



BRILL

ARIES – JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY
OF WESTERN ESOTERICISM 14 (2014) 20–31



ARIES
brill.com/arie

Translating the *Fama Fraternitatis*: Pitfalls, Problems and Challenges

Christopher McIntosh

University of Exeter, emeritus

mcintoshfbremen@yahoo.de

Abstract

Despite the importance of the *Fama Fraternitatis* as a primary source for the study of Rosicrucian history, contemporary scholars still use the 1652 ‘Vaughan’ edition as the standard English translation of the text, despite its many flaws. As other more recent English editions of the *Fama* are also unreliable, the author has undertaken the task of producing a scholarly translation. In this article some of the mistranslations and ambiguities of the Vaughan edition of the *Fama* are identified, and some suggestions for their more accurate rendering are put forward as a foretaste of the author’s new translation. The bibliographical history of the German and English manuscript editions of the *Fama* is also briefly outlined.

Keywords

Rosicrucianism – *Fama Fraternitatis* – Thomas Vaughan – Johann Valentin Andreae – Rosicrucian manifestos

Given the importance of the *Fama Fraternitatis* as a primary text in the study of the Rosicrucian movement, it is astonishing that the standard English translation still used by scholars is one that was produced over three and a half centuries ago, namely the version published in 1652 and linked with the name of the Welsh mystical writer and alchemist Thomas Vaughan (1621–1666),¹ although he was in fact not the translator. Consequently I took on the task of

1 Redrum, ‘Vaughan, Thomas, 1157–1159.’

producing a new translation, and it rapidly became clear to me how seriously defective the 1652 version is. At the same time, the task of translating the *Fama* proved to be full of difficulties. Apart from archaic German, inconsistent grammar and opaque phrases, expressions and references, there is also the problem of which version of the text to use, as the various printed and manuscript versions of the *Fama* differ significantly in certain places. In this article I aim to (a) outline briefly the bibliographical history of the *Fama* and identify the various German manuscripts of the text, (b) talk about the background to the “Vaughan” translation and list the other known English versions of the *Fama*, (c) point out some of the defects in the “Vaughan” version, and (d) discuss some of the difficult and ambiguous passages that I have encountered in the German text. As I have not been able to go to all the original manuscripts, my translation will probably not be the ultimate one, but in the meantime I hope it will be of some value to scholars.

While the exact origins and authorship of the *Fama* remain a mystery, it probably originated from the circle in Tübingen surrounding the Protestant theologian Johann Valentin Andreae (1586–1654). Apart from Andreae himself, another member of the circle whose name is linked with the *Fama* was the Paracelsian physician Tobias Hess (1558–1614). To recapitulate briefly the message of the text—it was essentially proclaiming a new and radical Reformation and looking towards a new age in Europe, bringing together science, religion and ancient wisdom, and strongly informed by Paracelsian ideas. This message was cloaked in a story about one Christian Rosenkreuz, a German monk and nobleman, who went on a journey through the Middle East, acquiring wisdom and knowledge from the wise men of that region, and then came back to Germany and founded a secret brotherhood called the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross.

Manuscripts of the *Fama* had been circulating since at least 1610—i.e. four years before the publication. It must have been copied numerous times, with the result that errors and discrepancies crept in, and when it came to the first publication in Kassel in 1614 the printed text also included some of these errors.

Of the many German manuscripts that must have existed only four are known to have survived. Two are in the library of the Wellcome Institute in London,² a third is in the university archive in Salzburg,³ and the fourth is in the Herzog August Library in Wolfenbüttel.⁴ Of these, the Salzburg manuscript

2 Ms 310, ff. 245 *recto*-264 *verso*, 1612 and MS 150, ff. 129 *recto*-139 *recto*.

3 Codex M I 463, ff. 1 *recto*-13 *recto*, 1610–1612 (?).

4 Cod. Guelf. 39.7 Aug 2°, ff. 365 *recto*-374 *recto*.

is considered the most accurate, although part of it is missing. So, in evaluating the English text it is not sufficient to compare it only with the German printed editions. Ideally, one should go back to the various manuscripts. Here I must acknowledge the work of the Spanish scholar Carlos Gilly in scrutinising and comparing the original Rosicrucian texts, in both manuscript and printed versions—see for example his catalogue for an exhibition of Rosicrucian books and manuscripts held in 1995 at the Ritman Library in Amsterdam.⁵

