

15. Horace, Ode 1.34, in *Odes I: Text, Translation and Commentary*, trans. David West (Oxford, 1995), 161–63.
16. Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, trans. W. H. D. Rouse (London, 1931), 472–73, 461–63.
17. Seamus Heaney, *Anything Can Happen: A Poem and Essay* (Dublin, 2004), 15.
18. Terry Eagleton, *Holy Terror* (Oxford, 2005), 50.
19. Patterson, *Early Modern Liberalism*; Gordon Teskey, *Delirious Milton* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006), 8.
20. John Carey, “A Work in Praise of Terrorism? September 11 and *Samson Agonistes*,” *TLS*, September 6, 2002; Feisal G. Mohamed, “Confronting Religious Violence: Milton’s *Samson Agonistes*,” *PMLA* 120, no. 2 (2005): 327–40; Paul Stevens, “Intolerance and the Virtues of Sacred Vehemence,” in *Milton and Toleration*, ed. Sharon Achinstein and Elizabeth Sauer (Oxford, 2007), 243–67; Neil Forsyth, “Suicidal Revenge and Milton,” *The Literary Magazine* 1, no. 1 (2005); available at <http://www.litencyc.com/theliterarymagazine/milton.php> (accessed April 23, 2007); Balachandra Rajan, “Samson Hath Quit Himself / Like Samson,” *MQ* 41, no. 1 (2007): 1–11; and essays by Joseph Wittreich, David Loewenstein, and Michael Lieb, in *Milton in the Age of Fish: Essays on Authorship, Text, and Terrorism*, ed. Michael Lieb and Albert C. Labriola (Pittsburgh, 2006).
21. See *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge, 2006); and Gordon Teskey, “Samson and the Heap of the Dead,” *Delirious Milton*, 197–99.
22. Linda Charnes, “Shakespeare, and Belief, in the Future,” in Grady and Hawkes, *Presentist Shakespeares*, 65; Ewan Fernie, “The Last Act: Presentism, Spirituality and the Politics of *Hamlet*,” in *Spiritual Shakespeares*, ed. Ewan Fernie (London, 2005), 187.
23. On presentism, see Robin Headlam Wells, “Historicism and ‘Presentism’ in Early Modern Studies,” *Cambridge Quarterly* 29, no. 1 (2000): 37–60; Grady and Hawkes, *Presentist Shakespeares*; Ewan Fernie, “Shakespeare and the Prospect of Presentism,” *Shakespeare Survey* 58 (2005): 169–84 (hereafter cited as “Presentism” in the text); Mark David Rasmussen, ed., *Renaissance Literature and Its Formal Engagements* (London, 2002); Marshall Grossman, ed., *Reading Renaissance Ethics* (London, 2007).
24. Hugh Grady, “*Hamlet* and the Present,” in Grady and Hawkes, *Presentist Shakespeares*, 161.
25. Linda Charnes, *Hamlet’s Heirs: Shakespeare and the Politics of a New Millennium*, cited in Grady and Hawkes, *Presentist Shakespeares*, 67, 77.
26. Stanley Fish, preface to *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in “Paradise Lost,”* 2nd ed. (Cambridge, Mass., 1997), lx, lxi, lviii.
27. Grady, “*Hamlet* and the Present,” 142; see also Hugh Grady, *Shakespeare, Machiavelli and Montaigne: Power and Subjectivity from Richard II to Hamlet* (Oxford, 2002), 83–84.
28. Among other works, see J. G. A. Pocock, “The Concept of a Language and the *Métier d’Historian*: Some Considerations on Practice,” in *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe*, ed. Anthony Pagden (Cambridge, 1990), 19–40; and Quentin Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas,” *History and Theory* 8 (1969): 3–53.
29. Geoffrey Galt Harpham, *The Character of Criticism* (London, 2006), 157.

MILTON & SONS: THE FAMILY BUSINESS

Ann Baynes Coiro

MILTON WROTE WORK TO BE sold in the midcentury and Restoration marketplace of books, although we rarely think of him in this mundane context. The two men he raised and educated, his orphaned nephews, Edward and John Phillips, were also writers, and between them they produced a staggering number of books. The reading and writing habits of these three men, their body of knowledge, their literary tastes, and sometimes even their writing itself are intertwined. This essay is a preliminary attempt to reconsider Milton’s domestic and public life in the context of the busy print marketplace of the 1650s, 1660s, and 1670s. It deploys many forms of historicism—history of reading, history of the book, literary history, and biography—in order to consider ideas of authorship rather different from the Virgilian template that usually shapes our thinking about Milton and his writing life.

Biographical and psychoanalytic criticism have, to some extent, analyzed Milton’s writing in the context of his father’s business dealings as a scrivener and work as a composer.¹ Milton certainly alludes to the obligation he felt toward his father: *Ad Patrem* tries to address and forestall both his monetary and his genetic debt to his father, and the figure of the profitable scrivener can be seen to shadow Manoa, the broker for Samson’s life with the Philistines. For us to see Milton only as a son, however, is to forget a long and changing life that in *all* of its psychic tragedies and comedies shaped Milton’s writing.

Considerations of the family context of the second half of Milton’s life normally make the time-honored turn to his marriages (he married his first wife, Mary Powell, in 1642; his second wife, Katherine Woodstock, in 1656; and his third, Elizabeth Minshull, in 1663) and his later relations with his daughters. But the complex and well-documented relationship among Milton and Edward and John Phillips, the two orphaned nephews he raised and educated, has been little explored.² Yet Milton’s *Of Education* (1644), the collaborative *Angli responsio* (1651), *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes* are inflected—sometimes profoundly so—by the daily reliances, humiliations, and relational ties of Milton as the father figure in a family of writers. By the 1640s and 1650s Milton was a family patriarch and a

major actor in the petty and profound family drama in which we all must play a part when we are no longer the son (or daughter) and young rebel, but—often to our utter astonishment and perhaps against our will—the representative of the sometimes cherished, sometimes resented, and sometimes simply laughable older generation. Edward and John Phillips are Milton's next generation; they lived with him, loved him, worked for him, and spent their lives defined by him. For us to ignore his nephews wrongly insulates Milton from the popular literary currents of his lifetime and deprives us of a sense of two of Milton's most intriguing contemporary readers, readers who were the product of Milton's own educational theories. Milton lost wives and children, but these men lived on, to write his words down for him, to defend him, to mock him gently, perhaps to betray him, and yet still to be his tribe, scrivener's progeny, and scribblers.

I

John Milton the poet had one son, also named John, born in 1651 when Milton was forty-two years old, and dead by his fifteen-month birthday. In important emotional and legal terms, however, Milton had two other sons who lived with him to adulthood and survived him. Milton's sister, Anne, and her first husband, Edward Phillips, had at least three children: a daughter who died as an infant and about whose death Milton wrote "Of a Fair Infant Dying of a Cough"; Edward Phillips, born in 1630; and John Phillips, born in 1631.³ Anne's husband died soon after the birth of his first son and namesake and before the birth of his second. John Milton was named godfather of the fatherless boy John. When the children were three and two, Anne Milton Phillips remarried and had two daughters; she died either before or at about the time Milton returned from Italy in 1639. The little boy, John, was sent to live with his uncle as soon as he had found lodgings. John's older brother, Edward, spent every day with Milton for a few months until Milton moved to a larger house on Aldersgate Street, whereupon Edward too came to live with Milton.⁴ So by 1640 Milton had two orphaned nephews and wards living with him, a nine-year-old and a ten-year-old. Both boys then grew to adulthood with John Milton not only as their guardian but also as their teacher. And in his *Life of Milton*, Edward points out that Milton regarded his teaching as private and familial: Milton "only was willing to impart his Learning and Knowledge to Relations, and the Sons of some Gentlemen that were his intimate Friends."⁵ Edward Phillips later went off to Oxford for a brief period, but Milton kept John home and provided his entire education.⁶

Edward Phillips is a familiar figure in Milton footnotes since he wrote an invaluable biography of Milton and was a key source for John Aubrey and

Anthony Wood's biographies. Because Edward Phillips was a professional writer and a teacher, his life echoed his uncle's, if in a much lower key. Any public demonstration of his sociopolitical position, however, makes clear he was not of his uncle's party, but a royalist.⁷ That his views differed from his uncle's did not block their continuing close relationship. Regarded by critics and biographers as relatively innocuous, the older boy has been rewarded by achieving a small degree of decorous fame, if little respect.

