understanding of ideas Kuin himself mentions in his introduction: Leicester's political problems, his marriage hopes, and the quest for patronage by artists. Indeed if some of the bibliographical niceties were replaced by texts from Gascoigne, which Kuin deletes in accordance with some unexplained principle that they are not "relevant" (Preface), readers might truly appreciate that Kenilworth was, as Kuin argues, "the grandest deed of personal homage of the reign" (3).

One has to wonder what objectives guided the preparation of this text, which seems to have been studiously begun but hastily completed by someone with lower standards or too little time, and guide that of other works in this series of Medieval and Renaissance Texts. The purpose cannot have been to provide an exhaustive bibliographical analysis of the text, for Kuin does not chart fully the variants among copies of A and B. The purpose cannot have been to provide all the raw materials for an understanding of Leicester's fête in honour of Elizabeth, for primary materials are omitted. The purpose cannot have been to provide the basis for a thorough study of the entertainment at Kenilworth, for this edition lacks even a selected list of studies of comparable prose works or of comparable manor house shows. In fact, no work published since 1977 (except Kuin's own "Langham's *Letter*: Facts and Problems" forthcoming in *The Library*, 1983) is cited. No work since 1973 except those dealing narrowly with the question of authorship is cited. The studies that might help put the entertainment in the various contexts that make it significant and intriguing—the works of Marie Axton, Jean Wilson, David Bergeron, Muriel Bradbrook, Ivan Shulze—are overlooked entirely. I am happy to have a reliable text of *A Letter* by Robert Langham, happy too that this text is based on the copy in fours in Emmanuel College, Cambridge, even though this new edition fails to do the justice modern scholarship might do to the magnificent entertainment of Elizabeth at Kenilworth.

C. E. MCGEE, *University of St. Jerome's College, Waterloo*

Ronald G. Shafer, ed. *Ringling the Bell Backward: The Proceedings of the First International Milton Symposium*. Indiana: Indiana University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982. Pp. vi, 150. Paper, \$6.50.

This collection of ten papers and seven responses from the first International Milton Symposium, July 7-9, 1981, represents in print what, judging from the photographs, must have been a most pleasant and elegant occasion. For the most part, the nature of the papers is dictated by the nature of their occasion: they are directly chiefly to other Miltonists, and they are content to shadow forth informally rather than to nail down their various arguments. The title, Dr. Shafer remarks in his Introduction, comes from "Little Gidding" and is intended to evoke the conference's theme, which was Milton's place in the historical relationship between Britain and America.

Jackie DiSalvo writes on Puritans and Indians in *Paradise Lost*. She sees in the American Puritan writings of Milton's time, which were so preoccupied by the "paradise-wilderness paradox," a possible model for Milton's Eden. Just as the early settlers inhabited what they thought of as a kind of Edenic garden in the midst

of a howling wilderness, threatened by Satan-worshipping savages, so Adam and Eve inhabit a garden set on a "steep savage Hill" and surrounded by "undergrowth / Of shrubs and tangled bushes" that block "All path of Man or Beast." The connection is conceivable, although, as Jon S. Lawry responds, travellers returning from Quaker Pennsylvania "reported no Satanic red men in devilish black forests" but rather a "peaceable kingdom."

Leo Miller gives a brief progress report on his transcription of the diary of Hermann Mylius, the release of which into the public domain "in its full awful illegibility" he obtained in 1980. Thus far no great surprises are indicated, though Milton's biographers will be grateful for any additional details they can get. Even small points may eventually prove significant. Thus, for example, Miller argues that Milton's newly demonstrated absence from London for several months in 1651 further dispels the canard that he took to heart his job as Licensor of *Mercurius Politicus*.

Estella Schoenberg successfully argues that publication of the third edition of *Paradise Lost* in 1688 was engineered by its Whig publisher and subscribers as a political gesture in anticipation of the Glorious Revolution. She further argues, more problematically, that the plate illustrating Book I was based on a statue of James II, and that in the plate to Book II Satan has the face of Charles II. Certainly Satan and Charles have noses of remarkably similar ugliness. But for me the statue theory is less likely than the proposition that the model for Satan leaning on his spear was Charon leaning on his oar.

In his paper on English and American Miltonists, Roy Flannagan poses a somewhat embarrassing question: How does it happen that English writers on Milton seem either to dislike him or to move rapidly into other fields? There are, he notes, judging by the subscription list to *Milton Quarterly*, "fewer Milton scholars in England than there are in Japan." Truly a frightening thought; does the study of Milton now "stand tiptoe" in California and British Columbia, poised for flight across the Pacific? If so, then North American Miltonists will be subjected to some of the same torments suffered by their English colleagues, and they will have to learn Japanese in order to keep up with the latest work.

Dennis Danielson writes briefly on the Miltonic theodicy, material now available in his book, *Milton's Good God*. Margaret Hannay wonders whether Milton was influenced by the Bay Psalm Book, or whether he influenced in turn the 1651 revision. Edward Sichi sees in Thoreau's *Civil Disobedience* a debt to Milton's political writings by way of Jonathan Mayhew. John Sears Tanner notes a number of resemblances between the theologies of Milton and the Mormons, concluding (after Christopher Hill) that "Mormons ought scarcely to be regarded as more scandalous bedfellows for Milton than Muggletonians, Familists, Fifth Monarchists, Ranters, Diggers, and Levellers." True; yet one must agree with Michael A. Mikolajczak that although the parallels are "intriguing," it is hard to tell "what they mean." Still, it is fascinating to learn that when R. Paul Cracroft wrote *A Certain Testimony: A Mormon Epic in Twelve Books*, Milton "was seldom out of my mind."

In the closing paper, originally the keynote address, Austin Woolrych, after some general remarks, returns to a question he has considered in several earlier studies. What was the political significance of Milton's remark, "after a short but

scandalous night of interruption"? And what did he mean when he criticized rule by a "single person"? Did he refer to the brief reign of Richard Cromwell, the chaos that followed his deposition, and the threat of Charles's return, or had he concluded that his earlier support of Oliver Cromwell was wholly mistaken? Woolrich believes the latter. He brings some fresh evidence to bear, as well as some heavy rhetorical guns: "There is really no blinking the facts that"; "There can also be little doubt that"; "What is inconceivable is that." In fact, as he reveals more plainly in his notes than in his paper, Robert Fallon has ably blinked, doubted, and conceived. One wishes that Fallon had had the opportunity to respond; perhaps time will tell which view is correct.

If, as Shafer remarks in his Introduction, Milton studies are too often "myopic" and "microscopic," this collection will do little to effect a change. America was not a topic that greatly interested Milton. Scholars have a natural enthusiasm for their own subjects, which is as it should be. About the theme of the First International Milton Symposium Shafer writes:

I think the cleavage with the dated conceptual categories and stereotypes of the past which I advocate here will enable us to reinvent a more accurate world picture of Milton and his day and to see it as the great confluence it was, the backwash of which stretches to the twentieth century, if we can but see it, bringing its own stentorian truth.

It would be fairer to say, however, that rather than replacing everything that preceded this collection, these papers will quietly take their place among the rest, contributing their insights as they do so.

ANTHONY LOW, *New York University*