As for English translations of the manifestos, there is a key article by Adam McLean identifying six surviving seventeenth-century manuscript translations of the *Fama* and *Confessio*.⁶ Two of these are in the Ashmole collection in the Bodleian Library in Oxford.⁷ The other four, which appear to be derived from an unknown common source, are as follows:

Firstly, a manuscript that belonged to the Scottish nobleman Sir David Lindsay, Earl of Balcarres (1585–1641), who also published a translation of the *Fama* in Scots dialect. The Lindsay manuscript is now in the Crawford collection in the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh.⁸

Secondly, the manuscript from which Sir David Lindsay appears to have made his copy. This is in the library of the Royal College of Physicians in Edinburgh, in the Cromertie collection.⁹

Thirdly, a manuscript in the private family collection of the Earl of St. Germans in Cornwall, among the papers of Sir John Eliot the first Earl of St. Germans (1592–1632).¹⁰

Finally, a manuscript in the Royal Collection in the British Library.¹¹ This manuscript contains the key information that it was based on the 1615 Danzig edition of the *Fama* and *Confessio*.

Adam McLean concludes that these four manuscripts are all based on a common source, which was also probably the source for the Vaughan edition. So we

5 Gilly, *Cimelia Rhodostaurotica*.

6 McLean, 'Manuscript Sources'.

7 MSS. Ashmole 1478 and 1459.

8 MS. 14/8/8.

9 MS AB4/21, Vol. IV.

10 Contained in a bound collection of papers on Spain.

11 MS. 17c. xix.

can also be fairly confident that this common source and therefore the Vaughan edition are based on the 1615 Danzig edition of the *Fama* and *Confessio*.

It seems surprising that it took so long for a printed English translation to appear, as the Rosicrucian phenomenon was already fairly well known in Britain through the works of Robert Fludd (1574–1637) and others. Ben Jonson (1572–1637) parodies it in a play that he wrote in 1624 called *The Fortunate Isles and their Union*, in which he pokes fun at the famous engraving of the Rosy Cross on wheels from Theophilus Schweighart's *Speculum Sopicum Rhodostauroticum* (1618):

The good old hermit that was said to dwell,
Here in the Forest without trees, that built
The Castle in the aire, where all the Brethren
Rhodostauroticke live. It flies with wings,
And runnes on wheels: where Julian de Campis
Holds out the brandisht blade.¹²

Coming to the Vaughan edition itself, Vaughan in his foreword says: 'The Translation of the Fame belongs to an unknown hand, but the Abilities of the Translator I question not ... The Copy was communicated to me by a Gentleman more learned then my self, and I should name him here, but that he expects not either thy thanks or mine'.¹³ So the person who gave Vaughan the manuscript was evidently not the translator, who is also unnamed.

The Vaughan translation appeared in London in 1652 under the title *The Fame and Confession of the Fraternity of R: C: Commonly of the Rosie Cross*, 'With a Preface annexed thereto, and a short Declaration of their Physicall Work by Eugenius Philalethes'. The name Eugenius Philalethes was Thomas Vaughan's nom de plume. The publisher was Giles Calvert, who produced mainly religious treatises and political tracts but also during the 1650s a number of books on alchemy and medicine, as well as English translations of a number of Jacob Boehme's works. There is a very good re-edition of the Vaughan edition, published in 1923 for the Societas Rosicruciana in Anglia with a detailed introduction by F.N. Pryce, analysing the text and comparing it with the manuscripts and the various German editions.¹⁴

¹² McLean, 'Manuscript Sources', 1.

¹³ Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, f. A3 verso.

¹⁴ Printed for the Societas Rosicruciana in Anglia by W.J. Parrett (Margate, 1923).