John Phillips, on the other hand, has been roundly condemned by generations of Miltonists as a miscreant, a ne'er-do-well, a family disgrace, and an opportunist.⁸ William Godwin set up what has become an abiding good boy/bad boy dialectic in his 1815 *Lives of Edward and John Phillips, Nephews and Pupils of John Milton*. Like Charles Lamb's Romantic revulsion at seeing Milton's imperfect humanity in the cross-outs and second thoughts in the Trinity manuscript, Godwin's criticism of John Phillips is surely fueled in part by his disappointment that Milton was, after all, fallible, and that his stirring plans for liberty were not always successful.⁹ For by the standards both of Milton's aspirations for England's future and of the high ideals readers of Milton have found in his work, the Phillips brothers are a disappointment and John the more so because, as a clever and sometimes brilliant writer, he demonstrated greater potential. Milton's godson and namesake may have tried to rebel in ways pointed enough to distinguish himself from his uncle, but his life has such strong resonances of his uncle's career and training that he seems as much Milton's alter ego as his rebellious son.

Milton's investment in these boys began, in a way, before they were born. When his sister's first baby died, Milton wrote "On the Death of a Fair Infant Dying of a Cough" to offer her solace. The poem's final gesture is a reassurance that if Anne Phillips forgoes grieving and instead thinks "what a present thou to God hast sent, / And render him with patience what he lent," then "This if thou do he will an offspring give, / That till the world's last end shall make thy name to live."¹⁰ Milton's final lines offer the kind of conventional trade-off that Ben Jonson offers Charles and Henrietta Maria in 1629 when their first child died at birth: "Hee can, he will, and with large int'rest pay, / What (at his liking) he will take away."¹¹ But whereas Jonson is writing a public poem for people whose sensibilities he never quite seems able to capture, Milton has the poetic advantage of writing for his own family, people he could count on to be familiar with the lines' biblical intertext—Isaiah's promise that those without children will have "a name better than sons or daughters: I will give them an everlasting name that will not be cut off."¹² Even if we may find "Fair Infant" an inept mishmash both poetically and emotionally, the teenage author's family may well have been touched by the effort and its biblical reassurance.

But Anne Phillips does have more children and they live on, so that the poem's promises of greatness and enduring fame come to mantle those sons. When Milton published his *Poems* in 1645, Edward was fifteen and John fourteen. Milton does not include "Fair Infant" with its almost messianic praise for Anne's future (now real) children in his *Poems*, perhaps because it may have seemed too much of a burden to place on his wards—and on his own abilities as guardian and teacher. Adding additional pressures and expectations, the year before he published his *Poems* Milton published *Of Education*, his bold and detailed plan for the revamping of the nation through education. Milton tells Samuel Hartlib that these are ideas he had thought through in theory, a "voluntary *Idea*, which hath long in silence presented it self to me, of a better Education, in extent and comprehension farre more large, and yet of time farre shorter, and of attainment farre more certain, then hath been yet in practice."¹³ But actually, for three or four years Milton had already been practicing his teaching techniques on his nephews. In *Of Education*, Milton imagined a "spacious house and ground about it fit for an *Academy*, and big enough to lodge a hundred and fifty persons" (YP 2:379). Instead, living together with Milton (and, on and off, his new wife) in a London house, the Phillips brothers were the experimental subjects for Milton's course of study designed for boys from twelve to twenty-one (joined at some point by Cyriack Skinner, himself a posthumous son, and perhaps a few other students).¹⁴ Milton aimed to produce "able writers and composers in every excellent matter . . . fraught with an universal insight into things" (YP 2:406). He led (and sometimes beat) them through his curriculum, and both Edward and John did achieve a great deal of the incredible range and proficiency Milton aimed to inculcate.¹⁵ Their mastery of modern languages was extraordinary, and the number of subjects about which they wrote, edited, and translated is impressive. Caught in the literary historical interstices between the heuristic categories of humanism and the public sphere, the Phillipses are usually called, in derision, hack writers. This epithet obscures the fact that they were neither ignorant nor dull. They were professional writers before professional writers held a recognizable niche.¹⁶ In other words, the careers of Edward and John Phillips combine writing and money; the tools of their trade were the classical education given them by John Milton.

But neither great humanist learning and facility with languages nor a hands-on knowledge of the world were Milton's ultimate goal as a teacher.¹⁷ He prefaces his tract with his patriotic belief that the reformation of education is "one of the greatest and noblest designes that can be thought on, and for the want whereof this nation perishes" (YP 2:363). His ideal pupils will study politics "to know the beginning, end, and reasons of politicall societies; that they may not in a dangerous fit of the commonwealth be such poor,

shaken, uncertain reeds, of such a tottering conscience, as many of our great counsellors have lately shewn themselves, but stedfast pillars of the State" (YP 2:398). Somehow knowing enough and knowing it deeply will make his students visionary republicans. Moreover, the proper teacher will "lead and draw them in willing obedience, inflam'd with the study of learning, and the admiration of virtue; stirr'd up with high hopes of living to be brave men, and worthy patriots, dear to God, and famous to all ages" (YP 2:384–85). The same promise Milton made his sister when he was seventeen he makes to himself and to his boys in the first flush of his teaching idealism. Yet neither Edward nor John became, by anyone's standards, "steadfast pillars of the state" or "famous to all ages."

The disappointment of subsequent generations cannot exceed the disappointment and anxiety these two chosen sons must have felt at their failure to live up to what is, after all, an impossibly high goal. In his *Life*, Edward Phillips speaks at length about the years he and his brother lived with Milton. That the conclusion of the years of their schooling coincided with his uncle's blindness increases his shame and defensiveness. Edward believes that they, the boys, taught Milton in a way as well—"by teaching he in some measure increased his own knowledge, having the reading of all these Authors as it were by Proxy" (*Early Lives*, 60). With some bravado and a lingering trace of childhood narcissism, Edward Phillips wonders if John Milton had devoted himself solely to his students and the benefits that teaching brought to the teacher, then perhaps he might not have gone blind: "and all this might possibly have conduced to the preserving of his Eye-sight, had he not, moreover, been perpetually busied in his own Laborious Undertakings of the Book or Pen" (*Early Lives*, 60).

Edward Phillips, who would become one of the guardians of Milton's memory after he died, appears to have been acutely aware of the commentary insinuated by the 1673 second edition of Milton's *Poems*. Among the several poems Milton added to the revised volume is "Fair Infant." Milton then appended *Of Education* to the book, which functions as a testimony and commentary on the accomplished poetry that precedes it. Edward Phillips did not miss the irony. In 1694, when Edward added his *Life of Mr John Milton* to his translation of Milton's *Letters of State*, he pauses to discuss in detail his and his brother's education. But Edward Phillips abruptly ends his digression with a painfully honest admission of their failures:

Now persons so far Manuctucted into the highest paths of Literature both Divine and Human, had they received his documents with the same Acuteness of Wit and Apprehension, the same Industry, Alacrity, and Thirst after Knowledge, as the Instructor was indued with, what Prodigies of Wit and Learning might they have proved! The

Scholars might in some degree have come near to the equalling of the Master, or at least have in some sort made good what he seems to predict in the close of an Elegy he made in the Seventeenth Year of his Age, upon the Death of one of his Sister's Children (a Daughter), who died in her Infancy:

Then thou, the Mother of so sweet a Child,
Her false Imagin'd Loss cease to Lament,
And Wisely learn to curb thy Sorrows Wild;
This if thou do, he will an Offspring give,
That to the Worlds last end shall make thy Name to live.
(*Early Lives*, 61–62)

As Edward sadly implies, the Phillips name does not live in fame. Nor did the scholars come close to equaling the master. Yet while the anxiety of influence is palpable and debilitating in the nephews' work, the influence itself is undeniable—both in their wit and learning and in the careful path they negotiated between identifying with and escaping their towering and controversial uncle.

There is also feedback from the Phillips brothers' work audible in Milton's late poetry. His students lurk behind Milton's worried, even negative portrayals of education—Raphael's education of Adam that fuels rather than prevents the Fall, Michael's impatient, almost harsh lessons, and the Son's absolute and shocking rejection of humanist education in *Paradise Regained*. More particularly, the hint of burlesque in the war in heaven and the hint of satire in the portrayal of Samson's backbiting and pedestrian fellow tribesmen suggest Milton's family and his personal and professional relationship with them.

