fourth section. It will be understood that in 1614, during the first flush of enthusiasm, there was only the voice of praise. It was raised by the anonymous APOCRISIS, called otherwise a lawful response to the greatly renowned FAMA, and is of course an affirmation of its claims, apart from criticism or question.[1] For the rest, it is not to be confused with applications for admission to the Order or pamphlets in the class of petition, as, e.g. those, otherwise negligible, which entreated the wise Brotherhood to issue its promised catalogue of false and sophistic works on alchemy. Speaking generally of tracts written in defence of the Order, there are those which stand at their value as individual testimonies but are without consequence, since they evoked no response or counter-criticism from anyone. There are a few very curious pamphlets which have the air of apologies but are in reality hostile works. There are, finally, those which are answers to direct attacks, and there are the attacks out of which they arose, altogether a notable group.

As regards the first on my list, there was nothing likely to be said about certain JUDGMENTS concerning the Status and Religion of the Brotherhood which were formulated at Frankfurt in 1616 by several anonymous but "well known and most learned men," who are described as separated from each other by their distant places of abode.[2]

[1] APOCRISIS, *seu* RESPONSIO LEGITIMA *ad Famam Laudatissimam Fratrum ac Societatis R.·.C.·.* Frankfurt, 1614. It was reprinted or reissued at the same place in 1615, *cum* CONFESSIONE ET LITTERIS *quorundum, Fraternitati se dare volentium.*

[2] JUDICIA *Clarissimorum aliquot ac Doctissimorum virorum, locorum intervallis dissitorum, gravissima de Statu et Religione Fraternitatis Celebratissimæ de Rosea Cruce, partim soluta, partim ligata oratione conscripta.* Francofurti, 1616. We may compare another but quite worthless performance of the same year which is also of multiple authorship, the persons concerned with the production of its eight unnumbered pages terming themselves Sadrach, Misach, Abednego, Pegasus, Aristæus and Serpentarius. They are Lutherans who regard the Pope as Antichrist, and their

The judgments are affirmed to be important, even to a high degree, but the tract is filled with perfervid adulation of the "holy and enlightened" Brotherhood. It is in reality a bid for initiation and might well have been placed previously with others of its own kind, except that it claims to pronounce as well as to apply. There is also another reason: its medley of verse and prose is like a herald going before and preparing the way for Robert Fludd at his best on the Rosy Cross, when he spiritualised the whole Order and its claims—as we shall see in the next chapter. The aspirants before us are in search of no material gold, whether that of Nature in the mines or of Art in the alembics of adepts; and this is their title to consideration, assuming implicitly that the all-wise Order stands guard over the true philosophical and spiritual treasure, a single particle of which is efficacious to transmute the soul. In a word, it is gold of knowledge, by which the pure mind—set free from earthly concerns—ascends to the Courts of Heaven.

Passing over some items which I can speak of by report only,[1] there are two tracts which have been the subject of a previous note, in connection with NUPTIÆ CHYMICÆ, otherwise ELUCIDARIUS CHYMICUS and ELUCIDARIUS MAJOR. The first is concerned more especially with unfolding Rosicrucian intentions on the subject of world-wide

discourse is concerning the star followed by the Magi at the nativity of Christ and the new star "seen by many for years in the German firmament," presumably that in Serpentarius. The pamphlet is entitled: *Ad Fratres illustres nec non doctrina sapientes ροδοσταύρου* EPISTOLA.

