The Physician's Religion and *salus populi* : The Manuscript Circulation and Print Publication of *Religio Medici*

Kathryn Murphy

Studies in Philology, Volume 111, Number 4, Fall 2014, pp. 845-874 (Article)

Published by The University of North Carolina Press
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/sip.2014.0031*

The Physician's Religion and *salus populi*: The Manuscript Circulation and Print Publication of *Religio Medici*

by Kathryn Murphy

Some notes in the diary of the London intelligencer Samuel Hartlib constitute the first and hitherto only evidence we have, beyond the extant manuscripts themselves, for the manuscript circulation of Thomas Browne's Religio Medici. *This article explores the implications of these recently uncovered notes, which place the manuscript in the milieu of Hartlib, of the Puritan Essex noblewoman Lady Judith Barrington, and of the clergyman John Gauden, and allow consideration of who may have wished to publish* Religio Medici, *and why, and in particular whether Gauden may have been involved. After developing the implications of Browne's connections with the individuals who we now know were involved in circulating the manuscript, the article turns to what these connections suggest about the significance of the first edition of* Religio Medici, *especially its engraved title page; the association of* Religio Medici *with contemporary political debates over the meaning of the Ciceronian tag* salus populi suprema lex*; and what this contributes to our understanding of the contemporary reception and potential political application of* Religio Medici.

I

When *Religio Medici* appeared in the press in two anonymous editions in 1642, its author professed himself shocked. Attempting—unsuccessfully—to forestall the publication of critical animadversions by Sir Kenelm Digby, Thomas Browne wrote him a letter disclaiming any involvement in the printing and decrying the corruptions his manuscript had suffered before reaching the press, "from whence it issued so disguised, the Author without distinction could not acknowledg it." "Having thus

miscarried," Browne told Digby, "within a few Weekes I shall, God willing, deliver unto the Presse the true and intended Originall."[1] An authorized version was published in 1643 under the considerably less memorable title of *A true and full coppy of that which was most imperfectly and surreptitiously printed before vnder the name of* Religio medici. The bookseller was Andrew Crooke, who had also been responsible for the "surreptitious" editions of 1642. Although the title page carried no name, the *True and full coppy* was printed with a signed authorial preface, in which Browne reiterated the protests of his letter to Digby and gave an account of his text's genesis and transmission, loaded with outrage at the indignities forced upon him:

> This I confesse about seven yeares past . . . I had at leisurable houres composed; which being communicated unto one, it became common unto many, and was by transcription successively corrupted untill it arrived in a most depraved copy at the presse. (1)

With its new title, defensive preface, the letter to Digby, and an anonymous letter "To such as have, or shal peruse the Observations [*sc*. Digby's] upon a former corrupt Copy of this Booke," the *True and full coppy* bristled with paratextual apparatus designed to differentiate it from the "imperfect," "surreptitious," "corrupted," and "depraved" printings of 1642 and supply the "distinction" necessary for Browne's assertion of authorship.

Browne thus simultaneously confesses to the identity of the first person of *Religio Medici* and drives a chronological wedge between the "I" of the preface and the "I" of the text: composed seven years previously, "there might be many things therein plausible unto my passed apprehension, which are not agreeable unto my present self." The text was written "for my private exercise and satisfaction" during "leisurable houres"; "the intention was not publik," it was "directed to my selfe" (1–2). Browne systematically consigns the 1642 *Religio Medici* to the past and to privacy.

Each of these strategies serves to distance Browne from *Religio Medici*. Yet he also insists that the 1643 text is "the true and intended Originall" and "a full and intended Copy."[2] The word "intention" occurs, in

[1] The letter was dated 3 March 1642/3 and published with subsequent editions of *Religio Medici*. See Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici and Other Works*, ed. L. C. Martin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), 76. All subsequent references to *Religio Medici*, the preface, and the letter to Digby are to this edition, unless otherwise noted, with page numbers given in the text.

[2] Despite this insistence, Browne did not supply Crooke with a holograph manuscript

various forms, four times in the paratexts, either to contrast the authorized edition with the printings of 1642, or to insist on the innocence of Browne's undertakings in the 1630s. The 1642 *Religio Medici* is thus emphatically marked as unintended. Browne's account of the printing occludes agency, framing the 1642 publication as contingent and accidental. In the preface the manuscript simply "arrived" (1) with Crooke, apparently under its own steam, while Browne's letter to Digby claims more pointedly that "the liberty of these times committed it unto the Presse" (76). Browne does not simply wish to absolve himself of bringing *Religio Medici* before the public, but attempts to make it impossible for the reader to think of its publication by someone else in 1642 as deliberate.

This essay uses new information about the circulation of *Religio Medici* in manuscript to propose both a possible candidate for the agency behind the 1642 publication, and some reasons for it.[3] Browne's attempt to deflect attention from these questions has been largely successful. No one has speculated on the original motives for publication in 1642, unless to propose that Browne himself was responsible. In his "Life of Sir Thomas Browne," Samuel Johnson reiterated Browne's account of the publication of *Religio Medici* and offered some general comments on "surreptitious editions" which cast doubt on Browne's motives:

> This has, perhaps, sometimes befallen others; and this, I am willing to believe, did really happen to Dr. Browne: but there is, surely, some reason to doubt the truth of the complaint so frequently made of surreptitious editions . . . It is easy to convey an imperfect book, by a distant hand, to the press, and plead the circulation of a false copy as an excuse for publishing the true, or to correct what is found faulty or offensive, and charge the errors on the transcriber's depravations.[4]

The rhythmic interpolation of Johnson's qualifications, hedged about with punctuation, suggests a gentlemanly hesitancy to claim otherwise than by indirection that Browne, or others like him, may have used "cor-

---

in 1643, but with a marked-up copy of a "surreptitious" edition: the "Originall" postdates its own corruption. The copy which Browne annotated is in Princeton University Library: see Brooke Conti, "Sir Thomas Browne's Annotated Copy of his 1642 *Religio Medici*," *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 67 (2006): 595–610.

[3] This discovery was first published, and its significance preliminarily explored, in Kathryn Murphy, "A Man of Excellent Parts: The Manuscript Readers of Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*," Commentary, *Times Literary Supplement* 5492 (4 July 2008): 14–15. See also Reid Barbour, *Sir Thomas Browne: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 275.

[4] Johnson, "Life of Sir Thomas Browne", in Thomas Browne, *Christian Morals*, 2nd ed., ed. Samuel Johnson (London, 1756), vi–vii.

rupt" first editions to test the waters of public opinion. The suspicion Johnson thus cast on Browne has however never quite been dispelled.[5]

The new evidence for the manuscript circulation of *Religio Medici*, however, broadly confirms Browne's own account of the stages of its transmission, if not his moral outrage, and makes his own involvement in the publication highly unlikely. In what follows, I supply a more detailed account of the new evidence for manuscript circulation, found in the Hartlib Archive, and suggest both a possible candidate for who, other than "the liberty of these times," may have wished to publish *Religio Medici* and why. After considering the implications of Browne's connections with the individuals who we now know were involved in circulating the manuscript, I turn to what these connections suggest about the significance of the 1642 publication, especially its engraved title page, and what this contributes to our understanding of the contemporary reception and potential political application of *Religio Medici*.

II

After settling in England in 1626, the Polish émigré Samuel Hartlib devoted himself to promoting the advancement of learning and universal reformation, willingly becoming a clearing house for new learning and innovations and a contact point for other individuals interested in such schemes. Promoting an astonishingly wide variety of disciplines and subjects—including beekeeping and indexing, mining and silk manufacture, artificial languages and mechanical devices, schemes for the reform of education, religion, politics, farming, horticulture, logic, mathematics and language—Hartlib made it his task to "investigate all manuscripts, and encourage correspondence with all excellent Men."[6]

[5] Comment on the issue generally suspends its judgment, or finds Johnson's case most plausible: see Samuel Wong, "Constructing a Critical Subject in *Religio Medici*," *Studies in English Literature* 43 (2003): 117–36, here 135, with summaries of other opinions at 122–23 and 134–35; Conti, "Thomas Browne's Annotated Copy," 597–98; Frank Ardolino, "The Saving Hand of God: The Significance of the Emblematic Frontispiece of the *Religio Medici*," *English Language Notes* 15 (1977): 19–23, here 19–20; and Barbour, *Sir Thomas Browne*, 275–76. Some of the skepticism rests on Browne's provision of the new text in 1643 to the same bookseller responsible for the anonymous printings, but this is to misunderstand the extent of authorial control—minimal—over texts that had become printer's copy; Crooke's actions were neither unusual nor "piratical," and Browne may both have had no other choice and no particular reason to take a new version of the work to another printer. Harold Love urges more credence for such authorial claims in *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth–Century England* (1993; 2nd edition, Boston, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), 72.

