



United Masters Lodge, No. 157

Of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons
(FOUNDED 1909)

Secretary:

V.W. Bro. R. F. NEWTON,
P.G. Lec., P.M.,
71 Selwyn Road, Howick, N.Z.,
Phone 5187S.

Auckland, N. Z.

Dear Brother,—

The enthusiastic reception of Volume 1 of the reprints of our Transactions, and the repeated requests for another, have encouraged us to put Volume 2 into preparation, and it should be available in the first half of 1960.

This year the Lodge will celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of its foundation, by a special Jubilee Meeting on Saturday, 12th December, 1959, and it is planned to include in the projected volume a short history of the Lodge and its work, and an account of that meeting.

The new book will be similar in size and binding to Volume 1, and the price will be the same, viz. 10/- per copy, postage paid.

The first volume was heavily oversold, and those who wish to have copies of the second are requested to kindly complete and post to me as soon as possible the printed Order Form overleaf.

It should be emphasised that the number of copies printed must largely depend upon the orders received in advance.

Those who have the first Volume will need no recommendation for the second, which also will be a mine of valuable information, and a fine addition to any Masonic Library.

Your fraternally,

R. F. NEWTON,

Secretary.



Pro. No.

58

Sheet

United Masters Lodge Order Form

Please forward, as soon as published, copies of Volume 2 of Reprints of Transactions of United Masters Lodge, No. 167, for which find enclosed the sum of £.....

SIGNED:

NAME:

ADDRESS:

NAME AND ADDRESS IN BLOCK LETTERS WILL BE APPRECIATED.

Copyright Worcestershire Masonic Library and Museum Trust

PLEASE NOTE TIME OF MEETING.

Vol. XIII.

No. 8.



United Masters Lodge, No. 167

Of Antient Free and Accepted Masons

MASTER:

W. Bro. A. S. OLDFHAM,

P. O. Box 1004, Auckland, C.1.

Phones: Business, 44-181; Private, 26 (Brown's Bay).

Masonic Temple,

St. Benedict's Street, Auckland.

15th October, 1959.

Wor. and Dear Brother,

You are hereby summoned to attend the Installation Meeting, which will be held in the IONIC ROOM on

TUESDAY, 22nd OCTOBER, 1959, at 6.30 p.m.

The Master will be pleased if you will extend a cordial welcome to any M.M.'s who are interested in our Masonic discussions.

By Command of the Master,

R. F. NEWTON, P.G. Lec., P.M.

Secretary.

Phone 5187S, Howick. Address: 71 Selwyn Road, Howick.

TREASURER: R.W. BRO. N. B. SPENCER, P.G.W., P.M.

Address: P.O. Box 2502, Auckland, C.1.

EVENING DRESS.

"MONARCHS THEMSELVES"

By W. Bro. L. H. Southwick, S.D.

OFFICERS, 1958-59

Master—W Bro A. S. Oldham
D.M.—R.W. Bro. A. L. Blank,
P.Prov. G.M.

S.W.—W. Bro. W. J. Angell
J.W.—W. Bro. J. M. Craig
Chaplain—W. Bro. C. J. Wilson,
P.G.D.

Treasurer—R.W. Bro. N. B. Spencer,
P.G.W., P.M.

Secretary—V.W. Bro. R. F. Newton,
P.G.Lec., P.M.

D. of C.—W. Bro. F. A. Howarth
S.D.—W. Bro. L. H. Southwick.

J.D.—W. Bro. F. T. Bartley
Asst. Sec.—W. Bro. G. H. McGibbon
Asst. Sec. (Waikato) W. Bro. V.
Towers, P.G.P.

Asst. D. of C.—W. Bro. H. Purdy,
P.G.S.

Organist—Bro. E. H. Nelson Mee

I.G.—W. Bro. A. L. S. Ferguson
S.S.—W. Bro. J. T. D. Lloyd, P.G.B.B.

J.S.—W. Bro. O. A. Wimsett

A.S.—Bro. M. E. Coates

A.S.—Bro. H. G. Ellison

A.S.—Bro. A. H. Frost

Tyler—Bro. A. D. W. Woolcott

AGENDA

Confirmation of Minutes.

Correspondence.

Treasurer's Balance.

Accounts.

To Ballot for as Joining Members:

W. Bro. C. R. Kidd, Master, Lodge Onewa, No. 182.

W. Bro. A. D. Thomson, I.P.M., Lodge Onewa, No. 182.

Proposed by W. Bro. A. S. Oldham; seconded by V.W. Bro.
R. F. Newton.

Installation of Master Elect, W. Bro. G. H. McGibbon.

Investiture of Officers for 1959-60.

Associate Members elected last meeting:

St. Andrews Lodge, No. 8:
W. Bro. B. H. Hodder, Master

Lodge Ikaroa, No. 115:
W. Bro. A. G. Muir, Master
W. Bro. E. J. Young, I.P.M.
Bro. T. F. D. Davis, M.M.
Bro. T. I. Pickett, M.M.
Bro. W. J. Stockley, M.M.

Lodge Papatoetoe, No. 227:
Bro. E. V. Burnside, M.M.
Bro. M. T. Burrill, M.M.
Bro. S. C. Gollan, M.M.
Bro. B. P. Mackay, M.M.

