

THE LANDMARKS
OF
FREEMASONRY



By
CHARLES CLYDE HUNT
Grand Secretary
GRAND LODGE OF IOWA, A. F. & A. M.

Printed by
LAURANCE PRESS COMPANY
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA
1943
Price 50c per Copy

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

I once visited an optician to have my eyes tested for a new pair of eye glasses. I offered him the glasses I was then wearing as a guide, but he declined, saying, "I will look at them later. I prefer to make an independent examination first." I have thought of that remark many times since when I have found myself being led astray by relying on the work of other students instead of making an independent investigation. Such is the case with the subject of the present paper. I have made statements on the subject, based on the writings of other students, which I now believe, after making an independent investigation, to have been erroneous.

In making such an investigation we should first consider the meaning of the term "landmark" independent of its connection with Freemasonry, and then consider its Masonic application.

The best source of information about the meaning of words is to be found in the una-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

bridged dictionaries, and I have therefore consulted the four best known and recognized English authorities as to the meaning of the word "landmark."

I found that all four agree in holding that a landmark is:

1. A fixed object serving as a boundary mark to a tract of land.

2. A familiar or prominent object in a landscape serving as a guide to a locality.

3. Figuratively, any event, characteristic, or modification, which marks a turning point; something that serves to distinguish a particular period of time or point in progress or transition. Illustration given by the Century Dictionary: "The close of the Crimean War is a great landmark in the reign of Queen Victoria."

I will hereafter refer to these definitions by number.

Let us now see how universal is the conception of a landmark and how well the three dictionary definitions, especially the first, agree with this universal conception.

Biblical References

The following quotations from the Bible illustrate the use of the word as given in the first definition:

INTRODUCTORY

Deut. 19:14. "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmark, which they of old time have set, in thine inheritance which thou shalt inherit, in the land that Jehovah thy God giveth thee to possess it."

Deut. 27:17. "Cursed be he that removeth his neighbor's landmark."

Job 24:2. "There are that remove the landmarks. They violently take away flocks, and feed them."

Prov. 22:28. "Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set."

Prov. 23:10. "Remove not the ancient landmark; and enter not the field of the fatherless."

Eccl. 10:8-9. "He that diggeth a pit shall fall into it; and whoso breaketh a hedge, a serpent shall bite him. Whoso removeth stones shall be hurt therewith; and he that cleaveth wood shall be hurt thereby."

This old saying, attributed to Solomon, refers to the remover of landmarks. It means that he who digs a pit to change the course of a border stream, or breaks down a hedge to destroy a landmark, or removes stones or splits the posts which define boundaries, shall be fittingly punished. In this case the words are figurative and refer to the metes and bounds of our duties to God, our neighbor, and ourselves. If we lay a trap for our brother we will be caught in it; if

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

we try to break out of the hedge which keeps our passions within due bounds, the serpent of retribution will bite us. If we remove the stones which define our respective duties, those very stones will harm us; and if we attempt to chop up the posts which keep out evil thoughts, we "shall be hurt thereby." As Solomon said, "I have seen servants upon horses and princes walking as servants" (Eccl. 10:7), "but justice and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne" (Ps. 89:14).

Literary References

The following quotations from literature show that the word also has a symbolical meaning:

"His eyes he opened, and beheld a field. . . . In the midst an altar as the landmark stood." Milton, "Paradise Lost," Book XI, line 432.

"Forever and forever thou shalt be to some the gravestone of a dead delight, to some the landmark of a new domain." Longfellow, "A Summer Day."

"All books are homilies by time; they are Temples at once and Landmarks." Bulwer Lytton, "The Soul of Books."

"Life hath set no landmarks before us." Owen Meredith, "Lucile," Part II, canto I, st. 5.

"May we not too hastily displace the ancient termini or remove the landmarks of virtue and vice." (Written 1652 A. D.)

INTRODUCTORY

From these quotations it would seem that even in its symbolic sense a landmark is something that marks a boundary line between two things.

Among primitive peoples, and modern too for that matter, boundary lines were frequent subjects of disputes; hence there has always been a necessity for a means to accurately determine the correct limits of a tract of land, whether that land belonged to nations, tribes, or individuals. As we shall see the landmarks which determine the boundary line between nations are often natural objects, as a river or mountains. Lacking a natural object carved pillars or monuments are used, while trees, boulders, etc., may determine the line between individual holdings. In either case the landmark was sacred to certain divinities who punished the person who wrongfully removed it.

This idea of a landmark being sacred to a divine being was very widespread and shows that in all recorded time and all over the world private ownership of property was considered to have divine sanction, and the objects which designated the boundaries of each tract were looked upon as sacred and not to be moved. Let

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

us see how widespread this idea was and consider the variety of objects used as landmarks.

Use Among Primitive Tribes

Australian tribes had each a well-defined tract marked off by various objects, such as bushes with branches broken and left hanging, a felled tree, etc.

In Fiji, gardens were sometimes planted on the boundary line, and to appropriate another man's tract by removing the landmark was a crime.

In Samoa the boundary marks were pathways, stones, rivers, and trenches. Quarrels had to be settled at the boundary.

In Tahiti carved images were placed at the boundary line as landmarks.

In New Zealand the landmarks were stones over which incantations had been said. To remove them was a sacrilege punishable with death. The hunting area was marked off by streams, trees, rocks, posts, etc. Also, fields were divided by hedges, fences, or walls of unhewn stone.

In Africa likewise boundaries were sacred and marked off by landmarks of various kinds.

In Oran heaps of stones marked the tribal frontiers where disputes were settled under oaths

INTRODUCTORY

taken there by the disputants. Family tracts were marked out by trees and stones as landmarks.

Among some of the tribes, pathways, trees, streams, stones, etc., are used as landmarks to mark the boundary lines between parcels of land. Among other tribes, heaps of earth in which trees are planted mark such boundaries. Other landmarks to mark boundary lines are mounds of earth and leaves, trees planted in line, hedges, stones, ditches, etc., all of which were considered sacred and their removal or destruction prohibited.

Among the North American Indians tribal boundaries were marked by rivers, lakes, mountains, trees, stones, etc. The same is true of the South American Indians.

In India similar landmarks are used as well as a cow path, all of which are sacred and subject to the curse, "May the man who destroys a boundary, a cow path, or a ditch have his lands sown by others, or may they lie waste." Among the Abors the boundaries are marked by upright stones; the Bhils use fences of boughs and bamboo; the Kandhs use stones set up in the presence of patriarchs, all of which are considered sacred and may not be removed.

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

Some years ago George Smith of the British Museum, while excavating in Assyria, discovered a stone tablet of date about 1320 B. C. The inscription on this tablet freely translated read:

“If a ruler, or eunuch, or citizen, shall destroy the memorial stone of this ground, or shall place it where it cannot be seen; if a brother, or an evil one, or an enemy, or the son of the owner, or any other person shall act falsely and destroy it, or throw it into water or fire, or take it from the land and send it away; may the gods Ann, Bell and Hea, Ninip and Gula and all the gods whose emblems are seen on this tablet destroy his name with violence. May they curse him with an unmitigated curse, and may they bring calamity on him. May his seed be swept away in evil and not good, and in the day he departs from life may Shamas and Merodock tear him asunder and may none mourn for him.”

This stone was about three feet high and seems to have been a landmark, defining the boundary of a field presented by the King to one of his subjects who had rendered him a service. The inscription shows the sacredness attached to the landmark and the curse invoked on anyone who removed it.

INTRODUCTORY

Use Among More Cultured Tribes

Among tribes of a higher culture similar landmarks were used and were likewise considered sacred and their removal a crime. They said the gods "hate those who falsify boundaries and weights." One who had met with misfortune or disease was thought to be suffering for his sins, and in order to discover the cause inquiries were made as follows: "Has he not fixed a just boundary? Has he fixed a false boundary? Has he removed a boundary? Etc."

In India, besides the instances cited above, we have evidence from their law books that boundary lines were to be marked by such objects as trees of a specified kind, i.e., one person's landmarks might be kola trees, another a tree of a different kind, etc.; also ant-hills, other hills, artificial mounds, gardens, cisterns, wells, tanks, dikes, thickets, roads, temples, etc. The destroyer of a landmark was to be punished.

In Egypt the annual overflowing of the Nile obliterated boundary lines and the principles of Geometry were used to restore them. However, it was necessary to have permanent stationary objects as fixed points of reference, as does the surveyor of the present day. For this purpose boundary stones were set up on which were in-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

scribed the name of the owner and other details needed to determine the limits of his property. Such stones were given a name which, once given, was never changed. In the Book of the Dead is the declaration, "I have not falsified the cubit of land."

In early Greece heaps of stones, or erect stones, were set up to mark paths as well as boundary lines. Plutarch says that Theseus placed a pillar between Peloponnesos and Attica, on one side of which was inscribed: "This is not Peloponnesos but Ionia," and on the other: "This is Peloponnesos not Ionia." Plato says: "One should be more willing to move the largest rock which is not a landmark than the least stone which is the sworn mark of friendship and hatred between neighbors."

Notwithstanding the fact that the right of private ownership was universally recognized, it was not considered the ideal condition of life. It was recognized as necessary because people are selfish and will take the advantage of others if they can. In the dim past of unrecorded history we find legends of a "golden age" when all property was held in common and there was no need for landmarks. Such was the case in ancient Rome for instance, but the golden age came to

INTRODUCTORY

an end long before the dawn of Roman history and it was still in the legendary time when we are told that Numa prescribed the first law regarding landmarks. Thus we find that even the gods recognized the fact that laws cannot create or keep ideal conditions in a selfish world; therefore the law, "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmarks," was a Divine Command. Stones, sacred to Jupiter, were to mark the boundaries of property, and yearly sacrifices were offered to them. Anyone who removed the landmark might be slain without any guilt being ascribed to the slayer. Curses were sometimes inscribed on landmarks against whoever might remove them. J. A. MacCulloch, who has given this subject considerable study, says:

Besides marking private lands, boundary-stones also marked the limits of territories, public lands, etc. In later times the removing of landmarks was punished by a fine of 5000 sesterces, and any one could lay the accusation. Hadrian enacted banishment for persons of higher degree, and for those of lower degree forced labour for two or three years. Fearful curses had already been pronounced by the Etruscans against the remover of landmarks. The gods punished him by wasting disease, ruined crops, extinction of his family, etc.

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

Among the Teutons MacCulloch says:

Both stones and trees forming landmarks were sacred. Even to break a twig off the latter was not permissible, and right down through the Middle Ages very severe and cruel punishments were meted out to those who removed a landmark. In folk-belief, ghosts wandering through the fields or the Jack O'Lantern were thought to be the spirits of those who had committed this crime or who had made false measurements of land.

And among the Celts:

The Brehon Laws define a large variety of boundary-marks — e.g., stones of worship, memorial stones, trees, stakes, mounds, ditches, rivers, lakes, wells, and roads — and give details of the fines for unlawful possession of lands. In Wales the laws speak of the three “stays of boundaries”—privilege, proprietary title, and prior occupancy — but elsewhere principal waters, a lawful **randir**, and a dwelling. Three things preserve a memorial of lands and stand as witness—a fireback stone, stones of a kiln, and a mounting stone, because the mark of the kindred remains on them. An action for theft arises against the man who removes these, a forfeit of life attaching to all who destroy a strong testimony. Trees, stones, ditches, and rivers are also mentioned as marks. A fine is levied against any one who ploughs up a ditch or removes a stone cross, or timber, or anything else preserving a boundary, and

INTRODUCTORY

he must restore it to its former state. In disputes the church fixes the boundary to the court, the court to the country, and, in cases of lands belonging to those co-equal in privilege, the oldest men are to assign the boundary after inquiry of witnesses. The judge and the king in such cases receive fees.

Other Applications

A textbook published in 1627 says, "A landmark is any mountain, rock, church, windmill or the like." In other words the object is immaterial provided it serves the purpose of designating and determining the limits of a piece of property. Job uses the word in a figurative sense when he speaks of stealing flocks as an act of removing landmarks.

There is a "Landmarks Club" in California which was organized in 1895 to preserve the monuments and historic landmarks of that state. Among the objects which it seeks to preserve as ancient landmarks of California are the Indian and early Spanish remains in that state.

Summary

Thus among primitive people we found various objects used as landmarks such as trees, a felled tree, hedges, bushes with broken branches left hanging, thickets, trees in line, trees of a

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

specified kind, posts, pillars, ditches, trenches, rivers, streams, lakes, wells, cisterns, stones, heaps of stones, carved images, cow paths, pathways, roads, hills, heaps of earth, gardens, mountains, tanks, temples, etc. The particular object in itself was of little importance if it performed the purpose for which it was set up, namely, to determine the boundaries of a tract of land.

It would therefore seem that the primary meaning of "landmark" is the first one given by the dictionaries quoted above, and from this primary definition the others are derived. The ancients also used the word in a figurative sense, for among primitive peoples we find landmarks were also used:

1. To mark a shrine of worship.
2. To mark a burial place.
3. To mark a great event.
4. To denote a meeting place.
5. For monuments of all kinds, including temples, churches, etc.

Such landmarks are striking objects standing out conspicuously from the surrounding landscape as a guide to travelers.

Is it not evident from all this that the value of the object used as a landmark lies in the

INTRODUCTORY

purpose it serves, not in the thing itself? Anything that serves to determine the boundary line between two pieces of property may be used for a landmark, and the **value** and qualities of the properties do not depend on the objects used as landmarks.

CHAPTER II

EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

In the preceding chapter we stated facts about the ancient landmarks of primitive peoples with no attempt to draw Masonic conclusions therefrom.

Now let us see what we know or can find out regarding Masonic landmarks.

First we find that the Old Masonic Manuscripts do not use the term "landmark" at all. The first mention of it Masonically is in Payne's Regulations adopted by the Grand Lodge of England in 1721, where we find in the 39th Regulation: "Every annual Grand Lodge has an inherent power and authority to make new Regulations, or to alter these, for the real benefit of the Fraternity, Provided always that **the old Landmarks be carefully preserved.**" This statement was accepted as correct by the other Grand Lodges in the British Isles. There was no attempt to define a landmark at that time, the implication being that the term was then well

EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

understood and a definition unnecessary. The statement of Payne to the effect that a Grand Lodge had an inherent power to adopt regulations "provided always that the old landmarks be carefully preserved" met universal acceptance among Masons. They seem to have understood what the word meant, for no explanation of the meaning of the term was asked for or given. If the meaning was then obscure, as it seems to be at the present time, why was the regulation so generally accepted without question throughout the Masonic world?

I judge that since the General Regulations of each of the early Grand Lodges in Great Britain use the term "landmark" with no attempt to define it, they all used it in the commonly accepted sense of the word. (See definitions in Chapter I.)

I believe there is a close parallel between these definitions and those of Freemasonry. Therefore I would define a Masonic landmark as:

1. A fixed trait or characteristic which serves as a boundary mark to the Fraternity, distinguishing it from some other organization, as the application of the rules of operative masonry to character building.

2. A familiar feature generally associated

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

with Freemasonry, as, the emblem of the square and compass, or a building, monument, or other object marking the place where an important Masonic event occurred.

3. Any event, characteristic, or modification which marks a turning point, etc., as the organization of the Grand Lodge of England in 1717 is a great landmark in the history of Freemasonry.

(a) The purpose of a landmark (Masonic or otherwise) is to (1) mark a boundary line, (2) designate a locality, or (3) mark a turning point in history.

(b) It must not only have a location of its own, but also be so located as to determine the location of something else, and this fact must be generally recognized. Such recognition is a necessary element in making it a landmark, and the longer it exists as such the more sacred it becomes. Hence the regulation regarding "the old landmarks."

(c) It is not necessary that a landmark have legal sanction. The fact that it is generally recognized as a landmark makes it such. Hence it is not itself a law nor dependent on enacted law, although a law may be enacted which gives official recognition to an established fact.

EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

(d) The character of the object used as a landmark is independent of that of the properties whose limits it determines. It may give no information regarding the soil, what crops it will produce or the uses to which the properties will be put. However, the character of the soil may in itself assume the character of a landmark, if it serves to distinguish between two adjoining pieces of property. In such a case we must distinguish between the inherent character of the soil itself and those traits which cause it to function as a landmark.

(e) When we apply the idea of a landmark to human societies, the limits or boundaries of such societies may lie in the internal characteristics which differentiate them, but they also apply to external things such as badges, a characteristic form of dress, certain words or forms of speech peculiar to that particular society, etc.

Masonic Application

The proviso of Payne's 39th Regulation may be likened to that of any society which should acknowledge that it had no power to change the essential nature of the society. Thus, if some men should organize a baseball club, they might adopt the following regulation:

“This club has the power to adopt new regu-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

lations, or to alter these for the best interests of the club, provided always that the characteristics (landmarks) of a baseball club be carefully preserved." It would mean that all laws adopted by the club must be consistent with its character as a baseball club. Any law adopted by the club which was inconsistent with its character as a baseball club would change its nature so that it would no longer be recognized as such a club. Again let us suppose this baseball club should adopt laws, none of which were inconsistent with its professed character as such a club, but should never play the game or take any interest in the game. Could it rightfully claim to be a baseball club and would other clubs recognize it as such? The determining factors are facts and characters, not laws. The characteristics which make it a baseball club are not its laws and would exist even if no laws at all were adopted. Also, regardless of its laws, it would not be such a club if it lacked the necessary characteristics. Similarly the landmarks of Masonry are the traits in which it differs from other societies. They are not its laws, although its laws must be consistent with its character or landmarks. The **Ancient** Landmarks are in a class by themselves. They are the characteristics of Freemasonry

EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

which existed in pre-historic Masonic times. They may be likened to the racial characteristic of humanity. In the dawn of human history we find there existed certain races, for instance the Caucasian, to which we belong. This race is often called the white race from the color of the skin of those who belong to it. There are other characteristics by which it is known, which are analogous to the Ancient Landmarks of Freemasonry. These characteristics have existed in that race from time immemorial, and one who does not possess them is not a member of the race. By what process of evolution they came into existence we do not know, but they never were **adopted** as laws or rules of action. They are simply the characteristics of the Caucasian race, and have been so preserved through the ages.

We **preserve** things, objects, etc.; we **obey** laws. Objects may be removed or destroyed; laws may be enacted or repealed. The enactment of a law which required the removal of a landmark would violate Payne's Regulation. The early references to landmarks never speak of their **enactment** or **repeal**, but of their preservation or infringement, of **deviating** from or **reverting** to them. Such terms are not applicable to laws, and I believe Mackey led the Masonic

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

world astray when he speaks of the **enactment** of the landmarks and says they cannot be **repealed**.

When Payne's Regulation was adopted the Grand Lodge of London was only four years old; yet the Masons of that time looked upon their landmarks as "old" and their Fraternity "ancient." They believed that in organizing the Grand Lodge they had **revived** the General Assembly. They also believed that it was obligatory on them and on all Masons to **preserve** the things they called the "old landmarks." The obligation to preserve the landmarks is a law but the **thing** to be preserved is not. The eighteenth century Grand Lodges seem to have known what the term meant and did not think it necessary to define it.

A landmark in the ordinary sense has reference to location, but when applied to human societies the character of the society must be known if we would distinguish it from other societies. Therefore, before applying the term to Masonry we must know what kind of an organization we have.

The word "masonry," according to the dictionary, means "The art or work of constructing, as buildings, walls, etc., with regularly arranged stones or bricks." It joins unorganized material

EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

into an organized body. As Freemasons we symbolically apply the term to moral building. Man is both a material and a moral builder. As Freemasons we apply material terms to spiritual ideals. We make the material serve the spiritual and work to make the ideal real. The Great Architect of the Universe has given us a Trestle Board on which He has drawn the design for a spiritual temple we are to build, and in building this temple the stones of human life must submit to the Divine gavel, the rough corners must be knocked off, and the stones squared and shaped for their respective places in the building. As Brother A. S. MacBride says:

“The grand ideal of Masonry, to which all the rest are subsidiary and contributory, is that which represents the soul of man as a Holy Temple and dwelling place for The Most High. This ideal has, no doubt, been expressed by poets, prophets, and philosophers, but in Masonry only has it been made the basis of an organization, having a system of instruction, as unique in form as it is rare in history.

“The mission of the gunshot is death and destruction; of the rocket-line, life and preservation; of the University, knowledge; of the Church, salvation; of Masonry, the building of the Ideal Temple.”

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

Therefore, the nature of Masonry, as well as its mission and ideals must be kept in mind if we would recognize and understand its ancient landmarks. This point will be discussed more fully in a future chapter. Meanwhile let us consider the views of some early English Masons.

Views of Early Masonic Authorities

Preston in his **Illustrations of Masonry** published in 1772 gives as part of an old Masonic charge, "Our ancient landmarks you are carefully to preserve, and never to suffer any infringement of them; or, on any pretence, to countenance deviations from the established usages and customs of the Order."

Also, every Master at his installation agrees that it is not in the power of any man or body of men to make innovations in the body of Masonry.

These instructions are still found in our present-day ceremonies, but no definition or list of landmarks is there given.

The Grand Lodges of Ireland and Scotland claimed that the Grand Lodge of England had failed to preserve the Ancient Landmarks and another Grand Lodge was organized in England by some Irish Masons residing in London.

EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

This Grand Lodge was called "Ancient" because it claimed to preserve the "ancient landmarks." This later Grand Lodge was recognized as the genuine Grand Lodge of England by the Grand Lodges of Ireland and Scotland. The Grand Lodge organized in 1717 was called "Moderns" and was accused of making innovations in Freemasonry. Therefore, a study of the differences between the "Ancients" and "Moderns" may give us a hint as to what the former considered "landmarks," although they made no attempt to define or list them. The Grand Lodge (Moderns) practically admitted the charge of having deviated from the Ancient Landmarks when on April 12, 1809, it adopted the following resolution:

That this Grand Lodge do agree in opinion with the Committee of Charity that it is not necessary any longer to continue those measures which were resorted to . . . respecting Irregular Masons, and do therefore enjoin the several lodges to **revert to the ancient Landmarks** of the Society.

As a result a warrant was issued for a "Lodge of Promulgation" whose duty it was to ascertain and promulgate "the Ancient Landmarks of the Craft." The minutes of this lodge show that the landmarks it was to promulgate were ritualistic. The members were sworn to secrecy re-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

garding the Ritual and there are many blanks in their minutes, but the following quotations will indicate their nature:

December 8th, 1809. The Lodge was opened in due form according to ancient practice. "Read sundry passages in the book of Constitutions touching the Ancient Forms, and proceeded to a critical investigation and ascertainment of the Ancient Landmarks restricted to the first Degree, and the several particulars respecting the mode of placing the three Great Lights, seating the Wardens, and opening the Lodge in the First Degree, rehearsing the Ancient Charges at Opening . . . and the several particulars respecting seating the Wardens and opening the Lodge. . . . The forms of preparation, admission, . . . and otherwise conducting the Candidates through the Ceremony of Initiation in the first Degree; the Ceremony of Inviting the Brethren to and calling them from Refreshment. . . . After which the Ceremony of rehearsing the Ancient Charges before closing was recognized and resolved on which several arrangements, forms and ceremonies were approved and Resolved to be adopted for the future conduct of the Craft. And the Lodge was closed in Ancient form."

December 13th, 1809. Minutes of the last Lodge read, corrected and confirmed, "Resolved that Deacons (being proved on due investigation to be not only Ancient but useful and necessary officers) be recommended."

EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

December 29th, 1809. Bro. Joyce as Senior and Bro. Carr as Junior Deacons were appointed by the R. W. M.

Determined the situation of the Deacons.

January 5th, 1810. Resolved that the situation of the # be on the right hand of the Master.

“The situation of Officers . . . as well as the utility and the Antiquity of the appointment of Deacons” was explained as to the Masters of Town Lodges on the 26th of the same month, and approved.

1810, January 5th. Bro. Valentine described the Ancient practice in opening the Lodge, and the ceremonial work of the first and second Degrees. And it was resolved that the variations from the practice before explained do not relate to essentials, or require any alteration in the arrangements previously determined on except in apparently trifling matters of detail.

January 23rd, 1810. Amongst various points for explanation to the assembled Masters of Lodges were named,

• “Wardens, Junior in the South.”

“Stewards and their Duties, not as Officers, but appendages.”

“The preparation of the Candidate is then described, and he is then received by the Junior Deacon, and after the Invocation, the Senior Deacon takes charge of the Candidate, and conducts him through the ceremony of Initiation.”

#Left blank. Probably Senior Deacon is meant.

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

October 19th, 1810. “Resolved that it appears to this Lodge that the ceremony of Installation of Masters of Lodges is one of the two Landmarks of the Craft and ought to be observed.”

Early Conceptions of Ancient Landmarks

From the proceedings of the Lodge of Promulgation we may infer that the following were then considered Ancient Landmarks:

1. The form of the Lodge.
2. Its Officers and their Duties.
3. The Ritualistic Ceremonies.
4. The Installation Ceremony.

We may accept this list as correct, provided we do not consider it exclusive. There are other landmarks, some of which may be older than the four named.

It should be noted that all of these landmarks are Masonic characteristics. Whenever seen they are recognized as Masonic and belonging to Freemasonry. In spite of all the differences in the Rituals of different jurisdictions, a Mason who sees the degrees conferred will recognize them as Masonic. When people claim that certain things or traits are not uniform throughout the world they forget that changes and differences in nonessentials are to be expected. No two human beings are alike, but each one has

EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

certain characteristics by which he is recognized as a human being. There have been great changes in Masonry since the Regius MS. was copied about 1390 A. D., but it had certain characteristics, landmarks if you will, by which an antiquarian, a non-Mason, recognized it as a Masonic document. It was cataloged in the British Museum as "A Treaty on Moral Duties," and it was not until one who, though not himself a Freemason, knew the characteristics of Freemasonry, in reading the manuscript, recognized it as a Masonic document. In 1390 as well as now, Masonry had certain characteristics or landmarks by which it could be recognized as distinct from other organizations, even by one who did not belong to the Fraternity.

It should also be noted that the Lodge of Promulgation from whose minutes we have quoted was under the Moderns, which had been accused of removing the Ancient Landmarks, and its proceedings were preliminary to the union of the two Grand Lodges in 1813.

The reference in the minutes of October 19, 1810, namely, the "Ceremony of Installation of Masters of Lodges is one of the **two** Landmarks of the Craft," has given rise to much discussion as to what the other landmark might be. It is

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

the only place in the minutes where a landmark is named as such, but remarks in other parts of the minutes imply that there were more than two and this reference is probably an error. There are several manifest clerical errors in these minutes, and some brethren suggest that a clerk in copying misread "true" for "two" and that the reading should be "one of the true landmarks." At any rate, the Ancients claimed that the ceremony of installation was a true landmark which the Moderns had removed. The latter finally admitted their error in this and in some other respects and paved the way for the two bodies to unite. In fact, the "Act of Union" by which this was accomplished practically conceded all the points for which the Ancients had contended, but this concession was not sufficient to satisfy the Grand Lodges of Scotland and Ireland. Therefore, in the minds of the British Masons of that time a landmark was a Masonic characteristic which no lodge, Grand Lodge, or group of lodges or Grand Lodges could change. Any attempt to do so would cause them to lose their standing as **Masons**. This is shown by the action of an International Conference which was held in London in June and July, 1814. The following quotations from the minutes of this conference are suggestive:

EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

The Assembly was opened by reading the Minutes of the Grand Lodges of Ireland and Scotland, appointing the deputations, and the correspondence of the Three GRAND LODGES on the same, together with the ARTICLES OF THE UNION, in which it is earnestly desired that this correspondence, uniformity, and communion should take place. Upon a strict Masonic examination on matters which can neither be written nor described, it was ascertained that the THREE GRAND LODGES were perfectly in unison in all the great and essential points of the Mystery and Craft, according to the immemorial traditions and uninterrupted usage of Ancient Masons, and they recognized this unity in a fraternal manner.

Does not this indicate that, in the opinion of the Grand Lodges of England, Scotland and Ireland in 1814, "the great and essential points of the Mystery and Craft," were Ancient Landmarks of the Craft?

Resolutions Adopted

The record states that the following resolutions were adopted unanimously:

1st. It is declared and pronounced that pure Ancient Masonry consists of three Degrees, and no more, viz:—those of the Entered Apprentice, the Fellow Craft, and the Master Mason, including the Supreme Chapter of the Holy Royal Arch.

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

2nd. That a constant fraternal intercourse, correspondence, and communion be forever maintained on the principles which were recognized in 1772 between the THREE GRAND LODGES of England, Ireland, and Scotland. That the proceedings of each GRAND LODGE be regularly transmitted to one another (where the same be communicated by writing, or otherwise, be made known by special mission), so that they may all examine, discuss, and concur in such resolutions as may be judged essential to the security and welfare of the Craft.

3rd. That as the Eternal Truths upon which Masonry was originally founded (and which have given it a duration beyond all written record), can neither be changed nor improved, it is the solemn determination of the THREE GRAND LODGES of England, Ireland, and Scotland, by a strict and sacred adherence to the simplicity, purity, and order of the Ancient Traditions and Principles, to entitle the Fraternity in the United Kingdom to the continued protection of every wise and enlightened Government.

* * * * *

6th. That it being of vital importance to the well-being of the Craft that the Ancient Rules for the initiation of members be most strictly and peremptorily observed, not only as to the moral character of the Individuals to be admitted, but as to their knowledge in their gradual advancement, it is Resolved that the

EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

THREE GRAND LODGES shall in their circular communications, with their respective Lodges, enjoin the necessity of conforming to these Rules, and that upon no occasion, and under no pretext of emergency, shall they be departed from, except by special dispensation from the Grand Masters respectively.

7th. . . . the undersigned call upon the Brethren to attend most particularly to these Resolutions, the importance of which must be evident to the Fraternity in general, who from motives of attachment to the welfare of the Craft at large, as well as to the value necessarily entertained to each individual Brother in regard to his own private character, are interested that it should be known all over the surface of the inhabited Globe, that their principles, absolutely discountenancing in all their meetings every question that could have the remotest tendency to excite controversy in matters of religion, or any political discussion whatever, have no other object in view but the encouraging and furthering of every moral and virtuous sentiment, as also, of nurturing most particularly the warmest calls of Universal Benevolence and Mutual Charity one towards another.

The allusion in the second resolution to the principles recognized in 1772 by the **three** Grand Lodges of England, Ireland, and Scotland is significant in that the Grand Lodge of England

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

there mentioned was the Ancients, **not** the Moderns.

I have now recited all the **official** acts of the British Grand Lodges regarding the nature of the landmarks which I have been able to find. It was not until many years later that attempts were made to list them, and then it was in America, and by individuals.

First Publication of Lists of Landmarks

There is some uncertainty as to when and by whom the first list of Masonic landmarks was made. It has been stated that Mackey compiled a list in 1855, but if so it was not published until 1859. Rob Morris gave a list in his "Code of Masonic Law," published in 1856. Probably the honor belongs to the Grand Lodge of Minnesota.

In January 1855 a new Constitution was proposed in the Grand Lodge of Minnesota, which was adopted at the annual communication in January 1856. Section 8 of this Constitution listed twenty-six items which were "enumerated as among the Ancient Constitutions, having the force of Ancient Landmarks of the Fraternity, having as such been generally received and acknowledged by Masons."

Mackey and Morris each published a list

EARLY CONCEPTIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

about the same time. Thus we see that almost simultaneously three different lists of so-called Masonic landmarks were published in this country. This fact proves that the subject was considered very important at that time, as it has been ever since. The topic is indeed important, and it seems too bad that these lists treat a landmark as an unrepealable law and that Masonic writers have followed in the way thus marked out. So far as I can learn, this was the first time that Masonic landmarks were defined as laws instead of traits or characteristics. You can neither enact nor repeal the stone which marks the boundary line of a tract of land. Neither can you enact or repeal the characteristics which determine a Masonic body. The body might change its nature, in which case it would no longer be Masonic. Therefore, we have the regulation that every Masonic body, in adopting laws for its government, must **preserve** the Ancient Landmarks—in other words, retain its Masonic character.

