<AT> "*Shakespeares* Workes, and such Prelaticall trash": Milton's Shakespeare from the Philadelphia First Folio to the Political Prose

<A>Nicholas McDowell

<AFF>University of Exeter

<abs>Abstract

How are we to connect the way that Milton uses Charles I's love of Shakespeare against him in *Eikonoklastes* (1649) with the evidence of Milton's own close appreciation of Shakespeare in his copy of the First Folio, recently identified in the Free Library of Philadelphia? Is there any relationship between the linguistic and textual fascination with Shakespeare on display in the Philadelphia Folio and the polemical quotation of Shakespeare in the prose, or should we focus on the difference between them? This article makes the case that there is a relationship between Milton's use of the First Folio and the political prose, but one that has less to do with content or with Milton's attitudes toward Shakespeare per se than with critical methods of reading. This relationship exemplifies the effect of polemicization on literary and textual criticism, as on every aspect of British culture, during the Civil Wars of the 1640s.

</abs>

<ky>Keywords: Shakespeare, First Folio, Charles I, British Civil Wars </ky>

The identification in 2019 of Milton's markings in a copy of the 1623 First Folio of Shakespeare's plays in the Free Library of Philadelphia, one of the great literary discoveries

of our time, intensifies the irony for modern readers of Milton's mocking reference in *Eikonoklastes* (1649) to Shakespeare as "one whom we well know was the Closet Companion of these [the king's] solitudes." Milton contends that his readers can find a model in Shakespeare's *Richard III* (ca. 1592–93) for what he regards as the feigned piety of the *Eikon Basilike* (1649), the book of meditations and prayers supposedly composed by Charles I in the weeks before his execution. Milton's example of how "the deepest policy of a Tyrant [is] to counterfeit Religious" is taken, as he sarcastically puts it, from Shakespeare rather than "an abstruse Author, wherein the King might be less conversant."[1] Milton's polemical point is that the king should have been reading the Bible in his final weeks, pleading contrition and begging forgiveness as he moved ever closer to his doom: Charles's preference for Shakespeare only exemplifies his indifference to true religion and the public good, and his preference for his own private pleasure, which sealed his fate. We now have the material proof that Milton himself had spent a considerable amount of time with Shakespeare as his "Closet Companion"—with 121 instances of textual emendation and over 600 instances of lines and passages that have been scored and bracketed (apparently in inks which can be matched to the verbal markings). The First Folio in Philadelphia is testament to just how deeply "conversant" Milton himself was with Shakespeare's plays.[2]

The identification of Milton's copy of the First Folio—or, at any rate, one of Milton's copies, as we cannot be sure he did not use others at some point—*intensifies* the irony for us because we have always had proof of Milton's particular interest in Shakespeare from a comparatively early age: Milton had himself contributed a commendatory poem to the Second Folio of Shakespeare's plays of 1632, which (though anonymous) was his first appearance in commercial print.[3] Even if some readers have found in Milton's "An Epitaph on the admirable Dramatick Poet, W. Shakespeare" (later renamed "On Shakespeare" and dated 1630 in Milton's 1645 *Poems*) some form of doubt about the value of Shakespearean

art—even hostility, whether conscious or unconscious, to its power—the poem is incontestable evidence of Milton's own fascination at the age of twenty-two with the "deepe Impression" that the Folio makes on the hearts of its readers.[4] (One supposes that Milton also marked a copy of the Second Folio, given his own poem was published in it; perhaps that book will also turn up one day.)

There is a further historical irony. Charles I's copy of the Second Folio is preserved in the Royal Library at Windsor with some interesting annotations of its own. Charles annotated the table of contents, renaming some of the plays after the characters whom he apparently regarded as of leading interest: *As You Like It* becomes "Rosalind"; *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is retitled "Pyramus and Thisbe"; and, perhaps revealingly given his trouble with Puritans, *Twelfth Night* is remembered as "Malvolio." The survival of this copy of the Second Folio raises the possibility that Charles, awaiting the judgment of Parliament on his life and sketching the meditations that became the *Eikon Basilike*, was reading the verses of the man who would soon be commissioned to defame his memory and discredit his book.[5]

Milton tells us in *Eikonoklastes* that Shakespeare "introduces the Person of *Richard* the third, speaking in as high a strain of pietie, and mortification, as is uttered in any passage of this [Charles's] Book," and then quotes from one of Richard's more breathtakingly duplicitous speeches in front of the court, just after we have seen Clarence brutally murdered on Richard's command: "I doe not know that Englishman alive / With whom my soule is any jott at odds, / More then the Infant that is borne to night; / I thank my God for my humilitie." Milton adds that "Other stuff of this sort may be read throughout the whole Tragedie, wherein the Poet us'd not much licence in departing from the truth of History, which delivers him a deep dissembler, not of his affections onely, but of Religion" (OM 6:291–92).[6] It remains unclear whether "him" here refers to Shakespeare's Richard or to Charles himself—perhaps that merging of identities is part of the point. There is presumably a good chance that

Milton had the Philadelphia First Folio open in front of him as he wrote *Eikonoklastes*. Yet the passage that he quotes (accurately, although the spelling is slightly altered in several words) is unmarked in the Folio.

The citation from *Richard III* is in fact the single occasion in all of Milton's writing, whether in prose or verse, whether in print or in manuscript, when he directly quotes from Shakespeare. The absence of any markings against the only lines from Shakespeare that Milton ever cites is proof, if we really needed it, that the visible use of the Folio does not encompass all the parts of Shakespeare that Milton appreciated, or all the ways in which Milton read Shakespeare. Milton's hand was recognized by Jason Scott-Warren after reading an essay on the Folio by Claire M. L. Bourne, and in their various blogs, interviews, and talks on the discovery Scott-Warren and Bourne have remarked that the "style of reading" on display in the Philadelphia Folio does not show Milton to have used it as "a resource for political reflection," nor does it give us any evidence of Milton as "an emerging radical engaging politically with the plays." The textual emendations, annotations (of which there are three), and additions (of which there are two) "speak not to plot or politics," they argue, but evince an interest in "striking turns of phrase"—in Shakespeare above all as a "technician of language."[7] Yet the citation of Shakespeare in *Eikonoklastes* does unquestionably constitute an instance of Milton's reading Shakespeare for plot and characterization—not simply for memorable turns of phrase—and his engaging with Shakespearean drama as a political resource for history lessons in the tyrannical behavior of kings.

