

PREFACE

Despite the many editions of the text of John Milton's *Paradise Lost* as it was published in 1674, this edition represents the only diplomatic text of the epic as it was first published in 1667. To (or authoritative) be sure, several editions claiming to have reproduced the 1667 text have appeared since the nineteenth century. These include items such as an 1873 "facsimile" edition, with a monograph by R[ichard] H[erne] S[hpherd]; a "facsimile" edition by David Masson (1877); the Scolar Press facsimile (1968), actually in two editions; and Harris Francis Fletcher's facsimile published as part of his *John Milton's Complete Poetical Works Reproduced in Photographic Facsimile* (1943–1948). (In addition to these items, there are various e-texts available on the Internet.) Not one of these items, however, can in any way be conceived as the kind of accurate and exhaustive work required to produce an authoritative text of the 1667 edition of *Paradise Lost*. As the only edition of its kind, the text reproduced here seeks to provide access to the first edition of Milton's epic as it was originally published. By making this edition available as an authoritative text, the editors hope to encourage additional research on a work that was, after all, complete and whole unto itself and "worthy t'have not remained so long unsung." With such an objective in mind, a companion volume of essays on the subject of the first edition of *Paradise Lost*, "*Paradise lost: A Poem Written in Ten Books*": *Essays on the 1667 First Edition*, is likewise the first of its kind. *Nota bene*: The 1667 edition consistently reads "Paradise lost", thus emphasizing what was lost and minimizing the act of loss. Likewise, the running titles print, for example, "Book 3, *Paradise lost*." on verso and "*Paradise lost*. Book 3." on rectos. Line numbers are given

in the left margin on versos and in the right margin on rectos. Both of these printing styles are altered to current style.

Although no manuscript of *Paradise Lost* in its entirety has been found as a source for the first edition, the extant manuscript of book 1 (in the hand of an unidentified amanuensis with numerous corrections by various hands) is the copy source for the first edition, as compositor markings make clear, and it thus can offer insights into how the manuscript as a whole was transcribed and the possible differences between manuscript and published text. In addition to taking into account the extant manuscript of book 1 of *Paradise Lost*, the text reproduced here is transcribed from the most authoritative texts, including the text of the 1667 edition (first issue) housed in the collections of the Newberry Library. The transcription, in turn, has been collated with a copy of the 1667 edition (first issue) owned by the British Library. Moreover, all transcriptions have been checked against the facsimiles of Fletcher and the Scolar Press, both of which must be used with care (as noted below). Throughout the present edition, notice has been taken of alterations in the states of given pages or signatures included in the six issues of the poem that are the result of corrections, errors, or non-Miltonic forms. While the second edition sometimes employs one or another state of a page and makes numerous corrections, particularly in orthography and accidentals, it contains its own errors that are correspondingly problematic. Except where indicated, errata are corrected, and all corrections or changes are duly noted in our section "Changes and Lack of Changes Made in the Edited Text," which is part of our full textual discussion that follows the text. In the first edition, there are also errors in line numbers that occur frequently (only sometimes corrected in new states, which may also make incorrect corrections), and these are also noted and corrected. Finally, all textual remarks have been checked against at least one additional copy of each issue of the first edition and one copy of the second edition. However one might attempt to construct a text faithful to the "Miltonic original," no text can be entirely "thorough" or entirely "Miltonic" because the texts as originally published are frequently "non-Miltonic" in such matters as spelling, capitalization, italicization, punctuation, and the

like. Furthermore, no copy of any issue of the first edition has been found to be exactly the same as any other copy of any issue.

Some caveats about the Fletcher and Scholar Press facsimiles: To be frank, both are unreliable, and both contain serious errors of omission and transmission. For example, although Fletcher's facsimile edition purports to reproduce the original text as it was published in 1667, his text is drawn from the University of Illinois copy of the 1669 (first issue); that is, the fifth title page issue. His edition, moreover, very often fails to indicate whether specific facsimile pages are from one copy or from another copy. This, along with other errors and omissions, renders Fletcher's edition at once unreliable and even at times unacceptable. In its own way, the Scholar Press edition—or rather two editions—is correspondingly of questionable value. With recourse to an unidentified copy (perhaps the sixth title page issue of 1669) from its own holdings, this edition neglects to identify the states of the text it reproduces, and it ventures to offer "corrected" pages of the text randomly. What results is not a true facsimile of the first issue of the first edition, but a composite of different issues of the first edition. Although we are grateful for all the work that went into both the Fletcher and the Scholar editions, we must also be on guard at all times in any attempt to come to terms with the 1667 edition of *Paradise Lost*.