As we consult the history and literature of the Craft prior to 1855 we can find nothing to justify the conclusion that a landmark is a law.

A landmark is an identifying object or characteristic and it need not be ancient as we shall

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

see when we continue the discussion in chapters to follow.

Mackey presents neither argument nor facts to sustain his assertion, but his was a name to conjure with and his authority was generally accepted. His statements were so often repeated that the mere repetition and the persistence of the declarations by so many people took the place of argument and ignored the facts of both history and tradition.

However, we must not forget that Mackey's list of landmarks have a very close connection with Masonic fundamental law and usage, and we owe him a great debt of gratitude. If he had considered landmarks as characteristics instead of laws, there would be little to criticize. A law is specific and definite while a characteristic admits of many variations. A law admits of no exceptions not explicitly stated in the law itself, but a characteristic may be recognized as such under many forms, just as we recognize a human being though no two are exactly alike. As an English writer expresses it, "The Masonic landmarks are clear in principle but vague in detail, and the very fact of definition and clear expressions would deprive them of their essential character. But in the U. S. A. it has been attempted."

CHAPTER III

ANCIENT AND MODERN

I do not understand why no one seems to have made a distinction between landmarks and the **ancient** landmarks. The phrase "Old Landmarks" or "Ancient Landmarks" is not peculiar to Freemasonry. It was used in the English language before the Norman conquest. The Regulation of the Grand Lodge of England adopted in 1721 refers to "the old landmarks" which are to be carefully preserved. Mackey laid down three requisites of a landmark, as follows:

1. Immemorial antiquity.
2. Universality.
3. Absolute irrevocability and immobility.

Landmarks which were **old** in 1721 and which must be preserved fulfill Mackey's first and third requisites of "immemorial antiquity" and "absolute immobility." However, "irrevocability" applies to a law or rule of action, not to an object like a landmark. The expression "an irrevocable stone, or other object" is meaningless. The act authorizing the placing of a stone in a certain place may be repealed or revoked, but the stone

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

itself is not a "rule of action," and the terms "enact" and "repeal" do not apply. Mackey's second requisite, "universality," needs explaining. If the owners of adjoining tracts of land agree to place a stone, for instance, on the boundary line as a landmark, it will be universally accepted as such, and in that sense a landmark may have universality, but it is not true that every stone is a landmark or that all landmarks are stones. The true test is, "Does it mark a boundary line? Is it a distinguishing characteristic, etc.?" Not, "Is it universal?" Very few of the so-called landmarks named in lists of Mackey or others are universally accepted as such. However, Mackey probably meant that a landmark is something that is always found wherever Masonry exists, and in that sense he is right, but traits which are universally found in Masonry may admit of variations, if they do not destroy the Masonic character of the institution. Thus a Plymouth Rock chicken has certain characteristics by which it is known wherever found, and yet no two of them may be exactly alike.

Mackey first defines landmarks as "those ancient and universal customs of the Order, which either gradually grew into operation as rules of action, or, if at once enacted by any competent

ANCIENT AND MODERN

authority, were enacted at a period so remote that no account of their origin is to be found in the records of history. Both the enactors and the time of the enactment have passed away from the record, and the landmarks are therefore of higher authority than memory or history can reach.”

Custom—Enactment

Notice how skillfully Mackey changes a custom into an enactment. The **custom** gradually grows into a **rule of action** and that into an **enactment** by competent authority. As a matter of fact a custom does not become a rule of action until by some means its observance becomes obligatory, and even then the obligation may not arise from an enactment. Thus it may become a custom for me to go from my home to my office by a particular one of several routes, but that custom is not a “rule of action” for I am under no obligation either to myself or anyone else to take that particular route. If, however, I should have an errand that required that route at any time there would be an obligation to take it, but even then it would not be the result of an enactment.

A custom to become a landmark must be a distinguishing one—one that is peculiar to the

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

class that observes it. If the class should adopt a law requiring its observance, and such a law was generally obeyed, there would be an apparent identity between the custom and the law. Nevertheless, there is a distinction which should not be forgotten. The custom and the law are not identical, and the custom, not the law, is the landmark. The fact that a particular class observes a certain custom which distinguishes it from other classes is the landmark, whether or not there is any law requiring its observance.

Mackey said a landmark :

. . . must have existed from time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. Its antiquity is an essential element. Were it possible for all the Masonic authorities at the present day to unite in one universal congress and with the most perfect unanimity to adopt any new regulation, although such regulation would while it remained unrepealed be obligatory on the whole Craft, yet it would not be a landmark. It would have the character of universality, it is true, but it would be wanting in that of antiquity.

As the congress to which I have just alluded would not have the power to enact a landmark, so neither would it have the prerogative of abolishing one. The landmarks of the order, like the laws of the Medes and the Persians, can suffer no change. What they

ANCIENT AND MODERN

were centuries ago, they still remain and must so continue in force till Masonry itself shall cease to exist.

He then lists his twenty-five landmarks.

Other writers following Mackey have made lists of their own, numbering from one to sixty or more so-called landmarks each, and it is significant that, while most of them criticize Mackey's **list**, they adopt his three **requisites**. It is therefore with much hesitation that I take issue with him on this point also. In no dictionary can I find such requisites applied to landmarks, and even among Masonic students they were not mentioned until Mackey stated them. Mackey's first requisite "immemorial antiquity" might apply to an "ancient landmark" but it certainly does not apply to **all** landmarks. I think his mistakes were made, for the most part, in identifying a "landmark" with a "law." A law is a **rule of action**, while a "landmark" is an **identifying object or characteristic**. A law may **sometimes** be a landmark in a figurative sense, but in general a landmark is a **stationary object**, not a "**rule of action**." To illustrate, "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmark" is a law, but the landmark itself is not. If the government should enact a law permitting a man to use his neighbor's land without that neighbor's consent, such law

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

would violate the Divine command. It would be a law that did not preserve the landmarks. Perhaps, technically, the landmark, or rather the object itself, was not removed, but such a law, if enforced, would render the object useless as a landmark. Therefore, the proviso of the 39th Regulation of the Grand Lodge of England was an acknowledgment of the fact that it had no power to make a law which changed the character of the Institution which their "fathers had set up." The Institution itself was not a law, and the characteristics which determined its nature were not laws or "rules of action." In a recent article I held that the use of the Bible in the lodge ceremonies was an Ancient Landmark. There might, or there might not, be a law requiring its use, but the landmark was the fact that the Bible itself was used, not the law requiring such use.

Mackey, in my opinion, makes a greater error in identifying the landmarks with the **unwritten law** of Masonry. He follows writers on civil law in dividing the subject into written and unwritten law, the written law being the enactments of Masonic Grand Bodies, and the unwritten law Masonic usage and customs. However, in both civil and Masonic law the written takes precedence of

ANCIENT AND MODERN

the unwritten law wherever the two are in conflict. Mackey, when he says "the unwritten laws or customs of Freemasonry constitute its landmarks," makes the written law yield precedence to the unwritten, a most illogical proceeding from a legal point of view, even if landmarks were laws instead of traits. According to the Constitution of the Grand Lodge of Iowa the Unwritten Law of Freemasonry consists of its time-honored customs and usages of general recognition, which are not repugnant to the written law. Wherever the written and unwritten law conflict the former governs. A landmark is a characteristic of the whole Fraternity and is no more subject to enacted laws than are the characteristics which distinguish one race of human beings from another. As stated in the preceding article, a law is something specific. It admits of no variation, while a trait or characteristic does. However, there is something about each of the so-called landmarks listed by Mackey and others, which very much resemble a true landmark. Any trait or characteristic which is peculiar to Freemasonry or even found in Freemasonry is in a sense a landmark, (though it may not be ancient) and most of the things listed by Mackey, et al, are closely associated with such traits, but

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

we must distinguish between the trait and the law enacted to preserve the trait or make it effective.

Definitions

Now let us, for a moment, forget Mackey and the other list makers and see what we may learn about Masonic landmarks from the meaning of the word "landmark" and the official acts of Grand Lodges.

Boiling down the definition of a landmark as given in the dictionary we may say that it is any object which identifies something, usually the boundary of a tract of land. Its value may not be inherent, but lies in the use to which it is put. Any object which serves the purpose of identifying a locality is a landmark, and when we considered landmarks among primitive peoples we found a great number of objects of many kinds were used. Apply Mackey's requisites to those objects and they seem incongruous, even silly. I do not restrict the term "object" to material things. I also use it in the sense of trait, characteristic, etc., and I would define Masonic landmarks as those characteristics which mark or distinguish Freemasonry from something else.

All Masons recognize the fact that Masonic

ANCIENT AND MODERN

landmarks, both ancient and modern, must be preserved, but that does not mean that one object used as a landmark may not sometimes be replaced by another and different kind of object. The command "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmark which the fathers have set up" in essence meant: "Thou shalt not change the boundary line of his land." As applied to Freemasonry it means, "Thou shalt not change the nature of the Institution." "But," you say, "Masonry is a progressive science and therefore must change." Yes, Masonry is progressive, it must grow if it is to live, but growth does not change fundamental characteristics. The child grows to manhood. "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child; now that I have become a man, I have put away childish things," said Paul; but both as child and man he was a human being and possessed an immortal soul. The human traits in the child were also in the man. The landmarks of humanity were not destroyed by growth.

The term "landmark" usually means the object which marks a boundary line, but it sometimes means a prominent characteristic of the land enclosed by the boundary. In Masonry, un-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

fortunately, it is used in both senses without discrimination. This may be one reason for the confusion as to its application.

A landmark may not be **on** the boundary line between two pieces of property. It is sufficient if in **some** way it determines that line or locates the property. Thus a stake or stone may mark the corner of a city block or subdivision. I may own a lot far removed from that stake or stone, but if the limits of my lot are determined by their distance and bearing from the stake or stone, that stake or stone is **my** landmark as well as of others whose property is also so determined. In such cases, however, the relation of each piece of property to the stake or stone is different, and it is that relation which makes it a landmark.

Standards of Recognition

Many Grand Lodges have adopted what they call "Standards of Recognition." The Grand Lodge of Iowa in its Constitution declares that a Grand Lodge has "an **inherent** power to form a constitution as its fundamental law and to prescribe such other laws and regulations for good government as its wisdom may direct; provided always that the **Ancient Landmarks** and usages of Freemasonry be maintained invio-

ANCIENT AND MODERN

late." Note that here, as in the 1721 Regulation of the Grand Lodge of England, it is only the **ancient** or **old** landmarks which are to be maintained. The words **adopt** or **repeal** are not used. The Grand Lodge of Iowa, like that of England, has never attempted to define or list the **Ancient** Landmarks, but it has adopted "Standards of Recognition," which will be considered later.

What are such "standards" if not landmarks? By these "standards" we determine for ourselves whether or not a body claiming to be Masonic is such in fact. They do not comply with Mackey's requisites, but they are none the less objects or characteristics which we use as standards or landmarks in the sense of being traits or characteristics by which we judge whether or not a body is Masonic.

When we consider the **Ancient** Landmarks, other considerations govern. When Grand Lodges confess that they have no power to enact laws which impair the **Ancient** Landmarks, they imply that the fundamental character of Freemasonry is permanent, that now as in the olden time there are traits which determine the Masonic character of an organization and that this character must be maintained. When we try to determine what those traits were and are, we must again, for a time, ignore Mackey.

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

The clericals who transcribed the Old Masonic Manuscripts were church men familiar with the Christian Bible, as were also those who compiled the Regulations adopted by the Grand Lodge of England in 1721. To them the command "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's Landmark, which they of old time have set" was applicable to Freemasonry. A Bible Dictionary defines a landmark as "an object, such as a stone, a heap of stones, or a tree with a mark in its bark, intended to fix the limit of a field, a farm, or the property of an individual. In Palestine these landmarks are scrupulously respected; and in passing along a road or pathway one may observe from time to time a stone placed by the edge of the field from which a shallow furrow has been ploughed, marking the limits of cultivation of neighboring proprietors." This indicates that the old Jewish law regarding landmarks is still observed in Palestine.

It is very probable that the Grand Lodge of England had the Biblical command in mind when it adopted the 39th Regulation. This command is: "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmark, which **they of old time have set**" (Deut. 19:14). "Remove not thy neighbor's landmark which **thy fathers have set**" (Prov.

ANCIENT AND MODERN

22:28). The new Grand Lodge asserted that it had **inherent** power to adopt Regulations “provided always that the **old landmarks** be carefully preserved.” In both cases it is not landmarks which they themselves have agreed upon, but “the old landmarks,” those which “they of old time have set,” the ones which “thy fathers have set.” In other words, the Masonic character of the Institution which our fathers set up is not to be changed.

The Hebrews, up to the time they settled in Palestine, had been a nomadic people, having no fixed place of abode and no ownership in the land they occupied. Their settlement in the “Land of Promise” changed all this. Fixed tenure of landed property was adopted. Each tribe, each clan, and each household was permanently settled upon some well-defined tract, and the estate passed through inheritance from father to son. Transferring ownership to a stranger was forbidden. “The Lord forbid it me, that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee” (I Kings 21:3), said Naboth to his king, Ahab, even though Ahab offered to give a better vineyard in exchange. The inheritance of his fathers might not be alienated, even though he profited thereby. If the owner became financially em-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

barrassed and obliged to sell, the next of kin had the right to buy or redeem, and in the year of Jubilee the land returned to the original owner. Also, the land belonging to one tribe might not be sold to another. "And every daughter, that possesseth an inheritance in any tribe of the children of Israel, shall be wife unto one of the family of the tribe of her father, that the children of Israel may possess every man the inheritance of his fathers. So shall no inheritance remove from one tribe to another tribe, for the tribes of the children of Israel shall cleave every one to his own inheritance" (Num. 36: 8, 9). The purpose in all this was to keep families and tribes together. "That my people be not scattered every man from his possession" (Ezek. 46:18).

Therefore, boundaries were permanent, and the removal of landmarks forbidden. Even the owners of adjacent properties were not permitted to agree upon such removal. This did not mean that one object serving as a landmark might not be replaced by another to serve the same purpose. The particular object, whether it be a stone, tree, mound, etc., was of no consequence, provided it determined the boundary line. The mound might be destroyed, the tree

ANCIENT AND MODERN

decay, etc., in which case it must be replaced by another. The command not to remove the landmark in reality meant not to change the boundary line.

The law of entail in England probably gave the English a better idea of the Biblical command than we have in America where property is constantly changing hands.

The English Ritual says, "Freemasonry is a peculiar system of morality veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols." It may be that this "peculiar system of morality" is one of the landmarks the Grand Lodge had in mind when it adopted the 39th Regulation.

In the next chapter we will consider the "installation ceremony" which all the Grand Lodges of England agreed was "an Ancient Landmark."

CHAPTER IV

THE INSTALLATION CEREMONY

At least one ceremony which was acknowledged to be an Ancient Landmark by both Ancients and Moderns is that of installing Masters of lodges. In view of the fact that it was so acknowledged, it seems strange that Mackey and the other list makers ignore it. Those who first used the term agreed that the installation ceremony is an Ancient Landmark. Certainly they had a better right to make the application than we of a later day have to dispute it. This ceremony is very ancient, and its charges and instructions are to be found in the Ancient Charges of the Craft. The Master, before he can assume his office, must receive certain instructions and assent to the charges. They are similar to the charges and instructions in the Old Charges which were agreed to by and given to the candidate when he was made a Mason. They are, however, of an advanced character, as we would expect in the case of a brother being advanced to the position of Master of his lodge.

THE INSTALLATION CEREMONY

Let me quote from the ceremony to illustrate this:

. . . By immemorial usage and the established landmarks of Freemasonry you are to be installed Master of this lodge, with powers and prerogatives which are of the highest importance and solemnity.

The office of Master is of great antiquity and honor, and is one of the highest positions to which a Mason can aspire. Its incumbent, to rule well, should possess and exemplify several important qualifications.

