

Tall, opaque words:

Diction and Rhetoric in the works of

Sir Thomas Browne

---

NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

-----  
085 13495 X  
-----

Thesis L3066

Peter Joseph Regan

---

Ph.D. Thesis,

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

1986

---

I hate set dissertations - and above all things in the world, 'tis one of the silliest things in one of them, to darken your hypothesis by placing a number of tall, opaque words, one before another, in a right line, betwixt your own and your reader's conception - when in all likelihood, if you had looked about, you might have seen something standing, or hanging up, which would have cleared the point at once.

Sterne, The Life & Opinions of  
Tristram Shandy

## Abstract

This thesis considers two aspects of the literary style of Sir Thomas Browne. The first four chapters examine the novelty and creativity of his diction, and chapters five to eight describe and interpret the rhetorical features inherent in his sentence-structures. A final chapter summarises the significance of my findings.

Chapter one surveys the history of critical opinion and comment upon Browne's choice of words. Chapter two assesses the degree to which it is possible to define innovation in English vocabulary by reference to lexicographical techniques. Chapter three, in three parts, considers the historical background to innovative diction in the seventeenth century, especially as it is evident in learned and scientific writings. The fourth chapter is a detailed examination of the presence, function and impact of word-coinage in Religio Medici, Pseudodoxia Epidemica and The Garden of Cyrus.

Chapter five provides a summary of the persuasive aspects of rhetoric in Browne's prose. Chapter six examines his use and omission of personal pronouns, as indicators of feeling and belief. Chapters seven and eight consider the processes of argument in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and both the direct and indirect means by which Browne registers the degrees of his convictions, beliefs and opinions. A brief concluding chapter asserts the value of Browne's style in discourses designed to persuade, as well as in those which provoke the imagination.

A substantial appendix registers, alphabetically, those words for which there is evidence that Browne was their first literary user. Further appendices provide data relating to these coinages, and analyse their presence in both Browne's works and in those of other contemporary writers.

## ABBREVIATIONS

R.M.	Religio Medici
P.E.	Pseudodoxia Epidemica
U.B.	Hydriotaphia, Urne-Buriall
G.C.	The Garden of Cyrus
L.F.	A Letter to a Friend
C.M.	Christian Morals
Tracts	Certain Miscellany Tracts
K.	<u>The Works of Sir Thomas Browne</u> , ed. Sir Geoffrey Keynes (1964) 4 vols.
M.	<u>Religio Medici and other works</u> , ed. L.C.Martin (1964)
R.	<u>Pseudodoxia Epidemica</u> , ed. R.H.A.Robbins, Oxford (1981) 2 vols.
O.E.D.	<u>Oxford English Dictionary</u>

A key to entries and abbreviations in Appendix I is provided on p. 226.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the way of personal debts, valuable encouragement and advice was provided by successive Professors of English Language at Newcastle University, the late Barbara Strang, and the present incumbent, Noel Osselton. My supervisor, Tom Cain, has always been ready to help with constructive criticism, and other members of staff at Newcastle University School of English have offered interested encouragement over a long period. To my mother and my sister Janet I owe especial thanks, and Deborah, Anna and Paul for enduring my long relationship with a long-dead rhapsodist.

The Department of Education and Science supplied the means by which initial research could be conducted, and Newcastle University have provided library and other facilities such as warmth and shelter, as well as patience in awaiting the completion of this work.

Peter Regan, March 1986.



## C O N T E N T S

	page
1. Diction and Style: the critical background	1
2. Innovation and the Dictionary	19
3. Hard Words and the Virtuosi	42
4. The Context of Innovation	93
5. Rhetoric: Eloquence and Persuasion	134
6. The Author's Presence	148
7. The Process of Argument	163
8. The Delivery of Judgement	194
9. Conclusion	214
Appendices:	
I The Coinages of Sir Thomas Browne	220
IIa Alphabetical Summary	300
b Errors and Omissions, <u>O.E.D.</u>	301
c Revisions to <u>Pseudodoxia Epidemica</u>	304
d <u>Pseudodoxia Epidemica</u> : Glossing, 1650	306
IIIa Distribution of Coinages	307
b Browne's Successors in Diction	308
Bibliography	310

## Chapter One

### Diction and Style: the critical background.

Whoever embarks on a discussion of Browne's style must find ample room to comment upon his diction. Of all aspects of the form of Browne's works, the extravagance, promiscuity, eccentricity, creativity and 'happy temerities' of his choice of words have persistently drawn attention. When commentators over the last three centuries have revealed the starting point for their enquiries into the matter or manner of his prose, his diction ranks alongside the personality of Religio Medici's author and the grandiloquent cadences of Hydriotaphia as the magnets for their attention. The habits of diction are distinct from these other two elements, however, in that commentary upon Browne's unique vocabulary has been, on balance, subject to censure rather than to praise, and subject to cursory rather than industrious investigation.

Dr. Johnson's majestic impartiality in judging Browne's diction is something we might do well to set aside, in view of the acknowledged influence of Browne's style on his own. We can illustrate a more detached view of the diction by reference to a contemporary critic, whose parody of Browne's style has not been given the attention it deserves; in fact Samuel Butler's satires on Pseudodoxia Epidemica and the style it embodies are so pointed that a brief survey of them is a good introduction to a history of Browne criticism, even if Butler is less than sympathetic to him.

As Ian Jack points out,<sup>1</sup> commenting on the "wealth of strange words" in Hudibras, "it has a greater variety of idiom than any other

<sup>1</sup> Ian Jack, "Samuel Butler and Hudibras", in Pelican Guide to English Literature (1957) Vol. 4, p.119

poem in the language", and the richness of diction testifies to Butler's powers of mimicry and parody. The very first account of Sir Hudibras' expressive manner is strongly suggestive of the tone of Pseudodoxia Epidemica's author:

It was a particoloured dress  
 Of patched and piebald languages;  
 'Twas English cut on Greek and Latin,  
 Like fustian heretofore on satin.  
 It had an odd, promiscuous tone,  
 As if he'd talked three parts in one,  
 Which made some think, when he did gabble  
 They'd heard three labourers of Babel,  
 Or Cerberus himself pronounce  
 A leash of languages at once. 2

Sir Hudibras is not, of course, a simple character; his complexities serve to satirize absurdities other than those of linguistic pedants; narrow Presbyterians, dogmatists, Aristotelians and pious committee-men, none of which epithets fairly fit Browne's known character, are all equally subject to Butler's invective. The 'promiscuous tone' of the knight, then, is not so specific that we can be certain that Butler had Browne in mind here, but other passages supply evidence of a very concrete kind that Browne's style and writings provided a useful source of pedantic usages. These early lines summarise the general view Butler takes of the lexiphanic habit and its exponents.

The conclusive allusions to Browne ridicule both the wilful use of inkhorn terms, and less obviously, a rhetorical patterning which is the 'hallmark' of a ruminative mood common in Pseudodoxia Epidemica and the works of 1658:

2 Samuel Butler, Hudibras ed. Zachary Grey (1892) Part 1, Canto 1, 95-104



They rode, but authors having not  
 Determined whether pace or trot  
 (That is to say, whether 'tollutation',  
 As they do term't, or 'succussation'),  
 We leave it, and go on, as now  
 Suppose they did, no matter how  
 (Yet some from subtle hints have got  
 Mysterious light it was a trot.  
 But let that pass)... 3

The neologisms tollutation and succussation are, on the evidence of the O.E.D., finding their first use in literary English in Pseudodoxia Epidemica IV,vi; Butler's choice of these terms for ridicule displays acute judgement; they are among Browne's more exotically useless coinages. Besides the pedantry of the diction, Butler satirizes the digressive mode of discourse common in Browne's middle works, and the habitual reference to 'authors', where reference to authority sheds no light on the subject at all, as is not infrequent in denser passages of learning in Browne. Less obviously, the leaving of matters to the judgement of others - "We leave it, and go on ..." - is a device highly characteristic of Browne, and one which I have singled out for full discussion in a later chapter.<sup>4</sup> Butler's dovetailing of this digressive passage with the onward journey of Hudibras and Ralpho is masterly; the irrelevance of the quibble on "pace or trot" embodies both an acute parody of Browne and a piece of character-writing worthy of his model, Cervantes. That Butler thereafter immediately turns his wit to a brief lampoon of Hobbes's mechanistic notions of human nature alerts us to the fact that Browne is in good company as the victim of satire, and that Butler's breadth of allusion is of a wide scope indeed.

3 Hudibras Part 1, Canto 2, 45-53

4 below, chapter 8. Butler repeats the device in Part 1, Canto 1, 346-8

The coinages, then, are in this instance peculiarly Browne's own, but there are other cases of single words in Hudibras which are redolent of his style. They include the following:

averruncate ( in Hudibras, I, i, 752) invious (I, iii, 386)  
equinecessary (I, iii, 1034) postic (II, i, 208)  
'postulate illation' (II, i, 763) ovation (II, ii, 732)  
'topical evasions' (II, ii, 262) enucleate (II, iii, 93).

Words and phrases like these are suggestive, if not conclusive evidence that Butler considered Browne to be a model pedant. If we turn to the allusions to topics in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, rather than stylistic traits, there is larger evidence. Among these allusions, many of which are scholarly commonplaces, are the following:

Hudibras I, i, 27-8 animals on land and sea (P.E. III, xxiv)  
 I, i, 179 Adam's navel (P.E. V, v)  
 I, ii, 34 beavers' testicles (P.E. III, iv)  
 I, iii, 1307 the unlicked bear-whelp (P.E. III, vi)  
 II, i, 47 chameleon's food (P.E. III, xxi)  
 II, i, 531 Friar Bacon's brazen head (P.E. VII, xvii)  
 II, ii, 705 the sexuality of hares (P.E. III, xvii)

None of these subjects is the sole literary property of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, but Butler certainly makes use of sufficient of them to suggest that he wanted his readers to recognise a Vulgar Error when they saw one. This being the case, he would be relying on the reputation of Browne as a dispeller of false beliefs, and would regard Pseudodoxia Epidemica as effective in at least one direction. It might be argued that Butler would not consider the subjects Browne deliberated upon as worthy of rational discussion; this is certainly the case with topics such as Adam's navel and rib, but then Browne himself takes up some of his subjects in less than full seriousness. Again, Butler's use of this kind of material is not always designed to hold his source up for scorn. The quantity of detail it is possible to derive from Browne makes it certain that Pseudodoxia Epidemica was useful to Butler for its more abstruse subjects and whimsies of style, but the



purpose of that work, to demolish error, would not recommend it as a whole for a satirical treatment. Indeed, Hudibras might be said to rank alongside Pseudodoxia Epidemica as a significant literary attempt to banish human illusions, despite their differences in almost all other respects. What remains, however, as a particular subject for satire is Browne's choice of words; tollutation, succusation, and, I suggest, ovation, postic and invious are probably all derived from the pages of Browne. Sir Hudibras' mania for word-coinage -

For he could coin or counterfeit

New words with little or no wit ... 5

is an effective comment on the extremes of contemporary logorrhoea.

The neologisms do not derive only from Browne. Writers as various as Peacham, Thomas Vaughan and Sir Kenelm Digby, and poets like Benlowes come in for similar satiric treatment. The point is that the literary habit is more effectively lampooned than the personality of its author, and such a brand of criticism is, in the end, more instructive as well as more entertaining than that provided by critics like Alexander Ross. Perhaps the fact that Hudibras is the sole English literary work of the seventeenth century that Browne ever refers to in writing <sup>6</sup> - but even that merely in his *Commonplace Book* - makes it a tantalising possibility that he felt some need to respond to the parody of his style, even if it only amounted to an acknowledgement that he had looked it over.

The privilege that satire enjoys is that, as criticism, it can draw attention to grotesque examples of, say, diction, without tempering it by reference to any other factors. The sober judge, occupied in an even-handed process of description and interpretation, has no such licence. However, sober judges of Browne have, since Johnson's Life (1756), neglected to spend much energy in describing

5 Hudibras Part 1, Canto i, 109-110

6 Works ed. Keynes Vol.III p. 245

or analysing the peculiar diction of Browne's work, early, middle or late. Since, at the same time, almost all of his commentators allude to his diction and its individual qualities (frequently in a pejorative sense), either in passing or in making a rapid assessment of that aspect of style, there is a large unweeded garden left for the student of diction to cultivate.

The reasons for this absence are not clear. Prior to the full publication of the O.E.D. in 1928, a valuable tool was not available to commentators on Browne such as Pater, Gosse and Stephen, although it is doubtful in any case whether gentlemen of letters of their kind would have embarked on the kind of quantitative analysis which was necessary. Since that time, when studies of Browne have been conducted by professional scholars and academics, the area of literary criticism known as stylistics has remained something of a wilderness, tended neither by linguistic philosophers nor literary critics. Close analysis of literary diction has fallen between disciplines, and for authors like Browne and, I suggest, Nashe<sup>7</sup>, Urquhart, Evelyn and the translators, Holland, Florio, Chapman and Sandys, the absence of close scrutiny of their diction has left a gap in our historical understanding - both of their respective talents as imaginative coiners and users of words, and of the general filling of the well of English vocabulary. In the case of major writers like Shakespeare, Milton and Johnson, concordances and glossaries, together with more intensive critical study, have enabled us to perceive the part diction plays in a profile of their literary styles. But the influential prose writers of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially Bacon, Raleigh, Burton, Donne, Hooker and Taylor, demand a closer understanding of their manner of expression.

<sup>7</sup> Nashe has received treatment by way of lexicographical analysis: Jürgen Schäfer, Documentation in the O.E.D.: Shakespeare and Nashe as test cases (1980)



Coleridge summarises the importance of Browne in stylistic terms as follows:

But Sir Thomas Brown with all his faults had a genuine idiom; and it is the existence of an individual idiom in each, that makes the principal writers before the Restoration the great patterns or integers of English style. In them the precise intended meaning of a word can never be mistaken; whereas in the later writers, as especially in Pope, the use of words is for the most part purely arbitrary, so that the context will rarely show the true specific sense, but only that something of the sort is designed. A perusal of the authorities cited by Johnson in his dictionary under any leading word, will give you a lively sense of this declension in etymological truth of expression in the writers after the Restoration, or perhaps, strictly, after the middle of the reign of Charles II<sup>8</sup>

That Coleridge, almost struck into ecstasy by The Garden of Cyrus, should choose to emphasise Browne's precision of diction is a point to keep in mind. His immediate experience of the prose may provoke remarks on Browne's "little twist in the brains", but his reflections on the wider significance of the diction lead to an appreciation of Browne's accuracy, of much the same kind that Walter Pater made, at the end of the same century:

As with Buffon, his full, ardent, sympathetic vocabulary, the poetry of his language, a poetry inherent in its elementary particles - the word, the epithet - helps to keep his eye, and the eye of the reader, on the object before it, and conduces directly to the purpose of the naturalist, the observer.<sup>9</sup>

Pater's essay, owing more than a little to Coleridge, contrasts with the opinions of Gosse, writing soon after, in 1905. Until Gosse's

<sup>8</sup> Coleridge, Literary Remains, reprinted in Coleridge, Select Poetry & Prose ed. S. Potter (1933) p.318

<sup>9</sup> Pater, Appreciations (1889) p. 149-150

full-length study,<sup>10</sup> the opinions of Johnson and Coleridge were pre-eminently influential, and, in the main, more constructively critical than those of commentators of the later nineteenth century. De Quincey contented himself with a colourful appreciation of Browne's rhetoric, although his approval of the "golden couplets"<sup>11</sup> is suggestive of the "doublets" of which Huntley gives an account in his study.<sup>12</sup> Leslie Stephen unaccountably neglected to comment upon Browne's diction in any specific way, and placed the onus of appreciation firmly back on the individual reader:

The perusal of a page will make us recognise what could not be explained in a whole volume of analysis.

This is calculated to provoke sage nods from cognoscenti, but does not represent a strong attempt to reveal what Stephen describes as "the secret of the strange charm of Sir Thomas' style."<sup>13</sup> Instead, Stephen's concern is largely to derive a character of Browne from the whimsy and oddity of his subject-matter, a paradoxical character made up of equal admixtures of the mystic and the sceptic. In general terms, his appraisal offers no real advance on the judgement of Coleridge.

The essay prefatory to his edition of Religio Medici in the Camelot Classics series (1886) enabled Symonds to make some distinctions on the subject.<sup>14</sup> Following Johnson's, rather than Coleridge's view of Browne's diction, he contrasts the styles of Religio Medici and Christian Morals:

10 Edmund Gosse, Sir Thomas Browne (1905)

11 Thomas De Quincey, Works ed. D. Masson (1878) Vol.X p. 105

12 F.L.Huntley, Sir Thomas Browne (1962) pp. 120-122

13 L. Stephen, Hours in a Library Vol.1 (1909) p.274

14 Religio Medici ... ed. J.A.Symonds (1886)



The diction, too, (of Christian Morals) shows signs of labour and of effort. Browne's hyperlatinism has become a vicious habit. He uses crude unaltered Latin words, like "compage", "confinium", "angustias". He talks of "vivacious abominations" and "longaevous generations". He recommends a moderate caution in this portentous sentence: "move circumspectly, not meticulously; and rather carefully solicitous than anxiously sollicitudinous". Such phrases have the appearance of some caricature of the style in which Religio Medici was written.<sup>15</sup>

Remarks such as these reinforce the notion that, in his old age, Browne lost much of the control that he had over his immense vocabulary, and that Christian Morals represents a decadent phase of his creative life, in which the diction is wilfully overblown and latinized. It is a notion that is probably more significant insofar as it relates to Samuel Johnson than to Browne himself, since critical attention has often held Christian Morals to be partly responsible for forming Johnson's style. Boswell's and Hawkins' biographies assert the influence as almost factual, and later critics such as Gosse and Pater compound the idea. For many readers, however, Johnson tends to suffer in the comparison, and one may well wonder how far the mere fact that he chose to edit Christian Morals and provide a biography to a new edition (1756) was responsible for linking him with that particular work.

In Wimsatt's thorough and valuable study<sup>16</sup> of Johnson's style, he emphasises the philosophic and scientific qualities of Browne's diction which find expression in Johnson's prose, though to different ends and with different effects:

He (Browne) deserves the name "exotick" which Johnson applies to him, a name which would sit most curiously on

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.* p.xxv. In the passage quoted three printer's errors have been silently corrected. Symonds' preface is littered with errors, some quite entertaining, such as the mis-spelling 'Oviglu' for Origen.

<sup>16</sup> W.K.Wimsatt, The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson (1941)



Johnson himself. Where Browne uses remote terms to make us think of remote things, Johnson "familiarizes". One of the strongest impressions we receive on reading Johnson's work is that we know where we are.<sup>17</sup>

Wimsatt refers to Pseudodoxia Epidemica rather than to Christian Morals as the work which contains especial resemblance in diction to Johnson's, and in placing emphasis on that earlier work performed a useful service, because the tendency to link the style of Johnson with that of Christian Morals had clearly been exaggerated. That emphasis is clear in Lytton Strachey's essay on Browne, which, although a balanced appreciation, and probably the finest short argument in favour of Browne's 'poetic' qualities, nonetheless engages in this easy and florid generalisation:

The peculiarities of Browne's style - the studied pomp of its latinisms, its wealth of allusion, its tendency towards sonorous antithesis - culminated in his last, though not his best, work, the Christian Morals, which almost reads like an elaborate and magnificent parody of the Book of Proverbs. With the Christian Morals to guide him, Dr. Johnson set about the transformation of the prose of his time. He decorated, he pruned, he balanced; he hung garlands, he draped robes; and he ended by converting the Doric order of Swift into the Corinthian order of Gibbon.<sup>18</sup>

Strachey's essay was important in the history of Browne criticism, chiefly as an antidote to the failings of Gosse's critical biography, of which it was a review. In respect of diction, the attitudes of Gosse and Strachey could not have been more different. As their differences marked, firstly, an important discussion of the uses and effects of Browne's vocabulary, and secondly, of the part that diction played as a marker and integral part of his style and that of his successors, it is pertinent to see just what those

<sup>17</sup> Wimsatt, p. 119

<sup>18</sup> G. Lytton Strachey, Books and Characters (1922) p. 34

opinions provided.

Gosse set aside a concluding chapter of his book for a discussion of "Language and Influence", and took it as an axiom that to study Browne was to interest ourselves in how, but not what he wrote:

Browne, therefore, is a pre-eminent example of the class of writer with whom it is form, not substance, that is of the first importance.<sup>19</sup>

Few writers are more attractive than Browne to the technical student of literature, since there are so few to whom the matter, in its crudest sense, is so completely subordinated to the manner.<sup>20</sup>

Strachey's essay does not take issue with Gosse on this essential point, and the burden of his argument is to show that Gosse is in various ways out of sympathy with the aesthetic values of Browne's style, and in particular with the value of his diction, complete with ornate latinisms and his "subtle blending of mystery and queerness". Strachey is at pains to offer Browne as an example of an artist, whose "'brushwork' is certainly unequalled in English literature",<sup>21</sup> and he finds Gosse's account of style to be self-contradictory:

In spite of what appears to be a genuine delight in Browne's most splendid and characteristic passages, Mr. Gosse cannot help protesting somewhat acrimoniously against that very method of writing whose effects he is so ready to admire. In practice, he approves; in theory, he condemns. He ranks the Hydriotaphia among the gems of English literature; and the prose style of which it is the consummate expression he denounces as fundamentally wrong.<sup>22</sup>

The contradictions are plain to see in Gosse's chapter, as the following two passages show:

19 Gosse, p. 190

20 Gosse, p. 203

21 Strachey, p. 39

22 Strachey, p. 32-33



He was conscious of no controlling taste around him, holding him in, subduing the most daring elements in his vocabulary.<sup>23</sup>

He thought that we had neglected our opportunities for the assimilation of precise and beautiful words. He believed that Latin was the guard and natural defence of the English language...<sup>24</sup>

On the one hand, the lack of "controlling taste" put no restraint on the wildness of his diction, and the "irregular splendour" of Hydriotaphia resulted; but on the other hand, Gosse postulates an innate theory underpinning Browne's style, in which Latin expression is preferred to a native alternative. He seems both to see and not to see a theory.

On one level, Strachey is clearly right, and the latinisms exist in a far from wholly-Latin context, which itself must be judged for its effect; when he quotes the phrase "the areopagy and dark tribunal of our hearts" and draws attention to the power of the word "dark" in the midst of classically-derived words,<sup>25</sup> he shows the value of contrast in diction for Browne. At another level, though, Gosse's strictures against latinism look as though they have some point, where he discovers a passage in Pseudodoxia Epidemica which seems to set forth a theory which confirms that Browne set out to cultivate "vicious tendencies". The passage in question is the well-known justification for writing Pseudodoxia Epidemica in English, and Gosse seems to read this as evidence of conspiracy to defile the purity of English:

In a passage of the Vulgar Errors, he has let us into his secret thoughts. He says that in writing that book in English, he has deliberately Latinised his vocabulary in order to reach "into expressions beyond mere English apprehensions" ... This evidence is very precious, for it leaves us in no doubt of Browne's intention, and explains his vocabulary where it becomes so servilely Latin as to be ugly. He had come to the conclusion

23 Gosse, p. 194

24 Gosse, p. 194-5

25 Strachey, p. 36

that classic words were the only legitimate ones, the only ones which interpreted with elegance the thoughts of a sensitive and cultivated man, and that the rest were barbarous ... It was thus that he started that "effectual injury" to the literary taste of the nation which Coleridge deplored.<sup>26</sup>

"Taste" is a key word here, towards which Gosse's argument gathers; excess of latinity in diction exemplifies an error of taste, and he is able to quote Coleridge in support, and elsewhere, Dr. Johnson. But is the passage to which he refers such valuable evidence of Browne's intention of wilfully neologising, to the detriment of plain English? Clearly some evaluation of the frequency and type of coinage will be useful here, and the next three chapters of this thesis are concerned to supply that, but here it needs noting that Gosse sees Browne's stated intention of providing "elegancy" in his latinate diction as tasteless. Here is a crux. Gosse interprets "elegancy" as equivalent to "pleasing", perhaps even "fashionably pleasing"; he sees Browne attempting to be cultivated and civilised in his diction, and deplores the snobbishness of it. He has some grounds for the opinion, as in this same passage Browne dismisses the understanding of "the people" and insists his work is addressed "unto the knowing and leading part of learning".<sup>27</sup> However, "elegancy" carries the meaning "accurate" as well as "pleasing", and it will be remembered that it was just Browne's accuracy of diction that Coleridge approved in his assessment of pre-Restoration prose style. Plainly, Coleridge's learned opinion could provide evidence of opposing kinds, and after all, we can go back again to Dr. Johnson to complete an argument that comes full circle:

... in defence of his uncommon words and expressions, we must consider, that he had uncommon sentiments, and was not content to express in many words that idea for which any language could supply a single term.<sup>28</sup>

26 Gosse, p. 195

27 P.E., 'To the Reader', R., p. 3

28 Johnson, 'Life of Sir Thomas Browne', in Wilkin, Works (1852), Vol. 1 p. xxxiii.



At the end of the Victorian period, then, (Strachey's essay first appeared in 1906) there were divided opinions about the effect of Browne's latinate or rugged diction; since that time, Strachey's valuation has had the upper hand. The elements and curious mechanics of the diction have been accepted or even taken for granted, since they issue in such 'triumphant art'. Joan Bennett, writing in 1962, is content to quote John Carter's preface to Urne-Buriall and The Garden of Cyrus as sufficient testimony to the adequacy of comment on Browne's style:

Where Johnson and Coleridge, Pater and Saintsbury, and (perhaps the most perceptive of all) Lytton Strachey, have praised and analysed, there is not much left to say about Sir Thomas Browne's style in general ... that has not been said better before.<sup>29</sup>

However, when, in the same study, Joan Bennett analyses the exotic qualities of diction in The Garden of Cyrus, she produces a very useful commentary on the origins and rarity of the vocabulary in one brief and "hideous" passage, in which the quincuncial figure is discovered in scissors, nutcrackers and forceps. She quotes Johnson's defence of Browne's uncommon words, and concludes that

We should not still be reading Browne and consequently he would not have 'augmented our philosophical diction', if he had usually erred as badly as in the paragraph last quoted. Nor must it be supposed that he never writes well when he writes simply ... the most memorable and often quoted lyrical passages in The Garden of Cyrus ... are predominantly simple in diction.<sup>30</sup>

Joan Bennett is willing to make a discrimination between acceptable and exaggerated diction, one which is absent from Strachey's account; and thus it becomes clearer how far Strachey writes as a partisan:

To the true Browne enthusiast, indeed, there is something almost shocking about the state of mind which would exchange 'pensile' for 'hanging', and 'asperous' for 'rough', and

29 Joan Bennett, Sir Thomas Browne (1962) p. 189

30 Ibid., pp. 217-218



would do away with 'digladiation' and 'quodlibetically' altogether. The truth is, that there is a great gulf fixed between those who naturally dislike the ornate, and those who naturally love it.<sup>31</sup>

If Bennett offers the possibility that flaws in diction make some parts of Browne's writing inferior to others, it is interesting to note that Huntley's contemporary study avoids making such a point. Where he makes reference to the inventing of English words, he is uncritical, beyond observing that "Some of these we never use",<sup>32</sup> and the strongest inference one can draw is that he feels anything which adds to the sum of vocabulary is in some way positive. Huntley, I suggest, without hinting at detraction, is an enthusiast of Strachey's type; Bennett less so, and less so again is John Carey, in a penetrating essay:

An object of more general uneasiness is Browne's weakness for pretentious polysyllables ... when Browne sets out to describe a pair of nutcrackers we may wonder whether language is being used as medium or obstacle ... The explanation usually advanced, rhythm, has the disadvantage of equating rhythm with mindless sonority. It seems more illuminating to view the polysyllables alongside Browne's other imaginative habits, his pleasure in hieroglyph and mystery ...<sup>33</sup>

Interestingly, Carey chooses the same 'flawed' passage out of The Garden of Cyrus (G.C.II, M., p. 139) as had Bennett before him; but in case it might be thought that no comparable short piece could demonstrate such a density of latinate polysyllables, reference could have been made to Pseudodoxia Epidemica ; Book II, chapter 1 would provide examples of diction quite as extreme as that which they quote:

31 Strachey, p. 35

32 Huntley, p. 169

33 John Carey, "Seventeenth century prose", in Sphere History of Literature in the English Language, ed. Ricks (1970), Vol.2, p. 415-6

... yet is not this a congelation primarily effected by cold, but an intrinsecall induration from themselves, and a retreat into their proper solidities, which were absorbed by the licour, and lost in a full imbibition thereof before. And so also when wood and many other bodies doe petrifie, either by the sea, other waters, or earths abounding in such spirits, wee doe not usually ascribe their induration to cold, but rather unto salinous spirits, concretive juyces, and causes circumjacent, which doe assimilate all bodyes not indisposed for their impressions. (R., p. 75)

Chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis will indicate how common this kind of densely latinate diction is throughout Browne's major works, and in those of some of his contemporaries. The extent of Browne's coining of terms is one measure of the energy he used in securing the most appropriate word in its context. That coinage supplies other functions within that broadly aesthetic purpose will also be examined. The coining habit is alluded to by many commentators, including Leroy and Bush, besides Huntley, Bennett and Carey, who borrows from the short list of 'useful' coinages provided by Huntley. However, in no examination of Browne's style is his diction analysed outside a general discussion of its place in context, and thus with Carey in 1970 as with Johnson in 1756, we are confronted with expressions of admiration for Browne's vocabulary, which are qualified with varying degrees of weight.

In the twentieth century, critics have, by and large, brought this admiration and its qualification into some sort of balance. A good example, bringing most of the important elements to the surface, is provided in Douglas Bush's assessment:

One prime feature of Browne's diction and rhythm is the combining of Saxon and classical derivatives. Sometimes his classicized language is technical (one of his most useful coinages was 'electricity'). Sometimes it is only the product of a bilingual habit, as in 'the Pensill or hanging gardens of Babylon', where he takes over the pensiles of Lipsius (book two of De Constantia) and other writers. When the language



overtops the idea we have inflation and 'quaintness',  
 'Emphatically extending that Elegant expression of Scripture:  
 Thou hast curiously embroydered me' - though even then Browne  
 has his own vitality and colour.<sup>34</sup>

Once again there is a passing reference to the creative side of  
 Browne's diction, and the matter is then taken no further.

The bulk of twentieth century criticism has concerned itself  
 with the subjects of Browne's writing. Many members of the medical  
 professions have interested themselves in details of anatomy,  
 embryology and physiology and evaluated the worth of Browne's  
 observations and experiments. His theological and philosophical  
 position, especially his Platonism and / or Stoicism have been  
 extensively analysed; the extent of his reading and learning have  
 been described; and the general relation of his thought to contemporary  
 science has been the subject of elaborate study, most succinctly  
 dealt with by Egon Merton.<sup>35</sup> In the last half-century, style per se  
 has tended to be discussed as an effect derived from the contact  
 between a peculiarly individual temperament and a diverse range of  
 subjects, and not as a detachable entity which bears independent  
 scrutiny.

The exceptions to this have been the studies of prose rhythms,  
 following the leads given by Saintsbury<sup>36</sup> and Croll,<sup>37</sup> where detailed  
 work on cursus-rhythms, synonymy and Browne's 'strong lines' has  
 enlarged our understanding of the musical qualities in the prose.  
 The general studies of Finch, Leroy, Huntley and Bennett bring  
 biography and criticism together and touch upon the verbal fabric  
 in various ways; the latter two are indispensable, but in opting out  
 of stylistic analysis, they leave the minutiae of the expressive  
 medium unexplored as to description and explanation, although  
 interpretation and assessment have not been wanting. Diction and

34 Douglas Bush, English Literature in the earlier seventeenth century  
 (1962), p.357

35 Egon Merton, Science & Imagination in Sir Thomas Browne (1949)

36 A History of English Prose Rhythm (1912)

37 Style, Rhetoric and Rhythm ed. J.M.Patrick (1966)

rhetoric, as approachable, even if problematic, aspects of style, have remained critically uncultivated, with a single recent exception,<sup>38</sup> and the evidence of the fine detail of Browne's texts has not been put to the service of evaluation.

38 V.C.Morris, The Style of Pseudodoxia Epidemica ... (Unpub. Ph.D. thesis, London, 1976)

## Chapter Two

### Innovation and the Dictionary.

A good writer, if he has indulged in a Roman roundness, makes haste to chasten and nerve his period by English monosyllables.

R.W.Emerson, English Traits

. . . . .

When W.K.Wimsatt set about giving a character to Johnson's diction, he regarded the choice of words as embodying an expressive tendency, and eschewed an analysis which relied on etymological or lexicographical principles.

If we consider Johnson's objection to "Gallick structure and phrase," his belief that the cultivation of the learned languages had helped to perfect and fix our language, we may understand some of the limitations of his vocabulary but hardly his way of using it. A lexicographical principle is not a stylistic, not an expressive one.

If we would philosophize on Johnson's use of words, we must go again to his meaning, we must describe his words as tending to have certain kinds of meaning. At once then we see the inadequacy of simple lists of words or statistics of the occurrence of certain kinds of words defined merely by qualities that may be observed in them when isolated. What is needed is the context.<sup>1</sup>

Wimsatt joined an earlier commentator, Warner Taylor, in rejecting "lists of musty curiosities", such as adscititious, labefactation and papilionaceous. They saw no value in studying deviations from currency for their own sake, and preferred to search for the reasoning processes which lay behind the distinctive qualities of Johnson's diction.

<sup>1</sup> W.K.Wimsatt, The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson (1941), p. 52



A century before Johnson, Browne and many of his contemporaries are to be found employing just the kind of elaborate diction from which Johnson can be said to have drawn justification for his own practices. What Wimsatt saw as "violations of idiom" in Johnson's case were, to some extent, commonplace experiments in the vocabulary of learned authors of the mid-seventeenth century. The evidence for this is available among the writings of authors such as Browne, John Evelyn, Henry More and Walter Charleton, to all of whom the enlargement of vocabulary seems to have been second nature. The Oxford English Dictionary stands as the great monument testifying to this, and to measure the innovations of Browne and his peers it remains indispensable. What Wimsatt regarded as "currency" in the second half of the eighteenth century differs from that which prevailed among the learned of the generations preceding the Restoration period, where neologism constitutes a habit which amounts to a common feature of literary style. Thus, although it is true that the mere listing of innovations tells us little about the use to which they are put in the whole context of a writer's output, there is a need to examine the extent to which they widened the scope of their vocabulary, and the areas in which it was put to use; description needs to precede interpretation. Of the making of words there is no end, but some have made more than others, and the O.E.D. suggests strongly that, in the early and mid-seventeenth century the practice of innovation was phenomenal, and it is demonstrable that Browne's place in this is pre-eminent. The general reader of the O.E.D. cannot fail to notice how frequently his works are used for citation, not only as showing the first use of words in separate articles, but in every respect as texts offering examples of idiosyncratic or innovative usages.

Neologism is a peculiarly difficult notion to explore insofar as it affects the study of style. It is normally, in its baldest state, the province of historians of language or of linguisticians,

rather than of literary critics. The concern of the historian of vocabulary is to provide, among other things, a description of the building of the lexis, aiming at a kind of objectivity founded in chronology. Such descriptions are of interest to those trying, in their turn, to describe and interpret features of style in literary works. Except in the special cases of works like Finnegans Wake and Urquhart and Motteux's translation of Rabelais, where innovation for its own, often playful sake is a principal textual feature, it is not usually worthwhile for the literary critic to offer accounts of an author's innovative vocabulary. Few authors are self-conscious about making new words; De Quincey's sense of his own creativity is the kind of pretension that the O.E.D. is useful for examining. In a letter to Sir William Hamilton, De Quincey claims, "Infibulate cannot be a plagiarism, because I never saw the word before; and in fact, I have this moment invented it."<sup>2</sup> The O.E.D. shows that the term appeared in the seventeenth century in Cockeram's Dictionary (1623) and in that of Phillips (1721). The intention to coin can never be indulged confidently, even by the prodigiously well-read; but, in one sense, De Quincey has re-invented the term in sincerity, and plagiarism can only exist where there is intention to borrow.

In the last twenty years, the computer<sup>3</sup> has enlarged the horizons of the lexicographical historian, and the possibilities of rebuilding and extending the foundations of the O.E.D. have begun to look practicable. It seems likely that, in a matter of decades, word-lists could be made available, covering a large number of literary works, showing the degree to which particular authors were the first recorded users of words. These are exciting possibilities, as they promise more and more precise datings of vocabulary. Creativity, however,

2 De Quincey, Works, ed. Masson, (1890), Vol. V, p. 326

3 Computer is a coinage of Browne's.



is both less tangible and more diverse than the bare facts and dates of neologising. It is in this area of qualitative evaluation that, traditionally, linguist and critic might be expected to part company. The facts of innovation are susceptible to one kind of analysis, essentially descriptive, while the quality of innovation is interwoven with other judgements about relevance and value, and always open to contradictory interpretations. A positive approach will recognise the mutual assistance available within the two disciplines, as is made explicit in Spencer and Gregory's valuable monograph:

... linguistics does not simply provide theories and techniques; at its best it leads to the development and critical maintenance of a sensitive attitude to language. In the study of style one is as important as the other. This linguistic attitude is shared in some degree by most linguists. Nor is the literary critic without such an attitude. His may not be expressed in the same terms as the linguist's, nor need he be expected to articulate a coherent account of it; this is not his central task. Nevertheless, an attitude to language that is both sensitive and possessed of an implicit internal coherence has always been a necessary part of the equipment, and a characteristic of those concerned with the appreciative and interpretative study of literature.<sup>4</sup>

My attempt, to build interpretation upon what are effectively notes towards a factual analysis, may fall between two stools, but I believe that enlisting the aid of lexicography produces evidence which makes the risk worthwhile. Browne is a writer whose diction, perennially stimulating to literary scholars, can be investigated in valuable ways with the aid of lexicographical data.

As with De Quincey, so with Browne; we can never know how far there is an intention to coin. Browne may have been, in many instances, re-inventing terms which had not entered common currency, and the documentation of the O.E.D. is often suggestive here. In the following

<sup>4</sup> J.Spencer & M.J.Gregory, An approach to the study of style, in N.E.Enkvist, Spencer & Gregory, Linguistics and Style (1964), p. 64-5



cases, Browne is cited as the second user of words not apparently common to the contemporary reader, where the first citation dates from before 1600:

<u>word</u>	<u>used in</u>	<u>O.E.D., first citation</u>
correlation	<u>G.C.</u> III	Norton, 1561
indisputable	<u>R.M.</u> I, 29	Robinson, 1551
inflexure	<u>G.C.</u> III	Banister, 1578
pistil	<u>G.C.</u> III	Lyte, 1578
salivous	<u>G.C.</u> III	Maplet, 1567
tegument	<u>P.E.</u> II, 6	Palladius (tr.), 1440

Browne may well be re-inventing in a sense here; in the O.E.D.'s documentation his name appears very prominently among early uses of very many words, and the separation of first citations for the purposes of determining coinage is in many ways an artificial process.

My list of coinages was compiled as noted in Appendix I, whose introduction outlines the scope of its enquiry. In the beginning, I compiled the list without any sophisticated idea of what it might suggest or reveal. Many commentators had confirmed my impression that Browne was a large-scale inventor of words, and since the O.E.D. gave citations to support the dating of its vocabulary, I decided to make a check of the text to see how exhaustive was the Dictionary's use of Browne. I undertook a listing of about three thousand words, from all of the works in Keynes' 1964 edition, which were latinate, obscure, or unfamiliar to me, or which seemed likely coinages, given the context. This last idea was significant, in that Browne often signals an unusual word by offering a synonym or explanation; there is, in other words, some help offered to the detector of neologisms in Browne's own consciousness of his oddities of diction.

My own criteria for selecting words have affinities with those of the original readers for the O.E.D., particularly since no concordance is available as a mechanical aid, and those glossaries

which exist are far from being exhaustive. More significantly, I had neither computer nor word-processor as an assistant, and so my predicament was like that of the readers as described by Schäfer:

Quite apart from the fact that many of the contributors of those five million citation slips were gentleman scholars following individual inclinations when hunting through their favourite texts, or that readers were sometimes instructed by the editors to examine many works for particular classes of words at the expense of others, it would have been an impossible task for even the most devoted reader to try to track down the potential first occurrence of every word.<sup>5</sup>

Of course, I was going to be able to use the O.E.D. itself as a check, and as I knew, from merely general perusal, that the readers had made extensive use of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, I had hopes that there would be some useful correspondences between my own list and that which could be extracted from the Dictionary.

After a complete scan of the O.E.D., excluding the Supplements, I found I had managed to identify about five hundred of the words cited as first used by Browne, that I had missed a further four hundred or so, and that my own list showed about thirty-five cases where Browne's use either antedated the first O.E.D. citation, or some other error existed in the Dictionary. I then undertook the task of consulting the Chronological English Dictionary,<sup>6</sup> glossaries and textual notes, checking back a revised list against the O.E.D. again, picking up a few omissions at each stage, and then called a halt at a substantive list of around one thousand 'coinages'.

This procedure makes use of all the material on Browne and the lexicographical aids that are available at the present time. There is one large factor which, from the standpoint of analysing Browne's text, might add to the list; that is the inadequacy of the selection of words from which my own survey started. This selection caught up thirty-eight words which antedated the first citations of the O.E.D.

<sup>5</sup> Jürgen Schäfer, Documentation in the O.E.D. (1980) p. 36

<sup>6</sup> ed. Finkenstaedt et al. (1970)



(see Appendix IIb), but I fully expect that a concordance to Browne would help supply some more; my guess is that the total list of coinages could be increased by between ten and fifty words; but on the other side, more intensive study of vocabulary among works published before 1643 might well show the total for Browne to be overstated. All my findings of a general statistical kind have to bear these considerations as riders, but most of my conclusions and observations are not altered by the potential for more accurate dating.

From the standpoint of analysing the O.E.D. itself as an instrument for determining coinage, the position is far more complex. Recent developments in studying the documentation of the O.E.D., in particular the work of the late Jürgen Schäfer, have meant that areas of the history of vocabulary which it provides are called into question. The advent of the computer has meant that, in Schäfer's words,

Instead of providing an unquestioned basis for further research, the O.E.D. has to become its object.<sup>7</sup>

Schäfer's studies in the vocabulary of Shakespeare and Nashe give a preliminary indication of how wide the gulf may be between the procedures and descriptions of the O.E.D. and a more precise chronology of English vocabulary. His examination of O.E.D. policies and principles brings together different kinds of limitations and inconsistencies which it presents, and illustrates them in a useful synthesis.<sup>8</sup> These problems affect any notions of 'coinage' in different ways, but taken together they suggest how hard it is to feel confident that a given author is indeed the first user of any given word.

It must be re-emphasised how cautiously the concepts of coinage, neologism and innovation need to be regarded. We are considering here

<sup>7</sup> J. Schäfer, p. 3

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., chap.2, pp. 12-34



the corpus of English vocabulary from a decidedly literary vantage point; the O.E.D. deals in the evidence supplied by a number (admittedly very large) of texts which are considered as illustrating and representing the use of lexical items. It is not, and cannot be, an objective compilation. Thus, the inventiveness of particular authors which it might be said to record is circumscribed by its own procedures. On the other hand, the fact that the Dictionary embodies a literary bias does not mean that it offers a comprehensive guide to literary inventiveness. There are numerous aspects of seventeenth-century diction which the O.E.D. cannot bring within its procedures; for example, the use of proper names and foreign, unassimilated words, phrases and quotations are essential threads in the fabric of many texts, but which usually fall outside English lexicographical scope. As an apt instance, Browne's use of America in his address "To the Reader" in Pseudodoxia Epidemica is used attributively:

Wee ... are oft-times faine to wander in the America and untravelled parts of truth: ... (R., p. 3)

America is not lemmatized in the O.E.D., despite the obvious point that it is a name chosen for attribution and for its aptness in 1646, carrying a range of associations as unexplored territory and not for mere denotation.

In a similar way, inventiveness transcends lexicography and its concerns where the user of words puts vocabulary conventionally found in one area - science, philosophy, the tap-room - to the service of a discourse in quite another region. Inventiveness here is metaphor, or that which approaches it; the dictionary which attempted to register all metaphoric usages would begin to look like that map of the world which was of the world's own size. To Schäfer's finding that his lists of coinages are not absolute, but potential first citations,<sup>9</sup> we must add that no lexicographical principles can encompass the description of all aspects of linguistic creativity.

<sup>9</sup> Schäfer, p. 40

To keep a description of Browne's innovative vocabulary within manageable limits has meant that in listing words I have generally confined my attention to words whose structural appearance is new, and which have attracted separate articles in the O.E.D., rather than to existing words put to new semantic uses. The linguistic 'creativity' which such attention to morphology might be said to measure is thus of a narrow kind. In chapters three and four below, these restricted notions are analysed within the context of Browne's diction in a broader fashion, and brought into relation with the mainstream of seventeenth-century prose of the learned kind.

In the following analysis, I summarise the six main problems of O.E.D. policy which Schäfer has discerned, and offer a further problematic topic; in each case, my purpose is to show how these problems apply to Browne and the lexicographical treatment of his text.

#### 1. LITERARY BIAS.

... there is a marked tendency to grant the great names in English literature preferential treatment ...: words of marginal importance used by these preferred authors are rarely omitted, and their vocabulary is usually assigned main lemma status.<sup>10</sup>

For reasons which will emerge, it is fair to say that the works of Browne are well represented in comparison with those of Nashe, but not in comparison with Shakespeare; he has indeed been accorded the status of a 'great name' in English literature. Omission is one measure of the diligence with which the compilers of the O.E.D. studied each author's work, and it appears from Schäfer's study that the Dictionary fails to notice a greater number of neologisms present in Nashe's text than is the case with Browne's or Shakespeare's. However, the reasons which might underlie such omissions are of crucial importance if they can be discerned, and this was outside Schäfer's scope. Another measure of bias is the diligence with which

<sup>10</sup> Schäfer, p. 13



textual variations have been attended to - perhaps from prejudices about the literary 'status' of an author - and in Browne's case the editors were assiduous in demanding readings of all the seventeenth-century editions of his longest work, Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and the very low rate of error suggests that a high value was set upon obtaining accuracy in Browne's particular case. Confirmation of this would only be available as and when a comparative study of, say, Bacon, Burton and Browne was carried out.

Schäfer's caution about bias creates the need to qualify one's basic concept of coinage; in the absence of firmer data, but aware that the O.E.D.'s datings of first citations may be only about sixty per cent reliable,<sup>11</sup> it is only at present justifiable to hold that Browne was the first man of letters to venture the use of the words listed in my Appendix I below, within the scope of the works consulted for the compilation of the O.E.D.

## 2. OMISSION OF WORDS.

Schäfer finds that, whereas every 'normal' word (excluding malapropisms) first used in Shakespeare has been registered in the O.E.D., forty-eight words used by Nashe have been omitted. It is assumed that some of these omissions result from their presence in Nashe's text simply being overlooked, and that others were regarded as too "outlandish or rare to be registered".<sup>12</sup> Thus, he concludes,

Nashe (and, by implication, probably most other authors) is under-represented in the O.E.D. documentation when compared with Shakespeare.<sup>13</sup>

It is not possible from my analysis to say exactly how far Browne is so under-represented, since there may be more omissions of neologisms, especially in the absence of a concordance or mechanical register of his vocabulary. That Browne is quantitatively represented on a scale comparable with Nashe confirms that a minute statistical study of his texts is a worthwhile project for the reforming lexicographer.

11 Schäfer, p. 65

12, 13 Schäfer, p. 15



Schäfer finds space to comment on the number of hapaxlegomena recorded for Nashe, because he finds many of these omitted, whereas "every word in Shakespeare has been registered in the O.E.D."<sup>14</sup> Of his list of forty-eight omitted words, most, he suspects, "were regarded by the O.E.D. editors as too outlandish or rare to be registered, even under subordinate lemmas." Browne's hapaxlegomena (I use the term broadly, to include all words classified in the O.E.D. with the superior index <sup>-1</sup>, whether nonce-words or simply 'rare') are a very large body - over two hundred in my listing - distributed throughout his works. In understanding the approach of the Dictionary's editors, this body of recondite and 'unused' words is significant. My cross-check of entries in the O.E.D. revealed a very small number of omissions, some of which are attributable to a defective examination of The Garden of Cyrus. In Appendix I below, only seventeen included words are omitted by the O.E.D.; eleven of these are classifiable as alien terms, and six form an assortment, some of which it was not reasonable for the editors to have identified: bipartited, conspire (sb.), presentation, crowdingly, solatory and tremultuating. Set against this small number of omissions is the presence of over two hundred hapaxlegomena, almost all assigned main lemma status. Even allowing that my own examination of Browne's text may have overlooked some items which had also escaped the notice of Dictionary readers, the fact remains that this treatment of Browne's 'unused' inventions is a generous one, especially in comparison with the registration of Nashe's hapaxlegomena. It is a generosity which, I conjecture, is founded on two factors: Browne's literary reputation, which was high during the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth; and the apparent bona fides of most of these words in terms of their morphology. Even though many of these words are grossly pedantic, they almost all seem to satisfy academic or orthographic orthodoxy. As an example,

<sup>14</sup> Schäfer, p. 13

nine hapaxlegomena are verbs, and these are: absterse, australize, celestify, detenebrate, mysterize, obduct, reinquire, reoppose, and terrestrify. All of classical pedigree, they conform to established patterns by building on standard prefixes and suffixes. The majority of other hapaxlegomena, whether nouns, adjectives or adverbs, all exhibit the same kind of orthographic conformity.

The editors of the Dictionary show an awareness of the element of chance in the survival of words, which has been alluded to by Joan Bennett,<sup>15</sup> and orthographical propriety plays its part here. In Browne's case, for two hundred words which have found no subsequent user, there are as many which have found one or two users, some in direct imitation, then lapsed into obscurity again; and as many again have become useful members of the everyday lexicon - pictorial, electricity, equitable and so on. I am not aware of any firm principle that makes possible a forecast of a word's future utility, and various factors which confirm only an uncertainty principle are detailed in chapters three and four below.

### 3. MALAPROPISMS.

The deliberate distortion of learned-seeming words is a feature of Dogberry's, but not Browne's prose; there may be accidental instances of distortion, and some rare words look as though they provide the raw material from which newer and more extraordinary distortions can be constructed. Schäfer lists ten of Shakespeare's malapropisms which (like those of almost all other authors) are not included in the O.E.D., but shows that the inclusion of most of Shakespeare's malapropisms points to an inconsistency of registration, and, once again, preferential treatment.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Joan Bennett, Sir Thomas Browne, (1962), p. 216

<sup>16</sup> Schäfer, pp. 15-16



#### 4. TEXTUAL PROBLEMS.

In respect of Shakespeare,

Far from contenting themselves with simply analysing the established text of the Cambridge or Globe editions, the editors bravely tackled the complicated textual situation. They recorded variant readings in the quartos and folios, discussed major cruxes and sampled quite a number of the emendations of the great editors of the past ...<sup>17</sup>

This again represents preferential treatment, however laudable the intent, especially when authors like Nashe, clearly of importance in the historical development of vocabulary, had received little editorial attention. Schäfer points out that McKerrow's 1904-10 edition of Nashe was only available to the O.E.D.'s compilers for the last third of the alphabet.

In Browne's case, the O.E.D. editors had the benefit of Wilkin's 1835 edition of the Works, an early classic of editorial diligence, which brought all the major writings together, even if it did not establish authoritative texts, and which provides much useful commentary. Some use seems to have been made of it, but most of the citations are referred, naturally enough, to the first edition of each work. In the case of the largest source-work, Pseudodoxia Epidemica, all the seventeenth-century editions were consulted, as is evident from the accurate datings of various words as they appear in the second and subsequent editions. Although the 1650 edition is not cited among Browne's works in the O.E.D.'s "List of books used ...", there are plenty of instances of its use in particular entries. That there was a haphazard approach to Browne's text is shown by a number of errors which point to a lack of coordination. Despite the use made of Pseudodoxia Epidemica's 1650 edition, the first occurrence in

<sup>17</sup> Schäfer, p. 18



that text was ignored of the words: cosmographically, denominable and narwhal; the citations are dated 1658, the fourth edition. The reader of the 1658 edition also appears to have assumed the existence in the first edition of sacrificable and selection, dating them respectively "1646" and "1646-58", when, again, they first occur in the edition of 1650. In the cases of narwhal, sacrificable and selection, Wilkin's edition in the Works would have supplied correct datings.

It is not possible to reconstruct exactly the working method by which illustrations were extracted from Pseudodoxia Epidemica. Some remarks can be made which show the general lack of a detailed policy, beyond the mere oversight of a word's occurrence in earlier editions. The conventions of supplying references from the 1646 edition, the most commonly referred to, suggests that different readers were at work on Browne. The most common procedure was to cite 1646, "Pseud. Ep.", with merely a page number, but almost as frequently, the book and chapter numbers are given in addition. Entries under N, O, P, R, S, T, V refer the reader predominantly by page number only. There are seven instances, throughout the complete works, where inaccurate references have been provided (commiserator, emaciate, ophiophagous, seminal, semi-bodies, septicall, and subclavian), which means that the error rate in this respect is less than one per cent. More significant are the errors in dating which derive from the failure to treat the various texts consistently. There is an example where outside authority - Dr. Johnson's Dictionary - is regarded as sufficient for the citation of beatifying, "1681", which I cannot substantiate. The assumption was made that the presence in the Works of 1686 of comber implied its presence in "1646-82", while in fact its first occurrence is in a chapter first added in the second (1650) edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica; as in the case of clickling, dated "a 1682", reference to

Wilkin would have rectified matters; the latter word is included in a passage first appearing the edition of 1672. Wilkin's edition is far from being free of error, but at the time of the O.E.D.'s compilation it represented a fair authority, and its textual notes would have cleared an appreciable number of errors. The modern editions of the major works by Robbins and Martin provide a sound base on which future lexicographers may depend; Keynes's editions, especially of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, are not adequate in handling textual variations.

## 5. WORD-CATEGORIES.

Schäfer finds from his study of Shakespeare and Nashe that there is no clear O.E.D. policy "as to whether compounds could be regarded as documentation for their lexical components ... should well-educated from Love's Labour's Lost be cited as the first occurrence of educated, first documented for 1670, or not?"<sup>18</sup> The categories Schäfer attends to are, first, hyphenated words and compound participial adjectives, then adverbs, verbal substantives, and participial adjectives ending in -ed and -ing.

Both Shakespeare and Nashe are rich in hyphenated forms (thought-executing, dear-bought, mouth-filling etc.) in ways that Browne is not, and the problem of first registration in Browne's case is more relevant to the second category, that of verbal substantives and adverbs ending in -ly. My word-list in Appendix I includes ninety-nine adverbs, of which only five (androgynally, anticipatively, gradually, impolarily and precariously) are not antedated by the adjectival forms from which their forms derive; indeed, the first and last of these five are coined by Browne in 1646 at the same time as androgynal and precarious.

<sup>18</sup> Schäfer, p. 22



Like Schäfer, in drawing up a list of an author's coinages, I have retained the O.E.D.'s system of documentation irrespective of the kind of inconsistency noted above, but have noted straightforward errors in dating. Schäfer's discussion ponders an appropriate treatment for what must be called 'implied forms', but seems to stop halfway towards a conclusion. It is clear that precariously must imply the existence of precarious, but by the same token negative forms, whether created by suffix such as -less or prefixes like non-, im- or anti- imply their positive forms. In Browne, non-adamical is a case in point; the negative form which he uses in Pseudodoxia Epidemica in 1646 antedates adamical, for which the O.E.D. cites Turner's translation of Paracelsus in 1657 as the first use. Browne's term, like Turner's, derives from his reading of Paracelsus. Likewise, the words indiduous and inexhalable antedate the positive forms given in the O.E.D.

In this section, Schäfer's discussion of the problem of consistency is very open-ended, and it is not difficult to see why. Once the attempt to dismember single lexical items (whether 'compounds' or not) has been entered into, there is no end to the procedure. Beyond adverbs, verbal derivatives and negatives, the next step would be to detect the implied use of acquire in acquirable, of inveterate in inveterateness, of elevate in elevator and so on. The fact that the O.E.D. has, in the case of Shakespeare, seemed to adopt special procedures in which 'potential antedatings' (cf. inventorially, in Hamlet, providing a citation for inventorial) and double registrations are indulged is a complicating factor, which the chronologer can only resolve by arbitrary means.

In attempting to throw some light on this topic, I have resorted to the provision of an impressionistic guide to 'implied forms'; in Appendix I, the words included in columns 5 and 7 are forms related to the main entry, with dates given for their first citation. These references go a little way towards suggesting the historical position of the main entry alongside related words in other grammatical



classes and of different structures, both as antecedents and successors.

## 6. PROPER NOUNS.

It is pointed out by Schäfer that, in line with the preferential treatment of Shakespeare's text, some names of countries and persons have been admitted as main entries in the O.E.D. in cases where they have no adjectival or attributive function, and that this violates what seems to have been general editorial policy. In addition, the antonomastic use of proper nouns has been treated irregularly, and Schäfer concludes it to be futile to try to find the reasons for their inclusion or exclusion. The same problem is observed in respect of toponymic adjectives ending in -an or -ian.<sup>19</sup>

There is a considerable problem in Browne's text in this respect. In Hydriotaphia, for example, the toponymic adjectives Thracian, Herulian, Esquiline and Anconian are not registered in the O.E.D., while Megarian, Dalmatian, Sarmatian and Ephesian are. In the absence of any guide to procedure, I simply excluded all proper names and adjectives derived from them from my list of coinages, with these exceptions: Scevolaes, which seemed to introduce a potentially useful term that personified left-handed people; Indiary, which was both interesting as an adjectival form and as a term chosen for exclusion from the second edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica; and adjectives formed with the suffixes -ize and -ism (e.g. Democratism, Euripize). To have done otherwise would have involved extending the list to very much larger proportions, especially if alien terms had also been added. Above all, I reasoned that such proper nouns are 'found' rather than 'coined' terms, and while their use may involve creative or imaginative composition, there is no firm standard by which to judge where a proper noun's denotative value is joined by a connotative value.

<sup>19</sup> Schäfer, p. 31

This is one area where my word-list omits, as a matter of policy, entries which are present in the O.E.D., and involves, regrettably, omitting the attributive use of Glastonbury, where Browne's use in P.E. II, 6 antedates the O.E.D.'s citation of Aubrey in 1691, Russia-leather in G.C. III, and Capella in C.M. III, 26, for example. My findings confirm those of Schäfer, in experiencing disarray in the O.E.D.; Democratism and Cynicism are jointly coined in the same passage in A Letter to a Friend (M., p. 189), and their equal condition as novelties in the seventeenth century makes it necessary for the modern reader to make a mental adjustment; Democratism (democritism) has sunk into obscurity, while Cynicism enjoys common currency. At the same time, there seems to be no good ground for the O.E.D. to exclude America, in "The America and untravelled parts of truth" (see above, p. 26), and yet include words such as Glastonbury.

Schäfer's survey of O.E.D. policy ends by considering the value of the 1933 and 1972/76 Supplements, chiefly for statistical purposes, and concludes that their impact upon the treatment of Shakespeare and Nashe is minimal. My own scanning of the Supplements similarly suggested that their relevance for Browne was negligible, and I have not incorporated any material from them.

