politics, visual art, and the environment, and thus Renaissance Ecology stands as a lovely and worthy tribute. In its own right, Renaissance Ecology succeeds in offering new, original, and noteworthy contributions to our understanding of Milton and seventeenth-century historical, artistic, and poetic texts and contexts. On the whole, this book holds to the highest standards of scholarship, from the quality of its essays, to the unusually plentiful array of visual images, to the careful management of the Notes, Bibliography, and Index.


This collection includes an introduction, an afterward, and fifteen newly-published essays on the concept of toleration, considered expansively enough to include the history of toleration, its legal and social practices, and the extent of Milton’s participation, both politically and imaginatively, in the discourses of toleration in the early modern world. The introduction by Achinstein and Sauer argues for the relevance of the collection’s contents not only to literary critics, but also to historians, on the assumption that “the images of literature, rhetoric, and poetry present a kind of ‘truth’ of the past” which critics are “uniquely skilled to explore” (5). Milton and Toleration balances its agenda by, on the one hand, treating comparatively narrow issues, such as the ways in which liberty of conscience expands historically into a wider “defence of human freedoms” (10); and, on the other, by constructing frameworks of inquiry for new assessment of the intricacies of Milton’s positions on toleration. The editors note that the collection “explores a poetics of tolerance” (19), and thereby qualify the work to join the important post-1990s discussion of the aesthetics of Milton’s prose.

The first part, subtitled Revisiting Whig Accounts, includes the following contributions:

Nigel Smith, “Milton and the European Contexts of Toleration”
David Loewenstein, “Toleration and the Specter of Heresy in Milton’s England”

Thomas N. Corns, “John Milton, Roger Williams, and the Limits of Toleration”

Nicholas von Maltzahn, “Milton, Marvell, and Toleration”

Loewenstein discusses, in the pamphlets of John Goodwin, William Walwyn, and Milton, instances of the rhetorical or tropal expression of the “visceral and irrational feelings” (46) which inevitably surrounded tolerationary debate in revolutionary England. Conceding that England in the 1640s was as fully involved in religious as in military conflict, Goodman’s writing nevertheless expressed reservations about the role of coercive power in religious debates and the fallible judgment of civic and religious authority in persecuting heresy. Goodwin understood how heresy-hunters might manipulate the fear of heresy into grounds for a more authoritarian state church. Walwyn shared Goodwin’s doubts about the increasing authority over conscience assumed by Presbyterian clergy, advocating a tolerant model of response to those demonized as “heretics” (60). In *Areopagitica* Milton grew scornful of the danger posed by “those terrible names of Sectaries and Schismaticks” and advanced his own distinctive notion of heresy, namely that one might be a heretic in the truth if his possession of that truth were static (68). Valuably, Loewenstein considers Milton’s position on heresy in the context of two of his most active pamphleteering contemporaries, and by so doing not only measures the evolution of that position, but begins to characterize its rhetorical articulation.

The second part, subtitled Philosophical and Religious Engagements, contains these selections:


Jason P. Rosenblatt, “Milton, Natural, Law and Toleration”
Victoria Silver, “‘A Taken Scandal not a Given’: Milton’s Equitable Grounds of Toleration”
Martin Dzelzainis, “Milton and Antitrinitarianism”
Andrew Hadfield, “Milton and Catholicism”

In “Milton and Antitrinitarianism” Dzelzainis contextualizes Milton’s engagement with antitrinitarianism, beginning with Of True Religion (1673) and working backward. In 1673 Milton’s position that Arians and Socinians should be tolerated can easily be inferred. In his capacity as licenser Milton probably authorized the publication of the Catechism or Racovian Catechism, and that decision suggests that by 1652 he had “abandoned the orthodox position on the Trinity” (181). Yet some evidence can also be found that he may have begun to doubt the orthodox position as early as the mid-1640s.

The third part, Poetry and Rhetoric, consists of five essays:
Elizabeth Sauer, “Toleration and Nationhood in the 1650s: ‘Sonnet XV’ and the Case of Ireland”
Sharon Achinstein, “Toleration in Milton’s Epics: A Chimera?”
Paul Stevens, “Intolerance and the Virtues of Sacred Vehemence”
Lana Cable, “Secularizing Conscience in Milton’s Republican Community”
Gerald MacLean, “Milton, Islam, and the Ottomans”

MacLean claims that Milton’s rare direct references to Islam, to Muhamed, and to the Ottomans do not constitute ignorance of or indifference to the role played by all three in seventeenth-century toleration debates. In the early seventeenth century, information about the Ottomans and their tolerant policies toward non-Muslims was available in English and other European languages, so that one can reasonably assume Milton’s general familiarity with Ottoman history. The Arab-Islamic critical response to Milton records repeated attempts by academics, writers, and critics to make Milton their own. Moreover, the Qur’an’s Satan-figure, Iblis, available to Milton through a 1649 translation of the Alcoran (294), suggests many parallels in motive
and character to Milton’s Satan. Milton’s idiosyncratic combination of learning and unorthodox interpretations of the Old Testament and various other ancient sources (297) might have made him attractive to Islamic readers and writers. Above and beyond the valuable particulars noted above, MacLean’s piece sets a welcome precedent for further inquiry into the Islamic reaction to the Milton canon.

In her afterward Ann Hughes, as she summarizes the themes and scholarly vantage points of *Milton and Toleration*, reinforces the important position that these literary-critical essays offer much to historians of toleration in early modern England as well as to scholars seeking to connect the variegated Milton, especially the republican Milton with the Milton who defended religious liberty.


Under the editorship of Jan Ross, Boydell and Brewer has published Volumes 2 and 3 of *The Works of Thomas Traherne*, an ongoing project that promises to be the complete and authoritative critical text of Thomas Traherne’s work. Following the 2005 publication of Volume 1 (which was comprised of the most recently discovered Traherne texts), Volumes 2 and 3 contain the unfinished *Commentaries of Heaven*, a kind of spiritual encyclopedia in which Traherne muses over topics ranging from “Anger” to “Babe” to “Babel” to “Bastard” and so on. In all, Traherne includes ninety-five such entries; the content and sentiment of some of these entries are consistent with the more well-known of Traherne’s work (the *Poems* and *Centuries*, for example), but there are also some surprises contained herein. The fact is the *Commentaries* is a huge work that is absolutely essential for students and scholars of Traherne. This is the first time it has been published in its entirety, and its publication will undoubtedly spark new explorations into Traherne’s work.

I have commented earlier on the editorial principles of this multivolume edition (see *SCN* 1 & 2 [2006], 3-6). Ross does a fine job of recreating the text and providing a readable, accurate rendition of