[1] As examples of these I will mention: (1) JUDICIUM THEOLOGICUM pronounced on the FAMA and CONFESSIO of the Laudable Brotherhood of R.·.C.·. and determining—apparently in the affirmative—whether a Christian can be affiliated to the Order with a good conscience, or without offending against the Majesty of God. It was completed on Jan. 27, 1616, by David Mader, a theologian of Osterfeld and pastor at Nolra. (2) FIDELE ANIMI FIDELIS SPECULUM, by Rudolph de Bry, 1620, *sine loco*. This "faithful mirror of a faithful soul" is an example of official publications—real or

reform and recalls therefore the UNIVERSAL REFORMATION translated from Boccalini; but, as indicated by the sub-title, there are many references in the second to the significance and importance of THE CHEMICAL MARRIAGE. The author was Radticho Brotoffer, i.e. Christoffer Rotbart. It is the larger and more important of his two tracts, but is in reality a sequel to ELUCIDARIUS CHYMICUS, comparatively a small pamphlet of the same year and both embodying an explanation of the projected reform as an allegorical veil of the secrets symbolised alternatively under the name of the Philosophical Stone. I characterised these tracts long ago as curious and perverse, which remains their proper description. It should be added that although their interpretations are couched in terms of certitude, they do not suggest that Brotoffer wrote as an initiate, testifying from within the Order.[1]

The next work which calls for consideration, entitled CONFESSIO RECEPTA, was composed in the month of March, 1617, and appeared in the course of that year,

supposed—which have not passed through my hands. It is described in the sub-title as a collection of letters sent abroad by the hands of a certain Fraternity, belonging to no bastard and adulterous generation but to the true and legitimate R.·.C.·., residing secretly over the whole earth. The description is useful for comparison with the testimony of Julianus de Campis, affirming on the basis of his own initiation that the world itself contained only four members of the Order, and also as another indication on the activities of impostors masquerading in its name.

[1] The titles in full are: (1) ELUCIDARIUS CHYMICUS, *oder, Erleuchterung und deutliche Erklerung, was die* FAMA FRATERNITATIS *vom* R.·.C.·. *für Chymische Secreta de Lapide Philosophorum, in ihrer Reformation der Welt, mit verblümten Worten versteckt haben.* Von Ratichs Brotoffer, 8vo, pp. 85. Published at Gosslar in 1616. A second edition appeared in the following year. (2) ELUCIDARIUS MAJOR, *oder Erleuchtungen über die Reformation der gantzen Welt.* F.·.R.·.C.·., *aus ihrer Chymischen Hochzeit und sonst mit vielen andern Testimoniis Philosophorum.* 8vo, pp. 234. Published at Lüneburg in 1617. After what manner the two tracts were supposed by Semler to combine the legend of Christian Rosencreutz with that of Caspar Rosencreutz, of whom no one has heard otherwise, it is impossible to conjecture.

without imprint, under the initials A. O. M. T. W. It was written—as the title indicates—to approve the Confessio Fraternitatis, which it describes as the Order's act of faith, and the consideration is certified as useful for those who have regard to their temporal and eternal salvation. The Society is not only good and profitable but righteous in the eyes of the Almighty and charged with many great secrets. The Lord Almighty reveals Himself in many ways, and those who follow the Divine counsels can enter into paths leading to true knowledge, with the consequent possession of transcendental secrets. The quest involves, however, considerable study and even indefatigable research, as well as personal sacrifice of other kinds. The Brethren of the Rosy Cross are exhorted to press on with their sublime work. The pamphlet is one of many which in addition to destitution on matters of fact respecting the Order were characterised by extreme poverty of thought and complete lack of suggestion. In what manner the reader's salvation was at stake does not emerge in the pamphlet.

In 1618 it cannot be said that simple applicants, accusers or defenders had learned anything by the experience of debate, but the arena was clearing slowly. Some interest attaches to Pegasus Firmamenti,[1] because it is held to

