EDWARD PHILLIPS AND THE MANUSCRIPT OF THE “DIGRESSION”

Thomas Fulton

AT SOME POINT PRIOR to the publication of Milton's History of Britain in 1670, a short, powerful screed against England’s revolutionary impotence was excerpted from the book. After the publication of the history, and perhaps soon after, this excerpt was copied as a separate entity entitled "The Digression," which surfaced to scholarly notice in 1926. Mostly in the hand of a single, unknown seventeenth-century scribe, the "Digression" compares the political disarray in the late 1640s with the void that followed the disintegration of Roman rule in ancient Britain. Although Milton does not supply the date of the described present—it is the subject, in fact, of considerable debate—careful examination of context can, I believe, locate Milton's excursion to a short period between the political stalemate following the end of the second civil war and Pride's Purge of Parliament on December 6, 1648.

The “Digression,” therefore, captures Milton's thinking at the very nadir of civil war history, when he perceives the revolution to have been utterly mishandled, and "ev'ry where wrong & oppression, foule and dishonest things committed daylie" by a corrupt Parliament, and by Presbyterian divines who executed "their places more like children of the devil, unfaithfully, unjustly, unmercifully, and where not corruptly, stupidly" (YP 5:1.449).

Written in the tone of a pained historian rather than an advisor to the republic, the manuscript is so openly critical as to suggest that Milton conceived a very different readership from that of his polemical prose, or that he really intended it to be printed. When it was printed, in a pirated and much altered form in 1681, Milton's criticism of the Long Parliament and Westminster Assembly was used as Tory propaganda. Called Mr John Milton's Character of the Long Parliament and Assembly of Divines and misdated 1641, its editors and publisher exploited the fact that even Milton—the most famous defender of the Good Old Cause—had written trenchantly on the corruption of Parliament.

The “Digression” deserves more attention as a piece of book history that provides valuable documentation of the vicissitudes of opinion during this
uncertain period. What seemed to Milton a failed revolutionary opportunity causes him to give vent to explicit expressions of republicanism, a conceptual vocabulary often denied Milton and his fellow revolutionaries until after the execution of the king in 1649. In comparing the political void experienced by the ancient Britons to England in 1647–48, for example, Milton writes of how the English people "had set before them civil government in all her forms, and giv'n them to bee masters of their own chose, were not found able after so many years doing and undone to hit so much as into any good and laudable way that might shew us hopes of a just and well amended commonwealth to come" (YP 5:1.441). These open expressions of criticism and republicanism are packaged in a material form very different from the printed texts that customarily embody Milton's ideas. The difference between these material forms and their relationship to content deserves further scrutiny, as does the rather unusual form taken by the manuscript itself. The existence of the manuscript as a semiseparate entity rather than merely a cast-off fragment from the History of Britain provokes several questions about the nature of the private circulation of political prose in the seventeenth century. Who gave it the title "The Digression" and saw to its preservation as a separate, even secret, part of Milton's corpus? Was it Milton or a close associate working with him, or a posthumous executor of his papers? When might this have happened? For what kind of audience was this manuscript preserved? Is this manuscript one of a kind, or—as I will suggest—part of a group of now missing copies circulated to select readers?

