Observations on Milton's Accents

JOHN K.
HALE

Summary: *Milton's diacritics in six languages, though mostly typical of his time, allow some inferences about his language attainments and scholarship. For Latin verse, he uses accents to disambiguate rhythm or meaning. For Greek scholarship, he is punctilious. Italian authors are culture to him, French ones merely data. His Hebrew accents suggest neither a theological fundamentalist nor a textual conservative. His English verse ones reflect both etymology and rhythm, but where these part company he gives priority to rhythm.*

Though the topic is a small one, these observations draw together information which is either new or widely dispersed. They ask how, and for what purposes, Milton employed accents as diacritical marks. They assess how far he used them accurately, consistently, conventionally or unusually. In so doing, they build up a sense of his practice (in microcosm) of his languages and scholarship. They also prompt a few inferences about his proof-reading and other matters.

The findings are presented in the order in which he learnt his languages, namely Latin, Greek, French, Italian and Hebrew.¹ Because the accidentals of printed work are mostly put there by printers, I keep as far as possible to the evidence of holographs. As there exists more of such evidence for his Latin than for his other languages (except English, which in the present context is a special case), most time is given to his Latin — whose accents, too, are the least generally understood.

Latin Accents: Humanist Practice and Its Decline

The Latin accents of Renaissance humanism,² though their names and diacritical marks were based on Greek ones, do not (like those) primarily assist pronunciation. Granted, the Roman *apex* over a vowel indicated *geminatio* (= doubling, that is, lengthening) of that vowel. Thus Quintilian mentions it as distinguishing ablative singular long *-a*,³ and the usage was revived among humanists as circumflex (*mensâ*, as nowadays we use macron). Nevertheless, *apex* does not indicate where stress falls. The Roman *apex* system had disappeared before the humanists, whose system — or rather, systems — works differently.

Grave, for instance, has not the force of *apex* (nor that of grave in French or Italian), because it does not differentiate sound at all, but instead meaning. Typically, it appears on adverbs or other indeclinables which are homographs of declined forms (inflections); so *verò* = “but” or “in truth,” particle or adverb, whereas plain *vero* is the inflected form, ablative or dative of *verus* or *verum*. By a curious extension of this differentiating practice a final grave was placed on indeclinables even where (since no homograph existed) there was no need to differentiate. Grave was used on the prepositions *à* and *è*, not to distinguish them from homographs but to keep them separate from words preceding and following.

Circumflex appeared less often than grave. Besides being used to distinguish inflections having long vowels from their homographs having short ones (as *mensâ* / *mensa*, mentioned above), the other chief function of circumflex was to indicate contraction (as *amâsse* for *amavisse*).

Acute was used mostly to mark suffixes like *-que*, *-ne*, *-ve*, though it had implications — somewhat vague — for pronunciation. This practice served mainly to distinguish the enclitic forms from homograph inflections: thus *imaginatióne* (= “imagination?”, nominative with suffix) from *imaginatione* (ablative singular), or *quóque* (= “and whither,” with suffixed *-que*) from *quoque* (= “also”). This acute could be placed in various positions — on the *q* of *-que*, for example, or be a grave instead.

Performing a different function, acute might appear on the first vowel of a pair if the pair was not a diphthong: *Muséum*, and commonly with Greek loan-words. It might be supported, for total clarity, by diairesis: *Hyperíön*. (Diairesis had exactly its modern function). The value of this usage for poetry, to establish scansion in ambiguous instances, is clear and we shall return to it.

Most of these usages disappeared in the course of the eighteenth century as the number of people communicating in Latin dwindled, while those who did so communicate were scholars who despised this use of crutches. But contrariwise, in the two preceding centuries accents guided the *common* reader of Latin through its lengthy periodic sentences. Being only guides, the accents do not appear every time they might, nor with total consistency (any more than with road signs now): something was left to the reader.

Milton's Handwritten Latin Accents

Milton's earliest handwritten Latin illustrates several of these humanist practices. In the prose theme "Mane citus lege" ("Get up early in the morning"), based on Lyly's *Grammar* and dating from his time at St. Paul's School,⁴ *grave* occurs most often, some thirteen times. It occurs on indeclinables having homographs and on the preposition *è*; but also on adverbs lacking homographs (*radicitùs*). Humanist fluctuation too occurs, as when in the first three lines we read *sanè* and *quàm* but *Mane* and *minus*. Circumflex is placed on final - *a*, ablative singular. Acute does not occur, but there is no occasion for it.

