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Dedicated in 1890, the Sons of Israel and David Synagogue on Friendship Street was the first synagogue building constructed in Providence. It was used by the congregation until 1911. (Sketch: "Friendship Street Synagogue") Rhode Island Jewish Historical Association.
Jews, Freemasons and Religious Accomodation:
Rhode Island's Redwood Lodge and the Congregation of the Sons of Israel and David
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On September 23, 1889, the members of the Congregation of the Sons of Israel and David converged on a lot at the corner of Providence’s Friendship and Foster Streets. The occasion was the laying of the cornerstone for the first synagogue building in the city, which would house Rhode Island’s Moderate Reform congregation. The Sons of Israel and David (better known today as Temple Beth-Eli) had enthusiastically fostered interfaith relationships with Christian neighbors, hundreds of whom supported the synagogue’s construction in principle, while offering material assistance. Also turning out to sanction the endeavor were officers of the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island and members of its subordinate Masonic lodges. That afternoon, a Masonic procession had set out from Freemasons Hall, the Grand Lodge building at Dorrance and Pine Streets, making its way to the Sons of Israel and David’s recently purchased land.

Following the arrival of the procession at the corner lot, the Sons of Israel and David’s president, Alexander Strauss, delivered a brief address on the congregation’s history. He then asked Grand Master George H. Kenyon, the leader of Rhode Island’s Freemasons, to lay the cornerstone. Strauss began: “Most Worshipful Grand Master of Masons of the State of Rhode Island: The Congregation Sons of Israel are about to have this structure erected for the purpose of worshipping God the Almighty, and perpetuating our faith, and in their behalf I most respectfully request you to lay the corner-stone, according to the ancient rites and usages of Free Masons.”

The success of Rhode Island’s Moderate Reform Jews in integrating their congregation into the Christian social fabric of the state, and in gaining the recognition and respect of their non-Jewish neighbors, as well as the role Freemasonry had played in this process, was fully evident that September day. An array of Masonic and Jewish communal documents were placed in a box beneath the synagogue’s cornerstone, among them the by-laws of Redwood Lodge No. 35, whose members had acted as an escort to the Grand Lodge officers during the procession.

Redwood has often been referred to as Providence’s first Jewish Masonic lodge. Yet Jewish affiliation with a decidedly Christian branch of the Masonic fraternity, particularly through the formation of Redwood Lodge, also resulted in the utilization of Christian symbolism and doctrine by the fraternity’s Jewish members in Rhode Island.

Between 1865 and 1877, the Jewish population of Providence and Pawtucket grew from perhaps several dozen people to about five hundred. This community was comprised mainly of immigrants from Western Europe, primarily Germany. In her
American Freemasonry moved through several phases from its colonial beginnings up to the time Redwood was founded. It had generally enjoyed a steady and successful expansion until the virulent anti-Masonic activism that occurred between 1826 and 1840 threatened to decimate the fraternity in the United States. Rhode Island was the scene of some of the worst of this activity. By the 1870s, however, Rhode Island Freemasonry had recovered in numbers and respectability, its former troubles gone, if not entirely forgotten. In his sesquicentennial The Providence Plantations for Two Hundred and Fifty Years (1886), Welcome Arnold Greene was able to confidently assert, "[t]he Free Masons of to-day, secure in the esteem of the community, can afford to smile at the falsities then so recklessly thrown at them, but at the time it was no laughing matter." This widespread communal esteem was evident in 1889, when the Sons of Israel and David requested that the Masonic fraternity participate in the cornerstone ceremonies for its new synagogue.

There was a close connection between the members of the Sons of Israel and David and Redwood Lodge. As described in Henry Rugg's History of Freemasonry in Rhode Island, "[i]n the year 1877 some of the Israelitic Masons residing in Providence, felt the need of uniting themselves together, more closely, by the establishment of a Masonic Lodge. The idea of forming such a new Lodge originated with Bro[ther] Myer Noot." According to Redwood tradition, Noot "visualized a lodge wherein the question of religion or race should be no criterion of membership." In addition to founding Redwood that year, Noot also led the 1877 restructuring of the then-Orthodox Sons of Israel and David into Rhode Island's first Moderate Reform congregation. Most of the other men whose names appear in Redwood's 1878 petition for a charter from the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, including Henry Green, Leopold Hartman (Hardman, Hirtman), Joseph Schwarz (Schwartz, Swartz, Schwartz), and Charles Jacobs, were members of the Sons of Israel and David, as well. After its formation, Myer Noot became Redwood's first Master. In addition, he served the Sons of Israel and David congregation in such varied capacities as secretary, vice-president, teacher, dues collector, cantor, and—though not ordained—rabbi. Green and Hartman held the other highest offices in the lodge, Green, who served as the congregation's president for some twenty years, became the lodge's first Senior Warden, while Hartman became its first Junior Warden. Like Noot, Green and Hartman drove the Sons of Israel and David's Moderate Reform restructuring.

Several of Redwood's founding members already belonged to exclusively Jewish fraternities in Rhode Island. Green had been among the organizers of three such Jewish non-Masonic lodges: Haggai Lodge (B'nai Brith), Providence Lodge (Free Sons of Israel), and Isaac Leeser Lodge (Free Sons of Benjamin). Hartman, Schwarz, and Jacobs, along with Green, had been charter members of Haggai Lodge in 1870. Hartman also co-established Providence Lodge in 1876. Redwood's first meeting was held at Haggai Lodge's hall and it continued to make use of the hall on other occasions. However, Redwood's Jewish founders were not satisfied to direct their energies toward the already-existing Jewish fraternities. Though closely associated with the Sons of Israel and David and of great importance to many of Redwood's founders, Rhode Island's exclusively Jewish fraternities did not satisfy their cosmopolitan aspirations.