The material form of the manuscript itself—its layout and the nature of its corrections—offers some help in answering these questions. Strangely, these material attributes have never been fully considered, even though the function of manuscripts after Gutenberg has increasingly been the subject of inquiry. One reason for the paucity of attention devoted to this manuscript may simply be that its material aspects and problems produce more questions than they can answer. Editors have avoided some problems by simply not mentioning them, as in the case of a passage that is mysteriously blotted out, leaving an unfinished sentence and several partially legible phrases. This unfinished fragment is silently closed with an added period in the Columbia edition, and given a slightly more honest—though still unrevealing—"[.]" in the Yale text, neither edition mentioning the serious textual crux or canceled passage in the original. Focusing on such knotty and untended aspects of the manuscript, this investigation will also produce more questions than it can answer with certainty. But one previously unnoticed fact in particular will, I hope, help to answer questions concerning the nature of the manuscript's circulation and the amount of care taken in its preservation. Milton's nephew Edward Phillips appears to have corrected the manuscript copy, which indicates that it was clearly seen—and editorially overseen—by readers other than the copyist alone, and that Phillips had a copy of the original or another, more accurate, copy against which to check the extant manuscript. It also means that Phillips bothered to check the copied manuscript word for word, which suggests that he may have been involved in having it copied, and, therefore, in seeing to its distribution. The existence of Phillips's corrective hand indicates that he knew of the "Digression," and almost certainly of Character of the Long Parliament (1681), even though he does not mention them in his biography or in the list of Milton's works, which he prefaces with the remark that this added catalog contains "every Book of his that was ever publish'd, which to my knowledge is full and compleat."7

Unfortunately, little is known about the provenance of the manuscript, which was acquired by Harvard in 1926 from a bookseller who bought it from a sale of the Mostyn library, where it had probably been since the late seventeenth century. Evidence suggests that some form of the text was once in the hands of Daniel Skinner, who claimed to have been a kind of executor of Milton's papers. As he wrote to Samuel Pepys in November 1676, "Your worship may please to remember I once acquainted you with my having the works of Milton which he left behind him to me, which out of pure indiscretion, not dreaming any prejudice might accrue to me, I had agreed with a printer at Amsterdam to have 'um printed, which as good fortune would have it he has not printed one title of 'um." Among these works, it seems, was a manuscript on the very topic of the "Digression" and Character of the Long Parliament. An anonymous letter written after Skinner's departure to Holland in early November 1676, and before mid-January 1677, discovered among the papers of Henry Coventry, reported:

[Since the death of Mr. Milton his Books have byn lookt over by one Mr. Skinner a scholar and a bold young man who has cul'd out what he thought fit, & amongst the rest he has taken a manuscript of Mr. Milton's written on the Civil & Ecclesiastical Government of the Kingdom which he is resolved to print and to that purpose is gone into Holland and intends to print it at Leyden (and at this present is either there or at Nemegen) and then to bring and disperse the copies in England.]

This single manuscript on "Civil & Ecclesiastical Government of the Kingdom" is most likely the "Digression," published later in London by Henry Brone as Character of the Long Parliament. It seems less likely that "the reference may be a garbled reference to the state papers and theological treatise that had been sent to Elsevier," though these may be included in the ambiguous phrase "among the rest," since the "Digression" fits closely the description of a single manuscript on civil and ecclesiastical government. As Campbell, Corns, Hale, Holmes, and Tweedie write in their analysis of this evidence,
Skinner also records that [Sir Joseph] Williamson had asked permission to examine papers of Milton in his possession. Skinner was so flattered by this request that he composed another Latin epistle petitioning for preference, and presented it to Sir Joseph; it is now lost. In due course Williamson "return'd me my papers with many thanks." [T]hese papers may . . . have included the Digression, though there are two other possibilities with respect to this manuscript: it may have been sent to Elsevier, if this is the work to which the Longleat letter [that is, the above letter among Coventry's papers] refers, or it may have been retained (or copied) by Williamson, who could have passed it to Roger L'Estrange, who arranged for Brome to print it.11

If Skinner were the official executor of Milton's papers, of course, it would be fitting for him to have possession of the manuscript in Milton's own hand, as an excerpt of the History of Britain, rather than as a separate manuscript on "Civil & Ecclesiastical Government." The fact that it is called this soon after Milton's death—approximately two years—indicates that the manuscript had a separate identity long before it was appropriated by Brome in 1680. It seems most likely that the "Digression" as a separate entity emerged from the cutting room floor just prior to the History's publication in 1670, and possibly before that. William Parker believes that "Milton suppressed the passage [of the "Digression"] himself, long before the History was printed."12 and presumably before July 15, 1657, since Milton writes disparagingly to Henry de Brass on July 15, 1657, of the historian who essentially digresses into topical criticism, "lest by interrupting the thread of events, the Historian should invade the office of the Political Writer: for, if the Historian, in expounding counsels and narrating facts, follows truth most of all, and not his own fancy or conjecture, he fulfills his proper duty."13 This is indeed a strange admission, for if the "Digression" were still in the book, Milton clearly would be implicating himself. But there is more evidence that topical political writing was censored in 1670, as I mention at the end of this essay, and therefore the "Digression" would not have been the only aspect of The History of Britain that invaded the office of a political writer that Milton nonetheless maintained in his text. It seems more likely that Milton would have made the decision to cut this passage when preparing the manuscript for press in 1670, and not precisely because he did not wish to be topical, but because the topicality had itself passed into history.