How then are we to connect the polemical deployment in *Eikonoklastes* of *Richard III*, and the levelling of Charles I's own love of Shakespeare against him, with the evidence of Milton's close appreciation of Shakespeare in the Philadelphia First Folio? Is there any relationship between the linguistic and textual fascination with Shakespeare on display in the Philadelphia Folio and the polemical quotation of Shakespeare in the prose, or should we

focus on the gap, or difference, between them? In what follows, I seek to make the case that there is a relationship between Milton's First Folio and the political prose, but one that has less to do with content or with Milton's attitudes toward Shakespeare per se than with method; and this relationship exemplifies the effect of polemicization on literary and textual criticism, as on every aspect of British culture, during the Civil War of the 1640s—the "first European civil war to be fought within a well-established culture of the vernacular printed word."[8]

I borrow the term "polemicization" from work in political philosophy influenced by Jacques Rancière's *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*, in which Rancière defines political polemic as "not the conflict between one who says white and another who says black. It is the conflict between one who says white and another who also says white but does not understand the same thing by it or does not understand that the other is saying the same thing in the name of whiteness."[9] Civil war, as an internal conflict within a nation, fought between sides who share similar or the same cultural history, is particularly prone to provoke such disagreement about meaning and consequently to polemicize more thoroughly than other types of conflict the language, culture, and values of the society that it afflicts.[10] "Shakespeare," as the name of a writer associated with the theater and the court, became part of the process of polemicization in Civil War Britain; but, as *Eikonoklastes* shows us, so did the very modes of textual criticism that Milton applied to his copy of the First Folio.

<1>Shakespeare in the Pamphlet Wars

Bourne and Scott-Warren have persuasively argued on the basis of the hand that the Folio was used by Milton between the late 1620s and the early 1640s, even if they date nearly all the markings to the period after Milton went on his tour of France and Italy in April 1638, when there was a (more or less consistent) change in his writing from an epsilon "e" to an

italic "e."[11] If we accept this dating of the markings then—even allowing for the caveat that the italic "e" is already apparent in the revisions to *Lycidas* in the Trinity manuscript, datable to the period between November 1637 and April 1638, before Milton left for the Continent—the polemical application of Shakespeare in *Eikonoklastes* and the markings in the Folio are separated by the momentous historical events of the Civil Wars and the regicide.[12] Hence one way to explain the apparent disjunction would be to see Milton's use of Shakespeare in his political prose as in some sense an ideological "expulsion" of a writer who had become tainted for Milton by his association with the corrupt court culture of the Stuart monarchy.[13] Indeed, Milton's association of the vices of Charles I with his excessive reading of Shakespeare has been seen as the clearest manifestation of a wider aversion to the literary that is forced upon Milton by the logic of polemicization in the aftermath of civil war and regicide. For Steven Zwicker, the "association of the king's person with learning and aristocratic refinement, with poetry, drama, and visual culture, forced Milton to trivialize the artistic forms and genres most closely identified with Charles I."[14]

Another striking instance of this "trivializing" of literary culture and the aesthetic is Milton's infamous charge that Charles's book substitutes heathen idolatry for Christian inspiration by its unacknowledged appropriation, first spotted by Milton, of a prayer from Philip Sidney's *The Countess of Pembrokes Arcadia* (first published, 1590). In *Eikonoklastes*, Sidney's *Arcadia* is decried as a "vain amatorious Poem"; yet we know from Milton's surviving Commonplace Book that he had been reading Sidney's prose romance in the early 1640s for its lessons in ethical virtue.[15] (Shakespeare is not cited in Milton's Commonplace Book, although it is dedicated to moral philosophy, and there were certainly other books given over to other topics, such as the theological commonplace book to which Milton makes reference in the extant manuscript.[16]) For Blair Worden, *Eikonoklastes* is "almost an attack" on poetry and is close to a "repudiation of the literary imagination," with Shakespeare

"presented in no admiring spirit."[17] Milton is seen as having been pushed by the popular success of the *Eikon Basilike* into an ideological and rhetorical posture that makes him look like an anti-theatrical, Philistine Puritan and with which, as a poet and writer of dramatic entertainments, he was profoundly uneasy. This uneasiness, framed in psychological terms as a consequence of arguing against his own nature ("in turning iconoclast Milton almost inevitably—though perhaps unconsciously—turned against his former self," according to Richard Helgerson) is regarded as a chief reason why *Eikonoklastes* fails as effective polemic. *Eikonoklastes* fails, for Kevin Sharpe, because Milton was "forced" to "critique the *Eikon Basilike* as text: as a work of literature and authorial performance."[18]

Shakespeare, like other dramatists associated with the early Stuart courts, had become part of the culture wars of the 1640s. After his execution, Charles's copy of the Second Folio fell into the possession of Thomas Herbert, who after the Scots handed the king over to the Parliamentary Army in 1647 was appointed groom to Charles in his captivity. T. A. Birrell suggests that Herbert essentially stole the Shakespeare, along with several other books, and that Herbert was "the source for the story that Charles I was reading Shakespeare and Ben Jonson in his last days: the story that was made so much of by Milton and the other Puritan pamphleteers."[19] But Shakespeare had already been appropriated by both Parliamentarian and royalist polemicists. One of the distinctive aspects of the Parliamentarian propaganda of Marchamont Nedham, who in 1650 would join Milton as the leading propagandist for the new Commonwealth, had been his claim that the royalists' self-deluding fantasies about their successes in the war were an anachronistic and incongruous continuation of the distracting illusions peddled by early Stuart theatrical culture. In the newsbook *Mercurius Britanicus* in 1644, Nedham mocked his royalist rival *Mercurius Aulicus* as

<ext>

a woefull spectacle and object of dullness and tribulation, not to be recovered by the Protestant or *Catholique* liquor, either Ale or strong beer, or Sack, or Claret, or Hippocras, or Muscadine, or Rosasolis, which hath been reputed formerly by his Grand Father *Ben Johnson*, and his Uncle *Shakespeare*, and his Couzen Germains *Fletcher* and *Beaumont*, and nose-lesse *Davenant*, and Frier *Sherley* the Poets, the onely blossoms for the brain, the restoratives for the wit, the bathing of the wine muses, but none of these are now able either to warme him into a quibble, or to inflame him into a sparkle of invention[.][20]
</ext>

If the royalists are the "sons of Ben," or rather the grandsons, Shakespeare is also cited as a direct literary ancestor of the royalist polemicists—uncle to *Aulicus*—presumably because he was also the recipient of Stuart patronage.