[1] Pegasus Firmamenti, *sive* Introductio Brevis *in veram Sapientiam quæ olim ab Ægyptiis et Persis Magia, hodie vero a Venerabili Frat. R.·.C.·. Pansophia recte vocatur, in piæ ac studiosæ inventutis gratiam conscripta a* Josepho Stellato *Secretioris Philosophiæ Alumno* 1618. We may compare with Stellatus a Geistlicher Discurs und Betrachtung, by a doctor who styled himself Gratianus Amandus de Stellis, which is in the best manner of Rosicrucian sacramental names. The tract appeared at Oppenheim, also in 1618, with a Rosicrucian reference on the title-page and the following symbol: a Rose encircled by a Crown of Thorns, a St. Andrew's Cross superposed on the flower and a large C at the extremity of each arm, being the initials of a sentence which serves as an inscription, namely, *Crux Christi Corona Christianorum*. The Spiritual Discourse and Consideration is on the proper manner of creating that piety and love which are presupposed on the part of

have been written by Christopher Hirsch, the pastor of Eissleben, at the request of John Arndt, whose acquaintance we have made previously in connection with Andreæ. The name which appears on the title of this pamphlet is however, Josephus Stellatus, described otherwise as "a pupil of the Secret Philosophy." It was published by the favour of Apollo and with the special privilege of the Muses, though the content cannot be said to justify such exalted patronage. It refers to the "Glorious Society" as people dedicated to God wholly and only, while as regards their status they "flourish triumphantly in the fell labyrinth of this world," even as the rose amidst thorns. The Sibylline Oracles are taxed for their homage, and the writer seems to regard them as in some sense the successors of Christ. The tract, speaking generally, possesses all characteristics of its class, or all marks by which we are able to distinguish the typical German advocates of the Rosicrucian Order: (1) Strenuous impeachment of what is called the ethnic, i.e., the Aristotelian philosophy; (2) enthusiastic devotion to the principles of the Reformation and laudation of Martin Luther, who is termed unconditionally "a man of God"; (3) similar praise of Paracelsus, whose allusions to Elias the Artist had caused him to be regarded as the special prophet and preceptor of the Rosy Cross, for the promised *adventus Artistæ* was identified with the coming of the Order. According to Stellatus, there are two chief interpreters of Nature, Hermes Trismegistus and Theophrastus of Hohenheim, after whom—but obviously at a distance—comes the Benedictine monk, Basil Valentine. Beyond this common ground of all the apologists, Stellatus exhibits a great

those who would share in the communion, science, wisdom and fraternal fellowship of the Brethren R.·.C.·., who are said to despise the whole universe and yet to be held in esteem and friendship by God. The counsel is not to love only in words but in deed and truth. There are references to John Arndt, Valentine Weigel and to a so-called EVANGELIUM of Tauler.

respect for his contemporary, the alchemist Michael Maier, and he refers also frequently to THE CHEMICAL NUPTIALS, about the great impression created by which there can be no question, for it had the outward aspects of a romance embodying an ordered meaning. The main inspiration, however, is that of Maier, described as "the most famous poet and doctor of medicine," who furnishes proof infallible from monuments of antiquity that Colleges of a Rosicrucian kind have been always in the world, although not visible to all. Whether Maier succeeded in establishing a valid analogy will be seen in the chapter devoted to this famous Son of Hermes. Stellatus seems further to infer from the testimony of Bernard Trevisan that the celebrated TURBA PHILOSOPHORUM originated from some such source as a secret society and was therefore edited rather than written by its reputed author Aristæus.[1] There is a reference also to a congress of "certain brethren," held from time to time at such towns as Frankfurt. That there were conventions of this kind is perhaps inevitable rather than a matter of possibility, just as there was a *Militia Crucifera Evangelica* and a conference which formulated the Confession of Augsbourg; but as a contribution to Rosicrucian antiquities they are cited to little purpose.[2]

[1] The TURBA was a great authority for Trevisan, but he says nothing of the sort. The reference of Stellatus is probably to a passage in THE NATURAL PHILOSOPHY OF METALS, which represents Aristæus or Arisleus (1) as Governor of the universal world for sixteen years, owing to his great knowledge and understanding; (2) as convening the disciples of Pythagoras who—"as we read in the Chronicles of Solomon" (*sic*)—was the most wise of men after Hermes. The TURBA is "the code of all truth" and truth above all falsehood. Hereof is the witness of Trevisan. The Rosicrucian apologist accepts the *Dramatis Personæ* of the old debate, explicitly and implicitly, as those whose names they bear and as assembled in actual session, however divided in time, in which case, since they were adepts of a secret science, they would constitute a secret society. But I have stated elsewhere that the TURBA bears all the marks of a manufactured thesis, not of a report.