Lodge Waiapu, No. 241:
Bro. K. S. Williams, M.M.

Lodge Karori, No. 247:
Bro. A. S. Wickens, M.M.
Lodge Westmere, No. 333:
Bro. D. MacGregor, M.M.

Cornish Masters Lodge, No. 3324 E.C.:
W. Bro. G. H. Fradd, P.M.
W. Bro. C. U. Stewart, P.M.

Lodge Balgonie, No. 764 S.C.:
Bro. G. R. Kerr, M.M.

Hinemoa Lodge, No. 786 S.C.:
W. Bro. H. H. Klieman, P.M.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY,
24th SEPTEMBER, 1959.

The Lodge opened at 7.30 p.m.

PRESENT: The Master, W. Bro. A. S. Oldham, and Officers and Brethren as recorded in the Attendance Register.

THE MINUTES of the previous meeting were confirmed.

CORRESPONDENCE: Letter of appreciation from M.W. Bro. M. Herman, Grand Master, Grand Lodge of Saskatchewan, our Local Secretary for Canada. Proposals for new members from W. Bro. C. J. Wilson (1); V.W. Bro. W. H. V. Taine (1); W. Bro. A. S. Oldham (2 full); W. Bro. F. J. Young (5); W. Bro. C. U. Stewart (Cornwall) (2); W. Bro. G. S. Jenkin (1). Requests for Lectures from Lodge Manurewa and Lodge Pono. Appreciation of Lecture from Lodge Roskill.

ELECTION OF MASTER for the year 1959-60: Although only one Brother was nominated for the Office, a ballot was taken as required by Rule No. 196 of the Book of Constitution, and W. Bro. G. H. McGibbon was elected.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS: There being no other nominations, those proposed at the previous meeting were declared elected.

ELECTION OF LODGE COMMITTEE: The following brethren were elected: R.W. Bro. A. Burns, W. Bros. W. R. Bazeley, J. P. Glenie and H. J. Hulse.

ELECTION OF EDITOR: V.W. Bro. W. H. V. Taine was re-elected.

ELECTION OF LIBRARIAN: V.W. Bro. C. G. Herdman was re-elected and the following brethren elected as Assistants—W. Bro. T. R. Bird, and Bro. A. Rogers.

ELECTION OF AUDITORS: V.W. Bro. C. G. Herdman and W. Bro. H. J. Hulse were re-elected.

A BALLOT for Membership by Affiliation, which proved successful, was taken for the admission of Bro. L. N. Harris, R.W.M. St. Andrew Lodge, No. 418 S.C., and W. Bro. C. H. O'Callaghan, G.S., P.M. Chevalier Lodge, No. 303.

VISITORS: The Master received with the customary honours: W. Bro. J. C. Jessop, Master, Takapuna Lodge, No. 202; W. Bro. W. E. Hildebrand, Master, Lodge Pukemiro, No. 301; W. Bro. G. A. Lupton, Master, Lodge Mangere, No. 330; and W. Bro. H. C. Sweetman, Master, Lodge Trinity, No. 360.

PAPER READ: W. Bro. L. H. Southwick, S.D., read a paper entitled "Monarchs Themselves". A very hearty vote of thanks was accorded to the lecturer.

DISCUSSION: The paper given by W. Bro. T. R. Bird on the 27th August was then reviewed. A large number of brethren took part, as recorded on a later page.

LIBRARIAN'S REPORT: The Librarian reported a very heavy demand for books.

LECTURES WERE REPORTED to have been given since the last meeting at Lodges Kumeu, Trinity and Maungakiekie.

THE MASTER ROSE for the first and second times.

APOLOGIES were received from R.W. Bros. N. B. Spencer and A. L. Blank, W. Bro. O. A. Wimsett and Bros. E. A. Oxner, A. D. W. Woolcott and H. G. Ellison.

NEW MEMBERS: The Secretary proposed on behalf of various brethren the Associate Members listed; the proposal was seconded and the brethren elected.

THE MASTER ROSE for the third time and received the fraternal greetings of the visitors.

THE LODGE WAS CLOSED in peace, love and harmony at 9.40 p.m.

DISCUSSION OF PAPER "THE TWO BRONZE PILLARS"

BY W. BRO. T. R. BIRD.

The Master congratulated Bro. Bird upon his recovery from the illness which had denied him the pleasure of personally reading his paper to the Lodge, and warmly welcomed him back to his Masonic labours.

His excellent paper, he said, presented a clear picture of the famous Pillars, which were the outward expression of Israel's endeavour to indicate some of the attributes of the Most High. Josephus, the Jewish historian, had established for us their relative positions at the entrance to the Temple proper.

Perhaps Bro. Bird would refer to this matter and also to the question as to whether Boaz was a Prince and Ruler in Israel or merely a prosperous and kind-hearted farmer; he appeared to have died a century before the time of Solomon.

Bro. A. L. S. Ferguson (himself an experienced metallurgist, said: Bro. Bird's paper is very interesting to me; the method of casting in those days is beyond my comprehension, but the system would be the same as now: making the pattern, making the core, moulding the job, pouring the metal, and after cooling fettling and dressing the castings. The pillars were possibly cast in one length and the chapters and their ornaments separately. They would not be cast in pure copper; whatever the "bronze" mixing was is a big question, but it would be easy for a metallurgist of today to analyse a sample.

