

coerciveness of religious practice.

Dubrow closes her book by suggesting that lyric poetry's relationship to subjectivity is overdue for reconsideration; such a reconsideration would be especially timely insofar as the Foucauldian and/or Althusserian approaches that have underwritten much recent work on subjectivity are also ripe for re-consideration, with a view to more nuanced understandings of the self as agent and the self-in-process. Perhaps she will give us that study herself, but until she does there is much to be gleaned from this book concerning the relationship between subjectivity and performance in a genre whose status is alternatively, and even on occasion simultaneously, that of artifact, memorial inscription or trace, and script for soliloquy or dialogue.

"Like all my previous books," Dubrow comments in a concluding chapter that is aptly titled "The Rhetorics of Lyric," "this study has attempted to foster a more capacious and generous approach to critical methodologies" (238-39). There is an ethical as well as an intellectual stance implicit in this retrospective statement of intention, and indeed Dubrow's goal of sustaining a "capacious" scholarly conversation is apparent on every page. She never succumbs to the temptation most of us know intimately, of seeking to create an audience for our subject by making large pronouncements that simplify its contours and achieve a specious clarity by suppressing nuance and accountability. Like her earlier books this one not only delivers a powerful set of lenses for re-reading the early modern lyric, but also harvests the work of other scholars in a spirit of judicious yet generous inclusiveness.

John T. Shawcross and Michael Lieb, eds. *"Paradise Lost: A Poem Written in Ten Books": An Authoritative Text of the 1667 First Edition*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2007. xvi + 456 pp. bibl. \$68. Review by REUBEN SANCHEZ, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

Michael Lieb and John T. Shawcross, eds. *"Paradise Lost: A Poem Written in Ten Books": Essays on the 1667 First Edition*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2007. xii + 288 pp. index. append. \$60. Review by REUBEN SANCHEZ, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

Until recently, we have had access to the first edition of *Paradise Lost* (1667) via rare books and facsimiles, or via electronic and microfilm versions. But with this publication edited by John T. Shawcross and Michael Lieb, we now have access to the ten-book poem in an authoritative, hard copy edition. This is a transcription of the Newberry Library's copy of the first edition (first issue), the transcription then collated with the British Library's copy of the first edition (first issue), and with the two twentieth-century facsimiles (one published in Harris F. Fletcher's *John Milton's Complete Poetical Works Reproduced in Facsimile* [1943-1948], the other published by the Scholar Press [1968], although the editors caution us about the reliability of these facsimiles). In preparing their text, the editors have, further, made use of all the first edition issues (six from 1667 through 1669), the extant manuscript of Book I, and a copy of the second edition (1674). The result is a carefully prepared text, as unadorned, appropriately, as the first issue of the first edition. Following the poem is a seventy-seven page section titled "Discussion of the Edited Text," organized into subsections comprised of interesting and useful bibliographical information on the first edition, on its various issues, and on the second edition. This section and the poem testify to the care, expertise, and thoroughness with which the editors have done their work on this volume.

The accompanying volume is a collection of ten essays by various scholars. In their preface to the collection, Lieb and Shawcross contend that because we know of the "existence" of a work, it does not necessarily follow that the work is "known" to us (vii); for most, the first edition of *Paradise Lost* will be a "discovery" as opposed to a "rediscovery" (vii). The publication of the poem and the accompanying collection of essays, therefore, "represent a 'first' for Milton studies" (vii). Since scholarship is usually based on the 1674 edition (hereafter referred to as "1674"), the editors offer the essays as ways by which to "elucidate major aspects of the first edition of *Paradise Lost*" (viii). They emphasize, however, that they do not wish to place the 1667 edition (hereafter referred to as "1667") above 1674, but rather to show how and why the former is important in its own right and yet how it leads to, and results in, the latter. This aim validates 1667, at least partly, by demonstrating its value to 1674, thus inadvertently shifting the focus of the collection away from 1667: Some of the es-

says take 1667 as a starting point, but their interest lies mainly in later editions or in various issues of the first edition; others infrequently cite 1667, instead focusing on matters extra-textual—the historical period in which Milton lived, for example; still others offer analyses that do not seem endemic to 1667 per se but rather to the poem in any of its editions.

