer base than this charge of 1730 of the major portion of which

he was acquitted.

It is with pleasure that I join in the vote of appreciation and thanks to

Bro. J. Walter Hobbs for his interesting and valuable paper, and give expression  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

to the hope that he may yet be able to identify the family of our first  $\mbox{\mbox{\bf Grand}}$   $\mbox{\mbox{\bf Master.}}$ 

Bro. Rodk. H. Baxtee writes: -

Bro. J. Walter Hobbs is certainly to be congratulated on his patient endeavours to unearth authentic particulars of our first Grand Master's

antecedents, and, although he has not quite succeeded in his quest, I, somehow,

have the feeling that his work will lead to a definite result.

It is unfortunate that Bro. Hobbs should have mentioned in his ' ' Fore-

word " that Bro. Levander was W.M. of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge in the  $\,$ 

early part of 1916, as, actually, his installation did not take place until November

in that year. The point may not be very important, but it is always well to

be accurate.

As to the Highmore portrait of Sayer, "Bromley's Catalogue" may be quite right in assigning the engraving to 1750. It does not follow that the

painting was of the same date. Indeed, if it were I should be disinclined to

place much reliance on it from a likeness point of view, and so far as details

are concerned they could hardly be of value. I have heard it argued that Saver  $\,$ 

must have been an operative. - probably a master-builder in a small way of

business — because the hand in the portrait is that of a workman. The story  ${}^{\prime}$ 

that he was a clerk in Wren's drawing office comes from a tainted source and

deserves no credence, although, as Bro. Hobbs points out, a position of that

kind would be rightly looked on as one of importance and entitle the holder to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

be regarded as a gentleman.

Paragraph (d) in the Summary of Part I. of Bro. Hobbs' paper seems to me to offer hope that the inquiry may be further followed. It is> not made

clear that birth registers have been searched for the issue of the Joseph Sayer -

Mary Pyseley wedding of 1645, nor that the burial register of St. Paul's, Covent

Garden, has been examined for particulars of parentage.

Discussion. 243

Bro. H. Poole writes: -

I have read Bro. Hobbs' paper with great interest; and, though I cannot

but agree with the writer that the results are not yet conclusive, I feel sure

that the majority opinion will be that he has established the claim of Anthony

Sayer to the title of ' Gentleman.'

I am particularly struck with his suggestion that Sayer was probably  $\mathbf{a}^{+}$ 

least one of the prime movers of the re-organisation of 1717; and also — which

had not occurred to me - that the incidents of 1724, and perhaps even of 1730,

were perhaps due to his anxiety at the way things were going. (May I suggest

that the quotation in full of the  ${ t G.L.}$  Minutes at those two dates would be

useful to the reader who has no Masonic library: or at least a reference —  $\ensuremath{\text{G.L.}}$ 

Minutes, 28 Aug., 1730- to the latter.)

One point appears to me to require correction — and one which, though slight, is not without its interest, though hardly throwing light on the present

subject. I do not agree that the first two Grand Wardens must have been

speculative is ; nor that, as a Mason, a Carpenter could only have been a

Speculative. In London, the Carpenters' Gild was in existence as a separate

body in 1333, the Plasterers' in 1501, and the Tylers' and Bricklayers' in 1568  $-\,$ 

there may be earlier references, but I have no note of them; but in a number

of provincial towns the '  $\mbox{building trades}$  ' were associated as a single  $\mbox{Gild}$  or

Company. At Norwich, sixteenth century, the Masons and Tilers seem to have

belonged to the same Gild as the Smiths and Lime-burners; but the import of

the term 'Mason' seems clear from an order of 1549  $\{A.Q.G.~xv.,~203\}$ , where

we find "  $\hdots$  . . artificers of the mysteryes scients & occupacions of masons-

craft . . . reputed & called by the name of Roughemasons briklayers & Fremasons Eeders Carpenters & Tylerscrafte." Again, the 16th- 17th Century

Company of the Wrights at Kendal consisted of the Carpenters, Joiners, Masons,

Wallers, Slaters, Thatchers, Glaziers, Painters, Plasterers, Daubers, Pavers,

Millers, and Coopers. Even in London there seems to have been at an early

date a close connection between the Carpenters and Masons; and Bro. Conder  $\ensuremath{\text{Conder}}$ 

{A.Q.G. xxvii., 81) quotes the appointment, in 1272, of two Master Carpenters

and two Master Masons as 'viewers.'

It seems to me, therefore, that, as we are justified in supposing that some of the 'Masonry' worked in London in the early eighteenth century was

on ' provincial ' lines, there may well have been a number of operatives calling

themselves Masons, who were really of the allied crafts; and that it was his

operative qualification which led to the selection of Mr. Joseph Lamball as one  $\,$ 

of the first Grand Wardens. Furthermore' — and this is why I consider the point

worth raising — this operative qualification, I believe, was regarded as a necessity;

for the first of the  $^{\prime}$  ' New Articles, '' given by both the Roberts pamphlet and

Anderson as of 1663, and perhaps actually appearing earlier in the  $\operatorname{Grand}$ 

Lodge 2 and Harleian 1942 MSS., insists on the presence, among the five  $\,$ 

Freemasons constituting a Lodge, of at least one operative of the Craft. This,

I feel sure, is why in every year from 1717 to 1722 we find at least one genuine

operative among the Grand Wardens; and, even in 1723, the name erased seems

to be that of William Hawkins, Mason.

# Bro. Ernest A. Ebblewhite writes: -

I esteem the privilege of being allowed to see the advance proof of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Bro}}$  .

J. Walter Hobbs' scholarly article on " Mr. Anthony Sayer, Gentleman."

My maternal grand-uncle, the late Francis Compton Price, 1 a facsimilist,

who worked for many years at the British Museum and collaborated with uhe

1 " Whose name is a guarantee of accuracy " (Dr. W. J. Chetwode Crawley, in A.Q.C. xi., 4).

#### 244 Transactions of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge.

late Bro. Speth in the early days of A.Q.C., died on the 12th September last,

aged eighty-three. In 1898 Mr. Price gave me an advance copy of the portrait

of Anthony Sayer which afterwards appeared in "  $\!\!\!$  History of the Old King's Arms

Lodge No. 28," and lie described it to me as "the portrait of a kinsman."  $\,$ 

In 1903 he gave me a copy of the book itself, which contains a Chapter on

Anthony Sayer.

In 1898 I showed the print to my maternal grandfather, the late Nathaniel  $\,$ 

Price, who was born 14th December, 1825, fifteen years before the donor, and

he told me that he had heard from his father, Bro. James Price (1790-1859).

member of the Salopian Lodge No. 262 from 24th December, 1814, to 1822, that

the latter believed he was related to Anthony Sayer through his maternal grand-

father Sayer, and that this belief was based on a statement made to him by

his maternal uncle, William Sayer, " a student of old-world subjects," when he

stayed with him, as a young man, in Parliament Street, Westminster, but that

Bro. James Price added: "We are not proud of the connection."

I have never followed up this information, and cannot give either the Christian name or origin of my Sayer ancestor, who must have been born about

eleven years after Anthony Sayer was elected Grand Master; but I have these

notes as to five of his children (who are not in order of birth): -

(a) William Sayer of Parliament Street and formerly of  ${\tt H.M.}$  Victualling

Office, Accountant for Cash to the Commissioners of Victualling 1756-1799. He held a freehold messuage at Penkridge, Staffordshire. Died 24th April, 1811, leaving a widow, Mrs. Sarah Sayer, who removed to No. 15, Great Queen Street (the old house now occupied as a joiner's shop by Messrs. Spencer and Co.), and died 30th March, 1830. They both lie buried in Westminster Abbey. William Sayer (who gave the tradition to my great-grandfather, Bro. James Price) was born in 1737, the year in which Bro. Anthony Sayer, as Tyler, was first relieved by the Old King's Arms Lodge.

