

# FREEMASONRY – CHILD OF THE ENLIGHTENMENT? OR VICE VERSA? FREEMASONRY AND THE ENLIGHTENMENT

INAUGURAL PAPER BY BRO. MICHAEL SPURR

[9 November 1995]

WHILE FREEMASONRY has its roots in the seventeenth century and earlier, it was brought to the attention of the public in the eighteenth century, particularly following the formation of the premier Grand Lodge in 1717. It attracted general interest and this led to an expansion of membership both at home and abroad. This paper looks at the possible reasons why this purely English eccentricity should have been welcomed by Europeans and others.

It is my intention to try to demonstrate that the main reason for this was because it was a period of intellectual growth in Europe generally and a time when ideas which had previously been held were being questioned. The eighteenth century has been called 'The Age of Reason', 'the Age of Challenge, Contrast and Compromise'<sup>1</sup> but the period is now commonly known as the Enlightenment.

The Enlightenment covers the period, approximately, from 1700 to the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789. The early beginnings can be seen in the seventeenth century and it continued into the early part of the nineteenth century. Since the Enlightenment was an intellectual movement there are no sharply defined initial and final dates and the major blossoming of ideas coincided with the formation of the premier Grand Lodge and the spread of Freemasonry into Continental Europe.

The English term 'Enlightenment' was not used until the nineteenth century but in France the period was known as *le siècle des lumières* – the century of lights.<sup>2</sup> In Germany it was called *Aufklärung* which is derived from meteorological terms and implies the awareness of cloudy skies clearing to reveal the sun. Similarly the Russian *prosveshchenie* and the Italian *illuminismo* are derived from the same root. The implication is that of the sun shining into the corners of a dark room, spreading light and revealing the truth. The German *Aufklärung* was used also as meaning the process of becoming more enlightened.

Perhaps this can be best illustrated musically with the following extract from the music of a Freemason, Joseph Haydn (1732–1809). *The Creation* was first performed in 1798. This particular extract may be of interest to Freemasons since some rituals use the wording which is sung here. This is taken from the second and third verses of *Genesis* and reads '... And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said let there be light and there was LIGHT ...' [the musical extract is played at this point]. You notice the emphasis on light! This term, 'The Enlightenment', is used for the movement which gave 'light' to the scientific, political, intellectual and artistic life in the eighteenth century. Towards the close of the period, Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) defined it as '... man's emergence from his self-incurred immaturity ...'<sup>3</sup> An enlightened person was one who made up his own mind about matters and did not rely on authority or precedent. Everything was open to be questioned and all matters investigated in order to discover and reveal the truth.

It must also be stressed that the spread of the ideas and ideals of the Enlightenment did not progress evenly across Europe. Some countries were leaders in the field and others lagged far behind. The divided nature of many European States created difficulties in the spread of new ideas and this was exacerbated by religious differences. Another important point is that the dispersion of the ideas was initially restricted to the higher levels of society and it was very much a matter of the élite talking to the élite. The pace of change, as new thoughts percolated through, varied during the period and from country to country.

Views held at the beginning of the century had changed radically by the end of it as new thinkers and writers took up the torch. The main change in ideas dates from the 1770s to 1790s when the conclusions reached by earlier thinkers started to be questioned in the light of further discoveries and as fresh viewpoints were expressed by others. In particular there was a move away from Deistic thought to a more spiritual belief.

To try to set the background picture it is proposed to look at various countries which either contributed to or were influenced by the Enlightenment and to see how they differed from each other both socially and historically.

However, before doing this, it is important to stress that there are certain basic considerations to be borne in mind. The eighteenth century differed considerably from the present day in terms of social, political and religious outlook and thought and it is worth stressing these variations since without understanding them, it is difficult to appreciate the gap between eighteenth and twentieth century ideas. The principal factors which affected attitudes were religion and social structure. Another less important feature was the influence of classicism in the educational system.

## RELIGION

The Christian religion was a major force in the everyday life of an inhabitant of the British Isles and Europe. Religious considerations had been an important factor in the Civil War in England and debates over this during the mid to late 1600s had been protracted and fierce. The accepted religion in England was that of the established Church of England but there were many divisions within the national church. Outside there were other dissenting sects which included puritanical elements such as the Quakers. In Scotland, the Calvinism of John Knox (1505–1572) had vied with Catholicism. In England, Roman Catholics either had to attend the national Church under the Acts of Uniformity (1552 and 1559) and take Communion, or be fined for failing to do so. They were also subject to Penal Laws well into the eighteenth century and could be heavily taxed but the strict letter of the law was not always observed. The cry of 'No Popery' was sufficient to start riots in the streets and the Gordon Riots in 1780 against the Catholic Relief Act of 1778 was an example of ignorant persons being led by bigots.

Well-to-do people such as Samuel Pepys (1633–1703) regularly prayed at home, morning and evening, as well as attending church at least once on Sundays, as was normal in Protestant countries. The Bible was read by all those Protestants who could read – religion was a part of everyday life.

During the eighteenth century, much of the debate about religious matters centred round those movements which offered alternatives to the accepted religious orthodoxy of the country concerned, be it Catholic or Protestant. For these two churches, Christian belief was in a God that was transcendental and personal; who existed apart from his creation, was not impersonal, was benevolent, just and concerned with the daily affairs of His people. The Bible was the revealed word of God and from this it was taught that from time to time God had communicated directly with the Jewish prophets, giving them Laws and intervening in human history. He had sent his Son, Jesus Christ, into the world to save mankind. Jesus and later his Apostles had performed miracles.

These basic acceptances of orthodox religion were being increasingly questioned. The debates over this had started during the Reformation and reached a peak in England during the Civil War, Commonwealth and Restoration periods. Deist thinkers, who, while not accepting orthodox Christian doctrines, retained a belief that the universe was the work of a good, wise and benign God. They drew attention to the idea of natural religion rather than revealed religion.

The background to this lies in the vicious and often bloody religious schisms which had divided Europe since the Reformation. No wars are more savage than those fought over religion. Protestants and Catholics had persecuted each other and were unable to agree which set of dogmas were God's truth. One result of this was the creation of different sects: there were protestant sub-divisions, which included Lutherans, Calvinists,

Anglicans, Zwinglians and many others; the Catholics also had divisions which included the Jesuits, Jansenists, Thomists and Molinists.

Instead of bringing Christian peace to the world, disagreement between the various sects was rife and was frequently accompanied by aggressive zeal which was referred to by Anderson (1684–1739) in his *Constitutions* as ‘enthusiasm’.<sup>4</sup> The phrase ‘He was no Enthusiast’, carved on a tombstone was intended to show approval. Deists suggested that the answer was to try to find common ground for religious belief which required no special revelation and which could, consequently, be agreed by all, by the use of reason alone. Somewhat surprisingly, the Deists turned to the scientific discoveries of Isaac Newton (1643–1727).

The impact which Newton’s discoveries made on the intellectual world cannot be overestimated. For the thinkers of his time, the publication of his laws of motion and theory of gravitation brought the apparent chaos of the universe into measured order. The whole universe worked like a clock and its movements became predictable. Suddenly, it could be seen that it was subject to rules which had been discovered by human reason, following observation and experiment. The impact is seen in the epigraph written by Alexander Pope (1688–1744) as a tribute to Newton:

Nature, and Nature’s Laws lay hid in Night.  
God said, *Let Newton be!* and All was *Light*.

