<CT>Refining the Sublime: Edward Phillips, a Miltonic Education, and the Sublimity of

Paradise Lost

<CA>Nicholas McDowell

<AF>University of Exeter

<ABT>ABSTRACT Edward Phillips is central to our understanding of Milton's life due to his role as lead amanuensis during the composition of *Paradise Lost*. Yet Milton's nephew has long been considered a failed product of his uncle's educational method. This article recovers the intellectual dimension of Phillips's literary and publishing activities and their neglected place in the reception of *Paradise Lost* as sublime. Enduring claims that Phillips was a Cavalier renegade to Miltonic principles and inveterate plagiarist are shown to be of less interest than how he can be seen to have applied the methods in which he had been schooled.

<KW>KEYWORDS *Paradise Lost*, Edward Phillips, *Paradise Lost*, the sublime, literary history

In the peroration to his *Lives of Edward and John Phillips* (1815), William Godwin observed that the "nephews of the great poet threw off the peculiar and favourite modes of thinking of their uncle, by the time they were twenty-four or twenty-five years of age." Godwin put this rebellion down to "the weakness and unmanliness of their tempers, that corrupted their hearts, and obscured their judgement." The evidence for this reaction against the "modes of thinking" in which Edward Phillips (b. 1630, d. in or after 1696?) and John Phillips (1631–1706?) had been instructed during the 1640s, when they resided in Milton's household as his pupils and sometime assistants, was to be found in their published writings of the later 1650s.[1] In the case of Edward Phillips, with whom this article is concerned, his literary

---

Deleted: Edward

Deleted: Edward

activities in the 1650s are taken by Godwin to exemplify his revolt from hard Miltonic republicanism to a soft, degenerate Cavalierism.[2] In particular Phillips's printed miscellany *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* (1658) contained "gross provocations to libertinism and vice": it is a work "entitled to no insignificant rank among the multifarious publications, which were at that time issued from the press, to debauch the manner of the nation, and bring back the king." Godwin's judgment is echoed in later authoritative accounts of Milton's life and times: for David Masson, the Phillips brothers "slipped the Miltonic restraints" in the later 1650s, while more recently Barbara Lewalski referred to their publication of works "in the vein of Cavalier licentiousness."[3]

In his 2004 study, *The Arms of the Family*, John T. Shawcross challenged at length the Godwinian narrative of the psychological and ideological revolt of the brothers against the dominating authority-figure of their uncle/tutor. Shawcross focused particularly on the case of John Phillips, whom he regarded as consistently "non-royalist" and anti-Catholic in his writings.[4] Shawcross spent less time on Edward Phillips, who is seen as less open to rehabilitation as authentically Miltonic in his modes of writing and thought. He represented Edward less as a Cavalier rebel to his uncle's principles—where John is classified as "non-royalist," Edward is tentatively denominated "royalist(?)"—than as someone who avoided political controversy and behaved mainly as a professional writer. That judgment is echoed in Gordon Campbell's account of Edward's life for the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, which includes the heading "Amanuensis to Milton and Hack Writer." This characterization of Edward as hack writer has roots stretching back to Anthony Wood's insistence that Edward "wrote and translated several things merely to get a livelihood" rather than out of any ideological motivation, royalist or otherwise. Another contemporary, John Evelyn, offers yet another perspective on Edward, whom he employed as tutor to his son in 1663–65. Evelyn remarked with evident surprise that Edward was "not at all infected with

[his uncle's] principles, and though brought up by him, yet no way tainted"; but he presented Edward less as a Cavalier debauchee than something of a general scholar, if in a minor key: "a sober, silent and most harmless person, a little versatile in his studies, understanding many languages, especially the modern."[5] Edward was also employed by Elias Ashmole in the period when he was tutor to Evelyn's son, transcribing materials that Ashmole later used in his study of *The Institution, Laws, and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (1672)—at least a dozen manuscripts of his transcriptions survive. He moved in aristocratic as well as intellectual circles in the Restoration: Evelyn notes that after leaving his employment in 1665, Edward was employed as tutor to Philip Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, in the lavish surroundings of Wilton House, outside Salisbury.[6]

Whomever we choose to believe—and Evelyn, as his employer, was presumably the best qualified to offer a character reference—Edward Phillips is unquestionably central to our understanding of Milton's life due to his role as lead amanuensis during the composition of *Paradise Lost*; to his translation and publication of Milton's *Letters of State* in 1694, prefaced by his own biographical sketch of his uncle; and to the information that he gave to John Aubrey and John Toland for their own early lives of Milton. What is less well known is that Edward pursued several literary and intellectual projects of which his uncle would likely have approved and even personally encouraged. In what follows, I consider these various characterizations of Edward Phillips—middling graduate of an accelerated Miltonic education, devoted secretary to his blind uncle, cynical hack writer, Cavalier renegade who "slipped the Miltonic restraints," "sober" and "versatile" scholar and tutor—and seek less to reconcile them into a consistent personality than to explain how they may all be, in some sense, true.[7]

I consider first the intellectual dimension of Edward's literary and publishing activities in the 1660s and 1670s and their neglected place in the early reception of *Paradise*

Deleted: ly

Lost as sublime. Such activities would seem to answer the morally inflected charge that Edward turned out to be a flimsy Cavalier who preferred the easy yoke over hard liberty. Yet my subsequent discussion of the notorious *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence*, and in particular its appropriation of contemporary claims for the relationship of sublime eloquence with republican liberty, invites further questions: did Edward elevate courtly over republican culture in the final years of the Protectorate in provocatively anti-Miltonic fashion, or was he was simply writing to make a living, with little regard for the politics of culture? As I will suggest in conclusion, Edward's interest in advancing the emerging genre of English literary history raises wider questions about early modern ideas of originality and plagiarism, as well as more specific ones about the method of a Miltonic education.