II

The Phillips brothers were skilled collaborators. Although Edward was accused at one point of lifting other people's work and calling it his own, in the main each worked with other writers in ways that we now think of as normative—as translators, editors, and compilers of anthologies. For this work, which is basically an earlier version of our own academic work, Edward and John Phillips have been dismissed, even reviled, as second-rate hacks. Our nervousness about the Phillipses' careers can only be increased by the fact that a considerable part of their collaborative work was with John Milton.

We do not normally think of Milton as a collaborative writer.¹⁸ Yet, to begin with, his great poems and much of his polemical prose were written when he was blind; he could not write without collaborative help at the most basic and mechanical level. The narrator of *Paradise Lost* dramatizes his

lonely writing: "In darkness, and with dangers compass round, / And solitude" (7.27–28). The narrator's claim that he is "yet not alone" (7.28) because Urania visits his slumbers is mysterious and evocative. But if amanuenses did not show up in the morning, if the busy, populous day did not bring family and friends, the poem would remain a dream. Most obviously, then, the Phillips brothers were crucial collaborators with Milton since they served as his amanuenses after he went blind.¹⁹ Holding the pen for a poet, seeing what he cannot, is a strange relationship under any circumstances, and especially in this instance when the copyists had been trained to read, write, and think by the poet.²⁰ Edward's curious comment about the amplification of Milton's learning through teaching them—"having the reading of all these Authors as it were by Proxy" (*Early Lives*, 60)—could extend in reverse to their scribal functions, "Authors" themselves "by Proxy."

The nephews' collaborations with their uncle extended beyond writing down his words. Edward translated Milton's letters of state from the Latin and edited them for publication, prefacing the documents with the authoritative biography that has been important ever since in shaping Milton's historical persona.²¹ Both Phillips brothers traded as well on their incomparable education, each working as teachers or tutors at various points in his life. John Evelyn employed Edward Phillips in 1663 as a tutor for his son, for example, assured that Phillips "was not at all infected by his uncle's principles, tho' brought up by him."²² Evelyn describes him in his diary as "a sober, silent, and most harmless person, a little versatile in his studies, understanding many languages, especially the modern," and Edward continued to make a steady supplementary living as a writer using his modern language skills for translations. But a classical education by an uncle who also happened to be the secretary of foreign tongues and a brilliant, if fiercely polemical, author of modern Latin was not a commodity to be neglected, either. Edward Phillips spent most of his career channeling his learning to the popular reader (and making money in the process). In 1682, for example, Phillips published *Tractatus de modo et ratione formandi voces derivativas linguae Latinae* and republished an English version in 1685. His little treatise is meant to be an aid to those who have already bought a dictionary and learned Latin words, but not the language: "He that hath Treasured up in his Memory a competent stock of Words, will be the more easily induc'd to take pains to inform himself of what ever may conduce to the Application of them, as any one will sooner ingage himself in the Concernments of a familiar and known Person, than of a Stranger."²³ Like much of his work, this handy book is a teaching tool, aimed at far more ordinary people than Milton imagined as students in *Of Education* but with the same basic goal of "bring[ing] the whole language quickly into their power" (YP 2:374).

According to Anthony Wood, Edward Phillips was in possession of Milton's Latin thesaurus after his death, and Edward recounts in familiar detail how Milton dictated it to his amanuenses on and off for years after he went blind.²⁴ Its fate remains a mystery, but Edward Phillips's description of the state of the project sounds as if he had the manuscript: "the Papers after his death were so discomposed and deficient, that it could not be made fit for the Press; However, what there was of it, was made use of for another Dictionary" (*Early Lives*, 72). Wood claimed that Edward Phillips published versions of it as his own in 1684, a decade after Milton's death. He describes two octavo volumes, *Enchiridion linguae Latinae; or, A Commendious Latin Dictionary* and *Speculum linguae Latinae; or, A Succinct and New Method*, which "were all or mostly taken from the *Latin Thesaurus* writ by Joh. Milton."²⁵ Neither the manuscript nor the published books survive—all we have is the shadowy association.

Edward Phillips was a collaborative or secondary author on other books as well, but often still in the orbit of his uncle or his reflected glory. He first contributed (as did his brother) a complimentary poem to the 1653 volume of *Ayres* by Henry Lawes, Milton's longstanding friend and associate and the boys' music teacher. Milton's sonnet "To Mr H Lawes" was probably intended for the same volume. On June 11, 1655, Edward Phillips presented the Bodleian with copies of *Eikonoklastes* and the second edition of *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* on behalf of his uncle; on the same day, Phillips presented the Bodleian with copies of his own translations of two Spanish romances by Juan Pérez de Montalván, *The Illustrious Shepherdess* and *The Imperious Brother*, each effusively dedicated to a daughter of the Countess of Derby, the royalist heroine.²⁶ He edited the posthumous publication of William Drummond of Hawthornden's poetry in 1656, where he praises Drummond in terms he borrowed from Milton's "On Shakespeare":

Fame courts his Verse, and with immortall wings
Hovers about his Monument, and brings
A deathlesse trophy to his memory;
Who, for such honour, would not wish to dye? (A₁v)

The connections (and the contrast) between Milton and Edward Phillips are clear, too, in their history writing. Edward Phillips aided Milton as an amanuensis in writing the *History of Britain*, as he had with his Latin thesaurus. But Edward also compiled and continued others' histories.²⁷ He published updated editions of Sir Richard Baker's *The Chronicles of the Kings of England*, in 1660 adding a continuation from 1650 to 1658 that has a strongly royalist skew. In 1662, he released a new update, this time using the private papers of General Monk to describe the arrival and inauguration of Charles II, papers

given to him by Monk's brother-in-law for this purpose. Milton admired Monk, but he was also profoundly disappointed that he was instrumental in bringing back Charles II. That Milton's nephew and amanuensis, the man who would be entrusted with many of Milton's papers after his death, was the trusted repository and mouthpiece for General Monk demonstrates how complicated were the cultural and familial politics of that moment. Brought up as an example, trained as a mirror of his uncle's ideals, committed early to transcribing, editing, and cataloguing, Edward Phillips becomes an important secondary figure, a supplement, an editor, a translator—a writer living in the shadow of other writers.

Plagiarism is the unsavory side of living in the shadow of another writer, and Edward Phillips has that on his collaborative record as well. In 1658, Edward published the first edition of *A New World of Words*, a dictionary that had a number of subsequent editions. Phillips lifted some of his definitions from a dictionary compiled by Thomas Blount in 1656. Blount's *Glossographia*, published by Humphrey Moseley, was a no-nonsense contribution to the busy midcentury market for self-help books aimed at the emerging middle class.²⁸ Blount eschewed "Poetical Stories" in his definitions "since they are not necessary to be understood by the Generality" he addresses—"the more-knowing Women, and less-knowing Men" (A₃v, A₅v). Much like a seventeenth-century SAT review book, *Glossographia* means to teach people root words, prefixes, and suffixes so that even if they do not know Greek or Latin they "may, with a little pains, and the help of this Book, know the meaning of the greatest part of such words as we now use in English, and are derived from either of those Languages" (A₅v). Edward Phillips jumped on Blount's rather labored and awkward endeavor and added some class.²⁹ In his prefatory address, "To the Most Illustrious and Impartial Sisters, the Two Universities," he claims to have "illustrated and refined" English, and "instated it in its proper majesty, rendered it admirably useful for all persons on all occasions, worthy of the greatest masteries of Rhetoricians and the tongues of our Vernaculous Oratours" (A₄v). His dictionary would be a kind of university education for everyone, in other words. He cheerfully admitted he had borrowed wholesale from others, including Blount, on the grounds that such an ambitious undertaking would have to be a joint task.³⁰ Phillips makes his collaborative endeavor a patriotic contribution, offering "the quintessence of what ever was offer'd at before, in another cast and better method, that it might be a complete work, and not wanting in any thing that could be desired in a designe so usefull to the Nation" ("Preface," C₂r). Like his uncle, Edward Phillips aimed to use education to supply his nation's needs.

