description, is—in all frankness—to bear false testimony. The manifesto in question alludes to a mysterious Book T, being a parchment, described as a great treasure. It ends with a Latin ELOGIUM, after which the Brethren of the first and second circles are said to have placed their initials, by way of signature. Among those of the earlier group—and belonging *ex hypothesi* therefore to the fifteenth century—is *Fra* ∴ F ∴ B ∴ M ∴ P ∴ A ∴, described as *Pictor et Architectus*.[1] There is neither sense nor sincerity in affirming that these initials signify Francis Bacon, nor could he be identified otherwise under such denominations as Painter and Architect, though Mr. Wigston has dedicated several pages to an argument that he was both, if the words are understood within their figurative or emblematical measures.

We see, therefore, that so far as evidential values are concerned the deponent here cited is out of court or non-suited on every count of his affidavit. Were it possible to think for a moment that the Fraternity of the Rosy Cross had its concealed founder and chief in this country, Robert Fludd would be assuredly a far more plausible claimant than Francis Bacon; he corresponds to all the essential qualifications, generally as occult philosopher, especially as Theosophist, Alchemist, Kabalist, Magian and Exponent of *medicina catholica*, who taught from a seat of learning placed within the veil of a mystical sanctuary of healing, according to his own description. Bacon was none of these things, and Mr. Wigston has fallen into many signal errors of enthusiasm in attempting to shew that he was.

There is also Mr. Harold Bayley, who appealed long ago, for "further investigation and research" in respect of

[1] The same original member seems to be mentioned earlier as Brother B ∴, and the alleged personal description says that he was "a skilful painter," which cannot be called a characteristic definition of Francis Bacon.

Francis Bacon.[1] He lays down (1) that "St. Alban, poet and dramatist," belonged to "the mystic Brotherhood of the Rosicrucians," apparently because it was one of "their principles and rules to produce works under other names than their own"—being Mrs. Pott's thesis, as we have seen; (2) that the history of Bacon offers a parallel with that of Christian Rosy Cross, because at the age of fifteen he requested his parents to remove him from Cambridge, "as he had acquired everything the university was able to teach," while—according to the FAMA FRATERNITATIS—the Rosicrucian protagonist went Eastward in search of wisdom at about the same age; (3) that Mr. Bayley has discovered "peculiar and distinctive Rosicrucian symbols, cunningly but unquestionably concealed in the ornamental head and tail pieces" of Baconian books; (4) that certain watermarks on the paper used in printing THE ADVANCEMENT OF LEARNING shew the initials R. C., C. R. and "perhaps" C. R. C., while others include roses. The frivolity of these intimations is manifest on their surface. (1) The original Rosicrucian manifestoes were by their hypothesis on the part of the Society at large and could appear under no individual names, but the expository literature of the subject is under well-known names, like those of Robert Fludd, Michael Maier, Thomas Vaughan, John Heydon, whence it is the very reverse of the truth to propose that the mystical Brethren were accustomed to produce works under names other than their own. (2) Between the biography of Bacon and the traditional personality of FAMA FRATERNITATIS there is no analogy

[1] See TRAGEDY OF SIR FRANCIS BACON, 1902, and also JOURNAL OF THE BACON SOCIETY for the same year. I do not know whether Mr. Bayley has abandoned the views summarised above, but in his NEW LIGHT ON THE RENAISSANCE and LOST LANGUAGE OF SYMBOLISM, published some years later, the references to Bacon are few and far between and are confined to brief quotations, quite apart from any thesis, though he is dealing with watermarks and printers' ornamental blocks.

whatever. The one left Cambridge, weening himself stuffed with its knowledge, but the other went to the East, presumably in search of knowledge. It seems almost beneath the native dignity of criticism that one is called upon to point out a fact so obvious as this. (3) The alleged Rosicrucian symbols in the head and tail-pieces of Bacon's works can be dismissed in a no less summary manner, for the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross has only one characteristic and exclusive emblem,[1] being that whence their name derives, and it appears nowhere in connection with the writings of Verulam, whether as a printer's ornament or as a watermark on the paper. (4) As regards watermarks, I make no pretence of distinguishing the specific edition of THE ADVANCEMENT to which Mr. Bayley refers, but it is certainly not that of the first two books, which appeared in 1605, is long antecedent to the original proclamations of the Order in Germany and could therefore—under any circumstances—prove nothing. I am of course far from admitting that the initials C. R. and their variants used as watermarks would prove anything at any period, and I remember Mr. Bayley's methods in two later books, where any watermark chalice is affirmed to be the Holy Graal, and any pictured castle is that of Corbenic or Mont Salvatch. It is not in such manner that great debatable questions attain a settlement.[2]