The 1667 Text and Its Audience

The text of *Paradise Lost* that a 1667 audience would have read poses many problems that a modernized edition of *Paradise Lost* obscures. Not only are there verbal errors, only some of which are corrected in the second edition of 1674, but also difficulties in the mechanics of spelling, punctuation, italicization, and capitalization that may lead to confusion and misreading. Added to this confusion is the visualization of the text on the page. Verbal errors (as well as the errata supplied in the preliminary sheets of issues four through six, and alterations in states of the text) are enumerated below and corrected in the text presented here, as indicated in "Changes and Lack of Changes Made in the Edited Text." While mechanical matters like spelling

were not yet codified in the seventeenth century, a reader reading “the sudden blaze / Far round illumin’d hell” (1.665–66) may be disconcerted by the lack of uppercase “Hell”; or in “and fierce with grasped arm’s / Clash’d” (1.667–68) by the inaccurate possessive form of “arm’s.” In 8.346 and 706, verbs are capitalized meaninglessly: “his creating hand/ Nothing imperfet or deficient left / Of all that he Created” and “he knows that in the day / Ye Eate thereof, your Eyes . . . shall perfetly be . . . Op’nd and cleer’d.” Confusing is the italicization of one noun but not another, as well as a questionable capitalization of that italicized word, in 1.713: “Built like a Temple, where *Pilasters* round / Were set.” Regarding these mechanical matters, the copy-text for the first edition (the manuscript of book 1) is frequently not followed. (Not that the manuscript is necessarily correct: it often is not.) For example, the manuscript of book 1 does read “hell” in 1.666, and “arm’s” in 1.667, but 1.713 has “Built like a temple, where pilasters round / Were set.” This indicates the reproduction of the incompetent text of the manuscript and at the same time the unacceptable alteration of the manuscript.

Milton’s long sentences are not always helped by punctuation—for example, 1.192–220, which includes two colons and various commas—but a reader is surely not aided in trying to comprehend all that is being said. The manuscript has a semicolon and a period instead of those two colons, a reading that is thus more easily followed. The punctuation of 1.619–21 in the manuscript (although not all other matters) is repeated in 1667 and is not changed in the second edition: “Thrice he assayd, and thrice in spite of scorn, / Tears such as Angels weep, burst forth: at last/ Words interwove with sighs found out their way.” Most modern editions, although seemingly intended for a modern audience, iterate this incompetent punctuation (or in a couple of instances a comma is added after “Tears”—an inadequate change—and other alterations are made). Although the printer Samuel Simmons refers to the reason “why the Poem Rimes not,” his expression that “many” were “stumbled” is apt for the text itself.

Looking at the printed page, we pause to make sure that we are reading what goes with what (4.697–703):

Fenc'd up the verdant wall; each beauteous flour,
Iris all hues, Roses, and Gessamin (wrought
 Rear'd high thir flourisht heads between, and
 Mosaic; underfoot the Violet,
 Crocus, and Hyacinth with rich inlay
 Broiderd the ground, more colour'd then with Stone
 Of costliest Emblem: other Creature here

Run-over lines, completed either above or below that line, occur frequently because of the size of the page; at times words are run together because of the length of lines: "Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Vertues, Pow-" with "(ers," above the line (5.601) or "being, stil" (8.266), causing this wrong and inconsistent spelling of "still." A large decorated first letter of the first word in the first line of each book causes the first three lines to require indentation and frequently overhang; this printing is not reproduced here. One may ask whether such indentation and overhanging in the first three lines may not be interpreted to yield significant meaning for the text.

Further, the poem is long, as Samuel Johnson remarked, and individual books seem to go on and on, but books 7 and 10 in the 1667 edition are very long—1,290 and 1,541 lines, respectively, the next longest being book 8 with 1,189 lines—and perhaps we can entertain the idea that a reader skipped or at best skimmed at least much in those two books, which do not offer pictures of Satan or specifically of the Fall and its aftermath for Adam and Eve.