As a man, he should be of approved integrity and irreproachable morals; free from the domination of hasty temper and ill-governed passions, of good repute before the world, and practicing as an example to his brethren, the cardinal virtues of temperance, fortitude, prudence, and justice.

As a citizen, he should be loyal to his government, obedient to its laws, prompt in the duties he owes to society, and a pattern of fidelity in all social and domestic relations.

As a Mason, he should cling to the old landmarks, and be firmly opposed to their infringement; desirous to learn and apt to teach; prompt to aid and relieve, and ever mindful that, though elevated for a time above his fellows, he is elevated by them, and should therefore cultivate, everywhere and at all times, the golden tenets of brotherly love, relief, and truth.

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

As an officer, he should remember that he is an individual Mason, sharing in that respect a common lot with his brethren, and therefore interested in the welfare of each and all. He should cultivate the closest friendship with his brethren; be eager to take counsel and ready to give it; and wholly impartial.

* * *

My brother, previous to your investiture it is necessary that you signify your assent to those ancient charges and regulations which point out the duty of the Master of a lodge.

“You promise to be a good man, and true, and strictly to obey the moral law?”

“You promise to be a peaceable citizen, and cheerfully conform to the laws of the country in which you reside?”

“You promise not to be concerned in plots and conspiracies against the government, but patiently to submit to the law and constituted authorities?”

“You promise to pay a proper respect to the civil magistrates; to work diligently, live creditably, and act honorably by all men?”

“You promise to avoid private piques and quarrels, and to guard against intemperance and excess?”

“You promise to be cautious in your behavior, courteous to your brethren, and faithful to your lodge?”

“You promise to respect genuine brethren, and to discountenance imposters and all dissenters from the original plan of Freemasonry?”

THE INSTALLATION CEREMONY

“You promise to pay homage to the Grand Master for the time being, and to his officers, when duly installed, and strictly to conform to every edict of the Grand Lodge, or general assembly of Masons, that is not subversive to the principles and groundwork of Freemasonry?”

“You promise a regular attendance on the committees and communications of the Grand Lodge, on receiving proper notice, and to pay attention to all the duties of Freemasonry on convenient occasions?”

“You agree to hold in veneration the original rulers and patrons of Freemasonry, and their regular successors, supreme and subordinate, according to their stations, and to submit to the awards and resolutions of your brethren when in lodge convened, in every case consistent with the constitutions of Freemasonry?”

“You agree to promote the general good of society, to cultivate the social virtues, and to propagate the knowledge of the mystic art?”

“You agree that no visitors shall be received into your lodge without due examination and satisfactory evidence of their having been initiated in a regular lodge?”

“You admit that no person can be made a Mason in, or admitted a member of, any regular lodge without previous notice and due inquiry into his character?”

“You admit that no new lodge shall be formed without permission from the Grand

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

Lodge, and that no countenance shall be given to any irregular lodge, or to any person clandestinely initiated therein, being contrary to the ancient charges of Freemasonry?

“You admit that it is not in the power of any man, or body of men, to make innovations in the body of Freemasonry?”

“Do you submit to these charges and promise to support these regulations, as Masters have done in all ages before you?”

According to Anderson (Constitutions of 1723, page 71) the “Candidate Master” must be examined and found “well skilled in the Noble Science and the Royal Art, and duly instructed in our Mysteries.” Therefore, the Marshal, prior to installation, reports regarding the officers-elect: “I believe them to be of good morals and great skill, true and trusty, and lovers of the whole fraternity wheresoever dispersed. I doubt not that they will discharge their respective duties with fidelity.”

Compare this with the old ceremony where, according to Anderson, an officer “shall take the **Candidate** from among his Fellows, and present him to the Grand Master; saying, Right Worshipful Grand Master, I present this my worthy Brother to be Master, whom I know to be of good Morals and great Skill, true and trusty,

THE INSTALLATION CEREMONY

and a Lover of the whole Fraternity, wheresoever dispers'd over the Face of the Earth."

In this old ceremony we are told, the Grand Master shall then install "the Candidate" "by certain significant ceremonies and ancient usages and present him with the Constitutions, the Lodge Book, and the instruments of his Office, not all together, but one after another; and after each of them the Grand Master shall rehearse the short and pithy Charge that is suitable to the thing presented."

Present Installation Ceremony

In our present ceremony this is done by the installing officer as follows:

Brother -----, in consequence of your cheerful conformity to the charges and regulations of the fraternity, I now install you as Master of ----- Lodge No. -----, not doubting your care, skill, and capacity.

You will now be invested with the charter, furniture, and implements of your lodge.

(The Marshal will hand each of these, as it is referred to, to the Master who will retain it during the explanation thereof by the installing officer, and then return it to the Marshal.)

The charter or warrant from the Grand Lodge of this jurisdiction, alone gives authority to this lodge to meet and work, and without its presence no meeting of the lodge is lawful. This you are carefully to preserve.

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

In no case should it ever be out of your immediate control, until, at the expiration of your term, you shall have duly transmitted it to your successor in office.

The Book of Constitutions you are to search at all times. Cause it to be read in your lodge, that none may pretend ignorance of the excellent precepts it enjoins.

Receive also the By-laws of your lodge, which you are to see carefully and punctually executed.

The Holy Bible, the great light in Masonry, will guide you to all truth. It will direct your path to the temple of happiness, and point out to you the whole duty of man.

The square is the distinguishing jewel of your office. It is an instrument made use of by operative Masons to square their work. But as Free and Accepted Masons, making use of the tools of the operative craft as symbols for our moral instruction, we are taught to make use of it for the more noble and glorious purpose of squaring our actions by the square of virtue.

The compass teaches us to circumscribe our desires and stay within the boundary line of our duty to God and man. Within its two points are contained the most excellent tenets of our institution, which are friendship, morality, and brotherly love.

The various implements of your profession are all emblematical of the virtues which should characterize your daily life, and to

THE INSTALLATION CEREMONY

them your attention cannot be too frequently directed.

The 24 inch gauge teaches us to so measure and divide our time that just proportions of it may be given to the service of God and a distressed worthy brother, to our usual vocations and to refreshment and sleep. Ruling our lives by a punctual observance of duty and following the **line** of moral rectitude, we travel the straight path of virtue which leads at last to immortality.

The common gavel we should use, symbolically, to break off the corners of our rough earthly natures, thereby fitting ourselves, as living stones, for that spiritual building, that house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

The plumb admonishes us to walk uprightly in our several stations before God and man.

The level teaches equality.

The trowel, in the olden times, was the Master's especial tool. Use it, my brother, to spread in this lodge the cement of brotherly love and affection.

I invest you with the jewel of your exalted station, and seat you in the oriental chair. I cover you with that mark of distinction which has been worn by Masters from time immemorial when presiding over a Masonic lodge.

Is not the observance of this ceremony truly a landmark pointing out the Master's duty and describing the nature of our Institution as dis-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

tinct from others? Can we not see how the Moderns removed an Ancient Landmark when they omitted this ceremony?

If you leave blank the words "Mason," "Freemason," "Masonic," etc., you will still recognize this as a **Masonic** ceremony. It is full of landmarks.

I do not mean by this that the details of the installation ceremony are the same in all Grand Jurisdictions, but every such ceremony will, everywhere among Masons, be recognized as a Masonic ceremony, and that a lodge ceasing to use this ceremony, at least as applied to their Masters, would also cease to be Masonic. The 1717 Grand Lodge of England tried it and, as a consequence, was not recognized as Masonic by other Grand Lodges. In 1810 this very Grand Lodge acknowledged that the ceremony of installation of Masters was a true landmark of the Craft.

I have mentioned this ceremony as having been considered by the Ancients as an Ancient Landmark which the Moderns had removed, a charge which was finally admitted by the latter. I will now simply call attention to several points in this ceremony which are true Masonic landmarks:

THE INSTALLATION CEREMONY

1. The charge to the Master which contains a list of the qualifications he should possess to perform the duties of his office. These qualifications are Ancient Landmarks and are given in the Old Charges but not in the present order.

2. The promises made by the Master before he is installed. The duties which the Master promises to perform are all ancient Masonic duties, and the fact that they are required may be considered a Masonic landmark.

3. The lodge charter is an Ancient Landmark if we regard it as the successor of the Old Charter supposed to have been given the Masons by the King of England about 926 A. D. Each, in turn, served the same purpose, namely, legal authority for a Masonic meeting.

4. The symbolic application of the tools and implements of Operative Masonry is an Ancient Landmark. Without it Masonry would not be what it is.

All these things are called to the Master's attention in the ceremony of installation.

The Moderns, before the Union, admitted their error, thus bringing the Grand Lodges of Great Britain into accord. Since the words "Landmarks" and "Ancient Landmarks" first appear Masonically in the "Regulations" adopted by

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

these Grand Lodges, I know of no higher authority for determining what a landmark is. Those who deny that the installation ceremony is a landmark advance reasons which prove that they are judging it by their own ideas of what it should be. It is like a man deciding that a cat has nine lives and asserting that his kitty was not a cat because it had had but one life.

Note that while the ceremony we now use may in some particulars differ from that used in 1721, it is in essence the same, as will be seen by comparing our ceremony with that described by Anderson. It is true that every Mason need not become a Master, but every Master must be installed in practically the same way.

There is another significant thing about the ancient installation ceremony. As Anderson gives it, it was practically the same as we have it now, except that he refers to a secret ceremony which we do not give, nor do we know the secrets that were communicated in the ancient ceremony. Anderson says some things were told to the Candidate Master which "are proper and usual on that occasion, but not proper to be written," but he does not give us any idea of their nature. I can therefore simply offer a suggestion. Suppose that the **true Word** was communicated to the

THE INSTALLATION CEREMONY

new Master at this time. It would explain much about the differences between the Ancients and Moderns. For instance, the Ancients held that the Royal Arch Degree was an essential part of Ancient Craft Masonry and should be conferred in a Masonic lodge. The Moderns, on the other hand, held that the Royal Arch was not a lodge degree and should not be conferred in a lodge or its activities entered on the lodge minutes. There were more Royal Arch Masons among the Moderns than among the Ancients, but the former organized separate bodies in which to confer the degree, while the latter made it part of the lodge work. Also, the Ancients insisted that only those who had "passed the Chair" could be made Royal Arch Masons, a qualification not always insisted on by the Moderns, even by lodges which disobeyed the commands of the Grand Lodge by conferring it as a lodge degree. Thus, among the Ancients, a Royal Arch Mason must have been installed as Master and it may be, have received the true Word. Thus it may be that originally the Royal Arch Degree was the installation ceremony at which the Candidate Master received the true Word. (Anderson, in his description of the installation ceremony, calls the Master to be installed "the candidate.") This

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

view is supported by the fact that in pre-Grand Lodge catechisms the secrets of our present First and Second Degrees were given to the Entered Apprentice, while those of our present Third Degree were given to Fellow Crafts. The Master Mason of that time corresponded to our Worshipful Master, and it is possible that his degree was the installation ceremony. At any rate, this would explain why the Ancients were so insistent on the Royal Arch being an essential part of Ancient Craft Masonry and that the installation ceremony was an Ancient Landmark.

I admit that this is a guess, but it seems the best explanation of some references and actions which are very puzzling to us who do not have the key to their meaning.

CHAPTER V

DEFINITIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

As showing the confusion existing in the thought of Masonic writers on the subject of landmarks, I quote the following definitions, to which I will hereafter refer by number:

Masonic Encyclopedias and Dictionaries

1. **Hawkins:** "Landmarks of the Order are those boundary marks which have been set up to check any innovation or incroachments on the field of Freemasonry."

2. **Inman:** "If the ancient and supposedly immutable customs are to be claimed as Landmarks, then their number is legion. They have been defined by different authorities as (a) Leading and essential characteristics, (b) Leading principles from which there can be no deviation, (c) Universal laws of Masonry, (d) Ceremonies, rules, and laws deemed absolutely necessary, (e) Immemorial and universal observances."

3. **Kenning:** "Landmarks of the Order are those leading and essential characteristics which are generally received among us and so bound

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

up with the very existence and condition of Freemasonry. Many of those listed by Mackey are duties, qualifications, customs, etc., rather than landmarks.”

4. **Mackenzie:** “Generally speaking, landmarks are pillars or stones, denoting boundaries, and the term has been adopted by the Freemasons to indicate certain leading principles from which there can be no deviation.”

5. **Mackey:** “Those ancient and universal customs of the Order, which either gradually grew into operation as rules of action, or, if at once enacted by any competent authority, were enacted at a period so remote that no account of their origin is to be found in the records of history. Both the enactors and the time of the enactment have passed from the record, and the landmarks are therefore of higher authority than memory or history can reach.”

Noted Masonic Writers

6. J. Mason Allan: “Landmarks are those elements in our peculiar system of spiritual philosophy and instruction which are so essential that, if any of them were omitted or changed, the completeness, the consistency, and the symmetry of the system would be marred.”

7. George W. Baird: “To a seafaring man

DEFINITIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

a landmark is any elevated or conspicuous object in the landfall that serves to guide the navigator into a harbor. To a surveyor it means any fixed object which may designate the boundaries of land areas or properties.”

8. Thomas Carr: “The original landmarks (of Operative Masons) were lines or cords which were laid from the center point to the four corner points and were carried on beyond the corners of the intended structure, and marked by landmarks, so that if the corner point were at all displaced, it might immediately be seen and rectified.”

9. W. J. Chetwode Crawley: “The Ancient Landmarks of Freemasonry, like all other landmarks material or symbolical, can only preserve their stability when they reach down to sure foundations. When the philosophic student unearths the underlying rock on which our Ancient Landmarks rest, he finds our sure foundation in the triple dogma of the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, and the life to come. All laws, customs and methods that obtain amongst us and do not ultimately find footholds on this basis, are thereby earmarked as conventions and conveniences, no way partaking of the nature of Ancient Landmarks.”

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

10. E. H. Dring: "The Landmarks cannot be defined absolutely, except in so far as they are the old established customs in use at the time, and were recognized by everybody when Grand Lodge was first formed. . . . When Anderson used the word 'landmarks' he did so in a general sense, and intended to imply what everyone understood were old established customs."

11. Josiah Drummond: "It is a law or custom that has existed from time immemorial. If any universal usage exists, and has existed so long that its origin is unknown, it is a Landmark."

12. J. Q. A. Fellows: "A belief in God, our Father; in the immortality of the soul; in the brotherhood of man; and in the necessary practice of all the moral and social virtues were the essentials. Our duty to God, our country, our neighbors and ourselves, was everywhere and universally inculcated. These we take to be the Landmarks of the Order."

13. S. Furze-Morrish: "The Masonic landmarks indicate the boundaries to the freedom and powers not only of the brethren, individually and collectively as lodges, but also of the Grand Master himself."

14. R. F. Gould: "Nobody knows what the

DEFINITIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

landmarks are and they are of no earthly authority.”

15. H. B. Grant: “A Landmark that cannot be established by the writings of the fathers, or other recognized authorities to have been the rule or belief among Freemasons in 1723 or before, or that is not now generally accepted as such, can hardly be held as a Landmark.”

16. E. L. Hawkins: “The Old Landmarks of the Craft are its unwritten laws, either sanctioned by ancient custom, or, if enacted, enacted at a period so remote that no trace of their enactment can now be found.”

17. W. B. Hextall: “The Old Landmarks were, in fact, the secrets which existed amongst the operative masons in the days when they alone supplied the membership of the Craft.”

18. W. J. Hughan: “My idea of an Ancient Landmark is a rule or usage of the Premier Grand Lodge which cannot be abrogated, without cutting off the offending Body from the Universal Craft.”

19. J. T. Lawrence: “A landmark not only defines, but it separates. It is a term used by conveyancers. The artificial divisions of property such as walls and fences are always dependent upon landmarks. . . . A water course, a ra-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

vine, an old tree, a mountain, are landmarks; but a wall or a drain or a newly planted tree could not be so regarded. Bringing this into the Craft, there are certain practices and beliefs which distinguish our system, that is, establish its peculiarity, which also divide it from other systems of morality, and which have both antiquity and universal recognition in their favor. It follows that every point of the boundary of a property is a landmark. Not only is a stream a landmark, but every bend of the river, and every tree planted by the water side. Mackey quotes 25, but there is no reason why there should not be 2,500."