[6] *The Hartlib Papers*, Sheffield University Library, electronic edition (Ann Arbor, 1993);

His papers, including extensive correspondence, diaries, pamphlets, and manuscripts, testify to the extended "commonwealth of learning" and networks of intellectual exchange both in England and on the Continent.[7]

I have written elsewhere about Browne's connections with Hartlib in the later 1640s.[8] Here, however, it is the earliest reference that is significant. In the summer of 1640, Hartlib received a visit in his London home from John Gauden, chaplain to Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick. Alongside a "weather-glasse"—a primitive thermometer used to prognosticate the weather, which Hartlib deemed "very pretty"—Gauden delivered "a MS. of divinity called Medici Religio," identifying its author as "[a] man of excellent parts living at Norwich acquainted with my Lady Barrington."[9] The Barringtons were a prominent Essex family, neighbors to Robert Rich, and engaged, in 1640, in the same parliamentarian causes. The head of the family was Sir Thomas Barrington; "Lady Barrington," as later references make clear, was his wife Judith (rather than his mother Joan). Approximately two months after Gauden's visit, Lady Barrington herself delivered several alchemical manuscripts to Hartlib and identified this "man of excellent parts." Hartlib noted that a "Mr or Dr Browne physitian of Norwich is the Author of the MS Religio Medici."[10] Though very brief, these two entries in Hartlib's diary have much to tell us about the circulation, and potentially, as I shall argue, about the publication of *Religio Medici*.

A first observation is that this evidence largely confirms scholars' inferences about the circulation of *Religio Medici* on the basis of the extant manuscripts. Of these there are eight, none of which is identical

---

2nd ed. (Ann Arbor, 1995), 29/2/30A. References hereafter, prefaced by *HP*, follow the system of reference by bundle and page number. For Hartlib's manuscripts and diary, see Stephen Clucas, "Samuel Hartlib's Ephemerides, 1635–1659, and the Pursuit of Scientific and Philosophical Manuscripts: The Religious Ethos of an Intelligencer," *Seventeenth Century* 6 (1991): 33–55; for his London milieu, see Rob Iliffe, "Hartlib's World," in *London and Beyond: Essays in Honour of Derek Keene*, ed. Matthew P. Davies et al. (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2012), 103–22.

[7] See esp. Charles Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626–1660*, 2nd ed. (Bern: Peter Lang, 2002); and the essays gathered in Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, and Timothy Raylor, eds., *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

[8] See Kathryn Murphy, "The Best Pillar of the Order of Sir Francis: Thomas Browne, Samuel Hartlib, and Communities in Learning," in *"A Man Very Well Studyed": New Contexts for Thomas Browne*, ed. Kathryn Murphy and Richard Todd (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 273–94.

[9] *HP* 30/4/51A–B.

[10] *HP* 30/4/67A.

with another or with the text of the editions of 1642. Since the collation of Jean-Jacques Denonain in 1953, they have been divided into two main groups, early and late; Crooke's first "surreptitious" version was printed from a manuscript belonging to the later group, now lost.[11] The two early versions are generally assumed to have been circulated in Browne's immediate circle; one of them bears Browne's name in the same hand as the text, but neither has the title "Religio Medici." Of the second group, none carries Browne's name in a contemporary hand (while one has a false ascription), but all carry the title. Both Denonain and Vittoria Sanna, whose study of the manuscripts is the most thorough printed thus far, assign the groupings to different biographical periods. The first group, representing Browne's first version, was written during Browne's medical apprenticeship, spent most probably in Yorkshire.[12] The second is thought to derive from the period after Browne's move to Norwich in 1636. Sanna sees in the later versions, in which she identifies two further subgroups, a move from the privacy and relative seclusion of his apprenticeship into the public life of the second biggest city in England and into a circle of prominent figures from the Norfolk gentry.[13] She also suggests a *terminus ad quem* for the second version of 1640, on the basis of a note found on a manuscript of the later group, now in the Norwich Public Record Office, which reports a rumor that the author was Alexander Reid or Read, a Scottish anatomist and surgeon, resident in London, who, as the anonymous note points out, had died in 1641.[14] Sanna's argument is vulnerable to the objection that, since the attribution mentions Reid's death, it must itself have been written after 1641, and there is no guarantee that the manuscript had been seen by that reader before then; in theory, it could date to any point between 1641 and Browne's acknowledgement of authorship in 1643 (or even later, if that news took some time to spread). More

[11] See the textual material in Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici: Edited from the Manuscript Copies and the Early Editions*, ed. Jean-Jacques Denonain (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), ix–xxi (hereafter Denonain). For refinements of Denonain's outline, see Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici: Edizione critica*, ed. Vittoria Sanna, *Annali delle Facoltà di lettere–filosofia e magistero dell'Università di Cagliari* 26 (1958): xiv–xli (hereafter Sanna). Our knowledge of the textual history will be much enhanced with the publication of the first volume of the *Oxford Thomas Browne*, containing texts of both manuscript stages as well as the 1643 print edition and edited by Reid Barbour and Brooke Conti.

[12] Barbour has made some suggestive observations about the possible origins of one of these manuscripts with the Power family of Halifax: see *Sir Thomas Browne*, 237–39. On the composition of the first version, see more generally 237–55.

[13] Sanna, xxviii, xxxiv–xxxvii. See also Barbour, *Sir Thomas Browne*, 272–75.

[14] Sanna, xxxiv–xxxv. The anonymous note is cited in full in Denonain, xvii.

recently, Brooke Conti proposed the same time frame of 1638–1640 for the composition of the second version, on the grounds of internal evidence suggesting Browne was concerned with the Bishops' War.[15]

Hartlib's encounter with the manuscript bears out these more speculative arguments with material evidence. Clearly, the manuscript was, by 1640, circulating outside the circle of Browne's immediate acquaintance, since neither Gauden, who could not supply Browne's name, nor Hartlib knew Browne personally. That Gauden was initially able to provide Hartlib with information on Browne's geographical location, but not his name, suggests that the manuscript had a provenance in Norwich; that it had reached Lady Barrington confirms the suggestion that it was circulating among the gentry. Browne's own account of the route of his manuscript to the press is also bolstered by what we now know of its circulation, and it follows the standard pattern outlined by Harold Love: "an initial phase of dissemination under the author's personal supervision, then a second stage of uncontrolled private copying."[16]

It also gives us information about specific individuals among whom the manuscript was circulating. By considering the interest that Hartlib, Lady Barrington, and Gauden may have taken in *Religio Medici*, we can retrieve some of the circumstances of its early reception, as well as some speculative consideration of a possible route to the press. I will begin with Lady Barrington, with whom this manuscript originated, before addressing Gauden and Hartlib, whose connections with the London book trade were more extensive.

III

Lady Judith Barrington was the wife, as we have seen, of Sir Thomas Barrington of Hatfield Broad Oak, Essex. In the early 1640s, Hartlib was closely connected with Sir Thomas, who was in the parliamentarian and Puritan vanguard, closely associated with Gauden's patron, Robert Rich, the Earl of Warwick, and through his mother, Lady Joan, related to Oliver Cromwell and Oliver St. John. He raised troops in Essex for the parliamentarian cause and was a member of several committees for

[15] Conti, "Thomas Browne's Annotated Copy," 599–603.

[16] There is no evidence to suggest that the *Religio* entered Love's third stage—"copying for sale by commercial scriptoria"—but the unauthorized publication in 1642 is just as Love suggests. See "Oral and Scribal Texts in Early Modern England," in *Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, vol. 4: 1557–1695*, ed. John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 97–121, here 105.

defense and of the Westminster Assembly before his death in 1644.[17] He donated money to Hartlib in the late 1630s and early 1640s and was part of a parliamentary party that tried to secure an official stipend for him.[18]

He married Judith in 1624 and was notably uxorious; during their engagement, Sir John Chamberlain described him as "so inamored of her and her vertues that she may make her own conditions," and the Barrington letters, preserved in the British Library, are full of testimony to his unusually passionate devotion to her.[19] She appears indeed to have been a remarkable figure: a patron of literature, whose various intellectual activities have gone largely unremarked since the seventeenth century.[20] She is occasionally glimpsed on the periphery of English literary history as a character in someone else's story. After the death of her first husband George Smith, it was rumoured she was to marry Thomas Carew, the poet and her distant relative;[21] through the Barringtons, she came to act as a patron to Francis Quarles, who wrote comedies for the family.[22] John Chamberlain noted her eagerness to attend Thomas Middleton's *A Game at Chess* in 1624, and in another letter, described her "studies" as "somewhat poeticall."[23] Sir John Bramston

[17] For biographical details on Barrington, see Chris R. Kyle, "Barrington, Sir Thomas, second baronet (c. 1585–1644)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online ed., May 2009), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/70626, accessed 24 July 2013. References to *ODNB* hereafter will use those initials to identify them. For an account of his personality, see Jared van Duinen, "The Obligations of Governing Masculinity in the Early Stuart Gentry Family: The Barringtons of Hatfield Broad Oak," in *Governing Masculinities in the Early Modern Period: Regulating Selves and Others*, ed. Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline van Gent (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 113–30, esp. 119–24. On Barrington's military activities, see further J. T. Cliffe, *Puritans in Conflict: The Puritan Gentry during and after the Civil Wars* (London: Routledge, 1988), *ad indicem*.