Nineteenth-century Reform Jews were particularly preoccupied with integrating themselves into the Christian social fabric of Europe and America. The formation of Redwood Lodge in 1877 united the Jewish Freemasons of Providence and also served an integrationist function, linking the Sons of Israel and David with an established, respected, and largely Protestant fraternity. Similar correlations of
The originator of Redwood Lodge and its first Master, Myer Noolet, led the 1877 reorganizing of the Sons of Israel and David which became Rhode Island’s first Moderate Reform synagogue. From Louis Baruch Rubinstein, A Centennial History of Redwood Lodge Number 35 A.F. & A.M. in the Grand Jurisdiction of Rhode Island (ca. 1982).

Nineteenth-century Reform Judaism with Masonic membership have been observed in other contexts. In his article “Religious Assimilation in a Fraternal Organization: Jews and Freemasonry in Gilded Age San Francisco,” Tony Fels argues that “[c]rucial to an understanding of the Reform position is the realization that it was always thoroughly intermixed with secular aspirations.” He maintains that “the principle of Masonic universalism, which promised that the distinctions based on blood and birth would be washed away in the solvent of brotherhood, shone as a beacon from the Protestant world pointing toward fulfillment” of Jewish hopes to escape from “intellectual, political and economic restrictions.”

According to Fels, “[l]early every Jewish Mason whose writings have survived from the nineteenth century—both in Europe and the United States—emphasized this aspect of Freemasonry above all others.” Myer Noolet’s vision of a Masonic lodge “wherein the question of religion or race should be no criterion of membership” exemplifies such hopes.

The naming of Redwood Lodge attests to the cosmopolitan aspirations of its founders, who had originally considered calling their unique Masonic lodge “Liberty.” As explained by Earl H. Mason in his history of Redwood Lodge, in deciding to name the lodge after Abraham Redwood, “the organizers chose to honor a non-Mason from Newport, famed for his philanthropy, broadmindedness and general good citizenship . . . a staunch Quaker, who numbered many Masonic and Jewish leaders of his day among his closest and most loyal friends.” In naming a Masonic lodge with a Jewish majority after a tolerant Newport Quaker who had “befriended many of the Jewish people in that city,” Redwood’s founders demonstrated their hopes for acceptance into the wider Rhode Island social fabric.

Jewish cosmopolitanism, integration, and societal acceptance were central to Noolet’s Moderate Reform vision of Judaism in America. In 1885, for example, he gave an address to the members of the Rhode Island Veteran Citizens Historical Association at a meeting convened “to secure as far as possible a record of the Jews in Rhode Island and their manners of worship.” The focus of Noolet’s talk, delivered in his role as the state’s Moderate Reform rabbi, was the recent positive transformation in Gentile attitudes toward Rhode Island’s Jews. He attributed this development to Moderate Reform Judaism’s progressive religious approach, which differed from the previously prevailing and more insular Orthodox one. Noolet told the Historical Association’s members:

We [Moderate Reform] Israelites have worked towards commanding the respect as a religious sect from those who do not believe as we do. I have only to go back ten years to rehearse before you how things were in this city as far as the mode of worship was concerned . . . the service was entirely in the Hebrew language, and to have introduced English into the synagogue at that time would have been considered an innovation . . . if a non-Israelite happened to enter the synagogue it was so much Greek to him, to comprehend what was going on . . . Our doors are open now to any one who is desirous of hearing our service . . . Our Christian brethren have access to our place of worship, can understand what we are doing and may perchance become interested in what might be termed a Jewish worship . . . In this direction, my friends, we have done much to diffuse among our people and the community at large a certain amount of respect which must ultimately give rise to a better feeling for the Israelites of this city.”

Noolet’s Historical Association address reflected his optimism about the continued benefits that Moderate Reform Judaism would bring to Rhode Island’s Jews. He contended that prior to the advent of Moderate Reform Judaism in the state, its Jewish residents had been living “in oblivion, our Christian brethren could not find out anything about them.”

Now, though, the situation was much improved:

Everybody is aware that there are Israelites living here, have lived here for many years, but how have they lived? in obscurity, so to speak.

What has time wrought for our people, however, during the past ten years? Wonders, if I may use the term, Miracles. You may ask in what manner; in what particular? I will answer thus wise.

The Israelites of Rhode Island to-day as a religious class are respected . . . There is a bright future for this city for our people. Although few in numbers compared with other cities, we have the satisfaction of knowing that we command the respect due from one to the other notwithstanding what his belief may be.”

The September 1889 cornerstone ceremony for the Sons of Israel and David’s new synagogue represented a public fulfillment of the Moderate Reform congregation’s desire for the esteem and support of its Christian neighbors.

In his Centennial History of Redwood Lodge (ca. 1982), Louis Baruch Rubinstein emphasized that the “relationship between the Congregation Sons of Israel and David and Redwood Lodge continued [after the cornerstone ceremony] and persists to the present, with many of Redwood’s membership also active in that congregation.”

Eventually, Redwood Lodge attracted not only Rhode Island’s Reform Jews, but its Orthodox, Conservative, and unaffiliated ones as well.

