

ing faith, a surprising omission had Milton been responsible for the work in that the story of Samson obviously occupied much of his thought early and late.

One closes the book with a troubling question posed by the events of September 11, 2001, and the destruction of our own temple of Dagon with the deaths of thousands of innocent people: Will we now read *Samson Agonistes* in yet a new light? Was Samson indeed a suicidal fanatic? (John Donne raised the issue of his suicide, and the possibility is mentioned in the play.) Or as Shawcross shows, a major issue that it poses is, "Whose god is God?"

Jameela Lares. *Milton and the Preaching Arts*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2001. 352 pp. \$58.00. Review by JAMES EGAN, THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON.

Though Milton claims in *The Reason of Church-Government* that poetry and the pulpit are integrated for him, critics have traditionally preferred to separate the two. Lares sets out to demonstrate Milton's substantial, lifelong connection to what she designates as the "preaching arts," the formal manuals of sermon construction and the pervasive technical or "applied" manuals that embodied them. Preaching manuals typically adopted classical rhetorical theory, invoking Aristotle in matters of argumentation and the deployment of *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*. Lares begins by tracing Milton's indebtedness to specific traditions of English Reformation homiletics and then locates applications of these homiletic designs in the anti-prelatical tracts of 1641-42, *Paradise Lost*, and *Paradise Regained*. She attempts the combination of intellectual history and rhetorical analysis undertaken by the editors of the Yale Prose and such distinguished practitioners as Kranidas, Wittreich, and Lieb.

Lares evaluates biographical evidence to show that Milton was not as reluctant about the ministry as scholars, particularly postmodern ones, normally assume. Obviously, there was ample precedent in the seventeenth century for poet-priests: Donne,

Herbert, and Traherne are prominent cases. Milton believed that an unordained person of his intellectual and spiritual qualities could perform the function of a minister, and he considered writing to be a type of “extraordinary” ministry (35). Lares explains the aesthetic digression in *The Reason of Church-Government* as a “turning” of poetry to account for the ministry (47). Her discussion of Reformation *artes praedicandi* examines the work of Andreas Gerardus Hyperius, a Flemish Lutheran scholar who wrote *De formandis concionibus sacris* in 1553, a work translated into English in 1577 by John Ludham, under the title *Of Framing of Divine Sermons, or Popular Interpretation of the Scriptures* (56). Hyperius synthesized several prominent Reformation notions of homiletics and proposed the five sermon types so influential in seventeenth-century English treatises on preaching. English translations of his works were readily available. Though Hyperius respected classical rhetoric and recommended the form of the classical oration for the sermon, his emphasis was on the *confirmatio*; he proposed five categories of *confirmatio*, all of them to be drawn directly from the Bible: doctrine, reproof, instruction, correction, and consolation. The popularity of the Hyperian classification was profound—“virtually all of the English sermon manuals after 1590 refer to Hyperius’s five sermon types” (78). Lares presents and collates an important constellation of sources here, without question-begging or special pleading. She concludes the presentation by suggesting that Christ’s College was a center for homiletic theory and that Hyperius influenced at least two sermon manuals written by William Chappell, Milton’s first tutor at Cambridge: *The Preacher* (1656) and *The Use of Holy Scripture* (1653). Whether generally, as a student at an institution whose graduates produced “the lion’s share of English Reformation preaching manuals” (95), or specifically, as a tutee of William Chappell, Milton would have been exposed to Hyperius.

Chapter Three, “The Poet as Polemicist,” applies the homiletic traditions Lares has documented to the antiprelatical controversy of the early 1640s, including the work of Joseph Hall, Milton’s five pamphlets, and those of his allies, the Smectymnuans. “The most important sermon type for the controversialist,” Lares ar-

gues, was the “redargutive sermon,” the one that “reproved false doctrine” (98). Hyperius advised that the redargutive sermon be based on Scripture and directed at contemporary heresies. In Lares’s reading, Joseph Hall’s tracts qualify as the canny, rhetorically adept productions of a doctrinal dissembler. Hall’s first opponents, the Smectymnuans, not only attack his false doctrines, but provide a metadiscursive commentary on his rhetoric, revealing how Hall was “hiding his art” (119). For his part, Milton, in the *Animadversions* and *An Apology*, adopts the ideology of the sermon manuals of Hyperius and his followers, notably the rationale for the redargutive sermon. Milton, of course, was considerably more creative than the Smectymnuans and not afraid of appearing so. In short, though Milton transcends the argumentative strategies outlined in the sermon manuals, he insists, as the manuals had insisted, that Scripture itself was the model for discourse. Lares’s interpretation of the rhetoric of the episcopal controversy is a mixture of strength and weakness. The contextualization she provides for Joseph Hall’s polemic and that of the Smectymnuans is plausible; she develops important supporting evidence for Kranidas’s characterization of Hall as a shrewd controversialist, anything but an underdog. Lares does manage to fit Milton’s *Animadversions* and *An Apology* into the Hyperian model, but oversimplifies them as she does so. In contrast to her position, much of the scholarship on these tracts over the past decade has argued for their creative sophistication. Lares’s claim of sermon manuals as templates might have been more persuasively demonstrated in Milton’s pamphlets of 1659–60, the divorce treatises, or even the antimonarchical tracts. The fact remains that native polemic conventions in the seventeenth century, classical rhetorical theory, and the sermon manuals Lares studies are woven together so closely that, in a pamphleteer of Milton’s training and sophistication, a distinct, single line of influence is difficult to establish conclusively.

Chapter Four, “*Paradise Lost* and the Sermon Types,” treats Books 11 and 12 of the epic on the assumption that the dominant model for them is neither pedagogy nor typology, but rather the sermon. Book 11 draws from the correction model of the sermon

and Book 12 from the consolation model. These sermon modes of correction and consolation also structure the angelic discourses of Raphael and Michael at the middle and end of the poem. Lares's reading of the angelic discourses as manifestations of traditional preacherly aims of encouraging obedience, warning against sin, and rousing the passions is persuasive and energetic, and her treatment of Books 11 and 12 as a whole is a plausible alternative to the overextended pedagogical and typological readings of the past thirty years.

The final chapter, "Using the Word and Defending the Word in *Paradise Regained*," returns to the history-of-ideas format of the second, with a fresh contextualization of Christ's defense of Scriptural style in the poem's Athens temptation. Christ's argument parallels those voiced by Milton's contemporaries from 1650-1690. Defenses of Scriptural style by Norwood, Assheton, Boyle and many others, in turn, derive from the paradigm of *artes praedicandi* Lares has explicated. In this context, Christ's denunciation of heathen rhetoric takes on new meaning as an analog to mid-seventeenth-century theoretical discussions of the validity of verbal ornaments in discourse. Christ's remarks about the "majestic unaffected style" of the Scriptures become a signature identifying Milton, not with a retreat from humanism, but with the "progressive" side in post-1650's debates over Scriptural style. The chapter concludes by measuring the "contemporary phenomena" provoking defenses of Scriptural style, namely Neoclassicism, Restoration "wit," and skeptical readings of the Bible. As she did in the chapter on *Paradise Lost*, Lares again registers as generally persuasive, in local instances dramatically so, and consistently fresh in her conclusions. Despite some unevenness early on, *Milton and the Preaching Arts* breaks enough new ground to merit serious attention.