Shakespeare is not given particular prominence over other writers here, but in another issue later in 1644, Nedham anticipated Milton's scorn for Charles's spending his time reading Shakespeare rather than the Bible. Nedham includes—presumably with ironic intent, given he himself was no Puritan—Shakespeare's Folio in a list of devotional books by noted Laudian clerics that he claims Parliamentarian troopers would have found in a royalist's library that *Aulicus* had accused them of wrecking: "*Cosins* devotions, and *Pocklingtons* Altar, and *Shelfords* sermons, and *Shakespeares* Workes, and such Prelaticall trash as your Clergy men spend their Canonicall hours on."[21] The inclusion of Shakespeare in this list, alongside John Cosin, John Pocklington, Robert Shelford—notorious high Laudians all—mocks Laudian religion as mere theatricality, but it also suggests a known taste specifically for Shakespearean drama among the Cavaliers. Needham had perhaps seen Van Dyck's life-size portrait of Sir John Suckling (1609–41)—the poet on whom the stereotype of the libertine Cavalier was partly based through Parliamentarian polemics such as *The Sucklington*

Faction or (Sucklings) Roaring Boyes (1641)—in which Suckling is shown standing with a copy of either the First or Second Folio in his hands, open at *Hamlet*. Dated to early 1638, this portrait is thought to be one of the first in England to include an identifiable book in the vernacular not by the sitter, other than the Bible and the Prayer Book. To Suckling's contemporaries, "the inclusion of the Shakespeare Folio must have seemed a startling gesture," even if we are now learning that some in the early Stuart universities had begun to regard Shakespeare as already "an author worthy of academic study."[22]

If Parliamentarian propaganda associated royalists with Shakespeare, royalists accepted the charge and associated monarchism with Shakespeare in their efforts to portray England's new rulers as stereotypically Puritan Philistines, as Malvolio's and Zeal-of-the-Land Busy's. The anonymous play-pamphlet *The Famous Tragedie of King Charles I* (1649) reminds its readers in its prefatory verses that

<ll>
Though *Johnson, Shakespeare, Goffe*, and *Davenant*,
Brave *Sucklin*, Beaumont, Fletcher, *Shurley* want
The life of action, and their learned lines
Are loathed, by the Monsters of the times;
Yet your refined Soules can penetrate
Their depth of merit[.][23]
</ll>

The appropriation of Shakespeare, along with other poets and playwrights associated with Stuart patronage, was part of the wider royalist aim of delegitimizing politically the Parliamentarian and then republican regime by asserting its lack of culture, invoking the early

modern commonplace of "arts united with empire in a properly constituted polity."[24] The invocation of Shakespeare by both sides in the 1640s can be seen as an example of Rancière's notion of polemicization as "the conflict between one who says white and another who also says white but does not understand the same thing by it." The Parliamentarians charged royalists with liking Shakespeare and represented this taste as a sign of irreligion and theatrical duplicity; the royalists accepted the charge of liking Shakespeare but represented this taste as a sign of superior culture and humanity.[25]

In *Eikonoklastes*, Milton returns to the polemical strategy adopted by Nedham in *Britanicus* of portraying the Cavaliers as irreligious dilettantes, more interested in Shakespeare than Saint Paul and seeking to turn religion into a form of theater with their Laudian, and ultimately popish, love of spectacle. His use of Shakespeare against Charles may thus be more a matter of polemical exigency than a coherent expulsion of the Shakespearean from his literary imagination—the debt to Shakespeare in *Paradise Lost* (1667) is testament enough to the continuation of Shakespeare's influence on his poetic imagination, or at least of a return to the works of Shakespeare that he studied so closely earlier in his life. Moreover, as I have argued elsewhere, *Richard III* is presented as instructive in *Eikonoklastes* in that it "delivers" or reveals to the English people the dissembling practices of tyrant-kings in British history: Shakespearean tragedy can act as a kind of guide to readers of the *Eikon Basilike*, as they are confronted with the duplicitous performance of a corrupt king.[26] And yet it is hard to deny the sense that the king is also attacked for spending too much time with an inappropriate author—a darling of the Laudians, according to Nedham in 1644, but also an author with whom, as the identification of the Philadelphia Folio makes explicit, Milton himself had spent much time. In the second half of this essay, I take a different tack and look less for continuity or discontinuity in Milton's attitude toward Shakespeare than at how the ways of reading on display in the Philadelphia

Folio, as in several other books we know passed through Milton's hands, reappear as a key component of Milton's polemical method in the political prose.

<1>Milton's Books and Textual Criticism

This copy of the First Folio in the Free Library of Philadelphia has, as I have mentioned, over 600 lines and passages that have been scored or bracketed in the margins of every play, other than the *Henry VI* plays and *Titus Andronicus*; it also has 121 textual emendations that show, among other things, the reader to have been carefully collating the folio texts of *Romeo & Juliet* and *Hamlet* with their quarto editions, which Bourne demonstrates must have included the fifth quartos of both these plays, first published in 1637. There are two striking additions which underline this concerted process of textual collation: the prologue to *Romeo & Juliet*, missing from the folio but which the reader has transcribed on the final page of *Titus Andronicus* from a quarto edition of what the reader refers to as "Juliet & Romeo," and the second stanza of a song from *Measure for Measure*, transcribed on the final page of the play (with a note at the opening of the first scene of the fourth act that "the other stanza is after the end of the comedy").[27] This second stanza was not put into print until 1639 in John Fletcher's *The Bloody Brother*, although it may have been circulating earlier in manuscript. There are (only) three annotations. Two refer accurately to sources for lines in *Hamlet* and *The Tempest* in, respectively, Totell's *Songes and Sonnettes* and the collection of travel narratives, *Purchas his Pilgrimes*, which was first published in four volumes in 1625 and from which Milton was taking notes in the early to mid-1640s.[28] The third annotation, to *Timon of Athens*, interestingly notes, given Milton's notoriety as a defender of regicide, that "Gold" is the subject of Timon's speech beginning, "thou sweet king-killer."[29]

The emphasis on textual collation and emendation in the annotations in the Philadelphia First Folio, rather than on matters of plot or character, make it more rather than

less plausible that Milton is indeed the reader whose marks are preserved. The same scholarly method of textual emendation and collation of editions is evident in the small number of extant books that we know to have belonged to him—nine, not including the Milton family copy of the King James Bible or the Shakespeare First Folio, all seemingly purchased in the 1629–1638 period when Milton was first studying for his MA at Cambridge University and then pursuing his intense course of private studies in the family homes in Hammersmith and, from 1636, Horton.[30] In Milton's two-volume works of Euripides, published by Paulus Stephanus in Geneva in 1602 and purchased in 1634, the textual emendations seemingly date from both before and after his time in Italy in 1638–39—like those in the Philadelphia First Folio—and indicate that he similarly returned at different times of his life to these volumes. He may well have employed the Stephanus edition for pedagogical reasons in the early 1640s, when he was tutoring his nephews Edward and John Phillips, and later several other boys. Milton's use of the Stephanus edition of Euripides follows squarely in the humanist critical or philological tradition of intensive comparison and correction of the text of ancient works. A dozen of Milton's emendations of the Greek texts are accepted in modern editions of Euripides through their incorporation by a later owner of Milton's volumes, Joshua Barnes, into his 1694 edition.[31]

