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I. Introduction

The Hiramic Legend is, no doubt, the most important myth of Freemasonry. It forms the background against which the last of the three Craft-degrees (that of Master Mason), as well as several of the so called higher degrees are situated. Therefore, a study of its development is certainly justified.

Fascinating as it is, I shall not dwell on the question of the origin of the Hiramic Legend, but just start with the first written version available to us and from there follow its development in England and France during a period of about a century.

In order to arrive at the more interesting results, it is necessary to start with an exposition of the two dimensions which set up the field of material we will be looking at.

In the first place there is the story itself. Despite the many variations, it is possible to recognize the global structure of the story, displayed in all its actual versions. I shall present that first.

The other dimension is that of the texts used. In order to study the evolution of a particular story, it is necessary to look at a collection of its versions which is as complete as possible. For this particular study, I collected some fifty versions of the Hiramic Legend. The next thing I therefore have to do is to present that collection.

When these two dimensions of the field have been presented, we shall look at the results of my research. However, the sheer size of the corpus
involved makes it impossible to present all conclusions that can be drawn from it here. So I shall restrict myself to one aspect only, viz. that which is related directly to the subtitle of the conference where this paper was presented: «filiations et emprunts», or in English: «descents and borrowings». In other words, I shall try to outline the global developments and to show which text borrowed what from which older ones. Special attention will be payed to the classical question whether the developments in England and France were independent or not.

II. The global structure of the Hiramic Legend

I. Hiram or Adoniram?

Some of the French versions of the Hiramic Legend are either preceded by or start with a discussion of who the hero of the story was and what was his real name. (2) It is then always stated in the first place that he was not Hiram, the king of Tyre, which is clear. (3) As a rule, however, when such discussions are included, it is also postulated that he was neither Hiram, the admirable worker in metals who forged the two pillars before the temple of Solomon and the other objects in brass, silver and gold, made for that temple. (4) It is concluded then that the person involved is the architect of the temple, which the Bible (according to our sources) calls not Hiram but Adoniram. As a result, some of the versions of the Hiramic Legend call the hero Adoniram, rather than the more usual Hiram or Hiram Abiff. In most cases, however, it is clearly assumed that Hiram, the worker in metals, was the same as the architect of the temple.

I regard this discussion, though related to it, not a part of the Hiramic Legend itself. It is rather a discussion about it. Therefore, I will not return to it here.

2. David, Solomon, treasures, workmen

Some of the French versions (5) include now the story, derived from the Bible and Flavius Josephus, of David’s intention to build the temple, how he received the plans from the Lord, why the Lord finally did not allow him to build it, that Solomon inherited both the kingdom and the obligation to build the temple, how many treasures were amassed for it, how many workmen were involved, etc. This part of the story may size from a few lines, up to almost a page A4 of text, (6) but it outlines the context within which the Hiramic Legend takes place, rather than that it is an integral part of it. Also, whereas the previously mentioned discussion concerning the
name of the architect, is clearly copied and adapted from version to version, this part of the story is usually not. It seems rather the product of the individual compilers' creativity and initiative. So, I will not return to this part of the story either.

3. Building the temple

The first part of the Hiramic Legend proper, but nevertheless in some versions also missing, describes how Solomon, wishing to start the building of his temple, asks his neighbour, ally and friend Hiram, king of Tyre, to help him. Hiram agrees and sends, besides the cedars from the Lebanon, necessary for the building of the Temple, also the Master Builder Hiram or Hiram Abif(f), «a widow's son of the tribe of Naphtali, and his father was a man of Tyre» (1 Kings 7:14). Solomon appoints Hiram Abiff as the superintendent and architect of the whole enterprise. Since many workmen are involved, Hiram divides them in three classes: Apprentices, Fellow Crafts and Masters. Since the salary of each class was different, Hiram decided that each would get his pay at a different location and he provided them with ways to identify themselves as belonging to the class of which they demanded the salary. The Apprentices were payed at the column Jachin, which name was also their word of recognition. Besides that, they had a sign and a grip to distinguish themselves. The Fellow Crafts were payed at the column Boaz, which name was their word of recognition, and they too had a distinguishing sign and grip. The masters got their pay in the Middle Chamber and had only a word to distinguish themselves. These measures had excellent results and the work prospered.

4. Hiram's death

The second part tells how three Fellow Crafts, however, were not content. They wished to receive the wages of a Master Mason. Thus they decided to force Hiram to tell them the Masters Word. Each day at noon, when the workmen had gone to refresh themselves, Hiram went into the Middle Chamber to pray to the Lord and inspect the works. Because that was the only time when they would find Hiram alone, the three conspirators decided to hide in the temple and await his return. Each of them posted at one of the three doors. Hiram came in through the West door. When he wanted to leave through the South door, one of the ruffians asked him the Masters Word, threatening to kill him if he would not give it. Hiram, however, refused, whereupon the ruffian gave him a blow with the object he held in his hand. Hiram, hurt but not dead, tried to escape through the West door, where the same happened again. Finally trying to escape through the East
door, and again refusing to give the Masters Word, the third ruffian struck him so heavily on the head that he died. The three conspirators thereupon buried the body of Hiram, hoping that their action would remain unnoticed.

5. Finding Hiram

In the third part of the story, Solomon, missing Hiram after some days, sent out several men to search for their Master. Suspecting what might have happened, either Solomon or these men also decided that, if Hiram was found dead, the first word spoken would be the new Masters Word, replacing the old one. Three of these searchers did find the body of Hiram. One tried to raise him with the grip of an Apprentice, but (the skin of) the finger he took a hold of let go. Another tried to raise him with the grip of a Fellow Craft, with the same result. A third one then took his right wrist with his right hand, and, foot to foot, knee to knee, breast to breast, and supporting the back of Hiram with his left hand, he raised the Master. While doing so, he exclaimed: «Makbenak», which, according to the legend, means: the flesh falls from the bones. This became thus the new Masters Word. Thereupon the body of Hiram was brought to Jerusalem, into the Temple.

6. The murderers found

In the fourth part of the story, occurring in some versions, three others of the searchers found, in stead of Hiram, the three Fellow Crafts who had killed him. These murderers called out about themselves several lamentations of the form: «I wish that I had been killed in such and such a manner, rather than that I had been the cause of the death of our Master Hiram». The three searchers caught the murderers and brought them to Jerusalem, before Solomon, who sentenced them according to the punishments they had wished for themselves.

7. Hiram buried

Finally, in the fifth and last part of the legend, Solomon ordered Hiram to be interred with great ceremony in the Temple, according to some versions in the Sanctum Sanctorum. Those who had sought him were present, dressed in white aprons and white gloves as a token of their innocence. Solomon also ordered that a golden triangle, with the old Masters Word, the Name of God in Hebrew, be placed on the tomb of Hiram.

So far for this outline of the Hiramic Legend. As we shall see, in some parts there exist some major, mutually exclusive, varieties of the story. I
have tried to leave these aside for the moment. However, elements which are sometimes present, and sometimes not, I have included in order to sketch as full a picture of the story as possible.

III. The collection of texts

1. The Early Masonic Catechisms

The earliest version of the Hiramic Legend is found in Prichard’s *Masonry Dissected* from 1730. This exposure belongs to the group of texts from between 1696 and 1730, partly manuscripts, partly printed, which are generally referred to as the *Early Masonic Catechisms*. *Masonry Dissected* is the last one published. After that, it takes until 1760 before other masonic exposures are published in England.

One other text from the *Early Masonic Catechisms* will turn out to be important in the context of our subject, viz. the *Graham manuscript* of 1726. It contains a Noah Legend, similar to the Hiramic Legend. This may have played the same role in the third degree ritual, before that, possibly under the influence of the publication of *Masonry Dissected*, the Hiramic Legend became the standard.

2. The Early French Exposures

Meanwhile, exposures appear in French, roughly in the 1740’s. Those including information on the Hiramic Legend are:
- *La Réception Mystérieuse* of 1738, which is a French translation of Prichard;
- Perau’s *Le Secret des Franc-Maçons* of 1742;
- Travenol’s *Catéchisme des Franc-Maçons* of 1744;
- *Le Sceau Rompu* of 1745;
- *L’Ordre des Francs-Maçons Trahi* of 1745;
- Travenol’s *La Désolation des Entrepreneurs Modernes du Temple de Jérusalem* of 1747;
- *L’Anti-Maçon* of 1748 and
- Wolson’s *Le Maçon Démasqué* of 1751.
3. The English Exposures, 1760-1769

The next wave of printed exposures appears in England, in the 1760’s. It starts in 1760 with A Master-key to Free-Masonry, an abridged translation of Le Secret. Originally English were then:

- Three distinct Knocks of 1760;
- Jachin and Boaz of 1762;
- Hiram or the Grand Master-Key of 1764;
- The Mystery of Free Masonry Explained of 1765;
- Shibboleth of 1765;
- Mahhabone, or The Grand Lodge Door Open’d of 1766 and
- The Free-Mason Stripped Naked of 1769, while
- Solomon in all his Glory of 1766 was a translation of Wolson’s Le Maçon Démasqué.

4. A few intermediate prints

Between this wave of the 1760’s and the « Grand Rituals » appear only a few printed texts with rituals of the Craft degrees. Those of which I know are:

- Nerad. Herono [i.e. Honoré Renard]: Les trois premiers grad. uniform. de la maç. of 1778;
- Louis Guillemain de St. Victor’s Recueil Précieux de la Maçonnerie Adonhiramite of 1785;
- the Recueil des trois premier grades de la Maçonnerie of 1788 and
- Brown’s Master Key, printed in cypher, of which the first edition, containing catechism questions only, appeared in 1798, and the second edition, including the answers as well, in 1802.