[18] *HP* 29/2/7; see also Tom Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620–1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 260.

[19] Letter of 24 July 1624, in *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman Egbert McClure, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939), 2:572. See e.g. British Library, MS Egerton 2644 ff. 209, 219; MS Egerton 2650 f.181; and cf. van Duinen, "Obligations," 121–22.

[20] Her *ODNB* article largely stresses her skills as a household and estate manager: Caroline M. K. Bowden, "Barrington [née Lytton], Judith, Lady Barrington (*d.* 1657), gentlewoman," *ODNB*, online ed. January 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/46469, accessed 28 January 2013. Van Duinen notes that Judith "assumed some of the patriarchal 'without door' responsibilities abdicated by her husband" during his periods of instability: "Obligations," 125. See also 127.

[21] See Chamberlain's letter to Dudley Carleton—Judith's cousin—of 8 January 1625, *Letters*, 2:594.

[22] See Karl Josef Höltgen, "Quarles, Francis (1592–1644)," *ODNB*, online ed., Jan 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22945, accessed 24 July 2013.

[23] See letters of 21 August 1624 and 24 July 1624, in *Letters*, 2:578 and 572.

referred to her as "that impertinent everlasting talker"—a more modern historian declares that "this was very probably a true character of her."[24] Her funeral sermon, meanwhile, drew the auditory's attention to "her rare Natural Endowments of Understanding, Wit, Memory, Judgement, improved by acquired knowledg in almost all things, wherein I believe she exceeded most of her Sexe, and was in the very upper Forme of Female-Scholars."[25]

Even allowing for the conventions of funeral eulogy, this speaks of intellectual interests that are corroborated by the evidence of the Hartlib archive. After Gauden's delivery of the manuscript of *Religio Medici*, Hartlib wrote a letter to Judith Barrington on 21 August 1640, establishing a regular relationship of the exchange of information and manuscripts, in which he wrote that "any . . . manuscript of what kinde so euer espetialy of Chymical subjects wilbee most welcome at all times, And it may be I shall be able to gratifie yo*u*r Ladishipe w*i*th the like informac*i*ons and communications w*hi*ch wilbee worth p*er*usal."[26] Shortly thereafter, Lady Barrington provided Hartlib both with the name of the author of *Religio Medici*, and with a selection of alchemical manuscripts:

> Shee communicated vnto mee MS. of Georg Riple which was a MS. of Iohn Dee's, . . . Item Georg Riplays verses vnto King Edward the 4. Item verses out of Sir [*sic*] Iohn of Bridlington. Item a MS. of Nortons with a Proeme and 7 Chapters of verses and peculiar curious diagrams. Item Sir Edward Kellies worke in verses.[27]

Lady Barrington's identification of Browne and her transmission of these manuscripts may not have been contingently associated. On 25 January 1658/9, Browne wrote to Elias Ashmole, enclosing a list of manuscripts on alchemy that he had in his possession, "most whereof I receaved from Dr Arthur Dee my familiar friend, sonne unto old Dr Dee the mathematician."[28] The list Browne provided includes "Cantilena Ripley. de L. phil. seu de phœnice"; "The great worke or great

[24] Cited in William Clayton, "The History of the Barrington Family," ed. G. Alan Lowndes, *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society* 2 (n.s.) (1884): 3–54, here 42.

[25] Thomas Goodwin, *A Fair Prospect . . . in a Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Honourable Lady Judith Barrington* (London, 1658), 63.

[26] *HP* 7/49/1A.

[27] *HP* 30/4/67A. The authors mentioned are George Ripley, d. c. 1490; John Thwing (c. 1320–1379); Samuel Norton (1548–1621); and Edward Kelley (1555–1595). For mention of Lady Barrington in the context of Hartlib's female intelligencers, see Iliffe, "Hartlib's World," 114.

[28] Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Ashmole 1788, f.153^{r}. The list and letter are printed in Thomas Browne, *The Works of Sir Thomas Browne*, ed. Geoffrey Keynes, 4 vols. (London: Faber, 1964), 4:293–94.

Elixir of Ripley ad Solem et Lunam with an accurtation for shortning of the great work"; "A Letter of Ripley sent to a friend subscribed by George Ripley ch. of Bridlington"; "An ancient manuscript of Nortons Ordinall"; and "Ripleys Emblematicall or Hieroglyphicall Scrowle."[29] That both Browne and Lady Barrington, at different times, were in possession of manuscripts of Ripley and Norton with supposed Dee provenance is highly suggestive that the "acquaintance" between them involved, or was founded on, a shared interest in hermetic philosophy and the transmission of manuscripts related to it.

IV

Judith Barrington's involvement in the circulation of manuscripts and her various intellectual interests suggest that there is fertile ground here for further study, from the perspective of female Puritan intellectuals of the seventeenth century or the distribution of alchemical material in the period.[30] However, there is no reason to associate her with the 1642 publication of *Religio Medici*, with Crooke, or indeed with the press in any connection. This is not the case, however, for Hartlib and Gauden. Indeed, Hartlib was in the habit of exploiting the instrumental use of the press that so vexed Browne in 1642. Later declaring that he felt himself "obliged to becom a conduit pipe [of the Observations and Experiences of others] . . . towards the Publick," Hartlib frequently supplied material to the press.[31] In 1640, a posthumous work by John Stoughton appeared with the title *Felicitas Ultimi Sæculi . . . Nunc, post decessum ejus ad fidem autographi, publici juris facta à S.H.*: "the happiness of the last age . . . , now, after [Stoughton's] decease, according to the true holograph, delivered to the public's judgement by S[amuel] H[artlib]." Several subsequent title pages carried the phrase "published by Samuel Hartlib."[32] In 1648, he bore the expenses for the publication of a trans-

[29] MS Ashmole 1788, f.154^{r-v}.

[30] On the former, see Elizabeth Scott-Baumann and Johanna Harris, eds., *The Intellectual Culture of Puritan Women* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); neither Joan nor Judith Barrington is mentioned in the articles gathered in this volume.

[31] Samuel Hartlib, "Preface to the Reader," in Richard Watson, *A Discours of Husbandrie* (London, 1650), A4r. On Hartlib's publishing activities, see Mark Greengrass, "Samuel Hartlib and Scribal Publication," *Acta Comeniana* 12 (1997): 47–62; idem, "Samuel Hartlib and the Commonwealth of Learning," in *Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, vol. 4: 1557–1695*, ed. Barnard and McKenzie, 304–22.

