

## 'Formed on ye Gr. Language': Benjamin Stillingfleet reads Paradise Lost, 1745-46

Adlington, Hugh

DOI:

[10.1111/milt.12148](https://doi.org/10.1111/milt.12148)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Adlington, H 2015, 'Formed on ye Gr. Language': Benjamin Stillingfleet reads Paradise Lost, 1745-46', *Milton Quarterly*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 217-242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/milt.12148>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Adlington, H. (2015), "Formed on ye Gr. Language": Benjamin Stillingfleet Reads Paradise Lost, 1745-46. *Milton Quarterly*, 49: 217–242, which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/milt.12148>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving

Checked Feb 2016

### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

“formed on y<sup>e</sup> Gr. Language”:

Benjamin Stillingfleet reads *Paradise Lost*, 1745-46

Hugh Adlington, University of Birmingham

By the middle of the eighteenth century, the bible scholar and sometime literary critic John Marchant could confidently declare: “*Paradise Lost* has obtain’d a Place in the first Rank of English Classicks.”<sup>1</sup> How this pre-eminence was achieved is a story well told, with star billing given to Milton’s early editors and commentators.<sup>2</sup> Key figures and publications include *Annotations* (1695) by “P. H.” (probably Patrick Hume), Joseph Addison’s *Spectator* articles (1712), and, infamously, Richard Bentley’s emendations in 1732 deriving from his belief that large tracts of *Paradise Lost* were spurious or corrupt.<sup>3</sup> The responses to Bentley were swift and often facetious, although the best – such as Zachary Pearce’s “Review” (1732) and the rhapsodic commentary of the Jonathan Richardsons, father and son (1734) – tried hard to resist the temptation.<sup>4</sup> A handful of Bentley’s alterations were universally accepted (such as “Soul” for “Fowle”, 1667; “Foul”, 1674; vii. 451), but the vast majority (such as Bentley’s proposal to replace the compelling and paradoxical “Darkness visible” with “a transpicuous gloom”) were emphatically rejected.<sup>5</sup> A decade and a half after Bentley, Thomas Newton’s variorum edition of the poetical works sought to put Milton on a footing with the classical greats, incorporating all three functions of editing as the eighteenth century understood it: establishing the text, explaining difficulties, and pointing out beauties and defects.<sup>6</sup> Landmark publications later in the century included Thomas Warton’s richly annotated edition of Milton’s minor poetry (1785), Charles Dunster’s *Paradise Regained* (1795), and Henry John Todd’s encyclopaedic six-volume variorum edition (1801) with its minute textual scholarship and massive compendium of parallels and sources.<sup>7</sup>

Todd’s meticulous textual approach set a new scholarly standard in editing Milton. By comparison, the “reckless bravado” of Bentley’s edition was regarded as a “monstrum horrendum”, as one derisive pamphlet quoting the *Aeneid* had it. Yet, for all that, the impetus Bentley gave to new editorial work on Milton was as powerful as that of any other eighteenth-century edition, including those of Newton and Todd.<sup>8</sup> Pearce, the Richardsons, Francis Peck, James Paterson, “Raymond de St Maur”, James Hawkey and Newton – all were motivated to a greater or lesser degree by a shared desire to correct Bentley and to restore and defend Milton’s text and language. Indeed, the extent of Bentley’s influence, or more accurate to say, his provocation, is yet to be fully understood.<sup>9</sup> The printed record only takes us so far. By contrast, study of manuscript sources from the period – including projected editions and commentaries that for one reason or another never made it into print – is long overdue. This essay argues that surviving manuscript evidence of readers’ reactions to Milton can help us reconstruct the fullest picture yet of the scholarly priorities, tastes and habits of mind that shaped Milton’s eighteenth-century reception, putting names and faces to the members of the otherwise abstract notion of “interpretive communities”.<sup>10</sup> Study of such sources reveals, at the local level, original proposals for Milton’s imitations of classical, biblical and Renaissance texts. Furthermore, such proposals shed fresh light on the larger question of the subsequent history of Milton’s critical reception, and the roads taken (deriving

from print editions) and not taken (deriving from manuscript annotations) in the two centuries since. This essay accordingly focuses on one of the most significant of these projected or abortive editions in manuscript, that of Benjamin Stillingfleet (1702-1771), grandson to the better known Edward Stillingfleet, book collector and Bishop of Worcester.<sup>11</sup>

## I.

In 1745-6, Benjamin Stillingfleet began to prepare a newly annotated edition of *Paradise Lost*. These copious ink notes survive in an interleaved copy of Bentley's 1732 edition, held in the British Library.<sup>12</sup> Stillingfleet's line-by-line annotations, in a legible if inevitably compressed cursive round hand, are densest in book 1 and the beginning of book 2, becoming considerably less frequent thereafter (see Fig. 1). The line-by-line notes are prefaced by a one-page list of "Editions of Authors used in the Notes", and a closely written eight-page letter (see Fig. 2) in which Stillingfleet explains his principles of annotation and his preliminary conclusions to his friend, Thomas Dampier (*d.* 1777), lower master at Eton College and subsequently dean of Durham. Biographical sources suggest Stillingfleet's mixed motives for embarking on such a project, combining intellectual fascination with a deep sense of personal injustice. In his early education, Stillingfleet excelled in classical languages and literature and entered Trinity, Cambridge in 1720 as a sizar at the request of the master of Trinity, Richard Bentley, who had been a domestic chaplain to Benjamin's grandfather, Bishop of Worcester.<sup>13</sup> Stillingfleet's academic career at Cambridge was a promising one until a crucial turning point in 1726. Having graduated for some years, Stillingfleet applied for a fellowship at Trinity. His application was rejected by Bentley, whose reported justification was "that Stillingfleet was too fine a gentleman to be buried in a college."<sup>14</sup> Stillingfleet never forgave him.

Instead of being interred in a Cambridge college, Stillingfleet spent the next fourteen years buried in Norfolk, at Felbrigg Hall, tutoring William Windham, the son of a wealthy relative.<sup>15</sup> His ambition stifled, worse was to come: Stillingfleet fell in love but was too poor to marry. This can't have made him look any more kindly on Bentley. Yet there were compensations. Stillingfleet took his pupil on the Grand Tour, taught him copious amounts of Latin and Greek – to the concern of William's country gentleman father who doubted it would help his son shoot any straighter – and when Stillingfleet was no longer needed as a tutor, the Windham family gave him an annuity sufficiently large that he could occupy himself with literary pursuits. Stillingfleet made plans for various publications and immersed himself in intense study of classical authors, especially Homer, Plato and Aristotle. He drafted Platonic dialogues on all manner of literary, grammatical and philosophical subjects, and meditated a rebuttal of Locke's *Essay on the Understanding*, preferring the notion of a system of ideal beauty to Locke's doctrine of no innate ideas.<sup>16</sup> His projected edition of *Paradise Lost* dates from this time, in the mid-1740s. Unfortunately for Stillingfleet, his editorial efforts were anticipated by the proposal for Thomas Newton's edition, sponsored by the powerful Lord Bath, William Pulteney, former privy councillor and lord justice. As Stillingfleet's biographer William Coxe put it, Stillingfleet "without hesitation relinquished his design", with what measure of disappointment can well be imagined.<sup>17</sup>

In the remaining years of his life, Stillingfleet's devoted himself to his two other great interests, botany and music. His *Miscellaneous Tracts* (1759) made the Linnaean system of classification more widely known, and his *Principles and Power of Harmony* (1771), which translated, clarified and corrected Giuseppe Tartini's work of musical theory, *Trattato di Musica*, was praised by Charles Burney.<sup>18</sup> Stillingfleet also wrote the libretto for *Paradise Lost: An Oratorio*, staged in London in 1760, and became known in musical and literary circles for his habit of wearing blue instead of formal black stockings at ladies' evening assemblies, a habit which, according to Boswell, gave rise to the title "Blue-stocking Clubs."<sup>19</sup> After Stillingfleet's death, his interleaved copy of *Paradise Lost* was passed by Thomas Dampier to his son, also Thomas Dampier (d. 1812), bishop of Ely and book collector, and communicated by him to Henry Todd in the late 1790s. Todd incorporated at least seventy of Stillingfleet's annotations in his edition of Milton, with proper attribution, as well as printing what Todd refers to as "the truly Miltonic Sonnet, written by Mr Stillingfleet", found in "one of these letters, intrusted to me . . . by Dr. Dampier."<sup>20</sup>

On the basis of these annotations printed in Todd, Ants Oras noted Stillingfleet's study of classical parallels in *Paradise Lost*, his comments on the connection between style and mood, and his analysis of the effect of metrical irregularities. But Oras felt that there was too little material "to . . . venture on any detailed characterization of the commentator."<sup>21</sup> He may have felt differently, however, had he been able to work through Stillingfleet's manuscript annotations, in which we find observations on features of Milton's poetic syntax and meter, and citations of literary parallels keyed to four hundred different lemmas, approximately three-quarters of which are unique to Stillingfleet among eighteenth-century editions (see Appendix). William Coxe may not have been exaggerating, then, when he observed that "The numerous references of every kind in different languages . . . may still furnish materials for new commentators."<sup>22</sup>




Fig. 1: Richard Bentley, ed. *Milton's Paradise Lost*. London, 1732. MS notes by Benjamin Stillingfleet. British Library, C.134.h.1. (interleaved page facing b1<sup>r</sup>). By permission of the British Library.




Fig. 2: Richard Bentley, ed. *Milton's Paradise Lost*. London, 1732. MS notes by Benjamin Stillingfleet. British Library, C.134.h.1. (interleaved page facing D4<sup>v</sup>). By permission of the British Library.

## II.

In his letter to Dampier, Stillingfleet categorises his observations under three heads: “Explication of difficult Passages – Imitations from other Authors – Grammar and Prosody.”<sup>23</sup> Examples from each of these three categories will be discussed in the pages below. First, the “Explication of difficult Passages”. Like all editors, Stillingfleet speaks feelingly of the pains such detective work has cost him, how he couldn’t have done it without returning *ad fontes* to Milton’s original sources, and goes so far as to raise *Paradise Lost* to the status of divine mystery by quoting *Il Penseroso*: “I was forct in more y<sup>n</sup> one Instance to unsp<sup>h</sup>ere y<sup>t</sup> spirit of Plato to unfold those secrets.”<sup>24</sup> He adds dryly that he has at least learned one thing from Bentley: not to trust one’s first thoughts “in Criticising great Men.”<sup>25</sup> The following example is characteristic in showing both Stillingfleet’s attentiveness as a reader and the nature of his differences with Bentley. At the beginning of book 2, Satan on his “Throne of Royal State” (2.1) pre-emptively fends off any challenges to his leadership.<sup>26</sup> His logic is impeccable:

Where there is [...] no good  
For which to strive, no strife can grow up there  
From faction. (2.30-32)

He compares his “unenvied Throne” (2.23) with that of God the Father:

[...] The happier state  
In Heav’n, which follows Dignity, might draw  
Envy from each Inferior; but who here  
Will envy whom the Highest place exposes  
Foremost to stand against the Thunderer’s aim  
Your bulwark, and condemns to greatest share  
Of endless pain? (2.24-30)

In his note, Bentley asserts testily: “The Words are miserably displac’d: caused by Second Thoughts and Interlines, not attended to by the Printer. He [Milton] must have given it thus,

*The happier State*  
*In Heav’n from each Inferior might HAVE DRAWN*  
*Envy, which follows Dignity: but here*  
*Who’ll envy?”*<sup>27</sup>

In his own note on the facing page, Stillingfleet acidly retorts: “Bent. mangles this passage miserably. The Sense is: In Heaven, where Happiness follows dignity, dignity may raise Envy; but here Dignity is peculiarly attended with uneasiness: How flat is y<sup>e</sup> Thought Bent. has substituted in y<sup>e</sup> room of y<sup>e</sup> Text.”<sup>28</sup> The disdain for Bentley’s reading is clear, but Stillingfleet’s gloss on Milton needs teasing out to be fully understood. By “Dignity” I take it that Milton (and Bentley and Stillingfleet) understand “rank” (*OED* 2.a), as opposed to merit

or worth (*OED* 1.a). As Stillingfleet explains, Satan observes that in heaven “dignity” or rank *may* cause envy, because precedence in heaven is a function of rank rather than of merit. In Bentley’s emended text, however, “Dignity” or rank *always* provokes envy. This is why Stillingfleet observes that in Bentley’s version, “Dignity is peculiarly attended with uneasiness” (meaning unpleasantness or ill-feeling).<sup>29</sup> Bentley’s emendation strips Satan’s political rhetoric of its subtlety, turning his speech into a crude republican attack on inherited title and unmerited privilege. Yet, as Stillingfleet recognises, Milton’s word order signals a greater ambivalence on Satan’s part; Satan may well speak the language of merit when it suits him, but he is equally ready when necessary to recall the high estate and rank of the fallen angels: “Princes, Potentates [...] Princely Dignities, / And Powers, that erst in Heaven sat on Thrones” (1.315-60). Evidently Stillingfleet is a perceptive reader, but he is goaded into perceptiveness by Bentley’s emendation. Stillingfleet acknowledged as much, saying of Bentley what “Petavius saies of Scaliger; Dum errat, docet”; that is, he teaches even while he errs.<sup>30</sup>

A second example reveals both Stillingfleet’s strengths and limitations as a reader of verse. The passage comes from Moloch’s rousing speech in the hellish council in book 2.