A word about Thomas Vaughan himself, who was a key figure in the transmission of Rosicrucianism to Britain. He was ordained as an Anglican clergyman, but then devoted himself to practising and writing about alchemy and preparing Paracelsian remedies. He was a member of a circle of like-minded people in London, including Sir Robert Moray (1609–1673), who became first President of the Royal Society and was, incidentally, a close friend of Sir David Lindsay. Vaughan and his circle were enthusiastic about the message contained in the Rosicrucian manifestos, and Vaughan obviously felt it was time that an English translation of the *Fama* should be published.

Clearly this text passed through many different manuscript and printed versions and by the time it reached Vaughan it contained numerous errors. Some of these were already there in the German, but most of them were evidently made in translation and copying. The translator appears to have been someone with a basic but not perfect knowledge of German, who was often careless and had a tendency to misread things. Also one has to remember that at that time there were no dictionaries of the kind that we know today, and German grammar and vocabulary and spelling were much less consistent than they are now. So by the time the text appeared in printed form in English the errors had multiplied.

I would now like to compare the English text with the first German printed edition, identify some of the most important mistakes and consider certain passages of debateable meaning. The German edition I am using for this purpose is the one edited and introduced by Richard van Dülmen.¹⁵

Looking at the first page, the first thing to remark is that, in the first German edition, there is a message of greeting at the very beginning which says: 'We the Brethren of the Fraternity of the R.C. convey to all who read this our *Fama* with Christian intent, our greetings, love and prayers'.¹⁶ This is omitted in the Vaughan version although it is present in some of the manuscript versions. Interestingly, in the Wolfenbüttel manuscript of the *Fama* the 'R.C.' is spelt out: 'Fraternitet des Rosenkreuzes' (Fraternity of the Rosy Cross).

In the Vaughan edition the main text begins: 'Seeing the only wise and merciful God in these latter days hath poured out so richly His mercy and goodness to mankind ...'¹⁷ The English phrase 'these latter days' is an apocalyptic expression, suggesting that these are literally the last days before the end of the world

15 Van Dülmen, Richard (ed.), *Fama Fraternitatis (1614), Confessio Fraternitatis (1615), Chymische Hochzeit: Christiani Rosencreutz. Anno 1459 (1616)*, Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag 1973.

16 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 17.

17 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 17.

as we know it and the beginning of a new one. The German text says “in den letzten Tagen”, which at that time could mean either “in the latter days” in the millenarian sense, or simply “in recent times”. It is true that the overall message of the *Fama* is millenarian, but arguably not in the apocalyptic sense. So my interpretation is that it means “in recent times”. If so, then the translator has either misunderstood the German or deliberately introduced an apocalyptic tone.

In the next paragraph we find a couple of definite mistakes. Here the author is saying that, although all kinds of new knowledge are available to the age, the learned still persist in clinging to the outdated doctrines of Porphyry, Aristotle and Galen. The name Porphyry is a mistake. The original German says ‘the Pope’, and evidently the unknown original English translator put ‘popery’, and it was then miscopied as ‘Porphyry’. The text then goes on to say: if the ancient philosophers were alive today they would certainly acknowledge their errors. Then comes the sentence: ‘But here is too great weakness for such a great work’.¹⁸ This makes no sense at all and is a complete mistranslation. What the German says is: ‘hie aber ist man so grossen Worten zu schwach’.¹⁹ This is saying in effect: ‘but the learned people of today are too weak for such great words’, i.e. they don’t have the greatness and generosity to acknowledge their errors. Furthermore the German word “Worte” (words) has been incorrectly translated as “works”, making complete nonsense of the sentence.

At the end of the next paragraph the author describes Christian Rosenkreuz’ journey to the Middle East, and the English text says that he went from Damasco (i.e. Damascus) to Damasco (i.e. the same place), which makes no sense.²⁰ In all the German versions his first destination is correctly given as Damascus. The confusion comes with the further destination. The first German edition of 1614 contains an erratum, correcting the name of the further destination from Damascus to Damcar, which was a different place entirely. This erratum was left out of later editions of the *Fama*, so the error was repeated in the process of translating the text into English, based on one of those later editions, namely the Danzig edition of 1615.