- (b) John Sayer, of Atcham, Shropshire, miller and farmer, to whom the Penkridge property was devised, and who died in 1828.
- (c) Thomas Sayer, who died before 1809 leaving a widow, Mary.
- (d) James Sayer.
- (e) Mary, who, on the 17th January, 1788, married James Price, of Berwick Malveyson, otherwise Maviston, in the Parish of Atcham, yeoman, and died in July, 1809. She was my great-great-grand-mother.

Perhaps these few notes may be of service in extending the enquiry on the hypothesis that my great-great-great-grandfather Sayer was a nephew or

grand-nephew of the Grand Master.

I have always thought that Bro. Anthony Sayer may have been a countryman who became a freeman of the City of London, though I fear I cannot give

any reason for the faith which is within me, and would suggest a search in the

records of the Chamber of London and of some of the Livery Companies.

Bro. Philip Crossle writes: -

I see you are having a paper on Anthony Sayer on next Tuesday. I wonder if Bro. Hobbs has tried the Irish pedigrees. There is a Prerogated Will

indexed "Thomas Sayer of Dublin, merchant," proved in 1705, but the Wills

were burnt in the late conflagration of the Four Courts.

We are all indebted to Bro. Hobbs for his paper, and, more than that, for the great outlay of directed energy the results of which it embodies.

Although he has not achieved the main object of his investigations it is not

because of any lack of skill, patience, or diligence, but because of the inherent

difficulties of the task. He is like those bold explorers in Arctic regions who

fail themselves to reach the goal though they clear the path for others, or, at

least, prevent them exploring a cul de sac.

And now concerning Part I. "Was Anthony Sayer a Gentleman?"
Passing by the little asides concerning Jacobinism and other ' isms,'
and the

attack upon Dr. Anderson, whom Bro. Hobbs intends to call as his chief witness,

and of whom it may be said that, for this occasion only, he praises with faint

damns, we come after a while to the statement in the 1738 Constitutions that

Mr. Antony Sayer, Gentleman, was elected Grand Master of Masons. The 1738

account of the reason for forming a Grand Lodge is really no more than an

enlarged and supplemental statement of things more lightly touched upon in

the 1723 edition. It is not at variance with the former more concise statement.

As to the notorious fabrications by  $\operatorname{Dr.}$  Anderson of entries referring to

himself, presumably Bro. Hobbs refers chiefly to the alteration in the Grand

Lodge Minute Book as to the choice of James Anderson, A.M., as Warden in

place of Mr. William Hawkins. With full knowledge of what Bro. Vibert

written on that incident, there does not appear to be any ultimate falsity in

the altered statement which is made undisguisedly and prominently. Surely

this is a matter which comes within the principle of Bro. Hobbs' proposition

" that Anderson's account of the proceedings and parties to the Grand Lodge

formation are correct, for his publication of it took place in the lifetime of some

of the principal actors who would have known if the facts were not correctly

stated." We have all known cases where Minutes were irregularly, but truth-

fully, altered, or, rather, as in this case, added to - for it should be noted that

Anderson did not strike out the record of the appointment of  $\operatorname{Mr}$ . William

Hawkins.

As a matter of fact, the alteration is not in a Minute, but in a list of

Grand Wardens. Are there any other, and, if any, what, entries referring to

Anderson himself which are notoriously or at all fabrications by him ? I do  $\,$ 

not overlook Bro. Songhurst's note on p. 49 of Q.C.A. x. There is a grave danger

that, in our zeal for exposing the undoubted weaknesses and inaccuracies of

Anderson, we may be led into assuming jwima facie that only the contrary of

every statement he makes is true, and thus we may, unwittingly, convert  $\lim$ 

into a kind of negative guide. His great offence is that he undertook to write

the history of the Craft prior to 1717, with the alarming result recorded in the  $\,$ 

1738 Constitutions, of which it may well be said:  $- \blacksquare$ 

# ' ' When facts were weak : his native cheek Helped him serenely through."

Bro. Hobbs suggests that Bro. Sayer's petition in 1724 was not for the purpose of charity, and he would not be surprised if it had reference to

certain alterations in the original plan of Grand Lodge. If, however, the

Petition of Sayer so read and recommended by the Grand Master had dealt

with any such serious matter as the general published principles of the Society,

it seems certain that some further and fuller notice would have been taken of it,  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{T}}$ 

and it would not have been dismissed simply as read and recommended. The  $\,$ 

fact is there was then no general Charity Fund in existence, but the next entry  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{E}}$ 

in the G.L, Minutes (Q.C.A. x., 59) is: "The Kt. Honble the Earl of Dalkeith

"Late Grand Mar. recommended a General Charity as follows (vizt.)," as there

follows, and the juxtaposition is very significant.

After all the faculty of Imagination did not expire in the person of  $\lim$ 

who is dubbed by ' Bro. Hobbs the Master of Imagination. It would have been a sad loss to the World and to us if it had expired.

246 Transactions of the Qaatiior Coronati Lodge.

It should, perhaps, be pointed out that, if Bro. J. E. Shum Tuckett's

tentative suggestions in regard to Dr. Anderson's first charge are to be accepted,

Bro. Sayer, so far from being a complainant, was an arch conspirator; for the

motive and object which led to the formation of the premier Grand Lodge in

1717 was the desire to 'throw open 'the Craft, that is to remove the Christian

restriction so far as the Lodges of London and Westminster were concerned."

The probability is that for a time Bro. Sayer was financially helped by

his own Lodge and by other Freemasons. The fact that he had been Grand Master was well known, and would have been, and indeed was, a powerful incentive to the grant of such aid. As soon as there were any funds in hand

for Charity a petition from him came up again, and he was relieved thereout.

I am sure  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{Bro}}$  . Hobbs and most of us have known many cases of very worthy

and even wealthy people who have from affluence speedily and suddenly sunk

almost to destitution. Hence the subsequent poverty of Bro. Sayer cannot

rightly make us suspect the correctness of the attribution to him of the title  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{L}}$ 

 $^{\prime}$  Gentleman  $^{\prime}$  as implying the special status which in those days attached to

that word. There were many such ' Gentlemen ' in Debtors' prisons at the time.

May I suggest that in the final print  $\operatorname{Bro}$ . Hobbs should also set out the

fact that the Register of St. Paul's Church, Covent Garden, records Bro. Sayer's

burial under date 5th January, 1742, " Anthony Sayer from St. Giles in the

Fields "; and that the direct evidence of the marriage between Joseph Sayer and

Mary Pyseley should also be set forth in full. This seems desirable having regard

to our Brother's opinion that our Anthony Sayer was a child of that marriage.

This may aid the carrying out of the search as to any issue of that marriage. It may be possible to find out when and where one or both of the  ${\cal O}$ 

two parties to that marriage lived and died, and so narrow the area of search

for evidence of the birth or baptism of our Anthony Sayer, although we must

gratefully acknowledge that, even here, our Brother has to all appearance

exhausted all but a very small residue of possibilities, and that the absence

of the Registers of Little Wittenham for the material period almost bolts the  $\,$ 

door in our face.

However that may be, we have now more than ample reason for adopting the conclusion, for which no good reason for doubt has ever been assigned, that

Anthony Sayer, the first Grand Master of Free Masons under the new organisa-

tion of 1717, was accurately described by Brothers Anderson, Highmore, and

Faber as a Gentleman.

#### Bro. W. L. Rind writes: -

There is one point, I think, as to which Bro. Hobbs' admirable paper requires correction. He was wrong in identifying Sayer with Sawyer. The

latter is clearly an occupational name, while Sayer from the mere fact that we

have the variant Sayers, most certainly is not. I do not know of any instance

of an occupational name with the possessive final s.

