Italien in the late seventeenth century and the Pedrolino figure of the travelling Italian player troops coming into mid-sixteenth century France, in order to show the origins of a mask rather than of a particular class of clown. Storey necessarily eliminates competing clowns like Harlequin, Gilles and Crispin as their masks are not Pierrot’s. However, Storey’s reader will hardly miss them, as amid a welter of details about theatrical history he learns that, in one of his French Romantic manifestations, Pierrot macabre tickled his wife to death.

Pierrot is beautifully printed and well illustrated, and its cover is white, like the clown’s dress in Watteau’s painting, and its end sheets, like his buttons, are black.

ANTHONY RASPA, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi


The three volumes of Milton studies here under review contain scholarly examinations of Milton’s major poems, his prose, and some of his lesser poetry. The problem for the reviewer in marshalling this variety and doing justice to thirty assorted articles is somewhat relieved by the fact that Volume XI has a theme and its substance can therefore be considered separately.

The eleven articles of Volume IX and the thirteen in Volume X provide nine concerning Paradise Lost, two about Samson Agonistes, and one dealing with Paradise Regained. Five essays discuss some aspect of Milton’s prose, and seven treat minor poems. This distribution presents no surprises. Milton obviously continues to provide an effective stimulus to scholars with all aspects of his work; although interest primarily focuses upon Paradise Lost, his other work remains the source of lively discussion and penetrating scholarly analysis.

It is disappointing, however, that amongst all this material there is but one article on Paradise Regained (Richard D. Jordan, “Paradise Regained and the Second Adam,” X); even more disappointing than the paucity of material on the brief epic is the fact that Professor Jordan’s article does little to illuminate our understanding of the poem. Although he concludes that “PR is dramatically forceful” (273), his consideration of Christ as Second Adam fails to provide the character with dramatic intensity. Rather the reverse is true, for the article concerns itself primarily with ways Christ differs from rather than resembles Adam. If we are to be aware of the dramatic effectiveness of Paradise Regained, we must be made to understand that Christ voluntarily accepts the role of second Adam, abjures his divinity, allows the satanic full play, and resists evil with only the same capacity for Right Reason that all Adams and Eves share.
The two articles on *Samson Agonistes*, both in Volume X, differ considerably in focus and quality. The first, "The Comic Dimension in Greek Tragedy and *Samson Agonistes*" by C.A. Patrides, provides an interesting consideration of Greek tragedy to show that the dramatists then as in Elizabethan times were not inhibited by the current critical dogma. As there are "comic" elements in Greek tragedy in spite of Aristotle, so there are in *Samson Agonistes* in spite of Milton's dogmatic critical utterances in the Preface. Professor Patrides sees the Chorus as an individual so perverse and vulgar as to constitute a danger to him; Manoa, too, is "comic" in that his "blindness" is total and unrelieved in contrast to Samson's progression towards vision. Both these "comic" effects arise principally from the ironic contrasts, as Professor Patrides in his careful and persuasive manner indicates. Professor Patrides takes, I think, a far subtler view of the comic than Milton does in his preface, and can in this way succeed in making his points; for Milton, the irony is not a "comic" element, surely, but a device by means of which he intensifies the audience's reaction to the dramatic movement of the play, both as it is manifested within Samson, and by the messenger's account of the final climactic action. It is this intensification that Professor Patrides traces for us in his usual direct, clear and elegant manner. The effect is after all the meaningful element; what we call the cause is of little moment. A more formidable question remains: the fact that in *Samson Agonistes* we have a tragedy that ends "happily." Perhaps Professor Patrides will at some future time address that question.

