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Abstract

This thesis explores the word ‘addict’ and the concepts it was applied to, from the invention of the term in the early sixteenth century, through to the end of the seventeenth century. It begins with an examination of the historical and linguistic context in which ‘addict’ emerged, in the writing of early English protestant reformers. Next, it looks back to the Latin origins of the term, using dictionaries and translated works to draw links between the Latin term ‘addicere’, and the English words derived from it. This thesis then uses quantitative methods and corpus analysis to trace changing uses of ‘addict’ across the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, focusing particularly on the subjects and objects of addiction. Finally, the results of this quantitative analysis form the basis for two in-depth studies: first, on the relationship between addiction and the self; and second, on the ways in which addiction was employed as a tool for cultural stereotyping. This thesis finds that early modern addiction was commonly used for denoting habitual behaviours of all kinds, from devotional attachments to bodily sins. As such, the term had particular relevance for writers attempting to describe human behaviours, including religious reformers writing about sin, biographers defining the characteristics of illustrious men, and ethnographers discussing the behaviour of cultural groups.
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Introduction

Addiction is a word that grabs attention. It promises the reader a story of compulsion, deterioration, loss of control, a spiral downwards, paired with a story of withdrawal, recovery, and redemption. Often employed as a synonym for ‘substance abuse’, addiction is associated with intoxicating or illicit substances, and frequently incurs moral judgement. Addiction is also controversial: there are ongoing debates over the categorization of compulsive behaviours as addictions, and even disagreement over the classification of addiction as a disease.\(^1\) Gambling is the only behavioural addiction recognized by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM), and only since the fifth edition in 2013.\(^2\) In medical terms, addiction is still primarily a substance-related disorder.\(^3\)

The argument of this thesis is that, in stark contrast, early modern addiction was most often

---


associated with behaviours, not with substances. Furthermore, those behaviours were not necessarily considered reprehensible or medically harmful; in fact, addiction was not considered a medical phenomenon at all. Samuel Purchas’s 1613 collection of travel narratives provides a good demonstration of the range and variety of addictions in the early modern period. According to Purchas, the Pharisees ‘were much addicted to Astrology, and the Mathematics’, the Babylonians ‘addict themselves to Music, riot, and such like’, whilst ‘the Ephesians as all the other Ionians, were much addicted to niceness and sumptuousness of attire.’ Purchas tells his readers about a manatee in a lake in Hispaniola that was ‘addicted to one young man, which used to feed her’, and he tells the tragic tale of how ‘Cambletes a Lydian King was so addicted to gourmandise, that in the night he did tear and eat his Wife.’ These are not quite the stories of pathological consumption and compulsion that a modern reader might expect to find from addiction narratives. In this thesis I demonstrate that, in early modern English, ‘addict’ meant something quite distinct from the modern, medicalized, addiction concept. A term with a complex etymology, and roots in the English reformation, ‘addict’ was an incredibly versatile word for describing all forms of habitual behaviour, including religious and interpersonal devotion, and the pursuit of both pleasurable and sinful pastimes.

Addiction: the modern concept

Addiction studies is a well-established and very broad field of study, encompassing disciplines such as sociology, psychology, neuroscience, medicine, theology, philosophy, literature, and history. There is an entire branch of psychology dedicated to the study of addiction, and many more subject areas which, whilst not directly about addiction, are nevertheless clearly related; philosophical discourse on free will and compulsion, and the history of intoxicants, for example. Addiction is a topic of considerable interest to people

---

4 See Chapter III for an analysis of the most frequent objects of addiction.
5 Samuel Purchas, Purchas his pilgrimage. Or Relations of the world and the religions observed in all ages and places discovered, from the Creation unto this present In foure partes (London, 1613; EEBO-TCP Phase I). ‘Niceness’ is used here in the negative sense of indulgence and luxury.
6 Ibid.
8 The Society of Addiction Psychology (https://addictionpsychology.org/) has over 1000 members, promotes the training of addiction psychologists, produces a regular newsletter, The Addictions Newsletter, and holds an annual meeting, Collaborative Perspectives on Addiction. The Society also created an addiction psychology journal, Psychology of Addictive Behaviours. The Journal of Addiction Research and Therapy publishes work on addiction therapies, mainly by Clinical Practitioners, medical / health practitioners, and others working in the field of addiction treatment. Addiction is a journal published by the Society for the Study of Addiction, publishing research on pharmacological and behavioural addictions. Their scope ‘spans human experimental, epidemiological, social science, historical, clinical and policy research relating to addiction’ (http://addictionjournal.org/pages/aims-scope). For interdisciplinary approaches to addiction, see works like
from a broad range of disciplinary backgrounds. However, until recently, early modern addiction – and thus the origins of the term, which dates back to the sixteenth century – had received little attention. Scholars writing about the history of addiction have either disregarded early modern uses of the term ‘addict’ as being unrelated to the modern concept, or have ignored the fact that an earlier meaning existed.

In the late twentieth century a debate emerged on the origins of addiction, prompted by a 1978 article by Harry G. Levine, which argued that Benjamin Rush, founder of the Temperance Movement, was the first to clearly articulate a modern concept of addiction. Levine argued this was a radical break from earlier conceptions of drinking, which viewed drunkenness as a choice, and sometimes as a sin, but not as a compulsion. Rush contributed four characteristics to the new definition of addiction, claiming that it was both a disease and a compulsion, caused by spirits, which could be cured only by total abstinence. According to Levine, the social conditions that enabled the medicalisation of addiction included puritan individualism, an emerging middle class with aspirations to end social disorder, and a new medical model of mental illness. Levine’s focus was America, and he noted that, since Britain did not have the same social conditions, it ‘developed no addiction model of habitual drunkenness... until the 19th century.’

Levine’s model was challenged first by Roy Porter, and then by Jessica Warner, both of whom saw modern addiction emerging as a more gradual, long-term process. Porter’s 1985 article, ‘The drinking man’s disease: The “pre-history” of alcoholism in Georgian Britain’ focused on a similar period in time, but attributed the shift in attitudes to gradual changes in eighteenth and nineteenth century England, rather than to the work of one man. Whereas Levine linked addiction in Britain to the theories of Thomas Trotter who depicted alcoholism as a physical disease, Porter demonstrates that Trotter’s contributions were not new, he was

---

Neil Levy (ed.), *Addiction and Self-Control: Perspectives from Philosophy, Psychology, and Neuroscience* (New York, 2013); Don Ross (ed.), *What is Addiction?* (Cambridge, Mass; London, 2010), with chapters by ‘researchers from neuroscience, psychology, genetics, philosophy, economics, and other fields’.


10 Levine, ‘The Discovery of Addiction’.

11 Ibid., p. 47.

12 Ibid., pp. 52-3.

13 Ibid., p. 54.


just better at publicising them.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 390-2.} In his conclusion Porter adds that medical interpretations of drinking were already applied to the wealthy in the Georgian period, with the difference in the nineteenth century being that this spread throughout all ranks of society.\footnote{Ibid., p. 393.} In 1994 Warner wrote a rebuttal of Levine in which she discussed and dismissed each of his four claims about Rush in turn. Instead, she argued that the roots of addiction were to be found in seventeenth-century moral treatises and sermons.\footnote{Warner, 'Resolv’d to drink no more', p. 685; Cree, 'Protestant Evangelicals and Addiction', p. 447.} First she discussed different attitudes to spirits and weaker drinks to show that Rush was not the first to posit a specific link between spirits and drunkenness.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 686-7.} Next she used seventeenth-century sermons to demonstrate that loss of control, escalation, and disease, were associated with habitual drinking long before Rush.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 687-8.} Third she argued that seventeenth century preachers regarded drinking as a disease, and fourth she showed early advocacy for abstinence.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 688-9.} Peter Ferentzy, in 2001, defended Levine (and Rush) against Warner’s critique. He claimed that Warner’s argument was flawed because Rush’s contribution was in uniting four strands of thought, not inventing them individually, and he accused Warner of misrepresenting Porter to bolster her argument.\footnote{Peter Ferentzy, ‘From Sin to Disease: Differences and Similarities Between Past and Current Conceptions of Substance Abuse’, Contemporary drug problems 28 (2001), pp. 373 & 375.} Ferentzy also pointed out that Warner was not actually saying anything radically different to Levine: both agreed ‘that the current conception of alcoholism became dominant only by the late eighteenth century.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 372.} Ferentzy then examined some of the texts used by Warner in order to demonstrate that preachers used the same conceptual framework and terminology to refer to all sins, not just that of drunkenness.\footnote{Ibid., p. 375.} His conclusion was that there was a ‘holistic approach to sin that dominated Western thought up until the advent of modernity’, and that the disease-concept of alcoholism is ‘the product of a more recent, secular mindset.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 384.}

Crucially, the debate between Levine, Porter, Warner, and Ferentzy, is not about the origins of the term ‘addiction’, nor is it wholly about the origins of the modern concept of addiction either. It is about the point at which the word ‘addict’, and the modern medicalised concept of addiction, begin to coincide. As Quentin Skinner explains, concepts do not always map simply and straightforwardly onto words, and both a word and the related concept possess
their own distinct history. Skinner gives the example of the term ‘originality’, writing that ‘although a history of the word originality and its various uses could undoubtedly be written, such a survey would by no means be the same as a history of the concept of originality – a consideration often ignored in practice by historians of ideas.’

This is the case with addiction. The verb ‘addict’ dates from the sixteenth century, where it was used to denote the pursuit of habitual behaviours or devotion, rather than as a synonym for substance abuse. The modern, medicalised concept of addiction, with its connection to abused substances, can be found – as Warner demonstrates – at least as early as the seventeenth century. However, the word ‘addict’ and the concept of substance abuse did not merge together until the late eighteenth or early nineteenth centuries, and it is this point of coalescence which Levine, Porter, and Ferentzy are concerned with; a point which, they all agree, first occurs in the context of eighteenth-century discourses on alcoholism and temperance.

There is a persistent lack of clarity in the approaches of Levine, Porter, Warner, and Ferentzy to this very significant distinction between word and concept. Levine uses the World Health Organisation (WHO) 1957 five-point definition to define the concept of addiction: intoxication, compulsion, escalation, psychic and physical dependence, and negative social impact.

He refers to pre-Rush history as ‘the world without addiction’, where “addicted” meant habituated, and one was habituated to drunkenness, not to liquor.

Levine’s distinction between pre-modern and modern concepts of addiction is not in itself inaccurate, but his framing of them is misleading; he depicts them, not as two distinct concepts, but as a ‘false’ versus a ‘correct’ use of the word. Furthermore, Levine does not always make a clear distinction between word and concept in his own writing. For example, he writes that ‘Americans began to report for the first time that they were addicted to alcohol: They said they experienced overwhelming and irresistible desires for liquor.’

It is not clear here whether Americans actually began associating the word ‘addicted’ with their desire for alcohol, or whether Levine attached that label to reports of overwhelming desire based on his own understanding of the term. Porter does not provide a definition of addiction, and his only comments on the nature of addiction disregard early uses. Of Falstaff’s speech advising people to ‘addict themselves to the sack’, Porter comments that ‘clearly the term “addict” there did not anticipate Victorian psychopathology’, and he warns ‘that we must

---

28 Ibid., p. 45.
29 Ibid., p. 43.
beware anachronism and the fallacious discovery of bogus forerunners.'

Like Levine, Porter is concerned with the point at which the term ‘addiction’ was united with the modern concept. With his comments on Falstaff, coupled with warnings about anachronism and ‘bogus forerunners’, Porter completely disregards pre-Victorian use of the term itself. Warner provides a range of contemporary definitions of ‘addiction’, and concludes that the term is ambiguous in allowing for both a volitional act and a loss of will; people ‘used the label somewhat loosely, sometimes to judge, other times merely to explain a habit grown excessive.’ However, despite examining and acknowledging the ambiguity of the word, Warner then goes on to use it in the modern sense throughout her article. She labels Richard Garbutt’s drunks as ‘addicts’ on the grounds of their escalating consumption and physical symptoms, when the phrase he himself used was ‘habituate Drunkards.’ She warns ‘that the notion of addiction was [not] central to earlier definitions of habitual drunkenness’, and states that society wasn’t blind ‘to the addicts in their midst; but neither of these statements make sense if addiction is used in the early modern sense.’ Warner’s conclusion states that ‘While their usage of the label “addicted” is... riddled with ambiguity, the fact remains that’ the practice of identifying heavy drinkers as addicts originated with pre-industrial clergymen. In other words, far from incorporating contemporary uses of the word into her argument, Warner argues that her conclusions are correct in spite of them. Ferentzy, like Warner, acknowledges the existence of an earlier meaning associated with the term ‘addict’, but regards it as simply a more generalised version of later concepts; earlier uses of the term indicate ‘a sweeping definition involving nothing more than persons struggling with certain urges’, whilst modern uses denote ‘a chronic diseased state requiring abstinence as a solution.’

These twentieth-century debates surrounding the origins of modern addiction have either ignored or quite deliberately excluded earlier uses of the term itself. Instead, they have focused on tracing the modern concept – in Warner’s case – or, in the case of Levine, Porter, and Ferentzy, pinpointing the moment at which word and modern concept were united. Later approaches to the history of addiction have – until recently – tended to side with one or other of these models when describing the origins of addiction. James Nicholls wrote a 2008 rebuttal to Ferentzy which agreed with Warner, arguing that the roots of modern

32 Ibid., p. 687.
33 Ibid., p. 688.
34 Ibid., p. 689.
35 Ferentzy, ‘From Sin to Disease’, p. 364-5.
attitudes to alcohol are in seventeenth century England. Nicholls demonstrates that the key source used by Ferentzy was not characteristic; that other seventeenth-century sources did treat drinking as distinct from other sins, showed signs of ‘medical inflection’, and asked questions about compulsion. He concludes that, ‘We should see Rush as a conduit... for a conceptual shift that had been developing in England for some time previously.’

In 2003 the sociologist Robin Room wrote ‘The cultural framing of addiction’ which considered the origins of modern addiction. Room’s discussion of the emergence of addiction acknowledges the challenges to Levine’s chronology from Porter and Warner, but concludes that Levine’s article ‘holds up, at least in terms of popular conceptions applied by broad sections of the population in everyday life.’ In fact, Room’s use of a specific medical definition of addiction gives him an even later origin date than Levine’s. Room argues that the early temperance movement thought that if they educated the public on the harmful effects of drinking, then people would stop drinking. ‘The addiction concept emerges as a way of understanding this failure: the failure of the drinker or drug user to behave rationally... the failure to stop a recurrent pattern of use despite the harm it is seen as causing.’

Another perspective is provided by consultant psychiatrist Mervyn London in his 2005 ‘History of Addiction: A UK perspective’, which considers tobacco and opium as well as alcohol. London provides a very broad overview of consumption and treatment, as well as of changing approaches to addiction in the twentieth century. For London, the first half of the twentieth century was dominated by the view that ‘addicts were not willing victims but sick people whose will lay dormant.’ London’s definition of addiction is modern, and the article identifies emerging features of the modern addiction concept in the early modern and modern world; in particular, challenges to Galen from anatomists who ‘demonstrated the centrality of the nervous system’, thus paving the way for ‘an emerging awareness of the part played by personality and hidden motivation on human behaviour.’ His timescale agrees with Levine, seeing the emergence of alcohol addiction in the late eighteenth century, and consolidation of the idea in the nineteenth; he adds that ‘it was not until the twentieth

---

37 Ibid., p. 196.
38 Ibid., p. 203.
40 Ibid., p. 222.
41 Ibid., p. 224.
43 Ibid., p. 99.
century, with the invention of the cigarette as the ideal delivery system, that tobacco addiction burgeoned.44 London’s area of expertise and his focus is on twentieth century explanatory models, and he adds little to existing debates on the origins of addiction.

Another strand of scholarship which routinely uses the term ‘addiction’ in reference to the early modern period is the study of historical intoxication and consumption.45 Like the work of Levine, Porter, and Warner, these works seek to locate modern addiction in the past, and their use of the term ‘addiction’ often fails to explore contemporary meanings and uses. A 2016 collaborative article titled ‘History of the Concept of Addiction’, for example, provides a whistle-stop tour of intoxication in antiquity and ‘the middle ages’, as a preface to a much more extensive examination of addiction from the nineteenth century onward. The innaccurately-titled section on the middle ages discusses the availability of various beverages; John Calvin and the sins of excessive drinking; and increased social control of drinking practices during the industrial revolution.46 The focus, at least before the nineteenth century, is very much on intoxicants and not on concepts of addiction. Another example of intoxication scholarship employing the modern concept of addiction in an early modern setting is Scott K. Taylor’s 2012 chapter on the history of tobacco, “‘A Miserable Captivity’ or ‘Happily redeemed from Captivity to Liberty’: Tobacco, Addiction, and Early Modern Bodies and Minds’, which examines early modern experiences of tobacco use.47 Taylor’s work is ostensibly an exploration of language, and he argues that accounts of tobacco usage borrowed from both spiritual language, and from the language of slavery.48 However, although he is analysing language, Taylor includes no definition of the word ‘addiction’ or discussion of early meanings of the word, and he uses the term in a modern sense throughout the article.49 In fact, although he uses ‘addiction’ in his title, Taylor’s article is primarily about intoxicants; he subscribes to Levine’s view that addiction was a nineteenth-century creation, adding that ‘over the course of the nineteenth century [Rush’s] vision of addiction gradually

44 Ibid., pp. 99-100 & 103.
48 Ibid., pp. 192-3.
49 Ibid., pp. 200 & 201.
became the dominant model for explaining all similar intoxicants.\textsuperscript{50} A different take on early modern addiction to tobacco is provided by Dennis Kezar in a 2003 article, ‘Shakespeare’s Addictions.’\textsuperscript{51} Kezar provides a very broad definition of addiction as, roughly, putting an unjustifiable amount of time, effort, and willpower into something; he writes that, ‘By addiction I mean the emphatic ascription of agency and causality to time-bound matter that cannot completely support such investment.’\textsuperscript{52} Kezar also notes and engages with early modern meanings of the term, providing various definitions from the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), and adding that ‘It would... be a mistake simply to conflate the word’s modern usage with Othello’s Early Modern meaning.’\textsuperscript{53} However, despite recognising this important distinction, and despite providing a definition of addiction broad enough to encompass both early modern and modern meanings, Kezar’s actual use of the word ‘addiction’ throughout the article is, essentially, as a synonym for substance abuse. He writes that, ‘I want to suggest that Desdemona at this weird moment is also torn between competing critical grammars recognizable to us... through today’s familiar phrase substance abuse,’ and that ‘I argue that the play associates such analysis with metonymy, scapegoating, and substance abuse.’\textsuperscript{54}

With a few exceptions, scholars working on the modern concept of addiction and its pre-modern history – whether the history of the concept, or of the behaviours it now describes – are conscious of the distinction between modern and early modern meanings. Yet in many cases, scholars who discuss addiction in a pre-modern context make clear statements that disregard earlier uses, or mark them out as distinct from the modern meaning. In all the examples above, the term ‘addiction’ is employed almost exclusively in its modern sense, essentially as a synonym for ‘substance abuse’. It is only recently that scholars interested in addiction have begun to explore the existence of a distinct, early modern concept of addiction: the concept indicated when early modern writers used the term ‘addict’.

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., pp. 192-3.  
\textsuperscript{51} Dennis Kezar, ‘Shakespeare’s Addictions’, Critical Enquiry 30 (2003), pp. 31-62.  
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., p. 33.  
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., p. 51. Whilst Kezar integrates these earlier meanings into his argument, his source was an older version of the OED which contained several inaccuracies: it listed Othello as the first appearance of the word, and it suggested a transition from an initial legal meaning – ‘delivery by sentence of the court’ – to a more general meaning of inclined or given. Both of these errors are corrected in the most recent OED entries.  
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., pp. 47 & 50.
Addiction: the early modern concept

Recognition of an early modern history of addiction that was not simply the pre-history of the modern terminology was signalled by Deborah Willis in 2008, in a chapter on ‘Doctor Faustus and the Early Modern Language of Addiction.’\(^\text{55}\) Willis set out to explore the role of an emerging early modern addiction discourse in Christopher Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*, noting that ‘it is a discourse that has affinities with, but also crucial differences from, our own contemporary ideas about addiction.’\(^\text{56}\) She begins by observing that ‘Many recent studies of the history of addiction begin their account in the nineteenth century, despite the fact that... references to persons “addicted to” various behaviours appear as early as the 1530s’, and that ‘it is now difficult to divorce the term from its substance-related, pathologized meanings: the “disease-model of addiction” has come to seem the “true” or literal meaning.’\(^\text{57}\) She explains that in early modern usage, ‘one can be addicted to good habits as well as to bad ones’ and that addiction was not necessarily either compulsive or stigmatised.\(^\text{58}\) Looking to the origins of the term, Willis points etymologically to ‘the Latin term for being “bound over” in law’, and conceptually to four key discourses: ‘classical discourse about habits of virtue and vice, going back at least to Cicero. Other threads come from religious discourse about sinful habituation, going back to Augustine; from Galenic medical discourse about melancholy, gluttony, and drunkenness: and... from demonological discourse about possession and the demonic pact.’\(^\text{59}\) She notes that, as well as indicating habitual behaviours, early modern addiction could be used to describe ‘a commitment or contract one enters into freely and is subsequently obligated to keep’ such as service to a lord or ruler; this usage ‘emphasizes the voluntary nature of the original act that leads to a more binding relationship.’\(^\text{60}\)

Willis applies the concept of addiction to an examination of Doctor Faustus, linking addiction to ideas about pact-making, voluntary and involuntary loss of will, and most importantly the notion of ‘sinful habituation’ – the idea, dating back to Augustine, that ‘the voluntary repetition of sinful acts impairs the will and produces a sense of powerlessness.’\(^\text{61}\) She concludes that Faustus has ‘a special contribution to make to the history of early modern

---


\(^{57}\) Willis, ‘Doctor Faustus’, pp. 135-6.

\(^{58}\) Ibid., p. 138.

\(^{59}\) Ibid., p. 137.

\(^{60}\) Ibid., p. 138.

\(^{61}\) Ibid., p. 142.
discourses of addiction, enabling us to read Faustus’s fall as the spectacle of a free agent manipulated into the repetition of acts that, over time, produce a changed inner nature and a diminishment of agency.\(^{62}\) Willis’s book chapter is not a long one, and the points she raises leave considerable scope for further examination and discussion. Nevertheless, Willis is the first scholar to articulate and employ a truly early modern concept of addiction in her work.

Rebecca Lemon, first in a 2016 article, and then in a 2018 monograph, *Addiction and Devotion in Early Modern England*, built on the foundations laid out by Willis.\(^{63}\) The concept of addiction outlined by Lemon is more developed than that of Willis, and whilst it contains many of the same elements – the same etymology, the link to classical discourses, and the focus on the role of the will – unlike Willis, Lemon distinguishes between two types or meanings of early modern addiction: devotional and compulsive. The first is ‘at once laudable, extraordinary, and even heroic’, whilst the second ‘resonates with modern scientific definitions’ with its associations of disease and enslavement.\(^{64}\) Both, however, involve an ‘overthrow of the will.’\(^{65}\) Since addiction is also a matter of personal choice, Lemon writes that, “To be an addict demands the simultaneous exercise and relinquishment of the will.”\(^{66}\)

Lemon argues that addiction-as-devotion has been obscured by the focus on addiction-as-pathology, and that devotional addiction was in fact the original meaning of the English term, popularised in the work of reformist writers. Secular texts later adopted the language of devotional addiction for their own purposes, which were often didactic. Crucially, this early form of addiction was almost exclusively laudable and desirable.\(^{67}\) Lemon gives the examples of Olivia and Viola in *Twelfth Night*, who were addicted to love, ‘an attachment requiring both commitment and devotion expressed not temporarily, but over and through time.’\(^{68}\)

Compulsive, negative, abusive addiction emerged as a corruption of devotional addiction, occurring particularly when addictions were pursued wrongly, or misdirected. Lemon’s

\(^{62}\) Ibid., p. 148.


\(^{64}\) Lemon, *Addiction and Devotion*, pp. ix-x.

\(^{65}\) Ibid., p. x.

\(^{66}\) Ibid., p. xiv.

\(^{67}\) Ibid., pp. 6-7.

\(^{68}\) Ibid., p. 50.
chapters provide numerous examples: Faustus, who attempted to addict himself to necromancy rather than religion, but failed since his devotion was bound by a contract, and ‘true devotion requires no contract, no promptings, and no threats.’ Falstaff, whose addiction to Hal is rejected, causing his affections to be diverted to a proxy; instead of Hal, ‘Falstaff devotes himself to drunken good fellowship, the material condition of their friendship.’ Similarly, Othello’s addiction to Desdemona was corrupted and diverted, ‘toward an irrational, shattering, destructive attachment to Iago.’ These corruptions of devoted addiction are caused by the ‘profound uncertainty surrounding both the agent propelling addictive devotion... and the object of the devotion itself.’ Since these fears originated in the work of puritan authors, abusive addiction was often linked to moral concerns about material pleasures such as drunkenness. Lemon points out, like Warner before her, that the writings of religious preachers thus ‘anticipate modern medical definitions of addiction far more precisely than the work of their contemporary physicians.’

The overall thread of Lemon’s work suggests a transition from addiction-as-devotion, apparent in the work of Seneca, Cicero, and Calvin, to a corrupted version of addiction as a form of compulsion. This transition is particularly apparent in her chapters on Falstaff and Othello, who themselves have addictions that shift from devotional to compulsive. However, Lemon explicitly denies any such historical narrative, writing that her final chapter ‘frustrates what might appear a historical trajectory on addiction embedded in this book’s argument... To read a historical narrative onto these shifting, alternate views on addiction would be reductive, for it would ignore the persistent gestures towards addiction as devotion through the seventeenth century.’

Early modern addiction is an emerging field of study with considerable potential, not only in its links to addiction today, but also for its ability to reflect upon early modern understandings of human behaviour. From a modern perspective, there are interesting parallels between early modern addiction concepts, and changing ideas about our own, medicalised addiction concept. The recent shift towards greater inclusion of behavioural addictions within the DSM is paralleled by growing concern over addictive behaviours such as sex, gaming, shopping,
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and eating.\textsuperscript{76} Early modern concepts of addiction allow this to be viewed less as an innovation and more as a reversion to a much older model of understanding. Even more interesting – in my view – is the potential this field of study has for uncovering early modern ideas about human behaviour. By exploring the types of addiction found in early modern sources we can answer broader questions about how early modern people thought habitual or compulsive behaviours were formed, and whether they believed a tendency to behave in a particular way was innate or learned. Early modern addiction has the potential to unite disparate fields of study in new ways; taking philosophical debates about free will, self-control, and compulsion, and applying them to everyday behaviours like drinking practices or academic study. Finally, analysing addiction enables historians not just to observe historical action, but also to explain the reasons behind it using terms and concepts that contemporaries would have understood.

Lemon’s examination of addiction provides an important introduction to this emerging field, and one that is grounded in the intricate relationships and complex character development of her sources, carefully contextualised with contemporary discourses and genres. However, her approach provides depth rather than breadth, detailing one particular aspect of meaning and use rather than providing an overview of early modern addiction. Whilst she mentions various types of addiction – to jealousy, witchcraft, law, and melancholy, among others – her case studies explore only two types of addiction in detail: addiction to drinking or drunkenness, and addiction to other people. The use of literary case studies also means that Lemon focuses on behaviours that could be classed as addiction, rather than on uses of the term ‘addict’ in the texts themselves. As she explains in her introduction, ‘rather than concentrate solely on those texts that repeatedly deploy the word ‘addiction’, I instead select texts that pose the broader philosophical issues at stake in invocations of addiction.’\textsuperscript{77} This approach allows for a detailed analysis of individual characters and their actions, enabling Lemon to move beyond the purely conceptual and embed her analysis in examples of human action. However, it also means that Lemon’s identification of addicted behaviour is based to a large extent on her interpretation of the word, rather than that of early modern writers; few of the texts she examines contain any instances of the term ‘addict’ at all.

This thesis builds upon the conclusions drawn by Lemon and Willis, extending their literary and close reading approaches by using combined quantitative and qualitative methods, to

\textsuperscript{76} See, for example, the list of addictions treated by The Priory Group treatment centres: ‘Addictions’, http://www.priorygroup.com/addictions [accessed 28/08/2018].

\textsuperscript{77} Lemon, \textit{Addiction and Devotion}, p. 19.
provide a broad overview of early modern addiction. I draw on the uses of the word itself to build a picture of changing meanings, uses, and contexts, across early modern print. Where Lemon shies away from the suggestion of a historical narrative, the much broader approach taken here allows this thesis to outline a pattern of change across the early modern period. In the process, I provide new contextualisation to the emerging field of early modern addiction studies, and hopefully a foundation for future early modern addiction scholars to build upon.

**Language and society**

This thesis takes as its premise the notion that, as Phil Withington puts it, ‘language is a powerful tool of historicism, enabling early modern culture to be recovered on its own terms.’ The idea that language can be a historical tool is well-established, forming the basis of work by earlier conceptual and semantic historians like Reinhard Koselleck, Raymond Williams, and Skinner. Koselleck argued that social history and conceptual history were distinct fields which ought to be studied in tandem; they ‘stand in a reciprocal, historically necessitated tension that can never be cancelled out.’ He made the point that if history is events, then language is the medium which those events are expressed in, and ‘There is always a difference between a history as it takes places and its linguistic facilitation.’ In fact, Koselleck argued that the event itself is nothing more than ‘an academic construction’, and the attempt to uncover ‘what has “actually” – and not linguistically – occurred in history’ is thus misguided.

Koselleck has been described as the ‘chief architect’ of the German *Begriffsgeschichte* school, which set out to produce ‘a comprehensive dictionary of words that can guide scholars’ interpretations.’ Within Koselleck’s work, and in that of many others in the school, concepts are represented by individual words. However, as James Sheehan points out, this approach can result in ‘distortion and confusion’, since ‘a great many concepts, and especially those which refer to social phenomena, cannot be easily extracted from their linguistic
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According to Sheehan, since words are often ‘deeply enmeshed in a larger vocabulary’ they must be studied, not as individual words, but as ‘a cluster of terms and expressions’ coming together to form a concept. This understanding of concepts forms the basis of Koselleck’s student, Rolf Reichardt’s, work. Along with other scholars, Reichardt produced a French equivalent of Koselleck’s dictionary which focused on concepts ‘as bundles of linked keywords’, rather than on individual words. The fact that the modern substance-based concept of addiction emerged – as documented by Warner – over a century before it was linked to the word ‘addict’, indicates that other words or phrases were being used to signify substance abuse prior to ‘addict’. A complete history of the medicalised concept of addiction should therefore encompass terms like ‘drunkenness’ and ‘drunkard’, as well as ‘addiction’ and ‘addicted’. Equally, as this thesis attempts to do throughout, examination of the concepts associated with early modern uses of ‘addict’ – habitual behaviour, and interpersonal or religious attachment – should consider related terms like ‘devote’, ‘give’, and ‘dedicate’.

A similar project to Koselleck’s, intended for a more popular market, was undertaken in English by Williams in his 1976 Keywords. Williams’ glossary of keywords is arranged alphabetically, but acknowledges the interconnectedness of words through cross-references and sub-entries. Williams is particularly concerned with problems of meaning, which are ‘inextricably bound up with the problems [the word] was being used to discuss’. Central to his work is the principle that words do not stand in isolation, but are a reflection of their social setting. This means that a single word can encompass quite different meanings and connotations, both throughout history but also in different social contexts. To recover the historical meaning of words, one must endeavour to understand ‘the more general rules, in social norms and in the system of language itself, which both enable sense and reference to be generated and in some large degree to control them’. Most importantly, Williams notes that language is not just a reflection of society, but that, ‘some important social and historical processes occur within language.’ Furthermore, that ‘the explicit but as often implicit connections which people were making, in... particular formations of meaning [were] ways
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not only of discussing but at another level of seeing many of our central experiences. However, whilst Williams argues that language can be a medium for social processes, he shies away from a fully integrated view of language and society, writing that ‘the problem of meaning can never be wholly dissolved into context.’ Skinner goes a step further, arguing that language does not simply reflect society, but also actively shapes it; society adapts to fit ‘the pre-existing language of moral principles.’ Skinner’s work on the history of language goes further than both Koselleck and Williams in distinguishing between words and concepts. Whereas Williams essentially regarded words and concepts as overlapping, Skinner argues that it is possible to possess a concept without having a word to describe it; in fact, concepts often predate the words that describe them. He writes that ‘the surest sign that a group or society has entered into the self-conscious possession of a new concept is that a corresponding vocabulary will be developed.’ As a result, the history of a word is often quite strikingly different to that of the concept it now describes. Skinner also views the mechanisms of linguistic change in starkly different terms to Williams. What Williams regards as changes in the meaning or sense of a word, Skinner argues ‘is nothing to do with sense; what is changing is simply a social or intellectual attitude on the part of those who use the language.’ In Skinner’s view, words do not have meaning in isolation, or even just within a broader social context; their meanings can only be understood in the context of both the writer’s intentions, and the reader’s understanding. The close relationship between vocabulary, writers, and audience, means that studying words can provide ‘insights into changing social beliefs and theories; into changing social perceptions and awareness; and into changing social values and attitudes.’

The approach taken in this thesis is more in line with the work of Skinner than that of Williams or Koselleck, in that I make clear distinctions between words and concepts throughout. I trace both the word ‘addict’, and the various concepts with which it was associated, across the early modern period, paying particular attention to shifts in associated concepts and the reasons behind them. Doing this in a way that is clear and unambiguous is challenging; it necessitates not only distinguishing between various forms of the word, but
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also identifying numerous concepts, modern and pre-modern, that have been applied to those words. Care must be taken when discussing different word forms, since the noun ‘addict’ and the adjective ‘addictive’ did not emerge until the nineteenth century; furthermore, whilst the noun ‘addiction’ was in occasional use in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the overwhelming majority of early modern uses of the term are the past tense/past participle of the verb, ‘addicted’. When speaking about historical addiction, care is needed not to slip back and forth between concepts, or to assume that a word and a concept are interchangeable; doing so distorts what contemporaries meant when they used the word, and risks imposing a modern understanding onto an early modern word. To address this problem, in this thesis I adopt the practices commonly employed by linguists to provide clarity when speaking about the history of words: using a range of formatting rules to make clear distinctions between terms. The following style rules have therefore been applied throughout the thesis from this point. Italicics are used to denote a specific word form, such as *addicted*. Where all the variant forms of a word are indicated, small capitals have been applied to the dictionary form (also known as the lemma). For example, *ADDICT* refers to all forms of the word (including *addict, addicted, addiction, etc.*), whereas *addicted* would refer just to that specific form. This formatting is also applied to Latin words: *ADDICERE* includes different forms of the verb (*addico, addicis, addicit, etc.*), whereas *addicere* refers to one specific term only. When speaking about concepts (or word and concept together), no special formatting is applied, and where the modern concept is referred to, it is always indicated. For example, the modern concept of addiction emerged later than the lemma *ADDICT*, but earlier than the noun *addict.*

There is one feature which unites the work of Koselleck, Williams, and Skinner, and which sets them apart from this thesis: they are all primarily concerned with tracing the histories of modern concepts. The German school in particular has what the Early Modern Research Group (EMRG) calls an ‘explicit modernist agenda.’ In a 2010 article, the EMRG set out an approach to the social history of language which aimed to recover contemporary words and concepts on their own terms, arguing that unless historical words are properly contextualized, they will always be ‘inscribed with meanings derived from the intellectual and
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99 In Latin dictionaries the past participle is often listed as a separate headword, so in this thesis *ADDICTUS* has been treated as a lemma distinct from *ADDICERE*. *Addico* (the active first-person present of *addicere*) is sometimes used as a headword instead of *addicere*. When referring to a dictionary in which this is the case (e.g. OLD, DML), *addico* has been presented as a lemma instead of as an individual word form.
political concerns of the twenty-first rather than the sixteenth century.102 The main point made by the EMRG is that social context has been defined too narrowly by previous semantic historians. Their approach explicitly seeks to move beyond that of Koselleck and Skinner, “by expanding the range of contexts that demand analysis, and by exploring the usage of terms that constitute concepts.”103 First, they argue, the contexts in which words and concepts are understood should not be limited to texts, but should also include social and cultural practices, and non-textual performances in order to uncover “how practice shaped language.”104 These practice-based contexts include ritual, gesture, space, dress, manner, sex, location, audience, social status, genre, and physical sites of interaction.105 Second, since linguistic change is not solely top-down, but more often a process of negotiation and dispute between different actors or groups, it is important to go beyond conventional genres. In particular, to seek out “texts and spaces which “brokered” between different groups”, to think about authors, audience, and reception, as well as the words themselves.106 Third, the analysis of historical language should be both synchronic and diachronic – rooted in a key moments in time, and exploring change over time – and it should seek to “map the possible mechanisms and factors... across space and culture.”107 Finally, given the massive range of contexts to be explored, and the variety of skills necessary for examining them all, the EMRG argues that the study of the social history of language is best done by a collaboration of academics drawn from different disciplines.108

The work of the EMRG represents a recent trend in semantic history towards the use of more diverse and socially resonant texts to reconstruct the history of words and concepts. Naomi Tadmor’s work on the language of kinship and family uses diaries, conduct books for servants and apprentices, and popular novels, to uncover a common misconception in the reading of the term FAMILY. Using a keyword analysis of eighteenth-century texts, Tadmor demonstrates that FAMILY was commonly used to indicate the concept of a household-family, and not just a nuclear-family.109 Mark Knights and the EMRG published an examination of COMMONWEALTH which maps changing meaning across time, using “visual as well as written evidence; drama, poetry, and fiction as well as treatises and pamphlets;
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social custom and ritual as well as ideas and words; evidence generated in family conflicts, parish and village disputes, towns and shires as well as in law courts or parliamentary debate; and evidence surviving in manuscript, sometimes recording the spoken word, as well as evidence found in England’s rich print culture.\textsuperscript{110} They find that it was a keyword in a number of early modern discourses, because its ‘ambiguities gave it a creative adaptability.’\textsuperscript{111} This versatility made it a contested term, at the centre of debates about public versus private spheres, government, and community.\textsuperscript{112} Withington’s work on HAPPINESS situates both the term and its various concepts into their social and cultural contexts.\textsuperscript{113} Withington employs a variety of methodologies in his analysis, including translation studies – a comparison of different translations of Thomas More’s \textit{Utopia} – an individual case-by-case examination of all pre-1559 printed appearances of the term, and a quantitative analysis to show diachronic variation up to 1700. He reveals a much greater diversity of concepts, and a later emergence of the modern sense, than has previously been assumed; ‘it was only in the sixteenth century that happiness began to acquire the meanings with which we associate it today.’\textsuperscript{114} Withington’s work on HAPPINESS builds upon the previous scholarship of Matti Rissanen, who used an examination of translation practices alongside Latin-English dictionaries, to examine the emergence of the noun \textit{happiness}, and its relationship to Latin terms \textit{felicitas} and \textit{beatitudo}.\textsuperscript{115} Like the work of the EMRG, Withington, Tadmor, and Rissanen, this thesis employ a wide variety of sources from different genres, to produce an analysis of ADDICT and addiction across genres and social groups. Whilst the methodological approach (described below) restricts the analysis to printed sources, I have examined the presentation of addiction in evangelical works, dictionaries, Latin-English translations, philosophical works, ethnographic literature, and more; the resulting thesis situates a semantic analysis of addiction within the broad landscape of early modern English print culture.

Withington’s diachronic analysis of HAPPINESS reflects a growing trend in early modern history, as humanities scholars increasingly embrace digital methodologies that are well established in fields like computational linguistics and informatics. This shift is characterised by the adoption of new methods for exploring digital collections like Early English Books
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Online (EEBO). Whilst digital resources have been available for several years, they had previously been mostly used by historians to, as Stephen Pumfrey and Paul Rayson put it, “borrow” books from [a] digital library that s/he had already selected for study.”\textsuperscript{116} However, an alternative approach “turns the entire collection into a corpus and enables searching for patterns across multiple works using techniques from the corpus linguist’s toolbox.”\textsuperscript{117} This presents opportunities for conceptual and linguistic research which were not possible for Koselleck, Williams, and Skinner, who ‘had to limit their manual semantic searches to a manageable number of pre-identified texts.’\textsuperscript{118} Withington uses digital tools and quantitative research methodologies alongside more traditional historical techniques, in an interdisciplinary approach which enables him to approach the question of \textit{Happiness} from multiple analytical perspectives. Using a similar approach, in a 2010 article Withington used digital technology to conduct a diachronic analysis of the word \textit{Peace}, revealing clear links between the deeply contested semantic field surrounding \textit{Peace}, and political, social, and religious tensions of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{119} Whilst one scholar can borrow from other disciplines to produce interdisciplinary digital scholarship, more methodologically complex research can often be achieved – as the EMRG point out – through collaboration. Early modern historian Helen Baker has published several corpus-based analyses in collaboration with corpus linguist Tony McEnery. They are particularly interested in the way quantitative research can help recover the histories of marginalised groups, and their works include a book-length analysis of seventeenth-century prostitution, and articles on homosexual men, and the poor.\textsuperscript{120} Whilst Baker and McEnery explore social groups rather than keywords, an important part of their research process involves the identification of a semantic field, which can be used to identify and examine their topic.\textsuperscript{121} Beyond individual topics, the use of digital methodologies also opens up possibilities for much more ambitious projects. For example, building on the principles of Koselleck, Williams, and Skinner, and using the tools and methods of linguistics and digital humanities, the collaborative research project Linguistic\textit{DNA} is creating a tool to identify early modern concepts, and map conceptual
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change, across printed early modern texts. Crucially, and unlike any other project undertaken to date, by finding sets of words that frequently co-occur within a paragraph, the LinguisticDNA project aims to uncover the concepts that were key to early modern writers themselves.122

Whilst it was not possible for this thesis to adopt the collaborative approaches used by the EMRG, Baker and McEnery, or the LinguisticDNA project, I have employed a similarly interdisciplinary approach; each chapter explores early modern addiction using a different set of methods, tools, and approaches, many drawn from different disciplines. The use of quantitative research within this thesis is innovative, being at once more technology-focused than Withington’s use of quantitative techniques, yet also more historicised than the collaborative approaches of Baker and McEnery, which tend to place linguistic methodology first and foremost. Here, methods were chosen to fit the research questions, rather than the other way around: I compare all printed works within a certain time period to explore the origins of the word ADDICT; I use quantitative analysis of dictionaries and translations to examine the semantic origins of early modern concepts of addiction; I use collocation searches – which look at the words appearing near to ADDICT within printed sources – to conduct a diachronic analysis of the changing uses of the term; and I use close reading to explore concepts of addiction within key contexts in which they were defined. Interdisciplinarity thus provides the means of uncovering both the broad sweep, and the contextual detail, of ADDICT and addiction concepts.

Sources and methods

The interdisciplinary methods used in this thesis are made possible only by the availability of digitised resources. Early modern scholars are fortunate in having access to EEBO: a vast, largely digitised collection of English printed works, covering the period 1475 to 1700, which is the source of the majority of texts used in this thesis. EEBO consists of several different collections, including the Short Title Catalogue I and II, the Thomason Tracts, and the Early English Books Tract Supplement.123 It includes texts either printed in English anywhere in the world, or printed in England in any language, so the collection as a whole is both
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international and multilingual. Combined, EEBO consists of over 17 million scanned pages, from over 132,000 texts printed between 1475 and 1700, all of which exist in electronic form as scanned microfilm page images; there is ongoing work to scan and add a further 100,000 pages.

The Text Creation Partnership (TCP) is a project that began in 1999 as a collaboration between Michigan and Oxford University Libraries, and ProQuest (who own EEBO). TCP was set up to transcribe and encode page images from EEBO, in order to create a fully-searchable, typewritten corpus of early modern texts. The first phase of the project, transcribing 25,000 texts, was completed by 2009, and a second phase of 35,000 texts – which will supposedly include ‘each unique first edition in EEBO’ – is almost complete. In total the project has fully transcribed around 60,000 texts, just under half of all the texts on EEBO, creating a corpus of over 1.2 billion words. EEBO-TCP represents a significant proportion of early modern English print, and is an invaluable resource for scholars, but it has some limitations and weaknesses which it is important to be aware of.

The selection of texts for transcription by the TCP was not systematic. Chadwyck-Healey, which is the brand name used by ProQuest, explain on their website that, ‘In general, priority is given to first editions and works in English (although in the past Latin and Welsh texts have been tackled)’ and that, ‘Titles requested by users at partner institutions are placed at the head of the production queue.’ As a result of these criteria, certain genres are under-represented, whilst others are present in their entirety. The works of William Shakespeare are all encoded, but virtually none of the early modern dictionaries; the columns, tables, and large amounts of Latin and Greek text in dictionaries are costlier to transcribe than straightforward English print. Whilst the intention was to focus on first editions, many of the texts are encoded twice, and some heavily revised later editions are omitted. Thomas Elyot’s 1538
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Dictionary and his 1542 Bibliotheca have both been transcribed despite the fact that they contain the same material, yet Thomas Cooper’s 1548 revision of the Bibliotheca, featuring 33,000 new words, has not.\footnote{130}

The texts are not evenly spread across the early modern period, in part due to fluctuations in print output at the time, but also due to the types of collections that formed EEBO. The inclusion of the Thomason Tracts within EEBO, for example, creates a significant spike in the number of texts within the period c.1640-1660. In 2013 Anupam Basu created a graph comparing EEBO-TCP text counts to the titles listed on the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC), which is the most complete account of English print available. Although the graph is not up to date, it provides a good sense of the overall distribution of texts, and of the differences between the number of texts that are transcribed and the number we know to have existed.\footnote{131}

\textit{Figure 1 showing EEBO-TCP and ESTC text counts, by Anupam Basu (18/11/2013)}

EEBO-TCP can be accessed online through a number of different interfaces, which present the corpus in different ways.\footnote{132} The Chadwyck-Healey website contains both the transcribed
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\footnote{132} There are additional tools for accessing EEBO-TCP which are not mention in this list, because they are not used in this thesis. The TCP project webpages hosts all the texts, but unlike Chadwyck-Healey it does not
version of texts and the original page images. The search bar gives the option of searching with standardising spelling and form, and allows for various search limitations, but there is no way to download or further analyse the results. Andrew Hardie at the University of Lancaster has created a corpus interface called CQPweb, which includes the EEBO-TCP text files. The result is a corpus-style version of EEBO-TCP, complete with part-of-speech (POS) tags, which enables wildcard searches, and shows distribution tables and word collocations. Anupam Basu has built two tools for accessing EEBO-TCP, which are hosted on his website Early Modern Print. The first is a Google-style n-gram browser, which produces an instant diachronic overview of the uses of up to three sequential words. The second, called ‘key words in context’, is a concordance display which shows search results within the context of the sentence. Whilst Basu’s tools have less functionality than CQPweb, they are designed with historical research in mind; author and title are displayed on the concordance as well as the search result, and the tool allows the user to switch between regularised and unregularized spellings. In contrast, CQPweb does not allow the user to search using unregularized spelling, and it does not display unregularized spellings in search results.

There are other differences between these tools besides functionality. The metadata held on CQPweb and Early Modern Print is the same, taken directly from the TCP project website, which in turn takes its metadata from the ESTC. However, the metadata on Chadwyck-Healey is based on the original EEBO metadata, and is often noticeably different. For example, Leigh Valentine’s *The pleasaunt playne and pythye pathewaye* has a publication date of 1522 on Chadwyck-Healey – which would make it the earliest printed appearance of ‘addict’ – but the date on the ESTC, CQPweb and Early Modern Print is 1552. The actual content

provide access to the page images alongside the text. The webtool SketchEngine contains a corpus called the English Historical Book Collection, which contains Phase I of EEBO-TCP, ECCO-TCP, and texts from the Evan’s project. SketchEngine, https://auth.sketchengine.eu/ [accessed 28/08/2018].


It is now possible to switch to unregularized spellings on the ‘View more context’ screen, but this feature was not added until 2016.

Leigh Valentine, *The pleasaunt playne and pythye pathewaye leadynge to a vertues and honest lyfe no lesse profytable, then delectable* (London, 1522; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Leigh Valentine, *The pleasaunt playne and pythye pathewaye leadynge to a vertues and honest lyfe, no lesse profytable, then delectable* (London, 1552; ESTC), http://estc.bl.uk/S121899 [accessed 17/08/2018]; Leigh Valentine, *The pleasaunt playne and pythye pathewaye leadynge to a vertues and honest lyfe, no lesse profytable, then delectable* (London, 1552; TCP), http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A04975.0001.001 [accessed 17/08/2018].

It is clear from the title page, which is viewable on Chadwyck-Healey, that the ESTC metadata is correct.
of the tools is also different; Chadwyck-Healey is updated in real time as new texts are added, but the other two resources are static until a new version is released by Basu or Hardie. Basu claims that ‘we will update the database as new texts are released’ but it is unclear when this was last done, and it is not clear whether Hardie has updated the CQPweb corpus since it was added to the system in 2007.139

These variations present challenges to any study which combines different tools and methods as this one does, and some of the decisions made in this thesis, particularly regarding presentation and approach, were driven by practical considerations. First, an initial plan to explore genres in the corpus using metadata held on CQPweb had to be abandoned when the metadata was changed in 2015 and 2016. Similarly, attempts to use part-of-speech (POS) tags to examine sentence structure were unsuccessful because the tagging software in CQPweb incorrectly and persistently tagged the verb ‘addict’ as a noun. Second, the inaccessibility of unregularized spellings on CQPweb posed a number of problems. Wherever possible regularised spellings have been cross-referenced with the page images on Chadwyck-Healey in order to check that they were regularised correctly, but this was not always feasible – for example, when analysing several hundred texts at once. As such, regularised spellings have been used throughout the thesis for consistency. Third, referencing was made problematic both by inconsistencies in the metadata, by the often-complex background of the texts that comprise EEBO and EEBO-TCP, and by broader questions about the referencing of online sources. The referencing system used throughout this thesis, and the justification for it, is outlined in Appendix A.140

Outline

This thesis examines the early modern term ADDICT, from its invention in the early sixteenth century through to the end of the seventeenth century, focusing particularly on its semantic and morphological origins, and the shifting meanings and uses across the period. The chapters are broadly chronological, beginning with a chapter on the origins of ADDICT in the 1520s and 1530s, followed by one on the linguistic and semantic background of both ADDICT and the meanings attached to it. The third chapter provides a broad, diachronic overview of use across the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, whilst the fourth and final chapters move
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beyond the term itself to focus on two key contexts for understanding the broader applications of early modern addiction: the addicted self, and cultural addiction.

In the first chapter I explore the arrival of ADDICT into sixteenth-century English. I ask how and why the word ADDICT entered the English language, and why it became established when so many new words did not; I examine who was using the term, what it meant, and what distinguished it from other terms already in existence. I explore these questions, first through a quantitative analysis and comparison of the neologising practices of writers in the 1530s and 1540s, and second – following the example of Withington’s work on HAPPINESS – through an examination of all printed appearances of the term, through the first 20 years of use. The findings are striking, not only for what they reveal about addiction, but also because they suggest promising avenues for the future study of neologisms. The term ADDICT was introduced by protestant reformers and, unusually for a reformist neologism, it was originally borrowed from classical Latin. Its meaning was not new or distinct, and it was used alongside synonyms like given, dedicated, and bound. In fact, what made ADDICT distinctive was not its meaning, but the people who used it; for the first 20 years, the term appeared almost exclusively in the work of protestant reformers. This shows, first, that despite not having a specifically religious meaning, addiction clearly resonated with the concerns of evangelical writers; and second, moving beyond addiction itself, that neologisms could provide new opportunities for studying and even tracing early modern readership.

The second chapter is inspired in part by Rissanen’s work on HAPPINESS, which uses dictionaries and translations to uncover meaning. I examine the relationship between ADDICT and other languages, and in the process uncover the various senses in which the English term was used. As Williams observed, ‘many of the most important words that I have worked on either developed key meanings in languages other than English, or went through a complicated and interactive development in a number of major languages.141 Williams intended this as a general comment, but it is perhaps particularly relevant to a loanword like ADDICT, in a period where the majority of English scholars were multilingual. The methodology for this chapter is quantitative, and it is divided into three parts. The first explores entries for ADDICT and its Latin etymon ADDICERE in early modern dictionaries, using corpus analysis software to compare, contrast, and identify key patterns. The second examines translations of Latin texts into early modern English, to identify patterns in the translation from ADDICERE to ADDICT. The third section explores the relationship between

141 Williams, Keywords, p. 20.
ADDICERE, ADDICT, and other European vernaculars. The findings problematise the simplistic etymology put forward by earlier scholars of addiction, revealing a semantic relationship with neo-Latin – rather than classical Latin – sources. In the process, this chapter reveals that a previously-assumed connection between addiction and slavery is unsubstantiated. Finally, the analysis of other languages finds no cognate to ADDICERE in other European vernaculars, but reveals a notable semantic connection between the French ADONNER and the English ADDICT, which endures throughout the seventeenth century.