[1] It has been naturally a matter of convenience to father on the Brotherhood any emblems which happened to help the speculations of enthusiasts who have seen the Rosy Cross wherever they turned their eyes and would have liked to discover it everywhere. The pelican is one useful instance, but we shall find much later on its real position in our subject. As the Rosicrucians were alchemists, all the great cloud of pictorial symbols found in alchemical textbooks may have been part of their concern ; but they were not characteristic of the Order. So also on rare occasions we meet with figures and diagrams in Rosicrucian books which are suggestive of Masonic signs and moralities ; but again they are accidental or subsidiary, not essential to the Order and not belonging to its doctrine.

[2] See A NEW LIGHT ON THE RENAISSANCE, 1909, pp. 68, 69, where it is said that some writers represent the Castle of the Graal as situated on a moun-

Here are the findings of an exceedingly restrained criticism on the Baconian origin of the Rosy Cross, outside akasic records. The last state of the subject is far more frantic than the first in respect of these, for there has come about a kind of marriage between the two methods of research. The results of astral skrying have been fortified by gleanings from the Bacon-Shakespeare literature, while the pages of Mrs. Pott and her lineal descendants in the apostleship of literary unreason have been illuminated from time to time by the faculty of intuition and its substitutes, directed thereupon. There was never such a mad world, my masters, as that which has been formulated around the central figure of Viscount St. Albans. It seems idle to plead that for want of evidence—except in the opposite direction—we are unable to regard him as a Master of the Rosy Cross, or originator of the Rosicrucian Fraternity, or directly in touch with the Brotherhood and author of the allegory concerning C.·.R.·.C.·.,[1] when these comparatively minor marvels are swallowed up in the shadow of truly cyclopean revelations, according to which (1) Bacon "created single-handed the literature and to a large extent the language of the Elizabethan age"; (2) was the real author of Pope's ESSAY ON MAN, of Addison's contribu-

tain. "Figs. 155 to 158 are representations of this castle." Again: "In Figs. 165 to 213 we have a series of designs embodying the manifold phases of the Graal cult." There is no evidence whatever and no process of interpretation could beg any question at issue more completely. See also THE LOST LANGUAGE OF SYMBOLISM, 2 vols., 1912. "The object surmounting Fig. 127 is the Sangraal," p. 51. Many other places could be cited, and the method adopted throughout—whatever the subject in hand—seems to me quite as arbitrary. It is characteristic of the kind of research. M. Eugène Aroux pursued it for years in France, and his MYSTÈRES DE LA CHEVALERIE is its illustration at large.

[1] See THE ROSICRUCIANS, by Brothers H. C. and K. M. B., which says: (1) that there is a strong probability that its author was Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam; (2) that THE NEW ATLANTIS is a sequel to FAMA FRATERNITATIS; (3) that seal, sign, secrecy and oath were identical in both works, which is utterly contrary to fact; (4) that as in Bensalem of THE NEW ATLANTIS

tions to THE SPECTATOR, of SARTOR RESARTUS—perhaps by way of inspiration—of THE ANCIENT MARINER and Fitzgerald's OMAR KHAYYÁM; and finally (3) endured not only the incarnations and reincarnations which have been mentioned briefly but was the legitimate son of Queen Elizabeth and heir to the throne of Britain in place of James I. It seems incredible that a sane editor—if such a person exists in American theosophical literature—should publish month after month these vagaries of a literary mania in a periodical which pretends to be serious. But these on the one part are findings of the particular canon of criticism adopted in Baconian circles, and on the other are relations of ciphers and bi-literal ciphers, fortified by expert readings in the astral records of the past.