What is strange about the anonymous 1676–77 description of a separate manuscript on "Civil & Ecclesiastical Government" is that while it accurately describes the manuscript's content, it bears no hint that it is a digression from another text, or that it begins with a serious historical description of "this land soon after the Romans going out"—the very part of the digression Character of the Long Parliament. Indeed, it seems more than coincidental that the

Character begins exactly two pages—one leaf—in from the beginning of the "Digression." The coincidence that the printed text starts exactly one leaf in suggests the possibility that this first leaf was missing from the copytext used by the printer. This manuscript understood to be on "Civil & Ecclesiastical Government" may thus already have been an altered form of "The Digression / in Milton's History of England," as the extant manuscript is titled.

But what separates the "Digression" even more from Character of the Long Parliament are a couple of short passages contained in the Character that are not in the "Digression." These indicate either some kind of interpolation on the part of the editors in preparing the manuscript for print, or, much more likely, they indicate that the Character derives from a slightly different manuscript. These added words have, as French Fogle points out, "a true Miltonic ring" (YP 5:1.407), and seem very unlikely to have been added in the royalist editorial enterprise of 1680. In the first of these passages, which concerns the suppression of religious freedom and the Presbyterians' aims to control the magistracy, Milton writes of how the "Church-men" persuaded "the magistrats to use [force] as a stronger means to subdue & bring in conscience than evangelical perswasion" (5:1.447). In Character of the Long Parliament, this sentence continues, after a colon: "Distrusting the Virtue of their own Spiritual weapons, which were given them, if they be rightly called, with full warrant of sufficiency to pull down all thoughts and imaginations that exalt themselves against God" (5:1.446). These words regrettably bear the typographical and orthographic, and possibly the stylistic alterations of the late-seventeenth-century editor, so it is hard to recover Milton's voice with certainty from them. These are, however, phrases that match closely Milton's conceptual and verbal lexicon. In The Reason of Church Government, for example, he writes approvingly of the "approved way which the Gospell prescribes" "the spirituall weapons of holy censure" (YP 1:848).

Indeed, the full context of the sentence—that is, the longer version in Character of the Long Parliament—relates closely to the opening opposition of persuasion and force in The Reason of Church Government that "persuasion certainly is a more winning, and more manlike way to keepe men in obedience then feare" (1.745); the behavior of the Presbyterians has thus violated some of the central ideals established for Milton in his earlier tract. The words "exalt themselves against God" function in both Character of the Long Parliament and in The Reason of Church Government as an allusion to 2 Corinthians 10:4, although Milton only cites this passage in the antiprelatical tract, and quotes it in full, drawing from the King James Version: "warfare, not carnall, but mighty through God to the pulling downe of strong holds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth it selfe against
the knowledge of God” (YP 1:848; 2 Cor. 10:4–5). Although the royalist editor of Character of the Long Parliament would have been motivated to make stylistic alterations, he would have had no intention—to say nothing of ability—of impersonating Milton and embellishing a sectarian argument against the conformist policies of Presbyterians in the late 1640s.