Newtonian mechanics appeared to his contemporaries to supply the strongest reasons for a belief in God. ‘Where there is order and design, there must be an intellectual creator who is the source of this order and purposiveness’.<sup>5</sup> This thought was used by both the deists and the orthodox to support their arguments. As Norman Hampson perspicaciously remarked ‘If God said, “Let Newton be!” Sir Isaac returned the compliment’<sup>6</sup>

Deist thinkers, who, while not accepting orthodox Christian doctrines, retained a belief that the universe was the work of a good, wise and benign God, and drew attention to the idea of natural religion rather than revealed religion. Deists suggested that the answer was to try to find common ground for religious belief, which required no special revelation and which could, consequently, be agreed by all by the use of reason alone. They used the Newtonian theories as a point on which to base their arguments. If nature was bound by definable immutable laws, those laws must have been framed by an omnipotent God. Consequently, since those laws were immutable, it necessarily followed that since the universe was created, the creator never needed to intervene in its running again. The natural corollary of this was that the orthodox beliefs that God permitted the suspension of the laws of nature could not be true. This then opened Pandora’s Box and showed that God could not have communicated with the Prophets, inspired the authors of the Bible, miracles could never have happened and the authority of churches and priests was based on a false premise. This formed the basic argument used by the Deists, who then turned to alternative solutions.

To fill the void they had created, they turned to nature as the basis of true religion. This, they argued, was to be found in both the universe itself and in man’s human nature. It was suggested that there was a natural religion and these views were summed up by Matthew Tindal (1657–1733) in his work on deism, *Christianity as Old as the Creation* (1730):

By *Natural Religion*, I understand the Belief of the Existence of a God, and the Sense and Practice of those Duties which result from the Knowledge we, by our Reason, have of him and his Perfections and of ourselves, and our own Imperfections; and of the relation we stand in to him and our Fellow-Creatures; so that the *Religion of Nature* takes in everything founded on the Reason and Nature of things ... If God is unchangeable, our Duty to him must be so too.

Deists believed in a divine creator, beneficent but more remote than the God of orthodox believers. In Britain the arguments had run their course by the start of the century but had a marked impact on Continental thought where the arguments continued until the

1770s, when it was felt that deism lacked a central core and was hollow. Later thinkers moved to introduce a greater spirituality into religion.

Shortly after the premier Grand Lodge was formed in 1717, the Rev. James Anderson published the *Book of Constitutions*. This was issued in 1723 and contained the famous General Charge 'Concerning God and Religion' which read:

A Mason is oblig'd by his Tenure to obey the moral Law; and if he rightly understands the Art, he will never be a stupid Atheist, nor an irreligious Libertine. But though in ancient times Masons were charged in every country to be of the Religion of that Country or Nation, whatever it was, yet 'tis now thought more expedient only to oblige them to that Religion in which all men agree, leaving their particular opinions to themselves; that is, to be good Men and true or Men of Honour and Honesty, by whatever Denominations or Persuasions they may be distinguished; . . .

This 'new dispensation' permitted Deists and non-Christians to become members of the Craft but in spite of this the ritual remained largely Christian in content until the Union in 1813. This is fully discussed in the papers written by Bro. J. R. Clarke in *AQC* 78 (pp. 49-73) and Bro. N. Barker-Cryer in *AQC* 97 (pp. 34-74). It may have been one reason why Freemasonry had an appeal beyond the British Isles even though there were those who retained the Christian element.

## CLASSICISM

This term is used in this paper to describe the method of education which employed the classical Greek and Roman texts. It was introduced into the educational system during the Renaissance and in the early sixteenth century Latin was taught in secondary schools '*... students progressed through a series of grades from the rudiments of Latin to reading Cicero's prose, the drama of Terence, and the poetry of Virgil and Ovid, on to original composition of Latin verse and oratory. In many schools Greek was studied in the upper forms but mathematics and physical sciences seldom found a place in the curriculum.*'<sup>7</sup> By the eighteenth century mathematics had been introduced but the Latin teaching was little changed. In the grammar schools classical Latin had been taught since the fifteenth century although fashions changed with the passage of time and varied from the republicanism of Cicero, the early Empire of Tacitus to the middle Empire of Marcus Aurelius. For example, when studying the life of Caesar there was a tendency to support the views of Brutus when the authority of kings and princes was being questioned.

The Latin taught from the classical authors replaced the medieval Latin spoken and used in church services. Many of the Greek and Latin authors were treated with the same respect as Holy Writ; the works of Aristotle were given a particular sanctity and the Church treated him almost as an honorary Christian. By the eighteenth century, as knowledge grew and experimental work was undertaken to try to prove whether something was true, reliance on these authors began to be increasingly questioned.

When Dr. Samuel Johnson (1709-1784) visited France he spoke, by preference, Latin rather than French and had no difficulty in holding conversations - all gentlemen of education spoke Latin as a second language. They also had a day to day knowledge of both Greek and Latin authors which is generally unknown today.

## SOCIAL STATUS

In Great Britain and Europe society was organized on a hierarchical basis. It is too early to talk about division into classes but ranks or divisions were recognized. The standard way of demonstrating social organization is to liken it to a pyramid. At the top would be the ruler and nobility, in the middle 'the middle sort', that is the upper servants of the Crown and the professionals such as lawyers, doctors and wealthy city merchants. Below this, comprising the bulk of the population, were the remainder of the people, consisting of artisans, apprentices, general labourers, the part-time workers and unemployed or

unemployable. The latter comprised as much as ten percent of the whole and it was from their ranks that crowds could be quickly drawn in towns, whenever there was a public disturbance or riot. In Great Britain, the top of the pyramid consisted of not more than two to three hundred. At the start of the century the middle grouping comprised tens rather than hundreds of thousands, although this was to grow as the century progressed.

In Great Britain the social order was not static, it was possible for people to move from one grouping to another – both upwards and downwards. Within the groups there were divisions, based to an extent on wealth but particularly on the ownership of property. The right to vote was based solely on property qualifications. A rich merchant or successful barrister could invest in land and, with a country estate, might well be accepted into the local aristocracy within a generation or two. Similarly, within the broad groupings themselves there was movement from the bottom to the top. A successful master mason, for example, could move into the building trade for his own account with a consequent rise in status. There was greater mobility in Great Britain than on the Continent and visitors from there remarked on the freedom of expression and attitude of British workers. From the masonic point of view the more liberal regard for social divisions enabled members from all walks of life to meet together.

It will be remembered that the first Grand Master of the premier Grand Lodge was Anthony Sayer (1672–1742), a member of the lodge at the Apple Tree Tavern (later to become the Lodge of Fortitude and Old Cumberland No. 12), who was described as a 'gent', a courtesy title below that of 'esquire'. Sayer was a poor man because he was an early petitioner to Grand Lodge for charity and worked as the Tyler to King's Arms Lodge (now Old King's Arms Lodge No. 28) until his death.