That which emerges from the research embodied in the present chapter is the signal importance attached to the idea of the Rosy Cross, its fact and the claims advanced concerning it, for several occult interests at this day and during two or three generations immediately preceding. There is no greater name in alchemy than is that of Raymund Lully, whether identified with the *doctor illuminatus* of the Balearic Isles or regarded as an Unknown Master, described vaguely as a Jewish neophyte, which might

there were "books pertaining to the Christian Revelation before they were written," so in the tomb of Christian Rosy Cross were unwritten works of Paracelsus, truly a striking evidence of *lapsus memoriæ* in both cases. The rest of the evidence for the Baconian authorship of the FAMA is of similar value. No doubt the canon of criticism represents a high-water mark of Baconian erudition acquired in the light of theosophy and its peculiar glass of vision. As regards the work which I have cited and its authors, Brothers H. C. and K. M. B. are to be understood as ladies, in accordance with the unspeakable terminology of Female Freemasonry. The little volume forms one of the TRANSACTIONS of the Golden Rule Lodge, under the obedience of Universal Co-Freemasonry. This body is to be distinguished from an independent obedience which came forth therefrom, and because it is the newest thing on earth is not unfitly denominated Ancient Freemasonry. The book is innocent enough by intention, but fanciful in its dealings with the facts of Rosicrucian history and of wild extravagance in speculation.

suggest a " proselyte of the gate," but was used to identify a convert from the religion of Israel. There is no occult personality to compare with Paracelsus, while that other ill-starred pupil of Trithemius, Cornelius Agrippa, is of traditional repute in magic. Lastly, Francis Bacon is the monitor and prophet of the new age which followed the Renaissance and Reformation. It is these who are marshalled successively to explain the Rosicrucian Mystery. The pleas fail, as we have seen, but there is something momentous in the ascriptions. It means that in study-groups, as among romance writers, the Mystery loomed largely, portending much more than was exhibited on its surface, however curiously blazoned.

CHAPTER II

MILITIA CRUCIFERA EVANGELICA

So far as the inquiry has proceeded, we have failed to find traces of any Rosicrucian Fraternity prior to the seventeenth century. Certain conspicuous personalities—occult and otherwise—have been cited as its founders or members, but the ascriptions have proved on examination to be based (1) on false inferences from the text of an early document—as in the cases of Raymund Lully, the alchemist, and a Prince-Archbishop of Trèves; (2) on the authority of archives which are not produced in evidence—as in the case of Paracelsus; (3) on the identification of any report or rumour concerning any Secret Society of past centuries—more especially of an alchemical kind—with the *Fratres Roseæ Crucis*, as in the case of Agrippa; (4) on the careless misreading of a printed text—as in that of John Dee; or (5) on the literary arguments of persons whose canons of criticism are beneath contempt, and on the ravings of occult dreamers—as in the case of Bacon. The speculations on Rosicrucian origins apart from specific or known personalities are also numerous and have one common characteristic, being the absence of evidence to support them. I will pass over Michael Maier, who decides on 1413 as the date of the Order's foundation,[1] because he and his claims will call for consideration at length. Solomon Semler also refers the Rosicrucians to the fifteenth century

[1] See THEMIS AUREA: *hoc est, de Legibus Fraternitatis R.·.C.·.*. Francofurti, 1618.

and says that the name Rosenkreutz—being that of the traditional founder—was borrowed from a Knight of the Golden Fleece.[1] His speculative dates are as follows: 1410, a Rosicrucian Society arose about this time, or was then existing in Italy; 1430, there was another established in Flanders; 1459, another was extant in Germany.[2]

It must be admitted freely and fully that there was nothing more calculated to produce casual and informal association for aid and support in common than the arduous pursuit of alchemy and its gropings in the dark night of physics. There are traces of such association, and I have no doubt in my mind that Italy, Germany and France were full of Secret Societies prior to the Reformation [3]—some for the advancement of science, of which alchemy would be then a branch; some for the liberation of religion, of which the Brethren of the Common Life, the Friends of God and the sects in Southern France are typical examples; some for the administration of occult justice, like the Secret Tribunal. But the point is that in respect

[1] Unparteiische Sammlungen zur Historie der Rosenkreuzer. 4 parts, 1786–8.

[2] The facts—real or alleged—produced by Semler do not bear out his opinions. The so-called Rosicrucian Society is obviously the more or less mythical *Academia di Segreti*, of which we hear in connection with John Baptista Porta, who is supposed to have founded it in the second half of the sixteenth century.