In the verses attached to the theme, however, the practice differs. Neither "Surge, age, surge" nor "Ignavus satrapam" has any accentuation. This is despite occasions when it would be expected of a humanist: he writes *luxuriatque*, not *luxuriàtque* (or alternatives like *luxuriâtque*), and *castraque*, not *castráque*. While one cannot confidently assign a reason for this more than humanist fluctuation, I would infer from the presence of corrections to scansion and style in the elegiacs that Milton's attention was directed elsewhere, to matters of greater substance than accents. By the same token, the fullness and orthodoxy of accentuation in the prose theme suggest two things: he felt more at ease with prose composition at the time; or the prose stands nearer to fair copy than the verses do; or most likely, both.

The next Latin accents of any quantity would be those of entries in the *Commonplace Book*, but for three difficulties: (i) some entries may or may not be by Milton, (ii) entries span a number of years, and (iii) some entries are not personal summary but quotation or a mixture, so that accents may be those of edition annotated. Instead, therefore, I take three letters from his thirties: to the humanist scholar Holstenius (1639); to Bodley's Librarian Rouse (early 1647); and to his Florentine friend Dati (April 1647).

The letter to Holstenius (30 March 1639), the Vatican Librarian, has been excellently discussed by Joseph Bottkol.⁵ His collation of the Vatican manuscript with Brabazon Aylmer's edition of *Epistolarum Familiarum Liber Unus* (1674) demonstrates Milton at his most careful with accents. That is, as part of "quite plainly putting forward his best Latin and Greek, consciously addressing a great scholar in the language of scholars" (p. 626), Milton deploys the humanist accents fully, with almost total accuracy, and consistently. Some examples will show how, and especially where his usage contrasts with the printed accidentals.

Profectò potiùs (line 22) has no accent in 1674, and exemplifies the generally much fuller use of grave for the indeclinable form of a homograph pairing. The younger Milton's care stands out when one compares the handwritten circumflexes of *illâ bibliothecâ nisi impetratâ prius veniâ* (line 32) with the mixture in the printed *illa Bibliotheca nisi impetratâ veniâ*. This care leads him into one odd place: by placing grave on *penè* (line 16) he anxiously distinguishes the adverb meaning "almost" from the unseemly ablative of *penis* (which his very scruple made me notice). He could have simply written *paene*. Nonetheless, when he writes *dignumque adeo visum quicum velis* (line 26) several signs of his intelligence and mettle are disclosed together. First, he does not place acute on the enclitic of *dignumque*, because having no homograph the word is self-explanatory. Secondly, though, he places grave on *adeò* (adverb) to distinguish it from *adeo* (verb). Thirdly, the circumflex on *quicum* ensures that the unusual ablative (all genders) of the relative pronoun *qui* with suffix - *cum* is recognized by his reader. We, in turn, can recognize the care he lavished on the writing-out: he places circumflex above the dot above the - *i* -; a little awkwardly, too, but meaning must prevail over calligraphy.⁶

Elsewhere, perhaps, calligraphy receives its due, since a further reason why acute is absent from *dignumque* may be that otherwise the phrase would become overfull of accents (so let only the semantically more important be read). The pleasure of reading the letter in manuscript is, in fact, not only considerable but heightened by the rhythms and economy of the accentuation. I surmise that no more than errors would mere pedantic fullness of accents impress so eminent a humanist.

The accents of Milton's letter to Rouse eight years later make a different impression. For one thing, by "letter," is meant both the brief covering letter in prose and the verse-letter or Ode "Ad Rousium," because the latter — even if it is not in Milton's own hand — was certainly meant as

a fair copy and overseen by him.⁷ The prose letter, in Milton's own hand, resembles the Holstenius letter in having suffixed -*que* both with and without acute. The fact that now no graves adorn the indeclinables which lack homographs, whereas the earlier letter included *Cùm* (line 37) and *ferè* (line 45), may indicate a diminishing use of grave.

What stands out, in any case, is the careful diairesis of Rouse's name. Every time it occurs, whether in the prose or the ode, it is *Roüsius*, *Roüsium*, and so on. Milton wanted it to have two vowels in his Latin. Clearly, he wanted that sound to reverberate through his purpose-built (and very eccentric) Latin Pindaric-Catullan metres. So this time, and for the first time so far, his diacritic marking has a phonetic intention.