The distinction that maintained the difference between the various social groupings was known as deference. Each person knew his own station in life and lived according to it. Everyone paid due deference to those above them. This is neatly illustrated by the extract from the Second Degree Working Tools (non-Emulation) which reads:

'... we have all sprung from the same stock, are partakers of the same nature, and sharers in the same hope; and although distinctions among men are highly necessary to preserve due subordination, and to reward merit and ability, yet, no eminence of station ought not to cause us to forget that we are all brethren; as a time will most assuredly come, and the best and wisest of us know not how soon, when all distinctions, save those of goodness and virtue, shall cease, and death, the grand leveller of all human greatness, will reduce us to the same state.'<sup>8</sup>

These sentiments would have found ready acceptance by eighteenth century men since, while ideals of freedom were supported and expressed, this did not mean that forms of democratic government were considered. It was accepted that some restraints needed to be placed on autocratic monarchies and the system used in Great Britain with the King working in harness with the two houses of parliament and subject to statute law, was quoted approvingly by European *philosophes*. However, they were not suggesting any form of universal suffrage and saw the continuation of power remaining in the hands of those with property, money or a hereditary authority.

## GREAT BRITAIN

In the early part of the eighteenth century England and Scotland – London and Edinburgh – were important contributors to the new knowledge. The philosophical works of John Locke (1632–1704) and the scientific studies of Isaac Newton were known on the continent of Europe. The political system that had developed at the Restoration, under which the country was ruled by the two Houses of Parliament, the King having a more limited role, was admired by those countries which still had autocratic rulers with arbitrary powers. For a period everything that was British was admired and copied. It was for this reason that Freemasonry proved to be popular wherever it was introduced.

While British society was hierarchical movement between the different social groupings

was possible and the main requirement to move from a lower to a higher status was the ownership of land. Inheritance was passed to the eldest son so that large estates were not split on the death of the owner and junior members of the family did not inherit the family title, preventing a proliferation of the aristocracy, as happened in France. All in all it was a more open society than those on the continent and the possibility of rising in status was (theoretically) open to all, the main requirements being money and property. If one generation moved into the upper classes, even though originally connected with trade, once the sons went to public schools and mixed with the children of the aristocracy, they were accepted into their new social group. Equally, it was possible for people to lose status and fall in rank. This movement made British society more open and in social gatherings, in coffee houses or public inns all but the poor could meet.

While we know that the history of Freemasonry goes further back than the eighteenth century it really came to the attention of the public in the 1720s. The formation of the premier Grand Lodge in 1717 came at a most appropriate time. English culture was popular on the continent, travellers were moving both to and from Europe and there was a revolution in thought. Books were being freely printed, even though they were frequently subject to forms of censorship in most countries, so that new ideas were able to be passed quickly within a country and across state borders. Paris, Amsterdam and London were the main centres of this new thinking but Scotland also played an important part in the Enlightenment.

Edinburgh University had longstanding connections with the medical schools at Leiden University and also had traditionally high standards of education. Scotland had four universities (Glasgow, Aberdeen and St. Andrews', as well as Edinburgh) to England's two (Oxford and Cambridge). A key figure was David Hume (1711–1776), the philosopher, who had a major influence on philosophical thought of the period. Other contributors include the poet and freemason, Robert Burns (1759–1796), the architect Robert Adam (1728–1792), the chemist Joseph Black (1728–1799), Samuel Johnson's biographer James Boswell (1740–1795), also a freemason and James Lind (1716–1794), who discovered that citrus fruit acted as an anti-scorbutic, to name but a few. Scottish thought was to have an important influence on the American War of Independence and on the wording of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Burns was initiated in St. David's Lodge No. 174 in July 1781 and became a joining member of Canongate Kilwinning Lodge No. 2, where he was made Poet Laureate of the Lodge in 1787. Boswell, a contemporary of Burns, was raised in Canongate Kilwinning Lodge in the year Burns was born. The novelist Henry Mackenzie (1745–1831) was also a member of Canongate Kilwinning.

While there is a large list of English freemasons, it is worth recalling that Jonathan Swift (1667–1745), the author of *Travels into Several Remote Nations of the world* (popularly known as *Gulliver's Travels*), a noted satirist and political pamphleteer, and a member of Lodge No. 16, was Anglo-Irish. William Hogarth (1697–1764), the painter and engraver who satirized not only Masonry but the age in which he lived, served as a Grand Steward of the Grand Lodge of England in 1735. David Garrick (1717–1779), regarded as one of the greatest actors on the British stage, was a member of St. Paul's Lodge No. 194. Edward Gibbon (1737–1794), the author of *The History of the Decline and fall of the Roman Empire*, a brilliant writer and a master of the use of irony, was also a freemason. Edward Jenner (1749–1823) the discoverer of the vaccine that is used against smallpox and who laid the groundwork for the science of immunology was a member of Faith and Friendship Lodge No. 270, at his birthplace, Berkeley in Gloucestershire.

## FRANCE

During the reign of Louis XIV (1638–1715, enthroned 1643), the Sun King, the centralized authority of the monarchy was strengthened by a deliberate policy of absolutism. His successor and great-grandson, Louis XV (1710–1774, enthroned 1715), was an incompetent leader but the systems established by Louis XIV continued to work. Louis

XV was five years old when he reached the throne and the Duke of Orleans acted as Regent until 1723. For the following twenty years Louis was controlled by his ex-tutor and chief minister, Cardinal Fleury.

France had become too large to be ruled and administered personally by one man, even the hardworking Louis XIV had to delegate authority. Although it was nominally one country, the king, as King of France, also held the titles of Grand-Duke of Brittany, Count of Provence etc, and regional differences still existed. While French was the principal language and was spoken in the urban areas by the nobility and the bourgeoisie, in parts of the countryside Breton and Languedoc (Occitan) were still spoken.

Taxes were collected by *fermiers* (tax farmers) but the amount collected was insufficient to pay for the court and wars with either neighbouring countries or those in overseas territories.

The legal divisions, with overlapping areas of authority, made efficient government more difficult. The old administrative areas were the *gouvernements* controlled by a royal *gouverneur*. These areas were not always the same as the newer divisions known as *généralités* which were under royal *intendants*. The situation was further complicated by the *parlements*. These must not be confused with the English parliament as they were law courts with some powers to control censorship, religion, morals, trade and industry. There were twelve *parlements* until 1775 when a thirteenth was created for Lorraine.

The people were divided into three 'orders' or 'estates' consisting of the clergy, the nobility and the 'Third Estate' – all others not covered by the former two. It is estimated that the total population in 1700 was about twenty-one million and this grew to about twenty-eight million by 1790. The clergy were in a privileged position and, generally, were exempt from taxation. Some were wealthy, with political power, but there were also secular clergy who were not in regular Orders and acted as parish priests (*curés*). There were also those who did not always take holy orders beyond that of deacon, but were entitled to ecclesiastical benefits and were known as *abbés*.