[3] They were probably everywhere and for purposes of all kinds, England being no exception. Among Ashmolean MSS. at Oxford, the vellum fly-leaves of No. 360 contain (1) "Letters of Frater Johannes Gardianus . . . receiving Richard Ghonge (or Young) into a Fraternity. Dated in the Epiphany, 1450. . . . (2) Letters of Frater Wi . . ., receiving John Claxtone and Matild his wife into a Fraternity." See Catalogue of the MSS. bequeathed to the University of Oxford by Elias Ashmole. Ed. by W. H. Black, 1845, p. 271. The nature of these associations does not emerge, but the use of the term *Frater* in both cases carries occult suggestions, religious or otherwise. As regards Gardianus, see my note *ante*, p. 11, respecting Hortulanus. If this pseudonym and also that of Ortholanus covers the personality of Gardianus, writing in the mid-fifteenth century, it follows that Dumbeler's dedication to Falkenstein is antedated by nearly a century.

of alchemy every rumour—at however far a distance—of sporadic gatherings together has been at once labelled Rosicrucian by uncritical people in the past; and the qualifications of Semler are indicated by his last date. The year 1459 is that which appears at the head of the third Rosicrucian manifesto—being THE CHEMICAL NUPTIALS—and it is at once interpreted as evidence that the Order was extant in Germany at that period. But we shall see that the romance in question belongs, by the confession of its writer, to *circa* 1603.

Coming down to much later fantasiasts, there is John Yarker—always confused and confusing—who affirms that the early Rosicrucians were initiated by "the Moslem sectaries" and adds that the fact is "in evidence," but no authority is given.[1] It can be supplied, however, for according to the FAMA FRATERNITATIS the traditional Christian Rosy Cross visited Damascus and Fez, as well as a certain Hidden City, and was there instructed in the secret knowledge which became afterwards that of the Order. So does Rosicrucian myth become witness of Rosicrucian claims, according to the best spirit of Yarker's methods—other evidence being none. There is also the voice of Masonry, as it has been raised on the subject in Switzerland, and according to this the Rosicrucians were Gnostic heretics.[2] It is an exceedingly mixed instruction,

[1] THE ARCANE SCHOOLS, by John Yarker, 1909, p. 430. The chief point that is "in evidence" throughout this chaotic volume is the author's capacity for accepting anything that he has met with in print under practically any circumstances, so long as it serves his purpose. In his occasional periodical THE KNEPH, Vol. IV, No. 3, August, 1844, he alludes in similar terms of certitude to a "Rosicrucian MS. at Cologne, written by *Non Omnis Moriar*." But he is only quoting from THE ROSICRUCIAN UNVEILED of Magister Pianco, who cites nothing in support of his statement.

[2] MAÇONNERIE PRATIQUE: *Cours d'Enseignement Supérieur de la Franc-Maçonnerie, Rite Écossais Ancien et Accepté.* 2 vols, 1885. It is called *édition sacrée, s'addressant exclusivement aux Francs-Maçons réguliers*, and yet it is *publiée par un Profane*. The editor is an enemy of Freemasonry

which postulates Zoroaster as the fountain-source of Gnostic doctrine, but he derived apparently from India. It was after this manner—if I understand the deposition rightly—that Christianity itself came into the world, "a gnosticisation of the ancient symbolism." The Templars arose in their day and acquired Gnosticism at the feet of Persian Sufis. Being destroyed in due course, the "pure Gnostic symbolism" was inherited and preserved by the Rosicrucian sect. This is obviously matter of revelation—however and whencesoever inspired—so that it transcends the evidence which it is not in a position to furnish. We meet otherwise with the Order of the Temple, which—according to an alternative reverie—did not beget the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross, this having been transmitted by Ormuz, as we have seen already; but the two Orders subsisted in close alliance.

These inventions might be multiplied almost indefinitely, but enough has been cited for my purpose, and I do not claim to have taken the entire annals of folly as my province. Not one of those which have been selected carries the thinnest colourable tincture of the plausible on its surface, while the seals of intellectual dishonesty are the sign-manuals which are marked on most.

As a possible counterpoise to the myths of cloud and moonshine, I shall take in the present chapter one case which stands out by itself and appears to offer something in the guise of concrete fact, whether or not it may prove to have been overlaid subsequently. Our initial knowledge on the subject throughout English-speaking countries is and states that the work which he introduces is one of the worst of its kind. It claims to have been written *par le très puissant Souverain Grand Commandeur des Suprèmes Conseils confédérés à Lausanne en* 1875. There is, however, no Sovereign Commander of all Supreme Councils in the Scottish Rite. At the particular assembly or convention there would have been an elected President.