Blount said nothing about Phillips's borrowings for fifteen years, and then he published *A World of Errors discovered in The New World of Words*

where he protested bitterly: "Must this then be suffered? A Gentleman for his divertisement writes a Book, and this Book happens to be acceptable to the World, and sell; a Book-seller, nor interested in the Copy, instantly employs some Mercenary to jumble up another like Book out of this, with some Alterations and Additions, and give it a new Title; and the first Author's undone, and his Publisher half undone."³¹ Blount's outrage is an indication of the inchoate and lucrative war over intellectual property being waged in a society that had left behind the humanist ethos of borrowing and was moving, contentiously, to texts for sale. Blount's *Glossographia* was likely being out-sold by Phillips's enlarged dictionary with its university glamour and social ambitions, and so he belatedly retaliated. Blount complains about Phillips's branding, his "pompous Frontispiece, wherein are sculpted our two famous Universities . . . with a Scholar of each University in his Formalities" (A2r). An indication of how formulaic aristocratic language had become is Blount's derision of Phillips for fiddling with his own preface just enough "to make it pass as the Authors legitimate off-spring" (A2r). That is exactly the phrase Henry Lawes had used to describe the anonymous publication of Milton's *Maske* in 1637.³² This replicated phrase is a snapshot of a linguistic and cultural shift in the seventeenth century as aristocratic language moved from the restricted, more private realm of manuscript and limited publication to mass-marketed style, codified language copied. By the late 1650s, then, Edward Phillips was out in this marketplace making a living by writing and doing so in a way that punned elliptically on his scrivener grandfather and his own work for his uncle—copying.

III

Because subsequent interest in Edward Phillips has been focused on getting at an understanding of John Milton, his literary criticism has been mined for Miltonic insights, particularly his *Theatrum poetarum* (1675). Phillips's literary encyclopedia is a significant work of English literary criticism, meant, like much of his work, to teach the reading public. It was licensed for publication the same month Milton died. Since its introduction and some of the entries echo Milton, scholars have turned to *Theatrum poetarum* for clues to Milton's literary taste (careless or insensitive entries are ignored). Critics have, in other words, long assumed a one-way collaboration between Milton and Edward Phillips, and *Theatrum poetarum* does sound distinctly like it was written by a pupil of Milton. The preface, for example, argues at length that rhyme is not a necessary component of great poetry in words that closely echo (and point to) Milton's description of the verse of *Paradise Lost*:

there are other things of much greater consequence then the Verse; . . . the truth is the use of Measure alone without any Rime at all, would give far more ample Scope and liberty, both to Style and fancy then can possibly be observed in Rime; as evidently appears from an English Heroic Poem, which came forth not many years ago, and from the Style of Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and others of the Latins. (TP **4v)³³

Phillips's preface subscribes as well to a theory of tragedy very close to Milton's remarks in the brief essay "On That Sort of Dramatic Poem Which Is Call'd Tragedy" that prefaces *Samson Agonistes*:

I shall only leave it to consideration whether the use of the Chorus, and the observation of the ancient Law of Tragedy, particularly as to limitation of time, would not rather be reviving the pristine glory of the Tragical, advance then diminish the present, adding moreover this caution that the same Indecorums are to be avoided in Tragedy as have already been intimated in Heroic Poem, besides one incident in Tragedy alone, as namely that Linsie-woolsie intermixture of Comic mirth with Tragic seriousness, which being so frequently in use, no wonder if the name of Play be apply'd without distinction as well to Tragedy as Comedy; and for the Verse if it must need be Rime, I am clearly of the opinion that way of Versifying, which bears the name of Pindaric, and which hath no necessity of being divided into strophs or stanzas would be much more suitable for tragedy than the continued rhapsody of riming couplets, which whosoever shall mark it well, will find to appear too stiff and too much constraint for the liberty of conversation, and the interlocution of several persons. (TP **8r–**8v)

Phillips's theoretical principles are clearly close to his teacher and guardian (who had championed the use of the chorus in modern tragedy, had complained of "the poet's error of intermixing comic stuff with tragic sadness and gravity," and had argued for strophic stanzas in drama).³⁴ Edward Phillips is also a man of his generation, proposing a compromise between the polemical positions of rhyme and blank verse in plays.

In *Theatrum poetarum*, Edward Phillips aims to adjudicate and promote real literary accomplishment, as opposed to writing that may simply appeal to popular taste. Like his uncle, his principle of discrimination is decorum. In *Of Education*, Milton confidently predicted that a true education in poetry would teach "what the laws are of a true epic poem, what of a dramatic, what of a lyric, what decorum is, which is the grand masterpiece to observe. This would make [students] soon perceive what despicable creatures our common rhymers and play-writers be, and show them what religious, what glorious and magnificent use might be made of poetry, both in divine and human things" (YP 2:405–6). Although Phillips softens the rhetoric of "laws," his general sense accords with the lessons in *Of Education*. No modern writer better fits Phillips's sense of decorum than John Milton, which

backs Phillips into the kind of family politics that he will later have to negotiate in his *Life*.

Under the entry for Milton, Phillips suggests "how far he hath [in *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*] reviv'd the majesty and true *Decorum* of Heroic Poesy and Tragedy: it will better become a person less related then myself, to deliver his judgment" (TP 113–14). While Edward Phillips is coy about judging Milton in the entry explicitly devoted to him, he will, after all, overtly praise and judge his uncle in a way that identifies the complicated relationship of the Milton household. In the second entry following "John Milton," Phillips does more openly praise his uncle, but under his own surname:

John Philips, the Maternal Nephew and Disciple of a Author of most deserved Fame late deceas't, being the exactest of Heroic Poets, (if the truth were well examin'd, and it is the opinion of many both Learned and Judicious persons) either of the Ancients or Moderns, either of our own or what ever Nation else; from whose Education as he hath receiv'd a judicious command of style both in Prose and Verse, so from his own natural Ingenuity he hath his Vein of *Burlesque* and facetious Poetry. . . . nevertheless what he hath writ in a serious Vein of Poetry, whereof very little hath yet been made public, is in my opinion, nothing inferior to what he hath done in the other kind. (TP 114–15)

While John Milton's death is duly noted, the strain of mourning in the entry is for what his brother John could be if he chose to allow his serious writing to appear in public. Although John Phillips is the product of his education, beautifully trained in decorous style, he burlesques that style and hides that which is serious and beautiful. In this shrewd assessment by an intelligent critic and brother, Edward is as admiring of his brother John as he is of his uncle John, but he implies that his brother keeps his serious writing private, overshadowed by "the exactest of Heroic Poets." In his introductory remarks on literary history, Edward Phillips promises that his educational project in *Theatrum poetarum* is intended for anyone who reads his book. He postulates that education can reach all people and "raiseth beauty even out of deformity, order and regularity out of Chaos and confusion" (TP *3r). But there are some men of greater parts. Edward Phillips bemoans the loss of their memory and aims to do his best to recuperate the reputation of some of these overshadowed writers who would otherwise "sleep inglorious in the crowd of the forgotten vulgar" (TP *4r). In uncanny ways, Phillips anticipates by three-quarters of a century Thomas Gray's Miltonic "Elegy in a Country Churchyard":

Some village-Hampden, that with dauntless breast
The little Tyrant of his fields withstood;
Some mute inglorious Milton here may rest,
Some Cromwell guiltless of his country's blood.³⁵

His brother John Phillips does become, in a sense, a mute and inglorious version of their legal and literary father. But, in another sense, he gave a public voice to a side of Milton (his own "inglorious" side, perhaps) that was best known to those (like Edward) who knew him privately, a side otherwise mute to posterity.

For John Phillips's satirical side is not so much a rejection of Milton as an imitation. Anthony Wood ends his narrative of Milton's personal life by concluding that by all accounts Milton "was a person of wonderful parts, of a very sharp, biting and satirical wit" (*Early Lives*, 39). John Aubrey noted that Milton was "Extreme pleasant in his conversation, & at dinner, supper &c: but Satyricall" (*Early Lives*, 6). And, again, in Aubrey's notes directly following a passage in Edward Phillips's own hand describing his education and so probably a description from Edward himself, Aubrey points out that Milton was freest with both his criticism and his wit when dealing with his students: "As he was severe on one hand, so he was most familiar and free in his conversation to those to whome most severe in his way of education" (*Early Lives*, 12). It is understandable, therefore, that John Phillips's very close collaboration with John Milton is built on "his Vein of Burlesque and facetious poetry." John Phillips began his writing career in 1651, at the age of twenty or twenty-one, by writing a rollickingly satiric defense of his uncle against an anonymous attack on Milton's first *Defensio pro populo Anglicano* written by John Rowland and entitled *Pro Rege et Populo Anglicano apologia* (John Phillips thought Bishop Bramwell was its author). *Johannis Philippi Angli responsio ad apologiam anonymi cujuscumque tenebrionis pro Rege et Populo Anglicano Infantissimam* (*The Response of John Phillips Englishman, to the most Puerile "Apology for the King and People of England," by Some Anonymous Sneak*) is today an appendix in *Complete Prose of John Milton*.³⁶ Published under John Phillips's name and written using his strongly marked persona, nevertheless its authorship will probably be forever unclear because of the assumption that it is just too good to be the younger John's alone.