5. The « Grand Rituals »

The developments resulted in the publication of the four « Grand Rituals ».

- In 1782, the rituals of the Rite Ecossais Rectifié, written by Jean-Baptiste Willermoz and accepted by the Convent of Wilhelmsbad, were published as: Rituel du grade [d’apprenti, de compagnon, et] de maître franc-maçon pour le régime de la maçonnerie rectifiée redigé en Convent General de l’Ordre en Aout 1782.
- Next were the rituals of the Rite Moderne or Rite Français. Written by a committee, they were, in 1786, accepted by the Grand Orient de France. The next year they were copied and sent to all lodges of the Grand Orient.
The first printed edition appeared in 1801 under the title: *Le Régulateur du Maçon*.

- The origin of the rituals of the Craft degrees of the *Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite* remains unclear. The Rite developed in the West Indies at the end of the 18th century into a system of 33 degrees. The rituals of the « high degrees » included are known to be mainly of French origin. The first « Supreme Council » was officially founded in 1801 in Charleston, South Carolina. After the comte de Grasse-Tilly had brought this *Rite Ecos- sais Ancien et Accepté* to France in 1804, the rituals of the Craft degrees were printed in about 1815 under the title *Guide des Maçons Ecossais, ou Cahier des trois grades Symboliques du Rit Ancien et Accepté*. (7)

- Finally, after the union of the two competing English Grand Lodges in 1813 into the United Grand Lodge of England, this organisation approved in 1816 the rituals, demonstrated by the Lodge of Reconciliation. After this lodge had been resolved, several Lodges of Instruction were constituted, among which Stability in 1817 and Emulation in 1823. The earliest printed versions of these rituals appeared in 1826, 1835 and 1838, all three representing the Emulation working.

Since virtually all later masonic rituals are based on one of these four « Grand Rituals », I have chosen them as the end of the developments I will try to trace.

6. *Manuscript rituals*

Almost all the previous rituals are rather well known to the average student of masonic ritual. However, there are at some places rather large gaps between the years of publication of these printed rituals. Therefore I have tried to locate well dated manuscript rituals and other materials, either or not published in recent years, to complement the printed ones. I shall present here only the three oldest sources I found.

- the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon*, an English, rather deviant, ritual of about 1740.

- the confessions of John Coustos, made before the Portuguese Inquisition on the 21st of March, 1743, generally assumed to represent the workings of the lodge in Paris of which he was a member and Master between 1735 and 1740, but, as we shall see, also betraying influences from the workings in the lodge in London of which he was a member before he moved to Paris. In fact, John Coustos himself declared that he « learned all the matter... explained in the Kingdom of England ».

- *Ecossais Anglois ou le parfait Maître Anglois*, probably from between 1745 and 1750; which claims to be a French translation of an English ritual.
Internal evidence, as well as the results of the research presented here, support this claim.

Besides these, there is a rather large number of French manuscripts from the period 1760 to 1803. For these, the reader is referred to the appendix.

IV. Descents and borrowings

Having now an idea of the general outline of the Hiramic Legend, as well as of the texts concerned, we can proceed to investigate the differences between the texts. Though for purposes of establishing relationships between texts, minor differences as well as similarities in the precise wording of a particular phrase may be of crucial importance, I will concentrate on those differences which betray a shift of plot or of argumentation, in other words, a shift in the contents of the story.

1. Building the temple

The first part of the Hiramic Legend proper, describing the organisation of the building of the Temple, shows hardly any development and thus is of little interest to us. The only thing important to mention is that John Coustos declares in 1743 that «to [Hiram] alone was revealed the Sign which pertained to him as Master, in order thus to be differentiated from the other and inferior officers who worked in the same undertaking». Though John Coustos’ report is generally assumed to represent the working of his lodge in Paris between 1735 and 1740, this may in fact well represent an aspect of the working of the lodge in London, of which he was a member before 1735, because all 18th century French texts assume a rather large group of Masters, while according to Three Distinct Knocks of 1760, and all the other English texts of the 1760’s, Hiram says to one of his extortioners that « it was not in his Power to deliver [the Masters Word] alone, except Three together, viz. Solomon, King of Israel; Hiram, King of Tyre; and Hiram Abiff », which implies that these were the only Masters. The second edition of Brown’s Master Key of 1802 also states that « At the building of king Solomon’s temple, there were but three grandmasters, namely Solomon, king of Israel, Hiram king of Tyre, and Hiram Abiff », and that to his extortioner Hiram declared « that there were only two in the world besides himself, who knew [the secrets of a master mason] (namely Solomon king of Israel, Hiram king of Tyre and Hiram Abiff) ». So this characteristic seems to be specific for the English texts.
2. Hiram's death

The second part of the Hiramic Legend describes how Hiram was killed. With Prichard, there are only three conspirators, «suppos’d to be Three Fellow-Crafts». The number of Brothers who were later sent out by Solomon to search for Hiram, is fifteen, but there is no relation mentioned between them and the conspirators, nor whether they were Apprentices, Fellows or Masters. Finally, Solomon ordered «that 15 Fellow-Crafts... should attend [Hiram’s] Funeral », but again there is no relation indicated between these fifteen Fellow-Crafts and either the conspirators or the searchers.

John Coustos mentioned in 1743 that «some of the Officers or Apprentices... desiring to learn the secret sign which [Hiram] had, three of the said Officers [hatched the plot] ». This opens the possibility that it is assumed here that several others at first were involved as well, but later withdrew. This again may well represent an aspect of the working of his lodge in London, because all 18th century French texts mention only three Fellow-Crafts as conspirators, while Three Distinct Knocks of 1760 opens with:

There were Fifteen Fellow-Crafts, finding the Temple almost finish’d, and they had not received the Master’s Word, because their Time was not come, therefore they agreed to extort them from their Master Hiram the first Opportunity, that they might pass for Masters in other Countries, and have Masters Wages; but Twelve of these Crafts recanted, and the other Three were resolv’d to carry it on.

From then on, all English texts follow this version. So, the general rule is that the English texts from 1760 onwards have fifteen conspirators of which 12 withdraw to leave three, while the French and pre-1760 English texts have only three conspirators.

To this rule are a few exceptions. The English ritual of the Rite Ancien de Bouillon of 1740 mentions only two conspirators; the French text: Passus Tertius, by Th. Gardet de la Garde from 1766 has only one murderer; and Le Vray Maçon from 1786 has nine (three groups of three each) while we would expect three in each case. Brown's Master Key mentions in both editions only three while we would expect fifteen. The only French text following the English pattern on this point is the ritual of the Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté. This is a first indication that the ritual of the Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté is English, rather than French oriented. We shall see this confirmed several times.

If we accept the declaration of John Coustos as an intermediate, we may conclude that the English pattern developed slowly between 1730 and 1760. In itself, the two points mentioned thus far may seem of rather minor importance, but they gain relevance in combination with the next topics.
3. Finding Hiram

We now come to the third part of the Hiramic Legend, the finding of the body of Hiram. Prichard states that

Fifteen Loving Brothers, by Order of King Solomon, went out of the West Door of the Temple [to search for Hiram], and divided themselves from Right to Left within Call of each other; and they agreed that if they did not find the Word in him or about him, the first Word should be the Master’s Word.

In view of later developments, we should note two things here: in the first place it is not specified here who these fifteen brothers were, and, secondly, it are they who decide to change the Masters Word, though they have in fact no reason to suspect that Hiram is dead, let alone that he is murdered and why. Since this is not logical, it asks for a better solution. The English ritual of the Rite Ancien de Bouillon of 1740 resolves the problem thus. The (three) brothers who are sent out to search Hiram find a corpse and report this. Solomon then responds:

Alas, dear Brethren, we are now satisfied that you have discovered the grave of our worthy Grand Master. Soon after your departure, my Brethren, a Tyrian from the quarries reported to us, that two Fellow-Craftsmen had waited upon our worthy Grand Master a short time before his death, and demanded the secrets of a Master Mason from him, to whom of course he replied, that he could not impart them to any one, having entered into a covenant with the King of Tyre not to reveal the same in his absence, but that immediately after the dedication of the Temple all worthy and faithful Fellow-Craftsmen would be rewarded there-with. Angry at this reply they returned to the quarries, but meeting the Tyrian, they related the matter to him, and confessed to a diabolical plot of waylaying our worthy Grand Master, and extorting from him the Master Masons' word. He, the Tyrian, endeavoured to persuade them from so vile a course, but they assured him that they had resolved upon executing their plans at all hazard, and in return they taunted him with being no loyal subject of Tyre, since our worthy Grand Master, as they most falsely asserted, contemplated by means of his Craftsmen, which was generally known, nothing less than a usurpation of the crown of King Hiram. Upon this saying the Tyrian was mightily troubled, and fearing lest indeed they might denounce him as a rebel to his Sovereign, he consented to keep their counsels secret, although he approved not of their conspiracy. It is then, alas! too true that our venerable Grand Master has been most foully slain, and slain too by his own Fellow-Craftsmen. But the miscreants have fled, they have forfeited all claim to that which they might have obtained--they have become wanderers on the face of the earth, and are for ever accursed.