[2] There is nothing in the tract of Stellatus which lends any colour to a supposition that he was himself an initiate of the Order or one of its

"To you it is given to know the Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven" are words of Christ which the ECHO applies to the Order. There were darker things in the mind of yet another anonymous who penned a JUDICIUM on the Seal and Trumpet, and on the Mystery of the Reformation to come, according to the Fellowship of the Rosy Cross.[1] The Trumpet is that of the last Jubilee, and the Seal appears to connect with those ominous words of the APOCALYPSE: "One woe is past; and, behold, there come two woes more hereafter." There is much on the Key of David, the Corner Stone and the coming of the Holy Kingdom. We hear also in strange symbolism concerning the Fount of Life, and although there are no Rosicrucian references anywhere in the text itself, we are assured at the end of all that whosoever has doubted

early substitutes, nor indeed that he was acquainted with anyone who occupied such a position. What is more, the same statement, without need of modification, applies to the anonymous and pseudonymous partisans practically all round, the few excepted—well under six—who, at least by their own hypothesis, wrote officially as members. The others discuss divisions of philosophy, the several pillars of science—*de omni re scibili*—but leave their readers no wiser than before on the true issues of the whole investigation.

[1] F.·.R.·.C.·. FAMA E SCANZIA REDUX. *Buccina Jubilei ultimi. Eoæ Hyperboleæ prænuncia montium Europæ cacumina suo clangore feriens, inter colla et convalles Araba resonans.* 1618, *sine loco.* The last sentence reads in English: "Hyperbolic prediction of Eos, smiting with resplendent noise the summits of the mountains of Europe, sounding amidst the hills and valleys of Arabia." The English, however, is one thing and the meaning—if any—another. As regards the settlement of all doubts concerning the Order, the affirmation is expressed in the two following lines:

Quisquis de Roseæ debitas Crucis Ordine Fratrum,
Hoc lege, perlecto carmine certus eris.

To quote them reminds me of another pamphlet, containing some twenty pages of German verse, said to have been written originally in Latin by a Brother of the Society and printed by I. S. N., described as *Publicus et Poeta Coronatus*—perhaps a laureate of the Order. The preface is dated September 16, 1617, and the pamphlet was published at Neustadt in the following year. The title is ARA FŒDERIS TERAPHICI, followed by the letters F.·.X.·.R.·., meaning *Frater Crucis Roseæ.*

concerning the Order will be assured after reading, which notwithstanding I am unable to determine whether it is a defence of the Order or a judgment which relegates it among the seven last plagues. It is not unlikely that the Unknown Superiors of the Mystery were in a similar position at the time. If anything on the Rosicrucian subject fell still-born from the press, amidst all the curiosity and fever, it was surely FAMA E SCANZIA REDUX.

The REDINTEGRATIO of 1619 places on its title-page an epigraph from Holy Scripture which is in strong contrast to that of the preceding tract: *Omnes de Saba veniunt, aurum et thus deferentes, et laudem Domini annunciantes.* There are obviously all things good to follow from the coming of the Order. There is not only such an institution but it is in possession of great secrets—*Magnalia Dei et Naturæ.* The activities of the Brotherhood may be shared by all and any with a good conscience and with due regard to the sanctions of their Christian faith. The reproaches which are cast at the Order are therefore of no effect, as for example (1) that its members are enemies of lawful governments; (2) that they are Calvinists or Jesuits; (3) that the whole business is farcical, having some undisclosed purpose in view. There is a bid for initiation in certain prefatory verses dedicated to the *pia turba sophorum*, in which the author describes himself as a friend, hoping to be regarded propitiously and admitted within the ranks.[1]