There may be others here, if (though only if) the accents of the ode manuscript were Milton's own or seen and approved by him. At the risk of circularity, I maintain so, for this manuscript was like the letter to Holstenius, designed to impress a scholarly notable. I notice, then, the careful acutes on names borrowed from Greek, to separate those vowels from the following ones (*Phinéam*, *Pegaséo*, both at line 36); diaireses on names (*Iön*, at 56 and 60, *Creüsa* at 60); and the acutes on *teréris* (line 42) and *legéris* (line 70), to indicate future (not present) indicative form. All these usages, and especially the last, have the interest for us that while like many of the humanist accents they explain the meaning and grammatical function they are used more decisively to guide the reader as to sound, the startling prosody. Rouse is meant to read this aloud, so as to hear (prominently among the rest of it) the sound of his own name in Milton's Latin. The poet wanted his little *jeu d'esprit* to be appreciated, and accents made a part of the guidance he gave to that end.⁸

The third Latin letter, to Carlo Dati, dated 21 April, 1647, adds a few points.⁹ First, it confirms that Milton did not place grave above the preposition *à* (= "from" or "by"), though the printer in 1674 did so, and though Milton did place grave above the other preposition, *é* ("out of"). This may help disputes about authorship in some other connection: it is surely striking that for every other use of grave we find *more* in the manuscript than in the book. And, secondly, Milton places a careful circumflex for contraction above *rescîssent* (= *rescivissent*) and *liberâsti* (= *liberavisti*).

What, then, do the differences between manuscript and print indicate? That the printers cared less for accuracy, or used fewer accents? That Milton, when old and blind, cared less about accents than formerly, or could not

impose his own scruples? That there is some truth in all four inferences we shall see from later instances, in other tongues.¹⁰

Greek Accents and Milton's Greek Poems

Greek accents indicate pronunciation, more than is true of the Renaissance practice for Latin. For instance, they always indicate stress, which the Latin accents never did. The system was worked out, once and for all, by Aristophanes of Byzantium (c. 200 B. C.), to teach correct pronunciation of Greek to foreigners and perhaps to aid his generation's editing of the archaic Greek of Homer.

The accents comprise acute, circumflex, and grave. Acute divides into: oxytone ("sharp-toned," acute on a word's final syllable); paroxytone (acute on penultimate), and proparoxytone (acute on antepenultimate). Circumflex divides into perispomenon ("drawn around," marking a final syllable as long by nature), while properispomenon does the same for a long penultimate. Oxytone is reversed into barytone ("deep-toned"), where an accented word follows. Other diacritics comprise breathings and diairesis. "Rough" breathings distinguish initial aspirate from other initial vowels, which accordingly receive "smooth" breathings. Diairesis seems to have been a matter of taste historically. To reiterate, these accents have prevailed ever since Aristophanes of Byzantium, and to omit or mismanage them was in Milton's day, as now, a solecism.

Did Milton, then, penetrate such solecisms? That prose theme from his schooldays contains some Greek. Its accents are full and almost entirely correct. (He places one or two diacritics on the wrong vowel of a diphthong, and omits diairesis to guide scansion on a line he quotes from Homer). He is full again in the accents of the Greek of the *Commonplace Book*, and in his manuscript letters: fullness matters for Greek, as these accents, unlike those Latin ones, include no element of the optional. And Milton is accurate in the main.¹¹ In his marginalia to Greek texts (for his own eyes only, not those of a learned recipient who is to be impressed) Milton keeps the same general standards of fullness and accuracy.

In that case, however, the presence of incorrect accents in his Greek verses as published requires explanation. Whereas Burney, Landor and others rebuked Milton,¹² a different inference would be that he did not superintend or proof-read his Greek for *Poems*, 1645; and that he could not (being blind) ensure that they would be set right for *Poems*, 1673. Evidence for this view includes the fact that not even when making the engraver of his

portrait for 1645, William Marshall, engrave self-satirizing Greek verses below the offending portrait did Milton insist on the accidentals being correct, since at least two errors occur there.¹³ Further evidence comes from 1673 where attempts were made to correct the errors of 1645 (though they produced new errors).¹⁴ Thus the Greek accents indicate a Milton who did not strain to produce blameless diacritics in 1645, but tried (and failed) in his blindness to set them right later, perhaps as part of his whole self-presentation to posterity in a run of publications later on in his life. A degree of scholarly self-respect, at any rate, was involved in the correcting of Greek accents.

Diacritics in Milton's French, Italian, and Hebrew

Milton's French accents can be sampled in the *Commonplace Book*. Although they are fewer than the same words would carry in modern French, they work as normally for printed French books in his time. Thus we find *se reserverent*, without grave; and no acutes on *elire*, *election*, and *here-ditaire*.¹⁵ It seems that French practice at this period was less regularized than Italian, and that Milton takes it as he finds it — not being all that interested, perhaps, in French or its accents.