Sawyer appears in the Hundred Rolls as le Sawyere and le Saghere. Sayer from the fact of the existence of Sayers is a patronymic. The name seems

to have originated with Saher de Quincy, the Earl of Winchester.

It is of course only a coincidence, that our Anthony bears a strong facial

resemblance to the Chev. Queau de Quincy, who was the last French and first

English Governor of the Seychelles Islands in 1794, and whose portrait hangs in  $\ensuremath{\text{1794}}$ ,

Government House in that Colony.

The name Sayer seems to be connected with the legendary lore of Northern

Europe and derived from the root sig, meaning conquest. The same root appears  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

in Sigurd, Seward, Seaward, Sebert, Seabright, Seaman, etc. Sayer

Discussion. 247

appears in the Hundred Rolls as Sayer Herberd, Saer Batagle, and Saer Bude,  $\,$ 

and is found in the Calendarium Rotulorum Patentium in Turri Londinensi,

the Guildhall Records, and elsewhere.

#### Bro. J. Walter Hobbs writes in reply: $-\blacksquare$

I am extremely grateful to the Brethren who have commented on the Paper and for the reception my endeavours to discover something about our

First Grand Master have been accorded. Bro. Crossle's reference to Irish Sayers

is useful but such as I met with gave no indication of any member  ${\tt named}$ 

Anthony. Bro. Poole's valuable suggestions open out matters which, although

only incidental to my main purpose, would no doubt lead to much further light

being thrown on the position of the Brethren who were the originators of the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{E}}$ 

organisation afterwards taken out of their hands. Bro. Tuckett quotes the chief

references to Sayer's actions in 1730, and in response to Bro. Poole's suggestion

I here set out the whole of the statements in G.L. Minutes of  $1724 \ \mathrm{from}$ 

Q.C.A. x., 59: -

At a Quarterly Communication held at the Crown Tavern

behind the Royall Exchange London the 21st of Novr 1724

Present

His Grace the Duke of Richmond Grand Mar

M. ffolkes Esqr Deputy Grand Mar

ffran. Sorrell Esqr ) " . " T

->,,■ re t> t Grand Wardens

Mr George Payne )

Brother Anthony Sayers Peticon was read and recommended by the grand Master.

Now there is no indication of the nature of the Petition but it was recommended by the G.M. Grand Lodge was at that time concerned with the

making of Irregular Masons and the meeting of such in Lodges (Quart : Comm:

19th Feb: 1724), and this was dealt with later in the proceedings. Although

Lord Dalkeith's Motion to set up a General Charity was also brought forward

at this meeting  $\ensuremath{\text{I}}$  see no reason to suppose the Petition had reference to this

subject, or was an application for Charity; but there is much more reason to

regard the Petition as dealing with the question of the new Brethren and Lodges,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

the more so as until this very meeting Past Grand Masters as such had no right

to be present and vote, so that a Petition would appear a more dignified way of

voicing the statements of a Past G.M. than doing so as a Private Lodge member.

The Charity was not effective for years afterwards. Compare the reception of

Bro. Sayer's Petition on this occasion with that of Bro. Jones for Charity on

the 10th May, 1727, and I think it will be agreed that Sayer's Petition was

not for Charity or it would have achieved a similar result and been noted accordingly.

No Anthony Sayer was found among the Sayers of any region but Berkshire, and Bro. Ebblewhite's predecessors, so far as my investigations enable me

to form an opinion, were not related to the First Grand Master.

It has been suggested to me that the identification of "Sayer" with "Sawyer" is not likely to be right, but a re-consideration of the effect of

Wills and Deeds previously noted in Part II. (B) will demonstrate by actual

examples the correctness of  ${\tt my}$  statements. I may add that another  ${\tt Anthony}$ 

Sawyer has since been mentioned to me, but he was a Clerk in the office of the

Paymaster-General of Land Forces in 1742, while our Anthony Sayer died in

the first week of that year. This is probably the man referred to by  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Bro}}\xspace.$ 

Levander (ante).

248

Transactions of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge.

Bro. W. J. Williams has, since his verbal remarks, given me a reference

to "Hatton's new view of London," published in 1708, where Hatton, dealing

with St. Paul's, Covent Garden, refers on page 480 to a Tombstone erected by

Peter Sayer to the memory of his Father, Mother, Sister and Son in 1695.

and said to be at the West end of the Church. This Peter was a son of John

of the interior and exterior of the Church and its burial ground and no tuch

Tombstone is to be found; tire bulk of the ground is paved with such stones

most having had the inscriptions chiselled down. As to a possible reason for  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

the burial of Anthony Sayer at St. Paul's instead of St. Giles it is hardly

possible to speak with certainty. He was clearly not related to Peter Sayer or  $\,$ 

his Father, but from inspection of the Registers I incline to the opinion that

for some reason St. Paul's Church was fashionable, for Burials from many other  $\,$ 

Parishes having Burial grounds are entered. As an example, in the same year

as Anthony Sayer there was buried at St. Paul's " Peter son of Harmen Noorthouck from the Precinct of the Savoy." I think that as the Funeral

procession started from the Piazza in Covent Garden the probability is that the

"  $\mbox{\sc Gentlemen}$  of the best Quality," who formed it, made the arrangements and

probably found the cost.

To conclude, I remain of the same views expressed in the Paper, and content myself by saying that Anthony Sayer was in fact a "Gentleman" and cannot be dislodged from that position by unsupported assumptions or surmises.

Transactions of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge.

249

REVIEW.

HISTORY OF THE GRAND LODGE OF FREE AND ACCEPTED

MASONS OF IRELAND.

Vol. I.

By John Heron Lepper & Philip C'rossle. 1925.

HIS excellent work is published by the Dublin Lodge of Research, to whose enterprise we are greatly indebted. The book is dedicated to the Earl of Donoughmore, the Grand Master of Ireland, who contributes a charming note, exhibiting those characteristics of courtesy and kindly feeling which his ancestors also possessed and of which the English Masons in certain degrees outside the Craft fortunately have the benefit.

The opening chapters on early myth and legend in Ireland are interesting. These, however, resemble those everywhere arising

along the path of the Aryan race, with the usual racial variations. As early as

1688 speculative Masons were being admitted into operative Lodges in Ireland,

and probably long before the example of the English Masons was copied in the

formation of a Grand Lodge, speculative Masonry had spread over the whole country.

The Irish Grand Lodge was certainly in existence some time before the first date on which a definite record appears, for the notice in the Dublin

Weekly Journal of 26th June, 1725, shows a completely organised body. This

is not especially astonishing, for it must be recognised that  ${\tt Dublin}$  was never

an ' Irish ' city but was more or less cosmopolitan with a leaning towards English

customs, which generally came across by way of Bristol, and in Masonry, at any  $\,$ 

rate, was attended by a certain amount of reciprocity between the two Cities.

There was an early element of trouble in the formation of a rival Grand

Lodge of Munster, but this soon was put right, and in 1731 Munster merged

itself in the Grand Lodge of Ireland. From this date the real work of the

Grand Lodge begins. The type of man seeking admission into the  $\operatorname{Craft}$  of

Ireland was of the best, and this was materially assisted by the adoption of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{A}}$ 

Inspection Committees whose work was to make enquiry into the status and

character of the candidates. This was, and is, a very sensible method of

procedure, and is by no means unknown in England nowadays under the style

of a "Selection Committee," a quite unofficial body, however. In this matter,

as also in the issue of Lodge Warrants, first issued 1st February, 1731, it is

correct to say that "Ireland has given the lead to the whole Masonic world."  $% \label{eq:masonic} % \label{eq:ma$ 

There are other points worthy of commendation, such as the uniformity of the ritual which has not varied since 1761 and the Charge to the candidate

after initiation, which is of Irish origin. It first appeared in print in Smith's

Pocket Companion, Dublin, 1735. There is also the valuable reference to the

Royal Arch at Youghall in 1743, and an entry in the Minute Book of the Vernon

Masonic Lodge at Coleraine, dated 16th April, 1752, this being the earliest known

250 Transactions of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge.

reference to the Koyal Arch degree in a Lodge Minute Book. Similiarly, in the

Minute Book of the Shamrock Lodge, Cork, dated 23rd April, 1751, is an early

entry of the holding of a "Master's Lodge."