"Multiple Perspectives in *Samson Agonistes*: Critical Attitudes Toward Dalila" by John B. Mason, reviews the various notions about Dalila that have been promulgated in earlier criticism. Professor Mason suggests that Milton provides three perspectives on Dalila: Samson's, Dalila's and the Chorus's. There is nothing very startling or useful in this, nor in the succeeding discussion of Dalila's motives which confuses rather than illuminates the problem (if problem there is) by failing to distinguish her motives for betraying Samson from her motives for visiting him in his humiliated state. The fact that Professor Mason thinks the action of the play takes place in Samson's cell (to which reference is made twice on p. 25 and once again on p. 27) does little to give us confidence in his "guiding hand." He ought to read Milton's magnificent prologis with greater care.

The articles about *Paradise Lost* (five in vol. IX, four in vol. X) concern a wide variety of topics: some consider aspects of Milton beyond as well as in the epic, some comprehend the whole epic, others examine closely one or other of the elements that comprise the entirety, in one case simply an image in Book IV.

Marcia Landy, in "'A Free and Open Encounter': Milton and the Modern Reader (IX)," opens once again the old question of Milton's attitude to woman. She makes assumptions about the "modern reader" difficult to accept; she considers Milton criticism must be based upon an "understanding" of the modern reader's "responses in terms of contemporary psychological, sociological, and historical reality" (p. 11). Do we do the same with Chaucer? with Shakespeare? with Pope? with the Brontës? with Austen? Why with Milton? It appears that we must do this with Milton so that we can see the flaws in his portrayal of woman. Eve, we are told, is a "stereotype" (p. 19). She is susceptible to deviance and her freedom is restricted by "existing hierarchical structures of power and authority" (p. 19). In these respects, of course, Adam and Eve are absolutely identical, but of Adam in this context nothing is said;
but he, we are told, sins “out of fondness and interest in another being” (p. 19). A close reading of the event will show how untrue that is. Other evidences of less than penetrating reading abound in this paper, not the least of which is the statement that “the presentation of Eve during and after the Fall does not offer much evidence of the potential for later maturity.”

In “The Sacred Head: Milton’s Solar Mysticism” (IX), Don Parry Norford goes to a great deal of trouble to discuss the element of light in Milton’s work. He appeals to a veritable Jupiter of sources, and bombards his reader with an unending flash of meteorites. We learn “that the development of civilization and culture is masculine and solar”; we hear about “The Phallic sun” (p. 41); we are told that “In Samson’s climactic act we can see a death wish, despite Milton’s attempt to mitigate it” (p. 51), and that Samson “emasculates the worshipers of the fishtailed Dagon, in a way, by pulling down the theater upon their heads” (p. 67). The article goes on and on, providing in all 99 footnotes (5 full pages) to illuminate the emblem of light and to attest to the scholarliness of the whole procedure. The result is a distressing and oppressive darkness.

By contrast, the article immediately following, Burton J. Weber’s “The Non-Narrative Approaches to Paradise Lost: A Gentle Remonstrance” (IX), is one of the best pieces in the two volumes. Professor Weber, who, as he tells us in his Notes, “as blind as Milton” (p. 102), is gifted with the Miltonic power to see clearly where others stumble; his mind, irradiated, deals (gently) with the mythic critics (Mac-Caffrey, Cope), the Fish school, and “subjective” critics like Waldock and Peter “who claim that Paradise Lost is not a narrative” (p. 78), but rather, in the first instance, “a compound of many symbols,” and, in the second, “metaphorically speaking, a Platonic dialogue between the writer and the reader” (p. 89). This essay is remarkable for its lucidity, its good sense, its directness, its logic, and its careful analysis. Every page has a gift for the reader. Professor Weber’s concluding words provide good advice for us all, especially the Norfords among us: “A few fit readers might treasure Milton’s qualities, if only they knew what qualities he had. And so, I think, it is time to call the critics back from their exciting prospects, from the bull of novelty. The common field waits, and cushy cow bonnie the cow of truth, who will still let down her milk to anyone willing to whisper the familiar words” (p. 101).

Harold E. Toliver examines the domesticity of the Edenic household as an application of Milton’s innovative use of the epical, the heroic, to treat humble matters with dignity. “Milton’s Household Epic” (IX) makes no pretensions; it is a short and slight, but interesting analysis.