One of the most beautiful metals cast consisted of 88 lbs. of copper, 12 lbs. of tin and 2 lbs. of lead, as was used in the bearings and cog-wheels of the old Rimutaka Fell engines, the lead being added for softening for turning purposes. If Hiram's men had used a metal of that description it would be easy running and clean, whereas with brass (copper and zinc) there is a lot of flying dross.

Each pillar would possibly be cast in one piece, lying flat in the mould with a core of sand in the centre, strengthened with iron; if the weight was 20 tons, as stated, the runners and risers would add extra weight until they were cut off in dressing.

Those two beautiful pillars, cast and polished under the direction of Hiram, must have been a wonderful sight; what a pity that such glorious work should have been afterwards destroyed by a raiding party.

Bro. H. L. Hunt added his congratulations to the writer of such an informative paper, and referred to the contentious problem of the position of the pillars, due to the ambiguity of the respective references to them in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, the writing of which may have been separated by several centuries of time. However, he said, they were before the Temple, in its porch, and the left and right positions were to be judged from the stand-point of one looking out of the building towards the east.

As to their height: the seeming contradiction of I Kings 7:15 and 2 Chron. 3:15 could be reconciled by taking into account Jeremiah 52:21; the true height, he suggested, would then appear as 40 cubits; and the height of the chapters might be calculated from 2 Kings, 25:17, 3 cubits, plus the "wreathen work" 2 cubits, that is 5 cubits in all, as given in I Kings 7:16.

The Hebrew word for chapter, COHERETH, means "crowning" and was very significant when one noted the explanation given in the paper.

Bro. L. H. Southwick said he had found the paper fascinating and very interesting. In an article on I Kings in "A New Commentary on Holy Scripture", Alfred Guillaume, Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Languages at the University of Durham, had said that the two pillars apparently stood clear of the building and were thus similar to those of other ancient sanctuaries, where their significance was unknown. At Tyre, according to Herodotus, Melkarth was worshipped in the form of two pillars, but it was much more likely that there, as in Babylonia, two gods were represented.

However, Phoenician tombs afford excellent illustrations of slavish imitation of Egyptian symbols where all knowledge of their original significance had been lost, and the Professor claims that it was not impossible that the pillars merely followed conventional style. He concludes by saying, however, that against this is the fact that **they were named**, and also the persistence of obelisks in the Hebrew cultus.

As to the names, he writes, Jachin, "He shall establish" and Boaz, "in it or him is strength", but written as a compound word: compound words were unknown in Hebrew except as proper names, and the Professor leaves us with the interesting suggestion that the devices on the pillars were meant to be read as a sentence, which he translates "He will establish strength herein."

Bro. Hines asked three questions:—

- (a) Were the Pillars the only parts of the Temple to be given names?
- (b) It is said that there is no scriptural authority for the statement that "According to our traditions God said, etc."; is it known who made that assertion?
- (c) Would it be necessary for the basket or network illustrated in Plate II of the paper to be provided to avoid delirium by birds? Would they not be kept away by the noise made by the animals nearby, and the crowds of people?

Bro. G. H. Robertson warmly congratulated Bro. Bird on producing for the Lodge a paper which all would read with delight and profit.

Bro. J. P. Glenie said there was so much food for thought and so many points for discussion in Bro. Bird's invaluable paper that he must confine his remarks to two matters which seemed relevant.

The first was concerned with the heavy task of transporting and erecting the pillars, if each was cast in one length weighing 20 tons; the possibility of this had been doubted by some students.

But recently the Norwegian explorer Heyerdahl saw demonstrated at Easter Island in the Pacific the method by which the 50 ton statues found there were probably transported for distances of up to 10 miles and set up right on stone bases: by the primitive inhabitants of centuries ago. In his presence 180 men and women moved a 12 ton statue a considerable distance at a good pace, by strong, rhythmic pulling on a stout rope.

A 30 ton statue lying on its face was raised to the vertical by 12 men in 18 days, using poles as levers, stones of various sizes, and two ropes, such as their island ancestors could have made from native fibres.

Such operations would present no problem to the experienced men of Tyre under Pharam's command. The chapters could have been placed in position later by the long-established use of ramps.

(Editor's Note: A number of years ago, in the United Masters Lodge, W. Bro. M. Bin, S.G.D., showed how easily enormous and unwieldy masses of stone could be moved over any distance by means of barbuckles of rope, and skids.)

My second point, said Bro. Glenie, concerns the celestial and terrestrial globes which usually surmount the pillars in our Lodges, the origin of which may be found in the Eleusinian Mysteries of Ancient Greece. There the Sun god was "Iacchus" and the Earth god "Bohu", names very close to those of the pillars of the Temple.

Does this mean that those known to us, whose names are also of Jewish origin, really represent the heavens (Iacchus) and the earth (Bohu), the reconciliation of which brings stability, in the proper union of Man with God? This is the interpretation given by H. F. Inman.

Bro. C. H. A. Kean said he could not agree that the two pillars were each cast in one piece and so transported and lifted into place.