The other lines found only in Character of the Long Parliament occur within a passage of those discussed above. Milton writes in the “Digression” that the Presbyterians’ “intentts were cleere to be no other then to have set up a spirittual tyrannie by a secular power to the advancing of thir owne authoritie above the magistrate” (YP 5:1.447). In the Character, this passage was followed after a comma by “whom they would have made their Executioner, to punish Church-Delinquencies, whereas Civil Laws have no cognizance” (446). While these words may be less recognizably Miltonic, they nonetheless derive from the kind of language Milton used in arguing against Presbyterian intolerance in the late 1640s. In Observations upon the Articles of Peace (1649), for example, Milton similarly argues against the idea that the magistrate should execute, or bear a sword against, supposed spiritual crimes. He weighs, for example, against the use of the “fleshy arm of Magistracy in the execution of a spiritual Discipline, to punish and amerce by any corporall infliction those whose consciences cannot be edified by what authority they are compell’d” (YP 3:326). “These Divines might know,” he writes here about this kind of Presbyterian, “that to extirpt all these things can be no work of the Civil sword, but of the spirituall which is the Word of God” (3:324). The closeness of this passage in Character of the Long Parliament to Miltonic language of the 1640s suggests that it would not have been added by the editors of Milton’s manuscript. The two additional Miltonic passages in the Character thus strongly suggest that at least one different authentic manuscript was in circulation besides the “Digression.”

The extant manuscript is clearly designed not for the purposes of publication, but to accompany the History of Britain itself (see fig. 1). Indeed, even the words “in Miltons History of England” seem to have been added afterwards, as if it had seemed unnecessary at its creation to indicate where it went.

The manuscript comprises only six sheets, double-sided, on paper that measures approximately 6 by 7.5 inches. Originally, it was not bound, but was folded to fit in a 4½ by 3½ inch space—perhaps to fit an envelope, or to fit within the book. There are small tears from wear along one crease of each page, indicating that it spent a fair part of its life in this folded condition. Except for a couple of problematic passages, the short manuscript has every appearance of being a faithful copy of the original, or of another good copy. Many of Milton’s idiosyncrasies—such as his spelling of “thir,” and his frequent use of apostrophes—remain intact. Indeed, the orthographic idio-
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affires, a stick'd not to term them, godlie men, but execu[t] - 
ing thir places more like children of the devil, un 
faithfully, unjustly, unmercifully, and where not 
corruptly, stupidly. 

The added "be" seems most likely to be in Phillips's hand, since the Greek ε is characteristic of him, and the only two other Greek ε's in the manuscript are the similarly corrected word "fowily" (9), and in the word "devil" on this same page. Even though "devil" appears in the main text, it too seems to have been corrected, since the clear vestiges of a dotted "i" from the strange spelling "divil" remain (see fig. 2). The added line seems not to be the work of the unknown scribal hand, but of Edward Phillips. The persistent use of Phillips's distinctive Greek ε in the added line, as well as several other stylistic features—the e, r, s, d, and in particular the d in relation to other letters such as the combination "ndat," reproduced in detail in figures 3–7—demonstrate that this added line does not belong to the hand of the first scribe, but to the author's nephew. Indeed, a string of the same letters "ndatio" is fortunately present in both Phillips's Latin entry in the Commonplace Book and his English correction in the "Digression" (fig. 4), showing not only the same letter formation, but also the same series of strokes in forming the string of six letters, and the same ligatures used to connect them. Similar sequences of these letters (andat) in the unknown scribe's hand (fig. 5) indicate a very different style. The unknown scribe writes in a distinct, uniform, and stylized manner, with somewhat flamboyant back-arching ascenders on the d (which swoop toward the opposite direction of Phillips's perfunctory, upright, and loop-completing ascender), an inverted Elizabethan-style e, a k-like cut-off r, an r-like c, and a very long internal s.