To this, one of the searchers replies: «Sire, our Grand Master Hiram Abif being dead, I very much fear the most sacred and mysterious word may be lost.» This is now a logical reaction. Surprising is, however, that
what follows now is not in line with the account of Prichard. For Solomon answers:

I hope not, my Brother; we permitted him, it is true, after the casting of the pillars of J[achin] and B[oaz], to engrave the most mysterious word upon a plate of gold within the cabalistic figure of our signet, and to wear it as an especial mark of our royal favour and goodwill, and I doubt not that it remains with him. Let us however proceed to his grave and examine for ourselves.

Which is then done, and indeed, of course, the « gold medal, whereon is engraved a double triangle enclosed within a circle, and in the midst of which ... [is the tetragrammaton] » is found. This solution to this problem, though worked out later in some of the so called « higher degrees », was not adopted in any other version of the Hiramic Legend in our collection.

In 1743, John Coustos makes the first step in another direction: once the fifteen searchers found a body, they implicitly recognised it as « the body of the Master ». This was reported to Solomon, who ordered « the Officers and Apprentices » to « disinter the body ». Now, knowing that Hiram was dead, they decided

that if on the body of the Master, or in his pockets, they did not find the means of ascertaining what the signs were which pertained to him in his capacity as Master, they would follow the course of using the first word and sign which they used to each other after they had used those normally employed as Officers and Apprentices.

This decision is in line with the account of Prichard, but is more logical since they now at least know that Hiram is dead, though they do not know why he was murdered. In that respect this version is less convincing than the Rite Ancien de Bouillon. Notice also that John Coustos still refers to the possibility that they might find « on the body of the Master, or in his pockets,... the means of ascertaining what the signs were which pertained to him in his capacity as Master ». That recalls Prichard’s « in him or about him ». In that respect, John Coustos’ version is intermediate between the English versions of Prichard and the Rite Ancien de Bouillon on the one hand, and the French Catéchisme of 1744 on the other.

In this Catéchisme we find in the first place that the number of searchers is reduced from fifteen to nine. Also, the searchers are for the first time Masters, a point to which I shall return later. Three of these nine Masters, having found the corpse,

firent signe aux autres de venir vers eux, & ayant tous reconnu leur Maître, ils se doutèrent que ce pouvait être quelques Compagnons qui avoient fait ce coup là, en voulant le forcer de leur donner le mot de Maître ; & dans la crainte qu’ils
ne l’eussent tiré de lui, ils résolurent d’abord de le changer, & de prendre le premier mot qu’un d’entr’eux pourrait dire en déterrant le Cadavre.

So, here the recognition of the corpse as that of Hiram is mentioned explicitly, while also the suspicion of what might have happened is formulated. That makes the decision of the searchers to change the Masters Word much more acceptable. However, at the same time it introduces a new problem: how acceptable is it to doubt the loyalty of Hiram, by fearing that he might have given the Masters Word away? Yet, in France this became the standard version.

Meanwhile, a different variant was developing in England. The manuscript of the ritual of *Ecossais Anglois*, probably from between 1745 and 1750, which claims to be, and probably is, a french translation of an earlier English text, says:

Salomon ne voyant point venir Hiram suivant son usage, le fit chercher dans tous les endroits où il crût le devoir rencontrer. Ceux qu’il avoit chargé de ses ordres luy rapporterent que sans doute il étoit arrivé quelque chose d’extraordinaire, parcequ’il y avoit dans le Temple une quantité de sang répandu et qu’on ne pouvoit retrouver Hiram. Alors Salomon fit faire l’appel général des ouvriers, au quel il ne manqua que les 3. freres, qui s’étoient retirés à cet ordre ... Salomon ne douta plus alors qu’ils ne fussent auteurs du meurtre et il donna les ordres les plus précis pour qu’on les poursuivit et qu’on leur fit souffrir la peine du talion, après s’estre assuré que la force des douleurs n’avoit pû arracher à Hiram le mot de Maitre.

So, here, the blood found in the Temple convinces Solomon that Hiram is killed, and the missing of three Brothers makes clear who did it. Besides, it is not assumed that Hiram would break his oath, though it is checked in order to be sure. When one of the Masters then finds the corpse of Hiram, and sees its posture, « il le fit remarquer à ses camarades et en augura qu’il n’avoit rien revelé ». After Hiram is reinterred, it is Solomon who « leur enjoignit de conserver ces signes et ces attouchemens pour s’en servir pendant le reste de la construction du Temple », but there is no question of these replacing the old Masters Word.

The influence of this English ritual on the French ones is demonstrated by a French manuscript ritual (*Cahiers Concernant les Receptions et Cérémonies [etc.]*) of 1760, which combines elements of the two. At first it seems just the usual French version. Nine Masters are sent out to search for Hiram. Three of them find the corps and report this to Solomon. He then orders them to fetch the body. So far nothing surprising about this version. But then, Solomon inspects the workmen and finds three Fellow-Crafts miss-
ing, after which the text continues in the usual French way: the nine Masters decide to change the Masters Word, because they fear that it was divulged.

Likewise, the French manuscript *Passus Tertius* of 1766 mentions the blood found in the temple, and it has the phrase: « Ils augurèrent alors avec satisfaction, qu'il n'avoit rien révélé où divulgué ». It has also, at the point where the actual raising of the body of Hiram is described, the paragraph:

l’effort, que le M° fit, en relevant le corps de notre vénérable chef, occasionna qu’il lui en fonça le doigt du milieu entre les côtes, et aussitot l’air renfermé dans cette partie du cadavre sortit par le haut du corps, mais avec un tel bruit, que celui qui le tenoit s’écria : Ah ! Si le V°le M° Hiram eût été encore en vie je croirois et affirmerois qu’il eut proféré Moabon.

Compare this with:

l’Effort qu’il fit luy enforça le doigt du milieu entre les côtes, aussitost l’air qui étoit renfermé dans ce Cadavre en sortit avec un tel bruit que celuy qui le tenoit s’ecria que si le Respectable eut été vivant on eut cru qu’il aivoit proféré Moabon.

This quotation is from the *Ecossais Anglois* again. These two French rituals thus clearly demonstrate the influence of the French translation of the *Ecossais Anglois* on later French texts. Still later ones (8) copy these items, thus demonstrating their lasting influence, but it seems that they never made it into the printed French versions, (9) so that eventually they disappeared again.

A radically different approach shows up in *Three Distinct Knocks*, also of 1760, but English. We have seen before that here there were at first not three but fifteen conspirators, twelve of whom withdrew before the crime was committed. These twelve play a crucial part in the episode we are looking at now:

Our Master *Hiram* being missing, as he did not come to view the Work as usual, so King *Solomon* made great enquiry after him, and could not hear of any thing of him. Therefore he suppos’d him dead. The twelve Fellow-Crafts that had recanted, hearing the said report, their consciences pricking them, went and acquainted King *Solomon* with White Aprons and Gloves, as Badges of their Innocency; and King *Solomon* sent them in search of the Three Ruffians which had absconded.

Had, in the *Ecossais Anglois*, the identity of the murderers been assumed, only by their absence at the inspection, here they are positively identified by those who knew their plans, as was the case in the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* of 1740. Also, what has happened to Hiram is no matter of speculation now. Besides, like in the *Ecossais Anglois*, the nine Fellow-Crafts first find the three murderers, whom they bring before Solomon, and who confess their crime and are punished. Only then are the same twelve Fellow-
Crafts again sent out to fetch the body of Hiram. And then follows a most interesting new concept:

*Solomon* told them that if they could not find a Key-word in him, or about him, it was lost; for there were but Three in the World that knew it, and it never can be deliver’d without we Three are together; but now One is dead, therefore it is lost. But for the future, the first occasioned Sign and Word that is spoken at his raising, shall be his ever after.

We saw before that in this ritual, Hiram mentioned to one of his extortioners that «it was not in his Power to deliver [the Masters Word] alone, except Three together, viz. Solomon, King of *Israel*; Hiram, King of *Tyre*; and *Hiram Abiff*». Therefore, Hiram not only should not, but even could not divulge it. The very new concept here is that therefore, the necessity to have a new Masters Word stems not from any doubt of the fidelity of Hiram, but from the automatic loss of the old Masters Word, now that one of the three, required for its pronunciation, had died, precisely *without* passing it on. This concept of three being necessary to pronounce the old Masters Word – which, after all was the Name of God in Hebrew – may be considerably older than 1760. For example, the *Graham Manuscript* of 1726 mentions four times that it is necessary to be with three Masters to make a «trible Voice» to pronounce the secrets of a Master. (10) Also the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* of 1740 says that Solomon «did in solemn conclave communicate [this most precious name] to [his] royal friend King Hiram of Tyre, and also to our ... Grand Master Hiram Abif» and «we so write it, that no one can pronounce it but he who receives it from living lips». And John Coustos still knew that «to [Hiram] alone was revealed the Sign which pertained to him as Master». So, it seems that we have here an aspect of the Hiramic Legend which may be older than Prichard; was not expressed by Prichard, but is neither in conflict with what he does express; was not known in France; but continued to be known in England.

