

be seen that there have been substantial additions to the collection, however we define it, even before the 1974 purchase of the Stuart collection⁵ which increased the number of pre-1801 editions to 242, Turnbull's own contribution being about fifty percent; the number of seventeenth century issues rose to 81, four-fifths of which Turnbull probably bought. This ignores duplicates. Even now the character of the collection is strongly influenced by Turnbull.

A further difficulty comes with defining the borders of the collection. When the rare books were catalogued in their present style around 1960 the identifiable Milton collection was given a distinctive callmark; it is not, however, an infallible rule that all the Milton collection has the Milton callmark. A clear case is the Second Folio Shakespeare, probably bought by Turnbull because it contains the first extant printing of any work by Milton, the 'Epitaph' on Shakespeare;⁶ this is catalogued as part of the main rare book collection.

Another case of the inevitable inconsistencies which occur can be seen with two pamphlets that Francis Peck attributed to Milton in his *New memoirs of the life*. The first of these, *Tyrannical government anatomized*, a 1642 translation of George Buchanan's *Baptistes*, is catalogued as part of the Milton collection; the second, an anti-Laud pamphlet of 1641 called *Canterburies dreame* which Peck calls 'The Parallel', is catalogued as part of the ordinary rare books. Turnbull himself commented, in his copy of Peck's work, 'How on earth anyone could imagine the "Parallel" to have been written by Milton passes my comprehension.'

I do not cite these inconsistencies in criticism, but only to illustrate the difficulty of using the callmark as a sole guide to the Milton collection. When we enter the field of Miltoniana, works with allusions to Milton, attacking him or defending him, and works which make use of him or are influenced by him, then we enter a territory with uncharted boundaries—where do we stop? Do we say that because Sir Robert Filmer analyses Milton's political ideas in his *Observations concerning the originall of government* then we should include not only that work of Filmer's but his others also, in which Milton is not mentioned, and that we should also include John Locke's *Two treatises of government* which include a lengthy attack on Filmer's ideas, almost certainly taking account of Milton's political ideas but with no identifiable reference at all to Milton. If Hobbes's *Behemoth*, with its explicit reference to Milton, is included should the *Leviathan* also be included? Hobbes would have been aware of the ideas in *Eikonoklastes*, in the *Tenure of kings and magistrates* and possibly in the first *Defensio pro populo Anglicano* (the timing of publication makes that doubtful) but there is absolutely no reference to Milton in the *Leviathan*, nor in the many pamphlets which attacked it.