The Irish Lodge had the same difficulty in collecting its dues as had the English Lodge, human nature being pretty much the same everywhere. Chapter 4 gives biographical notes on the Grand Lodge Officers from 1725 to

1788, some of which are full of perhaps unconscious humour. The example of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

prenatal suggestion on p. 181 is interesting, but not convincing to the medical

mind. The play of wit in some of the poetical extracts is typically Hibernian;

perhaps the best is that on p. 210.

Probably the greatest service Ireland rendered to English Freemasonry was the formation of the Grand Lodge of the Antients by the Irish Masons who

had settled in England. The account here given is one of the most complete

statements that we are likely to need on this subject. It does full justice to

that remarkable man, Laurence Dermott, who emphatically left his country for

another country's good. This sequence by no means always or even necessarily

occurs, but when it does occur the results are usually phenomenal, and in this

instance have lasted up to the present day.

" The whole story of the split between the Antients and Moderns leads one to believe and hope that there is something so splendidly vital in our noble

Craft that neither the mistakes of its rulers, nor the tinkerings of would-be

innovators, will ever have more than an ephemeral effect." This admirably sums

up the situation, and its truth has been amply demonstrated time after time.

The good things brought forward by both were in the long run adopted by their

legitimate successor in England, and we are enjoying to-day the benefit of their

endeavours. The tumult and the shouting have died away, and only the valuable  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

results remain for our advantage.

The Antients were pioneers in many ways, and whether the ideas were translated into action from Irish originals or not, the effect has been most

satisfactory. The oldest form of a Lodge Certificate given by a Lodge at Lurgan,

which is still in existence, is interesting because it shews that in 1754 the term

of " Sublime degree of a master mason " had been evolved. It is also in a

large measure due to the fostering care of the Irish Masons that we owe the  $\,$ 

propagation of the Eoyal Arch and the Higher Degrees.

The story of the discords and rebellions in a disturbed country such

Ireland has been for many years, which had their inevitable effect on Masonry,

is told with fairness and accuracy. Particularly noteworthy is the account of

the attempt to make Masonry the servant of a political association under the

guise of meeting as a Lodge of Freemasons. The letter sent from the  $\operatorname{Irish}$ 

Grand Lodge dealing with the discussion or publication of religious or political

matters in a Freemasons Lodge is a dignified and clear statement of a most

important principle. " True Masonry prefers no Sect, and acknowledges no

Party." The later attempt to form a rival Grand Lodge of Ulster is described

at length, but, like the Grand Lodge of England South of the Trent, it lasted

only a short time. Things past may be repented, not recalled.

The task of reading through this book has been a very pleasant one. The details of the origin, progress and vicissitudes common to all things, is told

in a clear and convincing manner. The citation of authorities is of the utmost

value, and is evidence for all statements made on controversial matters. Irish

Masonry has long waited for an authoritative account, and the authors are ta

be thanked warmly and congratulated heartily on the result of their labours.

We hope that in the next part they will give a picture of the normal course of

a subordinate Lodge of the last century, whether the difference between then  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

and now be great or small.

The claim of Ireland to have advanced Masonry in many ways must be admitted, e.g., by means of the Military Lodges Masonry was spread over the

Globe, though some claims may be open to question, for example, " The  ${\tt Enter'd}$ 

lieview.

251

Prentices Song," which has always been attributed to Matthew Birkhead, is

tentatively thought to be of Irish origin, decidedly with respect to the tune,

"which is old Irish of a most characteristic kind," and probably also the words.

The so-called Celtic races are supposed to have a monopoly of good poetry, but

this trait is not specially apparent in this effusion, nor even in the other  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

Masonic poetry quoted.

The illustrations scattered without sequence throughout the letterpress are

of the utmost value. Every one of them is good and some are rare. This method of non sequitur lends a delightful feeling of anticipation to the reader,

who is sure to come across a charming and interesting photograph when not

expecting one, and every now and then he finds one which is worthy of prolonged  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

study. "As some witty device expressed with cunning workmanship, something  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$ 

obscure to be perceived at first, whereby, when with further consideration it is  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

understood, it may the greater delight the beholder."

We have never enjoyed reading a Masonic history so much as we have done this one, and we recommend it as deserving of careful study and worthy of

the sincere approval of every Freemason who desires light and information on

the history of the Craft. " Pleasant without hardness, smooth without any

roughness, sweet without tediousness, easy to be understood, without harsh,

absurdity; yielding a gracious harmony everywhere to the delight of the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

reader."

May, 1926.

John Stokes.

252

Transactions of the Quatuor Goronatt Lodge.

OBITUARY.

1 -^

^ \

e^g

T. is with much regret we have to record the death of the following Brethren : —  $\blacksquare$ 

Henry Ballentyne, of Glasgow, on 16th June, 1924. He was a P.M. of Lodge No. 556 and P.Z. of Chapter No. 122. Bro. Ballentyne was a Life Member of our Correspondence Circle, which he joined in 1919.

Charles Butcher, of London, S.E., on 2nd April, 1924. Our Brother was Past Assistant Grand Pursuivant; and Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies (R.A.). He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since March, 1906.

Frederick John Ghilds, of London, S.W., on 1st April, 1924. Bro. Childs was a P.M. of Stanhope Lodge No. 1269, and had attained L.R. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in 1908.

Owen Aly Clark, M.B.E., of Gorleston-on-Sea, in May, 1924. Bro.

Clark was Dep.Pr.G.M. of Suffolk, Past Grand Deacon in Grand Lodge, and

Past Grand Standard Bearer in Grand Chapter. He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since October, 1907.

Rev. Charles E. Cooper, of Lincoln, in 1924. He was a member of Lodge No. 24 (B.C.), and a Life Member of our Correspondence Circle, which

he joined in October, 1908.

Alan Bell Gordon, of Cape Colony, on 4th April, 1924. Our Brother was Past Grand Deacon of England, and held the offices of District Grand Master

and Grand Superintendent. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence

Circle in October, 1912.

Robert William Victor McCall, of Victoria, on 22nd April, 1924. Bro. McCall was Past Deputy Grand Master. He joined our Correspondence Circle

in November, 1922.

David Ogden, of Dublin, on 26th May, 1924. He was P.M. of Lodge No. 25, and P.K. of the Chapter attached thereto. Our Brother had been a

member of our Correspondence Circle since May, 1911.

Thomas John Railing, of Colchester, on 5th April, 1924. Bro. Railing

was Pr.G.Sec. of Essex, which office he had held since 1877; he was also

Pr.G.Sc.E., and held the rank of Past Grand Deacon in Grand Lodge and Past

Assistant Grand Sojourner in Grand Chapter. He was elected to membership

of our Correspondence Circle in January, 1890.

Richard James Reece, M.A., M.D., of London, W., on 20th April, 1924. Our Brother was Past Grand Deacon and Past Grand Standard Bearer (R.A.). He joined our Correspondence Circle in March, 1911.

John Tricks Spalding, J. P., of Nottingham, on 9th June, 1924. Bro. Spalding was Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies and Past Grand

Standard Bearer (R.A.). He had been a member of our Correspondence Circle  $\dot{}$ 

since May, 1894.