Schäfer seeks to find the chronological significance of his material and to test the accuracy of the O.E.D.<sup>20</sup> Shakespeare and Nashe are indeed test cases; the O.E.D. is his primary object of study, and not the diction of these two authors. I have taken an alternative focus, my primary idea being to establish the kinds of innovation which Browne was responsible for, taking into account the limitations of the research material, to evaluate it as a stylistic feature, to investigate Browne's own attitude to it, and to relate it to other features of diction and verbal structure. In doing so, I hope as a by-product to add to the understanding of the utility of the historical dating of vocabulary, and to offer an example of how the diction of



a particular author may be examined with the aid of such a process. In this process, I found it necessary to consider 'alien' words, and it is surprising that Schäfer does not find space to allude to this area of lexis.

#### ALIENS.

The O.E.D.'s principles of selection of 'non-naturalized' terms seems as arbitrary as those we must presume to exist for proper nouns. Browne's diction is rich in foreign terms, though not dense in direct quotation like Burton's and that of some other contemporary writers. In some places this feature becomes almost polyglottal, as in the case of the trilingual triplet at P.E. V, 15: "God made them χιτῶνας δερματίνοους, Vestes pelliceas, or coates of skinnes;". Fifty-two of the words listed in Appendix I bear the parallel mark // in the O.E.D., indicating their status as either non- or partially-naturalised. Beyond these, I have included another eleven words which do not appear in the Dictionary, and which are of obviously alien status, even by the rough and ready standards of its classification of citizenship. These eleven items are: cariola, conopeion, cuneatim, decussis, empedon, quinguernio, regulus, scevolaes, tenupha, tycho, ustrina. It is worth noting that quaternio is admitted to the O.E.D. (which overlooks its occurrence in The Garden of Cyrus, noting its use by Cudworth in 1678 as its first occurrence), while quinguernio is absent; and that empedon is excluded and labarum included<sup>21</sup> - both occur in the same paragraph of The Garden of Cyrus. The sense of unevenness in this category, where Browne is concerned, is strong, not merely because of overall inconsistency in the Dictionary, but because of an additional peculiarity which came to my notice as I was compiling Appendix I, chiefly affecting Browne's works of 1658.

21 For a disquisition on the use of labarum, see Schäfer, "The working methods of Thomas Blount" English Studies 59 (1978), p.407.

The Garden of Cyrus, and, to a lesser extent, Hydriotaphia provide over one hundred of the coined words in Appendix I, occurring in the two works in the ratio 4:1. The manner in which I compiled this Appendix did not change throughout my examination of all Browne's major works, and so it is fair to state that, page for page, The Garden of Cyrus is the most rich in neologisms of all Browne's works, and that chapters II and III, providing fifty-six coinages in only twenty-three pages (in Martin's edition) is the densest area. If statistics mean anything in this context, they emphasise the character of The Garden of Cyrus as linguistically innovative. When, however, the documentation of the O.E.D. is inspected, only four alien items are registered as first occurring in that work: acari, coagulum, ostracion, and reticulum. Consultation of my list in Appendix I reveals the following: those initial four words; six of the eleven items already noted above (conopeion, cuneatim, decussis, empedon, quinguernio, tenupha); and a further seven items which antedate their entries in the O.E.D. So, out of a total of seventeen aliens I have registered for The Garden of Cyrus, thirteen are overlooked by the Dictionary's reader. Of those thirteen, seven do find their way into the Dictionary on the authority of later writers, and six are lost.

That there was aberration in the reading of The Garden of Cyrus becomes more certain when the thirty-eight antedatings (Appendix IIb) are considered. Sixteen of these come from this work, and two from Hydriotaphia. I have already thrown doubt on the effectiveness of the reading of the 1650 edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica (above, p. 32), from which ten of these thirty-eight antedatings derive, but alongside this, the errors centring on The Garden of Cyrus look quite serious. Out of the ninety-nine entries for that work in Appendix I, as many as twenty-three bear the key-letter G indicating error or omission in the O.E.D. The fact that 'native' words in The Garden of Cyrus, such as cretaceous, culinarily, inversedly, spicated and vineall antedate



the Dictionary entries shows that an inadequate or merely cursory treatment of the text - or possibly the loss of some slips - is responsible for the omissions, rather than some particular policy, or ignorance of it, about the registration of aliens. There is reason to suppose that, on the analogy of quaternio and labarum, words like quinquernio and empedon would have found their way into the O.E.D. had they found a use among later writers, and that the list of aliens might well have been enlarged by such words in The Garden of Cyrus as crusero, spondae and subtegmen. I have not registered words such as these three in Appendix I, but I can plead no principle for omitting them; the decision to omit derives from an impression about both the degree and kind of a word's alienation from English, and an impression of its potential utility - both completely subjective criteria.

If the O.E.D. offers no principles, it does offer a guide in seeking to discover what constitutes naturalization. These remarks in the Preface<sup>22</sup> are helpful:

Opinions will differ as to the claims of some that are included and some that are excluded, and also as to the line dividing Denizens from Naturals, and the position assigned to some words on either side of it. If we are to distinguish these classes at all, a line must be drawn somewhere.

The distinctions that are provided, offering descriptions of Naturals, Denizens, Aliens and Casuals, gives that guidance some strength of foundation, but there can be no structure adequate for the great number of learned, chiefly Latin words in casual use in the seventeenth century among writers like Browne, Burton, More and Cudworth, as well as among more 'familiar' writers such as Felltham and Howell. Such writers are at ease in more than one tongue, and are usually confident that their audience is similarly lettered.

22 Compact O.E.D., p. xi

Their publications share obedience to no fixed principle in the way that terms of foreign origin are printed - in other words, the italicization of words, singly or in groups, cannot always offer us a sure guide as to what forms authors considered to be native, nor what terms they intended to assimilate into native morphology. There is no consistency, for example, in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, as to what forms are italicized; proper names are given in both roman and italic typefaces. Frequently, the decision as to which typeface was appropriate will have been left to the compositor. In the last chapter to be added to Pseudodoxia Epidemica (V, 21, 'Of Haman hanged'), there is much italicization of proper names and toponymic adjectives, even including words such as Jewish and Roman, which is not a practice consistent with the work's earlier editions. Generally, in Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus, italicization is more marked than in the printed editions of the works of 1643 and 1646. In this area, we have no guide to the intention of the words' user, whether to build on to the lexis from borrowed forms, or simply to transliterate, and without hindsight, there is neither a theory nor a consistent practice which helps forecast that prairie and gypsum would pass into common parlance, while mucro and fuligo would languish almost unused.

To summarise, the points raised in this chapter demonstrate how far the O.E.D.'s citations and policies of lemmatization can be held to offer a full description of Browne's linguistic innovations. A dictionary cannot be a register of inventiveness or creativity, because concepts such as these depend upon imponderables like the author's intention, his memory, his reading habits and his methods of composition, not to mention the changes over time of perceptions of value in matters imaginative. But Appendix I does show Browne to have 'coined', insofar as dictionaries can determine this, both



essential terms of science and philosophy, as well as an abundance of pedantical ephemera, and from this stock of innovations we can draw conclusions of varying kinds about the quality of his diction. The quality of innovation in semantic terms can only be judged by reference to the context, and the listing in the Appendix has to be taken as representing morphological novelty. No analysis of the mere forms of words will distinguish between 'happy temerities' and pretentious polysyllables. It is to the background of learning that we must refer next, to see just how much of an innovator Browne is, alongside his peers.

## Chapter Three

### Hard Words and the Virtuosi.

Nature it selfe cannot erre: and as men abound in  
copiousnesse of language; so they become more wise,  
or more mad than ordinary.

Hobbes, Leviathan, 1: 4

. . . . .

Browne's anglicizing of Latin vocabulary is a familiar feature  
to the historian of language, to whom it is convenient to refer:

Voyages of the mind ... were made by scholars and scientists,  
and their route lay through Latin writings. 'Latin' here means  
the language of scholarship at the Renaissance; it includes  
a great deal not found in classical Latin, especially elements  
from Greek, but also loans from other languages of learning.  
The linguistic merchandise brought back from these ventures  
generally differs in content from that of the Middle Ages;  
older branches of learning had developed their vocabulary, and  
newer ones now feel the need to do so. Though most of the  
borrowings are nouns when they enter English, in the source-  
language they had often not been nouns, or had been nouns in  
other than the quotation form. What this peculiarity reflects is  
the borrowers' easy familiarity with the source-language; they  
are at home in its sentences, and can readily snip bits out  
of them for use as quotation-nouns in English.<sup>1</sup>

In the history of Latin borrowings, Browne is a relative latecomer.

R.F.Jones has described the battles between English and Classical  
purists over the issue of 'inkhorn terms', and observes distinctions  
between the making of new words in the sixteenth and seventeenth  
centuries:

The development of the language through the sixteenth century  
had swelled its vocabulary by at least one-third with words

<sup>1</sup> B.M.H.Strang, A History of English (1970), p. 128



taken from other languages, Latin especially, and the seventeenth century continued the practice of borrowing, though in a somewhat different spirit ...

He explains this difference in a footnote:

One senses a different spirit, something akin to the metaphysical, a seeking for the strange and out of the way, perhaps a striving for certain imaginative or sound effects, in the borrowing of men like Burton, Donne, Taylor and Browne.<sup>2</sup>

A belief in the power, influence and imaginative possibilities of an exotically learned diction is reflected in a bewildering variety of seventeenth-century texts. Jones alerts us to its presence in the prose of a certain metaphysical kind, but it is as typical an everyday feature of antiquarian writing, of educational reformers like John Webster and Noah Biggs, of minor epic poetry, and of scientific writing of all kinds.

Of its presence as a feature of the poetry of the first half of the century, Saintsbury, who waded through more unreadable lines than most mortals, wrote:

One set (of the poets discussed) is in the direction of a sort of new 'aureate' diction - of 'inkhorn terms' corresponding to those of which the mighty chief of contemporary prose-writers, Sir Thomas Browne, is so prodigal. Chamberlayne, though not quite so lavish of them, is a thorough contemporary of Browne's in his 'enthean' and his 'astracisms'. But, as is well known, all Jacobean and Caroline writers, from Bacon and Greville to Thomas Burnet, succumb to this temptation, the indulgence in which was no doubt a main cause of the imminent reaction to a 'naked natural way of speaking', though some of the greatest men on that side, notably Dryden, never quite relinquished their fondness for 'traduction' and the like. This indulgence is certainly more pardonable in poetry than in prose, where also it is not unpardonable to some tastes ...<sup>3</sup>

2 R.F.Jones, The Triumph of the English Language (1953), p.272

3 G.E.B.Saintsbury (ed.) Minor Poets of the Caroline Period (1905) Vol.1, Intro., p. ix

Browne's innovations can be seen to constitute such an indulgence. But the evidence of the O.E.D. is that by no means all his coinages spring from Latin or Greek roots. Admittedly some ninety-five per cent do, but that still leaves around fifty in Appendix I which show his search for accuracy and point within an Anglo-Saxon idiom. Formations such as simple, empuzzle and tearbottle represent creativity without the use of the inkhorn, while the epithet swaggy, used to describe the beaver's fat, hanging belly, seems a good example of what Geoffrey Tillotson calls 'discreet onomatopoeia'.<sup>4</sup>

Browne's initiating use of dialect or 'peasant' forms can be seen in his miscellaneous writings, as for example in his notes on "Birds found in Norfolk"<sup>5</sup> (a series of notes which looks like the draft for a fairly ambitious ornithologist's handbook), where the names of birds previously unrecorded in written English occur: shearwater, cobble, chipper and wesell. The function here is less coinage, than placing on record, and the same may be remarked of instances in Pseudodoxia Epidemica which register the first written occurrence of the native names of species: narwhal, moon-fish and burst-cow. Along with borrowings from French - patois, prairie and fougade - and Italian - saltimbanco - and a range of words demonstrating grammatical conversion - wingy, inlay, namesake etc., the comprehensive character of Browne's writings as vehicles for innovation is established.

What it has been possible to assemble as evidence in the form of 'coinage', even subject to all the limitations produced in chapter two of this thesis, confirms a judgement which derives from a wider consideration of his style:

He proceeds from a very exact stylistic study, which continued throughout his school and university programmes in rhetoric.

Independently he develops his prose by attending to compromises

<sup>4</sup> G.Tillotson, Augustan Poetic Diction (1961), p. 102

<sup>5</sup> Works, ed. Keynes, Vol.III, pp. 401-415



between English and Latin syllabic groupings and the evocative rhythm his intuition demands ... Browne fully understands the linguistic resources at hand and how they can embody the thoughts and emotions he wants to record. There are no signs of a stated scholarly theory of language. Rather does he prefer freedom to create his style as the occasion arises. In this instinct he is the thorough artist.<sup>6</sup>

Browne uses his freedom to make what Warren calls his "personally compounded language",<sup>7</sup> and commentators as diverse as Patrides, who commends the "harmony of his creative diction"<sup>8</sup> and Johnson, who forgives Browne his recondite diction on account of his "uncommon sentiments"<sup>9</sup> manage to rationalise and make a virtue of his latinate excesses. However, all of these appreciations, whether of Browne's thought or his artistry, look partisan unless his innovations are considered alongside the contemporary mania for hard words, which afflicted so many writers of the same generation, which Saintsbury found hard to pardon, and which was later to earn Sprat's condemnation in his propaganda for the new 'naked' style of Royal Society-approved prose.

Somehow, the context and background of Browne's lexiphanic habit need to be brought into a synthesis: one that will show how individual a coiner he is alongside his peers, how influential his development of vocabulary was, and how far it affected the perceptions of value in his work. To provide such a synthesis, three historical factors are examined in this chapter: A. the development of the 'hard-word' dictionaries. B. Browne's position in the 'virtuoso' tradition. C. The inkhorn tendency among Browne's contemporaries.

6 Norman Mackenzie, "Sir Thomas Browne as a Man of Learning ..." in English Studies in Africa, X (1967), pp. 83-84

7 Austin Warren, "The Style of Sir Thomas Browne" in Kenyon Review, XIII (1951), p. 683

8 C.A. Patrides (ed.), Sir Thomas Browne ... (1977), p.47

9 Johnson, "Life ..." in Wilkin (ed.) Works (1852), Vol.1, p. xxxiii

#### A. THE HARD-WORD DICTIONARIES.

Hard words were nothing new. The great translators like Holland, Florio, Chapman and Sandys gave an impetus to the importation of learned terms, but the tendency was well established before then. The sixteenth century witnessed a running battle between English purists and Classical purists on the subject of linguistic borrowing; Sir John Cheke's objections to the use of 'inkhorn terms' is well known. Indeed it is a battle of a kind that never ceases, as interested spectators of the verbal patterns and innovations in, for instance, sociological studies and the pseudo-sciences will know well. From the sheer weight of latinisms that found a secure footing in the language by Shakespeare's time, it is clear that free traders in language easily overcame the objections of protectionists in vocabulary. Yet the simplicity of the vernacular held its own, often in the pages of writers notorious for neologising. One result of this conflict, though, was that the presence of the new 'hard' words in written English enabled the learned to equip themselves with a professional code which could keep the ill-educated still in ignorance, even after the need to use Latin as an international language had begun to be eroded. The possibility of the semi-learned being able to grasp the arcana of their intellectual superiors had become real by 1600, but the rapid latinization of English threw a heavy obstacle in their path.

This creation and maintenance of a recondite vocabulary was a protection against the populist invasion of professional and elite preserves; the translation of the Classics and, above all, of the Bible, could be seen as a dangerous innovation. But not all authors had professional concerns, like physicians and the clergy, to protect. In an analysis of the prose of four various sixteenth-century writers, (Hall, Elyot, More and Ascham), Matti Rissanen finds that the device



of using parallel pairs of native and loan words in 'doublets' is common, and represents different motivations:

Binomials or repetitive word pairs were very popular both in mediaeval and Renaissance prose. In the sixteenth century, word pairs were largely used for decoration, but also to introduce and interpret unfamiliar words. Thus there seems to exist a natural connection between the use of loan-words and word pairs; firstly, borrowed words are likely to be found in explanatory binomials of the type L(oan)/N(ative), or N/L; secondly, the search for synonymous words to create decorative binomials called forth the use of loan-words; and finally, coupling offers a natural means to give extra emphasis to loan-words used for stylistic elevation.<sup>10</sup>

Parallel, then, with the urge to project learnedness and sustain the exclusiveness of the Classics, we find the urges to explain, to decorate, and to elevate. Browne himself, in different registers of his prose, uses doublets of varying kinds with the effect of one or more of these categories, and his practice must be set against the remarks he makes against the 'vulgar' in the preface to

Pseudodoxia Epidemica:

Although I confesse, the quality of the Subject will sometimes carry us into expressions beyond meere English apprehensions; and indeed, if elegancie still proceedeth, and English Pennes maintaine that stream wee have of late observed to flow from many, wee shall within few yeares bee faine to learne Latine to understand English, and a work will prove of equall facility in either. Nor have wee addressed our penne or stile unto the people, (whom Bookes doe not redresse, and are this way incapable of reduction) but unto the leading and knowing part of Learning; as well understanding (at least probably hoping) except they be watered from higher regions, and fructifying meteors of knowledge, these weeds must lose their alimentall sappe and wither of themselves ... ('To the Reader', R., p.3)

10 M.Rissanen, "Strange and Inkhorne Tearmes..." in Style and Text: Essays presented to Nils Erik Enkvist, ed. H.Ringbom (1975), p.255

Austin Warren presumably had this passage in mind when he accused Browne of snobbery:

Latinity - whether scientific, theological, or literary - is the mark of the intellectual, of the citizen of the world, the "good European", and the inheritor of Graeco-Roman culture, of Mediterranean civilization. Browne is an intellectual snob: the most charming of his kind ...<sup>11</sup>

The density of much of Browne's diction confirms Warren's view, but the evidence of the way in which he regarded many of his own coinages and esoteric words, which is shown at large in Appendix I, column 4, is that there is a very frequent readiness to explain or re-express his own terms.

The difficulty for the modern reader here is in trying to understand what is signified by the concept of literateness in the first half of the seventeenth century; the notion which had previously implied an education in, and familiarity with the classics gradually approached meaning an ability to grasp the new 'hard' words that the learned introduced into English. Evidence of this is clear from the character of the English dictionaries which began to appear after 1600. The first of these was Cawdrey's A Table Alphabeticall (1604), whose title-page begins:

A Table Alphabeticall, conteyning and teaching the true writing, and understanding of hard usuall English words, borrowed from the Hebrew, Greeke, Latine, or French etc. With the interpretation thereof by plaine English words, gathered for the benefit & helpe of Ladies, Gentlewomen, or any other unskilfull persons ...

The successors of this volume, the dictionaries of Bullokar (1616) and Cockeram (1623), seemed to have a similar reading public in mind. The very organisation of Cockeram's English Dictionarie gives a clear indication of the readers' needs which he sought to meet; as he states

<sup>11</sup> Warren, op.cit., p.682



in his Preface, the first Book gives a list of

... the choicest (i.e. most learned) words themselves now in use, wherwith our language is enriched and become so copious, to which words the common sense is annexed. The second booke containes the vulgar words, which whensoever any desirous of a more curious explanation by a more refined and elegant speech shall looke into, he shall there receive the exact and ample word to expresse the same ...

It is also worth bearing in mind that Cockeram's third Book contained a

Recitall of several persons, Gods and Goddesses, Giants and Devils, Monsters and Serpents, Birds and Beasts, Rivers, Fishes, Herbs, Stones, Trees and the like ...

- in short, the very kind of raw encyclopaedic material Browne was to discourse upon in Pseudodoxia Epidemica. This kind of compendium was a feature of the Latin-English dictionaries of the period, as well as of Cockeram's successor lexicographers in English.

There was assistance, then, for those on its fringes to approach and perhaps join the society of the learned, through a familiarity with its vocabulary. What is not wholly clear about the 'hard-word' dictionaries is what social, cultural or educational utility they really provided. Their failure to "register the consent of the learned" about English is well summarised by Bolton:

From the beginning of the seventeenth century, dictionaries of English alone began to appear, but they were all concerned with the 'hard words' of the language, the unfamiliar recent borrowings, technical and learned terms, and the like. None of them answered Mulcaster's demand years before for a work which 'would gather all the words which we use in our English tongue, whether natural or incorporate, out of all professions, as well learned as not, into one dictionary, and besides the right writing, which is incident to the alphabet, would open unto us therein both their natural force and their proper use.'

Mulcaster here stipulated four requirements for the dictionary: it should contain all the words of the language, it should indicate their spellings, it should define their meanings,

and it should regulate their use. No English dictionary of the Renaissance came near to fulfilling these requirements.<sup>12</sup>

However, if the 'hard-word' dictionaries did not embody any effective academic approach to the lexicon, the term "elegance" in respect of the refined terms to which they provided a key should alert us to that use of the word in Pseudodoxia Epidemica mentioned earlier (p. 47), where Browne implies an aesthetic approval of latinisms, akin to the appeal to elitism which is plain in the attitude of the early lexicographers. Cawdrey, Cockeram and the others plainly sought success in popularizing learned terms, in a way that suggests that knowledge of hard words was a social, as well as an intellectual advantage.

The connection between these dictionaries and Pseudodoxia Epidemica can be made more clearly if we look at the next descendant in the English dictionary tradition, published in 1656, between the second and third editions of Browne's encyclopaedic work. Thomas Blount's Glossographia (1656) was a decidedly more scholarly work than its predecessors, despite its indebtedness to them in aiming to interpret the hard words "... as are now used in our refined English tongue." Blount quoted from contemporary literary texts to illustrate and explain the entries in his dictionary, which represented a distinct advance in technique from the practice of Cockeram. Among the authorities Blount refers to are the Bible, Acts of Parliament, and the historians Camden and Stow; but most common among his attributions are the works of Bacon and, above all, Browne. His debt to Browne was first noted in the seminal, if now outdated work on early lexicography, The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson by Starnes and Noyes:

...there are numerous correspondences between the Glossographia and Sir Thomas Browne's Pseudodoxia Epidemica, or Enquiries into Vulgar and Common Errors. Of thirty words collected from

12 W.F.Bolton, A Short History of Literary English (1967), p. 43



the Vulgar Errors, twenty are in the Glossographia without designation as to source; ten are in the same book but assigned to "Dr. B." or "Vulg. Er."<sup>13</sup>

However, the conclusions reached in this work as to the manner of the compilation of Glossographia have been rebutted.<sup>14</sup> It was held by Starnes and Noyes that Blount obtained his principal word-entries by anglicizing entries which he had found in Latin-English dictionaries such as those of Thomas (1632) and Holyoke (1639), and then supplying appropriate references from authors in whose works such 'invented' words occurred. The same assumption was made in respect of the working methods of Cawdrey and Cockeram. Schäfer's findings<sup>15</sup> that contemporary and sixteenth-century texts, with significant monolingual glossaries, played an important part as sources for the hard-word dictionaries up to 1640, apply in a similar way to Blount. Besides the wider evidence of shortcomings in the O.E.D. and the presence of sixteenth-century glossaries which serve as forerunners to the work of Cawdrey, the scale and extent of Blount's use of Browne show a very deep debt.

Osselton's short study of Blount's use of Pseudodoxia Epidemica is valuable in establishing the worth Blount found in Browne's work:

It is not hard to see why he turned to Sir Thomas, and in particular to the Pseudodoxia Epidemica. All dictionaries of that age were heavily Latinate, committed to explaining 'hard' words. There was on the one hand (because of the Latin-English source-books) a risk of overdoing the 'Englishing' of Latin or Greek terms, and so falling foul of the purists. On the other hand, there was an unquestioned need to expound the commoner of the new technical terms in the arts and the sciences; in doing this, the dictionary had an educative function. The Pseudodoxia Epidemica, easily the longest of Browne's works, covers with characteristic erudition an immense range

13 De Witt T. Starnes & G.E. Noyes, The English Dictionary ... (1946), p.43

14 T.C.G. Bongaerts, The Correspondence of Thomas Blount (1978), cited in: N.E. Osselton, "Vulgar Errors and Accepted Terms", in Times and Tide, festschrift for Prof. A.G.H. Bachrach (1980), p. 105

15 J. Schäfer, "Elizabethan Glossaries ..." in ALLC Bulletin I (1980), p.36-37

of topics ... It thus provided the dictionary compiler with a wonderful compendium of just those learned terms which the general reading public might wish him to include.<sup>16</sup>

Blount uses Browne's learning to supply encyclopaedic as well as lexicographic detail for his terms, and gives lengthy quotations for such topics as the Phoenix, salamander, pygmies and the Dog-days, showing that Blount's work also has affinity with the function of Cockeram's third section of his English Dictionarie, mentioned previously. He is able to anglicize very thoroughly on occasion, showing a certain relish for full interpretation; his definition, for example, of mucilaginous, which he found in P.E. III, 23, runs "snivilish, snotty, filthy, and thence flegmy, and the like."

Besides the evidence of Browne's usefulness to Blount, it is possible, from the data concerning coinage in Appendix I, to establish a more complicated relationship between the vocabularies of the two writers. It is clear, for instance, that Blount kept his library up to date. That he used the 1646 edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica is shown by his inclusion of ingannations, elychnious (which he defines wrongly), and zoographers, which only appear in that edition; his inclusion of æquicrurall, which occurs first in Browne's second (1650) edition shows an acquaintance with that. Entries under fougade, glome, utinam and spintrian from Religio Medici show not only his familiarity with its pages, but the first two words indicate his readiness to include strange terms that are not classical in origin. With the second (1661) edition of Glossographia, it is evident that Blount has plundered the pages of Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus, by his inclusion of profundeur, pyre, spicated, vinosity and other words which first occur in the works of 1658. However, there are knottier complications in this relationship. The first edition of Glossographia includes quite

16 N.E. Osselton, op. cit., pp. 107-108.



a few words which, on the evidence of the O.E.D. (which is by no means dependable in this area), appear in Browne's works of 1658, including globular, inlay and transversion, as well as close forms such as hypoge and botanomical, where Browne introduces hypogaeum and botanical in The Garden of Cyrus. Also, in the 1658 edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, Browne uses siliceous, which is antedated in the 1656 Glossographia. Finally, in Browne's works published posthumously (A Letter to a Friend and Miscellany Tracts in this case), pathology, desipience, serotinous, biferous and democritic are all antedated by Blount's registrations.

These complications are indicators that, despite Blount's debt to Browne, his use of the various texts was by no means a matter of slavish copying. They are also further pointers to the likely inadequacy of the O.E.D., since, if we discount the idea that Blount anglicized terms out of the Latin-English dictionaries wholesale, and note that he remains a significant coiner of the kinds of word also coined by Browne, then it is quite possible that an undocumented older source for his innovations exists. There are plenty of instances of Blount's inaccuracy, such as his references to Browne for panoptique and lithotomy, neither of which I can trace, besides the errors of definition noted by Osselton<sup>17</sup> and the failures to refer to his source, noted by Starnes and Noyes. In consequence, it is not possible to offer firm conclusions about Blount's working method; there does seem to be a significant number of 'hard' words both registered by Blount, and used by Browne, whose source is at present unknown, and it is possible that forthcoming studies of earlier glossaries will fill some of the gaps in our knowledge.

What does remain abundantly clear, however, is the status of Browne as a user of difficult and technical terms in mid-century, and the utility of Blount as an interpreter of such a 'refined' vocabulary.

<sup>17</sup> Osselton, op. cit., p. 106

Indeed, Blount's reliance on Pseudodoxia Epidemica is such that in one sense he duplicates Browne's efforts; the contemporary reader of Holland's Pliny and Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas could turn to Blount for explication of terms, but in Browne he could find sources for and discussions of all manner of beliefs and fictions, as well as a vocabulary which, while it did latinise the terms of discussion, also re-expressed itself in Anglo-Saxon terms with great regularity. Browne's habit of using doublets of loan and native words must have recommended Pseudodoxia Epidemica to Thomas Blount almost as much as the range and depth of its learning. Like the gentleman poet George Daniel, Blount would have found many compensations for its difficulties:

If a neat Stile, or Language, doe delight yee,  
Fall gladlie to; nor let the Hard words fright yee ...<sup>18</sup>

#### B. BROWNE AND THE VIRTUOSI.

The chief of English virtuosi, John Evelyn, carried on a correspondence and friendship with Browne for at least thirteen years. To Evelyn we owe the valuable account of Browne's house and garden, which were to his eyes:

... a Paradise & Cabinet of rarities, & that of the best collection, especialy Medails, books, Plants, natural things...<sup>19</sup>

It is a matter for particular regret that only a little of the correspondence between the two men has survived, and that which we have gives few clues to their opinions of one another, being buried beneath 'the reciprocal civility of authors', as Dr. Johnson acidly termed it.

It seems that Evelyn first approached Browne in 1659, through the agency of Robert Paston (later Earl of Yarmouth), with a request for

<sup>18</sup> Daniel, cited in R., intro., p. xlviii

<sup>19</sup> John Evelyn, Diary, ed. E.S. De Beer (1955), Vol.III, p.594: 17 Oct., 1671



advice and suggestions on Evelyn's plan for a work on gardens, that which eventually found publication as "Elysium Britannicum", in Acetaria (1699). In Evelyn's first letter,<sup>20</sup> he acknowledges receiving Browne's notes, and applauds his generosity as "the most obliging of all my correspondents". Although these notes have not survived, it is clear that Browne's commentary on the scheme was extensive, and one which was in general sympathy with Evelyn's intentions for the work. Later, Browne sent Evelyn additional material for the project, in the form of the Tract "Of Garlands, and Coronary or Garland-Plants", which was to be published as Tract II in Certain Miscellany Tracts (1683) after Browne's death, and further notes on grafting followed with another letter.

Critical comments of any type in these fragments of what may have been a far larger correspondence are confined to two, both gently made by Browne. First, in the tract "Of Garlands", the paper is given point by Browne putting the history of garlands into a larger historical perspective than Evelyn had been ready to provide:

Sir,

The use of flowry Crowns and Garlands is of no slender Antiquity, and higher than I conceive you apprehend it ...

(K. IV, p. 49)

Secondly, in Browne's response to Evelyn's letter of 28th January 1659/60, he adds a postscript adverting to one of the more extravagant notions about gardens that was to be included in Evelyn's scheme; the tone is not censorious, but seems to urge restraint and caution upon Evelyn:

The gardens upon great fishes I would not tearme miraculous gardens, butt rather extraordinarie & Anomalous gardens, Animal gardens, or the like.

(K. IV, p. 279)

20 Included in Browne's Works, ed. Keynes, (1964), Vol. IV pp. 273-278

The two remarks count for little, perhaps, but they are signs which indicate which man is the 'senior partner' in this learned correspondence, setting aside the obvious fact that Evelyn was by fifteen years Browne's junior. They do imply some deal of authority for Browne, and from remarks that Evelyn makes, it is evident that it is the author of Pseudodoxia Epidemica who merits that authority. At the same time, it is worth remarking that The Garden of Cyrus had been published in the previous year, reinforcing Browne's reputation as a man of learning.

Besides the fact that Browne's authority and erudition compelled Evelyn's attention, the nature of Browne's work in Pseudodoxia Epidemica holds a key to the diarist's interest. Evelyn was a veritable sponge for information; his appetite for facts and curiosities was insatiable, and Browne's works must have represented to him, as it had done for Thomas Blount, a treasure-house of information. A man with such quantities of learning was inevitably attractive to Evelyn. The fact and nature of their correspondence, and their subsequent meeting in Norwich in 1671, represent the most substantial direct connection between Browne and a figure who stood in the very centre of the 'virtuoso' tradition.

Like Browne, Evelyn uses a prose style which sometimes staggers under the weight of its polysyllables, but, because of its unfailing 'politeness', it never reaches heights of either the grotesque or of excellence. The O.E.D. confirms him as a notable importer of foreign terms, and it is a simple matter to validate this; Evelyn displays an alert consciousness of his own hard words, and often appended glossaries to his works. In perhaps the most useful of his varied publications, Sylva (1664), the list of botanical and horticultural terms which makes up the bulk of the unfamiliar or hard words in the glossary is impressive; of these, many are recorded by the O.E.D. as first used by Evelyn, including the following, given here with Evelyn's own definitions:



Arborator, Pruner, or one that has care of the Trees  
Conservatory, green-house to keep choice Plants, &c. in ...  
Emuscation, cleansing it (bark) of the Moss ...  
Fronstation, stripping off Leaves, and Boughs.  
Perennial, continuing all the year.

Evelyn's prefatory note to this glossary looks quite like Browne's justification for writing Pseudodoxia Epidemica in English rather than in Latin; the clear implication is that Sylva is written in a refined and superior English appropriate to its content and readership:

As I did not altogether compile this Work for the sake of our Ordinary Rustics, but for the more Ingenious; the benefit and diversion of Gentlemen, and Persons of Quality, who often refresh themselves in these agreeable Toiles of Planting, and the Gardens: I may perhaps in some places, have made use of (here and there) a Word not as yet so familiar to every Reader; but none that I know of, which are not sufficiently explained by the Context and Discourse. That this may yet be no prejudice to the meaner capacities let them Read for ...  
 (the glossary listing follows)<sup>21</sup>

But from this lofty position of intellectual superiority, Evelyn's attitude to the vocabulary of learning was to develop in sophistication. In the preface to the fourth edition of his translation of de Chambray's An Account of Architects and Architecture (1697), he expresses a weariness with the excess of imported terms, and explains his provision of etymologies for technical terms as follows:

Nor let any man imagine we do at all obscure this design by adorning it with now and then a refin'd and philological research; since, whilst I seek to gratify the politer students of this magnificent art, I am not in the least disdainful of the lowest condescensions to the capacities of the most vulgar understandings; as far at least as the defects and narrowness of our language will extend, which rather grows and abounds in complemental and impertinent phrases, and such froth ... than in the solid improvements of it; by either preserving what were truly needful. And really, those who are a little conversant in the Saxon

21 Sylva, 3rd edition (1679), A2(2) verso

writers clearly discovered, by what they find innovated or now grown obsolete, that we have lost more than we have gain'd; and as to terms of useful arts in particular, forgotten and lost a world of most apt and proper expressions which our forefathers made use of, without being oblig'd to other Nations; ...<sup>22</sup>

Evelyn concludes his preface by emphasising the continuing good research work of members of the Royal Society, and contrasts this with the deficiencies of "the late Dictionaries", which he blames for failing to interpret and present the "useful" mechanical terms of all the arts within their pages. In recognising here the innate strength of 'vulgar' native expressions, Evelyn seems to echo the kind of complaint against 'refinement' which we find in Dryden:

If Shakespear were stript of all the Bombast in his passions, and dress'd in the most vulgar words, we should find the beauties of his thoughts remaining; if his embroideries were burnt down, there would still be silver at the bottom of the melting-pot: but I fear (at least, let me fear it for myself) that we who Ape his sounding words, have nothing of his thought, but are all out-side; there is not so much as a dwarf within our Giants cloaths. Therefore, let not Shakespear suffer for our sakes; 'tis our fault, who succeed him in an Age which is more refin'd, if we imitate him so ill, that we copy his failings only, and make a virtue of that in our Writings, which in his was an imperfection.<sup>23</sup>

Evelyn and Dryden share a kind of social awareness of their roles as writers, even if, as the quotations above remind us, Dryden's style is much superior.

Evelyn often shows a readiness to erect theories and generalise from the subjects he handles, and in this he is a typical man of affairs, willing to comment on the social and cultural relevance of his theme. In this respect, he inhabits an intellectual milieu peopled by men a long generation younger than Browne, whose approach to learning as an individual, rather than a collective undertaking, is characteristic

22 Reprinted in: The Miscellaneous Writings of John Evelyn, Esq., F.R.S. ... collected... by William Upcott (1825), pp. 353-354

23 John Dryden, 'Preface concerning the grounds of criticism in Tragedy', in Troilus and Cressida ... (1679)



of the writers of the earlier part of the century. Yet both men took the whole of learning as matter for study, and besides their erudition bringing the two men together, the respect Evelyn paid to Browne looks much like that which he accorded to others for their collections of curiosities and rarities. The positive qualities one might find attributed to virtuosi in the pages of Evelyn's Diary are as often reflections upon the energy with which collections have been assembled, or the taste which they represent, as the importance of what they contain. From these accounts we can determine the virtues of learning which Evelyn himself sought to cultivate, and make a comparison with Browne's intellectualism. The comparison is well made by Merton:

As a roving antiquarian, Browne's interests and attitudes would seem to bring him close to the virtuoso type, of which John Evelyn was the supreme embodiment. Comparison between Evelyn and Browne may, therefore, help to elucidate the character of Browne's virtuosity. Evelyn was a connoisseur of wonders - of ancient coins, pictures, strange phenomena of nature and ingenious inventions of man. His Diary is, to a large extent, an account of his discoveries of such wonders ...

... A romantic sense of awe and wonder pervades Evelyn's attitude toward learning and science. In Browne ... he may have thought he found a spirit in accord with his own. The Pseudodoxia, of which Evelyn possessed a copy, undoubtedly appealed to his taste for the marvellous ...

... Browne's choice of subjects and his methods of composition often do indicate certain affinities with the virtuoso. He loves to lose himself in a mystery, to wander in the America and untraveled parts of truth ...

... His is an eclectic rather than a philosophic mind. He does not pursue a problem in all its implications, but glances over many problems. In this respect he is rather like Evelyn, for whom all learning, as well as all Europe, became the scene of a "grand tour".<sup>24</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Egon S. Merton, Science and Imagination in Sir Thomas Browne (1949), pp. 3-5

Merton goes on to claim that Browne consciously dissociated himself from the virtuoso tradition, that what collecting he did was purposeful and not an idle pastime, and that as a scholar and scientist, he cannot be placed in the ranks of "polite gentleman scholars" as Evelyn can. The uncertainty about Browne which we experience, Merton asserts, results from this ambiguity: "... his ambition was to be thorough and professional, his gift to be discursive and lyrical."<sup>25</sup>

Here we come to a point which is a crux in the understanding of Browne's work and the personality behind it. Merton sees Browne's professional, scientific ambition and his discursive gift as representing a paradox; but despite his protestations that Browne was a scientist in earnest, the features which Merton chooses as the marks of the scientist: "Eager curiosity, patient observation, extensive experimentation, intensive reading ..." <sup>26</sup> are equally the marks of a virtuoso like Shadwell's Sir Nicholas Gimcrack, <sup>27</sup> at least, certainly the abilities to carry out research which he would like to believe he possessed. If we dissent from Merton, and choose not to see any ambiguity, to see instead Browne's ambition and ability as consistent aspects of his character, consistent with each other, then we have a perfect picture of the virtuoso sensibility: a man with an urge to be scientific, who expresses that urge in scientifically inappropriate form, and whose literary inability to do anything other than play with his material makes his work, in the end, little more than a collection of curiosities itself. There is a problem of definition here, compounded by the modern readers' anachronistic desire for a stereotypical 'scientist' to identify in the mid-seventeenth century, when no such creature exists. Further attention to the concept of the 'virtuoso' provides some elucidation.

<sup>25</sup> Merton, p. 7

<sup>26</sup> Merton, p. 8

<sup>27</sup> see below, p. 67



In a footnote to his pioneer and standard essay, Houghton gives his summary view of Browne as follows:

... I do not mean to imply that Browne is a virtuoso. In many respects he fails to fit the type - his serious concern with metaphysics, his Platonic and mystical turn of mind, both are far from the study of things as they are; and on the other hand, G.K.Chalmers ... has shown conclusively that much of his work was a serious and valuable contribution to scientific knowledge. To a considerable extent, however, Browne shares the tastes and sensibility of a typical virtuoso.<sup>28</sup>

There is one telling omission from the enumeration of Browne's strengths, and that is any reference to his literary ability. Is it, perhaps, the 'sensibility' of which we become aware from Religio Medici and The Garden of Cyrus, for instance, which leads Houghton to attach Browne, albeit loosely, to the movement he describes? The tastes of the virtuosi Browne certainly shared, both in the subjects he chose to explore and the type of speculation that sprung out of that study; and that his sensibility is of a type which aligns him with the virtuosi is asserted, without always being explicit, in a large body of critical opinion, which cannot be overlooked at this juncture.

Edwin Morgan comments (following Coleridge) upon the peculiar relationship between the writer and his prose; here, he is comparing Browne with Burton and Milton:

... In Browne alone is the very peculiar quality of the metaphysical prose seen distinctly as a quality coming straight from the temperament of the writer, and it is this quality we must try to describe ...<sup>29</sup>

"Le style c'est l'homme" as applied to Browne has had few dissenters, and Morgan's view is echoed by almost all critics evaluating the tone of Religio Medici. But unlike Morgan, most critics are moved to consider aspects of Browne's abilities beyond his mastery of prose style, and

<sup>28</sup> Walter Houghton, "The English Virtuoso in the Seventeenth Century", in JHI, III (1942), p. 197

<sup>29</sup> Edwin Morgan, "'Strong Lines' and Strong Minds ...", in Cambridge Journal, IV (1951), p. 483

when they come to evaluate his achievements, and then try to measure the personality which seems apparent behind them, the result is an oddly-assorted body of comment. As an example, Austin Warren, in an essay favourable to Browne almost in its entirety - "out of facts, antiquarian or scientific, he makes poetry" - nonetheless implies that the speculative quality of his mind, from which this poetic ability results, embodies a parallel weakness:

The most unsavoury term one can justly apply to Browne is "eclectic". Encyclopedic in his interests, he is something of a rationalist, something of a laboratory scientist, something of a sceptic ..., even something of a mystic. A believer in a pluralist epistemology, in the concomitance of three or four modes of knowledge, he was unable - and aware that he was unable-- to harmonize them all into an impregnable system; yet he was tranquilly confident of their ultimate concordance.<sup>30</sup>

This assessment holds strengths and weaknesses together in balance, and Warren clearly does not regard Browne's eclecticism as some sort of negative cost against which the return - the stylist's imagination - has to be measured. But just that is manifestly the view held, if an extreme one, by Ziegler:

If we ask for more than a dazzling display of imaginative virtuosity, we find Browne's writing unsatisfactory. He answers no questions; he solves no problems. But his writing provides entertainment at the highest level.<sup>31</sup>

Ziegler's dissatisfaction with Browne's writing results from what he sees as a lack of 'unified experience' there; its absence is seen as the cause of Browne's irresponsibility in religion, and, implicitly, in his role as an artist, where

... the substitution of aesthetic sensitivity and imaginative intensity for truth was inevitably the work of the endowed resident of an ivory tower.<sup>32</sup>

This I take to be the least sympathetic general view of Browne's

30 Warren, op. cit., p.686

31 D.K.Ziegler, In Divided and Distinguished Worlds (1943), p. x

32 Ziegler, p. 98



work, from a supposedly rationalist position; but dilute forms of the same opinion recur in the responses of many other commentators. There is an affinity with remarks Houghton makes about the virtuosi, here making a distinction between their approach to knowledge and that of the philosopher:

... the 'philosopher', whether scientist or antiquary or critic of art, is concerned with facts as they illustrate or reveal a pattern of law or development. It was the failure of the virtuoso to use his learning in this way, as well as for immediate utility, that Shadwell had in mind when he laughed at knowledge as an ultimate end.<sup>33</sup>

From Gideon Harvey's scurrilous account of the butterfly-chasing<sup>34</sup> doctor onwards, readings of Browne have not failed to produce responses that lead to a presentation of him as introverted, pedantic and unworldly, to a degree that he is indifferent to the concerns of the real world outside the confines of his peculiar imagination. It is a view espoused by Gosse in his biography:

Sir Thomas Browne, as a scholar ... was the greatest and the most intelligent of a little group who handled facts, but delighted to take refuge from them in speculation. Science to him, as we see in his letters to Edward Browne, was still 'Literature,' just as it was to others in whom we now detect a certain taint of quackery.<sup>35</sup>

Somewhat after the same fashion, Merton can casually caricature his subject as a dyed-in-the-wool conservative; it is a caricature that results from Merton's literal interpretation of the handling of material in Pseudodoxia Epidemica:

Browne's attitude towards magic is like that towards 'authority', which he both attacks and utilises as a test of truth. In both cases his strong conservatism constitutes part of the explanation

<sup>33</sup> Houghton, pp. 55-56

<sup>34</sup> quoted in Keynes, Bibliography of Sir Thomas Browne (1924), p. 159

<sup>35</sup> Gosse, pp. 189-90

for his ambivalent attitude, a conservatism illustrated in his religious, political, and social attitudes, his absolute submission to the Church ..., his strong Royalist bias during the commonwealth period ..., and his boundless scorn for the "vulgar" multitude ...<sup>36</sup>

Similarly Basil Willey, perhaps relying rather heavily on literal recollections of parts of Religio Medici, paints a picture of Browne quite consistent with Merton's version:

His confidence in his own salvation seems the natural outcome of a studious, comfortable and complacent life - that life of his in Norwich, which continued in unruffled calm throughout the most disturbed years of the century, and which yet seemed to him 'a miracle of thirty years, which to relate were not a history but a piece of poetry.'<sup>37</sup>

The shortage of concrete information about much of Browne's personal, professional and family life seems to trouble neither Merton nor Willey, and their character-writings offer far too black-and-white a portrait. The assumption that where there are few known facts there can have been little interest is even repeated by the enthusiastic Browne scholar Patrides, in his biographical introduction to an edition of the major works: "It was a remarkably uneventful life."<sup>38</sup>

Inferences about Browne's 'comfortable' life and so on are rarely more than comfortable critical intuitions, for which we have little evidential backing; their most solid support comes, in the main, from impressions gained in reading Religio Medici as plain autobiography. This interpretation of Religio Medici's narrator as a non-dramatic entity seems a superficial one, which does not allow for freedom of response to the gaiety of rhetoric and posturing which run through the work, and which are analysed in chapter six below.

<sup>36</sup> Merton, p. 147

<sup>37</sup> B. Willey, The English Moralists (1964), p. 192

<sup>38</sup> C.A. Patrides (ed.) The Major Works (1977), p. 21



If we return to the judgement of Ziegler mentioned above, it becomes apparent that two different types of 'virtuosity' can trouble literary historians. In Ziegler's "dazzling display of imaginative virtuosity", he is clearly referring to the verbal surface of the prose, and not to Browne's standing as a learned antiquary. His reading of Religio Medici as if it were the plain rendering of a doctor's self-analysis is shown throughout his study, as here:

...Browne is always writing about himself; he is not so much concerned with virtue, the relation of man to man, as he is with his own reactions to virtue, and he generalizes from his own reactions to human nature.<sup>39</sup>

Ziegler engages in polemic against "the degeneration of the expression of consciously emotional belief into rhetorical extravagance";<sup>40</sup> he sees the virtuosity, or technically skilled performance of the prose writer as a product of Browne's emotional self-indulgence, and not as an instrument under his control, which itself does service in producing the artistic end sought for. This sort of virtuoso, the quasi-musical skilled artist-technician, does have a connection, in the collective critical imagination, with the amateur scientists and antiquaries described by Houghton, and it has perhaps a connection in fact, in the way that the virtuosi saw their own activities.

Houghton's essay provides no succinct summary of the typical virtuoso, because the 'movement' encompasses such a wide variety of individuals and interests; he notes that, among their contemporaries, Bacon, Boyle and Charles II were subject to being thus described.<sup>41</sup> We can extract from his account, however, a number of typical, if not essential characteristics:

1. The virtuoso has an interest in "antiquarian research ... shot through with romantic sentiment."<sup>42</sup>
2. His main concerns are with paintings, antiquities and science.

<sup>39</sup> Ziegler, op. cit., p. 93

<sup>40</sup> Ziegler, p. 5

<sup>41</sup> Houghton, p. 52

<sup>42</sup> Houghton, p. 190

3. He is a man of wealth and leisure - a gentleman, but also a student.
4. He is (like Gimcrack) devoted to a non-utilitarian pursuit of knowledge.

Houghton's attempts at definition oscillate rather uneasily between defining the serious or 'sincere' amateurs and the frivolous dilettanti. Likewise, the O.E.D. acknowledges the difficulty of achieving precise definition by heading its first two entries under virtuoso with this note:

It is frequently difficult in particular instances to decide which of the senses is intended.

The two senses are defined:

- (1) (Obs.) One who has a general interest in arts and sciences, or who pursues special investigations in one or more of these; a learned person; a scientist, savant or scholar.
- (2) One who has a special interest in, or taste for, the fine arts; a student or collector of antiquities, natural curiosities or rarities etc.; a connoisseur; freq., one who carries on such pursuits in a dilettante or trifling manner.

The third definition offered by the O.E.D. corresponds with that suggested in Ziegler's evaluation of Browne's style - special or remarkable in technique - but is limited at the date of publication to musical connotations.

From these attempts at definitions it will be appreciated that the complex of associations involved in the concept of the virtuoso carries dangers; a stylist credited with virtuosity for his skill can quite easily become tainted with the suspicion of dilettantism, not through a conscious play on words, but simply through the fluidity of the terms involved. It is perhaps just this difficulty of definition which has prevented the appearance of any valuable sequel to the work of Houghton.

Diction is a compounding factor here. Of the authors to whom it might be appropriate to fix the label 'virtuoso', a considerable number are habitual users of a polysyllabic diction and of hard words.



There is a certain inevitability about this; overindulgence in pseudo-learned jargon is often a refuge of the second-rate mind, and the dilettante's interest in intellectual fashions will obviously be attracted by their linguistic regalia. The vocabulary of a craft or profession is free for the use of practitioners and pretenders alike; and nowhere is this element of pretension more effectively satirized than in Shadwell's The Virtuoso (1676).

The modern editors of The Virtuoso report the opinion of Gerard Langbaine, in 1691, that

... no man ever undertook to discover the Frailties of such Pretenders to this kind of Knowledge, before Mr. Shadwell ... none since Mr. Johnson's Time, ever drew so many different Characters of Humours, and with such Success.<sup>43</sup>

Shadwell's satire is emphatically directed at scientific experimenters; Sir Nicholas Gimcrack's intellectual concerns are those of the members of the Royal Society, and it is his obsessive preoccupation with experimentation and observation of a particular and fashionable type that provides the slapstick element of humour, as in the swimming episode (II, ii). More subtle and serious, though just as wittily rendered, is Shadwell's device of using the rage for the microscope to provide a metaphor for the way the virtuoso looks at the world. The microscope registers minute images through a tunnel; Gimcrack thus views the insignificant in a blinkered way. Beyond this, as Nicolson and Rodes point out, "... the most frequent popular application (of the term 'virtuoso') was to 'collectors', usually in a pejorative sense."<sup>44</sup> This is certainly the sense which Evelyn invariably attaches to the term in his Diary, whether he is reporting an encounter with a collector in 1643 or 1683;<sup>45</sup> but Evelyn never hints that a virtuoso is

<sup>43</sup> The Virtuoso, ed. M.H.Nicolson & D. Rodes, (1966), Intr., p. xiii

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. xvii

<sup>45</sup> see, for example, Diary ed. E.S. De Beer (1955), Vol. II, p. 114, and Vol. IV, pp. 365/366

either laughable or reprehensible for his interests. Evelyn's lack of a sense of humour is probably the most telling reason why he attracts the description 'virtuoso' so readily. Finally, and most pointedly, there is the scientific jargon that Gimcrack and his supporter Sir Formal Trifle use to indicate their familiarity with the scientific mode:

Sir, alas, those men suffered not under the operation, but they were cacochymious and had deprav'd viscera, that is to say, their bowels were gangren'd. (II, ii, 216-218)

Let me rest a little to respire. So, it is wonderful, my noble friend, to observe the agility of this pretty animal which, notwithstanding I impede its motion by the detention of this filum or thread within my teeth which makes a ligature about its loins, and though by many sudden stops I cause the animal sometimes to sink or immerge, yet with indefatigable activity it rises and keeps almost its whole body upon the superficies or surface of this humid element. (II, ii, 15-23)

This diction, well-endowed with latinisms, immerge, superficies, filum and so on, has affinities with that which we find in Pseudodoxia Epidemica and elsewhere in Browne, but it is unlikely that Browne was in Shadwell's mind as an exemplar. More closely contemporary works - such as Henry Power's Experimental Philosophy (1663) (it being worth recalling that Power stood alongside Browne in the relation of pupil to master) and Robert Hooke's Micrographia (1664) - would have served as models containing elements of such vocabulary closer to Shadwell's hand. The focus was inevitably on London, with live as well as literary models, where the theatre of experimentation existed.

The habit of using scientific jargon was well established by 1676; it is an element of the virtuoso's equipage which has not drawn the attention of recent commentators such as Houghton or Nicolson.<sup>46</sup> The omission is strange, since every fashion or movement carries with

<sup>46</sup> E.g., M.H.Nicolson, Science and Imagination (1956).



it its own jargon or restricted language. Shadwell exploits the pretensions of that language in Gimcrack's mouth in a way that would evoke knowing amusement from the audience. The instrument for ridiculing the jargon is usually Snarl:

In sadness, nephew, I am asham'd of you. You will never leave lying and quacking with your transfusions and fool's tricks. I believe if the blood of an ass were transfus'd into a virtuoso, you would not know the emittent ass from the recipient philosopher, by the mass. (II, ii, 195-199)

Here Snarl picks up typical words of the virtuosi, emittent and recipient, and turns them against his nephew, just as his vitriolic remarks are made against the futility of so many of the virtuoso's experiments:

Pox! Let me see you invent anything so useful as a mousetrap, and I'll believe some of your lies. Prithee, did not a fellow cheat thee with eggs which he pretended were laid with hairs in them, and you gave him ten shillings apiece for the eggs till I discover'd they were put in at a hole made by a very fine needle. (II, ii, 231-236)

While any definition of the virtuoso that can be encompassed in a single sentence is obviously not likely to be satisfactory, Shadwell's satire does provide a picture of a certain type which was readily recognisable to the modish philosopher-philistines of the mid-sixteen-seventies; the problem for the late twentieth-century reader is that Shadwell's character of a virtuoso is an extremely good one, in a play that is attractive to the general reader, but it 'freezes' the idea of virtuosity at a crucial time in Restoration, metropolitan England when, as the historian assures us,

Fear of the vulgar, of the emotional, of anything extreme, was deeply rooted in the social anxieties of Restoration England ...<sup>47</sup>

Shadwell's use of the term is highly restricted, whereas Houghton's

<sup>47</sup> Christopher Hill, The Century of Revolution, (1980) (2nd ed.) p. 217

history of the growth of the movement shows how the shifts in intellectual fashion, mirrored almost exactly in the development of interests evident in the cultural progress of Evelyn, took the virtuosi's chief concerns from paintings in the 1620's to antiquities and natural rarities, and then to 'purer' science in the Restoration period.<sup>48</sup> From Houghton's study, it becomes clear that the patronage of learning and the practice of it ran very close together. At one extreme, a wealthy gentleman could collect, even if he had no capacity to understand or reflect upon the subjects he collected; he would not need to claim any standing as a scientist or antiquary, for he could content himself with the status of a man of culture. The virtuoso might be either, and could certainly buy himself cultural standing through simple acquisition. The motives of such gentlemen might be questionable, and they might be held to be concerned for their reputation and fame rather than anything higher; but we cannot forget that Elias Ashmole was certainly among their number, and that his acquisition, protection and consolidation of the great Tradescant collection secured the foundation of the museum bearing his name, just as Evelyn secured the Arundel Marbles for the same University.

Such collecting virtuosi are recognisable by their adherence to fashion in learning, as often as not, and Evelyn, wealthy, well-connected, and with research ability but no obvious creative or imaginative genius, might be cited as the typical specimen. But Evelyn was not just a follower of fashion; his role in establishing the foundation of the Royal Society and in conducting its Transactions was not negligible; with his long continental experience he represents an important influence in the importation of ideas about architecture and horticulture (to which his coining of terms provides testimony); and he did play a part in conducting experiments, even if they appear amateur alongside the

<sup>48</sup> Houghton, op. cit., pp. 71-73



achievements of Boyle or Hooke. His enthusiasms found positive and practical methods of expression; Houghton's criticism of his "subjective and romantic delight"<sup>49</sup> seems less than kind when it is considered how Evelyn worked to establish an institution for the better study of rarities and antiquities. Certainly his capacity for wonder and romanticising was great, and he did admire rarity for its own sake, but it is clear that he had the vision to realise that only through cooperative effort could learning be advanced. Insofar as the Royal Society represented anything to him, it was an ideal of the pursuit of knowledge free from self-interest, and the establishment of a forum for scholarship.

One of the large drawbacks to this ideal was simply that an enormous quantity of 'useless' - and often unintentionally amusing - knowledge was sifted. The large scope of Houghton's study happily demonstrates the limits to which the criticisms of satirists like Shadwell are significant, and the negative aspects of virtuosity are shown to consist chiefly in the romantic and pedantic tendencies. The practical virtues that Evelyn showed, his initiative and his championship of the interests of pure learning, were characteristic of many other educated country gentlemen of the period, the kind of curious gentlemen with Pseudodoxia Epidemica on their bookshelves, and when allied to his energy and insatiable curiosity, a man like Evelyn was a powerful force in disseminating Renaissance culture in England. As Houghton remarks, "That is why the decline of the movement about 1700 is devoutly to be regretted."<sup>50</sup>

If Evelyn's work had its practical side, the same may not so easily be said of Browne. His influence is of a decidedly imaginative kind, and his gifts to posterity need to be measured in these less

<sup>49</sup> Houghton, p. 191

<sup>50</sup> Houghton, p. 214

corporeal terms. The debts which Browne's younger contemporaries owed him often go unrecognised; despite the material evidence of his correspondence with figures like Power, Aubrey, Merrett and Oldenburg, and his contemporary Dugdale, there is a larger, subtler influence which can be detected in habits of expression and the resort to particular kinds of diction among writers of the century's second half. It is to their writings, rather than to their known achievements, that we must now turn.

### C. THE INKHORN TENDENCY.

In Appendix I to this thesis, the column headed 'successors' gives the names of authors who have been subsequent users of words and their allied forms which are included among Browne's coinages. These authors' usages, recorded from the O.E.D., are collated in the illustrative table in Appendix IIIb, which provides an interesting cross-section of writers active in the third quarter of the seventeenth century.

The apparent indebtedness of later writers to the vocabulary of, principally, Pseudodoxia Epidemica, goes far towards implying that Browne's diction was not disapproved of by scientists. Such an implication counters the arguments of R.F.Jones<sup>51</sup> which have been influential in conveying ideas of the 'naked' and 'plain' prose styles of the later part of the century. In essence, my findings show that scientists of real stature like Boyle and Ray were happy to use the same kind of terms as Browne without, quite evidently, sensing an inappropriateness of style. Some qualification is needed, then, in respect of scientific diction, as, for example, how much does scientific necessity admit Browne's coinages? Further, what does such a necessity tell us about both Browne and his 'imitators'? In parallel with this, how significant is the claim made over two hundred years ago by Johnson, that in a positive way, Browne "augmented our philosophical diction"? The

51 Jones, in The Triumph of the English Language (1953) and in Ancients and Moderns ... 2nd ed. (1961)



connections which it has been possible to make here are many and varied, and they provide material on which to base an approach which runs counter to conventional wisdom about the character of learned prose at this time.