[1] Φλενσθιουρε ανδας, *id est* REDINTEGRATIO *an die Frat. vom R.·.C.·. dass man sich mit gutem Gewissen derselben mag theilhaftig machen.* 1619, *sine loco.* It does not appear in what sense the Order was renewed by affirming that it could be joined with a clear conscience. This tract may be compared with THEOSOPHI EXIMII EPISTOLA . . . *de Sapientissima Fraternitate R.·.C.·.* Frankfurt, 1619, the text itself being dated September 3, 1617, and signed with the initials C. R. E. The person addressed is Anastasius Philaretus Cosmopolita and the letter replies to a question raised by him in regard to the Brotherhood. It is a defence of the Order on the ground that its religion is that of the Word of God and the Catechism of Luther. There is

The last tract offers a path of transition to the next stage of our research, for it indicates that the religion of the Order had become a rock of offence. I have mentioned already an implied suspicion that the original manifestoes protested too loudly and that Adam Haselmeyer—perhaps with a bee in his bonnet—scented the Jesuits at work behind the pamphlets. This—as we know—was in 1610 or thereabouts, and there could be nothing more fanciful on the surface. In 1616 Daniel Cramer, a Protestant theologian who taught at Wittenberg and Stettin, produced a tract entitled SOCIETAS JESU ET ROSEÆCRUCIS VERA,[1] which connected the two institutions, and the fact was not likely to be lost at that period, though it was not a polemical treatise but a collection of forty emblems and letterpress on the name of Christ Jesus. About the same time and at Frankfurt, Christianus Philadelphus, described as a lover of *pansophia*, the catholic wisdom, produced a meditation on the symbol, cipher or sign of the father original of the Rosy Cross, leading up to an inquiry concerning the religion of the Brotherhood.[2] It is obvious, the seal of Martin Luther notwithstanding, that the Rose centred on a Cross is not suggestive of the Protestant Reformation in any of its forms or ways. Moreover, the

a vague suggestion that the writer was speaking with first-hand knowledge of the subject. There is also WOHLGEMEYNTES ANTWORT-SCHREIBEN *an die Frat. von R.·.C.·.*, the text of which is dated July 8, 1618, but it did not appear till 1619, when it was published at Frankfurt. It is a pamphlet of eight pages, signed S. V. S. P., and deals generally with FAMA and CONFESSIO, giving reasons why all pious persons should be ranked on the side of the Order. The title claimed by the writer is that of *Philotheosophus*.

[1] The sub-title reads: *Hoc est, quatuor decades Emblematum Sacrorum de Nomine et Cruce Jesu Christi.* D'Alembert's ENCYCLOPÉDIE, *ou Dictionnaire Raisonnée des Sciences, des Arts et des Métiers*, T. XIV, 1765, mentions a counter-charge on the part of Christophorus Nigrinus, namely, that the Rosicrucian Brethren were disciples of Calvin.

[2] EULOGISTIA *e Symbolo Patris Primarii Roseæ Crucis, qui dicitur, cujusnam sint Religionis, Scripta a Chri: Philadelpho, Pansophiæ Amatore.* Francofurti, 1616.

vaunted new philosophy was admitted to contain "much of theology"[1] and implied a general reformation respecting Divine Things as well as those that are human.[2] It was to be expected therefore that many would ask, with Libavius in 1615: "What manner of new theology is this . . .? Again, where is its novelty, if it be that of the primitive Church? Is it of Gentile, Jew, Mahommedan, Papist, Aryan, Anabaptist, Lutheran, or follower of Paracelsus?" The most definite charge—though still in a manner of questioning—was formulated in 1619 by a tract entitled ROSA JESUITICA,[3] otherwise Companions of the Jesuit Band. The proposal put for consideration was whether the two Orders, being the chivalry of the army of Jesus and that of the Rosicrucians, were not in reality one and the same body, as if the one had been driven into concealment, to emerge later on as the other. The authorship has been referred to J. Themistius de Melampage. I conceive that the pretensions of the publication may be judged out of hand by the writer's alleged protecting office and that the place of original publication was perhaps part of the camouflage.