Henry Warne, of Norwich, in 1924. Our Brother was P.Pr.G.R., and P.Pr.G.J. He was elected to membership of our Correspondence Circle in March, 1907.

Major William Wilkinson, of Bishop Auckland, on 25th May, 1924. Bro. Wilkinson held the rank of Past Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies,

and had been a member of our Correspondence Circle since March, 1902.

SUMMER OUTING, 1924.

BIRMINGHAM AND NEIGHBOURHOOD.

BY BEO. J. WALTER IIOBBS.

HE venue for this year's Outing was fixed at Birmingham as a centre, though it is obvious that to visit a crowded City and manufacturing district does not hold out every advantage required for an outing; but the obvious reasons are fundamental, viz., that Headquarters can be obtained sufficiently large to provide Hotel accommodation for the whole party, and that ample- means of locomotion are available. Thus Birmingham answered these requirements to the full, and few if any of the visiting Brethren who journeyed from London on Thursday, 3rd July,

through rural scenes of beauty, anticipated or expected to remain within

the City boundary, but rather to be outing therefrom, and in this they were

not disappointed.

O'n arrival at Snow Hill Station the visitors were met and welcomed by V.W. Bro. Canon Barnard, Dep.Prov.G.M., Warwickshire, and other local Brethren, and proceeded to the Grand Hotel, where members from Bristol, Bath,

Sheffield, Lancashire and the North had already foregathered. The weather

was generally unpropitious, but the party started at once in motors to visit

Bournville and the works of Messrs. Cadbury Bros, there, upon the kind invitation of that Firm. O'n arrival the party transferred into the Firm's motor

vehicles and toured the Bournville Estate, having the various points of interest

indicated. The village was a precursor of the Town Planning schemes and of

other advantages now conceded to working class residences.

The story of the Bournville business covers the whole range of the growth

of an industry, from the early experiments of John Cadbury, who eighty years

ago made cocoa and chocolate with pestle and mortar in his Birmingham ware-

house, to the highly developed organisation of a concern whose functions are world-wide.

Though as early as 1853 Cadbury Brothers had received a Royal Appointment as Cocoa and Chocolate Makers to Queen Victoria, the rapid development

of the business dates from the late sixties. When, in 1879, the premises in

Birmingham became inadequate for the growing trade, Richard and George Cadbury transferred their works to a site in the country, which became known

as Bournville.

The step, at that time, was regarded as courting disaster, but the soundness

of the Firm's decision was at once justified by their rapid and continuous  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

prosperity. The progress of the business is perhaps best measured by the growth

in the numbers employed: -

In 1861 there were 14 employees; in 1879, after the transfer to Bourn-ville, there were 230; to-day the number approaches 10,000.

254 Transactions of the Quatnor Coronati Lodge.

The removal to Bourn ville was justified, however, in other ways. It rendered possible, not only the realisation of the ideal of the heads of the

business to secure a country environment for their workers, but the evolution

of many schemes for the employees' welfare which would have been impossible

under town conditions. They were fortunate in acquiring land in a countryside

possessing many natural beauties. With increasing prosperity they were from

time to time able to make additional purchases, including a picturesque estate

with extensive lawns and woodland, which was set aside as a recreation ground

for employees, and together with other lands was secured for that purpose for all time.

In 1895 Mr. George Cadbury founded the Bournville Estate, an incalculable asset to the Bournville community. Occupying at first some 300 acres

of land on either side of the pretty Bourn stream, from which the village takes

its name, it has constantly extended its boundaries. The original garden village

of Bournville and three other villages which have come into being now cover

860 acres, and have a population of 5,000.

Two villages have already been completed on the Estate, and good progress

is being made with two others. The first cottages were built in 1879, but the

greater part of the building dates from 1895 and onward. The originator of

the scheme was Mr. George Cadbury, of the Manor House, Northfield.

The whole property was handed over to a body of Trustees on behalf of the nation in 1901, and with accruing revenue, is administered by the Trustees,

subject to the final control of the Charity Commissioners, to whom a balance  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

sheet and report are sent year by year.

The Founder in the Deed states that he. desires the rents may :

if practicable, be fixed on such basis as to make them accessible to persons of the labouring and working classes, whom it is his desire to attract from the crowded and insanitary tenements which they now inhabit, without, however, placing them in the position of being recipients of a bounty.

To avoid misunderstanding, it should be said that the village is not reserved for Messrs. Cadbury 's workpeople, the scheme not being intended for their

benefit only, but as a contribution towards solving the Housing problem, especially

as it exists in large cities. A large number of the householders work at Messrs.

Cadbury's, but the others are employed in the neighbouring manufacturing

villages, or in industry or civil or other service in Birmingham, which is easily

accessible by rail, electric car, or bicycle.

The visitors were then formed in groups of six, with one of the clerical

staff detached as guide to each (the regular staff of guides, about twenty in

number, not being called on), and the Works were visited, or rather different

parts of them, so that the whole were seen by one or other group. The various

processes were explained, and the automatic machines in use were most interesting. One in particular rolled up a sheet of paper and by means of what

one may call mechanical fingers, folded down in succession one end of the roll,

which was then placed as a lining inside the tins to hold cocoa. The automatic

fillers were fed from above, and the supply cut off when the proper weight of

material had accumulated, which then was shot into the tin, and the process

resumed once more. The making of Chocolates and Confectionery, packing in

all stages, and ultimate delivery into railway trucks for despatch all over the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

world gave much to think of and was evidence of a fine organisation. The

visitors were specially entertained to tea in the Conservatory adjoining one of

the Recreation Gardens, and a souvenir was presented to each visitor.  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}$ 

torrential downpour of rain was experienced during this pleasant function, but

happily passed off just after starting the return to Headquarters.

In the evening there was a special meeting of welcome by the Provincial

Grand Lodge of Warwickshire at the Masonic Hall, New Street, when the Provincial Grand Master, Col. W. F. Wyley, P.G.D., expressed the pleasure of

the Warwickshire Brethren at the visit, to which Sir Alfred Robbins, our W.M.,

Summer Outing. 255

suitably replied. The Masonic Library and Museum of the Province was inspected, many of the special objects having been set out and arranged by

Bro. S. J. Fenton, the Secretary to the Library Committee. Much regret was

expressed on all sides at the enforced absence of Bro. Swinden, the  $\operatorname{Provincial}$ 

G.S. The Brethren who undertook his duties in regard to the visit very successfully filled his place and earned the gratitude of the visitors.

Friday, 4th July, saw the party on the way by motors to Knowle, a small town on the summit of a hill, formed into an ecclesiastical parish out of  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

Hampton-in-Arden in 1850. The foundation of the important collegiate church

or chapel of Knowle, usually wrongly stated, is set forth at length in vol. ii. of

the "Victoria History " of the County. In 1397, Walter Cook, Canon of Lincoln and native of the widespread parish of Hampton-in-Arden, rebuilt the

chapel of Knowle on a large and beautiful scale in honour of SS. John Baptist,

Anne, and Lawrence, and obtained official sanction for baptismal and burial

rights. Letters patent were granted in 1402, by Henry IV., to Canon Walter

and his father, Adam Cook, to found here a chantry. In 1413 Canon Walter

associated himself with six friends in founding here a guild of two wardens

with brethren and sisters. Meanwhile Canon Walter's emoluments materially

increased; he became also Canon of St. Paul's and of York, and also held

the archdeaconries of Berkshire and Exeter. He associated himself with Elizabeth, widow of Lord Clinton, and in 1416 obtained licence to found a

college of ten chantry priests connected with his chapel of Knowle; one of their

number was to be warden, and they were to have common board and lodging.