Let such bethink them, if the sleepy drench  
Of that forgetful Lake benum not still;  
That in our proper motion we ascend  
Up to our native seat: descent and fall  
To us is adverse. Who but felt of late,  
When the fierce Foe hung on our broken Rere  
Insulting, and pursu’d us through the Deep,  
With what compulsion and laborious flight  
We sunk thus low? Th’ Ascent is easie then (2.73-81)

When Moloch asks, “With what compulsion and laborious flight / We sunk thus low?” (2.80-1), Bentley observes: “The Ideas of *Flight* and of *Sinking* do not agree well together. I suspect the Author gave it: *With what Compulsion and laborious STRIFE*.”<sup>31</sup> Stillingfleet responds on the facing page: “Bent. says, y<sup>e</sup> Ideas of Flight & Sinking do not agree together. What, not where y<sup>e</sup> sinking is <sup>in</sup>voluntary? As in this case, where Descent is adverse.”<sup>32</sup> This is exactly right: Moloch is saying precisely that the fallen angels *flew* – resistant, defiant, only flying down because God was stronger. Descent is “adverse” or “inimical” to them; they, the angels, were actively descending, their sinking therefore was far from passive or involuntary. Thus “flight” is the appropriate word, not “strife”, as Bentley would have it. (Not to mention that “flight” also puns on fleeing.<sup>33</sup>) However, Stillingfleet’s note continues: “If he [Bentley] must change something, it should have been in y<sup>e</sup> word, Sunk, w<sup>ch</sup> carries y<sup>e</sup> Idea of Involuntary Descent. But this kind of unphilosophical Scruple w<sup>d</sup> ruin Poetry, if listened to.”<sup>34</sup> Stillingfleet’s parting shot may well be quite right, but he is wrong, for two reasons, I think, to suggest emending “Sunk”. First, because dramatic irony is lost if “Sunk” is changed. Moloch is advocating open war, but he is making it seem far too straightforward: “Th’ Ascent is easie then”. The note struck by “Sunk”, of involuntary descent, is a subtle or not so subtle hint that perhaps Moloch knows it. Second, doing away with “Sunk” loses a connection

between sound and sense. John Leonard in discussing Dr Johnson's commentary on this passage points out how the vowel sound in "sunk" works with "hung", "Insulting", "compulsion", "thus" to produce imitative harmony, conveying laboriousness.<sup>35</sup> But Stillingfleet, in attending to the sense and thinking to emend "Sunk", misses the sound. He is hardly to be blamed for this, especially given how attuned he is elsewhere to the particular music of Milton's poem. But what this example shows, once again, is the shaping effect exerted by Bentley's commentary on Stillingfleet, establishing editorial priorities, forcing him onto the defensive and directing his corrector's gaze.

The bitter irony that his editorial endeavours should in some way be shaped by Bentley, his perpetual antagonist, cannot have escaped Stillingfleet. Exasperation breaks out again and again. At 1.252, where Bentley emends "Receive" to "Welcome" on the grounds that Milton had used "Welcome" in a similar context in his *History of Britain*, Stillingfleet erupts: "A Doughty way this of mending an Author, w<sup>ch</sup> reigns thro' this Critic's Notes! As if a Man was not allowed to vary his phrase." Typically, Stillingfleet follows such outbursts with citations of parallel places to justify Milton's text. In this particular case he argues that in using "Receive" Milton had "y<sup>e</sup> above mentioned place out of Sophocles in his *Eye [Ajax 394-400]*, w<sup>ch</sup> has ἔλασθέ" (the second person plural imperative in the middle voice of the Greek verb αἰρέω, to take with the hand, grasp, seize or receive).<sup>36</sup> Yet while Stillingfleet cites classical precedents to show up Bentley's egregious errors, Bentley's irascibility has contaminated Stillingfleet's normally peaceable prose. Stillingfleet may even have been surprised to hear himself, in his frustration, punning sardonically on Bentley's diction: viz. his tart play on Bentley's "miserably" (above). In book 5, when Raphael looks out into the universe at Earth and Eden from the gate of heaven, Milton uses a modern simile to convey the vast distances and barely discernible prospects involved:

As when by night the Glass  
Of Galileo, less assur'd, observes  
Imagin'd Lands and Regions in the Moon (5.261-3).

Bentley rejects "observes / Imagin'd Lands", claiming that here Milton "confounds two Opposites, Observation with Imagination." Stillingfleet snaps back: "As to his objection to Imagined, there is no Confusion but a concise way of saying: Observes something w<sup>ch</sup> he imagines to be Land: I can't help saying, I am almost ashamed of making observations on such imagined faults as these."<sup>37</sup> "Almost ashamed" of stooping to correct such glaring critical misjudgments, yes, but perhaps even more ashamed of finding himself reduced to punning impotently on his former master's words.

From these few examples of Stillingfleet's explication of difficult passages a picture begins to emerge. First and foremost Stillingfleet is a staunch defender of Milton's words, only reluctantly and very infrequently granting that a line might be corrupted or in error. Further instances show that Stillingfleet's defence both justifies *and* excuses perceived difficulties in Milton's locutions.<sup>38</sup> Like Addison, he is willing to forgive "a little Slip" provided that "it is impossible . . . to mistake the Poet's Sense",<sup>39</sup> and he follows Hume's lead in justifying irregularities on the grounds that they are peculiarly expressive, and he cites classical precedent to do so. Lastly, Stillingfleet is like Bentley. Where Bentley compiled his

edition of *Paradise Lost*, pen in hand, by reading Addison, analysing and commenting upon the same quotations in the same places, Stillingfleet in turn follows Bentley, elucidating Milton's poem almost as a by-product or consequence of his compulsive desire to correct Bentley's "imagined" faults.

### III.

Stillingfleet's second and largest category of observations is "Imitations from other Authors". In his letter to Dampier, Stillingfleet champions imitation over novelty ("too much sought after & too much cried up"), and sees imitation and propriety (*imitatio* and rhetorical decorum) as "properly ποιήσις [Poesis] or Creation in the Pagan-Sence."<sup>40</sup> The poet for Stillingfleet, as for the Greeks, is first and foremost a "maker", a creator and craftsman, and only secondarily a "vates", a diviner or seer. Stillingfleet elaborates on his method: "I have often quoted parallel places<sup>out</sup> of authors, when it cannot be supposed Milton had those places in his Eye; But I quoted y<sup>m</sup> for Confirmation. For I look on y<sup>e</sup> *Paradise Lost* as an Abridgem<sup>t</sup> of all Human & Divine Philosophy."<sup>41</sup> This is a crucial disclaimer, defining the parameters for the kinds of parallels or allusions Stillingfleet proposes. For example, Stillingfleet cites a number of parallel places in his annotation on the invocation at the beginning of book 1:

Sing Heav'nly Muse, that on the *secret* top  
Of *Horeb* or of *Sinai* didst inspire  
That Shepherd (1.6-8)

Stillingfleet directs us first to the priest Chryses's prayer to Apollo at the beginning of the *Iliad*:

‘κλυθί μεν, Αργυρότοξ’, ὄς Χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας,  
Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην, Τενέδοιό τε Ἴφι ἀνάσσεις,  
Σμινθευ — ’ (1.37-9)

(‘Hear me, god of the silver bow, who stand over Chryse and holy Cilla, and rule mightily over Tenedos, Sminthian god’),

and second to the address of the Chorus in Sophocles's *Antigone* to Bacchus: “πολύωνυμε, Καδμείας” (l. 1115) (“God of many names, glory of the Cadmeian bride and offspring of loud-thundering Zeus”). Stillingfleet's annotation also points out Ovid's imitation of these lines in book 4 of *Metamorphoses*: “Bacchumque vocant &c.” (4.11) (“Bacchus [...] Whome solemnly they call / By all the names and titles high that may to him befall”).<sup>42</sup> I give this example simply to show that Stillingfleet behaves primarily like an editor rather than a critic, identifying parallels rather than analysing them. But in recognising Ovid's imitation of Sophocles, Stillingfleet implies at least that Milton's echo of earlier epic material here has a kind of sonic and semantic depth or density to it, deriving from the concatenation of sources and voices. This effect is not diminished by the fact that the parallels that Stillingfleet cites

here are broad ones, invocations to gods, commonplaces or *topoi* of classical poetry and drama. These are not direct acoustical parallels, as John Hollander called them, but rather a looser mode of allusion or “figure of echo”.<sup>43</sup> Or as Addison put it, “one great Genius often catches the Flame from another, and writes in his Spirit without copying servilely after him.”<sup>44</sup>

This is also a useful example because it is fairly representative of the balance of kinds of parallel texts that Stillingfleet proposes. Of the two hundred or so literary citations he provides, the most by far are references to Greek classical sources: one hundred and five in total to Homer (eighty-eight to the *Iliad*, seventeen to the *Odyssey*); twenty-three to Sophocles (across seven different plays), seventeen to Hesiod (including references to *Theogony*, *Works and Days*, and *The Shield of Heracles*), fifteen to Euripides (across nine different plays), fifteen to Aeschylus’s *Prometheus Bound*, and a handful each to Plato, Aristotle (*Rhetoric* and *Poetics*), Demetrius of Phaleron, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Dionysius Periegeta, Eustathius of Thessalonica, Apollonius of Rhodes, Thucydides, Polybius, Longinus, Theocritus, Aristophanes, Pindar, Callimachus, Lucian, Hierocles, Strabo, Porphyry of Tyre, Clement of Alexandria, and Diogenes Laertius. By comparison the Romans are poorly represented: unsurprisingly, forty citations refer to different places in Virgil (thirty to the *Aeneid*, eight to the *Georgics*, and two to the *Eclogues*), but just a smattering to Ovid, Horace, Juvenal, Lucretius, Cicero, Pliny, Plutarch, and Claudian. Only a few parallels are drawn with anything non-classical (aside from the countless bible references): thirteen to Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata* and *Aminta*, seven to Spenser (five to *The Faerie Queene*, and one each to his *Epithalamion* and *Hymn to Heavenly Beauty*), and just two references to Shakespeare (*Measure for Measure* and *Midsummer-Night’s Dream*). (See Appendix for the full list of citations, keyed to lemmas in *Paradise Lost*.)