<line#>

Edward Phillips was 10 when he became his uncle's pupil in 1640, and his brother John was a year younger. Edward subsequently seems to have lived with Milton in his various London residences for a decade, until he apparently matriculated at Oxford in 1650. Edward told Aubrey how Milton rendered both boys fluent in Latin within one year, and within three years he had led them through the "best of Latin & Greec Poets."[8] As William Poole has recently observed, in *Of Education* (1644) Milton "laid out what might seem an impossibly ambitious curriculum, were it not that [Edward] Phillips confirmed enough of it to suggest that it was grounded in practice." The brothers' education involved not only intensive instruction in Latin and Greek, with study of an exhaustive range of classical authors, but in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac, as well as in modern European languages in their spare time ("at any odd hour," as *Of Education* has it); and in the disciplines of (in order) arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, music, geography, natural history, natural and moral philosophy, logic, rhetoric, and poetics. What has often been taken to be an abstractly ideal curriculum in *Of*

Commented [T1]: (Technically, begging the question is a specific rhetorical fallacy, so I've changed the predicate here.) SBD1

Deleted: begs

Education was apparently applied in practice to the schooling of the Phillips brothers. Poole asks:

> <ext>Was this punishing programme successful? The evidence is that it was. Not only did Edward Phillips recall his home schooling with some pride, celebrating his uncle's importance as a teacher, but it gave him and his brother a solid humanistic training everywhere evident in their own published works, even if today we tend to find the brothers less talented, less original, less interesting, than their uncle.[9]

A prime example of this humanistic training is a schoolroom reference work that Edward edited and revised in 1670, likely soon after he left his position as tutor to the earl of Pembroke in Wiltshire and returned to London: the *Phrasium poeticarum thesaurus* of the German educationalist Joannes Buchlerus (1570–1640), one of the most popular guides to classical poetry in the seventeenth century. Edward edited the seventeenth edition, to which he appended his own Latin essay *Tractatulus de Carmine Dramatico Poetarum Veterum* ("A Little Treatise on the Dramatic Poetry of the Ancient Poets"), which shares the concerns with the meter proper to classical dramatic genres that are found in the preface to *Samson Agonistes*, "Of that sort of dramatic poem which is called tragedy," published a year later. This essay is followed by his Latin survey of the major modern poets of Europe, based on a brief survey of ancient poets by Gerard Vossius that is also appended to Edward's edition of Buchlerus and precedes Edward's own essays. Edward begins roughly where Vossius leaves off, with Petrarch.[10] The survey, *Compendiosa Enumeratio Poetarum* ("A Compendious Enumeration of Poets"), proceeds chronologically and is divided by European nation—Italy, Germany, England (including Scotland), and France—and in that respect notably differs from the much longer, vernacular survey of poets for which Edward is better known, *Theatrum Poetarum, or a Complete Collection of the Poets* (1675), which is also divided into ancients

and moderns but structured alphabetically. The *Theatrum Poetarum* is often cited as a significant early "step in the mapping of the English literary heritage," but the *Compendiosa Enumeratio Poetarum* anticipates it by five years and its chronological structure creates a narrative movement that is absent from the later vernacular work.[11] In its inclusion of English authors in a European-wide survey, the *Enumeratio* exemplifies pre–eighteenth-century exercises in the genre of *historia literaria*, which were "neither nationally nor generically limited in the same ways as the present canon of English literature."[12] Edward also includes a brief but interesting paragraph—separated from the main survey—on notable women poets in English.

Samuel Johnson, who was amused by Milton's efforts as a tutor—while the land was ablaze with civil war, Milton "vapour[ed] away his patriotism in a private boarding school"—damned Edward's *Enumeratio* with faint praise while deriding the Miltonic origins of Edward's display of knowledge: "From this wonder-working academy, I do not know that there ever proceeded any man very eminent for knowledge. Its only genuine product, I believe, is a small History of Poetry, written in Latin by his nephew of which perhaps none of my readers have heard."[13] Godwin was more appreciative, despite his own disdain for the supposedly spurious literary activities of the Phillips brothers; he noted that Edward refers in the *Enumeratio* to a work that John Milton "has recently presented to the judgment of the public":

<ext>a poem which, whether we consider the sublimity of the subject, the combined pleasantness and grandeur of the style, the sublimity of the invention, or the beauty of its similitudes and natural descriptions, will be accorded, if I am not mistaken, the name of a true epic; for in the opinions of many who are not unqualified to judge, it is thought to have attained perfection in this kind of poetry.[14]

(Poema quod sive sublimitatem Argumenti, sive Leporem simul &

Majestatem Styli, sive sublimitatem Inventionis, sive similitudines &

descriptiones quam maximè Naturales respiciamus, verè Heroicum, ni fallor,

audiet, Plurium enim suffragiis qui non nesciunt judicare censetur

perfectionem hujus generis poematis assecutum esse.[15])

This evaluation of *Paradise Lost* reminds us that Edward described himself as Milton's "chief Amanuensis" against the entries for *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* in Aubrey's list of Milton's works. Edward's claim is corroborated by the corrections in his hand to the manuscript of the first book of *Paradise Lost*. It is on Edward's authority that *Paradise Lost* was begun "about 2 yeares before the K.[ing] came in, and finished about 3 yeares after the K[ing']s Restauracion," and it is also Edward who tells us that Satan's soliloquy against the sun that opens book 4 was composed in the early 1640s, when Milton still planned to write a tragedy about the Fall.[16]

Corns and Campbell describe the central role of Phillips in the likely composition process of *Paradise Lost*:

<ext>The probable sequence of the production of the poem, then, is that

Milton composed the verses, any one of several people captured them in

manuscript, Phillips corrected them for accidentals and recopied them, Milton

worked on them again, a professional scribe then copied them out (perhaps

several times), and Phillips then perfected one of these copies for the press.[17]

No one, in other words, was as close to the composition of *Paradise Lost* as Edward Phillips: we might even, as Ann Baynes Coiro has suggested, call him a "crucial collaborator" on the epic.[18] And given Edward had been taught about poetics exclusively by Milton, it may be revealing that this praise of *Paradise Lost* as a "true epic" comes immediately after some

criticism of the pretensions to this status of William Davenant's *Gondibert* (1651) and Abraham Cowley's *Davideis* (1656), neither of which merits the description of "sublime." The former "presents itself as an epic; it was a grand undertaking but he who approaches these sorts of things must observe the arrangement and decorum of the best poets" ("poema ut præ se fert Heroicum, Grande quidem Inceptum fuit, at qui talia aggreditur, oportet eum Oeconomiam & Decorum poetarum optimorum observare"). The latter is "a work not wrongly designated [as an epic] if only it were agreed that throughout appropriate invention and decorum are observed" ("poema Heroicum Inscriptum, idque non male si modo Legitimam Inventionem & Decoram in eo ubique observari constet"). In-between is a caustic reference to John Denham's *Cooper's Hill* (1642) as "a poem remarkable for the great praise bestowed upon it by many" ("poema summa Multorum Laude Insignitum").[19] Are these critical judgments that Edward heard from his uncle? (Given Milton's more or less complete blindness from about 1652, he would, of course, have needed to have Cowley's *Davideis*, at least, read to him.)