The Guild of Knowle became exceedingly popular. An extant register, from

1497 to 1506, shows that it had 3,000 members, chiefly from among the ordinary

folk of Warwickshire and district. But about the beginning of the sixteenth

century influential people began to join in different parts of England to secure

the privileges of its fellowship. On a single page of the register of  $1506 \ \text{occur}$ 

the names of the Marquis of Dorset and the Earl of Kent and their wives;

the Abbots of Evesham, Pershore, Bordesley, and Hales; Sir Richard

and wife, the Archdeacon of Coventry, and the Rector of Solihull; members of

the Verney and Russell families, and ' ' Johannes Walleston, Cof urrer to Prince

Arthur and Agnes his wife de Yslep."

Eventually the college was suppressed, and its wealth and goods were seized by the Crown under Edward VI., but the actual fabric of the great

chapel was saved by the protest of the commissioners.

The church is a fine example of Perpendicular work, and consists of chancel, clerestoried nave with aisles and west tower. There is no chancel arch,

but a singularly good screen, the coving of which projects 3ft. 6in.

way to the rood-loft remains.. Six misericorde stalls remain on the north side  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$ 

and five on the south. There are two dug-out chests, the largest of which is

8ft. long by 2ft. wide; they are both considerably earlier than the fabric. The  $\,$ 

handsome altar-table is Elizabethan with bulbous legs. At the entrance to the

nave, on iron brackets, are the lion and unicorn, carved in oak, bearing brass

plates inscribed "Ex dono Anth Holbeche, An 1717."

Near the west end of the church is the half-timbered hall of the fifteenth

century collegiate house, recently restored.

The Rector kindly conducted the part and explained the history of the Church and Guild.

Thence the party proceeded to Temple Balsall. The manor was granted to the Knights Templar in the reign of Stephen, and a preceptory was duly

established with other endowments. In 1268 a weekly market and two three-day

annual fairs were granted. In 1308, when the Order was suppressed, eight of

the arrested brethren belonged to the Balsall house. After the  $\mathsf{Templars}^{\, \mathsf{r}}$ 

suppression the manor of Balsall reverted to the Mowbrays, but on the attainder  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{A}}$ 

of John Mowbray in 1322, the whole preceptory passed into the hands of the  $\,$ 

Knights Hospitallers. From the return of Prior Philip de Thame, in 1385, the

gross annual income of this preceptory was £127 2s. 6d.; it was served by a  $\,$ 

preceptor, two brothers, two chaplains, a steward, clerk, chamberlain, and seven

256 Transactions of the Quatuor Coronati Lodge.

other servants. When the Hospitallers' time for suppression arrived in 1540,

the manor was granted by Henry VIII. to Queen Katherine Parr; it subsequently formed one of Elizabeth's innumerable gifts to her favourite, Robert

Dudley, Earl of Leicester. From him it descended to Lady Katherine Leveson.

who bequeathed the property in 1670 for a hospital for poor widows. This

hospital, close to the church, is a large brick building of two stories, occupying

three sides of a quadrangle.

The church of St. Mary, of red sandstone, is a fine Decorated building,

of Geometrical, or early Decorated date, rightly considered the finest example  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{E}}$ 

of late thirteenth) century work in the Midlands; it was too severely restored

in 1849. It is  $104 \mathrm{ft-.}$  long by 39ft, wide and 57ft high. The Geometrical

window tracery is most effective; at the west end is a fine wheel window of

twelve divisions; there is a small tower at the south-west angle. On the south  $\,$ 

side of the altar are beautiful sedilia and a piscina niche. The east end of the

chancel is at a high level, to allow of a processional path to the preceptory

buildings. To the west of the church is the ancient hall, or refectory (both

these military orders were bound to be lavish in their hospitality),  $70 \, \mathrm{ft.}$  by

30ft., divided into three aisles by wooden pillars, and of timber framing; but  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

it was subsequently converted into chambers.

The journey was continued to Coventry and the early afternoon spent in viewing buildings there. Mention here in detail can only be made of the

following: -

St. Michael's Church, which is now the cathedral of the new diocese of Coventry, is a grand example of the Perpendicular style. The tower and spire,

begun in 1373 and completed in 1398, attain to the height of 303ft.; they are

of imposing and singular beauty. The full length of the church is  $293 \mathrm{ft.}$ , and

its greatest width 127ft. The chancel ends in a pentagonal apse; there are

fragments of old glass in the side windows. A striking feature of the church

is the series of chapels which used to be associated with the trade  $\operatorname{guilds}$  of

the city; they now form outer aisles on the north and south sides. Beginning

from the west end, the chapels on the south side were those of the  $\mathsf{D}\mathsf{yers}$ , the

Cappers (or St. Thomas), and the Mercers; on the north side are the  ${\tt Smiths}$ 

(or St. Andrew), the Girdlers, and the Drapers. The last-named is enclosed

with screenwork, and contains thirteen misericorde stalls. The south porch is

the oldest portion of the church; above the groined roof isi a priest's chamber,

afterwards used by the Cappers' Guild.

The good cruciform church of the Holy Trinity stands near by, and suffers somewhat from the comparison, but it is a fine building, 186ft. in length

by 105ft-. in breadth. The graceful spire rises to a height of 237ft. ; it was  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

renewed shortly after destruction in a severe gale of January, 1665. The

north porch is the oldest part; the whole fabric is, in the main, Perpendicular.

Like St. Michael's, it was encompassed in early days by gild chapels. Eastward

of the north transept is the Marlers' chapel; the south chancel aisle was the

Butchers' chapel; whilst the south aisle of the nave was appropriated to the

Tanners or Barkers. On the north side of the church, west of the porch, is

the Archdeacon's chapel, where the Consistory Court was held, and to the east

of the porch is St. Thomas' chapel, with the remains of a crypt. The Lady

chapel was a continuation of the south chancel aisle, now used as a vestry.

The pulpit, attached to the south-east pier of the tower, is a fine example of

fifteenth century stonework; both the font and the brass eagle are  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{coeval}}$ ,

and there is a fine Elizabethan alms-box. Neither of these great churches has

any notable monuments of early date.

St. Mary's Hall, near St. Michael's church, was erected about 1360 as

place of meeting for the trade guilds; the great hall, 76ft. by 30ft., and 34ft.

high, was added about half-a-century later. It belongs to the Corporation, and

is one of the very few mediasval English buildings used for municipal purposes.

The fine window at the north end of the grand hall has much old glass, but it

has been largely restored. Below it is the celebrated Coventry tapestry, which

Summer Outing. 257

extends acroiss the entire width of the hall. It is supposed to  $\operatorname{commemorate}$  the

visit of Henry VI. and Queen Margaret of Anjou to the city in 1451. On the

walls are portraits of James II. and Charles II. by Lely, and of George III.

and George IV. by Lawrence. Other details of this group of buildings are well  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

worthy of examination.

Other places visited were The Old Palace Yard, Grey Friars or Ford's Hospital, Cook Street Gate and the Masonic Hall. Subsequently the party

proceeded to The Charterhouse, the residence of the Prov.G.M. and Mrs. Wylev,  $\,$ 

where they inspected the old portions of the house (formerly the  $\operatorname{Carthusian}$ 

Priory), ancient panelling and mediaeval wall paintings — they then took tea in

a marquee in the garden, where there were present to meet the party many of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

the Masters of the Provincial Lodges and others. The proceedings were much

marred by rain, but Sir Alfred Bobbins, W.M., in gratefully thanking our

hosts, expressed the feelings of all the Brethren at the untoward weather, which,

however, did not damp either the ardour and welcome by the Hosts or the  $\,$ 

appreciation of the visitors for the kindness displayed to them.

In the evening there was a Conversazione at the Hotel, when Sir Alfred Bobbins, W.M., gave an interesting account of some of his experiences on his

recent tour to the U.S.A.

