Khunrath, Arndt, Dee and Kepler. Writings are then exhibited by the sympathisers with the movement—Figulus, Widemann, August von Anhalt, and, above all, Haslmayr. Here Gilly corrects certain points in his monograph. Haslmayr’s date of birth is established to have been 31 October 1562 (and not 1560). Another important document to have come to light since the publication of Gilly’s book on Haslmayr is the Beschreibung und Bericht des erschrecklichen Lebens, so man auf den Galeren fhieret, the manuscript description of Haslmayr’s experiences in the galleys held at the Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv in Wolfenbüttel.

From the early sympathisers the catalogue passes on to the activists, the little group of men at Tübingen responsible for the Rosicrucian manifestoes: the doctor and jurist Tobias Hess, who inspired the movement; Johann Valentin Andreae, mathematician, inventor and divine, who was the actual author of the manifestoes; and the younger polymath Christoph Besold. Besides a miscellany of works and letters by the three men, the exhibition has an impressive selection of manuscripts and printed editions of the manifestoes themselves, the Fama first printed (much against the wishes of its author, as Gilly points out) in 1614, and the Confessio first published in the following year.

The description of the 83 main items is followed by a list, with illustrated frontispieces, of another 264 exhibits. These are some of the immense mass of publications which Rosicrucianism provoked—translations, replies, defences, discussions, attacks, produced throughout Europe and dating from the second decade of the seventeenth century until the 1690s. Not only does this section show how wide were the repercussions of the movement organised by the three men in Tübingen, but it also gives an idea of the dimensions of the Rosicrucian bibliography in which Carlos Gilly is at present engaged.

Alastair Hamilton


In 1616, the London publisher Bill printed a book compiled by Richard Mocket, Warden of All Souls College and chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot. Now his Leiden near-namesake has brought out a facsimile reprint, introduced and supplemented with textual variants by M.A. Screech (hereafter S.). This Doctrina et Politia Ecclesiae Anglicanae consists of various treatises, intended to defend Anglican doctrine on the Continent: a reprint of John Jewel’s Apologia ecclesiae Anglicanae (first edition 1562), two Catechisms by Alexander Nowell, the Latin text of the 39 Articles, Mocket’s own Latin version of the Book of Common Prayer, and finally an original work, Ecclesiae Anglicanae Disciplina et Politia.

The sad story goes that Mocket’s book was censured and burnt soon after its appearance, its author dying of grief not long afterwards, in 1618. Moreover, there are two different versions of this book, one of 1616 and one of 1617; the difference is in the prelims and in the four quires containing Mocket’s own Disciplina et Politia. In his introduction S. is mainly concerned with finding out, by analysing the texts, why this work, written by one so close to the Archbishop, and appearing ‘cum privilegio’, was burnt. It is remarkable
that there is no documentary evidence at all for the burning; S. adduces none, nor have I found any. In fact, the only independent testimony is Th. Fuller's *Church-History of Britain* of 1655 (for P. Heylyn's *Examen criticum* may at least partly have been based on Fuller). In addition, there is an erased and practically illegible note in Abbot's private copy of the book stating: "This last treatise called Politia ecclesiae Anglicanae [was condemned by [authority and ordered to bee burnt]] G: Cant:," of which the words "was condemned by" are hypothetical, and the rest even more so. One wonders what the exact truth of the story is. In any case, it appears that the book failed significantly to achieve its most important aim, for on the Continent copies of the 1616-17 edition seem to be very rare (a superficial search yielded only one copy in the French Bibliothèque Nationale. S. bases himself on the *STC*, and lists only copies in Anglophone countries); this suggests that some problem arose concerning its distribution. If there are any references to the book in contemporary literature and letters, S. does not mention them (the one reference I know, in Hugo Grotius' *Correspondence*, 17 November 1616, is based on a mistake by its editor).

S. holds that it was the book as a whole which was censured, not just Mocket's own contribution — thus contradicting the reconstructed note by Abbot, and also Fuller's interpretations. On the whole his theories about what in the book might have aroused the Royal Theologian's anger are plausible; however, the basis must remain speculative: Mocket was obviously careless, guilty of omissions and additions to the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, and notably of the omission of two of the three first items in his translation of the *Book of Common Prayer*. Yet, as S. himself says, an effort must be made to construe this as an infringement on the Royal Prerogative, vigorously defended in Mocket's own *Disciplina et Politia*.

In one respect S. is certainly right: the 1616 and 1617 versions are not separate editions; indeed I think that one may safely go one step further than he does in considering them two separate issues: it seems rather that in the process of printing it was discovered that, for some reason, a superseded version of Mocket's own treatise was being printed, so that consequently this was replaced by a more correct version. Thus some early copies had a 1616 title page (there is no plate), while the next copies, containing the intended version, received the 1617 title page. Printing of a large book could take quite some time, and this would account for the rarity of the 1616 version compared to the 1617 one. This automatically means that I agree with S. that it was not the 1616 version which was burnt, and reprinted almost immediately in a more acceptable version: the two texts are clearly different, but all the changes concern points of style and clarity, correction of errors and the addition of some examples. Even where S. perceives a doctrinal change, it is simply a more correct Latin translation of the Greek in the 6th canon of Nicaea (p. 309, *Intr. xliv*).

In the margins of the facsimile of the 1617 version S. has written the variants from the 1616 one, and also those found in a manuscript of (only) Mocket's *Disciplina and Politia* in Lambeth Palace Library (Abbot Papers Ms. 178). This manuscript, offered to Abbot by Mocket, is apparently the earliest witness to the text, though not the source of either issue.

Had S. limited himself to composing an introduction to the facsimile, we might well have been grateful. However, now that he has done more, and presents us with a kind of critical edition, our judgement must be more adverse. That the result, with its crowded pages, is unaesthetic and unmanageable, is a minor point. Would it really have been impossible to type