[32] E.g. Jan Amos Comenius's *Reformation of Schooles* (London, 1642); John Dury's *A Motion tending to the Publick Good of this Age and of Posteritie* (London, 1642), and *A Copy of Mr John Duries Letter Presented in Sweden* (London, 1643).

lation, possibly by William Petty, of Cyprian Kinner's *A Continuation of Mr. John-Amos-Comenius School-Endeavours*. Here, the title page informed the reader that the work had been "*Translated out of the Original Latine, transmitted to Sam. Hartlib: and by him published*": the pattern of a manuscript "transmitted" to Hartlib, who delivered it to the press, with or without the consent of the author or translator, was typical. Kinner's response demonstrates that he had no hand with the way in which the manuscript was presented at the press; several writers, including John Amos Comenius, were dismayed to find themselves in print without their expectation or consent.[33]

Hartlib was particularly active in the early 1640s, around the time he received Browne's manuscript. One of the printers he used was Andrew Crooke. In 1641, John Dury's *A Briefe Relation of That which hath been lately attempted to procure Ecclesiasticall* PEACE *amongst* PROTESTANTS, was "Published by *Samuel Hartlib*," and appeared in Crooke's imprint. Suggestively, a further example also involves Gauden. In November 1640 Gauden delivered a fast sermon before Parliament in which he made a direct plea for financial aid for the irenic and scholarly endeavors of Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius. Parliament requested that the sermon be printed, and in 1641 it was issued under the title *The Love of Truth and Peace*.[34] This, too, was printed for Andrew Crooke. It was Gauden's first print publication; thereafter, he published seventeen further titles with Crooke—by far the bulk of the works printed under his name. Crooke also acted as bookseller for a volume of Gauden's controversial edition of the works of Richard Hooker.[35]

Gauden and Hartlib thus not only circulated the manuscript "Religio Medici" but were also in contact with its bookseller and using him in the early 1640s to further their religious and political aims. Gauden, in particular, developed a long-term working relationship with Crooke, encompassing both his own works and some of those he prepared for the press. At the least, this provides us with evidence for a network of scribal circulation with which Crooke was in contact and through which he could have received the manuscript. Subsequent sections will

[33] See G. H. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius: Gleanings from Hartlib's Papers* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1947), 421; Greengrass, "Samuel Hartlib and the Commonwealth of Learning," 320; and Greengrass, "Samuel Hartlib and Scribal Publication," 59.

[34] Gauden, *The Love of Trvth and Peace. A Sermon preached before the honovrable hovse of commons assembled in Parliament. Novemb. 29. 1640* (London, 1641).

[35] Hooker, *The Works of Mr. Richard Hooker . . . of Ecclesiastical Polity . . . Now completed, As with the Sixth and Eighth, so with the Seventh . . . with an account of his Holy Life, and Happy Death, Written by John Gauden* (London, 1662).

return to the possibilities this raises. In order to fully appreciate them, however, it is first necessary to address the significance of the anonymous printing of *Religio Medici* in 1642 on its own terms.

V

We have seen how Browne forestalled questions about the agency behind the publication of *Religio Medici* by coming forward as author, insisting on the importance and innocence of his own intentions and locating those intentions in the mid-1630s. The problem is compounded with the lack of internal evidence in the publication for what that purpose might have been. In 1643, Browne used the opportunities afforded him by paratexts—the title, preface, letters, not least the addition of his own name as author—to manipulate the frames through which his reader would encounter the text and the context in which it would be understood. The 1642 publication, by contrast, offered its reader next to nothing in the way of such devices for orientation. There is no preface and, of course, no named author. Apart from publication information in London in 1642, printed for Andrew Crooke—significant enough in itself, as the previous section might suggest—the only signpost the reader is offered is the emblematic title page (see figure 1). Engraved by the prolific William Marshall, it shows a man falling headfirst from a rock into the sea, rescued from his plummet by a hand emerging from clouds that catches him by the wrist. The words "à coelo salus"—salvation, health, or safety from heaven—issue from his mouth.[36]

Since Marshall, like other engravers, usually took his instructions on imagery and design for frontispieces from the author or publisher of a work, this offers the best clue to the intention behind its publication.[37] The simple imagery of the frontispiece has a rich tradition. The rock in the sea, a symbol of endurance in the face of adversity, has an ancient

[36] On the interpretation of the title page, see Ardolino, "The Saving Hand of God." On Marshall's engravings, see Margery Corbett and Michael Norton, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, A Descriptive Catalogue with Introductions*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 3:102–92; and, incomplete but including details of printers, Alfred Forbes Johnson, *A Catalogue of Engraved and Etched English Title-Pages Down to the Death of William Faithorne, 1691* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934). According to Johnson, Marshall had provided an engraving for three previous titles published by Crooke: William Hodson's *Credo resurrectionem carnis* (1635) and *The Holy Sinner* (1639); and Lewis Bayly's *The Practice of Pietie* (1638), for which he copied an earlier title page. He also provided an engraved frontispiece for the 1642 second edition of Richard Carpenter's *Experience, Historie, and Divinitie*, also published by Crooke.

[37] See Corbett and Norton, *Engraving*, 3:102.

Figure 1. Religio Medici *(London, 1642), title page, engraved by William Marshall. Reproduced by the kind permission of the Master and Fellows of Balliol College, Oxford.*

heritage and was frequently used in Renaissance emblems.[38] The falling man, meanwhile, overlays the myth of Icarus with Christian significance. Prefacing a work that treats of the limitations of reason and the exaltations of faith, the image conjures notions of the danger of striving beyond set bounds of knowledge, even as Browne takes pleasure in approaching them. One of the most substantial changes that he made for the 1643 authorized edition was the addition of a poem on the duties, pleasures, and dangers of the exercise of reason, which adopts the Icarian imagery:

> Give thou my reason that instructive flight,
> Whose weary wings may on thy hands still light.
> Teach me to soare aloft, yet ever so,
> When neare the Sunne, to stoope againe below.
> Thus shall my humble feathers safely hover,
> And though neere earth, more then the heavens discover.
> (13)[39]

Browne—a better prose writer than poet—thus recognised the appropriateness of the emblem prefacing his text and indeed used it to prompt this poem. Though the title was removed in 1643 and the motto's *coelo* replaced with the more orthographically orthodox *caelo*, the frontispiece was retained in all but two of the thirteen English editions published in the seventeenth century and copied for all but two of the twelve continental editions before 1692.

The motto "à coelo salus" has, however, more specific resonances than the general moral implications of the imagery, which connect the publication to political debates and pamphlets of 1642. I have found no other uses of the phrase in print in the years around the publication of *Religio Medici*, though "in caelo salus" is a recognizable tag, appearing sometimes on funerary monuments. In Richardson's *Clarissa*, for example, Lovelace imagines Clarissa planning a future pious family who would, in church, adopt a pose like that on "some old monument":

> where the honest chevalier, in armour, is presented kneeling with uplift hands, and half a dozen jolter-headed crop-eared boys behind him, ranged *gradatim* [. . .] all in the same posture – facing his pious dame, with a ruff about her neck,

[38] See Corbett and Norton, *Engraving*, 3:151.

[39] Browne would have encountered Icarian imagery as a reminder of the frailty of human ambition in the anatomy theater in Leiden, where he completed his medical studies in 1633. See Reid Barbour, "Discipline and Praxis: Thomas Browne in Leiden," in *"A Man Very Well Studyed,"* ed. Murphy and Todd, 15–47, here 35. See also Barbour, *Sir Thomas Browne*, 276.

and as many whey-faced girls, all kneeling behind *her*: an altar between them, and an open book upon it: over their heads semiluminary rays darting from gilded clouds, surrounding an achievement-motto, IN COELO SALUS[.][40]

For Richardson, writing in the 1740s, this "achievement-motto" is clearly a badge marking an old-fashioned vision of unworldly piety. But in the fraught print context of 1642, to invoke the word *salus* was to touch one of the most charged points of contention in the developing political crisis: the meaning of the phrase *salus populi suprema lex*. The next section explores that context.

VI

Usually translated in the seventeenth century as "safety of the people," the *locus classicus* for *salus populi* is Cicero's *De legibus* (*On Laws*) 3.3,8. Cicero declares that, in the legislative system of his ideal state, there will be two magistrates with regal powers, who will be appointed for a fixed term and have absolute executive powers in time of war. For them, Cicero writes, *salus populi suprema lex esto*—let the safety of the people be the supreme law. What, precisely, was meant by this is disputed by scholars, who offer two main interpretations. The weaker version suggests that Cicero intended merely that the preservation of the body politic ought to be the main consideration for these magistrates during their rule.[41] The stronger interpretation suggests that the preservation of *salus populi* provides the consuls with a mechanism enabling them to operate beyond the sphere of law in time of war or state of emergency.[42]

[40] See Samuel Richardson, *Clarissa*, ed. Angus Ross, 2 vols. (London: The Folio Society, 1991), 2:970 (Letter 294). I am grateful to Thomas Kymer for drawing my attention to this reference.

[41] For Cicero on *salus*, see Lorenz Winkler, *Salus vom Staatskult zur politischen Idee* (Heidelberg: Verlag Archäologie und Geschichte, 1995), 30–35. This position is put forward by Andrew Dyck, the most recent commentator on *De leg.*, in *A Commentary on Cicero*, De Legibus ([Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004], 458–59), who argues that *suprema lex* ought to be understood as "the supreme principle." It is also supported by Michael Grant's translation of *suprema lex* as "dominant preoccupation": *Cicero: On Government* (London: Penguin Books, 1993), 196.