Let me start away from an idea which could be inferred from the first section of this chapter, that, for Browne, to latinize diction was merely to rephrase elegantly. Such was certainly a popular practice throughout the seventeenth century, and Browne shows awareness of it, but my survey of his learned diction in general indicates that he did not seek elegancy for its own sake. This charge is more easily levelled at authors who latinized less frequently and without Browne's consistency. I take for an example Owen Felltham, in whose first century of Resolves<sup>52</sup> we find a marked tendency towards a use of ponderous words which had been absent from the first edition of his work. These two extracts are from his essay LXXXIV, "Of Drunkennesse"; I have underlined words which the O.E.D. suggests are coinages:

Indeed, Drunkennesse besots a Nation, and bestiates even the bravest spirits. There is nothing which a man that is soaked in drinke, is fit for; no, not for sleepe. When the Sword and Fire rages, 'tis but man warring against man: When Drunkennesse reigns, the Devill is at warre with man, and the Epotations of dumbe liquor damnes him ...  
... What a Monster Man is, in his inebriations! a swimming Eye; a Face, both roast and sod; a temulentive Tongue, clammed to the rooffe and gummes; a drumming Eare; a feavered Bodie; a boyling Stomacke; a Mouth nastie with offensive fumes, till it sicken the Braine with giddie verminations; a palsied Hand; and Legges tottering up and downe their moistened Burthen ...

Felltham can derive strengths of style from his innovations; the alliterative qualities of bestiates and temulentive are effective

<sup>52</sup> Felltham, Resolves ; I have used the 1636 edition. From the 1628-9 edition onwards, the 'first' century post-dates the 'second' century, which embodies the first hundred essays printed in the first edition, 1623.

in underlining the author's vituperation against the demon drink; furthermore, their 'learned' quality does serve to balance out the more heated Anglo-Saxon phrases and give a sense of control. But that control has become excessive by the very number of latinisms, and the voice of the pedant mixes uneasily with that of the campaigning pietist. Furthermore, his introductions of vermination and epotations are awkward; neither the context nor the author help us to understand their meanings, and so the flow of ideas is impeded as the reader fumbles in his mental lexicon (or his Cockeram) to translate them. In a passage of this character, part of a short moral essay, their refinement can constitute a flaw.

If we look at an earlier essay, from the second century of Resolves, we can see how much clearer Felltham's expression is when he confines his diction within an everyday vocabulary; this is from essay XCI, "That we cannot know God as He is":

Though his full light be inaccessible, yet from this ignorance springs all my happinesse, and strongest comfort. When I am so ingulfed in miserie, as I know no way to escape; God, that is so infinite above me, can send a deliverance, when I can neither see, nor hope it. Hee needes never despaire, that knowes hee hath a Friend, which at all assayes can help him.

Douglas Bush quotes Randolph's eulogy of Felltham which illustrates the qualities his contemporaries admired in him:

I mean the stile, being pure, and strong, and round,  
Not long, but Pythy: being short-breath'd, but sound.  
Such as the grave, acute, wise Seneca sings ...<sup>53</sup>

But whether the neologisms we find in Felltham's later essays add to or detract from his literary powers is rather beside the point. The latinisms may be an affectation, but they are a habit he shares with many others. By no stretch of the imagination can Felltham be

<sup>53</sup> Bush, English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 2nd ed., (1962), p. 202



considered an exotic literary figure. He is a Royalist, but has no political, religious or ideological drum to bang; his moral position is founded on Anglican moderation and common sense values; and his subjects and illustrations do not draw upon distant, surprising or reckless imagery. Yet the first century of Resolves contains a regular sprinkling of striking neologisms, on average two in each short essay, of this characteristic kind, all of which are marked as hapaxlegomena (<sup>-1</sup>) in the O.E.D.: intermutualnesse (p. 263), opinionately (p. 264), in-essent (p. 273), congeriated (p.139), encoldened (p.147), ascentive (p.149), torvitie (p.434).<sup>54</sup>

The same kinds of observations can be made about the prose of another contemporary belletrist, James Howell, whose familiar letters<sup>55</sup> are lightly peppered with sesquipedalia; a random sample of innovations (from vol. 3) includes: transvolve (p. 44), basilical (p. 50), conterranean (p. 68), and venatical (p. 89), all the kind of neologisms we might expect from Browne's pen. While we might expect a dense, polysyllabic diction in works like Digby's Natural Bodies (1644), or from great scholars like Joseph Mede (for example, in his Clavis Apocalyptica, trans. R. More, (1643)), the intermittent presence of hard words in everyday polite literature implies a widespread acquiescence in their aesthetic appropriateness, from the informal essay to the obscurely learned treatise.

In the early years of the century, the major writers who indulge in hard words are led by Bacon, and his example will have been influential. As I suggested earlier, Bacon's contributions to English vocabulary are large in scale, and need exhaustive study to set against the kinds of observation possible here, and such a study would benefit from the assistance of a computer. Here, it is only necessary to look at a brief sample of Bacon's coining habit, from The Advancement of Learning; these typical coinages have been noted by a recent editor in his

<sup>54</sup> Felltham, Resolves, 1636 edition.

<sup>55</sup> Howell, Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae (1645-55), Temple Classics edn., 3 vols. (1903)

critical apparatus.<sup>56</sup> fluctuant (II, iii, 1), circumferred (II, v, 2), reintegrate (II, vii, 1), adventive (II, vii, 3), colliquation (II, vii, 4), nugatory (II, vii, 5), flexuous (II, vii, 6), improficiency (II, vii, 6), pilosity (II, vii, 7), adjacence (II, vii, 7), intervenient (II, viii, 2), optatives (II, viii, 3). Bacon's range of innovation is comparable in frequency, utility and pedantry with Browne's. It may not provide evidence of "a seeking for the strange and out of the way",<sup>57</sup> but shows that the 'official' acknowledgement of Bacon's intellectual influence upon them by members of the Royal Society may have been paralleled by the readiness of some members to adopt a scholarly latinate diction which Bacon's prose sanctions - as does Browne's. Yet Bacon's influence on the thinkers of Boyle's and Sprat's generation was so pervasive that it is difficult to separate the content of his influence from the manner in which it was conveyed, and this large problem lies outside the scope of this discourse. But the learned of Browne's own generation afford clearer illustrations of the progress of aureate diction.

More like Browne in his coining than either Howell or Felltham, perhaps because his own talents and career as scholar physician are closer to those of Browne, is Walter Charleton (1619-1707). In the preface to his translation of van Helmont's Paradoxes,<sup>58</sup> he defends his Englishing of the work, a treatise on the magnetic cure of wounds, by referring to the elegance of English, in a way not unlike Browne in the preface to Pseudodoxia Epidemica. He cites Browne and Bacon as the two writers most responsible for the tongue's refinement; the tribute to them concludes:

... the Venerable Majesty of our Mother Tongue; out of which, I am ready to assert, may be spun as fine and fit / a garment, for the most spruce Conceptions of the Minde to appeare in Publicke in, as out of any other in the World: especially,

<sup>56</sup> The Advancement of Learning ..., ed. Arthur Johnston (1974)

<sup>57</sup> Jones, quoted above, p.43

<sup>58</sup> W. Charleton, A Ternary of Paradoxes... written originally by Joh. Bapt. Van Helmont, and Translated, Illustrated and Ampliated ... (1650)



since the Carmination or refinement of it, by the skill and sweat of those two Heroicall Wits, the Lord St. Alban, and the now flourishing Dr. Browne; out of whose incomparable Writings may be selected a Volume of such full and significant Expressions, as if uprightly fathomed by the utmost Extent of the sublimest Thought, may well serve to stagger that Partiall Axiome of some Schoole-men, that the Latin is the most symphoniacall and Concordant Language of the Rationall Soule.<sup>59</sup>

Besides this extravagant praise, there is evidence, among Browne's more exotic coinages, that Charleton had immersed himself in Browne's writings. This list of obscure words generated in Pseudodoxia Epidemica and repeated in A Ternary of Paradoxes shows Charleton's devotion to a teeth-breaking diction: benegro, causatrix (from Browne's causator), conglaciate, deuteroscopy, exantlate, latitancy, longimanous, magnalities, parergies, veneficious. All of these words appear to be Browne's coinages, and they clearly appealed to Charleton for their rarity rather than their utility.

Charleton was to become a member of the Royal Society in 1663, and was not untypical of the 'professional' early scientific members. Rolleston's brief biography<sup>60</sup> suggests that his association with John Wilkins at Oxford was the main factor in his election as an originating member, but the range of his published work before 1660 would have recommended him as an inquiring spirit, if not an original thinker. Indeed, in comparison with Browne he seems to have been ready to rush into print on the strength of sudden enthusiasms, and the result is a rather turgid prose, unalleviated by the kinds of tonal variation at which Browne is adept. Part of the Prolegomena to his translation of van Helmont shows him intent upon blinding the reader with science,

59 Charleton, B<sup>2</sup>, verso / B<sup>3</sup>

60 Humphry Rolleston, "Walter Charleton, D.M., F.R.C.P., F.R.S.", in Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine, Vol. VIII (1940), pp. 403-416.

rather than explicating his terms:

I conceive also, that Vitriol hath a very just title to the prerogative of being listed in the Inventory of these Astral Natures: and that when the powder thereof is applied to the blood, effused out of a wound, the Balsamical Faculty of it is not confined to a meer Topical Operation; but being conducted by the Mumial Efflux, or Aporrhoea's of the blood, which undoubtedly, by a Congenerous Magnetism, holdeth a certain sympathy with that Fountain, from whence it was derived, (as is to satiety of satisfaction demonstrated by Helmont) in a stream of subtiliated Atomes, extendeth to the individual Wound, and there operateth to the Deletion or extirpation of the Acid Impression, against which it carrieth a Seminal Antipathy.<sup>61</sup>

This is a good example of a writer captivated by the example of Browne's vocabulary, and continuing to be entranced by his own use of it. Besides the influence of the diction, Charleton also followed Browne (as did Evelyn) in expressing sympathy with Gassendi's promotion of the Epicurean philosophy, and was exercised by the notion of Atomism throughout the 1650's. Browne's glance at Epicurus in Pseudodoxia Epidemica VII, 17 represents the first appreciation of Gassendi's work in English.

A less conventional figure among the learned is cut by Noah Biggs, of whose life little is known, and whose The Vanity of the Craft of Physick (1651) was addressed to the "heroes of Parliament". This work displays a zeal for reforming the science of medicine from "the ruins of learning," and urges Cromwell and his colleagues to use their influence in "finding out more wholesome, expert, and rational ways of Healing".<sup>62</sup> Besides the imitation of Browne's diction which is abundantly evident in this work, Biggs finds space to approve Browne's purgation of error, both of which features are present in

<sup>61</sup> Charleton, D<sup>2</sup>

<sup>62</sup> Noah Biggs, Mataeotechnia Medicinae Praxeos. The Vanity of the Craft of Physick. Or, A NEW DISPENSATORY ... (1651) b2



this passage:

It hath somewhat whet our thoughts to consider what fabrick others have already rear'd: for some that have gone before us, have been diligent in the exploration not only of vulgar errors (as our own Country man Doctor Brown;) but medical ones; as the Teutonick Jacobus Primrosius, and the Belgick Helmont; but the most of other writers have dealt with us either like part of Gideons men, or as a Dog touches Nilus. But least this our impresse should be suspected of novelty by those who smell ranke of Antiquity, and as for such who list themselves under, and follow Authority, which to stronger heads Testimony is but a weake kinde of prooffe, and onely accommodate to junior indoctrinations, it being but a topically probation, and an argument in Logick rightly termed inartificiall, and doth not solidly fetch the truth by multiplicity of Authors, nor argue a thing false by the paucity that hold so; yet we will say thus much ...<sup>63</sup>

Among Biggs's own coinages are inkhorn terms such as: linguacious (p. 46), saporall (p. 47), amaricate (p. 47) and escharotically (p. 225), and Brownisms litter his pages, such as utinam (p. 230), mucilaginous and gummy (p. 109), ingustible (p. 173), and seminalities (pp. 215, 220 and 232).

In the physician John Collop's Poesis Rediviva (1656), two poems on Biggs form part of what is probably English literature's longest series of poems in appreciation and criticism of members of the medical profession, including Browne, Harvey, Ent and Watson, as well as on "the Astrologically Quack". Browne's work is strongly defended against "gut-inspired zealots", but Biggs' work is reviled as vain and ignorant occultism; one feature, however is singled out for praise - his style:

Yet thou dear Biggs so well of ill hast writ,  
He who can't praise thy truth, may praise thy wit.<sup>64</sup>

Intellectually, Biggs occupies an ideological position in the interregnum period not unlike that of the better known John Webster,

<sup>63</sup> Biggs, p. 227

<sup>64</sup> John Collop M.D., Poesis Rediviva: or, Poesie reviv'd (1656), p. 56

whose Examen Academiæ (1653) embodies a forceful appeal for an alternative University curriculum, and which employs a similarly weighty diction. I have not been able to detect many specific debts to Browne in Webster's polysyllabic usages (although metallist in the subtitle of his work Metallographia (1671) is only antedated by Browne),<sup>65</sup> nor does the O.E.D. provide evidence that he is a significant innovator, but of these five typical items, the first three are not recorded by the O.E.D. at all, which suggests that his work was not subjected to a very diligent scrutiny, especially given the striking character of their morphology: minutoloquious, recollacious, pamphoniactal, faetiferous, grandaevity. In addition, it is worth remarking that Seth Ward parodies Webster's pomposity of diction, in his Vindiciæ Academiæ (1654),<sup>66</sup> singling out foetiferous and pamphoniactal for imitation in a nicely pointed burlesque.

Debus, in his commentary on the Webster / Ward / Wilkins debate on educational reform, notes how Webster represents in his work both the Baconian empirical tradition and the chemical tradition of Paracelsus and van Helmont:

John Webster emerges neither as an 'ancient' nor as a 'modern'. Instead, he represents the chemical philosophers of the mid-seventeenth century - scholars who properly belong in neither camp. Natural magic was to be the goal of their new philosophy and this was defined as the search for a true understanding of the secrets of nature through observation and experiment. The macrocosm/microcosm analogy was implicit in Webster's work, and it is readily understandable how Robert Fludd could be one of his idols. Yet, it is equally understandable how he could point to Francis Bacon - the natural magician - as a guide.<sup>67</sup>

65 Robbins has pointed out an allusion in Webster's The Displaying of Suppos'd Witchcraft (1677), in his Introduction to P.E., Vol.I, p. xlv

66 Reprinted with Examen Academiæ in Allen G. Debus, Science and Education in the Seventeenth Century (1970)

67 Debus, pp. 42-43



Webster's prose manages to make a virtue out of the use of polysyllables in his hypercritical register; as an example, this passage shows him taking Aristotle to task for the emptiness of his abstract and speculative approach to nature:

But (his philosophy) is only conversant about the shell, and husk, handling the accidental, external and recollacious qualities of things, confusedly and continually tumbling over obscure, general and equivocal terms, which are only fit to captivate young Sciolists, and raw wits, but not to satisfy a discreet and wary understanding, that expects Apodictical and experimental manuduction into the more interiour clossets of nature.<sup>68</sup>

The affinity of diction between Browne and reformers such as Biggs and Webster suggests that it is idle to associate learned linguaciousness with political persuasions or intellectual partisanship of any particular kind. Reformers and conservatives alike dipped into the inkhorn to decorate their themes, and thus the universality of hard words is affirmed. Charleton, for example, had as great an enthusiasm as Biggs or Webster for the new iatrochemical theories, but unlike them he remained a firm Royalist, being physician to the King in exile.

Looking aside for a moment from prose to verse, the Royalist poet Edward Benlowes bears comparison in his diction with these polemicists of the mid-century. Along with a generous helping of vulgar errors in his grotesque Theophila (1652),<sup>69</sup> Benlowes indulged himself in some tremendous new formations: theanthropic (I, lxxviii), triduan (I, lxxxi), discardinate (V, xviii), overfulgent (V, xcix) incircumscribable (VIII, xvii) and so on. While this is very vague

68 Reprinted in Debus, op. cit., p.149

69 The vulgar errors include badgers' legs (I, lviii), Aristotle and the Euripus (III, lvii), that Christ never laughed (I, xxix) etc. John Cleveland's poetry displays a similar recourse to commonplace fallacies as a source of metaphor, as does another contemporary poet, Thomas Philipott.

territory in which to speculate, it is possible to draw some inferences from my table in Appendix IIIb in respect of writers of the decades following the publication of Pseudodoxia Epidemica.

The names significant in the table of Browne's successors in diction are predominantly figures active in scientific and antiquarian studies, and the strictly literary names are minor characters. Because my tables are generally abstracts from the O.E.D.'s selective dating of entries, they offer no precise data, but they do depict quite definite tendencies. It is possible to assert that major prosewriters between 1650 and 1670, such as Milton, Dryden, Hobbes, Bunyan, Walton and Harrington do not demonstrate imitation of forms used by Browne, whereas Boyle, Ray, Evelyn, Charleton, Glanvill, Plot and Grew do show affinities. It is Browne's example, I suggest, encourages Robert Plot, Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, to write concerning "oviparous digitated quadrupeds" (p. 251) in his Natural History of Staffordshire,<sup>70</sup> and sanctions the use of learned polysyllables (piscivorous, p. 231, subterrestrial exhalations, p. 87, cornigerous, p. 255, herbaceous, indigenous, p. 203/4) in a literary style which is otherwise not at all extravagant. But there are two writers whose use of hard words on Browne's models stand out: Robert Boyle and Henry More.

The case of Henry More is a special one. His works span the same period as Browne's almost exactly, and from his earliest work, Psychodia Platonica in 1642<sup>71</sup> he shows an inclination towards complex, even polyglot formations of words. He responds to new learning of physical, astronomical and mechanical kinds by attempting to reconcile it with his own, sometimes eccentric, doctrines of spirituality. In essence, his distinctive place in English philosophy is earned because of this reaction against encroaching materialism of various

70 Robert Plot, The Natural History of Stafford-shire (1686)

71 Henry More, ψυχωδία Platonica, or, a platonicall song of the soul ... (1642)(containing: Psychozoia, Psychothanasia, Antipsychothanasia, Antimonopsychia)



kinds. Geoffrey Bullough has noted of his philosophical poems:

... by the ruggedness of its elliptical style, by its heterogeneous mingling of the recondite, the homely, and the bizarre, by its daring adventures in, and attempted definitions of, spiritual realms beyond the reach of logic or of poetry, it suggests with fidelity the impulsive, humorous personality of the "divine Doctor".<sup>72</sup>

That More utilises scientific terms, confirmed by the list of his terms used in common with Browne, is self-evident in that the impetus for much of his writing stems from his reactions to modern thinkers; what is interesting about many of these usages is that More frequently applies them in figurative senses. In the following cases, where Browne coins a term to describe or name a physical condition or attribute, the O.E.D.'s citation of More's later usage shows the term fulfilling a metaphorical or emblematic signification: antipodal, cortical, erectness, rancidly, variegation. Similarly, where Browne's coinage hallucination is used to denote a pathological condition, More, in 1660, employs it to signify intellectual delusion. Latitant is a term Browne uses to denote hibernation, while More's use is more general, roughly equivalent to 'lurking', from the normal Latin significance of latitare.

Despite More's use of scientific vocabulary in an admittedly 'literal' sense, using terms such as flammeous, conglaciate and rectilinear in straightforwardly physical senses, the special and peculiar directions of his philosophical arguments dictate that he uses emerging learned terms with a specific imaginative emphasis. There is no evidence among commentaries on either Browne or More of an intellectual debt in either direction, but rather of a similarity of background and of learned eclecticism.

Quite distinct is the relationship between the diction of Browne and Boyle. The list of terms coined by Browne includes a large number - forty-six - subsequently put to use by Boyle. Boyle (1627-1691) was of the same generation as Henry Power (1623-1668) and

<sup>72</sup> Geoffrey Bullough, Philosophical Poems of Henry More (1931), p. lxxxi

John Ray (1627-1705), both of whom also show a debt to Browne's learned vocabulary, and we may conjecture that these three read Pseudodoxia Epidemica in the late 1640's, at a time when they were all young men eagerly digesting the 'new philosophy'. Browne's example as a progressive thinker, if it was at all influential, will have affected the open-minded scholars of Boyle's age group, in their twenties around the period of the second Civil War, and in Power's case his correspondence with Browne is sufficient attestation of this.

Above all his contemporaries, Boyle is the gentleman-scholar par excellence, and to such, the matter of style can never be unimportant.

Boyle's style is peculiarly his own, and clearly reflects both his education and his intent. All that juvenile interest in literature ... had given him a dangerous facility with words, a facility which increased when he came to dictate. Clearly he liked to retain the pretensions to literary taste which he had established in his youth in admiring imitation of his brother Broghill, and the literary taste of the times leaned toward prolixity. There was as well the fact that he was a gentleman writing for gentlemen - for though he moved in the scientific world, and found his greatest admirers there, he always hoped to be able to do what Galileo had so brilliantly done: make the latest advances in science available to the layman.<sup>73</sup>

Thus Boyle, perhaps the greatest scientific name among the founding members of the Royal Society, justifiably attracts the term 'virtuoso', as a scientist who was both patron and practitioner in his approach to natural philosophy, and who showed a constant awareness of the moral and social implications of his studies, however mechanical or academic they may have been.

Boyle's 'imitation' of Browne's vocabulary is almost wholly of

73 Marie Boas Hall, Robert Boyle on Natural Philosophy (1965) pp. 38-39



a technical, physical kind. Adjectives descriptive of physical states, largely first used in Books II, III and VI of Pseudodoxia Epidemica are among the terms which he found congenial to his disquisitions: aqueous, corrodible, cylindrical, glaciable, granulary, ruminating, scorious, vitreous; and similarly, he names conditions and physical occurrences in the same fashion as Browne: avolation, denigration, exhaustion, latitancy, polarity, subsidence. The list is a long one, and despite the absence of any large evidence (as in the cases of Charleton or Power) that Pseudodoxia Epidemica was constructively influential in forming Boyle's knowledge of the physical sciences, Browne must be given credit for helping to form the language in which Boyle wrote with such facility. Pseudodoxia Epidemica was, after all, a work designed to foster a critical appreciation of commonplace subjects in Natural Philosophy, and it is as such an instrument of enlightenment that Boyle and his coevals would have benefited from it. The case of Boyle suggests that the philosophic diction which Browne created and sanctioned was a proper contribution to the new language of learning.

The best known of Browne's coinages is probably electricity. One of Boyle's biographers notices how Browne's founding of the term in English (following Gilbert's Latin introduction) is given more precise significance:

The word 'electrics' had been used loosely by Gilbert in his De Magnete to describe the aura or charge associated with 'loadstones'. (Footnote: The first use of the noun electricity is usually attributed to Sir Thomas Browne who in Pseudodoxia epidemica (Book II, p. 79. line 21, 1646) remarks: 'if gently warmed ... they will better discover their electricities.'...) Boyle, in his Effluvia (1673) gives greater precision to the term in his discussion of loadstones. For Boyle an effluvium was the sphere of detectable influence emanating from a solid body. He conceived of this force as being particulate in nature

and responsible for the lodestone's magnetic influence. He likewise conceived of odours as particulate effluvia, exerting chemical action on the organs of perception, an assumption fully consonant with modern theories of smell perception.<sup>74</sup>

The example of Boyle as owing any kind of debt of influence to Browne is not one which fits historical theories of the advancement of science in the seventeenth century. Sir Thomas Browne, unlike his son Edward, never became a member of the Royal Society. Much was made of this fact in the influential essay by R.F.Jones, "Science and English Prose Style",<sup>75</sup> in which he followed the notions of Gosse<sup>76</sup> and Herford<sup>77</sup> before him that Browne's style debarred him from membership of the Society. A satisfying correction of this is made by Joan Bennett<sup>78</sup> when she points out the facts of life concerning seventeenth-century travel between Norwich and London.<sup>79</sup> Moreover, Jones's theories relied heavily on Glanvill's revisions to The Vanity of Dogmatizing, from the first edition of 1661 to the truncated third edition of 1676, which he took to represent Glanvill's complete conversion from a 'flamboyant' Brownesque way of writing to one which uses plain and familiar words and a 'natural' manner of expression. Jones's essay concludes:

... reformation of style was a very significant part of a definite program adopted by a closely organized society of prominent men who were aggressively active in promulgating their views. The extent to which Glanvill's style changed under their discipline is a fair gauge of the influence that must have been exerted upon all members of the society, and, through them, upon the outside world.<sup>80</sup>

74 John F. Fulton, "The Hon. Robert Boyle, F.R.S.", in The Royal Society: Its Origins and Founders (1960), ed. Sir Harold Hartley, p. 127

75 Reprinted in Literary English since Shakespeare, ed. Geo. Watson (1970)

76 Edmund Gosse, Sir Thomas Browne (1905), p.190

77 C.H.Herford (ed.) Religio Medici (Everyman, 1906) Intro., pp. xiv -xv

78 Joan Bennett, Sir Thomas Browne (1962), p. 20

79 Cf. also Evelyn's reasons for being left out of Council, Diary, ed. E.S. De Beer (1955) Vol.IV, p.225

80 Jones, in Literary English... (ed. Watson, 1970), p.220



It is curious that the only explicit criticism of Browne for flamboyance which Jones supplies is that of Alexander Ross, which is presented<sup>81</sup> as if it had embodied an influential contemporary assessment. There is little evidence that poor Ross influenced anyone with the grape-shot of his opinion directed against all the radical intellects of his day. He did, incidentally, provide glowing testimonials in favour of Charleton, in verses prefatory to his prolix translation of van Helmont, a work neither memorable nor influential. Jones's general argument, besides depending heavily on the example of Glanvill, assumes a coherence and unanimity of attitude among the members of the Royal Society towards the subject of style. Such an assumption may be theoretically justified on the basis of Sprat's well-known prescription for methods of clearer self-expression, but The History of the Royal Society<sup>82</sup> has been long recognised as frankly propagandist in intent. On the practical side, there is much evidence in the diction used by many early members of the Society, that no major revolution in style did take place. Few men's habits of writing change overnight.

In a separate analysis of the affinities between Browne and Glanvill, Bennett points out that Glanvill's conversion in terms of style was not accompanied by any equivalent conversion of mind:

It is not only in generalities that Browne shows a clearer intellect and more common sense than his younger contemporary ...<sup>83</sup>

She goes on to give numerous instances where Glanvill accepts with credulous enthusiasm many of the vulgar errors which, decades before, Browne had painstakingly dismissed.

Despite adequate rebuttals of the idea that Browne was in any way disqualified from being a member of the Royal Society, suspicions

81 Jones, op. cit., p. 224, citing Ross's, The Philosophicall Touchstone (1645)

82 Thomas Sprat, The History of the Royal Society of London (1667)

83 Bennett, op.cit., p. 168

linger. Somehow an image of Browne persists in which his dark broom-cupboard contains a cauldron, selected entrails and a black, pointed hat, as, for example, in Carey's essay:

The hieroglyph-mentality stops Browne being a scientist because it makes him rummage under the surface of nature for what he expects to find ...<sup>84</sup>

Yet somehow, the fascination which alchemy and apparently irrational speculation held for figures like Boyle and Newton is overlooked. Hoppen's study of the esotericism widespread among early scientists of the Restoration period<sup>85</sup> has provided a perspective that shows we are easily misled into making generalisations about new science and old learning. Browne's credulity in some matters is thoroughly matched by that of rationalists like Locke, propagandists like Sprat and Glanvill, virtuosi like Evelyn and Digby, and the great scientists Boyle, Hooke and Newton, all of whom gave serious attention to the subjects of either alchemy, witchcraft, or both. The nature of seventeenth-century science is still far more curious and inexplicable than most historians are ready to admit.

It is of assistance, in burying deeper the notions about Browne's style, its 'flamboyance!', and its supposedly hostile reception by his scientific contemporaries, to observe that many of the learned used Browne's vocabulary, hard words foremost, in spite of Sprat; and Glanvill, even after his conversion from decorated to plain style, continued to use many of Browne's polysyllables, useful and useless alike. It is instructive to note that the term aporrhoeias, for example is one used by Glanvill (in Plus Ultra, 1668) whereas Browne had purged this from Pseudodoxia Epidemica in his revisions for the second edition in 1650. We need to consider that

<sup>84</sup> John Carey, op. cit., p. 414

<sup>85</sup> K.T. Hoppen, "The Nature of the Early Royal Society," in BJHS IX (1976), pp. 10-19



Browne himself displayed alertness to the appropriateness of his diction, in revising his own text in the direction of simplicity:

...in order to conform, so far as it was possible for Browne to conform, to the acceptable style of the dawning scientific age; while thematically his periodic amendments and substantial additions suggest an unfailing commitment to the latest developments in several fields.<sup>86</sup>

The final emphasis needs restating: the arguments that Browne's style was inappropriate for science are not strong, since his diction is so often taken for imitation by leading scientific figures, and the suggestion that his intellectual proclivities were such as to earn him the distrust of his peers is unlikely, given their equivalent eclecticism.

The focus of attention throughout this chapter has been upon Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and the case has been well made in recent years<sup>87</sup> for interpreting that work as one which synthesizes and popularizes scientific knowledge, in quite the same way as Boyle intended his written work to be considered. The chief problem in interpreting Browne's style rests in the fact that the presentation and construction of each one of his works is distinct and original, and none of them fits easily into a recognisable genre or mould. Their character may be summarised as follows: a mannered spiritual autobiography, which embodies an elaborate declaration of beliefs; a large encyclopaedia of human error and fallacy; two parallel rhapsodies on the rituals and patterns of man and nature, life and death; an expanded clinical report, with meditations on mortality; a collection of short moral essays; and a miscellany of antiquarian tracts. With such a diversity

86 C.A. Patrides (ed.), Sir Thomas Browne... (1977), p. 33

87 By , for example, Robbins, Commentary on P.E. (Vol. II) passim, and Intro., Vol. I, p. xlix; and V.C. Morris, op. cit., chapters 4 and 5.

of compositions, each of which, excepting only Christian Morals, is itself difficult to classify, one would not expect to encounter a style uniform to them all. Pseudodoxia Epidemica has slight affinities with works in the hexameral tradition like Swan's Speculum Mundi (1635), but the approach to its subject matter - its critical function, in short - means that it runs counter to the basic urge of the hexamera: to celebrate the Work of the Days. It does follow Bacon's recommendation for a purging of error, as so many have noted, but invents its own procedure completely, and borrows no plan for appropriate language. The influence of Hakewill, for which a large claim is made by Robbins,<sup>88</sup> does not extend beyond the choice of subject matter; Hakewill's basic argument against the idea of the world's decline is absorbed so completely by Browne that it emerges again and again in all his works like a commonplace, and in Religio Medici (I, 46) it is referred to as "generall opinion". There is no stylistic correspondence between the diction of Hakewill's Apologie<sup>89</sup> and Pseudodoxia Epidemica.

Similar observations can be made about the uniqueness of Religio Medici and of Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus, for which no clear English forerunners exist. The absence of obvious literary categories gives all readers a challenge as to how to respond; there can be a diction, for instance, that we intuitively recognise as suitable for lyric poetry, for satire, or for a sermon, but in works which are original as to their genre such as Browne's, the reader's ability to anticipate a particular choice of words or a likely kind of rhetoric is curtailed. In the case of Religio Medici's monodramatic presentation, the eccentric first person<sup>90</sup> presents himself as a consistent character, and once the reader has surrendered to this engaging narrator, the diction of that work can be comforting in its consistency. But the

88 In P.E., Vol.I, Intro., pp. xxi-xxiv

89 George Hakewill, An Apologie of the Power and Providence of God ... (1627)

90 see below, chapter 6



rhapsodies of Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus allow no such comfort, and the loose structure of ideas makes matters yet more difficult.

This quality marking the four major works - of being unclassifiable in quite distinct ways - is most clearly remarked by Austin Warren:

It is at any event clear that Browne is not the writer of a single style, rich but rigid. Though our persistent idea of Browne is likely to be of a compulsive writer, not really conscious of what he is moved to do, we must revise it to that of a writer knowing of modes and textures.<sup>91</sup>

Warren uses this observation as a springboard for his discussion of the range of styles:

Browne has at least three styles - a low, a middle, and a high - the low represented by Vulgar Errors, the high by The Garden of Cyrus, the medium by Religio and (in decadent form) by Christian Morals<sup>92</sup>

This differentiation is a useful one, and one that corresponds with the experience of many readers at a general level. But if creativity of diction is an element of style, or if 'hard words' are able to tell us anything about the style of the works in which they are present, then Warren's distinctions don't work. Many sections of Pseudodoxia Epidemica are as densely latinate as any part of The Garden of Cyrus, and the 'low' and 'high' styles can share the same vocabulary. When Warren specifically treats the amphibious nature of Browne's diction, he abandons the idea of differentiation between the works, and resorts to general comment; the essence of this is that Browne's latinity marks his elitism, and his Saxon elements "the matter-of-fact, common-sense side"<sup>93</sup> of his writing. This is over-simple, and a sense that different levels of difficulty mark the vocabularies of each work is needed as a corrective, as well as a

91 Warren, op. cit., p. 678

92 Warren, p.678

93 Warren, p.682

sense of the kind of aureate diction Browne shared with his contemporaries. Having suggested where and how fashion in vocabulary dictated the imitation of Browne, it is now pertinent to consider the detail of innovative diction in Browne's own work.



## Chapter Four

### The Context of Innovation.

In considering the background to Browne's diction, I have emphasised its copiousness and its eccentricities. This is an inevitable result of concentrating upon neologism. The evidence of the texts, however, puts what often appear to be excesses into perspective. Lexicographical evidence is by its very nature arbitrary, and can only go a very short way towards showing what the context can tell us clearly. Another 'arbitrary' feature of diction is its etymology or immediate derivation, which is outside my scope here. It has been possible for Browne's editors Martin and Robbins to trace many of the classical and Neo-Latin sources out of which Browne quarried his innovations, especially in the middle works. Yet despite the energies of editors, and the usefulness of their commentaries, the provenance of his vocabulary is of marginal importance in the attempt to describe his style.

Frequently, what Browne's diction demonstrates is an urge to find a vocabulary adequate to his subject, and many of his subjects are abstruse. He was tackling areas of learning for which no specialised terminology had evolved in English to provide disciplined terms of discussion. This much is especially evident in the dense neologising of chapters one and five of Book II of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, chapters concerned with mineralogy and crystallography, where Browne anglicizes a Latin vocabulary itself specialised by writers such as Boodt and Caesius. But, contrarily, there is scant evidence of any persistent reliance on other men's labours for the effects of style and expression. In one feature of Browne's work all commentators concur - his originality of style. Even where it can

be shown that part of his erudition depends upon his reading of a particular authority - as in the case of his considerable debt to Kirchmann in Hydriotaphia - his process of composition is such as expands the terminology in which the argument takes place. His abilities in using synonymy to amplify, explain and digress are frequently astonishing.

V.C. Morris has noted of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, V, 5:

...his versatility with words he uses to express his meaning unrepetitively: "navel; conjunctive part; dependency; connexion; momental Navel; coherence; umbilicality; link; ligament; obligation; continuity; catenation; conserving union". This equals some of the sequences in the fifth chapter of Urne-Buriall, as in paragraph two; where the concept 'misery in this life' is expressed in these forms: "calamity; Adversity; misery; hidden state of life; abortion."<sup>1</sup>

John Carey notes the many synonyms for 'burying' in Hydriotaphia, and cautiously approves their enigmatic qualities: "the glinting syllabic clumps are verbal ceremonies ..."<sup>2</sup> This avoidance of repetition, the search for the exact term, goes far beyond the scientist's rational need for precision or the philosopher's for minute discrimination and definition. In the example of the navel it is a poetical rush at a theological puzzle; it offers the vocabulary of anatomy as the vehicle of metaphor by which we should understand the geography of Adam's and Eve's abdomens. Such an example shows Browne's sensitivity to his own choice of words, but there is one aspect of his writing which, in addition, reveals his sense of the impact of hard words and aureate diction on his readers.

#### THE REVISIONS TO PSEUDODOXIA EPIDEMICA

The substantial evidence for Browne's sensitivity to his own

<sup>1</sup> Morris, op. cit., p. 430

<sup>2</sup> Carey, op. cit., p. 416



difficulties is contained in his revisions of the text of Pseudodoxia Epidemica. Appendix IIc of this thesis gives a list of the latinate words, all present in the original 1646 text of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, but purged from later editions in the course of general revisions. It will be noted from this table what an astonishingly large number of these purged latinisms are indeed coinages, on the evidence of the O.E.D. The majority of changes are made in the preference of simpler, or at least less obscure forms than 'hard' words used in the first edition, but not all the changes are of this type, and some general remarks on the amendments to the 1646 edition are a first necessity.

Robbins has noted<sup>3</sup> the degree to which the 1650 edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica enabled Browne to incorporate the results of recent scholarship, and has remarked how the improvements in content over the 1646 text are more substantial than in subsequent revisions. He offers no comment on the alterations of vocabulary, and there are no large-scale changes in the general style. However, there are significant alterations of diction and phrasing, and it is fair to say that their main effect is to remove grosser examples of pedantry.

A number of phrases consisting of an adjective and a noun appear in 1646, in which Latin word-order is used. The effect is pedantic:

...and this diversity of clyme and observations Caelestiall...  
(VI, 3, R. 458)

The third consideration concerneth relations Medicall...  
(II, 3, R. 108)

No mettall attracts, nor any concretian Animall we know...  
(II, 4, R. 117)

In the 1650 edition, Browne reverses the word-order to that of 'normal' English, 'Caelestiall observations', 'medicall relations' and so on, although he fails to make amendments in one or two instances, such as 'compositions amiable' (VI, 11, R. 521).

In other cases, Browne shows himself willing, in the first edition, to make free with prefixes and to construct eccentric formations

<sup>3</sup> Robbins, P.E. Vol.I, p. xxv; my debt to Robbins's apparatus criticus in this chapter is considerable.

which violate orthographical customs. In the 1650 edition, he picks up many of these as aberrations and restores the conventional forms:

- (R. 161) 1646 immoved becomes 1650 unmoved  
 (R. 451) 1646 incertainely becomes 1650 uncertainely  
 (R. 465) 1646 unsufferable becomes 1650 insufferable  
 (R. 466) 1646 inhabitable becomes 1650 unhabitable.

Some passages are deleted in the second edition, whose excision makes no material impact on the subject under discussion, and one can only conclude that a decision to delete them has been made chiefly on stylistic grounds. A good example of this is at P.E. VI, 8 (R. 495), where this florid and tautological conclusion to a paragraph is rejected:

... conceiving a perpetuity in mutability, and upon unstable foundations erecting eternall assertions.

Browne's rejection of this is undoubtedly compounded by the jingling regularity of the rhythms, which is so intrusive as to be trite. A comparable passage at P.E. II, 6 (R. 145), with a similarly numbing quality about its diction, has the merit of drawing a general conclusion from examples under discussion:

Now parallels or like relations alternately relevee each other;  
 when neither will passe asunder, yet are they plausible together,  
 their mutuall concurrences supporting their solitary instabilities.

This passage remains virtually unchanged throughout the editions published in Browne's lifetime; it does, admittedly, contribute additional meaning where the passage in VI, 8 does not, but it is a good example of rhythmic parallelism being used in a summary, and where to the modern reader, the qualities of the vocabulary seem to have been exploited no more for their meaning than for their sound. The parallelism of sound and structure show the same qualities that Johnson exhibits in a certain conclusive register, as in this letter's final sentence:



...let not the contempt of superstition precipitate you into infidelity, or the horror of infidelity ensnare you in superstition.<sup>4</sup>

The list provided in Appendix IIc is illustrative rather than complete; it includes all the instances where revision of the first edition has been made, principally, to change the form of words. It excludes reference to longer passages where, for example, recent scholarship had occasioned revisions affecting Browne's treatment of the subject in hand. Had I included these, the list of rejected latinisms would have been considerably longer, taking in, for example, lapidificall, succity, dineticall, incongenerous and atramentous, all coinages. Some of the deletions are ruggedly recondite, even by Browne's standards, and the O.E.D. records no further use for the following after the first edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica: colament, elychnious, fritiniancy and ingannations. The same process of exclusion continues to a lesser extent in later revisions; the coinages telary and invision are deleted and replaced in the third edition, and epithumeticall in the 1672 edition. All of these neologisms vanish from the language after Browne's single use, but others, equally recondite, find occasional subsequent users, imitators tempted by their impressively learned quality. Aporrhoias and autoptically are picked up for use by Glanvill in 1661, benegro and others by Charleton in 1650, and lithontripticke by Lovell, also in 1661.

I am not suggesting that Browne removed these polysyllabic rarities because of the demands they made on his readers; there is little evidence elsewhere in Pseudodoxia Epidemica that he was willing to make concessions of this kind, and the tendency in revision is not merely to render the diction into simpler forms. The main urges

<sup>4</sup> Samuel Johnson, letter to F.A. Barnard, 28 May 1768, in Selected Letters of Samuel Johnson ed. R.W. Chapman (1925), p. 73

are to be more precise, to avoid repetition, and to make aesthetic or rhetorical improvements, in sound, rhythm, or associations. However, one feature of the second edition which does offer assistance and explanation to the reader is the careful and plain glossing of some thirty-two words that may be classified as 'hard words'. These are listed in Appendix IIId. In the first edition, there had been rare instances of the glossing of unusual or technical terms, as in the compound instance in P.E. II, 5, where Antidotall, diureticall and Antipilepticall are glossed "Against poyson", "provoking urine" and "Against the falling-sicknesse". Browne's usual habit, however, was to rely on synonymous re-expression within the text, rather than utilising footnotes. Thus, in explicating terms which, he had been brought to realise, presented problems to readers, glosses of an often homely kind, added in 1650, saved him the problem of interfering with the syntax and order of sentences. Examples of these are septentrionate (II, 2, R. 88), glossed "point to the North", and chiragricall (IV, 4, R. 301), glossed "Hand-gowty".

In the 1650 edition, twelve of the new glosses are provided for words registered in Appendix I as coinages, and a further one for an alien term (acus) absent from the O.E.D. In addition, four words can quite confidently be regarded as new minted in the second quarter of the seventeenth century: alexipharmacall (III, 23, R. 260), anthropophagie (I, 6, R. 36), diagonal (III, 5, R. 177), and chiragricall (IV, 4, R. 301). Many of the definitions are expressed in an Anglo-Saxon idiom, as one would expect, and the effect of the process is akin to that of 'doubling' within the normal course of the text.

Glossing does offer some guidance as to what kind of vocabulary Browne expected would offer impediments to his readers, but it is



guidance of an uneven quality. For example, deleterious is chosen for glossing in the 1650 text, (III, 7, R. 182), but is a word Browne had already used in Religio Medici II, 10, without the presence of either gloss or synonym; again, it is difficult to imagine what kind of reader would require glosses for athleticall (IV, 5, R. 308), graphically (III, 7, R. 182) or zenith (IV, 1, R. 294), given the demands of much of the unexplained vocabulary in the rest of the work. There was occasional glossing in the 1646 text, which adds complication, such as Iconomicall (glossed, "quarelsome with pictures", V, 22, R. 430), and so it is to the substantial alterations of diction to which we must now turn.

The changes listed in Appendix IIc are substantial indicators of Browne's strategies in revision, and they may be drawn up into four categories:

1. Change of idiom. Here, an Anglo-Saxon term is used to replace its Latin equivalent:

(R. 90) 1646 amits is replaced in 1650 by loseth

(R. 327) 1646 amitted is replaced in 1658 by lost

(R. 458) 1646 precept is replaced in 1650 by rule

(R. 328) 1646 occasioned is replaced in 1650 by begot

(R. 257) 1646 anfractuouse is replaced in 1650 by wreathy

(R. 129) 1646 continued and durable is replaced in 1650 by  
piercing and powerful

To these may be added the displacement of the Greek-derived term hydrargyrous by the more familiar latinate equivalent, mercuriall (R. 133).

Latin is again preferred to Greek in replacing autoptically by ocularly (R. 540), which latter form had achieved some currency in English by the early seventeenth century. Figment (in R. 330), though Latin in origin, has a more native ring than similitude, which it replaces in 1650, and is preferred for the purposes of alliteration and rhythm.

2. Suppressed repetition. In word-pairs, where the two elements are synonymous, one element is removed because of its obscurity or alien quality, and its lack of additional meaning. In the following pairs, the bracketed words appear in the 1646 edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, but are deleted from the second and later editions:

- (R. 169) (cystis or) bag
- (R. 127) (Aporrhoias, or) emanations
- (R. 130) (tonnitruous and) fulminating
- (R. 174) (rancide) and olidous
- (R. 253) (volatile and) dissoluble
- (R. 326) arenaceous (and friable)

Similarly, a phrase which re-expresses a meaning already present in a single term is removed in:

- (R. 216) snasts (or elychnious parts).

3. Accuracy. Numerous small alterations were made to the 1650 edition in the interests of caution or circumspection; the following revisions all show a tendency towards less positive, but more precise assertion:

(R. 303) (prehemineny and) preferment: the deletion of the first element coincides with the introduction of "seem to" in the sentence, making for a less assertive declaration; the revised version in 1650 reads: "all which doe seem to declare a naturall preferment of the one unto motion before the other..."

(R. 331) In 1650, the word canonicall is deleted from this statement in the first edition: "The second testimony is deduced from holy Canonicall Scripture..." Since Browne's discussion here is on the difficulty of accepting any translation and interpretation of scripture as authoritative, the notion of canonicity was clearly misplaced here.

(R. 558) In the second edition, the word authenticke in this sentence is replaced by received: "...wee must relye on their uncertain story, amd authenticke pourtraits of Colleins." Again, this corrects a self-contradictory element; this concerns the three Kings of Colleins, and the whole chapter's tentative direction is impeded by the idea that there might conceivably be authentic portraits of the Kings.

Revisions in later editions show similar tendencies:

(R. 232) In this observation of the method of copulation among "Apes,



Porcupines, Hedgehogges...", the word ventral replaces prone from the edition of 1658: "...some pronely, that is by contaction of the prone parts in both..." This is a replacement against the trend, of a familiar word by a neologism, but ventral is clearly more appropriate in the context; prone relates to posture or positioning, while ventral alludes to part of the anatomy. Browne's need is to be particularly precise here, in discriminating among the various ways of copulation among beasts, and the original term was vague enough to be misleading.

(R. 447) In the 1672 edition, the words is incontrovertibly in this sentence are replaced by the single word seems: "For the Hebrew, it is incontrovertibly the primitive and surest text to rely on..." Once again, Browne revises in the interest of caution, in describing the 'incorrupt' quality of the Hebrew edition of the Bible.

4. Modernising / Orthodoxy. Just as in 1650 Browne amended various prefixes (above, p. 96) to conform with conventional orthography, so some formations of 1646, including many ranked as coinages, were reformed. These revisions all constitute a reversion to more conventional practice:

(R. 19) 1646 imposture is amended in 1650 to impostor

(R. 37) 1646 extemporall is amended in 1650 to extemporary

(R. 47) 1646 Indiary is amended in 1650 to Indian

The coinages fritiniacy (R. 372) and lithontripticke (R. 123) are rejected in 1650 as incapable of sustaining life as English words, and the Latin forms - fritinnitus, lithontripticus - are used and glossed in footnotes. The same may be said of the obscurely latinate apophyses (R. 293), oedematous, schirrous and erysipelalous (R. 297), and solipeds (R. 165), since the text is simply reorganised to remove the need for their use in 1650.

The glosses of 1650 and these four categories of revision go some way to account for Patrides's remarks on Browne's care with the text of Pseudodoxia Epidemica:

Stylistically the revisions display an increasing devotion to a simpler form of discourse in order to conform, so far as it was possible for Browne to conform, to the acceptable style of the dawning scientific age.<sup>5</sup>

But this needs a perspective. The bulk of Pseudodoxia Epidemica is substantially the same in 1672 as in 1646, and the revisions of style are not extensive. To speak of 'devotion' to a simpler form is an exaggeration, when so many unreformed passages are dense, latinate, and sometimes obscure. The ruggedness of much of the diction in The Garden of Cyrus is a further contradiction of the idea that there is any overall stylistic change. The reforms show that Browne is not amending his "terms of art" in relation to the subjects under discussion, so much as attenuating the metaphysical force and ornamental qualities of his diction, where those elements affect the meaning he wishes to convey. It certainly involves a trend towards simplicity, but it is as much a personal simplicity as a scientific one. I suggest in chapter six below how there is a tendency to seek more detached forms of expression shown in the 1650 revisions; insofar as polysyllabic diction draws attention to the author's presence, its simplification can also represent an urge to neutralise the authorial personality.

The textual revisions provide solid evidence that Browne showed, in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, a vital critical sense of the kinds of diction whose recondite, alien or inappropriate qualities damaged the communications he wished to make. They offer us an insight into a deliberate stylistic policy. But Pseudodoxia Epidemica is distinctly scientific, and rational, verifiable truths are at stake. Religio Medici is, by Browne's own admission, 'flexible', and Hydriotaphia

5 C.A.Patrides, op. cit., pp. 32-33



and The Garden of Cyrus are rhapsodised records of observation and speculation. In respect of his diction, then, we are left with a critical problem. At a simple level, Browne is a habitual coiner, and his habits are evident in each of his works. But the different kinds and quantities of coinages in each work, as indicators of a wider superfluity of diction, can suggest differing standards and attitudes in each work. In the commentary on three works which follows, an attempt is made to explain such differentiation.

#### RELIGIO MEDICI.

In quantitative terms, Religio Medici is decidedly light in coinages. The 'thrilling eloquence' that characterises Browne's first work is of a kind not dependent on quaint or unfamiliar vocabulary. The ingenuity which strikes every reader relies upon exuberance of fancy and paradox, not on exuberant displays of learning or verbal dexterity. The informality of Religio Medici (however contrived we decide that may be) and the lack of need for a special vocabulary make it a work for which the gentleman reader of the mid-century would not so frequently need his Cawdrey or his Cockeram. At least twelve of the thirty-one coinages listed for this work in Appendix I recur in later works, suggesting that a new and useful general vocabulary is in the making; we rarely encounter diction that is of use only for the nonce, except in the cases of conformant (I, 35), recompensive (I, 47) and semi-bodies (II, 13).

The comparative simplicity and familiarity of Religio Medici's diction can be attributed to those features which make for its monodramatic intimacy of tone. Paradoxes, aphorisms and conceits loom large in its manner of proceeding, and neologism for its own

sake can make little contribution to these essentially witty, but not pedantic devices. The revisions Browne made to the text in producing the 'authorised' version of 1643 show no change of emphasis in relation to 'hard' or latinate words, beyond one or two minor alterations. Malevolous (II, 6), not a coinage, but a harsh word tainted with the inkhorn, is present in all manuscripts except one, but is replaced by the softer equivalent uncharitable in 1643.<sup>6</sup> The glosses which three<sup>7</sup> manuscript versions included, but which are not present in either the 1642 or 1643 editions have no authoritative value, and must be attributed to other hands. They are not of a kind with Browne's own footnotes, which supply references and quotations, rather than definitions.

The unsatisfactory state of the 1643 text of Religio Medici, and Browne's insistence on his own 'flexibility' of statement means that we should not expect the fastidious accuracy of diction of the kind we encounter in Pseudodoxia Epidemica. Though Religio Medici is full of uncommon sentiments, its diction is not more exotic than, for example, Bacon's in his Essays or The Advancement of Learning, nor Burton's in The Anatomy of Melancholy, nor other informal contemporary works. Browne claimed that Religio Medici was

...penned with such disadvantage that (I protest) from the first setting of pen unto paper, I had not the assistance of any good booke, whereby to promote my invention or relieve my memory... ("To the Reader", M., p. 1)

and this declared spontaneity provides one explanation for the relative infrequency of neologism. With his working library to hand, (as Robbins has shown at large in his commentary on Pseudodoxia

6 Robbins (R.M., 1972) prefers malevolous, Martin uncharitable; the retention of the first is to be preferred on the grounds of symmetry, but not if we regard the 1643 text as the most reliable of our authorities.

7 See Martin, p. xii; MSS. St. John's, Wilkin 1, Lehigh. These glosses explain, for example, the identities of the "three Impostors" (I, 20), and the River Arethusa's peculiarities (I, 6), and define Jubilee (I, 41) and Calcination (I, 50).



Epidemica, and Martin,<sup>8</sup> in demonstrating Browne's indebtedness to writers such as Kirchmann (in Hydriotaphia) and Curtius and Porta (in The Garden of Cyrus)), Browne had a ready means of supplying a diction sufficiently exquisite, precise or recherché for his most carefully-wrought themes. In addition, we have to recognise that, whatever the religious orthodoxy implied in his later works, Religio Medici remains his only substantially devotional writing. There is some suggestion in Pseudodoxia Epidemica that his coining habits are kept in check when he handles sacred subject-matter, as if in recognition that commentary on Scriptural material is improper if it is tricked out with too elaborate a vocabulary. Coinages are perceptibly less frequent in the early chapters of Book VII, and in many of the chapters of Book V which deal with pictures relating to Biblical characters; this, however is not conclusive, and there is no other general alteration of style in these chapters.

The language of Religio Medici, nonetheless, is a learned one. If we take a sample of latinate words from Religio Medici I, sections 34 to 38, the following words (besides five coinages noted in Appendix I as occurring there) are uncommon in the 1640's, and the O.E.D. gives Browne as either the second user or as the first user of the word in some sense subordinate to that first given:

Amphibium, Magisteriall, indisputable (I, 34)

Omneity (I, 35) inorganicall, Crisis (I, 36)

carnified (I, 37) Cadaverous, Vespilloes (I, 38)

The coinages here are as follows:

amphibious (I, 34) conformant (I, 35) inorganity (I, 36)

material (vb.) (I, 37) convulst (I, 38).

This is an extensive list of words unlikely to have been familiar to the contemporary reader, and while their meanings may not have proved problematic, their strangeness, both individually and collectively,

<sup>8</sup> Martin, p. 319 et seq., and p. 338

will have made a decided impact. In part to assist his reader, Browne makes re-expression or definition very frequent, but varied to the degree that no weighty formula is visible, as it is in parts of Christian Morals.

It is worth remarking the manner in which Browne converts words into less familiar parts of speech, a procedure typical of the poet rather than the prose writer. Instances of this are disproportionately high in Religio Medici; besides the cases noted in Appendix I, where abrupt, material, assassine, simple and carnal appear as verbs, there are other instances. Profound is a favourite verb of Browne's, which we would rarely think of as other than an adjective, and the O.E.D.'s documentation is illuminating. Three distinct senses are registered, and the following analysis of them points up the way in which resources of sound and meaning are exploited.

1. The first citation given is from Lydgate (1412): "to immerse or plunge deeply", and is used transitively and in an apparently literal sense. The second and only other example is from Religio Medici I, 55: "Vice and the Devil put a Fallacy upon our Reasons, and, provoking us too hastily to run from it, entangle and profound us deeper in it." The meaning is clearly less literal than Lydgate's "...Deeply profoundid is heete natural In thilke humydite i-callyd radical", and the context more abstract. It is a good instance of the creative distortion of the usual significance of a word; profound is here used to add the notion of depth to the basic sense of entanglement which is the theme of this section of Religio Medici, descanting upon the riddle of sin. The analogy of "confound" seems to be present here too.

2. Two citations, one from Religio Medici I, 13, and one from Pseudodoxia Epidemica I, 9 are given to illustrate the second distinct signification: "To go deeply into; to 'sound', 'fathom'." The example



from Religio Medici looks rather awkwardly framed: "There is no danger to profound these mysteries, no sanctum sanctorum in Philosophy." A writer of the last two centuries would not be likely to use the infinitive after this fashion, but in fact the sound-sense - "too profound" - carries an additional associative weight of meaning without committing Browne to the explicit statement that there is literally no limit to the enquiries reason may make. In the example from Pseudodoxia Epidemica, something similar is at work; the sentence, at fuller length than the O.E.D. provides, runs: "But no man is likely to profound the ocean of that Doctrine, (the Hieroglyphics of the Egyptians) beyond that eminent example of industrious learning, Kircherus." Again, the notion of profundity rubs off as a compliment to Kircher, besides making an apt verb in the metaphorical description of Egyptian philosophy.

3. Finally, profound is used as an intransitive verb in Religio Medici I, 14; again, I quote at greater length than does the O.E.D.:

In the causes, nature, and affections of the Eclipse of sunne and Moone, there is most excellent speculation; but to profound farther, and to contemplate a reason why his providence hath so disposed and ordered their motions ...

is a sweeter piece of reason, and a diviner point of Philosophy...

The Dictionary gives the definition "To penetrate deeply, 'dive' (into, etc.)", and it can be seen here that profound performs another function, that of setting contemplation on a deeper level than speculation. Throughout Religio Medici, there are discriminations made between vulgar or superficial kinds of knowledge or comprehension and deeper, more durable realisations and intuitions. Just this kind of usage adds to the discriminatory power of Browne's diction.

There is a remaining example of profound being used as a verb, in this third, intransitive manner; the O.E.D. takes an example from

Glanvill, in his The Vanity of Dogmatizing (1661): "Let the most confirm'd Dogmatist profound far into his indeared opinions, and... 'twill be an effectuall cure of confidence." This is a typical example of the influence Browne's diction had upon Glanvill, and while it is not necessary to take exception to this usage, there seems to be no good reason why Glanvill should have preferred the word to any of several synonyms - 'scrutinize', 'investigate', 'fathom' etc. - and in fact, the notion of depth which it involves implies a respect for the Dogmatist's ideas which one would expect a competent rhetorician to exclude, unless some irony were brought into play; Glanvill, however, is no ironist.

In Religio Medici, then, there is not so much that is intrinsically 'hard' or technical about the choice of words, but the example of profound shows how broadly the resources are deployed. It is characteristic of Browne to manipulate the commonplace into something new and striking; his facility for handling words in this way is writ larger in his manipulation of conventional wisdom. These denials of commonplaces are typical:

... 'tis we that are blind, not fortune... (I, 18)

I have heard some ... lament the lost lines of Cicero...; for my owne part, I thinke there be too many (books) in the world. (I, 24)

...there be not impossibilities enough in Religion for an active faith. (I, 9)

We tearme sleepe a death, and yet it is waking that kils us... (II, 12)

It is, one would suppose, no easy matter to deny commonplaces, in a work designed in large part to affirm the author's orthodoxy of faith and tolerance of disposition. But part of Browne's purpose in Religio Medici is to make connections between elevated and homely realms of experience, to dignify everyday ideas and to deflate the pretensions of excessive intellectualism. The reduplication of terms in making phrases - doublets, or synonymous re-expression - occurs throughout Religio Medici, and the most noticeable pattern of doubling is the



combination of latinate with Anglo-Saxon, a levelling of traditions in diction, as these instances demonstrate:

peccadillo or scape; compute and reckon; hatch and produce;  
common and quotidian (all II, 7); inherit and hold (II, 8)

One can only agree with Huntley's contention that the range of these doublets is so wide in intent and effect that it is useless to try and classify them; the Latin / Anglo-Saxon configuration is only one of many schemes.