However, an examination of the dedication ceremony of the Grand Lodge’s new Freemasons Hall, in February 1886, shows that from Redwood Lodge’s inception its Jewish members were part of a Rhode Island Masonic society that employed Christian perspectives and practices. While presiding
over the dedication services, Grand Master Lyman Klapp stood at the altar and prayed that "[t]he great mercy hallow this building erected for the greater Glory of Thy Sacred Name, under the patronage of the Holy Saints Johns, and for the celebration of the rites of our Order ... All which we ask, 0 FATHER Almighty, through the LION of the Tribe of Judah." As part of the dedication, Reverend George McClellan Fiske, rector of Providence's St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, delivered an oration on "The Mission of the Masonic Order." Fiske told the assemblage:

Masonry stands beside the Church of God, as one of the great interpreters and monitors of human life. It bears to that Divine Society a relation much like that, which the Holy Saint John the Baptist, whom Masonry delights to honor as a Patron, bore to the Prophet of Prophets, Jesus, the Prophet of Nazareth, of Galilee. It goes before the Church's face to prepare her way, to be a herald and forerunner of the fuller truth, and of the better office, of which the Church is the sole and only instrument, of reconciling of human souls to God. The dedication ceremony continued with more overtly Christian rhetoric. Rhode Island's Grand Chaplain, Henry Rugg, had prefaced the Grand Master's words by praying: "Here let no contentious thoughts divide those who are united in One Holy Brotherhood, but ... by the strong hand and mighty arm of the LION of the Tribe of Judah, raise us all to that House not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Grand Master Klapp, in turn, concluded by stating that "we, following the precepts of this earthly brotherhood, and as children of one Almighty Father, ever seek, in all humility, to build up our lives according to the principles of that heavenly brotherhood, so that, at last, through the merits of the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, our souls and bodies shall be raised from the tomb of corruption."

This overtly Christian approach to Freemasonry was by no means unusual, and a few months later, at the annual meeting of the Grand Lodge during May 1886, Grand Master Klapp addressed the legitimacy of using sectarian language in Masonic ritual:

[Whenever a Jewish brother, as he stands at our altars waiting for the promised Messiah, offers his prayers to the GOD of Abraham, the GOD of Isaac and the GOD of Jacob, the Christian brother recognizes the ancient faith of the chosen people of GOD. In like spirit, the devout Israelite joins with those who on bended knee offer their devotions to the Great JEHOVAH through the merits of the LION of the Tribe of Judah, JESUS CHRIST our LORD, ... If the sad day should ever come—which God forbid—when all reference to the Christian religion is eliminated from our work and ritual, and Christian prayers are no longer allowed in our Lodges, then genuine Freemasonry will disappear from among the institutions of every Christian country, or if perchance it remain for a time, it will only be as a dead and purifying body, alike offensive in the sight of GOD and man.]

The desire of Rhode Island Jews to integrate into a Christian-oriented branch of the Masonic fraternity thus resulted in some remarkable circumstances. Redwood's coat of arms, adopted by its founders in 1878, shows the disjuncture between Jewish identity and a Rhode Island Masonic tradition steeped in Christian doctrine. Redwood's crest is the profile of a prominent demi-lion. On its shield are two eagles, a six-pointed star (the Seal of Solomon Star of David) enclosing the Tetragrammaton (one of the Biblical Hebrew names of God), and a compass and three turrets. Beneath the shield is the lodge's motto: "Leo de Judah est Robur Nostrum," a Latin phrase meaning "the Lion of Judah is our strength." As explained in Albert Gallatin Mackey's 1874 Encyclopedia of Freemasonry and its Kindred Sciences, "all allusions to the lion, as the lion's paw, the lion's gripe, etc., refer to the doctrine of the resurrection taught by Him [i.e., Jesus] who is known as 'the lion of the tribe of Judah.' The expression is borrowed from the Apocalypse (v. 5): 'Behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.' Similarly, the Biblical Index to Freemasonry provided in the Heirloom Masonic Bible gives the following catechistic explanation of the phrase "Lion of the Tribe of Judah":

Q: What is the symbolisms of this phrase?
A: The Masonic use of the phrase "Lion of the tribe of Judah" is Messianic in its significance; it refers to Christ, who "brought life and immortality to life."

In other words, in selecting the Latin phrase "Leo de Judah est Robur Nostrum," Redwood's Jewish founders embraced a motto that means "Jesus Christ is our strength."

To be sure, the phrase "Lion of Judah" has different meanings, depending on the context in which it appears, and also has its own symbolic meaning in Judaism. The patriarch Jacob's blessing to his sons in the Book of Genesis establishes Judah as the royal tribe of Israel, and the lion as the banner of that tribe. Jacob compares Judah to a lion, the archetypal regal animal, a symbol of strength and royalty in different parts of the world. In Jewish tradition, in addition to being a broad symbol of bravery, courage, and nobility, the lion is also a symbol of the tribe of Judah itself, and by extension sometimes a symbol of the entire Jewish nation, which takes its most commonly used name today (Yehudim, in Hebrew) from Judah (Yehuda).
Regardless of its meaning in a Jewish context, however, the phrase “the Lion of Judah” or “the Lion of the tribe of Juda” in Masonic ritual and Redwood Lodge’s motto refers unambiguously to Jesus, the Christian deity and messiah. The Masonic identity of “the Lion of the Tribe of Judah” and its centrality in Rhode Island Masonry was reiterated by the Reverend Marion Law, of St. Paul’s Episcopal Church in his April 1897 oration at the laying of the cornerstone of a new Masonic temple in Pawtucket. Paraphrasing the Reverend George McClellan Fiske’s oration at the dedication ceremony of the Grand Lodge’s new Freemasons Hall a decade before, Law declared:

Masonry stands ranged beside the church of God as one of the great interpreters and monitors of human life. It is to the church of God what St. John the Baptist was to Jesus of Nazareth, the Lion of the Tribe of Judah. For, as John the Baptist, whom Masonry delights to honor as one of its patrons, even as he went before the Savor of Mankind, a prophet and a herald, so Masonry goes before the church, to prepare her way, to be a herald and forerunner of that mightier office, of which the church is the sole and only instrument, the reconciling of human souls to God.