These comparative samples of Phillips's characteristic hand come from two entries in Milton's Commonplace Book, which Maurice Kelley demonstrated were in Phillips's handwriting. Kelley compared the writing in the Commonplace Book to a letter penned on Milton's behalf by Edward Phillips on February 13, 1652 (that is, 1651). The close correspondence between the two samples of Phillips's handwriting has partially influenced the dating of the entries in the Commonplace Book—on Machiavelli's Discorsi—to the same period in the early 1650s. This dating might be reconsidered, however, for it seems based on a random coincidence of what has survived. The present addition to the samples of Phillips's hand should help correct this perception, since he must have made these corrections after 1670, as the extant manuscript is designed to go with the published history. There are other samples of Phillips's hand, which often appears in making corrections and amendments. He made a couple of additions to Aubrey's manuscript
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“Life,” in which he wrote a passage on Milton’s return to England and on his and John Phillips’s subsequent tutelage, and he also added a note to a list of Milton’s works that he was his “chief amanuensis” next to Paradise Regained and Paradise Lost. Edward Phillips’s handwriting seems also to appear in a corrective capacity in a later manuscript of Paradise Lost designed to be the printer’s copy, which was copied by an unknown scribe whose own hand appears in the Commonplace Book. Phillips also makes a couple of entries along with a careful cross-referencing note in Milton’s Commonplace Book. As Ann Coiro also suggests in this volume, Edward and John were deeply invested in their uncle’s intellectual endeavors. Phillips writes of the composition process of Paradise Lost, which he claims to have “had the perusal of... from the very beginning,” that he would come by to visit Milton, and Milton would have dictated a “Parcel of Ten, Twenty, or Thirty Verses at a Time, which beingWritten by whatever hand came next, might possibly want Correction as to the Orthography and Pointing.” Phillips seems to be following a similar pattern—correcting some of the spelling of the scribe, possibly adding some pointing, and, in this case, adding missing words from the copied text.

But whether Phillips was involved in canceling Miltonic passages—or perhaps non-Miltonic passages—is the question that confronts readers on the
Church-men most of whom they saw not to have preach'd their own bellies, rather than the gospel, many illiterate persecutors more then lovers of the truth; covetous, worldly, to whom godliness with contentment seems great gain, but godliness with contentment had great contentment, like in many things whereof they had accused their predecessors, [but] all were not such; [where] all were [such] as were not, many yet living can witness, and the things them'selves manifest that the more active part of them [such] were looking on all these the people, which had bin kept warm awhile by the affected zeal of th' pulpit, after a false heat became more cold, & obdurate then before; some turning to lewdness[,] some to flat atheism, put beside their old religion, & foully scandals'd in what they expected should be new.

While a few of the words in this textual crux possibly remain undecipherable, some clearly legible phrases deserve consideration. Unless a few undecipherable words manage to alter the context of the phrase about how “many yet Living can witness” and somehow cause them to apply to another event than the history reported here, the statement could not have been written within only a few years of the events recounted (that is, ca. 1643–48). It is also unlikely that they were written by a “yet living” man of forty, as Milton was in 1648. The lines may have been written ten years after the events, but still more likely in the same period that the manuscript itself was transcribed, sometime after 1670. This is the voice of someone calling on the witness of others who were there—probably of someone who had outlived many of those “living” at the time, such as Milton. Although Austin Woolrych might have used this passage in his argument that Milton in fact wrote the “Digression” in 1660, this cannot be the case because it suggests that Milton was indeed looking back from a distance. First, the orthography is so close to Milton’s own that it indicates that it could not have been written during his blindness (after 1652). Second, a fresh indictment of the problems of 1643–45 (with no mention of the many shifts in government after that) would have little relevance in the pressing context of 1659–60. The words are much more likely to have been added in a revision process.

Here the realm of possibility opens wider, but it is worth working through the different possibilities not only to ascertain what is not the case, but also in the hope that more evidence might surface that would determine the identity of the scribe, or the full sense of the deleted passage. If Milton sought to call upon the “witness” of those “still living,” he would have been involved in preserving and slightly revising the “Digression” into a semi-independent text, rather than merely allowing the unused passage from the manuscript of the History of Britain to fall into the hands of others who would take it upon themselves to create this digression at a later date. The canceled lines further suggest that the manuscript was produced shortly after the publication of the History to be circulated, as Shakespeare’s sonnets were, to his “private friends” in manuscript. But why were these words canceled, and by whom?