Edward's account of *Paradise Lost* in the *Enumeratio*, published two years after the first edition of the poem, is seemingly the first occasion on which the epic is described as sublime.[20] As Nicholas von Maltzahn has observed, "it was as a rhetorical category that Phillips used the adjective *sublimitas* in summarizing early responses to the poem," rather than in terms of the much more wide-ranging aesthetics of the sublime that Milton's epic was increasingly seen to exemplify in the eighteenth century.[21] The shift in the understanding of the sublime from a stylistic and rhetorical category to an aesthetic psychology is a lengthy process usually taken to begin in the wake of Nicolas Boileau's 1674 French translation of the first-century Greek treatise ascribed to Longinus, *On the Sublime*. Boileau distinguished between sublime style—complex figurative expression to be contrasted with the mediocre and low styles—and the Longinian sublime, which he described as "the extraordinary and the

marvellous which can strike us in discourse, making a work lift us up, ravish us, transport us" ("cet extraordinaire et ce merveilleux qui frape dans le discours, et qui fait qu'un ouvrage enlève, ravit, transporte").[22]

The Phillips brothers were presumably instructed in Longinian analysis by their uncle. The program in *Of Education* includes Longinus as the last in a recommended list of authorities for studying rhetoric—which means that Longinus came close to the end of the whole program, given that Milton inverts the normal order of the curriculum and has logic and rhetoric as its climax—although Edward himself does not cite Longinus in his own account of his education.[23] Edward's claim for the sublimity of *Paradise Lost* came five years before Boileau's translation but also five years before Marvell's tribute to the poem, first published with the 1674 edition: "Thy verse created like thy theme sublime, / In number, weight, and measure, needs not rhyme."[24] Marvell contrasts sublime Miltonic poetics with the recent attempt by the poet laureate John Dryden (1631–1700) to "tag" *Paradise Lost* by turning it into rhyming couplets for his "opera," *The State of Innocence* (1674; publ., 1677)— although it tends to be forgotten that Dryden himself, in the "Apology for Heroique Poetry," with which he prefaced the published text of *The State of Innocence*, declared *Paradise Lost* to be "undoubtedly, one of the greatest, most noble, and most sublime POEMS, which this Age or Nation has produc'd."[25] John Dennis (1657–1734), the leading exponent of early eighteenth-century theories of the sublimity of *Paradise Lost*, was evidently unaware of Phillips's comments in the *Enumeratio* when he wrote that "Mr *Dryden* in his Preface before *the State of Innocence*, appears to have been the first, those Gentlemen excepted whose Verses are before *Milton*'s Poem, who discover'd in so publick a Manner an extraordinary opinion of *Milton*'s extraordinary Merit."[26]

Milton's prefatory note on "The Verse" of *Paradise Lost*, which appears immediately after Marvell's tribute in the 1674 edition, famously proclaims "ancient liberty recovered to

heroic poem from the troublesome and modern bondage of rhyming."[27] David Norbrook has suggested that in Marvell's commendatory poem, "Milton's blank verse periods break through the closed rhyming couplets which Dryden . . . was trying to re-impose on his epic," and has argued for what he calls the "political coding" of both Milton's note and Marvell's praise of the poem's sublimity:

<ext>The recovery of ancient liberty was a political as much as a literary project, the ideal of the English republic which Milton had served. And for Milton and his allies, this ideal was associated with Longinus's sublime. The first English translation, in 1652, was by his fellow-republican John Hall . . . Milton's sublime epic involved a challenge to the emergent "Augustan" poetics in which harmony of versification, developed by translators of Virgil such as [John] Denham and [Edmund] Waller, became an image of monarchical stability. This anti-courtly sublime would be developed in Whig poetry, although with a shift towards a more pathetic mode. To be somewhat anachronistic, they preferred the sublime to the beautiful.[28]

John Hall of Durham (1627–56) was a talented young poet and polemicist who, as I have argued at length elsewhere, was likely friends with Marvell in the later 1640s and was employed by the new commonwealth government in 1649 to work alongside Milton and later Marchamont Nedham in the republican press office, having written the Parliamentarian newsbook *Mercurius Britanicus* in the late 1640s. As with Milton and Nedham, he continued to work as a propagandist for the Cromwellian Protectorate, at least until cost-cutting measures in 1655 saw him leave his position.[29] Hall's English translation of Longinus, the first in print, appeared in 1652 as *Peri Hypsous; or Dionysius Longinus of the Height of Eloquence*. Hall's translation was apparently regarded as a considerable achievement: Hall's friend and biographer, John Davies of Kidwelly, tells us that Hall's Longinus "was a piece

Deleted: C

very elaborate, and accordingly much esteemed in both Universities"; the intelligencer and educational reformer Samuel Hartlib noted the publication of the translation.[30] In the dedication to Bulstrode Whitlocke, at this point a member of the commonwealth's Council of State, Hall makes the political colouring of his translation clear, emphasizing the connection in Longinus between conditions of republican political liberty and the flourishing of sublime eloquence. Sublime speech and writing have become rare since Longinus wrote because "the corruption of time hath diseased most Gover[n]ments into Monarchies." Hall also goes on to explain that now eloquence is not required to persuade the people directly through an oration in person, as in the time of Greek democracy, but by means of the printed page.[31]

Is there "political coding," to borrow Norbrook's phrase, in Edward Phillips's earlier praise of the "sublimity" of *Paradise Lost*, 17 years after Hall's Longinus but five years before Marvell's commendatory poem and Milton's note on the verse of his epic? Edward's evaluation of Milton's poem follows the criticism of Davenant (who had died in 1668) and Cowley for their failure consistently to preserve epic decorum, although Davenant and Cowley were as well known for their association with the Cromwellian Protectorate as for their earlier and later royalism. Edward also criticizes Dryden for "go[ing] in too much for the French manner of writing in rhyme" ("attamen huic Gallico modo Rhythmicæ scribendi in comœdiis nimium indulgere videtur"), four years before Dryden rewrote *Paradise Lost* in rhyming couplets in *The State of Innocence*.[32] There is little sense in the *Enumeratio* as a whole, however, that Edward's literary judgment is directed by political considerations, tempting as it is to think the references to Davenant, Cowley, and Denham may have derived from comments made by Milton. Norbrook's argument for the emergence in the mid-seventeenth century of a republican sublime that was opposed to a courtly ideal of the beautiful does, though, direct us back to the publication that since Godwin has been seen as the embodiment of Edward's rebellion against the principles in which he had been educated

