plaints to Clement V. The pope, though at firſt unwilling to proceed againſt them, was under a neceſſity of comply­ing with the king’s desire ; ſo that, in the year 1307, upon an appointed day, and for ſome time afterwards, all the knights, who were diſperſed throughout Europe, were ſeized and impriſoned, and many of them, after trials for capital crimes, were convicted and put to death. In 1312 the whole order was ſuppressed by the council of Vienne. A part of the rich revenues they poſſeſſed was beſtowed upon other orders, eſpecially on the knights of St John, now of Malta, and the reſt confiſcated to the reſpective treaſuries of the ſovereign princes in whoſe dominions their poſseſſions lay.—The knights Templars, in order to juſtify the ſeverity with which they were treated, were charged with apoſtaſy to the Saracens, and holding correſpondence with them, with insulting the majeſty of God, turning into derision the goſpel of Chriſt, and trampling upon the obligation of all laws human and divine. Candidates, it is said, upon admiſſion to this order, were commanded to ſpit, in token of contempt, upon an image of Chriſt, and after admiſſion to worſhip either a cat or a wooden head crowned with gold. It is farther affirmed, that, among them, the odious and un­natural act of ſodomy was a matter of obligation ; and they are charged with other crimes too horrible to be men­tioned, or even imagined. However, though there be reason to believe, that in this order, as well as others of the ſame period, there were shocking examples of impiety and profligacy ; yet that the whole order was thus enormouſly corrupt, there is no reaſon to believe. The pope indeed, though he acted with ſeverity, acted with justice. He ſent two cardinals to Paris, who, publiſhing his bull againſt the order, condemned thoſe Templars who had made the volun­tary confeſſion to be burnt by a slow fire. The criminals recanted their former confeſſions, but acknowleged themselves worthy of death, becauſe they had unjuſtly accused the order of crimes of which they were innocent. Several authors of thoſe times wrote in defence of the order ; and Boccace alleges, that its extirpation was owing to the avarice of the king of France, who coveted the rich poſſeſſions the Templars then enjoyed in France.

The king of Arragon was much preſſed to treat the Templars in his kingdom as they had been treated in France ; but his constant anſwer was, “ We muſt be firſt convinced of their guilt, and it will be then time enough to talk of their puniſhment.” The people, however, were in general ſo provoked againſt them, that they were compelled to ſhut themſelves up in the fortreſſes belonging to their order, to prevent their being torn in pieces; which precaution was re­preſented to the king of Arragon as an act of rebellion. He marched, therefore, with a corps of troops againſt one of theſe fortreſſes. The knight who commanded ſurrendered immediately, and told the king the truth, aſſuring him that they desired nothing but a fair trial ; with which declaration the king was extremely moved, took the whole order into his protection, and forbade any to abuſe or inſult them under the heavieſt penalties. At the ſame time he declared, he was ready to receive any informations againſt them that were ſupported by proofs ; but if the informers failed therein, he would puniſh them as they deſerved.

Theſe facts plead ſtrongly for the innocence of the Tem­plars, or at leaſt they prove that their guilt muſt have been exaggerated ; and if we add, that many of the accuſations advanced againſt them flatly contradict each other, and that many members of this unfortunate order ſolemnly avowed their innocence while languiſhing under the ſevereſt tor­tures, and even with their dying breath—it would ſeem pro­bable, that king Philip ſet on foot this bloody tragedy, with a view to gratify his avarice, and glut his resentment againſt the Templars, and eſpecially againſt their grand-maſter, who had highly offended him, The principal cauſe of his invincible hatred againſt them was, that in his quarrel with Boniface VIII. the knights eſpouſed the cauſe of the pope, and furniſhed him with money to carry on the war. They originally wore a white habit, with red croſſes ſewed upon their cloaks as a mark of diſtinction.

TEMPLE (Sir William), was born in London in the year 1628. The family from which he ſprung was ancient, and is ſaid to have aſſumed the ſurname of Temple from the manor of Temple, in the hundred of Sparken-Hall, in Leiceſterſhire. He was firſt ſent to ſchool at Penſehurſt, in Kent, under the care of his uncle, the celebrated Dr Hammond, then miniſter of that pariſh ; but at the age of ten he was removed thence to a ſchool at Biſhop-Stortford, in Hertfordſhire. When he had acquired a ſufficient know­ledge of the Greek and Latin, he returned home at the age of fifteen ; and, two years after, he went to Cambridge, where he was placed under the tuition of the learned Dr Cudworth, then fellow of Emanuel Collega. His father, Sir John Temple, being a ſtatesman, ſeems to have designed him for the ſame way of life ; and on this account, after residing at Cambridge two years, which were principally spent in acquiring a competency of French and Spanish, both languages exceedingly uſeful for his intended pursuits, he was ſent abroad to finiſh his education.

Mr Temple began his travels by visiting France in 1648. As he chose to paſs through the Isle of Wight, where his majeſty was detained a priſoner, he there accidentally met with the ſecond daughter of Sir Peter Oſborn of Chicksand, in Bedfordſhire, then governor of Guernſey for the king ; and this lady being on a journey with her brother to St Maloes, where their father then was, our young traveller joined their party. This gave riſe to an honourable amour, which, at the end of ſeven years, concluded in a happy mar­riage. Having resided two years in France, and learned the French language perfectly, Mr Temple made a tour through Holland, Flanders, and Germany, during which he became completely maſter of the Spaniſh. In 1654 he returned from the continent, and, marrying Miſs Oſhorn, paſſed his time in retirement with his father, his two brothers, and a siſter, then in Ireland, happy in that per­fect harmony which has been ſo often remarked in their fa­mily.

As he rejected all offers made him of employment under Cromwell, the five years which he lived in Ireland were ſpent chiefly in improving himſelf in hiſtory and philoſophy ; but at the Reſtoration, in 1660, being choſen a member of the convention there, while others were trying to make their court to the king, Mr Temple oppoſed the poll-bill with ſo much ſpirit, that his conduct ſoon attracted the at­tention of the public, and brought him into notice. In the ſucceeding parliament, in 1661, he was elected with his fa­ther for the county of Carlow ; and, in the year following, he was choſen one of the commissioners to be ſent from that parliament to the king, which gave him an opportunity of waiting on the duke of Ormond, the new lord lieutenant, then at London. Soon after he went back to Ireland, but with a reſolution of quitting that kingdom, and of removing with his family to England.

On his return he met with a very favourable reception from the duke of Ormond ; and ſoon acquired ſuch a considerable ſhare in his eſteem, that the duke complained of him as the only man in Ireland that had never asked any thing from him. When he mentioned his design of carrying his family to England, his grace said, that he hoped he