On the other hand, he admired and composed in Italian. He was punctilious with graves in *Commonplace Book* entries. As for his poems in Italian, their accents are in general fuller and better in 1645 than in 1673. John Purves even thought that Milton wanted to "provide some guide to pronunciation, for not only are the usual verbal accents inserted (*è, dirò, farò, può* — *puo*, however, in sonnet V,2 —, but *natía, soléa, ridéa* are similarly marked."¹⁶ If this view were right, it would have two important consequences. First, for the present inquiry it would mean that Milton took a closer interest in the accents of his Italian than of his Greek poems. And secondly, it would suggest that he took a close interest in the printing of 1645 — closer than for 1673 — a finding opposite to ours above.

Certainly this is one place where the small matter of accentuation which we are pursuing impinges on larger bibliographical questions. But the evidence is more conflicting than Purves allows. If Milton was giving guidance, it is odd that he did not carry it through into proof-reading (one *può* is a *puo* despite the implied care) and had lost interest altogether by 1673. The acute on the short, poetic form of the Italian imperfect (*ridéa*, and so on) was a usage of *English* printings of Italian, not of contemporary Italian usage, and can be seen in seventeenth-century London printings of Dante or

Ariosto. Indeed, in *1645* itself, it is found in one of the commendatory pieces, hence not by Milton himself — on *natío*.¹⁷

More general considerations may contribute now. Granted that an interest in Italian accents may concern the *sound* of the verse of a still currently spoken language, and that guidance might be needed for the pronouncing of this stiff and *démodé* pastiche,¹⁸ Greek accents too were designed for pronunciation and Milton would know this; and correctness was no less *de rigueur* for *their* audience. The dull truth seems to be that even though Milton was as passionate in his love of Italian as of Greek, he was merely luckier with his Italian in *1645* than he was with Greek. “Luck,” here, means the luck of the printing house; and luck moved a little the other way in *1673*.

I have found no examples of Milton's handwritten Hebrew, but we do have some evidence of how he interpreted Hebrew's (numerous and complex) diacritical marks. He certainly knew the importance of the vocalizations or pointings, those indicators of vowels which sit under, over, inside, or after the consonant which begins the phoneme, in a language which for centuries wrote down only its consonants. In his translation of Psalm 88.15 Milton writes a note on the pointing: “+and shake / With terror sent from thee” is glossed “+Heb. *Prae concussione*.” The gloss means “shaking,” = “as you, God, shake me.” As one editor writes, “Milton has enlisted an homonymous root . . . to help him understand a difficult line.”¹⁹ For קנ'אר (*minno'ar*) he is proposing קנ'אר (*m'no'ar*), a putative pual from the root *n'r*, to shake. But no extraordinary scholarship is involved. Every reader of the Hebrew Bible has to decide things like this because they inhere in a consonantal text, in fact have in some ways been made harder not easier whenever the Masoretes added their conjectural vocalizing to a difficult or ambiguous reading. Milton is a normal, scrupulous reader of the pointing, because pointing is vital to understanding yet often crucially uncertain.

Milton's Accents in English

Modern English employs accents solely for loan-words, but in the Trinity Manuscript we see Milton using accents on English words in ways transferred from their normal use on Latin ones: acute, circumflex, diaeresis (but not grave). *Chaeronéa*, *Ligéas*, and *Alphéus* have the acute which those Greek loan-words would have in Milton's Latin. In *Thôn* the circumflex signifies long vowel, as is made clear when elsewhere he writes the word as

Thone. A careful diairesis makes sure that vowels when sounded do not join up into diphthong, so spoiling the rhythm and metre: *Drüids* (*Lycidas*, 53).²⁰

But why accentuate words written for his own eyes (and ears) alone? Was the habit of accenting so engrained? Or was the Trinity Manuscript meant as a copy to send for a printing of his English poems, hence carrying marks for printers to use to guide readers? The latter idea cannot be fully right, not so much because the actual printings of *Lycidas* and the other poems do not carry these accents as because other evidence from the manuscript proves the habit was indeed engrained. He marks with equal care some of the names in his (prose) listing of possible subjects for an epic: *Saul Autodaïctes*, *Elisaeus Hydrochóos*, *Elisaeus Adorodocétos* (p. 34). The accentuation preserves that of their Greek originals, for accuracy's sake — though *perhaps* also (since these were names for a projected poem) for rhythm's sake.