The nobility represented under one per cent of the population but there were wide variations in wealth, origin and ideological outlook. There were two main divisions: those of the sword and those of the robe. The *noblesse d'épée* had their origin in the old feudal system, while the *noblesse de robe* were drawn from the new administrative ranks, which had created government offices with associated privileges of nobility. By the mid-eighteenth century the differences between the two had mainly disappeared. The main division was between rich and poor. The poorer nobility lived in the provinces and even when they accepted work retained the right to wear a sword. A typical example would be Dumas' D'Artagnan, in *The Three Musketeers*, where the son of a poor nobleman comes to seek a commission as an officer in the King's guard. One reason for this was that all children of a noble took the same rank, unlike England where it descended to the eldest son alone.

The Third Estate covered all those that did not fall into the previous two categories and this would include all from the wealthiest bourgeoisie to the poorest peasant. While the original meaning of bourgeois was 'townsman' by the eighteenth century it had been legally defined as a person living off an income derived from property; in matters of wealth some bourgeoisie were equal to the nobility, although without the title and privileges.

Paris was the administrative and social centre of France and was also the arbiter of taste in music, literature, the fine arts and fashion for Europe as a whole. The new ideas of Locke, Newton and others in England were absorbed with interest and acclaim. Suddenly, Britain became fashionable in France, not only from the philosophical and scientific points of view but also for religious and political reasons. Newton proved that apparently impenetrable problems could be solved by reason, the views of the deists struck sympathetic chords in the hearts of those opposed to religious rule and the example of a monarchy answerable to an elected parliament was balm to those living under an absolutist monarchy. The ideas already circulating among the salons of Paris received added impetus from the British writers.

It was against this background that Freemasonry was introduced into France and was quickly adopted. As Bro. Batham remarked in his Inaugural Address in 1972:<sup>9</sup>

'Freemasonry had been introduced from England in or about 1725 and its appeal to the volatile, imaginative French was so great and so instantaneous, that, being quite unable to accept it in the simple form of the craft degrees, culminating in the loss of a secret, they invented more than 1,100 degrees between 1730 and 1790.'

Due to an absence of documentation and accurate records it is not possible to chart the early beginnings of Freemasonry in France. Records are missing and some were most probably destroyed during the French Revolution; reliance cannot be placed on most of the earlier French writers on masonic matters. Subject to this *caveat* it is now broadly accepted that the first two Paris Lodges were established in 1726, followed by four more in 1729 but the movement was widespread and during the next few years there were Lodges in Valenciennes, Lyons, Rouen, Le Havre, Pau, Nantes, Caen, Bordeaux, Aubigny, Avignon, Montpellier, Marseilles and Bayonne.<sup>10</sup>

Very shortly after Masonry was introduced into France a new series of degrees known as 'Scottish' or 'Ecosais' appeared. Bro. A. F. C. Jackson examined the evidence for an English or French origin for these alternative and knightly degrees. While it has been established 'Scots' Master degrees were being worked in London in 1733, it is not known what they were. The balance of evidence is that these 'higher' degrees were invented in France during the period 1730-1740 and further developments, creating 'higher' and 'higher' degrees continued for the rest of the century.

The question arises why the French were not satisfied with the original English three degree system and wished to embellish it with higher degrees. One possible explanation is that in France, as mentioned previously, all the children of a nobleman inherited the title. Members of the aristocracy may have preferred a degree in which they were referred to as 'knights', rather than being workmen in the quarries. The first evidence of these degrees in France is in the *Journal de l'Avocat Barbier* which mentions that French courtiers created a form of Masonry different from the English system, using expressions such as 'chevalier', 'chevalere' and 'chapitre'.<sup>11</sup> Equally, as members of the bourgeoisie entered Masonry it would have pleased them to be made 'knights' and given appropriate titles as a form of social snobbery.

It is, perhaps, appropriate to remember that Voltaire (1694-1778), one of the most influential and representative of French writers, was born François-Marie Arouet and adopted the nobiliary pen-name of 'de Voltaire' at the age of twenty-three. In 1725 when he sneered at the Chevalier de Rohan, he was beaten by lackeys under Rohan's direction. A challenge to a duel was accepted but Voltaire was flung into the Bastille and subsequently exiled. 'His exposure to English freedoms in his early thirties, following the harsh awakening to his lack of status in the eyes of the French nobles, turned his mind to social inequalities as never before'.<sup>12</sup> Voltaire's experience was not unusual and for those who had been snubbed, to obtain a form of 'nobility' through Masonry, could have been an added incentive in the development of the higher degrees.

Voltaire's experiences while he was in England were to have a profound effect on him. He quickly learned English and became friendly with Bolingbroke, Congreve, Pope, Swift and many others. '... and hailed English freedom of worship, thought and speech, as well as the Quakers, Shakespeare, Bacon, Locke, Newton, and the parliamentary system, in his *Philosophical Letters, or Letters Concerning the English Nation* ...'.<sup>13</sup> This freedom of thought was one influence which was exported from England during the Enlightenment period, of which Freemasonry was part.

Like many others, Voltaire objected to the privileged positions of priests and of the Church itself, particularly any form of religion which persecuted nonadherents or which was fanatically 'enthusiastic'. His well known phrase – *écrasons l'infâme* – 'let us crush the infamous one' – the 'infamous one' being the Church, summed up his attitude and that of many other Frenchmen. The deistic attitudes of the English, reflected in Freemasonry appealed to many elitist minds. Nevertheless, Voltaire and others still believed in the existence of God but in a humanist, Newtonian sense. A story is told that on his death bed Voltaire lay there with a priest on one side, urging him to return to the faith, and a

lawyer on the other side asking him to sign a will. He looked around and is alleged to have said: 'Now I die like our Saviour; a thief on either hand'.

The French writers and thinkers of this period are often referred to as the *philosophes*; these included the political philosopher and jurist Charles de Montesquieu (1689–1755), and an early representative of the movement, Denis Diderot (1713–1784). Diderot was one of the most profound original minds among the *philosophes* and the editor of the massive publication the *Encyclopédie* for fifteen years, during which time he wrote some 5,000 articles for the book. To say 'book' is perhaps wrong since it eventually consisted of 17 volumes of text and 11 volumes of plates. There were almost 72,000 articles and nearly 3,000 plates.

It had originally started as being a translation of Ephraim Chambers's *Cyclopaedia or Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*<sup>14</sup> but soon progressed beyond this in an attempt to include all knowledge known to man. The articles were written, rather like those in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, by experts in the various fields of study and included professional writers, doctors, army officers, civil servants, *abbés*, lawyers, members of the nobility and manufacturers. They have been described as 'a cross-section of the professional and upper classes of France in the period 1745–65'.<sup>15</sup> Surprisingly, in spite of the difficulties under which it was published – a continual fight with government censors – it was a commercial success and when it was later reproduced in a condensed form, it became available to a wider public.

The *Encyclopédie* contained attacks against the monarchy, the church and constituted authority but presented these in a veiled way in order to escape the censors. Many of the ideas expressed were in line with the views of Freemasonry and the thinking of writers like Locke on the political and Newton on the scientific side. In the original full size edition there was an article on Freemasonry but it was only a translation of an extract from Chambers's *Cyclopaedia*. By 1777, in the Yverdon reprinted edition, which was produced in quarto, the article was written by Joseph-Jérôme Le François de Lalande (1732–1807), a founder member of the famous lodge 'Les Neuf Sœurs'. The article starts by saying that 'The Society or Order of Freemasons is a gathering of chosen persons who have obligated each other to love their brethren, mutual aid and the keeping secret of "all that distinguishes their Order"'.<sup>16</sup> A history is related, which is stronger on imagination than fact but relates the development in the early eighteenth century of Freemasonry in England and gives some details of early developments in France.

There have been theories advanced by some French writers, more novelists than historians, that Freemasonry was responsible for the French revolution. In a well argued paper Bro. A. Mellor<sup>17</sup> sets out the various 'legends' which purport to show how the Revolution was due to masonic influence. In the closing part of his paper, after examining the various theories he says:

'By now it has surely been proved conclusively to anyone not prejudiced by pre-conceived opinions that Freemasonry should not be given either the credit or the blame which, according to several views, one writer or another has imputed to it. The French Revolution was neither prepared by Freemasonry nor even facilitated by it. Historians of impeccable reputations have constantly repeated this for many years, but such is the force of prejudice that not only do they preach in vain but many naïve persons believe, when this false masonic story comes to their ears, that they have discovered the facts behind history.'

A few other masons should be mentioned and these include Choderos de Laclos (1741–1803) a soldier who wrote *Les Liaisons Dangereuses* and who was the Master of a military lodge L'Union at Amiens. Antoine Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet (1743–1794) a mathematician and philosopher, is thought to have been a member of the lodge *Les Neuf Sœurs*, as was Comte Antoine François de Fourcroy (1755–1809), a chemist who worked with Lavoisier (Antoine Laurent 1743–1794) and Berthollet (Comte Claude Louis 1749–1822) to establish modern chemical nomenclature. Joseph Ignace Guillotin (1738–1814), who gave his name to the guillotine was one of the founders of the Grand Orient. Claude-

Adrien Helvetius (1715–1771), a contributor to the *Encyclopédie* was a member of *Les Neuf Sœurs*.

What influence did Masonry have on the social and political developments in France? In the absence of direct evidence it is difficult to point to anything specific but the speed with which it was adopted and the rapidity of its spread among the nobility and among the bourgeoisie testifies to its appeal. The tenets of Freemasonry had a universal appeal and fitted in with the new learning based on reason.

## PRUSSIA/GERMANY

In the eighteenth century Germany was not so much a country as a collection of 350 separate states. There were nine electorates in the eighteenth century, of which Cologne, Mainz and Triers were ecclesiastical and Brandenburg, Bavaria, Hanover, Saxony, Hanover and the Kingdom of Bohemia were lay electorates. In theory, all these German states were part of the 'Holy Roman Empire' of Germany, nominally the title given by the 'electors' to the male head of the Austrian house of Habsburg, who had held this office, except for a break in 1740–1745, for almost four centuries. The Emperor possessed great prestige and influence with the German princes but had no real authority and drew his power from the fact that he was a Habsburg. The Holy Roman Empire was, as Voltaire said, 'neither holy, nor Roman nor an empire'. Germany consisted of a quilt of independent states with differing political, economic and religious views, in the north-west and south-east mainly Catholic and in the north-east and south-west Protestant.

When Frederick II, King of Prussia (1712–1786, enthroned 1740), ascended the throne he reversed the policy of direct non-interference in European affairs which had been followed by his predecessors, who had followed the Austrian lead. Frederick, later known as 'The Great', was viewed by the *philosophes* initially with enthusiasm but later by a number with suspicion. On assuming the throne his first acts were to reopen the Berlin Academy of Sciences, abolish judicial torture and proclaim the freedom of the press and of religion. This was offset, in the eyes of the *philosophes*, by his annexation, in 1740, of Austrian Silesia. This led to the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–1748) which culminated in the Seven Years War (1756–1763).

Frederick was a Francophile, who spoke and corresponded in French and liked to consider himself 'the *philosophe* of Sans Souci',<sup>18</sup> from where he corresponded with d'Alembert, Voltaire and other contributors to the *Encyclopédie*. Voltaire visited him but two such positive characters could not agree and they quarrelled. Both Rousseau (Jean-Jacques 1712–1778) and Diderot disliked him and accused him of being both a tyrant and a warmonger. Even when Rousseau had to seek asylum in Prussia, he also quarrelled with Frederick. In retrospect it appears probable that in spite of Frederick's early promise when he wrote his *Antimachiavell*, in which he refuted the opinions of Niccolò Machiavelli and put forward his views for peaceful and enlightened rule, once he acquired the throne the force of *realpolitik* took over and he became more despotic than enlightened.

In Bro. R. F. Gould's *History of Freemasonry*<sup>19</sup> details are given of Frederick's acceptance into Freemasonry on 15 August 1738. He was initiated early in the morning (just after midnight of the 14th) by von Oberg, the Master of a Hamburg Lodge who travelled to Brunswick, together with the Lodge Secretary, Bielfeld and a Baron von Löwen. The ceremony was conducted in the hotel in which the Hamburg delegation were staying and to prevent a non-mason in an adjoining room from overhearing, because the partitions of the wall were thin, they proceeded to help him to get drunk. '... being prepared to encounter with him at chinking glasses, we left him towards night so fast, that he would have slept by the side of a battery and the thyrsus of Bacchus served us on this occasion as effectually as could have done the finger of the god Harpocrates.'<sup>20</sup> It was probably this ceremony and the King's reputation as being an enlightened person, that prompted French masons to forge a document purporting to be a set of Constitutions for the Ancient and Accepted Rite dated 1786.

Freemasonry in Germany was established in Hamburg at an early date. There are

suggestions that there could have been connections soon after the premier Grand Lodge was formed. Preston said that the Earl of Strathmore had granted a Deputation to open a Lodge in Hamburg in 1733 and there is evidence of another extinct Lodge working in 1737 under an English Provincial Grand Master for Prussia and Brandenburg. This Lodge is assumed to have developed into Lodge Absalom, which in spite of its possible earlier date was warranted on 23 October 1740. Further English Lodges warranted via Hamburg appeared in Brunswick (1744), Hanover (1746), Celle (1748), Oldenburg (1752), Schwerin (1754) and Hildesheim (1762). The Lodge Union of Frankfort was established at Frankfort-on-Main in 1742 and, ignoring the moves by other German lodges to adopt other ritual workings, continued to adhere to the purely English system of three degrees.<sup>21</sup>

After his accession, Frederick authorized the formation of a Lodge in Berlin. This was established in September 1740 and took the name of the Three Globes. It acted as the Grand Lodge.

The Enlightenment was slower in spreading through Germany/Prussia than in France. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–1781) earned his living as a writer and from 1751 was the editor of the Berlin Gazette (*Berliner privilegierte Zeitung*) and a critic. Berlin was a centre of literary criticism and there was freedom of expression (except for politics and State matters). Lessing wrote in German, a language which Frederick the Great considered crude and, as he was interested in the theatre, also wrote plays. Among his acquaintances and friends were Friedrich Nicolai (1733–1811), a writer and bookseller and Moses Mendelssohn (1729–1786). It was with the latter that he collaborated to write a contentious essay on Pope (*Pope – ein Metaphysiker!*). When he wrote his last great work, *Nathan the Wise*,<sup>22</sup> in 1778–1779 he was regarded as the most controversial writer in Germany and his plays put forward serious moral issues for debate. *Nathan* presents a drama between a Templar (Crusader), Saladin and Nathan the Wise, a Jew. It presents questions about the three religions but the whole thrust of the play is toleration. The daughter of Nathan, Recha, had a dream –

‘Where Christian, Jew and Muslim can unite  
As one – a dream that is so sweet’

It is, perhaps, not surprising that Lessing, after careful consideration was initiated in lodge Zu den Drie Goldenen Rosen in 1771, at Hamburg, but was disappointed to find that the members, instead of being drawn from all classes, consisted only of the wealthy upper class.

Other contributors to Enlightenment knowledge were Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834), the philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), the writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832), who was initiated in Amalia Lodge at Weimar in June 1780 and Friedrich Wilhelm Schiller (1775–1854). Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803) was a friend of both Kant and Goethe; he introduced the *Sturm-und-Drang-Periode* of German romanticism and was initiated in 1766 in Riga in lodge Zur Schwert.

## THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN EMPIRE

The Habsburg Empire consisted, broadly, of the Austrian Netherlands, parts of Bavaria, Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary and Austria. The defeat of the Ottoman Turks outside the gates of Vienna in 1683 led to a further expansion of the Empire into parts of the Balkans and these were to be consolidated as the Turks slowly retreated.

A problem which faced the country at the beginning of the eighteenth century was administrative control. Since the Empire was extensive, internal communications poor and economically the country backward, it was difficult to impose even the limited control that was exercised by the King of France. The power which the Habsburgs had inherited was becoming increasingly difficult to impose. In addition, the various territories which formed the Empire were dissimilar and each of them ‘retained a distinctive character, a

deep rooted and strongly marked political tradition of its own'.<sup>23</sup> 'The Austrian Netherlands were an administrative nuisance rather than a strategic advantage'.<sup>24</sup> There was growing expansionist pressure from both Germany and Russia.

When Charles VI (1685–1740, enthroned 1711 as Holy Roman Emperor and as Charles III of Hungary 1712) died, he was succeeded by Maria Theresa (1717–1780) who became Duchess of Austria and Queen of Hungary and Bohemia in 1740. As a woman she could not be elected to be the head of the Holy Roman Empire but she managed to acquire the title of Holy Roman Emperor for her husband (Francis Stephen of Lorraine (1708–1765)). Maria Theresa was conservative in attitude, pious, a strong supporter of the Roman Catholic Church and unfriendly towards the Enlightenment. While she was against reform, once her advisors managed to persuade her it was necessary for the good of the Empire, she introduced wide administrative changes which were to lead to conflict between Church and State. When Francis died in 1765, she appointed her eldest son co-ruler and emperor of the Austrian lands.

Joseph II (1741–1790, co-ruler 1765, Holy Roman Emperor 1765–1790) expanded the Empire through the acquisition of Galicia (1772) and Bukovina (1775). While he effected some changes in order, his control was limited until his mother died but after that he introduced further reforms in both Church and State, granted religious toleration to Protestants and ended the discriminatory laws against the Jews. He introduced a new code of laws, separated the executive from the judiciary, freed the serfs and introduced a number of other changes. These, however, were resisted in many quarters and before his death a number had to be rescinded.

Francis Stephen, when Duke of Lorraine, was initiated in 1731 in a special Lodge held at The Hague in which Dr. John Theophilus Desaguliers (1683–1744, 3rd Grand Master 1719) acted as Master with John Stanhope and John Holzendorff as Wardens; he was made a Master Mason at a Lodge of Emergency held at Houghton Hall in Norfolk summoned by Lord Lovel (1697–1759, Earl of Leicester 1744, 14th Grandmaster, 1732).

The Duke of Lorraine took a keen interest in Freemasonry. He married Maria Theresa in 1736 and when he succeeded to the Grand Duchy of Tuscany '... he proclaimed himself the protector of the persecuted Freemasons, who had been arrested at the instigation of the Inquisition ...'.<sup>25</sup> He prevented Pope Clement's Bull of 1738 being read in Austria and freed all freemasons who had been arrested and had their trials suspended. Maria Theresa was personally opposed to Freemasonry but while he was alive Francis managed to ameliorate some of the moves to suppress the movement. In spite of his support he was unable to prevent occasional outbreaks of persecution.

In 1742 the first Lodge was constituted in Vienna. It was called The Three Firing Glasses but afterwards changed its name to The Three Cannons. It attracted a number of the members of the nobility and during a period of less than 20 weeks 56 candidates were initiated,<sup>26</sup> but in March 1743 it was closed by command of the Empress and eighteen members, mainly of the nobility, were arrested. They were freed a few days later.

Following the death of Francis in 1765 and that of Maria Theresa in 1780, Freemasonry prospered during the reign of Joseph II, who was more enlightened than his mother and, while not a mason himself, was not opposed to the Craft. He ruled for ten years and during this period there was an expansion and Gould wrote: 'Lodges began to multiply. In 1771 the Strict Observance founded one – The Three Eagles – in Vienna; and Zinnendorff followed the lead by erecting two others in the same city, 1771 and 1775. In 1776 Prague already possessed four Lodges and, in 1777, Zinnendorff's National Grand Lodge in Berlin established a Provincial Grand Lodge of Austria at Vienna.'<sup>27</sup> By 1784 there were no fewer than 45 Lodges within the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

As mentioned in the introduction, Franz Joseph Haydn (1732–1809) was a freemason. He was encouraged to join by Mozart and was initiated in Lodge Zur Wahren Eintracht in 1785. His patrons, the Eszterházy family, also had connections with Freemasonry. Enough has been written about Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756–1791) and his masonic music and connections to need no further comment here but it should be noted that he '... joined the "Benevolence" Lodge (Zur Wohlthatigkeit) on the 14th December 1784

... he frequently visited “The Crowned Hope” Lodge, and was a regular guest of “The True Harmony” Lodge ... which ... was the most influential Lodge in Vienna in the 1780s.’<sup>28</sup>

The effect of the Enlightenment was muted during the reign of Maria Theresa but under Joseph II many of the changes advocated by the *philosophes* were adopted and Freemasonry flourished during his reign but was suppressed by his successors and could exist only clandestinely.

## ITALY

Italy, like Germany, was in the eighteenth century a similar patchwork quilt of independent kingdoms, republics, duchies and the Papal states. While there was strict press censorship and the Inquisition still had some influence, there was an intellectual climate which encouraged debate and which was open to new ideas. The independence of the individual states restricted the free flow of ideas but, as a legacy from the past, there were many universities and academies. The educated élite were Catholic but receptive to the rational and sceptical ideas of the Enlightenment.

It might have been anticipated that the spread of Freemasonry in a Catholic country would be slow. In fact this was not so in the non-Papal states. In 1733 Freemasonry was said to have been introduced by Lord George Sackville when a Lodge was opened in Florence, although there is evidence that this had been working prior to that date,<sup>29</sup> but after the Grand Duke Francis was initiated the spread was accelerated. This does not appear to be due to the influence of the Grand Duke but to the influence of large numbers of the English nobility who came to Florence on the Grand Tour.