How far Stillingfleet sees these parallels as allusions, in the sense of covert or indirect references, or puns or metaphors (a further signification of allusion in the eighteenth century), is unclear. Does he see Milton deliberately drawing parallels with the intention of discrediting pagan epic? Or, in the manner of mock-epic, of citing parallel places to diminish figures in *Paradise Lost* such as Satan and the fallen angels? Does Stillingfleet think Milton uses such parallels to make what Davis P. Harding called the “insinuated comparison”? Or, as Douglas Bush thought, does Stillingfleet consider that Milton uses allusions to create a sense of premonition, of dramatic irony, by having characters echo the words and actions of figures in earlier epics and tragedies?<sup>45</sup> Specific examples only hint at an answer. In Stillingfleet’s annotation of lines 17-18 of book 1 (“Thou, O Spirit, that does prefer / Before all temples th’ upright heart and pure”), he cites three different parallel places that may in some way lie behind Milton’s imagery and phrasing: 1 Cor. 3:16: “Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?”; Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto*, iii. 6. 23:

Principe nec nostro deus est moderatior ullus.  
Iustitia vires temperat ille suas.  
Nuper eam Cæsar; facto de marmore templo,  
Iam pridem posuit mentis in æde suæ

(No god is more lenient than our prince.

Justice moderates his powers.  
Caesar recently established her in a marble shrine,  
But long ago in the temple of his heart);

Claudian, *De Consulatu Stilichonis*, ii. 12: “Hæc Dea pro templis, & thure calentibus aris / Te fruitur, posuitq[ue] suas <sup>hoc</sup> pectore sedes” (“She [Love] dwelleth now not in temples nor by altars warm with incense but in thy heart wherein she has made her home”).<sup>46</sup> The texts cited here, biblical and Roman, provide both verbal and conceptual parallels with the Pauline idea conveyed by Milton’s induction: the dwelling of the spirit in the human heart rather than in the external temple. Yet Stillingfleet’s annotation cites these places without further comment, leaving us no closer to knowing what he thought of Milton’s art of allusion. We are forced back, reluctantly, to Stillingfleet’s rather unadventurous statement made in his letter to Dampier: that he adduces the parallels simply for confirmation that *Paradise Lost* is cosmically compendious, “an abridgem<sup>t</sup> of all Human and Divine Philosophy”.

#### IV.

Stillingfleet’s third category of annotations is “Grammar and Prosody”. In his letter to Dampier he distinguishes between philosophical and poetical grammar, and subdivides the latter into: “Foreign Idioms, Inversion of Words & Sentences; Ellipses of Words & Sentences; Idiomatic Expressions by Analogy; & Lengthening & Shortening of Words.”<sup>47</sup> Throughout his comments under these heads, Stillingfleet argues that Milton’s practice imitates or derives from classical models, especially Greek. Beginning with foreign idioms, Stillingfleet argues that English “runs more naturally into its [Greek] Idioms” than those of any other language. He adds that Milton’s use of foreign idioms gives novelty to his diction and saves him from using uncommon words.<sup>48</sup> For example, Milton’s epic catalogue of fallen angels in book 1 concludes:

*Belial* came last, than whom a Spirit more lewd  
Fell not from heaven, or more gross to love  
Vice for it self (1.490-2)

Stillingfleet takes “gross to love” as his lemma, commenting: “Græcism. vid. *Iliad*. 13. v. 488: ὃς μάλα καρτερός ἐστὶ μάχη ἐνὶ φῶτασ ἐναίρειν” (“right strong is he to slay men in battle”).<sup>49</sup> Infinitive phrases such as this one, modified by an adjective (“gross to love” / “strong [...] to slay”), are a characteristic feature of Greek epic idiom. Stillingfleet concludes: “Milton’s Diction is formed on y<sup>e</sup> Gr. Language. It w<sup>d</sup> be worth while to bring Instances of similar Gr. Expressions & compare y<sup>m</sup> w<sup>th</sup> His imitations of y<sup>e</sup> Manner & Turn & Position in y<sup>e</sup> Greek.”<sup>50</sup> It is important to understand that Stillingfleet here and throughout his commentary is countering rather than endorsing the argument that Milton’s idiom was foreign – an argument forcefully voiced by Dr Johnson in his application of Samuel Butler’s charge that Milton had formed “a Babylonish dialect.”<sup>51</sup> Rather, Stillingfleet echoes Dryden and Warburton who praised Milton’s Graecisms; indeed, Stillingfleet anticipates James

Burnet, Lord Monboddoo (1774) in arguing that the Greek (and Latin) idioms that Milton uses work in English.

With regard to inversion of words and sentences, Stillingfleet argues that Milton's art is copied from learned tongues but that such inversions are not undertaken wholly for the sake of harmony. Rather, "The Inversion gives a Suspence & keeps y<sup>e</sup> Hearer's or Reader's mind awake at the same time y<sup>t</sup> it shows, as if all came f<sup>m</sup> y<sup>e</sup> abundance of y<sup>e</sup> heart w<sup>th</sup>out study or over-much care."<sup>52</sup> One of many examples of Milton's inversion or transposition of words is at 1.293, in the depiction of Satan's spear: "Hewn on Norwegian hills to be the mast." Stillingfleet comments, "Construct. Partic. to Gr. & Engl. Lang. vid. *Iliad*, δ', 142: ὡς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικι μίγη / Μηονίς ἠὲ Κάειρα, παρήϊον ἔμμεναι ἵππων" ("As when a woman staineth ivory with scarlet, some woman of Maeonia or Caria, to make a cheek-piece for horses").<sup>53</sup> As can be seen here, Milton imitates Homer's inversion of the normal clause order by having the subclause precede the main verb clause (i.e., "Hewn on [...] to be the mast" / "As when a woman staineth [...] to make a cheek-piece"). Stillingfleet's suggestion that Milton imitates such Greek epic transpositions in order to affect a kind of artlessness ("w<sup>th</sup>out study or over-much care") is a fascinating and counter-intuitive one. It is of a piece with Stillingfleet's claim that Milton imitates Euripides and other Greek poets in concealing his artifice by "forming his diction out of the vulgar dialect" (e.g., deriving "Him thought" (*Paradise Regained* 2.266) "by analogy f<sup>m</sup> methought"). For Stillingfleet, nothing contributes so much as inversions, first, and idiomatic expressions by analogy, second, "to joining those two qualities together, y<sup>t</sup> ought to be y<sup>e</sup> aim of all Poets in y<sup>r</sup> Diction, viz. Novelty & Clearness."<sup>54</sup> (This concurs with Addison's prescription that "the Language of an Heroic Poem should be both Perspicuous and Sublime", where by sublimity Addison means that the language "ought to deviate from the common Forms and ordinary Phrases of Speech".<sup>55</sup>) Such insights helped Stillingfleet, by his own admission, understand some passages which he wouldn't otherwise have done; they also deepen our sense of Stillingfleet's appreciation of Milton the poetic "maker" or craftsman, and in particular of Milton's inventive appropriation of Greek poetic idioms.

Stillingfleet also praises Milton's use of ellipses of words and sentences, which like inversions, serve to keep the mind alert. Furthermore, for Stillingfleet, ellipsis is a device by which one speaker may be distinguished from another, for "To be Elliptical is y<sup>e</sup> Character of Ingenuity, & for y<sup>s</sup> reason y<sup>e</sup> Sayings of y<sup>e</sup> Wise are called in Scripture Dark Sayings & Riddles."<sup>56</sup> We may not be surprised then to find Stillingfleet pointing to a series of ellipses in consecutive lines of Satan's "O myriads of immortal spirits" speech to the fallen angels in book 1, concluding:

Peace is despair'd,  
For who can think Submission? War then, War  
Open or understood must be resolv'd (1.660-2)

"Peace is despair'd [of]", Stillingfleet observes, supplying the missing preposition; "For who can think [of] Submission?" He concludes: "The throwing out these & many other particles gives Beauty to Milton's Language." In praising the compression of Milton's verse, Stillingfleet swims in the mainstream of eighteenth-century criticism, echoing fellow

admirers such as the Richardsons (1734). Yet, as so often, Stillingfleet is provoked by Bentley to think and see further. In the speech above, Bentley emends “understood” to “underhand”. Stillingfleet retorts:

Understood) i.e. by y<sup>e</sup> fallen Angels whatever disguise they might put on. This word is here used in so common & obvious a sense, y<sup>t</sup> one w<sup>d</sup> wonder how Bent. could mistake it, who says, w<sup>t</sup> is understood, is not concealed. Whereas it happens to be just y<sup>e</sup> contrary in an Ellipsis, Something is always understood, that does not appear.<sup>57</sup>

This is a very fine observation. Stillingfleet anticipates Lord Monboddo’s (1774) and William Cowper’s (1791-2) defences of Milton’s use of transposition and ellipsis a quarter of a century later, finding that Milton’s practice of imitating common ellipses in Greek makes his verse spare rather than inflated. Such critical acuity derives not only from Stillingfleet’s burning wish to rescue Milton from Bentley. It also stems from his deep immersion in Greek letters, richly attested to by the citations that thickly populate his notes, of both poetry and poetics (such as his approving citations of Aristotle’s recommendation in *Poetics* (chapter 22) of the lengthening and shortening of words, and of Demetrius of Phaleron’s argument in *Libro de Elocutione (On Style)* that connectives which follow one another in close succession make even small things great, as in “Anguish and doubt and fear and sorrow and pain” (1.558).<sup>58</sup>

In the final section of his letter to Dampier, Stillingfleet turns to prosody. Stillingfleet maintains that languages naturally run into certain kinds of rhythmical verse: Latin into hexameter, French into anapaests and Greek and English into iambics. “Milton certainly observed y<sup>s</sup> resemblance between our Heroic & y<sup>e</sup> Greek Iambic verse & formed his Prosody upon it as far as y<sup>e</sup> difference of y<sup>e</sup> two tongues w<sup>d</sup> admit of.” Stillingfleet suggests three ways in which Milton forms his English iambics according to the Greek model:

First, w<sup>n</sup> he aims at smooth verse he gives long & short syllable [*sic*] alternately; Thus To sport w<sup>th</sup> Amarylis in the shade – or with y<sup>e</sup> tangles of Neæra’s hair. Secondly, he makes great use of Elisions, a thing almost unknown before him. Thirdly, He gives frequent[y] three short syllables for two; This last point I look on as y<sup>e</sup> most essential of all, as it is in some measure approac[h]es to y<sup>t</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> is so much wanting in all of modern languages, as Vossius justly observes, I mean, Isochronous Feet, a want y<sup>t</sup> causes a most disagreeable Monotony in our verse.<sup>59</sup>

Stillingfleet denies that our syllables are long or short by nature, as the grammarians say, but argues that “our vowels are long or short only by Position or Accent, w<sup>ch</sup> last frequently overcomes Position.”<sup>60</sup> Yet, he maintains, we have it still in our power, even under these disadvantages, to produce great variety. “Thus, wallowing, unweildy, enormous in y<sup>r</sup> Gait [7.411] – Grasping ten thousand Thunders, w<sup>ch</sup> he sent [6.836] – Both these Lines are equally clogged w<sup>th</sup> consonants, yet they are different as to y<sup>r</sup> Rhythm, w<sup>ch</sup> difference seems to consist in one having a pause, y<sup>e</sup> other none again – The flowery Dale of Sibma, clad with vines [1.410] – Arise, awake, or be for ever falln [1.330] – Both these verses are made up chiefly of Iambic feet; yet how different is y<sup>r</sup> Harmony only occasioned by pauses in one &

none in y<sup>e</sup> other . . . y<sup>e</sup> first is flowing & effeminate, y<sup>e</sup> last emphatic & masculine.”<sup>61</sup> Stillingfleet observes that Milton has so frequently made use of this artifice throughout *Paradise Lost* that he thought it “endless” to mark all the instances, yet he does so often enough.