Deleted: C

Deleted: s

by his uncle. This is, to give it its full title: *The Mysteries of Love & Eloquence, Or, the Arts of Wooing and Complementing; As they are manag'd in the Spring Garden, Hide Park, the New Exchange, and other eminent places. A Work, in which is drawn to the Life, the Deportments of the most accomplisht Persons, the mode of their Courtly Entertainments, Treatments of their Ladies at Balls, their accustom'd Sports, Drolls and Fancies, the Witchcrafts of their perswasive Language in their Approaches, or other more Secret Dispatches.*

Mysteries of Love and Eloquence was published in 1658 and is a baggy printed miscellany of, as the title page goes on to put it, "Addresses, and set Forms of Expressions for imitation, Poems, pleasant Songs, Letters, Proverbs, Riddles, Jests, Posies, Devices, A-la-mode Pastimes; A Dictionary for the making of Rimes, Four hundred and fifty delightful Questions, with their several Answers. As also Epithets, and flourishing Similitudes, Alphabetically Collected, and so properly applied to their several Subjects, that they may be rendred admirably useful on the sudden occasions of Discourse or Writing. Together, with a new invented Art of Logick." The volume is a sort of rhetorical handbook for a Restoration London that had not yet fully come into existence—the London of Restoration comedy, of Etherege and Congreve, of masquerade and seduction and obsession with whatever is in fashion, or "à la mode." Unsurprisingly, the book endured in popularity in the Restoration, appearing in a third edition in 1685 and again in 1699 under the title *The Beau's Academy*. It is addressed to the "youthful gentry," or the young social climber who wants to learn how to master the arts of courtly eloquence and employ them to fruitful effect in the city. There is, however, an obvious tension between Edward's "simultaneous advocacy of studied eloquence and social stability," which has been regarded as exemplary of how printed miscellanies are presented as "products of court elites [that] will smooth the path to court" while "commercially they stood as emblems of an almost total lack of exclusivity."[33]

The volume includes a guide to how to address ladies in various situations at balls, examples of how to make "an address of Courtship to a Mistress," and a jumble of love lyrics without ascription of authorship. There are a few lyrics by John Donne and Thomas Carew but all are in the vein of the bawdy Cavalier verse that Joshua Eckhardt has recently argued was published in printed miscellanies of the 1650s as a gesture of defiance against the rule of the Protectorate. Eckhardt's prime example of the printing of such poetry is the 1656 miscellany *Sportive Wit*, compiled by none other than Edward's younger brother, John Phillips.[34] *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* was published by Nathaniel Brook, who also published *Sportive Wit* as part of a presumably lucrative trade in satirical verse and printed miscellanies in the latter half of the 1650s.

As I have argued in a previous essay on John Phillips, the connections between John's literary activity and his service to the Protectorate in the 1650s suggests that the equation of bawdy, satirical poetry and anti-Protectorate values is sometimes too simple, and can fall into a stereotype of the Cromwellian as Puritan that actually tells us little about the poetic culture encouraged by those working for the Protectorate, such as Hall and Marchamont Nedham, who are best characterized as "anti-Puritan republicans."[35] Nonetheless, for all the light-heartedness of *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence*, which includes a long list of jokes about the usual seventeenth-century topics of city wives, cuckolds, lawyers, and Puritans, it would be hard to think of a publication during the five-year period of 1658–63 in which *Paradise Lost* was composed that more exemplifies a fascination with the lifestyle scorned in the fourth book of the epic:

<pxt>court amours

Mixed dance, or wanton mask, or midnight ball,

Or serenade, which the starved lover sings

To his proud fair, best quitted with disdain.[36]

The poet is here defining Adam and Eve's pre-fallen "wedded love" (4.750) and its natural, "chaste" sexuality by what it is not, echoing the description in the first book of the reign of Belial, "than whom a spirit more lewd / Fell not from heaven," over "courts and palaces" and "luxurious cities" (1.490–91, 497–98). These lines in book 4 are habitually taken to be a critique of the values of the Restoration court, exemplifying how Milton "sharply condemns the ethos of Cavalier libertine poetry, identifying it with the court culture of Charles I and the recently restored Charles II, who was notorious for favouring libertines such as John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, and for his own sexual promiscuity."[37] Milton's vocabulary in this passage is straight from *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence*: "Amorous" is a word that appears 40 times in Edward's miscellany; "court" or "courtly" 115 times; "dance" 34 times; "ball" 24 times; and "lover" 56 times. (Of course, "amorous" was by no means an irredeemable adjective for Milton, given its memorable place in the fourth book's description of the sexual relationship of Adam and Eve: "by her yielded, by him best received, / Yielded with coy submission, modest pride, / And sweet reluctant amorous delay" [4.309–11].)

There is a strikingly explicit instance in *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* of the absorption of what Norbrook calls the "republican sublime" into the culture of the courtly beautiful to which Phillips's miscellany is seemingly devoted. One of the prefatory sections of *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* is "a short advertisement to the Reader . . . for his better understanding of the Mysteries of Eloquence and Complementing." Edward Phillips incorporates a range of sentences and phrases directly from John Hall's discussion of sublime eloquence in his dedication of his rendering of Longinus. Edward observes "that the learned compare Eloquence to the Chymists Elixar; it contains all qualities in it, yet it should not have one perceiveable," and then declares solemnly:

<ext>It were to be wisht Eloquence could be so attained, rather then that the

Schools should so manacle and fetter it with their old Maxims; but if these so

pregnant persons in their own imaginations did but rightly consider what Eloquence is in its definition; How that it is a way of speech prevailing over those we have designed to prevail over: and that it is so Etherial, or rather I cannot tell, how Divine, that it depends not alone on the single Embroidry of words, but there must be somewhat more in it[.][38]

This is a stitching together of various parts of Hall's dedication to Bulstrode Whitlocke:

<ext>'Tis an easie objection, my Lord, that from the difference of *Tongue,* and *Time* (which ever change the conceptions of men) this piece must be look'd on as obsolete, and to this age not at all pertinent, as that which expects men to learn their *Eloquence* from their own *Genius,* rather then the *Schools,* which manacle it with these old maximes . . . that the end of Oratory is to perswade or Gain, I think he wants not a description, which if I may language is this, A way of speech prevailing over those whom we designe it prevail . . . 'Tis . . . the *Chymist's Elixar* conteining all Qualities in it, yet not one perceivable.[39]

This incorporation of Hall's words is not an isolated occurrence. Earlier in his dedication, Hall declares that:

<ext>the Crisis of Eloquence is not a little altered: In *Senates* and *Harangues* to the people length was necessary, for the same men acted both parts, (and that in a single Citie) & that which was necessary to gain the people, degenerated in time to be in fashion in counsel, so that this was play'd for a *prize,* and was held so far unnecessary[.][40]