There should be no need to say that about the last charge which can be brought in the likelihood of things against Rosicrucians of the early seventeenth century is one of being papal in disguise. To prefer it seems comparable to the counter-folly of a certain Jesuit, Abbé Gaultier, who is cited by Charles Mackay as devoting a book to prove that the Fraternity was Lutheran.[4] On

[1] CONFESSIO FRATERNITATIS R.·.C.·., cap. II.

[2] FAMA FRATERNITATIS R.·.C.·., following the description of the Tomb.

[3] ROSA JESUITICA, *oder Jesuitische Rottgesellen . . . von* J. P. D. a S., *Jesuitarum Protectorem* (*sic*). It claims to have been done at Brussels on the day of St. John, 1619, which of the two saints bearing this name not appearing. There was a reprint at Prague in 1620.

[4] *Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions*, s.v. Rosicrucians, edition of 1852, Vol. I, p. 171.

the surface, it is sufficiently proved by the FAMA and CONFESSIO, and these therefore, still at their surface-value, dispose of the papal charge. The matter of fact behind the whole business is that in a great and ever-expanding cloud of speculation no one knew anything certainly and that almost any view was tenable. Amidst a multitude of applicants some—as we have seen—may have been received within the secret circle, but they did not emerge to testify. It was therefore an open question whether any appeals had been answered; but if they were, there was no knowing whether the replies came from a genuine source. It is very clear that impostors were thought and known to be about.[1] It is to be observed further that there was a strong element of hostility manifested at a fairly early period, the chief case in point being that of Libavius, whom I have quoted already. He was no anonymous, unknown or obscure person, but perhaps the most prolific writer of his period on Hermetic Medicine and Alchemy. He was, moreover, of notable attainments in experimental research, the first person to speak of the transfusion of blood from one animal to another, while a preparation called "the liquor of Libavius" was long used in laboratories. Andreas Libau was born at Halle *circa* 1560 and died in 1618. He has been represented by Lenglet du Fresnoy as a follower of Paracelsus, but was really opposed to the school and recommended it on one occasion to slumber in its own absurdity. The point does not signify, for his firm belief in alchemy might have drawn him well enough in that direction. Among his Hermetic writings may be mentioned DEFENSIO ALCHEMIÆ TRANSMUTATORIÆ,

[1] See Dr. Georg Molther's RELATIO DE QUODAM PEREGRINO, *qui anno superiori Wetzlariam transiens, se Fratrem R.·.C.·. : confessus est et mira fecit.* Francofurti, 1616. It had been preceded in 1615 by "a true history of what passed at Wetzlar with a Brother of the Order of the R. C.," i.e. WAHRHAFTIGE HISTORIE, *so sich zu Wetzlar mit einem Bruder des Ordens der R. C. zugetragen.* Frankfurt, 1615. This was the original German version.

Opus Alchimiæ Practicum, Apocalypsis Hermetica and Alchemia Triumphans. They may be termed the records of a worker who had long laboratory experience, which is more than can be said of Michael Maier, though he is a much greater contemporary name in German alchemy. As the warfare of Libavius was less against the doctrine and practice, the claims and *philosophia sagax* of the sage of Hohenheim himself than it was against the *neo-Paracelsica* of his own day, so was his hostility to the Rosy Cross more especially an opposition to its methods rather than its pretensions otherwise. He had written so much and so long upon Alchemy and Hermetic Medicine that he could feel little tolerance for these anonymous upstarts who affirmed in their superciliousness that the art of transmuting metals stood last in the inventory of their secret treasures. He knew in his heart and no doubt reflected bitterly that after long years of labour he had failed to produce transmutation, though he could prove its possibility as he understood the nature of things. Who were they that had done far differently and better, according to their boasting hypothesis, and by what warrant did they denounce "the ungodly and accursed gold-making" or affirm that many books "under the name of *Chymia* were set forth *in contumeliam gloriæ Dei*"? It must be said that Libavius is captious enough in some of his criticisms, gratuitous in his own assumptions, and that—worst of all—he misses the obvious points and the strongest points badly. It is idle to belittle the alleged journey of Christian Rosy Cross in search of Eastern magicians because there were magicians and to spare at home. It is impertinent to affirm that a society ordained by God should be able to prove its mission, for in 1615 there was no such point at issue. It is feeble and sorry commonplace to condemn the secrecy of the Order on the ground that those are lovers of darkness whose deeds are