Though one cannot by the nature of the entries be sure if these list-name accents define pronunciation as well as provenance, a more intriguing instance occurs back in the writing of *Masque* 674:

By scaly Triton's winding shell,
And old soothsaying Glaucus' spell,
By Leucothea's lovely hands,
And her son that rules the strands . . . (p. 24)

If the Greek etymologizing habit was so engrained, how comes it that Leucothea has no acute on - *the* -? Either Milton has omitted his own usual practice or we have an indication of how he heard this line — as trochaic in seven syllables, rather than iambic in eight. The line does effect the transition from iambics preceding it to a trochee following. I surmise that Milton's pen paused over - *the* - to accent it, then moved on as he heard or felt a coming metrical change. In short, whereas normally his English accents reflected etymology and sound alike, in a few cases they parted company and he gave the priority to sound.

It would be instructive to look out for more such. Simpler instances would include diaireses in names without any clear inherited vocalization — *Gorlöis*, perhaps. Analogies from other poets come to mind here. Without anachronistically invoking the "strange moon-marks" of Hopkins' poems in manuscript, let me adduce Milton's contemporary Edward Benlowes.²¹ Benlowes, unlike Milton, took enormous pains to get all the Latin accents right for his bilingual poem *Theophila*. He not only applied but extended the humanist use of circumflex to indicate a Latin contraction: in presentation

copies he himself puts in circumflex over - *th* - of *father* and - *r* - of *Spirit* to show that these words are monosyllabic. Even though Benlowes' method and the degree of insistence are eccentric, their purpose recalls some of the Milton instances in that getting it to sound right becomes the absolute priority. My own exploration has shown some parallels, for example, the sounding of *Rouse* as *Roüsius*, and there may be more.

Conclusions

A variation in Milton's attitude to each language, and in his use of it, is indicated by his diacritic practice. He selects and adapts from the humanist Latin system, whereas he obeys the Greek one as binding. This may correspond with his usage of the two languages: Latin was familiar, like an old glove, but Greek was treasure; one was for *praxis*, the other for *theoria*. Possibly a similar inference about Italian and French can be hazarded: on the strength of his care with Italian accents, together with the much greater number of Italian than French entries in the *Commonplace Book*, can we infer that Italian represented culture — indeed Renaissance — whereas French represented no more than data?

Certainly Milton knew and practised some of his languages more, and better, than others. His emendation to the Hebrew of Psalm 88 is no wondrous emendation, just an unattractive and uneconomical guess — far inferior to the best emendation to the Greek text of Euripides. On the other hand, it is interesting that Milton felt no inhibition whatever about interpreting the sacred text and even emending its received form. He was neither a theological fundamentalist nor a textual conservative.

In the main Milton takes the accent system of each language as he found it. He seems to make less use of the humanist Latin one in private than when needing to impress the recipient of a letter — a practice not insincere but a matter of self-respect (and hence verging on calligraphy). This self-respect can be glimpsed in the spasmodic attempts to have his accents printed correctly or as he wished, though he is not obsessive about it.

In the last resort, the English accents may prove the most revealing. First, they show his Greek and Latin interacting with each other to influence his English practice with names. This interactiveness is a microcosm of his imagination at work, since words, phrases and whole allusions come to him in his best poems by a not essentially different intersecting of his foreign languages within his hospitable English. And secondly, at just a few points he uses accents phonetically, not as normally in conjunction with scholarly

accuracy but for sound alone. If more such can be found, my prolonged attention to such a minimalist topic as accents will have had value.