This passage has attracted the attention of leading scholars of literature and politics in civil war Britain. Nigel Smith suggests that "crisis" is used here "in the medical sense of the word (a critical point in a disease) as a metaphor for the critically effective design of eloquence,"

which is "continuous with the ancient art of eloquence" but is now applied through "the pamphlet and the newsbook." For Joad Raymond, Hall is explaining how "eloquence is now transmitted via a disembodied medium, and length and reason in eloquence have both been sacrificed to brief and effective, perhaps Machiavellian, communication," a perception "filtered through [Hall's] experience as a writer of newsbooks and pamphlets."[41] Hall's lines evidently impressed contemporaries as well, for Edward Phillips echoes Hall in discussing how ancient orators employed the power of rhetorical eloquence, in the precepts of which he promises to instruct the readers of his volume:

> <ext>the Crises of it having been so altered from time to time in all Speeches and publique Harrangues, in so much, that it cannot be amiss to consider how the ancient Orators that lead the people whither they pleased, were put to it, being forced to wrestle with the disadvantages of single nature, so as at the last to divide and throw it into several Subjects, by which they reigned over the mindes of men, and did many strange things, the end of Oratory being to perswade.[42]

Edward's rewriting of the passage may be considerably less complex in its analysis of the changing historical and technological conditions of eloquence, but if this sort of stitching of unsourced phrases were uncovered in a student essay, the student would surely be charged with plagiarism.

But is Edward's use of Hall's preface simply plagiarism, or is it "politically coded"? Did Edward just lift Hall's dedication because he thought it was a fine account of the history and purpose of eloquence, or is his refining of the sublime into lessons for what he calls "the Schools of Ceremony and Complement" a deliberate ideological response? Notably Edward does not repeat Hall's comments about the decline of government into monarchy since the Greeks and Romans. And where Hall invokes the "ethereal" and overwhelming nature of

sublime eloquence, which breaks boundaries of decorum to transform them—the "delight and horror" that "seize" Marvell on reading *Paradise Lost*—Edward is concerned with what he calls "the gracefulness of the presence, beautiful and set forth with a modest and native comliness."[43] Few would have been better placed in the 1650s than Edward Phillips to understand the political implications of poetic style for men like Hall, Marvell, and Milton. The contrast between Marvell's sublime aesthetics and the courtly beautiful celebrated in *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* is clarified by the extraordinary imagery in which Nathaniel Lee praises Dryden's achievement in having "refined" *Paradise Lost* in his commendatory poem for *The State of Innocence*:

<pxt>To the dead Bard, your fame a little owes,

For *Milton* did the Wealthy Mine disclose,

And rudely cast what you cou'd well dispose:

He roughly drew, on an old fashion'd ground,

A Chaos, for no perfect World was found,

Till through the heap, your mighty Genius shin'd;

His was the Golden Ore which you refin'd.

He first beheld the beauteous rustic Maid,

And to a place of strength the prize convey'd;

You took her thence: to Court this Virgin brought

Drest her with gemms, new weav'd her hard spun thought

And softest language, sweetest manners taught.[44]

The Miltonic epic is imagined as an uncouth country girl whom Dryden has fashioned into a court lady, decorated with finery and schooled in ceremony and complement (and presumably no longer virginal): a "rudely cast" poem now cultivated in the soft, sweet, and very theatrical mysteries of love and eloquence.

If Edward's plagiarism is politically coded, then *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* may indeed embody the nephew's rebellion against his uncle and the failure of a Miltonic education to imbue Miltonic principles of either style or cultural politics. Milton's ideal curriculum in *Of Education*—the efficacy of which he must have continued to believe in, given he reissued the tract with his 1673 *Poems*—was designed, after all, to reform an educational system that produced "souls so unprincipl'd in vertue and true generous breeding, that flattery and court shifts and tyrannous aphorismes appear to them the highest points of wisdom."[45] *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* claims to instruct its readers precisely in the art of "flattery and court shifts." Yet we have seen how Edward went on, 12 years later, to be the first to praise the sublimity of *Paradise Lost*. Did Edward renounce his Miltonic education for Cavalier values as the Protectorate failed, but then revert to his uncle's principles after the Restoration? This must at least be a possibility, and it is hard to believe that Edward was innocent of the political implications of the sublime given his familiarity with Hall's translation of Longinus and the apparently politicized reception of the style and form of *Paradise Lost* by Milton himself (in his note on the verse in the second edition), Marvell, Dryden, and commentators such as Nathaniel Lee.

If, on the other hand, Edward just pinched Hall's words because he was in a hurry and he thought they were well written, then it would fit with a track record of alleged plagiarism, the most infamous of which was Thomas Blount's charge that Edward's 1658 dictionary, *The New World of English Words* (also published by Nathaniel Brook), was plundered from Blount's *Glossographia* (1656). Although he waited 15 years to do so, Blount carefully anatomized Edward's debt to his work in *A World of Errors Discovered in the "New World of Words"* (1673). Blount declares that Edward's book was "extracted almost wholly out of mine, and taking in its first Edition even a great part of my Preface; only some words were added and others altered, to make it pass as the Authors legitimate off-spring." The

appropriation of his preface with which Blount charges Edward sounds very similar to what Edward did in *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* to Hall's dedication of his English Longinus. Blount does not name Edward, but perhaps takes a swipe at his relationship with Milton in suggesting that Edward's definitions of ecclesiastical terms are so insufficient because "he still fancies himself under a Commonwealth, and a Church without Bishops."[46]

What would Milton—still alive, of course, when Blount published his attack on Edward as a bare-faced pilferer of others' work—have made of all this? Milton was totally blind from 1652 and it is thus questionable how aware he would been of what his nephews were publishing later in the decade, unless they themselves brought it to his attention. That said, the Protectorate's Council of State ordered all copies of John Phillips's verse miscellany *Sportive Wit* to be seized and burned in April 1656 for containing "scandalous, lascivious, scurrilous and profane matter." Given Milton's position in the government and involvement in licensing, he would surely have been aware of the government's concern about such printed miscellanies—especially when his own nephews and former pupils were prominently involved in such volumes.[47]

But leaving aside questions of cultural politics, we should pause before automatically assuming that Milton would have been appalled at his nephew's behavior in incorporating or recycling other educational texts to produce a new one. Phillips includes in *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* a "new art of logick" that, as J. Milton French observed many years ago, is taken "wholesale and practically verbatim" from the 1632 English translation of Ramus's *Dialectica* by Robert Fage. French accounts for the similarities between Edward's art of logic in *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* and Milton's own *Ars Logica* (1672) by pointing out that Milton's work is itself heavily indebted to the Latin *Dialectica* and George Downham's 1601 commentary on it.[48] For French, the hack Phillips is a plagiarist, while Milton adapts his "sources," but the method they both employ in making their logic handbooks is rather

similar, and the distinction may look to the unblinkered eye to be one of degree rather than of kind.