... Some (doublets), like the double process of religious faith or doubt, first intellectualize a proposition and then relish it into being. Some exactly prescribe a spatial concept and then, with the second word, give it a psychological qualification. Some combine Latin and Anglo-Saxon, each with a particular effect. Some are different in connotation and similar in denotation; others divide the meaning but produce a single emotional effect. Some are correlatives to reconcile two parts of a concept; others, as antitheses, push two concepts poles apart.<sup>9</sup>

It is thus possible to use Browne's doubling to make many different observations on his style. Although he is concerned to make a particular case for Browne's "stylistic kinship with the psalmist through the use of substantial doublets", William Whallon<sup>10</sup> discusses a number of approaches. He finds that Browne, uniquely among his contemporaries, uses synonymous restatement in a way that elevates his subject, bearing comparison with the style of certain books of the Bible, especially Psalms and Proverbs. He quotes as his final example these lines from Religio Medici I, 51, and approves its "resonant concinnity", in which the same idea is restated not once, but three times:

The heart of man is the place the devill dwels in; I feele  
sontimes a hell within my selfe, Lucifer keeps his court in  
my brest, Legion is revived in me.<sup>11</sup>

There is much material in Religio Medici to support the idea that

9 F.L.Huntley, Sir Thomas Browne (1962), pp. 121-2

10 William Whallon, "Hebraic Synonymy in Sir Thomas Browne", in ELH XXVIII (1961), pp. 335-352

11 Quoted in Whallon, p. 352

synonymy is used to elevate the discourse. Whallon notes how the onward progress of narrative is impeded by such formulae, so that a kind of meditation upon his topic may take place. He cites Croll's finding that often two members of a period are connected by conjunctions, 'and', 'or' or 'nor', yet "the conjunction has no logical plus force whatever..."<sup>12</sup>

The lack of 'linear progress' in Browne's discourse is at its most evident in The Garden of Cyrus, where Browne does not make an argument or proceed from one idea to the next, so much as embroider his theme, working outwards from the central quincuncial idea. In Religio Medici, because his concerns are moral, fideistic and behavioural, and aesthetics play a lesser part, there is more of a logical sequence and forward movement of ideas. Thus, reduplication or brief restatement of words and phrases, in related or contrasting terms and images, allows a continuously expanding process of consciousness to be conveyed, while at the same time Browne progresses from subject to subject. While in Pseudodoxia Epidemica reduplication often functions as a system of running glosses on hard words, in Religio Medici such a necessity is infrequent.

There are explications of difficult and apparently coined terms in Religio Medici, as in "the Fougade or Powder plot" (I, 17), and restatements which, if they do not define the more obscure word, at least qualify and add to the term to make the meaning both broader and clearer - as in "There is therefore a secret glome or bottome of our dayes" (I, 43), and "I hold moreover that there is a Phytognomy, or Physiognomy, not onely of men, but of Plants ..." (II, 2). However, the majority of innovations which appear in paired phrases are not explained, but rather made complementary and designed to expand Browne's

<sup>12</sup> In Whallon, p.337



sense, and increase the suggestive or associative power of his discourse. This becomes quite plain when we compare the contexts of innovative words in Religio Medici with their context in later works. Three examples suffice to make the point.

First, the meaning of amphibious, first used in Religio Medici I, 34, is made clear by its context: "...that amphibious piece betweene a corporall and a spirituall essence, that middle forme..." But in its use in the 1650 edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica (II, 13, R.212), the term is very explicitly glossed in a footnote: "Amphibious Animals, such as live in both elements of land and water". Similarly, scintillation is used in a doubled phrase in Religio Medici (I, 32), "the fire and scintillation of that noble and mighty essence...", in a passage riddled with re-expressions of many kinds, but the restatement does not define the new term. In Pseudodoxia Epidemica V, 9 (R. 391), the word is more closely defined within a formula that refers to a specific image: "...our Saviour, and the Virgin Mary, who are commonly drawne with scintillations, or radiant Halo's about their head..." Lastly, the adjective wingy, though far from being abstruse or learned, occurs in this context of parallel phrases in Religio Medici I, 9: "As for those wingy mysteries in Divinity, and ayery subtilties in Religion..." By contrast, it is used in The Garden of Cyrus IV (M., 166) as an exact Anglo-Saxon restatement of a fairly rare latinism: "alary or wingy". In Religio Medici, the emphasis on the connotative and imaginative value of the diction is reminiscent of the remarks made above (p.83) on Henry More; the vocabulary of faith needs to suggest realms beyond logic or definition itself.

Of many other inkhornisms or innovations in Religio Medici, it is fair to say that, while their meanings are not likely to have been impenetrable to the classically-literate readership for which it was intended, it is not the kind of work whose business it is to

educate the reader in the use of scientific, philosophic or theological terminology. Browne's expansive treatment of his themes, however, almost always makes his meaning quite clear by implication, whereas in Pseudodoxia Epidemica his synthesis of erudite learning means that he is more often to be found making explicit definitions. Thus we find doublets in Religio Medici where the two components are not exactly equivalent, although the rhythm they supply to their context suggests, at the least, complementarity: "mercy and beneplacit"(I, 59), "be convulst and tremble" (I, 38), "mutilate and semi-bodies" (II, 13), "Phytognomy, or Physiology" (II, 2), "effront or enharden" (I, 40). This last example is, indeed, one of the less common examples of a doublet embodying direct contrast, and the presence of such confirms Whallon's remarks that parallelism for its own sake is habitual in Religio Medici, and elsewhere. He cites<sup>13</sup> the partially synonymous elements inherent in these directly opposed cola as typical:

To burn the bones of the King of Edom for lime, seems no  
irrational ferity; but to drink of the ashes of dead relations,  
a passionate prodigality. (U.B. III, M., 108)

In Christian Morals, this kind of parallelism becomes habitual to the point where it seems like an inflated caricature of Religio Medici; there is a persistence of dual elements in almost every assertion, and an urge to provide both balance and contrast at every opportunity:

Let thy Studies be free as thy Thoughts and Contemplations:  
but fly not only upon the wings of Imagination; Joyn Sense  
unto Reason, and Experiment unto Speculation, and so give life  
unto Embryon Truths, and Verities yet in their Chaos ...

(C.M. II, v, M., 221)

It is to Christian Morals that we must turn to see a continuation and extension of the kind of restatement which is so characteristic of Religio Medici. In the middle works, with morality giving way



to more scientific explorations of his themes, different strategies predominate.

#### PSEUDODOXIA EPIDEMICA.

Starting once again from the suggestions which are thrown up by his innovations, it needs emphasising that in Browne's largest and most scholarly work, neologism is present on a very large scale. I am not insisting that lexicographically-determined coinage is any more than a crude measure of creativity, and offer it as a starting point for an exploration of both idiosyncrasies and originality of diction, which tries to offer representative illustrations of the choice of words. The first specimen chapter is one in which a particularly specialised vocabulary is indicated by the wealth of new words.

Book III, chapter 17: "Of Hares".

This chapter is specialised to discourse upon oddities of copulation and sexuality. The general discussion concerns sex-changes, and among the twenty-four coinages listed in Appendix I, these specially relevant forms are encountered:

androgynal	masculo-feminine	spermatize
androgynally	retrocopulation	superconception
bisexual	retromingency	transexion
effemination	retromingent	transfeminate
feminality	seminality	

None of these fourteen words is in any form of common use today, despite the seeming usefulness of spermatize and seminality (a favourite term of Browne's, re-used elsewhere in Pseudodoxia Epidemica and in The Garden of Cyrus and Christian Morals); indeed, five of these are hapaxlegomena, and as many more considered rare or obsolete in the O.E.D. A sense arises from this kind of diction that Browne embarks on a discussion in a way that no man or woman before him

had done, and that no subsequent discussion takes place in the Queen's English that either adds or subtracts; solitary footprints in the snow where snow never falls again.

Besides these fourteen items ranked as coinages under the 'normal' qualifications set out in chapter two above, there is a further large number of what might be termed 'minor coinages'; these are cases where a distinct sense of a word as recognised in the O.E.D. shows Browne as its first user, but which I have omitted from Appendix I because another sense of the same form antedates his usage. In the following illustrative list, in which again some terms are made to suit the technicalities of the chapter, the particular numbered sense of the word as provided in the O.E.D. is cited, followed by its signification. The page numbers are from Robbins's edition and the definitions my own.

- 226 vb.3 emasculate (intransitive): turned into a female
- 227 1b unfrequent (with prec. neg.) (this antedates the O.E.D.'s  
example: Boyle, 1665)
- 229 1 ocularly: by ocular testimony
- 230 sb.12 cast: parturition
- 230 sb.3 exclusions: births
- 231 sb.4 notations: characters (this antedates the O.E.D.'s  
example: Fuller, 1661)
- 231 1 aversly: backwardly
- 232 2b anomalies: deviations from natural order

To these may be added a group of words classifiable as rare; where, for example, the O.E.D. cites Browne as the second user of a word first occurring in written English after 1600, where such a word has not found its way into any common use, or where some aspect of its form or grammatical use is unorthodox. Examples include

- |                                   |                                 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 226 <u>restore</u> (sb.)          | 228 <u>virilities</u> (sb. pl.) |
| 226 <u>posticke</u>               | 231 <u>cod of castor</u>        |
| 227 <u>master-formes</u>          | 232 <u>laterally</u>            |
| 227 <u>hermaphroditicall</u>      | 232 <u>sidewise</u>             |
| 227 <u>superintendent</u> (adj.)  | 232 <u>vitiosity</u>            |
| 228 <u>manifesto</u> (sb.1, obs.) |                                 |



Taken together, these three categories give an impression of just how rarefied the vocabulary is, and a fuller one than Appendix I alone would suggest. This chapter is a good example of how coinage only represents one limited aspect of creativity in diction, but also of how it is an arbitrarily-defined part of a far larger capacity for inventiveness, especially when Browne finds a 'bye and barren' theme to discuss.

Robbins's commentary testifies to the recurrence of sexual themes and subjects in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and Huntley summarises the extent of Browne's 'fascination' with sex, and recounts his observations and experiments. Concluding this useful section, Huntley remarks:

There may have been inside Browne's etymological head a relationship between 'conceit' as a vulgar error and 'mistaken conception' in biology. He uses for error the Latin word mola (II, vi, 159) which had two meanings: a fleshy mass occurring in the womb, and also a false idea.<sup>13</sup>

In this chapter, Browne does not fail to use the opportunity to toy again with conception. There are nine occasions in which the verb conceive or the noun conception are used, and if a pun is not always necessarily lurking in the background, nonetheless the inherent pattern of homonymy is exploited, as in: "...the inconceivable mutation of temper, which should yearly alternate the sex..." (R. 228), or again, with obtrusive parallelism of word-endings in: "...certain holes... being perceived in males, made some conceive there might also be a faeminine nature..." (R. 231). Such word-play has the appearance of being accidental here, but the reader has to be attentive. Elsewhere in Pseudodoxia Epidemica Browne shows how fond he can be of puns and verbal paradoxes; the 'conceit' example is just one of many attempts to exploit multiple meanings.

<sup>13</sup> Huntley, p. 168

Puns, conceits or ironies frequently decorate, but occasionally support the central body of ideas and associations particular to a chapter in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and this central body may be marked by a key word, operating as an overt or covert master-figure. Rarely is this a 'hard' word; that which normally serves the purpose is a term or group of connected terms which is capable of referring to both literal and metaphoric levels of argument. Conceit and conception function well in III, 17; they show at the ironic level how conception, or fruitful issue is not to be expected from the notion that hares change sex, because aberrations from the natural order cannot result in regular increase of the species; they support Browne's contention that the alternation of sex is "injurious unto the order of nature" (R. 228). More literally, they emphasise that the vulgar error itself is but a conceit, or a series of conceits, which apply fancy rather than reason to the subject.

In Book VII, chapter 1, "Of the Forbidden fruit", the word apple and words with associations of sound with it are exploited; it operates effectively as a key word, along with fruit, to supply comic and ironic commentary. Prompted by Virgil's pun on Mālum, the chapter begins with a commentary on the vulgarity of those who etymologise so badly as to take the evil (malum) of the Fall as proof that Eve's fruit was an apple, and the puns which follow allude back implicitly to the vulgarity of the opinion first noted:

...some fruits passe under the name of Adams apples, which in common acception admit not that appellation... (R. 536)

common heads will fly unto superstitious applications... (R. 537-8)

Since therefore after this fruit curiosity fruitlessly enquireth... (R. 539)

Browne's delight in this kind of pun is widespread; some misplaced or ludicrous feature of the error is used to deride those who would sustain the belief.



Another, more subtle example is present in Book III, chapter 1, "Of the Elephant". Here, the idea that elephants have no joints is held by men who forget the various pieces of evidence which Browne proceeds to supply; this is not punning, but implicitly alluding to a feature of elephants which is nowhere made explicit:

... herein methinks men much forget themselves, not well considering the absurditie of such assertions. (R. 160)

...men strangely forget the obvious felations of history (R. 162)

...they forget what is delivered by Xiphilinus... (R. 162)

...they call not to minde that memorable show of Germanicus. (R. 162)

...They forget the Etymologie of the Knee... (R. 162)

...they forget or consult not experience. (R. 162)

Elephants never forget, of course.

Again, in Book III chapter 4, the idea that the beaver bites off his testicles to escape capture:

...is a tenent very ancient, and hath had thereby advantage of propagation... (R. 172)

The old story takes advantage of the beaver's loss of the ability to propagate to propagate itself, and Browne repeats the pun - the story "hath been propagated by Emblems..." The same subtle irony is at work, creating antithetical patterns and exploiting double meanings.

As in Religio Medici, transmutation of diction is an active principle in producing effects of wit, surprise and elegance. This digression has been necessary to show the hard words are not used in the production of metaphysical effects unless some quality of sound or association fits them for the purpose, but rather to support either the learned or pedantic observations and commentary. Their presence more usually provides a kind of pyrotechnic display upon the surface of erudition, and by their scintillations, the ironic sub-texts are made even more shadowy. The next example shows something of a

specialised vocabulary in use in a plain and sober discussion of a topic, existing side by side with a comic and richly rhetorical exploitation of the absurdities inherent in a vulgar error.

Book III, chapter 19: "Of Lampries".

This chapter opens with a decorously ironic<sup>14</sup> allusion to Polyphemus, followed by a piece of typically ornamental parallelism:

...an error concerning eyes, occasioned by the errour of eyes... (R. 237)

There is something irresistible to Browne in this kind of comedy of words, and here eyes serve as the barely submerged image governing the course of the whole chapter. As to hard words, these arise in a small but significant number at a particular juncture of the argument. Halfway through the second paragraph, after the humorous allusion to Solomon's proverb about a wise man's eyes being in his head (Eccl. 2: 14), Browne drops out of a satirical mode into a plain discussion of the 'reasonableness' of the belief that Lampries have nine eyes. Until this point, the vocabulary has not been elaborate; the only coinage used has been inartificial in the first paragraph, where there is no stridency of latinisms; but together with a change in tone goes a sudden rush of polysyllabic novelties. In two sentences (from "True it is..." to "...opposite points at once", R. 238) we encounter sanguineous, quadrupedes and latirostrous, together with laterally, recorded by the O.E.D. as having only one user prior to Browne. In the final short paragraph which concludes the chapter, there are three more coinages, cetaceous, cartilaginous and protuberance, and fistula and conformation are registered by the O.E.D. as first used by Browne in the particular senses which apply here.

The rush of coinages and uncommon terms accompanies what is

<sup>14</sup> The particular figure embodying irony is synchoresis, discussed, as is the rhetorical structure of this chapter, in ch. 7 below, pp. 200-208.



essentially a discourse on anatomy, and Browne is always fastidious in the precision of his diction when he acts as anatomist. There is some re-expression of terms, and these words are all re-expressed in some synonymous manner, or explained with equivalent terms: latirostrous, cetaceous, protuberance, and fistula; but it is not a rhapsodic or ornamental set of restatements. The final paragraph's second half is a digression into an account of the lamprey's physique, and has the appearance of being derived from the inspection of a lamprey upon dissection. There is no marvelling, no metaphysics, and no comedy. What happens in this chapter is that the devices used to attack error occupy the early section, and these concern themselves with the principles and theories of vision. Huntley's remarks on the three determinators of truth are worth recalling here:

...far more often the three "cures for error" or "determinators of truth" are reduced to two. "Authority" tends to disappear, not because Browne is ambiguous but because in science "reason" and "ocular proof" are the authority.<sup>15</sup>

In this chapter, the argument from reason is carried by rhetorical means, and that from ocular observation by a punctilious vocabulary. Argument from authority is not so much absent as submerged here; Robbins has noted Browne's general debt to Aldrovandus<sup>16</sup> on this subject, as with many others in Book III.

As with the chapter on Hares, the same process is at work to produce a specialised vocabulary, and further evidence of this can be seen in groups of coinages which are outgrowths of subject matter specific to each of these three chapters:

Book III, chapter 16 deals with the supposed eating of the female viper by its emerging offspring; the pertinent coinages include: disruption, eruptive, exesion, parricidous, parturition and prorruption.

<sup>15</sup> Huntley, op. cit., p.154

<sup>16</sup> P.E., Vol. II, p. 853.

Book III, chapter 21 deals with the supposed ability of the chameleon to subsist on a diet of air, and produces the following coined terms: exenteration, hiation, ingustible, nutrication, pabulous and sapidity.

Book III, chapter 23 deals with the physical nature and attributes of Unicorns' Horn, and produces: antidotat, antidotally, cochleary, lapidescencies, nasicornous, petrifactive.

Almost one-third of the coinages of Pseudodoxia Epidemica are to be found in Book III, which deals with subjects in animal Natural History, and their presence as part of a diction of scientifically wide scope is perfectly clear. In the previous chapter of this thesis, the degree to which scientists like Boyle and Ray made direct use of such vocabulary was discussed, and its range outlined here confirms its utility. The hypothesis that can be derived from this is difficult to avoid proposing: that Browne uses a separable invented jargon of a scientific or potentially scientific kind, and that it is used in a distinct mode or register of discourse, found in areas of enquiry into physical (rather than abstract) subjects. This broad theory can be tested against other identifiable modes of writing, as perceivable in other Books of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and later works. But erecting any such hypothesis is always in danger of over-simplifying; if we consider a further example from Pseudodoxia Epidemica, with a close attention to the detail and manner of argument, as well as to the bare denotative qualities of the vocabulary, other characteristics emerge, showing hard words in use outside the specialist and technical modes of diction.

This example is the penultimate paragraph of a chapter which was first included in the 1650 edition: Book III, 25, "Concerning the common course of Diet...":

Thus we perceive the practice of diet doth hold no certain course, nor solid rule of selection or confinement; Some in an indistinct voracity eating almost any, others out of a



timorous preopinion, refraining very many. Wherein indeed necessity, reason and Physick, are the best determinators. Surely many animals may be fed on, like many plants; though not in alimmentall yet medicall considerations: Whereas having raised Antipathies by prejudgement or education, we often nauseate proper meats, and abhorre that diet which disease or temper requireth. (R. 270)

This is a summary passage, delivering general judgement upon the precedent particulars, which have, by Browne's usual standards in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, been rhapsodic rather than persuasive. It is a survey of beliefs about eating, and of dietary habits, and as Robbins has shown,<sup>17</sup> relies heavily on the treatises of Nonnius (Diaeteticon, 1646) and Castellanus (De Esu Carnium, 1626). The absence of a focus for argument makes for a digressive quality, as in the chapters on blackness; Robbins's observation on Book VI, chapter 10 "Of the Blacknesse of Negroes", serves as apt commentary on many of the vagrant chapters such as this:

Since the topic is not amenable to decision by authority or experiment, they are supplanted by eclectic theorizing and verbose rationalization. (R. 1063)

This summary paragraph is gross with latinisms, to the extent that its meaning is obscure at a first reading. Certain words are put to unfamiliar use; the O.E.D. records this use of indistinct, being equivalent to 'indiscriminate', as rare, and the first recorded usage. Preopinion is a coinage, and so is selection, whose modern currency challenges the reader's historical sense of perspective. Determinators is essentially Browne's own, though not a coinage, a word which fits the peculiar requirements of Pseudodoxia Epidemica in the same way as words like assertors, perpension, and illation, a vocabulary fitted for describing and weighing opinion. In the first sentence, any and many are used as euphonious parallel terminations - homoioteleuton -

17 P.E., Vol. II, pp. 874-880

to make a musical cadence; but in the process, clarity suffers. Some such term as "foods", or "animals" or "meats" is lacking after each, and the sense of incompleteness is a more significant flaw than the persistence of polysyllables.

It is a paragraph which gropes towards both a discrimination between the eatable and the edible, and a theory designed to show that dietary prejudices lack foundations in reason or necessity. In neither case, however, does this summary make any arbitration; there is no single vulgar error to be opposed, and the mass of opinion is left behind as a series of arabesques on a basic design. The special character of the discourse throws up coinages - commensality, sarcophagie, disanimation - in the way noted above, but this sample paragraph shows a different register of diction, which is learned to a non-specialist end. It is a register fitted for reasoning rather than experiment, for arranging the terms of argument; a number of words which were not familiar in English before 1646 can be seen as proper to this register. In this category we can place words such as incapacity, veniable, declarable; a large number of words formed with negative prefixes, such as unquarrelable, improbably, impardonably, inconditional, and inadvertisement; and an even larger number of adverbs: analogously, incontrovertibly, numerally, rectangularly, traditionally, and so on. I have already intimated that, in the case of Boyle and other physical scientists, it is a diction in which specific terms of science predominate that is influential, and not this more general, discursive vocabulary.

There is, then, one area of innovative technical diction in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, whose novelty arises directly out of Browne's subject-matter, and a separate area which innovates so as to present the arguments appropriately, and to express opinion in varied and persuasive ways. The distinction between innovation related to matter or to manner is undoubtedly a crude one, but it serves to suggest



that Browne evolves new forms both in analysing the subjects of enquiry and in creating a rhetoric of judgement and doubt. We can even suggest that these two areas correspond to the basic divisions of rhetoric, inventio and dispositio, the one collecting material, the other arranging it.

In the chapter on diet, the words associated with the arrangement of argument - selection, preopinion, indistinct, determinators - can be considered as of a general utility, and somewhat difficult to classify; but there are definable orders of new words in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, such as those which name or define precisely those who hold opinions, or have assumed authority to pronounce on the subjects Browne deals with. Many such words describe exactly the relationship between man and his subject: describers, beholders, discerners, considerators, conjecturers and so on, and few of these are coinages; however, their use is very common, and suggests that the manner in which errors are considered requires particular means of naming those who comment upon them, or are otherwise involved in their perpetuation, promotion, or demolition. Browne's practice throws up a wealth of associated words which describe experts in in specific areas of learning or experience, and many of these are coinages: emblematisit, metallist, veterinarian, numerist and so on.

This precision in the assignment of opinion and experience corresponds with his punctilious definition of areas of learning, which his virtuosity in the making of adverbs demonstrates. Thus, in many chapters of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, there is a wealth of adverbs which carry the weight of meaning to denote the correct way of looking at a problem, or in some way to make pointed discriminations. Innovations of this type include formations such as: anatomically, antonomastically, horizontally, illustratively and venificiously, but an example of the use of such terms of disposition in context will more graphically

show how much emphasis, compression and precise discrimination

Browne achieves in his uses of adverbs:

And under all these considerations were some Animals refrained;  
so the Jews abstained from Swine at first symbolically, as an  
Embleme of impurity; and not for fear of the Leprosie, as  
Tacitus would put upon them. The Cretians superstitiously,  
upon tradition that Jupiter was suckled in that country by  
a Sowe. Some Ægyptians politically, because they supplied  
the labour of plowing by rooting up the ground. (R. 268)

There are instances of this kind of adverbial succession elsewhere,  
as in Book III, chapter 12: "diversly, contrarily, or contradictorily"  
(R. 203), and Book IV, chapter 12: "Hieroglyphically, metaphorically,  
illustratively" (R. 342), and besides showing Browne's sensitivity  
to the needs of the precise arrangement of ideas, they suggest how  
attractive to him was decorum in presentation. The disquisition on  
the Lake Asphaltites (VII, 15) has an opening paragraph which is  
organised around a long sequence of adverbs that provides fine  
discrimination among a mass of conflicting opinions. Men deliver  
their opinions "variously"; some "too largely", "some more moderately...",  
"most traditionally", few "experimentally", "divers contradictorily,  
or contrarily"; Aristotle "lightly", and finally, Andrew Thevet  
"ocularly". All these qualifications form a valuable perspective  
of the whole body of opinion, which Browne uses to underpin a  
careful and moderate conclusion:

And therefore, untill judicibus and ocular experiment confirme  
or distinguish the assertion, that bodies doe not sinke herein  
at all we doe not yet beleeeve; that they not easily or with  
more difficulty descend in this then other water we shall  
readily assent: but to conclude an impossibility from a difficulty,  
or affirme whereas things not easily sinke, they doe not drowne  
at all; beside the fallacy, is a frequent addition in humane  
expression, and an amplification not unusuall as well in opinions  
as relations; which oftentimes give indistinct accounts of  
proximities, and without restraint transcend from one unto  
another. (R. 585)



The adverbs of the first paragraph have enabled Browne to be brief, to be precise in assigning experience and opinion to their proper areas of relevance, or to judge their consistency or relevance, and to make a pattern which both guides the reader through a wealth of opinion and disposes the ideas into definable groups. When, therefore, judgement is pronounced, Browne's task is made much easier, and the compressions of expression - here involving unusual phrases and usage, such as "indistinct accounts of proximities" - are not obscure, because the landscape of opinion has already been drawn in so clearly.

The procedure of such a chapter confirms that an error needs to be examined in appropriate diction, not just for the sake of logic and reason, but because things in nature exist in an order, part of an ascertainable design. The linguistic resources with which Browne works enable him to match that design more appropriately, both originating terms and disposing them suitably to the character of each chapter in Pseudodoxia Epidemica.

#### THE GARDEN OF CYRUS.

Design in The Garden of Cyrus is strongly marked, as befits its subject. The structure within which the quincunx is discussed is itself distinguished by the emphatic use of adverbs in the way noted above, both in the work's subtitle and in the running page-headings: "The Quincunx Artificially, Naturally, Mystically considered". In the dedicatory letter to Nicholas Bacon, Browne promises a "Garden Discourse", and explains the reasons why he has ranged into "extraneous things", and been confident to "conjoyn these parts of different subjects". (M. 87) There is a promise of rhapsody here beyond that in any other of his works.

Browne seems to imply that The Garden of Cyrus is in some way a preliminary study, notes towards a study of universal patterning. Joan Bennett, sympathetic towards the aims of the work as she is, sees as one of its characteristics a "delight in speculation that leads nowhere".<sup>18</sup> This seems a fair remark, considering the work's digressive elements; but there are many signs that Browne did not see his digressions as either irrelevancies to a central theme, nor as pleasant strayings from a rational structure. Close to the end of chapter V comes this forceful assessment of the ways in which truth may be discovered, and the semi-personification of "error" at the end of the passage shows that Browne has in mind something of the same purpose as that which lies behind Pseudodoxia Epidemica:

A large field is yet left unto sharper discerners to enlarge upon this order, to search out the quaternio's and figured draughts of this nature, and moderating the study of names, and meer nomenclature of plants, to erect generalities, disclose unobserved proprieties, not only in the vegetable shop, but the whole volume of nature; affording delightful Truths, confirmable by sense and ocular Observation, which seems to me the surest path, to trace the Labyrinth of Truth. For though discursive enquiry and rationall conjecture, may leave handsome gashes and flesh-wounds; yet without conjunction of this expect no mortal or dispatching blows unto errour. (M. 174)

For Browne, truth is a very large concept indeed. It is not just a corrective for error, but also something to be relished and enjoyed; scientific discovery will disclose truths, but the enjoyment of them and the pleasure of expressing them is equal to the knowledge of them. Norman Mackenzie's appraisal of the aesthetic predisposition of The Garden of Cyrus support's Browne's own idea of his treatise; he writes, having corrected the anachronistic views of W.P. Dunn in the process:

<sup>18</sup> Bennett, op. cit., pp. 210-211



In spite of the adjacence of firm knowledge, close observations and speculation, each is in its proper place in The Garden of Cyrus. It is not an intermingling of the concrete and the abstract which exists in this work in particular. When dealing with the concrete, Browne is accurate, scholarly in arrangement, careful in consideration and his bases of inference are scholarly, not whimsical. That, let it be repeated, is not the end of the process in enlarging and developing knowledge in its various spheres.<sup>19</sup>

There is a close relationship between the process of enlarging and developing knowledge in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and that which follows it in Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus. Browne's work on vulgar errors occupied him in revisions, corrections and additions through a quarter of a century, and the urge to correct misconceptions - ultimately, a paedagogic urge - is present in all his work. To grasp this is to see all his work as the expression of a temperament that is both scholarly and digressive.

The investigation of his diction in Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus makes possible commentary on the character of these works very like that made on the earlier works. The statistics of coinage offered in Appendix I show that The Garden of Cyrus contains around four times as many innovations as Hydriotaphia, which fact caused me to focus upon the former rather than the latter. Hydriotaphia certainly does have its own specialised vocabulary, evolved to handle its peculiar subjects; it is a diction of bone, burial chambers, ashes, tombs and graverobbery, as shown in this sample of innovations: cremation, incremable, incinerable, expilators, pyre, tear-bottle, ossuary and lachrymatories. However, the distribution of new words is very uneven, with almost all of them occurring in chapters III and IV, and none being present in the closing chapter, that which is prized above all other passages of Browne's prose for its purple sonorities. Equally, the last chapter of The Garden of Cyrus

19 Norman Mackenzie, "Sir Thomas Browne as a Man of Learning...", in English Studies in Africa, X (1967), p.80

is that which is least marked by innovation. This is sufficient evidence that there is no direct correlation between the making of words and Browne's renowned 'organ peal' or sublime rhetoric.

The diction of The Garden of Cyrus is specialised in a number of directions. There is one overarching concern with cross-shaped or cinqueform patterning, which issues in (a) a general vocabulary related to form; (b) a more specific theoretical set of words concerned with the number five and its geometry; and (c), a group of terms concerned with crosses and quincuncial nature in disparate areas. Under these loose headings, we can categorize the following innovations taken from Appendix I:

(a) decussate	(b) diametrals	(c) crucigerous
decussation (etc...)	pentagonally	retiary
cornigerous	chiasmus	interarboration
aculeous	æquicrurall	empedon
longilateral	quinquernio	textury
globular	rhomboidal	
folious	frustum	

After this large class of new words are a number of introductions from the natural sciences. These include the names of species, zoological and botanical, both homely and learned, such as acari, gnatworm and cunny-fish, and ragweed and gentianella; words related to the anatomy and physiology of animals and plants, as: omasus, quadruped (used before, in Pseudodoxia Epidemica), apophyses; and frutex, staminous and calicular. Yet a further group is concerned with the scientific process itself, coining terms to describe practitioners and their methods: botanologer, botanical, phytology, tulipist, numerists. This natural historical group of coinages emanates mainly from chapter III - "The Quincunx Naturally considered" - in which I number no fewer than sixty innovations, making it the most densely neologistic area of Browne's prose. There is some correspondence here with Tracts I and II in Certain Miscellany Tracts, in which there is innovation in the same area, and confirmation of Merton's view:



The Garden of Cyrus reveals his close observation of the countryside and his close reading in authorities like Theophrastus, Dioscorides, Pliny and Belon... (it) is, among other things, the notebook of a careful and imaginative botanist, one who combines a scientist's love for plants with an artist's appreciation of "the higher geometry of Nature".<sup>20</sup>

What this detailed and scholarly diction further confirms is the correspondence with Pseudodoxia Epidemica. Of the four editions of Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus printed in Browne's lifetime, the second, third and fourth were all sold bound together with Pseudodoxia Epidemica; only the second of these had Religio Medici appended as well.

Beyond the scientific area, there are significant differences in diction from Pseudodoxia Epidemica. Few terms peculiar to the ordering of argument are used or originated as in the earlier work. There are not the same necessities for convoluted statements of opinion or careful arbitration, and despite the presence of innovations such as anomalous, abstrucities, and paralogical, these arise out of simply constructed contexts, out of Browne's normal fecundity of expression, rather than any special structural dictates of the context. In The Garden of Cyrus, there is no weighing of large bodies of evidence; the weight of fact and information is used as illustration, not as evidence; and the opinions of special authorities are normally used to expand the theme, not to limit it.

There is large-scale re-expression of terms which are unfamiliar, but there is little by way of marginal glossing in either Hydriotaphia or The Garden of Cyrus; both cariola and medallions are glossed, and the O.E.D. cites Browne as their first user. On the other hand, there

20 E.S. Merton, "The Botany of Sir Thomas Browne", in Isis XLVII (1956), p. 162.

is much re-expression, mostly of one kind - the provision of a homely term to counterbalance a scholarly one, as in these very effective instances:

pappous or downy; exiguity and smallnesse; fasciating or wrapt up; coagulum or Runnet; conopeion or gnatnet, or in longer forms such as: "the Cuneus and Forceps, or the sheare and wedge battles..." (M. 140).

The parallelism of both the works of 1658 is not of the same rich variety as in Religio Medici, and on occasion, the headlong quality of discourse in The Garden of Cyrus threatens the coherence of the treatise; reduplication of statement serves to make more plain or explicit, and not to pause for meditation. I consider this feature of apparent rapidity in chapter eight below, but here it can be noted how the thread of ideas in chapters III and IV becomes very difficult to follow; this is mainly due to Browne's failure to observe the normal rules of syntax, omitting finite verbs and so on, but his choice of words is open to criticism at several points.

In chapter III (M. 152), there is a sudden change of register out of a fairly plain piece of observation, concerned with sexangular design in the anatomy of bees, into a pompous piece of circumlocution:

He ... must have a more piercing eye then mine; who finds out the shape of Buls heads, in the guts of Drones pressed out behinde, according to the experiment of Gomesius; wherein notwithstanding there seemeth somewhat which might incline a pliant fancy to credulity of similitude.

This concessive clause which ends the paragraph is out of character with the kind of statement normally attached to reports of experience in The Garden of Cyrus. It reads, rather, like the kind of ornately qualified assertion which might be found in Pseudodoxia Epidemica after an attempt at a difficult piece of arbitration. Here, I am at a loss to explain its presence, and can only suggest that it indicates a carelessly pedantic moment of composition.



In the following chapter (M. 159), the opening short paragraph resorts to a similar inflated diction, of such a kind that it may be wise to suspect that Browne is engaged in a little piece of self-mockery:

As for the delights, commodities, mysteries, with other concernments of this order, we are unwilling to fly them over, in the short deliveries of Virgil, Varro, or others, and shall therefore enlarge with additional ampliatiions.

The final four words make up a pleasantly comical piece of tautology, that seems quite apt in the breathing space after the torrent of facts of chapter III, and before the more speculative observations it precedes. It is a tautology which is related to Browne's consciousness of his own manner and structure, most visible in chapter I, where successive statements of Browne's own opinions run as follows:

...yet shall we chiefly insist on... (M. 131), ...Where by the way we shall decline... (M. 132), ...We will not revive the mysterious crosses..., ...we shall not call in the Hebrew Tenupha... (M. 133)

These pieces of commentary seem intended to vary the surface by using different forms of words to convey, simply, the inclusion or exclusion of material, which later in the work Browne abandons in favour of the perfunctory formula "To omit...", or "Not to omit...". What is the least important matter to Browne in disposing material in The Garden of Cyrus is orthodoxy in syntax, and it shows; there are special rhetorical structures which function as he needs them, which I describe in chapters seven and eight, and this specialisation is best accounted for by Norman Mackenzie:

...his responses to his material in The Garden of Cyrus constitute a "ritualization" that gives us art and not a scientific treatise.<sup>21</sup>

21 Mackenzie, op. cit., p.76

Browne's voluminous origination and importation of terms in The Garden of Cyrus (bearing always in mind the limitations and defects of the O.E.D., treated in chapter two), exists alongside a lack of concern for conventional sentence structure. It looks like a recipe for literary anarchy, and such a combination of factors probably lay behind Pater's difficulty in responding:

The Garden of Cyrus, though it end indeed with a passage of wonderful felicity, certainly emphasises (to say the least) the defects of Browne's literary good qualities. His chimeric fancy carries him here into a kind of frivolousness, as if he felt himself almost too safe with his public, and were not himself quite serious, or dealing fairly with it; and in a writer such as Browne levity must of necessity be a little ponderous.<sup>22</sup>

The Garden of Cyrus is addressed and dedicated to "a serious student in the highest arcana's of Nature" (M. 88). It deals with determinedly out-of-the-way matter; Browne emphasises the desirability of "excursions" or digressions, introduces terms from a host of different arts and sciences, and employs, for much of its length, incomplete sentence structures. Against this background, the innovative character of the diction in chapters III and IV need not surprise the reader. Its character is similar to that employed in his earlier encyclopaedic work - indeed, it might be called an extension of it - and, along with Hydriotaphia, it includes a very large number of foreign or alien terms. Its intended readership would not feel lost in either its latinate vocabulary, nor among its classical and scriptural allusions, even if they might be often bemused.

To the modern reader, it can be a paradise of abstrusity and eclecticism, and to those who can respond positively, its diction is a triumph of ingenuity. The texture which Browne's vocabulary provides for the embroidery of its extraordinary metaphysics is well

22 Pater, Appreciations (1889), p. 144



exemplified in this paragraph. The anatomical observation of cruciform patterns in membranes and blood vessels is adduced as an elegant and graphic demonstration of truth in the psalmist's thanksgiving (Ps. 139: 14):

This reticulate or Net-work was also considerable in the inward parts of man, not only from the first subtegmen or warp of his formation, but in the netty fibres of the veins and vessels of life; wherein according to common Anatomy the right and transverse fibres are decussated, by the oblique fibres; and so must frame a Reticulate and Quincunciall Figure by their Obliquations, Emphatically extending that Elegant expression of Scripture. Thou hast curiously embroydered me, thou hast wrought me up after the finest way of texture, and as it were with a needle. (M. 154)

## Chapter Five

### Rhetoric: Eloquence and persuasion.

There are two elements of Browne's style which make it quite original and unlike that of any other writer; its diction, which the first half of this thesis addressed, and its rhetorical arrangement of syntax. These elements correspond approximately to the classical rhetorical divisions of inventio and dispositio, insofar as language, rather than matter, is concerned, and it is to the latter, the management of argument, which the second part of this thesis attends. Within the scope of what I have called 'rhetoric', it is necessary to describe the position which the author adopts towards his own material, so as to understand his attitudes in argument more clearly.

In this chapter, an attempt is made to explain what rhetorical writing and skills we should be alert to in Browne's work, and to define the kinds of strategy that are usefully called 'rhetorical' in examining the persuasive side of his work. In the preceding chapter, I referred to Browne's 'paedagogic' urge; the analysis of the second half of my thesis is concerned to look beyond his subject-matter, to see what kind of teaching his works provide, and how he presents his arguments.

In Religio Medici, the image of a self-effacing, unambitious and retiring writer, who is yet scholarly, quietly witty and imaginative, is effectively conveyed, whether we accept the postures of that work as real or merely 'acting', a distinction to which I shall return. When the final gesture of humility is acted out - "Thy will be done, though in my owne undoing." (R.M., I, 15, M. 75) - the self-portrait, in which Browne's personal scepticism is minutely detailed and



ornately framed by reverential assertions of faith, is completed. The rhetoric of this, however it be defined, is successful, because it has persuaded us of this personality, complete with its humilities and eccentricities. Generations of readers have testified to the attractiveness of its pacific and charitable qualities, especially seen against a troubled contemporary background in 1643. The problem which analysis of this rhetoric tends to throw up is that any evidence that Browne's creative concern is to calculate the appearance of peace, charity and tolerance seems to cut across the belief in the truth of that character.

If we accept Endicott's definition of Religio Medici as "an expressive exploration"<sup>1</sup> of character, rather than as plain autobiography, it is possible to see this calculation as both revealing the artistic process and as showing the distance between posture and reality. Rhetoric here is the persuader, and some examples of it at work are needed. It has to be emphasised that, as a compositional element, the sum total of rhetoric in Religio Medici must be directed to a different end from that part which it plays in Pseudodoxia Epidemica or in the works of 1658, because of both the declared and the apparent emotional content of the earlier work.

The first person is the essential self-reference in Religio Medici, and the structural peculiarities of Browne's use of pronouns is discussed in the next chapter. In Part II, the first section affects a description of the author's charitable disposition, and the survey of himself consists of a series of contrasts, in which the idiosyncrasies, prejudices and antipathies of mankind in general are paraded, to be contrasted with his own reasonableness. These contrasts are consistent with Browne's prefatory caution (M. 2)

<sup>1</sup> N.J.Endicott, "Some Aspects of Self-Revelation and Self-Portraiture in Religio Medici", in Essays in English Literature, ed. MacLure and Watt (1964), p. 102

that "There are many things delivered Rhetorically..." This compendium, far from modest, but framed to appear so, progresses to a diatribe against the multitude:

...that great enemy of reason, vertue and religion, the multitude, that numerous piece of monstrosity, which taken asunder seeme men, and the reasonable creatures of God; but confused together, make but one great beast, & a monstrosity more prodigious than Hydra; it is no breach of Charity to call these fooles... (M. 55)

Of this section, Joan Bennett remarks:

Browne has wandered from his own catholicity of taste into a quasi-political discourse...

and observes:

It is usually possible, even here, to perceive some continuity in his ideas, but it is even less possible than in Part I to foresee into what paths they will lead him.<sup>2</sup>

What surprises Joan Bennett here is the process of dramatisation, and in considering Part II, section 2, she finds contradictions in Browne's legalistic theories of Christian benevolence.

Browne's promptness in taking the opportunity to posture is constant throughout Religio Medici, and of course we have his own theory of metaphysics, his version of man as microcosm, as a justification:

There is all Africa, and her prodigies in us: we are that bold and adventurous piece of nature, which he that studies wisely learns in a compendium, what others labour at in a divided piece and endlesse volume. (M. 15)

While Browne's concerns are with himself as representative and universal man, the rhetorical devices and structures are generally of a decorative or patterned kind, emphasising symmetry or paradox. But when the problem of defining himself as a member of his church or his nation, or as not of the multitude, brings him into discussions

<sup>2</sup> Bennett, op. cit., p. 99



threatened by controversy, he can resort to a polemical and deceptive rhetoric.

A good example of this hidden persuasion is at Religio Medici, I, 5:

It is as uncharitable a point in us to fall upon those popular scurrilities and opprobrious scoffes of the Bishop of Rome, to whom as a temporall Prince, we owe the duty of good language: I confesse there is cause of passion betweene us; by his sentence I stand excommunicated, Heretick is the best language he affords me; yet can no eare witnesse I ever returned to him the name of Antichrist, Man of sin, or whore of Babylon; It is the method of charity to suffer without reaction:... (M. 6)

This is an accomplished piece of oratorical deception. Browne manages to call the Pope names, and to allege that he has suffered personal insult at the Pope's hands. It is possible to break down the features of rhetoric with which this is suffused. "...by his sentence I stand excommunicated": here, the general condition of Anglicans is converted into a judicial image, in which the writer claims he is personally persecuted; a species of hyperbole. "...Heretick is the best language he affords me...": an illusion of a direct relationship with the Pope is concocted; the Pope affords Browne no language in reality; a personal interchange is implied, for the purpose of offering 'evidence' to the audience, akin to the classical device of sermocinatio<sup>3</sup>. "...yet can no eare witnesse..."; here is rhetoric of an audacious kind. Browne assures his audience that they will not hear what he is about to say, because it is presented in a negative construction: "...I ever returned to him the name of Antichrist, Man of sin, or whore of Babylon...". The epithets are bound to stick, and so Browne crowds in three pieces of abuse, and luxuriates in his formal innocence. This is a very effective use of the figure paralepsis; Peacham's<sup>4</sup> definition describes clearly what

<sup>3</sup> as defined in Lee A. Sonnino, A Handbook to Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric (1968), p. 168. I am indebted to this work here and elsewhere for its thorough synthesis of the systems of traditional rhetoric.

<sup>4</sup> Sonnino, p. 136

is taking place here:

When the orator feigneth and maketh as though he would say nothing in some matter, when, notwithstanding he speaketh most of all, or when he saith something: in saying he will not say it.

Finally, "...It is the method of charity to suffer without reaction..."; this thinly-veiled piece of self-pity rounds off a triumphant piece of anti-Catholic dialectic, and is followed, ironically enough, by a denunciation of pulpit rhetoric, and an oblique flattery of the knowing reader, who is sure to include himself among the "wiser beleivers", "...who know that a good cause needs not to be patron'd by a passion, but can sustaine it selfe upon a temperate dispute."

Now, close examination of these last thirteen lines in section 5 shows how it is possible to detect a voice of Browne's to which his commentators have not accustomed us. A temperate reasoning is proclaimed, but it is superimposed upon a deeply ironic structure. The sentiments themselves are not exceptional, since elsewhere Browne is capable of vituperation - against the Jews (R.M. I, 25) or against the 'rabble' (especially in P.E. I, 3); it is the rhetorical method that is surprising, the degree to which concealed calculation is evident in such a passage. If it is not concealed calculation, or, more succinctly, ironic, then it can only be a piece of stylistic self-delusion, in which the writer is a victim of his own falsehoods; but there is such an abundance of evidence that Browne is the absolute controller of his own style, that such a possibility cannot be entertained.

There are few other examples in Religio Medici of such processes of persuasive writing. There are instances of what might be called 'open casuistry', where Browne's mode of discourse bears a resemblance to that of Bacon in certain of his Essays, such as this typical



advice:

He that questioneth much shall learn much, and content much; but especially if he apply his questions to the skill of the persons whom he asketh; for he shall give them occasion to please themselves in speaking, and himself shall continually gather knowledge.<sup>5</sup>

The appeal to self-interest is present in this advice of Browne's, too:

...where wee desire to be informed, 'tis good to contest with men above ourselves; but to confirme and establish our opinions, 'tis best to argue with judgements below our own, that the frequent spoyles and victories over their reasons may settle in our selves an esteeme... (I, 6, M. 6)

Here, neither irony nor theatricality is present. This is not the voice of he who could "lose an arme without a teare, and with few groans ... be quartered into pieces" (II, 5, M. 61), which is the extravagantly stoical posture which is repeated throughout Religio Medici. Thus, with shrewd advice existing alongside an anti-Catholic diatribe, and a range of exaggerated monodramatic poses, it is not easy to make connections; the ideas of the different personalities which go to the making of the composite character offer many contrasts, and so it is rather the mannerisms - the rhetoric, in one sense of the word - to which we have to look, for connections at a level below the literal.

The most trusting, positive and thoughtful attempt to show that the lack of consistency of ideas in Religio Medici not only embodies useful truths, but is supported by a structure appropriate and meaningful in itself, is presented by Frank Huntley, in his chapter devoted to the work. This observation characterises the focus of ideas, and makes illuminating initial comparisons:

<sup>5</sup> Bacon, Essays: XXXII, "Of Discourse".

St. John and St. Augustine Christianized Plato's double view and Browne, torn between doubt and certainty, pride and humility, adds to the vision a deep irony. To love our neighbors as ourselves, we must love ourselves; he cannot truly love others who does not look upon himself as a son of God. But the moment he thinks this, he suspects that he is not really a son of God, and such a Lepanto humbles and chastens. Again, constant self-qualification defines as precisely as possible one's concepts of God, the universe, and time.<sup>6</sup>

On style, Huntley invites similarly striking comparisons:

A sensitive reader comes to Religio as he comes to Yeats' "A Dialogue of Self and Soul" or Eliot's "Four Quartets", sensing that all three are struggles to reconcile suffering with faith in the possibility of love and meaning. As literature, all three of these "poems" use the essential methods of art: evocation, incantation, implied and expressed opposition, modulation of one tone set against another, tension, and equilibrium.<sup>7</sup>

The comparison with Yeats and Eliot is revealing; Huntley makes of Religio Medici a demand that it function as if it were poetry in its impact on the reader. While there seems to me a clear case that poetic prose is the hallmark of Religio Medici, to agree that it expresses the writer's thoughts and feelings in the same way as, say, Yeats in his final stanza, is to stretch one's literary sensitivity a long way:

I am content to follow to its source  
Every event in action or in thought;  
Measure the lot; forgive myself the lot!  
When such as I cast out remorse  
So great a sweetness flows into the breast  
We must laugh and we must sing,  
We are blest by everything,  
Everything we look upon is blest.<sup>8</sup>

6 Huntley, op. cit., p. 106

7 Huntley, p. 117

8 W.B. Yeats, Collected Poems, 2nd ed. (1950), p. 267



All literary self-portraits are selective, and Yeats bears comparison with Browne because of their equivalent focus on their own shortcomings; but in the more flexible medium that is Browne's , Religio Medici conceals as well as reveals its author, as Endicott has so cogently argued.<sup>9</sup> To what extent this concealment is Browne's purpose is not important, because it is not discoverable; and, at the risk of seeming unduly hard-headed, I suggest that its rhetoric is useful to Browne for indulging himself as well as for conveying high points of revelation. The example of rhetorical usage which disguises partisan feeling under the cover of a judicial piece of reasoning should alert us to such possibilities. In the sprawl of Religio Medici, we can find flesh and blood as well as the picture Browne paints of himself, and if rhetoric conceals an antipathy to Catholicism quite as rooted as Milton's, this need not detract from the work's value. What is captivating about Browne is that he can invite comparison with Lamb or Melville<sup>10</sup> as well as with Yeats or Eliot, and that as well as rhetoric that is sublime, there is much that may deceive us in the familiar tone of Religio Medici.

Morris Croll detected the lack of logical movement in Religio Medici, showing how typical periods at their end:

...are saying exactly what they were at the beginning. Their advance is wholly in the direction of a more vivid imaginative realization; a metaphor revolves, as it were, displaying its different facets; a series of metaphors flash their lights; or a chain of "points" and paradoxes reveals the energy of a single apprehension in the writer's mind.<sup>11</sup>

Croll's analysis helps to show how what he defines as Browne's baroque structure tends away from logical succession and towards

9 N.J.Endicott, "Some Aspects of Self-Revelation..." in Essays in English Literature, ed. MacLure and Watt (1964) pp. 85-102

10 In: J.S.Iseman, A Perfect Sympathy: Charles Lamb and Sir Thomas Browne (1937); and: R.M.Vande Kieft, "When Big Hearts Strike Together..." in Papers in Language & Literature, V (1969) pp. 39-50.

11 Morris W. Croll, "The Baroque Style in Prose" (1st printed 1929), reprinted in Literary English since Shakespeare, ed. Geo. Watson (1970), p.95.

loose or casual expressiveness. In a work the length of Religio Medici, with the range of opinion, the weight of allusions, and the importance of dramatic posture, it is inevitable that extremes of either opinion or expression will be displayed. Out of context, sentiments such as these:

...at my death I mean to take a totall adieu of the world, not caring for a Monument, History, or Epitaph, not so much as the bare memory of my name to be found any where but in the Universall Register of God... (I, 41, M. 39)

suggest a serenity bred out of an extraordinary conjunction of egotism and humility; but because the whole work accustoms us to the recurrence of such attitudinizing, we can reconcile ourselves in the kind of response which Huntley finds congenial. We are in a poet's presence, rather than that of a doctor simply defending his calling, but it is not always a poet, as Coleridge suggested, "in his best clothes".<sup>12</sup>

My analysis of vocabulary has shown that Religio Medici demonstrates a different attitude to the making of words from the later works; it also suggests that the earlier work has a rhetorical structure which gives it a certain independence. There are features of syntax common to Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and to Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus which are not obvious in Religio Medici, and rhetorical formalities used to dispose and arrange scholarly matter, appropriate to the impersonal nature of treatises, which in Religio Medici would detract from both its familiarity and its freedom of gesture.

There is the persisting problem of the nature of rhetoric itself, and the fact that it is a term whose significance is as elusive and contradictory as its cousin, "style". The elements

<sup>12</sup> S.T.Coleridge, in Select Poetry & Prose, ed. Stephen Potter (1933), p. 414



of my attempt to interpret the place, types and functions of schemes and patterns in chapters seven and eight may fairly be assessed as rhetorical analysis, but I am conscious that wise heads before me have shied from such analysis. The caution expressed by Norman Mackenzie represents a view that forensic investigation is doomed to produce reductive conclusions:

Nor should we forget in this scientific age wherein Literature has been too often treated as something for chemical analysis and precise definition, that the human being which a work of art reflects is not a compound of consistent ingredients. To be vexed by human inconsistency is a sign of absolutist demands, a lack of tolerance, mistaken idealism and defective observation. With Sir Thomas Browne the surgical critic is bound to be baffled by a complexity of personality even when it clearly emerges.<sup>13</sup>

There is much to agree with here, but it can be retorted that to rest content in a state of puzzlement is no sign of 'negative capability'. One may repose with doubt, but not with an unsolved problem, and there remain features of Browne's prose which can be described, even if no final explanation of the creative personality emerges from them, and such description will help to define the manner of Browne's extraordinary compositions. All literary criticism is at best founded upon interim principles.

Under the heading of 'Rhetoric' can be considered all verbal and structural patterning which deviates from a 'normal' word-order, or which organises words in an ascertainable design. Browne's probing concern with design, seen at large in The Garden of Cyrus, eloquently in Religio Medici and intermittently in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, is such that investigation of his style has to proceed with the same thoroughness that would be applied to an analysis of a contemporary and 'metaphysical' poet - Vaughan, for instance, or

13 Mackenzie, "Sir Thomas Browne as a Man of Learning", ESA, X (1967), p.85.

even Milton. Thus, the meaning which I want to assign to the word 'rhetoric' is a broad one. As a preliminary, three facts about the kind of patterning encountered in Browne's works need to be mentioned:

1. Browne does use rhetorical devices of the classical oratorical tradition, for the purposes of eloquence and persuasion.
2. He uses such standard figures and other, non-traditional formulae in ways which may promote his own freedom of expression, but which can also tend away from persuasion and eloquence. An example is his habitual use of paralepsis, treated at length in chapter eight.
3. There is evidence that Browne, schooled along with all his contemporaries in classical rhetorical lore, can manipulate traditional figures and schemes for his own ends, either as a humorous or an aesthetic device, to a degree that suggests we have to exercise caution in committing his prose to an analysis of its classical elements.

Brian Vickers quotes Susenbrotus on the purpose of instilling principles of rhetoric into the minds of schoolboys, which he says is none other than "... to understand the mind of the author who is being read..."<sup>14</sup> It is quite possible to take a number of tropes and schemes of classical formulation and attempt an analysis of their occurrence, and to argue their significance and meaning in context. But such an attempt is likely to result in partiality and fragmentariness. It is just as possible to account for intricacies in the prose from an opposite angle, and to refer to classical models, not as starting-points, but as aids to analysis. To place too much reliance on classical schemes as keys to interpretation is to retreat to the schoolboy's rote-learning.

The most open-minded manner of interpreting an author's style is to develop an awareness of the inherent peculiarities of his approach to his subject. My search is for Browne's most significant idiosyncrasies,

<sup>14</sup> Brian Vickers, Francis Bacon and Renaissance Prose (1968), p. 49



even if they are not his most prominent. This means that interpretations which explain the style of a literary work in terms of some general theory, linking it to an external genre, movement or pattern, are not necessarily aids to comprehension of the works themselves nor of the author's mind. The general theory, for example, that prose of the late Renaissance in England can fall into either Ciceronian or Senecan 'schools' of style is too vague to be of use against the detailed treatment of diction provided here. John Carey persuasively calls these labels "contentious slogans".<sup>15</sup> More useful is the suggestion offered by Vickers that:

...the outlines of the traditional symmetries of syntax and of the local argumentative power of imagery could well be applied to the work of Shakespeare, Sidney, Raleigh, Nashe, Hooker, Sir Thomas Browne and others...<sup>16</sup>

I take this view to correspond with Browne's attitude to knowledge: that it is better to seek truth in nature, or things before our eyes, than to rely on authority and tradition.

Browne himself displays a distinctive attitude towards rhetoric, as frequent references in Religio Medici testify. On a positive note, he uses the term to denote the power of persuasion in the inspired language of Solomon:

Hee that giveth to the poore lendeth to the Lord; there is more Rhetorick in that one sentence than in a Library of Sermons, and indeed if those sentences were understood by the Reader, with the same Emphasis as they are delivered by the Author, wee needed not those Volumes of instructions, but might bee honest by an Epitome. (II, 13, M. 73)

But customarily, rhetoric is seen as the means by which stronger minds maintain their sway over the understandings of the weaker, or the multitude. Satan possesses a powerful rhetorical ability (R.M. I, 20),

<sup>15</sup> John Carey, op. cit., p. 390

<sup>16</sup> Brian Vickers, op. cit., p. 261

and the ears of the vulgar "are opener to Rhetorick then Logick" (R.M. I, 5, M. 6). The case against rhetoric is most plainly set out in Pseudodoxia Epidemica I, 3, where rhetoric is again interpreted as the antithesis of logic. To man in general, and the "deceptible part of mankind" in particular:

...a piece of Rhetorick is a sufficient argument of Logick, an Apologue of Æsop, beyond a Syllogisme in Barbara, parables then propositions, and proverbs more powerfull, then demonstrations. (R. 16)

This view consists with Browne's declared intent in Pseudodoxia Epidemica not to indulge in persuasion at the expense of demonstration:

...wee are not Magisteriall in opinions, nor have wee Dictator-like obtruded our conceptions, but in the humility of Enquiries or disquisitions, have only proposed them unto more ocular discerners. ("To the Reader", R. 4)

There can be few authors who show such concern that their readers should not be deceived, and in recognition of the insidiousness of rhetoric, in Religio Medici he realises it as a feature of his own and man's imperfect condition:

...the practice of men ... often runnes counter to their Theory; we naturally know what is good, but naturally pursue what is evill: the Rhetoricke wherewith I perswade another cannot perswade myselfe: there is a depraved appetite in us, that will with patience heare the learned instructions of Reason; but yet performe no farther than agrees to its owne irregular Humour. (I, 55, M. 52)

Browne's mistrust of eloquence, here extending to a mistrust of himself and inviting us to read him with caution, stands at an opposite extreme from the view expressed by Bacon in his discussion of the 'science' of rhetoric:

...speech is much more conversant in adorning that which is good, than in colouring that which is evil; for there is no man but speaketh more honestly than he can do or think...<sup>17</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Bacon, The Advancement of Learning, II, xviii.3 (ed. Johnston, 1974, p. 140)



Browne rarely offers us easy certainties of this kind. In the examination of his style which follows, his symmetries and schemes of expression will be seen to embody decoration, euphony, humour and a persuasive intent; but most significantly, they are capable of expressing doubts and uncertainty in the way that Keats approved, "without any irritable reaching after fact and reason".<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Keats, Letter to George and Tom Keats, December 1817. Joan Bennett uses the passage in which this phrase occurs as epigraph to her critical biography, Sir Thomas Browne (1962).

## Chapter Six

The Author's presence.

It is sometimes possible for the most elementary particles of discourse to reveal an author's motives or attitudes. Having looked at Browne's use of a diction tending to a complex extreme of erudition, I now want to preface the account of his manner of argument with a description of his references to himself, since, across the range of his works, his use of personal pronouns and his omission of them vary in instructive ways.