John Phillips was still living with his uncle when he wrote this vigorous defense. The speaker attacks the logic and character of his target, but becomes positively gleeful and triumphant in exposing his opponent's barbarous Latin. The success of the piece is predicated, therefore, on its author's own impeccable Latin. The Phillips persona taunts his adversary by saying John Milton could not be bothered to respond to such a doltish student. Instead, Phillips, "swayed not only by devotion to country but by love of that liberty recently restored to us" and also "bound by many ties of duty to that gentleman whom I have always honored and who is now attacked by this scurrilous fellow," takes up the task assigned by his teacher (YP 4:2.890–91). John Phillips emphasizes his youth and his excellence as a student of Latin

and sets out to "sharpen his pen on this blockhead" and display "the rudiments of my scarcely-matured capacities" (YP 4:2.891). Not only is the Latin impeccable, but *Responsio* vibrates with learned allusions, tossed off with graceful wit. Among the cleverest gibes of the piece are parodies of classical passages familiar to any well-educated student. He uses a passage from Virgil's *Eclogues*, for example, to mock "Bramwell" 's barbarous Latin, punning nicely on herds and errors:

But tell us, Bramwell, whence these herds [pecus] proceed?
Are they of genuine Latin breed?
No! This is only monkish stuff,
So countrified and awfully rough.³⁷

Plautus's plays, staples of schoolboy performances, also provide handy characterizations of Phillips's target, such as his version of an ignorant, voluble know-it-all:

There's nothing so crammed with conceit
And nothing so much of a cheat,
As this lick-spit denoted a leech
That knows nothing but devious speech,
And always has nothing but lying pretence
To hindsight and insight and foresight immense.³⁸

All this serves to humiliate the enemy. Milton's star student taunts his adversary: "Were you ever really a student at an academy? Why your childish blunders (close to illiteracy) would shame any country elementary school."³⁹ John Phillips, on the other hand, is obviously pleased with his own flawless and dazzling performance. He ends *Responsio* with himself and his nascent career: "This there is, which—if not to others, at least to me—is a source of gratification: that I have been offered this first opportunity of a writing from which my country will have derived something right and pious and my friends something pleasing" (YP 4:2.961).

Rather than an auspicious debut appearance as an English author, however, *Responsio* inaugurates John Phillips's career in the shadow of his uncle. Salmasius and other enemies of Milton believed the cleverly satiric piece must really be by Milton.⁴⁰ John's brother, Edward, offers a plausible alternative: Milton, "not thinking it worth his own undertaking, to the disturbing the progress of whatever more chosen work he had then in hands, committed this task to the youngest of his Nephews, but with such exact Emendations before it went to the Press, that it might have very well passed for his, but that he was willing the person that took the pains to prepare it for his Examination and Polishment, should have the Name and Credit for being the Author" (*Early Lives*, 71). The role of student to a great teacher provides the speaker's ethos,

and in Edward Phillips's telling, those roles are enacted in its collaborative authorship—the student writes his assignment and the teacher corrects it. The author of *Apologia* had tossed out the insult that "in the future everyone called 'Milton' will be tormented because of this name."⁴¹ John Phillips sneered back, "No matter what the fate of future 'Miltons' may be, you are a puerile paunch-prophet not to be trusted" (YP 4:2.905). The author of *Apologia* has been proven wrong, but in ways ironic for Milton's young defender. Phillips's fate has been to have his own name sucked into the powerful undertow of John Milton.

Three years later, John Phillips published *Satyr Against Hypocrites*, a poem that rips into devout Puritans with a wit and scurrility that Barbara Lewalski has aptly compared to Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*.⁴² There were five other editions in the seventeenth century.⁴³ Provocatively, in 1710 it was reprinted as *Mr. John Milton's Satyr Against Hypocrites*, so that John Milton and John Phillips are once again conflated as authors. But while Milton scholarship has embraced seventeenth-century reattribution when it comes to the learned satire of Phillips's *Responsio*, *Satyr Against Hypocrites* is generally regarded as a work that would have been repugnant to Milton. The poem's only modern editor goes so far as to suggest that Phillips published it "with . . . confidence . . . in his [uncle's] blindness and in the decent reluctance of friends to disclose the extent of the young man's departure from the paths of good instruction."⁴⁴ Others have been more moderate. Helen Darbishire, for example, speculates that Milton would have agreed with the poem's satire against corrupt clergy and mindless followers and that he would have been amused by the poem's delight in mocking gross smells, body fluids, and bad singing.⁴⁵

Written in rhymed couplets, the poem describes a church service and the gluttony and lechery that follow. The speaker frames the poem as the investigation of a logical problem about the efficacy of the "godly" 's reforming pronouncements: "The sins of parliament have long bawl'd at, / The vices of the City have been yawl'd at, Yet no amendment" (*Satyr*, 1). The speaker decides to investigate by going to the epicenter of godly activity: "Thought I: Well, I must know; / So putting on cleane cuffs, to Church I goe" (*Satyr*, 1). Once he gets there everything comes in for satiric treatment, from clothes to preaching styles, from lecherous wives to corrupt clergy. The enthusiastically inspired, for example, are ridiculous in the *Satyr*:

Then with a count'nance sad,
Upsteps a man, stark revelation mad,

Another mounts his chin, East, West, North, South,
Gaping to catch a blessing in his mouth,

And saying, Lord! We dare not ope our eyes
Before thee, winks for fear of telling lies. (Satyr, 7)

The poem's consistent target are the naïve Londoners who flock to such empty shows:

Meanwhile the vulgar frie sit still, admiring
Their pious sentences, as all inspiring;
At every period they sigh and grone,
Though he speak sometimes sense, and sometimes none:
Their zeal doth never let them mind that matter,
It is enough to her the Magpie chatter. (Satyr, 7)

The title of the 1661 edition suggests that the satire's particular object is *The Religion of the Hypocritical Presbyterians*, a target Milton would have appreciated. But, in fact, its satire ranges widely among Sabbath practices, and Milton would probably have enjoyed that, too, since he shared the poem's scorn for the gullible churchgoing crowd. Years after Milton's death, Jonathan Richardson recounts a story he heard about a servant of Milton, "a very Honest, Silly Fellow, and a Zealous and Constant Follower of these Teachers; when he came from the Meeting, his Master would frequently Ask him What he had heard, and Divert Himself with Ridiculing Their Fooleries."⁴⁶ (The servant quit.)

Awful singing is a leitmotif of *Satyr Against Hypocrites* and Milton would have found the poem's mockery of bad music particularly funny. The clerk sings "with woefull noise" "Tom Sternholds wretched Prick-song to the people" (*Satyr*, 5), for example. When the "Sunday Levite" leads others in prayer, "he whines" "like a sad ditty, / In a most doleful recitative style, / His buttocks keeping Crotchet-time the while" (*Satyr*, 6). In fact, because it is interspersed with musical scores and singing directions, *Satyr Against Hypocrites* becomes a performative, interactive text. The musical satire is a particularly familial joke since music was the shared pleasure of the Milton household. Milton's father was a composer, and Milton himself had a fine singing voice and was a talented organist. He made a point of teaching his nephews music; Aubrey learned from Edward that Milton "made his Nephews Songsters, and sing from the time they were with him" (*Early Lives*, 12).

Phillips's *Satyr* may be sophomoric but it is also wickedly funny; his uncle, who "was most familiar and free in his conversation to those to whome most severe in his way of education" and who had no qualms about scatological humor, would have been an appreciative audience (*Early Lives*, 12). Milton would certainly have agreed with the speaker's conclusion about his experiment:

So while they still on empty out-sides dwell,
They may perhaps be choakt with husk and shell:
While those, who can their follies well refute,
By a true knowledge, doe obtaine the fruit. (Satyr, 22)

To be obsessed with the surface of things is to miss the point.