It seems likely that Phillips would have made the correction, since he was involved in correcting the other passages. If he were following the same pattern of correction as in other instances, he would be correcting here—if it is still Phillips—with the intention of maintaining the authenticity of the Miltonic text. If he were concerned with authenticity, it may have been because the “yet living” passage was not original to the piece, or because it may have been the interpolation of another scribe. Possibly, Phillips sought not to offend those “yet living.” He may have been simply trimming his
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Philips's writing agent in providing the manuscript to be published. Yet it is extremely hard to believe that he would not have heard of the pirated publication of the "Digression" in the thirteen years prior to his account. Someone who had such an investment in his uncle's intellectual property would have been keen to hear of any use of it. This omission may thus reflect a disapproval of unauthorized use. He would have known, among other things, that the excursus was not about 1641.

Yet more puzzling is Phillips's careful account of "passages" that were excerpted from the history that seem to not refer to the "Digression," but to something else. Phillips records in his biography, which appeared with Letters of State (1694), that in 1670 Milton "enstit and publish his History of our Nation till the Conquest, all compleat so far as he went, some Passages only excepted, which, being thought too sharp against the Clergy, could not pass the Hands of the Licencier, were in the Hands of the late Earl of Anglesey while he liv'd; where at present is uncertain."" Could Phillips be referring to the "Digression" here? It has been generally thought that Milton removed the "Digression" from the text himself, not the licensor, and for structural, aesthetic, and logical reasons rather than political fear: a sharp criticism of the Presbyterians and Parliament in 1649 would no longer be relevant to the general reader in 1670. If at any rate, this description does not fit the "Digression," which is a discrete passage, rather than passages, and it is not about the clergy, especially not of the English church, as is suggested, but mostly about the impotency of the English people. Phillips goes on to refer to these excised passages as "papers": "The said Earl of Anglesey whom he had presented with a Copy of the unicens'd Papers of his History, came often here to visit him, as very much coveting his society and converse; as likewise others of the Nobility, and many persons of eminent quality[,]" (76). Given that Character of the Long Parliament was published at this point, if this were the "Digression," Phillips's words seem all the more oblique: most of the said passages were published, or released, as it were, from the licensor. Further, Phillips would have surely had a copy of the "Digression" himself, or he would have registered its loss more accurately, given that he had had an intimate knowledge of it. He must not be referring to the "Digression" here—but why does he not mention it, and instead go to the trouble of mentioning unlicensed passages? Could such disembodied passages on the clergy really have amounted to enough to create a presentation copy (of sorts) for an earl? Perhaps he means that the Earl of Anglesey had an entire manuscript copy of the History of Britain, including the excised passages. Whatever Phillips is up to here, it is clear that he is hiding information, preserving a private Milton from public view.

John Toland, who wrote a more detailed account shortly after Phillips's
in 1699, nonetheless had different qualifications: he did not know Milton personally, as he was born in 1670, the year the History of Britain appeared. Phillips, on the other hand, was forty in 1670. Either Toland had a different source or was simply embellishing Phillips’s history, and perhaps adding distortion to distortion:

In the year [16]70 also came abroad his History of Britain, whereof we had occasion to speak before. He deduced it only to the Norman Conquest, and yet we have it not as it came out of his hands; for the licensers, those sworn Officers to destroy Learning, Liberty and good sense, expung’d several passages of it wherein he expos’d the Superstition, Pride, and Cunnin of the Popish Monks in the Saxon Times, but apply’d by the sagacious licensers to Charles the Second’s Bishops... but not to digress [pun intended?] too far, our Author bestow’d a Copy of the unlicens’d Papers of his History on the Earl of Anglesey, his constant Visitor.25

Yet we need more evidence than the tantalizing “but not to digress too far” to suggest that Toland had any access to a source of information more detailed or credible than Phillips. Until such evidence appears, this passage can only be regarded with suspicion as a spurious embellishment and potential red herring.