Other books that passed through Milton's hands show his attention to textual comparison of different editions as well as textual emendation. One of the earlier notes in the "Index Politicus" of Milton's extant Commonplace Book—entered before April 1638 under the topic of "Rex" ("King")—refers to Boccaccio's *Vita di Dante* ("Life of Dante"), composed in the 1350s and first published in Venice in 1477 as part of an edition of Dante's *Divine Comedy* and then as a free-standing work in 1544: "That regal authority is not derived from the Pope, Dante the Florentine wrote in the book titled *On Monarchy*, which book Cardinal del Poggetto had burnt as a heretical text, as Boccaccio avouches in *The Life of*

Dante in the first edition, for all mention of this incident in the subsequent edition was censored by the inquisitor" (OM 11:211–12). Milton's copy of the 1544 edition, published in Rome, with annotations in his hand and the section he cites in this note marked, was identified by William Poole in 2014.[32] What both Milton's note in the Commonplace Book and his annotations on this copy reveal is that he carefully collated the 1544 edition with the later, censored text in *Vita nuova con xv canzoni e la vita di esso Dante da Giovanni Boccaccio* (Florence, 1576). The later text cuts Boccaccio's discussion of how Dante's *De monarchia* ("Of Monarchy," composed ca. 1312?) was condemned to be burned as heretical after its arguments for a balanced relationship between secular and religious authority were used, several years after Dante's death, against the papacy. The 1576 book carries the inquisitorial *imprimatur*, to which Milton refers in his note. Given that Milton is seemingly the first English reader to show any knowledge of Boccaccio's *Vita* at all, the collation of the 1544 edition against the later, censored text represents, as Poole puts it, "an act of considerable textual application."[33]

The attention to the detailed bibliographic and textual effects of Catholic censorship on Italian vernacular literature is evident elsewhere in Milton's reading and writing before the outbreak of civil war, even if we lack the evidence of his copy of the books in question. Milton's knowledge of the inquisitorial censorship of several of Petrarch's sonnets critical of the corruption of the papal court at Avignon—the so-called "Babylon" sonnets, which were put on the Index by Rome in 1559, ordered to be excised from existing editions of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, and excluded from any new printed editions—is on display in *Of Reformation* (1641). Here Milton quotes (in English) from the nineteenth canto of Dante's *Inferno*, then refers to the twentieth of *Paradiso*, and then translates the sestet from one of the political sonnets by Petrarch, who "seconds him [i.e., Dante] in the same mind in his 108. Sonnet which is wip't out by the Inquisitor in some Editions; speaking of the Roman Antichrist as

meerely bred up by Constantine," the first Christian Roman emperor.[34] Petrarch is not cited in Milton's Commonplace Book, and it is unclear which edition of Petrarch that Milton used. But interest in Petrarch's "Babylon" sonnets in Caroline Cambridge can be found in both a translation of two of these sonnets by Thomas Fairfax (1612–71), commander of the Parliamentary armies during the Civil Wars, and a transcription of another sonnet by Joseph Mede (1586–1639), the most celebrated Fellow of Christ's College in Milton's time there. Mede copied in his own commonplace book an English translation of a "Babylon" sonnet that he found in a popular Dutch attack on Catholic corruption, *The Beehive of the Romish Church*, first published in English in 1579.[35] The tradition of Protestant Petrarchism that Milton invokes, according to which Petrarch's anti-papal sentiment was seen to anticipate or prophesy the Reformation, was in the mainstream in post-Reformation England. What distinguishes Milton, however, is the attention to textual difference that we also see in his reading and marking of Boccaccio's *Life* of Dante—and that we also see, if in a less explicitly historical and political context, in his reading and marking of the Shakespeare First Folio.

This attention to the textual censorship of Petrarch supplies the polemical strategy of the attack in *Of Reformation* on the repressive policies and corrupt appetites of the bishops in England. Although Milton did not incorporate his study of the censorship of both Dante and Boccaccio directly into the published arguments about censorship and the free circulation of books in *Areopagitica* (1644), Poole observes how "Milton's anti-papal readings in the Italian authors form a coherent line from his first notes made in specific Italian books, through his deployment of such reading in *Of Reformation*, culminating in *Areopagitica*."[36] An author whom Milton did invoke as a presiding presence over *Areopagitica* is Euripides, quoting in Greek from *Suppliant Women* (lines 438–41) followed by a (free) English translation, presumably by Milton himself:

<ll>

This is true Liberty when free born men

Having to advise the public may speak free,

Which he who can, and will, deserv's high praise,

Who neither can nor will, may hold his peace;

What can be juster in a State than this?

</ll>

The Stephanus edition glosses these lines, which are spoken by Theseus in response to a Theban herald who questions the capacity of the people to guide a city, as an example of *parrhesia*, the term used in Euripidean tragedy for the exercise of free speech that characterizes Athenian democracy and civic culture.[37] The epigraph thus prepares the reader of *Areopagitica* for the free and bold speech that Milton will exercise in his criticism of Parliament and that he seeks through the publication of *Areopagitica* to establish as the standard practice of English society.[38] In *Tetrachordon* (1645), which appeared a few months after *Areopagitica* and was a further response to the hostile reception of his ideas on divorce, Milton again turned to Euripidean drama for his title-page motto; but this time he does not translate the four lines of Greek from the *Medea*, a decision that, combined with his Greek title (meaning "four-stringed"), would seem to display a clear disdain for those who would try to encounter his arguments without a good degree of classical learning. Those who had the capacity to read the epigraph would find a defiant proclamation, in the form of a speech delivered by Medea herself—an interesting choice for a work on divorce, given that Medea is the most infamous deserted wife in classical literature. Her words underscore the provocative truth of Milton's arguments:

<ll>

If thou bring strange wisdom unto dullards,

Useless thou shalt be counted and not wise;

And if thy fame outshine those heretofore

Held wise; thou shalt be odious in men's eyes.[39]

