

the German Stonemasons, certain exclusive rights? Bro. G. William Spoth contributes to the *London Freeman* of January 20th, 1888, the following curious and interesting information on this subject:—

* * Now, as to the papal bulls. The persistency with which this assertion crops up appears to me to be founded on something more than sheepwalking. There are two obvious sources from which this tradition springs. First, the general statement in the "Parentalia," which is well known to all of us; and, secondly, a very detailed list of imperial and other confirmations of the privileges of the Steinmetzen, given by Heideloff on page 21 of the "Bauhütte des Mittelalters," Nuremberg, 1844, 4to. This list, as far as regards the imperial confirmations, is reprinted in many works, the latest being Bro. Gould's "History," page 172; and so far is apparently not open to doubt of any sort. Amongst these confirmations in Heideloff appear two bulls—Alexander VI., Rome, 16th Sept., 1502, and Leo X., *pride Calendarium*, Januarii, 1517. Kloss, on page 5 of his "Freimaurerei in ihrer wahren Bedeutung," bewails the unfortunate fact that Heideloff omits to justify his assertion by quoting his authorities or sources of information. Nevertheless, the following passage on p. 235, second edition, would seem to show that as far as Germany is concerned, Kloss was ready to admit the above two bulls. He is speaking of the well-known statement in the "Parentalia," and says: "The statement concerning the traveling Masons, attributed to the celebrated architect Wren, should excite all the more suspicion the closer we investigate the surrounding circumstances, the incredibility of which is at once evident, and the more we consider the possibility of the facts narrated. We may, therefore, describe the whole tradition thus put into the mouths of Achmet and Wren, to an attempt at

adorning the Guild legends, which may be based on the papal confirmations really granted to the German Stonemasons in 1502 and 1517." He then confesses the inability of Povnhall, of Krause, of Kloss, and others, to discover a single bull, and concludes, from many circumstances, that such could not have existed for England; but, as we have seen, he evidently believes in the two quoted by Heideloff, as above, for Germany. This credulity on the part of such a critic as Kloss would appear remarkable, but I will presently show that he has good reasons for the belief that is in him. I will, however, first revert to Heideloff. On p. 23 he states that the German Stonemasons received an indulgence from Pope Nicholas III. (1227), which was renewed by all his successors up to Benedict XII. (1334.) Bro. "Bookworm" will thus see at a glance whence Rebold and Gyr take their statements. It is difficult to prove a negative, and I am not in a position to deny this statement; but, if true, where did Heideloff obtain his knowledge? Heideloff surely could not have invented it; such a proceeding would be too barefaced and hardly possible outside the pages of Fallon; there must, therefore, exist some sort of precedent for the assertion, and I regret my inability to discover it, despite two years of patient research. But why does Kloss believe in the bulls of 1502 and 1517? In 1518, Monday after Corpus Christi, the Lodge at Magdeburg petitioned their prince for a confirmation of their ordinances, they having just accepted the Strasburg Brotherbook (1459), and declared that if any part of these ordinances displeased him, they were willing to alter them, "always excepting the chief articles, which had been confirmed by *papal and imperial authority*." The Strasburg Lodge, in their quarrel with the Annaberg Lodge (this latter had up to that moment not joined the general bond, because they upheld the term of four years' apprenticeship,