The L'Estrange Portrait. (By Permission.)
On January 26, 1922, the skull of Sir Thomas Browne was brought from Norwich to the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons by special messenger. With the skull came a letter from Sir Hamilton Ballance, written on behalf of the staff of the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital, informing me that it was to be restored to its ancient resting-place under the floor of the chancel of St Peter Mancroft, Norwich, but before this was done the staff desired me to make an exact and permanent record of its form and features.

At the time this task was entrusted to me it was the good fortune of this Museum to have attached to it Miss M. L. Tildesley, a research worker, carrying out investigations under the aegis of the Department for Scientific and Industrial Research. She had been trained in the exact methods of the Biometric Laboratory of University College and had already made an excellent contribution to the literature of racial craniology. After successful plaster casts had been made of the outward form of the skull and of its brain cavity by Mr William Finerty, foreman in the Museum, I set out to make an anatomical examination and soon realized that this was the least part of my task. Every detail in the history of the skull had to be reinvestigated to make certain of its authenticity. It became necessary to collect and collate all facts relating to portraits and representations of the great Norwich Physician. Registers, libraries and private collections had to be searched for data bearing on his personality and on his lineage: in order that this part of the undertaking might be thoroughly done I enlisted the co-operation of Miss Tildesley. She set out on her part of the work with enthusiasm, skill and intuition, following up clue after clue, placing any doubt at rest as to the authenticity of the skull. Portrait after portrait and engraving after engraving she traced to its source; she unravelled many obscure threads of Browne's lineage. My part of the partnership lagged; first a multiplicity of engagements delayed me and then finally, a long and serious illness compelled me to hand the entire task over to her able hands. And
so it has come about that what I undertook to do has devolved in its entirety on Miss Tildesley.

And now, when I come to read over the proofs of her monograph on the skull of Sir Thomas Browne, I have the pleasant conviction, one which I am sure its readers will share with me, that my illness, for them, has really been a blessing in disguise. It has given Miss Tildesley the opportunity of manifesting an ability for research of a high order; throughout this monograph she pursues the truth with a restless and logical diligence. We have here exemplified the best kind of scholarship—one which illustrates the right application of laboratory methods to historical enquiry and to anatomical pursuits. If the skull of Sir Thomas Browne has now passed beyond the possibility of further enquiry this monograph will remain to give subsequent generations of his countrymen a faithful record of what the outward appearances of the Norwich physician really were.
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I. INTRODUCTION.

Early in 1922 the skull of the seventeenth-century physician and great man of letters, Sir Thomas Browne, was sent to the Royal College of Surgeons of England in order that records of it might be made and preserved for posterity to examine when the skull itself should have been restored to its original resting-place. Casts of the cranium and lower jaw, and casts of the brain-cavity have accordingly been made; photographs and drawings and exact measurements have been taken; and the skull, returned to Norwich, was duly re-interred within the Church of St Peter Mancroft on July 4th, 1922*. It will be asked by many what use our own day, or posterity either, can make of such records: and if they do anything further than satisfy human curiosity about famous men of the past. It will therefore not be inopportune to state here as definitely as possible what purposes can be served by records of the skull of Sir Thomas Browne.

Every skull of known race and period is useful, of course, as a contribution to the material required for the study of racial characters. The aim of this study is to determine with all possible accuracy the physical characters of the numerous races which inhabit, or have inhabited, the globe; to determine also their physical relation to one another, and, from this, somewhat of their past movements and wanderings; and to measure the degree to which various racial characters in the mental and physical domains tend to be associated together.

A very great amount of material is required to render such investigations possible. Considerable progress has already been made towards accumulating this, in the osteological collections of many countries: even so, the material already gathered can be looked upon as little more than a beginning. Seventeenth-century England is more fully represented than many other periods and many other lands, but even in this case there is room for more. The records therefore of the skull we are now considering have firstly a certain usefulness for the purpose of racial study.

But there is another study, akin to this, and provocative of far greater interest to the majority of men: it is one which seeks to answer the question: To what extent do various mental and physical characters tend to be associated together in the individual? Can the body really tell us anything about the mind of a man, and if so, how much?

* Copy from the Register of Burials in St Peter Mancroft Church, Norwich, Book No. 4, page 37. Number 292.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Abode</th>
<th>When buried</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>By whom the ceremony was performed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Skull of Sir Thomas Browne</td>
<td>Since 1845 † Norfolk and Norwich Hospital Museum</td>
<td>1922 July 4</td>
<td>317 years</td>
<td>F. J. Meyrick Vicar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† The date when the skull entered the Museum was more probably 1847: see our p. 40.
Numerous confident answers have been given, of course, and with great detail, by the palmist, the physiognomist, and the phrenologist, the last-named basing his conclusions upon the contours of the skull. Our faith in the neat charts in which he indicates and delimits the seats of some thirty-five mental and moral qualities, which divide up the surface of the brain between them, has, however, been rudely shaken by the newer charts which in our own day very different methods of research are slowly filling in. His methods are empirical, and have proved misleading. But was his basic idea that it was possible to establish some logical connection between the inward and the outward entirely at fault? The answer to this will depend upon the degree of association found to exist between:

1. the mental faculties and the proportions of the various parts of the brain;
2. and then on the degree of association, doubtless getting weaker at each remove, between
   2.1. the mental faculties, and the modelling of the brain surface,
   2.2. " " and the contours of the cranial cavity,
   2.3. " " and the outer surface of the skull,
3. and lastly
4. the mental faculties, and the living head.

To determine any one of these correlations, it is obvious that the investigator needs to be closely acquainted with the mentality of each individual studied. It is only seldom that this is known to him, except when he is dealing with the living head, and this is just where we should expect the degree of association to be slightest, and research to be least fruitful of result*. The pairs of characteristics which it is most desirable to study together are precisely those concerning which the data are fewest. To this branch of science, therefore, our records of Sir Thomas Browne make an especially valuable and welcome contribution, since here we know the cranial cavity from our casts, and the mind of the man from his books. Many more such records are needed, for however suggestive the study of small numbers may be, the conclusions based upon them are tentative at best, and it will probably be left to a later generation to answer our questions fully and certainly, by means of material which we must help to provide.

Two ways have now been indicated in which the skull-records of Sir Thomas Browne will be of value. They need not wait, however, for later years to prove their usefulness. Theory must and will leap ahead of knowledge, and needs continual testing. Such records as we have here supply a means of testing scientific theories; and not scientific theories alone, but common beliefs which pass currency for the most part unquestioned. It is almost a dogma in popular belief, that a receding chin reveals weak character, that the man whose eyes are close together is not to be

---

* Considerable research has in fact been undertaken in this direction, notably by Prof. Karl Pearson on 1000 Cambridge undergraduates (Biometrika, Vol. v. p. 105) and by Dr Chas. Goring on 5000 English criminals (The English Convict, pub. 1913). The result has been to demonstrate the absence of any degree of association of prognostic value between those mental and craniometrical characters with which the investigators dealt.
trusted, and that a low and receding brow involves a low mentality. Statistical investigation of the living can, and no doubt soon will, show whether any degree of association exists between these pairs of characteristics, and also give a measure of their tendency to be found together. Meanwhile it is quite useful to test by single examples such as the one before us whether our rules are quite as infallible as we are tempted to suppose.

More unconsciously however, doubtless more truly and to a far greater extent we base our mutual judgments upon the expression of the living face, upon features which are not determined by the shape of the bony framework alone.

We do not feel we know a man unless we know what he looks like, and our curiosity is very strong in the case of men dead and gone whom we have learnt to know in part through their actions or their works.

The faces of most of our great men are known to us, if known at all, at second-hand through the medium of an artist—perhaps of several artists, of various schools, of varying skill and truthfulness, their work coloured by differing individual mannerisms. Or it may be that we get the face at third-hand or fourth. The influence of any of these factors may render the artist’s work less faithful in the photographic sense.

The various results, considered merely as evidence, are apt to be rather confusing. If we place them side by side, we realise how imperfectly some of the portraits at any rate must have transmitted the exact appearance of the original: if one speak truth on this point the others cannot, but which is the truest?

That is a problem that we now have an opportunity of solving to some extent in the case of Sir Thomas Browne. If we could also have the skull of Shakespeare before us for a short time, what vexed problems that too would resolve! The skull alone cannot tell us all we wish to know about the living head, but the skull and the portraits together can do much.

We propose to deal with our two kinds of evidence, in the following order. First of all we shall study the portraits independently: all portraits whatsoever, in so far as we have been able to trace them, that make any claim to represent Sir Thomas Browne will be dealt with and their credentials examined. In the course of this, there will be some sifting of copies from originals, and those which can be looked upon as evidence will be reduced to a comparatively small number. We shall next examine the bona fides of the skull itself. Having satisfied ourselves as to that, we can study its characters and then compare it with the portraits which have survived the sifting process, using it to determine which of them conforms most closely to the details which the skull reveals. It is these portraits which will, presumably, portray most truthfully those details in which it cannot guide us.

(II) The Portraits.

The would-be student of the portraits of Sir Thomas Browne is usually referred to three well-known paintings, one at Norwich, in the church vestry of St Peter Mancroft, one at the Royal College of Physicians, London, and one in the Bodleian
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Picture Gallery at Oxford. It is sometimes confidently asserted that all three are original and contemporary*. We now know, however, that the last of these three was painted half a century after the death of the subject; and since definite evidence is lacking as to the date of the other two, we are perhaps on safer ground if we begin first with a study of the engraved portraits, dated by the publications in which they appeared.

(a) Early Engravings.

The earliest engraved portrait of Sir Thomas Browne to which we can find any reference, is one mentioned by Henry Bromley in his Catalogue of Engraved British Portraits (1793) as being in “the folio edition of Religio Medici 1663.” This 1663 folio edition with portrait is again referred to in Lowndes’ Bibliographers’ Manual (1834) and to this information H. G. Bohn added in his reprint that the edition was surreptitious. Again, in Jan. 1881, replies were given in Notes and Queries to an enquiry concerning early portraits of Sir Thomas Browne: one correspondent, Wm. H. Peet, writes: “There is a good portrait in the folio edition of Religio Medici, published in 1663” (Notes and Queries, 6th series, Vol. III. p. 58); another, J. Ingle Dredge, says: “There is an engraved portrait of ‘Thomas Browne, med. doctor’ in a small half-sheet. This was published before he was knighted by Charles II in Sept. 1671” (loc. cit. p. 57). With regard to the latter statement we might suppose either (1) that the “half-sheet” referred to was taken from the folio edition of 1663, or else (2) that the portrait in this edition was first published separately. Certainly J. Ingle Dredge’s description does not apply to the only engraved portrait published before 1671 with which we are acquainted, for this was in quarto, and bore a different inscription (see p. 7); and the only folio portrait we know was published in 1686, with again a different inscription (see p. 8).

Here then we have statements from five different quarters to the effect that an early portrait engraved on a folio sheet existed; and the place indicated for it by three of these, is a 1663 fol. edn. of the Religio Medici. Now this edition is not mentioned in any careful bibliography of the Religio Medici yet published†; it was not known by the late Sir Wm. Osler, who believed he had a complete collection (with one exception: the Dutch edn. of 1688) of the editions of this book; Dr Geoffrey Keynes, who has in course of preparation a bibliography of all the works of Sir Thomas Browne, has never heard of it; and extensive enquiries on our part have failed to bring it to light‡. One is tempted therefore to suppose that all these references originated in a mistake made by Henry Bromley, and

* See Notes and Queries, July 13, 1895.
† The most recent and the completest of these is that by Mr Chas. Williams, 2nd edition, pub. at Norwich, 1907.
‡ It may save possible future searchers after this edition some labour if I here detail the places in which it was not, in 1922:—the libraries of the British Museum, Royal College of Surgeons of England, Royal Society of Medicine, Royal Society, Royal College of Physicians, Guildhall, Medical Society of London, Cambridge University, University College (London), the London Library, the Bodleian, the John Rylands (Manchester), and the Cheetham (Manchester). Enquiries published in The Times Literary Supplement, and The Clique (a bookseller’s journal) have been barren of result.
echoed later by the other four writers. Our doubts may be strengthened by the
reflection that *Religio Medici* was a short work to publish alone in folio. Against
this theory, we have the fact that of the three later witnesses each provides a detail
given by himself alone, and not copied from Bromley: Bohn that it was “surrep-
titious,” Peet that it was a “good” portrait, Dredge that it is in “small” folio,
and without any reference to its being in a book. We must be content, therefore,
having put our evidence on record, to leave the probability of the existence of the
1663 edition an open question.

The earliest engraved portrait of Sir Thomas Browne which we know to have
been published was prefixed to the 5th edition of the *Pseudodoxia*, quarto, in 1669.
This is so unlike all the other portraits that one is unable to exclude the suspicion
that it might have been one of the forgeries not uncommon in those unscrupulous
days, when the trick of re-naming the previously published portrait of some other
man was frequently practised on the public. In some cases an engraved plate was
taken from stock—doubtless the one most nearly resembling the new subject—and
merely printed with a new inscription. In others the plate was further revised by
superimposing later work on portions of the original; or where this was impossible,
by first removing some details in order to engrave afresh. A noteworthy example
of this kind of faking is the equestrian portrait of Oliver Cromwell by P. Lombart,
which finally emerged, after five transformations, as that of the Royal martyr
himself*!

A close examination of the portrait in the 5th edition of Browne’s *Pseudodoxia*
suggests that this is another example of the same method (see our Plate VII,
Fig. 9). There are tell-tale signs of the original engraving having been erased, round
about the left side of the head. The outline of the cheek was probably altered, the
curls filled in as they are now, and the portion of the cliff behind roughly hatched
in. Some day we may identify this figure in its earlier incarnation. But however all
this may be, the portrait was replaced in the next edition of the *Pseudodoxia* (again
4to.) three years later by one entirely different, and one which we can believe to be
more authentic: the portrait of 1672 bearing the signature of Van Hove. The
“1669” portrait was unsigned. It may be the engraving referred to as “Cross, 4to.,”
in Edward Evans’ *Catalogue of Engraved Portraits* (1830...). In the opinion both
of Mr C. F. Bell and Mr H. Breun—authorities whose opinion carries weight—the
portrait is in the style of Cross and was probably attributed to him by Evans on
internal evidence alone. It was stated by J. Herbert Slater, a well-known authority
on books and engravings, to be by Van Hove, on what grounds we do not know†.
Simon Wilkin quotes Mr Ottley (Brit. Mus.) as attributing it to John Dunstall‡. It
has never been reproduced in any subsequent edition.

* See *The Headless Horseman*, by George Somes Layard. (Philip Allen & Co., London, 1922.)
† This statement was made in an Answers-to-Correspondents column, in reply to a question by
Dr George Peachey. I have seen the cutting which Dr Peachey has preserved, but it is difficult, after
the lapse of some thirty years, for him to supply the exact reference to the date, etc. of the periodical.
We now turn to consider and compare the next three portraits published. They are

(1) The engraving which bears the name of the Dutch artist Van Hove (sometimes called Van den Hove, *circa* 1630–1715*†*), forming the frontispiece to the 6th edition of the *Pseudodoxia*, 4to. in 1672, ten years before the death of the author (see our Plate VII, Fig. 10).

(2) That inscribed P. Vandrebanc (1649–1697), which accompanied the posthumous publication of *Certain Miscellany Tracts*, 8vo. in 1683 (limited edition) and 1684 (see our Plate VIII, Fig. 11).

(3) The engraved portrait bearing the name of R. White (1645–1704) which adorned the folio edition of the *Collected Works* published in 1686 (see our Plate VIII, Fig. 12).

As regards the dates of the engravings themselves, Van Hove is said to have worked chiefly for booksellers‡, and we may therefore assume that his portrait of Sir Thomas Browne was executed expressly for the 6th edition of the *Pseudodoxia*, which appeared in 1672.

Vandrebanc, or as he is more usually called, Van der Banck, did not come to England until about 1674‡‡. His engraving of Sir Thomas must in any case be given a later date than that, and I have, in fact, found nothing to encourage a supposition that either his or White's was published in any form previous to its appearance as frontispiece to the book named. The condition of the prints that have been examined indicates that, when they were struck off, the plates were in good condition and had not been re-touched. Such would not have been the case had these plates been used already for a previous issue. We may conclude, therefore, that both Van der Banck and White engraved their portraits of Sir Thomas Browne to serve as frontispieces to *Certain Miscellany Tracts* (1683) and *The Collected Works* (1686) respectively, and that these dates may be accepted as approximately the dates of the engravings too.

It is interesting to note that these three engravers represent three different schools, the Dutch, French, and English, a difference which is reflected in their work. Van Hove is not, indeed, a very accomplished representative of his school, and his training must have been fairly brief, for he was working for the booksellers by the age of about eighteen. Van der Banck, on the other hand—of Dutch extraction, but born in Paris—had the advantage of studying under the distinguished French engraver, François de Poilly, until he left France for England at the age of twenty-five. Robert White also served a long apprenticeship under a master in his art, David Loggan.

If we compare the three engraved portraits by these different men we notice a very considerable correspondence between them. The same arrangement of the hair, the same long and carefully-parted moustache, the same pointed beard, parted

---

* Date of death as given by Müller in his *Künstler-Lexicon*.
‡ Horace Walpole's *Catalogue of Engravers*, 1794, p. 128.
down the middle—very decidedly in Van Hove’s and White’s, but with a parting suggested in Van der Banck’s too; the same type of cloak with its broad collar seen covering the right shoulder; the same plain buttoned coat and plain linen collar, with two edges touching in front to preserve the square outline of the whole. These similarities might, perhaps, be explained by saying that Sir Thomas Browne was very conservative in his manner of dress, so that such details as have been instanced would appear in various portraits, dating from different times. But there are other details which cannot be explained in this way. In all three portraits the position is identical: all three are represented as seen rather from the right of the sitter, whose eyes are turned more in the direction of the artist; all have locks of hair straying over the forehead on the right side. We note the similar outline of the hair and the identical little curl which stands out from the rest on the extreme right, at the level of the eyes; and in Van Hove’s and White’s, the linen collar turned up at its right-hand corner. These are points of resemblance which can only be explained by supposing either that the two later engravings were based upon Van Hove’s, or that they were derived from one common original. We will consider the former of these alternatives.

We know from the date (1672) when the first engraving, Van Hove’s, appeared, that it was a contemporary portrait, as the others were almost certainly not; but did Van der Banck and White really copy from Van Hove? It is hard to believe so. One is accustomed to strange changes in a physiognomy as it passes from one brush or pencil to another, and to considerable innovations in the matter of dress. But even when we make allowance for the influence of the different schools in which the artists were trained, the number of differences here, especially between the engravings of the Dutch and French artists in spite of the details they share, point much more strongly to the existence of some source common to them all. If each went direct to this, we should expect to find that it lacked the details of dress which were supplied so variously by the three engravers.

Again, we remember that at the time the earliest of them was executed Sir Thomas Browne was in his sixty-seventh year. Now Van Hove was not a great artist, but if we can rely on the evidence of his engraving at all in the matter of age, it certainly seems to represent a much younger man. The rounded cheeks and clear-cut lips could hardly belong to a man well over middle age. Thus the second of our alternatives seems the more likely, and we are directed further back in our search for a more original record.

If we turn in our quest to the fine collection of miniatures in the possession of the Duke of Buccleuch I think we have found one!

(b) The Buccleuch Miniature and the Engravings compared.

The miniature which bears the name of Sir Thomas Browne in the Duke of Buccleuch’s collection is painted in oils on silver, and measures 1\(\frac{3}{8}\)” x 1\(\frac{3}{8}\)”: our reproduction (Plate I, Fig. 2) shows it somewhat enlarged. The face and shoulders are turned to the observer’s left, instead of to his right as in the engraved portraits, a difference which we were prepared to find in the original of these 17th century
engravings. In the latter half of the 17th century Wm. Faithorne's method of engraving from the original seen through a mirror was not used by all. By this method the engraver obtained on his plate a copy of the picture in reverse. This, of course, became again reversed in printing, with the result that the print and the original would face the same way. Until the adoption of this device became general, it was customary to produce the engravings in reverse, the more difficult alternative being to reverse in process of drawing on the plate.

In the miniature we find at once all the features which we had noted as common to the three engraved portraits: the outline and arrangement of the hair, the wisps hanging over the forehead, the same little curl already referred to, the same square white collar with the turned-up corner, the moustache framing the mouth, the imperial parted down the middle. The small dark spot seen just above the inner corner of the left eye is due to damage or discoloration. Near the edge at the bottom of the miniature, the oil-paint appears on a close examination to have peeled off and been restored, the largest patch reaching nearly to the turned-up corner of the collar. The part of the cloak which has not been disfigured does not show any detail.

In the three engraved portraits the cloak is carried further down to the level of the waist, but one point common to all three—the outline of the cloak at the shoulders—will be seen again in the miniature.

The history of the Buccleuch miniature is one I have been unable to trace, and since its authenticity as a contemporary portrait* and the probable parent of most of the long series of representations of Sir Thomas Browne which have been produced over two and a half centuries depends chiefly on internal evidence, it is worth while to compare it in more detail with the engravings whose dates are better known.

First with the Van Hove (Plate VII, Fig. 10). The similarities which connect this engraving with the miniature as a different version of the same thing have already been pointed out. But an engraving, apart from the details which an engraver frequently sees fit to add or modify, does not usually reproduce a picture with photographic faithfulness. There are differences; and it is profitable to examine these. The Van Hove engraving is harsher, harder, and more angular than the miniature, with a harshness not all involved in the different medium used, as the Van der Banck will show. The curve of the upper lip is exaggerated into a sharp angle; the eyebrows are heavier; the soft wisps straying over the forehead have become sharply outlined tails of hair; the pointed beard, brushed to right and left in the miniature, is reduced to an imperial drilled into a severe and rigid parting that nature unassisted could not possibly maintain! The eyes are larger and more sombre; the whole expression is forbidding, whereas that of the miniature is sweeter, and accords better with what we know of the character of the philosopher; more of the cloak is shown, and its folds are stiff and rigid.

* The Director of the National Portrait Gallery gives its date, from internal evidence, as 17th century or possibly early 18th century. He pronounces the artist a painter of ability, though not of outstanding distinction.
We now turn to the Van der Banck (Plate VIII, Fig. 11), engraved for a smaller book, 8vo. size. Here we have an engraving characterised by a softness of touch which, Horace Walpole tells us*, won for the work of this artist the popularity it enjoyed in his own day. The composition of the face is, however, less admirable: it is a weak face, and in this it differs from the miniature. When we compare it in detail with the latter, we note that the backward slope of the forehead is considerably modified, the face is longer, the eyebrows less firmly marked, the eyes lighter in shading, the parting in the beard retained only in its upper half. Van der Banck has his own interpretation of the indefinite hair on the forehead, differing from Van Hove's. Unlike the latter he retains the hair which we see on the cheeks of the miniature, and follows more faithfully the line of the nose. He introduces a variation of his own in the collar, narrowing it and straightening out the turned-up corner, and he fills in the details of cloak, which the miniature lacks, without reference to the earlier engraver.

We see, in fact, that whatever these two engravings have in common they have also in common with the miniature; where they differ from it, they differ in opposite senses.

We next examine White's engraving (Plate VIII, Fig. 12). This, prepared for the first folio edition of Sir Thomas Browne's Collected Works, is of course larger than either of the others. It is seen at once to be the work of a more accomplished artist. The parted beard is again shown, parted more like Van Hove's though not quite so severely. On the other hand, there is hair on the cheeks, as in Van der Banck and the miniature; the face is somewhat longer than in the latter, but not so long as in Van der Banck; the eyes, unlike those of both the other engravings which differ in opposite ways, are of the proportions and depth that we see in the miniature, and have more of the latter's light in them; the interpretation of the strands on the forehead is that of a gentler Van Hove; in the folds of the cloak White differs from both the other engravers, except that the general arrangement suggests Van Hove's, which he no doubt had before him. Again, he has been kinder to the slope of the receding forehead, than are Van Hove and the miniature-painter.

Altogether it is impossible to conclude that White copied exclusively either from Van Hove or Van der Banck, and if he had merely attempted to reconcile these two, he would probably not have achieved anything so much like the small portrait in oils. It is worth while to note Horace Walpole's comment on White's work as a whole, that "what distinguished him was his admirable success in likenesses†." This would hardly be true in the present instance if either Van Hove or Van der Banck had supplied him with his original.