In a stimulating recent essay, "Commonplacing and Originality," Jason Scott-Warren has considered the method employed by Francis Meres in *Palladis Tamia* (1598), one of the earliest efforts at an English *historia literaria* of the sort that Edward Phillips later attempted in the *Enumeratio* and then in the vernacular in *Theatrum Poetarum*. Meres's "pioneering statement about the English canon" has long been known to be a "tissue of unacknowledged quotations, stitched together from the work of others." For Scott-Warren, Meres should be regarded not as a plagiarist, however, but an "arch-commonplacer," whose silent incorporation of other bits of text requires "the labour of selection, translation, and reorganization": commonplacing "offers a way of optimizing the force of reading and writing as technologies of memory" and, "from this point of view, it is entirely appropriate that an arch-commonplacer should have been a key exponent of an English canon."[49] Something similar might be said about Edward Phillips and his Latin and vernacular versions of an English *historia literaria* in the 1670s; and it was presumably Milton who not only taught the Phillips brothers Longinian rhetoric and poetics but also schooled them in techniques of commonplacing. We know that when working at speed on *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1649; 2nd ed. 1650), probably composed in less than a week, Milton himself relied so heavily on the notes in his surviving commonplace book that at times he simply stitched together entries in the same order as they appeared in the "Index Politicus" of the notebook, with scant regard to their appropriateness.[50]

Harris Fletcher once speculated that Edward's *Theatrum Poetarum* was derived from a lost "Index Poeticus" compiled by Milton—unlikely, but not a completely outlandish thought, given the manuscripts of Milton's unpublished educational works passed into Edward's possession after his uncle's death.[51] In 1682 Edward issued a guide to the rapid learning of Latin, *Tractatulus de modo & ratione formandi voces derivativas linguae Latinae*,

which he then translated into English himself in 1685 as *A treatise . . . very much conducing to the more easie and speedy attaining of the Latin tongue; and to the saving of the labour of so frequently turning over voluminous dictionaries*. The principle of the "speedy" learning of Latin would have appealed to Milton, who lamented in *Of Education* the "seven or eight yeers" spent on learning as much Latin and Greek "as might be learnt otherwise easily and delightfully in one yeer," and whose own *Accidence Commenc't Grammar* (1669) probably derived from the system he had used to instruct the Phillips brothers in the language within a year in the early 1640s.[52]

According to Wood, Phillips then published in 1684 volumes entitled *Enchiridion linguae Latinae, or, A Compendious Latin Dictionary* and *Speculum linguae Latinae, or, A Succinct and New Method Method of all the most Material and Fundamental Worlds of the Latin Tongue* that "were all or mostly taken from the *Latin Thesaurus* writ by Joh.[n] Milton." No copy of either book is extant, nor is Milton's original Latin dictionary; however, Edward refers in his "Life" to Milton working on a "Thesarus Linguæ Latinæ" in the later 1650s, at the same time as he began in earnest on *Paradise Lost* and also the *De Doctrina Christiana*. The Latin thesaurus was compiled "according to the manner" of Robert Stephanus's great *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (1532), Edward informs us, and it was "a work which he had been long since collecting from his own Reading, and still went on with it at times, even very near to his dying day." Milton's manuscript was apparently used in a 1693 revision of Adam Littleton's popular Latin dictionary.[53] In a similar fashion, the *De Doctrina Christiana* incorporates and reworks earlier models of systematic theology, pre-eminently William Ames's *Medulla sanctæ theologiæ* (Franeker, 1623) and Johannes Wollebius's *Compendium theologiæ* (Amsterdam, 1626), both of which Edward recalled Milton discussing with his young nephews on Sundays.[54]

Deleted: and

Edward thus pursued projects in several of the same educational areas as his uncle—logic, grammar, and lexicography—alongside his pioneering efforts in *historia literatia* in both Latin and the vernacular. As Anthony Wood observes, he was in demand as a tutor because he was "so noted for the trivial Arts, the refined English tongue, and knowledge in several languages."[55] As early as June 11, 1656, Edward presented copies of the *Tenure* and *Eikonoklastes* (1649), in their 1650 imprints, to the Bodleian Library, along with copies of his own recent translations from the Spanish of two prose fictions by Montalván—as though asserting his own ambitions to be an author and, far from being a hack, one who might legitimately be considered alongside his uncle.[56] Yet even if Milton might have regarded Edward's method as a chip off the old block in works such as the Latin grammar, the *De Carmine Dramatico Poetarum Vetarum* and the *Enumeratio*, where *Paradise Lost* is given pride of place among English poems, he surely would not have entirely enjoyed the earlier uses to which it was put in promoting aspiration to "court amours" in *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence*, published even as Edward Phillips was beginning to record the inspired verse being brought nightly to his uncle by the Holy Spirit.

<aubio>Nicholas McDowell is professor of early modern literature at the University of Exeter. He is the author of *The English Radical Imagination: Culture, Religion, and Revolution, 1630–1660* (Oxford University Press, 2003) and *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars* (Oxford University Press, 2008), and the co-editor of *The Oxford Handbook of Milton* (Oxford University Press, 2009) and *The Complete Works of John Milton*, vol. 6, *Vernacular Regicide and Republican Writings* (Oxford University Press, 2013). He is a past winner of three of the annual awards for most distinguished publication by the Milton Society of America.

\<N1HD\>Notes

[1] William Godwin, *Lives of Edward and John Phillips* (London, 1815), 55, 317, 319. On Godwin's motives in writing the *Lives*, see Tilottama Rajan, "Uncertain Futures: History and Genealogy in William Godwin's "The Lives of Edward and John Philips, Nephews and Pupils of Milton,'" *Milton Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (1998): 75–86.

[2] This article is intended as a companion piece to my earlier essay reconsidering the character of John Phillips's writings and the nature of his allegiances in the 1650s; see Nicholas McDowell, "Family Politics: or, How John Phillips Read His Uncle's Satirical Sonnets (with transcription from Bodleian MS Rawl. Poet. 30)," *Milton Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (2008): 1–21.

[3] Godwin, *Lives of Edward and John Phillips*, 52; D. M. Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, 7 vols. (New York, 1854–93), 5:384; Barbara K. Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton* (Oxford, 2000), 336.