Although Redwood Lodge was formed over a century ago as a Masonic organization with enduring ties to the Sons of Israel and David and other synagogues in Rhode Island, its Masonic rituals continue to endorse Christian doctrine, and even assert that Christianity is superior to Judaism. Likewise, an allusion to Jesus as “the Lion of the tribe of Judah” is found in one of the concluding lectures of Rhode Island’s Master Mason Degree (as one of Rhode Island’s Craft/Symbolic lodges, Redwood has three separate initiation ceremonies, or degrees—Entered Apprentice, Fellowcraft, and Master Mason—in which Freemasonry’s symbols and philosophy are imparted to members through lectures, catechistic questions and answers, and dramatic reenactments of Masonic lore). The lecture discusses Christianite and the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and states that a Christian, thanks to Christian revelation and “Faith in the merits of the Lion of the tribe of Judah”—that is, faith in the virtues of Jesus—can be certain of his own immortality. The new Master Mason in Redwood, as in other Rhode Island lodges, is told:

Thus, my brother, we close the explanation of the emblems, upon the solemn thought of death; which, without revelation, is dark and gloomy; but the Christian is suddenly revived by an ever-green, ever-living sprig of Faith in the merits of the Lion of the tribe of Juda, which inspires him to look
forward with calmness and compose to a blessed immortality, so that he doubts not, that on the glorious morn of the Resurrection, the body will be raised and become as incorruptible as the soul."

Statements about resurrection in Rhode Island's Master Mason Degree extol the superiority of "the Christian dispensation" over "the Jewish hierarchy." The statements link the Master Mason Degree with Christianity, while proclaiming Christianity to be the most complete religious stage humanity has passed through. These passages assert Christianity's superiority over Judaism by positing that Christianity proves the doctrine of future bodily resurrection from the grave, while a search through the Hebrew Bible does not yield a single passage on the subject."

In this way, Rhode Island's Master Mason Degree reaffirms supersessionist/replacement theology—the belief that Christianity has superseded and replaced Judaism—with a Masonic framework. Similarly, An Encyclopedia of Freemasonry states:

"[Resurrection] is, as we all know, an essential part of the Christian faith, and was exemplified, in his own resurrection, by Christ to his followers. In Freemasonry, a particular degree, the Master's, has been appropriated to teach it by an impressive symbolism. "Thus," says Hutchinson [in Spirit of Masonry], "our Order is a positive contradiction to Judaic blindness and infidelity, and testifies our faith concerning the resurrection of the body.""

Other overtly Christian features of Rhode Island Freemasonry have endured in Redwood Lodge since its inception. Thus, the lodge is dedicated to "the Holy Saints John"—John the Baptist and John the Evangelist—and it is asserted in the Entered Apprentice Degree that modern Freemasons are homogenously Christian: "Masons in modern time, professing Christianity, dedicate [their lodges] to St. John the Baptist and St. John the Evangelist, two eminent Christian Patrons of Freemasonry.""

It is probable that for some of Redwood Lodge's founders and early members, like many liberal Jews in Germany who joined Freemasonry during the nineteenth century, "the impetus . . . to break through the barriers of social isolation prompted certain rationalizations for Jewish participation in a fraternity which, despite accommodations, employed overtly Christian allusions." According to Alice M. Greenwald, "[the] focus on ethical conduct, universalistic humanism, and the symbolic source of Masonry in biblical events and personages, seemed to most [Reform Jews] sufficient cause for Jewish Masonic activity." Yet, it is perplexing that the occurrences of overt Christian dogma in Rhode Island Freemasonry would continue to remain acceptable to its Jewish members over the decades. In over one hundred and thirty years of existence, Redwood Lodge has retained its "Lion of Judah is our Strength" motto and its dedication to two Christian saints. It continues to follow the same Christianized Masonic ritual as other Rhode Island lodges, a ritual that includes lectures that emphasize faith in Jesus and assert Judaism's inferiority to Christianity.

There are several possible explanations for this dissonance between faith and practice in Redwood Lodge's ceremonies and insignia. Masonic historian F. W. Seal-Coon argues that many non-Christian Freemasons in North America have not articulated any discomfort with, or opposition to, Christian aspects of Craft Freemasonry because its rituals and symbolism have been largely unintelligible to them. He asserts that this has been an ignorance born of apathy; many non-Christian Freemasons have been philosophically oblivious to much of what has been, said, and heard within their lodges, and to the instruction taking place there. He also posits that "for the generality of freemasons peace and harmony may best be served by the acceptance of things as they are." Tony Fels has suggested that "in presenting a version of the story..."
of Christ in Old Testament clothing, Masonry may have made acceptable to Jews sentiments regarding death and immortality that were virtually the same as those held by Christians. Focusing as it did more on deeds than on ideas, "the fraternity's indifference to exegetical discussion enabled such diverse interpretations to coexist unevaluated." 85

It is possible that many of Rhode Island's Jewish Freemasons have recognized Christian manifestations in Freemasonry, but have been willing to overlook them, even if their presence caused some unease, for the benefits of belonging to the fraternity. 86 The experience of many Jewish Rhode Island Freemasons may parallel that of Masonic author Paul M. Bessel and his father, Martin Bessel. In "Freemasonry & Judaism," Paul Bessel writes:

My father, Martin Bessel, was a Freemason from 1946 until his death in 1977. He was brought up in a religious Jewish family and he was orthodox in following more of the traditional rules than most Jews in the United States. He was very proud to be Jewish, as well as a Mason and an American . . . I recall hearing rumors that Freemasonry required members to say or do things in accord with the Christian religion and that it was not really an American institution, but I knew my father would not belong to an organization that had these characteristics . . . While there are many common aspects of Judaism and Freemasonry, it also should be recognized that because of the history of centuries of attempts to force Jews to convert to Christianity, they can be uncomfortable about being asked to say Christian prayers or otherwise indicate non-Jewish beliefs. Some parts of Masonry use New Testament prayers, references to Saints, the cross as a religious symbol . . . and at least one Masonic organization requires aspirants members to swear to support the Christian faith. Jews can deal with these references to other religions by remaining quiet or not participating in those parts of Masonry. I do not want to overemphasize these matters, though, since they are outweighed by the deepest meanings of Freemasonry—the universality of all people. 87