We can reject at once any attempt to explain similarities between the painting and the engravings, by the theory that the painting was later, and based on one of these, for it is most unlikely that the painter would ever reverse the picture he was

---

* Horace Walpole's Catalogue of Engravers, 1794, p. 129.
† Ibid. p. 136.
copying. (Incidentally, it may be mentioned that the same fact rules out these engravings as possible originals of any of the painted portraits which will be considered later.)

The hypothesis which best survives our examination is that the features common to the engravings are accounted for by the circumstance that each engraver found them in the original from which he copied. We might, therefore, naturally conclude that each copied direct from the miniature. But we must not overlook another possibility: the engravers may have copied from non-identical portraits if these were closely related and showed the same characteristics as are reflected in the engravings. Whether any other portraits as yet discovered can dispute with the miniature the title to which it has made out so reasonable a claim, will be seen in the course of our examination of the others. There is however one more contribution to the subject which the work of the engravers might yield, before we pass to other portraits. We have been content to accept for all three engravings an original facing the reverse way, on the ground that such reversal is frequently found. But it occurred to me that one would be on safer ground if one enquired into the actual practice of the individual engraver. To attempt to assemble data concerning all or even a large proportion of the work of the artists in question would have been an impossibly lengthy undertaking under the circumstances. I did however succeed in bringing together engraving and original in the case of five portraits engraved by Van Hove, one by Van der Banck, five by White, and four by Loggan, White's master. Van Hove's all reversed their originals, Van der Banck's also reversed; White's and Loggan's all reproduced the originals unreversed.

Now this evidence, while certainly not strong enough to support the assertion that these artists always did as they have done in these few instances, does at least predispose us to expect that the original of Van Hove's engravings would be a portrait facing to the left, as the miniature does. As regards White, we should expect, from this, that his original would be turned to our right. We do not, however, on the evidence forthcoming as yet, find any difficulty in making the miniature his probable original—for the discovery of a single instance in which White reversed would negative the inference drawn from the five in which he has not—but in his case we sit rather more loosely to our conclusions.

(c) The Portrait at the Royal College of Physicians (Plate II, Fig. 3).

This portrait (24" x 20"), bearing the inscription “Thomas Brown Eques Auratus” in large letters at the top, is painted upon an oak panel. It has no history that has been traced as yet. The name of the painter is unknown; so also is the date of the painting. The only clue to the date at which it came into the

* [It confirms the evidence which, I think, exists in the engravings themselves, that White had not the miniature before him, but simply copied Van der Banck; the wisp of hair curling to the right at its tip is not in Van Hove or the miniature, but it is in Van der Banck. In Van Hove the buttons are on the left side of the parting line of the vest, in Van der Banck and White they are on the right. He may have had Van Hove also, but I think there cannot be a doubt that he certainly had Van der Banck. Ed.]
possession of the Royal College of Physicians is to be found in the fact that Dr Edward Browne, Sir Thomas' eldest son, was President of the College from the year 1704 till his death in 1708, and it is presumed* that the portrait was his gift. If we examine the portrait we recognise at once some familiar traits. The same position as in the miniature and not reversed as in the three engravings; the streaks of hair on the forehead, the square collar with the corner turned up, the pointed beard. The beard is not parted as before, and though the general outline of the hair is much the same, the little curl which breaks through on the right in the other portraits (on L. in engravings) is scarcely indicated. This portrait is carried down to the level of the waist. It was very difficult however to distinguish any details of the dress except the central line of buttons until the picture was taken down from the walls, and could be inspected without the interposition of the glass which covered it in the frame. Fortunately it is not long since it was cleaned, so that such details as exist are not obscured by a veil of dirt.

I have examined the dress carefully, and can make out the folds of the cloak as it is gathered together by the two arms. The hands, covered with brown gauntlet gloves, are clasped in front. These details of dress and figure are merely sketched in, in dark colours, and it may be that the difficulty of distinguishing them caused the two engravers of this picture†, while preserving the buttons of the coat, to improvise a very different cloak.

The points of resemblance between this portrait and those we have just examined are however so marked that there can be no doubt we have here another member of a family of portraits of which one was the parent, and the others the offspring. In what relation does this stand to the others? Is it possible that this was the original portrait—that the miniature and the engravings by Van Hove, Van der Banck, and White were all copied from it? I think not. I ask the reader to look at this towering forehead, this conventional and rather wooden countenance, long and narrow: high foreheads were no doubt as popular then as today, and what artist, copying from this, would give his own production the low and sloping brow found in the miniature and Van Hove, or even reduce the height of it to the dimensions found in Van der Banck and White? Who would be likely to read into this face the life and expression found in the miniature, or turn its lips with their clear-cut outline of a boy of twenty, into the older mouth of the miniature portrait? Again, it is easy to understand how such different mouths as Van Hove and Van der Banck show could have had their origin in the miniature, but not easy to believe that anyone would translate that of the Royal College of Physicians' painting into the one represented by Van Hove. The more one studies these portraits, the more obvious it becomes that the painting at the Royal College of Physicians is the expression of the artist's own idea of what it would have been more becoming in Sir Thomas Browne to have looked like. Whether he was right or no, it is certain that he has nearly improved him out of all resemblance to

† See list of portraits on our pp. 73-4.
himself if the miniature be near the truth. And on this point it will no doubt be safe to fall back upon the same canon as obtains in literary criticism: where two versions differ, the more awkward and difficult is the correct one. I am afraid we must accept Sir Thomas Browne's disturbing forehead.......

(d) The Bodleian Portrait (Plate II, Fig. 4).

This portrait (29" x 24") is one which possesses a definite historical record. In editing Anthony à Wood's History of the Colleges and Halls in the University of Oxford John Gutch (p. 968) gives a list of eight portraits of doctors in the Bodleian Portrait Gallery, painted by J. Wollaston in 1734*, and presented by Humphrey Bartholomew of University College, M.A., in 1735, which "hung some time in the anatomy school." Mrs Poole, who has done so much valuable research work in connection with the Oxford Portraits, informs me that of these eight portraits, one, Thomas Wharton's, has disappeared; also that there is a second record later of the gift of a portrait of Thomas Willis—one of the eight—whereas only one portrait of this doctor is now in the Bodleian Gallery, so that it is not certain which portrait of him was preserved. The remaining six are each represented by a picture in the Bodleian collection†, and among them is Sir Thomas Browne. Mrs Poole adds that it is evident the portraits are copies of the stock likeness of each doctor.

If we look for the original of the portrait in which we are now interested we have not far to seek, for the shading on the white collar of the Royal College of Physicians' portrait corresponds exactly with this before us. The two paintings are indeed very much alike. A few changes have been made: thus the stray locks over the forehead have become rather more attenuated in the Oxford portrait, the mouth has acquired more of a rosebud effect, and apparently Van Hove or White has been referred to as well, and is responsible for the restoration of the very definite parting in the imperial, and in its full proportions, the silhouetted curl near the right eye.

Mr C. F. Bell, Keeper of the Department of Fine Art at the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, has been so good as to examine the dress as shown in this picture. He reports that "the clothes are a plain surface of black....No folds are visible, and the picture was not long since cleaned and is not darkened or obscured." In the picture on the walls of the Royal College of Physicians, as we have seen, details of the cloak are present but are not clear even now, while a thirty years' film of dirt would make them quite indistinguishable.

* The picture was loaned to the Manchester (Art Treasures) Exhibition of 1857, and the name of the painter given in the catalogue slip is "Robert Walker" (a painter who died about 1660). I have it on the authority of the Director of the National Portrait Gallery that it is not always wise to attach too much importance to such a statement. The organiser of an Exhibition is very often obliged to accept and print the name of the painter to whom the lender of the picture attributes it, unless he can prove to the lender's satisfaction that it is by someone else. The catalogue entry has, however, misled Mr Algernon Graves into including the Bodleian Sir Thomas Browne in a list of Walker's works: Century of Loan Exhibitions, 1813—1912, Lond. 1914, Vol. iv, p. 1597.

† See the Catalogue of Oxford Portraits, compiled by Mrs Rachel Poole, 1905.
In short, a comparison of the Bodleian portrait with this, and of the Bodleian with all other known portraits of Sir Thomas Browne, leads us to the fairly safe conclusion that it was the Physicians' picture which served as Wollaston's chief model when he executed this part of Humphrey Bartholomew's commission. And where else would Humphrey Bartholomew have been more likely to go, to choose portraits of famous doctors for the anatomy school of his own university, than to the home of that profession, the Royal College of Physicians in London? Thus, if we mistake not, we get in the Bodleian portrait another descendant of the miniature—one in the second generation.

(e) The Norwich Portrait (Plate III, Fig. 5).

The painted portrait in the vestry of St Peter Mancroft, Norwich, was presented to that parish* in 1739† by Dr Edward Howman, whose father purchased the house of Sir Thomas Browne in Norwich after Lady Browne's death in 1685‡. History takes us thus far back. It is not known how the painting came into the hands of Dr Howman’s father, but it is known that the latter was not a newcomer into Norwich§, that he had been a colleague of Sir Thomas Browne’s in that city, and presumably also a friend.

In examining the Norwich portrait, we realise at once that this face seems much more alive than those of the two paintings we have just studied: it would be easier to believe of the former that it had been painted from the living head. We will however compare it, as we did them, with the miniature. There are certain obvious differences. In the Norwich portrait the hair is smoothed back on the forehead, and a different type of collar is worn. It is surely a curious coincidence, however, if these portraits were painted quite independently of one another, that they should have been painted from exactly the same angle, facing the same way, with the eyes turned in nearly the same direction, and with the light falling similarly on both heads. We may take advantage of this similarity of position to compare the two faces more in detail. The chief difference lies in the smaller relative width in the region of the eyes of the larger portrait owing to the fact that the face tapers less below the cheek-bones, and that the forehead falls back rather less abruptly. The forehead, thus heightened, stops short however of giving the monumental effect of the Bodleian brow. We note also that the Norwich nose is somewhat aquiline. These differences apart, we find a close resemblance between the two faces. The lower part of the nose, the mouth, beard, etc. are strongly alike, though on the lips of the Norwich portrait there is rather more hint of a smile. It is to be regretted that the outline of the hair in the latter has become so vague under the varnish with which the picture is now heavily overlaid, that one can no

---

* F. Blomefield's History of the County of Norfolk, Vol. iv. p. 193. (Blomefield wrote in 1741.)
† I quote here the final conclusion as to date to which the late Mr Chas. Williams came on this matter (see Souvenir of Sir Thomas Browne, pub. Norwich, 1905) though he does not give his authority for the statement, nor have I so far been able to identify it.
‡ The East Anglian, Vol. i. 1885, p. 194: from transcript of Dr Ed. Howman’s marriage-settlement, 1704.
§ Notes and Queries, July 13, 1895, “Portraits of Sir Thomas Browne.”
longer say with certainty where the hair and background meet*. At our request, however, an independent observer, Mrs Sydney Long, has drawn upon a matt print of our photograph of the Norwich portrait the outline of the hair as nearly as she can judge it from the painting. Mrs Long was not told beforehand why we wanted it, nor with what we proposed to compare it. The general sweep of the outline she has given us is the same as is seen in the miniature.

What then can we conclude as to the relation between these two paintings? Are they independent, or is one copied from the other? The points they have in common fall into two categories:

(1) Similarity of face and feature, which might be ascribed simply to the fact that the living original was the same in both cases (a consideration which could apply quite well to the hair on the face; this, unless the wearer deliberately altered its cut or style, would vary its lines very little from day to day).

(2) Similarity of position. And it would not be possible to say dogmatically, on this ground alone, that one portrait was copied from the other. The position is not unusual; nor is the lighting.

As to other evidence, all we can say concerning the outline of the hair is that it is not definitely unlike in the two portraits, and that its general sweep seems in fact to be the same.

Dogmatic conclusions either way do not seem justified by the facts as yet before us and we must leave open the question of close relationship between these two pictures. There is one other question of interest in this connection, however, to which we may be able to find an answer: Supposing one portrait to have been copied from the other, which was the original? Here the style of dress can help. The collar of the Norwich portrait belongs to the sixth decade of the seventeenth century; that of the miniature, to the decade following. We must suppose, therefore, that if one is a copy, that one is the miniature. The artist who painted the copy might bring the clothes up to date, but he would hardly be likely to change them for the style of ten years earlier.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the possibility we have mooted in no way disturbs our first conclusions as to the parentage of the engravings: it merely confers upon the Norwich portrait the title of grandfather to these lesser fry.

A few words may be added as to the later history of this portrait. It had become somewhat damaged in the course of time, and at some date during the latter half of last century was cleaned and repaired at the cost of Mr Chas. Williams. The rents which had unfortunately been made in the canvas can be traced in our photograph: one is seen above the parting in the hair, and a little to the left; two other slits, one rather higher than the other, can be seen in the hair, to the right of the eyes.

* The outline shown in the reproduction published in 1905 (Souvenir of Sir Thomas Browne, by Chas. Williams) is not to be found in the painting itself and has evidently been introduced by the photographer. That in Miss Frere’s copy in oils (see our p. 17) is again different.
On Nov. 25th, 1871, it was transferred to the care of the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital, on the following conditions: "The Churchwardens of the parish of St Peter Mancroft, Norwich, having deposited in the Board-room of the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital the oil-painting of Sir Thomas Browne, the Board of Management hereby undertakes to return the same whenever it may be demanded by the Churchwardens of the said parish." In the year 1905, the year when the tercentenary of the birth of Sir Thomas Browne was celebrated, the Churchwardens of St Peter Mancroft demanded the return of the picture, and it rejoined other of their treasured possessions in the vestry of that Church.

Before returning it, the Board of Management commissioned Miss Amy Frere, of Norwich, to paint a copy; and this copy now hangs in the Board-room of the Hospital in place of the original portrait.

(f) The Gunton Portrait (Plate IV, Fig. 6).

This portrait (12" x 9") was discovered some ten years ago by Lady Suffield in a room in the servants' quarters at Gunton Park, Norfolk. Nothing is known of the date at which the picture came into the family, but the reason for its relegation to the servants' quarters is clear. It is feeble.

The figure in this picture is seated, the right arm resting upon a table, and near it two volumes. One lies flat; the second stands upon the first with its back to the observer, exposing the title Religio Medici. The picture is painted on an oak panel; the back is hand-sawn and rough, with bevelled edges. From the appearance and condition of the wood, and of the painting, Mr Milner, Director of the National Portrait Gallery, assigns this picture approximately to the end of the seventeenth century: it may have been a nearly contemporary adaptation, probably by a local artist.

We say adaptation, because, having features which link it closely with the miniature and the Norwich portrait, it is also poorer than either. Particularly does the artist's lack of skill become manifest when he departs from his copy, and embarks on variations that are all his own. From the shoulders downwards, the figure has been adapted to the introduction of the table, with a book upon it which indicates the identity of the person portrayed. The cloak is caught up in clumsy folds over the left arm. The right arm and hand are exposed; and if they are by the same artist as painted the face, they afford good evidence that the original contained nothing like this, but left the Gunton artist to his own unaided draughtsmanship.

We turn then to examine more closely the upper part of the figure, with a view to identifying the portrait from which this part was copied. The pose is the familiar one; the hair, though fairer than in any of the other pictures, presents the well-known outline; and we recognise at once the little curl which breaks through just above the bush of hair resting upon the left shoulder. The moustache also, and the cut of the beard, are old acquaintances of the reader who has followed
us thus far. Many of the features we have mentioned are present in the Royal College of Physicians’ and Bodleian portraits, as well as in the miniature which brought them forth; but a comparison of the Gunton portrait with these three together leads us to reject at once the idea that either of the two first-named served as its original. The Gunton face has not been lengthened out like these; and where these two introduce slight variations in the hair—such as bringing it down to the right shoulder in a solid mass—the Gunton does not follow suit. We may safely concentrate, therefore, upon the miniature and the Norwich portrait as its possible originals.

In one point the Gunton portrait resembles more closely the miniature: the nose is straight, and does not show the slight aquilinity of the Norwich nose. Again, the disposition and outline of the hair, as we have already noted, is the same as in the Buccleuch miniature: whether it is the same in the Norwich portrait we cannot now see. Certainly the Gunton hair as it frames the face is more like the Norwich. The separate strands on the forehead are smoothed back, the middle parting is shown, and no ear-tip is left visible. Again, the Gunton collar is of the Norwich pattern though its outline, on our left, has been adapted to the droop of the figure’s feeble right shoulder. The tassels of the collar-tie are there too, although less distinctly than in the Norwich picture. And once more we have to ask ourselves: Is it likely that a painter copying the miniature would deliberately change the collar for one earlier by ten years or so? It is not. Another fact which is not without significance for us, is that Gunton Park is but a few miles distant from the city of Norwich. Weighing together all these considerations, we are brought to the very reasonable persuasion that we have in the Gunton portrait a local copy of the painting which is now in St Peter Mancroft, Norwich, and which, as far as we can tell, has never left the city of Sir Thomas Browne’s adoption.

But to this conclusion there is a corollary. If the Gunton was copied from the Norwich portrait, then we know what the Norwich hair was probably like. And how does the outline of the Gunton hair come to correspond so closely—even to the silhouette curl—with that of the miniature? This surely is a detail that cannot be accounted for by mere coincidence, or by the simple fact that the pictures portray the same person? A reasonable answer to this question is not far to seek: the Gunton portrait and the miniature both, were probably copied from the Norwich. Here, then, we have the further piece of evidence which was needed to make us climb down from the fence on which we were left sitting a little while back; and the side on which we descend is that which would make the miniature not an independent portrait of Sir Thomas Browne, but a 1660–70 copy of the Norwich painting with the clothes brought up to date*.

* [Neither the Norwich nor Gunton portrait has the forehead curl of the miniature and of the later portraits and engravings. This with the difference of collars, and the barer upper lip below the nostrils at least suggests that the miniature may be—at any rate to some extent—an independent portrait of later date than the Norwich painting. Ed.]
(g) *The Plumbago Drawing, in the National Portrait Gallery* (Plate I, Fig. 1).

This portrait, recently acquired for the nation, was recognised by the Director of the National Portrait Gallery to be one of Sir Thomas Browne, through its likeness to White's engraving. It was one of three pencil portraits in the possession of the late Mr Charles Ready, who died in London in 1922. Mr Ready came of a Norwich family, and spent his early years in that city. He was an ardent collector of all kinds of *objets d'art*; it is not known how nor when the portrait came into his hands, nor whether he was aware of the identity of the subject.

This drawing was evidently composed as an oval on a rectangular piece of vellum which has been cut down. The slip of vellum now measures $4\frac{1}{6}'' \times 3\frac{7}{12}''$, and is pasted on a thin card its own size. It has no signature. Mr Milner assigns it to David Loggan (1635–c. 1700), who came to England about 1653.

David Loggan was the master from whom Robert White learnt the art of portraiture, both in pencil on vellum, and with the graver on copper. A collection of nine pencil-portraits by Loggan, and one of thirteen by R. White, in the Dept. of Prints and Drawings of the British Museum, will enable the student who is unfamiliar with the work of these artists to compare their styles. Loggan's work is very finished: it is distinguished by great precision and fineness of detail. This may be seen to especial advantage in his rendering of lace, ribbon, and embroidery.* White, on the other hand, when he finished the whole drawing (more often, he finished the face only, and sketched in the rest) did not give us such minute detail, nor was his drawing of the folds of a garment quite so sharp and clear. Unfortunately, the pencil portrait of Sir Thomas Browne has been rubbed considerably and has thus lost much of its clearness, so that we cannot test it on this point. Nor is the dress such as gives scope for much minute rendering of detail; but where an opportunity is given by the buttons we find there the detailed and conscientious drawing which is more characteristic of Loggan. In his drawing of hair, we see again Loggan's typical fineness and finish. It is a finish that might be termed rather mechanical: a curl is shown by a finely-drawn spiral, a wave by a series of curved parallel lines. This kind of drawing is used for the hair of Sir Thomas Browne in the plumbago portrait. White tended to freer line†, such as we see in the portrait of a gentleman which is inscribed *R. White delin. 1699*, though an earlier portrait, that of a divine, signed *R. White fecit 1680*, shews rather the mechanical hair-portraiture taught by Loggan. This latter is drawn with a coarser line than Loggan used; in the 1699 portrait however the line was fine. It is arguable that White might combine in some portrait the "mechanicalness" of the 1680 hair with the fineness of the 1699, and so produce hair such as we see in Sir Thomas Browne's portrait. It is certain nevertheless that the delineation of the hair in the latter is much more characteristic of Loggan, and points more strongly to him as the artist who produced the portrait.

* See, for example, the signed portrait of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester (dated 1671), and that of a gentleman unknown (dated 1674).
† "There is much greater freedom," Mr Milner observed, "in White's drawing and it has a marked superiority of characterisation, essentially English, fully compensating for Loggan's SUPERLATIVE FINISH and precision."

This content downloaded from 159.178.22.27 on Fri, 02 Sep 2016 15:08:54 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms
Another noteworthy feature of this portrait is the way in which the edges of the coat and of the cloak are picked out with a clear line of light. This appears to have been a favourite device of Loggan's: we see it again in his portrait of Peter Mews, Bishop of Winchester, and in that of Mrs Baily, to choose two examples out of several. This feature, which might be regarded almost as a Loggan hallmark, does not appear in the pencil work of White which I have examined. An indication of it may perhaps be traced in White's engraving of Browne (Plate VIII, Fig. 12).

The style of the pencil portrait of Sir Thomas Browne is thus seen to indicate David Loggan as its author; and it is definitely assigned to him by Mr Milner.

We must now attempt to find the place occupied by the plumbago drawing among the other portraits of Sir Thomas Browne. Its intimate connection with White's engraving is obvious: clearly one was copied from the other direct. And since Loggan was the master under whom White studied, and since also the plumbago drawing is a much finer piece of work than the engraving, we naturally suppose that it was the engraving that was the copy. Here however we are faced with the considerable difficulty of discovering the relationship of Loggan's drawing to the other portraits; for that they are somehow related is obvious. The family traits—square collar with turned-up corner, stray hair on the forehead, outline of hair, etc.—speak too clearly for the connection to be denied. But all the painted portraits that can substantiate their claim to be Sir Thomas face our left; only the engraved portraits, whose reversal can be accounted for by the process by which they are reproduced, face our right. Yet the plumbago drawing faces R., too. If it was copied from one of the paintings, say the miniature, and not from an engraving, how does it come to face the reverse way?

Or if we would make it the original *ad vivum* portrait*, and one of the others the first copy, the difficulty is exactly the same. It is in fact somewhat greater, for we then have to account for the likeness between the square-collared portraits, of which this is one, and the Norwich and Gunton portraits which show the costume of a decade earlier. There is moreover a likeness between the arrangement of the coat and cloak in Van Hove's engraving and that in the pencil drawing, which we can hardly dismiss as a coincidence. Yet we find it more difficult to believe that Van Hove, having this drawing before him, changed it deliberately (for it is not merely a poor attempt to reproduce) to his stiff and ugly garment, than it is to suppose that a better artist, finding insufficient indications of the cloak in the

* There is no difficulty as regards date in supposing the pencil portrait to have been drawn from life, by Loggan. The costume dates it as belonging to the sixties. Loggan was working at Oxford from 1665—1675 (references by Anthony à Wood, etc.); Sir Thomas Browne's eldest son, Edward, having graduated previously at Cambridge, worked for his doctor's degree at Merton College, Oxford, from June 1666 to July 1667. Possibly Sir Thomas visited his son there; possibly Loggan executed a portrait at that time. This, however, is sheer surmise. Merton College has no record of a visit from Sir Thomas, nor has Pembroke (his own college) at that time. Anthony à Wood does not refer to his visiting Oxford; yet he makes many references to Loggan, whom he knew well, and some to Sir Thomas, with whom he had some correspondence. And we know the minuteness with which he records the most trifling events of his daily life, including the people with whom he dined or had tea, and the gossip he heard.
original portrait, adopted and beautified Van Hove's scheme. Again, if White copied the plumbago drawing, how is it that he makes the head erect, as in the other portraits, but not as in the drawing? and how does he get the little silhouetted curl, which the drawing omits, in the same place as they? All these are difficult questions which have to be answered if we make the plumbago drawing the original of White's engraving.