Bro. J. C. Earl expressed the opinion that the method of raising them into position was a lost art.

Bro. J. S. Hester said the explanation given in his Lodge, St. Andrew, No. 418 S.C., seemed to make it plain that it was David who was indicated as a Prince and Ruler in Israel.

Bro. E. H. Lawn said that **Bro. Bird's** experience as an artificer in metals had enabled him to select items of special interest to the layman in the manufacture, size, weight, and adornment of the pillars which were the chief artistic glories of the Temple.

Regarding the cubit: the 18 inch cubit fits into the Jewish table of measures, a portion of which is as follows:—

4 Fingerbreadths (.75")	=	1 Handbreadth (3")
3 Handbreadths	=	1 Span (9")
2 Spans	=	1 Cubit (18")

Bro. W. H. V. Taine said that though **Bro. Bird** had not mentioned it, a pair of pillars was always prominent in the traditions of the craft; the *Cooke Ms.* made much of those on which the Seven Liberal Arts and Sciences were said to have been inscribed so that they might be preserved through the Flood, and other *Mss.* of later dates carried on the story. **Anderson**, in 1723 and 1738, credited **Enoch** with their construction for that purpose, being, he said, "expert and bright both in the science and the art".

Important considerations for us are the prominence of the pillars in our instruction now, and the attachment of one to the First and the other to the Second Degree; what is the significance in each case?

Would it be correct to say that at the end of his seven years of apprenticeship the operative was strong, in body and in training and ability, and that our Entered Apprentices are presumed to be similarly coming out in after the thorough grounding in the principles of the Craft they are given in the First Degree.

In the Second Degree we have the example of the same operative apprentice, now a fellowcraft and earning money wages; previously he had been paid in corn, wine and oil, that is kept and round, as was the custom in mediaeval England. We see him establishing himself in the craft by a course of what must have been long and arduous study; but in no other way could he arrive at the position envisaged in the conjoined meaning of the two names applicable to a skilled and experienced man who could be confidently selected as Master of an important work.

Could it be said that our Fellowcrafts can become real masters of the Craft only in the same way by experience and unremitting study of its instruction?

Bro. Bird, replying, said he had received a great deal of pleasure and gain in preparing the paper, and was very gratified that there had been so much discussion of it. He had been very interested in what had been said by **Bro. Ferguson** and thanked him for his informative remarks.

As to the matter of the Prince and Ruler in Israel, referred to by the Master: there seemed no doubt that it was David, not Boaz.

The position of the pillar **Jachin**, on the right looking out eastwards from the Temple was made clear by II Chron. 4:10, which says that the molten sea in the adjoining court was on the right side of the east end, over against the south.

Bro. Taine would realise, he said, that he had had to confine his remarks to the subject matter of the paper.

JACHIN AND BOAZ — BANKS PENINSULA.

During the Discussion at our July meeting, (page 74 of the present series) **V.W. Bro. Lawn** referred to the interesting matter indicated above. Further information was sought from the Dept. of Lands and Survey, Christchurch, and the following reply was received from the Chief Surveyor:

These names were first recorded on our map of Banks Peninsula, the survey of which was made by **R. Townsend**, between the years 1867 and 1874. The rocks are situated off the northern and southern headlands of Tumble Down Bay and not Peraki Bay as quoted by you. Our official maps still carry these names.

Regarding the origin of the names Johannes C. Andersen in his book "Place Names of Banks Peninsula" had this to say—"Boaz, an islet off the south east headland of Tumble Down Bay on the south east coast of Banks Peninsula. A similar islet off the north west headland is named Jachin. These two, Jachin and Boaz ("strength" and "stability"), were the names of the pillars of the porch of Solomon's Temple. Tumble Down Bay was frequented by whalers but it would appear unlikely that the names were given by the whalers; it is possible they were given by Bishop Selwyn, who during his ministration visited the various bays in his boat "Undine".

"Monarchs Themselves"

By W. Bro. L. H. SOUTHWICK, Senior Deacon.

MONARCHS themselves have been promoters of the art, have no thought it derogatory to their dignity to exchange the sceptre for the trowel, have patronised our mysteries and joined in our assemblies.

This sentence, contained in the ancient charge delivered after the initiation of a candidate, may sometimes be passed off as a piece of somewhat vain rhetoric. It may even seem that the question as to whether or not monarchs have played or do play any part in Freemasonry has little significance other than that of a purely historical nature, and the reference to the exchanging of the sceptre for the trowel paints no truly Masonic allegory; for to many the trowel is no Freemason's tool. However, the sentence, like many others within our teachings, is worthy of further study.

In this paper, in the time of my deposal, it is my intention to endeavour to discuss mainly the first phrase in the sentence, namely "Monarchs themselves have been promoters of the art". The verb "promote" means to cause to go forward, to further, to assist in the start or formation of something. Accordingly my research has been mainly directed towards the question of the assistance and encouragement monarchs have given throughout the years to the emergence and growth of the speculative Freemasonry now known to us.

Reference may be found in numerous places in the Bible to operative masons. For instance we read in the Book Genesis of Nimrod, a great-grandson of Noah, who became King of Babylon. In the Cooke Ms. we read "And this same Nimrod began the Tower of Babel; and he taught to his workmen the craft of masonry . . ."