Finally Stillingfleet observes “Two other Artifices still behind w<sup>ch</sup> are, if possible, still more important. I mean varying y<sup>e</sup> Pause, and using Prosaic Rhythm.” Both “Artifices” help the poet to vary the rhythm, and are welcomed and defended by Stillingfleet, who finds authority for the first in Dionysius of Halicarnassus: “I will only just take notice, y<sup>t</sup> he recommends this Artifice, because it makes verse approach to Prose, in w<sup>ch</sup> I am entirely of his opinion.” But Stillingfleet explains that by “Prosaic Rhythm” he means something different: “I mean by it breaking y<sup>e</sup> Ictus by y<sup>e</sup> Grammatical Construction in such a manner, y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Ear scarcely perceives the harmony. Thus: A Dove | sent forth | once and | again | to spy |; Where And w<sup>ch</sup> must by the Construction be joined with Again, destroys y<sup>e</sup> Ictus.” Stillingfleet observes that Milton does this so often when it could so easily have been avoided, “y<sup>t</sup> I can’t help think<sup>s</sup> they were intended. [...] Herein he differs f<sup>m</sup> y<sup>e</sup> generality of other Poets, who never fail to give y<sup>t</sup> readers as much harmony, as they think, is possible.” By way of illustration, Stillingfleet points to precedents in Homer, Sophocles, Euripides and Virgil. “They & Milton knew of how delicate a Structure y<sup>e</sup> Ear is & how easily cloy’d, therefore purposely reserved more y<sup>n</sup> ordinary Smoothness for such places only as wanted y<sup>t</sup> ornament where there was no Strength of thought, Character, or Passion.”<sup>62</sup> A good example is Stillingfleet’s response to Bentley’s emendation of “To do aught Good *never will* be our task” (1.159) to “will never”. Following the lemma for this line, Stillingfleet observes: “Ryth. Pros. visibly designed by y<sup>e</sup> author” and cites two sections of Demetrius of Phaleron’s (c. 360–280 BC), *De Elocutione (On Style)*, 15, 48:

Δοκιμάζω γὰρ δὴ ἔγωγε μήτε περιόδοις ὅλον τὸν λόγον συνείρεσθαι, ὡς ὁ Γοργίου μήτε διαλελύσθαι ὅλον, ὡς τὰ ἀρχαῖα, ἀλλὰ μεμῖχθαι μᾶλλον δι’ ἀμφοτέρων. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἐγκατάσκευος ἔσται καὶ ἀπλοῦς ἅμα, καὶ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἡδύς. καὶ οὔτε μάλα ιδιωτικός, οὔτε μάλα σοφιστικός. τῶν δὲ τὰς πυκνὰς περιόδους λεγόντων, οὐδ’ αἱ κεφαλαὶ ῥαδίως ἔστᾱσιν, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν οἰνωμένων, οἳ τε ἀκούοντες ναυτιῶσι διὰ τὸ ἀπίθανον, τοτὲ δὲ καὶ ἐκφωνοῦσι τὰ τέλη τῶν περιόδων προειδότες καὶ προαναβοῶσι.

(My own personal view is that speech should neither, like that of Gorgias, consist wholly of a series of periods, nor be wholly disconnected like the older style, but should rather combine the two methods. It will then be simultaneously elaborate and simple, and draw charm from the presence of both, being neither too ordinary nor too artificial. Those who crowd periods together are as light-headed as those who are drunk, and their listeners are nauseated by the implausibility; and sometimes they even foresee and, loudly declaiming, shout out in advance the endings of the periods.)

Ποιεῖ δὲ καὶ δυσφωνία συνθέσεως ἐν πολλοῖς μέγεθος. — λειότης γὰρ καὶ τὸ εὐήκοον οὐ πάνυ ἐν μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ χώραν ἔχουσιν, εἰ μὴ που ἐν ὀλίγοις. καὶ ὁ Θουκυδίδης δὲ πανταχοῦ σχεδὸν φεύγει τὸ λειὸν καὶ ὁμαλὲς τῆς συνθέσεως, καὶ αἰεὶ μᾶλλον τι προσκρούοντι ἔοικεν. &c

(In many passages grandeur is produced by a series of ugly sounds. — In other respects the ugly clash of sounds is perhaps unpleasant to the ear, but by its very excess it brings out the greatness of the hero, since in the grand style smoothness and euphony find only an occasional place. Thucydides almost invariably avoids a smooth, even structure. He seems rather to be forever stumbling)<sup>63</sup>

The argument about Milton's metricality is an old one, and Stillingfleet is responding here to Bentley's strict idea of prosody. Newton makes a similar defence of Milton against Bentley, and welcomes expressions of unusual rhythm. Newton simply says that Bentley reads it thus "as of a smoother and stronger accent: but I conceive that Milton intended to vary the accent of *never* and *ever* in the next verse."<sup>64</sup> Stillingfleet is keen, as always, to find authority for Milton's metrical irregularities and rhythmical variations in classical parallels, but he is also ahead of his time (and of Newton) in identifying and allowing Milton's use of tribrachs (metrical feet consisting of three short syllables; e.g. "ignominy") and catalectic or "maimed" verse, as Puttenham called it (i.e., wanting a syllable in the last foot).<sup>65</sup> It is important for Stillingfleet to argue that Milton's verse conforms to classical grammar and prosody because he claims that all great and lasting writing does so: "But we must study y<sup>e</sup> foundation in an Elementary way, & not be above little things, if we hope to arrive at great. For I think it next to certain y<sup>t</sup> had Milton wrote such verse as D<sup>r</sup> Donne, he w<sup>d</sup> be as little read in spite of all his Sublimity."<sup>66</sup>

## V.

Stillingfleet's Milton is a deeply classicist poet, his blank verse paragraphs steeped in Greek epic and tragedy in a densely worked interplay with his biblical subject and language. Not only do Milton's imagery and personae imitate classical sources, so too do the grammar and prosody of the verse itself through Greek and Latin idioms, inversion, ellipsis, shortening and lengthening of words, and prosaic rhythm. Stillingfleet cites numerous parallels that are original to him, and anticipates Newton in acknowledging the pre-eminence of stress in Milton's metrical system. His claim that "Milton's Diction is formed on y<sup>e</sup> Gr. Language", which he supports with copious examples from Homer (and from the *Iliad* in particular), indicates another way of thinking about both the supposed foreignness of Milton's English and Milton's practice of imitation. Addison declared that "no Poet seems ever to have studied *Homer* more, or to have resembled him in the Greatness of Genius, than *Milton*"; John Toland spoke of Milton's intimate knowledge of Homer, "whose two Poems he could almost repeat without book"; and the Richardsons had no doubt in finding Milton "more a Greek than a Roman".<sup>67</sup> Stillingfleet clearly agreed, his annotations show that he was familiar with the same Greek allegorical exegesis of Homer used by Milton, the Byzantine commentary of Eustathius of Thessalonica, and he is matched only by Callander among eighteenth-century critics in the extent to which he discovered parallels between *Paradise Lost* and the *Iliad*. Yet if early critics recognised Milton's debt to Athens and to Homer in particular, modern scholars by contrast have typically underplayed the relationship.<sup>68</sup> The title of Maurice Bowra's *From Virgil to Milton* (1945) speaks for itself, and finds an heir in the widely held modern view that "Milton almost always sees Homer through Vergil".<sup>69</sup> Ironically, modern

defences of Milton's style against age-old charges of his allegedly excessive use of Latinate diction and syntax have obscured recognition of what his idiom owed to Greek. Alastair Fowler and Thomas Corns, among others, have played down the extent and significance of Milton's alleged Latinisms, and Corns is representative when he observes that: "In some senses Milton may indeed be the English Cicero and the English Virgil; but his Englishness emerges uncompromised."<sup>70</sup> This is a welcome defence of Milton's English, but what of the English Homer?

Stillingfleet's composition of his manuscript notes and their later transmission to Todd also raise intriguing questions about attribution. Did Todd, in his edition of 1801, always properly credit Stillingfleet's annotations to their author? Or do some of the annotations claimed by Todd as his own derive from Stillingfleet's posthumous manuscript notes? There is sufficient similarity between some of "Todd's" annotations in print and Stillingfleet's in manuscript to prompt these questions at least, and well-documented precedent in Newton's unacknowledged use of Hume. (Although it is sometimes argued that early editors may have felt acknowledgement unnecessary when they themselves recognized a reference.)<sup>71</sup> Also, why didn't Stillingfleet send his manuscript notes to Newton? Newton's prospectus stated that "If any Gentleman has any Notes or Observations to communicate, the Favour will be thankfully acknowledg'd".<sup>72</sup> Should we in fact see the scholarly aims and methods of Stillingfleet's editorial endeavour as not only hopelessly entangled in and muddled by his relationship with Bentley, but also its wider dissemination as prematurely and unnecessarily suppressed by his rivalry with Newton? As we have seen, Stillingfleet's notes not only provide fresh evidence of the tastes and priorities of mid-eighteenth-century criticism of Milton, but the story of their making reveals much about the competitive process by which editors responded, often quite narrowly, to the editorial choices and regrettable errors of their rivals. Similarly, the story of how Stillingfleet's notes remained in manuscript, even after a portion of them were published by Todd, is significant not only for our understanding of Milton's early reception. More broadly, the fact of the long critical neglect of Stillingfleet's annotations sheds light on the process by which literary reputations are made, in which subsequent readers, students and scholars work exclusively from the printed record, omitting manuscript, performance, and other less recoverable forms of authorial presence.

As such, manuscript sources such as Stillingfleet's annotations constitute invaluable historical evidence of individual readings of Milton's work. Such artefacts are especially important now, at a time in which the astonishing convenience of online access to early modern print, afforded through electronic resources such as *Early English Books Online* and *Eighteenth-Century Collections Online*, risks scholarly dependence on printed sources at the expense of manuscript (which, for the most part, must still be hunted for in the catalogue and called up from the archive or stack). Stillingfleet and other eighteenth-century editors, commentators and readers in manuscript are worth studying, then, because they can restore to us things we have forgotten (in this case, an intimate knowledge of Greek literature), because they help us to understand the origins and development of critical debates to come, and because they remind us, if we needed reminding, that the motives for commentary are rarely pure.

## Appendix:

### Stillingfleet's citations of parallels and sources in *Paradise Lost*

Stillingfleet's annotations fall into three broad categories: explication of difficult passages; imitations from other authors; grammar and prosody. The first of these, and Stillingfleet's interpretative quarrels with Bentley, are discussed above. The list below comprises Stillingfleet's citation of: (i) Milton's imitations of other authors; and (ii) passages that illustrate Milton's grammar and prosody. All citations are keyed to lemmas, book and line numbers. Passages cited to illustrate Milton's grammar and prosody are indicated as such using Stillingfleet's own abbreviated critical terminology, e.g. {"Gr. construct.} or {"Pros. Rhythm"}.

In the majority of cases, Stillingfleet was the first to cite the parallel texts listed below (in 1745-6, though they were not printed until 1801, and not all of them even then). Out of approximately four hundred separate places in parallel texts cited by Stillingfleet, over three-quarters appear to be unique to him. This ratio derives from my collation of the following seventeenth- and eighteenth-century commentaries against Stillingfleet's annotations: "P. H." (Patrick Hume) (1695), Joseph Addison (1712), Richard Bentley (1732), Zachary Pearce (1732), Jonathan Richardson, father and son (1734), Francis Peck (1740), James Paterson (1744), Raymond de St Maur (1745), John Upton (1746), Thomas Newton (1749), John Callander (1750), John Marchant (1751), James Buchanan (1773), William Cowper (1791-2), Capel Lofft (1792) and Henry John Todd (1801). Where one of these commentators or editors cites the same parallel text noted by Stillingfleet, at the same place in *Paradise Lost*, I have indicated it using square brackets. Those of Stillingfleet's annotations included in Todd's 1801 variorum edition are indicated thus: [St, Todd]. The same applies to other contributors to Todd's edition, e.g. [Callander, Todd]. Two and half centuries later, some of Stillingfleet's citations are still original to him, while others have been incorporated into subsequent editions. It would be too cumbersome, however, to indicate below all of the modern editions which cite sources or parallels first adduced by Stillingfleet.

It should be noted that not all of Stillingfleet's annotations listed below appear in his annotated copy of Bentley's *Milton's Paradise Lost* (BL, C.134.h.1). Some derive only from Todd's 1801 edition. Todd refers in his edition to "several important letters of Mr. Stillingfleet to Dr. Dampier's father, formerly Dean of Durham, to whom he had presented his interleaved *Paradise Lost*".<sup>73</sup> It seems, then, that Dampier's son must have passed on a collection of Stillingfleet's working papers to Todd, including but not limited to BL, C.134.h.1.