The “chief proposition” of Kathleen M. Swaim’s essay, “Structural Parallelism in Paradise Lost” (IX), is that “Eve’s relationship with Adam parallels Adam’s relationship with [divine] agency . . . , and that the Eve-Adam data provide explicit experiential guidelines for more fully comprehending the abstract analogues of Adam’s intercourse with a divinity that must remain essentially mysterious” (p. 122). The first part of this proposition is self-evident; the second is the clearly sensible way to use the first and is not new. But the article performs a service by showing once more, as Summers did, the importance of Eve who “shows Adam the way to heavenly concilement” (p. 141), and carries within her the seed that will eventually produce the Redeemer. To see Eve, as Professor Landy does, as in some way presented as inferior because, in Books XI and XII she “does not play an active role”
(p. 23), is to misunderstand Milton’s concept of heroism. As Christ’s “weakness” overcomes “Satanic strength” so Eve’s meekness reveals her mastery over the consequences of sin. This Professor Swaim discerns, thought one might wish this major point had been more emphatically made and more fully developed.

Dustin Griffin builds an elaborate structure on the rise and suggestive significance of the moon in Book IV, 598-609. He controls the discussion with scholarly caution, properly not over-stressing the symbolic possibilities. “Milton’s Moon” (IX) is an interesting piece which, if accepted, indicates yet once more with what craftsman-like precision and care Milton fashions his masterpiece.

Of the four articles on Paradise Lost in Volume X, the most interesting and fruitful is George Yost’s exploration of Milton’s Paradise in “A New Look at Milton’s Paradise”. He suggests, with persuasive evidence, sources for Milton’s river Tigris, the mountain, and the gate, and explains Milton’s reasons for structuring his paradise as he does in terms of the blend of significant details, symbolic usefulness, and the use of dream. What emerges from the discussion is a locale which combines Man’s imaginative capacities and his tendency to idealization with his spiritual aspirations and the creative power of God. A great deal is effectively compacted into this brief cogent article.

E.R. Gregory’s “Three Muses and a Poet: A Perspective on Milton’s Epic Thought” deals with the vexing problem of Milton’s muse and indicates that Milton, writing an epic in which as Steadman has said he condemns “virtually the entire epic tradition” and humiliates “the conventional heroic ideal” (p. 53), turns away from Clio, the “Prime and General Representative of Poetry” (p. 37) whom he had invoked in earlier pieces, and adopts in her place Urania, his “Heavenly Muse”, who was Christianized in the Renaissance synthesis of Christianity and classical mythology, and who is related to religious poetry and antithetical to the traditional heroic. Urania is “a ‘poetical personification’ of Divine Art” (p. 57), and Art and Wisdom are sisters, for “the primal mover of every Art is God, the author of all wisdom” (p. 57; cf. P.L. VII, 7-12). This examination is exceedingly well argued and strongly documented.

This is unfortunately not true of M.C. Miller’s “Beelzebub and Adam and ‘the worst than can be,’” which fails to convince the reader that Adam’s soliloquy in Book X is a satanic dialogue like that of Satan and Beelzebub in Book I. Adam is arguing with the Beelzebub within himself who recognizes the awful truth. Adam eventually transcends the satanic within himself, and Satan himself, by making peace with the truth and showing compassion for posterity, and in his eventual humility. The fact that Satan too accepts the truth of his situation (“Evil be thou my Good”), and is at least once revealed as feeling compassion for “the millions of spirits for his sake amerc’ of Heaven” is not acknowledged. Adam is said to be “settling” (in his moments of despair) into the abyss that Satan cannot see” (p. 73). This of a Satan who cries out in full knowledge of “the abyss”, “Which way I fly is Hell; myself am Hell”! Adam also transcends Satan because “unlike Satan, he can cry out in spontaneous anguish” (p. 72). The soliloquys of Book IV surely belie this concept of Satan. Satan, when he experiences profound emotion (Book I, 604-621), says Professor Miller, “melts into a public sort of emotion, perhaps sincere, perhaps histrionic — or, more likely, a disingenuous blend” (p. 73). Such disregard for what the narrator makes explicit at this point is unlikely to yield valid interpretive results.
“Adam rues and would undo what killed his progeny,” whereas Satan in his address to his followers “slyly excuses himself from blame” (p. 74). But to suggest that Satan is without regret, is plainly to misunderstand Satan and the Hell he cannot escape from. “Nay curs’d be thou,” he says to himself, “since against his thy will / Chose freely what it now so justly rues” (IV, 71-2).