At the same time it is remarkable to see again the notion: «if they could not find a Key-word in him, or about him», which reminds us of Prichard’s suggestion that the Masters Word might be found «in him or about him»; the golden medal with the tetragrammaton of the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon*, which is found on the corps of Hiram and the suggestion by John Coustos that the secret might be found «on the body of the Master, or in his pockets». In other words, also this element is consistently present in all English versions and absent in all French ones. Besides, this too can be found as early as 1726 in the *Graham Manuscript*, which states:

shem ham and Japheth ffor to go to their father noahs grave for to try if they could find anything about him ffor to Lead them to the vertuable secret which this famious preacher had[ ;] for I hop all will allow that all things needfull for the new world was in the ark with noah[.] Now these 3 men had allready agreed
that if they did not find the very thing it self[,] that the first thing that they found was to be to them as a secret they not Douting but did most firmly be Live that God was able and would also prove willing through their faith[,] prayer and obedience for to cause what they did find for to prove as vertuable to them as if they had received the secret at first from God himself.

These characteristics remain present in all later English texts.

In all the preceding versions, the place where Hiram was buried was found by accident. This is changed in the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié* of 1782, which mentions: « trois d'entre eux allèrent par l'éclat d'une lumière extra ordinaire se dirigèrent vers l'eminence ou le cadavre avoit été enterré ». Apart from that, the Hiramic Legend of this first of the « Grand Rituals » is a typical example of the 18th century French rituals. The *Rite Moderne* of 1786 too has a natural phenomenon guiding the searchers to the grave:

Au lever du Soleil, l'un d'eux apperçut une vapeur qui s'élevait dans la campagne, à quelque distance ; ce phénomène fixa son attention ; il en fit part aux autres maîtres, et tous s'approchèrent de l'endroit d'où sortoit la vapeur. Au premier aspect ils virent une petite élévation, ou tertre.

Though in many details different from that of the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié*, the Hiramic Legend of the *Rite Moderne* is, apart from this point, also an example of the form, generally found in the 18th century French rituals.

The 2nd ed. of Brown's *Master Key* in fact returns to the form of Pri-chard : only three conspirators from the start and « fifteen loving brethren » being sent out to search for Hiram, though it is made clear that they are « fellowcrafts ». There is no mention of the possibility that they might find the Masters Word « in him, or about him », nor of the impossibility to pronounce it without the presence of three Masters. As an echo of that, it only mentions that « [Solomon] informed them that by [Hiram's] untimely death the secret of a master-mason was inevitably lost ». This last statement is, rather surprisingly, also found in a French manuscript of 1803.

The Hiramic Legend of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté*, the third of the « Grand Rituals », follows, as we have seen, the English pattern, of which it is a perfect example. The most remarkable innovation is that it is said that the twelve Fellow-Crafts, sent out to search for Hiram, had « la promesse de Salomon d'être récompensés par la maîtrise, s'ils parvenaient au but de leur recherche ». This makes sense. In the French versions it is always Masters who go looking for Hiram ; then there is no problem. In the English versions so far, the twelve Fellow-Crafts who bring back the new secrets of a Master Mason, by definition know them. Yet, the logical consequence that they are thus Master Masons from now on was not taken
before. The only text which comes close to it is the *Ecossais Anglois* of ≥ 1745, which is a French translation of an English text. It has the (apparently numerous) Masters searching for Hiram (which may be a French influence), while the Fellow-Crafts find the murderers. Then this, unusually extensive, text tells that Solomon, after the completion of the Temple, « gratification de la maîtrise les plus vertueux des Comp., et surtout ceux qui avoient vengé la mort d'Hiram ».

The *Emulation Ritual*, the fourth and last of the « Grand Rituals », follows, with respect to the variations discussed so far, the same English pattern. The main deviation is that Solomon did *not* send the twelve Fellow-Crafts who had recanted from the conspiracy to search for Hiram, but that he « selected fifteen trusty Fellow-Crafts » to do so. This will be inspired by Prichard’s and Brown’s « fifteen loving brethren ».

4. The murderers found

The fourth part of the Hiramic Legend tells how the murderers of Hiram are found. Prichard says nothing with respect to what happened to them. The *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* of 1740 mentions that « the miscreants have fled, they have forfeited all claim to that which they might have obtained – they have become wanderers on the face of the earth, and are for ever accursed. » It is the ritual of *Ecossais Anglois* which for the first time elaborates on this point. We have seen that it mentions that « Salomon fit faire l’appel général des ouvriers, au quel il ne manqua que les 3. freres, qui s’étoient retirés à cet ordre ». This fact is mentioned in some French manuscripts from 1760 onwards. But the ritual of *Ecossais Anglois* is much more informative, giving the following account:

Les Compagnons au desespoir de ce que la vie de Hiram avoit été ravie par des ouvriers de leur classe, prirent Salomon de leur permettre la vengeance de ce crime, ce qu’il leur accorda avec défense d’effacer la moindre trace du sang jusqu’à ce que la vengeance fut accomplie. Il en choisit à cet effet 60, dont 15 restèrent à la garde du Temple [et] 5 à chaque porte ; 45 se divisèrent en 3 bandes dont 15 partirent du côté de l’Or., 15 du côté du Mdy et 15 du côté de l’Occ. : après estre convenu d’une marche particulière pour pouvoir distinguer les endroits par où ils avoient passés, ainsi que d’un signal particulier pour se rallier s’il étoit nécessaire.

Ceux qui marcherent du côté de l’Or. rencontre G[ubelos.] II avoïa son crime. Ils luy firent subir la mesma peine ; ils brulerent son corps et jetterent ses cendres au vent. Ils arriverent à Jerusalem le 3e. jour de leur départ et le 5e de la mort.

G[ubelos] fut rencontré au Mdy, après l’avœu de son crime, il eut le ventre ouvert, ses entrailles arrachées et le tout fut brûlé avec son corps, les cendres
jettées au vent. Ceux cy arriverent à Jerusalem le 5e jour de leur départ et le 7e jour de la mort.

G[ubelum] fut rencontré à l'Orient et après estre convenu que la force des tourments n'avoit pu arracher d'Hiram la parole de Maitre, on luy arracha le cœur, les entrailles & la langue, les 4 membres furent coupé et exposés aux 4 parties du monde sur des figuiers, les restes furent brulés et jettés au vent. Cette troupe arriva à Jerusalem le 7e jour de son départ et le 9e jour de la mort.

This text asks for extensive comments, but I will restrict myself. Let me just point out the introduction of an explanation for the imprecations, which formed part of the traditional oath since at least 1727. (11) Note also that the text, despite its extension, is clearly incomplete, for the statement « Ils luy firent subir la même peine » raises the question: the same as what? Apparently this was assumed and known, but not written down. What it refers to becomes clear from the next text which contains this element, which is *Three Distinct Knocks* of 1760:

One of those Parties travell'd down to the Sea of Joppa: one of them sat himself down to rest by the Side of a Rock, he hearing a frightful Lamentation in a Clift of the Rock. Oh! that I had had my Throat cut a-cross, and my Tongue torn out by the Root, and that buried in the Sands of the Sea at low-water Mark, a Cable's Length from Shore, where the Tide ebbs and flows [twice?] in 24 Hours, rather than I had been concerned in the Death of our Master Hiram. Says the other; Oh! that I had my Heart torn from under my naked Left-breast, and given to the Vultures of the Air as a Prey, rather than I had been concerned in the Death of so good a Master. But Oh! says Jubulum, I struck him more hard than you both, for I killed him; Oh! that I had my Body severed in two, one Part carried to the South, and the other to the North; my Bowels burnt to Ashes in the South, and the Ashes scattered before the Four Winds of the Earth, rather than I had been concerned in the Death of our Master Hiram.

This Brother hearing this sorrowful Lamentation, hailed the other Two, and they went into the Clift of the Rock, and took them and bound them, and brought them before King Solomon, and they owned what had pass'd, and what they had done, and did not desire to live; therefore Solomon order'd their own Sentences to be laid upon them: Says he, they have sign'd their own Death, and let it be upon them as they have said.

Jubela was taken out, and his Throat cut a-cross &c. Jubelo's Heart was torn from under his naked Left-Breast &c. Jubelum's Body was severed in two, and one Part carry'd to the South and the other to the North, &c.

Essentially the same text is also found in Brown's *Master Key*, and the ritual of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté*, while the *Emulation Ritual* shows a shortened version, lacking the *raison d'être* of this part of the story, viz. the contents of the lamentations and the actual punishments as an explanation of the imprecations of the oath.

It is clear, then, that the finding and punishing of the murderers is an
element which is found exclusively in the English rituals, which seems to have developed there after 1740. No French ritual has it, while all English ones do. This confirms the earlier findings that the ritual of Ecossais Anglois is indeed a French translation of an English ritual, as it claims, and that also the ritual of the Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté is to be considered English rather than French.

To deduce now that this element from the ritual of Ecossais Anglois left no traces in France, as opposed to the less remarkable ones which, as we saw, were copied in later French manuscripts, would be too hasty a conclusion. For it is clearly this element which was in France elaborated into a complete, but separate, degree: the Maître Elu. Traditionally it is assumed that this degree was created in Lyon in 1743, but there is no evidence available to substantiate this claim and Paul Naudon argues that «Il nous paraît quelque peu prématuré de fixer dès 1743 la création du grade d’Elu, même dans sa forme primitive d’Elu Ecossais, incluse dans l’Ordre des Ecossais.» (12) I would agree with Naudon here and assume that it was the ritual of Ecossais Anglois which, in its French translation, gave rise to the degree of Maître Elu. The first printed version of its ritual is that in Les Plus Secrets Mystères des Hauts Grades de la Maçonnerie Dévoilés, first published in 1766. No doubt there are older manuscript versions, but lack of time prevented me from tracing them, so I don’t know what is actually the oldest reliably dated version available right now.