The third chapter utilises the tools and methods of corpus linguistics to conduct a diachronic analysis of ADDICT across the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. At the same time, it explores specific sources in more detail in order to provide social and cultural context for these broader patterns. The approach is one that Martin Mueller terms ‘scalable reading’: ‘a happy synthesis of “close” and “distant” reading which he compares to Google Earth, in that ‘you can zoom in and out of things and discover that different properties of phenomena are revealed by looking at them from different distances.’ Specific research questions focus on tracing the two key uses identified in Chapters I and II – religious or interpersonal devotion, and the pursuit of habitual behaviour – and on identifying the main ‘subjects’ and ‘objects’ of addiction; the people who were described as addicted, and the things they were supposedly addicted to. The data analysed and discussed in this chapter is considerable, but among the broad patterns several key findings emerge. First, that the devotional uses of ADDICT declined throughout the seventeenth century, corresponding with the introduction and establishment of the participle devoted as a synonym for addicted. Second, that addiction was used with both positive and negative connotations throughout the early modern period; however, there was a steady diversification of the objects of the addiction, with the majority of new objects being negative. Third, that the objects of addiction can be directly linked to broader social and cultural concerns, such as fears of Catholic political influence in the 1620s and 30s. Fourth, that whereas modern addiction is usually classified according to the object – alcohol addiction, gambling addiction, drug addiction – early modern addiction was often classified according to the subject of the addiction. Young men were described as addicted to lust, old men to contemplation, and Jews to idolatry; people inhabiting the same region were described as sharing the same addictions. In other words, ADDICT was used in the construction and reiteration of group stereotypes.

---

The fourth chapter builds upon a characteristic of addiction hinted at in Chapter III: the use of adverbs like generally, naturally, and less to describe addiction suggests it was viewed, not as absolute or extraordinary, but as variable and everyday. This chapter asks, if addiction was not always extraordinary, then what was it? What determined the addictions an individual would have, and how they formed? Whereas previous chapters have focused on the term itself, in this chapter I move beyond it to examine addiction as a function of the soul, situated in relation to the complementary functions of reason, the passions, and the will. This chapter also marks a methodological break, moving from quantitative methods to close reading. The choice of sources is inspired by Skinner, who observed that minor texts reveal established ideas, whereas the classics by their very nature ‘challenge the commonplaces of the period.’

The main text examined is Pierre de La Primaudaye’s relatively obscure encyclopaedic work, _A French Academy_ which summarises existing knowledge rather than confronting it. I then examine challenges to established notions of addiction through the canonical works of René Descartes, Thomas Hobbes, and John Locke. The model of addiction which emerges from these texts is one that is habitual, natural, and universal; it had the capacity to be extraordinary or ordinary depending on the strength of the passions that drove it, and of the will that regulated it. There was a correlation between disposition and addiction – providing a link to humoral theory – and, in La Primaudaye’s work at least, a strong moral element, both of which influenced the type of addiction pursued. Finally, as Lemon notes, contemporaries regarded addiction as a habit of mind which, like all habits, grew stronger through repetition; addictions became harder to break the longer they were in place.

Where the fourth chapter examines how addiction was thought to form within an individual, the fifth chapter applies similar research questions to the group addictions identified in Chapter III. In particular, I focus on cultural groups that were assigned addictions in travel writing, cosmographies, geographies, chronicles, and other ethnographic genres. I ask, how were these shared behaviours thought to form? And what factors determined which addictions European writers assigned to other peoples? Like Chapter IV, the analysis moves beyond the term ADDICT itself, and examines the concept of cultural addiction; a concept defined by a group of semantically related terms, all of which were used to describe culturally shared habitual behaviours. The first section examines the various frameworks for understanding and explaining cultural difference, some of which were geographically-based and others which were genealogical. The second section relates these frameworks to a specific case study: European accounts of addiction in early modern Africa, a continent.

which lay on the intersection of both geographical and genealogical explanations for cultural addiction. I find that, despite a self-conscious move towards more ‘realistic’ observation-based accounts of cultural behaviour, the prejudices born of medieval and classical frameworks persisted. Furthermore, both personal motive and social expectation played a powerful role in determining the addictions that early modern writers assigned to different cultural groups.
The arrival of ADDICT into sixteenth-century English

ADDICT made its print debut in 1529 in the work of the young evangelical author John Frith. It was quickly taken up by other evangelical writers, and in the 20 years that followed ADDICT made regular appearances in evangelical print. Despite being one among thousands of early sixteenth-century neologisms, ADDICT was in many ways unusual. It did not fit the normal neologising practices of early protestant writers, who preferred to coin words from existing English words rather than borrow from other languages. It offered no unique or original meaning – it was broadly speaking a synonym for GIVE – yet where other synonyms faltered or failed, ADDICT gained fairly rapid acceptance. And, perhaps most notably, it was used almost exclusively by evangelical writers for a period of around 20 years. ADDICT appears in 56 out of the 732 searchable texts on EEBO-TCP printed between 1529 and 1549. Of these, over 78 percent – 44 texts – had evangelical authors.

This period in the history of ADDICT is worth focusing on in detail not only because it reveals the origins of the word – the functions it originally served, the meanings it originally held, and the contexts in which it was used – but also because previous scholarship on addiction has largely omitted it. Dennis Kezar is the only scholar of addiction to engage with the first printed use of the term in English, but his analysis was based on a previous version of the OED which recorded the first use as being Shakespeare’s Othello. Lemon discusses the

---

2 Kezar, ‘Shakespeare’s Addictions’, p. 51. Kezar actually notes that he has found earlier uses of the word, but he does not discuss what those earlier uses are.
origins of addiction briefly in *Addiction and Devotion*, commenting on the use of the term by George Joye in 1530, and noting that ‘in the 1540s the term appears repeatedly in church histories by writers such as John Bale, Polydore Vergil, and Thomas Becon.

However, she does not mention the earlier printed use of the word by John Frith, and the reformist uses of ADDICT are not explored in depth.

Lack of interest in the early uses of ADDICT may have something to do with the concept of ‘first use’, which has often – with some justification – been criticised. Too often, the ‘first use’ of a word is used to make inaccurate claims about the number of words a particular writer ‘invented’, when in fact most linguists would agree that new words rarely make their first appearance in print; the majority of new words circulate orally before being written down. Furthermore, in order for a word to appear as ‘first’ in the OED – often the most reliable source on historical use – it must not only make its way from speech to paper, but also survive in printed form, and become part of the corpus of texts used by compilers of the OED. As the OED itself puts it, ‘First citations from an author are of interest in that they represent the earliest recorded evidence for a particular term. But in many cases, this does not mean that a word or meaning was first used in the source cited, but rather that no earlier evidence has yet come to light.

On the other hand, writers do not choose their words at random or on a whim, but after careful thought and consideration. This is particularly true when those words are new or relatively unknown. Whether the user of a new word has coined it themselves or has heard it spoken by someone else first, the act of writing it down is one of deliberate and self-conscious selection. In the context of the early English reformation, this was especially true. Lucy Wooding points out that ‘The ferocity of their argument and the complexity of the linguistic and theological issues involved demonstrate just how contested and problematic the task of Biblical translation was in this era.

Naomi Tadmor wrote of William Tyndale’s

---

translation of the New Testament that, ‘When Tyndale notably insisted on using ‘love’ rather than ‘charity’, ‘elder’ instead of ‘priest’, or ‘congregation’ instead of ‘church’ he was willing to risk his life.’ Writers made conscious choices about whether to use words sourced from Latin or Greek, to use words made by combining other words, or to avoid new words altogether. These choices are significant regardless of whether they personally invented the word or not. The OED’s record of ‘first use’ is thus valuable in indicating who was using neologisms, in what quantity, and what type; it also – assuming that words are written not long after they are spoken – gives a broad indication of when words were coined. In fact, the main limitation of the OED is not that it fails to reveal who invented each word but that it only shows the first printed appearance of a word, when the second, third, and fourth appearances of a word can be just as valuable and revealing – as the second part of this chapter demonstrates.

This chapter sets out to explore the origins of ADDICT, and to explain some of its more puzzling features, by examining the people who used it first, framed within the context of broader neologising practices and the emergence of an English evangelical community. I begin by examining the state of the English language in the early sixteenth century, and the perceived inadequacies which lead to the mass borrowing of non-English words. Next, I explore the earliest printed appearances of ADDICT in the work of two reformist writers, John Frith and George Joye, focusing in particular on the various meanings they applied to the word, none of which were new. This raises questions about their motives for introducing ADDICT into English, particularly given that, as reformers, clarity of message was of fundamental importance. In order to understand their reasons for borrowing, I compare their neologising practice in a selection of works to those of five of their evangelical and non-evangelical contemporaries: William Tyndale, Miles Coverdale, Thomas More, Thomas Elyot, and John Heywood. The examination reveals that evangelical authors as a group coined fewer words than their non-evangelical peers, and when they did coin words they preferred to coin from existing English words, rather than borrowing from other languages. Frith’s preference for classical Latin loanwords was unusual among reformist writers, but typified his approach to neologising. Meanwhile Joye went further than most reformers in avoiding coining new words, preferring to adapt existing words to suit his purposes. The examination of word borrowing also reveals a discrepancy between the claims made by early modern writers about new words, and their actual practice when writing; self-proclaimed
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anti-neologisers still borrowed and used neologisms, sometimes even as much as those who openly embraced new words. In the final section I examine the uses of ADDICT by protestant writers, who used the term almost exclusively in pre-1550 printed works. Since ADDICT was primarily used in the context of either habitual human behaviour (virtue and vice), or spiritual or interpersonal allegiance, it had direct relevance to the preoccupations of early protestant writers. However, it is notable that non-reformers expressed similar concepts in their own work, but did so using words like given and bound. This suggests, I argue, the existence of a reformist vocabulary – a set of words which were evangelical through association rather than through their meaning – and so potentially a means of tracing the people who were engaging with reformist literature. Vocabulary may have been a way for this group, who were living under threat of persecution, to create a sense of community and shared identity.

Since this chapter is primarily concerned with neologisms – both with neologising practices in general, and with the specific loanword ADDICT – it is important to establish the mechanisms by which words are coined, and the different terms which can be used to describe them. A neologism, or coinage, means any new word entering a language, by any method. Neologising occurs through one of two processes: borrowing, and word-formation. In the latter, words are formed from existing English terms, most commonly through derivation, compounding, or conversion. Derivation (also called affixation), is where existing words are given a new prefix or suffix, for example brawl + ing. Compounding is where two existing words are combined, for example frost + bitten. In conversion, a word is given a different form, such as when the noun air became the verb to air. The other method of creating words is borrowing, which happens when all or part of a word is taken from another language. The process of borrowing is complex, in part because ‘Words have both a form and a meaning [and] Either component can be borrowed.’ The category of borrowed words can thus be broken down into a number of sub-categories including semantic loans (words that borrow meaning from another language, but not form), loan translations (words that are borrowed in their translated rather than original form – for example almighty from the Latin omnipotens), and loanwords (words that take both form and meaning from the donor language). There are also loan blends, whereby ‘a borrowed word is adapted or remodelled using material from the borrowing language.’
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8 See Appendix B for a full list of works on EEBO-TCP containing the term ADDICT, from 1529-49.
9 Cree, ‘Protestant Evangelicals and Addiction’.
12 Ibid., pp. 3-4 & 8-9.
13 Ibid., p. 9.
form and meaning are taken from the donor language, grammatical adaptation is common. For example, Latin word endings are often omitted or adapted to fit English conventions: -us becomes -ous or -al (conspicuous, external), -tas becomes -ty (brevity), and -bilis becomes -ble (considerable, susceptible). In the early modern period, 'By far the most frequent type [of loanword] are verbs borrowed from the Latin past participial stem', ending in either -tus or -sus. Of these, about 78 percent change the Latin word ending to -ate. For example, communicatus becomes communicate.

To put this into context, a purely morphological examination of ADDICT suggests the verb addicte (which is the form in which ADDICT first appeared) is borrowed from the Latin past participle ADDICTUS, from the verb addicere. Like similar past-participial borrowings communicate, supervise, and predicate, the Latin -us ending was changed into -e in English. Addict (without the -e) is a spelling variation that emerged shortly after. The past tense/past participle addicted is derived from the verb, and the noun addict (which appeared much later, in the nineteenth century) is a conversion. The noun addiction is more ambiguous: it could, like addicted, be a derivation of addicte, but it could also be a loanword in its own right, borrowed from the Latin noun addictio. In order to determine whether ADDICT is a loanword in the full sense – that is, whether it took meaning as well as form from the donor language – a semantic analysis is needed, as well as a morphological one. A semantic analysis forms the basis of Chapter II, and reveals that ADDICT had multiple meanings, which do not map cleanly onto the meanings of the classical Latin term. However, this first chapter remains focused primarily on the word itself, in order to establish the social and cultural context – rooted in both linguistic change and the English reformation – in which ADDICT was borrowed and used.

The perceived inadequacy of the English language

The sixteenth century was a period of unprecedented religious change, with bouts of intense religious persecution; it was also a period of educational reform, and one in which a vibrant print culture emerged. In the 1520s Lutheran ideas began to spread in English universities, and a number of scholars became convinced of the need for religious reform. Many were humanist-educated, trained in the skills of classical translation, and the reformation provided
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a powerful motivation to apply these skills to propagating religious works and ideas in the vernacular. However, early reformers faced strong opposition from the Henrician government, and the 1530s and 40s saw a steady stream of evangelical executions. John Frith was burnt at the stake in 1533, and John Lambert in 1538, both for denying transubstantiation. Robert Barnes was executed in 1540 for unspecified heresies, and Anne Askew was tortured and executed for heresy in 1546. Despite the threat of persecution, from the 1520s onwards English Biblical translations and Lutheran-inspired treatises began to be produced, circulated, and read by those eager for reform.

Often those aiming to propagate religious works in the vernacular found that the English language did not have the vocabulary required to either translate Biblical works accurately, or to explore complex theological arguments with sufficient nuance. Miles Coverdale’s 1535 English version of the Bible contains several untranslated Hebrew words for which no English equivalent existed, including the names of ethnic groups like Amorite and Kenite, and the oft-repeated exclamation hallelujah. Similar problems were faced by those translating practical and instructive works in fields such as botany, architecture, grammar, heraldry, and navigation. As Christian Kay and Kathryn Allan write, ‘nothing reveals the deficiencies of a language more surely than translating into it.’ Alongside these more practical motives for neologising there were those who sought to change the English language for aesthetic reasons; to raise it to the level of eloquence seen in classical Latin and Greek. Perhaps the most dedicated neologiser of the period was the humanist writer Thomas Elyot, who was vocal about his belief that English needed words ‘which be borrowed of the Latin tongue,'

18 These executions and others are described in John Foxe, Acts and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable (London, 1583; EEBO- TCP Phase I).
20 Baugh & Cable, A History of the English Language, p. 218.
21 The Oxford English Dictionary, search results. Advanced search for “Bible Coverdale in – First Quotation” and “Origin – Hebrew”. http://www.oed.com.eresources.shef.ac.uk/search?case-sensitive=true&f_0=-. +First+Quotation&langClass=Hebrew&nearDistance=1&ordered=false&q_0=Bible+Coverdale&scope=ENTRY [accessed 18/11/2016]. With the Bible in particular, translators sought not just to translate the original, but also to render them in a way that was intelligible to an English audience. Tadmor explains in detail the various ways in which English writers ‘Anglicised’ the Bible. ‘The Biblical text was not simply translated in English... but also transposes, slightly moulded, or otherwise rendered in terms that made sense to people at that time and invoked certain notions and ideas.’ Tadmor, The Social Universe of the English Bible, p. 17.
for the insufficiency of our own language." This combination of humanist values and reformist designs, along with a flood of translations, prompted a period of intensive linguistic reform. Perceived inadequacies were gradually swept away in a process that involved the rapid expansion of English vocabulary, regularisation of spelling, and the emergence of a lexicographical discipline. Stylistic practices like *copia*, which was achieved by employing multiple synonyms for emphasis – sometimes in sets of three or more – became increasingly popular. According to Philip Durkin, this ‘dominant factor in the rhetorical style of the period, coupled with the enormous prestige of Latinate word forms, may help to explain the very high density of Latin loanwords in this period.’ Whilst it is hard to say for certain how many new words were introduced in this period, the number was large enough that, according to David Crystal, ‘the character of the English lexicon was permanently altered.’

The various motives for neologising described here were not wholly compatible, and the process of change was neither straightforward nor uncontested. There were numerous attacks on so-called ‘inkhorn terms’, and whilst ‘inkhorn’ could refer to any new word, in practice criticism was reserved for borrowed words rather than domestic coinages. Particular condemnation was levelled at words which were seen as purely for rhetorical or eloquent ends – the result of what Jurgen Schafer calls ‘baroque exuberance.’ One vocal opponent of inkhorn terms was Thomas Wilson, who wrote in 1553 that, ‘among all other lessons, this should first be learned, that we never affect any strange inkhorn terms, but we speak as is commonly received.’ Wilson demonstrates his point with a particularly grievous letter, which starts off with the line: ‘Pondering, expending, and revoluting with myself your ingent affability, and ingenious capacity, for mundane affairs: I cannot but celebrate and extol your magnifical dexterity, above all other.’ Criticism came from other quarters as well. Protestant reformers in particular faced a dilemma when it came to borrowed words, because they saw themselves as ‘learned men... faced with the solemn duty of educating by means of the vernacular their less fortunate brothers’, and large numbers of loanwords could counter-
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24 Thomas Elyot, *The boke named the Gouernour* (London, 1537; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
28 Durkin, *Borrowed Words*, p. 308.
31 Thomas Wilson, *The arte of rhetorique for the use of all suche as are studious of eloquence* (London, 1553; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
32 Ibid.
productively make their texts less accessible to an English-speaking audience.\textsuperscript{33} Finally, there were some scholars who opposed the practice of borrowing words on the grounds that English was already sufficient; Thomas More wrote that ‘there is no doubt but it is plenteous enough to express our minds in anything whereof one man hath used to speak with another.’\textsuperscript{34} One of the ways that this debate is often framed in secondary literature is as ‘neologisers’ versus ‘purists.’ Kay and Allen write that, ‘The two sides in the Inkhorn Controversy, as it is often known, were Neologisers, who believed that the English language could be improved by extending its vocabulary through borrowing, and Purists, who thought that any expansions should come from a language’s own resources.’\textsuperscript{35} Durkin writes similarly about ‘comments from neologisers justifying their adoption of new words’, opposed by ‘purists, who sought to use loanwords sparingly.’\textsuperscript{36} Certainly, as seen in the quotations from More and Elyot above, examples of both viewpoints can be found in sixteenth-century writing, often expressed in the strongest terms. However, reducing the complex debate about new words to just two absolutist standpoints – ‘purist’ and ‘neologiser’ – creates a simplistic and false dichotomy. In fact, individual writers were often driven more by personal stylistic preferences, concern over loss of transparency, or a desire to steer the development of the language in a particular direction, rather than by an indiscriminate like or dislike of new words. These motivations were not mutually exclusive, and they manifested very differently in different authors. Some writers were opposed to words borrowed from specific languages; some were opposed to borrowed words but not domestic coinages; others were concerned only that new words be used in moderation. John Cheke, for example – ‘staunch Protestant, royal tutor, and first regius professor of Greek at the University of Cambridge’ – strongly opposed the practice of borrowing words from Latin or Greek, and went to great lengths in his translation of the Old Testament to borrow instead from Saxon and Old English.\textsuperscript{37} It is also important to note that, however strongly writers like Elyot, More, and Cheke may have felt on the topic of word borrowing, all early modern writers used borrowed words to some extent in their work, simply because, as Richard Foster Jones put it, ‘the inadequacy of the

\textsuperscript{33} Foster Jones, \textit{The Triumph of the English Language}, p. 31.

\textsuperscript{34} Thomas More, \textit{A dialoge of yr Thomas More knyghte} (London, 1529; EEBO-TCP Phase I). The work is written as if More is responding to a ‘messenger’ – a young student confused about heresy. This quotation comes from a chapter in which More is writing as himself. For more on this see Ilona N. Rashkow, ‘The Renaissance’, in John F. A. Sawyer (ed.), \textit{The Blackwell Companion to the Bible and Culture} (Malden Mass; Oxford, 2012), p. 57.

\textsuperscript{35} Kay & Allan, \textit{English Historical Semantics}, p. 17.

\textsuperscript{36} Durkin, \textit{Borrowed Words}, pp. 316-7. See also Barber, \textit{The English Language}, p. 188.

\textsuperscript{37} Durkin, \textit{Borrowed Words}, p. 317.
English language was too clearly realised to permit an indiscriminate attack on inkhorn terms.\textsuperscript{38} The vehemently anti-inkhorn Wilson not only uses borrowed words in his work, but even ‘makes the point himself that words such as communion or prerogative have enriched the language.’\textsuperscript{39} This is not to say that a writer’s views on neologisms had no effect on their writing practice: as the next section will show, attitudes towards loanwords could affect the overall number of new words appearing in a work, and scholars who shared common values and goals often had similar approaches to new words. However, the debate around word borrowing, and the choices made by individual authors, cannot be reduced to ‘for’ and ‘against’ neologisms.

\section*{The borrowing of ADDICT}

Whilst Cheke and Elyot were outspoken about language change, we have no record of how the majority of early modern writers felt about neologisms. This is the case for the writers responsible for the first printed appearances of ADDICT: Frith and Joye. Frith was still in his twenties when he wrote a series of influential treatises on the topic of transubstantiation, before being executed on the orders of More in 1533. He was the first to use the word addicte, in a 1529 text called Antithesis which compared the actions of Christ to those of the Pope. The work is loosely based on a much shorter, illustrated Latin pamphlet by Phillip Melanchthon, which was itself translated from a work by Martin Luther; however, addicte appears in a passage that Frith added himself at the end of the piece:

\textit{Judge... all these things with a simple eye / be not partially addict to the one nor to the other / But judge them by the scripture.}\textsuperscript{40}

In \textit{A disputacion of purgatorye} two years later, Frith used the word again. This time he is mounting a defence against those who would dismiss his work because of his youth. Referencing Timothy 1, ‘Let no man despise the youth’, Frith argues that:

\begin{quote}
no man should despise his youth for as the spirit of god is bound to no place / even so is he not addict to any age or person.\textsuperscript{41}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[38] Foster Jones, \textit{The Triumph of the English Language}, p. 96.
\item[39] Durkin, \textit{Borrowed Words}, p. 317.
\item[40] John Frith, \textit{A pistle to the Christen reader The revelation of Antichrist. Antithesis, wherin are compared to geder Christes actes and worme bolye father the Popes} (Antwerp, 1529; EEBO-TCP Phase II). Part one is translated from Martin Luther and part two is loosely based on a text by Melanchthon, but this particular section was written by Frith, not translated.
\item[41] John Frith, \textit{A disputacion of purgatorye} (Antwerp, 1531; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
\end{footnotes}
In both cases, Frith used *ADDICT* in the context of making a choice between two or more things. In the first, he urges his reader not to be predisposed to one idea or another, but to judge purely by the scripture. In the second, he explains that God is not bound to a particular place, age, or person. In both sentences the word indicates a preference for one choice over another.\(^2\)

Frith undoubtedly borrowed *ADDICT* from the Latin participle *ADDICTUS* (from the verb *ADDICERE*) which in classical Latin was primarily a legal term, used when goods were sold or delivered as a result of a legal judgement. In cases concerning debt, it could also describe the forced servitude of a debtor to their creditor, until the debt was repaid.\(^3\) However, *ADDICERE* had a second, less common meaning as an augural term. Pierre Danet’s 1700 *Complete dictionary of the Greek and Roman antiquities* offers this definition: ‘After the Augurs had consulted the Will of the Gods by the Flying of Birds, if the Signs were favourable, they answered thus, *Id addicunt aves*, Gods favour this Enterprise.’\(^4\) When used in the augural sense, *ADDICERE* meant favouring one course of action over another. Similarly, Frith used *ADDICT* in the context of deciding between different choices, of favouring one idea over another, of prejudging something or someone. It is notable too that in both of Frith’s examples, to be addicted, or to favour one thing over another, has negative connotations. Frith may have chosen to borrow *ADDICERE* not only for the meaning of the word, but also because, in a reformist text, referencing the augural rituals of pagan Gods was a way of highlighting how undesirable the behaviour was.\(^5\)

Many words that entered English were short-lived, and were either never taken up by other writers, or were dropped shortly after. According to one study, ‘over a third of all neologisms which entered the language at that time are not recorded after 1700.’\(^6\) This might have been the case with *ADDICT* if it was not for the work of Joye who, in a translation published in 1530, a year after Frith, used the word five times. However, whilst *ADDICT* became a permanent addition to the English language, it was rarely used in the same way that Frith used it, to indicate a preference for one choice over another. There are some uses that are related, but not identical. For example, in Edward Hall’s 1548 chronicle, the Lady Margaret

urged her son (the future Henry VII), ‘with all speed & diligence to addict & settle his mind and full intention how to return home again into England.’ ADDICT is used here to determine a course of action, but there is no suggestion of preformed bias, and no alternative actions to choose between. The next printed use of ADDICT that matches the meaning applied by Frith was not until 1555, when the evangelical martyr John Bradford wrote that ‘thou needest no more to confirm thy faith in this matter, but to read them with an indifferent mind, not being addict otherwise, than to the desire of the truth.’ Instead later writers used ADDICT almost exclusively with meanings first found in the work of Joye.

Unlike Frith, Joye’s use of ADDICT in 1530 was in a translation from Latin. Joye was a prolific writer who produced a string of English translations in the early 1530s, including two primers, two psalters, and the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah. His 1530 Psalter of David, which he translated from Martin Bucer’s 1529 S. Psalmorum libri quinque, contains five uses of ADDICT:

Deliver us from these mortal men which are thy hand wherest thou smittest / even the mortal men addict to this world [psalm 17]

All that are addict unto wickedness, shall begin to spread themself [psalm 92]

Shall they thus boast themself / these men addict and all given to wickedness [psalm 94]

They were addict & married unto Baal peor [psalm 106]

Make fast thy promises to thy servant: which is addict unto thy worship [psalm 119].

Rather than a pre-existing judgement or prejudice towards a particular course of action or idea, Joye used ADDICT to mean either the type of binding attachment between a person and a God, or the act of giving up, or surrendering, to an activity or action. The first can be seen in psalms 106, and 119, in which a person is both bound and devoted to a God. The second

---

47 Edward Hall, The union of the two noble and illustre families of Lancaster [and] Yorke (London, 1548; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
48 John Bradford, An e xhortation to the carie of Chrystes crosse (Wesel, 1555; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
sense can be seen in psalms 17, 92 and 94, two of which describe an attachment to wickedness. Psalm 17 is slightly different because it refers ostensibly to a place rather than a behaviour. Examining the context, however, it is clear that ‘this world’ refers to a very similar type of behaviour as ‘wickedness.’ The psalm is one in which David prays to God for deliverance from his attackers. The ‘mortal men addict to this world’ are his attackers; they are ‘the violent ungodly’ that are more concerned with their material life than their spiritual salvation.\footnote{Cree, ‘Protestant Evangelicals and Addiction’, p. 454.} The OED notes both senses of the word in its entry for ‘addict, adj.’, defining the first as, ‘That is or has been attached by compulsion or obligation to a person (or occasionally thing); tied, bound; obligated’, and the second as ‘That devotes oneself or is attached to a form of conduct, pursuit, etc., esp. immoderately or compulsively; (also in weakened sense) inclined or prone to.’\footnote{OED Online (June 2018), www.oed.com/view/Entry/2175 [accessed 10/01/17]. The OED lists Frith’s uses of ADDICT as examples of the first sense listed in this entry. However, Frith’s 1529 use in particular does not relate to a person or a thing, but to a course of action, and the context is that of a judgement, not an obligation. In this matter, I believe the OED has misinterpreted Frith’s use of the term.}

While it is clear from this analysis that ADDICT was borrowed morphologically from the Latin ADDICERE, semantically the situation is more complex. Frith drew on the augural meaning of the classical Latin term, but Joye – whose use of the word was ultimately more influential – did not. Nor does his use of the term match the Roman legal term ADDICERE; there are some overlaps, but the English ADDICT does not relate to the physical transfer of goods or people, and it is not a punishment inflicted by a third party.\footnote{Kay & Allan, English Historical Semantics, p. 14.} Complex etymologies are not unusual among loanwords, since – as Kay and Allen point out – ‘borrowing is not always a straightforward process of one language taking a word from another.’\footnote{Kay & Allan, English Historical Semantics, p. 14.} As Chapter II will demonstrate, whilst Frith took both meaning and form from classical Latin, Joye’s use of the word was inspired by later Latin uses of ADDICERE. For the purposes of this chapter, however, what is significant is that none of the ways in which ADDICT was used were new to the English language. Frith could have used the word favour (‘to treat with partiality’) or prefer (‘to favour one person or thing in preference or to another.’)\footnote{OED Online (June 2018), http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/149997 [accessed 21/07/18].} Joye could have used the words given (‘Inclined, disposed, addicted, prone’), or bound (‘To attach to (a person) by ties of duty, gratitude, affection, etc.’).\footnote{OED Online (June 2018), www.oed.com/view/Entry/78553 [accessed 21/07/2018]; ‘bind, v.’, OED Online (June 2018), www.oed.com/view/Entry/19117 [accessed 21/07/18].} Both writers chose to employ a new word, taken from...
Latin, rather than using a word already in existence. This raises questions about their motivations for borrowing, which can only be answered in the context of broader neologising practices.

Neologising practices

In order to understand Frith and Joye’s motives for choosing a loanword over other words, and for using a word borrowed from Latin, it is important to situate their use of ADDICT within the wider context of early sixteenth-century neologising practices. In the following section I do just that, by examining neologisms in a sample of texts written by both reformist writers – including Frith and Joye – compared to some of their non-reformist contemporaries, in order to see what made reformist neologising distinctive. I do this by examining the new words in texts by different authors, and comparing not just the overall quantity of words, but also their language of origin. What is revealed is a clear pattern in evangelical versus non-evangelical word use, suggesting that the use of new words was linked to personal values and motives for writing. In general, evangelical authors used fewer new words than their non-evangelical contemporaries, and where necessary they preferred words coined within English rather than borrowed from other languages. When they did use borrowed words, evangelical authors demonstrate a clear preference for post-classical Latin over classical Latin terms. Against this background, the neologising practices of both Joye and Frith are in their own ways distinctive. Unlike his fellow reformers, Frith had a notable preference for classical Latin loanwords, whilst Joye’s concern for clarity over precision meant he used an unusually small number of neologisms in his work.

Five authors are included in this sample, in addition to Frith and Joye. The other writers were chosen because they met two criteria. First, since the OED was used as the source for this study, the other writers had to be in the OED ‘Top 1,000 sources’ list. Second, they had to have at least four works printed in the period 1529 to 1536, with titles listed on both the OED and EEBO (with one exception, which I will address). Three of the writers who met these criteria were explicitly not supporters of evangelical reform. First, Thomas More, who was councillor to Henry VIII, Lord High Chancellor, and a strong opponent of the

---

57 While the word devotion was well established, the verb devote, which Lemon uses as a synonym for addict, appeared much later. The first use found by the OED was 1586. devote, v., *OED Online* [June 2018], www.oed.com/view/Entry/51568 [accessed 9/08/2018].

reformation, responsible for tracking down and executing reformers including Frith. 59  
Second, the humanist lexicographer Thomas Elyot, who as mentioned previously was a keen neologiser. 60  
Third, the poet and playwright John Heywood, a ‘lifelong Catholic’ who had familial ties to More via the printer John Rastell. 61  
Only one other evangelical writer met the criteria set for this study, and that was William Tyndale: a prolific writer of polemical treatises, and famously the first English translator to produce a printed version of the New Testament using Greek and Hebrew texts. To provide more context for understanding the neologising practices of Joye and Frith, I included an additional reformist writer: Miles Coverdale, who produced an English translation of the complete Bible a few years after Tyndale. Coverdale’s only other surviving printed work in this period was a book of psalms set to music, but his Bible translation is both significant and lengthy enough to warrant inclusion in its own right.

To begin with, all texts written by these authors within the period 1529 to 1536, as recorded on the OED, were considered for the study. However, in order that information about book length could be factored into the analysis, the texts also had to be available as page images on EEBO. The list of titles on the OED was cross-referenced with titles on the Chadwyck-Healey catalogue of EEBO, and any texts that were either not available, or where the dates did not match (i.e. where the text was printed after 1536) were excluded. The remaining list included 31 titles. The OED records whether quotations from any given work form the ‘first entry’ for a word. These figures were used to record the number of ‘first entries’, or new words, found in each text included in this study. 62

---

62 References for all works, in the order they appear on the table:
Bucer, trans. Joye, *The Psalter of David in English* (1530); George Joye & John Ashwell, *The prophete Iosey, translated into englyshe, by George Ioye* (Antwerp, 1531; EEBO-TCP Phase I); George Joye, *The letters which Iohan Ashwel priso[n] of Newnham Abbey besids Bedforde, sente secretly to the Bishop of Lyncolne* (Antwerp, 1531; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Ulrich Zwingli, trans. George Joye, *Dauis Psalter* (Antwerp, 1534; EEBO-TCP Phase I); George Joye, *The subuersio[n] of Moris false foundacion where upon be sweeth to set faste and shoue under his shameles shoris* (Antwerp, 1534; EEBO-TCP Phase I); George Joye, *An apolgye made by George Ioye to satisfye (if it maye be) w. Tindale to purge & defende himself against many slauewormes eyes fayned upon [bi]m in Tindals uncharitab[le] a[n]d vnshu[m] pestyl* (London, 1535; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Frith, *A pistle to the Christen reader, Frith, A disputacion of purgatorye, John Frith, A boke made by John Frith prisoner in the tower of London answeringe vnto M mores lettur* (Antwerp, 1533; EEBO-TCP Phase I); William Tyndale, *The Newe Testament dylygently corrected and compared with the Greke by William Tindale* (Antwerp, 1533; EEBO-TCP Phase I); William Tyndale, *The practyse of prelates Whether the Kings grace maye be separated from hyr queene, be cause she was his brothers wyfe* (Antwerp, 1530; EEBO); William Tyndale, *The Pentateuch* (Antwerp, 1530; EEBO-TCP Phase I); William Tyndale, *An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialgo made by Vvillyam Tindale* (Antwerp, 1531; EEBO-TCP Phase II); William Tyndale, *The exposition of the first epityle of seynt Jhon with a prology before it* (Antwerp, 1531; EEBO); William Tyndale, *The souer of the Lorde wher vnto, that thou mayst be the better prepared and suer[er] enstructed* (London/Antwerp, 1533; EEBO-TCP Phase I); William Tyndale, *An exposition vppon the v. vi. vii. chapters of Mathew which three chapters are the keye and the dore of the scripture*.
The texts vary considerably in length – from Coverdale’s 1000+ page Bible, to Heywood’s 16-page play – so the new word numbers needed to be scaled according to the overall text length before they could be compared. Whilst the Chadwyck-Healey metadata includes a physical description of the text, the actual data recorded there varies; some entries list page numbers, others record the number of leaves, and many have no data recorded there at all. Instead, in order to ensure that the data I collected was not based on inconsistent metadata, I recorded the total number of page images on Chadwyck-Healey, where each page image shows a double-page spread of the text. It is important to note that this method of measuring text length is not completely consistent, since the total number of words-per-page could differ considerably depending on page size, font, and print area. Nevertheless, it provides a valuable insight into the ratio of new words to text length, and allows for a comparison of different works.


A more accurate alternative would have been a comparison of new-word-count to total-word-count, but since many of the texts were not transcribed this was not feasible.
Figure 2 showing the list of titles included in the analysis of neologisms, including length of text and number of new words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Translated</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Length (page images)</th>
<th>New words</th>
<th>Words per page image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Joye</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>The Psalter of David</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>The prophet Isaye</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The letters which Iohan Ashwel… sent</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Dauids Psalter</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The subversion of Moris</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>An apolgye to w. Tindale</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Frith</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A pistle to the Christen reader</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Disputation of purgatorye</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A boke made by John Frith</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Tyndale</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>The Newe Testament</td>
<td>1529-34</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The practye of prelates</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Prolog to boke of Moses</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>An answere vnto Sir Thomas More</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The exposition of st Jhon</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The souper of the Lorde</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>An exposition vppon Mathew</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Coverdale</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Biblia the Bible</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Goostly psalmes</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas More</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The supplicacyon of soulys</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A dyaloge</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The colnwfucion of Tyndales answere</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The apologye</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Colnwfucion of Tyndals answere part</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Salem and Bizance</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Elyot</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>The educacion of children</td>
<td>1530/32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The gounernour</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Knowledg whiche maketh a wise man</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pasquile the Playne</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Heywood</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>pardoner and the frere</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Iohan Iohan</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The play of the wether</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A play of loue</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All seven authors were involved in creating new words to some degree, and in many ways the overall amount of neologising is less interesting than the decisions made about source language; that is, whether a writer chose to use a word borrowed from another language, or to use one coined from existing English words. To examine the origins of neologisms, the entries on the OED were examined and the source language was recorded for each new word. Where there were very large numbers of new words, only the first 40 new words were included. The origins were broken down into the five most frequent categories: English, post-classical Latin, classical Latin, Hebrew or Greek, and other European vernacular.64

---

64 Where the OED does not record which period a Latin word originated in, I consulted a Latin dictionary: http://latin-dictionary.net/
Since etymology is often complex, some simplifications were necessary in order to assign each word to a single category. Where multiple origins were suggested by the OED the word was categorised by whichever origin the OED listed first (usually Latin). Where both classical and post-classical Latin origins were suggested, the word was categorised as coming from classical Latin. Whilst this results in the simplification of often complex word origins, it ensures that the data collected is consistent and usable.

Figure 3 showing the number of new words per-page-image broken down by their language of origin

The figure above shows the average number of new words per-page-image, and the proportions which are drawn from different languages. Overall, evangelical authors are united in using fewer new words than their non-evangelical contemporaries. Coverdale is the biggest neologiser among the reformist writers examined here, but when his works are averaged out, he uses fewer neologisms per-page-image than More. If Bible translations are discounted, this gap between reformers and non-reformers becomes even more stark, with non-reformers using almost twice as many neologisms per-page-image as reformers. Unlike More and Elyot, the protestant reformers coin the overwhelming majority of their words from existing English words; Tyndale and Coverdale coin more than 80 percent of their neologisms within English, compared to Elyot’s 54 percent and More’s 64 percent.

The overall amount of neologising – in non-translated works particularly – makes the reformist writers distinct from their non-reformist contemporaries. It is therefore particularly
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notable that both Tyndale and Coverdale took a very different approach to neologising in their Bible translations. Rather than coining very few words, their Bible translations neologise extensively, but with new words sourced almost entirely from English. It is also interesting to note that this pattern of neologising is remarkably similar to that of the Catholic playwright, Heywood. Unlike Tyndale and Coverdale, it is not clear whether Heywood read Latin; whilst his son Ellis was ‘gifted in languages’, Peter Happé notes that Heywood himself ‘found his studies at Broadgates Hall, Oxford, rather uncongenial’. Heywood’s use of English coinages includes compounds like fingertip and midleg, derivations like prattling and gadding, and onomatopoeic words like thwack and peep. Whilst Heywood’s sourcing of new words may have been limited by his linguistic ability, the reformers examined here benefited from the same humanist education as More and Elyot, and spoke at least Latin, and in many cases Greek; this was a driving factor behind the translations which in many ways characterised the efforts of early reformers. Their avoidance of borrowed words was a deliberate choice, driven by the desire to make their work accessible to monolingual English readers, yet also by the need to render the words of God as accurately as possible. In his dedication for the English Bible, Coverdale – who is, not coincidentally, the most frequent neologiser among the evangelical writers – wrote that in translating it to English, ‘I have neither wrested nor altered so much as one word... but have with a clear conscience purely & faithfully translated this out of five sundry interpreters.’ Accuracy required the creation of new words, but accessibility dictated that those words be coined from existing English words that would already be known. As well as issues of accessibility, there may have been another consideration for reformist neologising practice: there is evidence to suggest that evangelical writers deliberately avoided the writing strategies employed by more ‘worldly’ scholars. Rainer Pineas notes that Tyndale and John Bale used rhetorical devices reluctantly, and that they took pains to point out that the strength of their arguments lay in God’s word rather than their own skill. Employing established, well-known words instead of coining new ones was another means for reformers to signal that their work placed substance over style, and accuracy over eloquence, in order to set themselves apart from their more ‘worldly’ contemporaries.

In contrast to the reformist writers, both Elyot and More neologised fairly frequently, and both borrowed a significant proportion of new words from other languages. This does not mean that they were unaware of the impact of new words on their readers; in fact Elyot

65 Happé, ‘Heywood, John (b. 1496/7, d. in or after 1578)’.
66 Coverdale, Biblia the Byble.
claimed to have protected his readers from confusion by providing glosses for new words, writing that ‘throughout the book there was no term new made by me of a Latin or French word, but it is there declared so plainly by one means or other to a diligent reader that no sentence is thereby made dark or hard to be understood.” However, it is clear that Elyot and More had different priorities to the reformers, and this affected their approach to new words in general, and to borrowing in particular. Both show a clear and marked preference for classical Latin over post-classical Latin terms, which had much to do with aesthetics. The humanist veneration for all things classical extended to language, and post-classical Latin was regarded as a corruption of the more perfect, purer Latin which preceded it. Seventeenth-century lexicographers would often differentiate between ‘Latin-Proper’ and ‘Latin-Barbarous’ in their dictionaries, with the latter being ‘those words which through Mistake of writing have been corrupted from the Latin.” It is perhaps for similar reasons that humanist-educated writers would actively avoid post-classical Latin loanwords wherever possible, unless they had good reason to do otherwise. Building on this argument, Tyndale’s preference for post-classical loanwords could be seen as part of his broader strategy for avoiding ‘worldly’ associations.

It is in some respects curious that Elyot’s and More’s neologising practices are so similar, given that they express quite dramatically different views on the necessity of new words. Whereas Elyot believed that English needed words ‘which be borrowed of the Latin tongue, for the insufficiency of our own language’, More argued that English was ‘plenteous enough to express our minds in anything whereof one man hath used to speak with another.” In practice, More borrowed slightly less frequently than Elyot, but more frequently than any of the other writers examined in this study. More is not the only writer whose views on borrowing were not wholly supported by his actions. Tyndale wrote that, ‘A thousand parts better may [the Bible] be translated into the English than into the Latin’, because the translator could ‘translate it into the English word for word when thou must seek a compass in the Latin.” Yet in his translation of the Bible, Tyndale used words borrowed from both classical and post-classical Latin. When it came to coining words, there appears to have been a disconnect between the stated intentions and the actual actions of early modern writers.

---

68 Elyot, Of the knowledeg whiche maketh a wise man. Despite his promise, Elyot did not always do this in practice.
69 Adam Littleton, Linguae Latinae liber dictionarius quadripartitus A Latin dictionary in four parts (London, 1678; EEBO), title page.
70 More, A dyaloge of sr Thomas More knyghte, p. xci; Elyot, The boke named the Gouernour.
John Frith and George Joye

Both Frith and Joye’s uses of ADDICT can be understood against this backdrop of neologising practices, and in the context of their own approach to new words. The frequency of neologising in their non-translated work is on a par with that of Tyndale, and as might be expected they neologised less frequently than More, Elyot, and Heywood. They also, like Coverdale and Tyndale, coined the vast majority of their words from existing English words. However, in other respects, their neologising practices appear to be quite different to those of other contemporary reformers. First, both Joye and Frith show a clear preference for classical Latin over post-classical Latin loanwords. In Frith’s case, this echoes observations made by Rainer Pineas that Frith ‘evidently did not share his co-religionists professed dislike of “worldly” learning.’

Pineas adds that Frith’s taste for rhetorical devices in his work was such that it ‘provoked the accusation of intellectual pride from all who disputed with him.’ Frith’s choice of a loanword over an existing English word can thus be explained quite simply by his stylistic preferences; he had a penchant for borrowing classical Latin terms.

However, Joye only used frequent classical Latin loanwords in his non-translated works, so his use of ADDICT in his Bible translations cannot be explained through any stylistic preference. In fact, a closer examination reveals that Joye’s classical Latin loanwords are found almost entirely in a single text; his 1535 Apology to w. Tindal. Given the context of their dispute – which centred around Joye’s choice of language in an unauthorised revision of Tyndale’s Bible – it seems likely that Joye’s use of classical Latin neologisms when addressing Tyndale was part of a deliberate strategy to emphasise his own intellectual and scholarly ability.

This would certainly be in keeping with the hostile tone of his Apology. In fact, Joye used almost as many neologisms in his Apology as he did in the rest of his work combined, suggesting that his approach to translation was markedly different to that of Tyndale and Coverdale. Whereas other reformers neologised more frequently when translating the Bible, Joye appears to have made a concerted effort to use as few new words as possible.

---

73 Ibid.
75 Ibid.
This could be seen as a failure on Joye’s part to prioritise the accuracy of his work, particularly if the goal of translation was, as Coverdale believed, to have ‘neither wrested nor altered so much as one word.’ Such a view would be in keeping with the traditional historiographical depiction of Joye, which ‘is an almost unvarying defamation.’ Joye’s biographer Charles Butterworth said of him that ‘he lacked those qualities of greatness which might have endowed his work with more permanence’, and that ‘he was deficient in the literary faculties of taste, judgement, and perception.’ However, Gergely M. Juhász argues that Joye’s contemporaries saw him ‘as one of the most prominent members of the Lutheran group at Cambridge.’ In fact, I would argue that far from being deficient in literary faculties, Joye’s infrequent use of neologisms was part of a deliberate translation strategy. According to Juhász, Joye’s methodology was based on the principle that a good translation should ‘render the sense of the original and not its letter, for it is absurd to produce a literal but incomprehensible translation.’ Where his fellow reformers prioritised the wording of their translation, Joye was primarily concerned with conveying a message in terms that could be clearly understood by his readers. Joye’s decision to apply two different senses to an existing word (albeit a fairly recent one), rather than coining two entirely new terms, is consistent with his general strategy of minimising neologisms. It also fits with Joye’s approach to translation, which, as described by Juhász, regarded the meaning of each individual word as being less important than the overall message conveyed. Joye’s decision to use a very recent loanword instead of a more established one might seem at odds with his concerns about clarity and coherence. However, it is significant that Joye provided an explanatory synonym for both senses in which he used the word – ‘addict and all given to wickedness’, and ‘addict and married unto Baal Peor’ – thus mitigating the effect of using a potentially obscure recent loanword.

There is a further point to be made here that links Biblical translation, the re-evaluation of Joye’s work, and the neologising practices of reformers. There is often a sense in modern scholarship that the impact of early modern writers can in part be measured by the number of new words or phrases they managed to introduce. David Daniell praises Tyndale’s ‘gift for coining words’, and Juhász writes that Joye ‘has even enriched the English language with

---

76 Coverdale, *Biblia the Byble.*
a few memorable expressions, even if his influence is not comparable to Tyndale.82 These kinds of comments make sense when talking about someone like Elyot, who was a self-proclaimed and dedicated neologiser, but they sit less comfortably in discussions of Bible translation. Whilst most evangelicals did not overtly discuss their attitude towards new words, it seems clear from the examination done here that the majority of early protestant reformers self-consciously avoided the practice whenever possible. The fact that Tyndale and Coverdale coined and borrowed large numbers of new words, whereas Joye did not, could controversially be seen as a sign of Joye’s superior skill as a Bible translator; certainly the resulting text would likely have been more accessible to a monolingual English reader of the time.

Although the dominant meaning of ADDICT was established in a translation of a Bible book, the evolution of ADDICT is not linked to the English trajectory of the Bible. Apart from the odd appearance in small-scale translations, Joye’s use of the word was not imitated by later translators of the Psalter, no doubt in part due to their very different translation strategies.83 The first complete English Bible, translated by Coverdale and printed in 1535, contains no uses of the term. ‘Men addict to this world’ became ‘men of the world’, and rather than the lengthy ‘men addict and all given to wickedness’, Coverdale simply writes ‘wicked doers’.84 A search for ADDICT on the Bible comparison website Bible Gateway finds no results in any pre-twentieth-century Bibles.85

An evangelical community

Although ADDICT failed to make its mark on the English Bible, it nevertheless maintained a strong link to religious writing. The list of pre-1550 uses of the term is dominated by the

83 The word appears in Robert Crowley’s 1549 Psalter, although in a different psalm to Joye. ADDICT also appears in John Hall’s 1549 Proverbs of Solomon. Full citations: Leo Jud, ed. & trans. Robert Crowley, The Psalter of David newly translated into English (London, 1549; EEBO-TCP Phase II); John Hall, ed. John Case, Certayne chapters of the proverbes of Salomon drawn into metre (London, 1549; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
84 Coverdale, Biblia the Byble.
85 Google search term: “addict site:Biblegateway.com” found results in just three versions: The Message (completed 2002); Common English Bible (completed 2011); and New American Standard Bible (1971).
names of protestant reformers, many of whom had connections to Frith and Joye. The invention of addiction, in the 1530s, as well as works by Frith and Joye, appeared in an exposition on the apostle Jude written by Lancelot Ridley, two translations of contemporary Latin works by the antipapal printer and translator William Marshall, and one by the evangelical Richard Taverner. The word was included in works from the 1540s by active reformers Thomas Becon, John Bale, William Hugh, and Richard Grafton, as well as translated works by Nicholas Udall, Miles Coverdale, and Nicholas Lesse. Some of these texts are wholly reformist in nature; take, for example, Bale’s The image of bothe churches after reulacion of saynt Iohan the euangelyst, or John Hooper’s A declaration of Christe and of his office compylyd. Others are harder to define, particularly since a 1543 clampdown on evangelical printing meant that reformists directed their efforts towards ‘bland projects’; works which Alec Ryrie describes as ‘painfully moderate’. I have counted as ‘reformist work’ writings like Hugh’s The troubled mans medicine, which according to Ryrie was ‘more Erasmian than evangelical, but it did take a reformist line on justification.’ Also included is Edward Hall’s The vnion of the two noble and illustre families of Lancastre [and] Yorke; whilst Hall is described by his biographer Peter Herman as a ‘moderate Protestant’, the work was completed by Grafton, ‘whose sometimes incautious combination of reformist commitment and commercial activity made him one of the most eye-catching evangelicals of the period.’ In assessing the reformist credentials of these texts, I have prioritised the religious values of translators over those of the original authors. This is due to the practice described by Ryrie whereby printers or translators gave works ‘a reformist twist’. Thus, Thomas Langley’s Vergil was repackaged as anti-papal, and in the hands of Richard Taverner, ‘Erasmus became a full-blown evangelical.’ Discounting works where the translator was unknown, only seven out of 56 texts containing addict in the 1530s and 40s were not written by reformers. This fairly astonishing statistic suggests that evangelical writers were making use of at least one word which other contemporary writers
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86 See Appendix B for a full list of works on EEBO-TCP containing the term addict, from 1529-49.
88 John Bale, The image of bothe churches after reulacion of saynt Iohan the euangelyst (Antwerp, 1545; EEBO-TCP Phase I); John Hooper, A declaration of Christe and of his office compylyd (Zurich, 1547; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
90 Ibid.; William Hugh, The troubled mans medicine (London, 1546; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
tended not to use, perhaps indicating the existence of a discrete reformist vocabulary.93

What makes this of particular note is the fact that, whilst there is no doubt that ADDICT ties into the concerns of reformers, it was not inherently a religious term. It is possible to find exactly the same meanings conveyed in non-evangelical works, using words like GIVE, DEDICATE, and BIND. ADDICT in the sense of a binding attachment comes closest to describing specifically evangelical interests, since it could be used in reference to God, as in, ‘so wholly given and addicted to God the father’, or ‘the soul it self being addict unto God.’94 It could also be used indirectly to speak about the worship or service of god, speaking ‘of a mind more addict to the serving of god,’ or of one ‘wholly addict to the honouring of their false gods,’ or perhaps warning that a Christian man should not ‘addict himself to the wicked service of idols.’95 But it was also used to speak about a binding attachment to another person, such as loyalty to a monarch – ‘your most addict subjects Queen’ – and it could describe adherence to, or praise of, the ideas or principles of a particular figure.96 Examples of the latter include Coverdale’s translation of Erasmus, which speaks about ‘our divines, that are too much addict to Aristotle’, and Lancelot Ridley, writing of Saint Augustine and others, that ‘these authors would have no man so addicted unto their sayings that whatsoever they should speak or had written it should be believed as truth.’97 None of these contexts or topics were exclusive to protestant reformers. The humanist scholar Elyot wrote of someone ‘equally as much bounden to Aristotle’, and the advice of Catholic spokesman John Feckenham was ‘to dedicate our selves wholly to the service of God.’98 The meaning and context were the same – the difference lay in the choice of word.99

The same is true of the other sense in which Joye used ADDICT, which was to describe an attachment to habitual behaviours or customs. Plato and Anaxagoras welcomed isolation, according to William Hugh, because it meant ‘their minds were more quiet thereby and addict to the study of philosophy,’ and reformist writer and clergyman George Bancrafte advises
that we should not ‘be addict & given to the observance of the lavish ceremonies.’

When similar topics appear in the work of non-evangelicals, the same meanings are conveyed without the use of ADDICT. The humanist Thomas Starkey wrote that he had ‘given [him] self to the study of letters,’ and the Bridgettine monk Richard Whitford argued that religious persons ‘be not bound unto their ceremonies.’ These alternatives to ADDICT – GIVE, DEDICATE, BIND – are found in the work of evangelicals too; the difference is that reformers had an additional word in their arsenal, which non-reformers did not embrace. In other words, ADDICT had evangelical connotations because of the writers who used it, not because of its inherent meaning.