After the preface, the collection is framed by two essays that evidence the shift from 1667 to 1674 and beyond. In “Back to the Future: *Paradise Lost* 1667,” Lieb argues that 1674 cannot be fully known without recourse to 1667. But he also emphasizes the “transformations” 1667 underwent through the six issues of the first edition, as well as the “transformations” from the first to the second editions. Lieb adds that after the third edition (1678), the last three seventeenth-century editions (1688, 1691, 1695) witnessed much change. How would Milton have felt about such transformations resulting from Tonson’s marketing strategies or Hume’s annotations? Lieb believes Milton would not have been comfortable with them. In “That which by creation first brought forth Light out of darkness!/: *Paradise Lost*, First Edition,” Shawcross discusses “authorial revisions,” particularly those reflected in 1674, in order to account for Milton’s “bowing down to commercial demands” (213). 1667 is Milton’s “creation,” which “presents a significant meaning for the reader that *Paradise Lost* (1674) obscures” (216). Shawcross emphasizes the changes resulting from the poem’s division from ten books into twelve, how the changes appeared in 1674, and why those changes gave readers what Shawcross claims they expected.

The other eight essays begin with Joseph Wittreich’s “More and More Perceiving?: Paraphernalia and Purpose in *Paradise Lost*, 1668, 1669.” Quoting Stephen Orgel, Wittreich contends that the poem is “less a product . . . than a process, part of an ongoing dialectic” (31). He describes that process and how it applies to Milton’s works, particularly *Paradise Lost*, with some consideration given to Milton’s general publishing practices. When Wittreich does address the poem, it is to note the revisions made from 1667 to 1674, and what those revisions reveal about “each poem’s contradictory relationship to its counterpart. Each poem seems to subvert its own claim The contradiction at the heart of each poem opens upon various contra-

dictions between the two poems” (55). The essay is thus about 1667’s anxious and contradictory relationships with later editions. In “Simmons’s Shell Game: The Six Title Pages of *Paradise Lost*,” Stephen B. Dobranski considers contemporary publishing practices in order to explain why there were so many title pages to 1667. Dobranski concludes that there is no correlation between the “errors” within the text and the different title pages (65). Samuel Simmons, Milton’s publisher, used different title pages as ways by which to advertise because title pages could be posted even before a book became available to the public. Dobranski also points out that the way Simmons published the title pages of Milton’s epic—for example, in the way the author’s name or initials appear—would not have been unusual when one considers Simmons’ publishing practices with other authors.

In “Milton’s 1667 *Paradise Lost* in Its Historical and Literary Contexts,” Achsah Guibbory considers the ways in which the poem participates in the “cultural conversation” of the 1660s (79). When one considers the types of books published in the decade after the Restoration, Milton’s poem stands in opposition as “an alternative, counterculture discourse and ideology” to those many other books that presented Royalist visions of kingship and history as well as the reestablishment of the Anglican Church and its ideology (80). 1667 was out of step, then, with other contemporary publications. Richard J. DuRocher explores the similarities between Charles II and Satan in “The Emperor’s New Clothes: The Royal Fashion of Satan and Charles II.” Subtle references to Charles II’s style of dress are worked into the first two books of *Paradise Lost*, “believed to be among the last completed parts of the epic” (100). DuRocher points out that Charles’ “‘Persian’ style” of dress can be dated between 1666 and 1674 (100). In 1667, Milton’s attack on Charles and the Caroline court would have been an example of Milton “writing under censorship” (100). The essays by Guibbory and DuRocher represent good examples of how the new historicism can be used effectively to help explain the relationship between historical context and literary composition.

Laura Lunger Knoppers takes the gardens of post-1660 London as her subject in “‘Now let us play’: *Paradise Lost* and Pleasure Gardens in Restoration London.” 1667 was published at a time when these gardens were associated with the profligacy of king and court. Such

gardens were intended for leisure and play, but Milton associates leisure and play with laboring in the garden: “Adam and Eve [therefore] fall when they separate labor and pleasure” (124). Knoppers discusses, at some length, Pepys’ entries about feeling guilty that he neglects work for pleasure in the gardens, a tendency that Pepys ascribes to Charles II. Not until seven pages into her seventeen-page essay does Knoppers begin to discuss Milton, whose concern is with Adam and Eve laboring in the garden together, which thus becomes “more of a test than a task” (137). Because it can never be complete, laboring in the garden tests the obedience of Adam and Eve. The most interesting and persuasive essay in the collection, the quality of this essay is consonant with Knoppers’ other new historicist studies—*Historicizing Milton*, for example, remains one of the finest studies of the “late” Milton—and yet, Knoppers hardly mentions 1667. She quotes from it but, like some of the other contributors to this collection who quote from 1667, she could just as well be quoting the same passage from 1674, to the same effect. In “[N]ew Laws thou see’st impos’d: Milton’s Dissenting Angels and the Clarendon Code, 1661-65,” Bryan Adams Hampton connects “the politics of nonconformity and dissent in the early 1660s, and the Church of England’s programmatic legislation against it through the Clarendon Code” to Milton’s depiction of the rebel angels (142). In response to small groups of dissenters, the Restoration government enacted new laws, toward which Milton’s felt “ambiguous” (142): As a dissenter he opposed the established church, but he also criticized the dissenting angels because their rebellion resulted from “implicit faith” (156). In this new historicist analysis, Hampton focuses primarily on the history of the period rather than on 1667; he does not begin to address the poem in any detail until more than half way through the essay, where he discusses the elevation of the Son in Book V as leading to the rebellion. But by that time, the references to *Paradise Lost* seem tangential to the description of the times in which Milton lived.