[4] John T. Shawcross, *The Arms of the Family: The Significance of John Milton's Relatives and Associates* (Lexington, Ky., 2004), 73–134.

[5] Gordon Campbell, entry for "Edward Phillips," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; Anthony Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1813–20), 4:760–64; *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E. S. de Beer, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1955), 3:364–65.

[6] Ralph E. Hone, "The Period of Edward Phillips's Work for Elias Ashmole," *Notes and Queries*, n.s., 3, no. 4 (1956): 163; Shawcross, *Arms of the Family*, 78–79, 234 nn. 19–20, which lists the Ashmole MSS in the Bodleian in which Edward's transcriptions can be found.

Deleted: iv

Deleted: .

Deleted: .

[7] In seeking to get past the hostile images of Edward Phillips as failed Miltonic educational experiment and hack writer, my approach has elements in common with Ann Baynes Coiro's innovative essay, "Milton & Sons: The Family Business," *Milton Studies* 48 (2008): 13–37, although Coiro does not refer to Edward's Latin writings on poetry.

[8] Campbell, "Edward Phillips"; Helen Darbishire, ed., *Early Lives of John Milton* (London, 1965), 60.

[9] William Poole, *Milton and the Making of "Paradise Lost"* (Cambridge, Mass., 2017), 50, 65; see further the appendix, 297–300, which offers a systematic comparison of the curriculum proposed in *Of Education* with that experienced by Edward Phillips.

[10] Joannes Buchlerus, *Sacrarum profanarumque phrasium poeticarum thesaurus*, ed. Edward Phillips (London, 1669), 375–88, 388–402; for Vossius's *Poetarum Antiquorum tum Græcorum tum Latinorum quibus viguerunt tempora*, see 357–74. The separate title-page for Edward's two essays is dated 1670, so presumably Buchler's text was printed before Edward had finished his essays, which were then bound with it.

[11] Richard Terry, *Poetry and the Making of the English Literary Past, 1660–1781* (Oxford, 2001), 77. A rudimentary bibliographical account of the *Enumeratio*, with reproduction of the Latin text, can be found in R. G. Howarth, "Edward Phillips's 'Compendiosa Enumeratio Poetarum,'" *Modern Language Review* 54, no. 3 (1959): 321–28.

[12] Kelsey Jackson Williams, "Canon before Canon, Literature before Literature: Thomas Pope Blount and the Scope of Early Modern Literature," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 77, no. 2 (2014): 177–99, at 178. This essay does not cite Edward Phillips, but his Latin *Enumeratio* and vernacular *Theatrum Poetarum* anticipate by some two decades the essays in *historia literaria* by Thomas Pope Blount that, according to Jackson Williams, illustrate how "premodern canons" were constructed: as with Phillips, Blount initially composed a chronological survey in Latin, surveying European writers (*Censura celebriorum authorum*

[London, 1690]) and then an alphabetical survey in the vernacular, focused more on English writers (*De re poetica: or, Remarks upon Poetry with Characters and Censures of the Most Considerable Poets Whether Ancient or Modern* [London, 1694]).

[13] Samuel Johnson, *The Lives of the Most Eminent Poets: With Critical Observations on Their Works*, ed. Roger Londsdale, 4 vols. (Oxford, 2006), 1:248–49.

[14] Godwin, *Lives of Edward and John Phillips*, 145; *Edward Phillips's History of the Literature of England and Scotland: A Translation from the "Compendiosa Enumeratio Poetarum" with an Introduction and Commentary*, ed. Daniel G. Calder and Charles R. Forker (Salzburg, 1973), 52; I have altered Calder and Forker's translation of the second "sublimitatem" from "loftiness" to a repeated "sublimity." For a slightly different translation, see Poole, *Milton and the Making of "Paradise Lost,"* 282. Godwin also translated the passage in *Lives of Edward and John Phillips*, 145. All translations from the *Enumeratio* are from Calder and Forker's edition unless otherwise noted.

[15] Buchlerus, *Sacrarum profanarumque phrasium poeticarum thesaurus*, 399, correcting the misprint "saffragiis."

[16] Darbishire, ed., *Early Lives*, 13, 72–73.

[17] Thomas N. Corns and Gordon Campbell, *John Milton: Life, Work, and Art* (Oxford, 2008), 271.

[18] Coiro, "Milton & Sons," 18–19.

[19] Calder and Forker, eds., *Edward Phillips's History of the Literature of England and Scotland*, 51–52. See Buchlerus, *Sacrarum profanarumque phrasium poeticarum thesaurus*, 399.

[20] Though Edward's evaluation of the sublimity of the epic is absent from John Leonard's recent reception history: *Faithful Labourers: A Reception History of Paradise Lost, 1667–1970*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2013), *s.v.* "Phillips, Edward."

Deleted: i.

[21] Nicholas von Maltzahn, "The War in Heaven and the Miltonic Sublime," in *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration*, ed. Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (Cambridge, 2001), 154–79, at 164–65. On the reception of *Paradise Lost* as sublime in the earlier eighteenth century, see, e.g., Leslie E. Moore, *Beautiful Sublime: The Making of "Paradise Lost," 1701–1734* (Stanford, Calif., 1990).

[22] *Traité du sublime ou du merveilleux dans le discours, traduit du grec de Longin*, in Boileau, *OEuvres complètes*, ed. Antoine Adam and Françoise Escal (Paris 1966), 338; I use the translation given in Emma Gilby, "The Seventeenth-Century Sublime: Boileau and Poussin," in *The Art of the Sublime*, ed. Nigel Llewelyn and Christine Riding (Tate Research Publication, January 2013), https://www.tate.org.uk/art/research-publications/the-sublime/emma-gilby-the-seventeenth-century-sublime-boileau-and-poussin-r1133014. See also Emma Gilby, *Sublime Worlds: Early Modern French Literature* (Oxford, 2006), 21–34.

[23] Milton, *Of Education* (London, 1644), 6. See the appendix in Poole, *Milton and the Making of "Paradise Lost,"* 297–300.

[24] Marvell, "On Mr Milton's *Paradise Lost*," in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Nigel Smith, rev. ed. (2003; Harlow, 2007), ll. 53–54.

[25] *The Works of John Dryden*, vol. 12, ed. Vinton A. Dearing (Berkeley, Calif., 1994), 86. For an interesting recent discussion of Dryden's use of Longinus in the preface to *The State of Innocence*, see John West, *Dryden and Enthusiasm: Literature, Religion, and Politics in Restoration England* (Oxford, 2018), 46–47.

