

seen at the time my report was written, or it would have been included; it is substantially the same as the others. All of these Constitutions, save one (Krause's), and that of more than doubtful authority, give an unequivocal and strictly Christian character to Freemasonry, including the dogma of the Holy Trinity, not by implication, but in plain English. The dates of these Constitutions extend over a period of two hundred and thirty years (1490-1720).

Thanks to those indefatigable and intelligent Masonic archæologists, Hughan, Lyon, Woodward, Cooke, and that prince of English archæologists, though not a Mason, James Orchard Halliwell (Phillips), the contents of these rare and precious Masonic documents are brought within the reach of all Masonic students. Anderson's Constitution differs as widely as day from night in a material article—that concerning "God and Religion"—from any of these old Masonic Constitutions except Krause's, which, as I have already said, is among the doubtful authorities. Now where did Anderson find any old "Masonic Constitution, history, charge or regulation, either from Italy, Scotland, England, or beyond the seas," that authorized him to say: "But though in ancient times Masons were charged in every country to be of the religion of that country or nation [This is not true.—C.] 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 honor and honesty, by whatever denominations or persuasions they may be distinguished." Anderson's Constitutions were just what they were called in the "Approbation" appended to the book, "New Constitutions, with Charges and General Regulations." There were none before like them, "neither on the earth, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth."

In proof of my allegation that the "New Constitutions" "gave much dissatisfaction to some of the members of the Order," I quote the following passage from one of the best authorities we have on English Masonic history, Bro. Hughan, of Truro. In his "Memorials of the Masonic Union," (page 4), he says: "The precise origin of the secession of 1730-52 has not yet been exactly ascertained, but we may safely assume that the disagreement which arose was mainly fostered by the operatives, in whose practical minds the institution of the Society of Free and Accepted Masons on a cosmopolitan basis was evidently regarded as directly opposed to their ancient customs and privileges. The struggle for supremacy commenced in earnest on the festival of St. John the Baptist, 1723, when the election of the learned natural philosopher, Dr. Desaguliers, as Deputy Grand Master, met with opposition, forty-two adverse votes being registered out of a total of eighty-five. In 1730 (Sept. 15th) Anthony Sayer, the Premier Grand Master, was publicly admonished and well-nigh expelled for taking part in illegal assemblies of dissatisfied Masons, who were seeking to undermine the authority of the Society they and the others had so recently constituted."

In 1739 (June 30), "complaint was exhibited against certain brethren suspected of being concerned in an irregular making of Masons" (Northouck's Constitutions, edition 1784, p. 239). At the next meeting of the Grand Lodge (Dec. 12), "these transgressors were pardoned, upon submission and promise of future good behavior," &c. (Constitution 1784, p. 239). Some disagreeable altercations arose in the Society about this period—1739 (Preston's Illustrations, edition 1812, p. 241). For further evidence of my assertion that "dissatisfaction existed among some of the brethren" soon after the publication of Anderson's Constitution, and that it grew and became formidable, finally