[42] This view is held by Adrianus Turnebus in his 1596 *Commentarius in Ciceronis libros tres de legibus*, reprinted in Georgius Henricus Moser (ed.) and Fridericus Creuzer (annot.), *M. Tullii Ciceronis de legibus libri tres* (Frankfurt am Main, 1824), 515–744, here 704. With some differences of interpretation, it is also the position of C. W. Keyes, "Original Elements in Cicero's Ideal Constitution," *American Journal of Philology* 42 (1921): 309–21, here 317–18; Alfred Heuss, *Ciceros Theorie vom römischen Staat* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), 18–19; Gustav Adolf Lehmann, *Politische Reformvorschläge in der Krise der späten römischen Republik: Cicero* De Legibus III *und Sallusts Sendschreiben an*

Since the latter view is held by the majority of scholars and accords with seventeenth-century usage, I shall follow it here.

De legibus is a dialogue presenting an idealized republican politics, and the phrase *salus populi* had no independent existence in Roman law. However, Cicero's proposal of *salus populi* as the guide for action during a state of emergency finds a parallel in the *senatus consultum ultimum* (the ultimate decree of the Senate), which allowed the Senate to declare a state of emergency in Rome, freeing designated magistrates to act without regard for the usual procedures and laws in order to protect the republic from some perceived threat.[43] The safety of the body politic was both the guide to action during the state of emergency and the ground on which it could be declared. Cicero's defining role in forwarding the concept of *salus populi* was intimately tied up with his involvement in the response to the Catilinarian conspiracy in 63 BCE, when he used the *senatus consultum ultimum* to override the constitution and justify the extrajudicial execution of the Catilinarian rebels.[44] The lasting constitutional debate and controversy provoked by Cicero's actions during the state of exception—culminating in his exile in 58 BCE—underlines the inherent difficulties in the application of this "*suprema lex*." Though the safety of the people may be universally considered a laudable aim, it is subject to definitions and interpretations that vary both during and after the state of emergency it can bring into being, as Cicero found to his cost. Though the potential declaration of a state of emergency could—and can—be provided for in law, the nature of a threat to the safety of the people, and the best means to combat it, are necessarily definable only on a casuistic basis, and the need for a state of exception by definition impossible to predict.

The potential exploitation of *salus populi* for political expediency is obvious. Its inherently casuistic use could become opportunistic.[45]

Caesar, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 117 (Meisenheim am Glan: Hain, 1980), 29. Without acknowledging the potential slippage of meaning, this is also the position in Peter N. Miller, *Defining the Common Good: Empire, Religion and Philosophy in Eighteenth–Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 39 ff.

[43] See Jürgen von Ungern–Sternberg, "senatus consultum ultimum," in *Der Neue Pauly*, ed. Hubert Cancik, Helmuth Schneider, and Manfred Landfester (Leiden: Brill, 2007); on-line edition, http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-pauly, accessed 3 August 2013; and Siegfried Mendner, "Videant Consules," *Philologus* 110 (1966): 258–67. See also Giorgio Agamben, *State of Exception*, trans. Kevin Attell (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 41–51.

[44] Of the twenty uses of *salus populi* in Cicero's speeches and letters identified by Dyck, fifteen are directly related to the Catilinarian conspiracy: Dyck, *Commentary*, 459.

[45] Compare Jochen Bleicken, *Lex Publica: Gesetz und Recht in der römischen Republik* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 481: "die *res publica* ohne die *salus* nicht existieren konnte: Was aber

Though both the grammatical context and the idealized state of *De legibus* 3.3,8 refer consideration of the safety of the people to specific appointed officials, in the actual political arena it could be available for appropriation as a justification by various political actors.[46] Rulers could use it to remove opponents or take extraordinary or unpopular measures; their opponents could call on it to justify resistance or deposition. *Salus populi* could be used not only to bolster the stability of a state but also to promote rebellion against it.

This ambiguity and its opportunistic exploitation were particularly evident in England in the early 1640s. *Salus populi* was, Richard Tuck has suggested, one of the "key words of the new humanism" of early modern Europe, and had become associated with arguments of necessity and Machiavellian expediency.[47] With some few exceptions, it had mostly been used to justify the extrajudicial, and, to opponents, tyrannical maneuvers of monarchs.[48] The ancient concept of *salus* had associated the welfare of the body politic with the welfare of its ruler.[49] Preservation of the safety of the people thus came to be bound up with the preservation of the authority of the king. Thomas Hobbes's paraphrase of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, published in 1637, provides a neat summary. Section 1.8 defines the means and ends of the four forms of government (democracy, oligarchy, aristocracy, and monarchy). Hobbes states that "[t]he end of *Monarchy*, or *Kings*, is the *safety of the People, and conservation of his owne authority*."[50]

---

die *salus rei publicae* jeweils war, blieb Parteienstandpunkt und also politischer Standpunkt."

[46] *De leg.* 3.3,8 reads "*ollis salus populi suprema lex esto*": let *salus populi* be the supreme law *for them* [the consuls].

[47] Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572–1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 222; see also Agamben, *State of Exception*, 43. For examples of cynicism about appeals to "the language of public interest" in England, see L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 98; and Miller, *Defining the Common Good*, 38–39.

[48] See Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, 224. An exception, using *salus populi* to justify resistance, is George Buchanan's *De jure regni* (1579), which argued for the right of the people to depose unjust monarchs and declared allegiance to "illa Ciceroniana lex sancta et inuiolabilis": "*populi salus suprema lex esto*" (quoted here from the reprint in Buchanan, *Rerum Scoticarum historia, . . . accessit De iure regni apud Scotos dialogus* [Antwerp, 1583], b1^{r}). Buchanan was associated with the opposition to Mary Stewart. See also John Sanderson, "*But the People's Creatures*": *The Philosophical Basis of the English Civil War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), 1–9.

[49] See Winkler, *Salus*, 12, 24–26, and 60–62.

[50] [Thomas Hobbes], *A Briefe of the Art of Rhetorique* (London: 1637), 30. See Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 37–39, for the composition of Hobbes's paraphrase. Though "safety of the people" has no equivalent in the transmitted text of Aristotle—editors posit a lacuna—

The obvious problem with such a definition—what happens when the conservation of the king's authority runs counter to the interests of the people?—became crucial in the early 1640s. On Monday, 5 April 1641, at the trial of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, Henry Vane was called upon to respond to the question, "What Words he heard my Lord of *Strafford* speak to the King . . . tending to this; That the King had tried the Affections of His People, and was Loose and Absolved from all Rules of Government?"[51] Vane testified that, at a meeting soon after the dissolution of the Short Parliament, the Earl of Strafford had attempted to justify military action in the following words:

> Your Majesty having tryed all Ways, and [being] refused; in this Case of extream Necessity, and for the Safety of Your Kingdom and People, You are loose and absolved from all Rules of Government; You are acquitted before God and Men; You have an Army in *Ireland*; You may imploy it to reduce this Kingdom.[52]

Strafford's reported advice to Charles could not show more clearly the association of *salus populi* with a state of emergency: on the grounds of what Hobbes calls the "*safety of the people, and conservation of his owne authority*," Charles might be "absolved from all Rules" and use whatever measures were deemed necessary. Although it was a crucial matter of debate at the trial whether Strafford had meant England or Scotland by "this Kingdom," the very phrase "the safety of the people" was plainly considered provocative. The Earl of Bristol was called to testify that he had heard Strafford "use the Sentence, *Salus Reipublicae Suprema Lex*," as if that were in itself evidence of treason.[53]

Hobbes was working from the parallel Greek and Latin text of Theodore Goulston's *Aristotelis de rhetorica* (London, 1619), which included in its marginalia (though not in either text) a reference to "et regis et civium salus" (42)—the safety of both the king and the people. In *Leviathan*, Hobbes repeats the trope: "[t]he office of the Soveraign consisteth in the end, for which he was trusted with the Soveraign Power, namely the procuration of *the safety of the people*" (Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Noel Malcolm, 3 vols. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2012], 2:520).

[51] John Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, 8 vols. (London, 1721), vol. 8: *The Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford . . .* , 544.

[52] Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, 8:545. See also Ernst Sirluck, introduction, in *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, gen. ed. D. M. Wolfe, 8 vols. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1959), 2:13–14; and Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, 223. Vane's testimony was used at the trial on April 5 and 10: see Maija Jansson, ed., *Proceedings in the Opening Session of the Long Parliament: House of Commons and the Stafford* [sic] *Trial*, vol. 3: 22 March–17 April 1641 (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2001), 369 and 380. See also Terence Kilburn and Anthony Milton, "The Public Context of Strafford's Trial and Execution," in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth*, ed. J. F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 230–51.