an essay[1] by Thomas de Quincey, adapted rather than translated from a German original,[2] the work of Professor J. G. Bühle, a writer of consequence at the end of the eighteenth and early in the nineteenth century. He is one also who followed the golden counsel of citing the authorities from whom he derived on his own part, and in this manner I have got so far to the root of the subject as seems possible at this day. Bühle derived his information from WIRTEMBERGISCHES REPERTORIUM DER LITTERATUR,[3] containing an historical monograph entitled NEW ELUCIDATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE ROSICRUCIANS AND ALCHEMISTS, on which the following account is founded. It tells of a certain enthusiast named Simon Studion, who was born at Urach in the State of Würtemburg in 1543.[4] He graduated

[1] HISTORICO-CRITICAL INQUIRY INTO THE ORIGIN OF THE ROSICRUCIANS AND THE FREEMASONS. LONDON MAGAZINE, Vol. IX, January to June, 1824. The successive papers were initialled X. Y. Z. It has been reprinted frequently in the Collected Works of De Quincey and in selections therefrom.

[2] J. G. Bühle: UEBER DEN URSPRUNG UND DIE VORNEHMSTEN SCHICKSALE DES ORDENS DER ROSENKREUZER UND FREIMAURER, 1804. It was delivered originally in Latin as a discourse before a Philosophical Society of Göttingen and is supposed to have been printed in this form, but all references which I have met with have proved to be false lights. The following brief report appeared in GÖTTINGISCHE GELEHRTE ANZEIGEN UNTER DER ANSICHT DER KÖNIGB. GESELLSCHAFT DER WISSENSCHAFTEN. 5 *Stück den* 8 *January*, 1803: "Göttingen: *Am* 18 *December vor. F. hielt der Hr. Professor Bühle eine historische Vorlesung in der Königb. Societat der Wissenschaften über die Entstehung der Freymaurerey, als einen Gegenstand, der in die Geschichte der Philosophie gehört*, p. 41.

[3] The REPERTORIUM appeared in three small volumes, 1782–3, and is a collection of considerable interest. The monograph under notice begins at p. 512 of Vol. III and is pseudonymous, but—as suggested by Von Murr—they were all possibly the work of J. W. Petersen, who seems to have been editor of the whole and is described as *Herzogl. Wirtemb. Unter-Bibliotheker.* His name appears after Tract 8 in the third volume. The second volume is almost entirely occupied by a life of J. V. Andreæ. Behind the REPERTORIUM there stands a much earlier reference, being that of Melchior Fischlin: MEMORIA THEOLOG. WIRTEMBERG, 1708, Supplement, pp. 204–5, *s.v.* Simon Studion. To this I shall refer shortly.

[4] It is said that there is much confusion as to the date and personality of Studion. His name is of considerable importance "for the history of

at Tubingen in 1565, under a master named Martinus Crusius.[1] At a later period—probably about 1572—he is said to have become a "preceptor" at the town of Marbach, near Ludwigsburg, which itself is at no great distance from Stuttgart. Among other activities he was occupied with the collection of precious stones and monuments which are now in the Stuttgart Library.[2] Memorials of these investigations are still extant in manuscript, but they do not concern our subject.[3] Simon Studion is affirmed

antiquarian work in Würtemberg," and his epigraphical writings are said to have been examined with great care in modern times. Mr. F. N. Pryce, of the British Museum, informed me that there is an account of his antiquarian activities in Haug: Römische Inschriften, etc., Bildwerke Würtembergs, Stuttgart, 1912, but it contains nothing to my present purpose. There is also a critical review of his epigraphical writings in Corpus Inscr. Roman., Vol. XIII, Pt. 2, pp. 208, 209.

[1] I have searched the memorials of Martinus Crusius, who did not die till 1607. He was born in 1526 and was Professor of Greek at Tubingen. He wrote on Byzantine history and translated Homer into Latin. See Oratio de Vita et Obitu. . . . D. Martini Crusii, *Tubingensis Academiæ per annos octo et quadraginta Professoris nobilissimi ac celebratissimi . . . a clarissimo viro* D. Vito Myllero, 1608. Were there time in the world for everything, some of the Latin treatises of Crusius would repay reading. One at least on the Heavenly Jerusalem deserves more than the passing glance by which I have satisfied myself that it contains nothing regarding his pupils. But Crusius compiled also a Suabian Chronicle—Schwabischer Chronick—which seems to have been first published in 1733, and a reference to Studion will be found in Part III, Bk. XII, cap. xi, p. 311. He is mentioned again in Moser's Supplement to the second volume. See p. 78, in connection with an Historical Calendar of Würtemberg.