University of Otago

Notes

1. The order is established by Milton's statement in "Ad Patrem," 78–85. For the text of the passage see *The Poems of John Milton*, ed. John Carey and Alastair Fowler (London: Longmans, 1968), pp. 151–152. This edition of the poems, cited as "Carey," is used throughout unless otherwise cited.
2. This is not the only system of Latin accents, but is the main one studied here. For the others, being various ancient and medieval systems and an irrelevant Graecizing system of the Renaissance itself, see Piet Steenbakkers, "Accent-Marks in Neo-Latin," in Rhoda Schnur, gen. ed. *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Hafniensis: Proceedings of the Eight International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies* (Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1994), 925–934. I am in debt to correspondence with Dr. Steenbakkers throughout this section.
3. Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 1.7. 2–3, on *geminatio*, and see Steenbakkers, section 3.2.
4. I have used the Camden Society edition, *A Common-Place Book of John Milton and A Latin Essay and Latin Verses Presumed to Be by Milton*, ed. Alfred J. Horwood (1877), together with a photocopy of the original held by the Harry T. Ransome Library, Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Austin.
5. Joseph McG. Bottkol, "The Holograph of Milton's Letter to Holstenius," *PMLA*, 68 (1953), 617–627.
6. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P. G. W. Glare (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), p. 1548; Bottkol, 621 (transcription), 622 (collation), and Plate 1 opposite 622.
7. For the letter I have used a photocopy kindly supplied by the Bodleian Library. For the ode I have used a facsimile and transcript in Harris F. Fletcher, ed. *Milton's Complete Poetical Works in Photographic Facsimile* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1943), 4 vols., vol. 4. Fletcher (4.456) is non-committal on whether the ode ms. is in Milton's own hand, though most scholars have thought so. It suffices here that the ms. has the same distinctive accenting of "Rousius" as Milton's prose letter, and that he must have scrutinized the ms. even if he did not write it.
8. Similar purposes emerge if one looks at the same accentuation usages in the printed texts of the poems (1645 and 1673): *Eléo* and *Elegía* ("Elegia Sexta," 26 and 49); *Eöo* and *Philyrëius* ("Elegia Tertia," 34, and "Elegia Quarta," 27); *Parére fatis* ("In Obitum Procancellarii Medici," 1). Whose was the purpose, Milton's or his printer's? The more unusual and phonetic the purpose, the more likely to be Milton's. I am sure at least of the last example, *Parére*, where not only would the sense go wrong if we did not identify the

verb form as from *pareo* (= I obey) at once, but also the unusual iambic metre (unusual because coming amongst so many other metres) would be missed — and the poem would *sound* wrong. The concern for sound in a Latin poem seems best ascribed to the poet himself.

9. See *The Familiar Letters of John Milton*, tr. David Masson and ed. Donald Lemen Clark, in *The Works of John Milton* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931–1938), 18 vols, 12.44–50.
10. Bottkol (*ibid.*) notes a grave before enclitic (which ought to be acute there) at line 45 of the Holstenius letter. Similarly a very occasional error or misplacing of accent can be found among the *marginalia* to Euripides and Lycophron.
12. A summary account is given, with full reff., by Douglas Bush in *A Variorum Commentary on the Poems of John Milton* (General Editor, Merritt Y. Hughes), vol. 1: *The Latin and Greek Poems*, ed. Douglas Bush (London: Routledge, 1970), pp. 255–256.
13. *Phaies*, not *Phaieis* (omission of iota subscript); *autophues*, without any accent.
14. Carey, p. 229, summarizes the situation respecting Milton's longest Greek poem, the version in Homeric hexameters of Psalm 114.
15. The examples are from p. 186, but other entries and the practice of French printed books of the seventeenth century concur. I have used the rare autotype facsimile of the *Common-place Book: A Common-Place Book of J. Milton. Reproduced by the Autotype Process from the Original Manuscript in the Possession of Sir Frederick J. U. Graham . . . with an Introduction by A. J. Horwood* (London: Privately printed, 1876).
16. John Purves, in *The Poetical Works of John Milton*, ed. Helen Darbishire, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), II, xv.
17. In the ode by Antonio Francini, line 38, Fletcher, 4.218.
18. It is *démodé pastiche* because it uses words and idioms and senses from 200 years of Italian sonneteers, finishing with those of the sixteenth century: it is an Italian too eclectic, synchronic, and *passé* to convince Italian ears. I have discussed these matters in "The Audiences of Milton's Italian Verses," *Renaissance Studies*. 8, 1 (1994), 76–88.
19. John Milton, *Complete English Poems, Of Education, Aeropagitica*, ed. Gordon Campbell (London: J. M. Dent, 1990), p. 129.
20. The Trinity ms. is cited from John Milton, *Poems Reproduced in Facsimile from the Manuscript in Trinity College, Cambridge. With a Transcript*. (Menston: The Scholar Press, 1970). The accented words mentioned occur thus: *Chaeronéa*, p. 9 (Sonnet "To the Lady Margaret Ley," line 7), *Ligéas*, p. 24 (*Masque*, line 880), *Alphéus*, p. 31 (*Lycidas*, line 132), *Thôn*, p. 22 (*Masque*, line 675), nut *Thone*, p. 20 (*Masque*, line 674); *Drüids*, p. 29 (*Lycidas*, line 53).
21. All details are from Harold Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes: Biography of a Minor Poet* (London: University of London/The Athlone Press, 1952), app. III.