[53] Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, 8:524; see also the Earl of Northumberland's testimony, 560.

Crucial for the salience of *salus* in 1642 is that Strafford's accusers appropriated the phrase and turned it against him. John Pym's speech at the summing up shows the reinterpretation in action:

> it remaines clearly proved, *That the Earle of Strafford hath indeavoured by his words, actions, and counsels, to subvert the Fundamentall Lawes of England and Ireland, and to introduce an Arbitrary and Tyrannicall Government* . . . That which is given me in *charge*, is, to shew the *quality* of the *offence*, how *hainous* it is in the *nature*, how *mischievous* in the *effect* of it; which will best appeare if it be examined by that *Law*, to which he himselfe appealed, that *universall*, that *supreme Law*, *Salus populi*: This is the *Element* of all Laws, out of which they are derived; the *End* of all Laws, to which they are designed, and in which they are perfected.[54]

It remained to Pym to show how Strafford had infringed "that *universall*, that *supreme Law*." Strafford's use of *salus populi* to support royal absolutism was itself, paradoxically, the capital infringement.

Recalling his actions in the Strafford trial, Pym likened himself to "that great Orator and Patriot of his Countrey, *Cicero*," because of the "verie neere resemblance" of the calumnies each had suffered for their "care to the Publike Utilitie," thus comparing Strafford's treason directly to Catiline's conspiracy.[55] Pym's emphasis on the Ciceronian paradigm, coupled with his appropriation of *salus populi* from monarchical absolutism for the parliamentarian cause, highlights the latent republican connotations of the phrase. A single usage in 1642 cemented Pym's efforts and changed the associations of *salus populi* decisively. In early July 1642, Henry Parker published, anonymously, *Observations upon some of his majesties late answers and expresses*. Parker's pamphlet has been identified as the first expression of parliamentary absolutism and as the first text to move discussion in the 1640s away from specific issues and toward political theory and sovereignty in general, laying the groundwork for the Civil War and even the regicide.[56] Our concern here, however, is with his appropriation and reversal, following Pym, of Royalist appeals to *salus populi*. Parker argued that the people were both the efficient and final cause of all power, and thus had no obligation of loyalty to a monarch who did not serve their interests:

> [the monarch's] dignitie was erected to preserve the Commonaltie, the Commonaltie was not created for his service: and that which is the end is farre more

[54] *The Speech or Declaration of John Pym . . . 12. April 1641* (London, 1641), 2–3.

[55] John Pym, *Declaration and Vindication . . . concerning the divers aspersions which have been cast upon him* (London, 1643), 7–8. See also Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, 226.

[56] See Michael Mendle, *Henry Parker and the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 70–88; and Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 208.

honorable and valuable in nature and policy, then that which is the meanes. This directs us then to the transcendent ἀχμὴ [*sic*] of all Politiques, to the Paramount Law that shall give Law to all humane Lawes whatsoever, and that is *Salus Populi*: The Law of Prerogative it selfe, it is subservient to this Law, and were it not conducing thereunto it were not necessary nor expedient.[57]

The end of monarchy for Parker is emphatically not the preservation of either the monarch or the institution of monarchy, but *salus populi*. Parker went on to argue that where the monarch appears to act against this "Paramount Law," parliament, consisting of representatives of the people from whom all power derives, has the right to act without or even against him.

Parker had used arguments from *salus populi* before, in *The Case of Shipmoney*, where even "necessity" was held to be "subservient" to the law of *salus populi*;[58] but then, Parker had still deemed *salus populi* the *suprema lex* for the king. He argued that Charles's arguments from necessity and, implicitly, *salus populi* were unwarranted, because the situation was not of sufficient extremity—the safety of the people was not sufficiently threatened—for their use. It would take Pym's use of *salus populi* against Strafford's own in 1641 to open up the possibility of appropriating *salus populi*, and thus sovereignty, for parliament.

After Parker, the phrase appears in pamphlets *passim*. For his supporters, *salus populi* became a slogan to which to rally;[59] for Royalists, stymied by the law's proverbial supremacy, responding to Parker became in part an attempt to wrest *salus populi* back for the monarch.[60] After the publication of the *Observations*, at least twenty-seven printed works responded directly to it, while the phrase *salus populi* appeared in at least fifty pamphlets published in the 1640s.[61] Thomas Hobbes, in

[57] Parker, *Observations upon some of his majesties late answers and expresses* (London, 1641), 3.

[58] Parker, *The Case of Shipmoney* (London, 1640), B1ʳ.

[59] E.g., [Anon.], *Touching the fundamentall lawes, or politique constitution of this kingdome* (London, 1643); Parker's own *Jus populi* (London, 1644), or [Anon.], *Salus populi solus rex* (London, 1648).

[60] E.g., Henry Ferne's *The Resolving of Conscience* (London, 1642); and the anonymous *Christus Dei* (Oxford, 1642).

[61] This conflates the accounts in Mendle, *Henry Parker*, and Raymond, *Pamphlets*. My count of instances of *salus populi* was conservative and subject to the usual pitfalls of keyword searching: I included only usages of *salus populi*, *populi salus*, the people's safety/safetie, and the safety/safetie of the people. Nearly synonymous phrases such as "common safety," *salus civium*, *salus rei publicae*, public welfare, etc., were not included. The titles searched were all in English and published in England. Search conducted on *Early English Books Online*, ⟨http://eebo.chadwyck.com⟩, Chadwyck–Healey, University of Michigan, accessed 7 January 2013.

his *History of the Civil Wars of England from the year 1640–1660*, otherwise known as *Behemoth*, claimed that "the pretence of the Long Parliaments rebellion [in 1642] was *salus populi*."[62] For Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, similarly, it was the fault of the slipperiness of the term:

> a man shall not unprofitably spend his contemplation that . . . considers the method of God's justice . . . that the same principles, and the same application of those principles, should be used to the wresting all sovereign power from the Crown, which the Crown had a little before made use of for the extending its authority and power beyond its bounds, to the prejudice of the just rights of the subject. . . . [T]he same maxim of *Salus populi suprema lex*, which had been used to the infringing the liberties of the one, [was] made use of for the destroying the rights of the other.[63]

For both Hobbes and Clarendon, *salus populi* caused the Civil Wars.[64]

It should thus be clear that the phrase *salus populi* carried enormous charge in 1642. But even the single word "*salus*" and its English equivalent "safety" were at issue.[65] In May 1641, Parliament set up a "Committee for Peace and Safety" designed to handle the emergency of a threatened French invasion; in July 1642, an executive "Committee of Safety" was formed that could function in the time of war. Both confirm the association of *salus* and safety with a state of emergency. The secretary of the Committee of Safety was, appropriately, Henry Parker; its "manipulator behind the scenes" John Pym; Thomas Barrington was a member, as was Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick.[66] Further testimony comes from the repetitions in Charles Herle's response to Henry Ferne's criticism of Parker's *Observations*:

> The end or purpose of [the] mixture of the 3 *estates* in the governement, 'tis the *safety* of it's [*sic*] *safety*, as all government aymes at *safety*, so this temper in it at the making this *safety* more safe or sure: The common interest of the whole body

[62] T[homas] H[obbes], *The history of the civil wars of England from the year 1640–1660* (London, 1679), 253.

[63] Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, begun in the year 1641*, ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1888), 2.85–86.

[64] See also the anonymous *Salus populi, &c., or the Case of King and People* (London, 1681), 2.

[65] The admittedly incomplete corpus of printed matter used by Google n-grams underlines this, showing a sharp and near-simultaneous spike for each of the search-terms "salus," "Salus," and "salus populi" in the early 1640s. Search conducted on http://books.google.com/ngrams on 6 August 2013.

[66] See Lotte Glow, "The Committee of Safety," *English Historical Review* 80/315 (1965): 289–313; on the Committee for Peace and Safety, see 290; on Parker, 291 n.8; on Pym, 310–12; on Barrington, 292 n.7, 300, 308; and on Warwick, 299 and 301.

of the Kingdome in Parliament, thus twisted with the Kings, makes the *Cable* of it's [*sic*] *anker* of safety stronger.[67]

What *salus* might mean, and who was responsible for it, was thus a crucial issue in 1642, when Marshall engraved the frontispiece for *Religio Medici*. The use of the word in this contentious print context could not have been innocent.