5. Hiram buried

The last section of the Hiramic Legend, the reburial of Hiram, is generally rather short. However, there are some significantly different versions. To start with Prichard again, he has the following text:

Ex. What did King Solomon say to all this? R. He order’d him to be taken up and decently buried, and that 15 Fellow-Crafts with white Gloves and Aprons should attend his Funeral [which ought amongst Masons to be perform’d to this Day.]

Ex. Where was Hiram inter’d? R. In the Sanctum Sanctorum.
Ex. How was he brought in? R. At the West-Door of the Temple.

I will deal with the point of the white gloves and apron seperately (cf. below). The more essential point is that, according to Prichard, Hiram was buried in the Sanctum Sanctorum. Shortly after the publication of Masonry Dissected, this seems to have been changed, for the French translation of 1738 has only left: «dans l’interieur du Temple». The Rite Ancien de Bouillon does not mention the reburial at all. John Coustos stated «they took the body of the Master to the King, who ordered it to be buried, ...
and upon his sepulchre there was ordered to be engraved the following = Here lies Hiram, Grand Master Architect of the Freemasons ». And the Catechisme just mentions that « pour donner des marques de l’estime qu’il avoit pour la Mémoire d’Adoniram, [Salomon] le fit enterrer en grande Cérémonie dans son Temple ». A significant change is made by Le Sceau Rompu of 1745 :

D. Que fit-on du corps de notre très-respectable Maître Adoniram ?
R. Salomon pour récompenser son zèle & ses talens le fit inhumer dans le Sanctuaire du Temple.
D. Que fit-il mettre sur son Tombeau ?
R. Une Médaille d’or faite en triangle, où était gravé JEHOVA. Qui est le nom de Dieu en Hébreu.

Here we see a kind of restoration of what we saw with Prichard : Hiram is buried, not just in the Temple, but more precisely, in « le Sanctuaire du Temple ». This is copied in a significant number of the French manuscript rituals, though not in all. But Le Sceau Rompu also introduces an important new element : a golden triangle with the name of God in Hebrew is placed on the tomb. In the text of the rituals, this is new, but in the illustrations a prefiguration of it had been there for about a year. The word Jehova is found on the tomb even in the first picture we have of it, viz. that in the Catéchisme of 1744. There is, in fact, an older text which mentions a plate of metal with the name of God. In 1743, the day after he told the Inquisition the Hiramic Legend, John Coustos declared that « when the destruction of the famous Temple of Solomon took place there was found below the First Stone a tablet of bronze upon which was engraved the following word, JEHOVAH, which means GOD » etc. (13) And even three years older than that, of course, is the Rite Ancien de Bouillon of 1740, where we saw that Solomon stated that he « permitted [Hiram]... to engrave the most mysterious word upon a plate of gold within the cabalistic figure of [Solomon’s] signet, and to wear it as an especial mark of [his] royal favour and goodwill ».

All this seems to come together now in Le Sceau Rompu in 1745, from whence it is developed further. Interesting is the ritual of the Ecossais Anglois :

Le corps du Resp.: fut enfermé dans un cercueil et déposé dans un superbe Tombeau élevé dans le Sanctuaire, fermé par une pierre, sur le milieu de laquelle était une médaille d’or Triangulaire avec une Étoile flamboyante, au milieu de laquelle était la Lettre G. Ce Triangle était répété dans un Baldaquin suspendu perpendiculairement au dessus du mausolé.

In an English ritual, the letter G is easily recognised to refer to God. In the French rituals we sometimes find this mentioned explicitly, but the use
of the word Jehovah or of the tetragrammaton is more obvious. In La Desolation des Entrepreneurs Modernes of 1747 it is for the first time shown in the picture of the « tableau » of the third degree in the form of the tetragrammaton, and placed on a triangle. The text of this ritual mentions: « [Salomon] le fit inhumer en grande pompe dans le Temple du vrai Dieu, & fit mettre sur son Tombeau une Médaille d’Or faite en triangle, où étoit gravé JEHOVAH ». And in the version of Wolson from 1751 we read: « [Salomon] le fit inhumer pompeusement avec tous les honneurs, & on grava sur sa tombe l’ancien mot [de Maître], surmonté de deux branches d’acaciac posées en sautoir ».

When we look now at the English texts from the 1760’s, we see no trace there of the Golden Triangle with the Name of God. What we do see there, however, is that the specification of the place where Hiram is reburied as the Sanctum Sanctorum has been restored. In the formulation of Three Distinct Knocks of 1760: « King Solomon sent those 12 Crafts to raise their Master Hiram, in order that he might be interred in Sanctum Sanctorum ». This remains so in almost all later English texts.

Interesting with regard to this section of the legend is the version from the Amsterdam lodge « Concordia Vincit Animos » of 1761:

[Hiram] fit transporté avec grande pompe dans le Temple, et on l’exposa par ordre de Salomon, en attendant ses obsèques dans un lieu distingué, placé sous l’étoile flamboyante, et pour lui donner les marques d’honneurs qu’il auroit mérité, il fit graver sur une planche d’airain l’ancien mot de Maître avec deux branches d’acacia, comme les marques distinctives qui avoient procuré une découverte aussi précieuse.

Clearly, this is influenced by the ritual of the Ecossais Anglois (the tomb placed under the Blazing Star), but also the Old Masters Word is not placed on a Golden Triangle, but on a « planche d’airain », the « tablet of bronze » of John Coustos. The predominant French version will, however, remain that which we see, for example, in the ritual of the Stricte Observance of about 1762: « Salomon ordonna des obseques magnifiques, fit inhumer hyram dans le temple, et fit graver sur sa tombe une medaille triangulaire, sur laquelle étoit gravé l’ancien mot de Maître avec deux branches d’acacia en sautoir ». The location of the grave is either « le Sanctuaire du Temple » or just « le Temple », the word in the golden triangle may be indicated as « l’ancien mot de Maître » or « Jehova(h) » or « le nom de Dieu (en Hébreu) » or any combination or variation of these, and the branch or branches of acacia may be mentioned or not. Also the « Grand Rituals » of the Rite Ecossais Rectifié and the Rite Moderne show this form.

The reburial in the « saint des saints » is mentioned in a french manuscript version from about 1780 (which has more characteristics, generally found only in the English versions) and in one of 1803.
A new move is made in (apparently both editions of) Brown’s *Master Key*. Here, Hiram is reburied « as near the Sanctum Sanctorum as the mosaic judicial laws would permit » (ed. 1802), after which follows the question: « Why not buried in the Sanctum Sanctorum? » To which it is answered: « Because by the mosaic laws all men’s flesh was deemed unclean so that no person whatever was permitted to enter the Sanctum Sanctorum but the High Priest alone, and not even him but once a year after many purifications and washings on the grand day of the expiation of sins. » This argumentation was not new. It was forwarded in *The Perjur’d Free Mason Detected*, a rejoinder to Prichard’s *Masonry Dissected*, published that same year 1730:

Mast. don’t they tell you Hiram was buried in the Sanctum Sanctorum?

Jun. Yes, and he was buried there too be sure.

Mast. Yes, allegorically; but not really; ... for you might easily know, a dead Body to have been buried in the Temple, would have polluted the Place, and the Jews would never have come into it again.

This argumentation may have convinced some members, who then were responsible for the change to have Hiram no longer buried in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, but only in the Temple. (14) However, this argumentation is based on a misunderstanding of the import of the story and its function in the ritual. It should be clear by now that placing the name of God on the tomb of Hiram was a functional equivalent to his being buried in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*. Both make clear that Hiram is in fact Jahweh. (15) It is precisely that which renders the third degree ritual an initiation of a very well-known kind: the candidate is identified with a hero, who turns out to be (a) God. In that way, the ritual *Unio Mystica* between the candidate and the divinity is expressed and realized. Thus, this move by Brown removes the essence from the Hiramic Legend, rendering it only a moralistic story in stead of an initiation myth. It thus is highly significant that this example of Brown was followed by the *Emulation Ritual*. This change is hardly a more serious mutilation of the Hiramic Legend than that which we find in the ritual of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté*, which just does not mention the reburial of Hiram at all!

V. Some minor elements

I shall now discuss the development and variation of some elements of the legend which do not influence the main structure, but are more than just textual variations. At this level, there are certainly more elements which might be regarded worth looking at, but in order not get boring, I decided to select just some which I find fascinating personally.
Hiram is in all versions buried more than once. However, we may distinguish five places where his body remains for a shorter or longer time, or is so intended to. (1) Firstly, some versions have the murderers hide the body in or near the Temple under a pile of rubbish, because it is still day. (2) All versions have that it is buried somewhere outside the Temple, usually on a mountain, where it is later found. In some versions this grave is camouflaged by branches of acacia, but (3) other versions have the murderers place a sprig of acacia on this grave in order that they may later find it easily, because they want to bury it even further away and better. (4) When the body is found, some versions have it displayed a while in the Temple, before (5) it is finally interred in the mausoleum king Solomon made for it. With the exception of the ritual of lodge Concordia Vincit Animos (Amsterdam) of 1761, none of the versions, however, has all of these; most (including Prichard, the English rituals of the 1760’s, and the RER of 1782) have 1, 2 and 5; many (including John Coustos (1743), the Catechisme (1744), and the Emulation Ritual) just 2 and 5. The exceptions are as follows:

- The *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* (1740) mentions only 2.
- The *Ecossais Anglois* (≥1745), has 1 = 2, 4 and 5.
- Wolson (1751) and the RM (1786) have 2, 3 and 5.
- The English rituals of the 1760’s have 1, 2 and 5, like Prichard, but mention also an unusual variant according to which Hiram was buried by the murderers in the Temple under a stone.
- The *Maçonnerie des Hommes* (1760 à 1765) and the Stricte Observance (c.1762) have 1 = 2, 3 and 5.
- *Passus Tertius* (1766) has 1, 2, 4 and 5.
- The ritual « Marquis de Gages » (c.1767) and the *Recueil* (1788) have 1, 2, 3 and 5.
- GON 122.C.40 (1776) and the REAA have just 1 and 2.
- The RER, version 1778, and the *Recueil Précieux* (1785) have 1, 3 and 5.