</ll>

It has been suggested that, at this point in the mid-1640s, "a title-page Euripidean quotation may have been Milton's 'house-style,' signalling a particular kind of commitment to presence in the public sphere of ideas."[40] If Dante and Petrarch were regarded by Milton as proto-Protestant poets for their anticlerical and antipapal sentiments, then he seems to have regarded Euripides as something of a proto-Protestant heretic, a resource for some of the more daring arguments about liberty of speech and divorce that he advanced in printed prose in the mid-1640s.[41] In the *De Doctrina Christiana*, mostly written in the late 1650s, Milton turned once more, and unusually for a work of systematic theology, to the pagan source of Euripides's *Suppliant Women* as a proof for mortalism, the belief that the soul died with the body (to be resurrected at the Last Judgement) and one of the more controversial theological positions advanced in the treatise. Moreover, the reference to the *Suppliant Women* in the discussion of mortalism "is the longest literary citation in the treatise and it carries the greatest argumentative weight."[42] As with this later invocation of Euripides on a theologically provocative topic, the application of Euripidean drama in the polemical prose of the mid-1640s is grounded in the scrupulous textual attention that we know Milton had given the Greek text from the survival of his copy of the plays.

What is remarkable about the evidence of the Philadelphia Folio is that it shows Milton to have engaged himself—possibly in collaboration with others devoted to Shakespeare who lived close to Horton, such as the great scholar and Eton College tutor, John Hales (1584–1656)—in similar acts of textual application to a book of vernacular drama by a near-contemporary Englishman as he did to Euripides.[43] As Bourne observed of the Philadelphia First Folio before Milton's hand was identified, the various marks made by the reader "demonstrate that printed plays could be—and were—treated as reading matter worthy of study, improvement, and indeed even a version of editorial collation that predates the stated investment in such a practice by eighteenth-century editors of Shakespeare."[44] Even if the political application of Shakespearean drama in *Eikonoklastes* is not anticipated in any way in the markings in the Philadelphia Folio, the method of textual criticism and comparison on display in the Folio is central to Milton's polemical method. *Eikonoklastes* is formally constructed according to the method of animadversion, which Milton had previously employed in both *Animadversions* (1641) and *Colasterion* (1645) and involves "the quotation of an opponent's text and extensive refutation of it by means of logical, pathetic, and ethical proof"; the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines the intransitive verb, "to animadvert," as "to comment critically [*on, upon*]."[45] Throughout his extensive quotation of the *Eikon Basilike*, Milton never misquotes or misrepresents the king's words, even though we might expect him to have been tempted to do so to advance a polemical point. But this fact is indicative of the textual-critical method of the tract, the design of which, far from being iconoclastic, depends upon patient and painstaking reading.[46] It is this method which enables Milton to make his discovery that one of the prayers that Charles supposedly had in his possession on the scaffold, and which is printed in editions of the *Eikon Basilike* after March 15, 1649, as "A Prayer in Time of Captivity," is in fact taken almost verbatim, and without acknowledgment, from a pagan prayer by the heroine Pamela in Sidney's *Arcadia*—proof, for Milton, not only

of the insubstantiality of a book that relies on plagiarized material but of the king's preference for the fictions of romance over biblical truth: "a Prayer stol'n word for word from the mouth of a Heathen fiction praying to a heathen God; & that in no serious Book." Pamela's prayer is revealed, like the taste for Shakespeare that Milton has just criticized in the preceding paragraphs, as "a special Relique of his saintly exercises" (OM 6:292).

Milton observes that Pamela's prayer is "Printed in all the Best editions" of the *Eikon Basilike* (OM 6:292). That slightly odd phrase, "all the Best editions", shows Milton's awareness of the multiple different editions and issues of the *Eikon Basilike*. Milton clearly felt that he had scored a crucial polemical blow with this revelation. In the second, lightly revised edition of *Eikonoklastes*, which was published sometime between July and December 1650, he expands upon the discovery, directing readers to the correct page in seventeenth-century editions of the *Arcadia* so they can see for themselves: the reader skeptical of his claim "may satisfie thir own eyes at leasure in the 3 d. Book of *Sir Philips Arcadia* p. 248" (OM 6:292)—the correct page number in all English editions of the *Arcadia* from 1621. In the French translation of *Eikonoklastes*, undertaken by the Commonwealth agent John Dury (1596–1680) and published in London for distribution in Paris in 1652, the title page advertises the discovery of the provenance of the prayer, and there is added a substantial appendix with parallel columns printing the prayer ascribed to Charles alongside the one in the French translation of the *Arcadia* ("Priére de Pamméla tirée mot à mot de l'Arcadie").[47] Dury is also careful to give page numbers from the 1625 French edition of the *Arcadia* so that French speakers can go and verify the text. The *Eikon Basilike* had swiftly appeared in Latin, French, and Dutch translations, and it was evidently considered by Milton and others in the government that his discovery of the plagiarized Sidney prayer would prove of particular interest to a European audience, the learned class of which Milton was specifically addressing in his Latin prose works of 1651–54. The added prominence given to the

identification in Dury's translation, with its careful bibliographic design, indicates that Milton, who reviewed Dury's work before publication, regarded his textual discovery as a triumphant exposure of the royalists' duplicity and a major polemical coup. (In the aftermath of the reprinting of the first edition of *Eikonoklastes* in 1690, the charge was made that Milton himself had arranged for the prayer from the *Arcadia* to be inserted into editions of the *Eikon Basilike* after March 15. The controversy has periodically been revived, most infamously by William Empson, and, contrary to the assumption of most scholarship, has never been fully resolved, though *prima facie* the case for Milton's involvement is highly unlikely.[48]) The scrupulous attention to textual variants, grounded in comparative study of different editions, that we find in the markings of the First Folio may not in itself be political, but this method bears polemical fruit in the political prose.