At a very obvious level (and I am aware of skirting the obvious quite perilously in this analysis), 'I' is used as the essential pronoun of self-reference in Religio Medici, and its use far exceeds that of the impersonal plural 'we'. In a work purportedly autobiographical, so much we would expect, while in Christian Morals, a work constructed to address the reader through a succession of imperatives as a second person, we would equally expect the virtual absence of either singular or plural pronoun, 'I' or 'we', that is one of its features. Whatever may be the eccentricities of either work, in respect of their use of pronouns, there is no peculiarity of idiom.

The 'I' of Religio Medici is, nonetheless, given a voice whose idiosyncrasies are such that the reader is uneasy about accepting its utterances at face value. That some readers<sup>1</sup> have done so is regrettable, because it has produced confused notions about the kind of work Religio Medici is. The hyperboles and pleasant tropes which are used to support the dramatic postures of the narrator are not

<sup>1</sup> Such as D.K.Ziegler, in In Divided and Distinguished Worlds (1943), esp. pp. 98-99



consistent with a work of moral didacticism, but with a unique kind of monodrama. The first person of Religio Medici weeps at processions (I, 3), realises himself as a cannibal (I, 37), is "the miserablest person extant" (I, 38), holds "Lucifer's court" in his breast (I, 51) and Adam within him (II, 10), is beheld by his friends in a cloud (II, 4), and "could lose an arme without a teare" (II, 5); dozens of these hyperbolic postures make up the fabric in which the first person 'I' is best interpreted after Endicott's fashion:

The word 'I' is used hundreds of times, but this 'I' is to some extent a creation, not a person who wants to tell all or introduce himself in his slippers, to say nothing of the further undress proposed by Montaigne.<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Johnson's attitude was to take Religio Medici as some kind of naive confession of faith interspersed with flights of fancy; commenting on the narrator's willingness to lose an arm, he writes:

I am not sure that he felt in himself ... anything more than a sudden effervescence of imagination, which, uncertain and involuntary as it is, he mistook for settled resolution.<sup>3</sup>

This contrasts with the "natural and becoming egotism" of the work in which Coleridge took delight,<sup>4</sup> and which he saw as Browne's common ground with Montaigne.

Much of Religio Medici's appeal exists in the shifting quality of this revelation of character, and the challenge offered to the reader who is prepared to hunt down conscious and unconscious ironies, but we should also bear in mind Endicott's caution:

...it would be a foolish affectation to imply that one can always only approach his revelation of himself obliquely.<sup>5</sup>

There is, then, tension in Religio Medici between rhetorical and true autobiographical expression, and the first person pronoun may

2 Endicott, op. cit., p.89

3 Johnson's Life, in Works, ed. Wilkin (1852), p. xxxii

4 Coleridge, in Select Poetry & Prose, ed. Potter (1933) p. 412

5 Endicott, p. 101

either reveal or conceal. Revelation and concealment are appropriate poles upon which the sphere of Browne's confession may revolve, but in none of his other works is there any such clear polarity in which to found an understanding of the author's position, at least, not in defining the modes in which first person pronouns occur.

The middle works may be conveniently classified as treatises, laying information before the reader for his consideration, rather than exposing the writer's character or exhorting the reader to observe models of thought and behaviour. It is more appropriate for the writer, in general, to conceal himself, and the function of first person pronouns in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus is necessarily different. In all three works, 'we' is the habitual first person form that is used, akin to the slightly old-fashioned editorial 'we' to which the twentieth-century reader is accustomed.

The use of the plural form in a prose discourse suggests a particular attitude of the writer to his material; my first reaction is that it is chosen to neutralise the notion of authorial personality that might intrude into the presentation of facts and data. Strategies for delivering opinion are superimposed upon this 'neutral' arrangement. The individual 'I' can be thought of as an organizing, manipulative force behind a presentation, to a degree that the artificial plural cannot. The psychology of grammar is no exact science, however, and I have to rely on the broad distinctions given in the O.E.D. to make the simplest of discriminations. Definition 2b of we is that it is

... used by a single person to denote himself ... used by a speaker or writer, in order to secure an impersonal style or tone, to avoid the obtrusive repetition of 'I'.

The O.E.D.'s second relevant definition is 1f:



... used indefinitely in general statements in which the speaker or writer includes those whom he addresses, his contemporaries, his fellow-countrymen, or the like.

In the first definition, the word "obtrusive" begs further questions; is it in this author's interest to seek unobtrusiveness for some special purpose? In what kinds of writing do we expect an author to adopt the convention of submerging or muting his personality? In the second, is "indefiniteness" sought as a virtue? How do readers draw distinctions between a rhetorical inclusion of themselves in the writer's address, and a factual inclusion? The following short consideration of Browne's use of pronouns shows what evidence the texts of the treatises provide towards answering these questions.

In Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus, 'I' is all but absent. The singular pronoun occurs only once, in the Epistle Dedicatory to the first, where it is used in the familiarity of a final greeting; and in The Garden of Cyrus it is used only five times, apart from instances where Browne is quoting the words of other writers. The lapses from 'we' into 'I' in this work do not mark significant changes of either mood or persona, except perhaps here:

Though Somnus in Homer be sent to rowse up Agamemnon, I  
finde no such effects in the drowsy approaches of sleep. (M. 174)

This sentence introduces a note of personal experience to set against the preceding few paragraphs. These final four paragraphs of chapter V embody a strangely twisted chain of thought. A multiplicity of questions concerning quincuncial order is posed in strictly impersonal and conditional terms:

If any shall ... quaery ... why ... why (etc.) ... He shall  
not fall on trite or triviall disquisitions. (M. 173)

and this is succeeded by general remarks on the scope of knowledge. There follows, in the antepenultimate paragraph, a complete change

of the narrator's standpoint, from a continuous present to an instantaneous present, from the external world of learning to the personal and local world of the author's study:

But the Quincunx of Heaven runs low, and 'tis time to  
close the five ports of knowledge. We are unwilling to  
spin out our awaking thoughts into the phantasmes of sleep...  
(M. 174)

The quincuncial figure sustains the connection with the previous paragraph in a playful way, but Browne continues to use the plural pronoun, resisting the urge (if he has one) to bring the discourse into the realm of the personal, autobiographical experience. When he resorts to 'I' in the final paragraph, the discourse has slipped away from the immediacy of here and now, and the singular element is not immediate: "I finde no such effects in the drowsy approaches of sleep." "I finde" is habitual, and not related to the particular night in which "the Quincunx of Heaven runs low". Here, 'I' has been used in a neutral sense, while in the emotionally higher register, 'we' indicates that Browne wishes the tone to be inclusive; his marvelling at the quincuncial figure is conveyed as potentially a collective experience. Here, there is no rhetorical gain achieved by the switch from the impersonal form to the personal, and although Browne would have been capable of writing "we finde no such effects", it seems likely that he felt it necessary to speak for himself alone, on the rather individual experience of nodding off.

These most basic building blocks of discourse, 'I' and 'we' look interchangeable in such an example; there is insufficient material in the works of 1658 to make firm judgements. But in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, the breadth and variety of the whole allows us to see some patterning, and there are many occasions in which the singular 'I' is preferred to the 'regular' plural. We need to consider first



how the regularity of 'we' exists alongside other strategies making for detachment or impersonality. There is, for instance, the common inverted sentence, frequently following this kind of pattern:

That Molls are blinde and have no eyes, though a common  
opinion, is received with much variety; some affirming...  
(P.E. III, 18 R. 233)

Inversion<sup>6</sup> (often, as here, in key opening sentences) places the belief, or proposition, or error in the primary position, drawing the reader's attention to that element first, and puts the ostensible grammatical subject second. In this example, impersonality is reinforced by the passive construction, and the phrase "with much variety", which appears to function as an adverbial complement, really represents a hypothetical subject. We could rewrite this sentence (far less elegantly):

Men's opinions vary regarding the notion that moles  
are blind.

or,

A variety of opinion exists regarding the notion that moles  
are blind.

The value of Browne's construction can be seen in the context of the chapter; the 'variety' of opinion follows directly after this sentence; the inversion places the true subject of the chapter, the error, at its head, even if within the first sentence it exists formally as a predicate. The critical procedure of stating a belief and then applying tests to it has an appropriate grammatical idiom to support it, which facilitates a scheme of presentation peculiarly apt for the kind of work Pseudodoxia Epidemica aims to be, insofar as it is formally a kind of encyclopaedia. But if impersonality is

<sup>6</sup> A general caution is necessary in applying the description inversion; as Wimsatt points out in his study of this feature in Johnson's style, "Inversion, in general a reversal of a sequence, cannot be specifically understood until some normal sequence is defined..." (Wimsatt, op. cit., p. 67) I discuss the character of Browne's peculiar ordering of words in chapter eight.

easily sustained by passive construction, human interest is not. An examination of the use of first-person pronouns will suggest how far Browne is prepared to let his own character of himself enliven and intrude into a treatise which indulges the magisterial plural, in common with other works ambitious of objectivity.

There are some areas of Pseudodoxia Epidemica in which 'I' displaces 'we' as the customary first person. The most common instance is what I shall refer to as the parenthetic use. This occurs quite frequently from beginning to end of the work, and most commonly in the phrases "I confess" and "I perceive".

That there are Griffons in Nature, ...many affirme, and most, I perceive, deny not... (III, 11, R. 199)

Now of what authority soever this piece be among us, it is I perceive received with different beliefes... (V, 17, R. 411)

That Absalom was hanged ... we are not ready to deny. Although I confesse a great and learned party there are of another opinion... (VII, 11, R. 569)

...we have declared our selfe in a language best conceived. Although I confesse, the quality of the Subject will sometimes carry us into expressions beyond mmere English apprehensions...

("To the Reader", R. 2)

The last example shows Browne using 'we' as singular in an explanatory context, alongside the parenthetic 'I'. These parentheses present no problems; "I perceive" can be taken as the equivalent of 'so far as I am aware', and "I confess" may usually be taken as a synonym for 'however'. Their frequency implies that they are little more than perfunctory interjections, formal reminders that the author is still present. Neither perception nor confession obtrude themselves into the discussion in any important way. In this example:

...that the fume of an Agath will avert a tempest, or the wearing of a Crysoprase make one out of love with gold, as some have delivered, we are yet, I confesse, to believe, and in that infidelity are likely to end our days. (II, 5, R. 139)



'we' and 'I' are juxtaposed, and it can be seen that 'confession' does add an ironic note to a whimsically dismissive conclusion. "We confess" would be an impossibility here, however, and the context renders the singular form inevitable.

Secondly, there are uses of 'I' directly related to experimental matters, usually where Browne refers to a particular experience of his own. These empirical uses are common in Books II and III of Pseudodoxia Epidemica (but much rarer than 'we'), where Browne deals with matter appropriate to the laboratory, but absent from, for example, Book V, where the matter for interpretation is either common property, or abstract and aesthetic. Access to pictures of the Nine Worthies or the Sibyls is of one kind, but to the entrails of horses and the components of gunpowder quite another. The author intrudes as a trained observer in different ways from his position as learned commentator. However, in relating the detail of his own experiments, Browne has no consistent policy. Thus, in Book II, chapter 7:

We have taken many (dead-watch beetles) thereof, and kept them in thin boxes, wherein I have heard and seen them work and knock with a little proboscis or trunk... (R. 153)

there is a possible interpretation that "we" refers to Browne and members of his family or servants, and the change to "I" is made to coincide with his own ocular observation. Yet, in the same chapter, on the same page, on the subject of maggots, ocular observation is recorded in the plural mode:

...keeping these excrescencies, we have observed their conversions, beholding in magnifying glasses the daily progression thereof.

One further example illustrates Browne's lack of consistency in experimental contexts. In Book VII, chapter 15, experiments in flotation are recorded in the plural:

... as wee made experiment in globes of waxe ...

... as we have made triall in each .. (R. 584)

The singular form is used parenthetically - "I beleeeve a man should finde it very difficult..." - in the midst of this laboratory passage, showing that the number of the pronoun is particular to separate modes of discourse; 'we' carry out experiments, while, in parenthesis, 'I' may pass comment on the wide implications.

The impersonal enquiry where 'we' carry out the experimenting is matched by a kind of inverted personification, where the conduct of Browne's own research is assigned to an abstract intellectual entity: 'observation', 'enquiry', 'opinion' and so on:

Lastly, it is repugnant to experience, for Anatomicall enquirie discovereth in them a gall...(III, 3, R. 169)

...as ocular enquiry informeth, and as unto such as have not had the opportunity to behold them, their proper pourtraicts will discover in Rondeletius ... (V, 2, R.370)

This practice of separating self from the activity has affinities with Browne's awareness of the divisions of knowledge. Austin Warren has noted:

...his use of epistemological terms - words and phrases showing his constant sense of the realms of discourse, the context within which he is making a statement.<sup>7</sup>

In observing the structural use made of these terms, he shows how sophisticated is Browne's sense of the differing claims that may be made by instruments for disclosing truth. Behind this strategy of rendering his statements impersonal lies an urge to present them in the most correct context. Thus, this enquiry is proper to the science of Anatomy, that consideration is proper to Geography, this object must be looked at as a hieroglyphic, rather than as an emblem - and so on.

<sup>7</sup> Warren, op. cit., p.684



This connection between impersonality and the correctness of epistemological context is confirmed by other devices of style, as for example the particular positioning of adverbs to dispose comment appropriately,<sup>8</sup> and the device of referred judgement, or synchoresis (dealt with at length in chapter eight), where the reader is referred to a particular area of study or enquiry or experience to find his own conclusion. In this Browne is totally consistent. His personal grammar is constructed to remove reference to himself in exact proportion to the degree to which he refers the reader elsewhere. There is nothing imperative in this strategy, whose manner is perfectly adapted to the classification of knowledge.

In assigning his own research activity to an abstract faculty, Browne manages a removal of himself of one kind; removal to a further distance is accomplished by using generalities of an unattached kind, referring to un-named others who include the writer:

That Glasse may be rendred malleable, and pliable ... must needs seem strange, unto such as consider... (II, 5, R. 125)

This kind of strategy takes us completely out of the realm of self-reference, and into the general area of detachment of judgement, the subject of chapter eight.

Despite those occasions when 'I' and 'we' seem interchangeable, there are important instances where an emphatic 'I' is used, and others where Browne's references to his own statements elsewhere in Pseudodoxia Epidemica make the choice of 'I' over 'we' inevitable. Under the category of the rhetorical first person, I class all uses of 'I' where it exists as part of a repetitive pattern; and there is one particularly good example of this use. In the chapter "Of Pigmies" (IV, 11, R. 330-333), the phrase "I say" is used at the beginning of three separate paragraphs, the second, seventh and eighth, to refer the reader back to Browne's demand for "exact and confirmed

<sup>8</sup> see above, p. 124

testimonies" which was made in the opening paragraph. It makes the tone of argument forceful, and as I note elsewhere (below, chapter 7), this chapter is unusual for its persuasive rhetoric. The function of 'I' here is to reinforce decisively that the testimony considered is untrustworthy and erroneous. Besides the fact that 'we' would confuse here, as the community of learning offers no sure guide to the existence of pignies, "I say" is a piece of self-reference and so inevitable; on both counts it exists as a formal kind of device rather than a genuine intrusion of personality. A more impersonal formula would lack this emphatic quality.

The same scheme of repetition of "I say" occurs in the chapter, "A digression concerning Blacknesse" (VI, 12). This is a strange and speculative discourse, which Browne excuses as an "adventure in knowledge", rather than an exposure of error. Like the chapter on pignies, the phrase is used here to hark back to two separate assertions that govern his conjectures, and link particulars of argument to general assessments; but the linking function is paramount, for rhetorical emphasis is not a feature. Browne propounds two theories that explain the causes of blackness:

...things become blacke by a sootish and fuliginous matter proceeding from the sulphur of bodies torrifed... (R. 524)

and,

The second way whereby bodies become blacke, is an Atramentous condition or mixture, that is a vitriolate or copperose quality conjoyning with a terrestrious and astringent humidity... (R. 526)

The theories are separated by much density of discussion of authority, observation and experiment, and the formula "I say" is an effective way of signalling the re-statement of the proposition, joining disparate elements, but not to any persuasive end. There is one other instance of repetition of "I say", in the first paragraph



of II, 4, "Of bodies Electricall...", defining 'electrical bodies' with precision, and almost identical to its use in respect of Blackness.

In such cases, 'I' is used as a necessary element in a structural formula, but the context lacks heat or passion. The properly confessional or emotive 'I', akin to the omnipresent first person of Religio Medici, is rare in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, but does occur where we might expect to find it. The chapters that generate most feeling deal with dangerous threats to truth: Book I, chapters 10 and 11 on the wickedness of Satan, and the work's final chapter on the wickedness of man, Browne's own Historia Horribilis. In the succession of "I believe", "I doubt" and "I know" in I, 11, Browne affirms his belief in certain Old Testament miracles, against the larger context of cautions against the delusions brought about by Satan:

If Nahaman the Syrian had washed in Jordan without the command of the Prophet, I beleeeve he had beene cleansed by them no more then by the waters of Damascus. I doubt if any beside Elisha had cast in salt, the waters of Jericho had not bin made wholesome. I know that a decoction of wilde gourd ... will not from every hand be dulcified unto aliment by an addition of flower or meale. (R. 70)

The tone of voice and the authorial identity seem identical to this in Religio Medici, despite the plainer diction and simpler delivery of the earlier work:

I hold that God can doe all things, how he should work contradictions I do not understand, yet dare not therefore deny. I cannot see why the Angel of God should question Esdras to recall the time past, if it were beyond his owne power, or that God should pose mortalitie in that, which hee was not able to performe himselfe. I will not say God cannot, but hee will perform many things, which wee plainly affirme he cannot... (I, 27, M. 28)

This openness of personal declaration offers reassurance to the reader, in contrast to the regular impersonality of 'we'; if

it were objected that Browne simply modulates from 'we' to 'I' for the aesthetic purpose of varying the surface of discourse, here is evidence that a practical virtue underlies the ornament. Just as his immense vocabulary and freedom of phrasing allow Browne to make the same kinds of statement about errors or fallacies with tremendous surface variety, so his variation of the uses of pronouns works to an effective purpose. If we are to be persuaded of the dangers inherent in the most potent threats to truth, then Browne has to resort to his most strongly emphatic personal mode, as here, in the final chapter:

I am heartily sorry and wish it were not true, what to the dishonour of Christianity is affirmed of the Italian, who after he had inveigled his enemy to disclaime his faith for the redemption of his life, did presently poyniard him, to prevent repentance, and assure his eternall death.

and:

I hope it is not true, and some indeed have probably denied, what is recorded of the Monke that poysoned Henry the Emperour, in a draught of the holy Eucharist. (R. 606, 607)

This final personal emphasis, however, continues thus in the first (1646) edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica:

... Had I believed Transubstantiation, I should have doubted the effect...

but is amended in 1650 to read as follows:

... Had he believed Transubstantiation, he would have doubted the effect (of poisoning the chalice)...

There is a substantial change in meaning, and the amended version is at first puzzling, because it is not immediately clear to whom "he" refers, the poisoner or the victim. The principal point I want to make, though, is that the early version involves a very personal comment upon the theology of this particular crime, which Browne, in making revisions, saw fit to expunge. In 1646 he feels content to make his



own opinion plain, while in the 1650 version he makes a hasty and awkward attempt at detaching himself from the account.

There is a hint of a comparable textual change in Book I, chapter 9, less significant, but of a kind with the last example. The 1646 edition has:

...I thinke it cannot be taken for heresie, if herein I rather adhere unto the demonstration of Ptolomy...

while the second edition is revised to:

...it cannot be strange if herein I adhere to the demonstration of Ptolomy... (R. 55)

The revised version, when compared with the original, smacks of evasiveness, and the purpose of the alteration is clear; the mention of Browne's own 'heresy' is seen as unnecessarily personal. When taken with the example from the final chapter, the revisions provide a small piece of evidence that Browne revised in the direction of overt disengagement from his subject. In both examples, the 1646 versions carry overtones of the author of Religio Medici; is it fanciful to see Browne in 1650 as the careful encyclopaedist striking out flamboyant or idiosyncratic utterances of belief that belong to an earlier phase of his life, and to a different species of publication? When it is recalled how changes in the second edition removed a large number of extravagant coinages (above, pp. 94-99), the speculation carries more conviction, and is reinforced by the evidence of many textual changes in the direction of sobriety of expression.

To summarise, Browne's 'we' is doing its editorial job. 'I' breaks in, most often with little consequence and at regular junctures, to vary the surface in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and to offer a presence rather than any substantial comment. 'We' usually doubt, affirm, deny, acknowledge, know and believe; emphatic assertions do not usually call forth the 'individual' in Browne, except in the notable areas

where especially threatening material is dealt with, and where it can play an argumentative part in certain rhetorical structures.

There are other features of Browne's style of argument in Pseudodoxia Epidemica which give additional point to the consideration of pronouns. Principal among these is the way in which terms of opinion and judgement are varied, and the remarkable fact that, taking one chapter with another, there is scarcely any repeated method of denial or refutation, in terms of the form of words used. It is possible to identify certain repeated structures within which this variety is contained, as I shall show. It is demonstrable that, rather than simply and usefully identifying the authorial voice for the reader, pronouns are used to a rhetorical end, possibly at a level just below creative consciousness. 'I' and 'we', or evasions of their use, show the degrees of impersonality Browne strives for at different points, and, beyond that, their uses form part of the pervasive rhetoric conveying doubt, that underpins so much of Pseudodoxia Epidemica.



## Chapter Seven

### The Process of Argument.

Pseudodoxia Epidemica, claiming as it does the expurgation of error, shows Browne's powers of persuasion and illumination in most concentration, even if traditionally that work has not been regarded as his most eloquent. An enquiry into the ways Browne prosecutes his arguments is the subject of this chapter, with some other works of a similar scope and intent, and examines the procedures in representative dissertations in Pseudodoxia Epidemica.

Some initial comment on the total design and effect of the work, insofar as it exhibits a structure that predisposes the reader to a certain obedience of response is needed, to show how each chapter exists within a whole whose character influences the constituent parts.

Cynics might describe Pseudodoxia Epidemica as the 'virtuoso's handbook'. Many of the subjects in which it deals are commonplace virtuoso themes: oddities in natural history; the interpretation of paintings and sculpture; anatomical curiosities; and the properties of minerals and vegetables. The address, "unto the knowing and leading part of Learning" (R. 3) might well convey to the virtuoso the opinion he would like to have of himself. The exhaustive manner in which arguments and authorities are marshalled in each chapter would impress as well as interest the virtuoso. The very semblance of a 'collection' which the work represents can be reminiscent of Evelyn's comment about Browne's collection of objects: "... a paradise and cabinet of rarities, and that of the best collections..." (quoted above, p. 54). But beyond these features, the association breaks down. Orthodoxy is congenial

to Browne socially and in matters of religion, but not intellectually. Both the scale and the presentation of Pseudodoxia Epidemica show abilities which are far beyond those of the average gentleman-scholar, and they demonstrate a scepticism in that temperament which is at odds with any notions of his complacency (above, p. 63).

A leading historian writes of prose development in the 1640's and 1650's:

Prose was shorn of its florid circumlocutions, and a direct, racy, sinuous, conversational style began to emerge. First the Bible in English, then the laws in English; then prose in English. University education, as Defoe was to say, ruined English prose style by making men think in Latin...<sup>1</sup>

It is not possible to see Browne as part of this development towards 'shorn' prose; perhaps, in terms of style, Pseudodoxia Epidemica is more likely to be seen as a regression from the openness of Religio Medici. The increased incidence of Latin neologism is, for example, one positive indicator of this. And yet, the critical function of the work places it firmly in the decades of which Hill also writes:

Whereas before 1640 Bacon's had been a voice crying in the wilderness, by 1660 his was the dominant intellectual influence.<sup>2</sup>

Robbins puts a strong case for seeing Browne as an inheritor of Bacon's mantle:

...Pseudodoxia is not, for the most part, Bacon's 'Calendar of Dubitations', a static roll-call of perplexities, confusions and indecision, but a frontal assault on the troops of error... (P.E., Vol.I, Intro., p. xxx)

There is, then, a crux. Even if modern scholarship has offered much encouragement to see Pseudodoxia Epidemica as a work contributing to progress in learning, its style seems not to follow any corresponding

1 Christopher Hill, The Century of Revolution (2nd ed., 1980), p. 157

2 Hill, p. 154



modernizing tendency - or, at least, it fails to fit into the pattern which most historians of ideas have offered as characterising the decades in mid-century. It is to throw light on this central problem that an analysis of argument is most necessary.

To handle such heterogeneous material as the nature of crystal, the pictures of Moses with horns and the blackness of negroes, and to sustain a continuous level of critical appraisal throughout, is a large ambition. The demands of some of the subjects cause his critical ability to fail occasionally, but Browne's design of the work helps to counterbalance that. Robbins, in his introduction to Pseudodoxia Epidemica, again emphasises the indebtedness to Bacon's Advancement of Learning, observing correspondences of a detailed kind in Book I, and broad similarities in the remaining books.<sup>3</sup> Nonetheless, the ordering of encyclopaedic works treating of the sciences in general had traditionally recognised the ordering of the Creation - the work of the seven days - and both Bacon's and Browne's schemes retain some foundation in that base of Genesis.

Although the separation of material into seven books is imposed in the interests of logicality and religious orthodoxy, with the general arguments about the causes of error occupying Book I and the remaining books following as illustrations in different areas of learning, Browne also has an eye for the aesthetic shape of the work. That the books it contains are seven in number relates it to the hexameral tradition, which was surely intentional; but the intention is not referred to. Huntley remarks:

The books follow the chronological order of the creation - from the earth of minerals and vegetables, through animals, to man - followed by man's works. Thus they go from natural to artificial, from God's clear design to the complex muddles of human history.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Robbins, P.E., Vol.I, Intro. pp. xxix-xxxiv.

<sup>4</sup> Huntley, op. cit., p. 158

The connection with hexameral works, then, represents a flourish, one which is significant if we compare it with contemporary encyclopaedic works of the more traditional type. In contemporary terms, Pseudodoxia Epidemica is really an anti-encyclopaedia. Its purpose is directly opposed to reference works that feed upon sources like Pliny and Aristotle, because it is designed to foster a critical appreciation of what so many encyclopaedias contained.

A typical contemporary encyclopaedia in the hexameral tradition, and which enjoyed nearly as much popularity in terms of book sales as did Pseudodoxia Epidemica, was the cleric John Swan's Speculum Mundi, first published in 1635, and re-issued in 1643, 1665 and 1670. Swan's work rambles aimlessly in comparison with Browne's work, is heavily reliant upon Pliny's Natural History for both information and opinion, and upon poets like Du Bartas. It is the product of learning on a large scale, but without much overall sense of purpose, rather like an epic with a plot that is impossible to follow. The title-page itself shows a disjointed face:

SPECULUM  
MUNDI  
or  
A GLASSE RE-  
PRESENTING THE FACE  
OF THE WORLD; SHEWING  
both that it did begin, and must also end,  
The manner How, and time When,  
being largely examined  
WHEREUNTO IS JOYNED  
an Hexameron, or a serious discourse of the  
causes, continuance and qualities of  
things in Nature; occasioned as matter pertinent  
to the work done in the sixe days of  
the Worlds creation.  
(etc...)

A plan such as this can obviously include anything the author chooses, and although the discourses on "things in Nature" observe the normal respect to the hierarchy of creatures, this seems to be of no assistance to the reader, beyond signalling to him that Swan dedicates his work in this way, as in others, to the greater glory of God.



The contrast with Pseudodoxia Epidemica is considerable; both works might find their way into a country gentleman's library as containing collections of knowledge with some comment thereon. But in considering the quality of that comment, we can see a sceptical and analytical process of enquiry at Browne's service, which barely exists in Speculum Mundi. Swan's account of the ability of goat's blood to soften diamond, for example, is typically credulous, and tends against his own affirmation of its hardness:

The Adamant or Diamond, the most precious of all stones, and the hardest; insomuch as it cutteth glasse, and yeeldeth not either to stroke of hammer or fire: notwithstanding it is softened with Goats bloud being warm, soon after she hath eaten parsley or drunken wine. (p. 292)

Browne's rejection of this notion (in P.E. II, 5:i) is forceful and satirical. Similarly, Swan is content to accept crystal as a form of frozen water, where Browne devotes twelve closely argued pages to a thorough examination of its nature. (P.E. II, 1). Swan says:

Crystall is a kinde of Ice made of waters which congeal themselves by a vehement and very long cold, as for the space of 10 or 12 continuall yeares. (p. 296)

The attention given by Swan to a questionable beast is largely a matter of recording opinion other than his own. In the case of outlandish creatures, he can sometimes appear more sceptical, as in this account of the Cockatrice:

That they (cockatrices) be bred out of an egge, laid by an old cock, is scarce credible, howbeit, some affirm with great confidence, that when the cock waxeth old, and ceaseth to tread his hens any longer, there groweth in him, of his corrupted seed, a little egge with a thin filme in the stead of a shell, and this being hatched by the Toad, or some such like creature, bringeth forth a venomous worm, although not this Basilisk, that King of Serpents. Plinie describeth the Cockatrice not to be above twelve inches long, in which regard

Mr Topsell thinketh this not to be the main and great Cockatrice, but rather that worm bred out of the former egge: whereof I wish every man's judgement to be his own. (p. 487)

This passage demonstrates more scepticism than is customary with Swan, and his doubt is expressed in referring the reader to his own judgement - a device commonly used by Browne. For comparison, here is Browne handling similar material:

As for the generation of the Basilisk, that it proceedeth from Cocks egge hatched under a Toad or Serpent, it is a conceit as monstrous as the brood it selfe: for if wee should grant that Cocks growing old, and unable for emission, amasse within themselves some seminall matter, which may after conglobate into the forme of an egge, yet will this substance be unfruitfull, as wanting one principle of generation, and a commixture of both sexes, which is required unto production, as may be observed in the egges of hens not trodden, and as we have made triall in some which are termed Cocks egges; It is not indeed impossible that from the sperm of a Cock, Hen, or other animall being once in putrescence, either from incubation, or otherwise, some generation may ensue, not univocall and of the same species, but some imperfect or monstrous production; even as in the body of man from putrid humours, and peculiar wayes of corruption, there have succeeded strange and unseconded shapes of wormes, whereof we have beheld some our selves, and reade of others in med icall observations: and so may strange and venemous Serpents be severall wayes engendered; but that this generation should be regular, and alway produce a Basilisk, is beyond our affirmation, and we have good reason to doubt. (P.E. III, 7, R. 184)

Browne cannot testify for certain that no basilisks or cockatrices exist, but in this passage he holds up the notion for polite and elegant scorn, qualified by his precision in setting out, with evidence from his own experiments, the possible means by which such creatures might be generated. He also refers to doctrines or principles of reproduction which need consideration in such discussions, and makes comparisons with corrupt productions in other creatures, all of which can be used to test the truth or falsehood of the belief.



Swan's account reproduces the old myths about the cockatrice, and manages to appear confused about them in the process. He is not an originator, but (despite the occasional note of scepticism) a perpetuator of errors; in Speculum Mundi we encounter vast numbers of the same legends and superstitions that originate with Pliny and Aelian, Basil and Ambrose, and many other of the authorities whom Browne identifies in Book I chapter 8 of Pseudodoxia Epidemica as the "authors who have most promoted popular conceits." Swan's authorities also include scholars of the more recent past who perpetuate error, but the range of opinion cited falls far short of Browne's. The one species of author that Swan relies upon and quotes more regularly is the modern Biblical commentator, like Napier, Willet and Ainsworth. Speculum Mundi offers a very good example, then, of what exactly Browne meant in his address "To the Reader" (R. 4) in asserting that "wise men cannot but know, that Arts and Learning want this expurgation (of error)".

Swan's intention is perhaps to entertain or edify, through the relation of as much that is marvellous as he can assemble ; the hexameral element is by this made not pietistic, but sensationalist; the beginning and end of the world provide material which is as sensational as it is possible to obtain, and we know Browne's opinion of this:

The wisdom of God receives small honour from those vulgar heads, that rudely stare about, and with a gross rusticity admire his workes; those highly magnifie him whose judicious enquiry into his acts, and deliberate research into his creatures, returne the duty of a devout and learned admiration.

(Religio Medici I, 13, M. 13)

Remembering the popularity of Speculum Mundi, it becomes easier to see the magnitude of the task Browne shouldered in attempting to dispose of traditional myths, and appreciate more fully why often Pseudodoxia Epidemica does not seem wholehearted in its commitment to that end. Let us not forget that when Alexander Ross set about asserting the eternal truths of Aristotle's teaching, he chose to

refute the ideas of Browne in company with those of Bacon, Harvey and Comenius, which is a small indication of the status among the learned that one man saw Browne fitted for, even if Ross's testimony<sup>5</sup> counts for little. The popularity of Swan's work need not surprise us; the conservatism of men like Ross and the thirst for marvels remained prominent features of the reading habits of the mid-century, habits which connect closely with our impression of the virtuoso mentality. The readers of such a book, of works like John Bulwer's Anthropo-metamorphosis (1653), dealing at great length with curious human deformities in a 'historical presentation', and like Chilmead's translation of James Gaffarel's Unheard-of Curiosities (1650), cannot have been drawn from just one credulous or impressionable section of society. The leaders of learning, unless they took pains to expose the futility of restating the opinions of 'authority' without critical appraisal, must be judged to have approved of such works by their silence.

The continuing shocked reaction to Hobbes's Leviathan for decades after its first appearance in 1651 shows how difficult many found it to accept challenges to beliefs and 'facts' to which tradition had accustomed them. Douglas Bush observes:

Most of the English scientists of the middle and latter part of the century, Wallis, Wilkins, Charleton, Boyle, Ray, and others, were concerned about the growth of atheism and sought, directly or through 'natural religion' (a double-edged weapon), to sustain Christianity. But while Bacon's sincere tributes to the Creator's glory - the tributes, so to speak, of a junior partner - helped to keep him immune from attack, the more obviously dangerous Galileo, Descartes, and Hobbes, despite their sincere or prudential concessions to orthodoxy, were in their several countries vigorously assailed.<sup>6</sup>

5 Alexander Ross, Arcana Microcosmi (1652)

6 Bush, English Literature in the earlier Seventeenth Century (1962) p. 308



In contrast to these provoking works, there was a stream of learned and pseudo-scientific work which failed to rise to the level of originality or perceptiveness, but which enjoyed a steady, if unspectacular popularity; the reading habits of the 1640's and 1650's sustained many publications like those of Swan, Bulwer and Gaffarel.

Gaffarel's work, published in English in the same year as the second edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, offers many examples of entertaining credulity, of which this description of the 'Vegetable Lamb' is typical:

...You will meet with some such rare Figures, as would seem incredible; did not such Excellent Historians confirme us in the beliefe of the Relation. Of this sort is the Boramet, which grows in Scythia, having a perfect Resemblance of a Lamb, having a Head, Eyes, Eares, Teeth, and the rest of the parts of the body proportionable. This Plant crops and feeds upon all the grasse that growes round about it; and when there is no more left, it dies with famine. You may see the story of it, in Sigismundus, Cardan (Exercit 181), Scaliger, Vigenarius, Rovillius, Duret ...<sup>7</sup>

What is here regarded as literal truth is treated with scepticism by Browne, who at the same time points out the source of the belief:

Much wonder is made of the Boramez, that strange plant-animall or vegetable Lamb of Tartary, which Wolves delight to feed on, which hath the shape of a Lamb, affordeth a bloudy juice upon breaking, and liveth while the plants be consumed about it; and yet if all this be no more then the shape of a Lamb in the flower or seed, upon the top of the stalk, as we meet with the formes of Bees, Flies and Dogs in some others, he hath seen nothing that shall much wonder at it. (P.E. III, 28, R. 289)

Whether or not the material in the 'books of marvels' met with total credulity, the chief point is that, before the 1640's, such relations met with few systematic contradictions in print. In the

<sup>7</sup> J. Gaffarel (Trans. Edmund Chilmead), Unheard-of Curiosities (1650), p. 120

encyclopaedic technique that Browne used, he invited the same readership as such works. It is a readership that bears comparison with that for Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas's Divine Weekes and Works (1605), which peddled popular, and sometimes grotesque, science founded securely on the traditional hexamera, and which remained very popular for half a century. In containing many of the tales and marvels that readers had an appetite for, Pseudodoxia Epidemica would thus draw some - or many - of the credulous to its pages, irrespective of how the material was treated. Whether Browne calculated this is difficult to decide, but it seems quite possible that he did, in the same way that he might have calculated the flattery in his address to the reader; many would consider themselves as among "the knowing and leading part of learning" who had no title to be so considered. In this sense, Browne's circumspection about many of the errors is of a piece with his overall intention; he knew that many of them were comfortable to believe in, often recognising the attractiveness of them himself; I believe we can trust his aims in Pseudodoxia Epidemica because he knew and understood what we can only recognise in a vivid caricature as the virtuoso sensibility.

We know from the character Browne gives himself in Religio Medici how his temperament reacts to difficult problems:

I desire to exercise my faith in the difficultest points,  
for to credit ordinary and visible objects is not faith  
but perswasion ... 'tis an easie and necessary belief to  
credit what our eye and sense hath examined ... (R.M. I, 9, M. 9)

This, of course, relates to Browne's religious beliefs, but the mark of that temperament is set like a seal on Pseudodoxia Epidemica. It shows that, for Browne, epistemological enlightenment had to result from individual enquiry, and could not subsist in revelation; that was the characteristic of the followers of Aristotle, and something like it



survived in the virtuoso tradition, in their enthusiasm for relics. Relics and curiosities, medals and fossils could be treated as 'genuine' particles of truth, as res and not verba; the same sensibility looked to authority in learning as a rock, a thing on which to lean. Browne's work opposes such dependency, questioning human authority, if not always defying it, seeking not to erect for truth a foundation of 'reliable' and attested fact, but examining facts for their reliability, and knocking holes in the antique fabric that supported ignorance. Its function is critical before it is creative.

At the same time, though, there is evidence of Browne's own fascination with the intermingling of res and verba. In his notes on anatomy can be found investigations into the significance of terms, side-by-side with comment derived from practical research into pathology. In his notes on the pericardium, he compares his own findings on the properties of fluid within the sac enclosing the heart with those of the physiologist Richard Lower<sup>8</sup>; but in the following paragraph he is moved to relate a piece of proverbial wisdom and connect it with an instance of rustic parsimony:

...as men's hearts are commonly in their pursies, so many of the countrie people taking advantage of the figure and toughnesse of this part make little purses hereof and carry their money in it. (K. III, p. 343)

Following this, he shifts into etymological speculation, to play on the ideas of expiration and death:

Death is expressed by expiration, and men are sayd to expire when they dye, because Spiration or breathing begins by inspiration and endeth by expiration. This may hold in naturall deaths; butt in suspension, choaking, and violent stranglinge of animals it may happen otherwise. (K. III, pp. 343-4)

These shifts out of one register of investigation into first one, then another kind of enquiry are of a kind with the digressive habits

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Lower's De Corde (1670) and P.E. IV, 3, R. 297.

found throughout Pseudodoxia Epidemica. In such incomplete notes we can see the critical and the collecting instincts coexisting. It is, moreover, the kind of enquiry that can be the stimulus for an image in completed literary work:

Some have digged deep, yet glanced by the Royal Vein; and a man may come unto the Pericardium, but not the Heart of Truth.

(C.M. II, 3, M. 220)

The declared intention of Pseudodoxia Epidemica is at odds with traditional attitudes, and the temperament revealed at least in Religio Medici seems to be at odds with what we understand of the collector mentality. Some defenders of Browne rely too heavily upon this declared intention to support their belief in his powers of scholarship and persuasion; Huntley comes close to this in his assertion that "for him the search for truth was a stern and often lone revaluation of the whole history of error."<sup>9</sup> Still, the compiler of "Vulgar Errors", despite waging war on 'collection' for its own sake, may seem to many readers to collect compulsively in so doing, and the execution, as opposed to the intention of the work, may be thought to present us with that same ambiguity that Merton discerned, in that the "discursive gift"<sup>10</sup> seems to threaten Browne's critical talents, whether in the fields of science, natural history or anthropology. This it is which brings us to the point where the quality of his arguments need to be examined in detail, to show how much Browne's discursive gift is put to the service of his critical intelligence. The two chapters for consideration are short: "Of Pigmies" (IV, 11) and "Of Lampries" (III, 19).

#### "Of Pigmies"

On the face of it, this chapter offers a clear example of well-ordered argument in its structure. Running through the ten paragraphs which make it up, the matter examined in each is as follows:

<sup>9</sup> Huntley, op. cit., p. 147

<sup>10</sup> Merton, Science and Imagination in Sir Thomas Browne (1949), p. 7



1. The common beliefs about pigmies.
2. The testimony of authors who have promoted belief in them.
3. The testimony of authors who reject pigmies.
4. The particular evidence of Aristotle.
5. The (questionable) mention of pigmies in Scripture.
6. The problems in 5 arising from translation.
7. The want of precision in accounts of pigmies
8. The absence of confirmation of such accounts
9. and 10. ridicule some extravagant stories about pigmies.

The nature of beliefs about pigmies is in the same category as beliefs in Griffins, the Phoenix and the Amphisboena, in that it constitutes belief in something exotic, and thus unlike loadstones, badgers' legs or the young of vipers, they are not available for inspection, and the strictly Baconian determinator of truth - experience - is absent.

Browne's instruments of discovery are reduced to reason and authority, and this accounts for the rhetorical stress which he lays on the word "testimony", which recurs at significant intervals. In fact, this chapter relies almost wholly on the examination of testimony, and not upon the reasonableness or otherwise of the belief. It is instructive to note that, in an instance where the epistemological instruments Browne can use are restricted by the subject, he rejects a belief which nineteenth-century exploration proved to have foundations in Equatorial Africa.

The first point to note is that Browne is successful at giving an impression of an adequacy of evaluation. In the first paragraph, he sets out the terms upon which belief in pigmies might be acceptable, and for him, these are "exact and confirmed testimonies".

By Pigmies we understand a dwarfish race of people, or lowest diminution of mankind, comprehended in one cubit, or as some will have it, in two foot, or three spans; not taking them single, but nationally considering them, and as they make up an aggregated habitation, whereof although affirmations be many, and testimonies more frequent than in any other point which wise men have cast into the list of fables, yet that there is, or ever was such a race or nation, upon exact and confirmed testimonies, our strictest enquiry receives no satisfaction. (R. 330)

Browne undercuts the assertion of the numerousness of accounts of pigmies by the phrase "any other point which wise (my emphasis) men have cast into the list of fables". That the accounts might be fables is strongly implied before any evidence is weighed, but that wise men might have made up such fables is an unexpected construction, which gives "wise" an ironic edge. Because the unusual word-order separates "wise men" from "testimonies", we take the point of the frequency of the belief without attributing to it any wisdom. The rhythmic detachment of "upon exact and confirmed testimonies", besides serving the purpose of rhetorical emphasis, achieves a dual purpose, because it appears to confirm the findings of "our strictest enquiry"; the word "upon" is left in a state of syntactical ambiguity, with the possibility of its phrase qualifying either the preceding or the succeeding clause. "Upon exact and confirmed testimonies" also figures as the first half of the connecting rhetorical device of copulatio, with the phrase "exact testimonies" at the beginning of the next paragraph. Copulatio here has the effect of making the 'exact'-ness more vehement through emphasis.

In the second paragraph, the account of only one author is examined, that of Homer; the others are merely cited as his imitators, and rather than a consideration of various testimonies Browne only offers an illustration of one episode in the Iliad, and the observation that it is metaphorical in intent. The use of the opposed terms "derivative" and "primitive" is pointed, because their pairing in opposition is a commonplace in philology and grammar, with "primitive" usually signifying an absolute radicality (per O.E.D.); thus the many 'affirmations' of the first paragraph are reduced directly to one; the short roll-call of names - "Herodotus, Philostratus, Mela, Pliny, Solinus..." - creates atmosphere, but denies any information beyond itself. Robbins, in his commentary, (pp. 925-7) observes that all these authorities except Herodotus and Solinus are supplied in Aldrovandus's



chapter on Cranes. The explanation of the Homeric original as being poetry, and not history, signals a relaxation of style, appropriately, into the harmonious water-imagery of the paragraph's close, with its balanced and alliterative phrases mimicking poetry:

...being onely a pleasant figment in the fountaine, became a  
solemne story in the streame, and current still among us.

In this paragraph, Browne made two textual alterations after the first edition, which help us to understand his thought in the shaping of the chapter. The first is that the underlined phrase in the following was deleted from the second and subsequent editions:

... the primitive Author was Homer; who, not onely intending  
profit but pleasure, and using often similies, as well to delight  
the eare, as to illustrate his matter ...

The second alteration is that, in the preceding quotation, the word "similitude" was replaced by "figment" in the editions of 1650 and those which followed it. The changes seem to indicate, first, that Browne realised that Homer's cranes and pigmies image at the beginning of Iliad Book III is a purely decorative one, and to attribute some didactic intention in the image is wrong; and, secondly, he decided that his alliteration in the deleted phrase ("profit", "pleasure") came too early in the paragraph, and would make a greater impact in the closing figure; the substituted word ("figment") there makes for syllabic balance and a matched pair of alliterating members. The second point is the more interesting because it shows clearly that Browne's concern for the sound of this passage is as important to him as the sense, even though it is also true that "figment" is far better fitted to the sense of the passage than the rather pedantic word it replaced.

In the third paragraph, we have a roll-call of authors again, but it is different from the previous list, and rather too obviously so. The credulous authors cited previously (of whom, it needs to be

remembered, Herodotus, Pliny and Solinus are numbered among Browne's "authors who have most promoted popular conceit", in Book I, chapter 8) were merely named. Here, each of the first four sceptical authors enjoys a little encomium from Browne, and it is not immediately clear why their praises should be sung in this way:

...Strabo an exact and judicious Geographer... Julius Scaliger a diligent enquirer... Vlysses Aldrovandus a most exact Zoographer... Eustathius his (i.e., Homer's) excellent commentator...<sup>11</sup>

This remains puzzling until we recall that the whole chapter deals with the weighing of testimony and little else, and thus the only explanation can be that Browne is drawing attention to the general qualities of these authors to underline the likely value of their testimony; this is a rare case of Browne assigning the credentials of authority as a verification of his argument. It is a practice we are more likely to associate with his critic, the Aristotelian Alexander Ross, who comments on this section of Pseudodoxia Epidemica:

But if the incredulity of two or three Writers be enough to make a Vulgar Error, what a multitude of Errors will there be? For what truth is there in the world which by some or other hath not been doubted or denied?<sup>12</sup>

The suspension of credulity of Albertus Magnus is assigned as further evidence for rejection, while the one possibility - "they were surely some kinde of Apes..." - which reason might (though perhaps with twentieth-century hindsight) suggest merited further consideration, is not followed up.

The fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs deal with the analysis of passages in Aristotle's Historia Animalium and in Ezekiel 27: 11 "which from their authority admit consideration". Though both these authorities are treated with respect, the evidence of Aristotle is considered in a way suggesting that Browne knows him too well;

<sup>11</sup> This is the only example of repeated eulogy of authors in Pseudodoxia Epidemica.

<sup>12</sup> Ross, Arcana Microcosmi (1652), p. 107



"...Aristotle plays the Aristotle..." involves the rhetorical figure of heratio, or ploche, which in Peacham's Garden of Eloquence (1577)<sup>13</sup> is defined thus:

Ploche, a proper name being repeated signifieth another thing.  
... May signify the constant nature and permanent quality of a man well known, by the repetition of his name.

This figure, together with the semi-colloquial usage, "... at the last he claps in..." reinforces the indication that Browne refuses to accept any statement of Aristotle's that ends in "sicut aiunt", or 'so they say'. The lightness of this dismissal hardens into a vein of irony directed at Historia Animalium; having caught Aristotle out, his work is praised: "...ever to be admired...", "... containing most excellent truths...", to be let down again with a crash, as "...repugnant unto the history of our senses..." It is a tough, sardonic repudiation of Aristotle's testimony, compounded by Browne's allusion to Athenaeus's mockery of the large financial reward Aristotle received - "eight hundred talents" - from Alexander for its composition.

The near-banter of this paragraph subsides in the next two into a genuinely learned dissertation on the definition of the Hebrew word Gammadim, which is rendered Pygmaei in the Latin Vulgate. The two paragraphs are sober, expository, and free from obvious rhetorical devices. The second of them is a shade digressive, but Browne himself concludes that consideration of the term's numerous interpretations is a distraction. It adds little to the arguments on either side.

With the seventh paragraph, and the opening phrase, "Again, I say, exact testimonies...", we encounter a feature unusual in Pseudodoxia Epidemica. The use of the first person singular pronoun is not nearly so common as the plural, "we", but the emphatic assertion, "I say", used in this patterning at the commencement of three separate paragraphs, only very rarely.<sup>14</sup> Rhetoric as forceful as this is not common in Browne's writing. The commanding quality of this opening contrasts

<sup>13</sup> quoted in Sonnino, A Handbook to 16th-Century Rhetoric (1968), p. 103

<sup>14</sup> As discussed above, pp. 157-8

with the broken ranks of the diverse relations which follow, which accumulate towards the paragraph's close with the figure of anaphora<sup>15</sup> in the repetition "...some ... some ...some...", here having the effect of diminishing any significance which might be attached to such opinions, and parodying Aristotle's evasion with its "sicut aiunt". Within this, the alliterating repetition of "Partridges" emphasises the ridiculous aspects of the opinions.

The opening of the eighth paragraph parallels the "I say" of paragraphs two and seven; just as the confusion of opinion in the preceding paragraph opposed the 'exactness' required there, so Browne here postulates a series of the most outlandish possibilities for confirmation, Japan, the Moluccas and Greenland affording a topographical arena of complete uncertainty, following on from the differing locations suggested previously. He underlines their unsatisfactory basis with the figure of paronomasia to provide satire, in the change from "confirmation" to "confirmable", and then homoioteleuton (in their similar endings), to point up the contrast between "affirmation" and "perswasion". Once again, the dismissive 'p-' sounds follow to underline the ridicule that has been prepared for, in "Pygmies of Paracelsus"; the name of Paracelsus is invoked as an authority legendary for his untrustworthy witness. The reader who provided the marginal annotations for the 1650 edition of Pseudodoxia Epidemica<sup>16</sup> was convinced by Browne's arguments by this stage, as is seen in his comment at the word "perswasion": "The story of Pigmyes rejected". At no other point in this annotator's many comments is his persuasion rendered with such conviction.

The final two paragraphs continue in the vein of ridicule, but it is enlivened out of rhetoric into anecdote. The ninth paragraph begins with a change from considering "confirmation" into denying

<sup>15</sup> cf. Sonnino, under "repetitio", p. 161.

<sup>16</sup> Given in Keynes's edition: K.II, p. 305



"impossibility" to the belief, but it is a change conveyed in a section which buzzes with words ending in "-y" or "-ies" ("verity", "possibility", "faculties", "impossibility": homoioteleuton again), and has a numbing effect on the comprehension. Thus, we are not sure what "the opinions of Austine" in the following sentence refers to, and our attention flashes to the musically rendered story which follows, stiff with alliteration, of Philetas, who was "fain to fasten lead unto his feet lest the wind should blow him away." Though Browne withholds a formal conclusion that the belief is impossible, the use of ridicule rather than reasoned argument takes us farther away from ratiocination. That he is diverted into entertainment is signalled by the reference to his favourite entertainer, Athenaeus.

Finally, the ridicule emerges from beneath anecdote into plain and explicit assertion, in the last paragraph: "...yet is it ridiculous what men have delivered of them..." The Homeric original is restated with an air of exasperation, and is followed by the opinion of Ctesias, of whom in Book I, 8, we were warned:

In his Indian relations, wherein are contained strange and incredible accounts, he is surely to be read with suspension...  
(R. 47)

The fact that, to twentieth-century readers, Ctesias's affirmation that pigmies "are Negroes in the midst of India" comes nearer the truth than Browne is matter for amusement, but also serves to show how much, in this chapter, Browne has limited the terms of his discussion to the weighing of conflicting testimony and opinion. There is, for example, no reasoning from anatomy, which might have been expected in an examination of human peculiarities, and which is a prominent feature of chapters such as "Of the wish of Philoxenus to have the neck of a Crane" (VII, 14, R. 580), in which exhaustive comparison of necks and their functions takes place, and where opportunities for satire are

not exploited to the degree that they are in the case of pigmies. The concluding sentence is a typically witty flourish, where the supposed extremity which pigmies represent is taken as the antithesis of the extremity represented by Hercules, whose myth is here treated as if it were true, to demolish another 'myth'. The whole is a model of balanced urbanity which combines irony with ornament, and which neatly relates the insignificance of the pigmies to the lightweight opinions that have been adduced for their existence.

To summarise the qualities of a chapter like this is problematic, by reason of the enormous lapidary skill Browne has at his disposal. I have shown some of the rhetorical devices which Browne uses to sustain argument, to sway the reader, and to colour the discussion in a way that best suits the argument. Besides the rhetorical aspects, I have indicated how the authorities and opinions are played off against one another, and how the reputations of many authors play a part in appealing to the reader's prejudices. I must reiterate how unusual a chapter this is; Browne shows that he has more designs upon the flexibility of his readership than elsewhere, and this is occasioned by the fact that it is a chapter relying entirely upon the evaluation of testimony, where reason, as an active tool of discovery is scarcely in evidence, and ocular proof or experience is completely wanting. It is thus a chapter tailor-made for showing Browne wearing his best rhetorician's clothes.

There are chapters in Pseudodoxia Epidemica which exhibit a similar reliance upon one single method of examination of error. In, for example, the chapter "Of Plurisies" (IV, 2), the discussion reads like a set of notes for an anatomy lecture; neither reason nor authority is of particular value in discussing the proposition - "That Plurisies are only on the left side" - because Browne's particular knowledge and



experience as a physician are sufficient for his purposes. We could say that his mind is already made up in both cases, which might be justifiable in the chapter on pleurisies; but not in the case of belief in pigmies, where we see strong methods of persuasion at work. Only in the two paragraphs dealing with scriptural analysis, where the possibility of divine testimony is at issue, does the surge of the argument hesitate on its way to a complete rejection of the belief. In terms of ideas, we can see how distant the ideal Baconian empiricism can be in Pseudodoxia Epidemica. In terms of style, we can see what an armoury was at Browne's disposal when essential elements for discussion are wanting, and literary processes supply the absence of matter with which to reason; rhetoric begins to have a deceptive, as well as an expressive function. Material elements for discussion are not lacking in the second chapter chosen for examination.

### "Of Lampries" (III, 19)

In the chapter on pigmies, satire was shown to be a very keen weapon in effecting a convincing rejection of a belief. The satire in that case was directed at authorities, but in the chapter "Of Lampries", the error itself is the target of satire, and this is probably the most frequent object of satirical attack throughout Pseudodoxia Epidemica. Authorities are its next most frequent target, with the process of reasoning, or lack of it, the third class of butts. The beginning of this chapter offers a typical short example of immediate ridicule of the error itself:

Whether Lampries have nine eyes, as is received, we durst refer it unto Polyphemus, who had but one to judge it. (R. 237)

The point of this witty allusion is simply that even one eye is enough to see the absurdity of the belief, alerting the reader to the analytical purpose of vision. Having opened with scorn for the notion, Browne alters his tone through the decorous parallelism of "an error

concerning eyes, occasioned by the error of eyes", and subjects the belief to tests of reason, while asserting that experience itself will refute it. The ringing quality that alliteration gives in "repugnant unto Reason", and the vehemence of "repugnant" and, in the next sentence, "monstrosity", underline the sense of the degree of irrationality to which the explanation that follows will oppose itself. Also, 'repugnant' is a key word throughout the chapters of Book III, doing duty as an emphatic synonym for 'questionable' in chapters 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10.

As in the chapter on pigmies, then, we are confronted by rhetoric, a judicious choice of words and satire, all operating to support Browne's argument at an initial stage, besides a structure in which the flow of ideas decisively affects the way we follow that argument. In the next section of the paragraph, where natural design and function with respect to the location of the eyes are examined, it is evident that the rational account Browne gives depends upon that support, for the account shows a tendency to become tedious through its closeness to tautology; it involves the following successive statements, paraphrased:

- a. Nature gives two eyes to all animals to correspond with the division of the brain.
- b. It is superfluous to have so many eyes in one plane, because
- c. The two eyes at either end perform the same function as two ordinary eyes.
- d. These two eyes would perceive as much as the other seven.
- e. The 'visible base' of the object would be defined by the outer two eyes.
- f. The middle eyes would not see as much, and that is why
- g. Man does not have a third middle eye.

These reasoning processes are adequate to the point at issue, and fairly quickly summarise the arguments implicit in nature, anatomy and optics against the belief, but Browne clearly realises their



dullness. The passage is not marked by any particular device, literary or rhetorical, that would enliven the discussion, so at once, a mythological allusion, an 'entertainment' is brought in to change the tone: "...the fiction of Argus seemes more reasonable then this..." The reader is naturally struck by the wit of including one-eyed Polyphemus and hundred-eyed Argus closely in the same discussion. A poet, Ovid, rather than a scientist, illustrates the argument. The 'reasonableness' of belief in a fabulous fiction like Argus is a common tactic of Browne's in reducing errors to the level of fairy tale; here it goes beyond just that sort of satire and takes the idea of Argus as a subject for anatomical consideration, observing that his eyes at least, unlike the lamprey's, were disposed in positions that were of utility. The eyes of spiders are considered, but merely tacked on after mention of Argus, added from his notebooks in the 1672 edition. Though a more 'scientifically' appropriate comparison might have been made between spiders and lampreys, the example of Argus suits Browne's argument better.

The second paragraph considers the exact nature of the 'eyes' of the lamprey, and compares the eyes of other creatures. Again, the emphasis is upon testing the reasoning behind the belief, and although this section largely reasons from ascertainable fact, the pattern is continued in which the logical process is relieved by witty or graphic devices. Throughout the chapter, Browne does not concern himself with the opinions of authority, with the exception that the name of Galen is once invoked to testify to the universal propinquity of brain to eye. His debt to Aldrovandus, noted by Robbins (Vol. II, p. 853), is not acknowledged. The observation that the lamprey's 'eyes' are not placed in the head sets off a series of assertions which tend towards the establishment of a 'law', but stops short of it; instead of rounding off the accumulated evidence of his deliberations, which

are confirmed by the testimony of Galen, Browne turns obliquely from the subject in hand to this semi-digression:

...and therefore we relinquish as fabulous what is delivered of Strenophthalmi, or men with eyes in their breast; and when it is said by Solomon, A wise mans eyes are in his head, it is to be taken in a second sence, and affordeth no objection...

Several things happen at once here; a side-swipe is delivered at a completely separate 'vulgar error' which had some considerable coverage among contemporary writers,<sup>17</sup> using the evidence accumulated against the main subject, and then this in turn is used to construct an elaborate pedantic joke out of a scriptural quotation. Browne, seeing an objection potentially implicit in the quotation from Ecclesiastes (2: 14), that if "a wise man's eyes are in his head", then those of an unwise man may be elsewhere, dismisses that possible (but rather unlikely) objection by assigning a figurative meaning to the phrase, and not a literal one. The first sense I have is of a sudden ludicrous collocation, and undoubtedly this is part of Browne's satiric intention, but because the deviation is twofold - from lampreys to Sternophthalmi to Solomon - it seems to exceed any necessity there is at such a point for emphatic mockery. It is, I think, a very good example of Browne finding witty allusion irresistible, and of permitting the material that comes to his mind to affect the course of his argument, rather than the other way about.