[2] See C. F. Sattler: (1) Allgemeine Geschichte Würtembergs und dessen angränzenden Gebiethe und Gegenden, etc. 5 *Theile*, 1764–8; (2) Historische Beschreibung des Herzogthums Würtemberg und aller desselben Städte, Clöster und dazu gehörigen Aemter, etc. 2 *Theile*, 1752.

[3] See Die Historischen Handschriften der Königlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Stuttgart. *Beschreiben von Oberstudienrat Dr. W. von Heyd, Oberbibliothekar. Erster Band: Die Handschriften in Folio.* Stuttgart, 1889–90. (1) No. 57 in this Catalogue reads as follows: *Vera origo illustrissimæ et antiquissimæ domus Wirtembergiæ*, etc., *una cum venerandæ antiquitatis Romanis in agro Wirtembergico conquisitis et explicatis monumentis industria et labore* M. Simonis Studionis *præceptoris apud Martisbacenses.* (2) No. 137 reads: *Ratio nominis et originis antiquissimæ atque illustrissimæ*

to have expended great pains and to have received considerable assistance from State grants of funds. He was more, however, than an antiquarian and *virtuoso* of his period. In the year 1586 he was at Lüneburg[1] in Hanover, where he either convoked or attended a memorable assembly of a religious character, out of which there arose the MILITIA CRUCIFERA EVANGELICA—otherwise, the Evangelical Brotherhood, according to a description in the REPERTORIUM. The REPERTORIUM adds (1) that this soon became "a strong sect" and (2) that it was a branch of the Rosicrucians, as is "well known." C. G. von Murr, a writer who was contemporary with Bühle, bears the same testimony.[2] If this be so, it will have to be admitted—in however broad a sense—that a Brotherhood or Society in the likeness of that with which we are dealing—and are now on the quest of its origin—had been established in Germany some twenty-eight years prior to the issue of the first formal Rosicrucian documents, and that this fact puts an end for ever to the most generally favoured hypothesis respecting the Order, being that which looks to the Würtemberg theologian Andreæ as inventor or founder, after one or another manner. The year 1586 was that of the birth of Andreæ.

domus Wirtembergicæ fideliter inquisita anno nostri salutis 1597 *authore* SIMONE STUDIONE *Uracæo apud Marpachenses præceptore.* See also *Ibid.*, *Zweiter Band*: DIE HANDSCHRIFTEN IN QUARTO UND OKTAVO. Stuttgart, 1891.—No. 96. *Fragment einer Geschichte Schwabens ohne Titel, Aufang und Ende, lateinisch geschrieben von* SIMON STUDION.

[1] Wigston affirms in HERMES STELLA (1) that Lüneberg was "one of the head centres of the Rosicrucians"—but he means the MILITIA CRUCIFERA EVANGELICA—and (2) that De Quincey mentions a meeting of them at this place (p. 51). As a matter of fact, so far as De Quincey and his original are concerned, his brief reference to the MILITIA CRUCIFERA EVANGELICA is by no means a reference to Rosicrucians.

[2] Christoph Gottlieb von Murr is noted as born at Nuremberg in 1733, and he died on April 8, 1811. His Essay on the TRUE ORIGIN OF THE ROSICRUCIAN AND MASONIC ORDERS—ÜBER DEN WAHREN URSPRUNG DER ROSENKREUZER UND DES FREYMAURER ORDENS—appeared in 1803 and had an appendix on the history of Knights Templar.

The allegations concerning Studion and his MILITIA may be summarised briefly thus: (1) They accepted the occult teaching and philosophy of Paracelsus on chemistry and astronomy,[1] which would mean that the Hermetic Art was something far more catholic and important for them than the mere transmutation of metals one into another. We find also the FAMA FRATERNITATIS discoursing upon "the ungodly and accursed gold-making," and claiming on the part of the Brotherhood "a thousand better things,"[2] while the CONFESSIO dilates upon "the worthless books of pseudo-chemists," though testifying that it does not "set at naught" the transmutation of metals and "the supreme medicine of the world." This is precisely the position of Paracelsus. Astronomy of course included for the Helvetian Master of Secrets the signs and portents of the heavens, in accordance with which the CONFESSIO talks of new stars in Serpentarius and Cygnus as "powerful signs of a great council" and as evidence that the Book of Nature stands open for all eyes, though it can be read only by a few. (2) They looked for the renovation of the earth and a general reform to come, in other words, a Rosicrucian universal reformation, the correction of many "errors of our arts," a new order in "divine and human things" and, in fine, an "amendment of philosophy," which expectations were also the cause and reason of addressing the FAMA and CONFESSIO to the learned of Europe. (3) They regarded the revelations of Holy Scripture as *intus et foris scriptæ*—written within and without—like the

