

Adams, Robert, Ikon: John Milton and the Modern Critics (Cornell: N.Y.) 1955

p. 73 But these are not the usual devices of rational demonstration; and I think Miss Darbishire's elaborate game of hopscotch will convince most people only that if principles for an emphatic use of "their" ever existed in anyone's mind, it was certainly no in poor blind Milton's.

Indeed, Mr. Harris Fletcher concedes, though only with the greatest reluctance, that, so far as he can see, at least half and probably two-thirds of the changes made between the first and second editions were the work of the compositor, or at least of someone other than Milton, his friends, and amanuenses [Fletcher, III, 57,59]

p. 74 It would have been very odd indeed if Milton had expected his readers to seek buried significance in every extra letter of his 10,665-line poem; for he was not a particularly careful speller, even among authors of his day. In the ordinary course of writing, consistency was not of paramount importance to him, and there is no conceivable rationale, either of buried significance, of philological origins, or of euphony, for a very great number of his spelling variations.

p. 95 Of modern editors, only Canon Beeching and Professor Patterson refuse to go along with Bentley in emending; both seem definitely committed to following a text supervised by Milton, without allowing any emendations at all.

p. 112 Empson on Pearce on Bentley on Milton; one would hesitate to involve the Chinese puzzle any further, if it were not for the hope of clarifying it. Milton wrote the poem, Bentley emended the text, Pearce criticized the emendations, Empson to gain his private ends revived the debate.<sup>1</sup>

1. Milton, Paradise Lost; Richard Bentley, ed., Milton's "Paradise Lost", (London, 1732); Zachary Pearce, A Review of the 12 Books of Milton's "Paradise Lost" (London, 1733); William Empson, Some Versions of Pastoral (Norfolk, Conn., n.d.).