For the most part, Jewish Freemasons in Rhode Island have accepted the Masonic fraternity as it is. Whatever their degree of personal discomfort with Christian aspects of the ritual, lectures, and symbolism, it was not so great that they were dissuaded from joining the fraternity, driven to argue for change, or compelled to withdraw from it altogether. Tony Fels suggests that in their desire to be part of the Masonic fraternity, Jews were willing to ignore the Christian aspects of Freemasonry, even though "[t]he Hebrew [resurrection] myth and other Christian aspects of the fraternity's practice must have created anxieties." Fels writes that "[f]or the most part, one suspects, Jewish members chose to ignore those aspects of Masonry which were susceptible to a specifically Christian interpretation and to concentrate instead on those features of the fraternity's faith, such as its monotheism, universalism and rationalism, which seemingly placed it above any particular religion."

Another explanation for Jewish Freemasons' acceptance of Christian ritual and symbolism over the years is the power of tradition. A Jewish Freemason who knows that other Jews—his father or grandfather, his relatives or neighbors, his rabbi or fellow synagogue congregants—are or were Freemasons, and sees no sign that these men have protested or expressed discomfort with Christian aspects of Freemasonry, is also unlikely to do so. If a Christianized Freemasonry has been acceptable to them, he may decide, it is good enough for him too. He may also reason that since these Jewish relatives and friends have been enthusiastic participants in Freemasonry, what seems overtly Christian must not really be so. 88

It is possible that Myer Noot and the other Jewish founding members of Redwood Lodge were unaware of the Christian meaning of the Latin phrase chosen as the lodge's motto. Since the coat of arms includes a large Star of David and the Tetragrammaton, it is even possible that they thought the motto, with its "Judaah," had a Jewish meaning. 89 As Tony Fels observes, the joining together of Protestants and Reform Jews in the Masonic fraternity has "not [been] without its ironies and subtle misunderstandings." The success of this merging was due to "the convergence of religious outlooks" among the members of these two groups, 90 but where such an affinity was lacking, "Protestant and Jewish fraternity members retained somewhat divergent interpretations of their common Masonic tradition." 91 This difference in understanding Freemasonry also extended to the reading—or misunderstanding—of Masonic concepts and symbols.

Early on in the history of Redwood Lodge, one Rhode Island Grand Master alluded to the possible disjuncture between Rhode Island Freemasonry and Jewish tradition. At the one hundredth annual meeting of the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, in May 1890, George H. Kenyon spoke of the 1889 Masonic cornerstone ceremony for the Congregation of the Sons of Israel and David, which he had overseen the previous year. His account contradicted the Providence Journal's portrayal of the event, which described Christian prayer and the invocation of Christian saints. According to Kenyon, "the corner stone was laid in ample form according to the ritual adopted by Grand Lodge, 92 with only such slight modification as would make it conform to the Jewish faith." He told his Masonic audience:

I wish here to correct an impression which has been circulated extensively, and commented upon not only in the Masonic journals of our country but abroad, wherein we were represented as performing this ceremony in terms inconsistent with the religious faith of our Jewish brethren. Such was not the case, and all who were present and gave attention to the services can well remember the omission of the words which were said to have been used, and to have been distasteful to the people for whom we were laying the corner stone. 93

In an acknowledgement of the potential tension between Rhode Island Masonic ritual and Jewish beliefs, Kenyon felt it necessary to correct what he perceived to be a widespread misapprehension about aspects of the cornerstone ceremony.

Whether or not the Grand Lodge slightly modified its 1889 cornerstone ceremony in consideration of the members of the Sons of Israel and David, it made no similar modifications for internally used Masonic ritual. Yet the contradictions between Rhode Island Masonic practice and Jewish doctrine were rendered inconsequential, as Redwood Lodge's Jewish founders either did not pay close attention to Freemasonry's ritual, lectures, and symbolism—and therefore did not recognize its Christian features—or were quite willing to overlook those features for the sake of belonging to the Masonic fraternity. Once a concentrated number of Jews had affiliated with Rhode Island Freemasonry, it was simpler for others to follow in their footsteps, and the contradictions continued to be considered inconsequential. The movement of the Sons of Israel and David away from Orthodoxy and toward Moderate Reform Judaism in the 1870s had been motivated in part by its members' desire to better integrate into American society, while at the same time retaining their Judaism. The parallel formation of a Jewish-majority Masonic lodge was an extension of this goal. Such integration came at a cost, however. Rather than challenging the existing state of affairs, in which Rhode Island's Masonic lodges operated in an openly sectarian manner, its Jewish members prized belonging over egalitarianism. Whereas in early nineteenth-century England, for example, Masonic lodges underwent a comprehensive process of de-Christianization, Jewish Freemasons in Rhode Island tacitly continued to accept a ritual based on doctrine that was alien to their own religious beliefs, and that elevated the merits of Christianity over Judaism. Aside from its Jewish beginnings and many Jewish members, Redwood Lodge has not differed in any substantial way from other Rhode Island lodges, and Redwood's Jewish members continue to accommodate themselves to Rhode Island Freemasonry's Christian ritual, lectures, and symbolism.
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When Was Providence Founded?

LINDA MACLACHLAN

Every knowledgeable Providence schoolchild and citizen aware of the story behind their city's seal can draw a mental picture of the founding of Providence: Roger Williams's canoe was paddled across the Seekonk River. Williams was greeted by some Indians as he passed what was thereafter called What Cheer Cove, and rounded Fox Point to pull to shore at what is now called Roger Williams Landing. But when did this event occur?

