

questioning as well as the violence. We in the United States may have found it too easy, given our Puritan heritage, to identify with the Israelites in our readings of Milton's text and of the Book of Judges; Wood reminds all of us what it can mean if we recognize ourselves in the Philistines.

Graham Parry and Joad Raymond, eds. *Milton and the Terms of Liberty*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002. xvi + 218 pp. \$60.00. Review by JAMES EGAN, THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON.

This collection includes twelve essays originally presented as papers at the Sixth International Milton Symposium, held at York in July 1999. The essays touch on Marvell, Milton, and the Millennium, though the focus is, in fact, the political Milton, linkages between literary form and ideas in the expression of his political concerns, and occasionally the language of political engagement practiced by his contemporaries.

Quentin Skinner's "John Milton and the Politics of Slavery" locates the essence of Milton's theory of free government in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, *Eikonoklastes*, and *Pro populo Anglicano defensio*. Milton appears to share the view of Henry Parker and other defenders of Parliament from 1628 through 1642, namely that a legitimate government entails a ruler morally accountable to his subjects, and subjects who accept the "strenuous" social and ethical challenges of a life of freedom (21). Like Henry Parker's, Milton's views generally align with those of Roman law, but Milton also extends the positions of classical authorities by multiplying the liabilities of monarchical rule. In "Milton before Lycidas," Thomas N. Corns questions much of the evidence currently invoked to support claims of Milton's youthful radicalism, particularly the notions that Milton's relationship with Alexander Gill urged him toward Puritanism, that the Earl of Bridgewater admired Milton's radical ideology, and that the religious poems of the 1645 collection embed the same radical ideology. *Comus*, Corns argues, celebrates the beauty of holiness characteristic of the *via media* so

eloquently that Laud himself would have applauded. *Comus* may be read as a transference of the values, assumptions, and sensibility of Laudianism to the genre of the pastoral masque. Corns offers the first of several prudent caveats in *Milton and the Terms of Liberty*, succinctly challenging the second round of attempts, this time by new historicists and cultural materialists, to radicalize the young Milton. John Creaser's "Prosody and Liberty in Milton and Marvell" contrasts Milton's innovations as a prosodist to Marvell's prosody of containment, demonstrating these contrasts in each poet's treatment of poetic form. If Milton proves to be as much a radical individualist and libertarian in his politics, theology, and social policy as he was in prosody, Marvell tries regularly to match content and expression in the same way that he remains attached to stability (47).

"Milton and Roman Law," by Martin Dzelzainis, moves in the same general direction as Quentin Skinner's essay by examining a controversial translation from Martin Bucer's *De Regno Christi* in Milton's *The Judgement of Martin Bucer*, a translation which seemingly manipulates Bucer's original. Dzelzainis exonerates Milton when he suggests that Milton knew Roman law well enough to realize that the apparent resistance in Bucer's text to his own argument for divorce was, in effect, overruled by historical circumstance. Joad Raymond's "The King is a Thing" studies the "nature of the relationship between the word 'king' and its referent, whether material or merely nominal" (70). In the 1640s royalist and republican pamphleteers and journalists, with Milton prominently among them, battled over the meanings of the language of kingship and tyranny. By 1654, Milton's earlier (1649-51) ambivalence and anxiety over nominal versus material definitions of "king" "had shifted wholesale onto Cromwell" (94). In

"The Politics of Martial Metaphors in Post-regicide England," Christopher Orchard demonstrates the political subtext of "military metaphors in ostensibly apolitical texts" (95), using as examples Christopher Wase's translation of *Electra* (1649) and the preface to Davenant's *Gondibert* (1650). Milton's *Eikonoklastes* pro-

vides a plain, aggressive republican antidote to the royalist rhetoric of stealth and passive resistance.

“Self-representation and Anxiety in Milton’s Defences,” by Stephen M. Fallon, measures the growing importance of self-representation and self-defense in Milton’s heroic prose of the 1650s. As Alexander More recognized, Milton “projects onto others—and condemns—his own propensity for self-serving self-representation” (113). The very hyperbole of Milton’s heroic self-construction in the 1650s increasingly and ironically exposes the uneasiness it seems intended to conceal (117). John Rumrich’s “Stylometry and the Provenance of *De doctrina christiana*” raises several weighty challenges to the “Burrowes technique” of stylometric analysis recently applied to determine the authorship of the *De doctrina*. Among the reservations Rumrich voices are these: that the statistical, quantifiable stylometric method used so successfully in attributing the authorship of *The Federalist Papers* does not properly apply to a seventeenth-century Latin work of exegetical theology; that Milton’s prefatory epistle leaves intact the assumption that he himself wrote the following treatise; and that stylometric analysis generates flawed conclusions because of its inability to measure Milton’s use of scripture (135). Like the earlier piece by Corns, this essay offers a welcome caveat, namely that stylometry constitutes an extraordinary standard of authorial attribution and may risk statistical oversimplification of available evidence.

Janel Mueller’s “Samson as a Hero of London Nonconformity, 1662-1667” reads *Samson Agonistes* as incorporating “the three notable events of the nonconformist perspective on London experience between 1662 and 1667: imprisonment for steadfastness in God’s service, the dejections and sufferings of the plague, and the consuming catastrophe of the fire” (146). This trope suggests that after the Restoration Milton continues to honor English nonconformity in the figure of Samson, but disavows revolutionary militancy. Katsuhiko Engetsu’s “The Publication of the King’s Privacy” traces Milton’s treatment of the interaction between the private and the public in *Paradise Regained* and *Of True Religion*, with particular emphasis on Milton’s exposure of the corrupt “private”

life of “public” figures in Charles II’s court (171). “Milton’s last Seven Years,” by Barbara Lewalski, traces the pervasiveness of Milton’s role as oppositional educator, from the models of political response to conditions of trial and oppression he presents in *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*, to his plea for toleration for Protestants in *Of True Religion*, to the political implications of certain features of presentation in the 1673 edition of his shorter poems (188). The twelve-book edition of *Paradise Lost* published in 1674 seems intended to counter the attempt of Dryden, Davenant, and the royalist culture to appropriate the Vergilian epic (189). In “Surveying Milton’s ‘vain empires’ in the Long Eighteenth Century” Anne-Julia Zwierlein correlates British imperial politics to eighteenth-century adaptations of Milton’s epics, establishing that over the course of the century Milton was transformed from a sacred poet into a national, and then an imperial one, while the sacred images of divine rule in *Paradise Lost* and the images of “vain” empires in *Paradise Regained* were transformed into visions of the British imperial mission and sublime vistas of worldly possessions.

Though the essays by Skinner and Creaser are reprinted here in revised forms, their inclusion does not compromise the overall timeliness and integrity of this collection, nor does the fact that *Milton and the Terms of Liberty* is a vague title for a collection preoccupied with the political Milton. The political Milton has been subject to such frequent, energetic recontextualization that the 1999 date of the essays might seem to leave them dated, but that is not the case. Ideally, the caveats provided by Corns and Rumrich will provoke a general re-examination of currently fashionable methodologies and assumptions, and for that provocation Miltonists should be grateful. Finally, the Raymond, Mueller, and Zwierlein pieces, with their fresh insights into major texts of Miltonic prose and poetry, allow *Milton and the Terms of Liberty* to strike a welcome balance among reassessment, wary skepticism, and the forward movement of Milton scholarship as a whole.