The list below is indicative only; it is *not* a semi-diplomatic transcription of Stillingfleet's annotations. To save space, the list includes only those of Stillingfleet's annotations supported by specific textual citations, and omits the many instances where Stillingfleet identifies features of Milton's style, such as ellipsis or elision, but without pointing to a specific place in a parallel text. The list modernises and makes consistent the form of Stillingfleet's citations. It omits all Greek and Latin quotations provided by Stillingfleet from parallel texts, and it omits Stillingfleet's many cross-references to other places in *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*. Readers interested in exploring the original

form and extent of Stillingfleet's annotations should consult his copy of Bentley's edition in the British Library.

## Book 1

- 1.6. *Secret*: Exod. 24: 18, 20: 18, 19: 18; Deut. 5: 22.
- 1.7-11. *Oreb . . . Sion Hill*: Homer, *Il.* i. 37; Sophocles, *Antig.* 1127; Ovid, *Met.* iv. 11.
- 1.8. *That Shepherd*: Exod. 3: 1 [Hume; Richardson; Paterson; St Maur; Newton].
- 1.15. *Aonian*: Hesiod, *Theog.* 23.
- 1.18. *Before . . . temples*: 1 Cor. 3: 16; Ovid, *Epist. ex Ponto*, iii. 6. 23; Claudian, *De Consulatu Stilichonis*, ii. 12.
- 1.19. *Instruct me*: Homer, *Il.* ii. 284.
- 1.20. *Wast present*: Wisd. 9: 9.
- 1.21. *Dove-like*: Gen. 1: 2 [Hume; Paterson; Newton].
- 1.28. *Deep . . . Hell*: Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, 3 vols. (Basil, 1741), i. 639. 15, 321. 29; Dionysius Periegeta (Dionysius of Alexandria), *Οικουμένης περιήγησις (Orbis Terræ Descriptio)* 271, 620, and commentary of Eustathius.
- 1.33. *Who first*: Homer, *Il.* i. 8 [Hume; Callander].
- 1.36-7. *What . . . Heav'n*: Virgil, *Georg.* i. 61.
- 1.37. *Had . . . out*: 2 Pet. 2: 4.
- 1.39. *To . . . Peers*: Ps. 45: 7.
- 1.40. *He . . . high*: Isa. 14: 13 [St, Todd]; Homer, *Odys.* xi. 312.
- 1.41. *If . . . oppose'd*: {Gr. idiom} Sophocles, *Electra* 999.
- 1.44. *Him . . . power*: Hesiod, *Theog.* 716 [St, Todd]; Virgil, *Aen.* vi. 589.
- 1.46. *With Hideous*: Hesiod, *Theog.* 695.
- 1.47. *To . . . Perdition*: Sophocles, *Antig.* 1138; Jer. 44: 2.
- 1.48. *Adamantine chains*: Rev. 20: 2; Aeschylus, *Prom. Bound* 6 [Callander].
- 1.56. *Torments him*: Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* iv. 1 [St, Todd].
- 1.63. *Darkness visible*: {"Poet. Gram. by analogy f<sup>m</sup> Vulg. Idiom"} Euripides, *Phoenissae* 290; Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 427.
- 1.66. *Hope . . . comes*: Euripides, *Troades* 676 [St, Todd].
- 1.69. *With . . . Sulphur*: Rev. 20:10.
- 1.74. *As . . . removed*: Homer, *Il.* viii. 16 [Hume; Newton; Callander]; Euripides, *Hecuba* i. 1.
- 1.81. *Beelzebub*: 2 Kgs. 1: 2 [Hume; Paterson; Callander; St, Todd].
- 1.84. *If . . . fallen*: Virgil, *Aen.* ii. 274 [Hume; Newton, Callander]; {Hyperbaton} Longinus, *De Sublimitate* 22; Isa. 14: 12.
- 1.86. *Cloath'd . . . brightness*: Ps. 104: 2 [Todd]; Homer, *Il.* vii. 164;
- 1.90. *Hath join'd*: Homer, *Il.* i. 37.
- 1.105. *And . . . throne*: Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* iv. 15 [Newton].
- 1.110. *That . . . might*: Aeschylus, *Prom. Bound* 988, 1001 [Todd]; Homer, *Il.* xvi. 625.
- 1.124. *Holds . . . Tyranny*: {Gr. idiom} Euripides, *Phoenissae* 509 [St, Todd].
- 1.126. *Vaunting*: Virgil, *Aen.* i [Hume; Callander, Todd].
- 1.131. *Perpetual King*: Virgil, *Aen.* vii. 176; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, 3 vols. (Basil, 1741), ii. 699. 29.
- 1.153-4. *Feel . . . being*: {Gr. construct.} Homer, *Il.* x. 98.
- 1.158. *Suffering*: Hesiod, *Theog.* 659; Thomas Johnson, *Novus Græcorum Epigrammatum . . . Delectus* (London, 1732), Epig. 200, l. 11.
- 1.159. *To . . . task*: {"Ryth. Pros.} Demetrius Phaleron, *De Elocutione* 15, 48.
- 1.171. *Back . . . heaven*: {Construct.} Homer, *Il.* viii. 486.

- 1.172. *Hath laid*: Homer, *Odyss.* iii. 158.
- 1.176. *His shafts*: Exod. 25: 37.
- 1.179. *Satiate*: {abbrev. of “satiated”} Aristotle, *Poetics* 22.
- 1.193. *With . . . wave*: Homer, *Il.* xiii. 474.
- 1.195. *Lay floating*: Homer, *Odyss.* xi. 575; *Il.* xvi. 775, xxii. 407 [Callander].
- 1.198. *Titanian . . . Jove*: Hesiod, *Theog.* 631, 149 [Callander].
- 1.199. *Whom . . . Den*: Homer, *Il.* i. 402; iv. 142; Hesiod, *Theog.* 733; Virgil, *Aen.* 10; Pindar, *Pythian Odes* i. 252 [St, Todd].
- 1.202. *Created . . . stream*: {rhythm adjusted to the matter} Homer, *Il.* iii. 5, xvi. 151; Virgil, *Georg.* iv. 232 [Callander].
- 1.203. *Him . . . foam*: Spenser, *Epithalamion*, xvi.1-18 [Bentley].
- 1.205. *Deeming . . . oft*: Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, 3 vols. (Basil, 1741), ii. 498. 14.
- 1.210. *Chain’d . . . Lake*: 2 Pet. 2: 4 [Todd].
- 1.244. *Change . . . heaven*: Horace, *Odes* i. 17; {Hypallage} Sophocles, *Ajax* 208.
- 1.251. *Infernal world*: Sophocles, *Ajax* 394 [Newton].
- 1.252. *Receive*: Sophocles, *Ajax* 397.
- 1.259. *Built*: Aeschylus, *Prom. Bound* 31; Homer, *Il.* ii. 269.
- 1.263. *Better . . . hell*: Euripides, *Phoenissae* 517.
- 1.284. *Was . . . shield*: Homer, *Il.* xx. 373.
- 1.287. *Hung . . . Orb*: {“Poet. Gram.”} Homer, *Il.* xi. 544 [Hume].
- 1.293. *Hewn . . . mast*: Homer, *Odyss.* ix. 322 [Hume; St, Todd]; {“Gr. and Eng. construct.”} Homer, *Il.* iv. 142.
- 1.302. *Thick . . . leaves*: Homer, *Il.* ii. 468, 800 [Hume; Callander]; Virgil, *Aen.* vi. 309 [Hume; Callander; Todd]; Apoll. Rhodius, *Argonautica* iv. 216.
- 1.305. *Afloat . . . winds*: Virgil, *Aen.* i. 539 [Newton; Callander].
- 1.314. *He . . . deep*: Homer, *Il.* viii. 223, xix. 221.
- 1.315. *Princes, Potentates*: Spenser, *Hymn to Heavenly Beauty* 85-91; Homer, *Il.* viii. 228, 423.
- 1.318. *Or . . . place*: Lucan, *Pharsalia* i. 343.
- 1.330. *Awake . . . fall’n*: {rhythm} Homer, *Il.* xvi. 151.
- 1.332. *Upon . . . wing*: Homer, *Il.* xii. 413.
- 1.335. *Nor . . . plight*: Virgil, *Georg.* i. 83, 118; {“Poet. Gram.”} Spenser, *FQ* ii. 6. 20.
- 1.337. *Yet . . . obey’d*: {Scriptural diction; Lat. idiom} Acts 7: 39; Rom. 6: 16.
- 1.339. *Of . . . day*: Exod. 6: 20 [Hume].
- 1.355. *Beneath . . . sands*: Dionysius Periegeta (Dionysius of Alexandria), *Οικουμένης περιήγησις* (*Orbis Terræ Descriptio*) 20; Virgil, *Georg.* i. 240-1.
- 1.373. *And . . . Deities*: Lev. 17: 7; Ps. 106: 37 [Todd].
- 1.375. *Idols . . . world*: Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 902, Schol.; *Philoctetes* 970.
- 1.376. *Say . . . last*: Homer, *Il.* v. 703 [Todd]; Homer, *Il.* ii. 484 [Callander].
- 1.392. *First . . . blood*: Lev. 18: 21; 1 Kgs. 11: 7 [Hume; Paterson; Newton; Callander].
- 1.396. *Him . . . Ammonite*: 2 Sam. 12: 26 [Hume; Paterson; Callander].
- 1.397. *Rabba*: Jer. 49: 2.
- 1.399. *Utmost Arnon*: Josh. 13: 16.
- 1.403. *On . . . Grove*: 1 Kgs. 11: 7 [Hume; Paterson; Callander].
- 1.404. *The . . . thence*: 2 Kgs. 23: 10; Isa. 20: 39; Jer. 19: 6, 7: 31-2 [Hume].
- 1.406. *Chemos*: 1 Kgs. 11; 2 Kgs. 23: 13 [Paterson].
- 1.407. *Aroer*: Jer. 48: 19.
- 1.407. *Nebo*: Isa. 15: 2.
- 1.408. *Hesebon*: Isa. 15: 4.
- 1.409. *Seon’s realm*: Josh. 12: 2 [Callander]; Isa. 15: 5.