evil. But these are the kind of considerations which fill two folio tracts devoted to the Order alone. The supposed makers of a new theology are recommended to make also a new god, but above all to beware of going headlong into the old perdition; and those who would unveil the *Mysteriarcha Dei* are warned that the "searchers of majesty shall be overwhelmed with glory."[1] It is obvious that the Rosicrucian House of the Holy Spirit—even if more properly it was a House of Dreams—was not likely to collapse when trumpets like these sounded before its gates and walls. The truth is that Libavius was strong in hostile purpose but he had no offensive materials, or only instruments of debate. I have given already his analysis of the CONFESSIO FRATERNITATIS in quite another connection; but having produced the "thirty-seven reasons" of Rosicrucian "purpose and intention," his objections to all and several do not bear citation.

Now, it happens that the star which ruled the fortunes of Rosicrucian hostile criticism must have been provided with a sense of humour which the criticism itself lacked, and it was able to promote in its subjects a marked disposition towards change of mind. It began early with Libavius and continued till late in the story. I do not suggest that he had read over his folios and in cooler moments had found them weak or inconclusive; I do not suggest that they were written prior to NUPTIÆ CHYMICÆ and that because he was an alchemist the glittering pageant of the MARRIAGE brought him to another frame of mind; I am scarcely prepared to affirm that he would have recognised a new spirit intervening in his Rosicrucian reverie, yet it came about that in a final treatise Libavius changed

[1] The Rosicrucian vision of a possible Paradise on earth connoted the Anabaptist heresy, according to Libavius, and he seems generally to have regarded the Order as an Antichristian movement.

his ground.[1] He wrote forty-three chapters, *de omnibus rebus Rosicrucianis*, the Stone of Philosophers, the Magical Language, the Spheric Art, the Universal Reformation as a prelude to the Day of Judgment, the restitution of all arts, the wisdom of Adam, Enoch and Solomon, the Earthly Paradise to come. He was prompted, as he tells us, by the desire and command of certain worthy persons and confessed to a spirit of friendly criticism, by the inspiration of which he proceeded to affirm (1) that the Rosicrucian Order was no mere figment of debate, but a Society which existed in fact; (2) that all persons would be well advised to join it; (3) that there was much to be learned thereby and considerable wisdom to be attained; (4) that it was graced by sound doctrine in things belonging to religion; (5) that it was to be praised for denouncing the Pope; (6) that it had laudable views on Mahomet; and (7) that the value which it set upon the Bible redounded to its great credit. The one thing needful, however, was that seeing the corruption of the world and its incapacity for improvement prior to the Judgment Day, the Order should relinquish forthwith any programme of universal reformation, the same being left to God, and should set its heart upon one of a private kind, restricted presumably within its own ranks and working in the hearts of its accepted postulants.[2]

[1] The Rosicrucian writings of Libavius are (1) De Philosophia Harmonico-Magica Fratrum Roseæ Crucis, incorporated with Examen Philosophiæ Novæ, *quæ Veteri abrogandæ opponitur*, 1615; (2) Analysis Confessionis Fraternitatis de Rosea Cruce, 1615; (3) D. O. M. A. *Wolmeinendes Bendenken von der* Fama *und* Confession *der Bruderschafft dess Rosencreutzes*, 1616. These have been noticed in the text. He wrote also Admonitio de Regulis Novæ Rotæ, *seu Harmonica Sphæræ Fratrum de Societate Roseæ Crucis*, incorporated with Appendix Necessaria *Syntagmatis Arcanorum Chymicorum* Andreæ Libavii. Francofurti, 1616.