On December 17, 1885, in connection with the approaching celebration of the 250th anniversary of the settlement of Providence, a committee of the Providence City Council reported that, "The best historical authorities name the date of the founding of Providence as between the 20th and 25th of June [1636]." Consequently, Providence's two-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary was celebrated on June 23 and 24, 1886.

In 1936, however, the Providence Tercentenary Committee announced that "A New Theory is Propounded" about the founding of Providence. The Committee suggested that when Roger Williams and his companions came to Providence in June 1636, his follower William Arnold had already been residing in the area (purportedly at the mouth of the Pawtucket River) with his large family for two months. While the report cites no sources, it is undoubtedly based upon an early family record in which William Arnold's son wrote: "Mem, We came to Providence to Dwell the 20th of April, 1636. per me Benedict Arnold." Yet the Tercentenary Committee's startling "new theory" does not explicitly challenge Williams's status as founder of Providence.

An additional record by William Arnold himself further underlines the problem of establishing the date Providence was founded. On 27 April 1659, William Arnold wrote the Rhode Island General Court concerning his land holdings and reminded the Court that: "...I was that the very first day entered with some others upon the land of Providence..." It is noteworthy that both of these original sources of primary information explicitly locate Arnold near the mouth of the Pawtucket River, as the Tercentenary Committee had asserted, but at what would become Providence itself.

The inference seems unavoidable. If the Arnold party was already well-settled at Providence when Roger Williams first paddled ashore in June, then the founder of Providence is not Roger Williams, but William Arnold, father of the distinguished Rhode Island governor, Benedict Arnold, who was great-great-grandfather of the infamous General Benedict Arnold. Does the weight of historical evidence require us to unseat Providence founder Roger Williams in favor of the ancestor of this traitor?

This article reviews all the evidence currently available and argues that its weight supports the alternative conclusion that Williams founded Providence, not in June 1636, but before 20 April 1636, when he and the Arnold family concurrently settled there. The historians and writers who have maintained for years that Roger Williams founded Providence in June 1636 misunderstood both the planting season in southern New England and Roger Williams's own words. The evidence presented below integrates the Arnold records with all other available documentation related to the circuitous route by which Roger Williams came to select the site of Providence, one to three weeks prior to his settlement there with the Arnold family on 20 April 1636.
within six weeks. However, Williams was ill and his wife was about to give birth. The Court extended the time he could remain in the colony until spring, with the proviso that he was “not to go about to draw others to his opinions” in the interim. By January 1635/6, Massachusetts officials were convinced that Williams was violating this condition and that, “[h]e had drawn above twenty persons to his opinions, and they were intending to erect a plantation about the Narragansett Bay, from whence the infection would easily spread into these [Massachusetts] churches, (the people being many of them, much taken with the apprehension of his godliness).”

The Massachusetts Bay magistrates resolved to deport Williams to England on a ship then anchored at Nantasket. They sent a marshal to fetch him. The marshal returned empty-handed, having been told that Williams was too ill to travel in bitter winter weather without hazard to his life. The magistrates immediately sent the ship captain with a warrant to apprehend Williams, but it was too late. The captain reported back that Williams had fled three days earlier, “but whither they [i.e., the Bay magistrates] could not learn.”

This entry about Williams’s flight in the journal of Massachusetts Bay Governor John Winthrop is dated only as “11 no. January [O.S.].” The next entry is labeled 18 January 1635/6, and it establishes Williams’s departure from Salem as no later than 15 January. After careful study, one Williams biographer has concluded that the most likely date that Williams left Salem was the 8th or 9th of January.

The date Williams departed from Salem is critical to establish the beginning of the settlement of Providence, as Williams later recalled that he was in flight for “fourteen weeks” before arriving in Providence. After what was probably close to a 100-mile overland trek, circling the Boston area on less-traveled trails and then hiking southward, Williams settled at Manton’s Neck on Seekonk Cove. There, just above the narrows where the Central Bridge was to be built in 1792, Williams later recalled, he and a few companions began to build and plant in the spring of 1635/6:

“I gave leave to W. Harris then Poor and destitute to Come along in my Company. I Consent to John Smith[,] Miller at Dorchester [banished also] to goe with me, and at John Smiths desire, to a Poor young fellow Frances Wicks also to a lad of Rich. Watermans. These are all I remember.”

Williams was to remain in Seekonk only a short time. The Indian sachem (leader) of Plymouth Colony’s territory notified Plymouth’s Governor, William Bradford, that Williams had settled within that tribe’s territory. To Bradford, this meant that Massachusetts Bay would hold Plymouth Colony responsible for Williams’s future conduct—a burden that Bradford did not wish to undertake. In a letter known only from Williams’s description of it, Edward Winslow, who had taken over as Plymouth governor on the first Tuesday in March (4 March 1635/6), urged Williams to cross the Seekonk River and eschew beyond Plymouth’s jurisdiction.

Williams promptly heeded Winslow’s directive to cross into indisputably Narragansett territory. He met with the Narragansett sachems and acquired, “[T]he lands and meadows upon the two fresh rivers called Moosauick and Wanasquatucket [bounded] from the river and fields at Pawtucket, the great hill of Neotacononkit on the northwest and the town of the Mashape on the west.”

The deed containing these words is dated March 24th of Providence Plantation’s “second year,” but is said by Williams to commemorate an oral agreement to the same effect made one year earlier. There is no reason to believe that Williams traveled to the Indian encampment to execute this deed precisely on the anniversary of the date the Narragansetts originally granted him this land. Indeed, as discussed below, there is good reason to believe that this original agreement with the Narragansetts was reached a week or two later than March 24, 1635/6. But Williams obviously made his first canoe trip to the desired site—and thereby “founded” Providence—just before the date the Narragansetts actually agreed to give him the land he had selected. If the date of Williams’s settlement at Providence can be determined, the actual date of the original land grant will become clearer. When all other available information is analyzed, it is possible to create a timeline that smoothly incorporates Williams’s oral agreement with the Narragansetts.