One possible explanation for this is that ADDICT spread orally, through personal interactions between reformers. Whilst there is little evidence that reformers ever met in any great number, there were opportunities for personal interaction. Both Frith and Joye were living in Antwerp when ADDICT first appeared in their work, and at various points in the late 1520s and 30s, Tyndale, John Rogers, Coverdale, and Simon Fish, were all described as residents there. Other reformers, like Robert Barnes, passed through on their way to other cities. John Foxe’s claim that reformers held regular meetings in the White Horse Tavern in Cambridge are unsubstantiated, but certainly large numbers of reformers (or future-reformers) attended the university at various points, including Frith, Joye, Coverdale, Hugh Latimer, Barnes, Thomas Bilney, and Stephen Gardiner, among others. However,

100 Hugh, The troubled mans medicine, Anon, trans. George Bancrafte, The answere that the preachers of the Gospel at Basile, made (London, 1548; EEBO-TCP Phase II).

101 Thomas Starkey, A preface to the Kynges byghnes (London, 1536; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Bernard of Clairvaux, trans. Richard Whitford, Here begynneth the boke called the Pype (London, 1532; EEBO-TCP Phase II).


104 For a list of reformers supposedly in Cambridge see Juhász, Translating Resurrection, p. 18, fn. 61:

‘Just a few who were present in Cambridge while Joye was there: George Stafford, (Pembroke College. fellow in 1515), Nicholas Ridley (c.1500-55, Pembroke College, fellow c.1524), Thomas Arthur (Pembroke College, BD in 1523), Thomas Bilney (c.1491-1531, Trinity Hall, BD in 1524), John Rogers (Pembroke College, BA in 1526), Edward Foxe (c.1496-1538, a personal friend of Joye, King’s College), John Frith (1503-33, King’s College), Richard Bayfield (Benet Hall, (d.1531), Matthew Parker (1504-75. Benet Hall, BA in 1525, fellow in 1527), Richard Taverner (1505-75, Benet Hall), Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556, Jesus College, reaccepted fellow in 1523), John Bale (1495-1563, Jesus College, BD in 1529), Stephen Gardiner (1497-1555, Trinity Hall, JCD in 1521), Hugh Latimer (c.1485/90-1555, fellow of Clare College, BD in 1521), Robert Barnes (1495–1540, DD in 1523), Simon Smith (Gonville Hall, MA). Having assumed his vows as Augustinian friar, Myles Coverdale (c.1488–1568) was also living in the Cambridge priory where Robert Barnes was the prior.’ However, David Daniell writes that ‘The hard evidence that any of them, in Cambridge, were ever in the same place at the same time, never mind together in the snug of a Tudor pub, is minimal’ (Daniell, William Tyndale, p. 50), Juhášz calls the White Horse legend ‘romantic’ and ‘unsubstantiated’ (Juhász, Translating...
evangelicals lived with the threat of persecution, often in exile, and meeting in person carried significant risks. As a result, writing, reading, and circulating reformist literature became a key means not only of communicating ideas, but also of building a sense of community. It is therefore likely that the spread of ADDICT among reformers occurred in large part through the circulation of written texts. Since reformist books were frowned upon, if not explicitly banned, they tended to be shared within a tight network of reformers; when a new word appeared in a reformist text, it took longer to reach a wider audience.

If ADDICT was circulating among reformers via written texts, then appearances of the word can provide a means of tracing readership. When a writer in the 1530s or 40s is observed to have used the term, it means they are likely to have read reformist literature. Going even further, since these writers were not just passively reading words, but also actively reproducing them, the use of ADDICT may indicate more than just readership; it may have been part of a deliberate strategy of building and reinforcing reformist identity. It is widely recognised that vocabulary can both reflect and define a social group. This concept forms the basis of Alan S. C. Ross’s now infamous 1954 comparison of upper- and middle-class vocabularies, which Ross refers to as U and non-U class indicators. A more contemporary example is provided by Peter Burke, who described how sixteenth-century English puritans were ‘recognisable by their nasal twang and also by their vocabulary, in which terms such as ‘abomination’, ‘backsliding’, ‘discipline’, ‘edify’, ‘godly’ and so on made a frequent appearance.’ In the same way if ADDICT was seen as part of evangelical vocabulary of the early sixteenth century, then the act of using it could be viewed as a deliberate statement of evangelical support.

constant, addict or fervently disposed.)  In his 1542 revised edition, these two uses had increased to six, with ADDICT appearing in the entries for solidurij and persequi uoluptates, as well as the biographies of Horatius Flaccus and Paul the Apostle. The appearance of ADDICT in Elyot’s dictionaries is an anomaly. He was a prolific writer who produced ten English works and seven translations over the course of the 1530s and 40s, yet ADDICT appears in none of his other writing. Significantly, as well as being a humanist scholar, a diplomat, and a lexicographer, Elyot was also an opponent of the evangelical cause. Since he was clearly aware of the existence and meaning of the word, it seems to have been a conscious decision to use ADDICT – a Latin loanword – only in his two Latin dictionaries. In other words, Elyot used ADDICT only when it would be understood in the context of classical Latin lexicography, and avoided using it in his other works where it could be interpreted as an affinity for protestant reform.

If ADDICT was recognised as being part of evangelical vocabulary by both reformers and non-reformers alike, this has interesting implications for those non-reformist texts that used the word in 1530s and 40s. Seven out of 56 printed texts that used ADDICT in the 1530s and 40s were not written by reformist writers. The earliest of these appeared just three years after Frith’s Antithesis in a 1531 work titled A glasse of the truth, which argues for the annulment of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon’s marriage. In A glasse a lawyer and a divine are discussing what a shame it is that learned men put their own self-interests above the public good, and that they are not united in their opinion; the divine comments that this ‘showeth a great lack of grace, and an overmuch addiction to private appetites, mixed with too much headiness and obstinacy.’ As when Joye wrote of ‘the mortal men addict to this world,’ so A glasse used addiction to refer to behaviour that was both morally reprehensible and limiting; ‘private’ appetites restrict one from pursuing the much preferred ‘public’ appetites. The text is often believed to express the personal views of Henry VIII, with Steven Haas contending that Henry ‘gave much personal effort to it and that hence A glasse is in fact a mirror to his own views.’ It is, however, unlikely to have been written personally by the king. The royal tutor Richard Croke noted that ‘many besides Roper [Dean of Henry VIII’s College at
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111 Elyot, The dictionary of tyr Thomas Eliot knight.
112 Elyot, Bibliotheca Eliotae Eliotis librarie (1542).
114 Henry VIII (attr.), A glasse of the truth (London, 1532; EEBO-TCP Phase I). This also happens to be the first surviving printed appearance of the noun form, addiction, which arguably means Henry VIII invented addiction.
Oxford] cannot believe it is the king’s writing, and, though they admit his wit, think that he lacketh leisure to search and bolt out so difficult a matter. The fact that ADDICT was used in a sense almost identical to Joye, and only a year later, suggests that whoever wrote A glasse was not only reading reformist works, but also imitating the language found in them. It may not be too much of a stretch to suggest that Henry VIII’s ghost writer in 1532 was a reformist sympathiser.

Henry VIII was also involved in another of the seven non-reformist texts: the 1543 *A necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christen man*, commonly called the King’s Book. The work aimed to establish the official doctrine of the Church of England, and was based on an earlier version known as the Bishop’s Book. However, whilst the 1537 original – which took the combined efforts of 46 divines – does not contain ADDICT, the 1543 rewrite, which was written by just six scholars, does. At one point, the King’s Book argues that the customs and ordinances at the time of Christ are closer to the true doctrine of Christ, than any put forward by ‘the bishop of Rome, or any other addicted to that see and usurped power.’ At least two of the contributors had evangelical leanings in the 1530s, which may explain the appearance of the word ADDICT in this text. Nicholas Heath was ‘clearly a member of the evangelical circle’ around Thomas Cranmer in 1533, although by the 1540s he was having ‘second thoughts about the extent of his evangelical commitment.’ Similarly Thomas Thirlby shared Cranmer’s evangelical opinions in 1533, but was later described as ‘the keenest opponent of the reformist cause.’ Either of these men could have retained the vocabulary of their previous radical phase. There remains also a remote possibility that Henry VIII may have written the line himself. He apparently ‘read the Bishops’ Book thoroughly and proceeded to alter words, rewrite sentences and delete whole sections’, before involving a team of experts in the editing process. Whilst his direct authorship may be improbable, it seems likely that Henry VIII at least read – and authorised – the use of the term.
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118 Henry VIII (attr.), *A necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christen man set furthe by the kynges maiesty of Englelde* (London, 1543; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
119 Dunstan Roberts, ‘An Annotated and Revised Copy of The Institution of a Christen Man (1537)’, *Historical Research* 84:223 (2011), p. 32. The three main writers are Nicholas Heath, Thomas Thirlby, and George Day, with advice from Richard Cox, John Redman and Thomas Robinson.
120 Henry VIII (attr.), *A necessary doctrine*.
Continuity and change

The evangelical monopoly on ADDICT was short-lived, and non-reformist appearances of the term increased from the 1540s: three of the seven non-reformist uses appear in the latter half of that decade.\footnote{Three other non-reformist texts that use ADDICT are: William Chedsey & Scott Cuthbert, Two notable sermons lately preached at Pauls Crosse Anno 1544 (London, 1545; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Desiderius Erasmus, trans. Thomas Chaloner, The praise of folie = Moriae encomium (London, 1549; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Church of England, The booke of the common prayer and administracion of the sacramentes, and other rites and ceremonies (London, 1549; EEBO-TCP Phase I).} However, for a period of around 20 years it appears to reveal a limited network of reformist readership; one that may have included Henry VIII’s 1532 ghost writer, and the once reformist-leaning contributors to the King’s Book. The appearance of ADDICT in these non-reformist works was also an important step in transmitting the word to a wider audience; by the 1550s it could no longer be considered an exclusively evangelical term.\footnote{Cree, ‘Protestant Evangelicals and Addiction’, pp. 461-2.}

In Addiction and Devotion Lemon describes the process of change as one in which an extraordinary, fundamentally laudable form of religious addiction was adopted by secular writers as a model for other forms of devotion.\footnote{Lemon, Addiction and Devotion, p. 7.} She describes sixteenth-century addiction as ‘an extraordinary form of commitment’, but also a cause of ‘profound uncertainty’ because it was so easily misdirected; as a result, she writes, ‘sixteenth-century religious polemics warn against the dangers of fervent attachment to the wrong object.’\footnote{Ibid., pp. 10-1.} It is possible to see both this praise and this uncertainty in the writing of protestant reformers. Devotional addiction is present when Marshall writes ‘Make fast thy promises to thy servant: which is addict unto thy worship’; when Hugh writes of minds ‘addict to the study of philosophy’; and when Udall writes of ‘A mind, wholly addict, to sober living.’\footnote{Catholic Church, ed. William Marshall, A prymer in Englyshe with certeyn prayers [et] godly meditations, very necessary for all those that understonde not the Latyne tongue (London, 1534; EEBO-TCP Phase I) [based on work by George Joye]; Hugh, The troubled mans medicine; Desiderius Erasmus, trans. Nicholas Udall, Apophthegmes that is to saie, prompte, quicke, wittie and sentencious saiynges, of certain emperours, kynges, capitaines, philosophiers and oratours (London, 1542; EEBO-TCP Phase I).} Meanwhile, concerns around misdirected addiction are apparent when Hooper writes of ‘men that be addict unto the pleasure of this world’, when Lesse writes about ‘those men, which are all together given and addicted to this world’, and when Urbanus Rhegius warns that a bishop or priest should ‘in no wise addict him self in worldly matters.’\footnote{Hooper, A declaration of Christe; Johann Aepinus, trans. Nicholas Lesse, A very fruitful & godly exposition vpo[n] the xx. Psalme of David called Lord, who shall dwell in thy tabernacle (London, 1548; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Urbanus Rhegius, A lytle treatise after the manner of an epistle wryten by the famous clerk Doctor Vrbanus Regius, unto a speyall fynde of ys (London, 1548; EEBO-TCP Phase II).}
According to Lemon, over time secular texts ‘adopt a language of devotional addiction as a means of educating readers on the attributes of good rulership.’ However, I would argue that it was in both its devotional and morally objectionable forms that ADDICT spread beyond the work of reformers; if anything, it was used more frequently in a negative than a positive light. John Brende’s translation of Quintus Curtius Rufus’s *History* uses ADDICT in the devotional sense, writing of ‘Aristander... to whom he [Alexander the Great] was addicted in belief.’ However, William Bavand’s translation of Johannes Ferrarius’s 1559 *Orderynge of a common weale* uses it in the pejorative sense, warning that ‘it is dangerous so to addict a man unto an others opinion’; condemning ‘he that is addict only to the world & men traditions’; and writing of those ‘of lamentable estate... wholly addicted to affections.’ Nicholas Smyth’s translation of Herodian’s *History* contains both positive and negative uses: ‘the nation of Syrians is chiefly addicted unto jests and plays’, but Severus was ‘above all measure addicted unto avarice’; Alexander was ‘addicted to gentle benevolence’, but Commodus was ‘wholly addicted unto... slaves and such as used most filthy manners.

In the examples above, it is clear that both senses used by Joye survived, in both devotional and denounceable forms; an attachment to a person could be positive like Alexander’s to Aristander, or negative like Commodus and his slaves. Equally, the pursuit of a particular course of action could be positive like addiction to benevolence, or negative like addiction to avarice. ADDICT continued to be used with the meanings and connotations established in the work of protestant reformers. What changed when it spread beyond the writing of reformers – as will be shown in Chapter III – was that it began to be applied to a greater variety of behaviours, people, and contexts.

**Conclusions**

This chapter has examined the emergence of ADDICT in the context of both early modern language change and the early English reformation. In order to explore the borrowing of ADDICT I set out to situate it within the wider context of early modern neologising practices. In doing so I rejected the dichotomy of ‘language purist’ and ‘neologiser’, arguing instead
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133 Johannes Ferrarius, trans. William Bavand, *A worooke of Ioannes Ferrarius Montanus, toucheynge the good orderynge of a common weale wherein aswell magistrates, as private persons* (London, 1559; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
that all writers coined and used new words to some extent. There is value in exploring the more nuanced distinctions between writers, in the choices they made about how and where to source new words. I found that motive and purpose played a decisive role in determining the number and type of words coined, and that decisions about the use of neologisms were often made consciously. Reformist writers balanced concerns about loss of clarity for their readers, the need for accuracy in translation, and fears about seeming too ‘worldly’, making different choices depending on both the purpose of the work, and their intended audience. The appearance of ADDICT in English print can best be understood against this backdrop of evangelical neologising; the product of both Frith’s defiant preference for classical Latin terms, and Joye’s unusual translation practice which prioritised clarity over precision, even when translating the Bible.

Once introduced, ADDICT was also quickly accepted and adopted by a reformist community not known for their love of loanwords. What makes this particularly curious is that, whilst ADDICT was easily relatable to reformist interests, it was neither semantically original nor exclusively evangelical in meaning. By distinguishing between the word ADDICT and the concepts it applied to, I have found that ADDICT’s reformist ties were a result of the people who used it, rather than any evangelical ‘meaning’ inherent to the word. The almost exclusive use of ADDICT by protestant reformers points to the existence of a discrete textual community, made up of writers who employed specific language in their work, including words that were not used in English print more generally. Whilst ADDICT was not in a conventional sense a religious term, it may have been part of a reformist vocabulary helping to forge a sense of shared reformist identity.

Methodologically this chapter has used new approaches which have great potential for further exploration of early modern language. Whilst the concept of ‘first use’ has been justifiably criticised for being almost certainly inaccurate in the majority of cases, there is still a great deal to be learnt by examining the people – and groups – who chose to use new words in their writing. Rather than viewing them as the ‘inventors’ of words, it is useful to think of them as early adopters. Examining the very earliest uses of a word can tell us how early modern writers felt about issues of translation, comprehension and accessibility, and style, and how they reconciled conflicting values in their own work. Exploring the spread of new words over a longer period has the potential to uncover textual communities and audiences, and may help us to better understand the dissemination of new ideas through the words that carried them.
Ultimately, ADDICT did not remain restricted to the works of protestant writers beyond the mid-century. However, the origins of the word had a lasting impact on the connotations and meaning of addiction across the entirety of the early modern period. ADDICT – a morally ambiguous, profoundly versatile English term – was used throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to describe two very intimate sentiments: a deep sense of attachment to another person or being, and a strong disposition for doing particular activities or practices. Evangelical addiction thus became a means for early modern people to define both their devoted attachments, and their habitual behaviours.\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{135} Cree, ‘Protestant Evangelicals and Addiction’, p. 462.
In the last chapter we witnessed the arrival of ADDICT into sixteenth-century English amid thousands of other neologisms, many of them Latin loanwords. Morphologically ADDICT had clear links to the classical Latin term ADDICERE, but the semantic links were less apparent, making the nature of the relationship between donor word and loanword complex and unclear. This was not unusual: loanwords were not borrowed as fixed units in a static transfer, but as part of an ongoing process in which meaning, connotation, and context, were negotiated between two or more languages. As Williams observed in his work on keywords, ‘many of the most important words that I have worked on either developed key meanings in languages other than English, or went through a complicated and interactive development in a number of major languages.’

There is an understandable tendency among early modern scholars to rely on the OED for definitions of historical meaning, since the OED represents the most comprehensive historical account of the English language currently in existence. However, when the OED is used as the basis for conclusions about the relationship of English words to other languages, this reliance becomes problematic. The type of complex, interactive relationship which is typical of many early modern words is represented poorly by dictionaries. Williams writes that, ‘the dictionary is primarily philological and etymological; one of the effects of this is that it is much better on range and variation than on connection and interaction.’

Historical dictionaries like the OED are excellent at showing the changing meaning of words, but provide only a brief, basic etymology, in which the relationship between the donor
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1 Williams, *Keywords*, p. 20.
2 Ibid., p. 19.
language and English is depicted as static and one-way. Bilingual or polyglot dictionaries like the Oxford Latin Dictionary (OLD) are better at depicting the complex relationships between languages, but often fail to give any sense of change over time.

In *Addiction and Devotion* Lemon devotes a large part of the preface to a discussion of etymology, quoting Jeffrey Masten’s appeal for scholars ‘to be more carefully attuned to the ways that etymologies, shorn of their associations with “origin”, persist in a word and its surrounding discourse.’ In explaining the meaning of *ADDICT* Lemon highlights two etymological strands, and also draws on early modern lexicography. She writes that *ADDICT* comes from the Latin *addicere* which is a combination of ‘*ad* + *dicere*’, “to speak, say””, from which she deduces that addiction ‘involves a dependence on declarative speech’, and ‘hinges... on a verbal contract or pledge.’ She points to ‘the term’s origins in Roman contract law’ under which ‘an addict was an individual, usually a debtor, who had been sentenced or condemned,’ and she also links addiction with devotion on the grounds that in ‘glossing “addiction”, [early modern] dictionaries turn to the words “devotion” and “dedication”.’ Based on these etymologies and synonyms, Lemon defines an addict ‘both as the person conscripted by an external authority into service to someone or something, and as the person who devotes and assigns himself or herself to such service.’ The rest of Lemon’s analysis is built upon this foundation – that addiction involves declarative speech, loss of free will, and a type of devotion.

Yet a closer analysis of both etymology and early modern lexicography casts doubt on the strength of the semantic connections made by Lemon. Whilst *ADDICT* was borrowed from *ADDICERE*, *ADDICERE* was not itself static; its meanings shifted from its classical Latin use (up to the third century AD), through late Latin (third to sixth centuries), medieval Latin (fourth to fifteenth centuries), and into neo-Latin (sixteenth century onwards). By 1500 *ADDICERE* was used almost exclusively to describe either the pursuit of a particular activity or behaviour, or devotion to a person or god. As this chapter demonstrates, semantically *ADDICT* was borrowed, not from the classical Latin meanings, but from these neo-Latin uses of *ADDICERE*. Furthermore, whilst there is undoubtedly a semantic connection between
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5 Ibid., p. xii.
6 Ibid., p. xii.
addiction and devotion, it was not one that was commonly made by early modern lexicographers; in fact, out of 18 English-Latin and English dictionaries examined for this chapter, not one used the term DEVOTE in their definition of ADDICT. Finally, whilst there is something undeniably appealing about the transition from legally-imposed slavery into other forms of compulsion, this connection is at best over-simplistic. As will be shown in Chapter IV, in much philosophical writing the free action of the will is a prerequisite for both the formation and the continuation of habit and addiction.

This chapter sets out to clarify the complex relationship between ADDICT and its Latin origins using early modern dictionaries and translated works. Dictionaries, particularly Latin-English and English-Latin works, were written by humanist scholars with a passion for language, and a wealth of linguistic knowledge, whilst translations made classical, medieval, and neo-Latin writings accessible to monolingual English readers. When taken together these sources reveal that both ADDICERE and ADDICT have multiple meanings, and the meanings and connotations of one do not map perfectly onto the other.

I begin by examining the definitions for ADDICT and ADDICERE provided by early modern dictionaries, including Latin-English, English-Latin, and English monolingual works. The conventions for bilingual Latin dictionaries were different to those of monolingual English dictionaries; the former aimed to exhaustively document word use, whereas the latter provided brief, key meanings. Bilingual Latin dictionaries were often based on humanist principles, and brushed over the ‘barbarisms’ of post-classical Latin to depict only ‘pure’, classical Latin. As a result, Latin-English dictionaries in particular tend to depict an idealised version of Latin, as opposed to reflecting contemporary Latin use. All were written in a highly competitive and expanding market, and scholarly standards were high. In the second section of this chapter I examine English printed translations of Latin texts, comparing them to their Latin original to discover both how ADDICERE was translated into English, and which Latin words or phrases were rendered as ADDICT. The texts were chosen by cross-referencing works on the online collection The Latin Library with EEBO-TCP, to match up instances of ADDICT and ADDICERE with their translations. The comparison of original text with translated text shows – more clearly than dictionaries – how language was used in practice. Whilst the translations themselves are all early modern, the Latin originals are divided into classical, late, medieval, and neo-Latin texts, and thus show the changing meaning and uses
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8 See Appendix C for full list of dictionaries examined.
of ADDICERE over time, as understood by early modern writers. Unlike dictionaries, translated works do not focus upon isolated words, but upon entire sentences or texts. Translators are concerned not just with meaning, but also with tone, style, and context; all of these variables affect word choice. Finally, in the last part of this chapter I examine polyglot dictionaries, which provide the opportunity to explore the translation of ADDICERE into other European vernacular languages.

**Early Modern Dictionaries**

In the sixteenth century, humanist education in England trained a new generation of scholars in the skills of classical translation. Humanist Latin-English dictionaries were a side effect of this shift in scholarly concern. They aimed to document classical Latin (as opposed to the ‘barbarous’ Latin that followed it) and were based explicitly on classical sources: Thomas Cooper’s 1565 entry for ADDICERE, for example, cites Quintilian, Suetonius, Cicero, and Caesar. Distinct from their medieval equivalents, these works were intended as handbooks for the ‘good and creative imitation that characterises the Latin writings of the Renaissance.’

In his 1538 dictionary Thomas Elyot – the first of the humanist Latin-English lexicographers – recorded the purpose of his work as being that, ‘men being studious, may understand better the Latin tongue in six months, than they might have done afore in three years, without perfect instructors.’ Other dictionary writers were quick to follow in Elyot’s footsteps, and new works were published throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth century as more classical texts became available, or in response to changing ideas about scholastic rigour or lexicographical conventions. Francis Gouldman, in his 1664 *A copious dictionary in three parts*, justified ‘adding this Dictionary after others that have been well reputed and are useful’, by arguing that his work corrected ‘Multitudes of Faults’, and that it included ‘very many Additional Latin words inserted in their places’, as well as both etymology and instances of use. The outcome of this expansionist approach was that entries in Latin-English dictionaries tended to be very long, and got longer over time. Elyot’s 1538 entry for ADDICO is just 47 words long, compared to Cooper’s 387-word entry in 1565, and Francis Holyoake’s

---

10 See Appendix D for full list of translations examined.
14 Francis Gouldman, *A copious dictionary in three parts I. the English before the Latin ... II. The Latin before the English ... III. The proper names of persons, places ...* (Cambridge, 1664; EEBO).
470-word entry in 1648. Humanist Latin-English dictionaries thus provide a wealth of information on the changing relationship between Latin and English words, often including etymologies, quotations, and multiple translations. The downside to this exhaustive approach is that the entries are difficult to summarise, and comparing the entries from several works can be problematic.

The desire to revive classical Latin sat alongside a growing concern – discussed in the previous chapter – over the relative poverty of the English language. As increasing numbers of non-English texts were translated into English, this concern crystallised into a pressing need for new words, to convey both the meaning and the eloquence found in other languages. A flood of new words entered the English language – ADDICT among them – accompanied by a lengthy process of spelling reform and regularisation. However, there was also widespread concern about the impact of borrowed words on English readers and their ability to understand English texts. Monolingual English dictionaries emerged as a solution, initially documenting only those ‘hard words’ which English readers might not be well acquainted with. One of the first was Robert Cawdry’s 1604 dictionary, titled *A table alphabeticall conteyning and teaching the true writing, and vnderstanding of hard vsuall English wordes, borrowed from the Hebrew, Greeke, Latine, or French*. 20 years later Henry Cockeram produced his *An interpreter of hard English words*, which claimed to include ‘some thousands of words never published by any heretofore.’ As Thomas Blount explained in the preface to his *Glossographia*, ‘few, without the help of a Dictionary, would be able to understand our ordinary English Books.’ Whereas Latin-English dictionaries were intended for a scholarly audience, monolingual English dictionaries were aimed specifically at the ‘uneducated’; a category which included women, students, and foreigners. Far from being encyclopaedic, the entries typically contain fewer than five words. As a result of this brevity, the most comprehensive lexicographical source of information on early modern English is not monolingual dictionaries, but English-Latin ones, which tended to follow the more encyclopaedic approach of their Latin-English counterparts; the entries are longer, and often include several

18 Thomas Blount, *Glossographia: or A dictionary, interpreting all such hard wordes* (London, 1656; EEBO), preface.
19 Cawdry’s title page states that his work is ‘gathered for the benefit & help of ladies, gentlewomen, or any other unskilfull persons. Whereby they may the more easily and better understand many hard English words.’ Cawdry, *A table alphabeticall*. 
examples of common English phrases, accompanied by Latin translations. Furthermore, whilst the length and detail contained in English-Latin and English monolingual entries differs, the actual content is often very similar; the writers of 'hard word' dictionaries frequently drew heavily on the work of their Latinist counterparts.20

The practice of borrowing between dictionaries arguably devalues a comparative approach to studying them. If their content is just copied, then there is no point in examining multiple versions. Certainly, dictionary writers themselves sometimes felt their work had been stolen, and accusations of theft were not unknown.21 However, in many cases adaptations were requested or authorised by the printers, and contained substantial revisions of earlier material. John Véron added English entries to Robert Estienne’s Latin-French dictionary, and it was printed in 1552 under Estienne’s name; the work was expanded further by Ralph Waddington, and printed under Véron’s name in 1575.22 Whilst it was customary for early modern lexicographers to build upon existing foundations, dictionary writers consciously assessed and updated their definitions in line with broader patterns of use. Elyot’s 1538 dictionary was heavily edited and expanded by Cooper over a number of editions (in 1548, 1552, 1559), in works which were printed under Elyot’s name, and with Elyot’s title.23 When Cooper eventually had a dictionary printed under his own name in 1565, he reproduced remarkably little of the content he had written for Elyot’s dictionary.24 Francis Gouldman, borrowing heavily from John Rider, deliberately chose to omit key meanings from Rider’s definition of addicting, presumably regarding them as inaccurate or obsolete.25 Furthermore, borrowing was not always an easy solution or a quick fix, but often a laborious process of

21 In 1673 Thomas Blount wrote A World of Errors in which he accused Edward Phillips’ The New World of English Words (1658) of being ‘extracted almost wholly out of mine, and taking in its first Edition even a great part of my Preface.’ Thomas Blount, A world of errors discovered in The new world of words, or, General English dictionary, and in Nomothetis, or, The interpreter of law-words and terms (In the Savoy, 1673; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
23 This feature of dictionaries can make it difficult to write about authorship, since the author may not be the person listed on the title page. Where this is the case, I have listed additional authors/editors with significant or sole input in square brackets after the citation, with clarification if necessary. Elyot, The dictionary of syr Thomas Eliot knight; Elyot, ed. Cooper, Bibliotheca Eliotae (1548); Thomas Elyot, ed. Thomas Cooper, Bibliotheca Eliotae = Eliotae the second tym enrich’d (London, 1552; EEBO); Thomas Elyot, ed. Thomas Cooper, Bibliotheca Eliotae Eliotae dictionarie / by Thomas Cooper the third tym corrected (London, 1559; EEBO).
24 Cooper, Thesaurus linguae Romanae (1565), ‘addico’.
revision, alteration, and correction. Richard Huloet’s 1552 English-Latin dictionary was painstakingly converted from Elyot’s Latin-English work, entry by entry. Dictionary writers were intensely aware of the work that had gone before them, and thought carefully about their own contribution. In 1676 Elisha Coles wrote of his predecessors that ‘I know the whole Succession from Dr Bulloker, to Dr Skinner, from the smallest volume to the largest Folio. I know their difference and their Defects. Some are too little, some are too big; some are too plain (stuffed with obscenity not to be named) and some so obscure, that (instead of expounding others) they have need themselves of an Expositor. The method of some is foolish, and supposes things to be known before they are explained.’ The didactic aims of dictionary writers, combined with the enormously competitive market in which dictionaries were produced, meant these works were subject to intense scrutiny. Writers aimed to reflect best practice in translation and the latest principles of lexicography, and knew that they would face criticism if they failed to deliver. In this environment, repetition between works was not just lazy copying, it was an indication of considered approval and agreement. An examination of dictionary entries for ADDICT and ADDICERE can thus reveal a great deal about how the words were understood by early English lexicographers, and by the English readers and writers who relied on these works.

In this chapter I compare Latin-English, English-Latin and monolingual entries, to explore the relationship between the Latin ADDICERE and the English ADDICT as presented by these sources; in particular, to examine those specific meanings which the two words shared. Many of the Latin entries are extremely long, containing multiple Latin quotations with English translations, and sub-headings for various forms (such as the past participle addictus, the noun addictio, the adverb addicte). In contrast, the English monolingual and English-Latin entries are very brief, and there is a considerable amount of overlap between different works. The disparity in length of entries makes direct comparison difficult. To address this, I used the corpus analysis software SketchEngine to analyse all the entries. SketchEngine allows users to upload collections of text files, and then search across all text within a collection (known as a corpus) to show high-frequency words and phrases. I created two collections of texts (corpora): one for entries with Latin headwords, and one for those with English headwords. As well as showing the most frequent individual words in each corpus, SketchEngine can


27 Elisha Coles, An English dictionary explaining the difficult terms that are used in divinity, husbandry, physick, phylosophy, law, navigation, mathematicks, and other arts and sciences (London, 1676; EEBO), preface.
also find phrases or pairs of words that appear often. These phrases – which are between two and five words long – are known as n-grams.

**Figure 4 showing the top 11 words and n-grams in dictionary entries for ADDICT and ADDICERE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin headwords</th>
<th>N-grams that appear most frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words that appear in the most entries</td>
<td>Corpus: Latin-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 works in corpus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lowercase word</td>
<td>document frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addicere</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addico</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>another</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addictus</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goods</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addicteo</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unto</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servilely</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addict</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English headwords</th>
<th>N-grams that appear most frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words that appear in the most entries</td>
<td>Corpus: English-Latin &amp; English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 works in corpus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lowercase word</td>
<td>document frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addicted</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addict</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studiosus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disposed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donatus</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devotus</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addicting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addictus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devinctus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. 174 stopwords – very common words that are not relevant to the analysis – were blacklisted before the individual word lists were generated. See Appendix E for a full list. The list was not used on the n-gram searches. Latin words and phrases are shown in blue.
The Latin-English corpus contains 68 entries, taken from 18 different works, under the headwords *addico, addicere, addictus,* and *addictio* (the first-person singular, the infinitive, the past participle, and the noun forms of the same word). The corpus has a total of 3,923 words. Examining the most frequent n-grams, nearly all relate to the Roman law mentioned in the OED etymology. There are n-grams relating to the passing of a legal judgement (*to pronounce, to condemn, to avow*), and n-grams that refer to the physical transfer of goods or objects (*to sell, to deliver, to give, to confiscate, to alienate*). Turning to the list of single words, some of the most frequent English terms are *goods* (found in 21 percent of entries), *serveably* (16 percent of entries), *appointed* (15 percent), and *confiscate* (15 percent). It is clear that the primary meaning of the Latin word was the Roman law referred to by the OED, in which a judgement was passed that transferred a person or thing into the possession of another. However, there is one clear anomaly: the phrase *or give himself to* appears in five of the entries on the n-gram list, and the word *himself* appears in a further four entries. This corresponds to a self-referential meaning which is quite different to the legal sense of the term. Christopher Wase in 1662 includes the phrase ‘Addicere se cupiditatibus. To abandon himself to his lusts,’ and Gouldman in 1674 writes ‘Addicere se cupiditatibus, petulantiae, &c. To addict, to enthrall, give or bequeath himself to.’ Cooper’s 1565 entry contains the following example of use ‘Addicere corpus suum turpissimae cupiditati. Ad Heren. To give or abandon his body to most filthy pleasure.’ ADDICERE had a secondary, lesser meaning, which was not a physical transfer, or a court-mandated process, but the self-imposed pursuit of disgraceful types of behaviour.

The second corpus, containing entries for English headwords, is shorter: it has just 38 entries.

---


30 Cooper, *Thesaurus linguae Romanae* (1565), ‘addico’.
taken from 18 works, under the headwords addict, addicted, and addiction. It has a total of 421 words. The top n-grams for this corpus contain none of the legal language found under the Latin ADDICERE. There are no words related to judgement, and none that refer to the physical transfer of objects; dispose is used in the same sense as incline, rather than in the sense of discard, and give always relates to the self – to give oneself to – rather than the transfer of anything physical. John Bullokar defines ADDICT as ‘To apply, or give oneself much to anything’, Cockeram defines it simply as ‘Given to’, and John Wilkins as ‘Addict, v. incline, naturally/habitually.’ The phrase give himself to is the fifth most frequent n-gram in the English corpus, compared to 87th in the Latin corpus. It appears that the secondary meaning of the Latin word – the action taken by, and upon, the self – was the primary meaning for the English word. However, whereas with ADDICERE the behaviour indicated was usually negative, definitions of the English word often referred to positive behaviour in the quotations. In his entry, Gouldman includes a translation for ‘Addicted to his profit’, but also for ‘To addict himself to some art’; John Baret includes the phrases ‘To addict & give himself to ones friendship for ever’, ‘In those studies to which we both are addicted’, ‘Addict, and given to the study of learning’, and ‘To addict himself to live uprightly.’ It seems that although both ADDICT and ADDICERE shared a specific meaning relating to habitual behaviour, where the Latin word usually implied depravity, the English word did not.

The Latin-English dictionaries show that ADDICT and ADDICERE were linked to each other, but not exclusively. In the Latin corpus, the phrase to addicte appears only nine times in 68 entries, making it far less frequent than to sell (17 times), to deliver (16 times), and to pronounce (12 times). Since the intention of Latin dictionaries was often to comprehensively document all uses of a Latin word, the absence of ADDICT in entries for ADDICERE is particularly notable. In the English corpus, the Latin participles STUDIOSUS, DONATUS, and DEVOTUS, are all more common than ADDICUS, and the most frequent Latin n-gram is artem colere. It


appears that, despite being derived from *ADDICERE*, the English word *ADDICT* was more often associated with other Latin words and phrases, the majority of which had positive connotations. *STUDIOSUS* could mean ‘zealous, diligent, attentive, keen’ or ‘engaged in learning’; *DEVOVERE* was ‘to devote’; and *COLERE* ‘to cherish, devote oneself to’.

These words are offered as suitable translations for *ADDICT* in positive contexts, most likely because *ADDICERE* had predominantly negative connotations. Thus, ‘To addict & give himself to ones friendship for ever’ is translated as ‘*Devovere se amicitiae alicuius*’; ‘To addict himself unto an art’ is translated as ‘*Artem colere*’; and ‘addict and given to the study of learning’ is translated as ‘*devotus & donatus studiis*’.

The dictionaries clearly indicate that *ADDICT* took its meaning from a subordinate use of *ADDICERE*, in which the self is given to an activity or task. Whereas *ADDICERE* described behaviours that were morally condemned, *ADDICT* could be used for both positive and negative actions.

### Modern dictionaries

Early modern dictionaries are an invaluable source of information on the ways that people viewed language in the past. However, it is important to remember that, as with all dictionaries, they were written with a specific goal in mind. The humanist values which underpinned early modern lexicography meant that Latin works almost exclusively depicted classical Latin, and purposefully avoided using post-classical quotations or words.

This means that, whilst Latin influences on *ADDICT* may have been drawn from classical, late, medieval, and neo-Latin, it is mostly the classical Latin influences that are visible in dictionaries.

In fact, a comparison of two modern dictionaries of classical and medieval Latin suggests there was a shift in usage of the term *ADDICERE* at some point after the third century AD. The full entry in the OLD, which documents the classical meaning of Latin terms, contains seven distinct senses for *ADDICO*, and one entry for the past participle *ADDICTUS*. *ADDICO*

---


36 For more information on different types of Latin see Sidwell, ‘Classical Latin—Medieval Latin—Neo-Latin’.
could mean ‘To assign the custody of... to sentence to slavery...[to] sell... to award, assign... To attach oneself (to a party, opinion, etc.)... to appoint... to designate... to give over (to), hand over, surrender... to make a slave... to devote (an organ of the body to a particular task)... To sentence, condemn, doom.’ The OLD also records an additional meaning for ADDICO related to fortune-telling: ‘(of the sacred fowls, omens) To speak favourably, indicate approval, be propitious.’ The past participle ADDICTUS could be used in the same sense as the verb, but it was particularly used to mean ‘addicted (to), a slave (of); bent upon (a disgraceful course).’ This was clearly a very versatile term with a broad range of meanings, but several specific themes emerge. The word was related to the transfer of goods or people (give over, sell, surrender); to legal judgements (assign, sentence, condemn); and to physical loss of freedom (make a slave). It could also be used when a person – or part of a person – attached themselves to an idea, or to a pursuit (attach oneself, devote an organ, bent upon). Particularly notable is the meaning ascribed to ADDICTUS, of being bent upon a disgraceful course; it suggests an action that is self-driven, full of urgency and purpose, but also both self-destructive, and morally reprehensible. Significantly, all of the meanings found in the OLD are mirrored in the early modern Latin-English dictionaries examined above.

The Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources (DML) covers Latin use from the sixth to the sixteenth century. Unlike the OLD, the DML is based specifically on British sources, and was chosen because this chapter is interested primarily in English understandings of ADDICERE, rather than the broader European Latin context. The DML contains a similar (if briefer) definition of ADDICO: ‘to subject, sentence, condemn... to appoint’. However, the definition of ADDICTUS is notably different: it is defined as ‘addicted, devoted.’ Far from the disgraceful attachment described by the OLD, the DML’s use of ‘devoted’ suggests that ADDICTUS carried connotations of piety, love, and moral integrity. The comparison of the OLD with the DML seems to suggest that, whilst the meaning of the verb as a whole remained the same, there was a shift in the way the past participle was used; originally used to indicate the pursuit of disgraceful behaviour, it came (in British Latin at least) to mean worship or devotion, possibly in a religious context.

Modern dictionaries do not necessarily reflect how early modern translators and readers understood Latin words. Meanwhile, early modern dictionaries represent a deliberately

---

39 The verb devote, for example, did not enter English until the end of the sixteenth century. ‘devote, v.’, OED Online.
narrow aspect of meaning, which did not necessarily correspond with the way words were generally understood at the time. In the second section of this chapter I therefore examine early modern translations of Latin texts into English. Unlike Latin-English dictionaries, early modern translations were based upon late Latin, medieval Latin, and neo-Latin sources, as well as classical ones. By examining translated ‘pairs’ – that is, instances where ADDICERE was translated into English, or where ADDICT was translated from Latin – it is possible to trace the changing meanings of ADDICERE from classical to neo-Latin, and in the process reveal how these meanings were conveyed in English. Also, it is possible to explore other semantic influences on ADDICT, by examining the wide variety of Latin terms which it was translated from.

**Latin-English translations**

Translated texts were abundant in the early modern period. The renaissance was characterised by humanist fascination with all things classical and antique, whilst the contemporaneous process of religious reformation was accompanied by mass translation of religious works, past and present. The bibliography of *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* lists roughly 200 to 400 translations per decade for the period 1550-1660, and in some years over a quarter of books printed in English were translations.40 Around 40 percent of these were translations from Latin texts, predominantly classical and contemporary, but with a few medieval religious works.41 A not-insignificant factor in this translation boom was humanist pedagogy, which placed value not only on the reading of classical texts, but also on the act of translation itself. Students were taught to translate word for word in order to learn language skills, and then to translate sense and meaning, to understand literary conventions.42 Translation became a lifelong habit for those taught in this style.43 Translations – along with their Latin originals – provide a rich and varied resource for examining the relationship between early modern English, and classical and post-classical Latin.

In order for a source to be included in my analysis, both the Latin original and its English translation had to be located and compared. Using the online collection, The Latin Library,
and cross-referencing with translations in EEBO-TCP and other sources, I was able to pair 59 instances of ADDICERE with their English translations. The Latin texts come from a variety of different time periods. 12 instances of ADDICERE were taken from classical Latin texts, 16 were from late Latin texts. Only one pairable medieval instance of ADDICERE was found, in the work of Bede, but 30 were found in neo-Latin texts. The English translations for these texts had print dates ranging from 1530 to 1699. It is important to note that these numbers are not a reflection of overall usage of ADDICERE in Latin texts. In order to be included in this study, the Latin text not only had to contain the word ADDICERE, it also had to have an early modern English translation available on EEBO (ideally, EEBO-TCP). Therefore, only Latin texts which were of interest to early modern translators could be included, and only those which survived in printed form and were then published online. Whilst these restrictions make analysing the frequency of ADDICERE difficult, examining and comparing the individual examples nevertheless provides insight into the relationship between ADDICERE and ADDICT, their meanings, and their uses.

Figure 5 showing the total number of translated pairs found in each Latin period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Pairs found</th>
<th>ADDICERE translated to other English</th>
<th>Other Latin translated to ADDICT</th>
<th>ADDICERE translated to ADDICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical Latin [up to 200 AD]</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Latin [200 to 500 AD]</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval Latin [500 to 1350 AD]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-Latin [1350 onwards]</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 12 classical Latin examples include Latin works by Cicero, Livy, and Lucius Apuleius, and the translations of William Adlington, Philemon Holland, John Dolman, Christopher Wase, Nicholas Grimald, Roger L’Estrange, Thomas Cockman, and Joseph Webbe.  

---

44 This number includes a small number of Latin sources from other digital collections, as well as The Latin Library.
45 See Appendix D for full table of translations.
Translations: Marcus Tullius Cicero, trans. John Dolman, Those five questions, which Marke Tullye Cicero, disputed in his manor of Tusculanum (London, 1561; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Marcus Tullius Cicero, trans. Christopher Wase, The five days debate at Cicero’s house in Tusculum between master and sophister (London, 1683; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Marcus Tullius Cicero, trans. Nicholas Grimald, Marcus Tullius Ciceroes three books of duties (London, 1556; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Marcus Tullius Cicero, trans. Roger L’Estrange, Tullius offices in three books (London, 1680; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Marcus Tullius Cicero, trans. Thomas Cockman, Tully’s three books of offices (London, 1699; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Marcus Tullius Cicero, trans. Joseph Webbe, The familiar epistles of M.T. Cicero Englished and conferred with the French Italian and other translations (London, 1620; EEBO-TCP Phase I);
ADDICERE is primarily used in the sense of a legal judgement, particularly a death sentence, and none of the translators use the word ADDICT. No other English word emerges as a clear substitute however – even when the Latin phrase is the same, the translations all differ. ‘Morti addictus’ is translated by Grimald as ‘condemned to die’, by L’Estrange as ‘sentenced... to death’, and by Cockman as ‘appointed a time wherein one of them should die.’\(^47\) Further echoing the legal definitions seen in the OLD and DML, Holland translates ‘addictus’ as ‘awarded to the thraldome of their creditors.’\(^48\)

16 late Latin examples were examined, predominantly in the work of Ammianus Marcellinus, but also in works by Saint Augustine, Tertullian, and Lactantius. Their translators include Philemon Holland, John Healey, Gilbert Burnet, and a translator known only as H. B.\(^49\) The same legal sense was applied to ADDICERE as was seen in classical Latin texts, but it was also used in the sense of fortune-telling, and to describe the pursuit of disgraceful behaviour. Just two of the 16 examples are translated as ADDICT: in Holland’s translation of Marcellinus’s *Res Gestae* ‘from the very beginning of his reign much given and addicted to the sweetness of pillage and robberies,’ and ‘Exceeding much addicted he was to his wives, to the small puling voices of Eunuchs, and to some Courtiers.’\(^50\) Both refer to the pursuit of negative actions or behaviour and both are specifically actions that the subject chose to pursue, rather than anything imposed upon them by a third party. None of the examples where ADDICERE related to legal judgements and sentencing were translated as ADDICT. ‘Poena addictum’ is


translated as ‘adjudged to be punished’, ‘capitali addictus’ as ‘judged and condemned to lose his head’, and ‘hominem addicitum’ as ‘a man destined... to death’. ADDICT is also not used in sentences where a particular course of action is imposed by another: an honour is conferred upon emperors, not addicted to them (‘seeing whilst they lived you conferred this honour upon them.’) Finally, one of the Latin sections refers to the augural (fortune-telling) meaning of ADDICERE, and is translated as the ‘consultation of beasts inwards and bird-flight’. All of this corresponds closely with early modern dictionaries, suggesting that from the very broad range of possible meanings that could be applied to ADDICERE in classical and late Latin texts, only in one specific context – self-imposed, morally reprehensible behaviour – was it connected to the English word ADDICT. And again, as suggested by dictionaries, it seems this was a less common use of ADDICERE across classical and late Latin works than its legal one.

The neo-Latin uses of ADDICERE stand in stark contrast to classical and late Latin uses. 30 examples were found, 24 of them from one of Erasmus’s works, Moriae Encomium, which uses ADDICERE eight times, and was translated by three different authors: Thomas Chaloner in 1549, John Wilson in 1668, and White Kennet in 1683. There are two other examples taken from works by Erasmus – Colloquia and Concio de puero Iesu – as well as examples from Thomas More, Marsilius of Padua, and Martin Bucer. As well as Chaloner, Wilson, and Kennet, the other English translators are William Marshall, Ralph Robinson, George Joye, and one unknown translator. Almost none of the neo-Latin instances carry that sense of a

54 Latin texts: Desiderius Erasmus, Moriae Encomium, Latin Library, http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/erasmus/moriae.shtml [accessed 17/04/17]; Desiderius Erasmus, Colloquia, Latin Library, http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/erasmus/coll.shtml [accessed 22/03/17]; Desiderius Erasmus, Colloquia Familiaria: Funus (STOA), http://www.stoa.org/hopper/text.jsp?doc=Stoa:text:2003.02.0006:colloquium=41 [accessed 22/03/17]; Thomas More, De Optimo standing as ‘judged to be punished’, ‘capitali addictus’ as ‘judged and condemned to lose his head’, and ‘hominem addicitum’ as ‘a man destined... to death’. ADDICT is also not used in sentences where a particular course of action is imposed by another: an honour is conferred upon emperors, not addicted to them (‘seeing whilst they lived you conferred this honour upon them.’) Finally, one of the Latin sections refers to the augural (fortune-telling) meaning of ADDICERE, and is translated as the ‘consultation of beasts inwards and bird-flight’. All of this corresponds closely with early modern dictionaries, suggesting that from the very broad range of possible meanings that could be applied to ADDICERE in classical and late Latin texts, only in one specific context – self-imposed, morally reprehensible behaviour – was it connected to the English word ADDICT. And again, as suggested by dictionaries, it seems this was a less common use of ADDICERE across classical and late Latin works than its legal one.

The neo-Latin uses of ADDICERE stand in stark contrast to classical and late Latin uses. 30 examples were found, 24 of them from one of Erasmus’s works, Moriae Encomium, which uses ADDICERE eight times, and was translated by three different authors: Thomas Chaloner in 1549, John Wilson in 1668, and White Kennet in 1683. There are two other examples taken from works by Erasmus – Colloquia and Concio de puero Iesu – as well as examples from Thomas More, Marsilius of Padua, and Martin Bucer. As well as Chaloner, Wilson, and Kennet, the other English translators are William Marshall, Ralph Robinson, George Joye, and one unknown translator. Almost none of the neo-Latin instances carry that sense of a
conviction or judgement which was so frequent in classical and late Latin. Instead ADDICERE is used to refer to slavery, to devotion, and to the pursuit of disgraceful acts. These were not new meanings of the word, but they indicate a significant shift in the primary meaning of the term, from a form of legal judgement, to a form of devotion or habituated action; what had been a rare use in classical Latin – perhaps not even a use, but an available connotation – became the main sense of the term in neo-Latin. As a result of this shift in the meaning of ADDICERE, more of the neo-Latin uses of ADDICERE are translated as ADDICT (12 out of 30), than in any other period. In all of the translations, the English ADDICT was used exclusively to indicate either devotion, or the pursuit of disgraceful behaviour.

Occasionally neo-Latin ADDICERE was used in the context of slavery. These instances were never translated as ADDICT. When More writes ‘in servitutem addictis’, it is translated by Robinson as ‘punish with bondage’. When Erasmus writes ‘omnem illam servitutis tragodiam, cui se ulter addixit’, Wilson renders it as ‘all that slavery he willingly submits to.’ The single paired example found in medieval Latin – from Bede’s Historiam Ecclesiasticam – translates ‘seruitio addictos’ to ‘made bondmen.’ A slightly different example is provided by Erasmus’s phrase ‘addictum vitiiis’, which one would expect to be translated as ‘addicted to vice’, since – like other examples that are translated as ADDICT – it refers to disgraceful behaviour. In fact, none of its three translators chose this option, almost certainly because Erasmus draws specific links to slavery in the same sentence. He writes ‘Tum animum habet plurimis addictum vitiis, iam turpiter servus est’, which is translated by Chaloner, Wilson, and Kennet, as ‘be given to sundry vices’, ‘given up to a vice, a shame how it enslaves him’, and ‘worse than a galley slave to his own lusts, and passions.’ It seems clear that when ADDICERE indicated a form of slavery, even indirectly, it was not associated with the English word ADDICT. When Erasmus referred to disgraceful behaviours without any connotations of slavery, his translators rendered it in English as ADDICT. When Erasmus writes ‘addictum voluptatibus’, two of his three translators link it to ADDICT: ‘addicted to all voluptuousness’, ‘given up to pleasure’, and ‘addicted wholly to pleasures, and delights.’ Used in the context of gambling,
‘addictos’ is translated as ‘to behold many of them so given to the play’, ‘to see some addicted so to it’, and ‘when we see some persons so devoutly addicted to this diversion’.60

The meaning linked to ADDICT in these texts is the same as that seen in the Latin-English dictionaries, and the OLD: ‘bent upon (a disgraceful course).’61 Neo-Latin texts also use ADDICERE in the sense given by the DML – ‘addicted, devoted’ – and these instances are also translated as ADDICT.62 Bucer’s ‘cultui addixit’ is translated by Joye as ‘addicted unto thy worship,’ and Erasmus’s ‘addicti imperatori’ is translated as ‘being ones addict to such a captain.’63 Only in this sense – of devotion, rather than habitual action – is the neo-Latin ADDICERE used in a positive way. It is also notable that this devotional sense of the word is virtually absent from early modern dictionaries. Just eight of the 40 Latin-English entries mention devotion, and then only briefly. Gouldman in 1674, for example, includes ‘to devote’ in a lengthy list of verbs, and Littleton in 1678 includes the phrase ‘to engage or devote to allow or approve of.’64 None of the entries provide supporting quotations to illustrate this use, and – as mentioned in the introduction – in the English-Latin and English monolingual dictionaries devotion is absent entirely.

The analysis of translations suggests two important changes in the use of ADDICERE, occurring after the fourth century, and unrepresented in early modern dictionaries. The first is the rise of a new meaning – interpersonal devotion – which existed alongside previous definitions, rather than replacing them. The second change is less conclusively demonstrated, since measuring overall frequency is problematic with such a limited source sample. Nevertheless, this sampling of texts suggests that ADDICERE came less and less to mean CONDEMN, JUDGE, and APPOINT, and instead became predominantly used to indicate the pursuit of disgraceful behaviour, or positive devotion to an entity. Of all the meanings that could be applied to ADDICERE, it is only these two – devotion and disgrace – that were shared with ADDICT. In other words, it seems most likely that the English word ADDICT was derived, not from the classical Latin legal term ADDICERE, but from the later, and especially the neo-Latin uses of that same term.