<1>Critical Reading and the Republic of Letters

What we see in the period after Milton's private engagement with the textual criticism and comparison of poetic and dramatic texts by Euripides, Dante, Boccaccio, Petrarch, and Shakespeare in the late 1630s and early 1640s is the polemical application of his method of critical reading to printed controversy. Would Milton have in any way felt that his polemical use of a literary-critical method in the service of the new English republic was in some sense a betrayal of the values of the larger "republic of letters"? The Florentine literary academies that Milton encountered in his time in Italy in 1638–39 offered him an example of the ideal community of learned men, engaging in poetic display, competition, and tribute; his pride in his acceptance by the academies is evident in the *Defensio secunda* (1654), where he refers to them as deserving "great praise not only for promoting humane studies but also for encouraging friendly intercourse" (YP 4:615–16).[49] The kind of conversation in which Milton engaged in the academies is suggested by one of the extant letters that Carlo Dati

(1619–1676) wrote to Milton in November 1647, nearly a decade after Milton had first met Dati, then aged only eighteen but already hailed as an intellectual prodigy in Florence. Dati wrote to Milton in Tuscan because Milton is so gifted "for making dead languages live again and making foreign languages your own." He asked if Milton would write an elegy for a recently deceased Florentine poet, Francesco Rovai, and disclosed "those most excellent patrons and men of letters of our age," Nicholas Heinsius and Isaac Vossius, had already agreed to do so (YP 2:767). Dati's reference to Heinsius (1620–81) and Vossius (1618–89), both renowned Dutch humanists and textual scholars, indicates how Milton's contact with the Florentine academies gave him insights into the workings of the "republic of letters" in seventeenth-century Europe—a loose community of scholars joined by correspondence and personal affection who freely exchanged books, news, and ideas across national boundaries. Given Milton's vigorous anti-Catholicism, it has often been thought startling that he wrote in such fulsome terms from Florence in March 1639 to the Vatican librarian, Lukas Holste (1596–1661), who had shown him around the library and recommended him to Cardinal Francesco Barberini (1597–1679), the Prime Minister of Rome and chief advisor to Pope Urban VIII. When Milton attended the performance of a comic opera in the theater of the newly constructed Palazzo Barberini in February 1639, the Cardinal "singled me out in so great a throng and, almost seizing me by the hand, welcomed me in an exceedingly honourable manner" (YP 1:334).

It has become increasingly clear that it is a misrepresentation of the seventeenth-century republic of letters to regard its "citizens" as standing above confessional divisions, dedicated to the "higher" truths of scholarship: for example, Patrick Young (1584–1652), the Royal Librarian under both James I and Charles I, who may have tutored the young Milton in some capacity and to whom Milton made a gift of a collection of his prose works in the later 1640s, found that his friendship with Holste was not enough to surmount confessional

barriers when he asked about any manuscripts in the Vatican or Barberini libraries that would help him with his work on a new edition of the Septuagint. Holste and Barberini were both anxious not to assist an enterprise that could assert the superiority of Protestant biblical scholarship.[50] However, Holste was apparently happy to show Milton around the Vatican Library, as Milton records in his (Latin) letter to Holste from Florence on March 30, 1639: "I was permitted to browse through the invaluable collection of Books, and also the numerous Greek Authors in manuscript" (YP 1:333). If issues of biblical criticism could reveal the limits of interconfessional collaboration, it was poetry and the textual emendation of literary texts that were the focus of Milton's communications with Italian men of letters. Dati's 1647 letter to Milton turns into a dizzying list of poetic citations and comparisons that encompass a range of classical and vernacular literary works, beginning with how the Italian literary theorist Castelvetro—whose commentary on Aristotle's *Poetics* is recommended by Milton in *Of Education* (1644)—had noted the Horatian echo in a tercet in the *Triumph of Love* from Petrarch's *Trionfi* sequence. This leads Dati to consider whether a line in one of Tibullus's elegies that describes the "whirling [*rapido*] sea" should be emended to *rabido* (furious, fierce) by way of reference to Homer, Catullus, Ovid, Virgil, Seneca, Valerius Flaccus, and Tasso, among others (YP 2:768–72).

This is the kind of textual scholarship on classical and literary texts that Milton can be seen engaged upon in the emendations that he made in the late 1630s and early 1640s to the Geneva edition of Euripides. These emendations and the correspondence with men such as Dati show Milton dabbling in the textual criticism of classical literature that was an important part of the republic of letters, and for which men such as Nicholas Heinsius and Vossius had earned European renown. More surprisingly, we now know Milton extended this critical method to English vernacular drama in the form of the First Folio. In doing so, he was following the lead of his friend Dati, an eminent philological scholar who gave the same

textual attention to Petrarch's poetry in Tuscan as to the literary works of the Romans and Greeks. Supra-confessional philological scholarship had never really been a feature of the intellectual landscape of post-Reformation England, however, where it had more usually been expected that textual criticism of the Bible would be put to polemical and confessional uses.[51] Milton would himself soon put his own scholarship to polemical use in the prose works that he began publishing in 1641. Even in Dati's intensely literary letter, the pressures of confessional allegiance are felt. In response to Milton's request in his letter of April 21, 1647, that in reading the anti-papal satire of several of the pieces in the 1645 *Poems*, he show "the same indulgence to freedom of speech" that was shown to Dante and Petrarch in the past—given Milton's interest in the textual censorship of both writers, we can now see there may have been an element of irony in this request—Dati's tone becomes suddenly more guarded: any of Milton's poems "which are in dispraise of my religion . . . although coming from the lips of a friend, can only be excused, not praised" (YP 2:764, 772–73).[52] Dati's letter conveys the sense that textual criticism of literary texts could offer an ideal that might surmount ideological and confessional difference but also the awareness that such an ideal would always struggle to become reality in a world riven by religious and political conflict. In his letter to Dati, Milton at one point yearns for such an ideal world of disinterested scholarship. He laments the "extremely turbulent state of our Britain" and asks rhetorically, "Do you think there can be any safe retreat for literary leisure among so many civil battles, so much slaughter, flight, and pillaging of goods?" In response, Dati expresses his sorrow that "the disorders of the realm have disturbed your studies" (YP 2:764, 772). Yet in the early 1640s Milton had used the techniques of collation and textual criticism to advance polemical positions against Laudian episcopacy, and in *Eikonoklastes* he would deploy them in defense of the new republic and to expose the dead king's taste for the very literature, most

prominently the dramatic works of Shakespeare, upon which he had himself earlier practiced such modes of critical reading.

<1>NOTES

<insert endnotes here>

---

[1] *Vernacular Regicide and Republican Writings*, ed. N. H. Keeble and Nicholas McDowell, vol. 6 of *The Complete Works of John Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns and Gordon Campbell (Oxford, 2013), 291; hereafter cited as OM 6. For the identification of Milton's hand in the Philadelphia First Folio, see Jason Scott-Warren ("Milton's Shakespeare?," *CMT Blog*, Centre for Material Texts, September 9, 2019, https://www.english.cam.ac.uk/cmt/?p=5751), who recognized the hand after reading an essay by Claire M. L. Bourne on the markings in the volume ("*Vide Supplementum*: Early Modern Collation as Play-Reading in the First Folio," in *Early Modern English Marginalia*, ed. Katherine Acheson [New York, 2019], 195–223).