Then the account relates that:

... he sailed over the whole Mediterranean sea for to come to Fez, where the Arabians had directed him. And it is a great shame unto us, that wise

18 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 3.

19 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 17.

20 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 4.

men, so far remote the one from the other, should not only be of one opinion, hating all contentious writings, but also be so willing and ready under the seal of secrecy to impart their secrets to others.²¹

The phrase ‘under the seal of secrecy’ is completely wrong. In fact the German says exactly the opposite, namely ‘in *Vertrauung und Eröffnung*’²²—‘in trust and openness’. This is an important point, because the translation implies that the wise men of Fez formed a kind of esoteric lodge which guarded its secrets carefully, whereas in fact the German text is emphasising how openly the Arabians of Fez share their knowledge, in contrast to the learned of Europe, who guard their knowledge jealously.

Now let us go to the next paragraph but one, which begins: ‘Of these of Fez he did often confess that their *Magia* was not altogether pure, and also that their *Cabala* was defiled with their religion ...’²³ The word ‘defiled’ is perhaps too strong—the German says ‘*beflekt*’, which would be better translated as ‘tainted’.

The next paragraph describes how Christian Rosenkreuz went on to Spain and showed the Spaniards ‘new growths, new fruits and beasts, which did concord with the old philosophy’.²⁴ But the German text says ‘... did *not* concord with the old philosophy’.²⁵ In other words, these things were completely new to the learned of Spain. So here again the translation is saying the opposite of the original.

At the end of the next paragraph there is another serious mistranslation. The author has been describing how Christian Rosenkreuz attempted to offer his knowledge to the people of various countries, but they rejected it and laughed at him. And the paragraph ends: ‘Who-so loveth unquietness, let him be reformed’.²⁶ This again makes no sense. The German says: ‘*Ein anderer deme mit Unruhe gedienet, möchte eben wohl reformieren*’.²⁷ This is an odd formulation in the German. It is implied that this is what the learned of Spain would have said when challenged with new knowledge, namely ‘let someone else who is served with disquietude reform himself’.

Reading on in this paragraph, there is an interesting passage, describing the idea of having ‘a Society in Europe, which might have gold, silver and precious

21 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 5.

22 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 18.

23 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 6.

24 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 8.

25 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 19: ‘... die sich nicht nach der alten *Philosophia* richteten ...’.

26 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 19.

27 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 19.

stones, sufficient for to bestow them on kings, for their necessary uses and lawful purposes'.²⁸ This has sometimes been interpreted as a call for a kind of early United Nations, possessing a store of wealth which could be bestowed on rulers for good purposes. However, 'necessary uses and lawful purposes' is incorrect. The sense of the German is that the riches should be shared with kings 'along with appropriate guidelines'.

Going on to the next paragraph but one, beginning 'But that we do not forget our loving father, brother C.R., he after many, painful travels, and his fruitless true instructions, returned again into Germany ...'²⁹ Here the phrase 'fruitless true instructions' is a mistake which was not the fault of the translator, as it is actually present in the German printed edition of 1615. The printed edition says 'übel angelegten treuen informationen' (dative),³⁰ which means roughly his 'badly placed true information', whereas the Salzburg manuscript version says 'neuen Reformationen'—his 'new reforms'³¹—which makes more sense in the context. A few lines further on Rosenkreuz is described as 'arbeitsam, hurtig und unverdrossen',³² meaning 'industrious, agile and tireless'. The translator of the Vaughan version, however, has rendered 'hurtig' as 'painful', no doubt wrongly associating it with the English word 'hurt'.

Then comes a description of how Christian Rosenkreuz founded his brotherhood, first choosing three brethren from his old monastery and building a headquarters, the House of the Holy Spirit. Then, when the house was finished, more brethren were recruited. A few paragraphs further on is a passage dealing with the rules of the order. Rule 2, in the English, states that 'none of the posterity should be constrained to wear one certain kind of habit'.³³ But the German says 'fraternity' and not 'posterity'.³⁴ Rule 6 states that the Fraternity 'should remain secret one hundred years'. This is a correct translation from the German 1615 edition, but in later editions the figure was changed to 120 years, which was the time that elapsed before the opening of the tomb, as mentioned later in the text.

