

Templary.

THE London *Freemason* says Bro. Carson, that very able Masonic writer and student, is right no doubt in his main contention, that a Trinitarian basis—an avowal of belief in the Holy Trinity—has always been the mark and token of Christian Templary. From its active promulgation by Dun-keeley in this country such has been the invariable dogma, the unvarying avowal it made; so much so that none but believers in the Trinity could be properly or conscientiously members of the Order. Such an assertion has also, no doubt, we may add, an historical certainty as its characteristic and reality. When Templary appeared in England, is a very moot question. The well known Ramsay in France, in 1756, first threw out the idea of a Knightly and Crusadory origin for Freemasonry, not especially Templar: indeed, he is credited with the Rite de Bouillon, which took its name from the famous Godfrey de Bouillon, the leader of the first crusade. The Templar perpetuation theory emanated from the Chapiere de Clermont, at Paris, and to have culminated in the "strict observance" under Von Hund. But there was no contemporary movement in England. Some attempts have been made to identify the Stuarts with Templary in 1745, but we apprehend the evidence is very scanty and dubious on that head also—as hazy as that of the Rosi Croix of Heredom at Arras, at the same date. We do not contend that these assertions are positively untrue, but only that they are very doubtful; so doubtful as to render them, we are inclined to think,

almost apocryphal. At the same time we say this—we are open to evidence, proper evidence, on this subject. There is no trace of Templary in England, so far as we are aware, strictly speaking, before 1780. It has been alleged that there are much earlier Templar warrants. We can only say that we should like to see them, and have them exhibited to experts. We do not believe that any such really exist. But then, on the other hand, Templary exists now, and it seems to us far better to deal with it as it is than to enter upon researches that lead to nothing, and indulge in discussions upon archaic forms and ceremonies about which we have not a scintilla of trustworthy evidence. In all probability, Templary, like some other grades, came to England from the continent; but to prove that Masonic Templary is indigenous to England we must also certify the existence of some lingering remains of the old Templars. But that is a "crux" that overpasses even our able Bro. Carson's admitted Masonic power and knowledge to remove or smooth over. That the Templars had a "secreta receptio," with ceremonies akin to Masonic forms, is, we think, provable from the examinations at Paris prescribed by Dupuy and others; but how Masonic Templary got to England, or when received in England—if it was received—must be left, we apprehend, to that mystery and obscurity in which it has long been involved. Bro. Carson's account of its existence in England in 1780 or thereabouts, if not earlier, cannot be accepted as either historical or authentic. We shall await with interest to hear what the Great Prior of Canada, Col. Moore, and our friend Rt. Em. Sir Knight Enoch Carson, have to say in response to Bro. Woodward's views on the question.