The return to the main subject shows a change of another kind. In comparing the situation of eyes in different groups of creatures,

17 Sternophthalmi were one of a type of freak that gained much contemporary coverage in books of 'wonders', perhaps originating from Mandeville's Travels. Martin Lluellyn's entertaining poem, Men-Miracles (1646), published in the same year as Pseudodoxia Epidemica, mentions them as the tenth of his examples of twenty-two freaks: The vales of Tartary men live in,  
Whose heads are wondrous like a Griphyn,  
And what is strange as all the rest,  
Eyes they have seated in their breast...



the tone is changed from that in which the 'reasonableness' of belief is examined, into a tone that Browne often uses in physical description; the hallmark of this type of description is the diction. The rush of polysyllables in this second half of the second paragraph has already been described in chapter four above (pp. 118-119), and signal Browne's concern to define his terms precisely, as is pertinent for the role he assumes for the rest of the chapter, that of the careful anatomist. Once the argument from anatomy is entered, the tone is more sober than before, although the presence of neologisms can be frequent in exuberant passages as well, and the chapter continues in a relatively plain and easy style. At the end of the second paragraph, the situation of the eyes in man is described by means of a compass-image that assists the argument with graphic description, but thereafter the discussion stays with the lamprey.

After explaining the true purpose of its nine cavities (although in fact the lamprey has seven spiracles and not nine, which casts some doubt on Browne's powers of observation), the paragraph digresses into an account of its physical structure. This final digression has the clear appearance of being derived from the inspection of a lamprey upon dissection. It serves to show the lamprey as a creature with unusual characteristics, but from its position as a lingering digression at the chapter's end, admission of the creature's peculiarity does not threaten the argument as a whole. As in the chapter on pigmies, the rejection of the belief as erroneous has been accomplished by a combination of devices; the explanation of the 'eyes' function is held over into the latter part of the chapter, and itself forms the impulse for digression. It is worth noting that, as in many chapters in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, the chapter-heading "Of Lampries" differs from the title in the Table of Contents, where

it appears as "That Lampries have many eyes". The general rule is that the titles in the Table of Contents are more detailed and explicit about the particular principal error treated than the chapter-headings, and this provides possible evidence that Browne felt at greater liberty to digress (and thus used a less precise title) when immersed in his subject, than when summarising his material, when the accuracy of indexing may have seemed to demand a corresponding accuracy in summarising his particular aims.

Analysis of two chapters alone will not describe the methods of Browne in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, for the heterogeneous quality of the material demands many approaches to the rejection of error, as various as the errors themselves. Some have inherently comic qualities, some have serious medical repercussions; some result from gross ignorance, some are poetical fancies. These two chapters are no more representative than any other two, but they do include the most important kinds of literary approach which Browne takes in his process of argument. The critical tendency in recent times has been, in studies of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, first, to study its place in the 'History of Ideas', as a serious contribution to knowledge as regards its subject-matter, and secondly, in general studies, to focus upon one feature of the prose--rhythm, structure, or allusion - and to draw general conclusions about the work from that one feature. The merit of analysing the way that the argument in the above two examples proceeds is that the total effect of the literary devices is obtained, and so one can feel more confident of keeping sight of how matter and manner are connected.

What is shown is that Browne's style (in the broadest sense of the word) operates as a support to his argument which is as strong as - or, in "Of Pigmies", even stronger than - the reasoning apparent through a literal reading of the statements he makes about errors. The chapter on pigmies shows that if we take the literal, or 'external'



statements that are made, the fact remains that Browne at no point says that he doesn't believe in pigmies, nor that they cannot exist. The internal evidence of his belief, in both chapters, is quite conclusive, however, and perfectly lucid. To suggest that either of these chapters is 'evasive' in argument, or desultory without purpose (as does Gosse<sup>18</sup>), is to mis-read them, and equivalent to accusing Browne of being unaware of the impact of his argument. The opposite is true; he shows he is fully aware of the differences between figurative assertions or denials, and straightforward 'rational' statements about his subjects. The decisive part played by rhetorical manipulation of both matter and language shows Browne capable of delivering opinion with force, if not vehemence, but in a manner which is not explicit.

Huntley's study of Pseudodoxia Epidemica<sup>19</sup> emphasises the importance of Browne's principles of arrangement to the exposure of error. Like Bennett and others, he sees the application of the three "determinators of truth" - reason, authority and experiment - as providing the foundation for Browne's order and effectiveness of enquiry. There is no question that, in many of the discussions in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, a competent dismissal of error takes place, also using irony, humour and ratiocination to produce unequivocal results. The example of Book III, chapter 5, "Of the Badger" is often cited as a case where reason, authority and experience (of other beasts, if not the badger itself) are marshalled, "to satisfy himself and convince his readers", as Joan Bennett puts it.

In this instance Browne's three determinators [of truth] all serve him well and point decisively to the overthrow of this vulgar error: there is no weight of authority to support it; the senses cannot discern it; it would be irrational to suppose it.<sup>20</sup>

18 Gosse, Sir Thomas Browne (1905), pp. 94-5

19 Huntley, Sir Thomas Browne (1962), chapter x.

20 Bennett, Sir Thomas Browne (1962), p. 161

This is a chapter where Browne himself indicates the presence of all three determinators explicitly, helpfully for those who have commented on his work:

... upon enquiry I finde repugnant unto the three determinators of truth, Authority, Sense and Reason... (R. 176)

But such explicitness is rare; beyond the assertion of a systematic principle for determining truth, the declaration of intent exists in various other ways. The headings for each of the Books II, III and IV are phrased to indicate that each subject to be handled will "prove either false or dubious" upon examination. The fifth Book is declared to concern "many things questionable as they are commonly described in Pictures" (R. 367), but the final pair of Books are prefaced by more neutral headings. Browne's statements of intent vary, then, in resolution, as to the large areas of error. Something similar is observable in the chapter headings, which appear in more explicit terms in the Table of Contents than in headings within the text. Successive headings in the early Books frequently embody the single principal error for demolition: "That the Chamaeleon lives only by Aire"; "That the Ostridge digesteth Iron" and so on, whereas this tendency is much less frequent in Books V to VII.

There are very diverse kinds of error in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and very diverse treatments of it, to the extent that the reader is sometimes forced to search in the author's tone for guiding principles. This diversity bears upon how much we can take for granted; at times it seems the reader is expected to be sceptical, at others to have an open mind. A miscellaneous chapter serves to show that Browne assumes in the reader a sceptical attitude for the time being. In Book V, chapter 23, sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 deal with four beliefs which are included as errors of the vulgar, and which seem prime instances of popular fallacies.



The beliefs are as follows, largely summarised in my own words:

3. That killing swallows is unlucky
4. That candles burn with a blue flame on the apparition of spirits
5. That coral makes a therapeutic amulet
6. That minerals can be divined using a forked stick.

Each of these 'fallacies' is dealt with in a single short paragraph, and the brevity of treatment might suggest that contemporary learned opinion would regard such beliefs as worthy of scant consideration. Brevity and the compendious character of the chapter inevitably suggest that the errors are of little significance, and the reader's sceptical habits have been formed by reading many successive rejections of error before this point. Nonetheless, both the nature of the subjects and the manner in which Browne's opinion is delivered should give us pause before writing off each belief.

Beliefs about the divination of metals were tested repeatedly at meetings of the Royal Society, as Robbins records (R. 1011); and claims for its effectiveness continue to be made in the present century. Oil companies employ diviners, and forked hazel sticks are still carried to evening classes in London to gain instruction in dowsing. It is not now a belief, and was not in Browne's time, to be dismissed without weighing of evidence, alongside rustic superstitions, and clearly such 'compendious' chapters of Pseudodoxia Epidemica cannot be taken as addressing less significant errors. Thus, it is dangerous to assume that the lengths of discussions or the positioning of beliefs among certain kinds of error offer the reader clear directions as to what are the most potent threats to truth; neither is it safe to expect that each subject which is treated necessarily involves either vulgarity or erroneousness. There are few short cuts to grasping Browne's conclusions, and we must read his every word. That Browne himself

recognises this is rarely explicit in the text; an exception is the conclusion to Book V, chapter 13, "Of the Pictures of the nine Worthies":

Now if any shall say that these are petty errors and minor lapses not considerably injurious unto truth, yet is it neither reasonable nor safe to contemne inferiour falsities; but rather as betweene falshood and truth, there is no medium, so should they be maintained in their distances, nor the contagion of the one, approach the sincerity of the other. (R. 402-403)

This is an important paragraph; it may at first look like a weak justification for indulging in discussions of recondite matters, but reflection on how it affects the whole work reinforces the principles Browne laid down in the first Book of Pseudodoxia Epidemica. No truths can ever be presumed; the whole work enquires, as the title-page informs us, into "received Tenents" and "commonly presumed Truths". To return to the 'miscellaneous' tenets of Book V chapter 23, from this, is to realise that Browne is not making assumptions about how much of a habit of scepticism we have formed in reading so far, and the assurance of this can be seen in the language of judgement which he applies to his subjects of enquiry.

The manner in which each of the four beliefs is introduced and then considered or judged displays that extreme variety and flexibility of expression which characterises the whole of Pseudodoxia Epidemica:

3. Whether herein there be not a pagan relique, we have some reason to doubt ...
4. That ... may be true ... and may also be verified ... But of lower consideration is ...
5. Though Corall ..., yet is it used ... But whether ... were not superstitiously founded ... is not beyond all doubt.
6. ...many there are who have attempted to make it good, yet untill better information, we are of opinion ... it is a fruitlesse exploration ...



Whatever the reader's preconceived notions about the subjects of discussion, Browne is even-handed in delivering his judgements. The range of ways in which those judgements are delivered, qualified, referred elsewhere, or withheld make it frequently, as in the case of the four brief discussions above, the most important element of the argument, not just in the obvious sense that a summary conclusion is needed in each case, but also because the stylistic arrangement is such that the whole process of argument, grammatically, rhythmically and illustratively, gathers towards that judgement as the apex of the discourse. So important are these curious and individual mechanics of judgement, affecting as they do other works besides Pseudodoxia Epidemica, that they merit separate consideration in a final chapter of analysis.

## Chapter Eight

### The Delivery of Judgement.

Vulgar error is the name given to an opinion which, being thought to be false, is considered in itself only, and not with a view to any consequences which it may produce. It is termed vulgar with respect to the multitude of persons by whom it is supposed to be entertained.<sup>1</sup>

Bentham's definition of a 'vulgar error' is apposite to Pseudodoxia Epidemica in several ways. Its hesitant quality, "...thought to be false...", "...supposed to be entertained...", reflects Browne's readiness to concede and allow alternative opinion; under each heading, the consequences of error are not dwelt upon, but rather the inherent truth or falsity of the belief itself; the errors may or may not be entertained by a multitude, but their believed currency is sufficient for Browne to examine them. Above all, since the consequences of error are not the focus of attention, the importance of making a judgement of some kind is increased, and of rendering that judgement in the most appropriate tone and manner. Browne's awareness of the dangers of reasoning from consequence is made explicit in the fourth chapter of Book I, "wherein indeed offences are most frequent, and their discoveries not difficult." (R. 27)

To meet the needs of the scope and range of subjects which make up his encyclopaedia, Browne evolved a sophisticated architecture of expressions specialised to deliberate and derive conclusions out of the mass of information and opinion. It is a procedure of art rather than any kind of mechanical system, whose object is to match each

<sup>1</sup> Jeremy Bentham, Handbook of Political Fallacies ed. H.A.Larrabee (1952), p. 5



subject or belief with a judgement which is pertinent. It is a procedure which is partly concealed behind rhetorical structures, and which commonly depends in the first instance upon a distinctive device of syntax. This device is inversion, and its presence in Pseudodoxia Epidemica is followed by similar devices in the works of 1658.

Sentence-inversion is one of the features which makes Browne's prose style so distinctive as to make it readily recognisable. It was, to some extent, an element of the syntax in Religio Medici which first fixed the Brownesque style in the public gaze:

That Miracles are ceased, I can neither prove, nor absolutely deny ... (I, 27, M. 27)

Whether Eve was framed out of the left side of Adam, I dispute not ... (I, 21, M.22)

How shall the dead arise, is no question of my faith ... (I, 48, M. 45)

These kinds of construction enjoy a moderate frequency in Religio Medici, and they occur in what may be called the register of decision, not unidiomatically, but with an effect of emphasis. Placing the substantive object clause before subject and verb also produces a rhythmic effect of deferring judgement, so that the reader considers the 'topic' of the statement before being made aware of the writer's opinion or experience. By far the most common signal of this manoeuvre is the opening "That..." or "Whether..."

In Pseudodoxia Epidemica, this construction is extremely common, and made more noticeable by the fact that many individual chapters and sections of chapters open with such inversions. The work is peculiarly suited to this; the belief, or vulgar error is announced, to be followed by a statement about its frequency, its currency, or its erroneousness:

That every plant might receive a name according unto the disease it cureth, was the wish of Paracelsus... (R. 156)

That a Salamander is able to live in flames, to endure and put out fire, is an assertion, not only of great Antiquitie, but confirmed by frequent, and not contemptible testimonie... (R. 214)

That Children committed unto the school of Nature, without institution would naturally speak the primitive language of the world, was the opinion of ancient heathens... (R. 434)

It is clear that this strategy in sentence-construction fulfils several needs for Browne. First, it will have been suitable for rapid execution in writing. The author can take a subject from his index and make it the first element of his discussion, before deciding what is the next appropriate matter to disclose. The presence of inversion of just the same kind in letters and notebooks suggests that such a mental procedure was habitual with Browne.

In a fairly formal letter to Sir William Dugdale, 11 December 1658, Browne offers responses to conjectures made by Dugdale in a manner exactly phrased as it would have been presented in Pseudodoxia Epidemica:

...yet how indisposed they were for workes of so high a nature, seemes probable from their insufficiencie in minor Arts... and again, in the following paragraph:

But that such workes, & even in those parts, were not neglected by the Romans, beside the policie in imploying of the people, and the benefitt of themselves in improving their acquests, seems also probable from experimentall encouragements in workes of like nature... (K. IV, p. 312)

Among the notebooks, it can be seen even more clearly how, in incomplete writings, an idea may be jotted down, operating as the potential object-clause of a whole statement, and then left hanging as the flow of thought is interrupted, or a decision or judgement fails to suggest itself. In these "Notes on Bubbles", Browne starts



off with an extravagant theory in an inverted construction, which his own, delayed opinion then deflates. The ungrammatical sentence which follows implies that its more rational definition of the nature of bubbles is what he will settle belief in, in antithetical relation to the conceit with which his train of ideas started:

That the last circumference of the universe is butt the bubble of the chaos & pellicle arising from the grosser foundation of the first matter, containing all the higher & diaphanous bodies under it, is noe affirmation of myne;

Butt that bubbles on watery & fluid bodies are butt the thinne parts of ayre, or a diaphanous texture of water, arising about the ayre & holding awhile from eruption. (K.III, p. 438)

What takes place here is very similar to the structure of parts of The Garden of Cyrus, where in chapters III and IV, Browne's accumulation of examples of his pattern is enlarged, to the extent that it threatens grammatical coherence. In chapter III, a listing process begins, in which both assertions and questions concerning the quincuncial order are heaped up, partly utilising the conventional subject - predicate sentence structure, and partly the customary form of inversion. The digression on seeds (M. 146-150) runs from a series of observations of nature into a concluding set of speculations, first framed as doubting propositions:

That seeds of some plants are lesse then any animals, seems of no clear decision; That the biggest of Vegetables exceedeth the biggest of Animals ... (etc) (M. 149)

followed by a long sequence of questions:

Now whether seminall nebbes hold any sure proportion unto seminall enclosures, why the form of the germe doth not answer the figure of the enclosing pulp, why ...(etc),

which are perfunctorily resolved thus, after many more 'whys' and 'whethers':

...are quaeries which might enlarge but must conclude this digression. (M. 149-150)

These examples illustrate how Browne finds the inverted sentence congenial in a discourse where he seeks to secure and sustain a hypothetical tone. Inversion of the sentences in the more wildly speculative areas of The Garden of Cyrus merges with his use of interrogative sentences, especially in chapter IV, where statements opening 'Whether...' and 'Why...' develop interchangeably into questions or into notes for further enquiry, with some such closing formula as "... we have not room to conjecture", or "... deserves a further enquiry". (M. 162)

The peculiarities of The Garden of Cyrus are such that Browne needs, in depicting an infinitely-expanding universal order, a form of declarative statement which can be the vehicle for endless speculation and hypothesis. Thus, besides suiting his likely need for rapid execution, this kind of inversion has the merit of great flexibility; it can bear statements of opinion from the assertive to the neutral.

W.K.Wimsatt discerned the more usual and general benefits of sentence-inversion in his account of Johnson's inversions:

The usual purpose of any writer in inverting is to obtain relevance through order, and especially that kind of relevance known as coherence, which means sequence or continuity. Or, since continuity is maintained by a series of emphases, we may say that the purpose of inversion is emphasis.<sup>2</sup>

It can be judged how adequate such a general explanation is when we consider what function Charles Lamb is drawing attention to in this fine parody of Browne, consisting of an elongated inversion, quite typical of the style of Pseudodoxia Epidemica:

<sup>2</sup> W.K.Wimsatt, The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson (1941), pp. 69-70



That the author of the *Religio Medici*, mounted upon the airy stilts of abstraction, conversant about notional and conjectural essences; in whose categories of Being the possible took the upper hand of the actual; should have overlooked the impertinent individualities of such poor concretions as mankind, is not much to be admired ...<sup>3</sup>

While it is obviously true that, as in successive sentences and paragraphs in both The Garden of Cyrus and Hydriotaphia (especially chapter IV), the commencement with 'whether', 'that' or 'why' helps to secure a torrential conjunctive patterning, Lamb's imitation provides a picture of the weightier structural function of inversion: it displaces the primary declarative element of assertion into a secondary position in the sentence. In Lamb's caricature, we learn much about the object of the statement - Browne's character as a speculatist - before reaching the verb governing the apparent main assertion. It is a structural device which gives the effect, as Morris Croll puts it,

...of being, not the result of a meditation, but an actual meditation in process.<sup>4</sup>

Croll's analysis of different kinds of period among Browne and his contemporaries draws upon general characteristics of expression, and while his findings suggest that violation of usual English syntax is often what lends Browne his distinction of style, he concludes, after commenting on Religio Medici I, 4, that:

To write thus, and at the same time to create beauty of cadence in the phrases and rhythm in the design - and so Browne constantly does - is to achieve a triumph in what Montaigne called "the art of being natural"; it is the eloquence, described by Pascal, that mocks at formal eloquence.<sup>5</sup>

With the more specific characteristic of sentence-inversion, it is possible to show Browne putting that eloquence to persuasive use,

<sup>3</sup> Lamb, "Imperfect Sympathies", in Essays of Elia (Everyman ed., p. 68)

<sup>4</sup> M.W.Croll, "The Baroque Style in Prose", reprinted in Literary English since Shakespeare, ed. Watson (1970), p.102

<sup>5</sup> Croll, pp. 102-103

and to derive conclusions which affect far more than the aesthetic impact of his style. Croll's seminal work showed conclusively how the 'Baroque' styles embodied a definite rhetoric, and by reference to classical rhetorical analysis, it is possible to reveal some other strategies which are involved in this aspect of Browne's technique.

The schemes of classical rhetoricians recognise many methods of summarising arguments, making conclusions and delivering judgement. There is, for example, the simple figure of conclusio, which is the name given to a short summary of what has been previously delivered in a discourse. If the summary is abrupt, then the term iteratio is used in some of the classifications of rhetoric.<sup>6</sup> It would be simple, if rather tedious, to show Browne employing such figures in his work, but I am not here concerned to show the extent and kind of his background in rhetorical studies, nor to classify his various methods of letting his opinions be known. Instead, I am concerned with certain less common modes of expression, which can be more vividly defined and usefully explained by reference to classical schemes, especially as inversion points graphically to their use.

In the Greek rhetorical tradition, there exists the scheme known as synchoresis, defined by Henry Peacham the elder as follows:

Scheme. The orator, trusting strongly to his cause, giveth leave to the judges or to his adversaries to consider of it with indifference, and so to judge of it, if it be found just and good, to allow it, if evil, to condemn and punish it.<sup>7</sup>

In Pseudodoxia Epidemica, Browne sometimes constructs his view of a problem so that a decision is left, or referred, to be judged by others, as in this short example to which I alluded in chapter 7 (p.183):

Whether Lampries have nine eyes, as is received, we durst refer it unto Polyphemus, who had but one, to judg it. (III, 19, R. 237)

<sup>6</sup> As before, I am here indebted to Sonnino's Handbook to 16th-century Rhetoric (1968). (cf. above, p.137)

<sup>7</sup> Sonnino, p. 212



The construction fits neatly into an inverted sentence, typically where a dubious assertion forms the opening element, to be ridiculed or refuted in the closing element. Alternatively, the senses or good sense of the reader may be appealed to:

Who can but pity the vertuous Epicurus, who is commonly conceived to have placed his chief felicity in pleasure and sensuall delights, and hath therefore left an infamous name behinde him? How true, let them determine who reade that he lived seventy years, and wrote more books then any Philosopher but Chrysippus ... (P.E. VII, 17, R. 599)

This example, requiring the reader to apply his own judgement to the question "How true..." seems close to the notion supplied in Peacham's definition of the scheme. That it is an orator's device, in its plainest manifestations, is suggested by its fitness for closing a point, for offering a foregone conclusion, and for presenting an argument whose terms admit little contradiction. It can admit a wide range of different emphases and forms, and in Browne's works it is not easy to pin down, because it serves different functions in different areas; it is not always used in an oratorical sense, nor necessarily to add strength to an argument.

The distinction between synchoresis and permissio is not great. Permissio's etymology suggests a surrender, so that Quintilian's definition

When we leave some things to the judgement of the jury, or even in some cases of our opponents.<sup>8</sup>

implies a 'throwaway' quality. The speaker makes an argument, and feeling he has said enough to make his point clear, refers the matters unsaid to the judgement of his hearers.

Synchoresis (ἡ σὺν ἡσυχίᾳ) means in general terms concession or consent, or more particularly, the taking of silence for consent.

<sup>8</sup> Sonnino, p. 140

There is no sense of the speaker or writer having omitted something, which is left to the hearer; the material of argument itself is referred for consideration and consent. It seems allied to the rhetorical question, interrogatio, which expects only affirmation or agreement. Synchoreasis refers the thing itself to others, permissio, in Puttenham's words, seeks "to avoid tediousnesse"<sup>9</sup> and omits details which would have been relevant. This closeness to the rhetorical question is significant if we recall how, in The Garden of Cyrus, hypothetical and interrogative modes seem almost interchangeable. (above, p. 198). To refer to others is, essentially, to ask them questions, to urge them to supply answers, and in so doing, the orator or writer not only engages the energies of the readers by involving them in the process of discovery, but affects a closeness of sympathy with his audience or readership. The less overt the schematic nature of this involvement, the greater the achievement of the orator or writer in making a persuasive argument is likely to be.

Synchoreasis in Peacham's terms, where the phrase, "trusting strongly to his cause" may be kept before us as important, is in full rhetorical use in the assertion about the lamprey, quoted above. We may paraphrase this as meaning 'Even a one-eyed man can tell whether Lampries have nine eyes'. In such cases as that quoted regarding Epicurus, Browne does trust strongly to his cause. Wit and irony usually accompany the device, and the comfort of certainty is what enables this piece of rhetoric to be employed.

Probably the most serious and emphatic example of the scheme in its full expressive use is to be found in the disquisition on the existence of the Phoenix (III, 12). In a paragraph which summarises the arguments of the chapter, Browne makes use of anaphora in repeating the word "since" no fewer than seven times to hammer home the reasons

<sup>9</sup> Sonnino, p. 140



for his disbelief in the Phoenix, and finishes off thus:

...and lastly, since so strange a generation, unity and long  
life hath neither experience nor reason to confirme it, how  
farre to rely on this tradition, wee referre unto consideration.  
(R. 207-208)

It is undoubtedly a bare form of conclusion; one rhetorical device, the anaphoric repetition, has done the work of conveying conviction, and the 'reference to others' has been reduced to a kind of shorthand, a form of words whose presence is necessary, but whose content is not important. Despite the formal lack of expressiveness in the words used, the reader is brought forcibly face-to-face with the necessity of giving his own considered judgement, and the strength of the argument is such that his opinion can only be given in one way. There is no Phoenix.

At the other extreme, reference to competent and impartial judges can take most elaborate forms. At the outset of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, Browne defines the boundaries of his enquiries, and analyses the causes of human error as they originated in the Fall. In this elaborately patterned paragraph in Book I, chapter 1, Browne refers groups of enquiries to appropriate authorities:

And therefore whether the sinne of our first parents were  
the greatest ... wee shall referre it unto the Schoolman.  
Whether there were not in Eve as great injustice in deceiving  
her husband, as imprudence ... we leave it unto the Morallist.  
Whether the whole relation be not Allegoricall ... we leave it  
unto the Thalmudist. Whether there were any policie in the devill  
to tempt them ... we leave it unto the Lawyer. Whether Adam  
foreknew the advent of Christ ... we leave it unto God... (R. 8)

This passage, clearly, is neither a concluding nor a conclusive one. It exists to show the kinds of scepticism that the Genesis story may prompt, and to show what it is necessary to pass over in setting the limits of enquiry he is to follow. Its rhetorical pattern does not really

conform to the definition afforded by Peacham, because Browne is not 'trusting strongly to his cause' within the logic of the argument. Nonetheless, the form of words used - 'Whether (x = y) we leave to N.' - is akin to clear examples of synchoreasis in fully expressive operation.

There are examples of 'leaving to the judgement of others' which embody no persuasive force, as in

Many others there are which we resigne unto Divinity, and perhaps deserve not controversie... (P.E. VII, 11, R. 568)

and the list of speculations on the significance of numerals in the Scriptures, which culminates thus:

...why ... David took just five pibbles out of the Brook against the Pagan Champion? We leave it unto Arithmetically Divinity, and Theologically explanation. (G.C. V, M. 172)

In fact, the listing of questions or propositions is such a common feature of the 'compendious' areas of Browne's middle works, that we may become immune to the statements Browne makes about the components of his lists. In this respect, other rhetorical schemes come close to synchoreasis, because some form of words becomes necessary within which to frame the catalogues, or rhapsodies, and rhetorical conventions serve as convenient. In the densities of chapters III and IV of The Garden of Cyrus, paralepsis occurs as a formal construction, signalled by sentences opening "To omit ...", but the constructions function to no persuasive end.

The use of forms suggesting the employment of paralepsis is often neutral, for Browne's free use of formalities is such that, preceding a list or series of questions, especially in The Garden of Cyrus, he is as likely to open with the phrase "Not to omit..." as he is to use "To omit...". The case is similar with synchoreasis, and that is why I refer to this feature of style as a habit, and not as something necessarily designed to persuade. The conventions of



expression which synchoreasis provides for Browne are regenerated, in many cases, to make useful vehicles in the marshalling of material, but are not put to the use of compelling the reader to give his judgement.

Paralepsis is mannered, and very frequent in The Garden of Cyrus, used in giving an impression of superfluity. Its presence is noted by Breiner as a device for exploratory work:

Paraleipsis is one of his favourite rhetorical devices in The Garden of Cyrus (for example, the recurring catalogue in chapter 2, strung together by the phrase, "To omit..."), and the whole essay ends with a long series of open questions, culminating in the assurance that "A large field is yet left unto sharper discerners to enlarge upon this order..." (p.225). Intent on his work like the gravedigger in Hamlet, Browne tosses up fragments for others to brood on; his own task is simply to dig.<sup>10</sup>

In chapter I, an extended passage of three paragraphs begins "Where by the way we shall decline the old theme,..." and goes on in a digression "of crosses and crucifixion", all of which is said to be "not revived", "not made further use thereof" and so on. (M. 132-133). The same scheme is prominent in chapter V, and the formula is signalled at the end of a disquisition on the presence of five as significant in Scripture: "More considerable there are in this mysticall account, which we must not insist on." But what follows is nonetheless an inclusion of material, framed as a succession of questions "why...", concluding with this refusal to make a judgement, after the fashion of the usual recourse to synchoreasis: "We leave it unto Arithmetically Divinity, and Theologicall explanation". (M. 172).

A century after Browne, Laurence Sterne, steeped in rhetorical lore, personifies the habit of omission, making it a sanctified

<sup>10</sup> Laurence A. Breiner, "The Generation of Metaphor in Thomas Browne", in MLQ xxxviii (1977), p.269

being among the learned:

- Read, read, read, read, my unlearned reader! read - or by the knowledge of the great saint Paraleipomenon - I tell you beforehand, you had better throw down the book at once; for without much reading, by which your reverence knows I mean much knowledge, you will no more be able to penetrate the moral of the next marbled page ...<sup>11</sup>

The marbled page is a distinctly suitable memorial to Paraleipomenon, and might serve as a reminder of Edwin Morgan's description of Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus as "marmoreal memorials".<sup>12</sup>

Both these schemes, then, are put to use by Browne when he deals in compendiums of material. In Pseudodoxia Epidemica, such schemes may dominate even whole chapters. Book VII, chapter 12 starts with a 'resignation' of problems to "Divinity" for judgement (R. 568), and ends with what amounts to an elaborate etcetera:

Many more there are of indifferent truths, whose dubious expositions worthy Divines and Preachers doe often draw into wholesome and sober uses, whereof we shall not speake; with industry we decline such paradoxies, and peaceably submit unto their received acceptions. (R. 570)

In other compendious chapters, omission of all but the names of poetical fancies does take place, or matters named may be referred to appropriate authorities and judges - or they may be referred to the eye or experience of the common reader:

As for the Unicorne, if it have the head of a Deere, and the tayle of a Boare, as Vartomannus describeth it, how agreeable it is to this picture every eye may discerne... (V, 19. R. 416)

Often, a property of this scheme is irony; we are left in no doubt as to the writer's opinion, while the literal significance of the words is to invite us to consider the view presented "with indifference",

11 Sterne, The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Book 3, ch. 36.

12 Edwin Morgan, "'Strong Lines and Strong Minds'..." in Cambridge Journal, IV (1951), p. 486.



as Peacham puts it. If irony - or, more blatantly, ridicule - is not a product of the use of such a scheme, then it is only operating as a form of words, a mannerism. When the satirist Butler seizes on the form, it is its pedantic and empty use that is ridiculed:

But let that pass at present, lest  
We should forget where we digressed,  
As learned authors use, to whom  
We leave it, and to th' purpose come.<sup>13</sup>

It can be argued that, as in the case of paralepsis, synchoreisis is reduced to a mannerism in many instances in Browne, its expressive force being quite neutralised. Butler's acute perception of what is ridiculous in learned contemporary writers like Browne includes many of the eccentric features of Pseudodoxia Epidemica and The Garden of Cyrus, such as the neologisms and the arcane subject-matter, and that he should parody stylistic devices as effectively as he mocks other oddities of Browne's is reinforced in this more comprehensive piece of burlesque:

They rode, but authors having not  
Determined whether pace or trot  
(That is to say, whether 'tollutation',  
As they do term't, or 'succussation'),  
We leave it, and go on, as now  
Suppose they did, no matter how  
(Yet from some subtle hints have got  
Mysterious light it was a trot.  
But let that pass).<sup>14</sup>

Again, the 'leaving to others' convention is mocked, with the comedy of pedantry even more pointedly exploited when the declaration that he is dropping the matter is followed by a return to the speculation that "it was a trot".

A further contemporary instance of the use of permissio or synchoreisis is to be found in the "Horatian Ode", where, as might be

<sup>13</sup> Butler, Hudibras, I, i, 345-348

<sup>14</sup> Hudibras, I, ii, 45-53

expected, Marvell makes full use of the ironic potential of the device:

And now the Irish are ashamed  
To see themselves in one year tamed;  
So much one man can do,  
That does both act and know.

They can affirm his praises best,  
And have, though overcome, confessed  
How good he is, how just,  
And fit for highest trust.<sup>15</sup>

Here Marvell evades stating in his own words that Cromwell is good, just and fit for trust, and refers us to the opinion of the Irish, newly defeated. The passage admits of more than one interpretation and suggests an ambiguity in the matter of finding praise for Cromwell. To refer to the Irish for judgement is to put the consent to praise him in question. If we think we know where Marvell's opinion lies, we may presume his device to be synchoreasis; if we think he is leaving the matter quite open, it will be permissio.

From this tortuous ambiguity it is sensible to return from Browne's rhetorical strategies to consider what Pseudodoxia Epidemica gives us as literal statement about the making of judgements. In the address "To the Reader", Browne makes it quite clear that his work is designed to propose opinions to his readers:

Lastly, wee are not Magisteriall in opinions, nor have wee Dictator-like obtruded our conceptions, but in the humility of Enquiries or disquisitions, have only proposed them unto more ocular discerners. (R., 4)

The stylistic and discursive emphasis on proposition is extremely important in Browne's handling of error, and is one of the factors which makes Pseudodoxia Epidemica essentially different from encyclopaedias, whether of the hexameral or the modern kind. It is a feature which

15 Andrew Marvell, The Poems... ed. H.M. Margoliouth (1971), Vol.I, p.93



needs careful critical appraisal, because it has suggested to many readers that Browne is less than decisive in his efforts to establish truth. In a recent article, it has been suggested that he resorts to a kind of 'rhetoric of doubt', which derives from Browne's conviction that reason and sense-perception are severely limited in their ability to combat error:

Despite Browne's interest in the discovery of truth in the Pseudodoxia Epidemica, there is a great amount of emphasis on doubt and the fallibility of man's apprehension of truth. Browne's writing is riddled with words suggesting incertitude. "If", "may", "might", "seem", "suspicious", "dubious", and "questionable" recur with striking frequency. Most of his conclusions are couched in uncertainty.<sup>16</sup>

It is possible to sympathise with the impression which this critic received; there certainly exists a vocabulary framed to cast doubt upon erroneous propositions in many and varied ways; but it is not possible to agree with this conclusion drawn from such an impression:

The Pseudodoxia Epidemica thus reveals the same epistemological process as Browne's other works, and this process implicitly undermines a Baconian faith in the advancement of knowledge.

Nor can this deduction from a presumed anti-Baconianism be entertained: (this process)...ultimately brings it closer to a religious sermon on the vanity of human knowledge.<sup>17</sup>

What Guibbory discerns as a 'rhetoric of doubt', following Joan Webber's <sup>first</sup> use of the phrase to describe a characteristic of Religio Medici<sup>18</sup>, is more properly defined as a rhetoric designed for doubting. This, after all, is the very rational business of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, to cast doubt on common and popular errors, and this chapter has shown how the kind of classical rhetorical formulae with which Browne will have been acquainted since his schooldays at Winchester are

16 Achsah Guibbory, "Thomas Browne's Pseudodoxia Epidemica and the Circle of Knowledge", in Texas Studies... XVIII (1976-77) p. 492

17 Ibid., p. 495

18 Joan Webber, The Eloquent 'I' (1968), pp. 168-170

used, in constructing an expressive manner capable of establishing many kinds and degrees of truth and error. They are part of a language remarkably expressive of scientific and rational value, which attempts to register agreement, assertion and denial as well as doubt in every shade of possibility.

It is possible, at the level of direct, rather than oblique statement, to demonstrate the breadth of this register of judgement more clearly. In the compendious chapter 7 of Book II, Browne considers a miscellaneous group of beliefs at the chapter's end, concerning the properties of plants, chiefly relating to their supposed poisonous qualities. The judgements which are made about these properties are delivered, as in other brief notices in compendiums, in inverted constructions, which can be summarised as follows:

Cataputia: That ... is a strange conceit

Cucumbers: That ... we readily concede: but  
that ... it will be hard to allow...

Elderberries: That ... experience will unteach us

Ivy: That ... wee know not how to affirme...

Ros-solis: That ... seems beyond dispute;  
That ... Shepherds affirm and deny;  
That ... sensible experiment doth hardly confirm;  
That ... practise and Reason conclude

Flos Affricanus: That ... in two experiments we have not found

Yew: That ... we know

Ashe: That ... we can deny. (R., pp. 157-158)

Patrides has observed that

... Browne's stature as an experimental scientist should be measured not by any immediate practical results but, as in Bacon's case, by method.<sup>19</sup>

This example shows Browne making judgements which take precise account, in few words, of the kind and quality of evidence available. The attention which he gives to the precision of grammar and diction in making his judgements constitutes a method suited to a discursive and readable system. As in the case of inverted sentences which make

19 C.A.Patrides (ed.), Sir Thomas Browne... (1977), p.35



less direct arbitrations, these straightforward pronouncements make a virtue out of syntactic displacement. In each instance, the subject is announced as an opening element, and judgement delivered in closing. What is remarkable is the precision of the forms of words in each case. There is no repetition, no casual recourse to abstract notions of 'truth' or propriety, but a completely appropriate response to each tenet, having regard to reason, experience, experiment or observation.

What the middle works of Browne have in common, and what can make them daunting to the modern reader, is a characteristic of much pre-scientific learned writing: the listing of authorities and facts gleaned from authorities. Despite the addition of much of his own experiment and observation, and the fact of his familiarity with much scholarship that was modern, these works are founded, like so many others of the time, upon a pedantic thoroughness in displaying knowledge of a bookish kind - an approach more akin to mediaeval than to modern science. Yet, in the method and organisation of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, Browne has imposed upon his material an effective means of deriving decisions. It is not a work like Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, which we value for its inventorial qualities or its fascination with excess in learning. The learning is there, it is often, to modern tastes, over-indulged, and rhetorical advantage is taken from its presence: but rhetoric is put to the service of demolishing error, serving utility as well as ornament.

In Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus, the utility of schemes imposed upon inversions of syntax is less obvious than their aesthetic convenience. Scrutiny of typical inverted sentences in these works reveals that each of them conveys distinct epistemological approaches to their subject-matter. In Hydriotaphia, the approach is one of conjecture; that is, the material has been buried or burnt, and relates to a past about which we can only guess; while in The Garden of Cyrus,

the approach is one of speculation; the pattern or order is visible in all directions, stretching beyond the reach of vision. The one looks back, the other forward, and as Huntley remarks,

...Browne made The Garden of Cyrus a volume of exact knowledge, and the first four chapters of Urn Burial a tissue of doubt. In the second and longer discourse he knows particulars through universals, whereas the best knowledge anyone can attain of "these dead bones" is that of particulars through other particulars.<sup>20</sup>

In these examples from The Garden of Cyrus, the closing elements of these assertions in chapter IV look forward and outward, extending the possibilities of Browne's basic perception of patterning:

Whether ... may also be considered (M. 161)  
 Whether ... deserves a further enquiry (M. 162)  
 Whether / why (series) ... we have not room to conjecture (M. 162)  
 Whether ... might perhaps deserve the question (M. 162)  
 Why ... deserves another enquiry (M. 164)  
 Why (series) ... were too long a speculation (M. 164)  
 Whether ... were no unpleasant speculation (M. 168)

In Hydriotaphia, inverted syntax of this type is much less common; where it does occur, the closing element is rarely resolute, and, as in these instances from the first two chapters, it stresses the incomplete character of knowledge concerning antiquities:

Whether ... we have no authentick conjecture (M. 92)  
 Whether ... we hold but a wavering conjecture (M. 94)  
 In what bulk ... tradition and history are silent (M. 97)  
 But whether ... we hold no authentick account (M. 98)  
 Whether (series) ... there is no assured conclusion (M. 100)

Both the works of 1658 are meditative in comparison with the arguments of Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and these constructions do not serve in arriving at an opinion. Yet clearly the inversion of sentence-order, with the rhythmic cadence which so often accompanies it, is as well-suited to convey the expansion into speculation as it is to deliver the carefully-weighed determination or reference to authority.



In all of Browne's work there is a strong presence of what Austin Warren calls "the grammar, or logic, of belief",<sup>21</sup> and he alludes to these kinds of sentences as making up a "litany of the degrees of assent". He concludes as follows:

If one were to reconstruct the spirit of Browne from these sentences, of one type eminently characteristic of him, one might plausibly conclude that, if not an atheist, he was a sceptic. But taken in conjunction with other characteristic types of sentence ... I read them as the thought-form of an inquiring and - to use a more exalted term - a speculative mind.

This does justice to the spirit informing Browne's imaginative work; but we need to add to this to give a fair character to his service to the language of deliberation and argument. In brief, to say that, in his search among the disorder of human conceptions, he brought a unique elegance to method, and evolved a most sensitive and humane means of persuading his fellows along paths of truth.

21 Warren, op. cit., p. 685

## Chapter Nine

### Conclusion.

The bulk of this thesis has been taken up with considerations of the diction which Browne uses and with the kinds of grammatical and rhetorical usages which sustain in his work an individual voice. It has, historically, been more common for readers to apply their concentration to the poetical character of his prose, to try to understand the manner in which his uncommon sentiments are given expression, and to interpret the unusually musical quality of his purple passages, chiefly in Religio Medici and Hydriotaphia. In taking as my focus two areas of language which are not especially prominent in his more regularly-thumbed pages, but rather in The Garden of Cyrus and Pseudodoxia Epidemica, it may be objected that the features I have emphasised do not contribute in a major way to Browne's principal virtues as a prose stylist. The obvious richness of his vocabulary offers no guarantee that imagination will convert prose into poetry, and there are stretches of Pseudodoxia Epidemica which can serve as evidence of this.

However, the imaginative habits which provoke admiration of the closing chapter of Hydriotaphia were formed before Browne ever published a word. The innovative urge in his personal vocabulary and his minute attention to the processes of argument are central to Browne's approach to the business of writing. He writes with both a strong critical instinct, and with a persistent urge towards speculation, and, disconcertingly, these instincts are made into supports for each other, rather than diluting their respective effects.



Against a background of new learning, where his contemporaries were seeking a much-needed methodology, to arrange systems of thought adequate to support new discoveries, Browne's discourses have not been easy to categorise. In twentieth-century perceptions of the 'Ancients and Moderns' conflict, his speculative and mediaeval tendencies have caused historians of ideas to cast Browne as a conservative. R.F.Jones looked for a focal point to explain the reaction of scientific writers like Wilkins and Sprat against florid expression in the Restoration period, and found Browne an easy target; on the evidence of contemporary theory Jones had marshalled, it was the literary and intellectual habits of Browne, with his 'swellings' and hard words against which the early members of the Royal Society revolted.<sup>1</sup> Browne is caricatured as an imaginative writer who trespasses into territory properly occupied by more 'rational' thinkers, whose concern is to test hypotheses, and to use hard evidence as the basis for establishing scientific proofs. Under the 'rules' of discourse made explicit in Sprat's History of the Royal Society, adequate vocabularies were deemed to exist for the naming of experiences and phenomena, without constant recourse to Latin; rhetorical invention and arrangement was an unnecessary practice; Bacon's dictum, derived from Biblical sanction was that men must understand the wisdom of God's creation, as Adam had done in Paradise. St. Paul:

...assigneth two marks and badges of suspected and falsified science: the one, the novelty and strangeness of terms; the other, the strictness of positions, which of necessity doth induce oppositions, and so questions and altercations.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, Browne has been seen as a Baconian because of his declared intent in Pseudodoxia Epidemica, and his recourse to experimental

1 R.F.Jones, in "Science and English Prose Style"; see above, pp. 86-88

2 Bacon, Advancement of Learning, I, iv, 5

investigation as well the marshalling of authority; but as quite un-Baconian for his supposed misuse of language in the dominion of science.

I have shown how his achievement in the making of words swelled English vocabulary in two distinct ways. First, in naming and describing phenomena and experience in technical discussions; this body of new terms is that which we can find later writers like Boyle, Ray, Charleton and Plot using as a convenient and apt diction fit for scientific purposes. The utility of this stock of words counters the idea that 'hard words' were always improper vehicles of expression in the new science, and the variety of writers who indulged in new, stiff latinisms before and after Browne suggests that they are common to a rich diversity of intellectual traditions. Secondly, Browne developed, more idiosyncratically, a vocabulary specialised to deliberate within complex discussions in which there existed a variety of fact, opinion and experience; this rich fabric enabled him to make the most sophisticated discriminations between truth and falsehood, and to convey nuances of certainty and doubt within a careful intellectual hierarchy of terms.

In his diction, then, Browne does make a positive contribution towards establishing a methodology for critical scientific research. Despite his occasional descent into macaronics, he shows, in his revisions to Pseudodoxia Epidemica, a sensitivity to his own lexicaphanic tendency, and revises in the direction of sober expression. He provides an example for later writers of the flexibility of latinised English, and even if he makes no scientific discoveries nor any new conceptual connections, he devises a verbal structure rich in the capabilities of invention and disposition. In Pseudodoxia Epidemica the value of this richness is apparent in his relativity



of judgement; in Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus it is put to the service of conjecture and speculation.

Alongside the resources of diction, Browne's habits of syntactic arrangement fortify his powers of discrimination. I have shown in chapter six how he strives for personal detachment in rational deliberations, and how the formulae of self-reference enable him to make persuasive arguments in a context approaching discursive neutrality. Beyond this, the control which he exercises over each argument into which he enters is subtly manoeuvred by deft arrangements of syntax; these arrangements make order out of disorder, and instead of confronting the reader with dogma or oracular pronouncements, offer him conclusions in which he may feel he has participated.

We may contrast, finally, Browne's virtuosity and flexibility of assertion with his contemporary hunter-out of errors, James Primrose.

...Having already spoken of divers sorts of men that practise physick, it will not be amisse to point out the errour common to them all; for they observe the beating of the Arteries, peepe into Urines, and prescribe purges. Yea silly women doe it. And who is able to refrain from laughter, when he sees women feelee the pulse. Where it is to be noted, that such observatours take notice of only one difference of the pulse, to wit, the swiftnesse and slownesse; but there are many differences of the pulse necessarily to be considered by the physician, simple, compound, absolute, relative, in only one pulsation, and in many. All which if they were considered according to Galen's minde, & the Ancients, they would be more than two thousand differences ...<sup>3</sup>

Primrose makes it obvious that the affronts offered to truth must be censured in certain terms, and at the same time, displaying his professional credentials, emphasises the inaccessibility of these particular truths to all but a select few.

3. James Primrose, Popular Errours, or the Errours of the People in Physick, trans. Robt. Wittie (1651), p. 56

Browne addresses a similar vulgar error about physic in Pseudodoxia Epidemica; he denounces the vulgar belief in the diagnostic power of uroscopy, from similar motives to Primrose's censure of amateur sphygmography. Primrose had also expressed contempt for the idea that physicians might easily judge diseases by the study of urines:

Fuchsius in the beginning of his chapter of urines, he calls Physicians that peepe into urines asses, cheaters, pisse-drinkers, unworthy with whom good men should contend, seeing they more esteeme of the gain they get by urine, then of truth it selfe...<sup>4</sup>

The comparison is fruitful. Browne's ridicule is learned, oblique, and allusive, where Primrose is direct to the point of abusiveness. Primrose's gifts include a power of invective, which he often uses to emphasise his own learning, as well as its absence in the vulgar. Browne's range is far wider. Besides drawing attention to the abuse of the practice, he stresses its inherent limitations, and likens credulity in uroscopy to belief in oracles; his allusions lead him into ornamentation of his theme, and finally he refers in humility to his own personal problems in offering medical diagnosis:

Physitions (many at least that make profession thereof) beside divers lesse discoverable wayes of fraude, have made them beleeeve, there is the book of fate, or the power of Aarons brest-plate in Urines. And therefore hereunto they have recourse as unto the Oracle of life, the great determinator of virginity, conception, fertility, and the inscrutable infirmities of the whole body. For as though there were a seminalitie in Urine, or that like the seed it carried with it the Idea of every part, they foolishly conceive wee visibly behold therein the Anatomie of every particle, and can thereby indigitate their diseases; and running into any demands expect from us a sudden resolution in things wherein the devil of Delphos would demurre, and we know hath taken respite of some daies to answer easier questions. (P.E. I, 3, R. 19)

<sup>4</sup> Primrose, p. 65



That he should end on an indeterminate note, even though his view of 'fruitless uroscopy' is plain, is characteristic. He has infused other matter into the subject under discussion, so as to relate it to more universal concerns; to rely on man's judgement is like relying on the delusions of Delphi. But the habit of doubting is progressive. In this habit, Browne stands above his contemporaries, a writer who formulated expressions capable of conveying useful dubiety and scepticism, which themselves correspond to the humility depicted so dramatically in Religio Medici. In this, he is a Baconian to the letter:

If a man will begin with certainties, he shall end in doubts; but if he will be content to begin with doubts, he shall end in certainties.<sup>5</sup>

. . . . .

5 Bacon, The Advancement of Learning, I, v, 8.

APPENDIX ITHE COINAGES OF SIR THOMAS BROWNE

This appendix gives a list of 1,007 words for which there is evidence that Browne was their first user in English. The chief source of evidence is the Oxford English Dictionary's systematic dating of quotations.

While this list is exhaustive, it has no pretensions to being definitive, and its value lies in providing a guide to the creativity and complexity of Browne's diction, rather than offering a precise account of a linguistic phenomenon. Two prefatory tables, below, show how the entries are arranged and classified, but it is necessary to add a few qualifying remarks to indicate how the list should be considered, and how it was compiled.

(1) The notion of "coinage" is itself questionable. Here, it should be held to signify that Browne was the "first man of letters to venture the use of" the words in question.

(2) The factor which determines the inclusion of a word is, in the first instance, its form, and not its meaning. Thus, I have not included words which had a literary existence prior to Browne, but whose significance was altered (for example, from a literal to a figurative meaning) in Browne's usage, except where there is a grammatical change involved, noted "D" in the key. This procedure has the disadvantage of causing the inclusion of "trivial" coinages (PARADOXY, PARRICIDOUS, etc.), but accurately reflects the approach of the O.E.D. in its system of analysis.



APPENDIX I (continued)

(3) Words of "alien" status present problems. Large numbers of imported terms litter the pages of all Browne's works, and often there is no typographical indication in the text to suggest how the author regarded them. On the whole, italicization is no more than random, and it is not possible to distinguish between the treatment of foreign words as semi-quotations, or as terms meaningful, in an otherwise English context, to a learned readership. The O.E.D. does not help resolve this except in the most arbitrary way. The result has been that I have accepted inclusion in the O.E.D. as the standard for inclusion here, except in eleven instances (see Chapter 2, p.37).

.

(4) My procedure in compiling this list will suggest the degree to which it is comprehensive, and the following are the methods used.

- (a) From a complete reading of Browne's works in print, 3,000 words were listed which were (i) unusual (ii) Latinate (iii) unknown to me (iv) historically likely to have been coined.
- (b) These words were checked against O.E.D. About 500 words were shown as "first used" by Browne, and 35 showed some defect in O.E.D.
- (c) A complete scan of all entries in O.E.D. produced a further 400 or so items.
- (d) The substantive list was checked against the Chronological English Dictionary. This provided a safety-net for items overlooked in the scanning, and added a further 20 words.

APPENDIX I (continued)

- (e) Glossaries (e.g. Greenhill's on R.M. and U.B./G.C.) were systematically consulted, and the commentaries of Martin and Robbins, to provide a check on meanings and antecedents. A contemporary "hard-word" dictionary (Blount, 1656) was consulted.
  - (f) All textual variations provided by the apparatus in Martin and Robbins, and the editions of Wilkin & Keynes, were incorporated in the list, for accurate dating, and to establish the most correct forms.
  - (g) The list was checked back against the O.E.D. to ensure conformity of treatment, and amended where O.E.D. was in error.
  - (h) All entries were coded according to their formal status.
- (5) The list should be considered alongside the summary of Schäfer's work in computer-assisted lexicography, in my Chapter 2, which sets out the limits of lexicographical enquiry.



TABLE A - Arrangement of entries

The list is arranged in seven columns, as follows:

- (1) KEY Letters given here indicate the status of the coinage (see Table B below).
- (2) FORM Word as spelt in Browne's works. A note may appear giving the part of speech in which it is used. Variations of spelling from one edition to another are noted in the fourth column, as are instances where the form was replaced by a different word in other editions. If the O.E.D.'s spelling of the main entry differs, this is indicated in the fifth column.
- (3) REFERENCE Abbreviations given here are standard, and relate to the editions of Robbins (PE), Martin (RM, UB, GC, LF, CM) and Keynes (1964), Volumes III and IV. Page references are only given in the last of these.
- DATES are only given here where there is any variation from:

RM 1643  
PE 1646  
UB/GC 1658  
LF 1682 )  
CM 1682 ) \*  
TRACTS 1682 )

\*These posthumous works are considered as bearing the limiting date of Browne's death, 1682. The O.E.D. conjectures that the date of composition of A Letter to a Friend was 1672, for which there is no conclusive evidence.

(4) SIGNIFICATION Included here are:

- A note that Browne supplies a gloss as to meaning. (see also Appendix IIId.)
- A brief note of the meaning where it is neither self-evident nor supplied by the context.
- A quotation showing that some kind of synonymous re-expression or explanatory formula is supplied by the context in a simple form.
- A note showing textual variants. (see also Appendix IIc.)
- A note "(context)", showing that the meaning is implicit in the text, otherwise than by a simple statement of synonymy or meaning.

(5) O.E.D. NOTES This column includes:

- O.E.D.'s spelling of the entry.
- Notes on omissions or error in O.E.D. (see also Appendix IIb.)
- Dates of first use for related forms.
- Other relevant notes from O.E.D.

(6) ANTECEDENTS This column includes:

- Authors' names where there is good evidence (from Robbins, Martin, and O.E.D.) that Browne anglicized or borrowed a term directly from his reading, indicating the source of neologism.
- Dates of usage and authors' names for related forms.
- Dates and lexicographers' names where the form's first use occurred prior to Browne's use, in a Dictionary (KEY, B).



(7) SUCCESSORS

This column includes:

- Authors' names and dates of publications  
(up to 1700) where the form has been used  
subsequently. (see also Appendix IIIb.)
- Notes of related forms subsequently used.

TABLE B - Key

All entries are classified A - E.

- A = first use per O.E.D. (adjusted for error).
- B = first use per O.E.D., but found earlier as an entry in a Dictionary.
- C = first use per O.E.D. of adverb, ' - ly'.
- D = conversion of pre-existing form to new part of speech, as ABRUPT (vb.), CARNAL (vb.) etc.
- E = first use of "alien" word.

Entries prefixed G indicates an error or omission in O.E.D. These are summarised in Appendix IIb.

Suffixes:-

- 1 "stillborn" coinage, word only found in Browne, with no subsequent user except Dictionaries.
- \* word common in current use (i.e. where the Pocket Oxford Dictionary includes an entry).