Then comes the account of the discovery and opening of Christian Rosenkreuz' tomb. This includes a passage that says the contents of the vault included a work by Paracelsus, the *Vocabulario*. This is impossible, because Christian

28 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 9.

29 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 11.

30 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 20.

31 Gilly, *Cimelia Rhodostaurótica*, 29.

32 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 21.

33 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 14.

34 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 22.

Rosenkreuz had allegedly died in 1484 and Paracelsus was not born until 1493. This is not a fault of the translator but is in the German version. But then, after the mention of the work by Paracelsus comes a curious formulation: ‘and these which daily unfalsifieth we do participate’—which surely, even in seventeenth-century English, would have been nonsense. The German text says ‘und denen so wihr täglich ohne falsch mittheilen’,³⁵ meaning roughly ‘those [i.e. those books] with which we daily communicate without fail’, which makes sense in the context.

Then follows the description of the finding of Christian Rosenkreuz’ undecayed body under an altar. And we find the sentence: ‘In his hand he held a parchment book, called I., the which next unto the Bible is our greatest treasure, which ought to be delivered to the censure of the world’.³⁶ There are several mistakes in this sentence. First of all, the German text says that the parchment book was called not the book I but the book T, possibly standing for *Testamentum*, and that it was written in gold.³⁷ The last part of the sentence in the Vaughan version says ‘which ought to be delivered to the censure of the world’. In fact this is the opposite of what the German says, which is ‘welches ... billich nicht leichtlich der Welt censur soll unterworfen werden’³⁸—‘which should *not* lightly be subjected to the censure of the world’.

A little further on is a paragraph that begins: ‘At that time were already dead brother I.O. and Fra. D. but their burial place where is it to be found?’³⁹ Then the text goes on to express the hope that others will search for the burial place of these brethren. And then there is a curious sentence: ‘so might perhaps our Gaza be enlarged or at least better cleared’.⁴⁰ What is meant by ‘our Gaza’? In the Latin eulogy to Christian Rosenkreuz that comes just before this the word Gaza also appears.⁴¹ Frances Yates translates it as ‘treasure’. The sentence in English reads: ‘In his journeys through Arabia and Africa he collected a treasure surpassing that of Kings and Emperors’.⁴² But clearly it does not mean a treasure in the sense of gold and silver, but rather knowledge. So why is the word Gaza used? Possibly the explanation is that Gaza at that time had a thriving Jewish population and was an important centre of Kabbalistic studies.

35 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 26.

36 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 24.

37 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 26.

38 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 26.

39 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 26.

40 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 26.

41 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 24.

42 Yates, *Rosicrucian Enlightenment*, 248.

So the name Gaza could have been taken as synonym for esoteric knowledge. The text could be expressing the hope that the discovery of these other tombs will reveal further esoteric knowledge which will add to that which has been discovered in Christian Rosenkreuz' tomb.

Let us go on to the next paragraph, beginning: 'Howbeit we know after a time there will be a general reformation, both of human and divine things, according to our desire and the expectation of others. For it is fitting, that before the rising of the sun, there should appear and break forth Aurora, or some clearness, or divine light in the sky'.⁴³ This again is a slight mistranslation. What the German says is roughly: 'Although we know that there is still some way to go before the hoped for general reformation happens, it is not undue that before the sun rises it casts a bright or dim light in the sky'.⁴⁴

Going to the next paragraph, there is a sentence that reads: 'God is not blind ... but is the Churches ornament'.⁴⁵ First of all, this is a *non sequitur*, and secondly it is very odd to talk about God being the Church's 'ornament'. Here both the Salzburg manuscript and one of the ones in the Wellcome Library⁴⁶ say not 'God' but 'gold', so the translation would read: 'Our gold is not blind like the Fortuna of the Heathens, but belongs to the churches as an ornament and to the honour of the temple'. This makes more sense, but it is still puzzling, because how can gold be blind? Possibly what is meant is blindly, i.e. indiscriminately, used.