[2] The Philadelphia First Folio is available to view and to download at https://libwww.freelibrary.org/digital/item/67237. On the inks used to make notes and marks in the folio, see Bourne, "*Vide Supplementum*," 202. I have not yet been able to examine the Philadelphia First Folio in person, so my understanding of the volume as material object relies on Bourne's extensively researched findings.

[3] I use the phrase "commercial print" because it is possible that Milton's first work in print were Latin "act verses" distributed before an academic disputation in Christ's College,

Cambridge; see Nicholas McDowell, *Poet of Revolution: The Making of John Milton* (Princeton, 2020), 94–95, 135–36.

[4] I cite the text of the poem in the Second Folio as reproduced in *The Shorter Poems*, ed. Barbara Keifer Lewalski and Estelle Haan, vol. 3 of *The Complete Works of John Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns and Gordon Campbell (Oxford, 2012; corrected impression, 2014), 530, line 12. For the epitaph on Shakespeare as suspicious of, or hostile to, the power of Shakespearean art, see e.g., John Guillory, *Poetic Authority: Spenser, Milton, and Literary History* (New York, 1983); Gordon Teskey, *The Poetry of John Milton* (Cambridge, Mass., 2015), 72; William Poole, *Milton and the Making of "Paradise Lost"* (Cambridge, Mass., 2017), 36–40. For alternative readings, see Paul Stevens, "Subversion and Wonder in Milton's Epitaph 'On Shakespeare,'" *English Literary Renaissance* 19, no. 3 (1989): 375–88; and McDowell, *Poet of Revolution*, 135–38.

[5] See https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/king-charles-is-copy-of-shakespeare. See also Nicholas McDowell, "Milton's Regicide Tracts and the Uses of Shakespeare," in *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*, ed. McDowell and Nigel Smith (Oxford, 2009), 252–71 (252–53).

[6] All references to Shakespeare's plays are to the copy of the First Folio in the Free Library of Philadelphia, shk00001, with the long "s," i/j and u/v modernized: see *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories & Tragedies: Published according to the True Originall Copies* (London, 1623), sig. r3v, second pagination, 182; cf. *Richard III*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York, 2008), 2.1.70–73.

[7] Claire M. L. Bourne and Jason Scott-Warren, "Re-Reading Milton, Re-Reading Shakespeare: John Milton and the Free Library of Philadelphia's First Folio," June 30, 2020, https://www.rensoc.org.uk/event/re-reading-milton-re-reading-shakespeare/. See also Claire

M. L. Bourne and Jason Scott-Warren, “Milton’s Hamlet,” Fall 2020 Workshop, September 14, 2020, video, 1:25:27, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R6Iq9CMcmWE.

[8] Glenn Burgess, “The Impact on Political Thought: Rhetorics for Troubled Times,” in *The Impact of the English Civil War*, ed. John Morrill (London, 1991), 67–83 (67). Compare N. H. Keeble, “Introduction,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution,* ed. Keeble (Cambridge, 2001), 1–11 (1). The seminal critical work on the effect of civil war on literary culture is Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven, 1994).

[9] Rancière, *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy* (Minneapolis, 1998), x; and Benjamin Arditi and Jeremy Valentine, *Polemicization* (Edinburgh, 1999).

[10] I develop here aspects of my wider argument about the literary and cultural effects of civil war in Nicholas McDowell, “Towards a Poetics of Civil War,” *Essays in Criticism* 65, no. 4 (2015): 341–67.

[11] Claire M. L. Bourne, “With(out) Milton: Dating the Annotations in the Free Library of Philadelphia’s First Folio,” ¶ of pilcrows, September 13, 2019, https://www.ofpilcrows.com/blog/2019/9/12/flp-folio-without-milton.

[12] For further discussion of this point, see Nicholas McDowell, “Reading Milton Reading Shakespeare Politically: What Milton’s First Folio Does and Does Not Tell Us,” *Seventeenth Century* 36, no. 4 (2021): 509–26 (511–12).

[13] Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, 16–17.

[14] Steven N. Zwicker, *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649–89* (New York, 1993), 19.

[15] OM 6:292; and *Manuscript Writings*, ed. William Poole, vol. 11 of *The Complete Works of John Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns and Gordon Campbell (Oxford, 2019), 123, 124, 241, 242–43; hereafter cited as OM 11.

[16] See OM 11:83–92.

[17] *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham* (Oxford, 2007), 51–52.

[18] Richard Helgerson, "Milton Reads the King's Book: Print, Performance and the Making of a Bourgeois Idol," *Criticism* 29 (1987): 1–25 (17); and Kevin Sharpe, "The King's Writ: Royal Authors and Royal Authority in Early Modern England," in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. Sharpe and Peter Lake (Basingstoke, 1994), 117–38.

[19] T. A. Birrell, *English Monarchs and their Books: From Henry VIII to Charles II* (London, 1987), 44–47.

[20] *Mercurius Britanicus*, 20 (London, 4–11 Jan. 1644), 152.

[21] *Mercurius Britanicus*, 49 (London, 26 August–2 September 1644), 386.

[22] Malcolm Rogers, "The Meaning of Van Dyck's Portrait of Sir John Suckling," *The Burlington Magazine* 120, no. 908 (1978): 739–45 (742); and Dan Blank, '"Our Fellow Shakespeare': A Contemporary Classic in the Early Modern University," *Review of English Studies*, new series, 71, no. 301 (2020): 652–69 (653).

[23] Anonymous, *The Famous Tragedie of King Charles I as it was acted before White-Hall* (London, 1649), sig. A3r.

[24] Derek Hirst, "The Politics of Literature in the English Republic," *Seventeenth Century* 5, no. 2 (1990): 133–55 (148–49).

[25] Interesting recent work on the reception and representation of Shakespeare in the mid-seventeenth century, mainly from the perspective of book history, does not pay much attention to the cultural-political context of civil war and regicide: see Emma Depledge, *Shakespeare's Rise to Cultural Prominence: Print, Politics, and Alteration, 1642–1700* (Cambridge, 2018); Heidi C. Craig, "Missing Shakespeare, 1642–1660," *English Literary Renaissance* 49, no. 1 (2019): 116–44; and Emma Depledge and Peter Kirwan, eds.,

Canonizing Shakespeare: Stationers and the Book Trade, 1640–1740 (Cambridge, 2017), although the exception here is the essay by Adam G. Hooks, "Royalist Shakespeare: Publishers, Politics and the Appropriation of *The Rape of Lucrece* (1655)," 26–37.