20. Luke A. Lockwood: "The Landmarks of Masonry are those ancient principles and practices which mark out and distinguish Freemasonry as such, and they are the sources of Masonic Jurisprudence."

21. MacBride: "The Landmarks in Masonry are certain established usages and customs that mark out the boundary lines of the Masonic world in its internal divisions and in its external relations to the outer world."

22. Robert Morris: "Those fixed tenets by which the limits of Freemasonry may be known and preserved."

DEFINITIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

23. Joseph Fort Newton: "A limit set beyond which Masonry cannot go, some boundary within which it must labor."

24. George Oliver: "Certain standard principles in the general laws, usages, customs, and language of the Order, which were originally established by our ancient brethren to preserve its identity and prevent innovation."

25. T. S. Parvin: "A Landmark, to be a Landmark, must command the universal respect and observance of all Masons."

26. Albert Pike: "The fundamental principles of Ancient Operative Masonry were few and simple, and they were not called landmarks. Each lodge was independent of every other, and there was no superior authority over all. . . . The ancient charges show by what principles the relations of those of the fellowship to each other were regulated, and these may not improperly be said to have been the landmarks of the Craft. The old forms of 'landmarks' were part of the English language before the Norman conquest; and the modern 'Landmark' is found in Coverdale's Bible of 1535, and in Milton's 'Paradise Lost' in 1667; whilst 'ancient landmarks' is a conjunction of words contained alike in the correspondence of Edmund Burke, and

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

the speeches of John Bright. For a moral application of the 'Old Landmarks' may not the three grand principles of the Order—Brotherly Love, Relief, and Truth, suffice us?"

27. A. J. A. Poignant: "A Landmark is something which is a fundamental part of Freemasonry, and which cannot be altered without destroying the identity of Freemasonry."

28. Roscoe Pound: "The Landmarks are certain universal, unalterable and unrepealable fundamentals which have existed from time immemorial and are so thoroughly a part of Masonry that no Masonic authority may derogate from them or do aught but maintain them."

29. Silas H. Shepherd: "Those time-honored and universal customs of Freemasonry which have been the fundamental law of the Fraternity from a period so remote that their origin cannot be traced, and so essential that they cannot be modified or amended without changing the character of the Fraternity."

30. John W. Simons: "We assume those principles of action to be Landmarks which have existed from time immemorial, whether in the written or unwritten law, which are identified with the form and essence of the society; which, the great majority agree, cannot be changed,

DEFINITIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

and which every Mason is bound to maintain intact, under the most solemn and inviolable sanctions.”

31. Frederick Speed: “Those parts of our law relating to the organic structure of the craft, which receive their binding power and the force of laws by long and immemorial usage, and by their universal reception throughout the craft.”

32. A. E. Waite: “In Masonry the word ‘landmark’ is used in a symbolical sense. According to the Book of Constitutions of the Grand Lodge of England: (1) All Laws emanate from the Grand Lodge: (2) Since it has the sole power of enactment, it only can alter, repeal or abrogate, but, in doing so (3) it shall always take care that the Ancient Landmarks of the Order be preserved. Therefore the Landmarks do not belong to the class of Rules or Laws.”

33. National Masonic Congress in the U.S.A., Chicago, 1893: “The Ancient Landmarks are those fundamental principles which characterize Masonry as defined by the Charges of a Freemason, and without which the institution cannot be identified as Masonry, combined with the essentials of the unwritten language by which brethren distinguish each other as Masons.”

Classifying these definitions we find that No.

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

14 does not know and claims that nobody does know what a landmark is. No. 25 insists on universality but otherwise does not define a landmark. No. 12 is not a definition but a list. No. 17 claims that the secrets of Freemasonry are its landmarks. Nos. 5, 11, 15, 16, 18, 30, and 31 define landmarks as laws which cannot be repealed; No. 32 claims that laws are not landmarks. No. 7 defines them as identifying objects; Nos. 1, 8, 13, 19, 22, and 23 as the limits or something which determines the limits of the Institution, while Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 20, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 33 identify landmarks with the usages and principles of Freemasonry.

Amid so much diversity we cannot say that there is a generally accepted meaning of "landmarks" among Masonic authorities, and we must therefore fall back on the generally accepted meaning of the word in the world at large and use it Masonically in a similar sense.

My own thought is that common and long continued usage has established the meaning of the word "landmark" as given in any unabridged dictionary and that the word as used in Freemasonry, in the absence of an **official** ruling to the contrary, must conform to its generally accepted meaning. In none of the recognized dictionaries

DEFINITIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

is a landmark defined as a “law.” It is always given as “a fixed **object** serving as a boundary mark,” “a familiar or prominent **object** in a landscape serving as a guide,” “an **event**, characteristic, or **modification**, which marks a turning point or a stage,” etc. Therefore, we must reject all definitions which define a landmark as a law or rule of action. A law that may be enacted may also be repealed. The law may disclose a characteristic of the body which enacted it, but the law itself is not the characteristic, nor is the characteristic the law. A biped is a two-footed animal. A law might be enacted requiring it to have two feet, but the landmark or identifying mark would not be the law but the fact that the animal naturally and normally actually has two feet. No law in itself can be a landmark, ancient or otherwise.

Sometimes the term “landmark” is restricted to natural objects, but the dictionaries do not recognize this restriction. Possibly this is what Mackey had in mind when he held that the landmark, rather than the boundary line, was unchangeable.

According to this view a landmark is a **natural** feature of the landscape, as distinguished from an **artificial** production, used to define a

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

boundary. The landmark is not the boundary line, but, because of its unvarying position, the means by which the boundary line may be determined.

As applied to Ancient Masonic Landmarks it means those permanent features in Freemasonry which indicate its origin and preserve its essential, distinguishing characteristics unchanged through the years. Such landmarks were not made nor adopted; they were inherent in the nature of the Institution. Otherwise they might be changed. No body of men, having the power to make laws and regulations, can deprive itself of the power to amend or repeal them. A law that can be adopted can also be changed, but a landmark is not a law. It is a characteristic, not a rule of action.

Therefore while, in general usage, the term "landmark" is not restricted to natural objects, such objects are best adapted for the purpose, as a river, a lake, a mountain, etc. Presumably such objects are permanent and have existed from time immemorial, and correspond to the "old landmarks" mentioned in Payne's 39th Regulation.

One such object is Geometry of which we will now speak.

DEFINITIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

Geometry

It may seem strange that landmarks, a word which primarily refers to objects which mark the boundaries of a tract of land, should be so important in a social, religious, and fraternal society like Freemasonry. I know of no other society in which the word is so prominent. Perhaps the fact that our Old Masonic Manuscripts identified Masonry with Geometry may account for it. We are told that Geometry and Masonry were originally synonymous terms. The word "Geometry" means "earth measurement." Therefore the term "landmark" so often used in connection with earth lines and measurements was considered appropriate to Freemasonry. This application is very old. In the Antiquity MS. we read: "The fifth Science is Geometry that teacheth a man mete and measure of earth and of all things of which this science is called by Euclid, 'Geometry' and by Vitruvius, 'Architecture.'"

Shortly after the organization of the Grand Lodge of England we find many Masonic references to Geometry:

The Freemasons Pocket Companion (1735-8):
"The number of lodges has so prodigiously increased within these few years and it is to be

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

hoped that Geometry and the Royal Art will be inculcated in every one of them.”

In 1733 the Old King's Arms Lodge acquired Le Cleris' "Introduction on the Principle of Architecture" and a "Drawing Board and T square for the use of the Master."

In lodges of that period lectures were given on "Military Architecture," "St. Paul's Cathedral," and "The Properties of the Compass."

A By-law adopted in 1737 provided "a certain portion of Andrea Palladio's Architecture" was to be read at lodge meetings.

Thus we see the importance attached to Geometry in the early days of the Grand Lodge and prior, and how naturally the term "landmark" in its generally accepted sense came into use by our early brethren.

Brother J. P. Simpson, of England, commenting on an article by Brother W. B. Hextall, in A. Q. C., says: "I think it must be admitted, and Brother Hextall's many quotations confirm in this, that Anderson and the writers of the eighteenth century certainly did not mean to imply that rules, regulations, customs, or usages were 'Ancient Landmarks': indeed they differentiate them, and I think the fanciful lists of

DEFINITIONS OF MASONIC LANDMARKS

Mackey and others are scarcely worthy of consideration.”

Brother Sidney T. Klein said: “In the case of Masonry, the word ‘landmark’ is most appropriate. The Old MS. Constitutions specially state that Geometry is Masonry.” The application of Geometrical principles to Masonry may therefore be considered a landmark of the Craft.

CHAPTER VI

STANDARDS AND MODES OF RECOGNITION

It would be useless to attempt to criticize the various unofficial lists which various Masons have compiled, but it may be profitable to consider acts of Grand Lodge. First, take the Standards of Recognition which our own Grand Lodge has adopted:

1. That such Grand Body has been formed lawfully by at least three just and duly constituted lodges, and that it has been legalized by a valid act issuing from the Grand Lodge of Iowa or from a Grand Body in fraternal relations with this Grand Lodge.

This is not an Ancient Landmark, but at the present time it is a commonly accepted test by which the Masonic world judges the Masonic nature of a Grand Lodge. It is based on the method by which the Grand Lodge of England was organized in 1717, but the parallel is not perfect.

Here again, the test or landmark is the **fact** that a Grand Lodge has been so constituted, and a **fact** is not a **law** or rule of action.

STANDARDS AND MODES OF RECOGNITION

2. That it is an independent, self-governing, responsible organization with entire, undisputed, and exclusive dogmatic and administrative authority over the symbolic lodges within its jurisdiction, and not in any sense whatever subject to, or dividing such authority with, a supreme council, or other body claiming ritualistic or other supervision or control.

Again this test or landmark is not ancient, but its application is very general.

3. That it occupies exclusively its territorial jurisdiction or else shares the same with another by mutual consent; and that it does not presume to extend its authority into, or presume to establish lodges in a territory occupied by a lawful Grand Lodge, without the expressed assent of such supreme governing Masonic body.

This again is not ancient, nor was it fully established until nearly one hundred years after 1717, when in 1814 the following International Compact among the three Grand Lodges of England, Ireland, and Scotland was adopted:

That each Grand Lodge shall preserve its own limits, and no Warrant shall be Granted or Revived by any one of these parties for the holding of a Lodge within the jurisdiction of either of the others. That in case any one of their respective military Lodges, being in the course of service resident, for a time, within the limits of either of the others, it shall con-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

tinue to make its return to its own Grand Lodge, but shall be recognized, visited, and have the right of visitation and intercourse with the Regular Lodges where it may happen to be: it being understood, and positively stipulated and enacted, that no such Military Lodge shall initiate, pass, or raise any person or Brother who does not actually belong to the Battalion or Regiment to which the said Lodge is confined; and, further, that the present practice, with respect to Lodges established in distant parts under either of the THREE GRAND LODGES, shall continue on the present footing.

This became a law of the Grand Lodges adopting it, and the practice has since become a test of recognition. Therefore, if a landmark at all, it is not ancient. If we concede that it is a modern landmark, it is the practice and its observance which makes it so, not the law requiring such practice.

This compact, however, was the culmination of a sentiment which had been growing up for years previously.

4. That it makes Masons of men only.

This has always been the Masonic practice, and it may be rightly called an Ancient Landmark, but here also it is the fact that it is a characteristic trait of Freemasonry that makes it such.

STANDARDS AND MODES OF RECOGNITION

I said it has always been Masonic practice, but it was not enacted into law until 1722. This enactment did not **make** it a landmark. It was a landmark before the enactment as truly as it has been since.

5. That it requires conformity to the following, which the Grand Lodge of Iowa considers necessary in a Masonic body:

- A. A belief in God the Father of all men.
- B. Secrecy.
- C. The Symbolism of Operative Masonry.
- D. The division of Symbolic Masonry into three degrees of Entered Apprentice, Fellow Craft, and Master Mason.
- E. The legend of the Third Degree.
- F. That the obligations of its initiates be taken in the name of God, upon the Volume recognized by the candidate as the sacred law, a part of the furniture of the lodge and indispensably present in the lodge while at work.
- G. That it excludes controversial party politics and sectarian religion from all activities under its auspices.

This test or landmark is the **fact** that a Grand Lodge does or does not possess certain specified characteristics.

A, B, C, and F are all Ancient Landmarks. The absence of these things in a body claiming

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

to be Masonic would be proof that the claim was false and that the body was in fact not now Masonic, even had it formerly been such. It would be similar to a bridge club ceasing to play bridge. The game of bridge no longer being a purpose of the club, it would cease to be a bridge club and other bridge clubs would no longer recognize it as such. Calling itself a bridge club would not make it so. In like manner, the **fact** that a body calling itself Masonic lacked A, B, C, or F would be evidence that in fact it was not a Masonic body.

D. If for "degrees" we substitute "grades," we may accept this as an Ancient Landmark. The existence of these grades has ever been a characteristic of Freemasonry, and an organization lacking them would not be Masonic.

E. The legend of the Third Degree. This certainly is a Masonic landmark, and, I believe, an ancient one. There may have been changes made in the legend as it has come down to us through the ages, but its teaching and essential nature are very ancient and no organization can be truly Masonic which does not have it in some form.

G. There may be some question as to this being an Ancient Landmark, and some foreign

STANDARDS AND MODES OF RECOGNITION

bodies claiming to be Masonic do not possess it. However, such bodies are not generally recognized as Masonic, and to the extent that it is a test of Masonic character it is a landmark.

Modes of Recognition

In our Masonic work there are certain modes of recognition which some writers call landmarks, and Ancient Landmarks at that; others claim they have been changed and therefore cannot be landmarks. There may have been some changes, but if so they did not change the nature of the Institution. The boundary line was not changed and the spirit of the law was not broken. For instance, so far as I can learn, the **Words** of our present three degrees have always been used in **some** form. Prior to 1717 those of our first two degrees were given in the First, and our present Third was given in the Second. Later, I do not know when, the two degrees were expanded to three, and the installation ceremony dropped. The **Word** of the Second was transferred to the Third, and the two **Words** of the First were given one to the First and the other to the Second. These changes were gradual, and I am not sure as to the order of events, but later when exposés were published, the Grand Lodge reversed the order in which these **Words** were

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

then given, and thus they did not serve as modes of recognition for Masons who did not belong to the Grand Lodge of England. This Grand Lodge was then charged with having removed an Ancient Landmark, a charge which was later admitted to be true. The removal, however, consisted in the fact that Masons could not use them as a mode of recognition wherever they went.

For a given mode of recognition to be a landmark it must enable Masons to recognize each other at all times and places. The fact that particular words, signs, and grips were changed or interchanged would not destroy the landmark if the new ones were generally used and recognized as such. Therefore, the modes of recognition are certainly landmarks which our fathers have set up, but they are objects which could be rearranged, provided they remained modes of recognition to **all** Masons, and provided further that such rearrangement did not interfere with the **symbolic lessons** of the degrees. In other words, the boundary lines of Freemasonry must not be changed.

What are the boundary lines of Freemasonry? What is the fundamental nature of our Institution? In a former article we said that the nature of Masonry as well as its mission and ideals

STANDARDS AND MODES OF RECOGNITION

must be kept in mind if we would recognize and understand its landmarks. We will now enlarge on that statement.

Definition

An old definition says Masonry is "a system of morality veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols." "It is a regular course of ancient hieroglyphical moral instruction taught by types, emblems, and allegorical figures." Another writer says, "Freemasonry is a system which inculcates morality by peculiar allegorical teachings, illustrated by suitable symbols, and derived from a hoary past." To these let me add a definition of my own: "It is an organized society of men symbolically applying the principles of Operative Masonry and of architecture to the science and art of character building." This definition embraces several Ancient Landmarks. For instance we would cease to be Freemasons if:

1. Freemasonry ceased to be an organized society.
2. Women or children were admitted.
3. We ceased to use the symbolism of Operative Masonry.
4. We did not teach the art and science of character building.