Shall we avoid them all by supposing that it was the drawing that was the copy, and the engraving its original? If we do, we must either suppose that Loggan copied his pupil's work, which sounds improbable, or assign the drawing to White, against conclusions drawn from the internal evidence. Furthermore we must allow that the better piece of work was copied from the poorer; and notwithstanding the admitted fact that White's ability was greater with the pencil than with the graver, I find a consensus of expert opinion against this theory, and here record the fact.

It remains to suggest a third possibility: that White's was a copy from the plumbago drawing, but that he incorporated some features taken from, say, Van Hove. Also that Loggan before him—though after the death of Sir Thomas?—wanting material for a portrait made some use of Van Hove's early engraving, but, in drawing the face, went to Norwich and made a direct study from that portrait. Thus Van Hove would contribute the collar, the general arrangement of the cloak, the position facing R., the definite parting of the imperial, and Norwich would do the rest.

Some such compromise as is outlined above might be devised to evade the difficulties of the other two alternatives, though we do not suggest it is more plausible than they. But confessing ourselves unable to find any ideal and unique solution of the problem, we place our data before the reader and leave it to who will—and can—to decide*.

(h) The Wellcome Portrait (Plate IX, Fig. 13).

There is in the Wellcome Historical Medical Museum, a portrait which was bought in Norwich, about 20 years ago, as that of Sir Thomas Browne. On the back are pasted two rectangular slips of paper. The wording on one, in manuscript, is now largely undecipherable, but some years ago it was copied for the late Sir William Osler and then read, "Sir Thos. Browne, Kt. M.D., Author of Religio Medici and other learned works. Practised in Norwich." Below it is a fragment of a printed description, placed centrally:

From which a mezzotint was aped by Simon, ssion of Wm. Douglas, Esq. of Teddington, near it to its present possessor, Sir John Lister Raze, efield, Yorkshire, for the sum of £400.

* [It seems impossible to doubt that either White's engraving was copied from the plumbago drawing or the latter from White's engraving. If the former, why was the rather graceful bend of the head dropped, and why was the familiar silhouette curl of the Van Hove introduced? If the latter, it was easy to leave out the curl and give a graceful droop to the head. White's engraving is the best of all the engraved portraits, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that some relative or admirer of Browne's commissioned White (or Loggan?) for a drawing. Ed.]
It will be noticed that there is no mention here of the identity of the figure in this portrait. There are given, however, a number of other possible clues to the history of the picture, which no proper investigation could afford to neglect. These led to the surprising discovery that the picture corresponded with a mezzotint by Simon, not of Sir Thomas Browne, but asserted to be of Shakespeare!

The portrait from which it claims to have been copied was not contemporary, but was painted by Gerard Zoust, or Soest (c. 1605—1681), who came to England in 1651 or before*. Abraham Wivell, in his Inquiry into...Shakespeare’s Portraits (1827), quotes various statements made by others concerning this picture, and adds notes of his own. Subsequent research appears to have contributed almost nothing to our information; so we shall find most of the little that is known conveniently assembled in Wivell’s pages.

Edmund Malone, in his 1790 edition of Shakespeare’s Works (Vol. I. p. 127), stated: “About the year 1725, a mezzotinto of Shakespeare was scraped by Simon, said to be done from an original picture painted by Zoust, or Soest, then in the possession of T. Wright, painter, in Covent Garden....I have lately seen a picture in the possession of — Douglas, Esq. at Teddington, near Twickenham, which is, I believe, the very picture from which Simon’s mezzotinto was made. It is on canvas (about 24 inches by 20) and somewhat smaller than the life.”

Commenting on this statement in his Inquiry into the...Portraits of Shakespeare (1824) James Boaden says: “Not very long since, the proprietor felt inclined to sell this picture, if he could obtain one hundred guineas for it; and Mr Sotheby, I remember, put it into one of his catalogues. He differed with Mr Malone as to its size, calling it a canvass, 20 inches by 16. He adds, ‘This fine and extremely interesting portrait has been in the possession of the family of the present proprietor for upwards of a century’.” Mr Boaden goes on to differ from Malone’s identification of the picture with Simon’s original.

Again, Abraham Wivell, commenting in 1827 on the above remarks by James Boaden, says: “Mr Douglas informs me, it never was his intention to part with this picture for a less sum than five hundred pounds. He employed Mr Sotheby to sell it, if possible, for the above sum, accordingly it was put up at the end of a sale, and bought in at one hundred pounds. Mr Douglas has presented me with the following memorandum, as to where it now is:—‘The present possessor, Sir John Lister Rayet†, Bart. of the Grange, near Wakefield, Yorkshire, purchased it of me for four hundred pounds. (Signed) William Douglas’.” He adds that Mr Douglas tells him the picture had been in his family about 60 years (Sotheby’s “upwards of a century” was evidently rather a generous way of expressing this!) and that its previous history was not known; also that Garrick and Sir Joshua


† Evidently Wivell’s mis-reading of Kaye as written in Douglas’ handwriting. The Lister Kayes are a well-known family. An application for information as to the present whereabouts of the picture met with no reply.
Reynolds had much admired it; and that he personally agrees with Boaden in thinking it was not the original of Simon's engraving. He also suggests that Simon's inscription may mean that Zoust painted a copy from the "Capital Picture, in the collection of T. Wright," and that he (Simon) engraved Zoust's copy. He then says: "There is in the possession of Mr Booth, Bookseller, a small copy, in oil, by Mr Cosway from the above picture, or print, which was purchased at his sale for nearly the sum of twenty pounds. The artist has taken some liberties, one in particular, by making the outline of the nose quite straight."

Thus we learn of the existence in 1827 of the following three portraits: a mezzotint by Simon, claiming to be taken from a portrait of Shakespeare by Zoust; an oil painting on canvas (20" × 16") (by some identified as the original of the mezzotint, by some not) in the possession of Sir John Lister Kaye; and a small straight-nosed copy in oils by Richard Cosway "from the above picture or print" in the possession of Mr Booth, Bookseller.

To-day the following portraits are known to exist: the mezzotint by Simon (of which a good pull is in the Prints Dept. Brit. Mus.); a picture in oils on canvas (20½" × 16½") said to be a copy of the Zoust, and attributed to Sir Joshua Reynolds; also a smaller copy of the same picture, in oils on panel (10" × 8½"), without a history, but thought to be possibly the one by Cosway. (Both this picture and the last are in the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, Stratford on-Avon.) We also learn from Mr Spielmann* that another version of the picture is in the possession of the Earl of Craven.

Whether the larger Stratford portrait could possibly be the one which was in the possession of Sir John Lister Kaye we do not know—the size is much the same—but it has not been possible to investigate the matter further.

The Wellcome portrait (Plate IX, Fig. 13) and the mezzotint (Plate X, Fig. 14), are here reproduced. They show differences in feature and expression which might give rise to doubts such as Wivell expressed concerning their common origin; but an engraver is not a photographer, and we have already seen how far from a facsimile an engraved copy—or a painted copy either—may be. But in the details of the hair, the collar, and the epaulettes upon the shoulder we find good evidence of relationship.

We now turn to the Wellcome portrait, 13" × 11", painted on canvas stretched over a panel. A comparison with the Stratford "Zoust" shows it to be another version of the same picture, and we also see correspondence with the details of the mezzotint. On the back of the picture are pasted fragmentary data which tally with the history of the picture which Malone identified as the original Zoust.

A mistake has been made, no doubt through the misreading of manuscript, in that Sir John Lister Kaye is here wrongly spelt Lister Raze, as also elsewhere† the name is mis-spelt Lister Raye. But that is a small point. With the help of

* Encyclopaedia Brit. under "Shakespeare's Portraits." An application to the Earl of Craven for information met with no reply.
† See page 22.
what is known of this portrait, and having regard to the fact that our completed lines must begin exactly underneath one another, we may reconstruct the original somewhat as follows*:

**Wm. Shakespeare**

*From a portrait by G. Zoust from which a mezzotint was scraped by Simon, at one time in the possession of Wm. Douglas, Esq. of Teddington, near Twickenham, who parted with it to its present possessor, Sir John Lister Raze, Bart., of The Grange, near Wakefield, Yorkshire, for the sum of £400.*

Possibly the opening words as we have restored them are not correct. That this was not the actual picture possessed by Wm. Douglas we know from Sotheby's measurements and our own; but that the two pictures are somehow related they themselves show. Beyond that we cannot go. As to the remainder of the restored portion, we have little doubt that it follows closely the missing original.

Thus the Wellcome portrait, purchased in Norwich, and bearing the name of Sir Thomas Browne written on a manuscript label pasted on the back, is identified as one of the various “Zoust Shakespeares.”

Is it possible that we have by chance exposed an error two hundred years old? Are the Zoust Shakespeares perhaps all portraits of Sir Thomas Browne?

The original (whichever it may be) has long been discredited as a reliable presentment of Shakespeare: Zoust came too late to have painted Shakespeare from life, and if he intended to represent him at all, his portrait must either have been a fanciful one, or else a copy of some other (and there is no portrait of him known as yet which obviously served as Zoust’s original).

But did he in fact attempt to portray Shakespeare? Our evidence consists solely of the statement made by Simon some forty odd years after Zoust’s death.

We are far from making a definite charge of fraud if we suggest that the inscription beneath Simon’s mezzotint may have been incorrect. Maybe the painting was not intended for Shakespeare; maybe it was not even by Zoust. The cheerful self-confidence with which people will assign a portrait to a certain artist, and name the person it represents—and affix labels accordingly, without finding it at all necessary to state whether what they record is a mere opinion or a historical fact—is unfortunately far too familiar to us. Possibly “T. Wright Covent Garden” was a sinner in this respect; possibly Simon himself was. Therefore we are quite prepared to believe that Zoust (if he was the artist) was not attempting Shakespeare at all, but was painting the portrait of a contemporary, its identity being forgotten later.

But it by no means follows that if this person was not Shakespeare, therefore it was Sir Thomas Browne: it might have been some other one of Zoust’s con-

*As a possible help in identifying, at some future date, the catalogue (?) from which this fragment was taken, and thus establishing the history of the picture, the same type has been used as was used for printing the original lines.
temporaries between 1644 and 1681. And as the writer of the manuscript label on
the picture has left no written justification of it as far as we know, he too may
have been one of the class we have just had reason to condemn.

If we look for other evidence to help us to decide, we may think the fact that
the picture was bought in Norwich suggestive*. It is; but not necessarily of
this being Sir Thomas Browne. The very fact that a picture bore that label
would make it more likely to gravitate to the city where his memory is held in
such pious respect by so many admirers. Or if it were nameless, and in Norwich
(possibly the fragment of printing was already there, but already only a fragment),
and the owner wanted to identify it, Sir Thomas Browne's name would easily
suggest itself, and he would be very pleased to detect in his picture a likeness to
the portrait at St Peter Mancroft.

We are therefore thrown back on internal evidence alone, until other evidence
is forthcoming.

If we were to select the Browne portrait which this most resembles, we should
say the one at Norwich; of the Shakespeare portraits, the Chandos. Comparing
it with these two, we think it more like the Browne than the Shakespeare in
general appearance, though the high and rather perpendicular forehead is more
reminiscent of Shakespeare.

All of Shakespeare's portraits represent him as bald over the forehead: the
Wellcome portrait is not that, and it happens to show a little loose lock coming
over the brow, as do so many of Sir Thomas's portraits. Neither the shape of
this, however, nor anything else about the hair, suggests a close connection with
any portrait of Sir Thomas Browne.

Again, the face we see in this picture is that of a comparatively young man†.
It might have been painted circa 1650 when Sir Thomas Browne was 45 years
old‡. Browne became famous at least eight years earlier, and the portrait cannot be
discarded as a Browne portrait on the ground of age. It can only be on the ground
of a lack of resemblance to other better authenticated portraits of probably a later
date.

On this ground, we should hesitate very greatly to affirm, on the evidence,
that the MS. label speaks the truth. But since we cannot absolutely prove that it
does not, from the data so far considered, we must submit it, together with all others
that are not clearly proved to be either copies of known portraits of Sir Thomas, or
else portraits of some-one else, to the test of the skull.

* [It is worth noting, perhaps, that the Soest portraits of the Earles at Heydon Hall date from
before 1667; and the forehead hair-curl and the general hair work of the Gunton portrait, suggest that
the Norwich portrait may have been by Soest, and he might have painted Sir Thomas Browne more
than once. The artist's name is given as 'Zoest' on the Heydon Hall portraits. En.]
† [The Soest portrait of Erasmus Earle must have been painted when he was 60 years old and he
looks to me not very much older than the Soest "Shakespeare." En.]
‡ Horace Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting, under Gerard Soest, gives 1657 as the date of his earliest
English painting, but this has now been thrown back to 1651.
The Sherborne Portrait (Plate V, Fig. 7).

This portrait, bearing the name of "Sir Thomas Browne, M.D." inscribed upon its frame, forms part of the collection at Sherborne House, Northleach, Gloucestershire.

Mr John Lane, the publisher, was shown this picture by the late Lord Sherborne, who was not able to supply any details as to its history beyond those which are inscribed beneath the name, and which read: "Died 1682. Antiquary and Physician. Married a Daughter of Sir Ralph Dutton, Bart." Mr Milner assigns the picture to the period 1650—1665.

In dealing with the above statement, it will be well to set forth such facts as can be traced concerning the connection between Sir Thomas Browne and the Sherborne branch of the Dutton family. For the connection was certainly not the one stated here. Sir Thomas Browne married but once, and his wife was a Miss Dorothy Mileham, who survived him.

His Dutton connection was established at a much earlier period.

After the death of his father in 1613, his mother married again, her second husband being Sir Thomas Dutton, Knt. of Isleworth.

Further details concerning this gentleman are given in the Pedigree of the Garraway Family*, a document which we owe to the research of Mr R. Garraway Rice, F.S.A., barrister-at-law. The second husband of Anne Browne (born Garraway) is here entered as follows:


This carries us back to the grandfather of Sir Thomas Dutton, Foulk Dutton of Chester, who died on April 11th, 1566.

There were several Dutton families in Cheshire at this time, branches of the original Dutton stock. Ormerod in his History of Cheshire gives us pedigrees of the Duttons of Dutton, the Duttons of Hatton, and the Duttons of The Hey; and Fosbroke (Hist. of County of Glos. II. 388) gives the pedigree of the Sherborne branch of the Duttons and refers also to another branch, the Cloughton Duttons. In none of these pedigrees do we find any mention of Foulk Dutton of Chester. We cannot say, therefore, to which Dutton family he belonged.

Turning now to the Sherborne branch, we find that the first Dutton of Sherborne was a Thomas Dutton, a member of one of the Cheshire families, who purchased the Sherborne estate in 1551, and died in 1581. From him the successive owners of Sherborne were as follows†:

* Unpublished, except for the extracts given in this monograph, and in Chas. Williams' notes on "The Pedigree of Sir Thomas Browne."
† From Fosbroke (loc. cit.); and communicated by Lord Sherborne.
Whether Foulk Dutton of Chester, who died 1566, and whose son migrated to
Isleworth, was closely related to Thomas Dutton who settled at Sherborne in 1551
and founded a family there, we do not know. But even if so Foulk Dutton's
grandson, Sir Thomas Dutton, Knt., of Isleworth, would be only slightly connected
with the Sherborne Duttons. We might conjecture from the fact of Sir Thos.
Dutton of Isleworth being also described as "of Gloucester," that intimacy between
the two families might possibly have been promoted by their residence for some
time in the same county; but it will be seen that suppositions as to any connection
whatever are based on the slenderest foundations.

With the known facts in mind, let us examine afresh the inscription beneath
the Sherborne portrait, which reads "Sir Thomas Browne, M.D....Married a Daughter
of Sir Ralph Dutton, Bart.,” and see what mistakes have been crowded into this
brief notice.

(1) Sir Thomas Browne did not marry a Miss Dutton but a Miss Mileham.

(2) Though connected with a Dutton family through his stepfather, this line
was quite distinct from the Duttons of Sherborne.

(3) There is only one Sir Ralph Dutton, Bart., in the whole Sherborne line*. His parents were not married till 1624, and the date of his birth would therefore be later than this. This alleged father-in-law of Sir Thomas Browne did not himself marry until 1674, so that no daughter of his could have been more than 7 years old when Sir Thomas Browne died in 1682, aged 77!

It is obvious that whoever composed the inscription beneath the Sherborne portrait was so entirely ignorant of the facts of the case, that he did not even get Sir Thomas Browne into the appropriate generation. We are very much tempted to wonder whether he did not make a fourth mistake, in naming this a portrait of Sir Thomas Browne. Our misgivings are much increased when we compare this portrait with any of those whose claim to be a portrait of Sir Thomas is well authenticated. And we may find confirmation of our doubts in the considered opinion of the Director of the National Portrait Gallery. He has carefully examined the Sherborne portrait, and come to the conclusion that this is not a portrait of Sir Thomas Browne.

* In "Le Neve's Knights" (Harleian Soc. Pub. p. 267), the name of Sir Thomas Browne's stepfather is given in error as Sir Ralf instead of Sir Thomas Dutton. Perhaps this helped the confusion.
We may be permitted to add here the remarks which have been prefaced by Lord Sherborne to the facts he has been good enough to supply concerning his family history. He writes: "I am not surprised to learn that it is not a portrait of that gentleman" (Sir Th. Browne), "nor do I know who imposed the inscription; but I suspect the author was the same individual who composed the inscriptions on the other pictures in this house, as they are full of mistakes, and the artists wrongly named in almost every instance."

(j) The Devonshire House Group, generally known as the Dobson Group (Plate VI, Fig. 8).

This group consists of a family of six people. The father standing behind to our left, three children in the forefront of the picture, and the mother seated to our right with the youngest child on her knee. It is in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire, and hung at Devonshire House in Piccadilly until the dismantling of the latter in 1921.

Tradition associates this picture with the Browne family, and it has been variously supposed (1) to represent Sir Thomas Browne as an infant on his mother’s knee, with his father, sisters and brother; (2) to represent him as a man, with his wife and four children. We will examine the evidence for and against each of these alternatives in turn.

(1) A correspondent, "C. D.,” writing to the editor of the European Magazine in 1801*, says that he finds a certain memorandum in the handwriting of Dr White Kennet (1660—1728), Bishop of Peterborough, in a copy of Sir Thomas Browne’s Works (1686 edition) which formerly belonged to that prelate. The memorandum states that Elizabeth Littleton (daughter of Sir Thomas Browne) lent to the writer in Nov. 1712, a copy of the Rev. John Whitefoot’s account of her father’s life, and that in it was a note in Mrs Littleton’s handwriting which he, Bishop Kennet, proceeds to copy. The note as it reaches us from Mrs Littleton via Bishop Kennet, “C. D.,” and the European Magazine, includes the following statement concerning Sir Thomas Browne:

"His picture is at the Duke of Devonshire’s house in Piccadilly in his mother’s lap. His father, mother, brother, and sisters in it. A family picture, his father being nearly related to that Countess of Devonshire whose picture is in the first room with her three sons by her, and very like to Sir Thomas Brown’s father, as the servants shew to persons who go to see the picture, which is so good painting, that my Lord Duke values it at four hundred pounds."

This written memorandum of Mrs Littleton’s, passed on to us through three transcriptions, is the authority upon which are based two statements frequently made: first, that we have in the so-called Dobson Group from Devonshire House a portrait of Sir Thomas Browne as a child; second, that he had two sisters and one brother. As far as I can discover, this memorandum is the sole authority for these statements. And indeed, unless there are any facts with which it is impossible to reconcile them, we should be inclined to consider the evidence good; though we might put in a caveat to the effect that a child having only two sisters and a

brother at the age of three to four (the age of the child in the picture), might possibly become possessed of more as time went on, and that it might be wiser in our historians not to limit the number definitely to three*.

Unfortunately the church of St Michael-le-Quern, Cheapside, was destroyed in the Great Fire, and with it its parish registers containing records of births and deaths in the family of Thomas Browne, mercer, of that parish, father of the future knight of the same name. Nor has any record as yet been found of the marriage of Thomas Browne and Anne Garraway. This record, if found, would tell us whether it was possible for a fourth child of their marriage to be born by October 19, 1605, the date of Sir Thomas's birth. Some facts are however known concerning the family, mainly through the researches of the late Mr Charles Williams of Norwich.

(i) Thomas Browne, the father, died in the year 1613, at some date between September 29th, when his will was made, and December 4th, when probate was granted.

His son Thomas would be 8 years old at this time.

(ii) He bequeathed the bulk of his wealth to “Anne my loving wife,” and “Thomas Browne, Anne Browne, Jane Browne, and Mary Browne, the children of me the said Thomas Browne and Anne Browne my wife” and to another child not yet born.

Now, although the daughters were doubtless named in the order of their births, the will offers no evidence that Thomas was at that time the eldest of the family, since it was the custom then, as also now, to mention the sons before the daughters. Even if it had proved him eldest, the high rate of mortality among children which an examination of the Browne pedigree reveals† would quite prepare us for his being the youngest of four in 1608–9, and the eldest of four in 1613.

There is nothing therefore in any records that have as yet been traced, to conflict with Mrs Littleton's statement as to brothers and sisters. We now turn to the evidence of the picture. Again we have the advantage of Mr Milner's report on this Group-Portrait, after a very careful examination.

(i) The two eldest children on the left are undoubtedly girls and the two youngest on the right boys: this is shown by the kind of dress worn, and by the fact, among others, that the girls wear pink and the boys blue, a tradition which survives with our babies today.

(ii) In the bottom right-hand corner, near the mother with the child in her lap, a skull is figured. This, he says, means either that the mother was already dead when this family group was painted; or that the child in her lap had died previously (the skull is placed equally near to both); or, less usually, that the skull was a general reminder of mortality.

It is obvious that if the skull conveys either of the first two meanings, the child in the mother's lap is not whom we have supposed, since Mrs Browne survived to become Lady Dutton, and Thomas survived to write Religio Medici.

(iii) The picture was painted in 1633 at the very earliest, and more probably not until 1640—50.

* See, among others, Mr Edmund Gosse's statement, p. 3 of Sir Thomas Browne (Macmillan & Co. 1905).
Then—it cannot have been painted in 1608-9. We are sorry; but the Director of the National Portrait Gallery is adamant. 1633 is the earliest possible date for the costumes; and though people may sometimes dress in a fashion long out of date, no family anticipates correctly the fashions of twenty-five years ahead.

We must conclude therefore that the Family Group tells us nothing of Sir Thomas as a little child. Hence it follows either that Elizabeth Littleton was misinformed, as people may easily be about family events of a century before; or that she was referring to some other picture at Devonshire House. Mr Francis Thompson, Librarian at Chatsworth, has been good enough to answer my questions on this point. There is no other picture in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire to which Mrs Littleton's description of the Browne Family-Portrait could apply; nor yet is there any group of a "Countess of Devonshire, her three sons by her," to whom the father in the first group was said to bear a resemblance.

In this connection it is worthy of note that Mrs Littleton's statement was handed on in manuscript by three different hands—her own, Bishop Kennet's, and "C. D.'s"—before it appeared in print: if a slight illegibility in any of these handwritings has led to a mis-reading of "three sons" for "two sons," the Countess in question might be the one in the disputed "Honthorst Group" whose history the Devonshire family has lost. Failing this, it is possible that both of the Group-Portraits existed as Mrs Littleton described them, but that both were lost in the fire at Devonshire House, to which the editor of the European Magazine refers in a note to Mrs Littleton's statement*. (2)

The other claim made for this portrait is that it represents Sir Thomas Browne with his wife and four children. This statement is derived from Horace Walpole, who, in giving a list of portraits by W. Dobson, says, "at Devonshire House is another family-piece of Sir Thomas Brown, author of Religio Medici, his wife, two sons and as many daughters†." Here we have an identification of the persons in the group which certainly accords very well with the date prescribed by the costumes. A difficulty arises, however, from the fact that Dobson died in 1646, whereas Sir Thomas Browne's third child was not born until that year‡, he having married in 1641§. It seems therefore that the picture must either be not by Dobson, or not of Sir Thomas Browne and his family. It is suggested by Mr Collins Baker‖ that it may have been by Isaac Fuller, whose style much resembled Dobson's. But could it represent Sir Thomas Browne? The pedigree may help us.