On the 5th July the party inspected buildings and institutions in the City. The Cathedral Church is that which was erected in 1711, when St. Philip's was built and a second parish formed. The church is a Palladian

building, good of its kind; the architect was Thomas Arden, a pupil of Vanburgh; it was enlarged ea; stward in 1883; the chancel has three large

windows of Sir E. Burne- Jones' design. This church serves as the procathedral for Birmingham. The see of Birmingham was constituted by an Order in Council on 12th January, 1905; it comprises the whole of the city of

Birmingham and adjacent portions of the counties of Warwick, Worcester, and

Stafford, together with a very small portion of Leicestershire.

The Art Gallery was then visited and the famous Burne-Jones' Cartoons inspected, and the party dispersed among the- various rooms in search of examples

of art or other objects in which they were interested. Two were found to have

obtained access to parts not open to the public, in search of Tokens, one of

which was discovered and compared with that brought by one of the two searchers, and, to the owner's pleasure, his specimen was far better than that

shewn in the Gallery.

The Public Library, the Shakespeare Library, and the Boulton and Watt relics were then seen and the kindness of the City Librarian in displaying

specimen books was appreciated.

In the afternoon there was another tour, on this occasion in private  $\operatorname{cars}$ 

belonging to local Brethren who came to the rescue as the ordinary motors were

not available. The first place visited was Coleshill, a small picturesque town on

the road from Warwick to Tamworth; it lies on the slope of a hill. It belonged to the Clintons, who had a castle here, up to the days of Edward III.,

and then to the de Montforts. When Simon de Montfort was executed in 1495, the manor was granted to Simon Digby, constable of the Tower.

family was ennobled by James I., and still retains Coleshill. James I. renewed the grant of a market and two fairs, originally granted by John. On

the old market house is fixed the pillory, whipping-post, and stocks combined,

but they have been renewed, save for some ironwork. The well placed church

of SS. Peter and Paul is a fine and interesting building of sandstone, with a  $\,$ 

lofty west tower and spire rebuilt in 1887; the seven-bayed nave is Decorated,

and the chancel Perpendicular. There was a general and too drastic restoration  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{T}}$ 

in 1859. The font is a singularly fine late Norman example, carved with

the rood and four Evangelists. The church is exceptionally rich in effigies.

In the north and south aisles are two recumbent effigies in chain-mail, under  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{mail}}$ 

sepulchral arches, of the Clinton family ; they are both fourteenth century,

and cross-legged, an attitude having no shadow of a connection with the  $\ensuremath{\text{c}}$ 

Crusaders. There are also effigies in the chancel to Simon Digby, 1519, and

258 Transactions of the Quatuor C'oronati Lodge.

Alice his wife; to John Digby, 1558, and Anne his wife; to Sir George Digby,

1586, and Abigail his wife; and incised figures of Reginald Digby, 1549, and

Anne his wife. There are also brasses to Alice Clifton, 1516 (a daughter of

Simon Digby); and to two vicars, William Abell, 1500, and John Fenton, 1516.

The bridge over the Cole is a good mediasval example, with the usual triangular

recesses for foot-passengers over the cut-waters.

The party then proceeded to view New Hall, near Sutton Coldfield, the residence of Mr. and Mrs. Owen, the latter being a daughter of the late Bro.

G. W. W. Beach, formerly Prov.G.M. of Warwickshire.

In the absence of Mr. Owen, by reason of illness, Mrs. Owen was good enough to shew the visitors over the Mansion, which is surrounded by a Moat.

the water in which was largely covered with water-lilies. The house dates in

part from the twelfth century with later additions.

It is said to be the oldest inhabited house in England. The early portions were Monastic, and the Abbot's dining-room is still used as a dining-

room and is a very fine example of fourteenth century work. There are  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{a}}$ 

large number of stained glass panels, chiefly of Flemish and French work, and

on one window is etched a Latin inscription signed by the notorious  $\mbox{\rm Dr.}$ 

Sacheverell, who was imprisoned here prior to his trial. The house was

generously thrown open to the visitors, who admired its many beauties and its

furniture in keeping with the style of the house. The lovely gardens were

much appreciated, and Mrs. Owen was sincerely thanked for her kindness, and

cordial good wishes expressed for her husband's recovery.

The final goal was Sutton Coldfield, where the V.W. Bro. Canon Barnard, the Rector, conducted the party round the Church. The town is of

considerable antiquity; it obtained a charter of incorporation in 1528 through

the influence of John Veysey, Bishop of Exeter from 1519 to 1554. Veysev

was a native of Sutton Coldfield, a wealthy man, and most generous to his

birthplace. He built Moor House as his private residence, in 1528, a mile to

the north-east of the town, where a modern! house in the midst of woods now

stands. Here he maintained great hospitality and considerable state, having,

as Dugdale states, "  $\operatorname{cxl}$ . men in scarlet caps and gowns, his household expenses

then amounting to 1,500Z per an., which was no small summe at that time."  $\,$ 

He built a town hall and market-place, founded and endowed the grammar school in 1540, and granted a park of 2,400 acres to the corporation.

The parish church of Holy Trinity is a large building consisting of chancel with north and south chapels, nave with aisles, south porch and west

tower. There are a few traces of Early English work; the aisles date from

1533; the nave was rebuilt in 1760. In the north chapel is the mitred effigy

of Bishop Veysey, who lived at Moor Hall until his death, in 1554, at the

great age of 103. The Norman font originally belonged to the chapel of Over

Whitacre; after serving for a time as a horse-block at an inn at Shustoke, it

was rescued in 1856 and given to this church.

Afterwards Canon Barnard kindly entertained the visitors to tea at the Rectory, whence they returned to the Grand Hotel. In the evening the visitors were 'At Home 'to the local Brethren, and Bro. L. Vibert gave an

address on some interesting questions for Masonic research which provoked  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

considerable and useful discussion.

On Sunday, 6th July, the visitors attended a special service arranged for them at the Cathedral, where an address was given by the Rev. B.  $\mathbb{W}$ .

Gilbey, Prov.G. Chaplain.

Later the visitors dispersed to their respective homes. The general opinion was that the outing had been most interesting and useful, thanks to a

large extent to the kindly welcome and assistance given by the Brethren of Warwickshire.

Those who attended the outing were: -

Bros. F. J. Asbury, of London, L.R., P.Pr.G.D.C, Surrey; W. N. Bacon, of London,

P.M. 15; Rodk. H. Baxter, of Rochdale, P.Pr.G.W., I. P.M. 2076; J. Blackburn, of

Summer Outing.

259

Birstall, 264; H. Bladon, of London, P.G.St.B.; F. J. Boniface, of London, S.D. 2694;

Robt. Bridge, of Rochdale, P.Pr.G.D.; J. M. Bruce, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne,

P.Pr.G.W.; Geo. W. Bullamore, of Albury, Herts., 441; W. N. Cheesman, of Selby,

P.Pr.G.W.; Robt. Colsell, of Chingford, P.A.G.D.C.; R. F. J. Colsell, of

Chingford, S.D. 12; Thos. M. Copland, of Falkirk, Pr.G.D., Stirlingshire;

Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, of Wisbech, P.M. 2283, S.D. 2076; Dr. A. J. Cross, of Dalton-in-Furness, P.Pr.G.W.; H. T. C. de Lafontaine, of London,

P.G.D.; R. A. Dickson, of London, P.Pr.G.D.C, Essex; E. H. Dring, of London,

P.G.D., P.M. 2076; Wm. S. Ellis, of Nottingham, P.Pr.A.G.P.; L. A. Engel, of

London, L.R.; G. H. Fennell, of London, L.R.; David Flather, of Sheffield,

P.A.G.D.C; A. Gates, of Sherborne, A.G.D.C.; J. T. Gaunt, of Eaglecliffe,

P.Pr.G.Sup.W.; J. F. H. Gilbard, of London, 56; F. W. Golby, of London.