64 Gouldman, A copious dictionary (1674), ‘addico’; Littleton, Lingua Latinae (1678), ‘addico’.
Whilst neo-Latin \textsc{addicere} was closer in meaning and use to \textsc{addict} than the classical term, it is important to point out that the words were by no means semantically identical. As the analysis of dictionaries revealed, \textsc{addict} was used to indicate both positive and negative forms of habitual behaviour, whereas \textsc{addicere} – even in neo-Latin – was not. In collecting translations of \textsc{addicere} for analysis, I also found 47 cases in which a different Latin word was translated by an early modern writer as \textsc{addict}: most frequently \textsc{deditus}, and \textsc{contemplātivus}, followed by \textsc{mundanus}, \textsc{do}, \textsc{occupo}, \textsc{propensus}, \textsc{studioum}, and \textsc{vaco}. These instances support and confirm the meaning of \textsc{addict} described so far. Several relate to devotion or worship: ‘\textit{vir religiousus}’ is translated as ‘he that is addicted unto devotion’; ‘\textit{tecum occupetur}’ is translated as ‘to have anybody addicted unto thee’; and ‘\textit{illi dediti}’ is translated as ‘singularly addicted and affectioned unto him’.\footnote{Innocent III, \textit{De contemptu mundi} chapter 28 (Hathi Trust Digital Library), \url{https://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.hnu7wd} [accessed 22/03/17]. Translated in: Innocent III, trans. H. Kirton, \textit{The mirror of mens lyfe} (London, 1576; EEBO-TCP Phase I). Thomas à Kempis, \textit{T.}, \textit{De Imitatione Christi}, book 2, Latin Library, \url{http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/kempis.html} [accessed 22/03/17]. Translated in: Thomas à Kempis, trans. Thomas Rogers, \textit{Of the imitation of Christ}, three, both for wisdowme, and godlines, most excellent bookes (London, 1580; EEBO-TCP Phase I). Livy, \textit{Ab Vrbe Condita Liber}, book 3. Translated in: Livy, trans. Holland, \textit{The Roman historie written by T. Livius}.} Some of the examples refer to wicked behaviour: Bucer’s ‘\textit{dediti iniquitati}’ is translated by Joyce as ‘addict and all given to wickedness’; Cicero’s ‘\textit{ad voluptates propensior}’ is translated by Cockman as ‘addicted to sensual pleasures’; and Apuleius’s ‘\textit{luxuriae popinalis scortisque et diurnis potationibus exercitatus}’ is translated by Adlington as ‘much given and addict to whome hunting and continual revelling’.\footnote{Bucer, \textit{S. Psalmorum libri quinque}, p. 311. Translated in: Bucer, trans. Joyce, \textit{The Psalter of David in English} (1530). Cicero, \textit{De Officiis}, book 1. Translated in: Cicero, trans. Cockman, \textit{Tully’s three books of offices}. Apuleius, \textit{Metamorphoses}, book 8. Translated in: Lucius Apuleius, trans. William Adlington, \textit{The xi. books of the Golden asse} (London, 1566; EEBO-TCP Phase I).} Similar translations were made to \textsc{addict} in the context of worldly or external concerns. This type of behaviour was framed in opposition to religious concerns and spirituality; to be addicted to this world was to pursue pleasure and vice over God. The meaning is thus similar to that seen in translations of \textsc{addicere}, relating to actions that were deemed disgraceful. When Thomas à Kempis writes ‘\textit{exteriaribius dedito}’, it is translated as ‘addicted to external things’ by Edward Hake, and as ‘addicted to outward things’ by Anthony Hoskins, William Page, and John Worthington.\footnote{Thomas à Kempis, \textit{T.}, \textit{De Imitatione Christi}, book 1, chapter 6. Translated in: Thomas à Kempis, trans. Edward Hake, \textit{The imitation or following of Christ} (London, 1568; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Thomas à Kempis, trans. Anthony Hoskins, \textit{The following of Christ} (Saint-Omer, 1613; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Thomas à Kempis, trans. William Page, \textit{The imitation of Christ divided into four books} (Oxford, 1639; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Thomas à Kempis, trans. John Worthington, \textit{The Christians pattern} (London, 1695; EEBO-TCP Phase I).} ‘\textit{Mentem mundo deditam}’ is translated by Worthington as ‘the mind which is addicted to the world’, and by Thomas Rogers as ‘the mind addicted to the world’.\footnote{Thomas à Kempis, \textit{T.}, \textit{De Imitatione Christi}, book 3, chapter 20. Translated in: Thomas à Kempis, trans. Worthington, \textit{The Christians pattern}; Thomas à Kempis, trans. Rogers, \textit{Of the imitation of Christ}.} These translations indicate that \textsc{addict} shared certain meanings with \textsc{addicere}, even when that
meaning was expressed using other Latin terms.

However, there are also several translations that use ADDICT to indicate studious pursuits, in a positive tone. Wilson translated *imperent* as *addicted* in, ‘Happy is that commonwealth... whose prince is addicted to philosophy’, and Cockman translated *cupidus* as *addicted* in, ‘who is there so wholly addicted to Contemplation and the Study of Nature.’69 Rogers’ translation of Thomas à Kempis turned ‘*contemplativi fuerunt*’ into ‘addicted to the contemplation of heavenly things’, and ‘*inveniuntur contemplativi*’ into ‘addict themselves to the study of celestial things.’70 This use of ADDICT – to indicate laudable intellectual pursuits – is not shared with ADDICERE. Yet it does not seem to have links to any other specific Latin word either, since it is used as the translation of several different terms. In other words, ADDICT was not an amalgamation of several different Latin terms; rather, it appears to have had its own independent semantic scope, even from its earliest appearances in English print.

**European vernaculars**

The Latin word ADDICERE did not gain a foothold in any language other than English, at least before the twentieth century. This is revealed by an examination of polyglot dictionaries, which contain translations between English and multiple other languages; like the other dictionary types examined in this chapter, polyglot dictionaries were a rapidly expanding genre in early modern England. Some of these works listed huge numbers of languages on their title-page, but did not necessarily provide translations for all headwords. John Minsheu’s *Hegemon eis tas glossas* (a guide to the languages), for example, boasts 11 languages, but his entry on ADDICT actually contains only an English definition.71 Some polyglot dictionaries were purely vernacular, like James Howell’s 1660 English-French/Italian/Spanish work, but many mixed in Latin and Greek as well; Baret’s (1580) was English-Latin/Greek/French, and Hadrianus Junius’s (1585) was Latin-Greek/French/English.72 Some were purpose-written as polyglot dictionaries, whilst others started life as bilingual works and later acquired new languages. Huloet’s 1552 English-Latin *Abcedarium anglico latinum* was revised and
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71 Minsheu, *Hegemon eis tas glossas*, ‘addict’.

reissued by John Higgins in 1572 with the addition of French. Examination of these works can reveal the relationship between ADDICERE and European vernacular languages in the early modern period.

Of all the European vernacular dictionaries examined, only John Florio’s 1611 Dictionarie of the Italian and English tongues contains a word derived from ADDICERE: adicto, which Florio translates as ‘One doomed to serve, such debtors as by an ancient law were adjudged to serve their creditors as slaves being unable to pay them.’ The similarity of this definition to that of ADDICERE is a clear indication that it is derived from the Latin, and unlike ADDICT, adicto appears to have adopted the legal meaning along with the word form. However, modern Italian has no such word, and it is unclear when the word dropped out of use, or if it even appeared outside of Florio’s work. There is an equivalent of ADDICT in modern Spanish – adicto, noun form adicción – but this appears to be a borrowing from twentieth century American-English, not from Latin. Instead, Richard Perceval’s 1599 A dictionarie in Spanish and English translates ADDICT as ‘Afición’ and ‘Inclinación.’ Henry Hexham’s 1647 Anglo-Dutch dictionary defines addicted as ‘begeven’, and provides examples including, ‘to addict, or give himself to somewhat, Hom-selven tot yts begeven’ and ‘Addicted to his gain, Tot sijn gewin geneegen.’ Thomas Jones’s 1668 Welsh-English dictionary contains no entry for ADDICT at all. Four of the dictionaries examined have French definitions for English headwords, and these – like other European vernaculars – contain no cognate for ADDICT. Huloet’s dictionary contains an entry for addict which reads, ‘Addict or give himself to live pleasantly. Persequi voluptates. S’addonner a toute voluptez.’ Howell’s Anglo-French work likewise defines addicted as ‘addonner’, and provides the example, ‘To addict himself unto. S’addonner a, s’appliquer a, se mettre a.’ Guy Miege’s Great French Dictionary suggests ‘addonner, applique, attache’ as translations for addicted, and ‘s’addonner, s’appliquer, s’attacher’ as translations for ‘to Addict.
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73 Huloet, Abecedarium anglico latinum; Richard Huloet, ed. John Higgins, Huloets dictionarie newlye corrected, amended, set in order and enlarged, with many names of men, townes, beasts, foules, fishes, trees, shrubbes, herbes, fruits, places, instrumentes &c. (London, 1572; EEBO-TCP Phase I) [French added by John Higgins].

74 John Florio, Queen Anna’s new world of words, or dictionarie of the Italian and English tongues (London, 1611; EEBO), ‘addicto’.

75 Modern Spanish does have direct equivalents in the words adición (addiction), adicto adicta (addict), and adicto (addicted). Examination of other Spanish sources (Covarrubias’s 1674 dictionary of Spanish, and the website CORD which takes its data from the Real Academia Española) indicate that these derive from American English in the twentieth century, and not from Latin.


77 Henry Hexham, A copious English and Netherdutch dictionarie composed out of our best English authours (Rotterdam, 1647; EEBO).

78 Thomas Jones, The British language in its lustre (London, 1668; EEBO-TCP Phase I).

79 Huloet, ed. Higgins, Huloets dictionarie newlye corrected.

80 James Howell, A French and English dictionary composed by Mr. Randle Cotgrave (London, 1673; EEBO) [includes work by Randle Cotgrave and Robert Sherwood].
himself. Abel Boyer’s *Royal Dictionary* contains translations for many of the different senses in which ADDICT was used, including the devotional sense (‘I am your most addicted Servant, je suis votre tres affectionne serviteur. To be addicted to one, etre dans les interets de quelqu’un’), and the self-reflexive sense (To addict ones self to, V. Recip. S’addonner, s’appliquer, s’attacher, se donner, se consacrer, se devouer, a). Abel Boyer’s Royal Dictionary contains translations for many of the different senses in which ADDICT was used, including the devotional sense (‘I am your most addicted Servant, je suis votre tres affectionne serviteur. To be addicted to one, etre dans les interets de quelqu’un’), and the self-reflexive sense (To addict ones self to, V. Recip. S’addonner, s’appliquer, s’attacher, se donner, se consacrer, se devouer, a).

There is no single French term which emerges as a direct semantic equivalent for ADDICT, and none of the French terms suggested by Anglo-French dictionaries are derived from the Latin ADDICERE. The absence of a French equivalent for ADDICT is commented upon by Lemon in ‘Scholarly Addiction’ as a source of difficulty for English translators of Calvin’s French sermons. When Calvin attempts to describe the phenomenon of addiction... he turns to potential cognates in terms ranging from *adonner* to *attacher* to *dedier*; terms which his English translators render as ADDICT. The closest French equivalent is ADONNER – which appears in all Anglo-French dictionary entries for ADDICT – yet Lemon’s examination of Calvin’s French sermons found that out of 206 instances of ADONNER, only three were translated as ADDICT by his English translator, Arthur Golting. Every time Golting chose ADDICT as the translation for ADONNER, Lemon notes that the form of attachment described is either ‘an active, dedicated devotion to God’, or ‘mistaken attachment to oneself and the world [which] might mirror a more desirable form of addiction to God’. However, whilst Golting viewed ADDICT and ADONNER as related only in specific contexts, other translators seem to have viewed ADONNER – which, as Lemon explains, ‘designates a wilful giving over of oneself’ – as essentially a direct equivalent for ADDICT. In Thomas Bowes’ translation of the first book of Pierre de La Primaudaye’s *Academie Françoise*, almost every use of ADDICT can be traced back to ADONNER in the French original. Some of these are reprehensible attachments to worldly things, as in Golding’s translation of ADONNER in Calvin: ‘Les hommes adonnez à servir leur ventre’ is translated as ‘Those men... that are addicted to the service of their bellies’, and ‘totalement adonné au vice’ is translated as ‘wholly addicted and given over to vice’.

81 Guy Miege, *The great French dictionary in two parts : the first, French and English, the second English and French, according to the ancient and modern orthography* (London, 1688; EEBO).
84 Ibid., pp. 875-6.
85 Ibid., pp. 876-7.
However, unlike Golding, Bowes also uses ADDICT when ADONNER indicates positive attachments to worldly objects: ‘que les estudes ausquels nous addonnons en l’adolescence’ is translated as ‘the studies unto which we addict our selves in the time of our adolescency.’

This means that, unlike ADDICERE – which only referred to habitual behaviours when they were negative – both ADONNER and ADDICT could also describe virtuous intellectual pursuits. In other words, despite their morphological differences, the semantic connection between ADDICT and ADONNER appears to have been stronger than that of ADDICT and ADDICERE.

Conclusions

This chapter has used two very different sets of sources to explore a single question: where did ADDICT come from? Early modern dictionaries provide structured, carefully considered definitions, that can reveal not only the meaning of words, but also the relationship between different languages. The lengthy entries found in Latin-English works were intended to provide comprehensive reviews of semantic meaning and use, whilst the more succinct monolingual works offer insight into the primary meaning of words. However, many of these works represent English in relation to an idealised classical Latin, rather than in relation to contemporary Latin use. They depict ADDICERE in its classical sense as primarily a legal judgement resulting in the physical transfer of goods or people, rather than in the neo-Latin sense of being devoted to another individual or pursuing habitual forms of behaviour. In contrast, early modern English translations of Latin texts offer a snapshot of Latin and English words in a wide variety of contexts and uses, but come with their own set of limitations. Translation takes into account not only a word as a single, separate entity, but also the meaning, sense, and tone, of the sentence or passage as a whole; the relationship between the original and the translated word is thus subject to multiple variables, not all of which can be easily accounted for. In addition, it is not always easy to locate pairs of translated texts; in order for a text to be studied in this way, both its original and translated forms must have survived in versions that are comparable.

It is notable that these two bodies of work, despite their differences and their limitations, are fundamentally in agreement on the meaning of ADDICT, and its relationship to ADDICERE. Dictionaries show that ADDICT was connected only to one, specific, secondary meaning of ADDICERE, relating to the pursuit of certain negative behaviours. The primary meaning of
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classical ADDICERE – a legal judgement, and the type of bonded servitude that resulted from it – was absent from ADDICT. Furthermore, ADDICT could be applied to positive behaviours, and this connotation was almost wholly absent from the Latin. This leaves a rather puzzling disparity, given that one word was apparently borrowed from the other, but the mystery is solved by the translated sources. Whilst the classical and late Latin translations support the depiction found in dictionaries, neo-Latin sources reveal what the dictionaries do not: a shift in the meaning and use of ADDICERE. At some point, between the fourth and fifteenth centuries, ADDICERE began to mean devotion to an entity, whether a person or a god. By the fifteenth century, the primary use of ADDICERE had shifted from its legal sense, to that of pursuing negative behaviours, and devotion. ADDICT shares both its primary meanings with the neo-Latin word ADDICERE. That is not to say that there is no semantic relationship at all between ADDICT and the classical uses of ADDICERE – both describe a form of dedication, although one is involuntary and physical, and the other self-imposed and cognitive – but rather, this chapter reveals a crucial missing piece in the genealogy of ADDICT, which had been absent from previous etymologies of the term.

One thing that apparently did not change between classical and neo-Latin ADDICERE is the moral tone. When used in reference to people or gods ADDICERE was a good thing, but the behaviours or pursuits it described were almost wholly negative. In contrast, ADDICT could describe both positive and negative types of behaviour or attachment. This comes across in both dictionaries and translated sources, in which examples of ADDICT used in a positive sense were linked to Latin words like STUDIOSUS or DEDITUS, not ADDICERE. In other words, ADDICT may have been borrowed from neo-Latin ADDICERE, but – in one very important way – it was not a straightforward cognate of that word. This discrepancy between the two words could perhaps be explained with reference to the French word ADONNER, which although morphologically and etymologically distinct from both ADDICT and ADDICERE, nevertheless had a strong semantic connection to both words. Most importantly, ADONNER, which had been in use since the twelfth century, could be used to describe devotion to an individual, and the pursuit of both good and bad habitual behaviours; as such, it may be the missing piece in the semantic development of ADDICERE.88

There is scope for further work on the semantic relationship between ADONNER and ADDICERE before the emergence of ADDICT. Nevertheless, this chapter has proposed a genealogy for ADDICT which is more complex and detailed than any previous account; it has

uncovered an English word with classical Latin morphology, but semantic origins in several neo-Latin, and possibly French, terms; and it has revealed words with multiple meanings, whose relative prominence shift and reorder over time. In some ways, the more complex origins of ADDICT make it harder to pin down, analyse, and explain. Under this new etymology addiction does not need to be declarative, nor does it necessarily involve a loss of free will. Etymology no longer tells an appealing yet simplistic narrative of slavery turned sinfulness turned substance abuse. However, in other ways this is preferable. Whilst I agree with Masten on the need ‘to be more carefully attuned to the ways that etymologies... persist’, there is a danger that etymology – just as easily as the modern meaning – can dominate our understanding of early modern words.\footnote{Masten, ‘Toward a Queer Address’, p. xi.} Rather than using a simplified etymology to justify the way a word is interpreted, we need to be open to the often complex and diverse influences which shape both the emergence and the development of words; only then can we seek to understand the full variety of uses and connotations with which a word is used, in all the contexts in which it is found. It is this diversity of use which the next chapter seeks to explore.
This chapter builds upon the study of meaning, etymology, and origins in the previous chapters, in order to take a much broader look at the overall uses of ADDICT across the early modern period. The aim is to explore not just a single genre, context, or use, but rather the entire scope of ADDICT across all kinds of early modern printed sources, in all of its various applications. Taking such a broad approach will allow patterns and trends within the sources themselves to become visible, rather than allowing implicit assumptions about the meaning and uses of ADDICT to dictate the focus.

This approach – which explores addiction through uses of the word itself – is not something any previous study of early modern addiction has sought to do. In Addiction and Devotion, Lemon is mainly concerned with the concept of addiction rather than actual uses of the term ADDICT. She writes that ‘rather than concentrate solely on those texts that repeatedly deploy the word “addiction”, I instead select texts that pose the broader philosophical issues at stake in invocations of addiction.’ When she briefly addresses actual use of the word, Lemon claims that ‘the word’s use clusters in three arenas: faith, love, and drinking.’ In fact, whilst this may be true of Lemon’s source base – early modern plays – this chapter will show that it is not true of uses of ADDICT in printed texts as a whole. Prior to Lemon, most discussions of early modern addiction ignored use of the actual word itself almost completely. Warner wrote that ‘[early modern] usage of the label “addicted” is […] riddled with ambiguity’, and
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1 Lemon, Addiction and Devotion, p. 19. Incidentally, this is another example of unclear language; Lemon is referring to uses of the lemma ADDICT, not the word addiction specifically.
2 Ibid., p. xiv.
Porter called early appearances of the word ‘bogus forerunners’, which clearly ‘did not anticipate Victorian psychopathology’.3 Willis, like Lemon in her earlier work on addiction, focused almost exclusively on a single source – Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus – which contained no actual uses of the term ADDICT.

The methodological difficulties of examining use across all printed sources are substantial. Only with fairly recent advances in digital technology is such an approach even conceivable. It is not a goal that is suited to traditional historical and literary methodologies such as close-reading. Instead, as digital sources become increasingly available, scholars have used a range of research methodologies to integrate both the broad sweep, and the fine detail, of large-scale historical textual analysis. Baker and McEnery’s 2017 collaboration, Corpus Linguistics and 17th-Century Prostitution, approaches ‘the same question from two disciplinary perspectives to then see to what extent those perspectives complemented or contradicted each other.’4 McEnery and Baker ‘worked separately, and only after drafting their own chapters did they read each other’s.’ The final chapter reflects on the success of this unusual enterprise, concluding that the two approaches were remarkably complementary; ‘the main point to be gleaned... is that of a useful bidirectional symbiosis.’5 Significantly, they observe that ‘we do not see a context at present, or in the near future, where computational techniques will negate the need for close reading or analysis and explanation by subject experts.’6

Collaboration is one means of combining historical and computational analysis, but the resulting research is often comparative rather than integrated. Other scholars have developed approaches that combine quantitative and qualitative methods into a single research methodology. Withington’s 2013 article on early modern PEACE includes ‘a crude but illuminating index of the relative visibility of “peace” in the early modern era’, which is used to support and develop the analysis of how specific genres and writers approached the topic.7 Withington’s approach to the analysis of peace has much in common with an approach developed by Martin Mueller, termed ‘scalable reading’, which provides ‘a happy synthesis of “close” and “distant” reading.’8 Scalable reading allows the analysis to zoom in and out, encompassing both the broader context and the finer detail of individual texts. As this chapter will show, this approach allows for a very broad overview of use, whilst also retaining
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4 McEnery & Baker, Corpus Linguistics and 17th-Century Prostitution.
5 Ibid., p. 199.
6 Ibid., p. 205.
8 Mueller, ‘Scalable Reading’.
This chapter uses scalable reading to explore three key research questions: How did writing about addiction change over time? What were the most frequent objects of addiction? And who was most often described as being addicted to them? To explore these questions, I use a linguistics tool built in 2008 for corpus analysis, called CQPweb, which holds a version of the transcribed texts from the Text Creation Partnership. The CQPweb EEBO-TCP corpus contains 13,000 instances of ADDICT in almost 5,000 different texts. I begin with an overview of change over time and word form, before conducting a much more detailed analysis using the most powerful tool offered by CQPweb: the proximity-based collocation search. This provides an overview of the changing syntax surrounding ADDICT across the period, and allows for a detailed examination of the objects of addiction – the behaviours which people are described as being addicted to – which I explore within the broader context of historical events. The most significant research finding is that the use of ADDICT to indicate interpersonal or religious devotion declines across the seventeenth century, replaced by the recent neologism devote (in its verb form). As a result, ADDICT is used increasingly to refer instead to forms of habitual behaviour. My detailed analysis of religious collocates of addiction finds that they increased during a period of heightened anxiety over religious political influence in the court, suggesting a correlation between the objects of addiction, and broader contemporary events.

The original intention of the second part of the chapter was to explore the subjects of addiction; that is, the people or groups of people who were described as having addictions. This wasn’t possible using CQPweb alone, so I created my own data set, based on results downloaded from CQPweb of the most significant objects of addiction across the early modern period. The data set contains almost 2,000 uses of the word ADDICT, fully cleaned (i.e. the data has been checked and corrected), and manually tagged with subject and object data. Using this data, I explore the relationship between the most frequent objects of addiction, and the people who were described as being addicted to them. Interesting patterns emerge, particularly with reference to the age and gender of the subject, but perhaps the most surprising finding – and arguably the most significant – is the large number of plural subjects. Whereas addiction today is related primarily to individuals, this study reveals that early modern addiction was just as often associated with large groups, defined by their culture, religion, or nationality. This finding highlights an important point about the analysis of
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addiction, which is that the descriptions discussed here do not represent the actual addictions of early modern people, but rather the interests, concerns, and stereotypes of early modern writers.

EEBO-TCP as a corpus

In previous chapters the sources have been taken primarily from the collection of transcribed texts known as EEBO-TCP. However, where texts have previously been treated on an individual basis, in this chapter I use EEBO-TCP as a whole body of work, or corpus. In many ways EEBO-TCP is an unconventional corpus, and it is worth taking some time to explore why this is, and what impact it has on this type of research.

The types of corpora used in linguistic analysis are often designed specifically to represent a particular aspect of human communication, whether written, spoken, or sign language. For example, the British National Corpus (BNC) is intended to represent spoken and written British language of the late twentieth century. It contains ten percent spoken material, and 90 percent written material, selected from a range of different genres, covering a relatively short chronological period. It is a fixed body of work totalling 100 million words. In contrast, EEBO-TCP is not a limited sample, nor is it chronologically or thematically representative. The texts within it have not been selected to represent any specific type of language use. Rather, EEBO-TCP has evolved. It began life as various collections of printed works, which were microfilmed, and later digitised as Early English Books Online (EEBO). Some of the digitised microfilm texts were selected for transcription as part of the Text Creation Partnership, and it is these transcriptions that form EEBO-TCP. To be included in EEBO-TCP, a text had to meet several different sets of inclusion criteria: for whichever collection it was originally part of; for the microfilm project; and for the Text Creation Partnership. Andrew Hardie and Tony McEnery would probably call EEBO-TCP a type of opportunistic corpus; these ‘make no pretension to adhere to a rigorous sampling frame, nor do they aspire to deal with issues of skew by the collection of an ever-larger body of data.... Rather, they represent nothing more nor less than the data that it was possible to gather for a specific task.’

In terms of corpus analysis, the nature of EEBO-TCP presents several potential issues. First, since it is not possible to reconstruct all of the steps involved in creating the corpus, there is
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11 Ibid., p. 11.
no way of knowing which texts were excluded from EEBO-TCP, or on what grounds. Any findings must take into account this unknown quality, and be wary of extending conclusions across all early modern print.

Second, the distribution of texts within EEBO-TCP is extremely uneven, as shown by the graph below:

*Figure 1 showing EEBO-TCP and ESTC text counts, by Anupam Basu, Early Modern Print (18/11/2013)*
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The results from any diachronic analysis will be heavily weighted towards the latter half of the seventeenth century, and should be adjusted for overall frequency. In addition, any quantitative analysis of pre-1550 texts will be unreliable, since the text count is too low to produce statistically significant results.

Third, because EEBO-TCP is made up of several different collections, the composition of texts within the corpus is unequal. In particular, the years covered by the Thomason Tracts are substantially better documented than any other within the period. From 1640 to 1661 the London bookseller George Thomason – recognising the historical significance of current events – set himself the goal of documenting every publication in London. He amassed a

---

huge collection of pamphlets, news books, and newspapers, in a collection that includes more than 22,000 items, and represents around 80 percent of all published material for two decades.\textsuperscript{13} Significantly, printed works which often have a low survival rate – ephemera like news reports, court gossip, and periodicals – are unusually well represented.\textsuperscript{14} The inclusion of around 10,200 texts from the Thomason Tracts within EEBO-TCP is problematic for any examination of change over time, because it means that these two extremely turbulent and transitional decades are better documented than other decades covered by the corpus.

Fourth, the nature of early modern print, as well as the inclusion criteria for EEBO-TCP, mean that there are a large number of duplicate or almost-identical texts within the corpus. In principle only the first edition of each work was transcribed by the TCP, but in practice second or third editions were often included when they were printed under a new title, or when several works were reprinted as a collection. In addition, as seen with the dictionaries, it was common practice for early modern writers to copy large sections of text from each other, or from their own previous work. This is one reason why it is so important to read the texts themselves rather than relying solely on statistical findings; what appears to be a significant spike in one decade could actually be three reprints of the same work.

The issues discussed so far affect the entire EEBO-TCP corpus, but the version held on CQPweb has undergone additional changes in order to make it suitable for corpus analysis. Whilst not necessarily problematic, it is important to understand how these changes affect the corpus. CQPweb is a web-based corpus analysis programme built by Andrew Hardie. It contains a corpus called ‘Early English Books Online (V3)’, which contains 44,422 texts, and just over 1.2 billion words (1,202,214,511). Unlike the version of EEBO-TCP held on Chadwyck-Healey, which is constantly expanding as new texts are transcribed, the version hosted on CQPweb is fixed. The findings in this chapter are therefore not only transitory, but also potentially already outdated. This is almost an inevitability of digital research, where innovation – the creation of new corpora, new tools, and new methods – is constant and often fast-paced.

The text data on CQPweb is not held in its original form, but has been subjected to various processes to enable corpus analysis. Most dramatically, all spelling in the corpus has been modernised and standardised. Spelling correction is necessary to maximise search results, and to smooth over the more variant spellings of earlier years, but it is important to be aware

\textsuperscript{13} Chadwyck-Healey, ‘About EEBO’, About the Thomason Tracts.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
that the altered spelling is not always consistent or correct. Whenever possible I have cross-referenced with the original spelling and page images on the Chadwyck-Healey website. The corpus has also been tagged, so that each word also contains information about its part-of-speech (for example, whether it is a noun, verb, or adjective). Whilst potentially useful, the tagging system was designed for modern syntax and is not accurate for early modern language, so I have chosen not to use the POS tags at all in my research.\footnote{For example, every instance of \textit{addict} in the corpus has been tagged as a noun, when in fact they are all verbs.} Finally, whilst the specific tools available through CQPweb will be discussed in the relevant sections, it is worth noting that its functions were designed for linguistic, not historical, research; they focus on the language of the text itself, rather than the metadata. There is no option for searching author or title, or restricting searches to particular authors, genres, or texts. This limitation has partly been overcome through the creation of a separate data set, which forms the basis of the second half of this chapter. However, the inaccessibility of authorial information, combined with the size of the data sample in both parts of this chapter, has made it impossible to focus on authorship in the way that previous chapters have done.

With any type of research it is important to be aware of the limitations of the source, and using EEBO-TCP as a corpus is no different. Many of the potential problems caused by its unsystematic nature can be addressed by taking a closer look at the texts themselves; hence the scalable reading approach discussed in the introduction. It is worth noting, too, that even a rigorously sampled and constructed corpus is not free from these problems. As Hardie and McEnery point out, ‘Balance, representativeness and comparability are ideals which corpus builders strive for but rarely, if ever, attain. In truth, the measures of balance and representativeness are matters of degree.’\footnote{McEnery & Hardie, \textit{Corpus Linguistics}, p.10.} At over 1.2 billion words, distributed over 225 years, EEBO-TCP represents a significant portion of early modern print, and there is no doubt that it is one of the most valuable resources we have for studying early modern English. Using it as a corpus rather than a repository of individual texts has the potential to unlock new discoveries about early modern print.

\section*{An overview of addiction on CQPweb}

The first step to analysing addiction on CQPweb was finding a search term that maximised the number of correct hits. CQPweb allows for the use of wildcards in searches – that is, punctuation which stands in for specific characters, or limits the search in some way. An
asterisk represents any number of letters, a plus sign indicates a single letter. Square brackets can be used to provide multiple options: for example, a search for ‘s[o,a]ng’ would find the words ‘song’ and ‘sang’. A search for ‘addict*’ found 12,954 results, but didn’t allow for variant spellings, missing out variations like ‘addycy’ and ‘adict’. A search for ‘ad+ct*’ found 30,855 results, many unrelated to addiction – including, for example, ‘adjunct’ and ‘adjective’. A lemma search for ‘{addict}’ found only 11,786 results, which was fewer than a basic word search. After multiple attempts, the search term chosen for use throughout this chapter is ‘ad[d,][i,y]ct*’. This brings up 13,074 results in 4,923 books. This term allows for variant spellings with ‘y’ instead of ‘i’, and ‘d’ instead of ‘dd’ – which persist in the corpus despite spelling regularisation – and it includes all word endings, including addiction, addicted, and so on. It is also specific enough to limit the inclusion of most non-relevant words: only 12 words out of 13,074 were unrelated to addiction, although 608 of the results are Latin (4.7 percent).

The chronological distribution of the 13,074 results is heavily weighted towards the latter half of the seventeenth century, and there are very few pre-1550 results; in other words, it matches the overall distribution of texts in the corpus. Since the period up to 1550 has been analysed in detail in a previous chapter, wherever feasible the quantitative analysis in this chapter will begin at 1550 rather than at 1500. Adjusted for frequency, the results show that the uses of ADDICT rose steadily throughout the sixteenth century, and remained relatively consistent throughout the seventeenth century, with two exceptions: there is a sustained dip in the period 1642 to 1650, and another in the period 1655 to 1660. The following graph shows the frequency-per-million-words of ADDICT each year in blue with a moving average shown in red.17

17 Figures were taken from CQPweb, using the search term ‘ad[d,][i,y]ct*’.
The frequency is based on appearances of ADDICT per million words, each year. This means that variation in book length, and variation in number of texts/words per year, do not affect the results. Search conducted on 9 May 2017.
Figure 6 showing the frequency-per-million words of ADDICT per year on EEBO-TCP
The two dips (which are clearly visible on the blue line, but merge into one in the red line), correspond with the English Civil War and the interregnum period, which are also the dates covered by the Thomason Civil War Tracts. As mentioned, the presence of the Thomason Tracts within EEBO-TCP poses a problem, since it is hard to differentiate between the impact of the period itself – of political conflict, religious turmoil, and war – and the impact of considerably more ephemeral texts within the corpus. It certainly appears that ADDICT was less frequent in the Thomason Tracts than it was in EEBO-TCP as a whole; for the whole period 1640 to 1661, ADDICT has a frequency-per-million-words of 9.1, whereas for the Thomason Tracts the frequency is just 7.5. However, whether ADDICT was particularly absent from civil war rhetoric, or whether it was less commonly found in all types of ephemeral print, remains unclear.

Whilst uses of ADDICT remained fairly constant from around 1590 onwards, there was considerable variation between individual word forms. By the 1570s the past tense/past participle addicted had replaced the infinitive addict as the most frequent form of the verb, and addicted remained the most common word-form throughout the rest of the period. There was a small but steady number of writers using the present participle addicting, but the noun addiction did not appear regularly until the 1630s, and never appeared in great number. The following graph shows a breakdown of the word forms that made up appearances of ADDICT.
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18 This is based on an analysis of CQPweb. Thomason Tract texts were identified using metadata category ‘ID numbers (STC)’ on the ‘Create Subcorpus’ feature. This allowed a search for ADDICT to be restricted to Thomason Tract texts.

19 The noun addict did not appear until the nineteenth century, according to the OED. All appearances of addict in the texts examined here are therefore the verb form. ‘addict, n.’, OED Online (March 2017), http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/2174 [accessed 15/05/17].

20 The data comes from the a CQP search for ‘ad[^d][i,y]ct*’. The ‘Frequency Breakdown’ function displays all word-forms. These can be selected in turn, and the per-year frequency of each individual word-form displayed using the ‘Distribution’ function. Search conducted on 15 May 2017.
The category ‘other’ mainly consists of Latin words. However, it also includes alternative spellings that were not picked up by CQPweb’s spelling normalisation (for example addycte, addycted, addicted); some of the less frequent word-forms (addictionness, addiction); and plurals (addicts, addictions). The anomalous years – those with a spike in appearances of ‘other’ word-forms – are often caused by a Latin text that contained several instances of ADDICERE. In 1628, *Rerum Anglicarum Henrico VIII* contained five uses of ADDICERE, and *Of the Church five bookes* contained four, which resulted in a percentage spike in ‘other’ word-forms. In 1681 *Vita selectorum aliquot virorum qui doctrinã, dignitate, aut pietate inclaruere*, which contained thirty-one uses of ADDICERE, had the same effect. In 1663 there is a percentage decrease in uses of addicted caused partly by an increase in ‘other’ word-forms, but also by an increase in use of addiction. Both of these can be attributed largely to a single text – *Fortescutus illustratus*, or, *A commentary on that nervous treatise De laudibus legum Angliae*, by Edward Waterhouse. This work contains 13 uses of addiction, six uses of addictions, and five uses of ADDICERE. Waterhouse’s work is unusual in favouring the form addiction over that of addicted, but it is not otherwise remarkable for its use of ADDICT; the frequency of ADDICT per million words
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in Waterhouse’s text is just 56.06, which is actually slightly less than average. In the whole corpus, the frequency-per-million-words of ADDICT within texts containing at least one hit is 58.

**Setting up a collocation analysis**

One of the most powerful tools on CQPweb is a function called ‘proximity-based collocations’, which allows for examination of the words surrounding the search term. This has the potential to reveal various features of a word, including meaning, synonyms, and syntax. In this section, the collocation function of CQPweb will be used to explore features of ADDICT in early modern print. First, some explanation is required of the three variables which determine the parameters of the collocate search.

The first variable when conducting a collocation analysis is the search window. The window is defined in terms of + (to the right) and – (to the left) of the search term, or node. The window can be as small as just one position: for example, if the search term is ‘addicted’ and the window is +1, CQPweb will search all of the words that appear one place after the node. Unsurprisingly, given that the most common word-form is addicted, the most frequent collocate in this position is to, as in the phrase, ‘addicted to’. The maximum extent of the window on CQPweb is 20 positions, from -10 to +10; this setting tells CQPweb to include all words within ten places of the node, to either side. A larger window means more results are included, but also means there is a higher likelihood that results will not be relevant to the search term. The optimum search window will vary depending on what the aim of the search is, but for the purposes of this study, none of the search windows are further than five from the node. Beyond this point, the majority of collocates belong to another clause, and are not directly related to ADDICT.

The second variable determines how CQP groups words together. As the default it uses ‘Word Form’, which treats each individual word or punctuation mark as a separate unit. However, it also offers the option of grouping words by their lemma: this option would, for example, group together the words addict and addicted under the lemma ADDICT. A third option is ‘Unregularized Spelling’, which removes the spelling corrections, and displays each variant spelling as a separate group. Examples of each grouping method can be seen in the table below (search term ‘ad(d)?(i|y)ct.*’, default window of -3 to +3, sorted by frequency).
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24 CQPweb also lets you group words using the various tagging systems it features. However, as stated elsewhere, these tags do not work well on early modern corpora.
Figure 8 comparing the results of a collocation search done on word-form, lemma, and unregularized spelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search</th>
<th>Word-form</th>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Unregularized Spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of groups</td>
<td>10,791 different words</td>
<td>9,823 different lemmas</td>
<td>12,560 different spellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>PUNC</td>
<td>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are slight differences in the top words, but the main change is in the total number of groups (words, lemmas, or spellings) for each option. ‘Unregularized Spelling’ has the highest number of different groups, because each variant spelling is treated as a separate item. ‘Lemma’ has the fewest groups, because it combines different forms of the same term together. In a collocation analysis, using the original spellings would result in many entries being excluded from the analysis, because the spellings are too low-frequency to feature in the top results; moreover, a disproportionate number of the excluded words would be from early on in the period, when spelling variation was more common. The other two options are ‘lemma’ and ‘word-form’. Grouping by word-form means, for example, that study and studies are separate entries, one of which appears three times as often as the other. A lemma search combines the entries for study and studies together; the results are more concentrated, and it is easier to find relevant results. The downside of using lemmas is that some of the accuracy and nuance is lost; there are quite important differences between the functions of the words are, be, and being, yet in a lemma search all are grouped under the lemma BE. For this study, I opted for a lemma grouping to maximise results, and used scalable reading to recover the nuance lost by merging terms.

The final variable is the method of organising results: whether by frequency, or some other statistical measure. If collocates are ordered by frequency, then the top results are always high-frequency but low-interest terms such as the, of, and, to. However, there are various statistical measures provided by CQPweb as alternatives to frequency. The default is log-likelihood, which is a measure of significance. It looks at the frequency of each word within the whole corpus, to measure the expectation that any word will appear near the node; words that have higher than expected appearance are ranked more significant. The other main statistical method featured on CQPweb is effect-size, which measures how exclusively two words are bound together; it tends to rank low-frequency words highly. The table below
shows the top five results ordered using some of the different options available on CQPweb: frequency; log-likelihood (significance); mutual information (effect-size); and z-score and dice coefficient (both of which combine significance and effect-size).

Figure 9 comparing the results of a collocation search ordered according to frequency, log-likelihood, mutual information, z-score, and dice coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of measure</th>
<th>Rank by Frequency</th>
<th>Log-Likelihood</th>
<th>Mutual Information</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Dice Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of measure</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>Effect-size</td>
<td>Significance &amp; effect-size</td>
<td>Significance &amp; effect-size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency range of top 5</td>
<td>2550 – 10317</td>
<td>712 – 10317</td>
<td>5 – 19</td>
<td>9 – 10317</td>
<td>39 – 712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>helveticae</td>
<td>helveticae</td>
<td>wholly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PUNC</td>
<td>much</td>
<td>reliquusque</td>
<td>confessioni</td>
<td>superstitiously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Be</td>
<td>wholly</td>
<td>profissioni</td>
<td>wholly</td>
<td>naturally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The</td>
<td>themselves</td>
<td>procancellarius</td>
<td>Reliquusque</td>
<td>zealously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>amplitudini</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>venery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NB. Search is by lemma, window is -3 to +3).

As well as showing the top five results for each of the different statistical methods, the table shows what the frequency range is for those top five – in other words, how many times each of the lemmas actually appears as a collocate. When ranked by frequency (first column), the top five collocates appear between 2,550 and 10,317 times each. At the other end of the scale, the highest scoring results by mutual information have frequencies of between five and 19; they are all relatively uncommon Latin words. Neither of these two organising methods is useful. When ranked by frequency, the results are just common words in general, they are not particularly relevant to ADDICT. The results ranked by mutual information are too obscure, and too unusual, to indicate any kind of broad trend or pattern. The remaining three options all include some measure of significance, either on its own (Log-Likelihood), or in combination with an effect-size measure (z-score and dice coefficient). Z-score has an incredibly broad frequency scope, ranging from the most frequent collocate (TO, which appears 10,317 times) to one that appears just nine times (RELIQUUSQUE). Dice coefficient has a much smaller frequency range, but all of the top five results are relatively low frequency; the highest ranked result – WHOLLY – has a frequency of just 712. There are two problems with using a measure that prioritises low-frequency lemmas. First, many of the less frequent words are Latin terms. These have not been lemmatised correctly, so their frequency scores are misleading (if all variant forms were included, the frequency would be much higher), but more importantly Latin is not the focus of this study. Second, whichever terms are ranked highest will form the basis of the data sample in the second part of the study. If low-
frequency terms score highly, then the data sample will have fewer entries. For the purposes of this study, log-likelihood provides the best balance between word frequency, and connection to ADDICT. The top five results are at the upper end of the frequency scale, between 712 and 10,317, but the measure still takes into account how common words are in the corpus as a whole.

Syntax

Collocation analysis can provide a useful base for determining further analysis, but it can also answer specific questions. In this broad overview of the collocates of ADDICT, I explore the adverbs used to define it, and what this reveals about concepts of addiction; I examine where the objects and subjects of the addiction are found, and how they are described; and I look at how both of these features change over time.

Normally a collocate window extends to either side of the node. However, for this first study, I use a window of just one position and repeated the search multiple times, for every position from -5 to +5 from the node. The results are ordered by log-likelihood. I replicated this search for three different time periods: 1550 to 1599, 1600 to 1649, and 1650 to 1699, to enable an analysis of change over time.25 Within each table, the lemmas are colour-coded according to word type: nouns are in yellow, adjectives and adverbs are blue, pronouns are in pink, and verbs are shown in green.26 Where a lemma is new – i.e. it did not appear in the table for the preceding time period – the entry is shown in italics and underlined.

25 It was not possible to use this method on the period 1500-49, because there are too few sources.
26 This classification system cannot be accurate for every word represented in the table, as some words can function as verb, noun, or adjective. Where various possibilities exist, the colour chosen is the one which appears to match the greatest number of results. Latin words and punctuation are shown in pale grey font.
Figure 10 showing a collocation search for 'ad(dic)tion' on CQPweb, for the top ten most significant lemmas in positions -5 to +5 relative to the node, for three different time periods.
Reading the table from left to right: on the left-hand side of the table (-5 to -2 from the node), there are a mixture of nouns and pronouns, mostly referring to individuals or groups of people: these are the subjects of the addiction. Directly before ADDICT (-1 from the node), most of the words are adverbs which describe the addiction, and these provide a useful insight into the characteristics linked with addiction. Under the central column are listed the most frequent results for the search term, ‘ad(d)?(i|y)ct.* From +2 to +5 from the node, almost all of the words are nouns, and these are the objects of the addiction.

Across the whole of the early modern period the word TO is by far both the most significant and the most frequent collocate at +1 from the node, as in the phrase ‘addicted to’. Other, less common alternatives are reflexive pronouns: THEMSELVES, HIMSELF, MY SELF, and THY SELF (the last two split into two words, covering the positions +1 and +2 from the node), and these pronouns are also frequently followed by the word TO. There is a strong connection between addiction and ideas of selfhood and personal autonomy; it appears that addiction was often something you did to yourself, rather than something that was done to you, and this remained consistent across the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Many of the examples of self-addiction are in religious invocations, as when Thomas Gataker urged his readers in 1638 to ‘First , addict thy self to the service of God. A few, however, are self-reflective; John Lyly wrote in 1578 that ‘I addicted my self wholly to the service of women to spend my life in the laps of Ladies, my lands in maintenance of bravery, my wit in the vanities of idle Sonnets.

Nouns, adjectives, and pronouns on the left side of the table define the subjects of addiction. The non-specific pronouns remain largely unchanged across all three time periods: terms like THEY, WHO, THOSE, and HE tell us little other than that the subject is not specified within the collocate window. A better indication of the types of people or groups referred to as addicted can be found by examining nouns and adjectives. The adjective YOUNG on the left side of the table – almost always followed by MAN in the texts themselves – suggests certain addictions were associated specifically with youth. Since YOUNG appears in both the 1550-99 table, and in the 1650-99 table, this association appears to have been present across the early modern period, and this observation is borne out by the texts themselves: John Florio, writing in 1578, described ‘a young man addicted to concupiscence’; Simon Latham’s 1618
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book of falconry complained that ‘in these days the young man hath so deeply addicted himself to sloth and idleness...that he had rather die then to meddle with a Hawk that will require either labour or attendance’; and John Tillotson claimed in 1694 that ‘Youth is extremely addicted to pleasure, because it is most capable and most sensible of it.’\(^{29}\) Whilst the association of youth with addiction remained constant across the early modern period, other characteristics of the subjects of addiction changed. In 1600-49 a series of nouns appeared that defined groups of people by their location or country; terms like INHABITANT, NATION, and PEOPLE, which suggest that addiction had begun to be used as a component of national or cultural stereotypes. Results include lines like, ‘This people [Syrians] were much addicted to shooting with bows’, ‘the inhabitants [of Dresden] are much addicted to trade’, and ‘This Nation [Russia] is generally addicted to venery and drunkenness.’\(^{30}\) This use of ADDICT continues into the later period. The noun MIND decreased as a collocate: it appears four times on the 1550-99 table, just once in the 1600-49 table, and not at all in the 1650-99 table. MIND almost always appeared in some variant of the phrase ‘addicting his mind to’ or ‘a mind addicted to’, both of which seem phrased deliberately to emphasise that addiction is a function of the head not of the body. As Chapter IV demonstrates, there was a strong relationship between addiction and the mind, but it was not one that declined across the period; addiction was just as much a function of the mind in 1700 as it was in 1600. It seems likely that the decline of MIND as a collocate of ADDICT had more to do with the familiarity of the term; as ADDICT became more established and better known, there was less need to reiterate its meaning.

The verbs appearing -2 or +2 from the node – with the exception of BE – are synonyms for ADDICT: they appear in the form ‘given and addicted’, ‘addicted and inclined’, ‘affected and addicted’, and ‘addicted and devoted’. It is significant that none of these synonyms appears in more than one of the time periods examined here. INCLINE and GIVE were well-known words dating to the fourteenth and the ninth century respectively, and their use alongside ADDICT in 1550-99 helped to establish the meaning of the neologism among early modern

\(^{29}\) John Florio, *Florio his firste fruites which yeelde familiar speech, merie proverbs, wittie sentences, and golden sayings. Also a perfect induction to the Italian, and English tongues, as in the table appeareth* (London, 1578; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Simon Latham, *Lathamns new and second booke of falconrie concerning the training vp of all hawkes that were vnmentioned in his first booke* (London, 1618; EEBO-TCP Phase II); John Tillotson, *Six sermons I. Of stedfastness in religion. II. Family-religion. III. IV. V. Education of children. VI. The advantages of an early piety* (London, 1694; EEBO-TCP Phase I).

\(^{30}\) Peter Heylyn, *Mikrokosmos A little description of the great world. Augmented and revised* (Oxford, 1625; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Lewes Roberts, *The merchants mappe of commerce wherein, the universall manner and matter of trade, is compondiously handled* (London, 1638; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Johannes Boemius, trans. Edward Aston, *The manners, laws, and customes of all nations collected out of the best vertiers by Ioannes Boemus* (London, 1611; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
readers. The verb *devote*, used in the sense of ‘give up, addict, apply zealously or exclusively (to a pursuit, occupation, etc., or to a particular purpose)’, dates to the early seventeenth century; it seems likely that, just as *give* and *incline* were used to help convey the meaning of *addict* in 1550–99, so too was *addict* used to introduce the word *devote* in 1600–49.\(^{31}\) The collocation of *affect* and *addict* is less easily explicable. The words co-occur within three positions (‘affected and addicted’ and ‘addicted and affected’) 18 times across the whole of the early modern period, and 15 of those are within the 50-year period 1595 to 1645; however, that sense of *affect* – ‘trans. (in pass.). To incline, like; to dispose’ – dates from the early fifteenth century.\(^{32}\) Whatever the reason for the co-occurrence of the two terms, it appears to have been short-lived.

The adverbs, which appear mostly -1 from the node, provide a sense of the nature and characteristics of addiction itself. In the period 1550–99, the majority of adverbs served to emphasise the scale of the addiction: *wholly, so, altogether, greatly*, and *overmuch*. Also appearing on the list of adverbs is the modal *should*: a term that suggests writers were urging their readers to acquire or avoid certain addictions. A 1569 translation of Pietro Vermigli’s *Godly Prayers* informed God that ‘mortal men should always addict themselves to extol thy worthy praises’; in 1587 John Bridges explained that ‘Princes should cheerfully addict themselves to the Empire of God’; and a 1565 translation of a treatise by the Bishop of Worms advised his readers that ‘it is not mete that a Christian man should be addicted too much to a creature.’\(^{33}\) Both the invocations to form or avoid certain addictions, and the emphasis on the scale of addiction, fit with the idea that early modern addiction was ‘an extraordinary form of commitment.’\(^{34}\)

However, in the same period – 1550 to 1599 – there are also adverbs which suggest a form of addiction that is more ordinary than it is extraordinary. If someone can be *too much* addicted to something, there must be a level of addiction that is *just right*; if someone can be *more* addicted, then other people are surely *less* addicted. This suggests that addiction may not have automatically implied excess, but rather that it existed on a sliding scale. As Pierre

\(^{31}\) The OED records the first printed appearance of *devote* (in the sense mentioned here) as being 1616. ‘devote, v.’, *OED Online*.

\(^{32}\) ‘affect, v.1.’, *OED Online* [June 2018], www.oed.com/view/Entry/3323 [accessed 17/08/2018].


\(^{34}\) Lemon, *Addiction and Devotion*, pp. 10-1.
de La Primaudaye writes, ‘that as every one is more or less addicted to any of these parts, so he delights most in those pleasures, which he may receive by that part unto which he is most given.’ Similarly David Papillon writes that ‘all such as are under the state of Nature, are more or less addicted to it [nature].’ The adverbs which serve to moderate addiction persist throughout the early modern period, and in 1600-49 we see the addition of naturally as a collocate; a word that denotes something ordinary and everyday rather than extraordinary and extreme. The fact that some addictions were considered innate, or naturally occurring, suggests interesting links to theories on humoral balance, temperament, and even, given the link to national stereotypes, to ideas on environment. For example, in 1640 William Habington claimed that the majority of English people were naturally addicted to arms due to their upbringing; he explains, ‘For though the Country by civil war was much dispeopled, yet the commonalty, being for the most borne and bred up in tumults, were naturally addicted to arms, and prone upon any innovations to take the field.’ In 1679 Paul Rycaut linked natural addiction to humoral temperament, writing that novices at a convent in Turkey ‘yield to the slothful temperament to which they are naturally addicted.’

The period 1650-99 sees the addition of three more adverbs which highlight the scalability of addiction: a person could be extremely or zealously addicted, but they could also be generally addicted. Addiction could be extraordinary and extreme; but it could also be naturally occurring and even – in some instances – moderate and mild.

Whereas the subjects of the addiction are often not specified within the search window – they are referred to instead as that, they, or he – the objects of addiction are well represented and clearly defined. In 1550-99 the concerns of early protestant reformers, described in Chapter I, are still clearly apparent. There are desirable addictions to study, service (of God), religion, and ceremony, as well as the negative worldly addictions of pleasure and desire. Presence appears as a collocate in two positions, and was commonly used in the phrase ‘bodily presence’, ‘corporeal presence’, or ‘real presence’, in reference to Christ. Examining the later periods, it is clear that the objects of addiction changed quite significantly from 1600 onwards. These changes will be discussed in detail in the next section, but two features are particularly significant and worth noting here: the first is a striking diversification in the objects of addiction, with ten new objects appearing in the top

36 David Papillon, The vanity of the lives and passions of men (London, 1651; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
39 Paul Rycaut, Roger Manley, & Richard Knolles, The history of the Turkish Empire, from the year 1623, to the year 1677 Containing the reigns of the three last emperors (London, 1687; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
collocates in 1600-49, and a further 11 in 1650-99. Clearly, addiction moved away quite dramatically from the evangelical concerns which characterised earlier use, and became a much more widely applied term. The second point is that two quite prominent collocates in 1550-99 – PRESENCE and SERVICE – either declined or disappeared entirely in the later periods; a shift which represents a significant change in the use of ADDICT. As the next section will demonstrate, whereas reformers had used ADDICT to refer to both personal devotion (usually to God), and the pursuit of habitual behaviours, later writers increasingly used it only in the latter sense.