The last of the articles on *Paradise Lost* is by Robert L. Entzminger: “Epistemology and the Tutelary Word in *Paradise Lost.*” The epistemological frame provides an exegesis of the text that is an interesting focus but it fails to provide an interpretation that is in any sense novel. But the considerations are sound and, though not on the whole innovative, do at times produce interesting results. For example, “Raphael uses space as the bard uses time. Adam’s problem with astronomy... functions as a cosmic epic simile, carrying Adam from his relatively simple theory to a reality beyond the capacity of even prelapsarian ratiocination” (p. 104). The function of ambiguity in the process of evoking “a sense that the Fall is ultimately fortunate” is something one would have wished were more thoroughly investigated in the article. Though it is mentioned more than once it is not examined in the sort of detail that seems to be required by the frequent occurrence of the device.

Three of the five prose articles appear in Volume IX; two of these deal with *Areopagitica*. Harry R. Smallenberg, in “Contiguities and Moving Limbs: Style as Argument in *Areopagitica*,” argues that the disjunctive style of *Areopagitica* is a deliberate device Milton employs to provide the reader with the experience of the search for, and promotion of, truth. The article ingeniously converts all the alleged faults of Milton’s distorted rhetoric into virtues — though not always convincingly.

Juanita Whitaker discusses the imagery of *Areopagitica* to indicate that it was Milton’s intention to envision his ideal as the fulfilment of the tradition of *sapienta et fortitudo*, that is, of the essentials of his concept of heroism in *Samson Agonistes* and *Paradise Lost* (and *Paradise Regained*?). The article, “The Wars of Truth: Wisdom and Strength in *Areopagitica*”, is admirably clear, forthright, and interesting, evidencing highly perceptive reading.

In “De Doctrina Christiana: Its Structural Principles and Its Unfinished State,” Gordon Campbell deduces from the state of the work that Milton only partially completed a revision of it; the last five chapters of Book I are chaotic and not adequately related to the rest which is, in contrast, neatly organized, and well provided with necessary transitions. He concludes that Milton left the work unfinished.

In Volume X we find “Milton on the Province of Rhetoric,” in which Irene Samuel with great efficiency demonstrates Milton’s thoroughgoing respect for the art of rhetoric and its base in logic. Her article is a model of crisp lucidity.

Last in the volume is John M. Perlette’s “Milton, Ascham, and the Rhetoric of Divorce Controversy” which examines the recently (1966) unearthed “Of Marriage” by Anthony Ascham and suggests that it is, though not overtly, a response to Milton’s *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. The essay considers various aspects of marriage Milton also discusses, but in entirely contrary ways and allegorically constructs a political ideal. Ascham succeeds in responding to Milton’s case for divorce without seeming to, thereby avoiding the notion that the subject was debatable. “Partly an argument against divorce, ‘Of Marriage’ is more an argument against that state of mind which could champion divorce among other reforms, ecclesiastical, domestic, and civil. Significantly, then, ‘Of Marriage’ serves as a reflector by which Milton’s
rhetoric can be viewed from a new perpective” (p. 201). In his examination of this mirror, Professor Perlette makes a useful contribution to the understanding of *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* in the context of its time and the prevailing circumstances.

Among the minor poems, