

of the events that transpired during its construction. The symbol had now been developed to its fullest extent to suit the ideas of those who were engaged in 1717 in the formation of a ritual. What was taught about the Temple by Anderson, although polished and perfected afterwards by Preston and other ritual makers, is substantially the same, so far as it goes, as is taught at the present day. Therefore, notwithstanding that Dr. Krause says in his "Kunsturkunden," that "the Temple of Solomon is no symbol, certainly not a prominent one of the old English system," I am constrained to believe that it was one of the principal symbols, incorporated in 1717 into the primitive ritual of the revivers of the Order, having been adopted by them in consequence of its common use for at least three preceding centuries.

The *Legend of the Temple Builder*, as he is commonly but improperly called, for he was only its decorator, is so intimately connected in the ritual with the symbol of the Temple that we would be naturally led to suppose that the one has always been contemporary and co-existent with the other. The evidence to this point is not, however, conclusive, although a critical examination of the Old Constitutions would seem to show that the writers of these documents were not altogether ignorant of the rank and services attributed by Masons to Hiram Abif. There was, however, considerable confusion in their minds on this subject. The Cooke MS. says: "And the kynge's sone of Tyre was his (Solomon's) Master Mason." The Landsdowne MS. states that he was the son of the King of Tyre and calls his name *Aman*. The variety of forms given to the name of the Temple Builder in these Manuscript Constitutions is rather surprising. Thus the Sloan MS. (1659) calls him *Dyan*; the Harleian (1670) *Amon*; the Lodge of Hope (1680) *Amon*; the Alnwick (1701) *Ajuon*. In 1714 the legend must have undergone some changes, for the Papworth MS. which has that date, calls him *Benaim*, which signifies in Hebrew, BUILDERS, and which was afterwards applied by Anderson to the Fellow Crafts in general.

Now the legend began to assume a definite form. The document known as the "Krause MS.," and which Dr. Krause too hastily supposed to be the original York MS. of 926, is really a production of the early part of the 18th century, a few years before the revival, and was most probably familiar to Anderson and Desaguliers. That manuscript refers to the legend in the following words:

"After it (the Temple) was finished, they kept a general feast and the joy over the happy completion was only dimmed by the death soon after, of the excellent Master, Hiram Abif. They buried him before the Temple, and he was mourned for by all."

The Roberts' Constitution, printed in 1722, is utterless worthless as an exponent of the Masonic ideas of the time, since it was merely a reprint of an older document. But in the Constitutions printed in 1723, by Dr. Anderson, the artist is called *Hiram Abif*, and is said to have been not the son but the namesake of King Hiram, of Tyre, and "Master of the Work" at the Temple. Nothing is said of his death, but in the Constitutions of 1738, also compiled by Anderson, and which are in the narrative part an amplification of those of 1723, we find this statement:

"The cope-stone was celebrated by the Fraternity with great joy. But their joy was soon interrupted by the sudden death of their dear Master, Hiram Abif, whom they decently interred in the lodge near the Temple, according to ancient usage."

Thus the legend of the Third degree begins to loom up before our view. And when in the expositions published immediately after 1723 we meet with the legend, accurately detailed, and in form substantially the same as the one that we now possess, we are driven to the alternative of believing, notwithstanding the intimations in the Krause MS., and in Anderson's Constitutions, either that the legend was the invention of Prichard or some other expositor (which would be extreme folly), or that the legend of the Third Degree, as it has been transmitted to us, formed an essential part of the ritual at the time of the revival, and has since undergone no essential change. It is not the object of the present article to determine how long before that time it existed, and was known to the Craft. The enquiry is here restricted to the condition of the ritual at the period of the revival.

The last of the symbols to which I invite attention is the *Word*, of all the symbols of Speculative Masonry, undoubtedly the most important and the one absolutely essential to its character as a science. I cannot conceive any idea of Freemasonry as a speculative science divested of its interesting speculations on the historical significance and the symbolic interpretation of the *Word*.

The Old Manuscript Constitutions are completely silent on this point. Either from ignorance of the *Word* as a symbol, or from a desire to abstain from any reference to a matter so *esoteric*, we do not find in these documents, anterior to the eighteenth century, any allusion to the *Word*. LYON says in his "History of the Lodge of Edinburgh," that in the latter part of the seventeenth century, the "MASON WORD" was imparted as a secret in the lodges of Scotland. In the beginning of the eighteenth century there is mention of "the Secrets of the Mason Word." In 1700 the minutes