Historicist criticism of Milton has, understandably, devoted a great deal of attention to the polemical writing of the middle decades of the seventeenth century, with a particular focus on the political. The Phillips brothers, however, allow us a wider vantage point on that print sphere. Both of them, for example, worked with the publisher Nathaniel Brook to produce popular miscellanies. Edward Phillips is the editor of *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* (1658), which is, true to form, a demystification of social formalities and an aid to advancement. "Any person of a reasonable capacity may quickly be expert" in the "artificial set Forms" Phillips gathers in his helpful compendium of sample conversations, letters, games, and rhymes "not as they are literally to be applied, but as they are additional helps to Genius."⁴⁷ In 1656, a year after publishing *Satyr Against Hypocrites*, John Phillips was responsible for a miscellany in keeping with his emerging profile, *Sportive Wit: The Muses Merriment, A New Spring of Lusty Drollery, Joviall Fancies, and A la mode Lampoones, On some Heroick persons of these late Times, Never before exposed to the publick view*.⁴⁸ *Sportive Wit*, with its mocking tone, ease with libertine morals, and offhand dismissal of Puritan morality, touched a nerve. Both John Phillips and Brook were summoned before the Council of State, from which Milton had only recently retired, accused of bringing out a book that contained "much Scandalous, Lascivious, Scurrilous, and profane matter."⁴⁹ Cromwell himself gave the order to have the whole run seized and burned. But within months, Phillips and Brook essentially reissued the collection with a new title, *Wit and Drollery*.

How it was they got away with this effrontery is a mystery, but it may be significant that in the same year John Phillips published a translation of Bartolomé de las Casas's *Tears of the Indians*, which Phillips presented as unabashed pro-Cromwell propaganda. He dedicates his translation to Cromwell:

I have here laid prostrate before the Throne of Your Justice above Twenty Millions of the Souls of the slaughter'd Indians; whose forc'd departure from their Bodies, Cruelty it self compassionates. Yet me-thinks I hear a sudden stillness among them; the cry of Blood ceasing at the noise of Your great transactions, while you arm for their Revenge. By which it is apparent, how well your Highness doth observe the will of the most High.⁵⁰

Phillips's dedication to Cromwell was written one year after Milton composed and dictated his sonnet on the Piedmont massacre, "Avenge, O Lord, thy

slaughter'd Saints, whose bones / Lie scatter'd on the Alpine mountains cold." In portraying Cromwell as the Lord's avenger, John Phillips's praise echoes his uncle's passionate plea for revenge. In 1656 John Phillips was, on the one hand, hauled before the Council of State and his work destroyed for profanity by order of Cromwell, and, on the other hand, he was writing powerful, religiously informed propaganda for Cromwell. Perhaps this flexibility is the very definition of a hack writer—or perhaps it is a salutary warning of the difficulty of decoding political positions from sarcasm and obscenity.

The emotional valence of travesty can be hard to gauge as well. In 1659, Phillips published *Montelion 1660*, an amusing travesty of an almanac of the kind William Lilley was churning out.⁵¹ In 1672, *Montelions Predictions*, a version whose satiric object has shifted to coffee houses and news, offered an intriguing moment of heartfelt defense: "And seeing he Labours under so many Crosses, we cannot but reprove the uncharitableness of some *Gifted Brethren* who in their Littel Conventicles, Rail so desperately at a *Civil grave old Gentleman*, whom they know no more than the *Pope of Rome*."⁵² William Riley Parker argues that it is only an unthinking dislike of John Phillips that has prevented Milton scholars from considering that Phillips is defending his uncle here.⁵³

In his lifetime, John Phillips's best-known work was *Maronides; or, Virgil Travesty . . . in Burlesque Verse* (his travesty of the fifth book appeared in 1672 and the sixth in 1673). Paul Scarron's 1648 *Le Virgile travesti* had initiated a fad for classical burlesque that swept France and, after the Restoration, England.⁵⁴ Charles Cotton first published his *Scarronides*, a burlesque of Book One of the *Aeneid*, in 1664, and Book Four in 1665, and they went on to be wildly popular for many years.⁵⁵ Phillips presents his own burlesques to his generation as a suitable revenge on their schoolteachers: "I leave the world to determine whether it be not reason, that he that has caused us so often to cry when we were Boys, ought not now to make us laugh as much now we are men. Our School Masters were Aeneas as our Tayles were Turnus. Turnus had the worst on't I'me sure then, though now he may endeavour to redeem his reputation."⁵⁶ The travesty that follows is naughty but affectionate.

John Phillips may also have burlesqued another epic, his uncle's, two years before it appeared in print. The canon of John Phillips's work is blurry around the edges, but a free translation of Scarron's *Typhon; or, The Gyant's War with the Gods* (1665) has been plausibly attributed to him.⁵⁷ Scarron's original is a parody, rather than strictly speaking a burlesque, since his story of the war between the gods and the giants is not an imitation of a classical text. From its obscene mockery of a Parliament of drunken gods ranged against rebellious giants, to its scenes of parliamentary debate, to its war with thrown

mountains and phallic weapons, *The Gyants War with the Gods* suggests Milton's war in heaven. *Paradise Lost*'s Book Six does flirt with epic burlesque, and so it is difficult to tell to what degree Milton is laughing, too, and to what extent he is being mocked along with the classics.⁵⁸ John Phillips had been Milton's authorized alter ego at least once, deploying classical parodies to defend his uncle. Now, out in the coarse Restoration marketplace, he may be hawking a scurrilous trailer for the coming epic.

IV

The world of writing for money was a virtually lawless terrain, and thieves abounded. Just as Edward Phillips lifted chunks of someone else's dictionary, so William Winstanley lifted almost the whole of Edward Phillips's literary encyclopedia to make up his *The Lives of the Most Famous English Poets* (1687). A former barber, Winstanley might be called a *real* hack writer, but he had enough original invention to write his own strident royalism into the collection. He changes, for example, Phillips's Milton entry to this: "his Fame is gone out like a Candle in a Snuff, and his Memory will always stink, which might have ever lived in honourable Repute, had not he been a notorious Traytor."⁵⁹ Having snuffed out John Milton, he uses some of Edward Phillips's language about his uncle to praise his brother John:

He was . . . Nephew to the before mention'd John Milton. . . . so that he might be said to have Poetical Blood run in his Veins. He was Accounted one of the exactest of Heroical Poets either of the Ancient or Moderns, either of our own or what ever other Nation else; having a Judicious command of Style both in Prose and Verse. But his chiefest Vein lay in *Burlesque*, and facetious Poetry, which produc'd that Ingenious Satyr against Hypocrites. He also Translated the Fifth and Sixth Books of *Virgils Aeniedes* into English *Burlesque*; of which that we may give you a Drought of his Method, take these few lines.

While Dido in a Bed of Fire,
A new-found way to cool desire,
Lay wrapt in Smoke, have Cole, half Dido,
Too late repenting Crime Libido.
Monsieur Aeneas went his waies
For which I con him little praise,
To leave a Lady, not i' th' Mire
But which was worsen, in the Fire.⁶⁰

And so in this plagiarized version of Edward Phillips's work, John Phillips takes the lead, at least for a little while, in the family contest for author. He becomes "the exactest of Heroical Poets" in burlesque.

Writing and money are materially connected in the Milton family over several generations. A scrivener, Milton's father was a member of the writers' guild. As an outgrowth of his work inscribing documents of exchange, he was also sometimes a moneylender. Milton lived largely off the money his father had accrued. Edward and John Phillips pieced together careers through writing, capitalizing on the prestige and notoriety of their uncle's writing. Milton's writing family adds a note of poignancy and humor to the Miltonic domestic scene, but it also adds resonance to some of Milton's most teasingly autobiographical works. The beauty and pathos of *Samson Agonistes*' first line, for example, "A little onward lend thy guiding hand," is deepened by the glancing reference to Milton's dependence on others' hands. Samson depends on his father, who attempts to use money to rescue his son's life, and he depends on the chorus of Danites, the most sustained presence in the play besides Samson.⁶¹ *Samson Agonistes*' Chorus, full of platitudes and I-told-you-so's, is more like a scolding clique of gossips than noble and sympathetic kin. They come as friends and equals, and Samson accepts them as such. He begins his brief welcome of the Chorus with a bitter remark about the cheap coin of friends who abandon friends in the time of need, but he means to reflect well upon his young tribesmen. Nevertheless, when, finally, Samson agrees to be led off to be a spectacle for the Philistines, the Chorus of Danites decides not to go for fear they might draw attention to themselves and get in trouble.