It may be objected that a definition is not a

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

landmark. Perhaps not, but the characteristics described in the definition are, provided they truly determine the thing defined. The boundary line is not a landmark but is determined by the landmarks. A definition is like a boundary line. It defines or determines the limits of something.

Let me illustrate by the definition of a "trowel." According to the dictionary it is "a flat-bladed, sometimes pointed implement, having an offset handle parallel, or nearly so, with the blade." These characteristics of a trowel are its landmarks, the means by which we recognize the tool. There may be slight differences in various individual trowels but there is a similarity by which we know each to be a trowel.

Two Kinds of Masonry

Masonry is of two kinds, Operative and Speculative. Will I be shattering another idol of Masonic writers if I say that these two classes have always been closely related? There never was a time when Masonry was **wholly** Operative, nor is it **wholly** Speculative now. The earliest Masonic MSS. we have refer to the Speculative feature and say Prince Edwin (about 900 A. D.) "was of the speculative part a master." The Regius MS. of about 1390 A. D. lists lords, dukes, earls, barons, knights, squires, and many more

STANDARDS AND MODES OF RECOGNITION

who were members in about 926 A. D., and now there are several Operative lodges holding charters from a recognized Masonic Grand Lodge. I, therefore, believe the Speculative feature, at least, of Freemasonry is an Ancient Landmark. If it were omitted, a fundamental characteristic of our Order would be changed and we would no longer be Masonic. It is now the dominant feature, but it has always been present, at least in theory and symbolism. Also the principles of Operative Masonry have always been applied by Freemasonry to the art and science of character building. This application is therefore an Ancient Landmark, marking a boundary line between Masonic and non-Masonic organizations.

Belief in God

Freemasonry is not the only society which teaches belief in God. How then can such belief be a Masonic landmark? By the form of its instruction. The Caucasian race is not the only one which has a skin, but it is the only one which has its peculiar kind of skin. So Freemasonry is not the only organization which teaches belief in God; but, so far as I know, it is the only one which emphasizes His functions as the Great Architect of the Universe. At any rate Freema-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

sonry emphasizes this function in its own peculiar way.

The part of Freemasonry from which our present Order sprang was, in its Operative character, engaged in the erection of temples, churches, etc., places for the worship of God whom we call the "Great Architect of the Universe." The erection of a spiritual temple, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, requires the following of the plans of a Divine Architect. Therefore, a belief in a Supreme Being, a Divine Architect, is an Ancient Masonic Landmark. The teachings of Masonry are meaningless without it. The old MSS. containing the Ancient Charges which were read to the candidates and which on the Holy Bible he swore to obey prove this. These Old Charges begin with a prayer to God, the candidate was charged to be true to God, and his holy church.

The Masonic character of the prayer in these Old Charges is seen in the fact that practically all of them are addressed to "the might (strength) of the Father, the wisdom of the Son and the grace and goodness (beauty) of the Holy Ghost." Do you not see in this a reference to the Masonic pillars—Wisdom, Strength, and Beauty? These attributes are all mentioned in the

STANDARDS AND MODES OF RECOGNITION

first prayer the candidate hears in the lodge room, and all through our ceremonies we refer to God as the Great Architect, the Divine Artist, the Almighty Father of the Universe, etc. All these are landmarks indicating the Masonic character of our teachings.

There are many organizations which require belief in God, each in its own way, and as between such organizations their peculiar methods are the landmarks by which each is recognized for what it is.

As between Freemasonry and atheists, the very fact that we require a belief in God and the other does not is landmark enough.

Immortality of the Soul

Many organizations besides Masonry teach that Man is immortal, but Masonry teaches it in ways of its own, for instance the sprig of acacia and the ceremony of raising. These methods of instruction are therefore landmarks.

It has been objected that Anderson's Constitutions do not require a belief in God. Perhaps not explicitly, but they do imply that an atheist cannot be a Mason and therefore distinguish between a Mason and an atheist. Absence of a definite law on the subject is not conclusive for we must remember that a large part of the law

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

of Freemasonry is found in the Ritual, which is not written and therefore not found in Anderson who confines himself to the written law. We might as well say our Masonic secrets are not binding because Anderson's Constitutions do not give them. None of our Grand Lodges give the Ritual in its written law, and many of the written Constitutions of our own State Grand Lodges do not explicitly require a belief in God or that the Holy Bible be present in the lodge room, but these are recognized requirements in those Grand Jurisdictions nevertheless. The Old Charges, however, require a belief in God when they make the candidate promise to obey Him. They also require the candidate to take his obligation on the Holy Scriptures. This fact is evidence that both are Ancient Landmarks and mark a boundary line between a Masonic body and one that is not.

The Holy Bible

The fact that the Old Charges required the candidate to take his obligation on the Holy Scripture prove that its presence in the lodge room was necessary. But there are other organizations which require the presence of the Bible, when an oath is administered. How then is it a landmark? Again the answer is in Masonry's

STANDARDS AND MODES OF RECOGNITION

peculiar use of it. When we speak of **The Great Light** we think of Masonry's use of the Bible. It is a Masonic expression and justifies us in calling the Bible an Ancient Landmark.

Masonry teaches by symbols and to a Mason, in addition to its other qualities, the Bible is a symbol of the Divine Light which God sheds upon his earthly children.

Legends

There are many legends which are distinctly Masonic in their character and may rightly be considered landmarks. Those which, in some form, have been used in the Ritual from time immemorial are Ancient Landmarks. I believe the legend of the Third Degree is a Masonic landmark, but that it is an ancient one is hard to prove by the Old MSS. It is everywhere found in Masonic lodges at the present time. I believe it has always been present in some form, but if so, it has not always been in the Third Degree, at least in its present form.

The legend of the Lost Word is not peculiar to Masonry, but in our Legend of the Third Degree, it takes a distinctive Masonic form, which the researches of antiquarians have failed to find elsewhere. Resemblances have been found and it may be that it has descended from the Ancient

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

Mysteries or some other older legends, but in Masonry it has a form which I believe is hinted at in the Old Charges.

There are other less prominent legends which we might also call Ancient Landmarks. Brother Edmund H. Dring of London read a paper in the Leicester Lodge of Research in 1909 on the subject "Landmarks in the History of the Legends of Freemasonry." He calls the Old Masonic MSS. such landmarks. We may not agree with him in this, but certainly in these old MSS. we find characteristics which determine their Masonic character. There are certain legends which are generally recognized as Masonic legends, especially many of those connected with the building of King Solomon's Temple. When we hear or read a reference to such a legend we recognize it as Masonic, just as truly as we recognize a landmark determining the boundary line between two pieces of property.

Secrecy

Secrecy is an Ancient Landmark. In all Masonic Rituals, from the earliest times of which we have any knowledge, a promise of secrecy has been insisted upon. The promise was in the form of a solemn oath, the candidate kneeling,

STANDARDS AND MODES OF RECOGNITION

with his hand on the Holy Bible. The following is a form found in a MS. of about 1640:

The Mason word and everything therein contained you shall keep secret, you shall never put it in writing directly or indirectly. You shall keep all that we or your attenders shall bid you keep secret from man, woman, or child, stick or stone, and never reveal it but to a brother or in a lodge of Freemasons, and truly observe the charges in the constitution, all this you promise and swear faithfully to keep and observe, without any manner of equivocation or mental reservation directly or indirectly; so help you God and by the contents of this book.

Masonry is not the only society which has secrets, but Masonic secrets are in a class by themselves. Not the fact that we have secrets, but the nature and form of the secrets sets us apart from other organizations. We would cease to be Masonic if we did not have these secrets. However no one has a right to complain because we have such secrets since they do not affect anyone who is not a member of the Order.

Our ritualistic instruction is effective because it is secret and these secrets are peculiar to Freemasonry.

Our secrets are like family secrets which af-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

fect only the family concerned and should not be revealed to anyone else.

The modes of recognition would cease to be such if they were not secret.

We have an officer called a Tyler whose duty it is to guard the lodge from intrusion from without. The very name "Tyler" denotes a **Masonic** officer. Thus the form in which Masonry guards its secrets as well as the secrets themselves is a Masonic landmark.

Qualifications of a Mason

Certain of these qualifications may be considered Ancient Landmarks, as that a Mason must be a man, free, of lawful age, of good moral character, physically able to perform his Masonic duties, etc. They are universal Masonic qualifications, but some Grand Lodges have adopted others which are peculiar to the jurisdiction adopting them and are not properly landmarks. In this connection it may be well to note that the landmark is the fact that Masons have these qualifications, not the law requiring it. A body that admitted women, slaves, or children would not be a Masonic body.

Test of a Landmark

There are many other landmarks which might be named, but I think I have given a sufficient

STANDARDS AND MODES OF RECOGNITION

number to illustrate my point, namely, that the test of a landmark is, "Does it mark a boundary line?" and of a Masonic landmark, "Does it distinguish between what is Masonic and what is not? Is it essential to the Masonic character of an organization?"

It may be claimed that some of the things I have named as landmarks do not meet this test. For instance, belief in God, teaching the immortality of the soul, taking the Holy Scriptures as the rule and guide of our faith, etc., are not peculiar to Freemasonry and therefore do not distinguish it from other institutions which teach the same. Masonry, however, teaches these things in its own peculiar way. Consider my illustration of the city block or subdivision in Chapter III. In the City of Washington is a stone from which the location of all landed property in this country is determined. That stone is a landmark for all our property, but for me and my property it is not a landmark in and of itself. It is the relation of my property to this stone which makes it a landmark for me. No other property has the same relation. In a similar sense it is our attitude toward God as the Great Architect of the Universe that makes him a landmark for us. One who does not believe in God at all

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

cannot have this attitude and cannot be a Mason. Too often belief in God independent of our attitude toward Him has been considered Masonry's landmark. The Bible tells us that the devils also believe, but that belief does not help them any. The important thing is our relation to God, rather than mere belief in Him.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY

In this, the concluding chapter in this series on the subject of Masonic landmarks, I will try to summarize and co-ordinate the statements made in the preceding chapters. I may again mention some of the things which I believe to be landmarks and give my reasons for my opinion. However, I will not attempt to give a complete list, for I believe that to be impossible. Any object which marks any point of the boundary line of a property may be considered a landmark. As Brother J. T. Lawrence says, "Not only is a stream a landmark, but every bend of the river, and every tree planted by the water side." What would you think of a person who would attempt to list every object on the boundary line of a piece of property? Foolish, isn't it? And it is just as foolish to try to list the Masonic landmarks.

In the first chapter of this series we stated we had tried to make an independent investigation of the subject of landmarks and that such investigations had modified the opinions we had

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

formed based on the statements of other writers. We had found it hard to distinguish between fact and opinion, for it is so much easier to accept the statements of other men than to make our independent investigations. I must confess to a feeling of disappointment when I found the statements, made by men whom I considered authorities, could not be supported by facts.

It seems that Mackey and his contemporaries are responsible for the erroneous conception that has grown up about landmarks. The Masonic **authorities** do not agree with him, but his influence is still very great. One brother wrote me that Mackey is a name to conjure with and he is right. The Masonic world owes a great deal to Mackey, but that is no reason for accepting his statements when we find that they are not supported by the facts. In studying the subject of landmarks, or any other subject, the facts should govern.

Again let me emphasize the fact that both in ordinary usage and in Freemasonry a landmark is an object, an event, a trait or characteristic, not a law. There may be laws regarding landmarks, but the landmarks themselves are not laws. The habit of Masonic writers in treating landmarks as laws is, I believe, responsible for

SUMMARY

the great confusion that has arisen regarding them.

“Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set” was a law, the landmark itself was not ; but the law is a reflection of the historical fact that the boundaries of a tract of land belonging to a person or a people were not to be changed. Objects were set up to mark out those unchangeable boundaries. As surveyors now determine the boundary lines to tracts of land and set up stakes, stones, etc., to mark those boundaries, so in the olden time the “fathers” who settled in Palestine divided the property, established boundary lines, and set up objects to designate the boundaries. The command not to remove the landmarks referred to a removal of the boundary line, which was never to be changed, and that is the real reason for the commandment. Sometimes one object used for a landmark had to be changed for another, but the boundary line was not changed and the new object marked the same line as did the old.

Masonically the recognized fact that the Ancient Landmarks must be preserved means the same thing. The fundamental character of our Institution must not be changed, nor should the objects or landmarks which mark out the limits

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

or indicate the character of the Institution be changed without good cause, and not even then if such change alters the fundamental character of the Order. As an illustration, certain religious sects wear a style of clothing by which they are recognized as belonging to that sect. We might call this style of dress a landmark of the sect. If, however, this style was independent of their religious beliefs, it **might** be changed without changing the character of the sect, but such change would be attended with inconveniences if the members wished to be recognized as belonging to that sect. If, however, that style of dress was an element in their religious creed, it could not be changed without changing the character of the sect.

Some brethren are very much disturbed because they are required to preserve the Ancient Landmarks and, they say, they do not know what they are. If they were golf enthusiasts and, in joining a golf club, were required to promise that they would carefully preserve the characteristics of a golf club, would they be disturbed? But, you say, we know the characteristics of a golf club but do not know the landmarks of Freemasonry. You may not be able to state them, but you can recognize them when you see them.

SUMMARY

You know certain things are not Masonic. You also know a human being when you see one, whether he be child or man, even though you may not be able to list the characteristics which distinguish him from other animals. Likewise you can recognize a Mason or a Masonic lodge by certain characteristics, and you do not have to list all such characteristics and know them all in order to do it.

An Illustration

Sometime before the dawn of history human beings appeared on this earth. When existing records of them were first written they were divided into races distinguished from each other by certain characteristics. Thus the Caucasian or white race is distinguished by the color of the skin and other characteristics such as the texture of the hair. The color of the skin and the texture of the hair may be called landmarks. Other races also have skin and hair, but it is different from those of the white race, and in that difference lies their function as landmarks. But there are other differences, many of them, and we do not need to know them all in order to determine whether or not a person belongs to the white race.

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

Likewise different classifications of the white race are distinguished by different characteristics which each possesses.

Freemasonry also appeared in England before the dawn of its history. The first documents we have speak of it as something already existing and well known. It had certain characteristics by which it was known, but how they came into existence is not known any more than we know the origin of the white race. In both cases they are landmarks which they of old time have set up.

Masonry Distinguished from Other Organizations

It may be objected that many of the things I have named as landmarks are not peculiar to Freemasonry, as that a belief in God is found and required in other organizations. That is true, but it distinguishes Freemasons from atheists who cannot be made Masons, for a body which admits atheists is not Masonic. Therefore, belief in God is a Masonic landmark. How then are we to distinguish Freemasonry from other bodies which teach faith in God? In various ways, according to the body with which we compare it.

God is the fundamental fact in the Universe. A man's belief or lack of belief in Him does not

SUMMARY

change that fact, but our relation to Him is a very important element in determining our own position in the world. In that sense God is Masonry's landmark.

As stated above the God of Masonry is associated with building and is therefore called "The Great Architect of the Universe." This designation, or at least its application, is peculiar to Freemasonry and is properly called an Ancient Masonic Landmark. Audubon in his great work on "The Birds of America," published in 1870, has 500 plates in color showing as many different kinds of birds in this country. In each one he names the traits which distinguish it from other birds. Thus, under the plate illustrating the "Painted Bunting" he gives its habitat, identifications, voice, and range. Under "identification" he says, "The brilliant coloration of the male identifies it; the female is a strong greenish blue and may be known from Vireos and Warblers by its thick bill." He does not describe the shade of color for the color plate gives it.

Another work, published in 1936, on the same subject, gives a more complete and minute description, but both works consider the characteristics named as identifying marks upon the birds.

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

There are very many kinds of birds in the country, all of which have common characteristics such as head, tail, wings, etc., and each has a combination of characteristics which distinguish it from every other kind. Such characteristics perform the function of landmarks. Similarly Masonry is not the only organization that requires a belief in God, but the conception of God as the Great Architect of the Universe is peculiar to Freemasonry, as is the conception of Masons as builders of a spiritual temple in which God is to be worshipped, and the use of the working tools of the builder of material temples as symbols of the tools of spiritual building. Likewise we distinguish our Order from other organizations in various ways, perhaps by its symbolism, its method of organization, its ritual, its peculiar secrets, etc.

Let us return to the commonly accepted definition of a landmark, as an object which marks the boundary line between two pieces of property. We must remember that a boundary line touches many pieces of property, and Freemasonry may be compared with many different kinds of organizations.

Consider again my illustration of the stone in Washington. Ranges east and west and town-

SUMMARY

ships north and south are surveyed in relation to this stone. The corners of townships thus determined are marked by monuments of some kind. Smaller tracts of land are measured from these monuments, etc., until finally the location of my own particular lot of ground is determined. The stone in Washington determines all the boundaries of my property, but other landmarks, like a stone on a boundary line, determine only the line between adjoining properties. In this sense a landmark which distinguishes Freemasonry from one organization may not distinguish it from another, in which case another landmark must be used.

Two Types of Landmarks

We may therefore distinguish between two kinds of landmarks—those directly on the line determining one boundary and those from which many boundaries are determined. The former may be likened to the stones which mark the boundary line at one end of a tract of land and do not mark the boundary line of the same tract of land at the other end. The latter is like belief in God. As just stated, Freemasonry is distinguished from some other organizations that require belief in God by its method of teaching. For instance, the application of the principles of

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

Operative Masonry to spiritual building, its method of symbolical instruction, etc.

Without going into details I may say that ordinarily we have no difficulty in distinguishing a Masonic body from one that is not Masonic. There is something in each case which we use as landmarks to make the distinction.

Brother MacBride defines a landmark as “certain usages and customs that mark out the boundary lines of the Masonic world in its internal division and its external relations to the other world.”

In commenting, he says that while a landmark must be an established custom, it does not follow that every established custom is a landmark. It must also perform the function of a landmark. A custom may have existed among Masons from time immemorial and never become a landmark. “For instance, it has doubtless been a custom with Masons from the time of Moses to blow their noses, but that custom does not make the blowing of the nose a landmark. It is not the custom in itself, it is the purpose it serves—the function it performs—that makes it a landmark. The stone set up at the boundary of a county may in kind and character be quite common. It

SUMMARY

is the purpose it serves that gives to it importance and entitles it to the name landmark.”

All very true, blowing noses is not confined to any class of human beings, but if Masons had a peculiar way of blowing the nose which distinguished them from other groups it would be a landmark. It would then be a distinguishing characteristic and perform the function of a landmark.

Since a landmark may have no intrinsic value, why has Masonry been so insistent on its preservation? For the same reason that any landmark is valuable because of the function it performs. It is very important that a landowner as well as others should know the limits of his property. It is equally important to Masonry that Masons as well as others should know its limits. Too many Masonic writers have assumed that landmarks are the valuable and intrinsic attributes of the Order itself instead of its outward and visible characteristics. The stone which marks the boundary line between two pieces of property may have no intrinsic value, and the same may be true of a Masonic landmark. For instance, belief in God is a fundamental element in Masonry, but that alone does not distinguish the Order from other bodies which have the

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

same element, but belief in God joined with Masonry's thought of God as the "Great Architect," etc., is distinguishing and therefore a landmark.

The Ancient Landmarks we are to preserve are marks of distinction and means of recognition. By what means do we recognize a human being whether child or man? By his peculiar characteristics. They may or may not have intrinsic value. They may be hard to list, but we recognize them just the same. They distinguish a human being from another animal and may therefore be called landmarks of humanity.

The Ancient Landmarks of Freemasonry are those traits or characteristics of the Order which distinguish it from some other organization, not only now but in all time. The truths of Masonry are eternal, and so are its fundamental characteristics, which we recognize by means of the Ancient Landmarks, but we must distinguish between truth and characteristics.

Truth is a divine attribute, and independent of man's attitude towards it; a landmark is something set up by men to distinguish between different human institutions. This is true whether it be two pieces of property or two different organizations.

The independent investigation with which we

SUMMARY

began the series of articles has not sustained the views of many Masonic writers, but it has suggested many thoughts which seem to me more reasonable than the ipse dixit statement of writers who do not support those statements with facts or by logical inferences from facts. If my own inferences are erroneous, I hope to receive evidence to set me right.

Three hundred years ago a learned man said: "Let none tax him for presumption in conjecture whence the matter was doubtful; for many probable conjectures have stricken the fire out of which truth's candle has been lighted afterwards." Later investigations will doubtless modify these conjectures of mine, but if they strike the fire out of which truth's candle will be lighted, they will have accomplished their purpose.

CHAPTER VIII

COMMENTS

Since the publication in the Grand Lodge Bulletin (Grand Lodge of Iowa) of the series of articles which compose the foregoing chapters, the author has received many comments which indicate that a supplemental chapter of comments should be added. I quote some of these with my replies.

“I do not agree with your statement that the term ‘Ancient Landmark’ was well understood by Payne’s contemporaries and a definition unnecessary.”

Why, then, was the provision of Payne’s 39th Regulation so quickly accepted in Ireland and Scotland as a true statement of Masonic law? If it were a new term or a term not then understood, it would not have attained such general recognition without a request for a definition. Later the Grand Lodges of Ireland and Scotland recognized the Grand Lodge of the Ancients as the true Grand Lodge of England, since they held that the Moderns, though the older body,

COMMENTS

was no longer Masonic since it had violated the Ancient Landmarks. They must have thought they knew what a landmark was, and if the term was not understood why did the Moderns admit that they had removed landmarks?

The very silence of the record on this subject indicates that the term was understood. The record indicates a bitter controversy over **other** matters, but not on the subject of landmarks.

At the communication of the Grand Lodge of England held December 27, 1721, the Grand Master "appointed 14 learned Brothers to examine Anderson's Manuscript, and to make report," and at the quarterly communication held March 25, 1722, the "committee of 14 reported that they had perused Brother Anderson's Manuscript, viz., the History, Charges, **Regulations**, and Master's Song, and after some amendments had approved of it." Upon which the Grand Lodge ordered it printed. The "Regulations" thus approved as given in Anderson's Constitutions were compiled by George Payne in 1720 when he was Grand Master and approved by Grand Lodge in June 1721. Do you think a regulation, not understood, would have passed unquestioned? If it had not been understood,

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

someone would be sure to ask what it meant. Laws are not so easily passed.

Try to get your own Grand Lodge to adopt a resolution which the members do not understand and see how quickly you will be asked for an explanation.

“If the Moderns had done something that put themselves outside the pale of Freemasonry, how could they become regular?”

This question confuses clandestinism with regularity of origin. The Prodigal Son did not cease to be the son of his father because he had wandered away from home. No one has accused the Moderns of being organized irregularly. It abandoned some of the things then recognized as landmarks and was no longer recognized as Masonic by the other Grand Lodges of Great Britain. It regained recognition by abandoning the practices which were not Masonic. However, this recognition was not accorded until delegates from the Grand Lodges of Ireland and Scotland had made a thorough investigation of the practices of the United Grand Lodge of England.

“Freemasonry has changed and will probably continue to change. How then can we determine its unchangeable features or so-called landmarks?”

COMMENTS

Consider my illustration of a child becoming a man. Do you know what humanity is? Can you point out the characteristics which distinguish human beings from **every** other animal? I doubt it. Any one you may mention can be found in **some** other animal, and yet you **can** and do make the distinction. You can also distinguish between Freemasonry and every other organization, though in some cases there is great similarity.

Yes, Freemasonry has changed and will continue to change. So does every human being on earth as he advances from the cradle to the grave. Yet he has certain distinguishing characteristics which do not change and by which he may be recognized and his identity established. I recently attended the fiftieth anniversary of the graduation of my class in Grinnell College. Thirteen of the original forty were present. Some of them I had not seen for fifty years. Some I recognized at once and others I did not until we told each other our names when forgotten features were recalled to mind; but then, in spite of the changes made by the intervening years, there was something which made recognition possible. What was it? I can't tell you. I can't describe it. Yet it was there. I did not have

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

to name it in order to recognize my classmates of fifty years ago. The fact that I cannot name the distinguishing characteristics does not disturb me.

Yes, it is difficult, if not impossible, to **name** the landmarks of Freemasonry, but what of it?

“Freemasonry appeals to me as a Universal Brotherhood of altruistic men. It teaches nothing which is not taught in other schools of thought and by various moral and religious systems. Its methods of teaching by symbol and allegory, while not exclusively our own, are peculiar to Freemasonry, but I am at a loss to find a landmark which will determine the boundary line of this philosophy.”

We are not talking about the boundary line of a philosophy, but that of an organization. My farm produces no crop that is not also produced on some other farm, and yet my farm is distinct from every other, and the landmarks which determine the boundary line may have no relation to the crops raised.

“The way landmarks have been interpreted by most of our U. S. Grand Lodges which have adopted lists seems to me to compare with the way creeds have been applied to Christianity. They have set up arbitrary dogmatic standards

COMMENTS

and want them to be considered the 'Landmarks of Freemasonry.'”

Yes and no. There is a similarity, but also a decided difference. The creeds which denominations have adopted are landmarks of each denomination. The creed is perhaps the most distinguishing characteristic by which the denomination is known. A body which adopted a different creed from that of a given denomination would not be recognized as belonging to that denomination, even if it took the same name. Thus a Baptist believes in immersion and any body calling itself Baptist which does not believe in and practice immersion would not be recognized as a Baptist body. *

But the creed is not the only distinguishing characteristic of a denomination. Baptists are not the only denomination that practices immersion, and in such cases other traits in connection with immersion are determining factors.

Grand Lodges which have adopted lists of landmarks do not claim that other Grand Lodges are not Masonic because they have adopted other lists or none at all. This would hardly be the case if they believed their lists named actual landmarks which other Grand Lodges were disregarding.

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

“The Standards of Recognition which various Grand Lodges have adopted are generally dogmatic, arbitrary, and lacking in universality. Therefore they cannot be landmarks.”

This objection shows the influence of Mackey. Universality is not a necessary characteristic of a landmark nor does it necessarily indicate the character of the property it limits. A landmark is **any** object which determines the boundary line between two pieces of property. It is not necessarily a basic or fundamental characteristic of the properties themselves. The sole purpose of a landmark is to determine the boundary line. Mackey’s “Universality” implies that if a stone is a landmark it not only determines the boundary line between the properties of A and B, but also between A’s property and that of C, or that the landmark is found everywhere on A’s property. A’s property, like Masonry, may contact many others and in each case require a different landmark.

I do not say that the standards of recognition adopted by Grand Lodges are Ancient Landmarks, but to the extent that they are used to determine the Masonic character of another body they are used as landmarks. Between my property and that of my neighbor I may set a

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

the character of Freemasonry itself and its landmarks. All the Grand Lodges of Great Britain agreed that the installation ceremony is an Ancient Landmark, and I know of no one who has a better right to determine the meaning of their own term. It is like all the owners of properties agreeing to the boundary line. If this does not agree with our definition of a landmark, we must change our definition to conform to the facts, not to our ideas. This is the trouble with Mackey and his followers. They insist that a landmark must conform to their own ideas and ignore facts.

“I think you are wrong in calling the ceremony of installation a landmark. It lacks all three of Mackey’s requisites.”

I am not sure about that, but I see no reason why we should accept Mackey’s requisites if they do not agree with the facts, and it is a fact that the Ancients insisted that this ceremony was a landmark, and the Moderns finally agreed that it was. The term “landmark” as applied to Freemasonry seems to have been first used by those Grand Lodges and we should accept their interpretations of their own terms.

“The Constitutions of the Grand Lodge of England, in 1723, was an earnest attempt to es-

COMMENTS

stone for a landmark ; he may set a post. If both are on the boundary line, it makes no difference which is regarded as the landmark. If either one or both are not on the line, there may be a fight over it, but don't say that neither is a landmark because both owners don't recognize it as such. To each owner his object is a landmark and will so remain until the true position is determined. Boundary disputes are not uncommon, and sometimes they continue for generations. They are very troublesome, and so are the disputes as to the true boundary lines of Freemasonry. Unfortunately the boundary lines, both to property and Freemasonry, are not always clearly determined, and both parties to a dispute often have to give and take until an agreement is reached. The objects which each party accepts as landmarks are indeed such, for they mark the limits of the land which he considers his own.

“The installation ceremony is not a landmark because it has been changed, but such change, even if it were changed beyond recognition, would not make Freemasonry something else.”

A change in the character of a landmark, as the replacing of a tree by a stone, does not change the character of adjoining properties. You find it hard, as I did, to distinguish between

COMMENTS

tablish a Universal Brotherhood on the most liberal basis. In those Constitutions there is no allusion to the Volume of the Sacred Law. This use of the Volume of the Sacred Law was a subsequent addition to the Masonic symbolism; therefore the Bible is not a landmark.”

I answered: I do not hold that the Book in and of itself is a Masonic landmark, but the Bible and Masonry's relation to it is. Neither do the Constitutions of the Grand Lodges of Iowa or other states allude to the Volume of the Sacred Law. Does that prove that its use is not required in those Grand Jurisdictions? We know better. The Ancient Masonic MSS. prove that the Holy Scriptures were used by the pre-Grand Lodge Masons much as we use them now as a part of the ritualistic ceremony. Some of the symbolism which we now ascribe to the Book may be new, but the essential use of the Book in the initiation ceremony is not new.

“I think landmarks are both characteristics and laws. For instance, the prohibition of admitting women is a law and also a landmark.”

True, in cases where women have been admitted, a landmark has been removed, and the bodies had the power to admit women to their own body if they wished, but in so doing they

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

ceased to be Masonic. A baseball club has the power to discard baseball and devote itself to tennis, but in so doing it ceases to be a baseball club.

Masonry is a society of men. When Masonic bodies by written enactment admitted women they ceased to be societies of men, and therefore ceased to be Masonic. The landmark is the **fact** that the members are all men, and this fact is independent of any written law on the subject, whether such law permitted or forbade the admission of women. It should be noted that whenever a Masonic body has admitted women the Masonic world has no longer recognized it as Masonic.

The Ancient Constitutions had no **law** against the admission of women, but they use masculine pronouns in referring to Masons. They always say "brother," never "sister," "man," not "woman," etc. The first **law** against the admission of women was adopted by the Grand Lodge of London in 1722. Nevertheless the fact that Masonry was composed of men only was as much a landmark **before** the adoption of the **law** as it has been since.

A quadruped is an animal having four feet, but there is no law requiring a quadruped to

COMMENTS

have four feet, and if there were it would be meaningless, since the determination of whether or not an animal is a quadruped would depend on facts, not laws.

“Thou shalt not steal” is a law, but the identifying characteristic of an honest man is the fact that he will not steal, not the law which forbids stealing. The honest man would be such regardless of the law, and the man who refrains from stealing simply because he fears the penalty of the law is not honest.

“Does not Anderson’s Charge ‘concerning God and Religion’ violate some of your landmarks? The religion of the Old Charges was Trinitarian and sectarian. The candidate was charged to be true to God and Holy Church and to use no heresy. Anderson’s charge then was a revolutionary one and a declaration of independence from dogmatism.”