[2] It must not be supposed that the Well-meaning Objections did in no sense correspond to their title. Libavius had little use, as we have seen, for the school of Paracelsus, but it was indubitable to him that the Order had sprung therefrom. I suppose that he held himself a Lutheran in the

The hostility of Libavius offered a plain issue on the part of a plain man, though somewhat dull of wit and missing great opportunities, even when he discovered errors and contradictions in Rosicrucian texts. It provoked a reply on the part of Robert Fludd, who is the subject of my next chapter. I refer to the TRACTATUS APOLOGETICUS, published at Leyden in 1617 to clear the Society from "the calumnies of Dom. Libavius and others of his kidney," but especially from charges of diabolical magic and superstition. The mistake of the German accuser was to regard all magic and Kabalism as abominable arts and all astrology as foolish; but the Brethren of the Rosy Cross were concerned only with their higher aspects and practice. The views of Libavius were, however, only a peg on which Fludd suspended an elaborate discourse; but the German critic has the merit, such as it is, of having opened the debate on its hostile side, and this in his own name. The pamphlets which followed seem endless, but we know them in most cases only by their titles in bibliographical lists. Among those which I have been able to see or of which it has been possible to find sufficient descriptions a selection must be made, as it would serve little purpose to analyse obscure pieces which do not count in the debate on either side.

An anonymous FAMA REMISSA appeared in 1616, and the title makes evident its hostility, the manifesto called FAMA being returned to those who had sent it forth.[1] There were in particular two reasons: (1) that the proposed reformation of the whole world was ridiculous as well as "best sense" of the Church of Luther, but the Rosicrucian expectation of Paradise regained on earth connected it with the Anabaptist sect. A second edition of WOLMEINENDES BEDENKEN was printed at Erfurt in 1617. It must be distinguished from D. O. M. A. CRUX ABSQUE CRUCE . . . *Auctore Vito del Capo de la Bona Speranza*, 1617—a pamphlet of eight pages.

[1] FAMA REMISSA AD FRATRES ROSEÆ CRUCIS, 1616—*sine loco*. There was no second edition.

impracticable, and (2) that the religion of the Brotherhood was abominable in the eyes of the writer. It must subscribe to the Confession of Augsbourg in public and unmistakable terms before it could be regarded as organised for the good of any reform in the German world. An appendix discusses the doctrine of transubstantiation in terms of Bedlam, but it is notable as indicating that at this early stage there was a disposition to connect the Rosy Cross with a peculiar teaching on the Mystery of the Eucharist.[1] The tract produced no answer from any quarter, so far as I can trace: it may have commanded a certain agreement in many directions at a period and in a place which had partisans innumerable of the secret sciences, and an audience for all claimants on this subject, but no toleration whatever for the apostles of a secret religion, which seemed to be represented by the Order.

Among the prophecies of Paracelsus there is one to which I have adverted on several occasions, and previously in the present work, as something that was taken into the heart of all subsequent Hermetists: it is that which foretold the coming of Elias the Artist, in whose glorious day whatsoever had been hidden in the deeps would be proclaimed on the heights, and by inference the secret science would be known throughout the world.[2] So the alchemists looked for his advent. There was, however, a tendency to believe that Paracelsus himself, hailed by his admirers as the great monarch of arcana, was in reality the expected Messiah of Hermetic lore, otherwise Elias the Second. When the Rosy Cross emerged in part from its penetralia by means of

[1] I have failed to meet with a later tract which appeared at Hanover in 1618 and may have carried the Eucharistic question further. This was Sylloge, *an Hostia sit Verus Cibarius, a Fratribus Roseæ Crucis donata Rhumelio et Puello.* The author was Theophilus de Pega, an assumed name. The title is varied by Kloss.

[2] Paracelsus; Opera Omnia. Geneva, Vol. II, 1658, in the treatise De Mineralibus, and elsewhere in his writings.