VII

With this context for the imagery of *Religio Medici*'s frontispiece in mind, we can return to John Gauden and his association with the manuscript of *Religio Medici* and the print world of the 1640s. Despite his support of Comenius, Dury, and Hartlib, his association with the Barringtons, and his chaplaincy to the Puritan and parliamentarian Earl of Warwick, Gauden was not as partisan as the company he kept would suggest.[68] The early 1640s saw him using pulpit and press as opportunities to promote peace and toleration and defuse the tension between king and parliament. The text for his fast sermon before parliament in 1640, which Crooke published, was Zachariah 8:19: "*Thus saith the Lord, The fast of the tenth moneth, shall be to the house of Iudah, joy and gladnesse, and cheerefull feasts; therefore love the Truth and Peace*." Though a sermon before parliament in support of Hartlib may seem to mark out Gauden's political sympathies, in the same year he had also preached before the king, when his text was Hebrews 12:14: "Follow peace with all men, and holinesse, without which no man shall see the Lord."[69] Again, he exhorts to peace and reconciliation:

in this *brokennesse* and *distraction* of *minds and times*, every one almost going a severall way, full of fractions and divisions, crossing and thwarting each other;

[67] *A fuller answer to a treatise written by Doctor Ferne* (London, 1642), 7–8.

[68] On Warwick's patronage of clergy, including Gauden, see Barbara Donagan, "The Clerical Patronage of Robert Rich, Second Earl of Warwick, 1619–1642," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 120 (1976): 388–419.

[69] The sermon, published in *Three sermons preached upon severall publike occasions* (London, 1642), is not dated, but Gauden later recalled that he had delivered it "sometime in 1640" – which may of course mean the early months of 1641 (*Kakourgoi, sive Medicastri: Slight Healings of Publique Hurts, Set forth in a Sermon Preached in St. Pauls . . . February 28 1659* [i.e. 1660] [London, 1660], 3). Gauden does not appear either in Nicholas Cranfield's list of "Chaplains in Ordinary at the Early Stuart Court: The Purple Road" (*Patronage and Recruitment in the Tudor and Early Stuart Church*, ed. Claire Cross [York: University of York Press, 1996], 120–47), nor on the list of chaplains extraordinary among the Lord Chamberlain's documents at PRO LC 3/1, f.38; Gauden must have been specially invited to preach on this occasion.

if we could all be so happy as to learne this lesson, and conspire to follow these two, *Peace* and *Holinesse*, no doubt it would much abate and compose our distances.[70]

Gauden was preaching systematically against what Browne called in *Religio Medici*—though referring in the 1630s to religious divisions between different branches of reformers—"the present antipathies between the two extreames" (5). Browne's peaceable insistence in another early passage that "I could never divide my selfe from any man upon the difference of an opinion, or be angry with his judgement for not agreeing with mee in that, from which perhaps within a few dayes I should dissent my selfe" (6) proposes a remedy to the "*brokennesse* and *distraction*" against which Gauden preached.

In 1660, Gauden returned to both of these sermons, along with another, preached, he tells us, "at another great *epidemick Assembly*" on 1 Corinthians 3:19: "*For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God*," which does not appear to have been printed. Gauden noted in recollection that his impartiality, unworldliness, and irenicism had attracted controversy: "Of *all three*, though wholsom and *innocent Texts, and* (I hope) *accordingly handled*, yet I heard some unpleasing Ecchoes and reflexions; the sore and *itching* ears of some men in all ages are such, that they will not endure . . . *healing* or *sound* and *wholesome Doctrine*[.]"[71]

That Gauden was actively counselling both king and parliament to strive for peace and avoid faction, that he saw this as a systematic duty, and that he used Andrew Crooke's presses to do so, suggests no more than that he would theoretically have approved of the publication of *Religio Medici* and agreed with its priorities. It has been argued that Edward Sackville, fourth Earl of Dorset, who first recommended *Religio Medici* to Sir Kenelm Digby, did so because of its "eloquent defence of the Church of England" and its "deep commitment to unity and tolerance": the same features would manifestly have appealed to Gauden.[72] That the texts on which he preached in the early 1640s—the Corinthians passage especially—accorded with the sentiment of seeking safety in heaven rather than on earth is also evidence rather of coincidence of intent than of influence or direct involvement. But Gauden also actively

[70] Gauden, *Three sermons*, 2.

[71] Gauden, *Kakourgoi*, 3–4.

[72] See David L. Smith, "Catholic, Anglican or Puritan? Edward Sackville, Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Ambiguities of Religion in Early Stuart England," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 2 (1992): 105–24, here 120. I am grateful to the anonymous reader for this reference.

engaged with Browne's text. In addition to circulating the manuscript of *Religio Medici*, Gauden had evidently read and thought about it. The same sermon in which he recalled his strategic preaching of 1640 and 1641, delivered in 1660 in St. Paul's Cathedral in thanksgiving at the restoration of the secluded members of parliament, used the title *Kakourgoi, sive Medicastri: Slight healers of publick hurts*. It took as its governing metaphor the health of the body politic—*salus populi*—as it had been abused by the zealots of the preceding twenty years, and as it ought to be tended in the present. The 112 pages of the printed sermon, obviously expanded after delivery, are another example of Gauden's use of sermon-publishing as an opportunity to further ideological aims, and a sometimes wearying exercise in extended metaphor: malcontents are like gout in the feet, toleration for Catholicism like scratching and exacerbating an itching rash, and some recent proposed remedies for public disorder "pittiful *partial applications*, . . . *diurnal doses*, . . . *horary medicaments*, . . . *slight* and *superficial plaisters*."[73]

The metaphor itself was common enough not to require Browne as an endorsement, but Gauden twice refers explicitly to *Religio Medici*. His first citation refers simply to the necessity of the combination of piety and skill in the ideal physician: "[t]he best things are commonly done by the *best hands*: *Religio Medici*, Conscience is here required as well as his *Science*: They will hardly do their Country good, who care not either to *serve* God, or to save their own souls."[74] The second reference, more suggestively, ties the title of Browne's text into association with the full Ciceronian significance of the phrase *salus populi*:

> these *Medicasters* are here blamed, reproached, and threatned by the *Spirit of God*; with whose *Philanthropy* (as with every good man) that *politick* and indeed pious (because *charitable*) *Maxime* beares sway; *Salus publica suprema lex*, The welfare of the whole, in all its integral Members, and essential parts, as compacted by the *constitution* and order of the publick *polity*, is the *supream Law*, rule, measure, and end of all just *Councels* and honest *actions* . . . In brief, the true and safe method of healing effectually the hurt of the daughter of my people, is . . . [b]y calling to her help wise and worthy *Physitians* . . . men of skill and experience, of Honesty and Ability, of honor and conscience . . . They must be Physitians that are not by much *study and practice* run out to *Atheism* . . . but

[73] Gauden, *Kakourgoi*, 47.

[74] Ibid., 78. For further examples of the association of Browne with the ideal practice of pious medicine, see Mary-Ann Lund, "The Christian Physician: Sir Thomas Browne and the Role of Religion in Medical Practice," in *"A Man Very Well Studyed,"* ed. Murphy and Todd, 229–45.

such as know what belongs to (*Religio medici*) the piety of a Christian, as well as the mystery of a Physitian.[75]

Gauden's recasting of the Ciceronian phrase and his pointed paraphrase reverse the usage of the motto by both Royalists and parliamentarians in the early 1640s. The public welfare (pointedly not the safety of the people) resides in the proportionate functioning of the whole of society. Rather than a justification for action outside the law, Gauden's version insists on the necessity of upholding it for the public good. His extended metaphor suggests that a mixed constitution is the ideal in politics as in Galenic medicine. Instead of an excuse to declare a state of exception, Gauden's supreme law bolsters the *status quo.* And it does so while invoking *Religio Medici*.

At the least, Gauden's persistent harping on the polyvalence of *salus* in association with the title *Religio Medici* demonstrates conclusively that the "salus" of the title page was understood by contemporaries as a pun on medical health, religious salvation, and political security. But his association of *salus populi suprema lex* with *Religio Medici* in a sermon delivered in 1660 need not necessarily mean more than that he had understood the message of the frontispiece of 1642—though given Browne's successful campaign to sap topical relevance from his text, it would show Gauden as an astute reader with an excellent memory. However, Gauden had already made the connection in an assize sermon preached in Chelmsford some time in 1641 or 1642. Gauden wrote that

> [a] Judge is, and should bee the publike *Physitian*, to cure the distempers of others. . . . Peace and tranquility, which is the health of the body politick, must bee preserved by an equall temper and proportion of justice. *Salus populi suprema lex*, is the great and renowned Theoreme of just and good Magistrates. . . . The name, and thought, and desire of peace is every-where, the endeavour for it nowhere. *Blessed are the peace-makers*: O rob not your selves and us of so great and pretious a blessing.[76]

Some time after he brought Browne's manuscript to Hartlib, and shortly before it would be published by the same bookseller who printed this sermon, Gauden was associating religion, medicine, the "health of the

[75] Gauden, *Kakourgoi*, 87–89.