It is recorded that when Asshur, Lord of Shinar, wished to erect a city he sent to Nimrod for masons and workmen of the craft. The charge with which Nimrod sent his 3,000 masons is set out in the Cooke Ms. thus— "And I shall give you a Charge, that it may be profitable both for you and me. When ye come to that Lord, look that ye be true to him like as ye would be to me . . . and look that ye govern yourselves well towards your Lord, and amongst yourselves, so that I may have worship and thanks for me sending you, and teaching you the Craft". Of Nimrod it was written "A Mason himself, and loved Masons well". Nimrod's training of his men in the art of operative masonry, and his insistence that they should deport themselves well, is a first glimmering of the recognition by an early monarch of the importance of the labourer not only as a craftsman but as a man. I feel that the claim that Nimrod's thinking was many years ahead of that of his fellows is demonstrated by the fact that although the early Egyptians are said to have been adroit stoneworkers, those who have studied their history point out that they were devotees of the concrete object; in other words they did not traffic in speculations or abstractions. In fact, in his work on Ancient Egypt, Manchip White says that the Egyptians were not metaphysicians but practical men. He says "It would hardly be going too far to say that the ancient Egyptian dreaded theorising and abstract

thinking." Thus it seems to me to be a reasonable claim that the early suggestion of a speculative significance glimpsed in Nimrod's charges was lost and not fostered during the days of the ancient Egyptians and during the reigns of the Pharaohs which followed Nimrod's days.

Some writers have claimed that the Egyptians did teach what they knew of operative masonry to the Children of Israel, but it seems clear that such knowledge as they may have taken with them when they were driven out of Egypt was lost. It was not until the defeat of the Philistines by King David that the Israelites were able to emerge as a great nation, and, as has often happened since, it was not till then that the art of the mason came into its own. We are told again by the writer of the Cooke Ms. that King David loved masons, and we know how King Solomon brought about his father's dream by completing the Temple at Jerusalem, the most noble masonic work to that time. Perhaps, however, Solomon too was a promoter of our art in a way that is not always given as much prominence as its importance could well warrant. We know that Solomon had to seek outside assistance in the erection of the Temple because of the lack of knowledge of his own people in the necessary arts. We know from the First Book of Kings, Chapter 5, that Solomon sought assistance from Hiram, King of Tyre: how Hiram provided cedar and fir trees for the Temple and Solomon paid in wheat and oil; we read "and the Lord gave Solomon wisdom . . . and there was peace between Hiram and Solomon; and they two made a league together." Then in the Cooke Ms. we read that Solomon confirmed the ancient charges of Masons, and "taught them their manners". It does not seem an unreasonable speculation that these words contain more than is at first apparent. Can it not be asked whether Solomon the Wise, the believer in the one true God, would have laboured with a heathen king and with heathen people, (for such were Hiram and his workmen) without the fervent prayer that the practice of a common art would lead the non-believers, through association with Solomon and his workmen, to the truth. Our traditions tell us that Hiram was closely associated with Solomon to the time of the completion of the work, and one cannot but feel that the beauties of that Temple erected to the glory of God must have had an effect, not only on the heathen King Hiram, but on his people, and one cannot but feel also that one with the wisdom of Solomon would have used that beautiful Temple to teach the lesson which must have been in his mind.

It may be thought that my speculation in attributing such a thought to Solomon is too bold, but I suggest that there is evidence that Solomon did look to the conversion of outsiders to a belief in the one true God. Let me read to you a portion of his prayer at the dedication of the Temple, and in doing so comment that such a missionary kindly spirit is not exhibited again in Holy Writ till we read something similar in Isaiah. I Kings Chap. 8 verses 41-43 reads thus—

41. Moreover concerning a stranger, that is not of thy people Israel, but cometh out of a far country for thy name's sake;
42. (For they shall hear of thy great name, and of thy strong hand, and of thy stretched out arm;) when he shall come and pray toward this house:
43. Hear thou in heaven thy dwelling place, and do according to all that the stranger calleth to thee for: that all people of the earth may know thy name, to fear thee, as do thy people Israel: and that they may know that this house, which I have builded, is called by thy name.

James Anderson, in his Constitutions, has described another monarch, Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, as a "sumptuous Grand Master". I have read the "History of Israel" by L. E. P. Erith, and there is much in that history to support the view that Nebuchadnezzar was a great and powerful ruler. From the viewpoint of the Babylonians he was a most successful soldier, but I have been able to find no evidence of his encouraging operative masonry. Kenning, in his Cyclopaedia of Masonry,

says that Nebuchadnezzar may have patronized the operative sodalities, but that nothing further can be averred concerning him and masonry.

The next monarch whose name I record must be Charles Martel, who ruled over Paris and France from about A.D. 714 to 741. He has been described as "The Saviour of Christendom" and a great patron of operative masonry. Whether or not one can find credence in the charming myth that Charles Martel was taught the science of masonry by one Naymus Graecus, a man of some longevity who was present at the erection of the Temple, one can again find food for meditation in the thought that the patron of operative masonry was also the one who has always been described as "The Saviour of Christendom."