From this we gather the following details as to the births of his children, and

* Mr Thompson has been unable to trace any reference to this fire in the family records; but as the Editor of the European Magazine referred to it in 1801, it must have been before that date.
† Vol. iii. of his Collected Works, in four volumes, p. 237.
§ Memorial tablet in Church of St Peter Mancroft, Norwich. See Plate XIV.
we include the date of the death of all who did not live to the age of twenty-one years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Daughter; died 1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Daughter; died 1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Son; died 1662.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Twin sons; died 1656 (aged 14 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can we make any possible selection from these to correspond with the four children in the picture—the two eldest, girls; the two youngest, boys? To do so, we should have to date the picture 1657, making the youngest child an infant of not more than fourteen months, one of the twin sons born in 1656; and it is difficult to believe that the boy in his mother’s lap was only just over a year old. We should also have to admit the improbable circumstance that Sir Thomas Browne left out two sons and two daughters from the family group. Further we should have to reconcile ourselves to the belief that the father of this family was the same man as we have seen appear already under different guises, but never so completely transformed as here*. 

The effort is too much for us, and we find it easier to believe that if Horace Walpole is to be convicted of only one mistake in his mention of this picture, he was probably better informed in attributing the painting to Dobson, than in making Sir Thomas Browne and Family its subject. Or, of course, we could consign the picture he described to the same fire at Devonshire House as has already screened Mrs Littleton’s reputation as a chronicler.

It would appear that a copy of this picture is somewhere in existence, for a photograph which was bequeathed by Mr Chas. Williams to Norwich Castle Museum shows this group with certain variations in detail which can hardly be accounted for by any “touching-up” of the photographic plate (see our Plate VIbis). This photograph is the same as is reproduced in the Souvenir of Sir Thomas Browne (1905). It differs from the picture in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire in several minor points. Thus the arrangement of the flowers in the hands of the

* It has been suggested that this family group, in some way associated by the traditions with Sir Thomas Browne, might represent Sir Thomas Browne’s mother with her second husband, Sir Thomas Dutton, and their children. He died in 1634, so the picture could only have been painted, if its earliest date be 1633, thirty years after his wife’s first marriage. It is highly improbable that she and he would then have any children of the ages in the picture! It is curious, however, that the men in both the Sherborne and Devonshire House portraits have a certain family resemblance, and both pictures have independently been linked with the Dutton family.
elder girl is different; the second girl has a row of buttons down the front of her
dress instead of ribbon, etc.

There is an inscription on the back of the photograph, in Mr Williams' hand-
writing, which reads "Oil-painting by Vansomer in Devonshire House, Piccadilly." But this need not be taken as literally exact. Just as Mr Williams does not mention
here that the painting is only attributed to Vansomer (to make the date square
with the age of the supposed Sir Thomas) so he omits to state, what is apparently
the case, that the photograph was not taken from the original picture, but only from
some copy. We regret that we are not able to add the whereabouts of this copy.

(k) Conclusions. With the "Dobson Group" we complete our survey of the early
engravings and of all the other portraits known to us which claim to reproduce
the features of Sir Thomas Browne. The Sherborne, the Devonshire House, and
probably the Wellcome, may be regarded as cases of mistaken identity; the 1669
engraving (5th edition, Pseudodoxia) as a deliberate imposture. The engravings by
Van Hove and Van der Banck, and probably that by White; the Royal College of
Physicians' and Bodleian paintings;—all these, together with the numerous repro-
ductions to which they have given rise, may be put on one side as mere echoes
of the miniature, some clearer, some more confused. The Gunton, again, reflects
the Norwich. And from the crowd there emerge only the Norwich painting, the
Buccleuch miniature, possibly the plumbago drawing, and the Wellcome portrait
to submit themselves to the tests which the skull will supply.

(III) History of the Skull.

The history of the skull of Sir Thomas Browne is here recorded as it emerges
after much disentangling of fact from rumour, and much testing of tradition by
contemporary records*. Sir Thomas Browne died on October 19th, 1682, and five
days later† his body was consigned to what was thought to be its last resting-place,
a vault below the chancel of the church of St Peter Mancroft, Norwich.

Inscriptions in the chancel‡ commemorate the previous interment there of two
of his grandsons, children of his daughter Anne and her husband Henry Fairfax.
Both boys were named Barker Fairfax: one died in 1670, the other in 1673.
Another inscription records the burial beneath the chancel of his daughter Mary,
in 1676. In the absence of evidence it seems probable that the vault which after-
wards received the remains of the great Physician had been built in 1670 or before,
and held already the remains of these three descendants who had predeceased him.

* I here express my grateful appreciation to Dr Sydney Long, M.D., Physician to the Norfolk and
Norwich Hospital, for his generous and valuable help in searching out these records, a help given
unstintingly in other directions too, whenever it was asked; also to Mr Douro T. Potter, Sexton of
St Peter Mancroft, for the information and assistance readily given in all matters relating to the
church and its records.

† Burial recorded Oct. 24th, 1682, in church register.

‡ A complete list of the inscriptions in the church was given in 1723 by Mr Benjamin Mackerell,
Author of the History of King's Lynn, in a MS. volume preserved in the British Museum, and entitled
"The Monumental Inscriptions, Fenestral and other Arms, in the Parish Churches of the City of
Norwich."
After a little over two years of widowhood Lady Browne died, on February 24th, 1685, and the vault was again opened that her coffin might be placed beside that of her husband. The mural inscription dedicated to her is the last of those relating to the family of Sir Thomas Browne in the church.

Our next information with regard to the resting-place of the distinguished Doctor comes from the pen of Mr Benjamin Mackerell, who copied the inscriptions etc. of this and other churches of Norwich, in the year 1723, and who, after recording that on the mural monument of Sir Thomas Browne, wrote the following.*

"The Late Dr. Jeffery gave notice to Sr. Thomas Browne's nearest Relative that his Vault wanted Reparation, who sent him word It might be filled up, which when the Dr. knew, desired that he might be Interred therin, who shortly after Dying His Corps was Deposited in the Vault & Afterwards filled up with Earth and over the Doctor on a Stone is this Ins.

M.S. Johannis Jeffery S.T.P. etc.......... Aprilis Ærae Xnae 1720, Ætatis suae 73."

The Dr Jeffery to whom reference is here made was appointed "minister" of St Peter Mancroft four years before the death of Sir Thomas Browne; and to him in 1716 was confided the task of editing Christian Morals, when this missing manuscript was at last discovered.

Thus to the remains of Sir Thomas Browne, of Lady Dorothy Browne, and probably of their daughter and two little grandsons, were added those of his friend and admirer, Dr John Jeffery. The vault which enclosed them was then filled in with earth†. A period of 120 years now elapsed. During this time the lead of which Sir Thomas Browne's coffin was made gradually became corroded, until at last it was "completely decomposed and changed into a carbonate which crumbled at the touch‡." The accidental "touch" which broke open this now fragile shell was given in the year 1840. In August of this year, excavation beneath the chancel floor proceeded afresh, in order to prepare a new vault for the reception of the body of Mrs Bowman, wife of the then incumbent of St Peter Mancroft. In the course of these operations the workmen dug right into the earth which had been carried there in 1720; a blow of their pickaxes struck and pierced a coffin concealed by the soil; and an examination of the brass coffin-plate revealed the fact that the human remains which were thus exposed were those of their most famous citizen.

The date of Mrs Bowman's death was Saturday, August 8th, 1840. Operations in the chancel would not be begun before the following Monday, August 10th, and we may take this day, or the next, as the one on which the discovery was made. Norwich at that time boasted two newspapers, weeklies. By Saturday, August 29th, the following item of news found its way into the Norwich Mercury:

"While the persons employed in opening the ground for the interment of the late Mrs Bowman were at their work, they accidentally struck a coffin and exposed the corpse, which proved to be that of the great Sir Thomas Browne. The features it is told us were perfect, and especially

* MS. in Brit. Mus. loc. cit.
† This is a step frequently taken in the case of vaults which are no longer in condition to support safely the church paving above them.
‡ See letter p. 35.
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the beard. Sir Thomas was accounted one of the handsomest men of his time” (the journalistic touch!). “The circumstance becoming known the men deemed it best to cover the remains immediately.”

It is evident from the last sentence that the news became somewhat bruited about, and that the attention and visitors attracted were such as to make the workmen uneasy, so that they deemed it best to cover from view what they had found. Persons in authority in the church however, such as the sexton (at that time “lord of the dead”), the churchwardens (the responsible officials in any alterations to the fabric), or any to whom they might give permission, would still be able to examine the remains, as long as they were accessible. This we may take to be until Friday, August 14th, at latest: on that day Mrs Bowman was buried, and the work of sealing the vault and replacing the chancel floor would be completed the same day, in order to allow time for the cleaning of the church in readiness for the following Sunday. Thus, we gather that for four days at most—August 10th to August 14th—and maybe for less, it was possible to have access to the coffin, and that during that time others, besides the workmen, viewed its contents.

The writer of the newspaper paragraph quoted above does not claim himself to have been among the eye-witnesses, and in the following number of the Mercury (Saturday, September 5th) his account is corrected by one who actually saw the remains. This is a Mr John Wortley of Norwich, who sends the following letter to the Editor:

“Observing in your paper of last week a paragraph stating that the remains of Sir Thomas Browne were found in a state of great preservation, I beg leave to correct the report given by your correspondent, that the head and features were perfect,—such was not the case, nothing more was found than in ordinary instances, the bones being perfectly bare; the skull was of the finest conformation, the forehead being beautifully developed.”

The inaccuracies with which this second description closes evoked a letter from another eye-witness in the next issue of the Mercury (Saturday, September 12th):

“Sir, Allow me to correct the errors of your last week’s correspondent with respect to Sir Thomas Browne’s relics. It is true that no trace of the ‘features’ remained, but the ‘beard’ was in good preservation, and of a fine auburn colour; the forehead was remarkably small and depressed; the head unusually long.”

This correspondent was a Mr Robert Fitch, of whom more anon. His version in the Mercury remained uncontradicted.

On the same date, September 12th, there appeared a more detailed account in the Mercury’s contemporary, the Norfolk Chronicle. It found a place in the editorial news-column, as an item of news of which “we are informed.” The account is as follows:

“On the occasion of an interment which recently took place in the chancel of St Peter Man-croft Church, in this city—the workmen employed to prepare the new vault, broke with a blow of their pick-axe, the lid of a coffin, which proved to be that of one, whose birth and residence within its walls conferred honour on Norwich of the olden time—the once celebrated and still by his writings well-known Sir Thomas Browne. This accidental circumstance afforded an opportunity of inspecting the remains. The bones of the skeleton were found to be in good preservation, particularly those of the skull. The brain was considerable in quantity but changed
to a state of adipocere—resembling ointment of a dark brown hue. The hair of the beard remained profuse and perfect though the flesh of the face as well as of every other part, was totally gone. With respect to the conformation of the head, we are informed that the forehead was remarkably low, but the back of the cranium exhibited an unusual degree of capaciousness.—The coffin-plate was of brass, in the form of a shield, and bore the following inscription:

AMPLISSIMUS VIR
DNS. THOMAS BROWNE, MILES, MEDICINAE
DR. ANNOS NATUS 77 DENATUS 12* DNI
MENSIS OCTOBRIS, ANNO DNI. 1682. HOC
LOCULO INDORMIENS, CORPORIS SPAGY-
RICI PULVERE PLUMBUM IN AURUM
CONVERTIT.

For the accuracy, in every respect, of the above copy we can safely vouch, since it is carefully taken from an actual impression of the engraving on the plate. Not so, however, as to the ‘doing into English,’ which is here subjoined merely for the use of ‘readers in general.’—Whether the last two lines of the original latinity were meant to predict an alchemic transmutation, or to express a hyperbolical compliment, we leave to the learned, with this remark that the coffin is still a leaden one.” (Here follows a translation of the inscription.)

Thus the account in the Norfolk Chronicle of September 12th. Again the Editor “is informed”: no name is given. It is interesting, however, to compare the wording of this account with that contained in a letter sent on December 4th of the same year to the Treasurer of the Society of Antiquaries† (London), bearing the signature “Robert Fitch.” This letter forms part of a volume of MS. letters bequeathed by the late Mr Charles Williams to Norwich Castle Museum, and runs as follows:

“Norwich, December 4th, 1840.

Dear Sir,

Feeling confident that anything connected with the history of one of the greatest men of his age will be interesting to the Fellows of the Antiquarian Society, I send you a short account of the discovery of the remains of the celebrated Sir Thomas Browne in the church of St Peter Mancroft, in this city. . . . . . . . n who were employed in digging a vault in the church, accidentally broke with a blow of their pick-axes the lid of a coffin which proved to be that of one whose residence within its walls conferred honour on Norwich of the olden times. This circumstance afforded an opportunity of inspecting the remains. The bones of the skeleton were found to be in good preservation, particularly those of the skull. The forehead was remarkably low and depressed, the head unusually long; the back part exhibiting an uncommon appearance of depth and capaciousness. The brain was considerable in quantity, quite brown and unctuous. The hair profuse and perfect of a fine auburn colour. The coffin-plate which was also broken was of brass, in the form of an antique shield, and bore the following inscription:” (here follows the inscription, with the date of death given rightly as October 19th) “I succeeded in taking a few impressions from the plate, will you present one to the Antiquarian Society?

There was another singular circumstance connected with the discovery. The lead of which the coffin was made was completely decomposed and changed to a carbonate which crumbled

* The day of the month was here mis-read from the plate as twelve. The “19” of the inscription is followed by a dot, which makes it look somewhat like “12”. See reproduction of plate in Mr Chas. Williams’ Souvenir of Sir Thomas Browne.

† The letter was read at a meeting of the Society on December 10th following, and an abstract of its contents is given in the Gentleman’s Magazine, Vol. xv. New Series, 1841.

‡ Words obliterated in the MS.
at the touch. Now as the substratum is chalk (carbonate of lime) would the carbonic acid in the chalk cause in so short a time as 160 years the complete decomposition? but this is not an antiquarian question.

I have the honour to be
Dr. Sir
Yours faithfully
ROBERT FITCH

Thomas Amyot Esq.,
Treasurer of the Antiquarian Society"

If we compare this letter of December 4th with the account in the *Chronicle* of September 12th we must conclude either (1) that Mr Fitch in phrasing his letter made use of the version sent to that paper by another witness, whose testimony agreed with his own given shortly on the same date in the *Mercury*, and who, like himself, had rubbings of the plate, or (2) that Mr Fitch, contenting himself with a brief correction in the *Mercury* of the mistakes of its correspondent, reserved the more detailed communication for the paper he preferred. Either alternative would serve, but the second seems more probable, especially if we suspect that Mr Fitch had reasons for not wishing his name to figure too prominently in local discussions of the affair, and requested the Editor of the *Chronicle* not to refer to the source of his "information."

We have then here (on September 12th and December 4th) three entirely consistent accounts of the finding and contents of the coffin of Sir Thomas Browne, two of which appeared in Norwich papers within a month of its having been inspected by several other persons. The fact that these remained uncontradicted is worthy of notice. It gives us, however, only negative evidence of their accuracy, and what is more important for appraising the value of these accounts, is an enquiry into the character and reputation of the witness who furnishes us with two of them, and probably also with the third.

Our questions concerning Mr Fitch find an answer in the following excerpt from Charles Mackie's *Norfolk Annals*:

"Mr Fitch.....was a partner in the firm of Fitch and Chambers, chemists and druggists, Norwich. In 1858 he was appointed upon the commission of the peace, and in 1867 became Sheriff of Norwich. He was connected with the directorate of several public companies, and for more than thirty years was an honorary secretary of the Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society. Among his literary contributions to the Society's proceedings was an admirable description of 'The Gates of Norwich.' Mr Fitch was widely known as a collector, and possessed one of the finest private collections in the kingdom, which some years before his death he handed over to the Trustees of the Norfolk and Norwich Museum."

We may add that he was a Fellow of the Geological Society, and of the Society of Antiquaries. Also that he attended the church which held the remains of Sir Thomas Browne disturbed in 1840, and was appointed to the office of churchwarden there five years later, in 1845.

If one reflects on the characteristics that are implied by this record, one concludes that ability, observation, capacity for detail, a mind alive to many interests and energy in the pursuit of these were prominent among them.

An incident that must here be recorded throws another side-light upon his character. It will be remembered that in his letter to the Treasurer of the Society of Antiquaries*, Mr Fitch mentions having taken a few impressions from the coffin-plate, though without implying that he had removed the plate in order to do so. It evidently became known in Norwich (how, it is not essential to the present enquiry to discover) that the plate had been taken from the coffin; and it was suspected that it was in Mr Fitch's possession. Probably this suspicion was voiced on many occasions. Of one occasion towards the end of his life, however, we have a definite record. The present sexton of St Peter Mancroft was appointed to the position in the year 1893; two years before the death of Mr Fitch, and he makes the following statement, a statement confirmed by contemporary records†:

"It was known that the late Mr Robert Fitch possessed some paper impressions from the plate which belonged to the coffin of Sir Thomas Browne. He (Mr Fitch) was questioned by the late Mr Charles Williams as to what became of the plate after the impressions were taken. He said it was returned to the sexton who probably put it away in one of the church chests. The late Rev. W. Pelham Burn, who was then vicar, ordered me to search for it in the chests and drawers. I made search but could not find it. Mr Fitch died on April 4th, 1895, and soon after his death the plate was found in a 'secret well' of a desk that had been used by him. The late Mr John Fitch, his son, returned the plate to the vicar in the following June, when it was placed in a case in the sacristy where it remains today. Some time after the return of the plate, Mr Charles Williams was collecting matter for a pamphlet he was writing about Sir Thomas Browne, and while I was helping him to search the church records I asked him if the story I had heard about Mr Fitch and the coffin-plate, and which I have just related, was true. His answer was 'Yes',"

We gather therefore, that Mr Fitch's antiquarian zeal sometimes led him to take steps which he was not afterwards prepared to admit, and even went so far as to deny. This incident may lead us to question the entire suitability of Mr Fitch for the office of churchwarden, but does nothing to call the value of his evidence as antiquarian in question. That he was a keen antiquarian his works do testify, and where the two interests clashed, we see it was not the latter that gave way.

Thus we feel we may accept without misgiving the accounts given on September 12th and December 4th, 1840, and rely upon their description of the contents of the coffin and of the human remains which it enclosed. They also give a detailed description of a skull whose peculiarities are sufficiently well marked for a verbal picture to serve to distinguish it from most other skulls.

We turn now to another contemporary record which has been handed down to posterity: one which figures for us the skull discovered and handled in 1840 with more exactness than the most minute verbal description could convey. This document consists of a plaster-cast, in the keeping of the Norwich Castle Museum, and entered in the catalogue there as "Cast in plaster from the skull of Sir Thomas Browne presented by Mr Charles Muskett on October 25th, 1841."

* See p. 35.
We may confirm the details given in this entry by reference to the next Museum Report* after this date, viz. the report of 1842.

The same report acknowledges the presentation of a "Phrenological Collection" of skull-casts by another donor; and it is evident, from the omission of the facial portion and most of the base in Sir Thomas Browne's cast, that we owe this plastic record to the keen interest which phrenology excited at that time. A lecture on phrenology had in fact been given in Norwich a few months before the finding of the skull and had aroused much discussion†.

But who was Mr Charles Muskett? Dr Long has kindly furnished me with the answer to this query:—Charles Muskett was a well-known Norwich printer and publisher whose place of business was no. 5 the Old Haymarket, just opposite the church of St Peter Mancroft. He had antiquarian interests; he published, and issued from his own printing-press in 1850, a large illustrated folio volume entitled Notices and Illustrations of the Costumes, Processions, Pageantry, etc. formerly displayed by the Corporation of Norwich. He, like Mr Fitch, was a prominent parishioner at St Peter Mancroft and held the office of churchwarden there from Easter 1848 to Easter 1850. We shall probably be correct in surmising that he was one of the persons who inspected the remains in situ when the accident to the coffin became known. It seems also very likely that he was a friend of Mr Fitch: certainly they must have been closely acquainted‡.

Whether Mr Muskett himself made the cast presented in 1841 we do not know. It is obvious that for the cast to be made the skull must have been taken from the grave; by whom, and whether by permission of the workmen, sexton, or churchwardens (or actually by one of these), again we do not know. There are hearsay accounts which attempt to fill in this gap in our information, but we will reserve those till later, and deal here with our store of actually ascertainable facts. There is no record in the Diocesan Faculty Book of alterations to the church in 1840–1; there are no Church inscriptions, and no entries in the parish register, relating to other burials in the chancel during that time; "moonlighting" when once Mrs Bowman's vault was sealed, and the very heavy marble slabs were fitted in above it, would require more time and assistants than would be safe. So the skull must have been taken during the preparation of Mrs Bowman's vault.

Possibly the intention was to return it; quite probably it was only "borrowed," for casting. But the utmost limit of time during which it was accessible was four days and probably less; out of that we have to allow for the news to be spread about and attract an inconvenient number of visitors; and the time still remaining in which the skull could be taken, cleaned, cast, and returned was all too likely to prove inadequate. This, concerning the possible intention to return it, is mere speculation. But the salient fact remains that Sir Thomas Browne's skull was taken from the coffin between August 10th and August 14th, 1840.

* In 1841 this Museum was not housed in Norwich Castle as now, and was called the "Norfolk and Norwich Museum."
‡ His name appears in the 1850 list of members of the Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society (founded 1846) and he remained a member till his death about six years later.
To this fact we may add another: it was never returned. The skull which has been preserved as that of Sir Thomas Browne for more than seventy years in the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital Museum answers to every point of the description left on record by Mr Fitch and we identify it as the original of the cast given by Mr Muskett.

The history of its wanderings from the grave to the hospital is incomplete; nor can we date its arrival more exactly than by saying it was before October 19th, 1848. This date is furnished from the Hospital Museum records by Dr Long, who writes as follows:

"The first separate pathological Museum that we had at the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital was built in 1845, and formally opened on the 10th of September of that year. Previously the pathological specimens had been arranged in galleries round the operating theatre. Mr Donald Dalrymple was then Hon. Curator of the Museum, having been appointed on December 3rd, 1844. At a meeting of the Museum committee on October 19th, 1848, 'The Secretary (Mr D. Dalrymple) announced that since the last meeting (June 29th, 1848) a complete catalogue of all the contents of the Museum had been made, that every preparation had been classed, numbered, described, and labelled under his directions, and that the work had been most thoroughly performed by Mr Harper, the sub-curator.'

Mr Dalrymple's catalogue is still in the possession of the Hospital Museum; and item no. 641, N. 5 is therein described as 'Cranium of the celebrated Sir Thomas Browne.' By the side of this entry, in the column headed 'Whence derived,' is written 'Dr Lubbock.' The handwriting is the same as for all the other items."

Thus it is clear that the skull was in the possession of the Hospital Museum by October 19th, 1848, though the Museum has no record to show how long it had been there. In 1894 Mr Charles Williams and Mr James Hooper stated variously (1) that Dr Lubbock presented it in 1845, (2) that it was handed to the Museum Authorities after his death in 1847.

One circumstance may be mentioned here which tends to support the second of these alternatives. In July–August 1847 the Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland held its meetings in Norwich. It will be remembered that

* For the detailed comparison between the Norwich Castle Museum cast and the skull preserved, see later, pp. 45–51.
† Extract from Minute-Book of the Museum Committee of the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital.
‡ Mr James Hooper was a journalist and writer on local antiquarian subjects. Both he and Mr Williams have died within the last few years, and neither was of an age to recall the events of 1840–8, though they might have got first-hand evidence from older men still living in 1894. The Rev. Chas. Turner uses the word "presented" in a letter written in 1885 (see p. 43).
§ See Notes and Queries, 8th series, Vol. vi. Sept. 22 and Oct. 6, 1894.
∥ Mr Hooper adds that a lock of Sir Thomas' hair was given with the skull. As to this, Dr Long informs me that a lock of hair was preserved with the skull in the Hospital Museum, though it is unfortunately now missing. This lock was however presented by Mr Chas. Williams in 1888, as he himself states (Catalogue of the Portraits in the Board Room of the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital, pub. 1890). Nothing has been found to show how Mr Williams obtained it, and nothing as to its earlier history. Dr Long, however, confirmed the statement that the hair was auburn in colour. There was also a lock of hair, said to be Sir Thomas Browne's, in the possession of the late Sir William Osler; Lady Osler states that this was obtained from a Mrs Wilkin of Norwich, and, as it was not specifically mentioned in Sir William's will, had to be sold with a large number of his books, at the order of his Executors. It was bought by Messrs Tregaskis, Booksellers of London, and has now been sold by them to Mr Sherman, an American professor.
Mr Fitch was closely associated with the local Archaeological Association*, and on this occasion he repeated for the benefit of their visitors the account he had already given in 1840 of the finding of Sir Thomas Browne’s coffin, using much the same words as before†.