**Objects**

As shown, a collocation search can be used to identify the objects of addiction, which frequently appear within the short search window available on CQPweb. The following analysis explores those objects across the period 1550-1700, with two significant findings. First, that one of the two primary uses of addiction before 1550 declines steadily across the early modern period, disappearing almost entirely by 1700. And second, that the changing objects of addiction reflect the immediate concerns, preoccupations, and interests of early modern writers.

For this analysis, the collocate window was set to include positions from +2 to +5, as this is where the majority of objects were named in the previous tables. The top 20 most significant collocates in this window were found for each quarter-century, from 1550 to 1699, and all non-nouns were removed, leaving only the objects of addiction. All six lists were ordered by log-likelihood, from one (most significant) to 20 (least significant). Altogether, the lists contained a total of thirty-one different objects of addiction. For these thirty-one objects, I extended the search to the top 50 collocate results for each quarter-century. I then re-ordered the lists to line up matching objects, using the log-likelihood numbers to indicate the changing significance of each object across six quarter-centuries; from one as most significant, to 50 as the least significant. Empty cells indicate no collocation within the top 50 results for that quarter-century. The results are also coloured according to their number, with dark green indicating a lower number (and therefore a more significant collocate), and pale green indicating a higher number (and lower significance).

---

40 Different search windows were tested that included positions further from the node (from +2 to up to +10), and individual texts were selected and read to determine the accuracy of the results. It was found that a window larger than +5 was likely to include nouns that were not objects of addiction, but (for example) belonged to the next sentence. A window of +2 to +5 provides sufficient results to be significant, without compromising accuracy.
Figure 11 showing the top collocates of addiction in each quarter-century from 1550-99 in position +2 to +5, ranked according to significance (with one as most significant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>1550-74</th>
<th>1575-99</th>
<th>1600-24</th>
<th>1625-49</th>
<th>1650-74</th>
<th>1675-99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>study</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superstition</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drunkenness</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astrology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idolatry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lust</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contemplation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>war</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vanity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceremony</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>witchcraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>villainy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most significant long-term trend is in addiction to SERVICE, which steadily increases in significance over 75 years, and then undergoes a prolonged and fairly dramatic decline over the next 75 years. As was shown in the last section, a similar decline occurred to uses of PRESENCE as a collocate of ADDICT. In fact, this sustained pattern in writing about addiction to SERVICE indicates a shift in the predominant use of ADDICT.

One of the earliest ways in which ADDICT was commonly used was to indicate a binding attachment between individuals. As seen in Chapter II, this use of ADDICT was carried over from the neo-Latin meanings of ADDICERE. In English, it can be found as early as 1530, when Joye’s translation of psalm 119 included the line, ‘Make fast thy promises to thy servant:
which is addict unto thy worship. In 1540 Taverner applied the same meaning to addiction using the word SERVICE, writing that ‘an ecclesiastical person... by his order and profession hath addicted himself to the service of god.' From this point on, SERVICE continued to be frequently associated with this particular meaning of addiction. In 1631 William Jones wrote that, ‘Now that is true godliness, when a man is addicted to serve God at all times’, and in 1574 Henry Howard that, ‘Ceres had a company of widows addicted specially unto her service.’ The binding attachment could also be used outside of a religious context, as when John Harrington claimed to be ‘so wholly addicted to her highness service.’ This particular use of ADDICT was a very close synonym for DEVOTE: both terms referred to a strong interpersonal attachment, that was almost always positive, and very often religious. In fact, the similarity between these two terms – ADDICT and DEVOTE – appears to have been the cause of the decline.

*Figure 12 comparing addiction to service and devotion to service in EEBO-TCP, 1550-1699*

---

42 Richard Taverner, *The principal laws customs and statutes of England which be at this present day in vre* (London, 1540; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
43 William Jones, *A briefe exhortation to all men to set their houses in order* (London, 1631; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Henry Howard, *A defense of the eccesiasticall regiment in Englande defaced by T. C. in his replie agaynst D. Vebitgifte* (London, 1574; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
45 The data for this table was generated using CQPweb. Lemma search for {devote}; limit to results with lemma TO in +1 to +5; limit to results with lemma SERVICE in +1 to +5. Lemma search for {addict}; limit to results with lemma TO in +1 to +5; limit to results with lemma SERVICE in +1 to +5. Searches done on 17/08/2018.
Whilst the noun *devotion* had been in use since at least the thirteenth century, the verb *devote* appeared considerably later, around the end of the sixteenth century. 46 The OED records the first printed appearance of it in 1586. 47 By this point, *ADDICT* had already become established – particularly through the work of protestant reformers – as a term for describing the wholehearted dedication of a person to God. However, as the table above shows, *DEVOTE* quickly took over as the preferred term; throughout the seventeenth century, early modern writers wishing to describe this kind of relationship increasingly used *devoted* instead of *addicted*. In practice, this meant that *ADDICT* became a less versatile term than it had been previously; it was no longer the preferred term for describing positive interpersonal attachments, but was used almost exclusively to refer to the pursuit of habitual forms of behaviour. Since its use as a synonym for *DEVOTE* was predominantly positive, this change also saw *ADDICT* shift towards more negative forms of addiction – although, as will be shown, positive types of behavioural addiction persisted.

One important point to note is that, although *ADDICT* was used increasingly rarely to describe service to God, this does not mean it was no longer used in a religious sense at all. Early modern writers still used addiction to describe other types of religious behaviour. The difference was that these behaviours tended to be specific actions (*PRAYER, CEREMONY*), general religiousness (*RELIGION, PIETY*), or had negative associations (*IDOLATRY, SUPERSTITION*), rather than describing faithful devotion to God or any other individual. In fact, as *Figure 11* shows, *RELIGION* remained a significant collocate across the seventeenth century, spiking – along with several other religious objects of addiction – during the period 1625-49. When all six of the religious objects of addiction from the table are grouped together, the low-frequency, short-lived objects of addiction like *PIETY* become more significant, because they are part of a group of related terms which all follow the same pattern. The graph below shows religious collocates as a percentage of overall hits for *ADDICT*, across the seventeenth century. The green line shows the percentage per year, whilst the blue line shows a five-year moving average. In some years, over 14 percent of all hits for *ADDICT* have a religious collocate.

---

46 ‘devotion, n.’, *OED Online* [accessed 17/08/2018].
47 ‘devote, v.’, *OED Online*. 
Figure 13 showing the percentage of all hits for *ADDICT* that have a religious collocate (RELIGION, CEREMONY, PRAYER, PIETY, IDOLATRY, or SUPERSTITION)

The graph clearly shows a period where religious collocates are more common, between 1624 and 1647 (the blue line extends slightly later, because it is a moving average). It is a period which corresponds closely with the reign of King Charles I (1625 to 1649), and one which was characterised by endemic religious conflict. As Michael Braddick explains, Charles embraced a programme of reform which sought to ‘challenge the hold of Calvinism on doctrine and practice,’ whilst also backing ‘the authority of bishops and forms of ritual and church decoration that emphasised the holiness of worship.’ This was not well received in Scotland, where ‘his English church and [the anti-predestinarian] Archbishop Laud were regarded with particular suspicion’, whilst ‘in England the promotion of ceremonialism was the really divisive issue.’ Accusations of popery were rife, in part aimed at Charles himself – as Braddick notes, ‘weak Protestants... could be popish too’ – but also directed at other influences in the court. ‘The dangers of popery were (naturally enough) particularly associated with the Pope and his agents’, and ‘it was unfortunate for Charles that the popishness of his Protestantism could so easily be associated with actual Catholicism at his

49 Ibid., p. 22.
50 Ibid.
court, [since] Charles was married to a Catholic – Henrietta Maria – and under her influence his court was open to Catholic influences. The sources in which religious addictions are discussed show direct links to these contemporary concerns. In 1634, Thomas Browne translated *The historie of the life and reigne of that famous princessse Elizabeth*. In an appendix of amendments at the back, the text includes a complex anecdote about a Catholic conspiracy in the court of the then-King of Scotland, James VI: in a plot to convert the king to Catholicism, the Bishop of Dublin sent an agent to convince the spy Robert Bruce to murder the King’s loyal servant and protector, Lord Chancellor Maitland. An opportunity arose when the King and Chancellor were invited to a banquet by ‘a Nobleman of Scotland, [who was] much addicted to the Romish Religion.’ Although the event took place almost 50 years earlier, it reflects more immediate concerns over covert Catholic political influence in the court of Charles I. These concerns were expressed even more explicitly by Edward Bowles, when he wrote in 1643 of ‘men addicted to Superstition and Idolatry’, who, ‘as the King presumed them his friends, so the Pope knew they were his own.’ Similarly, in a 1641 text by William Prynne, one of the accusations levelled against the Archbishop of Canterbury was that he had ‘chosen and employed, such men to be his own Domestical Chaplains, whom he knew to be notoriously disaffected to the reformed religion, grossly addicted to popish superstition.’ During this period of heightened concern over Catholic influence, religious addiction (specifically the wrong type of religious addiction) was one of the characteristic qualities of political conspirators.

Returning to *Figure 11*, there is one object in particular which is not only the most significant, but remains so across the entire early modern period: STUDY, which is in seventh place in 1550-74, and ranks either first or second throughout the rest of the period. PLEASURE and VICE are also both ranked highly from 1575-99 onwards, and both increase steadily throughout the seventeenth century. The enduring popularity of these three objects of addiction might be because each one is in itself a broader category: there are many different types of study, vice, and pleasure to which a person could be addicted. Examining the texts themselves, it is clear that these three collocates often appear with a qualifier. Adam Harsnett wrote in 1638 that ‘Zeno having suffered shipwreck, addicted himself to the study of

---

51 Ibid., p. 23.
54 William Prynne, *The antipathie of the English lordly prelacie, both to regall monarchy, and civill unity* (1641; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
Philosophy; in 1632 Jerome Porter described Edwin, son of King Edmund, as ‘a man so beyond measure addicted to the pleasures of lust and lasciviousness’; and in 1607 Thomas Walkington warned his readers to ‘Be not addicted to this foul vice of Gastrimargisme and belly cheer.’ It is possible to get a greater sense of the different types of behaviour described by doing an additional collocate search on the results for STUDY, PLEASURE, and VICE. This reveals that, whilst the varieties of STUDY are diverse – with top results including PHILOSOPHY, LEARNING, and the SCIENCES – PLEASURE is most often linked specifically to physical or sensual pleasure. For example, in Serenus Cressy’s The church-history of Brittany, Alfrid ‘addicted himself to the study of learning’, St. Petroc ‘addicted himself to the studies of literature and the holy Scriptures’, and St. Gregory was ‘addicted to the studies of Piety.’ However, Vortigern, King of Brittany, ‘a man void both of courage and counsel’, was ‘addicted wholly to carnal pleasure.’ The term VICE was most often used, not in reference to specific behaviours, but to discuss any negative actions; the top collocates either refer to all vices (ANY, ALL), or juxtapose vice as a whole with its opposite, virtue. Lewis Bayley’s claim that ‘No man is so wicked, that he is addicted to all kind of vices’ was contradicted by many of his contemporaries, who claimed (variously) that ‘Emperor Vitellius was addicted to all sorts of Vice’, ‘Bongi or Bonze [a magician at the court of the King of Pegu, was]... addicted to all sorts of vices and abominations’, and the Abdallas (a particular religious group in Persia) is ‘lewd sort of people, addicted to all manner of vices.’ Writing in much more general terms, Alexander Hart wrote in 1640 that ‘love makes a man that is naturally addicted unto vice to be endued unto virtue’, and a 1602 translation of Josephus Flavius advised that people ‘receive judgement of honour or disgrace, according as they have addicted themselves to virtue or vice in their life times.’

---

55 Adam Harsnett, A cordiall for the afflicted Touching the necessitie and utilitie of afflictions (London, 1638; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Jerome Porter, The flowers of the lives of the most renowned saints of the three kingdoms England Scotland, and Ireland (Doway, 1632; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Thomas Walkington, The optick glasse of humors. Or The touchstone of a golden temperature, or the Philosophers stone to make a golden temper (London, 1607; EEBO-TCP Phase I). Gastrimargisme = gluttony, voracityous.

56 Serenus Cressy, The church-history of Brittany from the beginning of Christianity to the Norman conquest under Roman governors, Brittish kings, the English-Saxon heptarchy, the English-Saxon (and Danish) monarchy (Rouen, 1668; EEBO-TCP Phase II).

57 Lewis Bayley, The practice of piety directing a Christian bow to walke that he may please God (London, 1613; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Anon, God’s judgments against whoring. Vol. I being an essay towards a general history of it, from the creation of the world to the reign of Augustus (which according to common computation is 5190 years) and from thence down to the present year 1697 (London, 1697; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Adam Olearius, trans. John Davies, The voyages and travells of the ambassadors sent by Frederick, Duke of Holstein (London, 1669; EEBO-TCP Phase I).

The results in the middle indicate lemmas in window +2 to +5 across the whole corpus. The results on the right are based on a further collocation search done on those results. It shows the top three collocates within a window of +2 to +10, not including stopwords [see Appendix E For list of stopwords].

PHILOSOPHY and LEARNING are linked with addiction frequently enough to appear on Figure 11 in their own right, along with other mindful pursuits such as ASTROLOGY, CONTEMPLATION, and POETRY. With the exception of religious collocates which, as seen, were often used in a negative sense – particularly after the rise of DEVOTE as an exclusively positive alternative to ADDICT – these contemplative objects of addiction were the only laudable addictions in frequent use. Furthermore, many of the lemmas relating to these contemplative pursuits – POETRY, STUDY, LEARNING, PHILOSOPHY – peak in the final quarter-century, indicating a trend that would continue into the eighteenth century. Edward Phillips’ 1675 Theatrum poetarum includes (among others) ‘Juba, a King of Mannitania... who being a lover of Learning in general, was also particularly addicted to Poetry’, and ‘Puerilla a Roman Lady, who ... was in general esteem for her Learning and virtue, and for her addiction to Poetry.’

Juan de Mariana’s 1699 General history of Spain claims that King Alonso ‘addicted himself to Learning’, that Charles II, King of Navarre, was ‘particularly addicted to Astrology and Chemistry’, and that the King of Castile ‘was addicted to Poetry and Music.’ Jane Austen used the term in this fashion as late as the nineteenth century, writing in her 1814

---

59 Edward Phillips, Theatrum poetarum, or, A compleat collection of the poets (London, 1675; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
60 Juan de Mariana, Hernando Camargo y Salcedo, & Basilio Varen de Soto, trans. John Stevens, The general history of Spain from the first peopling of it by Tubal, till the death of King Ferdinand (London, 1699; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
novel Mansfield Park that, ‘Everybody at all addicted to letter-writing, without having much to say, which will include a large proportion of the female world at least, must feel with Lady Bertram that she was out of luck.’

It is notable that none of the top collocates for ADDICT are substances, which could have indicated an obvious trend towards the later medicalisation of addiction. However, there is a growing association between addiction and the behaviour of drunkenness, which rises from 30th place in 1625-49 to become the seventh most significant collocate by 1675-99 (see Figure 11). DRUNKENNESS first appears in the top 50 collocates for ADDICT in 1600-24, corresponding with Lemon’s observation that ‘In the proliferating anti-alcohol pamphlets contemporaneous with Shakespeare’s plays, writers deploy the term “addiction”... in a fresh manner: to describe, and deride, the phenomenon of drinking excessively.’ However, even earlier than anti-alcohol pamphlets, addiction to drunkenness was referenced in accounts of historical groups or individuals. According to a 1556 translation of Herodian, the son of the Emperor Marcus ‘would addict himself to drunkenness, and superfluous riot’, and Lodowick Lloyd’s 1573 The pilgrimage of princes describes the Thracians as ‘addicted unto drunkenness’, and writes that “To this drunkenness the Byzantians were so addicted, that they sold their lands.” Addiction was frequently part of the language used in seventeenth-century discourse on drinking; Owen Stockton’s 1682 A warning to drunkards, for example, uses the term ADDICT 23 times. As well as providing specific examples of drunkards – ‘The Babylonians were much addicted to the sin of drunkenness’ – Stockton explains that ‘A Drunkard is one that is addicted and given to the sin of drunkenness,’ that ‘It is usual with those that are addicted to this sin, to be regardless of God’s dealings, both what God doth to themselves and others’, and that ‘the longer men have been addicted to this sin, and the stronger they are to bear wine, the more woeful their condition is.” Whilst the growing association of addiction and drunkenness is undoubtedly significant, and marks an important moment in the history of addiction, it is important not to overplay the importance of the connection at too early a point in time. For seventeenth-century writers, alcohol was associated with addiction no more than study, bodily pleasure, or poetry. Addiction to drunkenness is an important element of early modern writing on addiction, but it is just one part of a much wider story.

62 Lemon, Addiction and Devotion, p. 84.
64 Owen Stockton, A warning to drunkards delivered in several sermons to a congregation in Colchester (London, 1682; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
65 Ibid.
The subjects of addiction

It is often the objects of addiction which most interest modern readers, since this is how we tend to define categories of addiction today; we talk about drug addiction, alcohol addiction, or gambling addiction, rather than women’s addictions, or addictions of the elderly. We see the object itself as having inherently addictive qualities, which in part explain why the addiction exists. It is significant that the word *addictive* did not exist in the early modern period. As will be shown in Chapters IV and V, the characteristics and qualities of the subjects themselves are far more important in early modern explanations of addiction. It is therefore an important aim of this chapter to explore the subjects of addiction quantitatively, both to gain an overview of the relationship between subject and object across the early modern period, but also to provide a foundation for the more qualitative analysis to follow.

Initially this proved problematic. As shown, collocation analysis can be used to find the objects of addiction, but it is less useful in identifying the subjects of addiction, since these are rarely identified within a specific collocate window. Non-specific pronouns like THEY, MAN, WHO, THOSE, and HE might appear near ADDICT, but the actual people or group is often named in a previous sentence or paragraph. Here is a fairly typical example from Thomas Fuller’s 1662 *The history of the worthies of England* (objects and subjects are underlined):

Sir ROBERT NAUNTON, was born in this County, of Right ancient Extraction...
[117 words later]
... He addicted himself from his youth to such studies, as did tend to accomplish him for Public employment.66

This distance means that collocation analysis cannot be used consistently to reveal the subjects of addiction.

The solution I found was to create my own data sample, and manually find and input the subject for each instance of addiction within it. The sample needed to be large enough to provide a useful overview of the subjects of addiction across the early modern period, but small enough that the data could be manually input and checked. One option was to use CQPweb to randomly select a certain percentage of the overall hits for ADDICT. This would have eliminated selection bias, but the resulting data would have had a huge number of variables for both subject and object, and there would have been no means of ensuring that the sample was representative. My preferred option was to select a fixed number of objects
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66 Thomas Fuller, *The history of the worthies of England who for parts and learning have been eminent in the several counties* (London, 1662; EEBO-TCP Phase 1).
from the collocate analysis, and include every hit for those objects. For example, STUDY appears as a collate of ADDICT 405 times – all 405 hits were exported into the data sample. Limiting the objects of addiction made it easier to analyse the results, since there were fewer variables, and there was less work involved in compiling the data since the object had already been found. Also, by selecting objects that were significant at different points in time, it was possible to have some degree of control over the chronological distribution of the data. The downside of this approach is that it does not necessarily reveal the most frequent addictions of specific people. Hypothetically, hundreds of kings could be addicted to tyranny, but the data would only reveal this if TYRANNY were on the list of pre-selected objects. Whilst it is unlikely that a really significant connection like this would go unnoticed (hundreds of hits for any single object would have shown up in the collocate search), it is an important limitation to bear in mind during the analysis.

17 objects of addiction were accordingly selected for inclusion in the sample. 14 of these were taken from the top 20 most significant collocates for the period 1550-1699: STUDY, PLEASURE, VICE, SUPERSTITION, SERVICE, DRUNKENNESS, RELIGION, HUNTING, POETRY, LEARNING, PHILOSOPHY, VENERY, ASTROLOGY, and IDOLATRY (see Figure 15). Although the collocate search was set to find lemmas, PLEASURE and PLEASURES, and VICE and VICES, were listed separately in the results. The hits for these variants have been merged. Two additional objects were chosen for inclusion because, although they were not ranked in the top 20 overall, they appear in the top 50 most significant collocates in five out of six quarter-centuries (see Figure 11). LUST, which shows a clear pattern of increasing significance from 1575 to 1650, and CONTEMPLATION, which is ranked eleventh place in 1575-99 and declines steadily over the next hundred years. The final object selected for inclusion is CEREMONY, which is ranked in the top ten for two quarter-centuries (Figure 11). Since there are fewer texts in the earlier decades, words that are only significant in the sixteenth century are likely to be obscured in the results for all-time significance.
Figure 15 showing the top collocates for ADDICT in position +2 to +5 across the whole period, with the selected objects highlighted in green

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Observed collocate frequency</th>
<th>In no. of texts</th>
<th>Log-likelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>study</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>2911.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>1910.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>1597.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>pleasure</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1021.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>wholly</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>912.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>vice</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>834.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>superstition</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>723.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>service</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>588.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>drunkennes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>570.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>537.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>hunting</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>523.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>poetry</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>498.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>pleasures</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>488.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>learning</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>431.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>philosophy</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>415.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>venery</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>396.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>astrology</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>386.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>idolatry</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>350.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>magistri</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>340.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>unto</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>331.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>party</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>314.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>312.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>lust</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>310.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>magic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>298.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>contemplation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>294.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>ceremony</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>117.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the objects were selected using a collocation window of +2 to +5, when exporting the results a window of -5 to +5 was used to maximise results. Added together, these 17 objects of addiction have a total of 2,305 hits, out of 13,074 hits for ADDICT on the corpus as a whole. These entries were exported onto a spreadsheet along with their metadata, including author name, title, date, and the context before and after the search result. The data was then cleaned, as described below, and additional information was added to each entry.67

First, duplicate entries were removed from the data set. This includes exact duplicates (for example, a sentence like ‘addicted to pleasure and vice’ would have been exported twice),
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67 Data extracted from CQPweb on 14 June 2016.
and also second editions of the same text. Some of the hits contained identical text, but under a different author name and title; these were removed only when the section containing the term ADDICT was an exact copy. In total there were 366 duplicates, reducing the spreadsheet to 1,938 entries.

Next, each entry was checked to make sure the object was correct, and additional information was added in the ‘object’ column: for example, on the specific type of study, vice, or pleasure. In 75 cases (3.8 percent), the identified collocate was not the object of addiction, but belonged to a different sentence clause. Examples can be found on the table below. In the first line, for example, the object of the addiction is ‘active life’, rather than pleasure. These instances have been left on the spreadsheet, but since they are not paired with any of the pre-selected objects, they do not contribute to the results discussed below.

Finally, the subject of addiction was found for each entry, by cross-referencing with the full transcription on the Chadwyck-Healey database. Each subject was entered into the ‘subject’ column, and also given subject-tags to indicate general characteristics. Some of the tags were chosen at the start of the data cleaning process: [male], [female], [plural], [singular], and pronouns [I], [we], [you]. Other tags were added along the way, when it became clear that a significant number of subjects were being defined by that characteristic: [named], as opposed to unnamed; [religion] e.g. Jew; [occupation] e.g. doctor; [family] e.g. the son of...; [royalty], such as kings, queens, etc.; [age] i.e. old or young; [time period] e.g. long ago; and [location]. [Quality (misc.)] refers to any other quality, for example ‘a sanguine man’, or ‘dull people’. None of these appear in sufficient quantity to merit their own tag. The tag [Conditional/abstract] refers to sentences like ‘if men are greatly addicted to...’, or ‘any one that is addicted to...’. The tag [Other] refers primarily to non-human subjects, such as dogs, gods, partridges, and nature. The full list of subject-tags and object categories are shown below, along with the total number of times each appears in the data sample.
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68 Chadwyck-Healey, ‘Home’.
Subjects were given a tag only if the criteria are specifically mentioned as a defining feature; the only exception to this was royalty. For example, ‘Henry, King of England’ would be tagged [male], [single], [named], [royalty], and [location], but ‘Henry VIII’ would be tagged as just [male], [single], [named], and [royalty], since his location is not mentioned directly in the source. The [time period] tag has been applied to subjects which specifically mention the era, such as ‘in the time of the apostles’, or ‘Christians nowadays’, but it has not been applied to historic people or groups like ‘Pharisees’ or ‘Israelites’. The [occupation] tag has been applied to members of the clergy, including priests, monks, nuns, bishops, cardinals, and popes, but it has not been applied to saints, disciples, or gods. ‘English Lords’, and ‘Lords and Ladies’, both have the [occupation] tag, but ‘Lord Crofts’ does not; in the first two examples, ‘lord’ describes their role, but in the second example it is part of their name.

There are two sets of tags that are opposites – [male]/[female] and [plural]/[singular] – which might be expected to add up to 100 percent, but in practice they rarely do. Some of the subjects are tagged as both [male] and [female] (for example, ‘man-servants and maidservants’, or ‘Ferdinand and Isabella’), and others do not specify gender at all. Likewise, some entries are tagged as both [plural] and [singular] (for example, ‘Joshua and his family’), whilst others are unclear (‘you’ could be either, so where the context is unclear it has been left untagged). The result is that [male] plus [female] tags, or [singular] plus [plural] tags, often fall short of 100 percent (or in a few cases, exceed it).
The completed sample contains 1,938 entries. CQPweb has a total of 13,074 hits for ADDICT, meaning the sample represents just under 15 percent of all results. The data is skewed towards the latter end of the seventeenth century, and has significantly more entries for the period 1650 to 1662. This closely follows the pattern found on EEBO-TCP as a whole, when not adjusted for frequency. The graph below shows the results per-year from the sample data as a percentage of the total results for ADDICT on EEBO-TCP. There is some unevenness, particularly before 1560, but in most years the sample data represents between ten percent and 20 percent of total hits.

Figure 18 showing the distribution per-year of entries on EEBO-TCP as a whole compared to the data sample

CQPweb does not hold accurate metadata on genre, but it is possible to explore text count. The 1,938 entries in the data sample come from 1,190 unique texts. The highest frequency texts on the list are Samuel Purchas’s *Purchas his pilgrimage*, and Thomas Stanley’s *The History of philosophy*, each of which accounts for 17 of the entries in the data sample.69 Next, with 15 hits each, are a translation of the complete works of Seneca, a commentary on the first two books of Genesis, and an English interpretation of Marcus Manilius’s astronomical poem,

Many of the texts list multiple authors, so the number of different writers in the data sample bears little relation to the number of texts. If only the first named author is considered, then there are 909 different authors of the 1,190 texts. Counting all named authors (including second, third, and fourth authors), there are 1,403 unique names.

An important point to note is that, due to the sampling method used, not all of the instances of ADDICT from any given text will necessarily be included on the spreadsheet. For example, Purchas’s *Purchas his pilgrimage* has 17 entries in the data sample, but the work actually contains fifty-one uses of ADDICT in total; the other uses do not co-occur with any of the 17 objects of addiction selected for the data sample. In some texts, this can mean that the vast majority of hits are absent from the sample. Nicolas Sanson’s *Cosmography and geography*, for example, has only two entries in the sample, even though the text contains the term ADDICT 80 times. This means that texts are not represented as complete works, which is problematic for any consideration of genre or authorship. Similarly, it is not possible to draw conclusions about which addictions women, or rulers, or any other group, are most often associated with, because the data is limited to specific objects; it is only possible to state which groups are most often associated with those particular addictions.

The finished spreadsheet is not intended to be representative of all hits on EEBO-TCP, and, as has been noted, it has some important limitations. However, the data provides a comprehensive insight into 17 of the most significant objects of addiction, covering the period from 1530 to 1699; it allows for detailed analysis of the relationships between those objects and the subjects addicted to them; and it allows for the identification of key topics for further study.

**Who is addicted to what?**

Using the data set described this section explores the subjects of addiction, focusing particularly on the relationship between different groups of people, and the addictions to which they were commonly linked. It reveals that addiction was often used in early modern
texts to create and enforce stereotypes, whether based on gender, religion, occupation, nationality, or another characteristic. Women were often described as addicted to religion or drunkenness; Jews and Catholics were described as addicted to idolatry; young men were thought to be addicted to lust, and old men to contemplation; and famous or ‘illustrious’ men were frequently described as addicted to study, philosophy, or other intellectual pursuits. What makes this particularly notable is that addiction today is more often associated with individuals than with groups; if a group is defined in current addiction discourse, it is usually by the object (drug addicts, gambling addicts) rather than by any characteristic of the subject. In contrast, early modern addiction – at least within this sample of writers – was determined by the identity of the subject. The section below explores the data set as a whole, picking out key themes and patterns, whilst the following two chapters explore the theoretical basis for particular types of addiction in more depth.

The first table below shows the percentage of tags appearing with other tags. Since most entries feature multiple tags, the totals add up to more than 100 percent. The pronoun tags were included from the very start of the data cleaning process, but in fact the frequency of [I], [we], and [you] subjects turned out to be low, so have been omitted from the analysis. The second table shows the connection between these groups and the different types of addiction.
Figure 19 showing the percentage of subject-tags which appear alongside other subject-tags.
Figure 20 showing the percentage of each object that is associated with each subject-tag.
Women were less likely to be named specifically than men, and they were less likely to be discussed on their own. Many of the entries for women are also tagged [male] – for example, ‘Ferdinand and Isabella being addicted to the Roman religion’ – or they are mentioned as part of a larger group, defined by a characteristic rather than a name. A surprising proportion appear alongside the [occupation] tag. Among them are nuns, who are ‘separated from the world, and addicted to an especial service of God’; a bawd (prostitute) who ‘is addicted to any Religion, or all, or none’; and man-servants and maid-servants, who are both ‘addicted to vain conversations.’ However, by far the largest category used to define women is [family], and again these women are often unnamed. Ceres had ‘a company of widows addicted specially to her service’; the wives of Antiochus ‘entreated the continuance of those religions whereunto themselves were addicted’; Laban’s daughters were ‘addicted only to the true Religion’, and so on. Women were more than twice as likely as men to be characterised by a familial relationship or status.

Just over a third of women were specifically named (compared to 60 percent of men), with the vast majority of these being classical figures. Cleopatra was addicted to pleasures and intemperance, Cynthia (aka Diana) was addicted to virginity, Porcia was addicted to philosophy, and Claudia was addicted to ‘the ceremonies of Vesta.’ A few named individuals are contemporary royalty: Queen Elizabeth was reportedly addicted to study whilst her sister Mary was described as being addicted to popish religion. There is only one instance of self-identification by a woman, and that is in the work of Margaret Cavendish, who writes that ‘leaving to our Moderns their Experimental or Mode-Philosophy built upon deluding Art, I shall addict my self to the study of Contemplative-Philosophy, and Reason
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71 Roger Coke, *A detection of the court and state of England during the four last reigns and the inter-regnum* (London, 1697; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
72 John Cowell, *The interpreter: or Booke containing the signification of words* (London, 1607; EEBO-TCP Phase II); John Taylor, *All the worikes of Iohn Taylor the water-poet Beinge sixty and three in number. Collected into one volume by the author* (London, 1630; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Elkanah Wales, *Mount Ebal level’d or redemption from the curse* (London, 1658; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
73 Howard, *A defense of the ecclesiasticall regiment*; George Downame, *A treatise concerning Antichrist divided into two bookees, the former, proving that the Pope is Antichrist, the latter, maintaining the same assertion, against all the obiections of Robert Bellarmine* (London, 1603; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Johann Crel, trans. Thomas Lushington, *The expiation of a sinner in a commentary upon the Epistle to the Hebrewes* (London, 1646; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
74 Flavius, trans. Lodge, *The famous and memorable worke of Iosephus; Thomas Rogers, Celestiall elegies of the goddesses and the Muses de-deploring [sic] the death of the right honourable and vertuous ladie the Ladie Frances Countesse of Hertford* (London, 1598; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Plutarch, trans. various, *The fifth and last volume of Plutarchs Lives Translated from the Greek by several hands* (London, 1693; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Thomas Heywood, *The generall history of vvomen containing the lives of the most holy and prophane* (London, 1657; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
75 Marcus Tullius Cicero, trans. Abraham Flemming, *A panoplie of epistles, or, a looking glasse for the unlearned* (London, 1576; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Bridges, *A defends of the government*; Peter Heylyn, *Cosmographie in four bookes: containing the chorographie and historie of the whole vworld, and all the principall kingdomes, provinces, seas and isles thereof* (London, 1652; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
shall be my guide.\textsuperscript{76}

Out of all the included objects, women were most associated with addiction to venery, religion, and drunkenness. The tone of all three was normally critical, even religious addiction, since women were often described as being addicted to the ‘wrong’ religion. Izate’s mother Helen was ‘addicted to the religion of the Jews’, Esau’s wives were ‘addicted to religions false and impious’, and a woman of Samaria was ‘too much addicted to her father’s religion.’\textsuperscript{77} As Merry E. Wiesner shows, this period has sometimes been regarded as one in which ‘western European religion was feminised.’\textsuperscript{78} She cites the rise of radical religious groups such as the Quakers, many of which ‘were inspired by or even founded by women, and had a disproportionate number of women among their followers’; Wiesner notes that, whether the ‘feminisation’ of religion was true or not, ‘this female influence was recognised by contemporaries and seen as a reason for criticism.’\textsuperscript{79} John Taylor caricatures ‘a bawd’ (a sexually promiscuous woman, or one who runs a brothel), describing her as ‘addicted to any Religion, or all, or none, no further then her ease and profit doth incite her.’\textsuperscript{80} Comments about female addiction to venery or drunkenness were similarly critical. Francis Glisson warns against hiring any wet-nurse that is ‘immoderately addicted to venery, or any ways sickly,’ and J. Srenock tells a cautionary tale about an unnamed woman who was ‘very much addicted to drunkenness, swearing, and uncleanness.’\textsuperscript{81} As with religion, these addictions can be linked to heightened concern over certain types of female behaviour. Wiesner notes that ‘judging by early modern sex manuals, female sexuality was also viewed negatively in popular opinion’, whilst Bernard Capp describes the disgust of ‘the republican Henry Neville’ who, among others, ‘railed against a new breed of immodest women who drank, diced, [and] took tobacco.’\textsuperscript{82} These concerns over women’s behaviour – whether real or imagined – were sometimes explained through humoral theory or ideas about bodily difference. According to Richard Sibbes, women are ‘more addicted to religion, by the advantage of their affection.’\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{76} Margaret Cavendish, \textit{Observations upon experimental philosophy to which is added The description of a new blazing world} (London, 1666; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
\textsuperscript{77} Flavius, trans. Lodge, \textit{The famous and memorable vworke of Iosephus; Thomas Wetherel, Five sermons, preached upon several texts by that learned and worthy divine} (London, 1635; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
\textsuperscript{78} Merry E. Wiesner, \textit{Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe} (2\textsuperscript{nd} edition, Cambridge; New York, 2000), p. 242.
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{80} Taylor, \textit{All the workes of John Taylor the water-poet}.
\textsuperscript{81} Francis Glisson, George Bate, & Assuerus Regemorter, trans. Phil. Armin, \textit{A treatise of the rickets being a disaus common to children} (London, 1651; EEBO-TCP Phase I); J. Srenock, \textit{Gods sword drawn forth against drunkards and swearer} (London, 1677; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
\textsuperscript{83} Richard Sibbes, \textit{A heavenly conference between Christ and Mary after His resurrection} (London, 1654; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
These ideas will be explored further in Chapter IV.

Overall the number of women in the spreadsheet is low: only 79 of the entries are tagged [female], compared to 916 [male]. This lack of balance is an issue not only within this data set, but with quantitative analysis as a whole, which is often used to uncover the dominant narrative or pattern rather than teasing out less visible histories. Work is needed to build more equally representative corpora to redress the balance, and to update the metadata on existing corpora to make it possible to search and filter by gender.

In contrast to women, men are usually mentioned individually, and are more likely to be named. 532 of the entries – 27 percent of the entire data set – are tagged as [single], [named], and [male]. What is more, these individually named men are overwhelmingly associated with studious or contemplative addictions such as STUDY, LEARNING, PHILOSOPHY, ASTROLOGY, and POETRY. All of these behaviours are academic, and in many of the examples, the addictions are portrayed as positive, often in biographies or collected lives of famous individuals; for some biographers, listing the addiction of their subjects was almost a routine. In his *A new history of ecclesiastical writers* Louis Du Pin writes that Didymus of Alexandria ‘particularly addicted himself to the Study of Divinity’; describes Hilary, Bishop of Arles, as ‘much addicted to the Study of Spiritual and Ecclesiastical Matters’; and criticises St. Thomas for being ‘too much addicted to apply Principles of Philosophy.’

Stanley’s *The history of philosophy* describes Thales of Miletus as ‘earnestly addicted to Astrology’; states that Phaedo ‘addicted himself diligently to Philosophy’; that Plato ‘addicted himself much to Poetry, and wrote many poems’ and also ‘addicted himself to philosophy’; and claims that in the court of Dionysius, “The Courtiers addicted themselves to Philosophy so much, that the Palace was full of Sand (wherein they drew Geometrical figures).” Thomas Glover’s *The history of the worthies of England* describes how Robert Glover ‘addicted himself to the study of heraldry’, John of Northampton ‘addicted himself to the Study of Mathematics’, whilst Hugh Broughton had an ‘addiction to the study of Greek.’ It seems that for early modern biographers, addiction was often used as a means of summarising their subject, reducing them to a single, definable, scholarly interest.

Whilst many of the entries simply refer to their subject by name, in 376 entries – 19 percent
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85 Stanley, *The history of philosophy*.
86 Fuller, *The history of the worthies of England*. 
of the data set—men are defined by their religion, occupation, age, or a familial relationship. In contrast to women, the latter is rare; just five percent of men are defined by a familial relationship, and almost all of these are father-son: ‘Neoto, youngest son of Ethelwolph’, ‘king Bladud the Son of Hardibras’, ‘Plato son of Aristo’, and so on.87 There is only one example within the data set of a man being defined by his relationship to a woman. In Rycaut’s The present state of the Greek and Armenian churches he tells the story of ‘a Christian, called Theodosa, who educated these her two Sons in Religious Piety, and laudable Sciences; but they principally addicting themselves to the studies of Physick... cured all Diseases incident to Man and Beast without Money’.88

Men are defined by their occupation far more often than their family: 12 percent of male subjects of addiction are identified in some way by their occupational role. Don Antonio, Governor of Augsburg, was ‘addicted to his own pleasure’; the Earl of Southampton was ‘wholly addicted to the Romish religion’; and Isaac Barrow, Doctor of Divinity at Trinity College, ‘addicted himself only to the study of Divinity’.89 Some professions were apparently known for having certain types of addictions. Samuel Clarke wrote that soldiers of the Turkish Empire ‘generally addicted themselves to unwonted pleasures’; Nicholas Stratford claimed that the ‘modern and unhappy clergy’ were ‘addicted to Pleasures and infamous Practices’, whilst George Clifford believed that many judges were ‘addicted to the study of worldly matters’.90

Nine percent of men are defined by their religion, and here—as with occupation—the word ADDICT is used to convey stereotypes about particular groups. Unlike occupations, there is a great deal of consistency in the descriptions of religious addictions by different authors, suggesting that some of these stereotypes were well established and—at least within this sample of early modern English writing—widely accepted. For example, the claim that Jews

87 Richard Baker, A chronicle of the Kings of England, from the time of the Romans government [sic] unto the raigne of our soveraigne lord (London, 1643; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Percy Enderbie, Cambria triumphans, or, Brittain in its perfect lustre showing the origin and antiquity of that illustrious nation (London, 1661; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Claudius Ælianus, trans. Thomas Stanley, Claudius Ælianus, his various history (London, 1666; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
88 Paul Rycaut, The present state of the Greek and Armenian churches, anno Christi 1678 written at the command of His Majesty by Paul Rycaut (London, 1679; EEBO-TCP phase I).
89 Robert Greene, Greens farewell to fully Sent to courtiers and schollers as a president to warne them from the vaine delights that drawes youth on to repentance (London, 1591; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Camden, trans. Browne, The historie of the life and reigne; John Dunton, The Young-students-library containing extracts and abridgments of the most valuable books printed in England (London, 1692; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
90 Clarke Samuel & Richard Gaywood, A geographicall description of all the countries in the known vvorld as also of the greatest and famousest cities and fabricks which have been, or are now remaining (London, 1657; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Nicholas Stratford, A discourse concerning the necessity of reformation with respect to the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome : the first part (London, 1685; EEBO-TCP Phase II); George Gifford, Eight sermons, upon the first foure chapters, and part of the fift, of Ecclesiastes. Preached at Mauldon (London, 1589; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
are addicted to idolatry was repeated by numerous authors across the early modern period. In 1579 a translation of Marnix van St. Aldegonde’s *The bee huiue of the Romishe Church* claimed that ‘Jews were addicted to idolatry’; in 1635 Thomas Taylor wrote that Jews are ‘naturally superstitious, and addicted to idolatry’; John Wilson, in 1677, wrote that ‘The Jews were a People extremely addicted to idolatry and superstition’; in 1682 Arthur Jackson described Jews as ‘too much addicted to idolatry’.91 As Eva Holmberg explains, ‘early modern English discussions of religious rituals often emphasised the need to abandon empty rituals in order to differentiate oneself from idolatry and from the Catholic Mass, which were presented as embodiments of such emptiness and lack of true devotion. Jews had been chastised for a similar emptiness, and their rituals could thus easily be compared to those of Catholics.92 Indeed, English writers often ascribed similar addictions to Catholic subjects: George Downame wrote in 1603 that the ‘Church of Rome is strangely addicted to idolatry and superstition’, and in 1643 Edward Bowles described Bishops and their agents as ‘men addicted to superstition and idolatry’.93

There are fewer [age] tags than [religion] tags, but the pattern of addiction found in them is just as striking. Objects of addiction associated with age cluster in two areas; age is mentioned in 12 percent of entries for LUST, and in ten percent of entries for CONTEMPLATION. Examining the entries, it appears that LUST is associated primarily with the young, whilst CONTEMPLATION is linked to the old. William Hinde describes a young man addicted to what he called ‘the lusts of youth’, and Henry Lukin similarly writes about young men, ‘especially such as were addicted to youthful lusts’.94 Meanwhile Thomas Twyne refers to a ‘man of ripe years... much addicted to contemplation’, and William Averill describes a good old man ‘who...
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91 Marnix van St. Aldegonde, trans. George Gilpin, *The bee huiue of the Romishe Church a com[m]entarie vpon the sixe principall pointes of Master Gentian Heruet* (London, 1579; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Thomas Taylor, *Christ revealed: or The Old Testament explained A treatise of the types and shadowes of our Saviour contained throughout the whole Scripture* (London, 1635; EEBO-TCP Phase I); John Wilson, *Cultus evangelicus, or, A brief discourse concerning the spirituality and simplicity of New-Testament worship* (London, 1677; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Arthur Jackson, *Annotations upon the whole book of Isaiah wherein first, all such passages in the text are explained as were thought likely to be questioned by any reader of ordinary capacity* (London, 1682; EEBO-TCP Phase II). See also, John Trapp, *A commentary or exposition upon all the Epistles, and the Revelation of John the Divine wherein the text is explained* (London, 1647; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Edward Fowler, *The resolution of this case of conscience whether the Church of England’s symbolizing so far as it doth with the Church of Rome* (London, 1683; EEBO-TCP Phase I); John Weemes, *An exposition of the morall lavv, or Ten Commandements of almightie God set dovvne by vvay of exercitations* (London, 1632; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Henry Lukin, *Remedy against trouble in a discourse on John XIV, 1 : wherein something is also briefly attempted for clearing the nature of faith, of justification, of the covenant of grace* (London, 1694; EEBO-TCP Phase II).


was rather addicted to contemplation." In 1606 John Carpenter wrote of men that ‘the greater part of them in their youth are wanton, licentious, addicted to diverse vain lusts, and little regard the power of God, and the holy religion the which they esteem a thing only incident to old age, wherein men be more contemplative.’ These stereotypes have their basis in humoral theory, as will be shown in Chapter IV.

As with the other subjects described here, addiction also reveals the stereotypical behaviours associated with rulers. One of these is hunting: King Bogoris of Bulgaria, James I of England, Edward I of Portugal, and King Pelagius of Asturia (among others) were all supposedly addicted to hunting. The second addiction commonly associated with kingship is PLEASURE, which is so frequent in royal descriptions that it is almost a stock phrase; the list of rulers supposedly affected includes Henry’s II and III of England, King Dagobert, Prince Wenceslas, Emperor Mahamet of the Turks, King Sardanapalus of Assyria, King Philip II of Spain, Sultan Ibrahim, and many more. So common was it that some writers made a point of mentioning when rulers were not addicted to pleasure; Richard Baker wrote of King Henry VII that ‘never any Prince was less addicted to bodily pleasures of any kind, than he.’

Studious addictions appear to have been the masculine ideal – as modelled in countless biographies of famous men – and it is notable that the addictions most associated with kings and princes were not studious but physical. Catherine Bates explains that, ‘in the careful management of the royal image, hunting was a classic and well-recognised way of presenting...’
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95 Thomas Twyne, *The schoolmaster, or teacher of table philosophie: A most pleasant and merie companion, wel worthy to be welcomed* (London, 1576; EEBO-TCP Phase I) [based on work by Theobaldus Anguilbertus. Sometimes attr. to Thomas Turvswell]; William Averell, *A shal for dainty darlings, rookt in the cradle of securitie* A glasse for all disobedient sons to looke in (London, 1584; EEBO-TCP Phase I).

96 John Carpenter, *Schedononocham, or King Solomon his solace* (London, 1606; EEBO-TCP Phase II).


courtly magnificence and, in an age of personal rule, of asserting the prowess of the prince in the most embodied way possible.100 To some extent, the bodily addictions of rulers may have been part of a cultivated self-image. However, some sources reveal anxiety or concern over such models of kingship; Edward Weston, in a 1615 advice book for princes urged them ‘to be less addicted to pleasure and ease than their meanest subjects or vassals.’101

As well as being linked to rulers, HUNTING also has a strong correlation with the [location] tag. This is partly because rulers were often defined by the country they rule, but also because hunting was frequently a component of national stereotypes. The English, Irish, Lithuanians, and Libyans, were all described as being addicted to HUNTING.102 This highlights one of the most significant uses of ADDICT in early modern writing, which was to convey cultural stereotypes based on location, nationality, or race. As with the other types of stereotypes discussed, there is often repetition between different writers, suggesting that many of these stereotypes were well-established among English writers. Northern Europeans seem to have been particularly associated with addiction to DRUNKENNESS. Johannes Boemius writes that ‘This Nation [Russia] is generally addicted to venery and drunkenness’; William Winstanley describes the Dutch as ‘addicted to that swinish vice of drunkenness’; and Charles Estienne writes that ‘by how much the Countries are the colder, by so much the more they are given and addicted to wine and drunkenness.’103 Meanwhile, ASTROLOGY was strongly linked to Persia. Anthony Munday writes that ‘they are much addicted to the study of Astrology’; Adam Olearius that ‘they are extremely addicted to Astrology’; and John Chardin that ‘their addiction to Astrology is such that they carefully conceal the Moments of their Prince’s Birth, to prevent the Casting their Nativities, where they might meet perhaps with something which they should be unwilling to know.’104 The fact that addiction could be regional opens up questions not only about cultural stereotyping, but also about the relationship between
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101 Edward Weston, The triall of Christiann truht [sic] by the rules of the vertues (London, 1615; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
102 Hinde, A faithfull remonstrance of the holy life; Marc de Vulson, trans. J. Gent, The court of curiositie wherein by the algebras and lot, the most intricate questions are resolved... to which is also added A treatise of physignomy (London, 1669; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Moses Pitt, The English Atlas (Oxford, 1680; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Giovanni Botero, trans. Robert Johnson, Relations of the most famous kingdomes and common-wealths thorowout the worl... to which is also added A treatise of physignomy (London, 1630; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
103 Boemus et. al., trans. Aston, The manners, lauues, and customes; William Winstanley, aka Poor Robin, Poor Robins character of a Dutch-man as also his predictions on the affairs of the United Provinces of Holland (London, 1672; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Charles Estienne & Jean Liébault, trans. Richard Surflet, Maisoun rustique, or The country farme· Compyled in the French tongue by Charles Steuens, and Iohn Liebault, Doctors of Physicke (London, 1616; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
104 Munday, A briefe chronicle; Olearius, trans. Davies, The voyages and travells of the ambassador; John Chardin, The travels of Sir John Chardin into Persia and the East-Indies the first volume, containing the author’s voyage from Paris to Ispahan (London, 1686; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
environment, race, and addiction. These questions are explored further in Chapter V.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter I have explored how the word *ADDICT* was used across early modern print. Quantitative methods were used to allow patterns within the texts to emerge, as opposed to letting preconceptions about addiction dictate the focus. The aim was to examine three key research questions: How did writing about addiction change over time? What were the most frequent objects of addiction? And who was most often described as being addicted to them? These are not only important questions about the nature of early modern addiction in their own right, their answers also provide the focus for the chapters that follow.

The analysis of the objects of addiction reveals that one of the two main uses of *ADDICT* – devotion to a person or god – declined dramatically from around 1625 onwards, corresponding with the introduction of the verb *DEVOTE* as a partial-synonym for *ADDICT*. As *DEVOTE* took over as the primary means of denoting a positive religious attachment, *ADDICT* became increasingly limited to non-religious or negative habitual behaviours. This discovery is in some respects the missing piece to Lemon’s account of addiction and devotion, which recognises the synonymous nature of the terms, and marks a transition from positive to increasingly negative forms of addiction, but holds back from a chronological account of this transition. Lemon writes that ‘To read a historical narrative onto these shifting, alternate views on addiction would be reductive, for it would ignore the persistent gestures towards addiction as devotion through the seventeenth century.’ The quantitative analysis of addiction confirms those ‘persistent gestures’ towards devotion, but also reveals the underlying historical trend away from them.

Examining the adverbs commonly associated with *ADDICT* reveals something of the nature of addiction in early modern print. Throughout the early modern period, *ADDICT* was used to indicate extraordinary, excessive, or extreme behaviours; yet it was also used to indicate behaviours that were natural, or even moderate. In other words, addiction was not an extreme, it was a sliding scale. This is a significant finding which reveals a much broader scope for early modern addiction than has been described previously.

The objects of addiction – the things that people are described as addicted to – were
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105 Lemon, *Addiction and Devotion*, p. 139.
examined diachronically. Aside from the decline of addiction-as-devotion, the main chronological trend is diversification; addiction was used to denote a much wider variety of behaviours in 1700 than it was in 1600. Notably, the top objects of addiction contain no substances, only behaviours, but DRUNKENNESS trends upwards throughout the seventeenth century indicating a growing connection between addiction and drinking. The most frequent and significant object of addiction, however, throughout the early modern period, was STUDY; a term that was often (although not always) used to denote laudable activities. The association of studious or intellectual pursuits with addiction continues throughout the eighteenth and into the nineteenth century, suggesting this use co-existed with the medicalised addiction model which Levine, Porter, and others ascribe to the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century. Within the early modern period, there appears to be a correlation between temporary increases in certain objects of addiction, and the concerns or anxieties of early modern writers. There is a notable spike in mostly-critical religious forms of addiction during the reign of Charles I, corresponding with a period of heightened concern over covert Catholic influence within the court, and criticism of Charles’ anti-Lutheran (and therefore ‘popish’) religious reforms.

The examination of the subjects of addiction has several significant findings, not least of which is the fact that early modern writers seem to have categorised addictions according to subject rather than object. Whereas it is common now to speak of alcohol addiction, gambling addiction, or drug addiction, early modern accounts reveal addicted caricatures and stereotypes based on the person or group who (supposedly) had the addiction. According to early modern writers, young men were addicted to lust, old men to contemplation; women were addicted to drunkenness, religion, or venery; rulers were addicted to hunting or pleasure; Jews were addicted to idolatry; illustrious men were addicted to study. Groups defined by their culture, nationality, or location, were often consistently ascribed a particular addiction. Many of these stereotypes appear to have been well established, and were often repeated by writers across the early modern period. The fact that addictions were regarded as a shared characteristic raises significant questions about how addictions were thought to form, both on an individual and a group level; these questions tie into early modern ideas about selfhood, the connection between mind and body, and the link between behaviour, environment, and ancestry.

As a final point, whilst the methods used in this chapter are predominantly quantitative, I have attempted to situate the findings within a historical context by examining particular questions or features in more depth. This is a difficult balance, and one which inevitably
leaves potentially valuable results unexplored; quantitative approaches raise more questions than they can answer, and exploring those questions through close-reading is a lengthy process which risks losing sight of the bigger picture which this chapter aims to create. Whilst there is certainly potential for much greater historicization than has been possible here, the next two chapters provide much more detailed and in-depth qualitative analysis of some of the key findings made in this chapter.
The addicted self

One of the central themes in addiction narratives – both past and present – is the self. The autonomous self and the constrained self, the self which pursues either vice or virtue, the self which is dedicated, or given over to particular pursuits. When ADDICT first appeared in English, it was often used reflexively. A 1534 translation of Desiderius Erasmus warned against letting children ‘addict them selves to any voluntary purposed living’; Richard Taverner in 1540 praised the man who ‘hath addicted himself to the service of god’; in 1548 Edward Hall described how Margaret Beaufort urged her son ‘with all speed & diligence to addict & settle his mind and... return home.’ Whilst Chapter III found that the collocation of SELF with ADDICT became less frequent over time, it also found that the addictions associated with individuals – philosophy, poetry, study – rose throughout the period, and that individually named men were the category most often described as having an addiction. There is no doubt that addiction was closely linked to self-declared or self-imposed actions and choices throughout the early modern period.