In the same paragraph, seven lines further on, is a sentence that reads: 'It shall not be said, this is true according to Philosophy but true according to Theology'. Frances Yates has correctly put a footnote that the German says 'false in Theology'.⁴⁷ The correct translation from the German would be roughly as follows: 'It is incorrect to say that something is true according to philosophy but false according to theology. Rather, those things that were revealed to Plato and Aristotle as well as to Enoch, Abraham, Moses and Solomon—and especially the things that are conveyed in that marvellous book The Bible—all of this comes together and forms a sphere, all of whose parts are equidistant from the centre'. Then comes a curious formulation, which in the German reads: 'wie hiervon in Christlicher Collation weiter und ausführlich'.⁴⁸ The Vaughan version translates this as follows: 'as hereof more at large and more plain shall

43 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 27.

44 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 28.

45 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 28.

46 Wellcome Library, MS 310.

47 Yates, *Rosicrucian Enlightenment*, 250.

48 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 29.

be spoken of in Christianly conference'.⁴⁹ This makes little sense. The word 'Collation' must be derived from the Latin *collatio*, meaning essentially an 'analogy'. Provisionally I would suggest that it means roughly: 'this knowledge, which will be treated further and in greater detail in Christian analogy'.

Skipping on to the very end of the text, the last sentence in the translation reads: 'Also our building (although one hundred thousand people had very near seen and beheld the same) shall for ever remain untouched, undestroyed and hidden to the wicked world'.⁵⁰ Again, this is a slight mistranslation. The German text says: 'Es soll auch unser Gebäw, da es auch hundert tausent Menschen hätten von nahem gesehen, der gottlosen Welt in Ewigkeit ohnberühret, ohnzerstöret, unbesichtigt und gar verborgen bleiben'⁵¹ ('Even if a hundred thousand people had seen our building close at hand it would remain untouched, undestroyed and hidden to the godless world'). The German says not the 'wicked world' but the 'godless world'; in other words, it is invisible to the impious but not to those who are truly illuminated.

In this paper, as foretaste of my full translation, I have identified some of the mistranslations and ambiguous passages in the Vaughan edition of the *Fama* and suggested how they might be more accurately rendered. *Traduttore traditore*, as the aphorism goes, but the attempt to be as faithful as possible to the original is still worthwhile.

Bibliography

- Gilly, Carlos, *Cimelia Rhodostauritica. Die Rosenkreuzer im Spiegel der zwischen 1610 und 1660 entstandenen Handschriften und Drucke*, Amsterdam: In de Pelikaan 1995.
- McLean, Adam, 'The Manuscript Sources of the English Translation of the Rosicrucian Manifestoes', in: Gilly, Carlos and Friedrich Niewöhner (eds.), *Rosenkreuz als europäisches Phänomen im 17. Jahrhundert*, Amsterdam: Bibliotheca Philosophica Hermetica 2002, 235–286.
- Redrum, Alan, 'Vaughan, Thomas', in: Hanegraaff, Wouter et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Gnosis and Western Esotericism*, vol. 2, Leiden: Brill 2005, 1157–1159.
- Van Dülmen, Richard (ed.), *Fama Fraternitatis (1614), Confessio Fraternitatis (1615), Chymische Hochzeit: Christiani Rosencreutz. Anno 1459 (1616)*, Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag 1973.

49 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 29.

50 Vaughan (ed.), *Fame and Confession*, 32.

51 Van Dülmen (ed.), *Fama*, 30.

Vaughan, Thomas [ps. Eugenius Philalethes] (ed.), *The Fame and Confession of the Fraternity of R: C: ... with a Preface annexed thereto, and a short Declaration of their Physicall Work by Eugenius Philalethes*, facsimile of the 1652 edition with introduction and notes by F.N. Pryce, Margate: Societas Rosicruciana in Anglia 1923.

Yates, Frances, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment*, London: Routledge 2002.