His account is reported in the *Proceedings of the Archaeological Institute* for that year†. To “the hair profuse and perfect, of a fine auburn colour” are added in this report the words “similar to that in the portrait presented to the parish by Dr Howman, and exhibited at the meeting of the Institute in 1847, and which is carefully preserved in the vestry of St Peter Mancroft.” It seems probable that if the skull had been exhibited, as well as the picture, this fact would also have been mentioned. It seems likely, too, that if the skull were already on show in the Hospital Museum, it too would have been borrowed by someone for this occasion, or at least referred to, to illustrate the description given.

Dr Lubbock died on March 4th, 1847, and his affairs would not be settled and his effects distributed until about six months or more from that date. If, as Mr Hooper stated, the skull was given to the Hospital Museum after his death, it would not have been handed over by July 29th when the Archaeological Institute met in Norwich, nor would he himself be alive to lend it, if he so wished.

We cannot, however, presume too far on the assumption that if the skull had been in the Hospital Museum by August 1847, it would have been exhibited, because we know that the skull-cast had been in the Norfolk and Norwich Museum since 1841, and that it also was not referred to with a view to illustrating “the forehead remarkably low and depressed” etc. Still, the skull-cast was not likely to have attracted so much attention as the skull, nor the fact of its existence in a public Museum to be so widely known: those who had most to do with its presence there were perhaps unwilling to call attention to it, and apparently no one else produced it for the edification of the visiting society.

**Summary.** We will now resume briefly the facts that may be considered established in the history of the skull we have been considering:

- The coffin was broken into during excavations on August 10th or 11th, 1840.
- The coffin-plate, the skull and some locks of hair were taken from the coffin at some time between August 10th and August 14th.
- In the course of the month following, reports of the discovery appeared in the local press from three, or possibly four, different sources.
- One of the observers was Mr Fitch, an antiquarian of some ability, who gave a description of the remains which he amplified a few weeks later in a letter to the

---

* He was one of the original members enrolled at the founding of the Society in 1846. He was both Hon. Treasurer and Hon. Secretary for about 30 years, resigning from the former post in 1887, and from the latter a year later.
† See p. 85.
Society of Antiquaries. This included a careful description of the singular characters of the skull, and was accompanied by rubbings of the coffin-plate.

On October 25th, 1841, a plaster-cast of the skull was presented to the Norfolk and Norwich Museum (now Norwich Castle Museum).

At some date before October 19th, 1848, and probably during the year 1847, the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital became possessed of a skull, which is entered in their earliest catalogue as "The skull of Sir Thomas Browne," and which corresponds both with the description published within four weeks of the discovery in 1840, and with the plaster-cast taken probably at the same time, and certainly before October 25th, 1841.

A lock of hair,—of the colour observed at the time of discovery—which was preserved with the skull for some years from 1888 onwards, is now missing. A lock, said also to be of Sir Thomas Browne's hair, is now in America.

The coffin-plate, also removed in 1840, was restored to the church of St Peter Mancroft in 1895, and is now in the sacristy. The skull itself, preserved in the Museum of the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital since before October 1848, was re-interred beneath the chancel of St Peter Mancroft on July 4th, 1922.

Objections considered. Our researches have fully justified the tradition carried down through two generations that here was the skull of the great Sir Thomas Browne. And it is instructive to see what type of objection has been raised here and there against this tradition since the generation that remembered passed away, and the evidence they left was lost sight of by their successors.

It has been objected* that this cannot have been the skull of Sir Thomas Browne, because it is obviously the skull of a woman. Now it is a fact well known to every craniological student that skulls vary very considerably in the degree in which they manifest the characteristic sexual traits. Some may be classified at once and without doubt as male, or as female, while others may give rise to difference of opinion. It is in the first of these two groups that we put the skull in question: this is one that has strongly marked male characteristics. The prominent supra-orbital ridges, the well-defined inion, the irregular occipital surface with its well-marked ridges for muscular attachments, the robust mastoids—these and other features leave little room for doubt as to the sex.

Again we are cautioned that "an American surgeon," on being shown the skull of Sir Thomas Browne, "laughed heartily and replied that for his part he should class it as that of a Peruvian!" Alas, Sir Thomas—who, if thou didst jest by accident wouldst "blush at the levity of it"—that thou shouldst be made the subject of this transatlantic joke! For that such it is, we might be able to convince the correspondent who reports it so seriously, if he would come and examine here at the Royal College of Surgeons a series of the artificially-deformed crania referred to. The difficulty, however, of associating the low forehead of Sir Thomas Browne with the high intellectual capacity he evidences, has been felt by others than the

* Letter to Sir Arthur Keith.
American surgeon. I suggest that it is their previously-conceived ideas on this subject which need revision; a high brow does not invariably denote intelligence nor is it a necessary condition of the same.

Another difficulty has been suggested by the references to “the hair profuse and perfect of a fine auburn colour.” It has been hinted that this description by Mr Fitch is so unlikely to be correct (Sir Thomas being 77 at the time of his death) that it casts a doubt upon the value of any of Mr Fitch’s evidence*. The alternative suggestion, which Mr Williams also made†, is that Sir Thomas Browne wore, and was buried in, a wig. I do not think we can adopt either of these suggestions. As regards the latter, Sir Thomas gives his views on wigs in a letter to his son Thomas in November 1664:—“Be sober and complacent, If you would quit periwigs it would be better and more for your credit.” This was eighteen years before his death; but since we know from the Rev. John Whitefoot’s much-quoted description that no change of mode induced him to abandon his sober and old-fashioned cloak, we can be reasonably certain that he also maintained to the end his prejudice against wigs. As to the other theory, that Mr Fitch reported incorrectly: the difficulty about the colour is removed by the fact that hair of persons long buried is commonly found to have acquired a reddish tinge, whatever the original shade. Again, as to the “profusion” of the hair‡: it is not impossible, even in these degenerate days, to find a septuagenarian of whom it is quite untrue to say that:

“…… years of sorrow and of care
Have made his head come through his hair.”

In this connection, however, it should be pointed out that the earlier accounts§ only refer to the “hair of the beard,” and perhaps Mr Fitch on December 4th|| had this more in mind than the hair of the head, although he there omits to particularize.

One final argument against us shall be stated here with the same candour as has been observed hitherto. It comes from a gentleman who remembers a friend now deceased telling him of an experience made during alterations to the chancel of St Peter Mancroft at the end of the last century. The friend tested one of the lead coffins in a vault—not Sir Thomas Browne’s coffin, but a coffin—and found it to be composed of lead an inch thick. Therefore the labour of extracting Sir Thomas Browne’s skull would be impossibly great under the conditions obtaining. Having calculated that a coffin made of lead an inch thick would weigh about half a ton, and estimated at nil the chances of its having been used, we refuse to be daunted in our belief by this narrative. Lead coffins, moreover, do crack, corrode, and crumble, and the experience of the present sexton, Mr Douro Potter, furnishes many examples.

† Notes and Queries, Oct. 6, 1894.
‡ [The portraits taken possibly about ten years before his death show a good profusion of hair. The words used in the Proceedings of the Archaeological Institute (see our p. 40) suggest that the colour of the hair in the St Peter Mancroft portrait was originally light or at least of a visible colour, and this would correspond with the Gunton copy. Ed.]
§ See pp. 34 and 35.
|| See p. 35.
similar to the one described in the account of the finding of Sir Thomas Browne's remains.

_A Disputed Item._ The imperfect history of the skull has now been given, and difficulties in the way of accepting it dealt with. I have reserved till this point an account which attempts to fill in the gap in the story, and may indeed do so correctly. But that, I think, is not proven.

The account deals with how the skull found its way from the coffin to the collection of Dr Lubbock. It has been repeated on various occasions by the late Mr Charles Williams, echoed by later biographers, and hotly resented by the descendants of the sexton whom the story implicates. It runs as follows: "The skull was abstracted by the sexton, one George Potter, by whom it was offered to the late Mr G. W. W. Firth, one of the surgeons at the hospital. On his refusing to purchase it, the late Dr Edward Lubbock became its possessor*.”

Mr Edmund Gosse improved upon this story, in 1905, with the following dramatic narrative:

"(The workmen) broke into the neighbouring vault where the body of Sir Thomas Browne had lain since 1682, and called the sexton to look at what they had found. The sexton saw below him the skeleton of the Doctor, and bending into the tomb, seized the skull and carried it off. He offered it for sale, and it was bought by a collector over whose name, in my opinion, it is best to shed the poppy of oblivion†.”

We feel we must apologise to Mr Gosse for rudely disturbing, in the course of our enquiry, both the slumber of the collector's name, and the dream which spreads forth such an entertaining picture...the broken coffin, the workmen's call, and ha! the sexton's hawk-like swoop and sudden exit with his prey! Alas,—but truth demanded it.

We turn back to the account as given by Mr Williams. And our contribution to this much-disputed subject will consist in pointing out the source from which Mr Williams derived his information, and in furnishing the reader with any data we can find which may help him to form an opinion upon it. As to the source: there is in the book of MS. letters bequeathed by Mr Charles Williams to the Norwich Castle Museum one written in 1885 by the Rev. Charles Turner, vicar of St Peter Mancroft from 1848 to 1879. There is nothing in the letter to show to whom it was addressed, but it replies to an enquiry which was probably put by Mr Williams himself. The following is a copy of the letter:

"Framingham Earl,
Norwich.
14th Oct. 1885.

Dear Sir

I cannot speak with authority about the skull of Sir T. Browne but my memory says that Potter the sexton took the skull from the coffin at the time of the funeral of Mrs Bowman, the wife of the then incumbent of St Peter's; he offered it for sale first to Mr Firth who declined; then to Dr Lubbock who bought it and presented it to the hospital. In the above transaction a skull was bought, it might have been that of Sir T. Browne or any other person,

* Notes and Queries, Oct. 6, 1894.
† Sir Thomas Browne, by Edmund Gosse, p. 116.
about this I know nothing. Potter's children are living in St Peter's Parish and one of them is sexton thereof. Mr Fitch has a rubbing facsimile of the brass plate on the coffin.

I remain,

Yours very truly,

CHAS. TURNER.”

The first thing to be ascertained in connection with this account, was whether the Rev. Chas. Turner was intimately connected with Norwich and cognisant of current happenings there, before his appointment to St Peter's in 1848. We are indebted to the Rev. A. E. Alston (nephew of the Rev. Chas. Turner's second wife) for information on this subject. Mr Charles Turner came of a Norwich family; his father was twice Mayor of Norwich. He was Perpetual Curate at Cringleford (two miles from Norwich) from 1835 to 1849, and at the same time was vicar of the Church of St Michael-at-Thorn, Norwich.

There is no doubt, therefore, about Mr Turner's close connection with Norwich before 1848, as also after. With regard to his letter, we can only offer the following observations: Mr Turner was speaking of events which had happened 45 years previously. On the other hand, we must remember that an old man's recollection of the events of his early prime is apt to be very clear.

Again in spite of the note of uncertainty with which his letter opens, he does seem to be speaking decidedly and definitely of things he clearly remembered. What he states is, we should say, quite probably the same as what he understood to be the case at the time. How well informed he was then, we have no means of knowing. We only note that he does not mention that the skull was used for casting, nor its having been in the hands of anyone to whom we have reason to attribute the cast. And that he himself protests that he cannot speak with authority on the subject.

It seems on the face of it that men of Mr Fitch's or Mr Muskett's antiquarian and scientific leanings would have more interest in "borrowing" the skull than the sexton. If it were borrowed by permission of those in charge, these gentlemen, as prominent parishioners and "savants," would be best able to secure such permission. If without permission, "moonlighting" would not be so difficult a matter while the vault of Mrs Bowman was still open. Whether, when it had been used, it was returned to the sexton or not to dispose of, we cannot say. But, remembering the incident of the coffin-plate, we should not find it out of the question to believe that Mr Fitch let it be understood it had been given to the sexton when such was not the case. And we recall that when the Rev. Charles Turner came to St Peter's Mr Muskett was churchwarden for the first two years, and closely in touch with him, and Mr Fitch was ex-churchwarden.

All these are factors to be considered and it seems fair to sum up as follows: The Rev. Charles Turner's letter provides a strong argument in favour of the story cited, but it is by no means conclusive. The story will doubtless be repeated, but to our view it should not be repeated as an historical fact.

Can we not now say to this controversy, as to the illustrious relic which occasioned it?—

REQUIESCAT IN PACE!
(IV) COMPARISON BETWEEN THE 1840–1 CAST AND SOME OF THE 1922 RECORDS.

(a) Description of the 1840–1 Cast.

The cast presented to the Norfolk and Norwich Museum in October 1841 as that of the skull of Sir Thomas Browne is a very amateurish piece of work. The several pieces in which it was made have not been put together to fit exactly. On the left side (see Plate XV) a seam remains which runs backwards from a knot of plaster close behind the lateral projection of the frontal bone, and then turns downwards towards the auditory meatus. The section which it marks off is nowhere brought quite level with the adjacent portions of the skull-cast, and in the neighbourhood of the zygomatic ridge the amount of depression attains its maximum of one millimetre. A somewhat similar seam occurs on the right side of the cast: here the section is depressed about half a millimetre until the seam approaches within a centimetre’s distance of the zygomatic arch. At this point a dab of plaster appears to have been put on with the idea of raising the level, but with the result of raising it too much. Another seam, which may be plainly seen in Plate XVI, runs from mastoid to mastoid above the inion. This seam in its lower parts is merely a ridge dividing two surfaces fairly evenly matched together; in its upper part, however, where it passes round the inionic region, it reveals the fact that once more the section, when being fitted on, was pushed in slightly too far, this time about half a millimetre.

Then again, the purpose for which the cast was made being phrenological, the caster was evidently only concerned to obtain a replica of the actual brain-box. The face was omitted as of no importance, the cast stopping short about a centimetre below the nasion. The zygomatic arches...but one hesitates to identify as zygomatic arches the rough ledges that are left on the cast where those should be. Certainly the upper outline of what might be a zygomatic arch on the left can be traced for about three-quarters of its length, if one carefully distinguishes between it and an overlying blob of plaster on its horizontal portion; but for the rest of the distance there is merely a gap where the arch should run. On the right side, no attempt has been made to preserve anything like the shape of the zygomatic arch: the edge of the plaster ledge has been carved away roughly with a knife, and only a short “scoring” remains to mark where the middle of the upper edge of the arch met the overflowing plaster which filled up the cavity it bridges.

Turning to the base of the skull: only as far as the opisthion is there any attempt to reproduce the occipital bone. From there to about the level of the basion the skull is roughly filled in—one condyle indicated, one not—and at the basion a transverse slice is cut out right across the base of the skull. Smooth plaster fills in the space from here to the truncated nasal bones.

On the cast as it reaches us the tips of both mastoids are reduced to flat surfaces. But this is doubtless due to wear, since the cast rests upon the mastoids when it is placed upon a flat surface in the normal position, and eighty years of...
shifting about on shelves will supply quite enough friction to account for the wearing down of the tips.

The caster was apparently more successful in reproducing the finer irregularities of the surface when making the occipital section than the remainder: the region of the inion, for example, shows very considerable detail, whereas the temporal and coronal sutures are almost entirely lost, and the sagittal and lambdoid likewise except in the neighbourhood of the lambda. If any of these missing features were indicated in the cast as it left the hands of its maker, they certainly have not survived the stiff coat of paint which has since been applied to the whole surface.

Such then is the very imperfect document of 1840–1. To-day we should class it contemptuously as a miserable specimen of a skull-cast. But it is only fair to the man who made it to remember that his object was different from ours, and much more limited. He is to be judged by the extent of his success in attaining the end he himself had in view. This was simply to make an accurate record of the size and shape of as much of the cranial box as was mapped out upon the current phrenological charts.

If we examine the typical chart given in the Encyclopaedia Britannica* we see that he has covered well the phrenologically important area by taking as his limits (1) in the front, the orbital portion of the frontal bone as far as the fronto-malar sutures, and the central portion about as far as the nasion; (2) at the back of the head, a line drawn roughly across just behind the mastoids; (3) at the side, an area which includes the mastoids, goes as far as the auricular orifice, and follows a line across the temporal and sphenoid bones corresponding roughly to the line of the zygomatic arch. Two phrenological faculties he was obliged to leave quite unprovided for: the gift of languages denoted by the prominence of the eye-ball; and the capacity for recognising faces shown by the distance from the inner corner of the eye to the nose. Our worker evidently concluded that to reproduce the nose alone would not help to add this faculty to the many others which distinguished the famous doctor, for even the half-inch of stump he has left on the cast bears the mark of his knife, where he has scraped away a part of its right side†.

(b) Photographs of the skull and the 1840–1 cast compared.

The above description will serve to indicate the limits within which we may look for evidence concerning the skull from which this early cast was taken. Within these limits we can compare it with the recent records of the skull re-buried in July, 1922. As the existence of the 1840–1 cast was not known to us until after that date, it could not be compared with the skull direct. Our records must therefore serve instead.

To begin with, some preliminary conclusions may be drawn by the reader from a comparison of the photographs here reproduced of the skull and the 1840–1 cast.

* Under "Phrenology."
† The Royal Society of Medicine (Lond.) possesses a copy of the 1840–1 cast, presented to it by Mr Chas. Williams. It is easily seen, on comparison, that this R. S. M. cast is taken from the earlier one, and not from the skull direct: it reproduces all the casting-seams of the 1840–1, besides adding some of its own.
Each has been photographed from vertical, lateral and occipital aspects. These terms each carry with them an exact definition of the position required of the skull: it must be adjusted to the "horizontal," the "sagittal," and the "vertical" planes respectively, and these planes are determined by certain important points on the skull—the nasion, bregma, lambda, auricular points and orbital point*. Since the 1840–1 cast lacks malar bones and therefore the orbital point, gives no indication of the whereabouts of the bregma, and does not allow us to locate lambda or nasion with any exactness, we are reduced to appreciative methods in orientating it for the camera. Thus we cannot guarantee that skull and cast will be photographed from exactly similar, but from only approximately similar, points of view, and we must bear in mind, when comparing the results, that a slight shifting of the view-point means a slight—possibly more than a slight—alteration in the outline presented.

It is interesting to note here the general principle which holds in such cases: that photograph-outlines (and outlines are the chief part of what this cast will give us) can give convincing evidence of identity of shape, but, given a certain resemblance between the objects represented, cannot give convincing evidence against it! If the outlines differ, it may be due either to difference of shape in the objects, or difference of position; if they are alike, the chances are overwhelming that this is due to identity of shape.

With these considerations before us, let us now compare the corresponding Plates representing the skull, and the 1840–1 cast. We will begin with the norma verticalis (Plates XVII and XX). Our comparison is facilitated in this case by the fact that the length of the objects in the two plates has been made the same (173 mm.), excluding of course the nasal portion, which is incomplete in the cast. At first sight, we should say that the proportions of the two objects are different, and that the cast is the more dolichocephalic. We must beware, however, of the illusion produced by the different arrangements of lighting. The back and front lighting of the skull seems to shorten it, while the lighting of the sides in the cast makes this seem narrower, and it will be well to submit our impressions to the test of a millimetre rule. We find that the greatest width of the cast-photograph is 129 mm., that of the skull-photograph the same within half a millimetre (128.5 mm.). This is extraordinarily good agreement, especially when we remember that the position of the cast could only be adjusted to that of the skull by appreciative methods.

If we now compare the outlines in detail, we note how each change of direction in the one is reflected in the other; and if we test this by superposing a tracing of one upon the other, we find the two outlines are practically identical.

Other than the outline this view of the cast offers few features for comparison: the parietal foramina, quite clear in both; some markings in the region of the lambda, where, unfortunately, the photograph of the skull grows a little misty, and

* The required positions are the same as for tracing the three standard contours, and are defined in *Biometrika*, Vol. xiii. pp. 185, 187 and 194.
fails us; some idea of the moulding of the frontal region. Here too, in the frontal region, the skull-photograph is not at its clearest (the camera having been focussed more upon the detail of the sutures), but it is clear enough to enable us to recognise in the skull-forehead a good resemblance to that of the cast.

Thus, taking all the points where we can test the plates showing the vertical aspect of skull and cast, we find an agreement which it would be almost impossible to match between one skull and the cast of another skull, however carefully the two might have been selected.

Next the norma occipitalis (Plates XVI and XIX). Here the two photographs are not taken to exactly the same scale; but by measuring maximum width and median height in both cases we can readily discover whether the proportions are the same. We get:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Width</th>
<th>Maximum Height</th>
<th>Height+Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skull photograph</td>
<td>133 mm.</td>
<td>122.5 mm.</td>
<td>9210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>136 mm.</td>
<td>124.5 mm.</td>
<td>9154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see that the ratios are very nearly the same, the difference between them amounting only to about one-half per cent. The photographer has thus succeeded in orientating skull and cast sufficiently alike to furnish those students who cannot have access to the actual objects photographed with a means of forming their own conclusions as to the relationship between them. We now turn to the outlines of the two and find close correspondence except in the region of the mastoids. The extent to which wear has abbreviated those of the cast may be judged more easily from the lateral view shown on Plate XV. The fact that the mastoids in Plate XVI (norma occipitalis of cast) seem to have been not only shortened but widened is due to the fact that the rough filling in between the horizon of the opisthion and that of the basion comes slightly into the picture here.

It only remains to compare the surface detail; and we shall of course ignore the seam due to bad casting which runs from mastoid to mastoid above the inion, in Plate XVI.

There is more detail available for comparison in the occipital photographs than we found in the vertical. Thus the well-defined planeae superiores appear quite clearly in both plates. As seen in perspective their meeting-place seems to be the inion, which is really about a centimetre higher up in the skull and projects so as nearly to cover the union of these ridges. The inion, a well-marked feature in the skull and the cast, marks the junction of the planeae superiores, the latter being less conspicuous than the planeae superiores, but quite traceable nevertheless.

Then we turn from the region of the inion to that of the lambda, and we find in the cast distinct traces of all three sutures which meet at this point. It is very unfortunate that the left lambdoid, which is clearest of those in the cast, should be confused in the other photograph by white spots which may be either fragments of plaster left on the skull after casting, or flaws in the plate used. These
have been touched up by the engraver, and give an erroneous impression of the course of this suture. The parts of the three sutures that are available for comparison, though they do not supply enough data to warrant the assertion that the sutures are identical in the two plates, certainly resemble one another, both in their general course, and in their smaller detail where we can see it clearly. In order, however, to give the student an opportunity of forming more definite conclusions as to correspondence in the lambdoid region, we have enlarged this portion of the occipital aspect of the skull as shown in a small photograph taken earlier (Plate XIII). This agrees quite well with what we see in the cast.

The parietal foramina are seen again in our norma occipitalis (Plates XVI and XIX), and correspond in position in the skull and cast. In the norma verticalis of the skull (Plate XX) the left parietal foramen was marked by a white spot which evidently was a little core of plaster left in it, for the same white spot reappeared in this foramen in Plate XIX (norma occipitalis). Unfortunately it was touched up by the engraver in both plates, as due to a flaw.

In this pair of photographs, as in the pair already considered, allowance must be made for different lighting effects. We have the impression that the region of the occiput protrudes more in the skull than in the cast, owing to the way in which the light throws it into relief in the former case. But we can correct this impression by referring to the lateral aspects of both (Plates XV and XVIII), where the occipital region is seen in profile.