In *Addiction and Devotion* Lemon presents a model of addiction that is wholly centred on the self, tied into themes of agency and free will. She writes that ‘This project illuminates the fundamental dispersal of agency at the heart of addiction itself.’ Lemon’s addiction model encompasses two separate understandings of addiction; as a choice, and as a compulsion. These understandings, she argues, are ‘not solely oppositional.’ Rather ‘both meanings of addiction appear in the early modern period’, and ‘what unites these apparently opposed discourses is a shared emphasis, both rhetorical and experiential, on addiction as an
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1 Erasmus, trans. anon, *Ye dyaloge called Funn*; Taverner, *The principal lawes customes and estatutes of England*; Hall, *The vnion of the two noble and illustre famelies.*
2 Lemon, *Addiction and Devotion*, p. xii.
overthrow of the will. The centrality of the self in Lemon’s narrative echoes discussions surrounding addiction today, which often focus on the complex interplay between the addict and the addictive object. Lemon describes this relationship best when she compares it to her own experience of motherhood, writing that ‘I lived in a state of compulsion, pushed from the outside and pulled from the inside.’ According to Lemon, the addictive object tempts, and the addict chooses, but the resulting addiction is overwhelmingly one of compulsion; ‘To be an addict demands the simultaneous exercise and relinquishment of the will, a paradoxical and challenging combination. One must consent to give up consent, and banish the will, to addict oneself fully.’ She writes that the addict is paradoxically ‘willing away his own will.’ Lemon’s discussion of free will is framed in very modern terms, with the addict on one side, and the addictive object on the other. However, the fact that neither of these words entered the English language until the nineteenth century suggests they were not key to earlier concepts of addiction. In early modern accounts the ‘pull’ of addiction does not come from the object of the addiction, but from internal forces within the subject; addiction is thus an expression of inner self, rather than a means of losing the self. Furthermore, whilst Lemon’s addict wills away their own will, early modern descriptions of the function of the will make it clear that it cannot be turned on or off; in the words of John Locke, the will will will, ‘whether he will will or no.’

The terminology surrounding mind, heart, brain, and soul is problematic, as the terms were used differently by different early modern writers. Pierre de La Primaudaye, for example, allocated some features of the soul to the heart and others to the brain: memory ‘hath his seat by good right assigned him in the midst of the brain, as in the highest & safest fortress of the whole frame of man’, but ‘the will & affections, [are] comprehendeth under the name of heart.’ La Primaudaye used brain and mind interchangeably, often writing about the ‘hearts and minds of man.’ Meanwhile, René Descartes believed all the functions of the soul were carried out by a small ‘kernel’ at the centre of the brain. ‘I have plainly found out, that that part of the body wherein the soul immediately exercises her functions is not a jot of the heart; nor yet all the brain, but only the most interior part of it, which is a certain very small

---

3 Ibid., p. x.
4 Ibid., p. 166.
5 Ibid., p. xii.
6 Ibid., p. 85.
7 John Locke, An essay concerning humane understanding microform (London, 1690; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
9 Ibid.
kernel, situated in the middle of the substance of it. In this chapter it is the functions of heart, soul, and brain that are of interest – the will, reason, understanding, the passions, and so on – rather than the debate about their location. To avoid confusion, I have used MIND to encompass all of them, referring to specific parts – SOUL, HEART, BRAIN – only when the distinction is relevant and specified by the author themselves.

This chapter explores the role of the self in early modern concepts of addiction. In it, I set out to understand how contemporaries understood addiction to be formed within the processes of the mind, and how it related to contemporary ideas about habit, free will, virtue and vice, pleasure, and disposition. I put forward a model in which addictions are normal, habitual, everyday behaviours; where the noun *addict* is not needed because every person has addictions, and where the ‘pull’ of addiction comes not from the addictive qualities of the object, but from the internal disposition of the subject, in relation to external phenomena. In other words, this chapter develops an addiction model rooted in early modern descriptions of the mind, and early modern accounts of human behaviour.

Whereas previous chapters have used scalable reading to explore topics using combined methods, this chapter performs close readings of canonical writers, contextualised by linguistic analysis. I rely on La Primaudaye’s *Academie Française*, which consists of four lengthy volumes of moral, natural, and Christian philosophy, written and published in France between 1578 and 1608. The first book was translated and printed in English in 1586, with the next two following in 1594 and 1601. All four English volumes appeared as a single publication in 1618. Anne Lake Prescott calls it a ‘four-part quasi-encyclopaedia... on how a Christian might lead a good life’, which explores ‘first the little world – the body and psyche – through which that life is lived, and then the larger world God made for humankind, and last the largest world of all: eternity.’ Dana Jalobeanu describes the work as ‘eclectic and massive’; a neo-stoic version of Pierre Viret’s *Instruction Chrestienne*, ‘supplemented by certain elements of the nascent discipline of natural history.’ La Primaudaye’s sources for the *French Academy* are various. Aristotle is referenced more than 150 times in the whole work, and Plato and Socrates are not far behind. Parts of it follow Pliny’s *Historia naturalis*, but –
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10 René Descartes, trans. unknown, *The passions of the soul in three books the first, treating of the passions in general, and occasionally of the whole nature of man. The second, of the number, and order of the passions, and the explication of the six primitive ones. The third, of particular passions* (London, 1650; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
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according to Jalobeanu – also reveal the clear influence of Seneca’s *Naturales quaestiones*.\(^{13}\) Despite this, La Primaudaye is often highly critical of classical philosophers. Jalobeanu refers to the work as being ‘not only a school of wisdom, but also a battlefield’, in which the enemies are ‘the “Epicures and Atheists” and their modern followers. Chief amongst the “Epicures” are Pliny and Lucretius, Aristotle, Averroes, and the Arab philosophers.’\(^{14}\) On La Primaudaye’s side is the ‘true Christian philosopher’, backed up by scripture; La Primaudaye’s 159 references to Aristotle pale in comparison to his mentions of Saint Paul (216), and Jesus (447). In other words, the concept of addiction depicted within the *French Academy* – and its relationship to mind, body, and action – do not represent the work of any single school, but rather a diverse collection of knowledge gathered together under a Christian banner.

La Primaudaye’s work was chosen as the focus of this chapter for three reasons. First, it deals extensively with the subject matter: of addiction, habitual behaviour, virtue and vice, disposition, and the interactions between these different functions and elements. Second, it echoes established ideas and concepts, ‘gathering into one educational text varied evidence from other books’, rather than contributing anything radical or new. As Prescott puts it, ‘encyclopaedias are not meant to be original.’\(^{15}\) Whilst the format is ostensibly a dialogue, in practice the different voices rarely (if ever) disagree; their role is to break up the flow of information, not to introduce controversy. Third, the book was widely read and popular across Europe, but particularly in England. Jalobeanu writes that it ‘went through a large number of editions in French, English and Italian’, and that it ‘might have been an important source of “facts” and “stories” for the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean drama.’\(^{16}\) Cis Van Heertum writes that the work ‘had a considerable reputation, both in France and, judging from the number of English editions, also in England.’\(^{17}\) It would not be unreasonable to claim that La Primaudaye’s work was relevant, representative, and influential, within a certain segment of European intellectual culture.

The relevance of La Primaudaye’s work to this analysis of addiction was uncovered in the process of researching my third chapter. The data sample used for examining the subjects of addiction features 14 hits from his work, mostly for addictions to study, vice, and contemplation; overall, the 1618 collected translations of his works uses *ADDICT* 41 times.
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\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 218.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., pp. 219-20.

\(^{15}\) Prescott, ‘Pierre de la Primaudaye’s French Academy’, p. 160.


making it the eleventh most frequent text out of the 1,190 in the Chapter III data set. The other three sources consulted for this chapter are markedly different, not only from La Primaudaye but also from the other texts discussed so far in the thesis. Whereas previous works have been chosen for their use of the word ADDICT, and are often titles and authors that are relatively obscure, the next three writers were chosen because they are canonical philosophers whose work explores some of the key concepts underpinning human behaviour. None of them discuss addiction in direct terms, but they are often considered the definitive works on free will, selfhood, and the actions of the mind, in early modern Europe; in other words, they contain extensive discussion of various topics that addiction, for contemporaries, related to.\textsuperscript{18}

The three authorities (besides La Primaudaye) consulted for this chapter are René Descartes, Thomas Hobbes, and John Locke. Writing a few decades after La Primaudaye, Descartes was a French philosopher who is often considered the father of modern Western philosophy.\textsuperscript{19} His \textit{Les passions de l’âme} was printed in English translation in 1650 as \textit{The passions of the soule}, with sections dealing specifically with functions of the soul, the will, and the means by which excess passion can become habit. John Locke and Thomas Hobbes were both English philosophers published in the mid- to late-seventeenth century. Whilst Hobbes is best known for his political philosophy, his 1656 \textit{Elements of philosophy the first section, concerning body} contains his views on habit, the passions, and the will; ideas which he further developed in his 1684 work, \textit{Humane nature}. Locke’s political philosophy was underpinned by a philosophy of mind and body, and his work on the self directly contrasts with that of Descartes – particularly his views on the sources of human knowledge.\textsuperscript{20} His 1690 \textit{An essay concerning humane understanding} describes, among other things, the principal actions of the mind, one of which is volition or the act of willing; he focuses on the extent to which the will is free, and the reasons why it sometimes pursues evil. His 1693 \textit{Some thoughts concerning education} explains how good habits can be created, whilst his 1690 \textit{Two treatises of government} contains discussion on the free will (or otherwise) of women and children.\textsuperscript{21} Comparing the work of Descartes, Hobbes, and Locke to that of La Primaudaye, gives a sense not only of established

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{18} For example, Anthony Gottlieb, \textit{The Dream of Enlightenment: The Rise of Modern Philosophy} (New York, 2016), which begins with chapters on Descartes, Locke, and Hobbes.
\item\textsuperscript{19} For example, Roger Scruton describes Descartes as ‘the principal founding father of modern philosophy.’ Roger Scruton, \textit{A Short History of Modern Philosophy: From Descartes to Wittgenstein} (2nd edition, London; New York, 1995).
\item\textsuperscript{20} Locke, \textit{An essay concerning humane understanding}. Locke argues that there are no innate principles of knowledge.
\item\textsuperscript{21} John Locke, \textit{Two treatises of government in the former, the false principles and foundation of Sir Robert Filmer and his followers are detected and overthrown} (London, 1690; EEBO-TCF phase I); John Locke, \textit{Some thoughts concerning education} (London, 1693; EEBO-TCF Phase I).
\end{itemize}
understandings of addiction at the end of the sixteenth century, but also some of the challenges and changes which took place in concepts relating to discourses of addiction over the course of the seventeenth century.

**Habit**

To be addicted to something in an early modern context was to actively and physically partake in it; however, the processes which determined that activity took place within the mind. Addiction was thus the outward expression of mental processes. The seventeenth century saw several challenges to established notions about the mind, and the mechanisms which determine action. The work of La Primaudaye, published in French from 1578 onwards, articulated one of the models which later philosophers contested, and is explored here in depth.

In early modern accounts, addiction, like all human action, was determined by the will. The will, according to La Primaudaye, was ‘that power of desiring’; it was the part of the soul which decided whether to pursue a particular course of action or behaviour. La Primaudaye believed that the will was a free agent which could not be forced or limited. ‘Our Will is at liberty and free, and cannot be constrained...otherwise it should not be a Will.’ Even if a person was prevented from carrying out their will, ‘yet their Will, if we consider the matter well, is neither hindered, forced or constrained. For that keeps it not from willing still that which it pleases.’

And whilst the will was guided by reason, La Primaudaye writes, ‘Nevertheless it is not so subject thereunto, as that it may compel it to follow all the reasons that are propounded unto it by reason, or tie it to any of them, but that always she hath her liberty to make choice of which reason she please, out of all those that are set before her.’

Nevertheless, according to La Primaudaye, the will operated within certain limitations, which restricted or hampered its ability to choose freely. First, in his view the will, like all the functions of the soul, only had the ability to pursue good. La Primaudaye wrote that ‘there are two actions of will, whereof the first is that inclination to good by which it embraces the same, and the second is the turning aside from evil.’ Second, the will could only deal in absolutes. ‘The actions thereof are to Will, and not to Will: and the mean or middle thing

23 Ibid., book 2, chapter 41.
24 Ibid., book 2, chapter 34.
which she hath between them twain, is to suspend her action, until she decline either on the one side or on the other. In the long term, the will could not choose this ‘middle thing’ of inaction, but had to make a choice. This restriction meant that the will could not determine the strength of an addiction; it could only decide within each instance whether to pursue it or not.

In essence, whilst La Primaudaye regarded the will as immediately responsible for addiction, he did not see it as an independent agent, but rather as a gatekeeper between mind and action. According to him, there were three functions which determined the actions chosen by the will. He wrote that ‘the Philosophers made three chief principles and beginnings that affect men’s actions, namely, powers; habits, or qualities; & affections, or passions.’ Habits ‘are gotten by a long and continual custom of doing good or evil’, and are strengthened through repetition. The affections – a concept similar to emotion, but one that included desire – introduced the capacity for vice through their ability to overrule reason. The third category – powers – included disposition/inclination, and provided a means of explaining the impact of a wide variety of internal and external qualities on human behaviour.

Habit is of particular importance to understanding early modern addiction, because addiction was associated specifically with habitual behaviours rather than one-off acts. This was true from the first appearances of the word in the early sixteenth century. In 1530 George Joye wrote that the Israelites ‘were addict & married unto Baal Peor’, Thomas Becon in 1543 that ‘many are so addict to customs & old usages now a days’, and the 1549 Book of Common Prayer described those who are ‘so addicted to their old customs’. Throughout all four books La Primaudaye uses the term ADDICT exclusively to describe repeated actions. He writes that intemperance proceeds ‘until men are wholly addicted and given over to vice’, and that the Assyrian King Sardanapalus was ‘so addicted to lust and intemperance, that he stirred not all day long from the company of women.

La Primaudaye made the relationship between addiction and habit explicit in a chapter titled ‘Of four things to be considered in the Will’. He argues that habit was not a person’s
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27 Ibid.
behaviour, but rather the processes which occurred within their mind to produce that behaviour. He describes ‘how by this faculty [of understanding] it [the mind] doth not only know simple and particular things as beasts do, but also compounds and joins them together: how it compares one with another, separates them and discourses upon them: finally, how it judges, and either approves or refuses them. All which things are actions of the mind.’

This process – the series of actions that result in a judgement – can be over swiftly, or it can linger and repeat. ‘Now if these actions be sudden, and pass lightly, so that the mind doth not stay in them, nor acquaint it self with them, the bare & simple name of action belongs to them. But if the mind doth one and the same thing often, muses much upon it, calls it often to memory, and accustoms itself thereunto, so that it is in a manner imprinted in it, and thereby the mind becomes prompt and ready in regard of the long continuance therein, then do these actions take the name of habit.’ When the actions of the mind were brief or rare, the judgement was passed to the will, and a desire was formed, expressed, and extinguished. However, when the same judgement was reached repeatedly it became a habit: the will addicted itself to whatever the judgement recommended, and the actions of the mind changed to make it easier to keep reaching that judgement. In other words, even if the addiction began as an act of volition, the nature of habit made it increasingly difficult for the will to choose otherwise. As La Primaudaye explains, ‘habit... is bred by the often repeating and reiterating of the same things. Whereby the mind is made more fit and apt to perform those exercises, unto which they have addicted themselves, and wherein they have continued.’

The difference between habit and addiction is clear in the grammar La Primaudaye used: the noun HABIT described a process that existed in the mind, whilst the verb ADDICT indicated the action that proceeded from it.

The purpose of habit was to make the pursuit of good easier. ‘How hard soever it be to our flesh to follow after a virtuous, honest, and sober life, yet custom will make it easy to overpass, as likewise to forsake that which is contrary unto it.’ In practice a bad habit was formed in much the same way as a good one, and once in place it became easier and easier for the will to pursue vice. What habit could not explain was, since the will was only able to choose good, how were sinful behaviours pursued in the first place? In order to explore this, we must examine the other functions which La Primaudaye believed informed the will.
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Affections

The purpose of the affections, according to La Primaudaye, was to push the heart towards pleasure; to ‘prick it forward to the desire of pleasure, and... minister pleasure unto it.’ The affections played a fundamental role in determining human action, particularly when that action was considered morally reprehensible; they were the internal force which had the ability to overpower the soul’s innate propensity for good. However, all things being correct, the affections were supposed to be governed by reason and understanding, so that any impulse to sin could be overruled before it became an action. Furthermore, like the other elements of the heart and soul, their natural purpose was virtuous. For sinful addictions to form, two things must happen. First, the natural virtuous affection must become corrupted, and turn instead towards vice. Second, the affections must become strong enough to overpower reason and judgement.

La Primaudaye wrote that, ‘the natural affections of the heart... should be no sin at all unto men, but a benefit given them of God in the perfection of their nature.’ After all, ‘the affections proceed from the heart, [which] is a seat of that love which we ought to bear as well towards God, as towards men, which comprehends the whole law of God and all justice.’ However, they could become corrupted and pursue sinful pleasures instead of virtuous ones. This corruption or perversion of the affections was linked to inclination, which will be discussed fully in the next section. Briefly however, the type of pleasure a person pursued was determined by their own individual inclination or disposition. La Primaudaye wrote that, ‘God hath given to all his creatures a natural inclination, that leads every one of them to that which is natural and agreeable to it self.’ These inclinations, which ought to be towards good, could become corrupted: ‘Now if these inclinations be well guided, they are goodly seeds of virtues, but if they be not well ordered and ruled, they corrupt and degenerate, yea they turn into the vices that are contrary to those virtues.’ This could occur through excess – as when severity turned the virtue of justice into the vice of cruelty – or through sin, as when ‘the inclinations and natural affections of our soul... are turned into vices & into their seeds, through that corruption which sin brings unto them.’

However, even when an affection inclined towards vice it should still not result in sinful
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action, because the will should listen first and foremost to reason and understanding. La Primaudaye explains that whereas the affections reside in the heart, the faculties of knowing – reason, understanding, and judgement – inhabit the brain, ‘for God hath lodged the understanding & reason in the brain of man, as it were in a high tower, in which it ought to reign as a Queen and Princess.’ La Primaudaye explains that whereas the affections reside in the heart, the faculties of knowing – reason, understanding, and judgement – inhabit the brain, ‘for God hath lodged the understanding & reason in the brain of man, as it were in a high tower, in which it ought to reign as a Queen and Princess.’

The Will doth not follow after or refuse any thing, which the Judgement hath not first determined to be good or evil: and the Judgement decrees nothing before it hath taken advice of Reason. Understanding ‘determines and judges what is true and what false, what good and what evil. Then doth the Will choose that which is good, and refuses the evil. However, whilst the normal motion of the affections was gentle enough to be easily ruled, they had the capacity to become agitated. Some affections ‘are so violent, that they altogether trouble the soul, even in such a vehement manner, that they drive her from the seat of judgement.’

La Primaudaye ascribed a separate name to these violent affections in order to distinguish them from gentle ones (although elsewhere he used the term ‘affection’ to describe both types). ‘Therefore these two first kinds of motions are properly called affections, and the other that are so violent are termed Commotions and Perturbations. For they bring a kind of blindness with them.’ He likened them to a furnace throwing out thick, blackening smoke: ‘the mind, reason and memory may be troubled by the affections of the heart, which resembles a fiery furnace, & is like to a thick smoke ascending out of a great fire which would dim the eyes & make them as it were blind. And when the light of the mind is thus darkened, reason cannot discourse so well, nor judgement judge so uprightly, nor memory retain so firmly, or bring forth so readily that which it hath kept.’

Nor was it just reason and judgement that were affected: ‘the Will is much more troubled by this fire of affections that heats and kindles it, whereby it is made a great deal more untoward to follow the counsel & advise of reason.... And when these two principal parts & powers of the soul are thus troubled and moved, it is no marvel if man forget God & himself, and if with all his soul and body he turn aside from that which he ought to follow after.’ Strong affections could cloud judgement and understanding, and turn the will away from reason. It is important to note that La Primaudaye considered the will an active participant in the pursuit of sin; affections could cloud judgement and make the will ignore
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reason, but ultimately the will was still making the choice which it – wrongly – believed to be the right one. ‘If it so fall out, that the will give place to the appetite, it is always with her consent, and that because she agrees rather unto the sensual appetite then unto Reason. Which agreement proceeds...because she hath not patience to stay for the better, but rushes upon that pleasure, which at that present seems best unto her and nearest at hand.’

Disposition

As discussed, there were three factors which, according to La Primaudaye, contributed to human action: habit, affection, and power. Habit pushed for the repetition of established behaviours, whilst affection and the motions of the heart introduced the capacity for sin. There was considerable overlap between these two categories, since ‘when the actions of an affection are grown to be habits, then are they called either virtues or vices, according as they are well or ill done.’ In general, the affections pushed the heart towards pleasure. However, the type of behaviour that an individual found pleasurable differed from person to person, as determined by their powers, or disposition. La Primaudaye wrote that ‘Concerning powers, they come to us by nature, and are effective principles of all actions both good & bad, yea by them we know in children, during their young years, the signs and tokens of some virtue or vice, that will reign most in them afterwards, which we commonly call, Inclination orDisposition.’ The basis for understanding this category of powers is humoral theory, upon which the concept of inclination or disposition is based.

The humoral system was the dominant medical theory throughout the early modern period, and was based on the belief that the body contained four humours – blood, phlegm, black bile, and yellow bile – which existed in a perfect balance unique to each individual. Humoral theory was holistic, and the humours corresponded with other qualities (hot, cold, wet, dry), seasons (spring, summer, autumn, winter), elements (earth, wind, air, fire), and many more, effectively blurring the lines between the body, the mind, and the physical world. It was understood that a person’s humoral state dictated not just the physical condition of their body, but also their temperament: whether sanguine, melancholic, phlegmatic, or choleric. Each temperament came with particular personality traits, and corresponded with specific affections and behaviours. ‘As the bodies of men are compounded of the qualities of heat,
cold, moisture, and dryness, so among the affections some are hot, others cold; some moist, others dry, and some mingled of these diverse qualities. So that every one is most subject to those affections that come nearest to the nature, temperature, and complexio

of his body.\textsuperscript{50} To give specific examples: ‘When there is excess of the phlegmatic humour in men, their natures are commonly slothful, they shun labour and give themselves to bodily pleasures.... And if there be an excess of choleric humour, their natures are easily provoked and stirred up to wrath... they are fierce in assailing, but inconstant in sustaining the assault.'\textsuperscript{51} If the sanguine ‘complexion be not moderated and well guided, it will easily pass measure in every affection, so that it will fall into foolish and unlawful loves, into excessive and unmeasurable joys, and into prodigality instead of following liberality.'\textsuperscript{52} The humours ‘may be seeds and provocations, either to virtues or to vices, according to that correspondence which is between the bodies & the soul, and the temperature of the one with the affections of the other.'\textsuperscript{53}

Temperament was largely determined at birth – or even earlier, in the womb – but disposition was not a fixed quality. Instead, it varied depending on a whole host of external and internal qualities. La Primaudaye wrote, ‘Now concerning those things, which chiefly cause this great diversity, we have first to consider of the composition, complexion and disposition of mans body, whether it be sound, or whether it be sick. Also the Age, strength, or weakness, the perfection or imperfection thereof, common custom, the present disposition of voting qualities engendered by nourishment, time and place, with those actions and things that may outwardly happen to the body.’ Also, he adds, ‘the teaching and instruction which it hath had, what opinions are already rooted in it, and what persuasions have forestalled it, as also how far the behaviour, custom & authority of others can prevail with it. For all these things greatly trouble the minds of men, and procure not only diversity, but also contrariety of opinions, sentences and wills of men, which causes them to change and rechange so often.'\textsuperscript{54}

One striking example of the variability of disposition is the effect of consumption. Unsurprisingly, writers made connections between intoxicating substances and behavioural changes; La Primaudaye writes that an excess of wine, ‘makes men quarrellers, wranglers, rash, incensed, furious, dice-players, adulterers, homicides, in a word addicted to all vice, and
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dissolution.’ However, animal-derived products could also alter behaviour because disposition could be passed on through consumption. As Aristotle’s manual of choice secrets – a book on midwifery – explains, ‘take this for a Rule, That whatever any Creature is addicted unto, they stir up the same quality in the Man or Woman that Eats them. And therefore Partridges, Quails, Sparrows, &c. being extremely addicted to Venery, work the same effect in those Men and Women that Eat them.’ Similarly an anonymous 1677 work explained that the Emperor Tyberius was ‘excessively addicted’ to drinking, ‘by reason of his Nurse who suckled him; who her self was an excessive and unmeasurable drinker.’

Humoral theory provided a framework for understanding differences in human behaviour, and for linking those differences to a host of internal and external factors. Disposition – which was influenced by temperament, age, climate, diet, health, and more – determined both the types of affection someone was prone to, and the types of behaviour they were inclined towards. However, it is important to remember that an inclination towards a particular behaviour did not necessarily result in an addiction. Following Primaudaye’s argument, in order to form an addiction, a disposition must either be accepted by the faculties of the mind (reason, understanding, and judgement) or – in the case of sinful addictions – it must generate an affection strong enough to overpower the mind. An illustration of this can be found in an anecdote told about the Greek philosopher Socrates. According to the story – which is recounted by Cicero – Socrates was once accused by the physiognomist Zopyrus of having a long list of vices including addiction to women. Socrates’ disciples mocked and ridiculed Zopyrus for his absurd claim until Socrates actually came to his defence, confessing that he was in fact naturally inclined to the vices listed by Zopyrus, but did not act upon those inclinations. Cicero writes of the incident that ‘it is possible that these defects may be due to natural causes; but their eradication and entire removal, recalling the man himself from the serious vices to which he was inclined, does not rest with natural causes, but with will, effort, training.’
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Variables

As stated, there were an almost unlimited number of variables which could affect disposition. I want to discuss two which were particularly significant: age and morality.

La Primaudaye described the changes caused by age in detail. There were six distinct ages – infancy, childhood, youth, adolescence, virility, and old age – and in each, inclination and capacity for pleasure differed. In adolescence, from ages 14 to 28, La Primaudaye writes that ‘the nature of man is known, and whereunto he bends his mind.’ This was the age to establish good habits, because ‘the studies unto which we addict our selves in the time of our adolescence... declare what virtue there will be in time of ripeness.’ However, this was also an age of great risk, ‘For the inclination to pleasures, and the eschewing of labour, which are natural in man, commonly begin then to assault him with such violence, that if young men be not well followed, they quickly turn to vice.’ Adolescents were considered particularly susceptible to corporeal pleasures, and could become ‘like beasts [that] seek for nothing but to satisfy their lustful desires.’ The next age was virility, which lasted from 29 to 49, and ‘ought to be full of honesty and virtue, and to bring forth the effects of prudence, temperance, fortitude and justice.’ A person who had failed to establish good habits in adolescence could nevertheless gain them in the age of virility, for ‘there is good time and season, yea opportunity of great fruit, to profit in learning & virtue, so that he cannot allege this excuse, that he was not instructed in youth.’ Finally old age, which started at 50, was a time to focus on the soul rather than the body. ‘At this age the natural power and strength of man begins to decline & fade away’, but ‘the desire of contemplation and knowledge increases as much as the pleasures of their body decrease.

It is notable that, in the data from Chapter III, the two objects of addiction most frequently associated with the [age] tag are those of the idealised and of the unrefined adolescent: contemplation, and lust. Youthful addiction to study was often remarked upon in biographies of famous men, not only because it indicated a lifelong pursuit, but also because it was doubly virtuous; first, as the purest form of pleasure possible, and second, because it meant that reason and understanding were strong enough to overrule the youthful inclination to lust. In
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Anthony Wood’s book of famous people educated at Oxford, he often commented on the young age at which their addiction began: ‘JOHN RYCKS [was] much addicted in his Youth to Piety and Learning’; ‘JOHN HILSEY... [was] much addicted from his Childhood to Learning and Religion’; and ‘JOHN STANYWELL ... [was] much addicted to learning and religion when a Youth.’\(^{65}\) Marcus Manilius wrote his biographies of astronomers in a similar style: ‘JOHANNES PIERIUS VALERIANUS... being but yet young and much addicted to Astronomical Studies’; ‘TYCHO BRAHE ... even from his Childhood being addicted to Astronomical Studies, though diverted from them by the Advice of his Friends’; and ‘SIXTUS ab HEMINGA ... an excellent Astronomer, in his Youth much addicted to Judiciary Astrology.’\(^{66}\)

These praiseworthy individuals were set against a backdrop of youthful pleasure and vice, which was described in considerable detail in works like Thomas Gouge’s *Young man’s guide*. His chapter titles include the following:

‘CHAP. XII. Sheweth the Vices whereunto Young Men are addicted. One is Rash and hasty Anger’,
‘CHAP. XIII. Of Drunkenness, which is another Vice, whereunto Young Men are addicted’,
‘CHAP. XIV. Of Wantonness and Uncleanness, which is another Vice whereunto Young Men are addicted’,
‘CHAP. XVI. Of Lying, which is another Vice whereunto Young men are addicted’, and
‘CHAP. XVII. Of Back-biting, or Tale-bearing, which is another Vice whereunto Young Men are addicted.’\(^{67}\)

In a heartfelt plea at the end of the book Gouge urges his reader, ‘from your Youth, addict your selves to the reading of the Scriptures, which are able to make you wise unto Salvation.’\(^{68}\)

The second variable which I want to discuss is moral status; a quality which La Primaudaye considered to be innate, and which he linked directly with human behaviour. La Primaudaye wrote that the type of pleasure a person inclined towards was determined in part by their moral status; whether they were vile and base, prudent and wise, or somewhere in between.

‘The baser and more vile sort of people, and such as are most rude and ignorant, are more moved by corporeal and external things... But with prudent and wise men, and such as are more spiritual, it is otherwise. So that as every ones nature is more noble and excellent, or
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more vile and abject... so is the delight.\textsuperscript{69} La Primaudaye sketched out a hierarchy of pleasures from the lowest bodily pleasure to the highest spiritual one. ‘Now among those delights which a man may take by the bodily senses, the basest & most abject of all, is that which is received by the sense of touching.’ Touch is followed by taste – ‘a little more honest and less contemptible, and yet is it brutish enough’ – smell, hearing, and finally sight, ‘because the eyes are of the nature of the fire, which comes nearest to the celestial nature.’\textsuperscript{70} Above corporeal pleasures were those of the fancy, ‘namely the getting and possessing of silver, of riches, of power, of honours, and of glory’, and above those were the various pleasures of the soul: ‘For those which appertain to the nourishing and generative powers, are more corporeal, earthy and brutish, than those that belong to the vital parts & to the heart. And those that are proper to the spirit and mind, are purest and best of all among which that delight that is in contemplation is the chiefest.’\textsuperscript{71} The best and worst pleasures on La Primaudaye’s list correspond with the most frequent objects of addiction found in the analysis of Chapter III; the purest pleasures of the spirit – contemplation, study, philosophy, learning, religion – and the basest pleasures of the body – drunkenness, venery, and lust. Thus, it appears that whilst addiction was not always an extreme behaviour – as Chapter III shows, it was possible to be moderately addicted, as well as excessively so – addiction was associated particularly with pleasures found at two extremes of a moral spectrum.

According to La Primaudaye, corporeal and spiritual addictions were mutually exclusive. He noted that ‘they that are addicted to corporeal pleasures, have less knowledge and feeling of those that are spiritual; and contrariwise they that delight in spiritual pleasures abstain from those that are corporeal. For these delights are in continual combat one against another... because they are contraries.’\textsuperscript{72} This conflict occurred within each person, so that those ‘that are addicted to the service of their bellies... care nothing for the food of their minds’. But conflict also occurred between people with different addictions, since ‘Such men as are addicted to these other more base and earthly pleasures, mock and deride them that condemn their delights, and make so great account of these spiritual and heavenly pleasures.’\textsuperscript{73}

La Primaudaye noted another key difference between corporeal and spiritual pleasures. The pleasures of the body were wearisome and unsustainable, requiring long recovery periods,
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‘For how insatiable soever they be, yet can they not but be glutted therewith: neither are they able to continue their unruliness so long in that pleasure.’74 Thus the glutton, drunkard, or wanton (lustful person) tired quickly, and could not sustain the pursuit of their pleasure for long periods, yet was also left unfulfilled, since corporeal pleasures ‘commonly bring with them more irksomeness & loathing then joy & pleasure: leaving many times behind them a long & shameful repentance.’75 Once they had recovered from this weariness they returned immediately to their addiction, since ‘for the doing whereof he needs no external aid, but only that all lets and impediments should be removed and taken out of the way.’76 In contrast, since the mind is constantly active, ‘the spirit needs no space of time wherein to intermit his pleasures’ and is continually occupied by the pursuit of its pleasure.77 Since addictions of the fancy – ambition, covetousness, greed – do not weary the soul, ‘the more she hath, the more her delight increases, and becomes insatiable.’78 This was even more true of the pleasures of reason, ‘because the spirit is not weary or tired, but is recreated and refreshed.’79 As a result the only way to end a bad addiction of the mind was to ‘so change the matters about which it is to be employed, that they be good and honest’; to replace one addiction with another.80 On the other hand, a good addiction, once established, was easy to maintain.

Seventeenth-century philosophers

Many elements of La Primaudaye’s account of addiction were echoed throughout the seventeenth century. The habitual quality of addiction remained consistent; Owen Stockton in his 1682 Warning to drunkards wrote that ‘A drunkard is one that is given, addicted, accustomed to the sin of drunkenness, one that is frequently drunk. Noah was once overtaken with drunkenness, but he was no drunkard, he was not addicted and accustomed to this sin.’81 Sinful addictions continued to be regarded as products of the will. In a 1692 discourse William Pelling wrote that wilful sins are ‘of two sorts, Habitual, or Occasional. Habitual Sins are such as are the general Tenor and Course of ones Life; which he allows himself in, and gives himself up to, and usually follows as his common Trade and Way. As, when ill Men accustom themselves to Prophane the Holy Name of God, or addict themselves
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to Drunkenness.  

Similarly in 1655 Jeremy Taylor defined sinful habits as ‘the delight and custom of sinning contracted by the repetition of the acts of the same sin; as a habit of drunkenness, a habit of swearing, and the like.’ He went on to say that ‘every one that hath a vicious habit, chooses his sin cheerfully, acts it frequently, is ready to do it in every opportunity, and at the call of every temptation...the habit is not contracted, nor can it remain but by our being willing to sin.’

Like La Primaudaye, Taylor critiqued the ‘extremely dangerous and destructive’ false doctrine of the Roman schools, who believed that a habit ‘is so natural, that it is no way voluntary... and therefore it can have in it no blame.’

The connection between humoral disposition and addiction was also made explicitly by other writers throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A 1594 work by Juan Harte explained that men who are born of particularly hot and dry seed (humoral qualities associated with masculinity) are ‘malicious, wily, cavilling, and addicted to many vices and evils.’ A 1684 surgical thesaurus described sanguine people as ‘handsome, red checked, fleshy, strong; When young, addicted to Venery’. Meanwhile choleric people, ‘When irritated [are] addicted to strike, [and] more inclined to Drink and Watching, than to Eating and Sleep’, and melancholic people are ‘addicted to Venery, prudent, morose in conversation.’ A 1694 book on philosophy similarly described those of a sanguine complexion as ‘much addicted to Lust and Pleasure’ whilst ‘melancholy Persons addict themselves to Pleasure’ and choleric people ‘are of a hot and hasty Temper.’

It is clear from these and other sources that La Primaudaye’s view of the nature of addiction – its relationship to habit, will, humoral theory, and the affections – was shared by many of his contemporaries. However, in the second part of this chapter, I want to explore some of the alternative views proposed by the seventeenth-century philosophers Descartes, Hobbes, and Locke. Unlike La Primaudaye, none of them refer to addiction in direct terms, but they put forward related theories on the will, habit, affection, and action, and the relationships between them. My analysis of Descartes, Hobbes, and Locke is informed by Susan James’s
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research on early modern passions, since the passions – like addiction – have the power to
determine human behaviour via the will.

**Descartes**

Much of Descartes’ work can be seen as an attempt to solve the problem posed by the
‘divided soul’; the idea central to the work of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, La Primaudaye,
and others, that the soul contained different parts which sometimes worked against each
other to create internal conflict. For example, La Primaudaye put forward a concept of the
soul which included the affections, understanding, and the will, even though these faculties
were often in conflict with each other. For Descartes, the idea that the sensitive and rational
parts of the soul could struggle with each other was unacceptable, so as James explains, ‘to
solve this problem, Descartes allocates passions to the body’, thereby reframing the conflict
as soul versus body. Despite the important implications of Descartes’ achievement – ‘a
theory of psychological conflict which nevertheless presupposes a fully integrated and unified
soul’ – his model for explaining human behaviour was not that different to La Primaudaye’s.

For example, the faculties that determine action, and their essential functions, were
fundamentally similar. Like La Primaudaye, Descartes argued that affection could overwhelm
the will. He wrote that ‘those in whom the Will can most easily conquer the Passions, and
stop the motions of the body that come along with them, have without doubt the strongest
souls’, whereas ‘the weakest soul of all is such an one whose Will hath not at all determined
to follow certain judgements, but suffers it self to be swaye d with the present Passions, which
being often contrary one to the other, draw it backwards and forwards to either side.

Descartes’ will (like La Primaudaye’s) could not be forced into an action – Descartes writes
that ‘the will is so free by nature, that it can never be constrained’ – but it could be pressured
to ignore the rational faculties of the soul.

Descartes also described habit in similar terms to La Primaudaye. He noted that an often
repeated behaviour ‘leaves behind it a habit, that disposeth the Soul to stop in the same
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manner, on all other objects which present themselves. However, according to Descartes habits could also be formed from a single instance; he gives the example of ‘when a man at unawares meets with any nasty thing in a dish of meat...this accident may so alter the disposition of the brain, that a man shall never afterwards see any such kind of meat without loathing.’ Furthermore, Descartes believed that it was possible to break a habit by ‘separating an emotion from its object and attaching it to different feelings, as when we try to replace a fear of public spaces with a zest for civic life, or a loathing for beetroot with comparative indifference.’ There is a fundamental difference here: whereas La Primaudaye’s model of habit resulted in habitual behaviours (addictions), Descartes’ model of habit resulted in habitual affections.

This difference in focus is clear in their relative explanations of vice. As shown, both understood sinful behaviour in terms of affection, and its ability to overwhelm the will. La Primaudaye gave several explanations for immoral or sinful behaviour, including an excess of virtue (for example, an excess of justice becoming cruelty), disposition (explained through humoral theory, with all its numerous variables) and innate moral quality. However, for Descartes, the vices of drunkenness, bestiality, and avarice all sprang from the same place as the virtues of honour, or good parenthood, because all related to the passion of love. He writes, ‘The Passions of the ambitious man for glory, the avaricious for money, the drunkard for wine, the bestial for a woman he would violate, the man of honour for his friend, or mistress, and a good father for his children, be in themselves very different, yet, in that they participate of Love they are alike, but the four first bear a Love merely for the possession of the objects where unto their Passion relates, and none at all to the objects themselves.’ Descartes’ theories do not refer to or explain addiction or habitual behaviour directly, because his descriptions of vice and habit are concerned primarily with the internal effect of the affections, rather than their outward expression.

Hobbes

In both Descartes’ and La Primaudaye’s explanations for human behaviour, the capacity for vice existed due to conflict between the rational and passionate functions; the key difference is whether these were regarded as parts of the soul or not. In both, the (free) will acted as a
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gatekeeper, choosing between conflicting voices. Hobbes’ work marked a clear and dramatic shift away from this model of understanding. According to Hobbes, the will was not a separate function at all, but described whichever appetite or fear immediately preceded action.\textsuperscript{97} As James explains, ‘Whereas Descartes had presented deliberation as a conflict between motions with distinct origins, which is resolved by their relative strength, Hobbes conceives the process as involving forces of a single kind. The bodily motions that result in action are all passions. In addition, the motions that are appetites and fears do not directly confront one another. Each gives way, at least temporarily, to its successor.’\textsuperscript{98} In other words, each affection rises in turn and replaces the previous one, until eventually action is taken.

Hobbes’ model of the processes behind human action had some interesting, and controversial, implications. It removed the rational element of the soul which – according to both La Primaudaye and Descartes – was the part which distinguished humans from animals. As James puts it, ‘a hierarchical interpretation of nature which serves to legitimate the authority of rational men over the rest of creation is suddenly challenged.’\textsuperscript{99} She adds that ‘To abandon the idea that there is something uniquely active about human thinking would... be to give up some of the central tenets of the Christian order.’\textsuperscript{100} Perhaps most significantly in terms of addiction, Hobbes’ concept of the functions of the soul left no space for involuntary action. If the last affection was always the will, then action was always voluntary.

In fact, Hobbes’ views on the question of free will were slightly more complex than this. He wrote that ‘the Will is not voluntary: for, a Man can no more say he will will, than he will will will.’\textsuperscript{101} Essentially, he meant that the will was not free because it could not choose inaction; it must always take action, otherwise it would not be the will. However, he also wrote that ‘Voluntary Actions and Omissions are such as have Beginning in the Will; all other are involuntary.’\textsuperscript{102} The will itself is not free, but all of the actions that proceed from it are. The result of this argument is what James calls ‘the psychologically blank view that anything we are not physically forced to do, we do voluntarily.’\textsuperscript{103} To put this into context, in La Primaudaye’s and Descartes’ model, a virtuous person might become addicted to lust even though the rational part of their mind does not want to be; their reason opposes what they
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are doing but is unable to prevent it because of the force of their passions. In Hobbes’ model, people only become addicted to lust if they want to be addicted to lust. They might have other passions that oppose addiction to lust, but it is the passion towards the addiction which triggers an action.

The moral implications of this are considerable. As the Anglican theologian John Bramhall pointed out, without a distinction between passion and will, ‘we cannot make sense either of the moral differences between rational men and others, or of psychological struggle.’ However, Hobbes was a moral relativist, and denied there was any distinction between virtuous or sinful addiction. Instead, ‘Such is the nature of man, that every one calls that good which he desires, and evil which he eschews; and therefore through the diversity of our affections, it happens that one counts that good, which another counts evil; and the same man what now he esteemed for good, he immediately looks on as evil; and the same thing which he calls good in himself, he terms evil in another.’ For example, ‘the Name Lust is used where it is condemned; otherwise it is called by the general Word Love: for the Passion is one and the same indefinite Desire of different Sex, as natural as Hunger.’ To Hobbes, addiction to vice did not happen through corruption of the will or faulty judgement; all addictions occured in the same way, and the morality of them existed solely in the eyes of the beholder.

Despite the quite radical differences between Hobbes’ and La Primaudaye’s understandings of the mind, there is a surprising amount of overlap in their views on how habitual behaviours form. Hobbes’ description of habit, like La Primaudaye’s, focused on repetition and growing ease. He defined habit as ‘Motion made more easy and ready by Custom’, explaining that ‘it is attained by the weakening of such endeavours as divert its motion’, and that it ‘cannot be done but by the long continuance of action, or by actions often repeated.’ His discussion of habit focuses more on the physical body than the mind, and the motion he describes is ‘an easy conducting of the moved Body in a certain and designed way.’ However, it is clear that he viewed non-bodily habits in similar terms. He wrote that all appetites were formed through experience, or custom. According to Hobbes, ‘little Infants, at the beginning, and as soon as they are born, have appetite to very few things, as also they avoid very few, by reason
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of their want of Experience and Memory." In order to have an appetite for something, Hobbes argued, one must have experience of it, ‘For it is not possible, without such knowledge as is derived from Sense, that is, without Experience and Memory, to know what will prove pleasant, or hurtful.’ Experience and memory are built slowly: Hobbes wrote of infants that, ‘sometimes they approach, and sometimes retire from the same thing as their doubt prompts them. But afterwards by accustoming themselves by little and little, they come to know readily what is to be pursued, and what to be avoided.’ The more one experienced something, the greater that appetite became, for ‘as Men attain to more Riches, Honour, or other Power; so their Appetite continually groweth more and more.’

There was also overlap between La Primaudaye’s and Hobbes’ views on the types of addiction people pursue. Like La Primaudaye, Hobbes viewed transitory sensual or bodily delights, and imaginative pleasures which look to the future, as incompatible: ‘For Sensuality consisteth in the Pleasure of the Senses, which please only for the present, and take away the Inclination to observe such Things as condude to Honour, and consequently maketh Men less curious, and less ambitious.’ La Primaudaye argued that the type of pleasure a person enjoys stems partly from their innate disposition, their humoral balance, and their moral standing, but for Hobbes habit was the overriding power behind human action. To him, ‘people’s disposition and ability to deliberate more or less thoroughly, and the style in which they do so, will be shaped by the experience and passions they already have.’ In other words, according to Hobbes, addiction was determined purely by experience and memory.

**Locke**

According to James, on the topic of volition, Locke ‘owes a good deal to Hobbes, and yet stops short of some of Hobbes’ more shocking conclusions.’ Like Hobbes, Locke argued that the will does not have liberty: ‘It has not a power to forbear willing, it cannot avoid some determination’, so that a man cannot choose ‘whether he will will, or no.’ Again like Hobbes, according to Locke the actions that proceed from the will are nonetheless always free: ‘For God having given Man an Understanding to direct his Actions, has allowed him a
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freedom of Will, and liberty of Acting."\textsuperscript{116} Whereas La Primaudaye’s will was a gatekeeper between potentially conflicting functions, Locke’s will was ‘submissive to desire’ by its very nature, and ‘occupies the same position as Hobbes’s last and determining appetite.’\textsuperscript{117} Whereas Hobbes saw the will as just the final passion in a series of passions, Locke reinstated distinct, separate functions of the soul. Following in the footsteps of La Primaudaye and Descartes, Locke argued that the passions and the understanding were distinct functions, each with the ability to influence the will. In doing so, like La Primaudaye and Descartes, Locke introduced the capacity for both internal conflict, and involuntary action. However, Locke’s understanding of the different functions of the soul, and the relationships between them, is fundamentally different to that of previous scholars. In Descartes’ view the will was a gatekeeper which, when strong enough, could hold back the forces of passion. In Locke’s view the will was itself determined by a passion – it was driven by uneasiness, which is normally governed by desire – so in order to control the passions, the will must learn to submit to reason.\textsuperscript{118} This must be established from a young age, for ‘he that is not used to submit his Will to the Reason of others, when he is young, will scarce hearken or submit to his own Reason, when he is of an Age to make use of it.’\textsuperscript{119}

In this description of youthful will, Locke reveals an understanding of childhood that is starkly different to that of Hobbes. According to Hobbes, young children have fewer appetites, because they have less experience. In Locke’s view, ‘the younger they are, the less... Reason they have of their own’, but their inclinations – their disposition – was already formed because it was part of ‘the unalterable Frame of their Constitutions.’\textsuperscript{120} Young children were less able to govern their passions, so ‘some other must govern him, and be a Will to him, till he hath attained to a state of Freedom, and his Understanding be fit to take the Government of his Will.’\textsuperscript{121} As well as having less control, children were also less able to hide their true nature; ‘the peculiar Physiognomy of the Mind is most discernible in Children, before Art and Cunning hath taught them to hide their Deformities and conceal their ill Inclinations.’\textsuperscript{122} In order to govern their will children must establish good habits which would carry through into their adulthood.
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Locke’s views of habit fell somewhere between those of La Primaudaye and Hobbes. Like both La Primaudaye and Hobbes, Locke defined habit as the ‘power or ability in Man, of doing any thing, when it has been acquired by frequent doing the same thing.’\footnote{Locke, An essay concerning humane understanding.} Once established, habits ‘operate of themselves easily and naturally without the assistance of the Memory.’\footnote{Locke, Some thoughts concerning education.} Whereas Hobbes viewed experience – and by extension, habit – as the means by which inclinations were formed, for Locke, as for La Primaudaye, habit was a means to overcome the bad inclinations that you were born with. When raising a child, you should ‘Teach him to get a Mastery over his Inclinations, and submit his Appetite to Reason. This being obtained, and by constant practice settled into Habit, the hardest part of the Task is over.’\footnote{Ibid.} However, resembling Hobbes more than La Primaudaye, Locke gave examples of bodily habits rather than mental ones: he wrote about the unconscious habit of blinking, and he described in detail how it was possible to create a habit of regular bowel movements (‘in a few Months obtained the desired success, and brought Nature to so regular an habit, that they seldom ever failed of a Stool.’)\footnote{Ibid.} In essence, whilst all three defined habit as something gained, reinforced, and made easy through repetition, Locke’s version encompassed both bodily and mental habits (like Hobbes), and was the primary means of overcoming negative inclinations (like La Primaudaye).

The idea that there were ‘negative’ inclinations or addictions at all went against Hobbes’ principle of moral relativism. It is a principle which Locke set out, quite deliberately, to oppose. Locke wrote that ‘The wrong Judgement I am here speaking of, is not what one Man may think, of the determination of another; but what every Man himself must confess to be wrong.’\footnote{Locke, An essay concerning humane understanding.} Like La Primaudaye, Locke believed that right and wrong were absolute qualities, and that the will was fundamentally a force for good. He wrote that ‘Good then, the greater Good is that alone which determines the Will.’\footnote{Ibid.} This begs the question: ‘If our Wills be determined by Good, How it comes to pass that Men’s Wills carry them so contrarily, and consequently some of them to what is Evil?’\footnote{Ibid.} In part, Locke answered this question the same way that La Primaudaye did: some people have a disposition towards sinful behaviour, which they are either unable or unwilling to control. However, he also argued that people pursue vice rather than virtue because they are unable to judge future pleasure and
pain. He wrote that, when it comes to ‘present Pleasure and Pain, the Mind... never mistakes that which is really good or evil.’ In contrast future pleasure and pain are very often misjudged, because ‘Objects near our view, are apt to be thought greater than those of a larger size, that are more remote: and so it is with Pleasures and Pains.’ This is the case for both bodily and spiritual pleasures. Locke gives the example of drinkers, arguing that, ‘Were the Pleasure of Drinking accompanied, the very moment a Man takes off his Glass, with that sick Stomach, and aching Head, which in some Men are sure to follow not many hours after, I think no body, whatever Pleasure he had in his Cups, would, on these Conditions, ever let Wine touch his Lips.’ Similarly ‘The Rewards and Punishments of another Life, which the Almighty has established as the Enforcements of his Law, are of weight enough to determine the Choice, against whatever Pleasure or Pain this Life can shew.’ Given the potential pleasure of an eternity in heaven, only someone seriously lacking in judgement would choose to live in sin.

**Women**

One factor which is notably absent from – or at best, scarce in – the work of all the writers mentioned here is women. All the discussions of addiction, habit, affection, and disposition have assumed both a male subject and a male audience; women were more likely to appear as the object of an addiction than the subject. Of all of them, La Primaudaye provided the greatest insight into female addiction, but he used male pronouns and male examples throughout the vast majority of his work. It could be argued that his use of ‘man’ included women, since in his view ‘woman was flesh of the flesh of man, blood of his blood, and bone of his bones, even as it were his own body, and a second-self.’ Yet at certain points in the book, La Primaudaye makes it clear that the inclinations and affections of men and women are different. He writes that ‘women are commonly sooner driven into choler [anger, irritability] then men’, that women ‘are by nature more changeable by will, and more frail in counsel,’ and that ‘this sex is frail, spiteful, and given to revenge.’