[26] McDowell, "Shakespeare's Regicide Tracts and the Uses of Shakespeare," 270–71; "Shakespearean Constitutions: Literary Culture and Republicanism," in *Political Turmoil: Early Modern British Literature in Transition, 1623–1660*, ed. Stephen B. Dobranski (Cambridge, 2019), 132–45 (139–41). For the importance of Shakespeare to *Paradise Lost*, see Paul Stevens, *Imagination and the Presence of Shakespeare in "Paradise Lost"* (Madison, Wisc., 1985).

[27] *Measure for Measure*, in *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories & Tragedies*, sig. G2r, first pagination, 75.

[28] Theodore Haak told Samuel Hartlib that Milton was compiling an "epitome" of Purchas's work in 1648, and Milton's *Brief History of Muscovia*, published in 1682, may be derived from this undertaking; see OM 11:405.

[29] *Timon of Athens*, in *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories & Tragedies*, sig. hh3r, third pagination, 93; see also *Timon of Athens*, in *Norton Shakespeare*, 4.3.375.

[30] Three of these nine books are bound together in one volume. See further, McDowell, *Poet of Revolution*, 259.

[31] The shelf-mark of Milton's Euripides is Bodleian Library Don. d. 27 and 28; the edition is *Tragœdiae quae extant*, 2 vols. (Geneva, 1602). For accounts of the annotations and Milton's use of the Euripides volumes, see e.g., John K. Hale, "Milton's Euripides Marginalia: Their Significance for Milton Studies," *Milton Studies* 27 (1991), 23–35; Thomas Festa, *The End of Learning: Milton and Education* (London, 2006), 27–32; and Nicholas McDowell, "Milton's Euripides and the Superior Rationality of the Heathen," *Seventeenth Century* 31, no. 2 (2016): 215–37.

[32] It is Bodleian Library, Arch A f. 145, and belonged to Thomas Bodley before Milton; for the identification, see Poole, "John Milton and Giovanni Boccaccio's *Vita di Dante*," *Milton Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (2014): 139–70, which gives a full list of Milton's annotations in an appendix.

[33] Ibid., 149.

[34] *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, 8 vols., ed. Don M. Wolfe et al. (New Haven, 1953–82), 1:558–59, hereafter cited as YP.

[35] Mede's transcription is cited by Deidre Serjeantson, "Milton and the Tradition of Protestant Petrarchism," *Review of English Studies* 29 (2015), 632–49, who discusses the issue of which edition Milton might have used, given his non-standard numbering of the *Canzoniere*. Fairfax's translations of *Canzoniere* 136 and 138 are included in *Petrarch's Canzoniere in the English Renaissance*, ed. Anthony Mortimer (Leiden, 2005), 86–87, 90.

[36] Poole, "John Milton and Giovanni Boccaccio's *Vita di Dante*," 154.

[37] David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge, 1999), 127. For an analysis of the context in which these lines are spoken in the *Suppliant Women*, see Paul Hammond, *Milton and the People* (Oxford, 2014), 77–81.

[38] For various positions on and arguments about the significance of Milton's translation of these lines, see, e.g., David Davies and Paul Dowling, "'Shrewd books, with dangerous Frontispieces': *Areopagitica*'s Motto," *Milton Quarterly* 20, no. 2 (1986): 33–37; and John K. Hale, "*Areopagtica*'s Euripidean Motto," *Milton Quarterly* 25, no. 2 (1991): 25–27.

[39] *Medea*, in *Euripides, with an English Translation by Arthur S. Way*, vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), lines 298–30.

[40] Sharon Achinstein, "Medea's Dilemma: Politics as Passion in Milton's Divorce Tracts," in *Rethinking Historicism: From Shakespeare to Milton*, ed. Ann Baynes Coiro and Thomas Fulton (Cambridge, 2012), 181–208 (181, 191).

[41] Euripides is also a strong presence in Milton's poems from this period. For example, Sonnet 8, likely written as the royalist army advanced on London in 1642, invokes the story from Plutarch of how the singing of verses from Euripides's *Electra* by a defeated Athenian moved the Spartans to halt their planned destruction of the city. The Euripidean precedent emboldens Milton to proclaim the power of eloquence to have a transformative effect.

[42] David Norbrook, "Euripides, Milton, and *Christian Doctrine*," *Milton Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (1995): 37–41 (37). For further discussion, see McDowell, "Milton's Euripides and the Superior Rationality of the Heathen," 95–96.

[43] For further discussion of the possible social contexts for Milton's engagement with the First Folio, see McDowell, "Reading Milton Reading Shakespeare Politically," 513–14.

[44] Bourne, "*Vide Supplementum*," 206.

[45] James Egan, "Oratory and Animadversion: Rhetorical Signatures in Milton's Pamphlets of 1649," *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 27, no. 2 (2009): 189–217 (194); and OM 6:65–67.

[46] A point made by Daniel Shore, "Why Milton is Not an Iconoclast," *PMLA* 127, no. 1 (2012): 22–37.

[47] See OM 6:240; *Eikonoklastes, ou, Réponse au livre intitulé Eikon basilike . . . par le Sr. Jean Milton*, [trans. John Dury]{**au:** this purposefully in brackets?}[Yes] (London, 1652), sig. Hh6, 24.

[48] I reconsider in detail the arguments for and against Milton's involvement in OM 6:263–67; and Nicholas McDowell, "Milton, the *Eikon Basilike* and Pamela's Prayer: Revisiting the Evidence," *Milton Quarterly* 48, no. 4 (2014): 225–34.

[49] For Milton's time in the Florentine academies, see Estelle Haan, *From "Academia" to "Amicitia": Milton's Latin Writings and the Italian Academies* (Philadelphia, 1998); and A. M. Cinquemani, *Glad to Go for a Feast: Milton Buonmetti, and the Florentine Academici* (Oxford, 1998).

[50] McDowell, *Poet of Revolution*, 274, 395; Nicholas Hardy, *Criticism and Confession: The Bible in the Seventeenth-Century Republic of Letters* (Oxford, 2017), 285–303.

[51] Mordecai Feingold, "The Humanities," in *Seventeenth-Century Oxford*, vol. 4 of *The History of the University of Oxford*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford, 1997), 211–357 (265–66).

[52] For some interesting comments on the career of textual scholar as "an alternative scholarly future" for the young Milton, see Sharon Achinstein, "High Enterprise: Milton and the Genres of Scholarship in the Divorce Tracts," in *Scholarly Milton*, ed. Thomas Festa and Kevin J. Donovan (Liverpool, 2019), 19–40 (20).