Samson Agonistes has been read with justice as a great Christian and revolutionary text. It is also enigmatically personal. The tragedy's final image of the entombed hero may be a shocking metaphor for the end of a writing life, but left behind are the relatives at once admiring and critical and the "vulgar" Philistines outside the smashed temple (SA 1659). The tragedy's concerns with the intersection between family and politics and with participation in the entertainment market are issues that must have marked the living relationship of Milton to his sons, just as it marked their literary relationship. In the autobiographical element of *Samson Agonistes*' "economy," the fatherless boys who were Milton's responsibility, companions and students from 1639 on, whisper behind the men of the tribe.⁶² They also haunt the laboring mill and the temple of idolatrous entertainment and murmur behind the boasting competitor, the giant Harapha. The afterimage of the smashing giant shimmers lightly with the kind of "copious Legends" (SA 1737) that popular writers like Edward and John Phillips were peddling on the marketplace. "That Linsie-woolsie intermixture of Comic mirth with Tragic seriousness" (TP **8r) touches gently, almost sweetly, this tragedy about a man who tried, without success, to "retir[e] from the popular noise"

(SA 16). But he could not go anywhere without a guiding hand, nor could those guides escape him even after he was dead.

Rutgers University

Notes

I am very grateful to Thomas Fulton and Julian Koslow for their generous and perceptive readings of drafts of this essay.

1. Important critical readings, psychoanalytic and otherwise, have argued substantially and convincingly for John Milton Sr. as a significant presence in Milton's life, most notably William Kerrigan, *The Sacred Complex: On the Psychogenesis of "Paradise Lost"* (Cambridge, 1983), and John Guillory, "The Father's House: *Samson Agonistes* in Its Historical Moment," in *Re-Membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions*, ed. Mary Nyquist and Margaret Ferguson (New York, 1987), 148–76.

2. A notable exception is John Shawcross's group biography of Milton's extended family, *The Arms of the Family: The Significance of John Milton's Relatives and Associates* (Lexington, 2004).

3. In the 1673 *Poems*, "Fair Infant" is subtitled "Anno aetatis 17." Edward Phillips also notes that the poem was written when Milton was seventeen. There is no record of such a child's birth and death except for Milton's poem. Anne Phillips had a daughter who died in 1628, but she lived longer than the one winter Milton's poem tropes upon. She died when Milton was nineteen. John Carey, *Complete Shorter Poems*, 2nd ed. (London, 1997), 14–15, argues, on the one hand, that Milton must be commemorating an infant who died in 1626. Barbara Lewalski, *The Life of Milton: A Critical Biography* (Oxford, 2000), 27, on the other hand, believes that Milton misremembered how old he was when he wrote the poem or was trying to make himself appear precocious.

4. Shawcross, *Arms of the Family*, 91–93, remarks upon how unusual a situation this was. The boys had a maternal grandfather alive, and a paternal grandmother. They also had a stepfather. Milton's paternal relationship with them is thus all the more striking.

5. *The Early Lives of Milton*, ed. Helen Darbishire (London, 1932), 67. Subsequent references to biographies by Edward Phillips, John Aubrey, Anthony Wood, and Cyriack Skinner (Darbishire mistakenly thought the anonymous biography by Skinner was written by John Phillips) will be to this collection, parenthetically in the text.

6. Edward lived with Milton in Aldersgate Street, in Barbican (where they moved in 1645), and in High Holborn (where they moved in 1647). Edward was probably still living with Milton when he was appointed secretary of foreign tongues in 1649. He went to Oxford in 1649 or 1650, but left soon, without a degree. He reached his majority in 1651, when it is likely he moved out on his own. John Phillips also lived with Milton in the Whitehall apartment that was part of Milton's remuneration as secretary of foreign tongues. John moved with Milton to a house on Petty France in 1651, and in 1652 attained his majority and set off on his own. I am indebted here and throughout to Gordon Campbell's entries on Edward and John Phillips in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford, 2004), 44:106–9, 117–19.

7. Shawcross, *Arms of the Family*, rightly resists simple political labels. Like so many

members of Milton's family, however, Edward Phillips can safely be called—in cultural terms—a royalist.

8. Although Helen Darbishire argued against this oversimplified understanding (*Early Lives*, xxi–xxvii), Edward and John have continued to play their roles as the useful and the reprobate nephew in the critical imagination, bit players in Milton's afterlife. John Phillips's case is not helped by his later involvement in the Titus Oates hoax.

9. *The Lives of Edward and John Phillips, Nephews and Pupils of Milton, Including Various Particulars of the Literary and Political History of their Times* (London, 1815). See also Tilotama Rajan, "Uncertain Futures: History and Genealogy in William Godwin's *The Lives of Edward and John Phillips, Nephews and Pupils of Milton*," *MQ* 32 (1998): 75–86. Charles Lamb comments on the Trinity manuscript in a note appended to "Oxford in the Vacation," published in *London Magazine*, October 1820; see *The Life and Works*, ed. Alfred Ainger (Troy, N.Y., 1899), 2:300.

10. *Complete Shorter Poems*, 2nd ed., ed. John Carey (Longman, 1997), 18, lines 74–77. All further quotations from Milton's poems, except for *Paradise Lost*, will be from this edition, hereafter cited in the text by line number. *Paradise Lost* references will be from *Paradise Lost*, 2nd ed., ed. Alastair Fowler (Longman, 1998).

11. "To K. Charles, and Q. Mary. For the losse of their first-borne. An Epigram Consolatore," 4–5, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford, 1947), 8:236.

12. Merritt Y. Hughes's note for line 76 of "Fair Infant," in *Complete Poems and Major Prose*, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (New York, 1957), 37.

13. *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, 8 vols., ed. Don M. Wolfe et al. (New Haven, 1953–82), 2:364. All references to Milton's prose are from this edition, hereafter cited as YP, followed by volume and page number.

14. Lewalski, *Life of Milton*, 160, 199, says that Skinner would have been a student by 1643 at the latest. Skinner dryly remarks in his *Life of Milton*, "Hee had from his first settling taken care of instructing his two Nephews by his Sister Phillips, and, as it happen'd, the Sonn of some friend: Now hee took a large house, where the Earle of Barrimore, sent by his Aunt the Lady Ranalagh, Sir Thomas Gardiner of Essex, and others were under his Tuition: But whether it were that the tempers of our Gentry would not beare the strictness of his Discipline, or for what other reason, hee continued that course but a while" (*Early Lives*, 24–25).

15. John Aubrey reports that one of the things that made Mary Powell's early married life unhappy was that she "often-times heard his Nephews cry, and beaten" (*Early Lives*, 14).

16. In *Of Education*, Milton himself recognizes only a few life choices—none of them his own: divinity, law, politics, or retirement into "ease and luxury" (YP 2:375–76).

17. See Julian Koslow, "'Not a Bow for Every Man to Shoot': Milton's *Of Education* Between Hartlib and Humanism," in *Milton Studies*, vol. 47, ed. Albert C. Labriola (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007).

18. But see Leah S. Marcus, "John Milton's Voice," *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (London, 1996), 177–227; Stephen B. Dobranski, *Milton, Authorship, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge, 1999), esp. "The Myth of the Solitary Genius," 62–81; and Ann Baynes Coiro, "Anonymous Milton, or A Maske Masked," *ELH* 71 (2004): 609–29.

19. Cyriack Skinner remarked that "The Youths that hee instructed from time to time servd him often as Amanuensis" (*Early Lives*, 33). Skinner himself acted frequently as Milton's amanuensis. Dobranski, *Milton, Authorship*, points out Edward's memories of taking dictation from Milton even before he went blind, apparently for what became *De doctrina Christiana* and for the antiprelatical tracts (70). John Phillips's hand has not been absolutely identified. Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts* (London, 1993), 2:2.84, believes he "probably served as an amanuensis at times and is so characterized by a contemporary reader on the title page of the

British Library exemplum of *John Phillips: Responsio* in 1652." Lewalski, *Life of Milton*, points out that John was living with Milton during the years when his sight faded and completely disappeared (278). Gordon Campbell, *Oxford DNB*, 44:118, leans strongly toward the position that John acted as Milton's amanuensis in the early years of his blindness, although without a final identification of his hand, "it remains possible that the handwriting is that of another amanuensis."