- 1.410. *The . . . Vines*: Jer. 48: 32 [Hume].
- 1.411. *Eleala*: Isa. 15: 4.
- 1.411. *Asphaltic Pool*: Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, 3 vols. (Basil, 1741), i. 261.
- 1.412. *Peor*: Num. 25: 3 [Hume; Paterson].
- 1.420. *the Brook*: Strabo, *Geog.* (Paris, 1620), 749.
- 1.422. *Bäalim*: Judg. 2: 11 [Callander].
- 1.436. *Spear*: Euripides, *Rhesus* 20.
- 1.437. *With . . . Troop*: Hesiod, *Shield of Heracles* 231; Virgil, *Aen.* 5.
- 1.438. *Astoreth*: 1 Kgs. 11: 33 [Hume].
- 1.439. *Astarte*: Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* 15; Lucian, *De Syria Dea* 4 [Callander]; Isaac Casaubon, *Animadversiones in Athenæi Deipnosophistas* viii. 8; Jer. 7: 18.
- 1.441. *Paid . . . songs*: {Gr. construct.} Hesiod, *Theog.* 639; Exod. 20: 18.
- 1.450. *While . . . rock*: Henry Maundrell, *Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem at Easter A.D. 1697* (1703), 33-34 [Addison; Callander].
- 1.455. *Ezekiel saw*: Ezek. 8: 14 [Hume; Paterson; Callander; Todd].
- 1.457. *alienated Judah*: 1 Sam. 5: 4 [Newton].
- 1.469. *Abbana . . . Pharphar*: 2 Kgs. 5: 12 [Hume; Paterson; Newton; Callander].
- 1.472. *Ahaz*: 2 Kgs. 16: 10 [Hume; Paterson; Newton; Callander].
- 1.478-81. *Osiris . . . Orus*: Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* [Callander].
- 1.479-80. *abus'd . . . seek*: {Gr. construct.} Gal. 1: 1; Homer, *Il.* xiv. 360; Wisd. 12: 27.
- 1.485. *Doubled . . . Dan*: 1 Kgs. 12: 28 [Hume; Callander].
- 1.486. *Grazed ox*: Ps. 106: 20 [Hume; Pearce; Callander].
- 1.489. *Bleating*: Exod. 11: 5; Herodotus, *Hist.* ii. 42. 4; Aristophanes, *Wasps* 568; Homer, *Odys.* iii. 300.
- 1.491. *Gross . . . love*: {Gr. idiom} Homer, *Il.* xiii. 483; {And imitated by y<sup>e</sup> Latins} Horace, *Ars Poetica* 163.
- 1.500. *And . . . outrage*: {interrupted construct.} Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 249, 620.
- 1.503. *Witness . . . Sodom*: Gen. 19: 8 [Paterson; St Maur]; Judg. 19: 22, 24 [Richardson].
- 1.509. *yet . . . Earth*: Hesiod, *Theog.* 106 [Hume]; Deut. 32: 17 [Todd].
- 1.512. *By . . . Jove*: Aeschylus, *Prom. Bound* 220.
- 1.514. *Crete*: Strabo, *Geog.* (Paris, 1620), 468-9 [Hume].
- 1.515. *Snowy top*: Homer, *Il.* x. 615 [Todd]; Homer, *Odys.* vi. 42.
- 1.521. *Roamed*: {"Ellipsis; Poet. Gram. by analogy"} Sophocles, *Ajax* 30.
- 1.525. *Not . . . itself*: Sophocles, *Ajax* 674.
- 1.531. *Then . . . found*: Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* iv. 3.
- 1.542. *A . . . beyond*: Hesiod, *Shield of Heracles* 203, 278, 347; Polybius, *Histories* xv. 30; Juvenal, *Satyres* i. 1. 13.
- 1.546. *orient colours*: Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 142.
- 1.549. *depth unmeasurable*: Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War* v [Newton]; Cicero, *Tusculanæ Disputationes* ii. 15.
- 1.550. *Dorian mood*: Plato, *Opera Omnia*, trans. M. Ficino (Frankfurt, 1602), 486 F, 617 D; Plato, *Opera* (Paris, 1578), ii. 188 D, 410 C; Aristotle, *Opera Omnia*, ed. William du Val, 2 vols (Paris, 1629), ii. 455 E.
- 1.554. *Deliberate . . . unmov'd*: Homer, *Il.* ii. 536 [St, Todd].
- 1.558. *Anguish . . . pain*: Demetrius of Phaleron, *Libro de Elocutione* 54; Homer, *Odys.* xi. 611.
- 1.573. *For . . . man*: {"Lat. Post Homines natos"} Homer, *Il.* ii. 799.
- 1.575. *Could . . . Infantry*: Homer, *Il.* iii. 3 [Pearce; Callander].
- 1.580. *In . . . Son*: Aristotle, *Metaphysica* i. 5. 10; Milton, *Il Penseroso* 116-20; Longinus, *De Sublimitate* 136. 5; Demetrius of Phaleron, *Libro de Elocutione* 165.

- 1.583. *Jousted* . . . *Montalban*: Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso* xii. 43.  
 1.589. *their* . . . *rest*: Homer, *Il.* iii. 226 [St, Todd].  
 1.590. *gesture*: Homer, *Odys.* xi. 555.  
 1.600. *Above* . . . *face*: Homer, *Il.* ii. 769.  
 1.606. *fellows* . . . *rather*: 1 Cor. 15: 10.  
 1.610. *eternal splendors*: {“The Plural for y<sup>c</sup> Singular”} Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 35.  
 1.613. *Hath* . . . *Pines*: Virgil, *Aen.* ix. 681; Lucan, *Pharsalia* i. 135-44; {Construct.} Homer, *Il.* xii. 132, xiv. 414 [Callander].  
 1.619. *Thrice* . . . *Scorn*: Homer, *Il.* xviii. 228; Virgil, *Aen.* vi. 32.  
 1.620. *Tears* . . . *forth*: Homer, *Il.* ix. 14 [Todd].  
 1.621. *Words* . . . *way*: Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* iv. 9 [Todd].  
 1.635. *For* . . . *Heav’n*: Virgil, *Aen.* ii. 431.  
 1.674. *work* . . . *Sulphur*: Agricola, *De Re Metallica*, 520, 562. [St, Todd].  
 1.681. *Were* . . . *bent*: Homer, *Odys.* iv. 74.  
 1.688. *treasures* . . . *hid*: Horace, *Odes* iii. 3. 49 [Newton]; Spenser, *FQ* ii. 7. 36.  
 1.690. *ribs* . . . *Gold*: Virgil, *Aen.* x. 142.  
 1.704. *Bullion Dross*: Spenser, *FQ* ii. 7. 36 [Callander; St, Todd].  
 1.720. *Serapis*: {liberty with pronunciation of proper names} Sophocles, *Ajax* 1027, 1316; Callimachus, *Hymni et Epigrammata*, ed. Thomas Bentley (London, 1741), Præfatio (p. 9).  
 1.724. *Op’ning* . . . *wide*: Virgil, *Aen.* ii. 481.  
 1.729. *Naphtha* . . . *Asphaltos*: Strabo, *Geog.* (Paris, 1620), 743, 764 [Callander].  
 1.735. *Supreme King*: Euripides, *Hecuba* 1276.  
 1.736. *Gave* . . . *rule*: Virgil, *Aen.* i. 69, 82.  
 1.739. *In* . . . *Land*: Euripides, *Hippolytus* 1 (et Schol.); Homer, *Il.* i. 40, v. 74; Eustathius of Thessalonica, *Commentarii in Homeri Iliadem*, 3 vols. (Florence, 1730), i. 116.  
 1.740. *Men* . . . *fell*: Homer, *Il.* i. 590 [Hume; Newton; Callander].  
 1.745. *Like* . . . *star*: Theocritus, *Idylls* xiii. 49 [Todd].  
 1.752. *Of Sov’rain power*: Homer, *Il.* ix. 10; Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* iv. 3-4 [St, Todd].  
 1.768. *Brush’d* . . . *Wings*: Virgil, *Aen.* i. 434; Homer, *Il.* ii. 87 [Newton; Callander]; Hesiod, *Theog.* 54; Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 17.  
 1.780. *Throng* . . . *Race*: Homer, *Il.* iii. 6 [St, Todd].  
 1.781. *Indian Mount*: Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, 3 vols. (Basil, 1741), i. 373. 21 [Todd].  
 1.786. *Wheels* . . . *course*: Sophocles, *Ajax* 40; Homer, *Il.* xviii. 494.  
 1.792. *Of* . . . *Court*: Homer, *Il.* xviii. 516 [St, Todd].  
 1.796. *thousand* . . . *seats*: Homer, *Il.* xx. 10 [St, Todd].

## Book 2

- 2.1. *High* . . . *State*: Spenser, *FQ* i. 4. 8 [St, Todd].  
 2.11. *Deities &c*: {‘The Beginning of y<sup>s</sup> Speech peculiar to our Poet. For y<sup>c</sup> Artifice of it, vid.} Homer, *Il.* i. 201; xxiv. 763; xvii. 220; Virgil, *Georg.* iv. 444.  
 2.21. *What* . . . *Merit*: {“Lat. Quicquid”} Virgil, *Aen.* xi. 415.  
 2.46. *Deem’d*: {Gr. idiom} Euripides, *Hecuba* 480; Sophocles, *Antig.* 691; *Oedipus at Colonus* 1369; Matt. 5: 19.  
 2.69. *Strange Fire*: {repetition} Virgil, *Aen.* v. 790.  
 2.74. *Forgetfull*: Ovid, *Epist. ex Ponto* ii. 4. 23.  
 2.91. *Inexorable* . . . *hour*: Homer, *Odys.* v. 485.  
 2.95. *His* . . . *enrag’d*: Homer, *Il.* xv. 509 [St, Todd].  
 2.109. *Belial* . . . *humane*: 2 Chron. 13: 7.  
 2.163. *What* . . . *worse*: Aeschylus, *Prom. Bound* 307-29; Homer, *Il.* ix. 337 [St, Todd].

- 2.180. *Caught . . . Tempest*: Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure* iii.1.117-27.  
 2.204. *I . . . bold*: Homer, *Il.* xv. 282 [St, Todd].  
 2.264. *Thick . . . dark*: Virgil, *Aen.* viii. 354.  
 2.431. *With . . . silence*: Homer, *Il.* ii. 342; viii. 299; *Odyss.* ii. 167 [St, Todd].  
 2.478-9. *as . . . Extol*: Hesiod, *Theog.* 91 [St, Todd].  
 2.487. *rejoicing . . . Chief*: Homer, *Il.* viii. 551 [St, Todd].  
 2.548. *notes angelical*: Homer, *Il.* ix. 186 [St, Todd].  
 2.596. *Thither . . . hal'd*: Jerome, *Commentary on Matthew*, 10: 28; Job 24: 19 [Upton].  
 2.611. *Medusa . . . guards*: Virgil, *Aen.* vi. 600.  
 2.627. *Than . . . conceiv'd*: Virgil, *Aen.* vi. 285 [Pearce; Newton].  
 2.644. *Hell bounds*: Hesiod, *Theog.* 726 [St, Todd].  
 2.675. *monster . . . onwards*: Homer, *Il.* vii. 211 [St, Todd].  
 2.681. *Whence . . . thou*: Homer, *Il.* xxi. 150 [St, Todd].  
 2.722. *so . . . Foe*: Homer, *Il.* vii. 273 [St, Todd].  
 2.755. *Threw . . . wide*: “This Episode of Sin & Death seems partly an Imitation of y<sup>c</sup> Birth of Pallas; Partly of Spencer’s [*sic*] description of Error in y<sup>c</sup> *Fairy Queen*; And ’tis probable y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>c</sup> Poet took y<sup>c</sup> Hint from James 1: 14” [Upton].  
 2.810. *But . . . thee*: Homer, *Odyss.* xii. 118 [St, Todd].  
 2.841-2. *up . . . silently*: Hesiod, *Works and Days* 102 [St, Todd].  
 2.943. *As . . . Wilderness*: Aeschylus, *Prom. Bound* 803, et seq. [St, Todd]; Virgil, *Eclogues* vi. 27; Euripides, *Hecuba* i. 1.  
 2.959. *Throne . . . Chaos*: Thomas Burnet, *Archæologia Philosophica* (Amsterdam, 1699), 455-6 &c.  
 2.960. *Of Chaos*: Virgil, *Georg.* i. 247.  
 2.1043. *And . . . vessel*: {simile} Homer, *Odyss.* xxiii. 232 [St, Todd].

### Book 3

- 3.40. *Tunes . . . note*: Guarini, *Pastor Fido* iii. 1. 1-6 [Newton].  
 3.41. *Seasons return*: Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* xvi. 15. 3-4.  
 3.233. *once . . . lost*: Ps. 89: 35, 62: 11; Heb. 6: 4; Homer, *Odyss.* xii [Upton; Callander, Todd].  
 3.252. *Death . . . receive*: Seneca, *Hercules Oetaeus* 1116 [Thyer, Todd].  
 3.294. *from . . . life*: {“Milton imitates the style of St Paul”} Rom. 8: 30; 10: 14 [St, Todd].  
 3.528. *A . . . Earth*: Apoll. Rhodius, *Argonautica* iii. 160, 542 [St, Todd].  
 3.533. *On . . . fro*: Spenser, *FQ* i. x. 56 [St, Todd].  
 3.603. *unbound*: Virgil, *Georg.* iv. 444 [St, Todd].  
 3.652. *over . . . dry*: Homer, *Il.* xiv. 308 [St, Todd].  
 3.708. *I saw &c*: Apoll. Rhodius, *Argonautica.* i. 496, &c  
 3.716-18. *Ethereal . . . orbicular*: Plato, *The Republic* x. 616 E [St, Todd].  
 3.730. *her . . . triform*: Horace, *Odes* ii. 22. 4 [St, Todd].