There is evidence of an educated audience for the poem as presented in 1667, in addition to its source for the aborted translation of Theodore Haak (books 1–3 and part of 4 into German verse, dated ca. 1667–ca. 1680). In a series of letters from John Beale to John Evelyn (now in the British Library) the form, art, and subject of the epic are discussed, but the political concerns, the republicanism and Calvinism perceived in it are the foundation of Beale's enduring impression of it, in the words of Nicholas von Maltzahn.¹ (These

1. See Nicholas von Maltzahn, "Laureate, Republican, Calvinist: An Early Response to Milton and *Paradise Lost*," in *Milton Studies*, vol. 29, ed. Albert C. Labriola (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1993), 181–98.

letters are dated August 31, September 11, October 16, November 11, November 18, and December 24, 1667.) Letters exchanged between Sir John Hobart and his cousin, dated January 22, January 27, and January 30, 1668, offer favorable comments on the poem.² Apparently predating the second edition of *Paradise Lost* is an anonymous manuscript notation in *An Idea of the Perfection of Painting . . . Translated by J. E.* (1668) listing it as one of the “Books of advantage to a Painter . . . y^e Paradise lost of Milton.” Andrew Marvell, in “Last Instructions to a Painter,” reveals many echoes of the poem throughout; the manuscript of Marvell’s satire in the James Osborn Collection, Yale University, records its date as “September 1667,” and in the Portland manuscripts at the University of Nottingham as “Sept. 4, 1667.” Milton’s nephew John Phillips includes an appropriation from the poem on page 8 of his *Montelions Predictions; or, The Hogen Mogen Fortuneteller* (1672). The author of *The Transproser Rehears’d; or, The Fifth Act of Mr. Bayes’s Play* (1673) attacks Milton’s political and religious position by reference to biography, his association with Marvell, and various works including *Paradise Lost*.³ Rebuttal appeared soon after in 1673 by Marvell, *The Rehearsall Transpros’d: The Second Part* (and reprinted in 1674), which was countered by Parker in *The Reproof to The Rehearsal Transposed, in a Discourse to Its Author*.

In 1674 two encomiastic poems by S. B. (identified as Samuel Barrow) and A. M. (Andrew Marvell) were printed prefacing the second edition, obviously inspired by the first edition. The first poem emphasizes its “great universe,” its inclusiveness of “All things” important to humankind, the War in Heaven, Lucifer and the routing of the rebellious angels, and its dwarfing of epic authors like Homer

2. See James M. Rosenheim, “An Early Appreciation of *Paradise Lost*,” *Modern Philology* 75 (1978): 280–82.

3. The author has been cited as Richard Leigh and as Samuel Parker, but was probably Samuel Butler, as argued by Paul B. Anderson, “Anonymous Critic of Milton: Richard Leigh? Or Samuel Butler?” *Studies in Philology* 44 (1947): 504–18, and by Nicholas von Maltzahn, “Samuel Butler’s Milton,” *Studies in Philology* 92 (1995): 482–95.

and Vergil. Interestingly it does *not* cite the Fall and Adam and Eve or the effects of the Fall and ensuing biblical history. As Michael Lieb has shown, S. B. "demonstrates the extent to which Milton's earliest readers were inclined to single out the War in Heaven as an event of paramount importance" (75).⁴ In comparison is Marvell's poem which stresses "a rhetorical tradition of praise." Much has been written on Marvell's analysis of the poem and his championing its prosody (which was to receive general disapprobation) against the "tinkling Rhime" of John Dryden's tagging the lines. What is significant for us to observe here is Marvell's change of attitude within his encomium from his "misdoubting" Milton's "Intent / That he would ruine . . . / The sacred Truths to Fable and old Song" to exclaiming "Where couldst thou words of such a compass find? / Whence furnish such a vast expence of minds?"

The difficult text made more difficult for readers by length, by poor printing and composition work, by an unexpected and unpopular literary form did not, apparently, become well known until 1688 with the appearance of the fourth edition. Finally its reputation and influence spread and elicited both positive and negative evaluations of the author and his political and religious positions, but almost universally glowing evaluations of the poem's sublimity. Its author, as Dryden's epigram beneath Milton's frontispiece portrait in the 1688 edition pronounces, joins Homer's loftiness of thought and Vergil's majesty: "The force of nature could no further go."

John T. Shawcross and Michael Lieb

4. "S.B.'s 'In Paradisum Amissam': Sublime Commentary," *Milton Quarterly* 19 (1985): 75.