[76] Gauden, *Three sermons*, 82–83. For a similar combination of *salus populi* and medical metaphor, see John Maxwell, *Sacro-sancta regum majestas: or, the Sacred and Royall Prerogative of Christian Kings* (Oxford, 1644), 176. Maxwell's usage, however, lacks the religious dimension.

body politick," *salus populi*, and calls for peace: precisely the elements that appear together on the frontispiece to *Religio Medici*.

VIII

The previous section showed both that Gauden was committed in the early 1640s to the strategic promotion of ideas of peace and conciliation which would have found sympathy in *Religio Medici*, particularly in its early sections; and that Gauden himself associated these strategies with the imagery of both *salus populi* and the physician's religion. This final section of argument addresses Gauden's engagement with the imagery of engravings, in ways that suggest he was capable not just of interpreting *Religio Medici*'s frontispiece but also of designing it.

The reason Gauden is most widely discussed today has not yet been mentioned: he is the supposed ghostwriter of *Eikon Basiliké*, the most propagandistically successful text of the mid-century.[77] The frontispiece of that work was also the most widely reproduced, disseminated, and copied engraving by William Marshall (see figure 2).

The imagery of the frontispiece, published to coincide with the execution of Charles I on 30 January 1649, emphasizes fortitude in the face of adversity, trust in heaven throughout the vicissitudes of earthly life, and victory in the hereafter in spite of tribulation on earth. Marshall's design in the upper left-hand corner of a rock in a turbulent sea, standing firm amid turbulent waves with the motto "immota triumphans," shows remarkable similarity of design and execution with *Religio Medici*'s frontispiece. Though, as noted above, the emblematic significance of such a rock was commonplace, the similarity may suggest the success of Marshall's 1642 engraving: by 1649 *Religio Medici* had gone through five impressions in London and three on the Continent, all of which bore the emblematic title page, and the rock of *Eikon Basiliké* may have been designed to recall that familiar image. The fact that it was co-opted in the Royalist cause, an emblem of survivalism, may thus also tell us something of how *Religio Medici* was read.

[77] For a summary of the claims for Gauden's authorship, concluding that Gauden was the author, though basing his text on manuscripts originating with the king, see "Appendix I: On the Authorship of the *Eikon Basilike*", in Francis F. Madan, *A New Bibliography of the Eikon Basilike of King Charles the First* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950), 126–63. Madan's conclusions are accepted by the most recent editors: see *Eikon Basiliké*, ed. Jim Daems and Holly Faith Nelson (Toronto: Broadview Editions, 2006). See also Hugh Trevor-Roper, "'Eikon Basiliké': The Problem of the King's Book," in *Historical Essays* (London: Macmillan, 1957), 211–20.

Figure 2. Eikon Basiliké *(London, 1649), frontispiece, original design by William Marshall. This exemplar is from an unsigned English copy. Reproduced by the kind permission of the Provost and Fellows of Oriel College, Oxford.*[1]

1 The book was so popular Marshall had to reengrave the frontispiece seven times and was often copied, so that variants exist, though all retain the same basic elements. See Antony Griffiths, "Marshall, William (fl. 1617–1649)," *ODNB*, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18154, accessed 6 Aug 2013.

It also, however, supplies a further connection with Gauden. He later claimed of *Eikon Basiliké* that "the book and figure was wholly and only my invention, making and design."[78] By "figure," Gauden meant the design of the celebrated frontispiece; that Gauden designed elaborate engravings for others of his works lends credence to this claim. The title page (see figure 3) for his *Hieraspistes: A Defence of the Ministry and*

78 Quoted in Daems and Nelson, introduction, *Eikon Basiliké*, xxiii.

Figure 3. Hieraspistes: A Defence of the Ministry and Ministers of the Church of England *(London, 1653), frontispiece, engraved by Thomas Cross. Reproduced by the kind permission of the Provost and Fellows of Oriel College, Oxford.*

Ministers of the Church of England (1653), printed, of course, for Andrew Crooke and engraved by Thomas Cross, shows a taste for symbolic rays and pious mottoes descending from heaven also visible in both *Religio Medici* and *Eikon Basiliké*.

His *Hiera dakrya, Ecclesia Anglicanae suspiria* (1660) incorporates a complex representation of a tree showing the flourishing apostolic church towering over the stunted "moderne Shoots and Slips" of Presbyterianism and Independency. In his explanation of "*The Embleme of the Trees*," Gauden explains that "[t]he designe of this Figure or Embleme is to instruct Christians of the *meanest capacities*, who have less abilities or leisure to read large Discourses."[79] Given his evident interest in

[79] The engraving requests that it be inserted before the page on which the explanation appears: *Hiera dakrya, Ecclesia Anglicanae suspiria* (London, 1660), 23. For other figures, see

emblematic representation and communication of the themes of books through imagery, Gauden's boast of responsibility for the "figure" of *Eikon Basiliké* is plausible. If true, he must have instructed William Marshall in his task. In the light of the evidence linking Gauden to *Religio Medici*, it may not have been the first time he had done so.

IX

Detailed consideration of the 1642 publication of *Religio Medici* and the identification of Samuel Hartlib, John Gauden, and Judith Barrington as among those circulating it in manuscript open up further possible lines of enquiry. The brief accounts given here of Gauden and Judith Barrington suggest the need for further attention to their engagements with print and manuscript culture, respectively. That *Religio Medici* turns up with Hartlib and in the households of families such as the Riches and Barringtons of Essex so readily labelled "Puritan" is in itself surprising; it suggests a need for caution in assuming either too rigid a partisanship, or too close a connection between intellectual engagements and political commitments in such households, as does the complexity of Gauden's religious and political allegiances while under the patronage of Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick. The context they provide for the consideration of the significance of the publication of *Religio Medici* in 1642, meanwhile, supplies an important insight into some of its original topical application. That it was appropriated thereafter by Catholics, apologists for the Church of England, the heterodox, and Quakers, as well as being accused of atheism, is a useful indication of how Browne's amenable and reasonable tone was not useful as a rallying point for any particular party, except irenicists or those who wished to defend a tolerant church.[80] And that, perhaps, is precisely what made it so valuable to someone in 1642.

The evidence suggesting that that "someone" may have been John Gauden is circumstantial. He had certainly been involved in circulating the manuscript; most of his own works published before 1660 were published by Andrew Crooke; he would have found *Religio Medici*'s irenicism and quietism appealing and of a piece with his own priorities in the early years of the 1640s; he associated *Religio Medici* with *salus populi*

A Pillar of Gratitude, Humbly Dedicated to the Glory of God (London, 1661); and the engraved title for his edition of *The Works of Mr Richard Hooker* (London, 1662).

[80] For a wealth of information on the reception of *Religio Medici*, see Barbour, *Sir Thomas Browne*, 277–83 and 393–95. See also Murphy, "The Best Pillar of the Order of Sir Francis."

in ways that illuminate the imagery of the frontispiece; and throughout his life, he showed interest in communicating by means of emblematic frontispieces. Nevertheless, none of this can be conclusive; without further documentary evidence, we may never know with certainty who, other than the liberty of the times, deposited *Religio Medici* with Crooke and saw that it was published. We can, however, go some way toward accounting for the motives of that publication. When Hartlib received the manuscript from Gauden in 1640, it already bore the title "Religio Medici" or "Medici Religio." This was, in part, a joke: the proverb *ubi tres medici, duo athei*—where there are three physicians, there are two atheists—gave the religion of a physician the ring of an oxymoron. Whoever it was who brought the manuscript to Crooke, however, had seen further potential in the title. *Religio Medici* offered an opportunity to reorient the valence of "salus" from the controversies over sovereignty prompted by the Ciceronian tag *salus populi*, toward heaven: as Gauden put it in his 1660 sermon, the "welfare of the whole" was best served by such "Physitians" who "know what belongs to (*Religio medici*) the piety of a Christian."[81] The imagery and motto of the frontispiece reveal that someone, at least, felt that the physician's religion was exactly what was needed in 1642 to minister to the health of the body politic.[82]

Oriel College, University of Oxford

[81] Gauden, *Kakourgoi*, 87 and 89.

[82] I would like to thank Professor Reid Barbour, Ben Higgins, Marjory Szurko, the anonymous reader, and audiences in London and Leiden for their comments on drafts of this essay.