So much for the occipital photographs. It only remains now to deal with the lateral (Plates XV and XVIII), and here we have two photographs in which the respective scales differ rather more widely. We have no difficulty in selecting one of the two measurements which will be wanted for the purpose of comparing proportions: the maximum length from glabella to occiput is an obvious choice. The other one which we should like is the height taken vertically from the auricular orifice; but this measurement is made impossible in the cast because of the lack of malar bones and our consequent inability to determine the standard horizontal plane, and from it the vertical plane also. We will accordingly take as one terminal the top of the “bump” which lies about a third of the way between bregma and lambda in each. Here we doubtless have the “vertex” of the skull, this being defined as the highest point of the skull when adjusted to the standard horizontal plane. For the other terminal, we must assume that the upper edge of the round black shadow which indicates the skull’s auricular orifice corresponds in position with the upper edge of the white patch which does duty for the same feature in the cast. The results of our measurements from the vertex to the nearest point on this edge, on both plates, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Length</th>
<th>Auricular Orifice</th>
<th>Auricular Orifice to Vertical Maximum Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skull</td>
<td>139 mm.</td>
<td>81 mm.</td>
<td>.5827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>152·5 mm.</td>
<td>90·5 mm.</td>
<td>.5934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The ratios obtained are seen to differ by one per cent, a difference quite within the limits of variation for which we should be prepared when we can only orientate for the camera by appreciative methods, and select our terminals by the same means.

We now compare the course of the two outlines: the seam in the cast across the occiput from the mastoids forms a slightly projecting ridge which hides 7–8 mm. of the natural outline immediately below the inion. The mastoid lacks its tip. In front of it the roughly modelled portion of the base shows a projecting corner, and the part of the skull carved away from this point to the nose has of course an outline that nature would not attempt to imitate. The rough work on the nose stump ascends slightly above the nasion, so that we do not get in the outline of the cast the definite kink which marks the position of the nasion in the skull. With these exceptions, all of them due to the limitations of the cast, the correspondence with the outline of the skull is very good indeed.

Finally, the surface detail must be compared. Here we must disregard the little column of plaster that starts up from the fronto-malar suture in the cast, stretches out an arm for a grip on the temporal ridge, and provides a starting-place for the seam that ends up in the neighbourhood of the auricular opening. If we can also make allowance for the knob of plaster that sits upon the external orbital angle, and the waves that flow out from what in nature is the cavity filled by the temporal muscles, we shall be able to disentangle from this riot of plaster a line which closely resembles the sweep of the one continued in the skull-photograph from the temporal ridge down along the upper border of the zygomatic arch. At about 3 cm. from the centre of the auricular orifice, however, this line breaks down altogether in the cast.

Proceeding along the same line in the other direction, namely along the temporal ridge, we can follow it for some distance both in cast and skull. We can avoid being misled by the long dark patch on the skull-frontal which seems at first sight to form part of the ridge, if we note the course of the ridge beyond this patch, for it can be followed round in Plate XVIII nearly up to the lambdoid suture.

On the occipital bone we can see in both lateral photographs traces of the left *linea superior*, corresponding as far as they go. Of the coronal and lambdoid sutures nothing is seen in the cast-photograph (Plate XV); of the temporo-parietal only a little; and that little, we admit, does not look much like what we see in the skull (Plate XVIII). Nor does the posterior outline of the left mastoid where it merges into the temporo-occipital suture look the same in both plates.

When we sum up the evidence, however, yielded by our detailed comparison of the three pairs of photographs of skull and 1840–1 cast, we find that the two discrepancies noted are vastly outbalanced by the mass of points in which the cast, within its own limitations, agrees with the skull. And we conclude that these discrepancies must be due to imperfect workmanship.
Comparison between 1840–1 and 1922 casts.

We have chosen to use the photographs, rather than our other records, for the detailed examination of points which these and the others supply, because the photographs are available for all who wish to study the subject. There are some tests, however, which can only be applied direct to the 1840–1 cast and to our own plastic record of the skull, the cast of 1922. Photographs can testify to correspondence in shape, but not in size; and even as regards proportion, these two sets do not show more than a close approximation to one another owing to the factor of non-identical position. Again in comparing the two solid objects one finds similarities in contour and detail which do not appear in the photographs: thus, for instance, there is a small but distinct depression in the coronal suture of the 1922 cast just above where it crosses the right temporal ridge, and we find this depression in a similar position on the 1840–1 cast; then, on the right side, the course of the anterior portion of the temporal suture is shown in the earlier cast, and it corresponds with that in the recent one. But to enumerate all the further similarities between the two casts, even where these lend themselves to verbal description—and many do not—could serve no useful purpose. And we will say briefly that the evidence given by similarities in the photographs finds ample further confirmation in the casts. And, as regards size, we have taken on both casts all the standard measurements that the 1840–1 cast would allow and half a dozen others, and we find them to agree.

There is no other conclusion possible than that we have in the skull sent to us the original of the cast presented to the Norfolk and Norwich Museum in Oct. 1841. In other words, if the cast said to be taken of Sir Thomas Browne's skull in 1841 is that of Sir Thomas Browne's skull, then the skull recently returned to earth was certainly that of Sir Thomas Browne.

Measurements of skull and cast compared.

Before leaving the subject of the casts we will put on record a few of the major measurements taken on the 1922 cast to compare with those taken on the skull direct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skull</th>
<th>1922 cast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cranium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum length (L)</td>
<td>194.6 mm.</td>
<td>199.0 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; breadth (B)</td>
<td>143.7 &quot;</td>
<td>148.8 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zygomatic breadth (J)</td>
<td>132.3 &quot;</td>
<td>136.0 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basio-bregmatic height (H')</td>
<td>121.9 &quot;</td>
<td>120.9 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal height (left) (NH, L)</td>
<td>52.2 &quot;</td>
<td>52.5 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basion to nasion (LB)</td>
<td>102.7 &quot;</td>
<td>101.2 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of arc, nasion to opisthion (S)</td>
<td>380 &quot;</td>
<td>383 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside condylar width (w1)</td>
<td>120.8 &quot;</td>
<td>121.6 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projective length of mandible (ml)</td>
<td>105.2 &quot;</td>
<td>107.1 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonial angle (ML)</td>
<td>118.5° &quot;</td>
<td>116.0° &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This will give some measure of the spread of the plaster after the cast has been made, and show the unreliability of measurements taken from such a cast. In this case the length of the skull has been increased by 4.4 mm. The spread is longitudinal and lateral: the height has not been increased, but, on the contrary, slightly lowered. Perhaps the direction of the spread was due to the position in which the cast would rest.

Whether our figures give a measure by which to estimate the order of the differences to be expected generally between skull and cast we cannot say. It is interesting to note, however, that the measurements taken on the 1840–1 and 1922 casts agreed: in these two cases, at any rate, the spread was the same.

(V) The Portraits and the Skull Compared.

Our study of the portraits eliminated all but four from final consideration: many were demonstrably copies, and some were alien portraits mis-named Sir Thomas Browne. Of the four that remain, the Wellcome portrait makes a claim to represent him that is extremely doubtful, and it only stays to get, if possible, some support from the skull. As regards the other three—the Norwich painting, the Buccleuch miniature, and the pencil portrait at the National Portrait Gallery—these are all undoubtedly portraits of Sir Thomas Browne; it is very improbable that they were all done from life, or were all independent of one another, but the nature of the relationship between them has not been definitely established. In the case of these three portraits, we hope that a comparison with the skull will help to some extent to decide which represents most faithfully the face of the living man.

In order to facilitate our comparison, the cast of the skull has been photographed “three-quarter face” (Plate XXVIII). The position has been made the same as in the Norwich and miniature portraits as nearly as this could be estimated, but it cannot be guaranteed identical, and there is the possibility of enough difference to be misleading. If, for example, we had tilted the skull somewhat further forward we should have seen more of the top of the head, and thus increased slightly the apparent height of the forehead. Nothing could make it seem high, but the lowness might perhaps have been made rather less conspicuous.

Before studying the portraits, it will be well first to decide from the skull what characters we shall expect to find in the living head. To begin with that part of the vault of the skull which lies between the temporal ridges and descends to just above the supraciliary ridges, we shall expect the conformation of the living head to follow closely that of the underlying bone here, the thickness of the scalp being slight, and fairly even throughout this area.

The living forehead, then, must have appeared low. Must it also have appeared narrow? for we shall see that Sir Thomas Browne’s minimum forehead breadth (B′), measured between the temporal ridges, was considerably less than the normal. Now we notice in the skull that the temporal ridges, having approached to within their minimum distance apart, diverge rather more rapidly than is usual below that
point. Thus the width of the frontal at the level of the upper margins of the orbits is more normal than it is higher up. We shall therefore not expect the face to look unusually narrow at the level of the eyebrows. Again we notice that the general direction of the outline of the skull as seen in the horizontal contour (Plate XXX), after it has turned the corner at the temporal ridges, is not directed so sharply to the rear as usual; and that just beneath the temples there is a "bulge" in the bone that must push outwards that part of the temporal muscle which covers it. Thus, though the position of the temporal ridge will mark a change of direction in the horizontal contour of the living head, that change will not be abrupt, and, in addition, the width at the temples will help to take away the impression of narrowness in the forehead.

Still considering the question of width, we see that the malar bone, as seen in this "three-quarter" photograph of the skull, projects further than the upper part of the orbit. The amount of projection was increased, not diminished, by turning the skull either slightly more towards the observer, or more away from him. Now there is not normally much thickness of flesh over either bone at the spot silhouetted in our photograph. We shall expect therefore that in the living face, as seen from this aspect, the cheek-bone would project somewhat.

Turning to the nose, we find the nasal bones thrust forward at a considerable angle from the plane of the face. This of course will not represent the line of the nose, the thickness of flesh over the nasion being considerably more than lower down: over the tip of the nasal-bones there is in fact little but skin. It is evident, however, from the position of this tip, that the nose must have been either prominent or aquiline, the choice depending upon the shape of the cartilage which supported the lower portion.

Let us now see how far these expectations are fulfilled by the various portraits, beginning with the Wellcome (Plate IX). It is quite certain that Sir Thomas Browne's forehead cannot have looked like the one shown in this portrait. If we had other evidence to prove that this was intended for his portrait, the picture itself would not be disproof, for many misrepresentations, intended and otherwise, can find their way into a portrait. But if this picture looks to the evidences of its own features to support a very doubtful claim, it looks in vain.

Comparing now the other three portraits with our deductions from the skull, and considering first the shape of the forehead, the miniature seems to me to give more of an impression of lowness than the other two. By bending the head slightly forward the artist gets in the pencil portrait a legitimate addition to the apparent height, but I think he has also added somewhat more than this. None of the artists has been quite candid about the depressed forehead of the subject; but the miniature seems to have disguised the depression least.

With regard to narrowness of forehead, we have seen that this would probably not be so conspicuous as the $B'$ measurement alone would lead us to expect. We may notice, however, that the miniature and the Norwich painting have a shadow on the forehead to our left. This was not caused by the hair, for the light is not falling
from that direction. It indicates therefore a change in the direction of the contour of the brow; not an abrupt change, and one which does not take place as far down as the eyebrows. The position and appearance of this shadow fit in quite well with what we should expect from our examination of the skull. The plumbago drawing (Plate I, Fig. 1) gives no such indication and is, I think, less like the original in this point. About the malar region none of the portraits indicates any projection as compared with the part just above the eye. In the miniature, in fact, the cheek-bone seems to retreat slightly in comparison. It looks as though the miniature were farther from the fact, in this particular, than either of the other two.

As regards the nose, only one portrait satisfies us: the Norwich. Here the nose is aquiline. In the others it is neither aquiline nor prominent, and we are sure it must have been one of these, in life.

Summing up then, we surmise that the Norwich portrait is most like its subject in the shape of the nose; that it shares with the miniature the recommendation of being truthful in the temporal region of the brow, which the pencil portrait does not; that it and the plumbago drawing seem rather the more faithful—though not conspicuously so—in the region of the cheek-bones; but that the miniature is the one which gives us the truest indication of the slope of the forehead.

(VI) The Ancestry of Sir Thomas Browne.

The name English covers a variety of racial stocks, which still, in spite of some blending, differentiate the mental and physical characters prevailing in the different corners of England. To what stock or stocks does Sir Thomas Browne belong? The accompanying pedigree makes some contribution to our information on this point. The pedigree has been compiled from various sources and claims no authority of its own. It is left for some later student to amplify, and possibly amend, by means of direct research among registers, wills and other records such as the present worker has been unable, through lack of time, to explore.

A glance at the family-tree before us shows that most of the ancestors whose names are here set forth belonged to the class called the “squirearchy.” We must beware however of concluding that these are representative of the large majority who go unrecorded. That few of the latter belonged to the ranks of the nobility we may reasonably assume, for such would surely figure in the pedigrees handed down. But it is quite probable that many of the blanks in the table before us are due to the circumstance that the families concerned were of lower status than the squirearchy, and less likely to preserve their family records.

On his father’s side Sir Thomas Browne was descended mainly from Cheshire folk. The records of the male line go back only a few generations, and the reason is clearly that given above. We learn from Ormerod (Vol. ii. p. 819) that until after the dissolution of the monasteries the Brownes were only fee-farmers at Upton, holding their lands in fee to the Abbey of St Werburgh at Chester. After the dissolution came “struggles between the Dean and Chapter, and Sir Richard
Cotton”; and in the 22nd year of Elizabeth (1580–1) the abbey lands “were confirmed to various fee-farmers, the most considerable of whom were the Brownes and the Brocks.”

Of the families from whom Sir Thomas’ paternal grandmother could trace her descent many records exist in Ormerod’s History of the County of Cheshire. Evidently they were “county families” in the main, the predominant county being Cheshire, though we find one of her four grandparents coming from Essex*. There is also a great-great-grandmother of hers who takes the pedigree into Lancashire, and earlier still we note infusion from Flintshire, and before that, from Staffordshire. We may safely say, however, that the majority of her ancestors, for some generations back (as doubtless also those of her husband), were Cheshire-born and Cheshire-bred. Eighteen generations from Sir Thomas Browne—sixteen from his grandmother—take us back to the Conquest, and here we find, in several instances, that Norman knights were founders of the families whose blood was united in the veins of Sir Thomas Browne.

So much for his father’s folk. As regards his mother, biographers of Sir Thomas Browne generally assign the Garraway family to Lewes in Sussex, their authority being found in a reminiscence occurring in one of his letters: “I remember, when I was very yong, and I think but in coates, my mother carryed mee to my grandfather Garaways howse in Lewys†”; also in the fact that the brief pedigree drawn up by Sir Thomas in 1664 gives his mother’s name as “Anne, daur. of Paul Garraway, of…..in Coun. Sussex.” (The blank is his.) But we should be very much mistaken if we assumed the Garraway connection with Sussex to be as intimate as that of the Brownes with Cheshire. We see illustrated, in fact, in this family, the mixing process which was continually at work in the metropolis, and extended in some degree to the counties round about. Wherever Anne Garraway herself may have been born and lived until her marriage, certainly the designation “of Sussex” would require considerable qualification if applied to her parents‡. The birthplace of Anne’s mother has not been traced: we only know that she had been married previously, and that her first husband is described as “of London and Iver, Co. Bucks.” Anne’s father, Paul Garraway, was born at Acton, Middlesex (1553), married her mother at St Peter-le-Poor, London (1582), married a second time at Tingrith, Bedfordshire (1611)§, and was buried at St Martin’s-in-the-Fields, London (1620), being described in the register there as “late of Tingridge, Co. Beds.” That he lived for a time in Sussex we know only from Sir Thomas Browne’s recollection of the visit to the “howse in Lewys.” At the time of this visit the child must have been, as he said, “very yong,” and quite probably still “butt in coates,”

* Ormerod says a Horncliffe of Hallowbury in Essex. There are a Great and a Little Hallowbury on the borders of Essex near Bishop’s Stortford. I have found no record of the Horncliffes among the Essex pedigrees examined.
† Letter to his son Edward, Jan. 9, 1681–2. MS. Sloan 1847.
‡ The information here given with regard to the ancestors of Anne Garraway is derived from the unpublished pedigree compiled by R. Garraway Rice, Esq., F.S.A. Part of this has been taken from Harleian MS. No. 1551, p. 65 (Brit. Mus.).
§ Genealogia Bedfordiensis, by F. A. Blaydes, 1890, p. 294.
for he was not yet six years old when his grandfather married again and went to live at Tingrith. Whether the latter's stay in Lewes had been long we do not know. At any rate it is obvious that his* connection with the county was not such as to warrant our counting Anne Garraway as of Sussex stock: and we must look further back in her pedigree.

In the male line this carries us to Watkin Garraway of Weobley in Herefordshire (d. 1519). This family owned lands in Weobley which later in the sixteenth century were acquired by their neighbours, the Brydges, who had possessed the adjacent land called The Ley at least since 1428†. Here we come to land-owning families such as we met with in Cheshire, and we are probably safe in assuming that they had lived and died in Herefordshire for many generations, and that their wives were taken from this or neighbouring counties.

A younger son of Watkin Garraway, who migrated to London, took to wife one of a branch of the Brydges family which had also settled in the capital: the daughter of Sir John Bruges (or Brydges), Lord Mayor of London in 1520. Her mother was an Essex woman, whose people, said to belong originally to Kent, had been settled in Essex for several generations at least.

Thus we may count their son, who was the father of Paul Garraway, as three parts of Herefordshire stock, one part of Essex. He married a Middlesex woman, who brought into the family property at Church Acton, Middlesex, and in this parish their son Paul (or Powle) was baptized.

It follows that Sir Thomas Browne's ancestry was drawn from many districts in England. If we estimate the proportions which various counties contribute, according to what we know of his 16 great-great-grandparents, we get as result: 7 parts Cheshire (with infusion from Lancashire and Flintshire), 1½ parts Herefordshire, 1½ parts Essex, 1 part Middlesex, and 5 parts unknown but probably of the home counties.

It would have been interesting, from another point of view, to discover among the members of this family other distinguished names; but it must be confessed that our search reveals none. We note that the Huxleys of Cheshire are among the ancestors of Sir Thomas Browne in two lines, and it is most probable that the great scientist who has made the name of Huxley famous is another descendant of that same family. Even if the fact were definitely established‡, however, the link between these two men could hardly fail to be very remote.

The pedigree we have given includes only the names of Sir Thomas' ancestors. For the complementary table of his descendants we refer the student to the

* Some of his relations were more closely connected with Sussex than he. His uncle, Bartholomew Garraway, had married a Sussex woman, and died possessed of considerable properties in the county (including a mansion-house at Southover, Lewes), part of which came to him as her dowry. (Will of Barth. Garraway, 10 Nov. 1607, proved in P.C.C. 19 Feb. 1607/8 [9 Windebancke]). Another uncle, Anthonie Garraway, was vicar of Iford, Sussex, and died 1614.

† Mansions and Manors of Herefordshire, by Ch. J. Robinson, p. 290.

‡ [An attempt to link up, through the Macclesfield registers, T. H. Huxley's grandfather Thomas Huxley of Coventry with Samuel Huxley, Mayor of Macclesfield in 1746 (who was connected with the Cheshire Huxleys), was unsuccessful. Ed.]
"Pedigree of Sir Thomas Browne" brought together by the researches of Mr Charles Williams*. But one descendant, his son Dr Edward Browne, figures in our own pages (Plate XII), to demonstrate the fact that Sir Thomas passed on to this member of his family, not only a portion of his own ability, but also, in conjunction with it, his own depressed and sloping brow.

(VII) STUDY OF THE SKULL.

The skull of Sir Thomas Browne is distinguished by certain features sufficiently unlike those which we are accustomed to find among the majority of skulls, to attract our attention at the first glance. These features were observed and described by Robert Fitch in 1840. But though his description serves quite well as a contribution to the evidence by which the identity of the skull was established, both his and our impressions of unusualness need to be submitted to the test of exact measurement. We have, fortunately, two series of seventeenth century London crania available for comparison: I refer to the Whitechapel and Moorfields series† on which a large number of measurements were taken by the late W. R. Macdonell. As the Whitechapel is the considerably longer of these two series, we may consider the data it supplies the most reliable craniological evidence we possess concerning the London contemporaries of Sir Thomas Browne.

Outside London we have very little in the way of data to which we can turn. Two long series of skulls have been dealt with by Professor F. G. Parsons—the Hythe (Kent) and Rothwell (Northants) crania‡. Only six measurements were taken on each however; and of these, the auricular height is not measured according to the convention used for Sir Thomas Browne and the two London series, and would, therefore, have to be omitted.

Again, we are given only the means of the six measurements taken; the standard deviations are not supplied, nor are we able at the present to remedy this omission without very considerable computations. We are thus left without the means of gauging the probable significance of any differences that exist between Rothwell and Hythe values and any others. Even had we all the data we could wish, however, concerning these Northamptonshire and Kentish groups, they would be not more but rather less appropriate than a London series, as our basis of comparison. We have seen that Sir Thomas Browne's ancestry was not drawn from one county, but from half-a-dozen at least. In him was blended, to our knowledge, the N.W., W., and S.E. of England; and if our information as to his ancestry were more complete, we might have to add other parts of England to the list. Now although the London of the seventeenth century was not the melting-pot of local strains that it is to-day, it was doubtless more so than any other one district we could choose. In using a London series for our standard of comparison, therefore, we are using what would be most aptly chosen if we had any choice.

With considerable satisfaction at our good fortune in having data to hand so suitable for our purpose, we now turn to the examination of these, first putting on record in Table I the full series of measurements* obtained from the skull of Sir Thomas Browne.

The Whitechapel group contains 138 male crania, or parts of crania. In dealing with this group, Macdonell took 26 measurements direct from the skull, and calculated from them 16 others (5 angles and 11 indices), making 42 measurements in all. Two of these will not be used in our comparative Table II A, since the alveolar portion of Sir Thomas Browne’s upper jaw was too far absorbed to allow any measurement of palate breadth \((G_a)\); and the index \(100 \frac{H}{B}\) is not necessary when one has already \(100 \frac{B}{H}\).

In making his Second Study of the English Skull, with the Moorfields crania for his material, Macdonell measured 8 additional characters, obtaining their values for 34–44 individuals. For these 8 characters we shall use Moorfields means and standard deviations as our basis of comparison (Table II B), in default of constants obtained from the larger London group.

Thus we have in all 48 means and standard deviations based on numbers ranging from 34 to 138, to do duty for the corresponding constants of the total population they represent. Now, in any of these 48 characters, given the difference between Sir Thomas Browne’s measure and the mean measure for the total population with which we wish to compare it, the probability that this difference is merely due to the chances of a normal distribution could be readily found† by expressing the difference in terms of the corresponding standard deviation. Obviously these constants for the total population are unknown. But our substitution of the means and standard deviations of the samples measured will only affect the resultant figures to an unimportant extent; the probable error of the mean of samples containing over 45 individuals (as do nearly all of ours) is less than \(\cdot1\) times the s.d., and the probable error of the s.d. for the same number is less than \(\cdot07\) times the s.d.‡ In 9 characters only out of our total of 48 does the number of individuals measured fall below 45; and in the smallest number used (34) the probable error of the mean of the sample is \(11567\) times the s.d., and of the s.d., \(\cdot08179\) times. Variations of this order will not make the difference between significance and insignificance in the figures obtained for our \(\frac{B - \bar{W}}{\sigma_w}\) and \(\frac{B - \bar{M}}{\sigma_M}\) in Tables II A and II B.

In our last column of these tables we have entered the proportion of London population of that time which may be expected to possess characters differing from the mean in the same way and to the same extent as, or to a greater extent than, Sir Thomas Browne. This has been done only where the proportion was less

---

† See Tables for Biometricians and Statisticians, ed. by Karl Pearson, 1914, p. xvii and Table II.
‡ Loc. cit. p. xxii and Table V.