So we see that there are in fact three more or less rare variants: 1 = 2; 3 and 4.

The first (1 = 2, i.e. the body is buried in or near the Temple under a pile of rubbish and left there) is found only in the *Ecossais Anglois* (≥1745), the *Maçonnerie des Hommes* (1760 à 1765) and in the Stricte Observance (c.1762).

The second (3, i.e. the murderers place a sprig of acacia on this grave in order that they may later find it easily, because they want to bury it even further away and better) is found in Wolson (1751), the ritual of lodge Concordia Vincit Animos (Amsterdam, 1761), the *Maçonnerie des Hommes*
(1760 à 1765), the Stricte Observance (c.1762), the ritual « Marquis de Gages » (c.1767), the RER version 1778, the Recueil Précieux (1785), the RM (1786), the catechism of Le Vray Maçon (1786), and the Recueil (1788).

The third (4, i.e. when the body is found, it is displayed a while in the Temple, before it is finally interred) is found only in the Ecossais Anglois (≥1745), the ritual of lodge Concordia Vincit Animos (Amsterdam, 1761), and the MS Passus Tertius (1766). Exceptional are the ritual « Marquis de Gages » (c. 1767), Franclze Mnçonnerie (1786), and the Recueil (1788), where the body of Hiram is brought into (but not displayed in) Solomon’s « cabinet ».

Each option seems to have its own path through history, while any combination seems possible.

b) Who decides when to change the Master’s Word?

There are two variants on who decided to change the Masters Word: the searchers or Solomon. However, there is more variety as to when this decision was made.

With Prichard (1730), BN FM4.303 (1773-1785), and Franche Maçonnerie (1786), the searchers decide to change it before they depart to search for Hiram.

In GON 240.C.40 (1785) they decide to change it when they find the grave.

The Catechisme (1744) states that they decided so directly after finding the body. Usually it is then raised at once. In the Catechisme (and Franche Maçonnerie, 1786) it is apparently brought to Jerusalem at once too, after which all is reported to Solomon, but from the Trahi (1745) on, it is put back in the grave and only fetched again after Solomon has ordered so. This remains the predominant French version.

According to John Coustos (1743), GON 240.C.33 (1760), Récueil et Collection [etc.] (1768), UGLE YFR.200.RIT (c. 1772), Dépôt complet [etc.] (1776), GON 240.A.76 (c. 1780), and Clef du Trésor [etc.] (1803), they decided so after Solomon had sent them out for the second time, this time in order to fetch the body.

As we have seen, the Ecossais Anglois (≥1745) states that Solomon « Enjoignit [les maîtres] de conserver ces signes et ces attouchemens pour s’en servir pendant le reste de la construction du Temple », but not as a replacement of the old Master’s Word.

In the English versions of the 1760’s, it is Solomon who decides to change it after he has heared the report of the searchers. But here too, it is not really a replacement of the old Master’s Word, but a word which « shall be his [i.e. Hiram’s] ever after » (Three Distinct Knocks).
The RER (1782) combines the predominant French version (the searchers decided to change the word directly after finding the body) with the same decision by Solomon, just before sending them out again to fetch the body of Hiram.

In *Franche Maçonnerie* (1786) the decision to change the word, taken by the Masters before leaving to search for Hiram, is sanctioned by Solomon after they return to Jerusalem with the body. In the RM (1786) too, Solomon sanctions the decision taken by the Masters, this time after they have found the body of Hiram.

It is only in *Le Vray Maçon [etc.]* (1786) that Solomon orders to change the word, right at the point where he sends out the Masters to search for Hiram. This same form is also found in *Brown’s Master Key* (1802), the first English version where the new secrets are presented as substitutes for the old ones:

[Solomon] informed them that by his untimely death the secret of a master-mason was inevitably lost, but as a reward for their fidelity the casual sign, token and word, that should occur on the grave being opened and his upraising, should be substituted in their room, until future ages should discover the right.

Except for the phrase « until future ages should discover the right », which is absent, the same form is found in the REAA (c. 1815) and the *Emulation Ritual*.

Remarkable is the *Recueil* of 1788, where Solomon, after the body of Hiram has been brought to his cabinet, « résolut d’en changer les mots, & les neuf Maîtres convinrent que ceux qui leur étoient échappés en relevant le corps d’Adonhiram seroient substitués aux anciens », whereas after the reburial of Hiram, Solomon « ordonna en outre, que les mots, signe & attouchement seroient changé, & confirma le choix de ceux dont les neuf Maîtres étoient convenus. »

c) *Who places the sprig of acacia on which grave and why?*

With Prichard (1730), the murderers hid the grave with shrubs. Once the searchers had found and opened it, they closed it again, « and as a farther Ornament placed a Sprig of Cassia at the Head of the Grave ». In the *Rite Ancien de Bouillon* (1740), the corps is found « with a sprig of evergreen at his head ». According to John Coustos (1743), the grave was camouflaged with small bushes, but he does not mention the sprig of cassia or acacia. The *Catechisme* (1744) states that the murderers, « quand il fut inhumé,... couperent une branche d’un Acacia qui étoit auprès d’eux, & la planterent sur lui, pour pouvoir reconnoître l’endroit où il étoit, quand bon leur sembleroit ». Illogical as it is, this remains the predominant French version.
As an exception, Le Sceau Rompu (1745), Cahiers Concernant les Réceptions et Cérémonies [etc.] (GON 240.C.33, 1760), BN FM4.143 (≥1766?), Récueil et Collection [etc.] (1768), Dépôt complet [etc.] (1776), GON 240.A.76 (c. 1780), the RER (1782), Le Vray Maçon (1786), Brown’s Master Key (1802), the REAA (c. 1815), and the Emulation Ritual state that the searchers placed the sprig of acacia (Brown: cassia) on the grave, just as in Prichard. Here there are still two alternatives. According to most of these, and in accord with Prichard, it is the group of searchers which, after having found the body of Hiram and having closed the grave again, places the sprig of acacia on the grave in order to recognize it when returning, after having informed Solomon. In BN FM4.143 and Le Vray Maçon, however, it is the first searcher, who locates the grave, who places the sprig of acacia in order to recognize the place after having fetched his comrades.

The English versions of the 1760’s do not mention the sprig of acacia at all!

According to the ritual of Concordia Vincit Animos (1761), the murderers «planterent [sur la fosse] une branche d’Acacia, pour pouvoir reconnaître l’endroit, si l’occasion se présentait de le transporter plus loin, sans être aperçus». But also, the searcher who had found the grave «y planta une branche d’Acacia ou de Cannelle» before going to tell Solomon.

Several rituals mention also that the murderers placed the sprig of acacia, in order to recognise the place easier, because they intended to bury the body later further away (Cf. supra, section a).

d) Who dresses when in white apron and gloves?

Many versions, such as the Catechisme (1744), Le Sceau Rompu (1745), La Désolation (1747), Wolson (1751), the ritual CVA (1761), and the Stricte Observance (c.1762), do not mention the white apron and gloves, but quite a number do.

With Prichard (1730), «[King Solomon] order’d... that 15 Fellow-Crafts with white Gloves and Aprons should attend [Hiram’s] Funeral». Essentially the same is found in the Ecossais Anglois (≥1745), Brown’s Master Key (1802) and the Emulation Ritual.

According to John Coustos (1743), «Solomon caused a command to be given to the Officers and Apprentices... that, wearing their Aprons tied to their waists, as their custom now is, and gloves on their hands, they should go to the said place and disinter the body». The same timing, but without the order by Solomon is found in GON 240.C.33 (1760): «Les mêmes Maitres, qui avoient été à la recherche du corps de N(otre) R. M. H. partirent en gands et tabliers blancs, pour marquer, qu’ils n’avoient point trempé leurs mains dans le sang de leur Maitre», and in the REAA (c. 1815).
The Trahi (1745) states, that during the funeral of Hiram in the Temple, «tous les Maitres portoient des tabliers & des gands de peau blanche, pour marquer qu’aucun d’eux n’avoir souillé ses mains du sang de leur Chef». L’Anti-Maçon (1748), UGLE YFR.200.RIT (c. 1772), Philibert Bouché (c. 1779), Réceptions aux VII principaux grades [etc.] (c. 1780), GON 240.D.1 (c. 1784), and GON 240.A.73 (1787) have the same.

In the RER (1782) the Masters, sent out to fetch the body of Hiram, «porterent le Corps de notre resp. Maître Hiram Abif dans le Temple avec une grande pompe portant tous des gands blancs, pour marquer qu’aucun d’eux n’avoir trempé ses mains dans le Sang de leur Maître.»