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A *	ABERRANCY	PE I:3	divergency from truth etc.	aberr 1536		Blount 1656; aberrance Glanvill, 1665.
D	ABRUPT (vb.)	RM I:13 PE VI:10 CM III:X1		only in TB as adj. 1583		
A 1	ABSTERSE	PE III:22	absterge, to wipe away	absterge 1541		
A	ABSTRUCITIES	PE I:8 GC II	obscurities	abstrusity abstruse 1599		Blount 1656
E	ACARI	GC IV	a mite (Gk.)	acarus (zool.)		
D 1	ACCENDING (pp1. adj.)	PE II:5	kindling	accend 1432		
A	ACCENSION	PE II:1 PE II:5 PE III:21 UB IV				Phil. Trans. 1673
A	ACCESSIONAL	PE IV:7	additional	accession 1588		
C *	ACCOUNTABLY	PE VI:7		accountable 1583		Spencer 1665
A	ACCURATION	PE V:6(2)	"accubation or lying down at meals"			Cowley 1656
A1	ACCUMBING	PE V:6	laying down at table	accumb		Blount 1656. <u>accumbency</u> Robinson, 1658
A *	ACCUSABLE	PE V:7		accuse 1297		
E	ACIES	PE IV:1	line of vision		Latin, an edge	Hale 1677
A *	ACQUIRABLE	PE III:27		acquire 1435		

KEY	FORM	REF.	SIGNIFICATION	OED NOTES	ANTECEDENTS	SUCCESSORS
A	ACULEOUS	GC II	pointed, prickly	aculeate 1605..(Bacon)		
D *	ADDITIONAL (adj.)	PE I:1		as sb. 1639 .. (Fuller)		
A 1	ADDITIONARY	CM III:17	additional			
A	ADDLED (pp1. adj.)	PE IV:6		addle C13		
A. *	ADJACENCYES	PE II:2		adjacency adjacent 1430		
A	ADOREMENT	PE I:3 PE I:X1	adoration	only in TB		
"AEQUI-" see "EQUI--"						
A	AFFLUXION	PE IV:3	a flowing towards		afflux Cotgrave 1611	
A	AFTERGRAVE	LF: Martin p.187	"corruption or aftergrave"			
GAL	AGGELATION	PE II:1 (1650)	"accretion or pluvius aggelation"	OED gives 1681		
A	ALARY	GC IV	"alary or wingy"			
A	ALBUGINOUS	PE II:1	albuminous	albugineous 1543	Cabeus	Blount 1656 <u>albugineous</u> , Power, 1664
A	ALLANTOIS	PE V:22	the foetal membrane	allantoid 1633 Spigelius		Ray 1691
A	ALLICIENCY	PE II:2	attractiveness			allicient, Robinson 1658 <u>Glanvill</u> 1665
A1	ALOGY	PE III:4 PE VII:16	absurdity			



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
(c)B	ALTERNATELY	PE II:6		alternate 1513	Huloet (Dict) 1552	
A	ALTERNITY	PE III:1				
A *	AMBIDEXTROUS	PE IV:5		ambidexter C16		Gataker 1654
A1	AMBILAEVOUS	PE IV:5	left-handed on both sides			
A *	AMPHIBIOUS	RM I:34 PE III:13 PE III:24	"amphibious animals, such as live in both elements"	amphibian 1637		Butler, (Hudibras) 1663 L'Estrange 1654
A1	AMPHIDROMICAL	GC V	pertaining to the festival of Amphidromia		Athenaeus	Blount, 1681
A *	ANALOGUS	PE II:6		analogous analogy 1550		Power, 1664, Plot 1686, Webster 1671.
C	ANALOGOUSLY	PE III:1				
A1	ANATIFEROUS	PE III:12	producing ducks or geese			Blount, 1656
C *	ANATOMICALLY	PE III:3		anatomical 1586		
A.	ANDROGYNAL	PE III:17	androgynous; glossed TB: "consisting of man and woman"	androgynous 1628		<u>androgynous</u> : Biggs 1651 Gaule 1652
C1	ANDROGYNALLY	PE III:17				
E1	ANGUSTIA'S	CM II:13	difficulties		Latin, narrowness	
GA	ANHELENT	TRACTS VIII (K III, p.72; MS Slo. 1839)	"anhelent, strident, and of very harsh sound"	(anhelant) OED gives 1764 anhele 1340		
A *	ANOMALOUS	PE IV:5 PE II:1 GC III		anomaly 1571		Gaule, 1652, Phil. Trans. 1667
C	ANOMALOUSLY	PE V:5				

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	ANOPSIE	PE III:27	"anopsie or invision"	anopsy		Blount, 1656.
E	ANTANACLASIS	PE VII:13		(rhet.)	Puttenham, Peacham	
A*	ANTEDILUVIAN	PE VII:3 GC II	before the Flood			Trapp, 1657, Burnet, 1684
A	ANTEPILEPTICALL	PE II:5	preventive of epilepsy	(med.)		Blount, 1661. Phil. Trans. 1667.
GC	ANTICIPATIVELY	RM, Pref.		OED gives 1864		<u>anticipative</u> , H. More, 1664
A *	ANTIDOTALL	PE III:23 PE VII:17		antidote 1543		
C 1	ANTIDOTALLY	PE II:7				
C.	ANTIDOTICALLY	PE III:23		antidotical... Topsell 1607		
A *	ANTIPODAL	PE VI:7	of the antipodes	antipodes 1398		Blount, 1656, More, 1664
A 1	ANTIQUARISM	UB IV		antiquarianism 1779 antiquary 1563		
C 1	ANTONOMASTICALLY	PE III:23 (1646 only)	by way of antonomasia	(rhet.) antonomasia 1549		Blount, 1656
B(E)	APOPHYSES	PE IV:1 (1646 only) GC III	protuberances of bone	apophysis	Cotgrave 1611	
E	APORRHOIAS	PE II:5 (1646 only)	"aporrhoeas, or emanations from their bodies"	aporrhoea		Glanvill, 1681 Charleton, 1650
A 1	APPEARENCY	PE VII:4	phenomenon	appearance 1400		
A *	APPEND	PE II:5		(obsolete sense 1325-1470)		



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
C *	APPREHENSIBLY	LF: Martin p.181		apprehensible 1631		
A	APPROPRIABLE	PE VI:1		appropriate 1530 (vb.)		Fuller, 1662
A*	APPROXIMATE (adj.)	PE III:21	.			
A*	APPROXIMATION	PE VI:2				Power, 1664; More, 1660
A *	AQUEOUS	PE II:1 PE VI:12	watery	(another sense, 1643)		Boyle, in Phil. Trans. 1667
A*	AQUILINE	PE III:X1 PE VI:X1	"an hooked, or aquiline nose" "aquiline or hawked"			Blount, 1656
A*	ARBOREOUS	PE II:6	arboreal	arboreal 1667		Evelyn, 1676 <u>arboreal</u> , Cowley 1667
E	ARCHIDOXIS	RM I:19 PE II:1	a collection of secrets		Paracelsus (title)Glanvill 1665	
A	ARCHIMIME	UB IV	"archimime or jester"			<u>archimimic</u> Blount, 1656
A*	ARENACEOUS	PE IV:10	"arenaceous and friable"		Scaliger "arenidum"	Blount, 1656
A1	AREOPAGY	PE I:10 CM III:15	"areopagy and dark tribunal"		(Milton, <u>Areopagitica</u> 1644)	
A	ARIOLATION	PE I:3 PE IV:5	"ariolation, southsaying, and such-like"	ariole, 1398	Vulgate, Isàiah 15:23	Gaule, 1652
A	ASCENSIVE	PE IV:13				
A	ASPECTION	PE III:7 PE IV:2	the action of watching (context)	aspect (vb.) 1548		Gaule, 1652
A	ASPHALTICK	RM I:19	"asphaltick and bituminous"			Ussher, 1658; Milton, 1667
GD	ASSASSINE (vb.)	RMII:4	assassinate			

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	ASSIMILABLE (as sb.)	PE VII:19		(as adj. 1667) assimilate 1578		Boyle, 1667
E	ASTERIA	PE III:13	a precious stone		Boodt	
A	ASTRONOMIZE	CM III:9		astronomy 1205		Burnet, 1684
A	ATOMICALL	PE II:1	"powders and atomically divisions"	atomical atomic 1678 atom 1477		Power, 1664; Ingelo, 1660
A	ATRAMENTAL	PE VI:12	"atramental and denigrating"	atramental atrament 1398		Evelyn, Sylva <u>1662</u>
A	ATRAMENTOUS	PE VI:12 PE III:20 (1646-58)	black as ink			Phil. Trans. 1683, Simpson, 1669 <u>atramentitious</u> , Bulwer, 1650
A	ATTENUABLE	UB III	that may be made thinner	attenuate 1530		
A	AUGMENTING (pp1. adj.)	GC III	magnifying	augment 1400		
A. 1	AUSTRALIZE	PE II:2	glossed, TB's footnote: "point to the South"	austral 1398		Blount, 1656
A*	AUTOCHTHON	PE VI:1	"autochthon, or man arising from the earth"	predates other forms		Ingelo, 1660
A	AUTOMATOUS	PE V:18 CM I:24	"clocks, or automatus organs"	automaton 1625; all other forms later		
C*	AUTOPTICALLY	PE VII:2 (1646-50)	(1658 "ocularly")	predates other forms		Glanvill, 1661 autoptical Biggs, 1651 <u>Evelyn, 1675</u> <u>autopsie Wittie</u> , trans. <u>Primrose 1651</u> .



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	AVOLATION	PE V:23 (1650)	action of flying away			Boyle, 1684 <u>avolate Phil. Trans. 1673</u>
A	AXUNGIOUS	PE III:26	greasy	axunge 1541		
A	AZYGOS	PE IV:3 (1646-58)	"azygos, or vena sine pari"	azygous	fallopius/paré	
A	BALNEARY	PE VI:7	"balnearies or bathing places"	balneal 1645		
A.1	BALNEATIONS	PE II:6	"balneations, washings and fomentations"			Blount, 1656
A*	BELEMNITE	PE II:1		(palaeontol.) Boodt		Plot, 1677
A	BELOMANCY	PE V:23	"belomancy or divination by arrows"			
A	BENEGROE	PE VI:X1 (1646-50)	(1658 "denigrate")			Charleton, 1650; Hewyt, 1658
A1	BENEPLACIT	RM I:59	good pleasure			<u>beneplacity</u> (as RM 1642 ed.) Blount, 1656
A	BICIPITALL	PE II:3				
A1	BICIPITOUS	PE III:5 PE III:15	(context)			
A	BICORNOUS	PE V:19 (1650)	(context)		bicorn'd Sylvester 1608	Ray 1690
B	BIFEROUS	TRACTS I (K.III, p.40)	(context)	(bot.)	Blount 1656	

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
GD	BIPARTITED (vb1. sb.)	PE IV:5 (1646 only)	(1650 "divided	(not as vb. in OED)		
A*	BIPED	PE III:4	two-footed animal		bipedal, <u>Topsell</u> 1607	Tyson, 1699
A 1	BISEXOUS	PE III:17	"bisexous or double-sexed"	bisexed 1606		Blount, 1656
A*	BISSECT	PE VI:5		bisect	Vallesius	<u>bisected</u> Blount, 1656. <u>Barrow</u> , 1660
A1	BISULCOUS	PE III:27 PE V:19 Commonplace books KIII p.297	cloven-hoofed	predates other forms	Aldrovandus	<u>bisulk</u> Bulwer, 1650
A	BOATION	PE III:27	"mugieny or boation"			
A1	BOLARY	PE II:3	of the nature of clay			<u>bolar</u> Phil. Trans. 1676
A	BOMBULATION	PE II:5	buzzing	bombilation	Caesius	Blount, 1656
A*	BOTANICAL	GC II		predates all forms except Blount's ...	<u>botanical</u> Blount, 1656	
A*	BOTANIST	TRACTS I (K.III, p.34)		(botanic 1656) (botany 1696)		
A	BOTANOLOGER	GC I				
A	BOTANOLOGY	GC IV				
A1	BOUFFAGE	LF: Martin p.183	a satisfying meal			
A*	BUMPING	PE III:27	noise of bittern	Bump, v.2.		Dryden, 1700
A	BURST-COW	PE III:27	"buprestis or burst-cow"			Rowland, trans. Moufet 1658 (claims coinage)



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A1	CALCANTHOUS	PE VI:12	"calcanthous or atramentous"	chalcanthous		Blount, 1656
A	CALICULAR	GC III (5)	of a calyx	(calycular ) (calicular )		
E1	CALLIPYGAE	PE VI:6	"callipygae and women largely composed behind"			
C.	CANDIDLY	PE III:18		candid 1630		More, 1650
A*	CANOROUS	PE VII:14	singing, musical			<u>canorously</u> H.More, 1680
E	CANTHIS	PE III:27	"canthis or greater angle of the eye"	canthus (phys.)		
GA*	CAPILLARIE (adj.)	PE III:21	hair-like	(OED gives capillary 1656)		Blount, 1656; Power, 1664; Simpson, 1669
A*	CAPILLARIES (sb.)	PE VII:7) PE II:6 )	maidenhair ferns	capillary		Phil. Trans. 1667, Ray, 1692; Evelyn, 1665
A	CAPILLATION	PE III:3	"smaller veins, or obscure capillations"			Blount, 1656 (diff. sense)
A	CAPSULATED	PE IV:6	"lockt up and capsulated"	capsulary 1615		Power, 1664
A 1	CAPUCHED	PE V:3	"cucullated or capuched"			Blount, 1656
E	CARANNA	PE II:4	a resin		Bullokar 1616	
A	CARICATURA	LF: Martin P.183 TRACTS XIII (KIII, p.115) CM III:14	glossed, TB's footnote  "monstrous draughts, and caricatura representations"			
GE	CARIOLA	UB III	glossed, TB's footnote	not in OED		Florio (dict.) 1659

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
D	CARNAL (vb.)	RM II:7		as adj. 1400 as sb. 1528		Daniel, 1653
A*	CARNIVOROUS	PE IV:10 PE III:25				Power, 1664
A	CARTILAGINEOUS	PE III:19 GC III		=cartilaginous, 1541		Phil. Trans. 1694 Plot 1686 Grew, 1677
A1	CASTRENSIAL	GC II	belonging to a camp			
A *	CAUSABLE	PE III:21 PE VII:6				
A*	CAUSATION	PE I:X1				Blount, 1656
E1	CAUSATOR	PE I:10				<u>causatrix</u> , Charleton, 1650
A1	CECUTIENCY	PE III:18	partial blindness		Pliny/Aldrovandus: Blount, 1656 Lat: "caecitas"	
A1	CELESTIFY	PE IV:13	(cf. also terrestriify) (context)			Blount, 1656
A1	CENATORY	PE V:6	relating to dinner			
A *	CENTESIMAL	TRACTS I (KIII, p.23) CM (MS.Rawl) Martin p.272	hundred-fold			
A1	CEREALIOUS	TRACTS I K III, p.10	cereal (adj.) "edulous or cerealious"	predates other forms		
A*	CETACEOUS	PE IV:10	of the nature of the whale			Boyle, 1660
E	CHELY	PE III:5	"chely or great claw"	chela (zool.)	Lat: chele	
GE	CHIASMUS	GC III	diagonal arrangement	OED gives 1871		



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A1	CHIPPER	Misc: Birds of Norfolk. KIII, 415	bird: betulae carptor			
E1	CHORAGIUM	CM III:14	space for choral dancing			
A	CHYLIFACTIVE	PE III:22 )	digestive			
A	CHYLIFACTORY	PE II:5 )				
GA1	CHYMISTATOR	Letter to Power chemist 1646; KIV, p.255		OED gives (a) 1682		
A1	CILICIOUS	PE V:15 (2)	"cilicious and hairie"; "cilicious and sackcloth"	cilice 950		
A1	CIRCENSIAL	TRACTS V KIII, p.63	of the Roman circus	circensian 1598		
A.	CIRCUMAMBIENCY	PE II:1		circumambient 1633		
D	CIRCUMFERENCE (vb)	PE II:2	to encompass	(sb. 1393)		
C**	CIRCUMSTANTIALY	PE V:20 CM I:1		circumstantial 1596		Phil. Trans. 1665
A*	CIRROUS	GC IV	filamentous	(bot., zool.)		Blount, 1681
A1	CLANGOUS	PE VII:14	"harsh and clangous"			
E*	CLEPSYDRA	PE V:18	a water-clock		Salmuth	Blount, 1656
GA.	CLICKLING (ppl. adj.)	PE II:7 (1672)		OED gives 1682 "clicking"		
C.	CLIMACTERICALLY	LF: Martin p.190		climacterical C16		
A	COADJUVANCY	PE II:1	"concurrence or coadjuvancy"			

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
GE	COAGULUM	PE II:1 (1650) GC II GC III	"coagulum or runnet"	OED gives 1658		
A	CO-APPREHEND	PE V:20				
GA	COBBLE	Misc. Birds of Norfolk; KIII p.410	Great Northern Diver	OED gives 1802		
A	COCHLEARY	PE III:23	"anfractuous spires and cochleary turnings"	cochlea 1538	Belon	Fuller, 1661; Power, 1664
A 1	COEFFICACY	PE IV:13				
A *	COEXISTENCE	PE VII:4				
A	COEXISTENCY	PE I:10				H. More, 1684
A	COGNOMINALL (sb.)	PE III:24 PE VII:14	"cognominall or namesake"			(adj.) Blount, 1656
B	COGNOMINATION	PE V:8 PE VII:14			Cockeram, 1623	Bulwer, 1649
A1	COLAMENT	PE II:1 (1646 only)	(1650 "percolation")			<u>colate</u> , Lovell, 1661
A.	COLOURING (pp1. adj.)	PE VI:12				
A 1	COLOURISHING (vb1. sb.)	PE, Pref.			Florio, 1598 (as sb.)	
A*	COMA	PE IV:9				<u>comatous</u> , Baxter, 1651
GA	COMBER	PE III:26 (1658)		OED gives 1646		
A	COMMANDABLE	PE III:1		command 1300		Baxter, 1651



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
B	COMMENSALITY	PE III:25 (1650)	eating at the same table	commensal	1400 Cotgrave, 1611	
A.1	COMMENSATION	TRACTS I KIII: p.10	commensality			
A1	COMMUNUIBLE	PE II:5	capable of pulverisation			Blount, 1656
GA.1	COMMISERATOR	CM III:6		OED cites CM II:6 commiserate 1593		
A.	COMMITTABLE	PE IV:12				H. More 1664
A1	COMMOLITION	PE III:22 (1658)	"commolition, grinding, and compression"	commolate	1623	
C.	COMMUTATIVELY	CM III:12		commutative 1531		
A 1	COMPACTILE	TRACTS II KIII p.49				
A	COMPACTNESS	PE II:2	"compactness or gravity"			Phil. Trans. 1665
A.*	COMPENSATE	PE III:16		compensation 1387		
GC	COMPLEXIONALLY	RM I:8 PE VII:17 UB IV		(RM) OED gives "complexionably"		
A.*	COMPLICATED (ppl. adj.)	PE V:21	"elvelockes or complicated haïres"	complicate	1621	
B.*	COMPLICATION	PE V:21 PE III:27			Cotgrave 1611 Moufet	

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	COMPLYING (ppl. adj.)	PE IV:5	accordant	(obs. sense)		
A.	COMPRODUCTION	GC III		comproduce 1630		
D	COMPROPORTION (sb.)	UB III		as vb. 1447		
A *	COMPUTABLE	PE IV:12		compute 1413		Hale, 1677
A.	COMPUTING (vbl. sb.)	PE IV:12				
A *	COMPUTER	PE VI:6				
C.	CONCAVOUSLY	PE V:2		concave 1541		
A	CONCEALABLE	PE I:2		(cf. inconceal- able, infra)		
A.	CONCEDED (ppl. adj.)	PE V:20		(another sense 1632)		
C	CONCESSIVELY	PE VII:10		concessive 1711		
GA	CONCHYLIOUS	PE III:28	of shellfish	OED gives 1849		
A	CONCOLOUR	PE VI:X1	(context)			Power, 1664
C	CONCORDANTLY	PE VI:X1		concordant 1411		
A.	CONCRETIVE (adj.)	PE II:1 PE II:5		concretively 1637		
A *	CONFINEMENT	PE III:18	imprisonment (sb.1) limitation (sb.2)	confine 1523 OED gives 1678 (sb.2)		
El	CONFINIUM	CM III:14	limit, bounds			
A *	CONFIRMABLE	PE II:2 UB I GC II				



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A. 1	CONFORMANT	RM I:35				
D	CONFUTE (sb.)	PE II:6	"ridiculous, and false below confute"	as vb. 1529		
GA.	CONGELABLE	PE II:1 (1650)		OED gives 1686		
A	CONGENEROUS	PE III:21	akin in nature	(cf. incon- generous, infra)		Grew, 1671
A	CONGLACIATE	PE II:1	to become ice	conglaciation 1640		H. More, 1656; Phil. Trans. 1670
A. 1	CONGRESSIVE	PE II:6		congress 1528		Charleton 1650
A. 1	CONJECTURALITY	PE VI:1 PE VII:13		conjectural 1553		
A	CONNASCENCY	PE III:15	"geminous births, and double connascencies"			Blount 1656
A	CONNUMERATION	PE III:9		connumerate 1678		
GE	CONOPEION	GC II	"conopeion or gnatnet"	not in OED	Isidore	
C	CONSIDERABLY	PE I:10	in a way that should be considered	(obs; mod. sense 1673)		
A	CONSIDERATOR	GC I UB IV				
GA.	CONSORTION	CM III:9 (2)	keeping company	OED cites CM II:9		
GD	CONSPIRE (sb.)	PE III:12	conspiracy	as vb. C14: not in OED as sb.		
A1	CONTECTION	TRACTS I KIII, p.10	covering up			

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	CONTEMPORIZE	PE I:X1				H. More, 1664
A.	CONTINUATOR	PE III:16		continue 1578		
E*	CONTINUUM	PE II:1 (1650)				Hale, 1677
C 1	CONVEXEDLY	PE V:2	"repandous, or convexedly crooked"	convexed 1578		
A *	CONVINCIBLE	RM I:46 PE III:9	demonstrable			
A	CONVINCIVELY	PE VI:5		convincive		<u>convincive</u> , Daniel, 1649
A	CONVULST	RM I:38	"be convulst and tremble"	convulse convulsion 1585		
A.	COOPERATING (ppl. adj.)	PE: Pref		cooperation C14		
A	COPPEROSE	PE VI:12	"vitriolate or copperose quality"			Phil. Trans. 1698
A	CORALLOIDAL	PE II:5	coralloid	coralline 1543		
GE	CORCULUM	GC III	"corculum or little original"	corcle; OED gives 1772		
B	CORDIALITY	PE IV:4	"cordiality or reference to the heart"	mod. sense 1755 (obs.)	Florio 1611	
A	CORNEOUS	PE III:18	"corneous or horney"			
A	CORNICLE	PE III:20 (1646-58)	small horn			Rowland, trans. Moufet, 1658
A	CORNIGEROUS	PE III:9 PE V:19 GC III	horn-bearing			Plot, 1679, 1686



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
C	CORONALLY	GC I	"coronally or circularly"	coronal 1543		
A	CORRODIBLE	PE II:1				Boyle 1666, Blount 1656
A*	CORTICATED (pp1.adj.)	PE III:14 PE III:16	tough-skinned	predates cortex and all derivatives		Blount, 1656; cortical More, 1685 <u>cortical Grew, 1671</u> <u>cortical Plot, 1677</u>
GC *	COSMOGRAPHICALLY	PE II:2 (1650)	1646 has "geographically"	OED gives 1658 cosmography 1519		
A1	COTTONARY	GC III	"cottonary and wooly"			
B*	CREMATION	UB I UB II			Cockeram, 1623	
A	CREPUSCULOUS	PE VII:2	"glimmering light and crepuscular glance"	crepuscule 1391 crepuscular 1668		Glanvill, 1671 <u>crepuscular, Phil. Trans.</u> <u>1668, Blount 1656</u>
GA*	CRETACEOUS	GC III	"cretaceous and chalky"	OED gives 1675		Grew, 1675
E	CROTALO	TRACTS XIII KIII p.112	a castanet	crotalum 1727		
GC'	CROWDINGLY	Notes on Bubbles KIII: p.439		omitted in OED		
A 1	CRUCIGEROUS	GC I GC II	cross-bearing	crucigeran 1607		
A*	CRUSTACEOUS	PE III:17		(zool.)		Blount, 1656; H.More, 1659 Power, 1664; Plot, 1677
A	CRYPTOGRAPHY	GC III	secret writing	cryptographer 1641	(Gaffarel)	

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	CUCKOO-SPITTLE	PE V:3		cuckoo-spit 1592		Power, 1664
A	CUCULLATED	PE V:3	"cucullated or capuched"	(bot./zool.)		
GC	CULINARILY	GC III		OED gives 1837 culinary 1638		<u>culinary</u> , Biggs, 1651
GE	CUNEATIM	GC II	"cuneatim or wedgwise"	omitted OED		
GA	CUNNY-FISH	GC III	burbot	OED gives "cony-fish" 1721		
A	CURRICLF	CM III:23	a course, running			
E	CUSPIS	PE II:2	cus; "cuspiis or south extreme"		Cabeus	H. More, 1647
A *	CYLINDRICAL	PE III:1 GC III				Blount, 1656 Boyle, 1660
A	CYNEGETICKS	PE I:8	"cynegeticks or venation"	cynegetic (sb. pl.)		
A *	CYNICISM	LF: Martin p.189	"democratism or cynicism"	cynic 1547		



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
B.	DEBILITATED (pp1. adj.)	PE I:1		debilitate 1533	Cotgrave, 1611	
A	DECEPTIBLE	PE I:1 PE I:3		deception 1430		<u>deceptibility</u> , Glanvill, 1665
A	DECIDENCE	PE III:9	a falling off			<u>decidency</u> , Biggs, 1651
C	DECIDINGLY	PE VII:13		deciding 1576		
A.	DECIPIENCY	LF: Martin p.188	folly	desipience	<u>desipience</u> Blount, 1656	
A *	DECLARABLE	PE III:4		declare C.14		
A	DECREPITATE	PE II:5	to roast (a metal)			Plot, 1677; Boyle, 1684
A	DECUMBENCE	PE III:1	"they lie not down, and enjoy no decumbence"			<u>decumbent</u> , Blount, 1656
A	DECUMBENCY	PE V:6				
A	DECUSSATE (vb.)	GC III				Phil. Trans. 1665
A	DECUSSATED (pp1. adj.)	GC I				Plot, 1686
B	DECUSSATION	GC I	(context)			Evelyn, 1662; Blount, 1656 Newton, 1672
A.	DECUSSATIVE	GC III				
C.	DECUSSATIVELY	GC I	(context)			
GE	DECUSSIS	GC I	(context)	not in OED	Lat. decusso	
A	DEDENTITION	PE IV:12	"dedentition or falling of teeth"	(phys.)		Blount, 1656
A *	DEDUCTIVE	PE I:10	"secondary and deductive"			Glanvill, 1665
A1	DEFLOWING	PE III:4		deflow		

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A *	DELETERIOUS	RM II:10 PE III:7	glossed, TB's footnote: "destructive"	deletery 1576		
A 1	DELU DABLE	PE I:2		delude C15		
A	DEMOCRATISM	LF: Martin p.189	"democratism or cynicism"	democritism	democritical <u>Bulwer 1650</u> democritick <u>Blount 1656</u> democritish <u>H. More 1668</u>	
A	DENIGRATION	PE VI:12		denigrate 1526		Boyle, 1691
A	DENIGRATOR	PE VI:12				
GA	DENOMINABLE	PE IV:3 (1650)		denominate 1552 OED gives 1658		
A.	DENOTABLE	TRACTS I KIII:15				
A	DEOPI LATIONS	PE III:22	removal of obstructions	deoppilation deoppilate 1620		
C	DEPENDENTLY	PE III:25		dependent 1523		
A	DEPI LOUS	PE III:14 PE VI:10	hairless "depilous and without any hair at all"	depilate 1560		<u>depilatory/depiled</u> <u>Bulwer, 1650</u>
C.	DEPRAVEDLY	RM, Pref.		depraved 1594		
A*	DEPRECIATE	PE IV:10		predates other forms		Blount, 1656; Boyle, 1666; Power, 1665
A1	DEQUANTITATED	PE II:5		dequantitate		Blount, 1656
A1	DETENE BRATE	PE VI:6				Blount, 1656



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	DERTERMENT	PE VI:8		deter 1579		Boyle, 1661
A	DEUTEROSCOPY	PE I:3	"deuteroscopy and second intention"			Charleton, 1650; Blount, 1656
A	DEXTRALL	PE IV:5		dextral		<u>dextralize</u> , Biggs, 1651
A	DEXTRALITY	PE IV:5 (4)				
A	DIAMETRALS (sb.)	GC III		as adj. 1555		
F	DIAPALMA	PE IV:4	a deterrent plaster			Boyle, 1660
A 1	DIFFLUENCY	PE II:1		diffluent 1618 difffluence 1633		<u>difffluence</u> , Blount, 1656
A	DIGITATED (adj.)	PE VI:6		predates other forms		Robinson, 1658; Plot, 1686 digitate, Lovell 1661 <u>digitation</u> , Blount, 1656
A *	DILUTION	PE III:21		dilute 1605		Blount, 1656
A	DINETICALL	PE VI:5 PE II:2 (1646 only)	rotatory (context)	dinetical		Power, 1664; Ray, 1691; <u>dinetic</u> , Glanvill, 1668
A	DISANIMATION	PE III:10 PE III:25	privation of life	disanimate 1583		Plot, 1686
C	DISCOVERABLY	PE II:4		discoverable 1572		
D	DISCRETE (vb.)	PE II:1		adj. 1398		Blount, 1656
A *	DISCRIMINATION	PE III:23		discriminate 1628		
A1	DISCUBITORY	PE V:6	adapted for reclining	discubation 1635 (Cowley)	Mercurialis	<u>discubiture</u> , Vines, 1655

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	DISCUMBENCY	PE IV:5 PE V:6		discumbent 1562		<u>discumbence</u> , Blount, 1656
C	DISPROPORTIONATELY	CM II:8		dispropor- tionate 1555		
A*	DISRUPTION	PE III:16		predates other forms		
A *	DISSEMINATION	PE I:2		disseminate 1603		
A *	DISSOLVENT (sb.)	PE II:3	"menstruum or dissolvent"	dissolve C14 as adj. 1665		Ray, 1691
D	DITHYRAMBIC (sb.)	PE VII:14		as adj. 1603		Blount, 1674
A	DUBIOSITIES	PE I:5		dubious 1548		
C	DUBIOUSLY	PE III:5				
A.	EBRIOSITY	PE V:22	habitual intoxication	ebriety 1582		
C	ECLIPTICALLY	GC IV		ecliptical 1556		
A	EDIFICIAL	GC III		edifice C14		
A1	EDULIOUS	TRACTS I KIII p. 9,10	"edulous or cerealiuous"			<u>edule</u> , Evelyn, 1699
A	EFFECTIBLE	PE II:5		effect 1589		Hale, 1677



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A:	EFFEMINATION	PE III:17 (1650)		effeminate C15	Castellanus	
A.1	EFFLUENCY	PE II:1		effluence 1603		
A*	EFFLUVIUM	PE II:4 GC IV (3)	(plural used)		Gilbert (Lat.) 1600	Biggs, 1651; Robinson, 1658 Boyle, 1660 & 1583; Plot, 1677 <u>effluviate</u> , Power, 1664
A	EFFRONT	RM I:40				G. Daniel, 1649
A*	ELECTRICK (adj.)	PE II:4	(context)	electrical 1635	Gilbert (Lat.) 1600	Power, 1664; Boyle, 1675 et al ...
A*	ELECTRICKS (sb.pl.)	PE II:1 PE II:4				
A*	ELECTRICITY	PE II:1	"a power to attract"			Phil. Trans. 1668; Boyle, 1675 et al ...
D	ELEFEMOSYNARIES (sb.)	RM II:2	beggars	eleemosynary (adj.) 1620		Blount, 1656; Glanvill, 1665
A 1	ELEMENTARITY	PE II:1				
C 1	ELENCHICALLY	PE, Preface (1646 only)	(1650: "fallaciously")	elenchical 1641		
A. *	ELEVATOR	PE IV:7		(anat.)		
A. *	ELUSORY	PE I:10		elusion 1550		
A1	ELYCHNIOUS	PE III:14 (1646 only)	"snasts, or elychnious partes"			Blount, 1656 (incorrect definition)
GA*	EMACIATE	PE VII:13	"he emaciated and pined away"	predates other forms (OED's ref. incorrect)		Phil. Trans. 1665 Evelyn, 1675

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	EMBLEMATIST	PE V:3				Plot, 1679
GE	EMPEDON	GC I	"empedon or crossing foot-stay"	not in OED	Lipsius	
A1	EMPUZZELED	PE I:1	"it hath empuzzeled the enquiries .."	empuzzle		
A	ENDEMIAL	LF: Martin p.185	endemic	endemic 1662		
A.1	EPITHUMETICALL	PE V:22 (1646-58)	(1672: "concupiscentia11")	epithymetical epithymetic 1631		
A	EQUABLE	RMII:13	equitable	a.3 (obs.)		Blount, 1656
A	( EQUICRURALL (PE) ( AEQUICRURALL (GC)	PE V:23 GC II	isosceles (context)	equicrure 1644..Digby		
A1	EQUIFORMITY	PE IV:5	uniformity			
C.1	AEQUINOCTIALLY	PE II:2	(context)	equinoctial C14		
C.1	AEQUINOCTIONALLY	GC IV				
A *	EQUITABLE	PE. Pref		equitableness 1643		Cromwell, 1649 <u>equitably</u> , Charleton, 1650
D	EQUIVALENCE (vb.)	PE I:1	equal (vb.)	"nonce-word"		
A 1	EQUIVOCACY	PE III:7				
C	ERECTLY	PE IV:1 CM III:14				
A	ERECTNESS	PE IV:1 (Title)				More, 1647, Stillingtonfleet, 1662
B	ERGOTISM	CM II:4	logical conclusion		Blount 1656	



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	ERUGINOUS	PE VI:12	of copper or verdigris			G. Harvey, 1666 <u>Phil. Trans. 1681 eruginary</u>
A *	ERUPTIVE	PE III:16		eruption 1555		
A.	ERYSIPELATOUS	PE IV:3 (1646 only)		erysipelas 1398		
A1	ESPAUT	TRACTS I KIII p.14	millet			
A.1	EUNUCHATE	PE III:4 PE II:7	"eunuchate or castrate"			
A1	EURIPIZE	PE VII:13	"... is whirled hither and thither"	euripus 1601	Aristotle	Blount, 1656
GA	EVAPOROUS	Notes on Bubbles KIII p.438		OED gives 1694		Phil. Trans. (Halley) 1694
A1	EVENTERATE	PE III:6	disembowel		Matthioli (French)	Blount, 1656
A	EXANGUIOUS	PE III:21 (1646-58)	bloodless	exsanguious		<u>exanguinality</u> , Biggs 1651 <u>exanguine</u> , Lovell 1661
A	EXANGUINEOUS	PE III:21	(as above)	exsanguineous		Power, 1664
A	EXANTLATION	PE I:5 CM II:5	drawing out	exantlate 1650		<u>exantlate</u> , Charleton, 1650 Biggs, 1651; Boyle, 1660; Blount, 1656
A.1	EXCORIABLE	GC III	that may be rubbed off	excoriate 1497		
A*	EXFCUTIVE	PE III:17	capable of performance	(mod.sense 1649)		
A	EXENTERATION	PE III:21	disembowelling		Belon	
A	EXESION	PE III:16	"exesion or forcing through"			
A	EXHALEMENT	PE II:5		exhale 1400		

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A *	EXHAUSTION	PE III:21		exhaust C16		Boyle, 1661
B*	EXIGUITY	GC III	"exiguity and smallness"		Cockeram 1623	Robinson, 1658; Power, 1664 <u>exiguous Biggs, 1651</u>
A	EXILITION	PE II:5	a springing up	exility C16		Blount, 1656
A *	EXORDIAL	CM III:25	"exordial or a passage leading to it"	exordium 1581		
A1	EXOSSEOUS	PE III:13	"soft and exosseous"			
A *	EXPANSION	PE IV:5 CM I:19		expand C15		Power, 1664; Grew, 1701
A *	EXPECTORATION	LF: Martin p.186	"expectoration and spitting out"	expectorate 1601		
A.	EXPILATORS	UB III	plunderers	expilate 1627		
A	EXPLOREMENT	PE III:13	exploration			
A	EXTANCE	CM III:25		extancy 1644		
A1	EXTISPICIOUS	PE I:X1	divining by entrails "augurial and extispicious"			<u>extispicy</u> Blount, 1656
A1	EXTRADITIONARY	PE I:4	"extradictionary and real"			
A	EXUCCOUS	PE II:6 LF: Martin p. 185 UB IV, GC III	"exuccous and dry"	exsuccous		<u>exsuccation</u> Phil. Trans. 1697 Blount, 1656
A.	EXUDATE	PE III:4		exude 1574	Aldrovandus	Phil. Trans. 1671



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A*	FACTITIOUS	PE II:1	"artificial and factitious"	(obs; mod. sense 1678)	Caesius	Boyle, 1685
A	FALCATION	PE V:3	"falcation or forcipated tayle .."			Blount, 1656
C.	FALLACIOUSLY	PE, Pref. (1650)	(1646 - "elenchically")	fallacious 1509		
A*	FARINACEOUS	PE III:15	"farinaceous or mealy- winged"	predates other forms		Wilkins, 1668; Power, 1664 Phil. Trans.1664, 1667, Plot, 1686
A *	FARRAGINOUS	PE I:3		farrago 1632		Biggs, 1651
A'	FASCIATE	GC II	"fasciating or wrapt up"	fasciation 1650 (Bulwer)		Evelyn, 1664; Plot, 1677, 1686
A	FAVAGINOUS	GC II	resembling a honeycomb		Pliny	Plot, 1686
A1	FAVILLOUS	PE V:23 (1650)	resembling ashes			
A'	FEMINALITY	PE II:17	female nature			
A .	FERMENTALL	PE II:7 (1650)		fermental ferment 1398		
A *	FEROCIOUS	PE III:16	"fierce and ferocious"	ferocity 1606		
A*	FERRFOUS	PE II:3 (5) PE VI:12				
A'	FERTILITATING (pp1. adj.)	PF VII:7	(context)	fertilitate 1634		
A	FESTUCINE	PF V:3	"festucine or pale green"			

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A1	FESTUCOUS	PE II:4	straw-like			Blount, 1656 <u>festuceous</u> , Robinson, 1658
C	FICTITIOUSLY	PE V:20		fictitious 1615		
A	FIRMATION	PE IV:1	(context)			
A	FISSIPEDES (sb.)	PE V:1	(context)	fissiped		Blount, 1656 (as adj.)
A1	FLAMATION	PE II:5	combustion	flammation		
A	FLAMMABILITY	PE VI:12		flammable 1813		
A	FLAMMEOUS	PE III:27				Blount, 1656, H. More 1664
A	FLOSCULOUS	PE II:6 PE III:26 TRACTS I, K III, p.15	of the nature of flowers			
A1	FLUVIATION	TRACTS I K III, p.30	"fluviation or rotting"			
A*	FOLIACEOUS	GC III	leaf-like			Wilkins, 1668
B.*	FOLIATION	GC III		foliate 1605	Cockeram 1623	
A	FOLIOUS	GC III CM II:3	"folious and stalky"			
A*	FOLLICLE	PE III:2 PE III:4			Aldrovandus	Evelyn, 1706 follicular, Shadwell, 1676 <u>Plot, 1677</u>
A1	FORCIPAL	GC II	of forceps			
A	FORCIPATED	PE V:3		forcipation 1592		<u>forcipate</u> , Wilkins, 1668



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	FOUGADE	RM I:17	"fougade or powder plot"			Blount, 1656
Al	FRITINIANCY	PF V:3 (1646 only)	(1650: "fritinnitus") twittering	fritiniency		Blount, 1656
A	FROG-FISH	PE III:24	lophius piscatorius			
A*	FRUSTUM	GC III	geometrical portion of a solid	(math.)		Phil. Trans. 1669
GA	FRUTEX	GC III TRACTS I K III, p.37	a shrub	OED gives 1664 (bot.)		Evelyn, 1664
Al	FRUTICEOUS	TRACTS I K III, p.20	shrubby			
E	FULIGO	PE VI:12	soot			Evelyn 1693
A	FUNAMBULATORY	CM I:1		funambulo 1605		
A 1	FUNAMBULOUS	LF: Martin p.191		funambulant 1606		
C.	FUNERALLY	UB I				
A*	FURCATION	PE III:9	"antlers or lowest furcation"	predates other forms		Blount, 1656
GE	FURCULA	GC III	"furcula or merrythought" (wishbone)	OED gives 1859 (ornith.)		

<u>KEY.</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A1	GALLATURE	PE III:28 (1650) GC III	"grando, gallature, germe or tredde"	only in TB	Fabricius	
A1	GAROUS	PE III:4	of garum, a fish sauce			
A	GEMINOUS	PE III:15	"geminous births and double connascencies"		Aldrovandus (?)	
A.*	GENERATOR	PE VI:10	one who generates			
A	GENTIANELLA	PE VI:12 GC III	species of gentian			
A	GEOMETRIZE	GC III				Boyle, 1672 & 1680
A	GEOPONICAL	PE VI:3 (2)	agricultural	geoponicks 1608		geoponicks, Evelyn, 1675 & <u>1699; Plot, 1686</u>
A	GESTATORY	TRACTS II K III, p.49	(context)			
A1	GLACIABLE	PE II:1 (1658)	"aqueous and glaciabile"	glaciate 1623 (Cockeram)		<u>glacial, Blount, 1656;</u> <u>Boyle, 1681</u> <u>glaciating, Phil. Trans.1665</u>
A*	GLACIATION	PE II:1				Robinson, 1658
A1	GLACIOUS	PE II:1	"white and glacious"			
A 1	GLANDULOSITIES	PE III:27		glandulosity	Moufet	
GB*	GLOBULAR	GC III		This instance not cited OED	Blount, 1656	Stillingfleet, 1662; Power, 1664; Plot, 1686
A	GLOME	RM I:43	a ball of yarn			Blount, 1656
A	GNATNET	GC II	"conopeiuo or gnatnet"			



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A.	GNATWORM	GC III				
A	GRADUALITY	PE VI:10				
C*	GRADUALLY	PE VI:10		predates gradual (adj.)		
E1	GRANDO	PE III:28 (1650)	"grando, gallature, germe or tredde"		Fabricius	
A	GRANIVOROUS	PE VII:14	feeding on grain			
A	GRANULARY	PE II:5	granular	granulation 1612 granular 1794		granulate, Boyle, 1666; <u>Sprat, 1667</u> ; Ray, 1691
A	GUTTULOUS	PE IV:8	occurring in small drops	predates other forms		Biggs, 1651
C *	GYMNASTICALLY	PE IV:5	glossed by TB	gymnastical 1581		
A*	GYPSUM	PE II:5			Pancirollus	Evelyn, 1662
A 1	HABITATOR	PE VI:10	inhabitant			
E	HAEMOPTYSIS	PE I:X1 (1646 only)	"haemoptysis or spitting of blood"	(path.)		
A	HAIR-WORM	GC III & IV				
A	HALIEUTICKS	PE I:8	"halieuticks or piscation" fishing	halieutics		Edwards, 1696

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A *	HALLUCINATION	PE III:18	(context)	hallucinate 1604 (Cawdrey) 1623 (Cockeram)		hallucinate, Gaule, 1652 <u>H. More, 1660</u> Blount, 1656
A C	HATCH HEEDLESSLY	GC II CM I:30	an engraved line or stroke	sb.3 heedless 1579		
A*	HERBACEOUS	PE II:6			Clusius	Plot, 1686
C.	HERMAPHRODITICALLY	CM I:31		hermaphroditical 1605		
A	HIATION	PE III:21	"hiation or holding open its mouth"	hiate (inhiation 1620)	Pliny via Aldrovandus	
A	HIPPIATRICKS	PE III:2	glossed by TB: "medicina equaria"			<u>hippiatry: Urquhart, 1653</u>
A	HISTRIONISM	CM III:24	acting	histrionic 1648		
A	HOMONOMY	On Dreams, KIII, p.232 TRACTS VII KIII p.68	subject to a constant law			
C.*	HORIZONTALLY	PE II:1 PE V:18		horizontal 1555		
A.	HYDRARGYRUS	PE II:5 (1646 only)	(1650: "mercurial")	hydrargyrous hydragyrum 1563		<u>hydrargyral, Power, 1664</u> <u>Blount, 1656</u>
C	HYDROPICALLY	PE II:3		hydropical 1550		
GB (E)	HYPOGAEUM	UB III	an underground chamber	OED gives 1706 <u>hypoge (sic)</u> Blount, 1656		<u>hypogeal, Plot, 1686</u>
GE	HYPOMOCHLION	GC II	a fulcrum	OED gives 1665		Hooke, 1665



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	ICONOMICALL	PE V:22	hostile to images	iconomachal iconomachy 1581		Blount, 1656
A*	ICHTHYOLOGIE	PE III:24	glossed by TB: "History of Fishes" (1650 ed. ff.)	ichthyology ichthyophagan 1607		
(C)B*	IDEALLY	PE III:9 (1646-58)			Florio, 1598	Cudworth, 1678
A	IGNITIBLE	PE II:1	"a sulphur or ignitable parts"	ignitable (var.)		Blount, 1656
A	ILIACALL	PE V:5	iliac	iliacal iliac 1519		Jer. Taylor, 1654, Blount, 1656
A.	ILLUSTRABLE	GC II		illustrate 1526		
A.*	ILLUSTRATIVE	RM I:45				
C.	ILLUSTRATIVELY	PE IV:12				
A.	IMMANIFEST	PE VI:6	"immanifest and unknowne"			Boyle, 1674
C.*	IMMATERIALLY	PE III:7		immaterial 1398		
A.	IMMODERACY	CM II:1		moderacy 1601 immoderate 1398		Goad, 1686
A. 1	IMMODERANCY	PE I:2				
C	IMPARDONABLY	PE VII:17		impardonable 1523		
A1	IMPENNOUS	PE III:27	wingless			Phillips (Dict.) 1658
A	IMPERFORATED	PE VII:16 (1658)		perforated 1486		imperforation, Blount, 1656 <u>imperforate</u> (adj.) Ray, 1673
C1	IMPOLARILY	PE II:3		(cf. polarily, infra.)		

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	IMPONDEROUS	PE II:5	"imponderous and invisible"	ponderous 1400		
A	IMPOROUS	PE II:1		porous 1400 imporosity 1626		Bohun, 1671; Ray, 1691
C *	IMPROBABLY	PE IV:13		improbable 1598		
A	IMPROLIFICAL	PE II:1		prolifical 1615		Blount, 1656 improlific: Fuller, 1661; <u>Plot, 1686</u>
A	IMPROLIFICATE	PE VII:16	<del>PE</del> (crux: OED - "to fertilize"; (cf. prolificata, Robbins - "to render infertile")			
A: *	IMPROVABLE	PE VI:12		(an archaic sense, 1604)		Boyle, 1665
A	IMPROVISION	PE III:2				Jer. Taylor, 1649
A *	INACTIVITY	PE I:5		activity 1530		
A 1	INADVERTISEMENT	CM III:10	want of attention	advertisement 1523		
A 1	INANGULAR	PE IV:1 (1646-58)	1672: unangular	angular 1597		
A	INANIMATED	PE III:21	not endowed with life	inanimate C16		Hobbes, 1651
A	INCALESCENCE	PE V:22	rise of temperature			Boyle, 1669 <u>incalescency, Robinson 1658</u>
A	INCANTATORY	PE I:3 PE I:4				
B*	INCAPACITY	PE III:1			Florio 1611	Glanvill, 1665
A' 1*	INCINERABLE	UB III	incinerate 1571			
A	INCIRCUMSPECTION	PE I:X1	circumspection 1387			Cave, 1683



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A *	INCISORS	LF: Martin p.184	"incisors or shearers "	incisor (anat.) incisory 1594		
C	INCLINATORILY	PE II:2	"perpendicularly or inclinatorily"	inclinatory 1613		
A	INCOMMIXED	UB III		commixed 1420		Stanley, 1660
A	INCOMMUNICATED (ppl. adj.)	PE III:24 (1646-58)	1672: "incommunicate" = specific			H. More, 1664
A 1	INCONCEALABLE	PE VII:10		(cf. concealable supra)		
A 1	INCONCURRING	PE I:4				<u>inconcurrent</u> Hobbes, 1651
A 1	INCONDITIONAL	PE I:4	"inconditional and absolute"	conditional 1380		
A 1	INCONFIRMED	PE IV:12	"tender and inconfirmed"			
A 1	INCONGENEROUS	PE II:3 (1646 only)	not of the same kind	(cf. congenerous, supra)		
C	INCONNEXEDLY	PE IV:9	"casually or inconnexedly"	connexed 1614		
A *	INCONSISTENT	PE I:8		consistent 1604		(as sb.) Gaule, 1652 Fuller, 1655
A *	INCONSONANT	UB IV		consonant 1489		Hale, 1677
A	INCONSUMABLE	PE III:14		consumable 1641		
C	INCONTROULABLY	PE IV:12		incontrollably incontrollable 1599		
A *	INCONTROVERTIBLE	PE VII:13		controvertible 1614		

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
C	INCONTROVERTIBLY	PE VI:1 (1646-58)				
A1	INCONVERTED	PE II:6 PE III:10		converted 1594	Pliny	
A *	INCONVERTIBLE	PE II:5		convertible C14		Benlowes, 1652
C	INCONVINCIBLY	PE I:7	"obstinately and inconvincibly"	(cf. convincible, supra) inconvincedly 1642		
A 1	INCORRECTED	PE I:3		incorrection 1598		
A1	INCREMABLE	PE III:14 UB III				
A 1	INCUMMISCIBILITY	PE II:5 (1646 only)	"antipathie, or incummiscibility"	incommiscibility incommiscible 1620		Blount, 1656
A1	INCURVITY	PE V:2(2) Misc: Birds of Norfolk, KIII, p.413	(context)			
A1	INDIARY	PE I:8 (1646 only)	1650: indian			
A	INDICIDUOUS	PE V:22	"indiciduous and unshaven"	indeciduous (predates deciduous)		Blount, 1656
A *	INDIGENOUS	PE VI:10  PE I:3 PE I:6 PE IV:4	"indigenous or proper natives"	indigene 1598		Plot, 1686; Phil. Trans. 1697
B	INDIGITATE		"indigitate and point at"		Cockeram 1623	Roberts, 1649 H. More, 1653



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
C *	INDISPUTABLY	PE III:12		indisputable 1551		
A	INDISPUTED	RM I:15				
A 1	INDIVINITY	PE I:10		indivine 1603		
A *	INDOCTRINATION	PE I:7		indoctrinate 1626		H. More 1668
D	INDUBITATE (vb)	PE I:10	"to conceale or indubitate"	as adj. 1480		
A	INDUCIBLE	RM I:48 PE VI:6				
A	INEXHALABLE	PE III:28 (1650)	that cannot be evaporated			<u>exhalable Grew, 1671</u>
A	INEXISTENT	PE V:20	non-existent			
A *	INFERRIBLE	PE I:4 PE VII:15		inferable (var.)		Boyle, 1681
A	INFLAMABILITIES	PE III:21		inflammability (cf. flammability, supra) inflammable 1605		
A	INFLECTED (pp1.adj)	PE III:1		inflect 1425		
A1	INGANNATIONS	PE I:3 (1646 only)	1650 - deceptions		Florio (?)	Phillips (Dict.) 1658 Blount, 1656
A 1	INGENERATED	PE I:1	(autograph correction, 1658 ed.: "ungenerated")			
A	INGESTED (pp1.adj)	PE IV:7		ingest 1617		

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OFD NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
B	INGUSTIBLE	PE III:21	"ingustible, void of all sapidity"	ingustable gustable 1480	Cockeram 1623 Licetus: "ingustabilis"	Blount, 1656 Stanley 1656
A	INJUSTIFIABLE	PE IV:12		justifiable 1523		
B	INLAY (as sb.)	GC III		(as vb. 1596)	Blount, 1656	
A	INNITENCY	GC II	"innitency and stress"	innitent 1656 (Dict.)		Gurnall, 1658
C	INNOCUOUSLY	PE III:28 (1650)		innocuous 1598		
C	INNOXIOUSLY	PE VII:17		innoxous 1638		
A 1	INORGANITY	RM I:36				Dicts: Blount, 1656, Coles, 1676, Bailey, 1727
C 1	INSATISFACTORILY	PE I:2				
A *	INSECURITY	PE IV:12		security 1432		Jer. Taylor 1649
A	INSERVIENT	PE I:1 PE III:21	subordinate			Boyle, 1688
A	INSTITUTIONARY	PE V:6	educational			
A1	INTERARBORATION	GC IV				
A	INTERJACENCY	PE VII:17		interjacent 1594		Biggs, 1651
A *	INTERSTITIAL	PE II:1			Boodt (?)	Hooke, 1665 Blount, 1656
A1	INTROVENIENT	PE IV:10	entering			
A	INTUMESCENCY	PE VII:13(2) (1650)			Cabeus	Power, 1664 <u>intumescence</u> , Boyle, 1660; Blount, 1656



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A1	INTURGESCENTY	PE VII:13 (1650)				
C *	INVARIABLY	PE VI:7		invariable 1607		
GC	INVERSELY	GC III		OED gives 1753		Phil. Trans. 1753
C	INVERTEDLY	CM III:14	(context)	inverted 1598		
A	INVETERATENESS	PE VII:12		inveterate 1528		Burney, 1660
A*	INVIGORATE	PE II:2		invigour 1611		<u>invigoration</u> Glanvill, 1662
A1	INVISION	PE III:27 (1646-50)	"anopsie or invision" 1658 - non-vision			
A	IRRADIANCY	PE II:1	"irradiancy or sparkling"	irradiant 1526		
E	ISCHIAS	PE IV:1		ischium		
C	ITERATELY	UB III	repeatedly	iterate 1471		
A*	JOCOSITY	PE VII:16	"mirth and jocosity"			
A *	JOCULARITY	PE VII:16		jocularly 1500		
E	JUSTITIUMS	PE IV:13	legal holidays			Blount, 1656

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
GE	LABARUM	GC I	"labarum and famous Standard of Constantine"	OED gives Phillips Dict. 1658		
A*	LACHRYMATORIES	UB III	"lachrymatories or tear-bottles"	lachrymatory (sb.) lachrymatory (adj.) 1849	Perucci	Blount, 1661
A	LACTARY (adj.)	PE VI:10	"lactary or milky"	as sb. 1523		Tomlinson, 1657 Blount, 1656
A	LACTEOUS	PE IV:12 PE VI:10 CM III:24	milky		Philo	Smith, 1666; Simpson, 1669; Plot, 1677
A	LAMBITIVE	PE IV:8	taken by licking	obs. medic.		Blount, 1656
A	LAPIDEOUS	PE II:5 PE III:13	stony		Boodt	Phil. Trans. 1694
A	LAPIDESCENCIES	PE III:23	"lapidescencies and petrifactive mutations"	lapidescence lapidescent 1644	Boodt	Charleton, 1650
A	LAPIDIFICALL	PE II:1 (1646-50) PE II:5			Billichius Boodt	
A1	LAQUEARY (adj.)	CM I:24	armed with a noose	as sb. 1656, 1658 (Dicts.)		
A	LATERALITY	PE IV:5(3)	the quality of having sides			Blount, 1656
A1	LATIROSTROUS	PE III:27 PE V:1 (1650)	broad-beaked			Blount, 1656
A	LATTANCY	PE III:16 PE III:21 PE IV:13	the state of hibernating			Bulwer, Charleton, 1650 Boyle, More, 1660 Blount, 1656
A	LATITANT	PE III:21	hibernating			



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
D1	LAZY (sb.)	CM I:33	name for the Sloth of Brazil		Clusius	
A1	LENTOUS	PE II:1 PE II:7 PE III:13	viscous	"nonce-word" lensor 1626		Blount, 1656
A	LITERALITIES	PE I:3		literality		Hall, 1650; Blount, 1656
A*	LITERARY	PE I:9		(mod. sense 1749) obs.		
A	LITHOMANCY	PE II:3	"lithomancy or divination from this stone"		Kircher	Blount, 1656
A	LITHONTRIPTICKE	PE II:5 (1646 only)	1650 - footnoted "pulvis lithontripticus"	lithontriptic		Lovell, 1661; Phil. Trans. 1683, Blount 1656
E	LITHOPHYTON	PE II:5	"lithophyton or stone plant"		Sennert	Ray, 1691
E	( LITHOSPERMON ( LITHOSPERMUM	PE II:7 PE III:23	the plant Gromwell ("lithospermon or grummell")		Gerard	
A	LIXIVIATED	PE III:3 (1646-58)	impregnated with lye			lixivate: Starkey, 1657; Boyle, 1663; Plot, 1677
A	LIXIVIOUS	UB III				Harris, 1686
A *	LOCOMOTION	PE III:1	"progression or animal locomotion"	locomotive 1612	Fabricius	Power, 1664 Blount, 1656
A1	LONGILATERAL	GC I GC II				
A	LONGIMANOUS	PE VII:19	glossed TB: "long-handed"		Ovid	Charleton, 1650
C.	LUCIFEROUSLY	CM III:3	"luciferously or influentially"			luciferous: Blount, 1656; Plot, 1686.

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A *	MACULATED (ppl.adj)	PE V:23	spotted, defiled	maculate 1490	Pliny	Fuller, 1661
A1	MAGNALITIES	PE II:3 PE VII:2 GC III CM III:14	(always plural in TB)	magnality		Charleton, 1650
A *	MAGNIFIABLE	PE IV:12		magnify 1380		
A.	MAGNIFIED (ppl.adj.)	PE I:6 <sup>f</sup> PE VII:16 <sup>8</sup> GC I+	(of men: Virgil <sup>f</sup> , Merlin <sup>8</sup> , Cyrus <sup>+</sup> )			
A	MARCOUR	PE III:9	wasting, decay; "extenuation and marcour"	marcor		Tomlinson, 1657; Harvey, 1666
A	MASCULO-FEMININE	PE III:17	"hermaphroditicall and masculo-feminine"			
D	MATERIAL (as vb.)	RM I:37		adj.1340		Glanvill, 1661
B.	MATERIATION	PE VI:1	(context)		Cockeram 1623	Blount, 1656 materiate Boyle, 1680; <u>Urquhart</u> , 1693
A*	MEDALLIONS	GC II	glossed TB: "the larger sort of medals"			Blount, 1661
A *	MEDICAL(L)	PE, Pref., (and PE II:5, III:25, IV:12, V:21; GC I, III)		medicine 1225		Urquhart, 1653
C. *	MEDICALLY	PE IV:13				
C.	MEDICAMENTALLY	PE II:5		medicament 1541		
A	MEDITERRANEOUS	PE II:4		mediterranean 1594		Ray, 1692
A1	MEMORIST	CM I:21	one who prompts the memory			

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A *	MENDACITY	PE I:1 PE I:6		mendacious 1616		
A	MENDICATION	PE VII:17	begging	mendicate 1618		
A 1	MENSTRUANT	PE IV:12		menstruate 1398		Blount, 1656
A1	MERCURISMS	LF: Martin p.179	mercurial messages	mercurism		
A	METALLIST	PE VI:12 (1646 only)			Caesius	Webster (title) 1671 Moxon, 1703
C	METICULOUSLY	CM I:33		meticulous 1535		
GA	MICTION	PE III:13 (1658)	action of urinating	OED gives 1663		More, 1663
A*	MIGRANT (adj.)	LF: Martin p.180	"passager and migrant birds"	as sb. 1760	Belon	
B*	MIGRATION	PE IV:13 PE VI:6			Cotgrave 1611	Hobbes, 1650; Ray, 1704
A*	MINERALOGIST	PE II:1				<u>mineralogy</u> Boyle, 1690
A1	MINIOUS	PE VI:9	"red and minious"	minium 1398		Blount, 1656
A	MISAPPREHENDED (pp1.adj.)	PE I:4		misapprehension 1629 misapprehend 1653		Glanvill, 1665
A1	MISCOMPUTE (sb.)	PE VII:18		vb. 1672		
D	MISCONJECTURES (sb)	PE V:23		vb. 1626		
A *	MISTAKEABLE	PE VI:1		mistakable mistake 1380		Hammond, 1653



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OFD NOTES</u>	<u>ANCEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	MOON-FISH	PE III:24	"moon-fish or Orthrageriscus"		Rondelet	Grew, 1681
A	MORBOSITIES	PE III:18	"impediments, or morbosities"	morbidity predates other forms		morbose: Wittie, 1651; Ray, 1691
B	MOUTHING (vb1.sb.)	PE III:6			Florio 1598	
A	MUCILAGINOUS	PE III:23	"a jelly, or mucilaginous concretion"	mucilage 1400		French, 1651 Blount, 1656
A*	MUCOUS	PE III:21	"mucous and slimy" (1650 ff) 1646: "spongy and mucous"	predates other forms	Landius "cum muco"	
F	MUCRO	PE IV:2	"mucro or point"	zool. (sic)		
A	MUGIENT	PE III:27	(context)		Aldrovandus	remugient, More, 1660
A1	MUGIENCY	PE III:27	"mugieny or boation"		Gesner	
A	MULTIFIDOUS	PE III:27	divided into many parts		Erasmus	Phil.Trans. 1715
A	MULTIPAROUS	PE III:15 PE III:27	(context)			Ray, 1691
C	MULTIPLICIOUSLY	PE VII:2				
A1	MYSTERIZE	PE V:10 (1650)				

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A*	NAMESAKE	PE III:24	"cognominal1 or namesake"			Fuller, 1650
GA*	NARHWHALE	PE III:23 (1650)		narwhal OED gives 1653	T. Bartholin	
A1	NASICORNOUS	PE III:23	having a horned nose		Moufet	Blount, 1656
A 1	NATURITY	PE V:5				(quoted) Bulwer, 1650
A 1	NECESSITOUSNESS	CM I:6		necessitous 1611		
A	NEELED (adj.)	PE II:2				
A1	NERVIFOLIOUS	TRACTS I K III, p.13	having nerved leaves		Bauhin	
A	NIDULATION	PE III:10 TRACTS I K III, p.28	nesting	nidulate 1623 (Cockeram)		
GA.	NITRO-SULPHUREOUS	PE VII:13		OED gives 1671 Cabeus		
B	NIVEOUS	PE VI:12	snowy		Cockeram 1623	
A.	NODOUS	PE IV:4		nodosity 1601	Lemnius: "nodosus"	Evelyn, 1679
A	NON-ADAMICAL	PE IV:X1		adamical 1657	Paracelsus	
A	NON-EXISTENCE	PE I:7 PE IV:10 (p1)				Stillingtonfleet, 1662 Cudworth, 1678
A1	NON-USANCE	PE IV:12	"non-usance or abolition"	usance 1380		
A	NUMERALITY	PE IV:12	(context)	numeral 1530		More, 1687
C.	NUMERALLY	PE VII:17				Baxter, 1691

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	NUMERISTS	PE IV:12 GC V	numerologists			
B	NUTRICATION	PE III:21	nourishment		Cockeram 1623 Licetus	Tomlinson, 1657
B 1	OBDUCT	PE IV:5	"obducted and covered .."		Cockeram 1623 Richerius; "obductis"	
A	OBMUTESCENCE	PE III:8	dumbness			
C	OBSERVABLY	PE VI:8				
B	OBVERT	PE II:2 PE VI:7 GC IV	"obvert or turn aside"		Cockeram 1523 Cabeus	Tomlinson, 1657 Goad, 1686
D1	ODORATE (sb.)	TRACTS XIII K III p.118	fragrant substance	as adj. 1626		
A	OEDEMATOUS	PE IV:3 (1646 only)	dropsical	oedema 1400		Blount, 1656
A	OLERACEOUS	TRACTS I K III p.17	"an herby and oleraceous vegetable"			
A1	OLIDOUS	PE III:4	fetid ("rancide and olidous")			
GE	OMASUS	GC III	bullock's tripe	omasum (correct gender); OED gives 1706		



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
GA*	OPALINE	UB III		OED gives 1784		
A*	OPERABLE	PE I:3				Gale, 1677
GA	OPHIOPHAGOUS	PE III:28 (1650)	serpent-eating	OED gives Ref. PE VI:28		
E	ORGASMUS	PE III:16	"orgasmus or fury of their lust"	orgasm 1684		
A.	ORIENTALITY	PE VI:7		oriental 1371		
A *	ORNAMENTAL	PE, Pref. GC III		ornament 1225		More, 1664
A*	OSSEOUS	CM III:4	"osseous and solid"			
A*	OSSUARY	UB III UB V	a receptacle for the bones of the dead			
E	OSTRACION	GC III	the Trunk-fish or Coffer-fish			
A*	OVARY	PE III:28 (1650)				
A*	OVIPAROUS	PE VI:6 & elsewhere				Burnet, 1684; Plot, 1686
E	OXYCROCEUM	PE II:4	a plaster, of saffron, vinegar, etc.			