It was probably the publicity that this produced and the way in which the Craft was spreading across Europe that induced Pope Clement XII to issue the Bull, *In Eminenti*, against Freemasonry in 1738. Bro. Will Read pointed out in his paper *The Church of Rome and Freemasonry*<sup>30</sup> that the accepted reason for this action was the Lodge established at Florence. However, it should be noted that it was only after some civil authorities had taken steps to prohibit Freemasonry within their jurisdictions, that the papal authorities stepped in. The reasons for the prohibition have been discussed in other papers but the various Papal Bulls could be considered as part of the Catholic Reformation and a late continuation of the counter to the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century. Freemasonry was, in the eyes of the Catholic Church, a movement developed by the Protestant heretics, which appealed to both Protestants and Catholics and one which was proving very popular. This had to be stopped or at least Catholics must be prohibited from joining the organization. The fact that this ban only partially worked and was ignored even after the second Bull in 1751 demonstrates the appeal which Masonry had among the nobility and other classes.

## NORTH AMERICA

The thirteen colonies in North America were originally settled by men and women mainly of British origin and these frequently consisted of people who had rejected certain aspects of British society. This applied even in Virginia which was founded for commercial reasons and, while it followed the practices of the established Anglican Church, was from the beginning, led by those who were sympathetic to the Puritan part of that church.

When it could take up to three months or more for messages to pass between America and England, it is hardly surprising that specific American political forms should emerge. The similarity between English and American government institutions was only superficial and this was to create a crisis towards the end of the eighteenth century which resulted in the American Revolution. A war which was fought because of mutual misunderstandings. America had grown away from British institutional thought and developed political thinking more in line with Continental European views but was also strongly influenced by writers such as John Locke (1632–1704) who believed in a form of contractual

government. In his *Two Treatises of Government* Locke advanced the theory that monarchy was not a matter of heredity but that the authority of the king rested upon the consent of the people. 'Governments were designed to protect the rights of each individual to life, liberty and property'.<sup>31</sup>

The early pioneers arriving in North America were faced with the problem of controlling the settlements they established, protecting them from the attacks of the natives and creating a form of government that would ensure the welfare of the people as well as enforcing law and order. Since there was no hereditary nobility, those who had led the expedition of settlement usually retained their positions but free members (excluding servants and indentured persons) participated in decisions. As a result there was a far greater involvement in politics by the colonists than by the average British subject. It was quite usual for the former to have a vote in either group decisions or the election of leaders, though often the vote depended on some form of property qualification.

In 1763 British control over North America had been assured following the end of the Seven Years War (1756–1763), with the cession of the French possessions in Canada and of Florida by Spain. The colonialists no longer felt the need for British protection and when the British government tried to obtain contributions to pay for the war which had secured the American colonies from foreign aggression '... Grumbles about grievances turned first into resistance, then rebellion'.<sup>32</sup>

The War against the British was successful and by the Treaty of Versailles (September 1783) the independence of the American colonies was recognized.

America was not an active contributor to the Enlightenment but the educated members of its society keenly followed the arguments and debates that were being conducted in Europe. Visitors from America went to Britain and toured Europe, especially France. While perhaps not typical, a good example would be Benjamin Franklin (1706–1790), a self educated printer but also publisher, inventor, scientist, politician, diplomat and statesman. He might be regarded as a true example of an Enlightenment man, able to turn his hand to anything.

He was one of three Commissioners sent to France to ask for assistance during the War of Independence and was Minister to France from 1776 to 1785. During this time he was also one of the representatives at the peace treaty with Great Britain in 1781. Earlier, he had spent a number of years in England and was a friend of the chemist Joseph Priestley (1733–1804), the Scottish philosopher David Hume (1711–1776) and the economist Adam Smith (1723–1790).<sup>33</sup> He was elected a member of the Royal Society and was awarded the Copley Medal in 1753.

It is not, perhaps, surprising to find that Franklin was a mason. He was raised in a Lodge held at the Tun Tavern in Water Street, Philadelphia in February 1731. The earliest known Freemason in America was Jonathan Belcher (1681–1757) who was made a Freemason in 1704 during a visit to England. Daniel Coxe (1673–1739) was appointed as Provincial Grand Master of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania in June 1730. This office was on a one or two year basis and he was eventually succeeded by Franklin in June 1734. Franklin was a friend of Voltaire and was present when Voltaire was made a mason in the Lodge of the Nine Muses in 1778.

Freemasonry spread widely through America and out of the 56 signatories to the Declaration of Independence of 1776, nine were masons; the proportion was higher when the Constitutions of the United States were signed in 1787 as out of the 36 who signed, 13 were masons.

There is no suggestion that the Revolution was masonically inspired, in fact Franklin did his best to prevent an outbreak of hostilities and gave evidence before the House of Commons which assisted in the repeal of the hated Stamp Act. However, the Constitution shows definite signs of Enlightenment influence, as is only to be expected. While the future United States did not come within what might be regarded as the main Enlightenment area, the books that were available in Europe and Britain were widely reprinted and read locally and as keenly discussed. They had a strong influence on American political thought and its development.

There may also have been some masonic influence as well and while the 'all seeing eye' depicted on the back of a one dollar bill is not exclusively a masonic symbol, it does have those connections. The truncated pyramid below it could possibly be interpreted as a broached thurnel, unless it is in fact a full pyramid with the top obscured by the 'all seeing eye'. However, the interpretation of symbols such as these is much in the eye of the interpreter and not too much emphasis should be put on this.

The Declaration of Independence was to influence European political thought and its effect is to be seen in the 'Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen', which was adopted in 1789 by the National Assembly of France, during the French Revolution.

## CONCLUSIONS

It is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from this study of the development of Freemasonry during the Enlightenment period but it is probably fair to say that, to an extent, it was a two way traffic. The ideals of brotherhood, equality, respect for the law of the land, loyalty to the king and the belief in a Supreme Being essential to Freemasonry was mirrored in many ways during the Enlightenment. How far one reacted on the other is impossible to prove but certain words or phrases such as 'acting on the square', 'taking the third degree', 'the Mason word', 'I was taught to be cautious' and 'How old is your Grandmother?' (no doubt others will spring to mind) have passed into common usage. The popularity of Freemasonry among the public, in spite of severe repression in some countries, has stood the test of time and it is interesting to note, as an aside, that in Eastern Europe and the countries which have broken away from control of the USSR, how quickly it has been re-established, as it was in Germany once the Nazis were driven from power.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I must pay tribute to my wife, Patricia, who has, over the years put up with my absences on masonic occasions and more recently when I have been tied to a hot computer preparing this paper.

May I thank the Brethren of Quatuor Coronati Lodge for their support and in particular John Hamill and John Ashby for their help and courtesy in the Grand Lodge Library. To Aubrey Newman for help and suggestions, Michel Brodsky for assistance in obtaining French records which were unavailable here and to Neville Barker-Cryer for so speedily translating them for me. To Bro. Plez A. Transou, of the Scottish Rite Research Society, Texas, for kindly providing information about those Americans who were associated with the Declaration of Independence and those who were signatories to the Declaration of Independence. The staff of QCCC Ltd have been invariably kind and helpful and Charles Carter in particular has been a tower of strength. Finally, I would like to thank Mrs. Lynne Brown, my Open University Tutor and Counsellor for help and suggestions with this paper.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Marshall, Dorothy, *Eighteenth Century England*, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> 'lumières' can also mean 'the enlightened ones'.