The moment when the Masters so dress is shifted backwards even more in the RM (1786), where they do so after having found the body, before reporting to Solomon.

As we have seen before, in the English versions of the 1760’s it are the «Twelve Fellow-Crafts that had recanted,... [who] went and acquainted King Solomon with White Aprons and Gloves, as Badges of their Innocency» even before they start searching.

VI. Conclusions

From the information I have presented so far, we may draw several conclusions.

1) In the first place it has become apparent that not only the ritual of the Ecossais Anglois, but also that of the Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté, though available only in French, are in fact rituals belonging to the English tradition. For the Ecossais Anglois that is not surprising, since the text itself claims to be a French translation of an older English ritual; our research has only confirmed the correctness of this claim. As for the ritual of the Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté, this conclusion may be more surprising for everyone but a few researchers. (16) To be sure, I have only looked at the Hiramic Legend; it is thus quite possible, and surely not unlikely, that other parts of the rituals of the Craft degrees show equally clear French influences. The origin of these rituals must be looked for in the West Indies at the end of the 18th century, where French and British Freemasonry were both very influential. Further research still has to be done here.

2) A second conclusion may be, that with the Graham manuscript of 1726, Prichard’s Masonry Dissected of 1730, the Rite Ancien de Bouillon of about 1740 and the ritual of Ecossais Anglois of 1745 or slightly later, we have four quite different English versions of the Hiramic Legend, demonstrating how much there was experimented with its form, not only before, but also after the publication of Masonry Dissected. This runs counter to the general assumption, that this publication put an end to all such exper-
imenting, fixing the form by providing an easily accessible model. From what we have seen, it has become clear that the manuscript forms contain some features which are not found, or only implicitly hinted at, in *Masonry Dissected*, and which yet became part and parcel of the English tradition. However, they never made it to France. There Prichard, especially in its French translation of 1738, became the standard. From that, Travenol developed in 1744 his *Catechisme*, which became the model for all later French developments.

3) That brings us to a third conclusion, namely that the English and the French developments of the Hiramic Legend seem to be mainly independent. Elements like that there were only three Masters, who had to be together to make a «trible Voice» to pronounce the Old Masters Word, which was thus lost automatically once one of them had died, precisely because he had not revealed it to someone else; such elements, which belong to the oldest of the English tradition, were never incorporated in the French rituals. The same holds true for the reason why the death of Hiram is assumed, namely because there were originally more than three conspirators, who, suspecting what had happened, came forwards and reported to Solomon what they knew. This form, developed later in the English tradition, also remained restricted to that, while in France the form was developed that the death of Hiram was concluded when the Masters who found his body, recognised it as that of Hiram. The first indication of this French form is found with John Coustos, who, as we have seen, combines English and French elements, as was to be expected. Also other developments are strictly French and were never adopted by the English. We may think here of the indication of the divine nature of Hiram by the placement of the Name of God on his tomb, either or not in a golden triangle, rather than burying him in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*.

4) With that, however, we come at the point of certain elements that were transferred from one tradition to the other. We have seen that the tetragrammaton on a golden triangle, placed on the tomb of Hiram, may well have developed from the golden medal with the tetragrammaton of the English *Rite Ancien de Bouillon*. In its turn, this development may be related to that of the degrees of Maître Ecossais and Royal Arch, as I have indicated elsewhere. Of these developments we know very little yet, but it seems most likely that early English elements were further developed in France, one of the results of which, namely the degree of the Royal Arch, found its way back to England. Likewise, we have seen that the element of the punishment of the three murderers developed in England. The first ritual mentioning it, is that of the *Ecossais Anglois*. In France it was not incorporated in the Hiramic Legend itself, but it was elaborated upon in the separate degree of Maître Elu. Apart from these constructions of complete new degrees, there may well be influences in both directions on a much lower level, namely
that of the precise wording of certain phrases. I have not yet investigated that, but such items, even though they are less spectacular, may be of great use for developing a key to determine the date and tradition of a ritual of which these are unknown.

5) Finally, we may conclude a few things about the four «Grand Rituals». As we have seen, the Hiramic Legend of the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié* and of the *Rite Moderne* are classical representatives of the French tradition, whereas those of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté* and of the *Emulation Ritual* stand for the English one.

These last two, therefore, present in the main course of the Legend a much more coherent and logical story than is found in the French tradition. This richer and intellectually more satisfying form originated partly from the preservation of pre-Prichard elements, partly from innovations introduced between 1730 and 1760. Especially the more dramatic form of the *Rit Ecossais Ancien et Accepté* is, in my opinion, very attractive indeed. As opposed to the *Emulation Ritual*, it also retains the full form of the finding and punishing of the murderers, including the text explaining the traditional imprecations, contained in the oath.

However, as we have also seen, at the end of the 18th century, the English form of the Hiramic Legend loses its necessary conclusion: the indication of the identity of Hiram with Jahweh by either his burial in the *Sanctum Sanctorum* or the placement of the name of God on his tomb, thus rendering the English versions no more than a moralistic lesson. That element was preserved in both the «Grand Rituals» of the French tradition. Since this last point is vital for its function as an initiation myth, the quality of the Hiramic Legend of the *Rite Ecossais Rectifié* and of the *Rite Moderne* must, for this purpose, be regarded significantly greater. It is to be regretted that the English tradition did not preserve the conclusion it used to have: the burial of Hiram in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*. If it had, it would have been by far superior. Since it did not, we are forced to conclude that the English tradition fell victim to the loss of understanding of the masonic method, which characterizes the 19th century in general. Probably it is pure chance that the French tradition did preserve the essential structure. At the same time, we may regret that it was not influenced more by the developments in England with respect to the main core of the story. However, it may well be precisely the independency of the two traditions which saved the French rituals from the fate of the English ones.

J. A. M. Snoek
APPENDIX:
VERSIONS OF THE HIRAMIC LEGEND
AND THEIR SOURCES

BN = Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris
GON = Groot Oosten der Nederlanden (Grand East of the Netherlands), The Hague
UGLE = United Grand Lodge of England, London

English rituals

1764 *Hiram or the Grand Master-Key*, London (UGLE A.795.HIR, pp. 57-60)
1765 *The Mystery of Free Masonry Explained* (= Ch.21 from *Every Young Man's Companion*, 4th ed. UGLE A.795.GOR, pp. 422-424)
1766 *Mahhabone, or The Grand Lodge Door Open'd*, Liverpool (UGLE A.795.MAH, pp. 57-60)
1766 Thomas Wolson [= ?] *Solomon in all his Glory*, London (GON 209.E.104 pp. 33-37) (= transl. of Wolson 1751)
1769 *The Free-Mason Stripped Naked*, London (UGLE A.795.UAR, pp. 45-50)
(= *Cahiers des 33 gr.*: de la Maçrie: Ecoss: rit ancien-accepté, MS from c.1810, preserved in the archives of the S.C. de Belgique, probably given by Grasse-Tilly at the occasion of its foundation in 1817; pp. 114-122)
French rituals (also Belgian, Dutch or German if the rituals are in the French language)


1743  John Coustos: Confession of 21-3-1743 (in S. Vatcher: « John Coustos and the Portuguese Inquisition », *AQ C* 81 (1968) pp. 50/1)


1760  *Cahiers contenant les réceptions et cérémonies des Grades d'Apprentifs et Compagnons [et Maître]*. (Copied by Brönner from a French ritual of 1760; Kloss MS.23.2, GON 240.C.33 pp. 41-50) (= the rituals of Sébastien Charles de la Barre (from between 1774 and 1778), *Cahier concernant la Réception et Cérémonies de maître ; 3. Grade*, pp. 7-16) (7)


1761  *Ouvrage d’A... C... et M... M...*, (GON 123.B.1, MS.863: the oldest rituals used by lodge Concordia Vincit Animos, Amsterdam, pp. 22-27 + catechism (pages without number))


1766  Th. G[ardet] de la G[arde]: *Passus tertius vel Magister perfectus secundum ritus observantiae legalis* [etc.] (MS. of c.1798, GON 122.E.76: pp. 5-11; contains a ritual of the 3rd degree of the ambassador lodge Les Amis Fervens, Besançon, written in 1766. Only a few traces of the Strict Observance)

≥1766  *La Maîtrise troisieme Grade* (MS. of ≥1766 ?, BN FM4.143 pp. 5v-9r, 11r)
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1768 Récueil et Collection de toutes les instructions de la maçonnérie en tous grâds à l'usage du frere Bassand... reçâ maçon le 15. fevrier 1761, [copié par Bassand en 1768] (BN FM4.148 pp. 30-35, 41-52) (= Collection de tous les grades de la Maçonnerie, BN FR.14301 c.1770 (1772 ?) = Récueil Et Collection de toutes les instructions de la massonnerie En tous grades à l'usage du frere Gauthier... mis au net en l'année 5785, BN FM4.162)

c.1772 UGLE YFR.200.RIT: MS. (no title; pages not numbered)

1773/85 *Grade de Maître* (MS. of 1773 à 1785, BN FM4.303 pp. 40-42)