So in what ways did women differ from men in the accounts of these writers? First, and somewhat surprisingly given his other statements, La Primaudaye did not consider the souls of women to be inferior. He writes that ‘women (as Plato saith) have a soul as well as we,'
and as quick a spirit, yea oftentimes a more excellent spirit than we, we must not think them incapable of the goodly reasons of Philosophy, wherein many of them have gone beyond many Philosophers. \(^{134}\) Whilst the quality of a woman’s soul and spirit was equal to a man’s, and she had the capacity for excellent reasoning, her will was more easily swayed by the will of others. ‘Generally the weaker that thing is, which discourses and doubts, the easier may a man put and add unto it, what he will’, ‘and therefore youth is easier to be persuaded than old folks, sick than sound, women than men.’ \(^{135}\)

The weakness of the female will was a common trope in early modern writing. A 1555 work of erotic fiction by Oliver Oldwanton contains a story ‘to prove that women are never so much addict or bent to their own will and opinion, but that by wisdom and good policy, they may easily be broken thereof.’ \(^{136}\) In the story a gentleman approaches a widow on a journey and tries to persuade her to have sex with him through a mixture of bullying, stalking, and emotional blackmail. Eventually, agreeing to kisses and embraces and nothing more, she agrees to leave her door open for him, only to be raped by another guest. For Oldwanton this story illustrates ‘th’instability of womens determinations, and how by discrete diligence and policy, they may be allured whereunto men list, be it good or evil.’ \(^{137}\) Oldwanton not only considered the female will to be weak, he also believed that this weakness made it easier for their addictions to be broken. However, the same weakness also supposedly made women more susceptible to addictions in the first place. In a work translated in 1613 the French Catholic friar Sébastien Michaelis wrote that ‘this sex hath this property, to be exceedingly addicted unto something, be it good, or be it bad: so that if a woman addict her self to well doing, she is more servant in it then a man; and so contrariwise, if she abandon her self to evil, she is more obstinate to persist in the same then a man is.’ \(^{138}\) As Michaelis explains, this was the reason why ‘sober and virtuous women... are they that cast the first stones against Sorcerers, and cry louder then the rest to have them burnt: so contrariwise, Sorceresses are more obstinate, and more addicted unto witchcrafts, and do with less remorse of conscience plunge themselves into the most execrable facts that may be, than men.’ \(^{139}\)

Beyond this susceptibility to both form and break addictions, there was another perhaps
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more significant difference between the souls of men and women. It lay not in their capacity for reason or their strength of will, but in what they ought to do with those faculties. In his description of the male spirit La Primaudaye explained that the will takes input from both the mind – reason and understanding – and the heart – the affections. Ideally (in men), whilst the affections and natural inclinations had their say, both should ultimately be governed by reason, which in turn guided the will. Women had all of these faculties as well; they had the capacity for reason, which informed their will, and they had their own inclinations and affections, being ‘given to revenge’ and ‘sooner driven into choler.’ However, La Primaudaye argued that women should ignore their own reason and affections, and instead exclusively follow those of their husband. He writes that ‘a woman should rule and govern her self in all things, by the wisdom and good pleasure of her husband; because he is her head, and she as his body’, and that ‘a wife must have no proper and peculiar passion or affection to her self, but must be partaker of the pastimes, affairs, thoughts and laughter of her husband.’

The same sentiment was expressed by Locke, who wrote that ‘the Husband and Wife, though they have but one common Concern, yet having different Understandings, will, unavoidably sometimes, have different Wills too: it therefore being necessary, that the last Determination, i.e. the Rule, should be placed somewhere; it naturally falls to the Man’s share, as the abler and the stronger.’

This subservience of the female will to the male was not something dictated by reduced capacity; even when a woman was more capable than her husband, she should submit her will to his because that was his right. La Primaudaye writes, ‘For although there may be diverse women found, that are wiser then some men... Yet they must in such sort use those graces given unto them by God, that their husbands may thereby be honoured, and not despised, neither by them nor by any others; in all their actions giving their husbands that pre-eminence of superiority which of right belonged unto them.’

Where a woman’s own inclinations contrasted with those of her husband, according to La Primaudaye, she should abandon her own passions and instead adopt the inclinations, pleasures, habits, and addictions, of her husband.

This expectation is borne out in an anonymous work from 1677 called *The Batchellors banquet*, which documents ‘the variable humours of Women, their quickness of wits, and unsearchable deceits.’ The book describes various negative female stereotypes, but the
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greatest criticism is reserved for those women who fail to submit to their husband’s will. Some seek to dominate their husband in all matters. ‘The next humour whereunto a woman is addicted... [is] to be her husband’s commander, & a busy meddler in his matters.’ According to the author such a humour is common; ‘This is (I say) a general imperfection of women... to strive for the breeches.’ Later the book describes the stereotype of the ‘perverse woman (of which sort there are too many) whose whole desire is to be Mistress, and to wear the breeches or at least to bear as great a sway as himself.’ The work also contains several critical stereotypes of women who pursue their own addictions rather than those of their husband. There is the ‘woman that still desires to be gadding abroad’ after marriage, who ‘having thus gotten a vein of gadding, she will never leave it.’ And there is ‘the humour of a Woman given to all kind of pleasures’ who, without regular beatings, ‘being now without controlment, follows her evil and lewd life more freely than before.’144 Women who did not follow their husband’s wishes and will in all things – including his pleasures and addictions – were regarded as a threat to both marital harmony and the status quo.

As a final note it is worth pointing out that all of these sources – which reflect on the weakness of the female will, women’s greater susceptibility to addiction, and the necessity of their submission – were written by men. I have not managed to find any commentary on the topic by a female author. However, a book under a female pseudonym ‘Mary Tattle-Well’, probably written by the poet John Taylor, disagrees quite forcefully with the idea that addiction to vice is mostly found in women. Taylor asks ‘were Women ever since the Creation of the World, such notorious and Capital offenders as you men have been? ... how many women have you known or seen, that have been brought home drunken in a Porters Basket, or led home between two Vintners Boys, or that ever drank out their eyes, and left their wits behind them on a Tavern Bench; or came home with their Legs or Arms broken by their excessive Drinking?’145 The book almost certainly does not reflect Taylor’s actual views on the topic (it was written in confutation of two other works that were also by Taylor), but its existence at least suggests that women’s supposed capacity for addiction may not have gone unquestioned.

Conclusion

As shown in the introduction, modern scholarship on historical addiction has a tendency to
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focus around the issue of free will, which is unsurprising given its relevance to debates about addiction today. The disease-model of addiction, which frames addiction as an illness rather than a choice, effectively removes free will from the addict; it positions the addict as medically unwell rather than morally depraved. In recent years there has been a movement away from the disease-model of addiction – in some circles at least – towards a model that assigns the addict a greater degree of choice. Gene Heyman argues that addiction is a choice not an illness, and that being an addict means repeatedly and willingly making choices that are not in the addict’s own best interests.\textsuperscript{146} In an article titled ‘Addiction is not a disease’, psychiatrist Tim Holden writes that ‘Addiction is self-acquired’, and argues that ‘Calls to destigmatize addiction remove any sense of personal responsibility’, resulting in ‘a steady erosion of individual responsibility and loss of any concept of personal blame for bad choices.’\textsuperscript{147}

Discussions of addiction in a historical setting are often framed in terms of these modern debates, rather than in terms that make sense in an early modern context; too often historical accounts of addicted free will set the idea of the \textit{addict} against that of the \textit{addictive} object, when in fact neither are terms used by contemporary writers. As this chapter has demonstrated, free will was just as significant to early modern addiction as it is now, but questions surrounding it can only be understood in the context of early modern concepts of the mind. La Primaudaye, Descartes, Hobbes, and Locke all regarded human behaviour – including habitual addiction – as being a product of the will. However, they disagreed in fundamental ways about the character of the will, and about the constraints and limitations under which it operated. For La Primaudaye and Descartes, the will was a gatekeeper standing between the opposing forces of reason and passion. For Hobbes, the will was a product of the passions themselves – any passion – which comes before an action. For Locke, the will was a tool of the passions, to be governed and ruled by a strong reason. All four regarded the actions of the will as freely chosen, yet they also recognised that different forces push and pull the will: the motion of the affections; natural inclination based on age, humoral complexion, health; and the force of habit which gains strength through repetition. Of them all, only Hobbes considered all human action – and therefore addiction – as wholly self-willed; La Primaudaye, Descartes, and Locke all believed that internal conflict could cause a person to act against their own desires, wishes, and reason.

Throughout early modern accounts of addiction it is possible to find the language of
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constraint. Jeremy Taylor wrote that God orders us to ‘be not enslaved to [sinful habit], under the power of it, of such a lost liberty that we cannot resist the temptation.’\textsuperscript{148} Owen Stockton, voicing the hypothetical objections of reluctant reformers, wrote ‘But I have such inclinations to drinking, and have been so long addicted to this sin, and am so enslaved to it, that I think it is in vain to pray for help against it.’\textsuperscript{149} Early modern writers recognised that individuals could feel enslaved by their own addiction, and that this feeling was amplified the longer a habit existed. They also recognised how hard it could be to break an addiction. Stockton called addiction to drunkenness ‘an enticing, bewitching sin, which is very hardly left by those that are addicted to it’, and Taylor wrote that the reforming drunkard ‘is daily tempted, and the temptation is strong, and his progression is slow; he marches upon sharp-pointed stones, where he was not used to go, and where he hath no pleasure.’\textsuperscript{150} However, unlike both the disease-model of addiction, and the classical Latin legal term \textit{addicere}, it is clear that early modern addiction was not regarded as a force that could overthrow the will. According to Taylor ‘habit is not contracted, nor can it remain but by our being willing to sin’, and Stockton writes that ‘drunkenness is not a sin of infirmity, but a wilful and presumptuous sin.’\textsuperscript{151} Whilst there remained an uneasy balance between the undoubted freedom of the will and the forces that acted upon it, ultimately addiction’s power was to amplify and reiterate chosen behaviours, not to dictate them.

Questions surrounding free will are, as this chapter has shown, central to early modern accounts of addiction. However, there is another concept which has proven equally significant, and that is habit; the idea that habitual behaviours are formed and strengthened through repetition. The link between habit and addiction comes across clearly in \textit{La Primaudaye’s} work, in which \textit{addict} is the verb commonly used to describe habitual forms of behaviour. Essentially, addiction is the external behaviour resulting from the internal process known as habit. It is interesting to note that, despite their opposing views on the will and the passions, \textit{La Primaudaye, Descartes, Hobbes, and Locke} provide very similar descriptions of the action – if not the purpose – of habit. It was, as Hobbes put it, ‘Motion made more easy and ready by Custom.’\textsuperscript{152} In terms of purpose, \textit{La Primaudaye, Descartes, and Locke} saw habit as both a tool to be harnessed for good, and a source of potential harm when directed towards vice. Hobbes rejected the moral judgement this implied, regarding habit instead as the primary source of inclinations, which grow and strengthen with age and experience.
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Different purposes aside, the fact that all four defined habit in very similar terms seems to indicate a degree of consistency in understandings of addiction throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

This chapter has also attempted to examine how gender affected addiction, although this effort was hampered by the fact that writing on the topic is almost exclusively written by, and about, men. It appears that La Primaudaye and many of his contemporaries regarded women as more susceptible to addiction, as tending to form stronger addictions, but also as being more likely to break their addictions. There is a contradiction here, since addictions are habitual behaviours that become more entrenched over time; how can a woman’s will be at once too weak to resist repeatedly choosing affection over reason, yet also strong enough to break a long-established addiction on a whim? And if a woman’s will is too weak to listen to her own reason, how did La Primaudaye and others expect her to overrule both her reason and her affections, and follow her husband’s will instead? It seems likely that these expectations were based, not on the grounds of ability or with any thought to consistency, but on a belief in an innate male right to supremacy.

This chapter has been mainly concerned with how certain early modern writers understood the bodily and mental processes that led to addictions. However, it is important to distinguish between the self-determined human behaviour that was termed addiction, and the accounts of addiction which were often written by a third party; the former is a function of the self, whilst the latter is shaped by expectation and assumption, imposed by one party onto another. In the next chapter I turn to the stereotypes and prejudices which shaped the way early modern writers thought about the addictions of others.
V

Cultural addiction

Whereas the previous chapter was concerned with the habitual behaviour of individuals, this chapter seeks to provide an analysis of the habits and addictions of groups of people from shared cultural backgrounds. This marks quite a radical departure from modern discussions of addiction, which tend to focus either on the individual, or define addicted groups by the object of their addiction (i.e. alcohol addiction, heroin addiction). It is also, and not unrelatedly, an aspect of addiction which has not previously been discussed in addiction scholarship; a fact which highlights the pitfalls of treating history as nothing more than a path to the present.

Whilst this chapter provides the counterpoint to the examination of individual addiction in Chapter IV, the approaches are fundamentally different. This is because, although early modern writers used addiction to describe the behaviours of cultural groups, they did not reflect on the causes of group behaviours in the way that they did with the behaviour of individuals. Pierre de la Primaudaye – who devotes huge sections of his encyclopaedic work to the functions of the soul and their relationship to human behaviour – says virtually nothing about cultural behaviour, or why groups of people may have similar habits. Despite this, it is possible to discern some of the different frameworks for understanding cultural difference by reading the examples of group addiction themselves, as well as through secondary reading.

As with Chapter IV, the approach taken in this chapter is qualitative, but it should be noted that it owes a considerable debt to the quantitative research in Chapter III, without which the significance of addiction to cultural descriptions would not have been discovered. Quantitative research also assisted greatly in the identification of relevant sources, many of which were found using the data set that was created for Chapter III, based on the number
of [plural] and [location] tags linked to each text. In keeping with a more qualitative approach, the texts selected for this chapter are not necessarily the ones which use ADDICT the most frequently, but the ones which provide the greatest insight into the relationship between addiction and early modern cultural groups. As a result of this focus, it is also possible to explore the related terms used in such descriptions, and so build up a sense of the semantic field surrounding early modern cultural addiction.

The sources are taken from a variety of different genres including classical translations, travel books, cosmographies, chronicles, and physiognomies. The vast majority are from the seventeenth century rather than the sixteenth, simply because the seventeenth century saw a massive increase in printed works relating to travel, geography, and human behaviour. Collectively these works cannot be classed as travel literature since they do not necessarily document a journey, but they are all broadly speaking ethnographic works in that they are concerned – at least in part – with the study of people, society, and culture.\(^1\) Many are written by English writers, but there are also translated works by authors from countries around Europe. They are all printed; they are all written in English; and they all contain the term ADDICT. Most importantly, each of these works defines a group of people by the behaviours or practices which that group supposedly shared.

The chapter begins by examining the relationship between addiction and ethnographic literature, and the language used by early modern authors to define cultural addictions. Next, I explore some of the main frameworks for understanding cultural similarity and difference in early modern writing, and the concepts which explained why groups of people shared behaviours that were different to those of other groups. These frameworks fall into two broad categories: geographical frameworks in which behaviours varied depending on location, climate, and other external factors; and inherited frameworks, in which behaviours were passed down from generation to generation. The first category includes humoral theory – through which writers made explicit links between disposition, climate, and addiction – and the classical division of the world into latitudinal zones. The second category centres around concepts of race, including the Biblical basis for race in the story of Noah’s sons, and the idea that shared characteristics could be passed on through ancestry.

In the final part of this chapter I look specifically at the ways in which three early modern
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\(^1\) The term ‘ethnographic writing’ is used by Anna Suranyi and Margaret Hodgen to refer to early modern writing about other cultures and countries. Anna Suranyi, *The Genius of the English Nation: Travel Writing and National Identity in Early Modern England* (Newark, 2008); Margaret Hodgen, *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Philadelphia, 1964).
texts described cultural addictions in Africa, and the explanatory frameworks that they drew upon. Two of the writers – John Ogilby and Nicholas Sanson – explicitly rejected established frameworks for explaining cultural diversity, instead seeking to verify their words through empirical claims of accuracy and observation. However, regardless of how they framed their work, the specific cultural addictions which they used were drawn from the work of earlier writers; texts like John Pory’s heavily edited version of Leo Africanus’s *geography*, which embraced a Biblical explanation of racial difference. Older frameworks for understanding cultural difference thus lived on, as specific cultural addictions – or stereotypes – were repeated.

**Cultural addiction & ethnographic writing**

What all of the ethnographic works examined here have in common is that they provided overviews of several different cultures or peoples, rather than an in-depth analysis of a single group. Some of these cultural collections were haphazard; what the anthropologist Margaret Hodgen calls ‘A matter of miscellaneous bits and pieces, of unrelated odds and ends.’ Others were more structured: travel writers laid their cultural encounters out like a story, whilst cosmographers and map writers focused on each area in turn. One feature they all have in common is that, in order to describe the behaviours of multiple groups, these writers needed to create neat, brief, cultural summaries. Hodgen calls these summaries ‘collections of customs’, which were not dissimilar to material collections of antiquities. However, she points out that unlike their physical counterparts, ‘The accumulation of manners and customs, their filing and arrangement, introduced unsuspected problems.’ Hodgen writes that the collector must ‘grasp conceptually salient cultural themes, categories, and structures – themes which prevailed not only within the behavioural system of one people, but among all peoples; and then having done this for himself, to convey his findings descriptively to others... The common styles of their daily lives had to be discerned and made explicit... the common forms of their activities and ideas communicated.’ The potential subject matter of these cultural summaries was vast, but Anna Suranyi explains that often, ‘everyday practices were seen as indicative of the true nature of a people... [and] were also sometimes seen as indicative of the nature of broader social structures, such as government or public policy.’

ADDICT – a term which denoted habitual behaviour – was a useful shorthand for describing
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3 Ibid., p. 164.
4 Ibid., p. 165.
everyday practices. It enabled an entire culture to be summed up by the everyday activities or behaviours which, according to the ethnographer, most defined them. Thus, in Giles Fletcher’s 1597 *The policy of the Turkish empire* – which sets out to explain how ‘a people most rude and barbarous’ could attain ‘the excessive height of their present greatness’ – Fletcher used the language of addiction to describe four kinds of religious order in Turkey. The Giomailler are ‘addicted to a voluptuous kind of life’ and ‘wonderfully addicted to the love both of women and of young men,’ whilst the Torlacchi are ‘addicted and inclined to their brutish wickedness,’ and ‘addicted to all kinds of mischief and villainy, contrary to the Order of the Darvisses, whose chief profession is their pleasure.’ Meanwhile the Calenderi ‘have a hole bored through the skin under their privities, where they do wear a ring... by means whereof (howsoever they be otherwise by nature addicted) all desire and opportunity of luxuriousness and incontinency is taken from them.’

When describing these religious orders, Fletcher used the language of addiction to summarise what he regarded as their defining characteristics, in order to draw easy comparisons between them.

Fletcher used ADDICT to produce cultural summaries that compared different types of behaviour. However, ADDICT could also be used to compare different degrees of a single behaviour. Whilst we tend to think of addiction today as being an absolute – a person is either addicted to something or they are not – in an early modern context, addiction was mutable; a person (or group) could be partly addicted, mostly addicted, or wholly addicted. Thus, when Lewes Roberts’ describes the mercantile practices of different cultures in his *Merchants mappe of commerce*, he repeatedly used ADDICT to summarise, compare, and contrast.

He writes of Scotland that ‘I may conclude, this Kingdom, to be more addicted to Traffic and Navigation then the Irish, and yet not so much as the English.’ Of the inhabitants of Spain and Portugal, he says ‘they are in general lovers of Merchandising and traffic, neither so much despising it as the French, nor yet so much addicted thereto as the ~ans.’ The Moscovians ‘are more addicted to husbandry and fishing, than to merchandising’, whilst the people of Denmark ‘are frugal in food and apparel, and therefore not much addicted neither to Silks nor Spices, and the great traffic and concourse of other nations.’ The merchants of Constantinople ‘wholly addict themselves... to no further trade then what necessity doth for the most part compel them.’
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6 Giles Fletcher, *The policy of the Turkish empire. The first booke* (London, 1597; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
7 Ibid.
8 Roberts, *The merchants mappe of commerce*.
9 Ibid. The first half of this word is lost in microfilm static.
10 Ibid.
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only between different objects of addiction, but also between different strengths of addiction.

ADDICT has clear relevance to the production of cultural summaries, and it is no surprise that the term was adopted by ethnographic writers in many different genres. However, this process took time; as Chapter I showed, ADDICT remained largely restricted to the work of protestant reformers before 1550. One of the earliest instances of cultural addiction was in a 1542 translation of Theodorus Bibliander’s *A godly consultation*, which contained the line, ‘I trust... that among the Turks they be not all so greatly inwrapped and addict unto the superstition of Mahumet: But that some of them are pertaining unto the holy Catholic church.’ In the following decades, ADDICT appeared in a series of classical translations, where it was used to produce simple cultural summaries of ancient people. A 1556 translation of Herodian’s history claimed that ‘the nation of Syrians is chiefly addicted unto jests and plays’; Arthur Golding’s 1565 translation of the eight books of Caesar described ‘the whole Nation of the Gauls’ as ‘very sore addicted to Religion’; and Thomas Newton’s 1577 translation of Cicero claimed that the Samnites ‘might be a great deal more easily vanquished, when as they once addicted themselves wholly to Pleasures.’ By the seventeenth century ADDICT was a staple of ethnographic literature, and a tool of early modern ethnographic analysis. The word appears 80 times in Nicolas Sanson’s *Cosmography and geography*, 51 times in Samuel Purchas’s *Purchas his pilgrimage*, and 42 times in Peter Heylyn’s *Cosmographie in four bookes*.

In the works of Sanson, Purchas, and Heylyn – which contain discussion of all the known world – Africa, northern Europe, and the Middle East, are the regions most commonly associated with addiction. However, there is a great deal of variation: 30 percent of Heylyn’s uses of ADDICT are in descriptions of the Middle East, compared to 16 percent of Sanson’s, and just 12 percent of Purchas’s. Purchas does not use ADDICT in his accounts of northern Europe at all, but 27 percent of Heylyn’s uses of ADDICT refer to that region, as do 18 percent of Sanson’s. The attempt to quantify the distribution of ADDICT regionally is problematic due to the common practice – described later in this chapter – of writers borrowing and re-using
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14 Nicolas Sanson & Bernhardus Varenius, trans. Richard Blome, *Cosmography and geography in two parts, the first, containing the general and absolute part of cosmography and geography, being a translation from that eminent and much esteemed geographer Varenius* (London, 1682; EEBO-TCP Phase II); Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimage*; Heylyn, *Cosmographie in four bookes*. 
previous ethnographic material. For example, just over 50 percent of Purchas’s uses of ADDICT refer to Africa, but all of these examples are in a section of the text copied almost verbatim from Leo Africanus’s account of Africa; a work which also influenced Heylyn and Sanson. Ultimately, the reasons behind the assignment of particular addictions are more interesting, and more revealing, than the regional distribution of the term.

It is important to note that ADDICT was not the only word which could be used to indicate habitual forms of behaviour, although it was perhaps the only one which was primarily used in this manner. The concept of cultural addiction – a shared habitual behaviour that characterises a cultural group – could be conveyed without using the term itself. Claudius Ælianus’s translator does not use ADDICT when writing ‘Of the drunkenness of the Byzantines’ that they ‘live in Taverns, quitting their own houses, and letting them to strangers.’ Yet there is no doubt that Ælianus’s description was Lodovick Lloyd’s source when he wrote that ‘To this drunkenness the Byzantines were so addicted, that they sold their lands, set out their houses, to apply the Taverns.’ Lloyd’s version uses the word ADDICT to provide an explicit link between cause and effect, whereas Ælianus’s translator conveys the concept of addiction indirectly. He tells an anecdote which describes the serious effects of Byzantine drinking, thereby implying it was a habitual cultural behaviour.

There were some terms which were employed as synonyms or near-synonyms for ADDICT, to describe explicitly the relationship between a cultural group and the behaviours they were characterised by. The English translation of Leo Africanus’s A geographical historie of Africa uses the word addicted 35 times to describe the cultural addictions of various groups within Africa, but it also uses prone and given in the same way. Africanus writes that ‘The people called Mussim... are given only to theft and robbery’; that ‘these people [inhabiting the mountain of Demensera] are well given to thirst and good husbandry’; and that there is ‘no nation under heaven more prone to venery [than the Negros]; unto which vice also the Libyans and Numidians are to too much addicted.’ Similarly Peter Heylyn’s Cosmographie in four bookes contains ADDICT 42 times, but also describes the people of Sardinia as ‘Much given to hunting, and so prone to Rebellion’, and calls modern Egyptians ‘prone to innovations, devoted to luxury, cowardly, cruel, addicted naturally to cavill.’ What is notable about these

16 Ælianus, trans. Stanley, Claudius Ælianus.
19 Heylyn, Cosmographie in four bookes.
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examples – and there are many more like them – is that the writers employ a range of synonyms often within the same sentence, to create lists of addicted behaviours without repetition. ADDICT was part of a toolkit of words useful for forming cultural summaries, and thereby amassing the ‘collections of customs’ described by Hodgen.

The genres in which cultural descriptions appear were, on the whole, well established before the seventeenth century. From antiquity onward, and throughout the medieval period, travel books, chronicles, encyclopaedias, cosmographies (‘sometimes described as a mixed kind of history and geography’), and myths and legends, all brought cultural descriptions to a European audience. However, the early modern period saw a dramatic shift in both the quantity of texts, with a widening market for ethnographic literature tied into increasing opportunities for both travel and print, and in the emphasis given to observation over tradition. Hodgen writes that, whereas the ancient Greek writer Herodotus ‘avoided the temptation to wander very far from sober common sense, unfortunately, these qualities were not destined to persist in Western ethnological thought.’ She argues that, ‘Having lost touch with the classics, medieval scholarship purveyed a preposterous and fabulous sediment of what had once been a comparatively realistic antique ethnography.’ This tradition persisted into the sixteenth century, resulting in accounts of the voyages of Columbus that were, writes Hodgen, ‘embellished with all the trappings of medieval fantasy’; cannibals, popinjays, giants, monstrous or deformed people, ‘the most fantastic monsters – ethnological, mythological, and imaginary.’ According to Hodgen, whilst some elements of medieval tradition persisted in seventeenth century texts, increasingly early modern ethnographic accounts shifted away from the fantastical.

This shift away from fantastical or monstrous descriptions might seem to suggest that early modern European ethnographers reflected the reality of human behaviour in a way that their predecessors did not. There is some truth to this claim. As Sandra Young writes, ‘The early geographies... sought to refine the works of the ancients by mapping space and time with reference to “real” journeys and encounters with named, historical figures. Their modes of evidence gathering promised scholarly authority in the face of earlier, more sensationalist
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22 Hodgen, Early Anthropology, p. 28.
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modes of writing." Certain, seventeenth-century ethnographers regarded their own work as being more accurate than that of their predecessors. Vincent Leblanc claimed that his work contained ‘a more exact description of several parts of the world, then hath hitherto been done by any other author’; John Ogilby titled his book, *America: being the latest, and most accurate description of the new world*, whilst Nathaniel Wanley promised to have used only ‘the writings of the most approved historians, philosophers, physicians, philologists and others.’ However, the so-called ‘accuracy’ of early modern ethnographic writing is extremely problematic. First, as Hodgen points out, ‘travellers clung too stubbornly to tradition’, and even in the seventeenth century, ‘Medieval and modern ideas appear to jostle one another.’ This was the case even when what was observed was fundamentally different to previous accounts. David B. Quinn writes that ‘men saw in the New the Old, altered but not fundamentally changed... where novelty was total, it was conceived as an extension of the old rather than as novelty itself.’ Second, writers had their own agendas, whether personal or political, and their texts served rhetorical as well as functional purposes. For example, ‘Writings about foreign countries... produced a model of hierarchical relations between states’, through which writers negotiated their own cultural and national identities. As Michael Ryan points out, ‘All peoples and their customs were manipulated in more or less the same way for scholarly and polemical purposes.’ Finally, even if English ethnographic writers set out with the intention of accurately depicting another culture, the resulting text would at best show us ‘what the English believed about other societies’, and not necessarily ‘how those societies actually functioned.’ Ethnographic writing involved massive simplification and the reduction of a complex and varied set of human behaviours into a few key characteristics. The choices made about which addictions to focus on were both subjective and derivative.

The shift from medieval to early modern ethnographic writing can be better viewed, not as
a move from fantasy to accuracy, but as a transition from one set of cultural frameworks to another. The author of *Renaissance Ethnography*, Surekha Davies, writes that the circumnavigation of the world in the 1520s ‘marked an ontological seam between two discourses from classical antiquity for understanding human cultural and physical variation: the discourse of monstrous peoples... and the discourse of contingent human variance in temperament, appearance and capacities in relation to local climatic conditions.’ In fact, whilst seventeenth-century ethnographers drew on the language of observation and accuracy, the cultural addictions they recounted were rooted in medieval and classical frameworks for understanding human difference. The next part of this chapter examines those conceptual frameworks.

**Geographical frameworks**

As Davies points out, the ‘ontological seam’ in early modern ethnographic writing was as much a revival of classical or Biblical concepts of difference, as it was a shift towards any new model of understanding. In some instances, this resulted in a clash between traditional discourse and early modern discovery; conflicts which early modern ethnographers sometimes struggled to navigate. The various frameworks for understanding shared cultural behaviours are important, not only because they had an impact on the way early modern people wrote about and understood other cultures, but also because different conceptual frameworks had different implications for travellers and migrants. In an age of increasing movement, this raised serious concerns. Would an individual who travelled to a new location acquire new addictions, or would they retain the addictions of their birthplace? What if a group of people moved together? The answers to these questions depended upon whether culture was regarded as geographically or ancestrally determined. Models for both existed alongside each other, and will be discussed in turn.

Perhaps the most significant framework for the European understanding of cultural behaviour was the humoral system. The humoral system was complex and holistic, capable of explaining both human diversity and similitude, and it was often referenced directly by early modern ethnographic writers. There were four main complexions, or temperaments (i.e. personality types), determined by the dominant humour: choleric, melancholic, sanguine, and phlegmatic. As shown in the previous chapter, humoral complexion fed into a person’s
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disposition, which in turn was tied to addiction. Disposition dictated the types of pleasures which the affections, or passions, found pleasurable, and the affections had the ability to influence behaviour, either directly or by overpowering reason and understanding. Since dispositions tended to be either permanent or at least long-lasting, the behaviours which they lead to often formed habits, the outward expression of which was addiction. A disposition could result in addiction to either a vice or a virtue, or it could be subdued through force of will, or strength of reason. Most importantly, these processes took place on an individual level all the time; they were a natural, normal function of the soul.

The last chapter explored the impact of age and gender on disposition, but there were a wide variety of other influences, some of which were connected to location. The Greek physician Galen, whose work formed the basis of humoral medicine throughout the early modern period, wrote of six non-naturals which could affect the balance of humours within the body: air, exercise, sleep, food, excrement, and affection. Of the first of these, he writes ‘The Air alters the Body, as it cools, heats, moistens or dries, or according as these qualities are joined together, or the whole substance of the Air altered.’ Nicolas Culpeper elaborates further, explaining that the quality of the air is affected firstly by the situation – ‘For, 1. Stony ground is cold and dry. 2. Sandy ground, hot and dry. 3. Fenny ground, cold and moist. 4. Woody and fat Land, hot and moist’ – and secondly, ‘By the Region as it is well or evil tempered.’ Evil tempered air is intemperate; it is excessively cold, hot, dry, or moist. The dispositions created by these environmental factors were shared by all the inhabitants of an area. Thus, ‘the most temperate & best ordered countries... bring forth all kind of things needful for mans life, as France, Italy, Greece, and Anatolie. [But] in the uttermost coasts of the world which exceed in cold and heat, they keep from day to day their first wildness & rudeness, eating raw flesh and drinking nothing but milk.’

Humoral theory formed the basis of an entire genre of cultural descriptions, which dates back to classical times: physiognomy. Aristotle describes physiognomy as ‘an ingenious science, or knowledge of nature, by which the inclination and dispositions of every creature are understood.’ Physiognomy is the art – or science, as it was sometimes regarded – of
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34 Galen, trans. & ed. Nicholas Culpeper, Galen’s art of physick ... translated into English, and largely commented on: together with convenient medicines for all particular distempers of the parts (London, 1652; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
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studying facial and bodily features in order to determine a person’s character, or to predict their future. It was sometimes expanded to encompass not only the relationship of personality to facial and bodily features, but also connections between disposition, climate and location. Although it is now considered a pseudoscience, Patricia Fara points out that even ‘at the end of the eighteenth century it was not merely a popular fad but also the subject of intense academic debate about the promises it held for future progress.’

The French writer Marc de Vulson wrote a treatise – translated as *Treatise on Physiognomy* – which described the characteristics of different nations based on the humoral system. Of southern people, Vulson writes that ‘they are cold and dry... this people having many of their humours exhaled by the heat of the Sun, melancholy, which is most predominant in them, remains, and like the sediment or lees of wine, is the more exasperated by their perverse disposition... For, this people is addicted to study and contemplation (which suits well with their melancholic humour).’ Northern inhabitants, on the other hand are ‘big, phlegmatic, sanguine white, and flaxen-haired... great eaters and drinkers, and less inclined to contemplation, by reason of the abundance of humours which distemper their spirits, and obstruct their faculties... wholly adding themselves to Hunting, Husbandry, and other labouring exercises.’ Northerners ‘have ever been most populous.... They are apt for generation, but not to carnal concupiscence, as those of the South: which different qualifications (saith du Laurence) hath by prudent Nature been stowed upon every Climate, that those who are capable of generation, should not be over-addicted to pleasures, and others that want integral heat and moisture, delight in wantonness.’

It is notable that internal temperature mirrors that of the external climate. Southerners who live in a warm climate have colder complexions, whereas northerners who live in a cold climate have warm complexions. Vulson attributes this to ‘prudent Nature’, which ensures every person has what they need in order to thrive in whatever climate they inhabit. Guided by nature, the balance of the humours determines not only physical appearance but also personality (sociable or wanton, sanguine or melancholic) and habitual behaviours or pursuits (contemplation, study, hunting, drinking). Climate and behaviour are so fundamentally linked that even morality becomes geographically determined. Vulson writes, ‘let us not reproach those of the South with their sobriety, nor blame the licentiousness of drinking in those of the North; they are faculties peculiar to these people, and that not without reason; for if the

40 Ibid. The same point is made in Papillon, *The vanity of the lives and passions*. 
Southern people should feed high, wanting internal heat to procure digestion, they would fall into dangerous distempers; and the Northern could not possibly live so soberly, by reason of the continual thirst proceeding from their inward heat.’ It is perhaps inevitable that Vulson – who is French – concludes that those of the middle regions provide the perfect balance between the virtues and vices of southerners and northerners. ‘These of the middle Region are adorned with a thousand qualities fit for society’ he writes. ‘The Northern do not much fancy the pen, and the Southern hate the Pike; those of the middle temper affect both the one and the other.’

The stereotypes that emerge from this humoral explanation of cultural difference were echoed by other early modern writers, at least in their writing about Europe. Northern addiction to drinking is a common trope, with Charles Estienne writing that ‘by how much the Countries are the colder, by so much the more they are given and addicted to wine and drunkenness’, and Thomas Heywood that, ‘All those bred in cold Climates, love to warm themselves from within.’ Likewise, many writers associated contemplation and learning with southern nations. Nathanael Carpenter writes that ‘The Southern people (as we have showed) [are] altogether addicted to contemplation’, whilst Sanson describes the gentry of Parma as ‘much addicted to Learning and Arms.’ Giovanni Botero writes that northerners are not addicted to pleasures, unlike southerners who ‘delight in wantonness, to raise their appetites’, and similarly, Nicolas Sanson describes both the Italians and the Spanish as addicted to women. The humoral system was one of the main ways in which early modern writers made sense of behavioural similarities and differences across different climates within Europe, and it remained so across the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

If temperature – via the humoral system – was understood to be an important factor in determining shared group behaviours, then by extension people who lived in similar climates, no matter how far away, would be expected to act in similar ways. In fact, the idea of latitudinal similarity was a central feature in classical geographical theory. According to Aristotle the spherical earth was divided into five latitudinal zones: two polar regions, two inhabitable regions, and a central uninhabitable torrid zone. ‘All animals and plants that are

43 Nathanael Carpenter, *Geographie delineated forth in two booke Containing the sphericall and topicall parts thereof* (Oxford, 1635; EEBO-TCP Phase I); Sanson & Varenius, trans. Blome, *Cosmography and geography in two parts.*
on the same parallels ... equidistant from either pole ought to exist in similar combinations in accordance with the similarity of their environments.\textsuperscript{45} He writes that, ‘There are two inhabitable sections of the earth: one near our upper, or northern pole, the other near the other or southern pole; and their shape is like that of a tambourine...These sections alone are habitable. Beyond the tropics [of Cancer and Capricorn] no one can live.’ Of the strips of habitable land Aristotle writes that ‘in one direction no one lives because of the cold, in the other because of the heat.’\textsuperscript{46} The lands bordering the uninhabitable zones were also affected by the inhospitable climate, and ‘thought to be incapable of sustaining civil societies, or even of properly formed humans.’\textsuperscript{47} The existence of monstrous people in these regions was documented as far back as Pliny the Elder in c.77-99 CE. They typically had characteristics that matched their environment; ‘Particularly fertile regions could lead to beings with exaggerated attributes, such as Giants or Panotii (beings with very large ears); the inhabitants of desert regions might be lacking in some way, like pygmies (who lacked height); or, as in the case of troglodytes (cave-dwellers), they might attempt to avoid their environment.’\textsuperscript{48}

The impact of Aristotelian geographic divisions is clear in Vulson’s work on physiognomy, which divides human behaviour into northern, southern, and middle, making no distinction between east and west. Vulson’s notion of north and south fit neatly within the habitable region described by Aristotle; within the whole text, Vulson’s northern-most country is Scotland, and his southern-most country is Egypt. However, when it came to writing about cultural differences outside of the temperate zone, classical geographic divisions were often challenged and even dismissed outright by early modern ethnographic writers.

\textsuperscript{45} Davies, Renaissance Ethnography, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{47} Davies, Renaissance Ethnography, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p. 30.
Figure 21 showing William Alingham’s map of the world, on which I have highlighted the torrid zone in pink [copyright Chadwyck-Healey, image not reproduced in eThesis]49

49 William Alingham, *A short account, of the nature and use of maps as also some short discourses of the properties of the earth, and of the several inhabitants thereof* (London, 1698; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
Aristotle’s theories could not stand up to the irrefutable fact that the torrid zone was not uninhabited. William Alingham writes that the ‘torrid zone is that space of Earth, contained betwixt the two Tropics, viz. Cancer and Capricorn being in Breadth to 47 Degrees, which is 3290 English Miles; upon this Zone or Tract of Earth, lies most part of Africa, a great part of South America, also several Islands, as Java, Sumatra, St. Thomas, &c.’ He adds, ‘The Ancients, both Philosophers, Divines and Poets, counted this Zone altogether uninhabitable, by reason of the extreme Heat, and therefore termed it intemperate, but later Discoveries have proved to the contrary.’ Similarly Willem Blaeu writes that ‘Experience (by the long Navigations of Spaniards, Lusitanians, and others) shows, that not only the Torrid Zone is inhabited of several People and Nations, and abounds in several kinds of Animals and Fruits; but that likewise the Frigid Zones are not in many places destitute of Inhabitants.’ As Blaeu suggests, whilst writers of the seventeenth century continued to explicitly acknowledge and reject Aristotle’s theory, Europeans had been aware of its inaccuracy for several centuries; charts depicting the location of an Ethiopia inhabited by Christians were being produced in Genoa as early as 1320.

Even though some aspects of classical geography were acknowledged to be false, in other respects Aristotle’s concept of the torrid zone proved remarkably resilient. As noted above, writers continued to mention it throughout the seventeenth century, and the region itself is still recognised as a distinct geographical zone today. Furthermore, whilst no longer considered uninhabitable, it is clear that many authors still regarded the climate of the torrid zone as inferior. In 1699 Richard Bentley wrote, ‘For the Inhabitants of the Torrid Zone, who suffer the least and shortest recesses of the Sun... are not only shorter lived (generally speaking) than other Nations nearer the Poles; but inferior to them in Strength and Stature and Courage, and in all the capacities of the Mind.’ The torrid zone continued to be regarded as a geographical region with distinctive and negative characteristics, even if those characteristics no longer resembled the Aristotelian model.
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52 Willem Blaeu, trans. unknown, A tutor to astronomy and geography, or, An easie and speedy way to understand the use of both the globes, celestial and terrestrial (London, 1654; EEBO-TCP Phase II).
55 Richard Bentley, The folly and unreasonableness of atheism demonstrated from the advantage and pleasure of a religious life (London, 1699; EEBO-TCP Phase I).
What made the torrid zone and the frigid zones (the polar regions) distinct was their temperature; extreme heat and extreme cold were seen to have an effect on the human body and human behaviour. However, beyond any climactic concerns, the landscape itself could also create shared group addictions, for purely opportunistic reasons. Giovanni Botero wrote of England that ‘The land generally is exceeding fertile, and plentiful in beasts: whereby it commeth to pass that the English people are more addicted unto Grazing, than unto Tillage.’ Leo Africanus explains that the people of Beni Leginesen in Morocco ‘are too much addicted to drunkenness, by reason that their wines are so excellent’, adding that ‘No fruits grow upon this mountain but only great abundance of grapes.’ The availability of resources could determine the types of addictions found in the local inhabitants, and this extended not only to consumables, but also to visual resources. John Speed describes the Assyrians as ‘much addicted to Astrology’, explaining that they were questionless led to it by the opportunity of their situation, which gives them a more perfect view of the heavens, and several course of the Planets, then any other part of the world besides.

Inherited frameworks

So far the theoretical frameworks described have been linked to location and environment: air, temperature, and resources are all geographically fixed, and therefore create cultural change through the movement of people. However, there were other frameworks for understanding cultural behaviour, which Hodgen argues can best be understood in terms of horizontal versus vertical cultural transmission. ‘One, spatially or geographically orientated, involved the recognition that traits had been and could be carried “laterally”, or “transported” overland through the agency of moving, mingling peoples... The other, derived from the observation of the operation of the processes of tradition, resulted in the temporal uniformity of customs and institutions, and was attained by the “vertical” handing on of ideas and practices from father to son.’ Genealogy was a significant indicator of behaviour in early modern literature, as it was commonly understand that a group of people would inherit the cultural characteristics and activities of their ancestors. As Aristotle explains, ‘Experience tells us, That Children are commonly of the same condition with their Parents, and of the same Tempers.’
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The terminology for describing shared inherited characteristics or behaviours is problematic. As Robert Bartlett writes, ‘When, if at all, is it reasonable to employ the word race, the word nation, the word tribe? What collective term best describes, say, the Goths, the English, the Jews? What meaning does the concept “ethnic identity” have?’. Discussions of cultural difference in the early modern world are often framed around the concept of the ‘other’, but this was not part of the language employed by early modern writers themselves. Contemporary writers used the term ‘race’, but some modern scholars regard it as an anachronism to speak of early modern race, because ‘at the time “race” connoted family, class, or lineage rather than the classifications of modern imperial times’. Certainly, ‘the defining features of racial ideologies – the quasi-biological notion that physical characteristics denoted distinct types of human beings with distinct moral and social features – had not yet come into being.’ Yet as J. Burton and A. Loomba point out, ‘racial ideologies and practices are not just engendered as a simple consequence of modern colonialism. Rather, many pre-modern ideologies and practices shape the particular forms taken by modern European colonialism and slavery. Furthermore, whilst early modern concepts of race may have lacked the biological determinism of later racial theory, the word is both contemporary and relevant to discussions of pre-modern cultural inheritance. The OED shows that it was in use from at least 1572 to indicate ‘An ethnic group, regarded as showing a common origin and descent,’ and from 1612 to mean ‘A group of several tribes or peoples, regarded as forming a distinct ethnic set.’

The concept of racial difference predates even the origins of the term, as there was a well-established Biblical basis for race in the story of Noah and his sons. According to the Bible, Ham – father of Canaan – came across his father naked and drunk in a tent and told Shem and Japeth, who covered Noah up without looking at his nakedness. When Noah awoke he ‘knew what his younger son had done unto him’, and ‘he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant
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of servants shall he be unto his brethren.⁶⁷ The world was then divided up between the sons of Ham, Shem, and Japeth, each forming a separate nation.⁶⁸ Burton and Loomba note that in medieval writing Ham’s cursed sons were assigned to the Mongol empire, but from the fifteenth century this began to be re-ordered ‘with Ham being assigned Africa’, whilst at the same time the curse on Canaan began to be associated with black skin.⁶⁹ Leo Africanus’s geography of Africa, printed in English in 1600, explained that Africa ‘is inhabited especially by five principal nations... the greatest part of which people are thought to be descended from Cham [Ham] the cursed son of Noah.’⁷⁰ John Speed wrote in 1646 that ‘Cham by his fathers curse, for discovering his nakedness, roved to the utmost parts of the earth, and peopled with his progeny especially those Countries which are most touched in Histories for Barbarism and Idolatry... And those that at the confusion spread where ever they came this diversity of Customs and Religions, that possess the world at this day. To him was Africa.’⁷¹ Concepts of race were intrinsically hierarchical and bound up in moral judgement, since Canaan’s descendants were forever destined for servitude due to the crimes of their ancestor. The story of Noah thus provided a Biblical link between innate servitude, barbarism, and the inhabitants of the African continent.⁷²

It is often hard to differentiate between characteristics resulting from climate or landscape, and those resulting from descent. However, some indication of the significance of race can be found in comparisons between contemporary cultures and their ancestral tribes; early modern writers frequently referred back to the genealogical roots of various peoples, either to explain observed addictions, or to comment on changes. Speed writes in 1646 that ‘the Highland-men (the natural Scot indeed) are supposed to descend from the Seythians, who with the Getes infesting Ireland, left both their Issue there, and their manners, apparent in the Wild Irish even to this day.’⁷³ Heylyn remarks that the people of Crete had retained the vices of their ancestors without their ameliorating virtues: ‘The people have formerly been good sea-faring men; a virtue commaculated [defiled] with many vices, which they yet retain,
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as envy, malice, and lying; to which last so infinitely addicted that an horrible lie was called proverbially Cretense mendacium.\textsuperscript{74} The Egyptians, meanwhile, had lost all the virtues of their ancestors: ‘For such as have observed the nature of the Modern Egyptians, affirm them to have much degenerated from the worth of their Ancestors, prone to innovations devoted to luxury, cowardly, cruel, addicted naturally to cavil [the raising of frivolous objections].’\textsuperscript{75} There was clearly an expectation that descendants would share the addictions of their ancestors across the centuries, and any deviation was inherently worthy of note.

Race was particularly important in British accounts of their own cultural behaviour, which was often linked to the practices of ancient British tribes. Anthony Munday’s 1611 chronicle of the world claimed that ‘there arose a sect of Philosophers, both in Britain & Gallia, which were called Samothei’ who were ‘greatly addicted to religion: especially them of Britain, which... made the whole nation to take name of them.’\textsuperscript{76} In 1682 John Selden wrote similarly that the Samothei – allegedly among the earliest inhabitants of Britain – ‘were men very well skilled in Laws Divine and Humane, and upon that account were much addicted to Religion.’\textsuperscript{77} The Welsh historian James Howell wrote that ‘it is observed that the Britains were always by a special instinct very much addicted to Religion’, and English lawyer Peter Pett described ‘this Kingdom of England’ as ‘so naturally of old addicted to Religion and vehemence in it.’\textsuperscript{78} The English moral reformer Edwards Stephens wrote in 1695 that ‘there is a certain Natural Disposition in most Nations’, and that the ‘natural genius’ of the English is ‘addicted to sincere and substantial Religion.’\textsuperscript{79} Whilst British writers often used Samothei ancestry to explain their addiction to religion, other writers traced British and/or English behavioural traits to a different source. Vulson claims that the English ‘are much addicted to the subtlety of litigiousness and Law-suits, retaining still as it were a smack of their first original from the Normans, whence they issued.’\textsuperscript{80} Early modern writers used race and ancestry to evidence cultural behaviour, drawing on different ancestral models to justify their descriptions.
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The movement of people

These conflicting models of cultural behaviour – the geographical and the inherited – are brought into clarity in discussions of cultural transmission. The racial transmission of cultural behaviour – passed down from parent to child within a social group – was often associated with positive values such as tradition, heritage, and ritual. Thus, for example, Gerhard Mercator notes that in Scotland ‘when the King is publicly crowned, he promises to all the people, that he will keep and observe the Laws, Rites, and Customs of his Ancestors.’ As seen, English and Welsh writers found positive links between their own cultural behaviour and that of their supposed ancestors. In contrast, cultural transmission resulting from migration was often associated with degeneracy, illness, and death. Matthew Hale, writing in 1677, argued that the inhabitants of America must have migrated from Asia, Europe, and Africa over 500 years previously, and that in the interval ‘there must in all probability happen a great forgetfulness of their Original, a great degeneration from the Primitive Civility, Religion and Customs of those places from whence they were first derived... those that having been long there were fallen into a more barbarous habit of Life and Manners.’

Early modern writing reveals deep anxieties about the impact of travel and migration, and the potential changes to customs and cultural addictions. In Hale’s view, cultural change was an inevitable result of migration, although it could be delayed if a large enough group moved together and resisted integration. A colony ‘keeps it self in a Body, as the Roman Colonies anciently, and our Plantations in Virginia and New England do’, meaning ‘Customs both Religious and Civil, and the Original Language are long kept entire.’ However, Hale argues that even a large culturally homogeneous group of migrants would last no more than a few generations before undergoing a complete cultural shift. ‘The next Generation in such a mixture is quickly assimilated to the corrupt Manners and Customs of the People among whom they are thus planted’, and ‘the third Generation forget their Ancestors, and the Customs, Religion and Languages of those People from whom they were first derived, and assume various temperaments in their Language and Customs, according as the places of their Habitation and the Company among whom they live, obtain.’ Many of his contemporaries expressed similar views. Nathanael Carpenter, for example, writes of the
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Goths that ‘being a warlike people of the North, long after their first invasion of Spain, France, Italy, and other Territories of Europe, [they] retained their own disposition and nature... But in process of time it came to pass, that putting off their harsh temper they grew into one nation with the native Inhabitants.’

Whilst colonies could resist cultural change for a time, individual migrants or travellers ‘are driven to conform themselves unto their Customs for their very subsistence, safety and entertainment.’ This was as much the case within Europe as it was outside of it; in fact, so powerful were location-based factors in determining cultural addictions, that the attempt to resist their influence could result in death. The Anglo-Irish genealogist Francis Sandford tells the story of Lionel, the first Duke of Clarence, who was born in Antwerp and lived for a time in both Ireland and England. In 1368 at the age of 29 he travelled to Italy to marry, and spent several months celebrating before dying suddenly in the town of Alba. Sandford writes that ‘the Duke of Clarence (having lived with this new Wife after the manner of his own Country, forgetting or not regarding his change of air, and addicting himself to immoderate feasting, [was] spent and consumed with a lingering disease) departed this World at Alba Pompeia.’ The Duke of Clarence died because he failed to adjust his culturally-established addictions to match the climate he had moved to.

Whilst the impact of environment on cultural addiction was widely accepted among early modern writers, not everyone agreed that environmental factors could override race in determining human behaviour. Heylyn rejected that argument that the inhabitants of America were descended from the Phoenicians, writing that ‘the Americans could not so strangely degenerate from their Ancestors, but would have built great Cities like them; of which many were found in Phoenicia, but none of Antiquity in America.’ When it came to writing about early modern Ireland, English commentators were in almost complete agreement that the addictions of the Irish were racially, rather than environmentally, determined. Vulson, who links the character of every other country to its climate, writes that ‘the barbarity of these savages proceeds not from the quality of the Isle, but of their own proper nature.’ Many commentators explained the supposedly ‘natural’ barbarousness of the Irish by claiming that they were descended from Scythians: a notoriously warlike ancient
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nomadic people from Central Asia.\textsuperscript{90}

For English writers, framing Irish cultural behaviour as genealogical was a necessity in order to rationalise the continued ‘Englishness’ of the inhabitants of the Pale – a region of Ireland surrounding Dublin which had been colonised and occupied by the English since the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{91} Gerhard Mercator writes that, ‘those who refuse to obey the Laws, and live more uncivilly, are called Irishrie, and commonly Wild Irish. But those who are willing to obey the Laws, and appear before the Judges, are called the English-Irish, and their Country the English Pale.’\textsuperscript{92} Raphael Holinshed describes the inhabitants of the Pale as ‘in old time much addicted to their civility, and so far sequestered from barbarous savageness.’\textsuperscript{93} There were some concerns about cultural integration: Holinshed writes that ‘in our days they have so acquainted themselves with the Irish, as they have made a mingle mangle or gallimaufry of both the languages, and have in such medley or checkerwise so crabbedly jumbled them both together, as commonly the inhabitants of the meaner sort speak neither good English nor good Irish.’\textsuperscript{94} However, on the whole, English writers not only regarded the inhabitants of the Pale as more culturally English than Irish, in many cases they assumed that cultural integration in Ireland would eventually work in reverse; that only stubbornness was preventing the Irish from adopting English cultural addictions. Heylyn writes that, ‘The Kernes (for by that name they call the wild Irish of the poorer and inferior sort) most extremely barbarous; not behaving themselves like Christians, scarcely like men. All of them so tenacious of their ancient customs, that neither power, nor reason, nor the sense of the inconveniences which they suffer by it, can wean them to desert or change them.’\textsuperscript{95}

There is no doubt that these early modern English accounts of Ireland were also driven by colonialist ambitions. Burton and Loomba write, concerning the numerous disparaging English accounts of the Irish, that ‘this kind of description justifies an English colonial presence in Ireland in the seventeenth century.’\textsuperscript{96} ‘The supposedly racial – as opposed to environmental – differences of the Irish made it possible for English commentators to view their mission as ‘civilising’; it provided a conceptual basis for the invaders to see themselves
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as imposing their own cultural behaviours, rather than eventually acquiring those of the people they subjugated. Suranyi writes that, ‘some writers and policy makers justified the conquest of Ireland as a mission to civilise the barbarian, and maintained that the Irish could be taught to emulate the English.’ Adopting a racial rather than environmental model of cultural difference not only served as justification for colonisation – on the grounds of racial superiority – it also served to buffer English colonists against any fear of cultural integration, which might result from their occupation of Irish land.