**When Did Roger Williams Move to Providence?**

In a 1670 letter to Major John Mason, Williams complained that it took him a total of fourteen weeks, following his departure from Salem, to reach Providence:
Sometime after Plymoughs great Sachim (Osuamaquin) upon occasion affirming that Providence was his land, and therefore Plymoughs Land, and some resenting it. The then prudent and godly Govr Mr Bradford and others of his godly Councell answered, that if, after due examination it should be found true what the Barbarian said, Yet having to my lose of a Harvest that yeare, bene now (though by their gentle Advice) as good as banished from Plymough, as from the Massachus. And I had quietly and patiently departed from them (at their Motion) to the place where now I was, I should not be molested and tos (tossed) up and down againe while they had Breath in their Bodies. And surely betweene those my Friends of the Bay and Plymough I was sorely tost for one 14e weeks (in a bitter Winter Season) not knowing what Bread or Bed did meane... [emphasis added]1

Arnold's first reference to "some others" could simply be a reference to his own family, but the second one cannot. The "others" in "I and mine with others" must refer to people outside his family. If these "others" were Europeans—and it is hard to believe that Arnold would have regarded anyone else as worth remarking upon—they must have been members of the Williams party.

There is no reason to doubt the veracity of Governor Benedict Arnold's assertion of the date his family "entred" Providence, i.e., "came to Providence to Dwell." If Arnold was accompanied then by members of the Williams party, they would have come with the same intent: to create dwellings and fields there. Since Williams would never have condoned anyone coming "to Providence to Dwell" without permission from the Narragansetts, we must place his selection and negotiation for the purchase of Providence prior to 20 April 1636. We must also assume that Williams's selection of the Providence site occurred after he planted his corn at Seekonk because he would not have planted there after he knew he had to abandon the site.

Arnold's letter to the General Court can be read to support such a conclusion. In 1659 Arnold wrote:

"...I was [one] that the very first day entred with some others upon the land of Providence and so laid out my money to buy and helpe pay for it, besides [much] hardship and danger I and mine with others did under goe to possess and keepe the same a good while after & therefore I was one of the first in choice of any lands to bee laid out to the Townes men afterwards..." [emphasis added]

An illustration showing Roger Williams crossing the Seekonk River to found Providence in 1636. The title of the drawing erroneously states that the scene depicts Williams crossing the Pawtucket River; the Central Falls of Pawtucket are in the background. R.I. Historical Society (RH-012239).
than a crop at Providence. It is also noteworthy that, although Williams complained of his great suffering during the winter of 1635/6 for the rest of his life, he never mentioned privation during the following winter, as he should have in the absence of adequate food for both himself and his wife and children, who had arrived at Providence by spring 1637. Thus, Williams’s reference to “my losse of a Harvest that yeare” meant that he lost the produce of the hard-won fields he and his men had cleared at Seekonk.

**CREATING A TIMETABLE FOR PROVIDENCE’S FOUNDING**

Is it physically possible for Williams to have planted at Seekonk and then acquired an alternative settlement site at Providence in time to have accompanied William Arnold’s party there on 20 April 1637? It would seem to be a tight time frame, but for two other considerations.

First, the last frost of the winter now tends to occur about eighteen days earlier in Providence than in Plymouth. In colonial days the difference is likely to have been greater because climatologists have determined that Plymouth has incurred significantly more warming in the twentieth century than the rest of the New England coast. So the question is not whether Williams could have planted at his Seekonk camp in about mid-April and still have founded Providence before 20 April 1636; it is whether Williams could have planted at Seekonk in about late March and still have founded Providence before 20 April 1636—a much easier question to answer affirmatively.

Second, Thomas Prence specified mid-April as the time seed corn is actually planted at Plymouth, and placing the seed in the ground is the last task, not the first chore to be done when planting. Roger Williams was clearing new fields at Seekonk, and the back-breaking work of clearing virgin ground of rocks and trees, and then plowing it for the first time, would have commenced at Seekonk as soon as the ground surface thawed. Thus, if all that was left to do after further frost became unlikely was to actually place the seed in prepared fields, that process easily could have been completed within a day or two.

**TIMELINE FOR THE FOUNDING OF PROVIDENCE**

8-15 Jan 1635/6 Roger Williams flies Salem for Narragansett Bay.
8-15 Jan 1635/6 Before 4 Mar Williams arrives at Seekonk while William Bradford is Governor of Plymouth.
4 Mar 1635/6 Edward Winslow becomes Governor of Plymouth.
29 Mar 1636 Earliest planting date at Providence (18 days before planting can begin at Plymouth).
15 Apr 1636 Prence’s earliest date for planting at Plymouth.
13-20 Apr 1636 Fourteen weeks after William’s flight. Williams moves to Providence.
20 Apr 1636 Arnold arrives at Providence “with some others.”
End of May Prence’s last date for planting at Plymouth
24 Mar 1636/7 Williams signs deed for Providence with Narragansets about one year after the fact.

When the approximation of March 29 (eighteen days before Prence’s calendar for the earliest time to plant at Plymouth) is substituted for April 15 as the earliest planting time at Providence, the timeline of events related to the settlement of Providence seems clear.