20. Infamously, Milton's daughters acted as Milton's readers, although they had not been taught to understand the foreign languages they were reading. Edward Phillips acted as Milton's amanuensis for Books One and Two of *Paradise Lost*. Shawcross, *Arms of the Family*, 80, proposes that Edward Phillips was also the proofreader for both the first and second editions of *Paradise Lost*.

21. Edward Phillips had originally been one of Milton's amanuenses for the letters of state.

22. *Oxford DNB* 44:108.

23. *A Treatise of the Way and Manner of Forming the Derivatives of the Latin Tongue: With a Brief Discourse of Composites and De-Composites. A Work very much conducing to the more easie and speedy attaining of the Latin Tongue; and to the saving the labour of so frequently turning over Voluminous Dictionaries* (London, 1685), A₃r.

24. Shawcross, *Arms of the Family*, has doubts that Edward Phillips ever had the Latin dictionary (80–81). Given the testimony of Wood, however, Edward's description of the manuscript, and Edward's editing of the state letters, the evidence tilts strongly toward his possession of Milton's manuscript.

25. Cited by Gordon Campbell from Anthony Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses* (*Oxford DNB* 4:108).

26. William Riley Parker, *Milton: A Biography*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1968), 1:477, 2:1046. *The Illustrious Shepherdess* is dedicated to Katherine, Marchioness of Dorchester, and *The Imperious Brother* to Henrietta Maria, Countess of Strafford.

27. See Thomas Fulton's essay in this volume, "Edward Phillips and the Manuscript of the 'Digression,'" for a detailed discussion of Edward Phillips's role as amanuensis and literary executor. In 1676, Edward Phillips also published an edition of John Speed's *The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britain*, adding a geographical and topographical supplement of his own.

28. *Glossographia; or, A Dictionary, Interpreting all such Hard Words, Whether Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, Teutonic, Belgick, British or Saxon; as are now used in our refined English Tongue. Also the Terms of Divinity, Law, Physick, Mathematicks, Heraldry, Anatomy, War, Musick, Architecture; and of several other Arts and Sciences Explicated. With Etymologies, Definitions, and Historical Observations on the same. Very useful for all such as desire to understand what they read* (London, 1656). On this phenomenon in general, see Ann Baynes Coiro, "Milton and Class Identity: The Publication of *Areopagitica* and the 1645 Poems," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 22 (1992): 261–89.

29. I am indebted to Darryl Ellison for his insights on the dictionary marketplace (personal communication).

30. His defense for borrowing from other learned men is in language lifted verbatim from Blount's preface.

31. Thomas Blount, *A World of Errors discovered in The New World of Words* (London, 1673), A₂r. Gordon Campbell points out that Stephen Skinner also jumped into the fray. *Etymologicon linguae Anglicae*, his criticism of *The New World of Words*, was published posthumously in 1671. In subsequent editions of *The New World of Words* Phillips proceeded to borrow freely from Skinner (*Oxford DNB* 44:107).

32. In his dedication to Lord Brackley, Lawes, *A Maske: The Earlier Versions*, ed. S. E. Sprott (Toronto, 1973), explains, "Although not openly acknowledg'd by the Author, yet it is a legitimate off-spring" (39).

33. All references to Edward Phillips, *Theatrum poetarum* (London, 1675), will be made parenthetically in the text as *TP*.

34. Milton, "Of that Sort of Dramatic Poem Which Is Called Tragedy," in *Complete Shorter Poems*, 2nd ed., ed. John Carey (London: Longman, 1997), 356–57.

35. Thomas Gray, *The Complete Poems*, ed. H. W. Starr and J. R. Hendrickson (Oxford, 1966), 39.

36. YP 4:2.875–961. The preface and notes for Phillips's *Responsio* are by Robert W. Ayers and the translation is James I. Armstrong's.

37. YP 4:2.913. Phillips is parodying Virgil's third *Eclogue*, lines 1–2.

38. YP 4:2.913. Phillips is paraphrasing Plautus's *Trinummus*, lines 199–202, 205–6, and 209.

39. YP 4:2.897–98. Phillips uses the strategy of condescending to a poor student throughout the piece. Mocking his adversary's poor Latin, for example, Phillips imagines him whipped by Orbilius, Horace's schoolmaster. Even worse: "Indeed the students would dismiss you splendidly carried and combed with the rod and the whip" (YP 4:2.897).

40. See Robert Ayers's introduction for more on the authorship question (YP 4:2.877–79).

41. Cited by Phillips, YP 4:2.904–5.

42. Lewalski, *Life of Milton*, 333.

43. The five editions were published in 1661, 1674 (the year of Milton's death), 1677, 1680, and 1689. For the 1661 edition the title was changed to *The Religion of the Hypocritical Presbyterians in Meeter*. In another instance of familial confusion, the first (1655) edition was mistakenly registered under his brother Edward's name.

44. Leon Howard, ed., *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*, (Los Angeles, 1953), iii; hereafter cited in the text.

45. Darbishire, *Early Lives*, xxii–xxv. Parker, *Milton*, 2:1168–69, and Lewalski, *Life of Milton*, 333–34, agree that Milton would have found much of the poem both funny and in agreement with his own attitudes.

46. Darbishire, *Early Lives*, 238. It is not surprising that Leon Howard had a difficult time trying to pin down exactly who and what is being mocked in *Satyr Against Hypocrites* (i–iii).

47. Edward Phillips, ed., *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* (1658), A₄v–A₅r.

48. For a useful description of the context of books like *Sportive Wit*, see Timothy Raylor, *Cavaliers, Clubs, and Literary Culture: Sir John Mennes, James Smith, and the Order of the Fancy* (Newark, 1994).

49. *Oxford DNB* 44:118.

50. Phillips goes on, praising Cromwell for "using Your vast Power and Dignity onely to the advancement of his Glory among the Nations: while the Divine Dietie bequeathes You back again immediate Recompence; crowning You, like his holy Warrior, *David*, with the highest degree of earthly Fame" (A₃–A₄).

51. Montelion predicted, for example, that "There will be this year 365 Eclipses of the Sun; . . . These Eclipses will be visible all over Europe"; see *Montelion*, 1660; or, *The Prophetical Almanack: Being, A true and exact Accompt of all the Revolutions, that are to happen in the World this present year 1660* (London, 1660), A₇r.

52. Phillips's *Montelion*, 1660 inspired a number of imitations, probably by Thomas Flatman. *Montelions Predictions*, however, is ascribed to John Phillips in Donald Wing, *Short Title Catalogue*, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (New York, 1972–88), 3:69, and is accepted as Phillips's by Parker and Shawcross. Shawcross, *Arms of the Family*, discusses the work's pro-English, pro-monarchist, anti-Dutch sentiment (118).

53. Parker, *Milton*, 1:477, 2:1046.

54. I am indebted to Naomi Forsythe Phelps, *The Queen's Invalid: A Biography of Paul Scarron* (Baltimore, 1951).

55. *Scarronides* was published seventeen times between 1664 and 1700 and remained popular in the eighteenth century.

56. "To my Esteemed Friend Dr. Valentine Oldis," *Maronides or Virgil Travesty, Being a new paraphrase Upon the Sixth Book of Virgils Aeneids in Burlesque Verse* (London, 1673).

57. According to the Folger Shakespeare Library catalog. Shawcross, *Arms of the Family*, also lists *Typhon* as the work of John Phillips (104).

58. See Arnold Stein, "The War in Heaven," *Answerable Style: Essays on "Paradise Lost"* (Minneapolis, 1953), 17–37.

59. William Winstanley, *The Lives of the Most Famous English Poets* (London, 1687), 195.

60. *Ibid.*, 210–11.

61. In his dictionary, Edward Phillips borrowed his definition of "danist" from *Glossographia*. A Greek import that did not have historical legs, it means a usurer.

62. Milton uses "economy" as a synonym for "plot" in the headnote to *Samson Agonistes*.