### Book 4

- 4.27. *Sometimes . . . Eden*: Homer, *Odyss.* xiii. 197 [St, Todd].  
 4.32. *O . . . glory*: Aeschylus, *Prom. Bound* 88-127 [St, Todd].  
 4.37. *how . . . beams*: Euripides, *Hippolytus* 355 [St, Todd].  
 4.82. *and . . . shame*: Homer, *Il.* xxii. 99-108 [St, Todd].  
 4.177. *that . . . way*: Euripides, *Ion* 1326 [Newton].  
 4.183. *prowling wolf*: Virgil, *Aen.* ii. 355.

- 4.193. *Lewd Hirelings*: Claude Lancelot, *Primitives of the Greek Tongue*, trans. Thomas Nugent (London, 1748), 356.
- 4.194. *Tree . . . Life*: Homer, *Il.* vii. 58, xiv. 286.
- 4.269. *Proserpine . . . flours*: Tasso, *Aminta* i. 2. 85-6.
- 4.386. *loth . . . revenge*: Euripides, *Hercules Furens* 858 [St, Todd].
- 4.682. *Celestial . . . air*: Theocritus, *Idylls* xi. 39.
- 4.698. *Iris . . . Jessamin*: Homer, *Il.* xiv. 347.
- 4.720-4. *Thus . . . Night*: Virgil, *Aen.* viii. 293; Ovid, *Met.* iv. 15-17 &c.
- 4.778. *And . . . port*: Plato, *Opera Omnia*, trans. M. Ficino (Frankfurt, 1602), 537 [St, Todd].
- 4.858. *But . . . steed*: Aeschylus, *Prom. Bound* 1008; Apoll. Rhodius, *Argonautica* iv. 1606 [St, Todd].
- 4.866. *O . . . feet*: Homer, *Il.* x. 533 [Upton, Todd].
4. 873. *Stand firm*: Homer, *Il.* xii. 458 [Upton, Todd].
- 4.874. *He scarce*: Homer, *Il.* x. 540.
- 4.971. *limitary*: *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. John Urry (London, 1721), Glossary, 42, (“Limitour”) [Todd].
- 4.988. *His Stature*: *Wisd.* 18: 16 [Newton].
- 4.988. *And . . . Crest*: Homer, *Il.* xi. 37.

## Book 5

- 5.13. *Hung . . . enamour'd*: Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* i. 37 [St, Todd].
- 5.74. *Here . . . creature*: Homer, *Odys.* xii. 184 [St, Todd].
- 5.221. *the . . . Spirit*: Homer, *Il.* xxiv. 334 [St, Todd].
- 5.254. *The Gate*: Homer, *Il.* v. 749 [Hume].
- 5.266. *Down . . . prone*: Virgil, *Aen.* iv. 252 [Newton]; Homer, *Odys.* v. 44.
- 5.277. *Seraph wing'd*: Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* i. 13.
- 5.331. *So saying*: Homer, *Il.* ix. 205 [St, Todd].
- 5.357. *Dazles . . . agape*: Virgil, *Aen.* vii. 813.
- 5.443. *Mean . . . Eve*: Tibullus, *Elegies* i. 5. 29-34 [St, Todd].
- 5.446. *if ever . . . then*: Gen. 6: 4 [St Maur].
- 5.558. *for . . . Sun*: Virgil, *Aen.* ii. 8.
- 5.568. *And . . . unfold*: Virgil, *Aen.* ii. 157 [St, Todd].
- 5.607. *And . . . sworn*: Isa. xlv. 23 [St, Todd].
- 5.646. *roseat . . . dispos'd*: Homer, *Il.* ii. 1- 2.
- 5.688. *Where . . . possess*: Isa. 14: 13 [Richardson]; Jer. 1: 15.
- 5.891. *Impendent*: Aeschylus, *Prom. Bound* 1051-53; {as parallel to *lest the wrath distinguisheth it not*} Homer, *Il.* xv. 137 [St, Todd].
- 5.892. *as . . . deep*: Homer, *Il.* ii. 209, 394 [St, Todd].

## Book 6

- 6.103. *Then . . . throne*: Homer, *Il.* iii. 29 [St, Todd].
- 6.127. *So pondering*: Homer, *Il.* iii.21 [St, Todd].
- 6.194. *tenth . . . knee*: Homer, *Il.* v. 308 [St, Todd].
- 6.220. *Millions . . . fought*: Homer, *Il.* xx. 66 [St, Todd].
- 6.335. *Forthwith . . . run*: Homer, *Il.* xiv. 424-8.
- 6.360. *Refrain'd . . . blasphemous*: Homer, *Il.* v. 859.
- 6.541. *Sad . . . secure*: Homer, *Il.* xiv. 371 [Newton].
- 6.641. *Of . . . Dale*: {abbreviation of “situate”} Aristotle, *Poetics* 22.

- 6.693. *Whence . . . fight*: Hesiod, *Theog.* 635 [St, Todd].  
 6.838. *They . . . lost*: Homer, *Il.* xv. 322 [St, Todd].  
 6.862. *The . . . sight*: Homer, *Il.* xii. 52 [St, Todd].  
 6.875. *Yawning . . . whole*: Aeschylus, *Prom. Bound* 220.  
 6.882. *To . . . him*: Rev. 12: 10 [St, Todd].

### Book 7

- 7.6. *Nor . . . Nine*: Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* i. 2. 1-4 [Thyer, Todd].  
 7.35. *where . . . Ears*: Horace, *Odes* i. 12 [Todd].  
 7.100. *held . . . voice*: Virgil, *Eclogues* vi. 85 [St, Todd].  
 7.205. *Heaven . . . wide*: Ps. 24: 7 [Hume]; Homer, *Il.* v. 749.

### Book 8

- 8.40-4. *Eve . . . rose*: {“Eve’s withdrawing here, a great Instance of y<sup>e</sup> Suitableness of manners”} Horace, *Poetics* 316; Plato, *Republic* i {“making old Cephalus withdraw on y<sup>e</sup> pretence of a Sacrifice”} [Newton], {so much commended by} Cicero, *Epistles* iv. 16 [Upton].

### Book 9

- 9.69. *There . . . place*: Lucan, *Pharsalia* iii. 261.  
 9.499. *his Head*: Virgil, *Aen.* ii. 471.  
 9.892. *Garland . . . Eve*: Theocritus, *Idylls* iii. 21.  
 9.905. *Enemy . . . thee*: Euripides, *Alcestis* 330, 279.  
 9.1039. *Flours . . . Couch*: Homer, *Il.* xiv. 347 [Addison].

### Book 10

- 10.441. *He . . . unmark’d*: Virgil, *Aen.* i. 443 [Newton].  
 10.854. *Why comes*: Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 810 [Newton].  
 10.888. *O . . . God*: Euripides, *Medea* ix. 573 [Newton].  
 10.897. *Disturbances . . . snares*: Shakespeare, *Midsummer-Night’s Dream*, i. 1. 134-43 [Newton].  
 10.1069-70. *Ere . . . Night*: {Construct.} Sophocles, *Ajax* 683; Ps. 11: 6.

### Book 11

- 11.14. *To . . . Pray’rs*: Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* xiii. 72. 1-4 [Todd].  
 11.239-45. *Not . . . prime*: Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* i. 13. 5-7.  
 11.412. *Michael . . . remov’d*: Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* xviii. 93. 2-5.  
 11.518. *His . . . serv’d*: {personification} Homer, *Il.* xi. 37; Ovid, *Fasti* v. 23.  
 11.621. *To . . . race*: Gen. 6: 4 [Newton].

### Book 12

- 12.195. *Pursuing . . . dismiss’d*: Tasso, *Gierus. Liber.* xiv. 36. 5-8.  
 12.370. *And . . . Reign*: Virgil, *Aen.* i. 291; Ps. 72: 8 [Newton].

## Works Cited

- Addison, Joseph. *Notes Upon the Twelve Books of Paradise Lost*. London, 1719. Originally published in *The Spectator*, Nos. 267-369 (5 Jan – 3 May 1712).
- Anon. *A Friendly Letter to Dr Bentley. Occasion'd by his New Edition of Paradise Lost. By a Gentleman of Christ-Church College, Oxon*. London, 1732.
- Aryanpur, Manoocher, "Paradise Lost and the Odyssey." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 9 (1967): 151-66.
- Bentley, Richard, ed. *Milton's Paradise Lost*. London, 1732. MS notes by Benjamin Stillingfleet. British Library, C.134.h.1.
- Boswell, James. *The Life of Samuel Johnson, 2 vols*. London, 1791.
- Bowra, C. M. *From Virgil to Milton*. London and New York: Macmillan and St Martin's P, 1945.
- Buchanan, James. *The First Six Books of Milton's Paradise Lost Rendered into Grammatical Construction*. Edinburgh, 1773.
- Burrow, Colin. *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1993.
- Bush, Douglas. "Ironic and Ambiguous Allusion in Paradise Lost". *Milton Studies in Honor of Harris Francis Fletcher*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1961)
- Callander, John, ed. *Milton's Paradise Lost, Book 1*. Glasgow, 1750.
- Clarke, Samuel, ed. *Homeri Ilias Græce et Latine*. 2 vols. London, 1729-32.
- Claudian, *On the Consulship of Stilicho*. Trans. M. Platnauer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1922.
- Clucas, Tom. "Editing Milton during the French Revolution: Cowper and Hayley as 'Brother Editor[s]'." *Review of English Studies* 65. 272 (Sept 2015): 866-87.
- Corns, Thomas N. "Milton's English". *A Companion to Milton*. Ed. Thomas N. Corns. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. 90-106.
- Corns, Thomas N. *Milton's Language*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.
- Cowper, William. "Fragment of an Intended Commentary on *Paradise Lost*". Written 1791-2, in Cowper, trans. *Latin and Italian Poems of Milton*. London, 1808.
- Coxe, William. *The Literary Life and Select Works of Benjamin Stillingfleet*. Ed. J. Nichols. 2 vols. London, 1811.
- Demetrius of Phaleron. *Libro de Elocutione (On Style)*. Ed. W. Rhys Roberts. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1902.
- Demetrius. *On Style*. Ed. and trans. Doreen C. Innes, based on the trans. by W. Rhys Roberts. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995.
- Dunster, Charles, ed. *Paradise Regained, a Poem, in Four Books, by John Milton*. London, 1795.
- Fish, Stanley. *Is There A Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1980. 147-74.
- Fowler, Alastair, ed. *John Milton: Paradise Lost*. Rev. 2nd ed. Harlow: Pearson, 2007
- Good, John. *Studies in the Milton Tradition*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1915.

- Griffin, Dustin. *Regaining Paradise: Milton and the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Hale, John K. *Milton's Languages: The Impact of Multilingualism on Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Harding, Davis P. *The Club of Hercules: Studies in the Classical Background of Paradise Lost*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1962.
- Harper, David A. "Bentley's Annotated 1674 Edition of Paradise Lost: Hidden Method and Peculiar Madness." *Review of English Studies* 64.123 (2013): 60-86
- Haynes, Kenneth. *English Literature and Ancient Languages*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley: California UP, 1981.
- Homer, *The Iliad*. Trans. A. T. Murray, 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP; London, William Heinemann, 1924.
- Hughes, I. D. "Stillingfleet, Benjamin (1702–1771)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004; online edn, May 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26525, accessed 7 Jul 2015].
- Hume, Patrick. *Annotations on Milton's Paradise Lost*. London, 1695.
- Kilgour, Maggie. *Milton and the Metamorphosis of Ovid*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012.
- Kramnick, Jonathan Brody. *Making the English Canon: Print-Capitalism and the Cultural Past, 1700-1770*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Johnson, Samuel. *Lives of the English Poets*. Ed. Arthur Waugh. 2 vols. London: Oxford UP, 1906; repr. 1977.
- Labriola, Albert C., and Edward Sichi, Jr., eds. *Milton's Legacy in the Arts*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1988.
- Leonard, John. *Faithful Labourers: A Reception History of Paradise Lost, 1667-1970*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013.
- Lofft, Capel. *Milton's Paradise Lost*. Bury St. Edmund's, 1792.
- Loudon, Bruce. "Milton and the Appropriation of a Homeric Technique." *Classical and Modern Literature* 16.4 (1996): 325-40.
- Loudon, Bruce. "Pivotal Contrafactuals in Homeric Epic." *Classical Antiquity* 12.2 (1993): 181-98.
- Machacek, Gregory. *Milton and Homer: "Written to Aftertimes"*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne UP, 2011.
- Marchant, John. *Milton's Paradise Lost*. London, 1751.
- Martindale, Charles. *John Milton and the Transformation of Ancient Epic*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Bristol Classical P, 2002.
- Miner, Earl Roy, William Moeck, Steven Edward Jablonski, eds. *Paradise Lost, 1668-1968: Three Centuries of Commentary*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 2004.
- Monk, J. H. *Life of Bentley*. 2nd ed. London, 1833.