[1] In her LIFE OF PARACELSUS Miss Stoddart says that the MILITIA elaborated the views of Paracelsus "upon evolution, into an advanced theory." There is not a particle of evidence for this and no references are given. The speculations of the sixteenth century were not those of the twentieth.

[2] The heads of the criticism are (1) that under colour of alchemy "many runagates and roguish people do use great villainies," and (2) that even men of discretion are regarding the transmutation of metals as the highest point of philosophy.

Book of Nature. (4) They were an ultra-Protestant body, "heated by apocalyptic dreams," regarding the Pope as Antichrist and the Man of Sin—after the best manner of the CONFESSIO FRATERNITATIS R .·.C .·. (5) Finally, they used the symbols of the the Rose and Cross.

Against these arresting points of correspondence we have to place the fact that the MILITIA were ardent Second Adventists, according to their story, and that this enthusiasm did not especially characterise the later Order, though its documents shew certain traces. It constitutes—to my mind—a point of distinction, as between a transformation of the schools, effected *ex hypothesi* by communicating to Western scholars the treasures of a secret tradition hidden previously in the East,[1] and the creation of a new heaven and a new earth as a result of the Lord of Christendom coming in His good time to Judgment. The MILITIA CRUCIFERA were concerned therefore with a matter of religion and the enthusiasm arising out of a particular expectation based on doctrine, whereas the Order of the Rosy Cross might be said to cherish as its object the promotion of a religion of science. The marriage of a reformation in knowledge to a reform already affected in religious belief was at least their chief aim. However, as the years went on and a particular construction of the Book written within and without was not justified by the Second Advent coming to pass, it would not be impossible for a certain change of view to take place in the gospel sect, so that it could reappear under new auspices and characterised by a new name. The intimation here put forward is of course tentative in character and stands as such at its value: it will recur for consideration, and a conclusion will be reached later. We shall find that

[1] It will be seen later on that Christian Rosy Cross, the reputed founder of the Order, went in his youth to the East—that is to say, Arabia—and there met with wise men, who revealed to him many mysteries, in possession of which he returned ultimately to Europe.

as time went on there was a very good reason for a certain change of ground.

The REPERTORIUM LITERARIUM evidently derived its knowledge of the MILITIA in the main and it would seem exclusively from an unprinted work of Simon Studion, entitled NAOMETRIA, signifying a mystic measurement—that is to say, of the Temple—as if a deep understanding concerning it. The symbolical expression is reminiscent of Kabalistic or pre-Kabalistic tracts [1] on the DELINEATION OF THE CELESTIAL TEMPLES, the MEASUREMENT OF THE DIVINE BODY, and R. Eliezer's MEASUREMENT OF THE EARTHLY TEMPLE; but the immediate allusion is to the APOCALYPSE, X, 1: "And there was given me a reed like a rod: and the angel stood, saying: Rise, and measure the Temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein." For this reason the sub-title of the manuscript is termed "a naked and prime opening of the book written—within and without [2]—by the key of David and the reed like unto a rod." The book in question is presumably that which was sealed with seven seals, but was opened in heaven by the Lamb, standing before the Throne of God;[3] and NAOMETRIA is said to be a brief introduction to a knowledge of all mysteries in Holy Scripture and the universal world. It follows that Simon Studion, by the claim expressed in his title, had received the power which was given to the Lion of the Tribe of Juda and the Root of David.[4] Moreover, by the guidance of that Morning Star which appeared A.D. 1572, NAOMETRIA embodied a prophecy concerning the Second Advent of Christ, wherein He would restore His Church and assume the government of the world, while the Man of Sin—otherwise, the Pope—being destroyed, to-

[1] See my DOCTRINE AND LITERATURE OF THE KABALAH, Bk. IV, § 4, p. 154.
[2] Cf. "a book written within and on the back side." APOC., V, 1. The VULGATE gives: *Et vidi . . . librum scriptum intus et foris.*
[3] *Ibid.*, V, 6.
[4] *Ibid.*, V, 5.