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A1	PABULOUS	PE III:21	nourishing	pabulation 1623 (dict.)		<u>pabular</u> : Blount, 1656
A*	PAGINALL	PE V:6		paginal		
A	PALATIVE	CM II:1				
A1	PALEOUS	PE II:4	"straws and paleous bodies"		Lat. "palea" = chaff	
A 1	PALMIPEDOUS	PE V:1	"palmipedous or fin-footed"	palmiped 1610		<u>palmiped</u> : Lovell, 1661; Grew, 1681; Ray, 1691 Blount, 1656
A*	PAPAVEROUS	PE VII:7	resembling the poppy			
A	PAPPOUS	GC III	"pappous or downy"			<u>pappose</u> : Ray, 1691
A	PARADOXOLOGIE	PE Pref.	speaking by paradox	paradoxology paradox 1540		Blount, 1656
A 1	PARADOXY	PE VII:X1 (1646 only)	paradox (1650) (printer's error?)			
A	PARALOGICAL	GC I	Illogical	-06 - <u>paralism</u> 1565		
A1	PARALOGY	PE VII:3				
B *	PARENTAL	PE III:16			Cockeram 1623	Ward, 1647
A	PARERGIES	PE VII:16	something beside the present purpose	parergy parergon 1601		Charleton, 1650; Blount, 1656
A	PARRICIDOUS	PE III:16		parricidious 1609 parricidal 1627		
A*	PARTURITION	PE III:6	"parturition or very birth itselfe"	parturient 1592		Walker, 1659

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
E	PATERA	UB III	"patera's and vessels of libation"	(Rom.Antiq.)		
B*	PATHOLOGY	LF Martin, p.185 TRACTS I, K III: p.42			Blount 1656	<u>pathologist</u> : Charleton, 1650 <u>pathologize</u> : Bulwer, 1650 <u>pathological</u> : Boyle, 1688
A	PATIBULARY	PE V:21 (1672)	of the gallows	patibulate 1656 (Dict.)		
E*	PATOIS	RM II:8	"the jargon and patois"			
B	PATRONALL	PE I:3	"their penates and patronall gods"	patronal	Cotgrave 1611	
A	PECTINALS (sb.)	PE IV:1		(diff. sense 1541)		Evelyn, 1705; Blount, 1656
A	PECTINALL (adj.)	PE IV:10				
A *	PECTINATE	PE V:22	"pectinated or shut together"	(diff. sense 1623 - Dict.)	Pliny	<u>pectinated (ppl.adj.)</u> : Ray, 1691; Blount, 1656
A *	PECTINATION	PE V:22				
A	PEDESTRIOUS	PE III:1	going on foot	pedestrial 1611		
A	PENDULOSITY	PE V:13		pendulous 1605		
C.	PENTAGONALLY	GC III		pentagon 1570		
A	PERFLATION	GC IV	ventilation	perflate 1540		
C. *	PERIODICALLY	PE III:17		periodical 1601		



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
F	PERIPATUS	CM III:21	Aristotle's walk in the Lyceum			
A	PERMANSION	PE III:17	permanence			Pearson, 1659
A	PERMEANT	PE II:5	permeating			
A	PERPENSION	PE I:7	deliberation			Boyle, 1661
A *	PERSPIRE	PE IV:7		perspirable 1604 perspiration 1611 perspirable 1624		Herrick, 1648; Power, 1664
A*	PETRIFACTION	PE II:5	"petrification, and strange induration"			Plot, 1686; Ray, 1692
A	PETRIFACTIVE	PE III:23	"lapidescencies, and petrifactive mutations"	petrify 1594		
B*	PETRIFICATION	PE II:5			Cotgrave, 1611	Cudworth, 1678; Phil. Trans. 1665; Plot, 1677, 1686
E	PHAENIGMUS	PE III:3	"phaenigmus or rubifying medicine"	phoenigm (parenthesised)	Galen	Tomlinson, 1657
A 1	PHALANGIOUS	PE III:27		phalangium 1601	Moufet	Rowland (tr. Moufet) 1658 Blount, 1656
A	PHILIPPIZE	PE I:10			Plutarch	J. Smith, 1675
A	PHYTOGNOMY	RM II:2 PE II:6			Porta	
A	PHYTOLOGY	GC, Pref.			Duval	phytological, Grew, 1671 <u>phytologist</u> , Evenyn, 1699

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A.	PIACULOUS	PE III:25 PE V:22	expiatory/wrong	piacular 1610		Glanvill, 1665
A*	PICTORIAL	PE III:24				Blount, 1656
E	PINAX	CM I:1	a catalogue, or inscribed tablet			Phil. Trans. 1697
A	PISTICK (adj.)	PE VII:7	genuine (? - see OED)	pistic (as sb. 1621 = pistachio)	Vulgate	Jer. Taylor, 1649 H. Vaughan 1655
Al	PISTILLATION	PE II:5	pounding (context)			
A	PLANT-ANIMALL	PE III:12		plant-animal		Boyle, 1663; Hale, 1677
A	PLEASURIST	CM III:23				
Al	PLECTILE	TRACTS II K III: p.49	woven			
A 1	PLENILUNARY	PE IV:13		plenilune 1432		
C	POISONOUSLY	PE III:27				
C 1	POLARILY	PE II:2				
A*	POLARITY	PE II:2				Power, 1664; Petty, 1674; Boyle, 1691
A	POLLINCTOR	PE VII:19	"pollinctor or such as annointed the dead"			Evelyn, 1664; Phil. Trans. 1705
A*	PONDERABLE	PE III:27	having weight			
A 1	PORTENSIONS	PE VI:14 (1650)	omens	portention portent 1563		

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A1	POST-GENITURE	GC I				
A	POWDERABLE	PE III:23	"friable or easily powderable"			
A	PREACTION	PE II:2				
A 1	PREAMBULOUS	PE I:10		preambular 1645		
A .1	PREASPECTION	PE IV:X1				
A*	PRECARIOUS	PE I:7				Blount, 1656; More, 1659 Hale, 1677; Pepys, 1667
C	PRECARIOUSLY	PE I:10 GC III		(as prev. entry)		L'Estrange, 1654
A *	PRECIPITOUS	PE I:5 PE III:6		precipitious 1635		Evelyn, 1666
A**	PRECOCIOUS	PE II:6 (1650) LF: Martin p. 190 TRACTS I K III, p.41	(context)	precocity 1640		Cudworth, 1678
A	PREDECAY	PE VII:12				
A *	PREDISPOSED	PE VI:7		predis- position 1626		Burnet, 1684
A1	PRE-EXISTIMATION	CM II:4	previous estimation			
D*	PREFIX (sb.)	PE II:7 PE III:24		as vb. 1420		
A	PRENOMINAL	PE II:7				



KEY	FORM	REF.	SIGNIFICATION	OED NOTES	ANTECEDENTS	SUCCESSORS
A	PREOPINION	PE III:25 (1650)				Ray, 1692; Locke, 1692
A	PREPONDERANCY	PE IV:7				
A	PREPOTENCY	PE IV:5		prepotent 1450		Howell, 1651
E*	PRERIE	TRACTS XIII K III, p.113	"the prerie or large sea-meadow"	prairie		
A	PRESCIOUS	RM I:X1	foreknowing	prescient 1626		Dryden, 1697
GA	PRESENTION	PE III:10	presagement	not in OED		
C*	PRESUMABLY	PE I:8	with taking things for granted	(mod.sense 1846)		
Al	PROFUNDEUR	GC IV	"profundeur or depth unto their height"			Blount, 1661
C	PROGRESSIONALLY	GC V		progressional 1570		
A.	PROLIFICATE	PE III:28 (1650)	"prolificates and makes... fruitful"	(cf. improlificate, supra)		
C 1	PROMISSORILY	PE V:14 (1650)		promissor 1622 promissory 1649		
A	PRORUPTION	PE III:16				
B	PROSODIAN	PE VII:1			Cockeram 1623	
A*	PROSTATES	PE IV:5	"prostates or glandules of generation"			
Al	PROTERICAL	TRACTS I K III, p.40				

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A *	PROTRUSION	PE III:1 PE III:17 PE VII:18		protrude 1620		Boyle 1660 Blount, 1656
A *	PROTUBERANCE	PE III:19 GC III				<u>protuberancy</u> , More, 1653
A *	PROTUBERANT	PE III:4		protuberate 1578		Glanvill, 1661
A	PRUDENTIALITY	PE I:3		prudential 1641		
A*	PUBESCENCE	PE IV:12				
A	PUBESCENCY	GC III				
A*	PUBESCENT	PE IV:12				
A	PUGILL	PE IV:X1	a boxer (context)	pugil	Nieremberg	
A	PUNCTICULAR	GE III	the size of a dot			
A*	PUTRESCENCE	PE IV:10	action of rotting	putrefy 1412		
A	PYRAL	UB IV(2)				
A*	PYRE	UB, Pref.				Blount, 1656
GA	QUADRILITERAL	PE V:10	"the tetragrammaton, or quadriliteral name .."	OED gives 1771		
A *	QUADRUPEDE	PE III:1(7) PE III:17 GC III (and elsewhere)		quadruped quadrupedals 1643	Aldrovandus	Power, 1664; Plot, 1686 <u>quadrupedant</u> , Blount, 1656

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
GE	QUATERNIO	GC I	group of four	OED gives 1678 quaternion 1382		Cudworth, 1678; More, 1681
C*	QUINCUNCIALLY	GC IV		quincunx 1601		
GE	QUINQUERNIO	GC I	"quinquernio or cinque- point of a die"	not in OED		
GA.	RADIANCY	PE II:5 (1650)		OED gives 1646 (this ref. radiant 1450		
A	RADIATED (ppl.adj.)	GC II Brampton Urns		radiate 1619		Fuller, 1661
A.	RADICALITY	PE III:17	"radicality and power of .... formes"	radical 1398		
A	RAGWEED	GC III	ragwort	ragwort 1450		
A*	RANCID (printed "RAUCIDE")(1646 only)	PE III:4	"rancid and olidous"			<u>rancidly</u> , More, 1669 <u>rancidity</u> , L'Estrange 1654
D*	RATIONALL (as sb.)	UB IV	rationale			Marvell, 1676
B1	RECEPTARY (sb.) (adj.)	PE Pref. PE I:8	a received notion or belief received		Cotgrave, 1611	Blount, 1656
A *	RECESSION	PE VI:8	a going back in time	recess 1531 (mod.sense 1647)		
A	RECITEMENT	PE II:3				Goad, 1686



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A.1	RECOMPENSIVE	RM I:47		recompense 1422		
C	RECTANGULARLY	PE II:2 GC I		rectangular 1624		
A *	RECTIFIABLE	PE IV:10		rectify 1400		
A*	RECTILINEALL	PE IV:10				rectilinear, More, 1659 <u>rectiligneous</u> , Ray, 1691
A1	RECUBATION	PE V:6	recumbency			
A *	RECURRENCE	PE III:1		recurrent )1611 recurrency)(Dict.)		Jer. Taylor, 1667
A 1	RECURVITY	Letter to Merrett 1668/9; K IV, p.356		recurvate 1597 recurve 1623 (Dict.)		
A *	REFERABLE	PE VII:3 (1646)	spelt referrible 1650 ff.			
D	REFUTE (sb.)	PE VI:8		as verb 1545		Sergeant, 1657
GE	REGULUS	PE III:7	a basilisk	not in OED	Vulgate, Prov.23	
A	REIMPREGNATE	PE II:3				Worlidge, 1669
A 1	REINQUIRE	PE VII:1				
A	REMINISCENTIALL	PE Pref. CM III:10		reminiscential reminiscence 1589		
A.1	REOPPOSE	PE Pref.				
A	REPANDOUS	PE V:2 TRACTS I KIII, p.13	"repandous or convexedly crooked"			L'Estrange, 1655

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	RESEMINATE	PE III:12	"it begets and reseminates itself"		Ovid	
A *	RESINOUS	PE II:1(2)				Blount, 1656; Grew, 1673
A *	RESOLVABLE	PE VI:8		resolve C14		
A	RESTRAINABLE	PE V:19		restrain 1340		
A	RETIARY (adj.)	PE V:19 GC II	geometrical (a) relating to the making of webs/nets			as sb. in Blount, 1661
		GC II	(b) fighting with a net			
		CM I:24	(b) fighting with a net			
A *	RETICULATE (adj.)	GC Pref. GC III	constructed like a net	as vb. 1787 reticular 1597		Phil. Trans. 1703
E	RETICULUM	GC III	"the reticulum, or net- like ventricle"			Grew, 1676
A1	RETROCOPULATION	PE III:17 PE V:19	copulation rear to rear			
A*	RETROGRESSION	PE VI:3		retrogradation 1554 (astron.)		
A1	RETROMINGENCY	PE III:17	"retromingency or pissing backward"		Scaliger	
A	RETROMINGENT	PE III:17			Scaliger	Phil. Trans, 1704 Blount, 1656 Sparke, 1652
A	REVIVICTION	PE III:12	revivification			
A	RHABARBE	PE IV:13	(var. of rhubarb)	rabarbe/ rewbarbe 1597		Tomlinson, 1657
A*	RHABDOMANCY	PE V:23(2)	(context) dowsing		Jerome	G. Daniel, 1649

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A *	RHAPSODIST	PE I:8	"collector or rhapsodist" (of Pliny)	rhapsody 1542		Blount, 1656 Webster, 1671 (of Kircher)
A *	RHOMBOIDAL	GC II GC III		rhomboid 1570		Grew, 1681
A	ROPALIC	TRACTS VII (Title) K III, p.67	"of Ropalic or Gradual Verses"	rhopalic		
A	RUMINATING (pp1.adj.)	PE III:15 GC III			Boyle, 1688	
GA 1	SACRIFICABLE	PE V:14 (1650)	(context)	OED gives 1646 sacrificeable 1485, 1603 (diff.sense) sacrifiable 1603		
D1	SAGITTARY (adj.)	TRACTS I K III, p.45	used for arrows	as sb. C15		
D1	SALARY (adj.)	PE VI:12	saline (1650/58 have "solary" in error)	adj., = saleable, 1593, 1596		
A	SALINOUS	PE II:1	saline	saline 1450		Simpson, 1669; Lovell, 1687 Blount, 1656
A1	SALITION	Commonplace Books KIII, p.297	leaping			
A *	SALTATION	PE V:3	jumping	saltate 1523 (Dict.)		Blount, 1656; Wiseman, 1672



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
E	SALTIMBANCO	PE I:3	"saltimbancoes, quacksalvers ...."			Butler, 1663; Cotton, 1675
C	SALVIFICALLY	CM II:2	so as to obtain salvation	salvifical 1581		
A*	SAPIDITY	PE III:21	"ingustible, void of all sapidity"	sapid 1634		Blount, 1656
A.	SARCOPHAGIE	PE III:25 (1650)	glossed TR: "eating of flesh"	sarcophagy sarcophagus 1601		
A	SATISFACTIVE	PE VI:X1				
A	SAXIFRAGOUS	PE II:5	(context)	saxifrage 1440		Hughes, 1677 <u>saxifragant</u> , Blount, 1656
GE	SCEVOLAES	PE IV:5	left-handed people	not in OED	cf. Cicero: Q. Mucius Scaevola	<u>scaevity</u> , Blount, 1656
A	SCALARY	PE V:13	of a ladder	diff.sense 1588) 1635)		Howell, 1651
B*	SCINTILLATION	RM I:32 PE V:9	"scintillations, or radiant halo's"		Cockeram 1623	Gaule, 1652; L'Estrange, 1654 Blount, 1656; Webster, 1671
A	SCORIOUS	PE II:2	"drossie and scorious"	scoria 1398 (= slag)		Boyle, 1676; <u>scorium</u> , Grew, 1681
D	SCRIPTORY (adj.)	TRACTS I K III, p.45	used for writing	as sb. 1483		
A*	SEA-SERPENT	PE III:24				Lovell, 1661; Phil. Trans. 1671
A	SEA-UNICORNE	PE III:23	narwhal	sea-unicorn		

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A*	SECRETION	PE III:13 (1646-50)		predates <u>secrete</u>		<u>secretory</u> , Ray, 1692
GA*	SELECTION	PE III:25 (1650)		OED gives "1646-58" select 1565		
A*	SELENOGRAPHY	PE VI:14 (1650)	"selenography, or description of the moon"	predates other forms	Hevelius (Title)	Sprat, 1667
GAL	SEMI-BODIES	RM II:13		OED gives ref. RM II:14; "semi-body"		
AI	SEMICASTRATION	PE IV:5				Blount, 1656
GD	SEMINAL (sb.)	PE VII:17 CM III:4		as adj. 1398 OED gives ref. CM IV § 4		Glanvill, 1661
A	SEMINALITY	PE I:3 GC III CM I:28				Biggs, 1651; Needham, 1665 Blount, 1656
AI	SEMINIFICALL	PE VI:8	"seminificall and pubescent"	seminifical		Blount, 1656
A	SENTENTIOSITY	PE I:6	moralizing wisdom	sententious 1440		
A	SEPTENTRIONATE	PE II:2	glossed TB: "point to the North"	septentrional 1391		
C	SEPTENTRIONALLY	PE II:2				
GA	SEPTICALL	PE III:14	glossed TB: "a corruptive medicine ..."	OED gives ref. PE III:13 septic 1605		Biggs, 1651
A	SEPTILATERALL	PE V:23 (1650)				

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OFD NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	SEPTUAGESIMAL	PE VI:6	"abridged and septuagesimal"			Blount, 1656
D1	SEPTUARIES (sb.)	PE IV:12 (1646 only)	"septuaries or weeks" 1650: "septenaries"	septuary, adj. 1604		Blount, 1656
B	SEROTINOUS	TRACTS I K III, p.31	"serotinous or late"	serotine 1597	Blount, 1656 Vulgate	
A1	SERROUS	PE III:27	"serrous or jarring"			<u>serrate</u> , Wilkins, 1668
A	SHEARWATER	Misc. Birds or Norfolk; K III, p.403 Letter to Merrett, Dec. 1668; K IV, p.353				Ray, 1674
A	SHEATHIE	PE III:27		sheathy		Rowland, 1658
B	SIDERATED	PE VI:12	blasted	siderate	Cockeram, 1623	Vilvain, 1654 <u>sideration</u> , Blount, 1656; <u>Goad</u> , 1686
	(SIDEROUS: see SYDEROUS)					
A	SIGNALITY	PE I:X1 PE IV:9 GC I				Bulwer, 1650; Glanvill, 1661
A	SIGNATURIST	PE II:6				Blount, 1656
B*	SILICEOUS	PE II:5 (1658)	consisting of silica		Blount, 1656	
D	SIMPLE (vb.)	RM II:8		as adj. 1200 as vbl.sb. 1598		Ashmole, 1648; Rowland, 1658 Butler, 1664
D	SINDGE (sb.)	UB III		as vb. 1000 (singe)		



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	SINISTROUS	PE IV:2 PE IV:5 CM III:20	(context)	diff. sense 1560		Cudworth, 1678
C	SINISTROUSLY	PE IV:5				
GA	SOLATORY	LETTERS (1681) K IV, p.201	consolatory (punning on solitary)	not in OED solation 1483		
A	SOLLICITUDINOUS	CM I:33	filled with anxiety	solicitudinous solicitude 1412		
A	SOLIDUNGULOUS	PE III:2 (1650)	"solidungulous or whole- hoofed animals"		Grew, 1681	
A	SOLIPEDS	PE III:2 (1646 only) Commonplace Books K III, p.297	1650: "solidungulous animals"		Aldrovandus	as adj., Blount, 1656 <u>solipedous</u> , Plot, 1686
C *	SOLSTITIALLY	GC IV		solstitial 1559		
A	SOPITION	PE V:22	action of putting to sleep	sopite 1542		
A	SPADICEOUS	PE III:23	"spadiceous, or of a light red"			Ray, 1678; Salmon, 1683
B	SPERMATIZE	PE III:17	to produce sperm	spermatic 1539	Cotgrave, 1611	
GA	SPICATED	GC III(2)	having the form of spikes	OED gives 1661 predates spicate		Blount, 1661; Phil. Trans. 1702
A	SPICOUS	GC III	"the spicous head or torch"	Bot.		

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
GA	SPINTRIAN	RM II:7	relating to sodomy	OED gives 1656 (Dict.)	Tacitus	spinstrian, Marvell, 1678 <u>Blount, 1656</u>
GA	STAMINOUS	GC III	of stamens	OED gives 1786 (-1)		stamineous, Blount, 1661 <u>Wilkins, 1668</u>
B	STELLARY	GC III			Cockeram 1623	<u>stellar, Blount, 1656</u>
A 1	STILLICIDIOUS	PE II:1	"stirious or stillicidious"	stillicide 1626		Blount, 1656
A	STIRIOUS	PE II:1	(as prec.)			Blount, 1656; E. Browne (Phil. Trans.) 1670 <u>striate, Power, 1664</u> <u>Grew, 1681</u>
A*	STRIATED (ppl. adj.)	PE II:2	furrowed	predates striate		<u>striate, Cudworth, 1678</u>
A	STRIGMENTS	PE II:5	"strigments and sudorous adhesions"			
A1	STROMATICKS	PE VI:1	strewings	stromatic	Clement	Blount, 1656 (see OED's note)
GA	SUBCLAVIAN	PE IV:5	pertaining to the subclavian artery	OED gives ref. PE IV:4 (medic.)		Blount, 1656 (diff. sense) Holme, 1688, Phil. Trans. 1702
A	SUBCONSTELLATION	PE V:19				
A	SUBMONTANEOUS	TRACTS IX K III, p.86 (MS. Slo. 1827) (Circa 1658)	"hilly and submontaneous"	OED gives 1682		Wheeler, 1682
A*	SUBSIDENCE	PE II:5	sediment	predates other senses		T. Vaughan, 1650; Blount, 1656 Boyle, 1669 <u>subsidiency, More, 1655</u> <u>Ray, 1691</u>

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A.	SUBSIDING (pp1. adj.)	PE II:3		as vbl. sb. 1672		vbl. sb. Boyle, 1672 <u>Hale, 1676</u>
A	SUBTERRANITY	PE II:1		subterraneity (citing 1686 edn.) subterranean 1603		Blount, 1656 <u>subterraneous, Power, 1664</u> <u>Plot, 1686</u>
A	SUBVENTANEOUS	PE III:21	windy (esp. of eggs)			Parker, 1666; Plot, 1686; Holme, 1688
A.	SUCCEDANEOUS	PE III:4	acting as substitute	succedaneum 1643 (medic.)		Starkey, 1657
A1	SUCCITY	PE II:1 (1646-50)	moisture	succosity 1530	Boodt	
A	SUCCUSSATION	PE IV:6	"succussation, or trotting"		Scaliger	Bulwer, 1649; Butler, 1663 Blount, 1656
A	SUDOROUS	PE II:5 PE V:22	"strigments and sudorous adhesions"	sudorific 1626		
A1	SUFFRAGINOUS	PE III:1	"the hough or suffraginous flexure"		Pliny	Blount, 1656
GA	SUMEN	PE III:25 (1650)	"the sumen or belly and dugges of swine"	OED gives 1662	Pliny	Chandler, 1662
A	SUPERCONCEPTION	PE III:17				
A	SUPERCONSEQUENCY	PE I:3				
A	SUPERCRESCENCE	PE II:6	(context)	supercrescant 1638		
B *	SUPERFICIALITY	PE VI:10		superficial 1420	Palsgrave (Dict.) 1530	



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A1	SUPERFLUITANCE	PE II:1 (1646-50) PE II:5	floating substance	superfluity 1380		Blount, 1656
A	SUPERFOLIATION	TRACTS I K III, p.42				
A	SUPERHERESY	RM I:8				
A	SUPERSALIENCY	PE III:1	(context)			Blount, 1656
A	SUPPEDANEOUS	PE V:13	beneath the feet			Blount, 1656; L'Estrange, 1659
E	SUPPOSITUM	PE III:17	a being that subsists alone			Estwick, 1648; Baxter, 1651
A	SUSCITATION	PE VII:17	activation	suscitate 1528		Cogan, 1653; Pearson, 1659
A	SUTILE	TRACTS II K III, p.49	made by sewing or stitching			
A1	SWAGGY	PE III:4	pendulous with weight			
A1 (	SYDEROUS (1658)	PE III:X1	star-like	siderous	Kircher	
A1 (	SYDEREOUS (1672)	(from 1658)				
A	SYNCATEGOREMATICALL	PE VI:1	quantitative	syncategore- matically 1600		Hacket, 1670

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
C.	TABIDLY	LF: Martin, p.180	consumptively	tabid 1650 (Bulwer)		(Bulwer, 1650; <u>tabid</u> (Tomlinson, 1657; (Biggs, 1651; Felltham, 1661
A	TARDIGRADOUS	PE III:28 (1650)	"slow and tardigradous"	tardigrade 1623 (Dict.)	Bontius	
Al	TAURICORNOUS	PE V:9	horned like a bull		Vossius	Blount, 1656
A	TEAR-BOTTLE	UB III	"lachrymatories or tear-bottles"			Bargrave, 1662
Al	TELARY	PE V:19 (1646-50)	1658: "retary" of a web			Blount, 1656
C	TELARELY	GC III	after the fashion of a web	telarly		
A *	TEMPERAMENTAL	PE I:5 PE V:23 (1650)		temperament 1412		Charleton, 1650
B	TENUIFOLIOUS	GC IV	"tenuifolious or narrow-leaved"		Physical Dict. 1657	
GE	TENUPHA	GC I	"tenupha, or ceremony of .... oblations"	not in OED		
B	TEREBRATE	PE II:6	to penetrate by boring		Cockeram, 1623 (Vossius)	Phil. Trans, 1683
A 1	TERETOUS	GC IV	"teretous or long round leaves"	terete 1619		
A	TERREOUS	PE II:5 PE VII:13	"grosse and terreous"			

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A1	TERRESTRIFY	PE IV:13				Blount, 1656
A*	TESTACEOUS	PE IV:10 UB III				Wilkins, 1668; Grew, 1676 Evelyn, 1675
A1	TEXTURY	GC II	weaving			
A	THENAR	LF: Martin, p.183	"thenar or muscle of the thumb"	(Anat.)	Cardan	
D*	THERAPEUTICKE (adj.)	PE IV:13	"therapeuticke or curative physick"	therapeutic (sb.) 1541 therapeutical 1605		Blount, 1656
B	TINGIBLE	LETTERS: K IV, p.72 (1676) K IV, p.94 (1678)	capable of being coloured	tinge 1477 (Alch.)	Blount, 1656	
A	TITULARITY	PE VII:16	state of bearing a title	titular 1591		
A	TOLLUTATION	PE IV:6	"tollutation or ambling"	tolutation	Scaliger	Butler, 1663
C*	TOPICALLY	PE III:3		topical 1588		Evelyn, 1648
GE	TORQUIS	PE III:27	"torquis or carneous circle"	OED gives torques, 1693	Moufet	Pepys, 1693
A	TORTILE	GC III	"tortile and tiring"			
C *	TRADITIONALLY	PE I:8 PE VII:18		traditional 1600		
A.	TRANSCRIPTIVE	PE I:8(2)	(context)			
C 1	TRANSCRIPTIVELY	PE I:6				



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A1	TRANSEXION	PE III:17(2)	change of sex			
A	TRANSFEMINATE	PE III:17				Blount, 1656
A *	(TRANSFERABLE (1646) PE VI:3 (TRANSFERRIBLE (1650 ff.))			transferable transfer 1382		
A	TRANSGRESSIVE	PE I:10		transgress C16		
A	TRANSPECIATE	RM I:30	to change into a different species			
B	TRANSVERSION	GC I			Blount, 1656	
A1	TRANSVERTIBLE	GC III		OED gives "16 _" transvert 1432		
GA	TREMULTUATING	LETTERS, 1678 K IV, p.98	tremulous (?)	not in OED		
A.	TRICLINIARY	PE V:6				
E*	TRICLINIUM	PE V:6(4) PE VII:18	(context)			
A	TRIFISTULARY	PE III:12	three-tubed		Aldrovandus	
A1	TRIFLUCTUATION	PE VII:17	threefold wave			
A	TRIPUDIARY	PE I:4	"auguriall and tripudiary"	tripudiate 1623 (Dict.)	Cicero	Blount, 1656
A	TRIQUETROUS	GC II	triangular	triquetral 1646		

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A1	TRITURABLE	PE II:1	"triturable, and reduceable into powder"			Blount, 1656
A	TRITURATION	PE IV:7	reduction to powder			
A	TULIPIST	GC, Pref.				
GE	TYCHO	PE VI:6 (1646 only)	(Robbins queries - error for tyche?; Martin speculates - from teux <sup>ó</sup> = maker?)	not in OED		
		CM I:28	"tycho and primary generator"			
A	TYPOGRAPHER	RM I:24		typographical 1593		
A*	ULTERIOR	PE II:1	further			Boyle, 1661
A.	UMBILICALITY	PE V:5	close connection	umbilical 1541		Robinson, 1658
A	UMBROSITY	PE II:1	darkening	umbrous 1480		Bulwer, 1650
A1	UNCARNATE	PE VII:16	not incarnate			uncarnating, Gauden, 1659 <u>unincarnate</u> , 1687
A	UNCIRCUMSTANTIAL	PE VII:1	irrelevant			
A	UNCONGEALED (ppl. adj.)	PE II:1		uncongealable (Dict.)		Evelyn, 1700; <u>uncongeal</u> Power, 1664
A1	UNCOUS	GC III PE V:1 (1672)	"uncous and pointed"			

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A.	UNCULTIVATED	PE I:3				Boyle, 1684
C *	UNDENIABLY	PE VI:8		undeniable 1547		Bedloe, 1679
A1	UNDULARY	PE VII:17	coming in waves	undulated 1623 (Dict.)		
A*	UNDULATION	PE III:15				<u>undation</u> , Blount, 1656 <u>undulate</u> , Power, 1664 (1st user)
A *	UNESTABLISHED (pp1. adj.)	PE IV:13				<u>unestablish</u> , Milton, 1649
A:	UNEXISTENT	CM III:13		unexistence 1593		
C.	UNFREQUENTLY	PE I:2		unfrequent 1611		Boyle, 1674
A1	UNICORNOUS	PE V:19	one-horned			Blount, 1656
A	UNIPAROUS	PE VI:6	producing one at a birth			Petty, 1662
A1	UNITERABLE	CM III:23	that cannot be repeated			
A1	UNIVOCACY	GC III	oneness of character	univocal 1541		
A	UNPETRIFIED (pp1. adj.)	PE II:5				
A.	UNQUARRELLABLE	PE VI:10				
A.	UNTHORNY	PE I:5	"paradise or unthorny place"			



<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	UROSCOPY	PE, Pref.	glossed TB: "inspection of urines"			Brooke, 1650; Wittie (tr. Primrose) 1651; Blount, 1656
GE	USTRINA	UB II	"ustrina or place of burning... bodies"	not in OED		
E	UTINAM	RM I:24 PE I:10	an earnest wish			Biggs, 1651
A	VAGINIPENNOUS	PE III:15	"vaginipennous or sheath-winged"	predates other forms		Blount, 1656
A	VAIRED	GC II	parti-coloured	vair 1300		
Al	VALLATORY	TRACTS I K III, p.45	used for measuring a wall			
A*	VARIEGATION	PE VII:13		predates other forms		Blount, 1656; Evelyn, 1664; More, 1668; Glanvill, 1680
A	VEGETABILITY	PE II:5		(diff. sense 1400)		Phil. Trans. 1670; Plot, 1686
A	VENEFICIAL	PE II:6 GC V	of witchcraft	and in Gregory, 1646		
A	VENEFICIOUS	PE V:22		venefical 1584	Pliny	Charleton, 1650
C	VENEFICIOUSLY	PE V:22				
A 1	VENENATION	PE III:7 PE VII:19	means of poisoning			
Al	VENIABLE	PE III:12 PE III:23 PE III:19	pardonable			Blount, 1656

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OED NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
C	VENIABLY	PE V:21				
GA	VENTRALL	PE III:17(2) (1658)	1646/50: "prone"	ventral OED gives 1739		
A	VERISIMILITY	PE III:21 PE III:18	"verisimilarity or probable truth"	verisimil- itude 1603		Dryden, 1668 Blount, 1656
A	VERMIPAROUS	PE III:12 PE III:21 PE V:5 (1650)	producing young as worms			Blount, 1656
C *	VERTICALLY	PE VI:10		vertical 1559		Grew, 1677; Moxon, 1679; Plot, 1686
A	VETERINARIANS	PE III:2	glossed TB: "veterin- arians or farriers"	predates other forms		Blount, 1656; Plot, 1677
GA	VINEALL	GC I	pertaining to vines	OED gives vineal, 1659		More, 1659
A	VITELLARY	PE III:28 (1650)	"vitellary or place of the yelk"			Phil. Trans. 1687
A *	VITREOUS	PE II:1				Lovell, 1661; Boyle, 1663; Phil. Trans. 1676
A1	VITRIARIE	LETTER TO MERRETT, 1668; K IV, p.352	glass-making	vitriary vitrify 1594		
A *	VITRIFIABLE	PE II:3 (1646 only)		vitrification 1612		Boyle, 1684; Phil. Trans. 1709
A *	VITRIFIED (pp1. adj.)	PE II:1	"vitrified and pellucid"			Burnet, 1690
D	VITRIOLATE (adj.)	PE VI:12	"vitriolate or copporose"	as vb. 1605		Needham, 1665; Phil. Trans. 1665/66/67/70; Boyle, 1672/84

<u>KEY</u>	<u>FORM</u>	<u>REF.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICATION</u>	<u>OFD NOTES</u>	<u>ANTECEDENTS</u>	<u>SUCCESSORS</u>
A	VITRIOLOUS	PE III:22 PE VI:12(5)	"vacide and vitriolous humidity"	vitriol in Chaucer		
A	VIVENCY	PE II:1	vitality			Blount, 1656
A*	VIVIPAROUS	PE III:21 PE III:1 & elsewhere PE IV:1	producing live young  "volitation or flying"			Biggs, 1651; Wilkins, 1668; Grew, 1681; Blount, 1656
A	VOLITATION			volitate 1623 (Dict.)		Blount, 1656
A	WESELL	Misc. Birds of Norfolk K III, p.404	the smew (TB: "Mustela Variegata")	weasel		
A	WINGY	RM I:9 GC IV	"alary or wingy"			Cudworth, 1678
A1	ZODIOGRAPHER	PE V:1 (1650)	1646 = "zoographers"			
A	ZOOGRAPHER	PE IV:1 PE V:1 (1646 only) TRACTS IV K III, p.58	glossed TB: "describers of animals"  "zoographers and naturals"	zoography 1593		Blount, 1656; Plot, 1677; Boyle, 1688



APPENDIX IIa.

ALPHABETICAL SUMMARY, LIST OF COINAGES

<u>Letter</u>	<u>Total Entries</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>-1</u>
A	90	66	2	11	4	7	4	26	18
B	25	23	1	-	1	-	1	6	7
C	143	102	5	14	5	17	22	28	30
D	55	42	2	7	2	2	2	9	6
E	65	54	3	5	2	1	3	14	20
F	41	35	1	3	-	2	2	10	8
G	24	20	1	2	-	1	1	6	6
H	18	11	1	4	-	2	2	4	1
I	99	74	5	18	1	1	1	22	26
J	3	2	-	-	-	1	-	2	-
L	27	22	-	1	1	3	1	3	5
M	41	31	3	4	2	1	1	11	8
N	18	15	2	1	-	-	2	2	5
O	21	13	2	1	1	4	3	7	3
P	98	78	5	8	1	6	1	30	18
Q	5	2	-	1	-	2	3	2	-
R	42	36	1	1	2	2	2	14	8
S	92	71	7	4	7	3	12	12	17
T	45	31	4	5	1	4	3	7	10
U	24	20	-	2	-	2	1	4	6
V	27	23	-	3	1	-	2	6	4
W	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Z	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

---

TOTALS:	1,007	775	45	95	31	61	69	225	207
---------	-------	-----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----

---

- SUMMARY.
- A. Browne is first user of 775 words in O.E.D. (adjusted)
  - B. Browne is second user, after a lexicographer, of 45 words.
  - C. Browne is first user of 95 adverbs ending "-LY".
  - D. Browne is first user of 31 words, where he converts to a new part of speech.
  - E. Browne is first user of 61 words with 'alien' status.
  - G. 69 cases of error/omission in O.E.D. (6.8%)
  - \* 225 words out of the 1,007 total are in common current use (22.3%)
  - 1 207 words are only found in Browne's works. (20.5%)

APPENDIX IIb.ERRORS AND OMISSIONS, O.E.D.

This table summarises errors and omissions on the part of the O.E.D., the full details of which can be found at each word-entry in Appendix I. It is supplied as a form of quick reference to the main list of coinages. Entries are of three types:

- (a) omissions from O.E.D., noted OMITTED.
- (b) incorrect references and spellings, noted as such
- (c) incorrect datings. Here, the entries run: 1. the abbreviated name of Browne's text, and the correct date of use. 2. the incorrect date given in the O.E.D.. 3. the number of years by which Browne's use antedates that given in the Dictionary.

---

aggelation	P.E. 1650	1681	31
anhelent	Tracts VIII (MS Slo. 1839) - 1682	1764	82
anticipatively	R.M. 1643	1864	221
assassine (vb.)	R.M. 1643	1647	4
bipartited (vbl.sb.)	OMITTED		
capillarie (adj.)	P.E. 1646	1656	10
cariola	OMITTED		
chiasmus	G.C. 1658	1871	213
chymistator	Letters 1646	1682	36
clickling	P.E. 1672	1682	10
coagulum	P.E. 1650	1658	8
cobble	Misc: Birds of Norfolk - 1682	1802	120
comber	P.E. 1658	1646	-12 (error)
commiserator	INCORRECT REFERENCE		
complexionally	INCORRECT SPELLING		
conchylious	P.E. 1646	1849	203
congelable	P.E. 1650	1686	36
conopeion	OMITTED		

APPENDIX IIb. (contd.)

consortion	INCORRECT REFERENCE		
conspire (sb.)	OMITTED		
corculum (corcle)	G.C. 1658	1772	114
cosmographically	P.E. 1650	1658	8
cretaceous	G.C. 1658	1675	17
crowdingly	OMITTED		
culinarily	G.C. 1658	1837	179
cuneatim	OMITTED		
cunny-fish	G.C. 1658	1721	63
decussis	OMITTED		
denominable	P.E. 1650	1658	8
emaciate	INCORRECT REFERENCE		
empedon	OMITTED		
evaporous	Misc: Notes on Bubbles - 1682	1694	12
frutex	G.C. 1658	1664	6
furcula	G.C. 1658	1859	201
globular	G.C. 1658	1656 (Dict. only)	
hypogaeum	U.B. 1658	1706	48
hypomochlion	G.C. 1658	1665	7
inversedly	G.C. 1658	1753	95
labarum	G.C. 1658	1658 (Dict. only)	
miction	P.E. 1658	1663	5
narhwhale	P.E. 1650	1658	8
nitro-sulphureous	P.E. 1646	1671	25
omasus	G.C. 1658	1706	48
opaline	U.B. 1658	1784	126
ophiophagous	INCORRECT REFERENCE		
presentation	OMITTED		
quadriliteral	P.E. 1646	1771	125
quaternio	G.C. 1658	1678	20
quinquernio	OMITTED		
radiancy	P.E. 1650	1646	-4 (error)
regulus	OMITTED		
sacrificable	P.E. 1650	1646	-4 (error)
scevolaes	OMITTED		



APPENDIX IIb. (contd.)

selection	P.E. 1650	"1646-58"	-4 (error)
semi-bodies	INCORRECT REFERENCE		
seminal (sb.)	INCORRECT REFERENCE (C.M.)		
septicall	INCORRECT REFERENCE		
solatory	OMITTED		
spicated	G.C. 1658	1661	3
spintrian	R.M. 1643	1656	13
staminous	G.C. 1658	1786	128
subclavian	INCORRECT REFERENCE		
sumen	P.E. 1650	1662	12
tenupha	OMITTED		
torquis	P.E. 1646	1693	47
tremultuating	OMITTED		
tycho	OMITTED		
ustrina	OMITTED		
ventrall	P.E. 1658	1739	81
vineall	G.C. 1658	1659	1

APPENDIX IIc.

REVISIONS TO PSEUDODOXIA EPIDEMICA. (see chapter four, p. 95 ff.)

This table gives a list of 'hard' words and latinisms which were deleted from early editions, or replaced by another word or phrase. Coinages are marked with an asterisk\*. The list is arranged as follows: page ref., Robbins's edition; word which appears in 1646 edition; the date of the edition in which revision was made; the form to which revision was made, or a note of the word's deletion.

---

p.4	elenchically*	1650	fallaciously
19	imposture	1650	impostor
20	infusion	1650	illumination
21	ingannations*	1650	deceptions
37	extemporall	1650	extemporary
47	Indiary*	1650	Indian
66	collective	1650	consectary
70	haemoptysis*	1650	<u>deleted</u>
70	independent	1650	indifferent
76	generative	1650	<u>deleted</u>
82	colament*	1650	percolation
90	amits	1650	loseth
93	geographically	1650	cosmographically
121	representations	1650	representments
123	lithontripticke*	1650	<u>deleted</u>
127	aporrhoeias*	1650	<u>deleted</u>
129	continued and durable	1650	piercing and powerful
130	tonnitruous	1650	<u>deleted</u>
133	incummiscibility*	1650	<u>deleted</u>
133	hydrargyrus*	1650	mercuriall
158	composition	1650	transaction
165	solipeds*	1650	solidungulous* animals
169	cystis	1650	<u>deleted</u>
173	avelled	1650	<u>deleted</u>
174	rancid*	1650	<u>deleted</u>
216	elychnious*	1650	<u>deleted</u>
231	verity	1650	truth
232	prone	1658	ventrall*

APPENDIX IIc. (contd.)

p.253	volatile	1650	<u>deleted</u>
256	antonomastically*	1650	<u>deleted</u>
257	anfractuous	1650	wreathy
279	invision*	1658	non-vision
293	apophyses*	1650	<u>deleted</u>
297	oedematous*    ) schirrous        ) erysipelatous* )	1650	<u>deleted</u>
298	priviledge	1650	preheminency
299	topicall	1650	medicall*
303	preheminency	1650	<u>deleted</u>
305	bipartited*	1650	divided
309	fundamentall	1650	of consequence hereto
326	friable	1650	<u>deleted</u>
327	amitted	1658	lost
328	occasioned	1650	begot
330	similitude	1650	figment
331	canonicall	1650	<u>deleted</u>
339	septuaries*	1650	septenaries
372	fritiniancy*	1650	fritinnitus
390	equivocall	1650	<u>deleted</u>
403	insinuation	1650	contagion
416	telary*	1658	retiary*
427	continuation	1658	geneologie
428	epithumeticall*	1672	concupiscentiall
447	incontrovertibly*	1672	(seems)
458	precept	1650	rule
464	convinsively*	1650	convincingly
468	participating	1650	<u>deleted</u>
486	acceptions	1650	determinations
503	conveniencie	1650	<u>deleted</u>
507	concurrence	1650	cooperation
518	benegroee*	1658	denigrate
537	reasonable	1650	<u>deleted</u>
540	autoptically*	1658	ocularly
558	authenticke	1650	received



APPENDIX IIId.

PSEUDODOXIA EPIDEMICA: GLOSSING, 1650 EDITION. (see chapter four, p.98)

This is a list of all the instances where a 'hard' word included in the first (1646) edition was not glossed, and a gloss by way of footnote was added in the 1650 edition. Coinages are marked with an asterisk\*.

---

(page ref: Robbins)

16	Apologue
36	Anthropophagie
44	Collyrium
60	Apodicticall
61	Necromancy
63	Hipericon
85	Synonymy
88	phenomena's, septentrionate* Australize*
161	analogies
163	Cylindricall*
165	Veterinarians*
166	Flamen
177	Diagoniall
182	graphically, deleterious*
205	homonymy
207	Anomalies
212	amphibious*
214	Septicall
223	Acus (not in <u>O.E.D.</u> )
229	Androgynall*
260	Alexipharmacall
262	Ichthyologie*
292	Zoographers*
294	Zenith
301	chiragricall (persons)
308	Athleticall, gymnastically*
414	Trochilick
429	Anthropomorphites
514	Camoys nose
607	Longimanous*

APPENDIX IIIa.

DISTRIBUTION OF COINAGES

This appendix tabulates the distribution of coinages listed in Appendix I, to show their occurrence in each of Browne's works. In addition, the number of (G) instances of error in the O.E.D., (-1) hapaxlegomena, and (E) words of alien status recorded for each work are shown.

	Total coinages	G	-1	E
Religio Medici	36	4	5	3
Pseudodoxia Epidemica	752	29	147	32
Hydriotaphia	25	3	3	3
The Garden of Cyrus	99	23	16	16
Letter to a Friend	16		3	
Christian Morals	36	3	13	5
Tracts	30	1	15	2
Letters	6	3		
Miscellaneous writings	7	3	5	
TOTALS	1,007	69	207	61

APPENDIX IIIb.

## BROWNE'S SUCCESSORS IN DICTION.

This appendix summarises the significant names which appear in column 7, "SUCCESSORS", in Appendix I. It registers the names of seventeenth-century authors who have, on the O.E.D.'s evidence, re-used coinages of Browne, or closely related words, mostly latinisms, together with the number of occasions on which their names occur as 'successors' of Browne's diction.

It is followed by the list of words used by Robert Boyle and Henry More, illustrating the range and kind of correspondences in their respective vocabularies.

---

Robert Boyle	46
Phil. Trans. of the Royal Society	41
Robert Plot	36
Henry Power	30
Henry More	29
John Evelyn	22
John Ray	23
Joseph Glanvill	18
Noah Biggs	17
Nehemiah Grew	16
Walter Charleton	15
John Bulwer	11
John Robinson	9
Matthew Hale	8
Robert Lovell	8

(Lexicographers excluded)



APPENDIX IIIb. (contd.)Robert Boyle

aqueous  
 assimilable  
 avolation  
 cetaceous  
 corrodible  
 cylindrical  
 decrepetitate  
 denigration  
 depreciate  
 determent  
 diapalma  
 effluvium  
 electrick  
 electricity  
 exantlation  
 exhaustion  
 factitious  
 geometrize  
 glaciabile  
 granulary  
 immanifest  
 improvable  
 incalescence  
 inferrible  
 inservient  
 intumescence  
 latitancy  
 lixiviate  
 materiate  
 mineralogy  
 pathological  
 perpension  
 plant-animal  
 polarity  
 protrusion  
 ruminating  
 scorious  
 subsidence  
 ulterior  
 uncultivated  
 unfrequently  
 vitreous  
 vitrifiable  
 vitriolate  
 zoographer

Henry More

anticipative  
 antipodal  
 approximation  
 candidly  
 canorously  
 coexistency  
 committable  
 conglaciate  
 contemporize  
 cortical  
 crustaceous  
 cuspis  
 erectness  
 flammeous  
 hallucination  
 incommunicated  
 indigitate  
 indoctrination  
 latitancy  
 miction  
 remugient  
 numerality  
 ornamental  
 protuberancy  
 rancidly  
 rectilinear  
 subsidency  
 variegation  
 vineal

## Bibliography

The following is a list of works cited in the text; works consulted but not cited have not been included. Unless otherwise stated, the place of publication is London.

### 1. Browne's works (in chronological order)

Religio Medici 1643

Pseudodoxia Epidemica 1646, 1650, 1658 (twice), 1672

Hydriotaphia & The Garden of Cyrus 1658

The Works of the Learned S<sup>r</sup> Thomas Brown 1686

Works, ed. Simon Wilkin 1835-6 (4 vols.), reprinted (3 vols.) 1852

Religio Medici etc., ed. J.A.Symonds 1886

Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus, ed. W.A.Greenhill 1896

Religio Medici & other writings..., ed. C.H.Herford 1906

Works, ed. Sir Geoffrey Keynes (2nd ed.) 1964 (4 vols.) (K)

Religio Medici and other works, ed. L.C.Martin 1964 (M)

Religio Medici, Hydriotaphia and The Garden of Cyrus, ed. R.H.A.Robbins 1972

The Major Works, ed. C.A.Patrides Harmondsworth, 1977

Pseudodoxia Epidemica, ed. R.H.A.Robbins Oxford, 1981 (2 vols.) (R)

### 2. Other works

Bacon, Francis: The Advancement of Learning... ed. A. Johnston. Oxford, 1974  
Essays. 1625

Benlowes, Edward: Theophila. 1652

Bennett, Joan: Sir Thomas Browne. Cambridge, 1962

Bentham, Jeremy: Handbook of Political Fallacies ed. H.A.Larrabee,  
Baltimore, 1952

- Biggs, Noah: Mataeotechnia Medicinae Praxis, or, A New Dispensatory. 1651
- Blount, Thomas: Glossographia. 1656 & 2nd ed., 1661
- Bolton, W.F.: A Short History of Literary English. 1967
- Boyle, Robert - see Hall, Marie Boas
- Breiner, Laurence A.: "The Generation of Metaphor in Thomas Browne", in MLQ xxxviii (1977), pp. 261-275.
- Bullokar, John: An English Expositor. 1616
- Bulwer, John: Anthropometamorphosis. 1653
- Bush, Douglas: English Literature in the earlier seventeenth century. 2nd. ed., 1962
- Butler, Samuel: Hudibras ed. Zachary Grey; Chandos Classics ed., 1892.
- Carey, John: "Seventeenth Century Prose", in English Poetry and Prose, 1540-1674, ed. C.Ricks, 1970
- A Catalogue of the Libraries of the Learned Sir Thomas Brown, and Dr Edward Brown, his Son. 1711
- Cawdrey, Robert: A Table Alphabeticall. 1604
- Charleton, Walter: A Ternary of Paradoxes. 1650
- Chronological English Dictionary, ed. T.Finkenstaedt, E.Leisi & D.Wolff, 1970
- Cleveland, John: Poems, reprinted in Saintsbury, vol. III.
- Cockeram, Henry: English Dictionarie. 1623
- Coleridge, S.T.: Literary Remains, reprinted in Coleridge, Select Poetry and Prose, ed. S.Potter, 1933
- Collop, John: Poesis Rediviva. 1656
- Croll, Morris: Style, Rhetoric, and Rhythm, ed. J.M.Patrick, Princeton, 1966, and in Literary English since Shakespeare, ed. Watson, 1970
- Daniel, George: Poems, ed. A.B.Grosart, 1878
- Debus, Allen G.: Science and Education in the Seventeenth Century. New York, 1970
- De Quincey, Thomas: Works, ed. David Masson, 1890
- Dryden, John: Preface (to Troilus and Cressida) concerning the Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy. 1679
- Du Bartas (trans. J. Sylvester): Divine Weekes and Workes. 1605
- Emerson, R.W.: English Traits (World's Classics ed.) 1903



- Endicott, Norman: "Some Aspects of Self-Revelation and Self-Portraiture in Religio Medici", in Essays in English Literature...  
Ed. M. MacLure & F. W. Watt. Toronto, 1964, pp. 85-102
- Evelyn, John: Diary ed. E. S. De Beer. Oxford, 1955  
Miscellaneous Writings of John Evelyn... ed. W. Upcott. 1825
- Felltham, Owen: Resolves. 1636
- Finkenstaedt, T. (ed.): see Chronological English Dictionary
- Gaffarel, James (trans. E. Chilmead): Unheard-of Curiosities. 1650
- Gosse, Edmund: Sir Thomas Browne. 1905
- Guibbory, Achsah: "Thomas Browne's Pseudodoxia Epidemica and the Circle of Knowledge", in Texas Studies in Language and Literature, xviii, 1976-77, pp. 486-499
- Hakewill, George: An Apologie of the Power and Providence of God... 1627
- Hall, Marie Boas: Robert Boyle on Natural Philosophy. Bloomington, 1965
- Hartley, Sir Harold (ed.): The Royal Society: Its Origins and Founders. 1960
- Hill, Christopher: The Century of Revolution (revised ed.) 1980
- Hobbes, Thomas: Leviathan. 1651
- Hoppen, K. T.: "The Nature of the Early Royal Society", in BJHS, ix (1976), pp. 10-19
- Houghton, Walter: "The English Virtuoso in the Seventeenth Century", in JHI, iii (1942) pp. 51-73 and 190-219
- Howell, James: Epistolae Ho-Elanae. Temple Classics ed., 1903
- Huntley, F. L.: Sir Thomas Browne. Ann Arbor, 1962
- Jack, Ian: "Samuel Butler and Hudibras", in The Pelican Guide to English Literature ed. Boris Ford, Vol. 4. Harmondsworth, 1957
- Johnson, Samuel: Selected Letters, ed. R. W. Chapman. 1925  
"Life of Sir Thomas Browne", prefacing Christian Morals (1756), reprinted in Wilkin (ed.) Works, and Patrides.
- Jones, R. F.: Science and English Prose Style. 1951  
The Triumph of the English Language. 1953
- Keynes, Sir Geoffrey: A Bibliography of Sir Thomas Browne. Cambridge, 1924
- Lamb, Charles: Essays of Elia. 1823

- Leroy, Olivier: Le Chevalier Thomas Browne (1605-82). Paris, 1931
- Lluellyn, Martin: Men-Miracles. 1646
- Mackenzie, Norman: "Sir Thomas Browne as a Man of Learning...", in ESA  
(English Studies in Africa), X (1967), pp. 67-86  
"The Concept of Baroque and its Relation to Sir Thomas  
Browne's Religio Medici and Urn Burial", in ESA, X, pp. 147-166
- Marvell, Andrew: Poems & Letters, ed. H.M. Margoliouth. Oxford, 1971
- Merton, Egon S.: Science and Imagination in Sir Thomas Browne. New York, 1949  
"The Botany of Sir Thomas Browne" in Isis xlvii (1956),  
pp. 161-171
- More, Henry: Philosophical Poems of Henry More, ed. G. Bullough, Manchester, 1931
- Morgan, Edwin: "Strong Lines and Strong Minds...", in Cambridge Journal, IV,  
(1951), pp. 481-491
- Morris, Vivienne Claire: The Style of Pseudodoxia Epidemica... Unpub.  
Ph.D. thesis, Birkbeck Coll., London, 1976
- Nicolson, Marjorie: Science and Imagination. New York, 1956
- Oxford English Dictionary.
- Osselton, N.E.: "Vulgar Errors and Accepted Terms", in Times and Tide,  
festschrift for Prof. A.G.H. Bachrach. Leyden, 1980 pp. 104-109
- Pater, Walter: Appreciations. 1889
- Patrides, C.A. (ed.): Sir Thomas Browne: The Major Works. Harmondsworth, 1977
- Philipott, Thomas: Poems (1646); ed. L.C. Martin 1950
- Plot, Robert: The Natural History of Staffordshire. 1686
- Pocket Oxford Dictionary (1957 ed.)
- Power, Henry: Experimental Philosophy. 1663
- Rissanen, Matti: "Strange and Inkhorne Tearmes...", in Style and Text:  
Essays presented to Nils Erik Enkvist, ed. H. Ringbom,  
Stockholm, 1975 pp. 250-262
- Ross, Alexander: Arcana Microcosmi. 1652  
Medicus Medicatus. 1645
- Saintsbury, G.E.B. (ed.): Minor Poets of the Caroline Period. 1905

- Schäfer, Jürgen: "The Hard Word Dictionary: A Re-assessment" in Leeds Studies in English, IV, 1970, pp. 31-48  
 "The Working Methods of Thomas Blount" in English Studies 59, 1978, pp. 405-408  
Documentation in the O.E.D. Oxford, 1980  
 "Elizabethan Glossaries: A Computer-Assisted Study...", in ALLC Bulletin No. 1 (1980), pp. 36-42
- Shadwell, Thomas: The Virtuoso (ed. Nicolson & Rodes, 1966)
- Sonnino, Lee A.: A Handbook to Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric. 1968
- Spencer, J. and Gregory, M.J.: "An Approach to the Study of Style", in N.E. Enkvist, Spencer and Gregory, Linguistics and Style. 1964
- Starnes, De Witt T. and Noyes, G.E.: The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson. Chapel Hill, 1946
- Stephen, Leslie: Hours in a Library. 1909
- Sterne, Laurence: The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy. 1759-1767
- Strachey, G. Lytton: Books and Characters. 1922
- Strang, Barbara M.H.: A History of English. 1970
- Swan, John: Speculum Mundi. 1635
- Tillotson, Geoffrey: Augustan Poetic Diction. 1961
- Vickers, Brian: Francis Bacon and Renaissance Prose. Cambridge, 1968
- Warren, Austin: "The Style of Sir Thomas Browne" in Kenyon Review, xiii, 1951, pp. 674-687
- Watson, George (ed.): Literary English since Shakespeare. 1970
- Webber, Joan: The Eloquent 'I'. Madison, 1968
- Webster, John: Examen Academiæ 1654; reprinted in Debus, above.
- Whallon, William: "Hebraic Synonymy in Sir Thomas Browne", in ELH, xxviii, 1961, pp. 335-352
- Willey, Basil: The Seventeenth-Century Background. 1934  
The English Moralists. 1964
- Wimsatt, W.K.: The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson. New Haven, 1941
- Yeats, W.B.: Collected Poems (2nd ed.) 1950
- Ziegler, D.K.: In Divided and Distinguished Worlds. Cambridge, Mass., 1943