**TABLE 1. Measurements of the Skull of Sir Thomas Browne.**

### I. Cranium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(F) Ophryo-occipital length</td>
<td>190.0 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) Glabellar projective horizontal length</td>
<td>195.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) Maximum length from glabella to occiput</td>
<td>194.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Maximum horizontal breadth on parietal bones</td>
<td>143.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B') Least forehead breadth</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H') Basio-bregmatic height</td>
<td>121.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H) Height from basion to point vertically above it (with skull adjusted to Frankfort horizontal plane)</td>
<td>122.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OH) Auricular height</td>
<td>102.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LB) Basion to nasion</td>
<td>102.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q) Transverse arc through apex terminating at top of craniopharyngeal ear-rods</td>
<td>293.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q') Transverse arc terminating at auricular points</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S) Sagittal arc from nasion to opisthion</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S1) Nasion to bregma</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S2) Lambda to opisthion</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S3) Chord from lambda to opisthion</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(U) Horizontal circumference above supraclavicular ridges and round the most projecting part of occiput</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PH) Alveolar point to tip of anterior nasal spine</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G'H) Nasion to alveolar point</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GB) From lower end of one zygomatic-maxillary suture to that of the other, where sutures cross lower front rim of cheek-bone</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J) Zygomatic breadth</td>
<td>132.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NH, R) Nasion to lowest edge of pyriform aperture, right</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NH, L) Nasion to lowest edge of pyriform aperture, left</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NB) Greatest breadth of pyriform aperture</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DS) Dacryal subnate</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DC) Dacryal chord</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DA) Dacryal arc</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS) Simotic subtense</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SC) Simotic chord, i.e. minimum between the two naso-maxillary sutures</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O1, R) Greatest breadth of right orbit (using Fawcett's curvature method)</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O1, L) Greatest breadth of left orbit</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O2, L) Greatest height of right orbit taken perpendicular to O1, L</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O2, R) Greatest height of left orbit taken perpendicular to O1, L</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G1) Length of palate from point of spina nasalis posterior to an imaginary line tangential to the inner rims of the alveoli of middle incisors</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G1') Similar to G1 but taken from base of spine</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G2) Breadth of palate between inner alveolar walls at 2nd molars</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G'L) Basion to alveolar point</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fmb) Greatest breadth of foramen magnum from basion to opisthion</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PL) Angle between line joining nasion to alveolar point and horizontal</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NL) Angle between lines joining nasion to basion and alveolar point respectively</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AL) Angle between lines joining alveolar point to basion and nasion respectively</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BL) Angle between lines joining basion to alveolar point and nasion respectively</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((\theta_1)) Angle which line joining nasion to basion makes with horizontal, i.e. ((180° - PL - NL))</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((\theta_2)) Angle which line joining basion to alveolar point makes with horizontal, i.e. ((PL - AL))</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of cranium</td>
<td>622.5 grs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of skull</td>
<td>1509 cm³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 (\frac{B}{L})</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (\frac{H}{L})</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (\frac{H}{D'})</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (\frac{B}{D'})</td>
<td>117.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (\frac{G'H}{GB})</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (\frac{NB}{GB})</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (\frac{O_2 R}{O_1})</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (\frac{O_2 L}{O_1})</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (\frac{fmb}{fml})</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (\frac{DS}{DC})</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (\frac{SS}{SC})</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O_6, i.e. )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE I (continued).


(The alveolar rim of the mandible was so far absorbed that several measurements could not be taken.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>mm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>((wp))</td>
<td>Greatest width from outside one condyle to outside of the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((w_a))</td>
<td>Greatest width from outside one angle to outside of the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((z))</td>
<td>Least distance between inner rims of foramina mentalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((c,c_r))</td>
<td>Coronion to coronion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((r_b))</td>
<td>Least breadth of left ramus parallel to standard basial plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((c_p,c_r))</td>
<td>Condylion to coronion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((G_{r}G_{l}))</td>
<td>Gonion to gonion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((G_{g}G_{o} (j)))</td>
<td>Gnathion to left gonion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((H_{g}H_{o} (r)))</td>
<td>Gnathion to right gonion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((c_{q},c_{r}))</td>
<td>Greatest length of left condyle in any direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((c_{r},c_{l}))</td>
<td>Greatest breadth of left condyle perpendicular to (c_{r})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((P_{g}G_{o}))</td>
<td>Pogonion to gnathion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((G_{0}P_{g} A_{v}))</td>
<td>Are measured with steel tape from one gonion to the other through the pogonion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((i_{h}))</td>
<td>Least height of incisura (left) above standard basial plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((i_{h}'))</td>
<td>Greatest depth of incisura (left) from line joining condylion to coronion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((c_{r},h))</td>
<td>Height of coronion (left) above standard basial plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((c_{l},h))</td>
<td>Height of condylion (left) above standard basial plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((c_{r},j))</td>
<td>Length of corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((r_{l}))</td>
<td>Length of ramus (left)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((m_{l}))</td>
<td>Projective length from line joining posterior points of condyles to pogonion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((M_{l}))</td>
<td>Angle between left ramus tangent and standard basial plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((R_{l}))</td>
<td>Angle between condylo-coronoidal line and left ramus tangent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((G_{l}))</td>
<td>Angle between the lines joining gnathion to right and left gonia respectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weight of mandible** | 63 grs.

**Indices.**

\[
\begin{align*}
100 \frac{c_{r},h}{m_{l}} & \quad 59·3 \\
100 \frac{c_{r},c_{r}}{m_{l}} & \quad 96·6 \\
100 \frac{G_{r}G_{o}}{c_{r},l} & \quad 121·1 \\
100 \frac{r_{b}}{r_{l}} & \quad 51·8 \\
100 \frac{c_{r},b}{c_{r},l} & \quad 36·1 \\
100 \frac{G_{r}G_{o}}{c_{r},c_{r}} & \quad 95·4 \\
100 \frac{G_{r}G_{o}}{c_{r},h} & \quad 92·9 \\
100 \frac{i_{h}}{c_{r},c_{y}} & \quad 30·4
\end{align*}
\]

than 1 in 25—a figure that has been chosen to bring it roughly into line with the standards used when comparing two sample populations. It is reckoned, as a rule, that when the chances are only 1 in 22 (i.e. when the difference between the two means equals 2·5 times its probable error) in favour of their being part of the same population, these figures are possibly significant of their belonging to different populations. When the chances are reduced to 1 in 46 (3 times prob. error), the disproportion is counted quite probably significant.

We will examine first of all the way in which the *absolute* measurements of Sir Thomas Browne's skull compare with the mean values for contemporary Londoners as shown in the above tables. We see that in the great majority of characters he is entirely normal and usual: only four measurements demand any enquiry into their possible significance, viz. \(B'\) (least forehead breadth), \(H'\) (height of skull from basion to bregma), \(OH\) (vertical height above the ear-rods of the craniophor when the skull is orientated to the Frankfort plane), and \(G_1\) (length of palate from tip of posterior palate spine).
**TABLE II A.**

*Comparison of Sir Thomas Browne's Skull with Whitechapel Series (Males).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Sir Thomas Browne (B)</th>
<th>Whitechapel Series</th>
<th>Deviation of Browne from Mean (B - W)</th>
<th>Deviation in terms of s.d. ([B - W]/σW)</th>
<th>Expected frequency where less than 1 in 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1476:9</td>
<td>122:37</td>
<td>+32:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>190:0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>187:4</td>
<td>6:17</td>
<td>+2:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>195:1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>187:8</td>
<td>5:64</td>
<td>+7:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'</td>
<td>194:6</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>189:1</td>
<td>6:27</td>
<td>+5:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>143:7</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>140:7</td>
<td>5:28</td>
<td>+3:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'</td>
<td>87:4</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>98:0</td>
<td>4:20</td>
<td>-10:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H'</td>
<td>121:9</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>132:0</td>
<td>5:56</td>
<td>-10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>102:7</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>101:6</td>
<td>4:13</td>
<td>+1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>307:9</td>
<td>11:40</td>
<td>-10:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>377:1</td>
<td>13:69</td>
<td>+2:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>524:3</td>
<td>15:02</td>
<td>+24:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G'H</td>
<td>73:1 (?)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70:2</td>
<td>3:86</td>
<td>+2:9 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>90:9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90:9</td>
<td>5:07</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>132:3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>130:1</td>
<td>5:57</td>
<td>+2:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>52:2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>51:2</td>
<td>2:90</td>
<td>+1:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>22:6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24:3</td>
<td>2:16</td>
<td>-1:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1, R</td>
<td>43:7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>43:0</td>
<td>2:02</td>
<td>+0:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1, L</td>
<td>42:8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43:1</td>
<td>1:81</td>
<td>-0:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2, R</td>
<td>36:3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33:4</td>
<td>2:22</td>
<td>+2:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2, L</td>
<td>36:7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33:5</td>
<td>1:58</td>
<td>+3:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1,</td>
<td>53:3 (??)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48:3</td>
<td>2:74</td>
<td>+5:0 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1'</td>
<td>49:0 (??)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44:7</td>
<td>2:59</td>
<td>+4:3 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL</td>
<td>98:3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>95:9</td>
<td>4:49</td>
<td>+2:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>84:7 (?)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86:1*</td>
<td>3:92</td>
<td>-1:4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>65:4* (?)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65:2*</td>
<td>3:52</td>
<td>+0:2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>71:9* (?)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73:4*</td>
<td>3:41</td>
<td>-1:5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>42:7* (?)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41:4*</td>
<td>2:50</td>
<td>+1:3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ1</td>
<td>29:9* (?)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28:7*</td>
<td>2:53</td>
<td>+1:2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ2</td>
<td>12:8* (?)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12:9*</td>
<td>3:34</td>
<td>-0:1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 B/L</td>
<td>73:7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75:2</td>
<td>2:97</td>
<td>-1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 B/L'</td>
<td>73:8</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>74:3</td>
<td>3:26</td>
<td>-0:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 H'/L'</td>
<td>62:5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70:4</td>
<td>2:67</td>
<td>-7:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 H'/L</td>
<td>62:6</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>70:0</td>
<td>3:22</td>
<td>-7:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 B/H'</td>
<td>117:8</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>106:3</td>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>+11:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 G'H/GB</td>
<td>80:4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>76:5</td>
<td>5:39</td>
<td>+3:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 NB/NH</td>
<td>43:3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47:6</td>
<td>4:58</td>
<td>-4:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 O2/O1, R</td>
<td>63:1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77:7</td>
<td>4:96</td>
<td>+5:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 O2/O1, L</td>
<td>85:7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77:9</td>
<td>3:78</td>
<td>+7:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Macdonell's H is the same measurement as our H'.
† Re Macdonell's OH as here corrected, see *Biometrika*, Vol. xIII. p. 217.
‡ Macdonell used the bregma in measuring the transverse arc (his Q), instead of taking this measurement in the vertical plane, as is done now. It so happens that in Sir Thomas Browne's skull the bregma is very nearly vertically over the auricular axis (see Plate XXIX), so that his Q gives the same results in this skull as our Q'.

---
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### TABLE II B.

Comparison of Sir Thomas Browne's Skull with Moorfields Series (Males) as regards Characters not measured on Whitechapel Skulls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Sir Thomas Browne (B)</th>
<th>Moorfields Series</th>
<th>Deviation of Browne from Mean (B - M)</th>
<th>Deviation in terms of s.d. ([B - M]/σ)</th>
<th>Expected frequency where less than 1 in 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Means (M)</td>
<td>Standard Deviation (σM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129.3</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₂</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>128.7</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₃</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>120.1</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₃'</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fmt</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fmb</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100fmt/fml</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oc. L (CC)</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last of these can be dismissed at once from serious consideration. Its value as given for Sir Thomas Browne is marked with a double query, owing to the fact that the exact position of both terminals could only be guessed at: the tip of the palate spine had vanished, and the loss of the upper incisors had been followed by the disappearance of their alveoli through absorption. Were the measurement here given absolutely reliable, the deviation of Sir Thomas Browne from the mean in this character only borders on what might be judged significant, for 1 in 29 of the population may be expected to possess as long a palate or longer; while a reduction of 1 mm in the length (and we cannot guarantee the accuracy of this measurement within a millimetre) would make it quite normal.

There remain the three measurements B', H', and OH. In the first of these the deviation is certainly striking: the minimum width of Sir Thomas Browne's forehead is 10.6 mm. less than the average, and only 1 in 170 of the population may be expected to fall below the mean to this extent. Suspending comment on this discovery until the other singularities of the skull have been examined, we turn to the characters OH (vertical auricular height) and H' (basio-bregmatic height), and find that each falls short of its mean value, OH by 9.5 mm., H' by 10.1 mm. The auricular height and the basio-bregmatic height of a skull will obviously be influenced to a considerable extent by the same factors, and when we find one of them differing widely from the mean, we expect to find the other differing, as here, in the same sense. It would be interesting to know whether the whole of the deficiency in our H' can be attributed to the portion of it which lies above the level of the auricular point; but we must wait for this until the complete sagittal type contour for the seventeenth century English is some day worked out*.

I have to thank Mr Geoffrey Morant† for working out the position of the auricular

* See p. 64.
† I am also indebted to Mr Morant for his kindness in revising my measurements. I have to thank Mr E. S. Pearson for his photographs of the skull and casts and Miss Ida McLearn for her drawings of the skull contours and the preparation of the pedigree.
point, as a step towards the completion of this contour. From this we see that
the bregma of the English contour lies 16 mm. in front of the vertical through
the auricular point. Had bregma, auricular point, and basion lain practically in
the same vertical plane, as in Sir Thomas Browne's skull, we should have been
able from our figures to apportion correctly Sir Thomas' deficit in height of skull,
and say whether any at all was sub-auricular.

However, from the fact that the deficiency in \(OH\) is such as would be expected
in only 1 in 76 of the population represented by the Whitechapel skulls, while an
\(H'\) no longer than this one would be found in 1 in 29, it seems probable that the
sub-auricular portion of \(H'\) is the more normal.

Our comparison of the absolute measurements given in Tables II A and II B
thus yields two differences only which are markedly unusual: the forehead is
narrower, and the height of the skull less, particularly above the ear-passages. It
is possible, however, that unimportant differences in absolute size may cause note-
worthy differences in the proportions of skulls. For comparison from this point of
view we turn to the indices given in our tables. Here we find four in which our
figures indicate significant differences. Into three of these the factor height (\(H'\))
enters: 100 \(H'/L'\), 100 \(H'/L\), and 100 \(B/H'\), and from them we see that the
small height is more uncommon in conjunction with the comparative broadness
and length of the skull than it is as an absolute value. Skulls which are platy-
cephalic to this degree (indicated by 100 \(B/H'\)) or more, might be expected in
only 1 in 82 of the population. As regards the height in proportion to length,
we have two indices giving a measure of the chamaecephaly of the skull, according
to the two different methods by which the length of skull is measured. The two
indices are practically the same for Sir Thomas Browne; and they are also prac-
tically the same for the Whitechapel mean. But the values of \(L'\) having been
found less variable than those of \(L\) in the Whitechapel series we get standard
deviations for 100 \(H'/L'\) and 100 \(H'/L\), of 2.67 and 3.22 respectively. Measured by
these standards, it would seem that the chances are 1 in 649 in favour of the
occurrence of skulls with Sir Thomas Browne's 100 \(H'/L'\) index or less, and 1 in
93 in favour of his 100 \(H'/L\) or less, in the total population. It must be remem-
bered however that these figures are only exact if we assume that the sample
measured is exactly representative of the total population from which it is drawn.
All that we know is that the chances are strongly in favour of its being very
nearly representative, when the number of cases measured is 69 (as in \(L'\)), but
still more strongly when the number is increased to 120 (as in \(L\)).

We are therefore bound to take 1 in 93 as the truer measure of the chances of the
occurrence of chamaecephaly as great as or greater than Sir Thomas Browne's; and
to suppose that the 69 skulls which were sufficiently complete to be adjusted
on the craniophor for the measurement of \(L'\) give us the mean value correctly, but
show somewhat little variation from it. In fact that they are probably not only a
very average lot, but rather more average than is usual!

One other index remains: that of the left orbit (100 \(O_4/O_1, L\)). Sir Thomas
Browne's face was somewhat asymmetrical as to the orbits, the left orbit being
higher in proportion to its breadth than the right. Both had a higher index than
the Whitechapel mean male skull, but while the difference is not significant in the
case of the right orbit, it seems to be otherwise with the left. We see from the
figures that this apparent significance is largely due to the fact that the standard
deivation for the left orbital index of the Whitechapel males is considerably less
than for the right. If the latter had been the appropriate one by which to measure
the larger of Sir Thomas Browne's orbital index deviations, we should have found
the chances of this index being equalled, or exceeded, as many as 1 in 21 instead
of 1 in 50; and we should have accordingly considered the deviation insignificant.
Are we thus to regard greater variation in the right than in the left orbit a charac-
teristic of the total population to which the Whitechapel skulls belong? It might
be so, of course, but unless we have strong evidence to the contrary we are in-
clined to expect the variation to be of the same order for both. If the females of
this series had manifested this characteristic too, the evidence would have been
strong. As it is, we suspect that it may not have been so true of the total male
population as of the 63 skulls whose left orbits were measured; and until further
evidence is available, we find it advisable not to stress too much the apparent
unusualness of the proportions of the left orbit of Sir Thomas Browne.

We have now exhausted, in our survey, the data with which Macdonell supplied
us; but we have another source of information to which we can turn. In his study
of Cranial Type-contours, R. Crewdson Benington made use of the Whitechapel
and Moorfields material to build up the type-contours of the seventeenth century
male Londoner*. The figures on which these contours were based were not
published, but they have been preserved in the archives of the Biometric Laboratory,
University College, London, and among them we can find the standard deviations
of the various measurements used. We thus have a means of judging the importance
of any difference which may strike us when we compare Sir Thomas Browne's
contours each with its corresponding type.

Fewer points were plotted in the construction of these type-contours than it is
the custom to take now: in the vertical one, for instance, the crests of the zygomatic
ridges were not marked, nor were the temporal ridges in the horizontal type-
contour. The omission of these features modifies somewhat the appearance of the
type-contours which Benington gave us, but we can allow for such differences.
Again, in the sagittal type-contour, only that portion which lay above the horizontal
through the nasion (the Nγ line) was plotted. To this has now been added the
auricular point, the co-ordinates of which, as estimated by Mr Geoffrey Morant,
are: length of ordinate to Nγ line, 30.0 mm.; length of abscissa measured from γ
along Nγ, 98.7 mm.; s.d. of abscissa, 5.86 mm. These figures are based on measure-
ments taken on the same contours as Crewdson Benington used for his sagittal
type-contours, viz. 78 of the Whitechapel male contours and 20 of the Moorfields.
The other sagittal contours of the two series were too incomplete to allow of the
standard horizontal plane being determined.

* See Biometrika, Vol. VIII. pp. 148—147, 191—195. We regret that space has not permitted the
reproduction of the contours here.
For the other two type-contours, the horizontal and vertical, Benington used only Whitechapel skulls: 113 for the former, 65 for the latter.

Comparing Sir Thomas Browne's three contours with these, we will begin with the sagittal, and will place nasion on nasion, and \( N_\gamma \) along \( N_\gamma \). Of course the small height of Sir Thomas Browne's skull, which was already noted in our figures, becomes at once very apparent. But what is further revealed is the fact that the deficiency in auricular height can be attributed entirely to that part which lies above the level of the nasion. The auricular points of the two contours very nearly coincide; their distance from the \( N_\gamma \) line is thus practically the same, the slight difference of 2 mm. being in fact in Sir Thomas Browne's favour. This gives us 70.6 mm. for the portion of the auricular height lying above \( N_\gamma \) in Sir Thomas Browne's contour, against 82.1 in the type-contour.

If, while keeping nasion upon nasion, we revolve one contour a little until the bregmas coincide as nearly as possible, we see that the curve of the frontal bone is very much the same in both cases. Sir Thomas Browne's low forehead is therefore not due to a flattened frontal bone, but to one which is rotated further backwards. The degree of rotation may be measured by the bregmatic angle, i.e. the angle between \( N_\beta \) and \( N_\gamma \). For Sir Thomas Browne, this is 38.2°; for the type, 47.1°. Measured by the appropriate S.D., 3.36°*, this or a greater degree of rotation of the frontal is seen to be likely to occur in only 1 in 248 of the population.

If we compare the bregma to lambda curves also, by superposition, we see that their convexity is practically the same, and their length differs little. We cannot compare the curve of the occipitals in the same way with our incomplete type-contour, but we have already seen from the occipital index (Oc. I., Table II B) that there is no significant difference here. The difference between the two sagittal contours, Sir Thomas Browne's and the type, is due therefore much more to the different positions of the bones than to difference in shape.

Let us now restore the contours to their first position (\( N_\gamma \) lines together). We notice that the greater length of Sir Thomas Browne's skull is due to an increase in the length of that portion only which lies behind the vertical through the auricular points. The length of this portion of \( N_\gamma \) is 93.7 mm. in the type, 103.7 mm. in Sir Thomas, giving an excess of 10 mm. for the latter. We must of course express this difference in terms of the S.D. in order to get a measure of its significance. The S.D. is 5.86 mm.; Sir Thomas Browne's deviation is 1.71 times the S.D., and the expectation of an excess as large as this is 1 in 23 of the population. The difference noted is, therefore, not very significant.

Turning now to the vertical contours, we note only one outstanding divergence from the type, and that is one we have already dealt with elsewhere, namely, the deficiency in auricular height. We pass on therefore to the horizontal contours. Here we note that although, as we have learnt from the direct measurements, Sir Thomas Browne's frontal breadth is unusually small, his skull widens out very quickly, so that it equals the type-skull in breadth by the time Ordinate 3 of the

* Calculated by Mr G. Morant.
contour is reached. Where the maximum breadth occurs, between ordinates 6 and 7, his measurement is somewhat the larger, although, as measurement B shewed, not significantly larger. We notice, however, from the contours that the outlines to left and right, in the type, converge more quickly after the maximum is passed. It was doubtless partly owing to this characteristic that Mr Robert Fitch described "the back part" of Sir Thomas' skull as "exhibiting a remarkable degree of depth and capaciousness." It would be of interest therefore to get some measure of the width of the back part, and for this we may avail ourselves of the constants worked out for Ordinates 9 and 10 in the type. From the s.d.'s (as given by Benington) of the left and right portions of these ordinates, I have calculated the s.d.'s of the width of skull at these points. The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ordinate 9 (L + R)</th>
<th>Ordinate 10 (L + R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir T. B.</td>
<td>129.6 mm.</td>
<td>102.9 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type contour</td>
<td>117.4 &quot;</td>
<td>88.6 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Sir T. B. over Type</td>
<td>12.2 &quot;</td>
<td>14.3 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d. of character</td>
<td>4.54 &quot;</td>
<td>3.78 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess in terms of s.d.</td>
<td>2.69 &quot;</td>
<td>3.78 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected frequency in population</td>
<td>1 in 280</td>
<td>1 in 12755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus while the width at the horizon of Ordinate 9 is unusual, the extent to which it is maintained at Ordinate 10 is still more unusual. In this character Sir Thomas Browne differed, not by defect, but by excess, from the average Londoner of his day.

With the material now examined we come to an end of all available comparative data which are accompanied by figures enabling us to gauge the significance of any deviations we may observe. At this point, therefore, it will be well to sum up the results of our comparisons.

Taking the constants obtained from the Whitechapel series of skulls as the nearest approximation we can get to the cranial constants of the population of London in the seventeenth century, and supplementing these constants, where they are lacking, by data obtained from the Moorfields series, we gather that Sir Thomas Browne's skull possessed the following characteristics: It was quite normal as regards length and maximum breadth, but was deficient in height, this deficiency occurring in the height of the vault above the horizon of the nasion. Its circumference, however, whether horizontal, vertical or sagittal measurements be taken, is quite normal. Of the major proportions of the skull, those in which height is a factor (height in relation to breadth, and to length) are unusual. The breadth of his forehead is significantly smaller than the average breadth, but the skull widens rapidly at the temples, and having attained normal maximum breadth in the region where the maximum usually occurs (a little more than mid-way from front to back) it maintains more than is usual of this breadth as it approaches the occipital region. The breadth at the back of the head is thus significantly greater than usual, and, the length of the head behind the vertical through the auricular passages having also an excess over the normal which borders on significance, the small
capacity of the skull in the frontal region is compensated for by increased capaciousness at the back, with the result that the total capacity of the skull comes within the normal range. The face presents no unusual features with the possible (but not probable) exception of the proportions of the right orbit.

It is unfortunate that we are unable to deal with the mandible in our study, but figures for a series of certainly male English mandibles are at present lacking.

(VIII) THE ENDOCRANIAL CAST OF SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S SKULL.