Charles Martel is said to have loved masons well, and to have extended to them the privilege of being freed from Watch duty. This, of course, in his day was a marked privilege and the Cooke Ms. claims that he also gave to masons the right "to assemble once a year, and come and speak together and to be ruled by Master and Fellows . . ." Is there not again something to inspire our thinking in the suggestion that once more we have a man doing much for operative masonry who also showed a vital interest in the welfare and affairs of the men who made up the band of operative masons?

As we watch operative masonry growing and spreading we follow it with interest to England. St. Alban is said to have been the first English mason, but savage wars throughout the land put a stop to building, and the exercising of the mason's art, until peace was restored in the reign of King Athelstan.

According to history, Athelstan, who was a grandson of Alfred the Great, reigned from 924 to 940. He was the first Saxon King to be called King of all Britain, and by his defeat of the Celts and Danes at Brunanburgh in the year 937 restored peace to England. The fact that he was the first King of all Britain led to his name being surrounded by a good deal of legendary lore.

Factually there seems no doubt that Athelstan encouraged building in the land and so vitalized the trade of the operative mason which had been neglected since the coming of St. Alban, through the wars.

Athelstan certainly seems, as said of him, to have loved masons well and as he gave charters to Guilds in England no doubt it can be confidently claimed that one of these charters was given to the early operative Guilds of Freemasons.

The Cooke Ms. makes much of Athelstan's youngest son, who is said to have become a mason himself. The Ms. reads "And he gave them Charges and manners as it is now used in England and in other countries, and he ordained that they should have reasonable pay. And he purchased a free patent of the King that they should make an Assembly when they saw reasonable time and come together to their Council."

History claims that Athelstan had no son, and much has been written of the identity of him referred to in the old Ms. He may have been Edwin, the first Christian King of Northumbria, but be that as it may these two great figures were indeed promoters of our masonic art, and by the very association of their names permit one to speculate that practical masonry as it grew in strength under Athelstan was progressively more aware of the importance of the men who made it up. Much of the history of Saxon England is lost to us, and can only be pieced together from legends which themselves have become distorted over the year. There is however again food for interesting speculation in the partly historical and partly legendary account of how in the year 936, on his return from the wars, King Athelstan publicly offered up thanks in St. Peter's Church at York; (according to the old legends this was the Church built by St. Edwin of Northumbria). In the acts of Athelstan we have the interesting legend of the victorious king, the promoter of practical masonry, paying homage in the church of St. Edwin, the man who, the old Ms. claims, gave the Masons "charges and manners", and who "ordained that they should have reasonable pay, and the right to meet in their Coun-

cils. It may be that this influenced the thinking of those who claimed years later that York was the Alma Mater of English Freemasonry.

Practical masonry continued to prosper, and though little in the way of substantial building arose much before the death of William the Conqueror, the following list of abbeys and substantial church buildings built of stone during the years following his reign, is convincing evidence of the encouragement given masons by monarchs. In the list, I set out the name of the King, then the number of years during which he reigned, followed by the number of substantial stone abbeys and other church buildings:

William II	13 years	27
Henry I	35 years	150
Stephen	18 years	138
Henry II	28 years	165
Richard I	10 years	52
John	17 years	81
Henry III	56 years	211
Edward I	23 years	106
Edward II	19 years	36
Edward III	51 years	48
(this included the beginning of Windsor Castle where masons were specially summoned and took of course a very vital part)		
Richard II	22 years	14
Henry IV	14 years	12
Henry V	9 years	4
Henry VI	39 years	24
(during the reign of this monarch Eton and King's College, Cambridge were commenced)		
Henry VII	21 years	
(a few priories, a hospital and one college)		
Henry VIII		5 hospitals

Bearing in mind the building methods used in those days and the incidents which surrounded the erection of these buildings, including the War of the Crusades, the Great Plague, and the Wars of the Roses, it is remarkable that so much was achieved by the operative masons over these years, from 1100 to 1500. Much has been written in support of the view that the masons, in that era of great building, were closely linked to those of the Saxon days. As the result of my reading I doubt whether there is any real foundation for this claim, but it is true, I would suggest, that many of the practical lessons of the earlier days were handed on from father to son, from brother to brother, and I feel that the importance of man in relation to his task, arising so early in history, continued to grow during the monarchy's promotion of masonry over these years. In fact the difficulties which arose, following the tragic plague of 1348 and the resultant shortage of labour, may well have found some of their source in the close comradeship and union of the masons and other workers. It will be recollected that as the result of that shortage of labour the masons and others sought extravagant wages. This led to the Statutes of Labourers, including that of 1381, which forbade unauthorised gatherings, and the specific Statute of 1425 wherein reference was made to masons and their yearly congregations, and confederacies were banned.

It is not my purpose to discuss the Statutes of Labourers in relation to Freemasonry in this paper, but I do make the comment that the continued growth of the realisation that the labourer was important, not only as a craftsman but as a man, was one of the factors which led to the restricting Statutes. Maybe the monarchy, the rulers of those days, were afraid of the strength which the unity of masons and others labourers gave.

It is interesting, however, to read what James Anderson says in his Constitutions of 1723 concerning these statutes. I quote from them—

"Now though in the third year of King Henry VI, while an infant of about 4 years, the Parliament made an Act that affected only the working Masons yet when King Henry VI arrived at man's estate, the Masons laid before him and his Lords the above mentioned records and charges, who 'tis claimed, reviewed them and solemnly approved them as good and reasonable to be holden: nay, the said King and his Lords must have been incorporated with the Free-Masons, before they could make such review of the records; and in this Reign Masons were much encouraged. Nor is there any instance of executing that Act in that, or any other reign since, and the Masons never neglected their Lodges for it."

It has been pointed out by learned Masonic writers that the above instance is the first upon which Anderson endeavoured to appropriate the masons' charges and records to Speculative Masonry only, but it may well be, as Fort says in his work "Antiquities of Freemasonry" that 1425, the date upon which the Statute of Labourers specifically referring to masons was passed, is the proper date to assign for the cessation of English Freemasonry as a strictly operative association, and the epoch of its decided tendency towards a speculative science such as we now find it. It is for this reason that I would offer the suggestion, as an interesting speculation, that the monarchy, by preventing meetings of operative masons, did in fact promote the speculative science. As Anderson says, the meetings of the speculative Masons were not stopped, and, as Fort says, it could well be that it was at that time that the speculative science made its real start; and accordingly, even if it were done unwittingly and without intent, even, in other words, if one does not accept what Anderson says, then we owe much to the monarchy in promoting the beginning in that way.

Anderson has compiled in his works a list of Grand Masters, and in that list down to 1717 he includes the following monarchs:—

Alfred the Great
King Ethred
King Athelstan
King Edward the Confessor
King Henry
King Henry VII
King Charles I
King Charles II
King William III

Despite considerable research, I have not been able to find out anything which shows any marked influence by quite a number of the above monarchs. Probably some of the names are included because of their patronage of the operative Guilds, but the inclusion of Henry VII is of interest. Anderson, in his Constitutions, claims that this King was elected Protector of the Order of Saint John in the year 1500, and he says that on the 24th June 1502 the King summoned his deputies, John Islip, Abbot of Westminster, and Sir Reginald Bray, to a Lodge of Masters in the Palace, and with them proceeded in Ample form to the east end of Westminster Abbey and levelled the footstone of his famous Chapel. Historically there is considerable doubt concerning the accuracy of this account. Certain historians claim, and the records appear to support, that it was Islip, Abbot of Westminster, who laid the foundation stone in January of either 1502 or 1503, but again I suggest that in this incident we may find the truth in the laying of a stone by operative masons to which certain speculative significance may have been attached: in other words, again we may have seen speculative masons invited to take part in some degree in the performance of tasks by operative masons; we may have seen in that little ceremony, as reported by Anderson, the early beginnings of the Art we now know.

From what I have already written I would suggest that there is ample evidence for the claim that monarchs have been promoters of our art. I suggest there is evidence from which it can be argued that

they have been responsible in their way first of all for the gradual recognition of the importance of the craftsman as such and as a man; and they have also been responsible by their actions, I would suggest, for the development of our speculative science out of the operative art. Down the centuries, till the formation of our first Grand Lodge in 1717, their influence has played a vital part in the development of our speculative art.

Monarchs, members of their families, members of notable titled families close to the Crown, have patronised our mysteries and joined in our assemblies since that year, and I do trust that history will continue to record the names of such people. In France, the United States of America, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Germany and other countries, kings, princes, presidents and the nobility generally have patronised our brotherhood, and the reason why I do not name them all here is that time does not permit me to repeat what a reader may readily find in any recent history of our Order. Many of the famous Lodges in England and elsewhere which have come into existence since the year 1717, contain the names of kings, princes and rulers. They have all played their part and it could well be that on another occasion an instructive paper could be presented giving something in more detail of their activities and influence. I have endeavoured in the main, as I indicated earlier, to show how monarchs have been instrumental in promoting our art.

I conclude by reference to the phrase: "have not thought it derogatory to their dignity to exchange the sceptre for the trowel".

The art of the operative mason has always been considered that of a cutter and shaper of stone, and it could well be that this led to the trowel being ignored by the Craft as a Working Tool.

On the other hand, the trowel remains the only surviving link with operative Masonry in the laying of a foundation stone with Masonic ceremonial.

In the eighteenth century the trowel played an important part in our ceremonies, and Bernard Jones refers in his "Freemason's Guide and Compendium" to the fact that a Lodge at Carmarthen in June 1754 paid for "5 trowels and mending 12 others".

I refer again to Bernard Jones; he claims that early in the eighteenth century the trowel had become the weapon of the Junior Entered Apprentice, whose duty, thus early in his Masonic career, was to act as inner door-keeper, a duty which later devolved upon an Inner Tyler, who later still became known as the Inner Guard.

In the records of some old Lodges, this Junior Entered Apprentice—the newest Initiate—is armed with a trowel.

Thus it is that the trowel, an instrument said to be regarded by the ancient Egyptians as an emblem typifying the profound secrecy that binds the Initiate, has been claimed to be the tool associated with the Entered Apprentice—the tool used by the newest Mason in his first task in the Lodge.

If we look upon the trowel in this way, do we not find room for rewarding speculation in the words "have not thought it derogatory to their dignity to exchange the sceptre for the trowel"?