I conclude, therefore, with a call to arms of a pacific, scholarly sort, for I suspect that some of the evidence required to fill in the gaps of this story remains unexamined in an archive such as the Public Record Office, the Bodleian, or a small private collection. The outstanding work conducted by the team of researchers who unearthed new evidence pertaining to the provenance of the De Doctrina Christiana provides an exemplary model of how archival work can be done collaboratively and collectively. This recently conducted archival project also proves that information vital to understanding Milton’s work—perhaps in the paper remains of the Earl of Anglesey, Lord Preston, Brome, L’Estrange, Skinner, or Edward Phillips—remains hidden only because it has not yet been sifted.
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Notes

1. Late 1648 as the moment of composition has been argued in Barbara Lewalski, The Life of Milton: A Critical Biography (Oxford, 2006), 213–16, and will be the subject of a forthcoming study of mine. One compelling piece of evidence is in a contemporary dating by Samuel Hartlib, G. H. Turnbull, Hartlib, Dury and Comenius: Clearings from Hartlib’s Papers (London, 1947), who writes in his diary in 1648 that “Milton is not only writing a Univ. History of Engl. but also an Epitome of all Purchas Volumes” (40). But for different views, see Austin Woolrych, “The Date of the Digression in Milton’s History of Britain,” in For Veronica Wedgwood These: Studies in
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6. Published with Letters of State Written by Mr. John Milton... to Which Is Added an Account of His Life (London, 1694), xlvii.

7. See WP 5:1406. This information derives from a letter from William Jackson, librarian at Harvard, to French Fogle; there is no record of this at Harvard; see also Peter Beal, Index of English Literary Manuscripts, vol. 2 (London, 1993), pt. 2, p. 99.


11. Ibid., 73.


16. This point is made by von Maltzahn, “Dating the Digression,” 949.

17. Maurice Kelley, “Milton and Machiavelli’s Discorsi,” Studies in Bibliography 4 (1951–52): 215–27. This is the letter to Hermann Mylius, which is numbered in WP 5:2 as 18, pp. 847–48, and is kept in the Niederschlesische Staatsarchiv at Oldenburg under the pressmark Beul. 20 (Grafschaft Oldenburg), Tt. 38, No. 73, Fasc. 5, no. 8. See also Beal, Index of English Literary Manuscripts, 2:27–73.

18. This is the Bodleian MS Aubrey 8, f. 68, which is partially reproduced in Darbishire, Early Lives, 12; see also 9. See also Kelley, “Milton and Machiavelli’s Discorsi,” plate 2. For another sample of his writing, see Samuel Leigh Sotheby, Readings in the Elucidation of the Autograph of Milton (London, 1861), plate 24, opposite p. 190.

Photographic Facsimile, 4 vols. (Urbana, 1945), 4:31–99. The corrections to this carefully produced manuscript are very slight by comparison with the manuscript of the “Digression.”

20. There are a few indications that he took matters into his own hands here. In one instance in the Commonplace Book, for example, he supplies a detailed marginal cross-reference to a missing notebook of Milton's in Latin, “See the Theological Index, Of Not Forcing Religion” (YP 1:477), the only cross-reference made by one of the seven non-Miltonic hands in the Commonplace Book, and also the only one of the twelve cross-references that actually names the index; the others merely point to topics and to “another index.” The cross-reference suggests a self-motivated student of Milton's who knew both notebooks well enough to draw connections between topics. See YP 1:F541 for a list. See Parker, Milton, 2:80,416. John Shawcross, Arms of the Family: The Significance of John Milton's Relatives and Associates (Lexington, Ky., 2004), 73, states that “Edward frequently aided his uncle in the recording, correction, and publication of his work,” which rightly applies to a wide period of connection.


22. It is possible that these canceled words never close the period, and that the capital L in “Looking on all those people” is one of a few examples of a stylistic tic this scribe uses to represent lower-case l's as uppercase (as in “Living,” which follows).