At the request of Professor Karl Pearson, Professor G. Elliot Smith most kindly consented to write a brief report on the endocranial cast of Sir Thomas Browne.

Report. The general features, so far as the shape and size of the brain are concerned, follow closely the conclusions which have been already set forth with reference to the skull. The special features of the endocranial cast can be best elucidated by means of orthographic projections of the cast compared with those of other endocranial casts (Plates XXXII—XXXIV). This has been done in the three sets of superimposed contours representing the endocranial cast of Sir Thomas Browne's skull in contrast with that of Dean Swift's, which is of large size and shows exceptional development, and also one, obtained from a modern English skull picked at random from the teaching collection in the Anatomical Department of University College, the capacity of which is 1463 c.c. The random specimen of English skull is somewhat narrower and a little higher than the average of the normal series, but it serves to bring out the flatness of Sir Thomas Browne's cast, most pronounced in the frontal region. The outstanding peculiarity of the cast, in fact, is this lowness and the next feature is the marked depression of the prefrontal region of the brain, which is the area which modern research seems to suggest as the part of the brain the high development of which is intimately correlated with powers of concentration and discrimination. In contradistinction to this, if one takes into account its unusual breadth, the temporal area of the brain is well-developed and the parietal area is also larger than the average.

Comparison with the endocranial cast of Dean Swift's skull shows the very definite superiority of the latter in every region. The normal asymmetry is not pronounced. The prominence of the anterior end of the right hemisphere and of the posterior end of the left and the larger size of the right sinus are conditions usual in right-handed persons. These features are less pronounced than is normally the case. There is nothing in the peculiar features of the cast indicative of exceptional or particular development of brain.

(IX) CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The general conclusions to be drawn from this discussion of the skull and portraits of Sir Thomas Browne are, we think, of the following nature:

(a) There are two original portraits of Sir Thomas Browne only, namely: the Buccleuch Miniature and the Norwich Painting. It is not certain, however, that they are absolutely independent. Of these the miniature is the later, and may be to some extent dependent on the painting.
(b) The skull recently re-interred is undoubtedly the same as was seen and reported on by Mr Fitch in 1840. That gentleman appropriated the coffin plate, and may well have appropriated the skull. The skull is the same as that of which, a cast was presented to the Norwich Museum in 1841 as Sir Thomas Browne's.

(c) The Norwich painting and the Buccleuch miniature are as close to the form that in life draped the skull as we can reasonably expect such portraits to be. They indicate, if they do not stress, the markedly receding frontal of the skull. This not very flattering characteristic, apparently inherited from his father by Dr Edward Browne, the son of Sir Thomas, is wholly removed in the portraits in the Royal College of Physicians and at the Bodleian, but neither of these pictures is an original. It is more or less disguised in the plumbago drawing and in White's engraving.

(d) This outstanding peculiarity of the skull, emphasised also in the endocranial cast, seems to suggest a defect of marked development in that part of the brain intimately correlated with powers of concentration and discrimination. There are two possible solutions of the problem raised by this result:

(i) Sir Thomas Browne is undoubtedly a characteristic writer who has charmed many generations of English readers; but after all do his writings suggest great powers of concentration or discrimination? He was in the first place a lover of literature and not a scientist; he was never elected a fellow of the Royal Society, and he did not hesitate to make a public avowal of his belief in witchcraft. We should rather anticipate that the sense of rhythm, the appreciation of sound and music, the artistic rather than the logical side of mind would be markedly developed in him. Hence it is possibly not reasonable to demand that Sir Thomas Browne must have been "high browed." Still the receding frontal is not what some admirers of Sir Thomas Browne may demand for their hero, and to such the Royal College of Physicians or the Bodleian portrait will appeal as satisfying not only their demand but also popular opinion as to the relation of intelligence and head shape.

(ii) The other solution of the problem is to take the results of this memoir as confirming earlier investigations which indicate that there is very little correlation between the shape of the head or indeed of the brain cavity and the mentality of the individual. Readers of Biometrika may remember that some years ago an investigation of the skull of Jeremy Bentham* showed that it was essentially mediocre with no outstanding characters which might be associated with marked intellectuality. The present investigation seems to indicate that the skull of another man of genius can depart from general mediocrity in a few isolated characters, and in some of these reach a form which current opinion describes as a "low type" of skull. Thus the second solution, and to us the more reasonable one, may be summed up in the words that Sir Thomas Browne's skull supports the conclusion that the correlation of superficial head and brain characters with mentality is so low as to provide no basis for any prognosis of value.

APPENDIX I.

Notes on Pedigree.


IV 1. Admon. in P.C.C 6 Dec. 1592, to son Powle; therein described as “of Acton, Co. Middx.”

IV 2. Widow of [John] Lain of the Privy Chamber Edw. VI; married to John Garraway between 17 Aug. 1545 and 1 Mar. 1552/53 (will of Jno. Edwyn and admon. to Agnes Edwyn).

IV 3, IV 4. Both living 1572.

IV 5. Died 12 Aug. 1629; 2nd wife.

IV 6. Prothonotary and Clerk of the Crown for the counties of Chester and Flint; purchased the manor of Backford June 1571, tog. with estates in Bromborough from Thos. Aldersey, haberdasher; died 7 Mar. 10 Jac. I (1613); Inq. p.m. 12 Jan. 11 Jac. I (1614).

V 1. Married before 1538, a younger son.

V 2. Living 18 Dec. 1571 (will of son Walter).


V 5. Brownes of Upton. Until the dissolution of the monasteries the Brownes of Upton were fee-farmers, in fee to Chester Abbey; the lands were thereafter confirmed to them. (Ormerod’s Hist. of County of Chester, Vol. ii. p. 819).


V 9. 2nd son; Clerk of the Green Cloth to Hen. VIII, Prothonotary and Clerk of the Crown for the counties of Chester and Flint.


VI 1. Will 16 Mar. 1518/19; proved by wife P.C.C. 10 May 1520 (26 Ayloffe); brass in Church of the Apostles Peter and Paul, Weobley, where buried.

The Garways or Garraways were an old Herefordshire family who until the 16th cent. had lands at Weobley; these were then added to the adjacent estate of the Ley, the seat of a branch of the Brydges family (Ch. J. Robinson’s Mansions and Manors of Herefordshire, p. 290).

VI 3. Citizen, draper, and alderman of London; sheriff 1513, Lord Mayor 1520.

Brugge (Brydges, Bruges) Pedigree, Banks’ Dormant and Extinct Peerages, Vol. iii.; line traced from Sir Simon de Brugge (temp. Hen. III and Edw. I) to Simon Brugge of the Leye, Herefordshire, whose will is dated 1385 (Robinson, loc. cit. [VI 1]). This Simon Brugge of the Leye was the ancestor of Sir John Bruges [VI 3] (Banks, loc. cit.). The pedigree is incomplete, but the descent was evidently through a younger son, for there were Brydges of the Ley until 1702 (Robinson, loc. cit. p. 291).

VI 5. Living 22 Hen. VII (1506–7), died 27 Nov. 32 Hen. VIII (1540), seized of manors mentioned IX 1.

VI 8. Alderman of Chester; 3rd son.

VI 9. Died 19 Aug. 1516, buried at St Mary’s, in Chester, where a monument remains to his memory.


VI 11. Erratum in pedigree, for Hallingbury read Hallowbury.
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VII 3. Aet. 25, 9 Edw. IV (b. 1443-5); obiit et Inq. p.m. 21 Hen. VII (1505-6); marr. 5 Edw. IV (1465-6).
VII 5. Alias Tho. de Pulle jun., Inq. p.m. 16 Hen. VII (1500-1).
VII 7. Descended from the Bainvilles of Chester (see XIII 15).
VIII 1. The ancient seat of the Aylof family was Boughton Aloph in Kent, to which its name was given. Differing accounts of the family are given in Hasted's Hist. of Kent, iii. 190, and Wright's History of Essex, ii. 443. The latter states that it was a Saxon family, one of whom was portreeve of London, temp. Edw. Confessor.
VIII 5. Aet. 40, 37 Hen. VI (b. 1417-9); obiit et Inq. p.m. 9 Edw. IV (1469-70), seized of lands mentioned IX 1.
VIII 11. Occurs 7 Hen. VII (1465-6) and 25 Hen. VI (1446-7); lord of a moiety of Aldersey.
VIII 13. Living 2 Edw. IV (1462-3); appears in a plea to quo warranto 15 Hen. VII (1499-1500); Inq. p.m. 16 Hen. VII (1500-1).
VIII 15. Living temp. Hen. V & VI.
IX 1. Died seized of the manors of Bunbury, Stanney, and Occleston, and of lands in Hoole and divers other townships; living 2 Hen. V (1414-6); obiit et Inq. p.m. 37 Hen. VI (1458-9).
Bunbury Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 395; succession shown through 12 predecessors (relationships uncertain) from...de St Pierre, a younger brother of the house of St Pierre in Normandy.
IX 3. Of Flint.
IX 7. In the Scotch and Irish wars, temp. Ric. II; governor of Carnarvon Castle 1 Hen. IV (1399-1400).
IX 9. Pardon for Percy rebellion 3 Nov. 5 Hen. IV (1403) at the battle of Agyncourt; knighted 1415; living 4 Hen. VI (1425-6); died before 7 Hen. VI (1428-9).
IX 16. Done Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 248 (Jonet [VIII 14] not given). The first of the Dones who held Utkinton (under the barons of Kinderton) was Richard Done, temp. K. John. IX 16 is probably the Sir John Done described in the pedigree as “Inq. p.m. 38 Hen. VI (1459-60), Knt.”
IX 17. Birkenhead Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 368. Three predecessors of IX 17 given (relationships uncertain) of whom the first was John de Birchened, temp. Edw. II & III.
X 1. Dutton Pedigree. Ormerod, ii. 796-6 (Alice [IX 2] not given); goes back to Wlofaith Fitz-Ivon, temp. Willm I.
X 5. Heiress of father. See note to XII 2.
X 8. Lord of Hoton, Cheshire, in right of his wife; in Ireland on King's service 1 Hen. IV (1399-1400); pardon for Percy rebellion 3 Nov. 5 Hen. IV (1403) at the battle of Agyncourt; aet. 30, 21 Ric. II (b. 1366-8); Inq. p.m. 6 Hen. VI (1427-8).
X 10. Arderne Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 85 (Blanche [IX 10] not given); line goes back to Agnes de Arden (born 11th cent.), descended from Turkettill de Eardene, Co. Warwick.
X 11. Lord of a moiety of Aldersey; occurs 16 Edw. III (1342–3).
X 13. Barton Pedigree (incomplete), Ormerod, ii. 749 (Margery, died 1355, [IX 12] not given); goes back to Sir Patrick Barton, Knt., lord of Barton, Cheshire, temp. Hen. III.
X 14. Uncertain whether Thomas de Hokenhull was father of John [IX 14], or grandfather, the father then being Richard.
XI 3. Osbaldeston (Balderstone) Pedigree, Baines, iv. 56½ (Katherine [X 3] not given); line goes back to Hugo de Osbaldeston, als. de Sunderland, living temp. Ric. I and John, of Saxon descent (Baines, iv. 55).
XI 6. ? obiit 1 Edw. II (1307–8); grantee of lands in Capenhurst, Cheshire, from Hugh de Bernston.
XI 10. Grantee of 20 marks per annum in lieu of the forestership of Wirral, 35 Edw. III (1361–2); occurs 1 & 2 Ric. II; Inq. p.m. 21 Ric. II (1397–8).
XI 14. Occurs 18–19 Edw. II (1324–6); died 1327.
XI 17. Mentioned in Plea Rolls 10 Edw. II (1316–7), and Harleian MSS. No. 1535.
XI 18. Part heiress of father.
XI 1. Seized of Speke, Lancs. in right of his wife (but see XII 2).
Norreys Pedigree, Baines, v. 58; the names, only, of six generations before this in the male line, are given, back to Alane Norreys of Sutton, Lancs. The names do not tally with the details given in Baines, v. 21. Norreys is a Norman-French name. There is mention of the family as early as 1199 (Baines, iv. 291).
XII 2. Said (Baines, v. 58) to have brought the lordship of Speke into the Norreys family. Baines, v. 236 states on the other hand that the lordship of Speke came through Jane Molyneux [X 5] whose daughter [IX 5] married Sir Henry Norreys.
XII 6. Living in the time of Simon the Abbot of St Werburgh, Chester, between 1265 and 1289.
XII 7. Widow of Richard de Coudrey; co-heiress with her sister of the hereditary office of cook to the Abbot of St Werburgh, and of her father’s lands.
XII 8. Died before 37 Edw. III (before 1364); bore Gules a chevron between three capons argent.
Capenhurst Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 570; five previous generations given in male line, of whom the first is John de Frodesham, temp. Hen. III. In Frodesham Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 48, the line is taken still further back to Hugh de Frodesham, temp. Hen. II and Ric. I.
XII 10. Obtained lands in Thornton by fine from Wm de Pensby, 3 Edw. III (1329–30); living 23–24 Edw. III (1349–51). (Ormerod, ii. 552.)
XII 11. Heiress of father.
XII 14. Did fealty 11 Edw. III (1337–8); Inq. p.m. 23 Edw. III (1349–50).
XII 15. Heiress of father.
Hooton Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 410; two predecessors of XII 16 given (relationships uncertain) of whom the first is Wm de Hoton, lord of Hoton, temp. Hen. III and Edw. I.
XII 18. Re Torond Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 378. The earliest record of Toronds of Mollington Torond is 2 Edw. II (1308–9).
XII 19. Second son; inherited only a moiety of estate.
Sir Thomas Browne: His Skull, Portraits, and Ancestry

XII 21. Re Handley Family, Ormerod, ii. 724; earliest mention 7 Edw. II (1313–4).
XII 22. Living 1308.

XIII 4. Poole Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 423.
XIII 6. Cook to William Marmion, Abbot of St Werburgh, Chester, 1226–8 (office hereditary and descended with lands to daughters).

XIII 10. Master-forester of Wirral, Cheshire (hereditary office); living 6–7 Edw. II (1312–4).
XIII 15. Living 1334; ancestor of the Bamvilles of Chester, who held lands in Storeton, Cheshire (see VII 7).
XIII 16. Lord of Aldersey, temp. Hen. III.

Aldersey Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 739. The family is supposed to have descended from Hugh de Altaribus, male ancestor at the Conquest (Ormerod, ii. 737).
XIII 18. Confirmed his uncle's donations of lands to Pulton Abbey; Sheriff of Cheshire, 50 Hen. III (1265–6); died circ. 30 Edw. I (1301–2).

XIV 1. In the commission for the perambulation of forests; had a forestership in Lancs. 1228.
XIV 7. Held of the Earl of Chester, in capite, the manor of Thorneton Maheu, also a moiety of the township of Pulton Waley for one-fourth a knight's fee; also land in the City of Chester and in Pulton Launcelyne 35 Edw. I (1306–7).
XIV 9. Holding part of Leighton under the paramount lordship of the barons of Montalt, in 6 Edw. II (1312–3). Ormerod, i. 549.

Stanley Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 415; relationships before William [XIV 11] uncertain, but 4 (?5) predecessors given of whom the first is Adam de Aldithlegh, alias Audley, Co. Staffs., temp. Hen. I; and of whom the third married an heiress of Stoneleigh, als. Stanley, Co. Staffs.

Masey Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 365; father of Robert [XIV 14] uncertain; line goes back to great-grandfather, Sir Hamon de Masey, 1st known baron of Dunham Masey and lord of Bacford, Cheshire, temp. Hen. I.
XV 3. Living temp. Hen. III; probably lord of Thorneton under the Earl of Chester (Ormerod, ii. 553).
XV 5. Master-forester of Wirral, Cheshire; obiit in or ante 1282.
XV 9. Winnington Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 205 (Hawise [XIV 17] not given); earliest of line mentioned is Wm de Wymington; his son Robert was living 56 Hen. III (1271–2) and may be XV 9 father of Hawise.
XVI 1. Acquired Little Crosby in right of his wife.
XVI 3. Born about 1160; in 1196 paid 20 marks to be excused crossing the seas with the army into Normandy; rebuilt Warrington Church; in 1225 appointed a collector of the fifteenth in Lancs.
XVI 5. Pulford Pedigree, Ormerod, ii. 857.
APPENDIX II.

List of Portraits since 1686.

The following is a list, which attempts to be complete, of all portraits of Sir Thomas Browne published since 1686 (the date of Robert White's engraved portrait) up to the present day, classified according to the portraits upon which they were based:

A. Reproduction of Buccleuch Miniature.


B. Reproductions from Royal College of Physicians' portrait.

(1) Engraving by J. Brown after the drawing by G. P. Harding, publ. separately by M. M. Holloway, Covent Garden, London, Jan. 1, 1849 (details of dress being difficult to distin-
guish in original, Harding has introduced a fur-edged cloak similar to that worn by Linacre in Holbein's portrait (painted 1521), of which there is a copy at the Royal College of Physicians).


(4) Engraving by C. H. Jeens, in Religio Medici, etc., publ. by Macmillan and Co., London, 1881 [cloak copied from G. P. Harding, see (1)].


(6) Same as (3) in a reprint of same, 1898.

(7) Portrait said by Mr Ch. Williams to be "Engraving by C. H. Jeens, 1885"; probably publ. separately; cloak plain, and buttoned in front (copy in Norwich Castle Museum).


(10) Photogravure in Some Historical Portraits, publ. by Oxford University Press, 1911.

C. Reproductions from Bodleian Portrait.

(1) Engraving by Hinchliff [said to be after Bodleian, but cloak certainly after White—see G (7)] in Collected Works, publ. by H. G. Bohn, London, 1852.

(2) Photogravure in Religio Medici, etc., publ. by G. Moreton, Canterbury, 1894.

D. Reproductions from Norwich Portrait.

(1) Lithograph of a charcoal drawing from this picture, by Cotman (Miles Edmund ?), publ. by Ch. Musket, Norwich (copy in Norwich Castle Museum).

(2) Wood-cut (poor) by J. Cooper, in Varia: Readings from Rare Books, publ. by Sampson, Low, Son and Marston, London, 1866.

(3) Same wood-cut as (2) (cut down, and very poor), in Religio Medici, etc., publ. by Sampson, Low, Son and Marston, London, 1869.

(4) Same as (2) in a re-issue of same edition with cancel title-page by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1869.

(5) Same as (2) in a reprint of same book by Sampson, Low, Son and Marston, 1877.

(6) Colotype reproduction in Souvenir of Sir Thomas Browne, by Charles Williams, publ. by Jarrold and Sons, Norwich, 1905.


(1) Photogravure in the Collected Works, publ. by E. Grant Richards, London, 1904–1907.


(3) Photogravure in Religio Medici, etc., publ. by E. Grant Richards, London, 1906.


G. Reproductions taken directly or indirectly from R. White's Engraving. (Collected Works, 1686.)

(1) Engraving (no name) in Alle de Werken van Thomas Brown, publ. by de Widuwe van Steven Swart, Amsterdam, 1688.


(3) Same as (2) in a reprint of the Posthumous Works, publ. by E. Curll, London, 1736.

* Blomefield says (in 1741) that Van der Gucht copied from the Norwich portrait, but he is mistaken (Hist. of County of Norfolk, Vol. iii. p. 198).


(7) Engraving by Hinchliff in The Works of Sir Thomas Browne, publ. by H. G. Bohn, 1862 (claims to be after Bodleian painting, but dress certainly copied from White).

(8) Engraving (unsigned), in Religio Medici, etc., publ. by Ticknor and Fields, Boston, 1862.

(9) Same as (8) in reprint of same, 1863.

(10) Same as (8) in reprint of same, 1868.

(11) Same as (8) in a re-issue of same with cancel title-page by Jas. R. Osgood, Boston, in 1872.

(12) Same as (8) in a re-issue of same with cancel title-page by Roberts Bros., Boston, in 1878.

(13) “Photomezzototype” reproduction of original engraving by White; in Religio Medici, etc., publ. by David Stott, London, 1892.

(14) Photogravure by Walker and Boutal of engraving by Van der Gucht [see (2)] in Hydriotaphia, Urn Burial; with an Account of Urns found at Brampton, publ. by Ch. Whittingham and Co., London, 1893.

(15) Engraving (no name) in Religio Medici, etc., publ. by J. M. Dent and Co., London, 1896 (not carried so far down as in White).

(16) “Photomezzototype” reproduction [same as (13)] in Religio Medici, etc., publ. by Smith, Elder and Co., London, 1898.

(17) Photogravure of engraving by Van der Gucht [see (2)] in Religio Medici, etc., publ. by Geo. Bell and Sons, London, 1898.

(18) Photogravure of original engraving by White, in Religio Medici and Other Essays, publ. by Gray and Bird, London, 1902.

(19) “Photomezzototype” reproduction [same as (13)] in Religio Medici, etc., publ. by Sherratt and Hughes, Manchester, 1902 (a re-issue, with cancel-title, of Smith, Elder and Co.'s edition) [see (16)].

(20) Same as (17) in a re-issue of same with cancel title-page, by Scott Thaw Co., New York, 1903.


(22) Half-tone reproduction of original engraving by White, in Quaint Sayings from Works of Sir Thomas Browne, publ. by Elliot Stock, London, 1905.


In addition to the above, Simon Wilkin (in Sir Thomas Browne's Works, publ. 1835-6, Vol. ii. p. 168) alludes to a mezzotint portrait of which he has seen a copy in an extra-illustrated Blomefield's Norwich, in the Dean and Chapter's Library at Norwich (an unsuccessful attempt was made to find this portrait; a search under more favourable circumstances might reveal it).
APPENDIX III.

It occurred to the Editor that a search in the records of Winchester College might throw some light on Sir Thomas Browne's history. He made an application to Mr Herbert Chitty, the Bursar, who not only most kindly forwarded the information given below, but also a list of the editions of Browne's works in the various College libraries, which has been communicated to Dr Keynes. The material is of great interest.

Register of Scholars admitted to the College. Vol. I. p. 111.

"Nomina Scholarium admissorum a 19o Augusti 1616 viz. a fine Electionis tunc celebratæ usque ad promixam [sic] Electionem anni sequentis 1617."

[2nd name:—]

"Thomas Browne de parochia sancti Michaelis in le Cheape comitatu Midlesex 10 annorum ad festum sancti Michaelis præteritum admissus 20o Augusti 1616—London. [diocesis]." [Marginal note:—] "recessit sponte. Medicus Dr. Norvici."

MUNIMENT ROOM.

"Liber Prothocollorum de iuramentis tam Sociorum quam Scholarium de novo compositus A Diœni 1576."

"Nomina Scholarium juratorum ultimo die Septemb. Anno Dni 1620."

[Amongst other names:—]

"Thomas Browne de St Foster comitatu Middlesex, Londô dioc."

The notary who made the record was "Johannes Harmar civilista London. Diocesis publicus authoritate Regia notarius."

Under Rubric V of the College Statutes the scholars had to take an oath to obey the Statutes, etc., "post quintundecimum annum completum."

MUNIMENT ROOM.

Election Roll 1622. Roll of Scholars selected for New College, Oxford.

"Oxon. Anno Domini 1622 a decimo die Augusti ad decimum septimum eiusdem mensis."

[The 11th boy on this Roll is:—]

"Thomas Browne de parochia Scti Michaelis in Le Chepe de comitatu Midlesex annorum 17 festo Michaelis præterito—London. [diocesis]."

[He was too low down on the Roll to succeed to a vacancy at New College.] The Roll is signed by "Robertus Pinck, Custos" [Novi Collegii], "Gullielmus Oldys" and "Thomas Boothe," "Examinatores": "Nicholas Love, Custos [Win. Coll.], Henricus Madgniake, Vice-custos, Hugo Robinson, Informator."

[Thus examiners through the ages!]

FELLOWS' LIBRARY.

Warden Nicholas's MS. Book relating to the building of "the new School at Winton Colledge" begun to be built in Sept. 1683 and finished June xi, 1687.

"Nomina Nobilium et Dignissimorum Virorum, Qui surgenti Wichamicae Scholae Magnificentiae auxiliares manus admoveunt Quantumque Collegium Wintoniense gratia valuit spontaneis Beneficiis plurimisque docuerunt."

[Inter alios:—]

"Thomas Brown Eques. Med. Dr. Quondam hujus Coll. Comënsalis, Dedit. . . 10 0 0"