- Moore, Leslie E. *Beautiful Sublime: the Making of Paradise Lost, 1701-1734*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1990.
- Moyles, R. G. *The Text of 'Paradise Lost': a Study in Editorial Procedure*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1985.
- Mueller, Martin. "Paradise Lost and the Iliad." *Comparative Literature Studies* 6 (1969): 292-316.
- Newton, Thomas, ed. *Paradise Lost*, 2 vols. London, 1749.
- Newton, Thomas, ed. *Paradise Regain'd . . . Samson Agonistes . . . Poems upon Several Occasions*. London, 1752.
- Oras, Ants. *Milton's Editors and Commentators from Patrick Hume to Henry John Todd-1695-1801, A Study in Critical Views and Methods*. Tartu: U of Tartu P; London: Oxford UP, 1931.
- Ovid, *Epistulae Ex Ponto*. Trans. A. L. Wheeler. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Ovid, *Metamorphoses*. Trans. Arthur Golding. London, 1567.
- Paterson, James. *A Complete Commentary . . . on Milton's Paradise Lost*. London, 1744.
- Pearce, Zachary. *A Review of the Text of the Twelve Books of Milton's Paradise Lost*. London, 1732 [1733].
- Peck, Francis. *New Memoirs of the Life and Poetical Works of Mr John Milton*. London, 1740.
- Poole, William. "The Early Reception of *Paradise Lost*." *Literature Compass* 1 (2004): 1-13.
- Porter, William. *Reading the Classics and Paradise Lost*. Lincoln and London: U of Nebraska P, 1993.
- Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie*. London, 1589.
- Revard, Carter and Stella. "Milton's Amerc't: The Lost Greek Connection." *Milton Quarterly* 12 (1978): 105-6.
- Richardson, Jonathan (father and son). *Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Milton's Paradise Lost*. London, 1734.
- Rumrich, John. "Critical responses, early." *Milton in Context*. Ed. Stephen B. Dobranski. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. 119-29.
- St. Maur, Raymond de. *The State of Innocence and Fall of Man*. London & York, 1745.
- Shawcross, John T., ed. *Milton: The Critical Heritage*. London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Shawcross, John T., ed. *Milton 1732-1801: The Critical Heritage*. London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.
- Shawcross, John T. "Later publishing history." *Milton in Context*. Ed. Stephen B. Dobranski. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. 155-68.
- Sophocles. *Antigone*. Trans. Sir Richard Jebb. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1891.
- Sophocles, *Ajax*. Trans. Francis Storr. London; New York: William Heinemann; Macmillan, 1913.

- Stevenson, Kay Gilliland. "Reading Milton, 1674-1800." *A Companion to Milton*. Ed. Thomas N. Corns. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. 447-62.
- Todd, Henry J., ed. *The Poetical Works of John Milton*, 6 vols. London, 1801.
- Toland, John. "*The Life of John Milton.*" *A Complete Collection of the Historical, Political, and Miscellaneous Works of John Milton*. London, 1698.
- Upton, John. *Critical Observations on Shakespeare*. London, 1746.
- Verbart, André. *Fellowship in Paradise Lost: Vergil, Milton, Wordsworth*. Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1995.
- von Maltzahn, Nicholas. "Milton's readers." *The Cambridge Companion to Milton*. Ed. Dennis Danielson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 236-52.
- von Maltzahn, Nicholas. "The Whig Milton, 1667-1700." *Milton and Republicanism*. Eds. David Armitage, Armand Himy and Quentin Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 229-53.
- Walsh, Marcus. *Shakespeare, Milton, and Eighteenth-century Literary Editing: the Beginnings of Interpretative Scholarship*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Warton, Thomas, ed. *Poems upon Several Occasions*. London, 1785.

---

<sup>1</sup> Marchant, vii.

<sup>2</sup> See Oras; Shawcross, 1970 and 1972; Moore; Leonard.

<sup>3</sup> Hume; Addison; Bentley. See also Toland.

<sup>4</sup> Pearce; Richardson.

<sup>5</sup> Bentley, 1.63.

<sup>6</sup> Newton, ed. *Paradise Lost*; Newton, ed. *Paradise Regain'd* [...] *Samson Agonistes*; Walsh, 94.

<sup>7</sup> Warton; Dunster; Todd.

<sup>8</sup> Harper, 62; Anon., title-page.

<sup>9</sup> A point made more generally by John Leonard: that editors and commentators show others where to look, even if they themselves misread what is there (Leonard, 1.21-29).

<sup>10</sup> Fish. See Poole for the importance of manuscript sources in reconstructing early individual reactions to Milton.

<sup>11</sup> The majority of whose books were bought by Narcissus Marsh and now grace Marsh's Library in Dublin.

<sup>12</sup> Bentley. This volume was purchased from the booksellers T. & W. Boone for £6.6s, and contains a date stamp for accession into the British Library's collections on 24 September 1849. The volume was rebound in 1936.

<sup>13</sup> Bentley was also private tutor to Benjamin Stillingfleet's uncle.

<sup>14</sup> Hughes; Coxe, 1.9; Monk, 254.

<sup>15</sup> A niece of Bishop Stillingfleet.

<sup>16</sup> Coxe, 1.84.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.85.

<sup>18</sup> *Miscellaneous Tracts* concludes with an original treatise, *Observations on Grasses*, which included suggestions for the best species for the improvement of turf and the nourishment of cattle and makes a plea for the study of natural science.

<sup>19</sup> For discussion of Stillingfleet's libretto, see John Rodrigue, "'Rewritten to Aftertimes': Adaptations of John Milton's Poetry 1674-1767." Unpublished Ph.D. Diss. Oklahoma State University, 2013. Boswell repeated this story in his *Life of Samuel Johnson*, 2 vols (1791), 2.393 adding that the excellence of Stillingfleet's conversation was so greatly missed when he was absent that it used to be said, "We can do nothing without the blue stockings."

<sup>20</sup> Todd, i.8.

<sup>21</sup> Oras, 329.

<sup>22</sup> Coxe, 1.87.

<sup>23</sup> Bentley, interleaved page facing a4<sup>v</sup>.

- <sup>24</sup> Ibid. Cf. *Il Penseroso* (ll. 85-92).
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid, interleaved page facing b1<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>26</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from *Paradise Lost* are taken from Bentley.
- <sup>27</sup> Bentley, F3<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>28</sup> “A place in a series, narration, or logical sequence” (*OED*, “room”, n.<sup>1</sup>, 5.c. Sc).
- <sup>29</sup> *OED*, “uneasiness”, 2.c. Cf. *OED* 2.b: “unwillingness, reluctance”; *OED* 3.c: “anxiety”.
- <sup>30</sup> Bentley, interleaved page facing b1<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid., F4<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid., interleaved page facing F4<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>33</sup> I am indebted to Margaret Kean for this point.
- <sup>34</sup> Bentley, interleaved page facing F4<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>35</sup> Leonard, 1.57-59.
- <sup>36</sup> Bentley, interleaved page facing C3<sup>f</sup>. See Sophocles, *Ajax* 394-400.
- <sup>37</sup> Bentley, interleaved page facing X2<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>38</sup> For discussion of these two strategies by defenders of Milton, see Leonard, 1.16-18.
- <sup>39</sup> Addison, 21.
- <sup>40</sup> Bentley, interleaved page facing b1<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid., interleaved page facing B1<sup>f</sup>; Homer, i.1.37-9; Sophocles, *Antigone* l. 1115 (Stillingfleet’s annotation cites *Antigone* l. 1127; I have corrected this to match the Loeb Classical Library line numbering); Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 4.13-14.
- <sup>43</sup> Hollander, 1-5. Hollander’s other four figures of echo are allegorical, schematic, metaphorical, metaleptic.
- <sup>44</sup> Addison, 94.
- <sup>45</sup> Harding, 36; Bush. Cf. Leonard, 1.306-10.
- <sup>46</sup> Bentley, B1<sup>v</sup> and facing interleaved page; Ovid, *Epistulae Ex Ponto* 3.6.23; Claudian 2.12-13.
- <sup>47</sup> Ibid., interleaved page facing b1<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>48</sup> Ibid. E.g. “I.v.41. If He oppose) i.e. should oppose. Thus in Greek vid. Sophoc. *Elect.* v.999.”
- <sup>49</sup> Ibid., interleaved page facing B1<sup>v</sup>; Homer, i.13.483. (Stillingfleet’s annotation cites *Iliad*, 13.488; the verse quoted is 13.483 in the Loeb Classical Library line numbering.)
- <sup>50</sup> Ibid., interleaved page (recto), preceding B4<sup>f</sup>; *OED*, “turn”, n., VI.31, “style of language, arrangement of words in a sentence.”
- <sup>51</sup> Cited by Leonard, 1.72.
- <sup>52</sup> Bentley, interleaved page facing b1<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>53</sup> Ibid., interleaved page facing C4<sup>f</sup>; Homer, 4. 142.
- <sup>54</sup> Ibid., interleaved page facing b2<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>55</sup> Addison, 21, 23.
- <sup>56</sup> Bentley, interleaved page facing b2<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>57</sup> Ibid., interleaved page facing E4<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>58</sup> Ibid., interleaved page facing b2<sup>f</sup>; Bentley, interleaved page facing E1<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>59</sup> I.e., feet equal in metrical length. Stillingfleet’s use of ‘isochronous’ in relation to prosody precedes the first usage cited by *OED* by almost forty years (1784). Stillingfleet also uses the variant, “isochronic”, preceding the first usage cited in *OED* by two hundred and ten years (1956). “Vossius” refers to G. J. Vossius, *Poeticarum Institutionum Libri III* (1647) (with English translation and commentary) (Stuttgart, 2006).
- <sup>60</sup> Bentley, interleaved page facing b2<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>61</sup> Ibid., interleaved page facing b3<sup>f</sup>. Stillingfleet, like Samuel Johnson, adds a comma to the 1674 version of ‘Wallowing unweildie, enormous in thir Gate (7. 411), with similar consequences.
- <sup>62</sup> Ibid., interleaved page facing b3<sup>f</sup>; *PL* 11.857; *OED*, “ictus”, n. 1: “Stress on a particular syllable of a foot or verse; rhythmical or metrical stress.”
- <sup>63</sup> Ibid., interleaved page facing C1<sup>f</sup>; Demetrius, 1. 15, 2. 48; Demetrius. *On Style*, 355, 377. *On Style* is traditionally attributed to Demetrius of Phaleron, but this attribution has no authority and the identity of the work’s author is unknown.
- <sup>64</sup> Newton, *Paradise Lost*, 1. 24.
- <sup>65</sup> Puttenham, 108.
- <sup>66</sup> Bentley, interleaved page facing b3<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>67</sup> Addison, 118; Toland, 129; Richardson, xx-xxi. See also Johnson, i.107.
- <sup>68</sup> Honourable exceptions include: Aryanpur, Mueller, Revard, Loudon, Burrow, Martindale, and most recently, Machacek. See also Jessica Wolfe’s forthcoming work on Milton and Homer.
- <sup>69</sup> Porter, 94.

---

<sup>70</sup> Fowler, 13-23; Corns, "Milton's English", 106. For Milton's Latinisms see Hale and Haynes. See also the emphasis on Virgil in Verbart.

<sup>71</sup> Oras, 343-9; Miner, Moeck, and Jablonski, 26.

<sup>72</sup> Oras, 350.

<sup>73</sup> Todd, i. 8.