1776 Dépôt complet des Connaissances de la Franche-Maçonnerie ; 1776 (GON 122.C.40 : pp. 130-135 ; MS with collection of rituals of the Grand Orient of France)


c.1779 *Livre de la Bibliothèque de Philibert Bouché, de Cluny* (MS. of which the first degree is marked : « à l'orient de Dunkerque le 25° du 2° mois de la vraye Lumiere 5779. et de L'era vulgaire 1779. »). BN FM4.168 pp. 137r-141r, 131r

1780 *Premier Grade de Maître* (MS. of c. 1780, Kloss MS.23.27, GON 240.A.76 : pages not numbered)

1780 Réceptions aux VII principaux grades de la Maçonnerie Rédigées pour l'usage de la R.: L.· des neuf sœurs, à l'O.: de Toul (MS of c. 1780, BN FM4.B.14, pages not numbered)


c.1784 *Instruction pour les trois premiers grades* (Kloss MS.31.1, GON 240.D.1 : pp. 50-55) (= first version from *Grade de Maîtrise Bleue – Histoire d'Hiram – Catéchisme et discours*, 1787 Kloss MS.23.21, GON 240.A.73 containing two manuscripts of the Hiramic Legend : pp. 3-6 & 12-17) (This is also identical to the second half of the « Discours Pour La Réception de Maître » in the undated MS. *Rituel de la Loge Saint Napoléon des artistes réunis, BN FM4.658 pp. 15r-17v»


1785 Réception et catéchismes ; 1. des Apprentis, 2. des Compagnons, 3. des Maîtres (Kloss MS.23.23, GON 240.C.40 : pp. 6-10)


1786 *Franchise Maçonnerie ; Cahier contenant les grades de Maître, [etc.] L. : deGarre, L'an de la Lumiere 5786* (MS of 1786, UGLE YFR.200.FRA pp. 22-40 ; related to *Recueil 1788*)

1786 *Le Vray Maçon ou Recueuil des differents grades de la maçonnerie ; à l'O. : de S. : ; l'an de la V. : L. : 5786* (MS of 1786, BN FM4.45 pp. 11-20, 26-30, 32)

1787 Second version from : *Grade de Maîtrise Bleue – Histoire d'Hiram – Catéchisme et discours* (Kloss MS.23.21, GON 240.A.73 containing two manuscripts of the Hiramic Legend : pp. 3-6 & 12-17 ; for the first version, see c.1784 above.)
NOTES

(1) I wish to thank Wim van Keulen and Evert Kwaadgras of the GON, Florence de Lussy of the BN, and John Ashby of the UGLE for their invaluable help in getting access to the different texts of the Hiramic Legend.

(2) Le Secret, 1742; Catechisme, 1744; Trahi, 1745; Désolation/Nouveau Catechisme, 1747/9; Anti-Maçon, 1748; Master-Key, 1760; Recueil Précieux, 1783. Wolson, 1751, (and thus Solomon, 1766, which is its English translation), UGLE YFR.200.RIT, c.1772 and Recueil, 1788, use the name Adoniram, but do not include the usual discussion about this name. Sometimes other variants are used, like Adonhiram, Adomiram or Adoniram Abif.


(4) Not so in Le Secret, 1742, (and, thus, the first version in the Trahi, 1745, which is copied from it, and Master-Key, 1760, which is its English translation) where he is regarded to be that worker in metals.

(5) I.e. Ecossais Anglois, $\geq$1745, «Marquis de Gages», c.1767; Dépôt complet, 1776; MS UGLE, 1786/Recueil, 1788; Guide des Maçons, c.1815.

(6) One MS. (Le Vray Maçon ou Recueil des differents grades de la maçonnerie; à l'O.: de S.; ; l'an de la V.: L.: 5786, BN FM4.45) has two versions, of which the first one, which is more than six pages A4 long, elaborates only on what preceded the assassination of Hiram. It takes for this part even more than two pages A4.

(7) On the date of this undated edition, see: René Désaguliers: «Essai de recherche des origines, en France, du Rite Écossais pour les trois premiers grades» (I) 2: «De la mere loge Ecossaise de Marseille à "La Vertu Persecutée" d'Avignon et au "Contrat Social" de Paris», Renaisssance Traditionelle 54/5 (1983) 88-101 (esp. 88/9), and (II) «addenda et corrigenda» Renaisissance Traditionelle 56 (1983) 285-315 (esp. 294-6, 298/9; 310/1, 313). However, R. Désaguliers did not take into account all the available evidence. For example, the S.C. de Belgique has a manuscript version of the REAA rituals of the Craft degrees which it probably received from Grasse-Tilly at the occasion of its founding in 1817. This does not mean that the printed version of these rituals existed at this time, but it does prove that the rituals existed. What is more, the version of these rituals in this manuscript can be dated more precisely. The first toast is to «Napoleon le grand, Empereur des Français,... l'impéra- trice Marie Louise, son auguste épouse, ainsi que celle des Princes et Princesses de la famille impériale...». This means that this version cannot be from before the marriage of Napoleon with Marie-Louise, daughter of the Emperor of Austria, on April 1st 1810. At the same time it seems likely that, had their son, Napoleon II, later Duke of Reichstag, been born already, he would have been mentioned explicitly. Therefore, the ritual is probably from before March 3rd 1811.

The printed version of the rituals formulates the first toast as to «Sa Majesté et son auguste famille». This may refer to Napoleon as well as to Louis XVIII. Considering that the allegiance of the masons changed three times in a few months during the hectic years
1814 and 1815, the absence of a precise indication as to who was the monarch to be toasted, probably was mere prudence. It suggests that the publication was printed during those few years after the fall of Napoleon (1814) when the political situation remained unsecure; let us say 1814 to 1817 or so. (P. Noël, personal communication, June 7th, 1996)

Personally I think it most likely that Grasse-Tilly brought the rituals (either in English or French) with him on his return from the West in 1804, where they may have been used even several years before.

(8) The ritual of the Marquis de Gage has the inspection of the workmen from which it is seen that three are missing. A manuscript of 1772 has the blood found « sur le pavé mosayque ». A manuscript of 1785 has three Fellow Crafts missing form « l’atelier des Moabites ».

(9) Only the Recueil of 1788 has the general inspection, where three from « l’atelier des Moabites » are found missing.


(11) A Mason’s Confession of c.1727 : « under the pain of having my tongue taken out from beneath my chowks, and my heart out from beneath my left oxer, and my body buried within the sea-mark, where it ebbs and flows twice in the twenty-four hours. » But maybe A Mason’s Examination of 1723 implies the same : « he swears to reveal no Secrets of the worshipful Fraternity, on Pain of having his Throat cut, and having a double Portion of Hell and Damnation hereafter. »


(13) AQCD 81 (1968) 52.

(14) Of course, it is a misunderstanding too that it would be possible to bury a corpse « as near the Sanctum Sanctorum as the mosaic judicial laws would permit » or even just « in the Temple » without « polluting the Place », as The Perjur’d Free Mason Detected rightly observes. So, this solution by Brown, copied by the Emulation Ritual, makes no sense at all.

(15) For any 18th century observer, this would have been obvious from the first moment when Hiram is referred to as the Architect of the Temple of Solomon. After all, the Bible makes perfectly clear that the Architect of the Temple of Solomon was God, who gave the plans to David, from whom Solomon inherited both his throne and the obligation to build the Temple, according to these plans (I Chron. 28).

(16) E.g. René Désaguliers, op. cit.

(17) The series of 24 rituals preserved in the castle at Ecaussines (Belgian Hainaut), presently occupied by distant heirs of the Marquis (the Lichterveld family), belonged to the Chevalier de la Barre, whose name appears on the ritual of the « Puissant Irlandais, Prévot et Juge », 8th degree of the series, 7th in the AASR.

Sébastien Charles de la Barre (1753-1838) was initiated in the « Parfaite Harmonie » lodge on December 21st 1774, in the presence of the marquis of Gage, Provincial Grand Master, with whom he had family connections by marriage. His masonic career was brief : passed on January 3rd 1775, then raised on January 30th 1775, he left Mons for the army. He appears as a member of a military lodge in Luxemburg in 1778. (J. J. Heirwegh and M. Mat-Hasquin : « Itinéraire intellectuel et gestion économique d’un noble hennuyer : Sébastien Charles de la Barre (1753-1838) » in Études sur le XVIIIe siècle 9 (1982) 117/8.)

There is no evidence that he ever joined the higher degrees. Nevertheless the dates of his masonic activities suggest that those rituals, particularly the Craft degrees, were used in 1774-1778. (P. Noël, personal communication, June 7th, 1996)

(18) The date of this manuscript is disputed. The title page (cf. Renaissance Traditionelle 54/5 (1983) 102) mentions 5763, i.e. 1763. Paul Naudon argues that it could also be read as
1767 (Renaissance Traditionelle 68 (1986) 305). I do not agree with Naudon on this point. But he is right in asserting that 1763 is impossible. According to the same title page, the ritual was « dédiée au... Marquis [de Gages, chambellent de II : Majestes imperiales royales et apostolique], grand Maitre de cette Loge [La parfaitte Harmonie, Etablie à l’orient de Mons] ». However, in 1763 the Marquis de Gage was not yet a member of this lodge, and maybe not even initiated. In 1763, the Comte de Pailly was the master of this lodge. Only in 1765 did the Marquis de Gage join this lodge, of which he was master in 1765-66 and 1767-70. Only in 1767 was he appointed « chambellan de leurs Majestés impériales, royales et apostoliques. » (Naudon, ibid.) Therefore, despite the clear indication 1763, the manuscript must be from the period 1767-70.