Addiction in the torrid zone

The factors which determined individual accounts of cultural addiction were complex, combining competing frameworks as well as personal and political motives. As Surekha Davies notes, ‘the fault-lines at which these frameworks met required expert arbitration as the number of intersections between them expanded sharply in the age of Atlantic expansion.’ These tensions came to a head in early modern European accounts of Africa: a continent that not only straddled the torrid zone, but was also explicitly mentioned in Biblical accounts of racial difference, and one in which – in northern regions at least – early modern accounts of cultural behaviour differed quite noticeably from classical accounts. The final section of this chapter explores early modern descriptions of Africa, focusing in particular on the reasons behind European descriptions of cultural addiction. It examines three sources: Leo Africanus’s *A geographical historie of Africa*, which was written in 1526 but first translated and printed in English in 1600; John Ogilby’s 1670 *Africa being an accurate description*; and Nicholas Sanson’s *Cosmography and geography in two parts*, printed in 1682.

Leo Africanus was born Wasan ibn Muhammad al-Wazzan in Granada, Spain, but fled the *reconquista* to Fez as a child. As a young man al-Wazzan travelled extensively in northern Africa, before being captured by Christians and brought to Pope Leo X. His conversion to Christianity securing his release, al-Wazzan changed his name, and spent several years living in Italy where he wrote his *Descrittione dell’Africa* in 1526. The work was unprecedented in Europe, both in scope, and on its reliance on personal experience, and it was translated into multiple languages. However, the English version of 1600 was heavily mediated by the editor

---

99 Crofton Black, ‘Leo Africanus’s “Descrittione dell’Africa” and its Sixteenth-Century Translations’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 65 (2002), p. 262. Al-Wazzan was only around 30 years old when his *Descrittione* was written, and it is unclear what happened to him afterwards. However, one source claims that he returned home to Tunis and reconverted to Islam (Black, p. 263).
and translator John Pory. Not only does Pory add substantial extra material – ‘having some spare hours since it came first under the press; I thought good... to make a brief and cursory description of all those main lands and isles which mine author in his nine books hath omitted’ – he also adjusts the work in line with English values and expectations. Sandra Young describes how Pory employs ‘terms such as “barbarous” that betray an antithetical, Eurocentric view’ and how he ‘found it necessary to undo the original text’s equivocation regarding the status of Islamic belief.’ Nevertheless, Young writes, ‘the narrative also registers a sense of sympathy in offering textured detail of aspects of North African existence’, and ultimately the image of Africa that emerges ‘does not reproduce centuries of inherited myth.’ Given Pory’s extensive editing and expansion of the original, as well as his interventions as a translator, it becomes very difficult to distinguish his voice and views from those of Africanus.

The format of Africanus’s work – I will use the name his work was published under – is akin to a travel book, with each region or town described briefly and in turn, as the narrative works its way around northern Africa. It is a format which depends upon brief cultural summaries, and this is enabled through the repeated use of ADDICT and other terms for denoting cultural addiction. As Young says there are no monstrous people or animals, but that does not mean the addictions ascribed to African people are necessarily positive. The Castle of Shame ‘was called by this name, because the inhabitants are most shamefully addicted to covetise’; ‘The inhabitants of this region [Errif] are valiant people, but so excessively given to drinking, that they scarcely reserve wherewithall to apparel themselves’; ‘The citizens of Tagtess are addicted unto theft and robbery’; and ‘No people under heaven can be more wicked, treacherous, or lewdly addicted, then this people [in the town of Ileusugaghen] is.’ The negativity of these accounts is accentuated by that fact that Africanus promises to ‘only record their principal and notorious vices, omitting their smaller and more tolerable faults.’ There are very few positive addictions in Africanus’s work. In a section titled ‘The commendable actions and virtues of the Africans’, he claims that ‘those Arabians which inhabit in Barbarie or upon the coast of the Mediterranean sea, are greatly addicted unto the study of good arts and sciences’, and later that ‘All the inhabitants of Tefethne are of a most white colour, being so addicted unto friendship and hospitality, that
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they favour strangers more than their own citizens."\textsuperscript{105}

In that last example, the fact that Africanus specifically links positive cultural addictions to white skin colour raises questions about the basis of his (and Pory’s) understanding of cultural difference; whether racial, Biblical, or geographical. On the concept of the torrid zone, Pory writes in his introduction simply that ‘the greater part [of Africa] is comprised between the said Tropics under the Torrid or burnt Zone, for which only cause the ancient writers supposed it to be uninhabitable.’ Pory’s division of the inhabitants of Africa is done according to race and ancestry, rather than location; he writes that ‘this part of the world is inhabited especially by five principal nations, to wit, by the people called Cafri or Cafates... the Abassins, the Egyptians, the Arabians, and the Africans or Moors.’ Furthermore, Pory’s introduction makes explicit reference to Biblical narratives when describing the origins of these groups. He writes ‘Of all which nations some are Gentiles which worship Idols; others of the sect of Mahumet; some others Christians; some Jewish in religion; the greatest part of which people are thought to be descended from Cham [Ham] the cursed son of Noah; except some Arabians of the linage of Sem [Shem], which afterwards passed into Africa.’\textsuperscript{106} Clearly, Pory subscribed to a race-based understanding of cultural difference and cultural hierarchy, on the grounds that Ham’s cursed descendants populated Africa. It is harder to identify whether Africanus shared the views Pory laid out in his introduction. However, there is further evidence of those views within the main part of the text. Africanus writes that ‘For all the Negros or black Moors take their descent from Chus [Cush], the son of Cham [Ham], who was the son of Noë [Noah].’ The text also makes links between race and slavery, claiming that ‘All the Numidians being most ignorant of natural, domestical, & commonwealth-matters, are principally addicted unto treason, treachery, murder, theft, and robbery. This nation, because it is most slavish, will right gladly accept of any service among the Barbarians, be it never so vile or contemptible.’\textsuperscript{107} Cultural addictions within the English version of \textit{A geographical historie of Africa} are largely assigned on the basis of race, which in turn is understood – or explained – using the Biblical story of Noah’s cursed son.

The other two books examined in this section are markedly different from that of Africanus. Both were printed over seventy years after Pory’s English edition of Africanus; both are based upon compilations of previous accounts rather than personal experience; and both explicitly rejected older frameworks for explaining cultural difference. However, whilst they
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represent a self-conscious shift towards a more ‘accurate’ style of ethnography, both continued to replicate the stereotypes and prejudices produced by the frameworks they reject.

John Ogilby was a Scottish-born dancer and theatre-owner who produced geographical histories of Japan, America, China, and Asia, as well as his 1670 work on Africa. As Charles Withers points out, ‘These were not the fruits of Ogilby’s own work but rather well-produced compilations of extant translations and others’ accounts.’ Ogilby is critical of Africanus, who ‘boasted that he had been through all, yet makes no more than four Provinces... not once mentioning upper Ethiopia, or Abyssine, nor the nether, nor many other places discovered by the Portuguese since; besides all that is now called New Africa, extending from the sixteenth degree of Northern Latitude, to the Great Southern Cape.’ Ogilby is equally critical of classical geographers, for similar reasons; they ‘were utterly ignorant... because much of those vast Tracts of Africa lying under the Torrid Zone, they concluded not habitable’ and because ‘therefore they never thought of further Penetrations, but blocked themselves up with a possessed prejudice, and their own ignorance: Yet for all this, some old Writers admit most parts to be habitable, but with such monstrous Nations, that they deserve not to be accounted Human.’

Ogilby’s description of the cultural addictions of the north Africans – the same regions covered by Africanus – balance positive and negative traits. Whilst the Arabians of Barbary on the whole are ‘much addicted to Robbery and Theft’, in Numidia ‘many of them are addicted to Poetry,’ and in the city of Barbary ‘some of the better Sort have great inclination to Arts and Sciences.’ The Libyans are ‘greatly addicted to Sorcery and Witchcraft’, but the modern Egyptians are ‘very Learned and naturally addicted to Hieroglyphicks.’ In contrast, Ogilby ascribes wholly negative addictions to the inhabitants of Africa living below the Tropic of Cancer; those within the torrid zone or below it. ‘The Men [of Pongo, in modern-day Cameroon] naturally incline to Cheating and Thieving.’ The inhabitants of Sette in modern-day Gabon are ‘very much addicted to Drinking Wine of Palm’, and even worse, ‘slighting our European Wine.’

In Ampatre, Madagascar, ‘The Natives addict themselves extraordinarily to Robbing and Pillaging of their Neighbours, not only of Goods, but also of
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their Wives.’ The ‘Quaqua-Blacks’ on the Côte d’Ivoire coast worship by ‘sacrificing Men to their Idols, and thereto so addicted, that they will not be won to alter it.’ The natives of what Ogilby terms ‘Negro-Land’, by the banks of the river Niger, are ‘much addicted to Venus’, whilst the women of the Zafferamini in Madagascar are ‘no less addicted to Venereal Sportings than the Men, and they let no opportunity pass to accomplish those Designs.’

It is clear that although his account of Africa features a latitudinal divide between a ‘barbarous’ south and more morally balanced north, Ogilby does not regard the torrid zone as a factor in determining cultural addictions. He writes that ‘the In-land Regions are found for the most part habitable, and the Suns heat by shorter days and coolness of an equal night, assisted with moistening Dews, and fresh Breezes, is much moderated.’ In fact, Ogilby goes out of his way to deny the impact of climate on cultural behaviours and traits; he writes that the Kingdom of Tigre in modern-day Eritrea, ‘although it lie under the Torrid Zone, yet the continual blowing of the North-winds (there not cold) so clears it, that many exceeding old People, very fresh, and strong of Limbs, are found there.’

In fact, like Africanus/Pory, the basis for Ogilby’s understanding of cultural addiction in Africa seems to have been race rather than geography. He writes that ‘There are in Africa diverse sorts of people, generally divided into Arabians, and Aborigines, sub-divided again into Whites and Blacks; of which two kinds so dispers’d over Africa.’ He places value on descent, writing that ‘The first Planters of the Eastern Deserts of Africa, are now term’d African Berbers, descended from the Sabeans of Arabia Faelix’, and that ‘both [the African Bereberes and Bereberes Xilohes] preserve their Pedigree and Descent.’ Ogilby also makes direct links between old and current cultural addictions; ‘The Mandingians were anciently altogether given up to the Delusions of the Devil... nor have they yet detested those old and wicked Customs.’ However, unlike Africanus, there is no Biblical basis for Ogilby’s understanding of racial difference. Ogilby mentions Noah when he explains that the old world knew of only three continents – ‘Antiquity confers on the three Sons of Noah; to Sem, Asia; to Ham, Africa; and gave Japhet, Europe’ – but he quickly discounts this division for its omission of America, and he makes no link between continents and the disposition of different races.

A similar pattern can be observed in the French geographer Nicholas Sanson’s *A geographical
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description. Sanson’s work was written in 1670 but first translated into English by Richard Blome for his 1682 *Cosmography and geography in two parts*. The other ‘part’ is a translation of Bernardus Varenius’s *Geographia Generalis*; but the term *ADDICT* appears only in the translation of Sanson’s work. Blome himself was, as S. Mendyk puts it, an environmental determinist.\(^{116}\) In his preface to the reader, Blome provides an explicitly geographical and astrological explanation for cultural diversity. ‘The Modes, Genius’s, Customs and Natures of Nations being vastly different; unto this very end she [nature] hath variously disposed the causes themselves... every Climate is distinctly subject to the Dominion of some Planet, as the chief cause of this Diversity.’\(^{117}\) Blome adds that ‘this diversity which is discovered in the Climates, the situation of Provinces; Contemporation of the Air and Elements, do variously discriminate the Constitutions of Men, and those Constitutions, their Natures; for the manners of the Mind follow the temperament and disposition of the Body.’ Blome goes on to provide a description of cultural difference that is remarkably similar to that of Vulson, grounded in humoral theory. He writes that ‘Northern People being remote from the Sun... are Sanguine, Robust, full of Valour and Animosity; hence they have always been Victorious and predominant over the Meridional or Southern Nations’, whilst ‘The Nations proximate to the Sun, have their Blood wholly exsiccated by immoderate Heat; hence the Inhabitants of those Places are melancholy, and profound in the penetrating of the secrets of Nature.’ Anyone moving to a new climate would, according to Blome, swiftly acquire addictions and dispositions to match their surroundings; ‘every Nation hath certain Propensions and fixed Affections appropriate to every one, which will adhere to Foreigners, if that they long remain amongst them.’\(^{118}\)

Outside of Blome’s introduction however, geographical determinism – at least based on latitude – does not hold sway. Like Ogilby, Sanson explicitly rejected the idea that the climate of the torrid zone resulted in barbarous people, writing that ‘if we would have believed certain Authors among the Ancients, this Africa had been represented to us with unsupportable heats, unsufferable droughts, fierce and cruel Beasts, perfidious Men... whereas time, which daily discovers things unknown to the Ancients, hath made us see that the greatest heats of Africa have some refreshments... that the Beasts are not so dangerous... nor the Men so faithless, but that they have Commerce and Society among themselves, as also with Strangers.’ It is also clear that Sanson does not subscribe to the idea that Ham’s descendants
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are a cursed race; he writes that Africa 'was the portion of Cham [Ham], second Son to Noah, which may make us judge it the second in greatness and goodness.\textsuperscript{119}

However, despite rejecting two of the main frameworks used to claim the inferiority of people living in the African torrid zone, like Ogilby, Sanson goes on describe the addictions of people living there in wholly negative terms. The people of Benim in Guinea ‘are all much addicted to Women, the King being said to keep about five or 600 Wives’, and also ‘much addicted to Theft, and take it for an honour, if they can cheat or steal any thing.’ Those of Biafra in Ethiopia ‘are very barbarous, addicting themselves to Witchcrafts, and sometimes sacrificing their Children to Devils.’ The people of Angra in Ethiopia, ‘though hardly and addicted to Arms, are unexpert in them: so that their Number would do them little good, if assaulted by the Europeans,’ and those of Madagascar ‘are addicted to idleness, and not caring to cultivate the Earth.\textsuperscript{120}

Meanwhile those living above the Tropic of Cancer – outside the torrid zone – are described in much more balanced terms, and ascribed a mixture of positive and negative addictions. The inhabitants of Elmadine in northern Morocco ‘addict themselves to Arts, Traffic, and Manufactures’, whilst those of Fez are ‘close, perfidious, inconstant, proud, much addicted to Luxury; the people of Errif ‘are valiant but much addicted to drink’, whilst those of Chaus are ‘fierce and warlike, to which they are addicted.’ In Tenes, Algieria, the ‘Inhabitants are addicted to Traffic’, those of Susa and Hammametha in Tunisia ‘addict themselves to Traffic, others to Whitening of Cloth’, whilst those of Numidia ‘are addicted to Theft, murder, are very deceitful.’\textsuperscript{121} Despite explicitly rejecting established geographical and racial justifications for prejudice, Sanson’s work – like Ogibly’s – reveals a strong bias against the inhabitants of central and southern Africa.

So why were specific cultural addictions so enduringly negative, despite explicit rejection of the frameworks which made them negative in the first place? Emily Bartels suggests that ‘the difference between the representations of the two groups may derive from the fact that Moors were textually and actually more familiar to the English than were Negroes.’\textsuperscript{122} However, more than just textual familiarity, it was the content of the texts which mattered, and the types of texts available to the compilers of ethnographic accounts were very different.
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above and below the Tropic of Cancer. Below it, there were classical accounts of extreme
heat and uninhabitable deserts, medieval monstrous people, and contemporary accounts
which were often influenced by both of the above. Hodgen suggests that when travellers
wrote down accounts of their journey, they would tend to describe what they expected to
see. ‘It may be that, except for a few well-balanced minds, indelible memories of fantastic
medieval ethnological lore made objective observations impossible.’ Above the Tropic of
Cancer, classical accounts tell of the great civilisations of Egypt and Carthage, whilst, as
Bartels points out, ‘the image of the Moor was connected to a long history of contact with
the East.’

When scholars came to compile or edit travellers accounts – as did Pory, Ogilby, Sanson,
and Blome – they pulled together multiple narratives, both recent and old, in order to
construct a single description. Whilst they may have rejected previous explanations for
cultural difference, they still relied on texts which were written with those frameworks in
mind. As Young puts it, ‘Mapping the versions of Africa that emerge in these texts
demonstrates that the epistemological systems early modern scholars identified as “new” and
“modern” carry traces of old assumptions. The assumed links between Africa and
“barbarism”, for example, and between nomadism and “beastliness”, are transformed in the
later geographies and made subject to the evidentiary modes of the new empirical method.’
The cultural addictions remained the same, but their ‘proof’ now rested upon claims of
observation and scholarship rather than Biblical or geographical frameworks.

This can be evidenced through a closer examination of some of the specific cultural
addictions mentioned by Africanus, Ogilby, and Sanson. Africanus, whose work (as edited
by Pory) subscribes to a Biblical explanation for racial difference, describes the inhabitants
of Biafra in modern-day Ethiopia as, ‘being addicted in such sort to witchcraft... Whereupon
they reverence more the devil then any thing else: sacrificing unto him... their own blood
also, and their children.’ The same cultural addiction – with the same suggestion of child
sacrifice – is repeated by both Ogilby and Sanson. Ogilby writes that ‘The Inhabitants [of
Biafra] are generally inclin’d to Conjuration and Witchcraft... for which knowledge they
honour the Devil so much, that they sacrifice... their own Children’, and Sanson that ‘Those
of Biafra more advanced in Land, are very barbarous, addicting themselves to Witchcrafts,

\[125\] Young, ‘Early Modern Geography’, p. 415.
and sometimes sacrificing their Children to Devils.  

Similarly, Africanus writes that Arabians in Numidia ‘take great delight in poetry, and will pen most excellent verses’, and Ogilby echoes him, writing that ‘in most parts of Numidia, many of them [Arabians] are addicted to Poetry’, and that ‘The Numidians are... Poets naturally, being much addicted thereunto.’ Sanson, notably, does not mention poetry, but instead writes that in general the people of Numidia ‘are addicted to Theft, murder, [and] are very deceitful’, but that ‘these Arabs [in Numidia] are esteemed more civil and ingenious than the Numidians are.’ Since Sanson had clearly read Africanus and used him as a source, this washed-out version of the original sentiment appears to be deliberate, but whether it was based on the work of another travel writer, or whether it reveals Sanson’s own religious prejudices, is unclear. However, it is evident that early modern ethnographic writing involved the reproduction of previous accounts of cultural addiction; these accounts were re-framed, re-worded, and presented as wholly accurate, resting on empirical not Biblical or geographical explanatory frameworks. Nevertheless, by reproducing descriptions of specific cultural addictions, ethnographers also reproduced the cultural stereotypes which those older frameworks had created.

Conclusion

Ethnographic literature was a booming industry in seventeenth-century England, powered by increasing opportunities for both travel and print, and a growing curiosity about the world. Interest was not limited to the new world, or even to the distant world. Descriptions of cultures just beyond the borders of England helped to clarify and cement English national identity, and as much time was devoted to historical cultures as contemporary ones. Ethnographic works were increasingly broad in scope, and many set out not just to describe but also to compare and contrast. Both of these goals necessitated the creation of simple cultural summaries – ‘collections of customs’ – which reduced complex, diverse, varied cultures into a single defining behaviour. Addiction – a concept which did exactly that – became a commonplace of these ethnographic works.

The language of cultural addiction was not limited to ADDICT alone. Early modern writers could implicitly signal the presence of cultural addiction by observing the strength of a shared habit and its effects, or they could explicitly signal it using ADDICT or one of its synonyms: prone, given, and inclined, could all be used interchangeably with addicted. Writers could switch

---

127 Sanson & Varenius, trans. Blome, Cosmography and geography in two parts; Ogilby, Africa being an accurate description.
129 Sanson & Varenius, trans. Blome, Cosmography and geography in two parts.
between these related terms in order to avoid repetition within a sentence, and they could replace one term with another when borrowing an account of cultural addiction from another author.

The surge in ethnographic writing was accompanied by a shift in the way cultural addictions were framed; a shift which some writers regarded as a move from fantastical to empirical. Geographers like John Ogilby and Nicholas Sanson explicitly rejected cultural frameworks based on the Bible, humoral theory, or classical geographical theory. However, since their accounts of the world were based on compilations of other works, the cultural addictions they described echoed the stereotypes and prejudices created by those established frameworks. Furthermore, there were many seventeenth-century ethnographic writers who made no attempt to reject older frameworks. Humoral theory created a division between the cultural addictions of northerners and southerners which, in Europe at least, was enduringly popular (and arguably has resonance even today). Geographical determinism, stripped of its disproved elements, could be found as late as 1682 in the editorial work of Richard Blome. The Biblical story of Noah’s curse was used to explain the apparent ‘barbarism’ and innate servitude of African people, and arguably left a concept of racial hierarchy which remained long after the curse itself was disregarded.

It is important to note that these frameworks were not used to ‘discover’ cultural addictions, but to support and evidence the writer’s account of them. They shaped early modern understanding to a point, but they were also tools to be deployed. Significantly, most writers seem to have been aware that multiple frameworks existed to explain cultural diversity. The movement of people, both as travellers and migrants, provided a test for early modern accounts of cultural addiction. Under a geographically-determined model, moving to a new location meant changing cultural addictions, and such changes were rarely described in favourable terms. Racial models of cultural addiction, on the other hand – stripped of Biblical associations – allowed for cultural stability across locations, and offered a means of differentiating between groups of people living in the same place. It is significant that English accounts of Ireland – a country too close to be differentiated geographically, and one occupied by an English colony – were almost always discussed in terms of genealogical differences. Perhaps more surprisingly, Africa – despite being uncolonized, geographically distinct, and already characterised as ‘barbarous’ under geographical models – was also often described in racial terms. As Francisco Bethencourt writes, ‘the construction of prejudices concerning ethnic descent... justified discriminatory action during the early modern expansion, and prepared the new wave of European colonialism in the late nineteenth and
The shift from a geographical basis for cultural addiction to a racial one enabled claims about the ‘civilising’ power of European expansion, linking cultural addiction to an emerging colonial theory.

As a final point, it is worth considering how these theories behind group addictions map onto the theories behind individual addictions that were outlined in the previous chapter, given the potential for tension between them. Geographical frameworks for understanding cultural difference were wholly compatible with humoral theory. Humoral theory provided a unifying model for explaining how external factors such as climate, temperature, and location, could combine with individual characteristics such as age, gender, and temperament, in order to influence human action. All of these qualities could affect disposition, which in turn influenced the affections, reason, understanding, and the will, as outlined in Chapter IV. The internal processes that supposedly created inherited addictions are less apparent. As Burton and Loomba point out, ‘the defining features of racial ideologies – the quasi-biological notion that physical characteristics denoted distinct types of human beings with distinct moral and social features – had not yet come into being.’

However, they also point out that ‘colonialism did not insert itself upon a blank slate but reshaped earlier understandings of human differentiation; these in turn prepared the ground for, and indeed often determined the form of, later racial and colonial perspectives.’ Just as the shift from geographical to racial models enabled new justifications for colonialism, so too did it lay the groundwork for an emerging racial theory; one which ultimately replaced humoral theory in explaining the causes of cultural addiction.

---

132 Ibid., pp. 8-9.
Addiction reveals how early modern people understood habitual behaviours. ADDICT was the verb used to describe the actions associated with habit; the patterns of behaviour established through the repeated choices of the will, made under the various influences of affection, reason, and understanding. The addicted behaviours that were most frequently discussed were those at the extremes of a moral spectrum: behaviours that were virtuous or sinful, contemplative or bodily, destructive or devotional. However, addiction itself was not necessarily an extreme behaviour, but could refer to various strengths of attachment. Addiction could be extraordinary and extreme, but it could also be mundane, moderate, and every-day.

The fundamental character of addiction did not change across the early modern period. The devotional, destructive, laudable, and sinful qualities of addiction were present, in some form, in the neo-Latin word ADDICERE from which addiction was derived. These characteristics can also be found in the earliest appearances of ADDICT, in the work of early protestant reformers in 1530s England. What did change, as the word moved beyond reformist works and entered into more general English vocabulary, was the scope of addiction: the types of subjects and objects to which it was commonly applied. The objects of addiction expanded beyond reformist concerns with devotion and worldliness, and ADDICT became a term commonly used in reference to drunkenness, poetry, venery, astrology, and more. As the verb DEVOTE became increasingly established from the early seventeenth century onwards, there was a corresponding decrease in devotional uses of ADDICT; the number of negative behaviours associated with addiction expanded, and by the end of the seventeenth century, ADDICT was rarely used to describe religious devotion, the service of god, or interpersonal attachment. The subjects of addiction also expanded as addiction was increasingly used, not to describe the behaviour of specific individuals or provide invocations to virtuous action,
but to define and denote stereotypical behaviours. Addiction was used to convey the association of ‘great men’ with studiousness; of women with venery and drunkenness; of Jews with idolatry; of young men with lust; and of cultural groups around the world with the behaviours that supposedly defined them. These stereotypes were not new, nor were they unique to addiction; rather, the term ADDICT became an easy shorthand for producing comparable summaries of established stereotypes.

My analysis of early modern addiction stops at least a century short of the point at which addiction became associated with a medicalised enslavement to substances. However, the roots of that association are clear to see in seventeenth-century writing. As a product of the will, early modern addiction was by its very nature freely-chosen and freely-pursued, yet it brought with it a form of constraint in its drive for repetition. That constraint – although self-imposed and breakable – can be traced back to the classical Roman legal meaning of ADDICERE, which indicated a legally-imposed physical constraint in the form of indentured servitude. Ongoing debates about addicted free will can thus draw upon two quite distinct historical models of addicted constraint, one in which addiction is self-imposed, and the other in which addiction is compelled by external forces. Whilst early modern addiction was certainly not regarded as a disease, or even as something inherently undesirable, it nevertheless had strong ties to early modern medical theory. Addictions were thought to be tied to a person’s temperament or disposition, which in turn was affected by factors such as their age, gender, environment, health, and the natural balance of their humours. Arguably, early modern addiction was therefore both a form of compulsion, and a medical phenomenon; however, in keeping with contemporary medical theory and notions of the self, it was a self-imposed compulsion, tied to a holistic concept of health.

There are two very notable differences between early modern concepts of addiction, and the nineteenth-century medicalised concept of addiction. The former was commonly applied to a much greater diversity of behaviours, and it was regarded as ubiquitous and routine, rather than subversive and disordered. However, outside of a very narrowly-defined medical context, the early modern idea of addiction as something generalised and pervasive has endured. There is a persistent and popular notion, although rarely expressed in academic genres, that everyone is addicted to something. A Huffington Post article by B.J. Gallagher asks, ‘is everyone an addict?’ and explores the question through recent popular non-fiction works by Anne Wilson Schaef, Pema Chodron, and M. Scott Peck, all of whom would, it seems, answer
'yes’ to Gallagher’s question.\(^1\) Gallagher and the sources she describes all regard this universal addiction as a disease; Gallagher writes that, ‘Schaef says that addiction is a pandemic American disease driven by our high-stress culture. Chodron and Peck say that addiction is a human dis-ease driven by our existential angst.’ Other modern writers have framed universal addiction as a means of describing everyday habits. A Guardian Opinion article by Michael Moran, titled ‘Face it, everyone’s addicted to something’, ran with the tagline, ‘It’s not just cigarettes that are hard to quit – exercise, coffee, video games or shouting at Question Time are habit-forming too.\(^2\)’ As Moran informs his readers, ‘Addiction is part of the human condition. We’re all addicted to something; it’s just a question of owning up to your own particular poison.’

The idea that addiction is something universal rests upon the notion that addiction encompasses a much greater diversity of objects than is found under a narrow medical definition; as well as intoxicating substances, ‘universal addiction’ counts behaviours like running, watching TV, eating cheese, playing angry birds, and countless more, as potential addictions.\(^3\)

As Gretchen Rubin notes in an article for the consumer-facing health website Psych Central, ‘In everyday conversation, of course, people throw around the word “addicted” a lot, as in, “I’m addicted to Game of Thrones.”’\(^4\) Moran’s list of potential addictions includes coffee, exercise, and video games; Gallagher mentions TV, work, shopping, cookies, and the internet. Both, interestingly, list religion as a form of addiction: Moran remarks (albeit somewhat sarcastically) that ‘There are perfectly good evolutionary reasons why humans are predisposed to devotion’, and Gallagher summarises Peck’s thesis that addictions are a means of filling the void left when, ‘At birth, humans become separated from God.’\(^5\)

One point of difference to the early modern understanding of addiction is that Gallagher, Rubin, and Moran all regard addiction as fundamentally negative – although Rubin notes that this is subjective, since ‘Sometimes, a behaviour that one person considers to be healthy and positive is viewed by another person as extreme and negative.’

---


\(^3\) A google search for the phrase “addicted to angry birds” (in quotation marks) finds 14,300 results. Search conducted 02/09/18.


\(^5\) Gallagher, ‘Is Everyone Addicted to Something?’; Moran, ‘Face it, Everyone’s Addicted to Something’.
Despite this, Moran’s definition of addiction as ‘the compulsive repetition of a behaviour that gives short-term pleasure’ bears many of the same elements as La Primaudaye’s account of addiction, as being both ‘bred by the often repeating and reiterating of the same things’, and swayed by affection which ‘rushes upon that pleasure, which at that present seems best unto her and nearest at hand’. Modern descriptions of addiction as something ubiquitous, predominantly behavioural, and prodigiously diverse, contain strong echoes of early modern accounts. Arguably it is in these more popular uses of the modern term that early modern addiction has survived, albeit in an altered form, into the present day.

---
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Referencing notes

The issue of how to cite EEBO is controversial. This is partly because, as Jacqueline Wernimont put it, ‘EEBO isn’t a catalogue of early modern books – it’s a catalogue of copies. More precisely, it is a repository of digital images of microfilms of single copies of books, and, if your institution subscribes to the Text Creation Partnership (TCP) phases one and/or two, text files that are outsourced transcriptions of microfilm images of single texts.\(^1\) In 2012 Jonathan Blaney wrote an article outlining the problems that occur when humanities scholars ignore the complexity of digital sources, and treat them like nothing more than print objects. He made the point that ‘Writers should talk about their methodology. This is simply good practice. It is qualitatively different to read a physical book than an image or a transcription online.’ He added that ‘If a researcher has benefited from a resource in work then they should acknowledge it.’\(^2\)

Whilst the importance of treating digital copies as distinct from physical sources is increasingly accepted, there is still debate over what information should be included. Heather Froelich suggests that EEBO-TCP citations should include URL, access date, and phase number, as well as the original book details (but not necessarily page number).\(^3\) The Chadwyck-Healey website’s own citation guidelines are similar, but exclude the EEBO phase number, and have slightly different wording (including the peculiar and unnecessary addition of the word web before the URL).\(^4\) Taking a more extreme stance, Sam Kaislaniemi argues strongly that access date is not needed if the resource is stable, and that the Chadwyck-Healey URLs are not informative, and should therefore be excluded.\(^5\)

The citation style used in this thesis for EEBO texts is in most respects the same as that of a standard physical book. However, in recognition of the time, effort, and cost that goes into

---


producing digital resources, and also to enable the reader to easily locate the source used, either EEBO or EEBO-TCP is listed as an additional place of publication. For TCP texts, the citation also records whether it is from Phase I or II, since the first phase is freely available, whilst the second phase is behind a pay wall until 2020. In terms of location within a text, page numbers are not included for TCP texts, since this information is often not available for texts on CQPweb or Early Modern Print; an exception is made for texts that combine several different works, such as Primaudaye’s *French Academy*, where the book and chapter number will be listed. For EEBO texts that are document-image only some indication of the location within the text is provided; page numbers where available, otherwise chapter or section headings, or if necessary, document image numbers. This is a reflection of the fact that, whilst specific text locations are easily found on EEBO-TCP sources using a simple search, it can be extremely difficult to find a particular quotation using just document images. URLs are not provided for EEBO or EEBO-TCP texts, partly because the texts can often be accessed through different tools, and partly because the main resources used for accessing texts – Chadwyck-Healey and CQPweb – do not provide stable URLs.

The metadata used in citations is not wholly that of any single source, but draws on the metadata found on CQPweb, Chadwyck-Healey, the ESTC, and often the title pages of texts themselves. For edited or translated texts, the title is always listed under the name of the original author, with the editor or translator named afterwards (this is not standard practice on Chadwyck-Healey). The only exception is Bible translations, which have the translator as the named author. If a translator has made substantial revisions to the text, for example adding their own material or notes within the original text, they are also listed as an editor. Where there are multiple authors, editors, or translators, all names are recorded, starting with the person listed as first author on Chadwyck-Healey. Where necessary, explanatory notes are provided in square brackets after the citation.

---

6 Chadwyck-Healey offers stable URLs, but since it is a subscription service and the URL is tied to the subscription, it could only be used by other people with a University of Sheffield account. Also, even for a University of Sheffield user the URLs are unreliable – in 2017 the university changed the way it accessed Chadwyck-Healey, and all previous URLs stopped working.
# Appendix B

## EEBO-TCP texts containing ADDICT, 1529-49

A list of all the texts on EEBO-TCP that contain the term ADDICT, printed from 1529 to 1549, in chronological order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Frith</td>
<td>George Joye</td>
<td><em>A pistle to the Christen reader The revelation of Antichrist</em></td>
<td>1529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Bucer</td>
<td>George Joye</td>
<td><em>The Psalter of Dauid in Enlishe</em></td>
<td>1530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Frith</td>
<td>George Joye</td>
<td><em>A disputacio[n] of purgatorye made by Ioh[a]n Frith</em></td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>George Joye</td>
<td><em>The prophete [Isaye,] translated into englysbe</em></td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>A glasce of the truthe</em></td>
<td>1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Frith</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>A boke made by John Frith prison</em></td>
<td>1533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus, Desiderius</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>[<em>Ye dyaloge called Funus</em>]</td>
<td>1534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girolamo Savonarola</td>
<td>William Marshall</td>
<td><em>An exposition after the maner of a co[n]templacyon vpon ye .i.[,] psalmes, called Miserere mei Deus</em></td>
<td>1534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Joye</td>
<td>William Marshall</td>
<td><em>The defence of peace: lately translated out of latin in to englysshe</em></td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsilius, of Padua</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>[<em>A ryght excellent sermon and full of frute and edificacyon of the chylde Jesus.</em>]</td>
<td>1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderius Erasmus</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Frith</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>An other boke against Rastel</em></td>
<td>1537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Elyot</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The dictionary of syr Thomas Eliot knyght.</em></td>
<td>1538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td><em>An epistle of the moste myghty [and] redoubted Prince Henry the .viii.</em></td>
<td>1538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancelot Ridley</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>An expositon in the epistell of Iude the apostel of Christ</em></td>
<td>1538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgang Capito</td>
<td>Richard Taverner</td>
<td><em>An epitome of the Psalmes, or briefe meditations vpon the same.</em></td>
<td>1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Taverner</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Epistles and Gospels with a brief postil vpon the same from after Easter tyll Advent</em></td>
<td>1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Taverner</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The principal lawes customes and estatutes of England</em></td>
<td>1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Elyot</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bibliotheca Eliotae</em></td>
<td>1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodorus Bibliander</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td><em>A godly consultacion vnto the brethren and companions of the Christen religion</em></td>
<td>1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Becon</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>A newe pathway vnto praier ful of much godly frute and christ[e] knowledge,</em></td>
<td>1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Becon</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Daudis harpe ful of moste delectable armony, newly strynged and set in tune by Theadore Basille</em></td>
<td>1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus, Desiderius</td>
<td>Nicolas Vdall</td>
<td><em>Apophthegmes that is to saie, prompte, quicke, wittie and sententious saynynes, of certain emperours</em></td>
<td>1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>A necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christen man set furthe by the kynges maiestye of England</em></td>
<td>1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Becon</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>A newe yeares gyfte more precious than golde worthy to be embrased no lesse joyfully than the[n]ke full</em></td>
<td>1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Becon</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>An inuenytie agenst the moste wicked [and] detestable vye of swearing.</em></td>
<td>1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Joye</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The vnitie and scisme of the olde chyrche</em></td>
<td>1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Tracy</td>
<td>A supplication to our moste soueraigne lorde Kyng Henry the eyght Kyng of Engleand of Fraine and of Irelande</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bale</td>
<td>The image of bothe churches after reualacion of saynt Iohan the evangelyst</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Chedsey</td>
<td>Two notable sermones lately preached at Pauls Crosse Anno 1544</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderius Erasmus</td>
<td>Miles Coverdale</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderius Erasmus</td>
<td>A shorte recapitulacion or abrigement of Erasmus Enchiridion</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hugh</td>
<td>The troubled mans medicine verye profitable to be rede of al men</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joye, George</td>
<td>The refutation of the byslopen of Winchesters derke declaratio[n] of his false articles</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polydore Vergil</td>
<td>Thomas Langley</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bale</td>
<td>The actes of Englysh votaryes comprehendinge their vnchast practyses and examples by all ages</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hooper</td>
<td>A declaration of Christe and of his offyce</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanus Rhegius</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Aepinus</td>
<td>Nicholas Lesse</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>George Bancraffe</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich Bullinger</td>
<td>John Veron</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Calvin</td>
<td>Richard Grafton</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderius Erasmus</td>
<td>Nicholas Udall</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Hall and R. Grafton</td>
<td>The union of the two noble and illustre families of Lancaste [and] Yorke,</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz Lambert</td>
<td>Nicolas Lesse</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Nicolls</td>
<td>The copie of a letter sente to one maister Christyne chanon of Exceter</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Crowley</td>
<td>The confutation of the. xiii. articles</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>The booke of the common prayer and administracion of the sacramentes, and other rites and ceremonies</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Baldwin</td>
<td>The cantickes or balades of Salomon, phrasesyke declared in Englysh metre,</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Bucer</td>
<td>Thomas Hoby</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Crowley</td>
<td>The Psalter of Davyd newly translated into Englysh metre</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderius Erasmus</td>
<td>M. Coverdalen &amp; J. Olde</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hall</td>
<td>Certayne chapters of the proverbes of Salomon drawnen into metre by Thomas sternebolde</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Latimer</td>
<td>The seconde [seventh] sermon of Maister Hugh Latimer which he preached before the Kynges Maiestie</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>E.T.</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderius Erasmus</td>
<td>Thomas Chaloner</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix C

## List of dictionaries from Chapter II

A list of all dictionaries examined for Chapter II in chronological order. The final column shows whether the dictionary contained an entry on ADDICT / ADDICERE or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dictionary</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Medulla Grammatice (Pepys MS 2002)</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pynson</td>
<td>Promptorium Parvulorum</td>
<td>English-Latin</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Ortus Vocabulorum</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastell, John</td>
<td>Expositiones terminorum legum anglorum</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyot, Thomas</td>
<td>The dictionary of syr Thomas Eliot knyght</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Sex linguarum, Latinae, Gallice, Hispanicai, Italice, Angloica, et Teutonica</td>
<td>polyglot</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyot, Thomas</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Eliotae Eliotis librarie</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyot, Thomas</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Eliotae Eliotis librarie</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyot, Thomas</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Eliotae = Eliotis librarie</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyot, Thomas</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Eliotae = Eliotes dictionarie the second tyme enriched</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estienne, Robert</td>
<td>Dictionariolum puororum, tribus linguis Latina, Anglica &amp; Gallica conscriptum</td>
<td>Latin-English &amp; French</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huloet, Richard</td>
<td>Alcedarium anglico latinum, pro tyrunculis Richardo Huloeto escriptore</td>
<td>English-Latin</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyot, Thomas</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Eliotae = Eliotes dictionarie the second tyme enriched</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyot, Thomas</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Eliotae Eliotis dictionarie / by Thomas Cooper the third tym corrected</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyot, Thomas</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Eliotae Eliotis dictionarie / by Thomas Cooper the third tym corrected</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper, Thomas</td>
<td>Thesaurus linguae Romanae &amp; Britanniae tam accurate congestus</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. H.</td>
<td>A dictionarie French and English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huloet, Richard</td>
<td>Huloets dictionarie newlye corrected, amended,</td>
<td>English-French</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Véron, John</td>
<td>A dictionary in Latin and English, heretofore set forth by Master Iohn Veron</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baret, John</td>
<td>An alenarie or quadruple dictionarie containing foure sundrie tongues: namele, English, Latin, Greekes, and French</td>
<td>English-Latin</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Le dictionaire des huict langages</td>
<td>polyglot</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junius, Hadrianus</td>
<td>The nomenclator, or remembrancer of Adrianus Iinnis physician divided in two tomes,</td>
<td>polyglot</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Thomas</td>
<td>Dictionarium linguae Latinae et Anglicanae In hoc operis quid sit praestitum</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rider, John</td>
<td>Bibliotheca scholastica. A double dictionarie</td>
<td>English-Latin</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollyband, Claudius</td>
<td>A dictionarie French and English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceval, Richard</td>
<td>A dictionarie in Spanish and English, first published into the English tongue by Ric. Percinale Gent</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cawdry, Robert</td>
<td>A table alphabetical conteyning and teaching the true writing, and understanding of hard vsuall English worde</td>
<td>English-French</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rider, John</td>
<td>Riders dictionarie corrected and augmented wherein Rider's index is transformed into a dictionarie etymologicall,</td>
<td>English-Latin &amp; Latin-English</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowell, John</td>
<td>The interpreter: or Booke containing the signification of words wherein is set forth the true meaning of all</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotgrave, Randle</td>
<td>A dictionarie of the French and English / tongues.</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florio, John</td>
<td>Queen Anna’s new world of words, or dictionarie of the Italian and English tongues</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Thomas</td>
<td>A Christian dictionarie Opening the signification of the chief words dispersed generally through Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minsheu, John</td>
<td>Hegemon eis tas glossas- id est, Doctor in lingusas, The guide into tongues</td>
<td>polyglot</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B.</td>
<td>An English expositor: teaching the interpretation of the hardest words used in our language.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus, Desiderius</td>
<td>Adagia in Latin and English containing five hundred proverbs</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>A Dictionarie English, and Latine wherein the knots and difficulties of the Latine tongue are vntied and resolved</td>
<td>English-Latin</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockeram, Henry</td>
<td>The English dictionarie: or, An interpreter of hard English words</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoake, Francis</td>
<td>Dictionarium etymologicum Latinum, antiquissimum &amp; novissimum,</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comenius, Johann Amos</td>
<td>Janua linguarum reserata: or a seed-plot of all languages and sciences</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. I.</td>
<td>Dictionariolum quadruplex: or A four-fold dictionarie for the use and benefit of grammar-schollers</td>
<td>polyglot</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlemont, Noël de</td>
<td>Den grooten vocabulaer Engels ende Days</td>
<td>English-Dutch</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexham, Henry</td>
<td>A copious English and Netherdaytch dictionarie</td>
<td>English-Dutch</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rider, John</td>
<td>Dictionarium etymologicum Latinum antiquissimum &amp; novissimum,</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon</td>
<td>Janua linguarum; or, an easie and compendious method and course for the attaining the Latine tongue.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis, Thomas</td>
<td>Vestibulum lingue Latinae.</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount, Thomas</td>
<td>Glossographia: or A dictionary, interpreting all such hard words</td>
<td>polyglot</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips, Edward</td>
<td>The new world of English words, or, A general dictionary containing the interpretations of such hard words as are derived from other languages</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell, James</td>
<td>Lexicon tetraglotton an English-French-Italian-Spanish dictionary</td>
<td>English-polyglot</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalgarno, George</td>
<td>Ars signorum, vulgo character universalis et lingua philosophica authore Geo. Dalgarno.</td>
<td>Universal Language</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wase, Christopher</td>
<td>Dictionarium minus a compendious dictionary English-Latin &amp; Latin-English</td>
<td>English-Latin &amp; Latin-English</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouldman, Francis</td>
<td>A copious dictionary in three parts I. the English before the Latin ... II. The Latin before the English ... III. The proper names of persons, places</td>
<td>English-Latin &amp; Latin-English</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman, Henry, Sir</td>
<td>Glossarium archeologicum continens latino-barbara, peregrina, obsoleta, &amp; novatae significationis vocabula</td>
<td>Post-classical Latin</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkins, John</td>
<td>An alphabetical dictionarie wherein all English words according to their various significations</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Thomas</td>
<td>The British language in its lustre, or, A copious dictionary of Welsh and English</td>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount, Thomas</td>
<td>Nomo-lexikon, a law-dictionary interpreting such difficult and obscure words and terms as are found either in our common or statute, ancient or modern laws</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowell, John</td>
<td>Nomotheutes, the interpreter containing the genuine signification of such obscure words and terms used either in the common or statute laws of this realm</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head, Richard</td>
<td>The canting academy, or, The devils cabinet opened</td>
<td>English slang</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell, James</td>
<td>A French and English dictionary composed by Mr. Randle Cotgrove</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1673 Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heldoren, J. G. van</td>
<td>An English and Nether-dutch dictionary composed out of the best English authors</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coles, Elisha</td>
<td>An English dictionary explaining the difficult terms that are used in divinity, husbandry, physick, physlosophy, law, navigation, mathematicks, and other arts and sciences</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1676 Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoake, Thomas</td>
<td>A large dictionary in three parts I. The English before the Latin, containing above ten thousand wordsmore than any dictionary yet extant, II. The Latin before the English</td>
<td>English-Latin &amp; Latin-English</td>
<td>1676 Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coles, Elisha</td>
<td>A dictionary, English-Latin and Latin-English containing all things necessary for the translating of either language into the other</td>
<td>English-Latin &amp; Latin-English</td>
<td>1677 Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miege, Guy</td>
<td>A new dictionary French and English with another English and French</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton, Adam</td>
<td>Linguae Latinae liber dictionarius quadripartitus A Latin dictionary in four parts</td>
<td>English-Latin &amp; Latin-English</td>
<td>1678 Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miege, Guy</td>
<td>The great French dictionary in two parts</td>
<td>English-French</td>
<td>1688 Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skinner, Stephen</td>
<td>A new English dictionary shewing the etymological derivation of the English tongue</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. H.</td>
<td>The ladies dictionary, being a general entertainment of the fair-sex a work never attempted before in English.</td>
<td>Ladies</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett, Basil</td>
<td>Romae antiquae notitia, or, The antiquities of Rome in two parts</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1696 Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. E.</td>
<td>A new dictionary of the canting crew in its several tribes of gypsies, beggers [, sic, thieves, cheats]</td>
<td>Slang</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyer, Abel</td>
<td>The royal dictionary in two parts, first, French and English, secondly, English and French</td>
<td>English-French</td>
<td>1699 Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danet, Pierre</td>
<td>A complete dictionary of the Greek and Roman antiquities</td>
<td>Latin-English</td>
<td>1700 Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcote, Thomas</td>
<td>An Anglo-Saxon dictionary : based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth</td>
<td>Anglo Saxon</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

List of translated works from Chapter II

A list of all works examined in the study of translation in Chapter II. Includes 22 Latin texts, translated in 31 English texts. Arranged in chronological order based on the Latin text.

NB. “Latin Date” for all classical, late, and medieval Latin texts, is the author’s date of death.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin author</th>
<th>Latin Date</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Latin Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>English title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cicero, M Tullius</td>
<td>43BC</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Tractatarum Disputationem</td>
<td>Dolman, John</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>Those five questions, which Marke Tullye Cicero, disputed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>Wase, Christopher</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>The five days debate at Cicero’s house in Tusculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero, M Tullius</td>
<td>43BC</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>De Officiis Liber</td>
<td>Grimald, Nicholas</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Marcus Tullius Ciceroes thre bokes of duties to Marcus his sonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>L’Estrange, Roger</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Tullys offices in three books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>Cockman, Thomas</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Tully’s three books of offices, in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero, M Tullius</td>
<td>43BC</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Epistularum ad Familiares</td>
<td>Webbe, Joseph</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>The familiar epistles of M.T. Cicero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Ab Urbe Condita</td>
<td>Holland, Philemon</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>The Romane historie written by T. Livius of Padua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apuleius</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Metamorphoses</td>
<td>Adlington, William</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>The xi. bookes of the Golden asse conteininge the Metamorphosie of Lucius Apuleius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertullian</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Tertulliani Apologeticum</td>
<td>H. B.</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Tertullians apology, or, Defence of the Christians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactantius</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>De Mortibus Persecutorum</td>
<td>Burnet, Gilbert</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>A relation of the death of the primitive persecutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammianus Marcellinus</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Historiae</td>
<td>Holland, Philemon</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>The Roman historie containing such acts and occurrences as passed under Constantius, Julianus, Iovianus, Valentinianus, and Valens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine, Saint</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Confessiones</td>
<td>R. H.</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>The life of S. Augustine. Written by himself in the first ten books of his Confessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine, Saint</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>De Civita Dei</td>
<td>Healey, John</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>St. Augustine, Of the cite of God vvith the learned comments of Io. Lad. Vines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bede</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Historiam Ecclesiasticae Gentis Anglorum</td>
<td>Stapleton, Thomas</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>The history of the Church of Englande.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent III</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>De Contemptu Mundi</td>
<td>Kirton, H.</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>The mirror of mans lyfe Plainely describing, what weake mould we are made of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Translator</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas à Kempis</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>Neo-Latin</td>
<td><em>De Imitatione Christi</em></td>
<td>Hake, Edward</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>The imitation or following of Christ, and the contemning of worldly vanities whereunto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rogers, Thomas</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>Of the imitation of Christ, three, both for wisedome, and godlines, most excellent books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoskins, Anthony</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>The following of Christ Divided into four books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Page, William</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>The imitation of Christ divided into four books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington, John</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>The Christians pattern, or A divine treatise of the imitation of Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergil, Polydore</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>Neo-Latin</td>
<td><em>De Rerum Inventoribus</em></td>
<td>Langley, Thomas</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>An abridgement of the notable worke of Polidore Vergile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus, Desiderius</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Neo-Latin</td>
<td><em>Moriae Encomium</em></td>
<td>Thomas Chaloner</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>The praise of folie. = Moriencomium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson, John</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Moriae encomium, or, The praise of folly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennett, White</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Witt against wisdom, or, A panegyrick upon folly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savonarola</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Neo-Latin</td>
<td><em>Exposition In Psalmos Misere Me Deus</em></td>
<td>William Marshall</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>An exposition after the maner of a con[n]templacyon vpon ye li. psalme,called Miserere mei Deus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus, Desiderius</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Neo-Latin</td>
<td><em>Concio De Puero Jesu</em></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>A ryght excellent sermon and full of frute and edificacyon of the chylde Jesus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More, Thomas</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Neo-Latin</td>
<td><em>De Optimo Stato Republicae Deque Nova Insula Utopia</em></td>
<td>Robinson, Ralph</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>A fruteful, and pleasaunt worke of the beste state of a publyque weale, and of the newe yle called Vtopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus, Desiderius</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Neo-Latin</td>
<td><em>Colloquia</em></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Ye dyaloge called Funnus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsilius, of Padua</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>Neo-Latin</td>
<td><em>Opus Insigne Cui Titulum Feicit Autor Defensorem Pacis</em></td>
<td>William Marshall</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>The defence of peace: lately translated out of laten in to englysshe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucer, Martin</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Neo-Latin</td>
<td><em>S. Psalmorum</em></td>
<td>Joye, George</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>The Psalter of David in Enlishe purely a[n]d faithfully tr[a[n]slated aftir the texte of Feline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanchthon, Philip</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Neo-Latin</td>
<td><em>Historia De Vita Et Actis Lutheri</em></td>
<td>Bennet, Henry</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>A famous and godly history containing the bynes a[n]d acts of three renowned reformers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

A list of stopwords used in Chapters II & III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>did</th>
<th>herself</th>
<th>not</th>
<th>the</th>
<th>we’ve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>about</td>
<td>didn’t</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>himself</td>
<td>off</td>
<td>theirs</td>
<td>weren’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>does</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>again</td>
<td>doesn’t</td>
<td>how</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>themselves</td>
<td>what’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against</td>
<td>doing</td>
<td>how’s</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>don’t</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>when’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>i’d</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>there’s</td>
<td>where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td>during</td>
<td>i’ll</td>
<td>ought</td>
<td>these</td>
<td>where’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>i’m</td>
<td>our</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>i’ve</td>
<td>ours</td>
<td>they’d</td>
<td>while</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>if</td>
<td>ourselves</td>
<td>they’ll</td>
<td>who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aren’t</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>out</td>
<td>they’re</td>
<td>who’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as</td>
<td>further</td>
<td>into</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>they’ve</td>
<td>whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at</td>
<td>had</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>own</td>
<td>this</td>
<td>why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
<td>hadn’t</td>
<td>isn’t</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>those</td>
<td>why’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because</td>
<td>has</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>shan’t</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been</td>
<td>hasn’t</td>
<td>it’s</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>won’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>its</td>
<td>she’d</td>
<td>too</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being</td>
<td>haven’t</td>
<td>itself</td>
<td>she’ll</td>
<td>under</td>
<td>wouldn’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below</td>
<td>having</td>
<td>let’s</td>
<td>she’s</td>
<td>until</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>should</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>you’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>he’d</td>
<td>more</td>
<td>shouldn’t</td>
<td>very</td>
<td>you’ll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>he’ll</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>you’re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by</td>
<td>he’s</td>
<td>mustn’t</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>wasn’t</td>
<td>you’ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can’t</td>
<td>her</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot</td>
<td>here</td>
<td>myself</td>
<td>than</td>
<td>we’d</td>
<td>yours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could</td>
<td>here’s</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>we’ll</td>
<td>yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>couldn’t</td>
<td>hers</td>
<td>nor</td>
<td>that’s</td>
<td>we’re</td>
<td>yourselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---