Copyright, all rights reserved. Requests for permission to reproduce any part hereof should be made to the Secretary of the Lodge.

The following letter has been received from Bro. L. N. Harris, R.W.M. of Saint Andrew Lodge, No. 418 S.C., of Auckland, and we are glad to give it the publicity its interest warrants; he referred to the paper "The Four Constitutions in N.Z.", which appeared in the July issue of our Transactions.

"W. Bro. Glenie's paper on the Four Constitutions was excellent reading and a praiseworthy contribution to our historic knowledge. I hasten to correct the impression however, that our Scottish brethren in Lodge Otago Kilwinning were the first of our Constitution to meet in the Colony. The "Southern Cross" records that the first Masonic Lodge to meet in N.Z. under the Scottish Constitution was Lodge Saint Andrew, No. 418, at Auckland, on the 9th December, 1861. It is true that the date of the charter of Lodge Otago Kilwinning precedes ours by some twenty-eight days, but the arrival in Auckland of a dispensation from the Prov.G.M. of New South Wales enabled our Lodge to "precede its predecessor", as I have outlined.

If the Historical Review of the District Grand Lodge, N.Z. (S.C.), published in 1927, is to be depended upon (page 12) it could be incorrect to state that the N.Z. Grand Lodge was accorded recognition by Scotland in 1899. The agreement envisaged then was never ratified and it was not finally until 1912 that recognition became effective. It is interesting to record that the reservations made revolved around a desire on the part of the Scottish brethren to reserve the right to resuscitate the dormant Scottish Lodges within a period of five years. This right was conceded by the N.Z. Grand Lodge and remained in full force and effect until 1914, so that in theory at any rate, there was permitted the recrudescence of something like thirty-nine lodges, whose charters were then still in the possession of the N.Z. Scottish District Grand Lodges.

The action of the Prov. G. Master in inducting Lodge Mahara under the Scottish Constitution back in the year 1900 has presumably not been lost sight of, because, while in doing so appears to have been quite within the scope of his authority at that time, his action aroused a storm of protest. In the final analysis, no steps were in fact taken by the Scottish Lodges to revive the dormant charters, and peace reigned again after the expiry of the given period.

Again, congratulations to W. Bro. Glenie on a thoroughly worthwhile paper."

SYLLABUS FOR 1959

- 26th March—"The Charges of a Freemason", by V.W. Bro. W. H. V. Taine, P.G.Lec., P.M.
- 23rd April—"The Seven Liberal Arts and Sciences", by W. Bro. A. O. Wilmott, Junior Steward.
- "Observations of a Past Master", by W. Bro. J. F. Y. Schischka
- 4th June—"M.W. Bro. Malcolm Niccol", by W. Bro. F. Howarth.
- 25th June—"The Four Constitutions in N.Z." by W. Bro. J. P. Glenie, P.M.
- 23rd July—"The Square Pavement" and "Masonic Words and Expressions", by V.W. Bro. W. H. V. Taine, P.G.Lec., P.M.
- 27th August—"The Two Bronze Pillars", by W. Bro. T. R. Bird.
- 24th September—"Monarchs Themselves", by W. Bro. L. H. Southwick, S.D.
- 22nd October—Installation.
- 12th December—50th Anniversary Meeting.

NEW MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

The Secretary will welcome the names of any new members or associate members. No special form is required, although forms will be sent on request. Please forward the following particulars:—

1. Name in full.
2. Lodge Name and Number.
3. Masonic Rank.
4. Mailing Address.

All members are especially requested to help in enlarging the membership of the Lodge so as to assist brethren in the daily advancement in Masonic knowledge.

NOTE.—Research Lodges meet as follows:

United Masters, No. 167, Auckland, meets in the Masonic Temple, St. Benedict's Street, Fourth Thursday, February to October.

Hawke's Bay Research Lodge, No. 305, meets at Hastings, First Monday, February, May, August and November.

Research Lodge of Wellington, No. 194, meets in the Masonic Temple, The Terrace, Second Thursday, February, April, May, July, September and October.

Masters and P.M.'s Lodge, No. 130, Christchurch, meets in the Masonic Hall, Gloucester Street, Third Wednesday, January, March, May, July, September and November.

Research Lodge of Otago, No. 161, Dunedin, meets in the Hiram Masonic Hall, Hillside Road, Last Wednesday, January, March, May, July, September and November.

Research Lodge of Taranaki, No. 323, meets in the Masonic Temple, Liardet Street, New Plymouth, Third Tuesday, March, May, August and October.

NOTE.—*Emergency Lectures* have been promised by a number of Wor. Brethren and Brethren, and the Lodge would be pleased to furnish Lecturers to assist the work of Sister Lodges. Will Lodges desiring these services please communicate with the Master or the Secretary, V.W. Bro. R. F. Newton.

LIBRARY

We have been fortunate in the number of books presented to the library, but we would appreciate the gift of any other books which brethren may no longer require.

LIBRARIAN

V.W. Bro. C. G. Herdman has undertaken the office of Librarian of the Lodge. Please communicate with him at P.O. Box 5027, Auckland. C.1.

Members and Associate Members may call and obtain books from the Lodge Library free of charge; but when they are required to be packed and posted 1/- per volume should be sent with applications.