No, Anderson’s charge did not violate a landmark. Masonry never required its members to be Trinitarian. God is the universal landmark, like the stone in Washington which determines the location of all property in this country. Masonry’s attitude or relation to God is peculiar to itself, like the relation of my property to the Washington stone, and that attitude is not af-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

fectured by our individual creeds. The Masons of the Old Charges were Trinitarian and naturally used Trinitarian language, but they did not **require** belief in Trinitarianism as a precedent to membership. Writers have misrepresented the position of the Old Charges by taking a clause out of its context. This first charge to the candidate is practically the same in all the Old MSS., and I quote the entire clause concerning God, using the York MS. No. 1 of about 1600, which is typical of all: "Every man that is a Mason take right good heed to these charges and if any man find himself guilty in any of these charges, that he amend himself before God and in any particular ye that are to be charged take good heed that ye may keep these charges right well, for it is perilous and great danger for a man to forswear himself upon the Holy Scripture. The first charge is that he or those be true man to God and the holy church and that you use neither error nor heresy *according to your own understanding or discreet and wise men's teaching.*" Those who quote this charge usually omit the words I have italicised, and which prove the charge was not "a purely sectarian regulation." At a time when there was but one recognized Church in England these words are truly

COMMENTS

remarkable. Anderson's "Concerning God and Religion" is not revolutionary, but an application of this old charge to the changed conditions in England. It is the same thing in a different dress. I can find nothing dogmatic in any of the Old Charges. It is true that prayers were offered to the Trinity for the English Masons of that time were Trinitarians, but I can find nothing to imply that belief in the Trinity was a **Masonic** requirement. Perhaps Anderson was right in stating that in those early days Masons were charged to adhere to the religion of their own country, and that this rule was later changed. Naturally migration of peoples from country to country would bring this about, and the right of each one to his own religion would be recognized. However, this much-quoted article of Anderson's does not countenance atheism, and never has the requirement of a belief in God been abolished. Regardless of the purpose of the Grand Orient of France in taking the action it did on this subject, the fact is that the action made atheists eligible, and the effect was similar to that of a Mexican Grand Lodge in making women eligible, namely, the greater part of the Masonic world withdrew recognition.

Some commentators do not distinguish be-

THE LANDMARKS OF FREEMASONRY

tween a landmark and the property it defines. In the case of a physical object in determining the boundary line between two pieces of property the distinction is easily seen, but they cannot understand why a fundamental characteristic of Freemasonry is not always a landmark, nor how anything can be a landmark if it is not necessarily a characteristic of the Institution. Nevertheless, just as a piece of property may contain no stone like the one on its boundary line, so there is no necessary similarity between Freemasonry and one of its landmarks.

Brethren too often apply the term "landmark" to Freemasonry as though it meant the **inherent** characteristic of the Institution. Landmarks usually give no information regarding the nature of the soil or the kind of crops raised on the property they define.

There is an old saying, "There can no great smoke arise, but there must be some fire." The fire is the cause, smoke the effect. A landmark is like the smoke that reveals the fact that there is a fire, but the two are distinct things.

To sum up, in determining a landmark we note if it is used to determine the location of a piece of property in its relation to other pieces. In a similar way we may determine a Masonic

COMMENTS

landmark by noting if it in some way distinguishes Freemasonry from other institutions. An Ancient Landmark is one that has been so used from time immemorial.

A law may acknowledge a landmark as in the case of Congress or State Legislatures making the stakes set by surveyors legal points of reference, but the stakes themselves are not laws. Likewise a Grand Lodge may adopt a law to the effect that certain features of Freemasonry are landmarks, but the law is not the landmark. Rather the landmarks are the features of the Institution itself which distinguish it from other institutions. All the law can do is to officially recognize a fact.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MATERIAL ON LANDMARKS IN THE IOWA MASONIC LIBRARY

General Masonic Collection:

- Alvord, H. J. The Ancient Landmarks: a Lecture . . . Washington, D.C., 1866
- Bacon, A. S. The Landmarks of Masonry . . . New York, N. Y., 1918
- Billson, F. W. Landmarks. Dundee, Scotland, 1932
- Darrah, D. D. The Question of Landmarks. Bloomington, Ill., 1920
- Findel, G. J. G. The Antient Landmarks. Hull, England, 1871
- Grand Lodge—Massachusetts. Report of the Committee of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts on the Relations of Freemasonry to Sectarianism . . . Boston, Mass., 1871
- Grant, H. B. Some of the Ancient Landmarks of Freemasonry, with Proofs . . . Louisville, Ky., 1894
- Halliday, Robert T. The Landmarks of the Order: . . . Liverpool, England, 1936
- MacBride, A. S. The Landmarks of Speculative Masonry. New York, N. Y., 1924 (also two editions printed in Glasgow, Scotland, 1914 and 1931)
- Masonic Service Association, U.S.A. Digest of the Ancient Landmarks of Freemasonry as Adopted, Recognized, Followed or Undecided by Thirty-nine Sovereign Grand Jurisdictions of the U.S. Washington, D.C., 1932
- Maxwell, J. M. Landmarks of Freemasonry. Denver, Colo., 1921
- Morris, Robert. A Code of Masonic Law; . . . Louisville, Ky., 1856

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Norton, Jacob. About our Philadelphia Landmark Sticklers. Boston, Mass., 1896 (?)
- Pike, Albert. The Ancient Landmarks. Washington, D.C., 1887
- Richards, George. Remove Not the Ancient Land Marks: a Masonic Discourse, . . . Portsmouth, N. H., 1808
- Shepherd, S. H. The Landmarks of Freemasonry: Being a Compilation of the Lists Made by Masonic Scholars or Adopted by Grand Lodges, Together with Material Planned to Assist Comparative Study: . . . Wisconsin, 1924. (Another edition, Washington, D. C., 1924)
- Timberlake, E. W. Masonic Landmarks. North Carolina Grand Lodge Proceedings, 1930.
- Transactions of Research Lodges and Associations:
- Furze-Morrish, S. The Landmarks of Freemasonry. Installed Masters' Association, Leeds, Transactions, 1907-8
- Hextall, W. B. The Old Landmarks of the Craft. Ars Quatuor Coronatorum, 1912
- Horsley, J. W. Intimations of Immortality. Ars Quatuor Coronatorum, 1899
- Poignant, A. J. A. The Landmarks. Ars Quatuor Coronatorum, 1911
- Race, Robert. Genuine Ancient Landmarks. Manchester Association for Masonic Research, Transactions, 1916-17

INDEX

Abors	9
Action, Law is a Rule of	40, 41
Adopt, Not Applicable to Landmarks	49, 78
Africa	8
Ahab	51
Allan, J. Mason	68
Ancient Landmarks	22, 48, 112
Ancients and Moderns	39
Differences between	27
Why so called	27
Anderson, Dr. James	80
Constitutions of	125
Andrea Paladio's Architecture	80
Antiquity, Immemorial	39
Applications, Other	15
Architecture	80
Assyria	10
Atheism	127
Attica	12
Australia	8
Badges	21
Baird, George W.	68
Bamboo	9
Baseball Club	21
Belief in God (See "God")	91, 99
Bhile	9
Bible, The	94, 99
Dictionary Definition	50
Landmark	44
Not Mentioned in Anderson's Constitutions	123
References	4, 5
Bibliography	130
Birds	107
Book of the Dead	12

INDEX

Boundary Lines	4, 7
Freemasonry	88
Landmarks	48, 77, 78
Mark	20
Permanent	52
Brehon Laws	14
Brotherhood, A Universal	123
Burial Place	16
Bushes	8
California	15
Candidates, Qualifications of	34
Carr, Thomas	69
Carved Images	8
Caucasian Race	105
Celts	14
Ceremonies	28
Changes in Masonry and Landmarks	116
Character of	
Landmark May Change	116, 122
Object and Property	21
Characteristics	22, 37, 45
Many Forms	38, 48
Societies	21
Charge	63
Charter, Lodge	63
Church Fix Boundaries	15
Clandestinism and Regularity	116
Comments	114
Compass, Properties of the	80
Conference, International	32
Constitutions	
Anderson's	123, 125
Old Manuscript	18, 81, 96
Corner Stones, Location of	99
Crawley, W. J. Chetwode	69
Creeds and Landmarks	118
Cultured Tribes, Use among	11
Curse on Remover	9, 10, 13
Custom—Enactment	41
A Landmark	110
And Law	42

INDEX

Deacons	28
Situation of	29
Definition	16, 46
Bible Dictionary	50
Established by Usage	76
Like a Boundary Line	90
Landmark Classified	75-76
Mackey's Criticized	40
Masonic	19, 20, 67
Unnecessary	24
Masonry	89
English Ritual	53
Various	
Masonic Encyclopedias and Dictionaries	67-68
Noted Masonic Writers	68-75
Degrees, Number of	87
Destroy Landmarks by Law	44
Details Vague	38, 46, 62
Determining Factors	22
Disputes, Subjects of	7
Ditches	9, 14
Diversity of Opinion	76
Divine Command	13
Dogmatic, Old Manuscripts	127
Dress, Form of	21
Dring, E. H.	70, 96
Drummond, Josiah	70
Dwelling	14
Early Conceptions	30
Earth, Heaps of	9
Edwin, Prince	90
Egypt	11
Enactment	41
England, Grand Lodge of	26
Entail, Law of	53
Essentials Similar	64
Etruscan	13
Event Marking a Turning Point	77
Facts	22
Fellows, J. Q. A.	70
Fences	8

INDEX

Fiji	8
Fines for Removal	14
Fireback Stone	14
First Mention of, Masonically	18
Form of the Lodge	30
Freemasons Pocket Companion	79
Fundamental Traits	49
Furze-Morrish, S.	70
Gardens	8
General Assembly Revived	24
General Regulations	19
Geometry	11, 78, 79-81
God, Belief in	91, 99, 106
Golden Age	12
Gould, R. F.	70
Grand Lodge	
England	26
Powers of	48
Three in 1772	35
Grant, H. B.	71
Great Event, Mark	16
Greece	12
Grinnell College Anniversary	117
Growth not a Removal	47
Guides	16
Hadrian	13
Hawkins, E. L.	67, 71
Hebrews—Nomadic	51
Hedges	8, 9
Hextall, W. B.	71, 80
Honest Man and Law	125
Hughan, W. J.	71
Human Beings Recognized	38
Ideal Conditions	13
Of Masonry	25
Illustrations	3, 21, 41, 90
Baseball Club	21
Birds	107
Caucasian Race	105
College Anniversary	117
Optician	3

INDEX

Optional route	41
Quadruped	124
Trowel	90
Immobility	39
Immortality	93, 99
India	9, 11
Indian, North American	9
Remains in California	15
Inman, Herbert F.	67
Innovations Forbidden	26
Inscription on Landmarks	10
Installation Ceremony	30, 54, 121, 122
A Landmark	30
The Present-day	59
Vows	26
International Conference	32
Introduction	3
Investigation	3
Ionia	12
Ireland	26, 32
Irish Masons	26
Irrevocability	39
Jack O'Lantern	14
Job, Book of	15
Jubilee, Year of	52
Jupiter	13
Kandhs	9
Kenning	67
King's Arms Lodge, The Old	80
Klein, Sidney A.	81
Lakes	9, 14
Landmarks	
Clear in Principle	38
Club	15
Defined	37
Detail, Vague in	38, 46, 62
Enacted, Not	23, 24
Eternal	112
Immovable	32, 33
Inherent Characteristics vs.	128
Naming	104

INDEX

Obligation to Preserve	24, 27
Preserve, Deviate from, Revert to	27
Two or True	31, 32
Uniformity not Essential	30
Law	37
Changeable	78
Consistent, Must Be	22
Determine, Does not	22
Enacted or Repealed	23
Independent of	20
Landmarks vs.	44, 129
May Recognize	20
Specific and Definite	38, 45
Unwritten	44
Lawrence, J. T.	71, 101
Learned Brothers	115
Legal Sanction Unnecessary	20
Legends	95, 96
Lists of	43
First Published	36
Impossible	38
Literary References	6
Location, Landmarks Determine	24
Other Things	20
Lockwood, Luke A.	72
MacBride, A. S.	25, 72, 110
MacCulloch, J. A.	13
Mackenzie, K. R. H.	68
Mackey, A. G.	36, 68
Description	48
Manuscripts, Old	18, 81, 96, 127
Mark a Boundary Line	20
Turning Point	20
Masonic Application	21
Landmarks, Early Conception of	18
Masonry Defined	24
Operatively	24
Speculatively	25
Mission of	25
Other Organizations	106
Meaning not Obscure in 1722	19

INDEX

Meeting Place	16
Men, A Society of	124
Middle Ages	14
Military Lodges	83
Minnesota	36
Mission of	
Church—Salvation	25
Gunshot—Death	25
Masonry—Building the Ideal Temple	25
Rocket—Life	25
University—Knowledge	25
Moderns	
Admit Error	63
Removing Landmarks	27
Why Called	27
Monuments	16
Morris, Rob	36, 72
Mounds	14
Mountains	9
Mounting Stone	14
Moved, Not to be	7
Naboth	51
National Masonic Congress (1893)	75
Natural Objects	7
Nature of Object Immaterial	17
New Zealand	8
Newton, Joseph Fort	73
Noses, Blowing	110, 111
Numa	13
Obey Laws	23
Object, Landmark a Fixed	77
Natural (See "Natural")	7
Removed	23
Restricted to Natural, Not	77
Trait	102
Officers and their Duties	30
Oliver, George	73
Operative and Speculative	90
Optician, Illustration	3
Optional Route	41
Oran	8

INDEX

Ownership, Private	12
Parvin, T. S.	73
Pathways	8, 9
Payne's 39th Regulation	18, 21, 24, 50
Recognized	114
Peloponnesos	12
Philosophy, Boundary Line of	118
Pike, Albert	73
Plato	12
Plutarch	12
Poignant, A. J. A.	74
Posts	8
Pound, Roscoe	74
Prayer in Old Manuscripts	92
Preservation of Landmarks Required	18, 37, 43, 47
By Law	43, 44
Preserve Things	23
Preston, William	26
Primitive Tribes, Use among	8
Principle, Clear in	38
Prior Occupancy	14
Private Ownership	12
Privilege	14
Progressive Science	47
Promise	
Land of	51
Required	63
Promulgation, Lodge of	27
Minutes of	28-30
Proprietary	14
Purpose	20
Quadruped, Illustration	124
Qualifications of a Mason	98
Quarrels Settled at	8
Races of Men, Illustration	106
Randir, Lawful	14
Recognition	20
Modes of	87
Of Old People	117
Standards of	48, 82, 120
Regius Manuscript	31, 90

INDEX

Removing, Penalty for	14
Requisites of, Mackey's	39
Criticized	43
Resolution of International Conference	33
Ritualistic	27, 30
Rivers	8, 9, 14
Roads	14
Rocks	8
Rome	12
Royal Arch	65
Rule of Action	40, 41
Sacred	7
Sacredness	
Grows with Age	20
Landmarks	11
St. Paul's Cathedral	80
Samoa	8
Scotland	26, 32
Secrecy	96, 97, 98
Sectarian, Old Manuscripts not	126
Shepherd, Silas H.	74
Shrine of Worship	16
Silence of Record	115
Simons, John W.	74
Simpson, J. P.	80
Smith, George, Discovery of	10
Society, Character and Landmarks of	24
Soil and Landmark	21
Soul, Immortality of	93, 99
Spanish Remains in California	15
Speculative and Operative	90
Speech, Form of	21
Speed, Frederick	75
Stakes	14
Standards of Recognition	48, 82
Dogmatic	120
Stones	8, 9, 14
Of a Kiln	14
Streams	8, 9
Summary of	
Chapters	101
Introduction	15

INDEX

Symbolic	
Application of Tools	63
Meanings	6, 7
Tahiti	8
Tenure of Property	51
Test of a Landmark	98
Teutons	14
Theseus	12
Three	
Preservers of a Memorial	14
Stays of Boundaries	14
Witnesses	14
Third Degree, Legend of the	86
Title	14
Traits	22
Trees	8, 9, 14, 19
Trenches	8
Trinitarianism and the Old Manuscripts	125
Truth	112
Eternal	34
Turning Point	20
Types of Landmarks	109
Union, Act of	32
Universality	39
Use of Landmarks	16
Vague in Detail	38, 46, 62
Value	
Intrinsic, not Necessary	111
Of Landmarks	16
Views of Early Masons	26
Waite, A. E.	75
Wales	14
Walls	8
Washington (D.C.) Stone	99, 108
Waters, Principal	14
Wells	14
Women Barred	123, 124
Word, The	87
True	64
Words	21
Worship, Shrine of	16
Writers, Noted Masonic	68
Written and Unwritten Law	45