In “Poetic Justice: Plato’s *Republic* in *Paradise Lost* (1667),” Phillip J. Donnelly explains why Milton chose to write ten books instead of twelve: Milton’s use of “the ten-book structure emphasizes a direct engagement and transformation of the major arguments in Plato’s *Republic*” (161). Donnelly argues for a numerological reading where

there are precise, “architectonic symmetries” between the two works (161). He contends, for example, that Satan was inspired by Thrasymachus, and that the first two books of *Paradise Lost* respond to the “Thrasymachus problem,” which characterizes the first two books of the *Republic* (165). As regards the several structural parallels Donnelly posits, however, while the traditional, ten-book structure of the *Republic* is certain, it is not certain whether Plato or a later editor divided the *Republic* into those ten books. Since Milton would have known Plato’s work in its traditional form, Donnelly naturally bases his assertions about the “architectonic symmetries” on that form. But because he wishes to explain Milton’s “engagement and transformation” of Plato’s “major arguments,” and because he insists that those points of contact occur in precisely paralleled books in both works, we might note the arbitrariness of the way in which Plato’s arguments could have been initially presented. The ten-book structure may be more a result of the way books were produced in Plato’s time, rather than the result of a carefully structured and sequential argument. A *book*, or in this case a *dialogue*, was incorporated onto a papyrus scroll, its argument and length, therefore, potentially dependent upon the length of the scroll. The *Republic*’s argument may seem unified, but to convey argument and sequence more clearly, scholars have sometimes chosen to abandon the traditional, ten-book structure, instead dividing it into three or four major sections, with further subsections, which is reflected in some modern editions. Michael Bryson points out that the London disasters of the 1660s were seen as God’s punishments, which elicited differing explanations about why God punished, most explanations based on the belief that God was a “partisan” for one side or the other (186). In “The Mysterious Darkness of Unknowing: *Paradise Lost* and the God Beyond Names,” Bryson concludes that Milton rejected “partisan notions of God” (186). The essay focuses on negative theology, or what became known as apophatic theology. Milton did not write a theodicy but rather an apophatic theology in which he did not try “to define what God actually *is*” (212). Hence, our images of God gleaned from the text are misreadings. For Bryson, after all, apophatic theology is “a dismantling of images, a denial of concepts, and a negation of the qualities that are posited to the divine” (187). God is thereby deconstructed into that which cannot

be known, imagined, or named—into “the mysterious darkness of unknowing,” in other words (212). Bryson himself notes the similarity between apophatic theology and deconstruction (186). But his argument—which threads its way through positive and negative theologies, deconstruction, Pseudo-Dionysius, Neoplatonism, medieval and Renaissance theologians, and *De doctrina christiana*—finally seems distanced from 1667 itself.

While these essays teach us much about Milton, his poem, and the time in which he lived, the collection, as a whole, does not substantially enhance our understanding of 1667. But the publication of 1667 is cause for celebration. This is, after all, a hard copy of the first issue of the first edition, and in reading it, one experiences the poem as Milton originally intended it. When one does begin on those ten-thousand five-hundred and fifty lines of poetry, though, one quickly encounters a glaring error in this publication: There is no punctuation at the end of the epic’s most famous line, “Better to reign in Hell, then serve in Heav’n” (I.263). The first edition copies owned by the British Library and by the Huntington Library show a period at the end of this line, as does the extant manuscript of Book I (as does every other edition one cares to name, for that matter). If the bibliographical history of *this* poem has taught us anything, however, it has taught us that most, if not all, publications of it contain errors. And yet, however egregious or trivial the errors, we continue to get excited about new editions of *Paradise Lost* because it is the poem itself, not necessarily what editors and publishers do to it, that finally matters. Of course, the closer we can get to what we think were Milton’s original intentions, and the smoother those intentions read, the better. For those of us who teach *Paradise Lost*, our classroom text has been 1674, or a text based on a combination of 1674 and later editions. But now that we have this fine, ten-book edition of the poem, we *almost* have a choice: Perhaps someday an introduction, annotations, an index, a more extensive bibliography than the one offered here, and other such pertinent material will be added to enable teachers, if they choose, to use 1667 as their classroom text.