

was abandoned because it was not true, and, if true, superfluous. The Society is based on Free Masonry so far that none are admitted but such as are "Masons," and the prefix is not found in the English Charter of the Duke of Kent of the 10th April, 1807, but was an illegal introduction, without any authority, when the High Grades passed to another jurisdiction in 1848.

The present title and nomenclature of the Order was the correction of ignorant errors, fully and clearly borne out by historical evidence that cannot be controverted, and which shews that the proper designation of the officer presiding over the Orders of the Templars for each nation is that of "Grand or Great Prior." The organization of the early Order in England as respects control of the members and management of estates was threefold, viz;—1st. The "Chief or Grand Prior" in London; 2nd. "Sub Priors," who managed the great estates of the Order when Priorial Houses had been erected; and, 3rd. "Preceptors," who were at the head of establishments for the supervision of smaller estates and farms. These smaller administrations were called "Preceptories," and for this reason: the Commissions, or Mandates, directed by the "Master of the Temple" to the officer at the head of these establishments, were called "Precepts," from the commencement of them, "*Præcipimus*," "we enjoin or direct;" and the Knights to whom they were addressed, were styled "*Præceptores Templi*," or "Preceptors of the Temple;" and the districts administered by them "*Præceptoria*," or "Preceptories." Here is historical evidence that the proper designation of the lowest organized bodies of Knights Templar was Preceptories, and their chief officer Preceptor.

The term, "Commandery," and the title, "Commander," were never used by the Templars, although, singularly enough, the order of St. John of Jerusalem (or Malta,) used both "Commander" or "Preceptor" indifferently for the same officer; no doubt their first title for heads of houses was, "Commander," but after coming into possession of large portions of the Templar property, after the outward suppression of the Templar Order, they adopted, in a measure, the Templar name, and called their chief of houses, sometimes, "Preceptor," at other times, "Commander." Although there is thus some reason for the Malta Order using the term, "Preceptor" or "Preceptory," there is none, whatever, for the Templar Order using the term, "Commander" or "Commandery."

As to the term, "Encampment," of course any one knows what an encampment properly is. An army in the field may, and often does, form an encampment; but why a military monastic body, such as the Knights Templar were, dwelling in fixed places of abode, should ever have termed their residences or places of meeting, "Encampments," passes comprehension. In fact, they never did. The use of the term was altogether at variance with history, logic, or common sense; but was, no doubt, adopted, when the Order was first attached to Free Masonry, by some modern unread aspirant for Chivalry who looked upon the name as appropriate for a military body. Besides the Knights were never made in the field but consecrated in Chapter of the Preceptory, or their Chapel. That is, the Chapter met in a Chapel.

The two designations of "Constable" and "Marshal" are very properly given to the two chief military officers of a Preceptory, and are much more appropriate than those of first and second Captains, which have no chivalric signification whatever. These latter titles are, in fact, modern and had no recognized existence as military titles at the Crusades. The "Constable" was anciently, particularly in France, *ex-officio*, the Commander-in-Chief, under the Sovereign, of all the military power of the State. The "Marshal" was a military officer next in rank to the "Constable."

"Sub-Marshal" was very properly substituted for that of "Expert." The