<sup>3</sup> Kant, Immanuel *Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung?*

<sup>4</sup> Samuel Johnson (1709-1784) defined 'enthusiasm' in his *Dictionary* as 'A vain belief of private revelation; a vain confidence of divine favour or communication'.

<sup>5</sup> Open University Course A206 Studies II, p. 6.

<sup>6</sup> Hampson, Norman, *The Enlightenment*, p. 77.

<sup>7</sup> Koenigsburger, H. G., and others, *Europe in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 77

<sup>8</sup> Extract from the Bottomley/McGee Ritual used in West Lancashire but also used in other rituals.

<sup>9</sup> *AQC* 86, p. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Bro. C. N. Batham *AQC* 86, p. 15.

<sup>11</sup> Quoted by Bro. A. F. C. Jackson in Appendix I of *Rose Croix*.

- <sup>12</sup> Open University, Course A206, *Texts*, 1, p. 309.
- <sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>14</sup> Ephraim Chambers was a Scot and *Chambers's Twentieth Century Dictionary* is its lineal successor.
- <sup>15</sup> Lough, J., *The Encyclopédie*, David McKay Co. Inc., New York, 1971.
- <sup>16</sup> Photocopy obtained by Bro. Michel Brodsky from Bibliothèque du Grand Orient de France and translated by Bro. the Revd. Neville Barker-Cryer.
- <sup>17</sup> *AQC* 97/1984, pp. 105–114.
- <sup>18</sup> Sans Souci (without or free from care) was the park and miniature palace which Frederick had built just outside Potsdam. This was both his business office and retreat.
- <sup>19</sup> Revised edition, Volume IV, pp. 108–111.
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*; quoted from a letter, p. 110.
- <sup>21</sup> Gould, Volume IV, p. 95.
- <sup>22</sup> It may be of interest to know that *Nathan the Wise* was the first play presented in Germany after the 1939–1945 War.
- <sup>23</sup> Anderson, M. S., p. 153.
- <sup>24</sup> Roberts, J. M., p. 497.
- <sup>25</sup> Gould, Volume IV, p. 161.
- <sup>26</sup> Bernhart, Frank, *AQC* 1963, Volume 76, p. 2.
- <sup>27</sup> Gould, Volume IV, p. 166.
- <sup>28</sup> Sharp, Arthur, *AQC* 1957, Volume 69, p. 17.
- <sup>29</sup> *AQC* 104/1991 Bro. J. F. Ashby, p. 82.
- <sup>30</sup> *AQC* 104/1991, pp. 51–94.
- <sup>31</sup> O'Day, Rosemary, Open University, *Themes in British and American History*, Focus Point 1 Essays, p. 5.
- <sup>32</sup> Roberts, J. M., *History of the World*, p. 575.
- <sup>33</sup> Author of *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AQC* 81 (1968) i) Chevalier Ramsay – A New Appreciation, Bro. C. N. Batham, pp. 280–315. ii) John Coustos and the Portuguese Inquisition, Bro. Dr. S. Vatcher, pp. 9–87. iii) The Climate of European Freemasonry 1730–1750, Bro. P. A. Tonbridge, pp. 88–128.
- AQC* 86 (1973) Inaugural Address, Bro. C. N. Batham.
- AQC* 97 (1984) Eighteenth-Century French Freemasonry and the French Revolution, Bro. A. Mellor.
- AQC* 104 (1991) The Church of Rome and Freemasonry (1738 ... 1917 ... 1983 ...) Bro. Will Read.
- Bartholomew, Michael; Hall, Denise; Lentin, Anthony (eds) A206, *The Enlightenment, Studies I & II*, The Open University, 1922, Course.
- Hampson, Norman, *The Enlightenment*, Penguin Books Ltd, 1968.
- Koenigsberger, H. G.; Mosse, George L.; Bowler, G. Q., *Europe in the Sixteenth Century*, Longman Group. 2nd Edition, 6th impression 1993.
- Marshall, Dorothy, *Eighteenth Century England*, Longman Group. 2nd Edition, 6th impression 1985.
- Jackson, Brig. A. C. F., *Rose Croix*, Lewis Masonic, revised edition 1987.
- Lough, J., *The Encyclopédie*, David McKay Co. Inc., New York, 1971.
- Gould, R. F., *Gould's History of Freemasonry*, Volumes I–V, edited by Dudley Wright, The Caxton Publishing Co., 1936.
- Anderson, M. S., *Europe in the Eighteenth Century 1713–1783*, Longman Group. 3rd Edition 1987, 46th impression 1991.
- Roberts, J. M., *History of the World*, Helicon Publishing, 1993.

In proposing the toast to the Worshipful Master at the Installation Banquet, Bro. Michel Brodsky said:

Tonight the lodge has a new master at its head, showing its strength, vitality and, above all, its capacity to follow the path laid out by its founders 108 years ago.

Bro. Michael Spurr has, like his predecessor – with whom he shares the same Christian name, the merit of being an old Royal Navy man. But he has much more than this to his credit. He is and has been for many years a masonic scholar of distinction, with three previous papers published in *AQC*; six further papers in other masonic journals and a brief *History of Freemasonry in West Lancashire* (1969) to his name.

And what of the man? Bro. Spurr was born in 1925 at Ilford in Essex. He completed his education at Liverpool, served on minesweepers towards the end of the War and on leaving the Royal Navy took up a career in the Merchant Marine, but he soon learned that even if sailors may have a girl in every port, the maritime life is not the path to follow if one wishes to lead a happy and stable life! So Bro. Spurr left the sea to marry – a move leading to three children and eventually to four grand-children – and to take up a new career in insurance, in which profession he soon became a highly qualified expert in the difficult field of Marine Underwriting (but do not ask me to explain its technicalities in detail – they are beyond my understanding!)

Bro. Spurr is also a most active mason. In the Craft he was initiated in Tower Lodge No. 3583, at Liverpool, in 1958, and is now Past Provincial Junior Grand Deacon (West Lancashire). He has also joined – and attained high office – in many other masonic Rites and Orders. Our new Master's publications also reflect the variety of his masonic interests, but after his first publication in our *Transactions*, 'The Liverpool Rebellion' (*AQC* 85, 1972), his professional duties curtailed his opportunities for research work and we had to wait until 1987 to enjoy once more the pleasure of his scholarship. Accurate research and a pleasant style brought back to life that extraordinary 18th century mason William Stukeley (*AQC* 100), and when our new Master explored the byways of 'The Bills of Mortality' (*AQC* 102) he brought to life an essential aspect of the social and legal background that is so important for us to understand if we wish to place early freemasons in the context of their everyday lives.

Michael Spurr is also a great traveller, his profession taking him at one time to as many as twenty-five countries each year, and while we may dream of visiting the Gobi Desert or watching the sunset in Thailand, he has been there and has done it! Brethren, I invite you to raise your glasses and drink the health of our Worshipful Master.