P.A.G.D.C; Arthur Heiron, of London, L.R.; J. Walter Hobbs, of London, L.R.:

John Holt, of Yarm-on-Tees, P.Pr.G.D., Durham; F. Houghton, of London, 1500:

Andrew Hunter, of Falkirk, Pr.G.Sup., Stirlingshire; J. R. H. Inkster, of London,

J.D., 2694; P. E. James, of Ashton-on-Mersey, W.M. 4365; T. F. Jolly, of Melbourne,

P.Pr.G.M., W. Australia; R. E. Labrow, of Rawtenstall, P.Pr.G.D.; J. Heron Lepper,

of London, P.Pr.G.Ins., Antrim, S.W. 2076; Dr. S. T. Lord, of Rochdale, P.Pr.G.D.;

H. A. Matheson, of London, P.M. 2978; A. Y. Mayell, of London, P.M. 227:

W. L. Mildren, of Barrow-in-Furness, P.Pr.G.Sup.W.; H. E. Miller, of London,

P.Pr.A.G.D.C, Durham; C A. Newman, of Peterborough, 607; H. D. Parsons, of

Eaglescliffe, P.Pr.G.W.; E. Piekstone, of Radcliffe, P.M. 2930; Geo. Pocock, of

London, P.M. 2730; Cecil Powell, of Weston-super-Mare, P.G.D., P.M. 2076; J. H.

Pullen, of London, P.M. 410; J. W. Rigg, of Castleton, Pr.G.Stew.; Sir Alfred

Robbins, of London, P.G.W., W.M. 2076; Rev. Dr. H. G. Rosedale, of London,

P.G.Ch.; A. P. Salter, of London, P.M. 2932; Thos. Selby, of Eaglescliffe,

P.Pr.A.G.D.C; C. E. Smalley-Baker, of London, 357; B. A. Smith, of London, 1962;

W. J. Songhurst, of London, P.G.D., Sec. 2076; J. W. Stevens, of London.

P.A.G.Sup.W.; Dr. John Stokes, of Sheffield, J.G.D., J.W. 2076; J. E. S. Tuckett,

of Bristol, A.G.S.B., P.M. 2076; W. D. Vallance, of Rhodesia, P.M. 1321; Lionel

Vibert, of Bath, P.Dis.G.W. Madras, P.M. 2076; E. H. Watts, of Sidcup, 683;

G. C. Williams, of London, P.M. 25; W. J. Williams, of London, J.D. 2696; W.

Wonnacott, of London, P.A.G.Sup.W., P.M. 2076; H. R. Wood, of Manchester,

P.Pr.G.D.; and Dr. A. E. Wynter, of Bristol, 1139.

FRIDAY, 3rd OCTOBER, 1924.

HE Lodge met at Freemasons' Hall at 5 p.m. Present: — Bros. Sir Alfred Bobbins, P.G.W., Pres.B.G.P., W.M.; J. Heron Lepper, P.Pr.G.Ins., Antrim, S.W.; John Stokes, J.G.D., J.W.; W. J. Songhurst, P.G.D., Secretary; Gordon P. G. Hills, P.Pr.G.W., Berks., P.M., D.C.; George Norman, P.A.G.D.C., J.D.; W. Wonnacott, P.A.G.Sup.W., P.M.; Lionel Vibert, P.Dis.G.W., Madras, P.M.; and E. H. Dring, P.G.D., P.M.

Also the following members of the Correspondence Circle: - Bros. James Thomson, P.G.St.B., F. J. Asbury, G. Trevelyan Lee, G. E. W. Bridge,

G. W. Bullamore, J. Walter Hobbs, W. J. Williams, Robert Colsell, P.A.G.D.C,

Wm. C. Terry, W. Digby Ovens, Ed. M. Phillips, Harry Tipper, P.G.St.B., Alfred C.

Silley, H. Johnson, W. Dewcs, B. Telepneff, G. W. South, J. A. Cheston-Porter,

H. C. Stags, J. R. Thomas, F. C. Stoate, A. E. Biggs, G. T. Harley Thomas,

P.A.G.S.B., G. Derrick, A. F. Bare, Rev. C. J. S. O'Grady, F. S. Henwood, Wilfred

Brinkworth, B. Ivanoff, Arthur Heiron, Hy. G. Gold, A. Presland, R. C. Eustace,

A. L. Miller, Wm. Lewis, Geo. C. Williams, A. E. Wynter, H. C. de Lafontaine,

P.G.D., R. Daubeny, W. Ridgeway, Alfred Hildesley, F. W. Le Tall, Albert D. Bowl,

Jno. R. Caswell, E. Glaeser, L. R. Ray, W. C. A. Candy, J. F. N. Davbyshire,

W. H. Rowlands, P. Green, Wm. R. Semken, and Jno. Buckley.

Also the following Visitors: - Bros. John Church, Affability Lodge No. 317:

N. Ganibs, J. Loukine and A. Soldatenkov, of the Aldwych Club Lodge No. .3794;

Jas. J. Nolan, W.M. Pegu Lodge No. 3330; F. R. Ayton, W.M. South Norwood

Lodge No. 1139; Rev. F. Carew Thomas, Ara Lodge No. 1, Auckland, N.Z.; Robert

Frew, P.M. Oriental Lodge No. 687; P. Cart de Lafontaine, Lodge of Antiquity No. 2;

Harold M. Horan, Albany Lodge No. 151; B. R. Helliwell, W.M. Marble Craft

Lodge No. 3522; Geo. Bovington, Donoughmore Lodge No. 6; and W. Stubbings,  $\,$ 

Bolingbroke Lodge No. 2417.

Letters of apology for non-attendance were reported from Bros. Rev. H. Poole,

l.G.; Ed. Conder, L.R., P.M.; S. T. Klein, L.R., P.M.; J. T. Thorp, P.G.D.,

P.M.; Rev. W. W. Covey-Crump, S.D.; F. J. W. Crowe, P.A.G.D.C, P.M.; Rodk. H. Baxter, P.Pr.G.W., E.Lancs., I.P.M.; Cecil Powell, P.G.D., P.M.-; and

J. E. S. Tuckett, A.G.S.B., P.M.

## Exhibits. 261

Bro. John Heron Lepper, P.Pr.Ins., Antrim, was elected Master of the Lodge

for the ensuing year; Bro. Edward Armitage, P.G.D., P.M., was reelected Treasurer;

and Bro. J. H. McNaughton was re-elected Tyler.

Three Lodges and Thirty-three Brethren were elected to membership of the  $\,$ 

Correspondence Circle.

The Secretary drew attention to the following

#### EXHIBITS :

By Bro. Wm. Wonnacott.

Jewel, R.A., 1798, of Wm. Purdie, Caledonian Chapter No. 2; made by Masters, a member of the same Chapter.

Jewel, P.M., of British Lodge No. 4, given to Wm. Adams, Peruke Maker, of the Ancient French Lodge (later L'Esperance). This brother supported a petition

on 14th February, 1776, for a Scottish Lodge in London (St. Andrews, now No. 231)

signing as Master of the Cumberland Lodge. (See A.Q.C. xviii. (1905), p. 73.)

Snuff Box of Richard Carpenter Smith with Masonic Devices and Tracing Boards painted thereon. The Boards shown are of Harris's pattern, thus fixing the date as after 1823.

A cordial vote of thanks was passed to Brother Wonnacott for kindly lending these objects for exhibition.

Bro. H. C. de Lafontaine read the following interesting paper, and a hearty

vote of thanks was passed to him on the proposition of Bro. Sir Alfred Robbins,

seconded by Bro. J. Heron Lepper; comments ' being offered by Bros. John Stokes,

W. W. Covey-Crump, and B. Telepneff;-