Roger Williams may well have planted at Seekonk shortly before the month of April began in

Opposite page: A close-up of the Providence area from a 1794 map of Rhode Island that best shows the location of Roger Williams’s Seekonk encampment (where Ten Mile River enters the Seekonk), relative to Providence. The camp was on the north bank of Ten Mile River as it joins the Seekonk, in the vicinity of what is now Roger Williams Avenue. (David Rumsey Map Collection, www.davidrumsey.com; accessed 5 October 2012).
1636. He probably received Governor Winslow's notice to vacate that area very soon thereafter. He would have immediately selected the new site for his settlement and secured the Narragansetts' assent to the grant by early April, which would make the founding date for Providence implied by his 1636/67 commemorative deed just about a week or two short of one year prior to 24 March 1636/7.

It seems clear that Roger Williams first surveyed and selected the land which became Providence, Rhode Island after planting his first crop at Seekonk but before 20 April 1636. The actual date upon which Williams founded Providence became important only after the fact. It would have been immaterial—and perhaps unknown—to William Arnold. Nor would Williams himself have considered the date he first landed at Providence as particularly memorable. Unlike most famous founders, Roger Williams had no intention of claiming land in the name of the Crown.

**Documentation of the Traditional Founding of Providence**

The assumption that Providence was founded after it was too late to plant at the new location is therefore incorrect. There are other questionable aspects of the founding of Providence as presently portrayed on the city seal. Early Rhode Island historians offer significant evidence that Williams made an exploratory trip to Providence in advance of his permanent move there.

Governor Stephen Hopkins (1707-1785), Providence's first serious historian, was convinced that Roger Williams first paddled over to Providence in the company of only one person: Thomas Angell. It is generally thought that Angell is the youth to whom Williams referred when he recalled, in his 1677 letter, "a lad of Rich. Watermans."31

Governor Hopkins32 had given up completing his *Historical Account of the Planting and Growth of Providence*33 by the time he resigned from the Continental Congress in 1776. Long before Governor Hopkins's death in 1785, Hopkins turned his extensive collections over to a younger historian, Senator Theodore Foster, and the two began to meet weekly to discuss the work.34 According to what Theodore Foster describes as "Foster Senator's deposition" of 6 June 1821:

In one of those interviews he told me that Thomas Angell, one of the first settlers and purchasers of Providence, when a young lad belonging to and living in the family of Roger Williams, the founder and afterwards the president of the state for some years, came with him, the said Williams, in a canoe down the Seekonk river on Mr. Williams' first visit to the Indians settled at Moshassuck (now Providence), in the former part of the same year in which Mr. Williams first came to settle with his family there; no other person except the said Thomas Angell, being then in company with him.35

Foster stated that Williams and Angell named What Cheer Cove because they were greeted by Indians with the words "What Cheer." He acknowledged that other versions of the "What Cheer" story place Williams and Angell in the company of four others on a later trip to this location,36 but concluded that, "There is every reason to consider this [i.e., the story quoted above] the true version of this interesting affair."37 Analyzing all available documents, historian Howard M. Chapin concurred:

It would seem probable that Roger Williams purchased from his friends, the sachems Canonicus and Miantonomi, the lands at Moshassuck [Providence] either on or shortly after his first visit there in company with Thomas Angell.38

Foster's final writing of this portion of the *History* begins: "When Roger Williams first came to Providence, he was accompanied only by a young domestic [illegible]39 of his family, named Thomas Angell..." 40

Thus, Roger Williams appears to have founded Providence in late March or early April 1636 when he landed at "Roger Williams Landing" and obtained the assent of the Narragansetts to occupy that land. Williams's own dating of the deed with the Indians as "the 24th of ... March, in ye second yeare of our plantation," and the subsequent information gathered by Hopkins and Foster support this account.

Williams may well have started transporting equipment and supplies41 across the river for the settlement of Providence before 20 April 1636, when his party and the Arnold family actually moved there. Williams's assertion that it took him "fourteen weeks" to arrive at Providence after he left Plymouth colony in early to mid-January, is consistent with Benedict Arnold's claim that he and his father arrived in Providence on April 20th. Williams's complaint of a "loss of a harvest" the year he founded Providence is presumed to refer solely to the crops he planted and abandoned at Seekonk, just before leaving that site, as Williams never complained of privation during the winter following his removal to Providence. Williams and his followers would have had ample time to plant a crop in Providence had they arrived in mid-April, and Williams himself never explicitly said he lost a harvest at Providence. Thus, when all the evidence is examined, it appears most likely that Roger Williams founded Providence nine to twelve weeks before the accepted date of June 20, 1636.

[The seal of the City of Providence]
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Marietta Donnelly Lee, Sussieretta Jones, “The Greatest Singer of Her Race,” 1868-1913 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2012). A comprehensive biography of Susie Rotier Jones who was born in Virginia and moved to Providence with her family when she was a girl. Jones trained in Providence and Boston and launched her career singing in churches on Providence's East Side. During some thirty years, the classically-trained Jones performed on stage both in the U.S. and abroad. She retired to Rhode Island in 1915.

Bruce G. MacGuigile (with an introduction by Cherry Bamberg, FASG), Regimental Book, Rhode Island Regiment for 1781 (Rhode Island Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, 2011). A meticulous transcription of the “regimental book” of the First Rhode Island Regiment, which fought in the Revolutionary War. The regiment was the first unit in the Continental Army to include free and formerly-enslaved African Americans. The regimental book includes names, birthplaces, towns, soldiers’ physical characteristics, occupations, records of enlistments and other details.

History Press of Charleston, S.C. has recently published a number of Rhode Island titles including: North Providence: A History and the People Who Shaped It, by Paul F. Caramci; Historic Taverns of Rhode Island, by Robert A. Geake; Rhode Island and the Civil War: Voices from the Ocean State, by Robert Grandchamp; Burning of the Gaspee: Revolution in Rhode Island, by Rory Raven; and The Quest for America’s Cup: Sailing to Victory, by Richard V. Simpson.