[26] *Critical Works of John Dennis*, ed. Edward Niles Hooker, 2 vols. (Baltimore, 1939), 2:169.

[27] John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Alastair Fowler, 2nd ed. (Harlow, 1997), 38–39. All quotations from the epic are taken from this edition.

[28] David Norbrook, "Milton, Lucy Hutchinson, and the Lucretian Sublime," in *The Art of the Sublime*, ed. Llewelyn and Riding, https://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/tate-

Deleted: (

Deleted:)

papers/13/milton-lucy-hutchinson-and-the-lucretian-sublime. The "republican sublime" is also a key organizing category of David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge, 1999), *passim*.

[29] For Hall and Marvell, see Nicholas McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit* (Oxford, 2008), *passim*.

[30] John Davies of Kidwelly, "An Account of the Author," in *Hierocles Upon the Golden Verses*, trans. John Hall (London, 1657), sig. b5r; Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, and Michael Hannon, eds., *The Hartlib Papers* (Sheffield, 2013), 28/2/42A, http://www.hrionline.ac.ik/hartlib.

[31] Περι υψους *Or Dionysius Longinus of the Height of Eloquence. Rendred out of the Originall. By J. H. Esq* (1652), sig. A8r. On Hall's Longinus as a manifesto for a republican poetics, see Annabel Patterson, *Reading Between the Lines* (London, 1993), 258–70; Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven, 1994), 189, 215; Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 137–39, 215–16, 268–69; McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, 206–7.

[32] Calder and Forker, eds., *Edward Phillips's History of the Literature of England and Scotland*, 53.

[33] Adam Smyth, "*Profit and Delight': Printed Miscellanies in England, 1640–82* (Detroit, 2004), 60–62. Smyth takes his title, "Profit and Delight," from Phillips's address to "the Youthful Gentry" which opens *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence*, sig. A4v.

[34] Joshua Eckhardt, *Manuscript Verse Collectors and Anti-Courtly Love Poetry* (Oxford, 2009), 162–72.

[35] See McDowell, "Family Politics," *passim*; on anti-Puritan republicanism, see further Blair Worden, "Wit in a Roundhead: the Dilemma of Marchamont Nedham," in *Political Culture*

and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe, ed. Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky (Manchester, 1995), 301–37.

[36] Fowler, ed., *Paradise Lost*, 4:767–70.

[37] I quote here Achsah Guibbory, "Milton and English Poetry," in *A New Companion to Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Oxford, 2016), 71–89, at 82, but the interpretation is commonplace.

[38] Phillips, *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence*, sigs. a2r–v.

[39] Περι υψους *Or Dionysius Longinus of the Height of Eloquence*, sig. B2r.

[40] Ibid., sig. A7r.

[41] Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, 188; Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641–1649* (Oxford, 1996), 275.

[42] Phillips, *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence*, sig. a2v–a3r.

[43] Marvell, "On Mr. Milton's *Paradise Lost*," l. 35; Phillips, *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence*, sig. a3r.

[44] "To Mr Dryden, on his Poem of Paradice," in *Works of John Dryden*, vol. 12, ed. Dearing, 537–38, ll. 11–22. On the politics of Dryden's adaptation, see most recently Tobias Gabel, *Paradise Reframed: Milton, Dryden, and the Politics of Literary Adaptation, 1658–1679* (Heidelberg, 2016).

[45] Milton, *Of Education*, 3.

[46] "To the Reader," in Thomas Blount, *A World of Errors Discovered in the New World of Words, or, General English Dictionary* (London, 1673), sigs. A2r–v.

[47] *A Chronology and Calendar of Documents Relating to the London Book Trade 1641–1700*, ed. Donald McKenzie and Maureen Bell, 3 vols. (Oxford, 2005), 1:384. See also Smyth, *"Profit and Delight,"* 132; and B. S. Capp, *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649–1660* (Oxford, 2012), 61, 79.

[48] J. Milton French, "Milton, Ramus, and Edward Phillips," *Modern Philology* 47, no. 2 (1949): 82–87. Phillips's source is *Peter Ramus of Vermandois, the Kings professor, his Dialectica in two books . . . By R.*[obert] *F.*[ages] *Gent* (London, 1632).

[49] Jason Scott-Warren, "Commonplacing and Originality: Reading Francis Meres," *Review of English Studies* 68 (2018): 902–23, at 918–19, 922.

[50] See *Complete Works of John Milton*, vol. 6, *Vernacular Regicide and Republican Writings*, ed. N. H. Keeble and Nicholas McDowell (Oxford, 2013), 16–17. The best guide to the structure and function of Milton's commonplace book is William Poole, "The Genres of Milton's Commonplace Book," in *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*, ed. Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith (Oxford, 2009), 367–81.

[51] Harris Fletcher, Milton's ['Index Poeticus']: The *Theatrum Poetarum* of Edward Phillips," *Journal of English and Germanic Pholology* 55, no. 1 (1956): 35–40. Fletcher based much of his argument on the Harvard copy of Pindar that he believed was annotated by Milton, but that has subsequently been shown not to be authentic.

[52] Milton, *Of Education*, 2.

[53] Campbell, "Edward Phillips"; Gordon Campbell, *A Milton Chronology* (Basingstoke, 1997), 161; Darbishire, ed., *Early Lives*, 72; Adam Littleton et al., *Linguæ Romanæ Dictionarium Luculentum Novum: A New Dictionary in Five Alphabets* (Cambridge, 1693), sig. A2r. See also Poole, *Milton and the Making of* "*Paradise Lost,*" 64, who points out that it is theoretically possible to work out some of the Miltonic additions to the 1693 edition of Littleton's dictionary.

[54] Darbishire, ed., *Early Lives*, 61. See further Gordon Campbell, Thomas N. Corns, John K. Hale, and Fiona J. Tweedie, *Milton and the Manuscript of "De Doctrina Christiana"* (Oxford, 2007), 89–120.

[55] Wood, *Athenæ Oxonieses*, 4.760.

Deleted: : Oxford University Press

[56] Campbell, *Milton Chronology*, 167. The shelf-mark of the presentation copies is Bodleian Library, MS 4o Rawl. 408. Edward's translations from the Spanish were both published by Nathaniel Brook: *The Illustrious Shepherdess. Dedicated to the Marchioness of Dorchester* (1656) and *The Imperious Brother. Dedicated to the Countess of Strafford* (1656). Did Edward learn Spanish with his uncle? These translations from the Spanish are not considered in Gordon Campbell, "Milton's Spanish," *Milton Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (1996): 127–32.

Deleted: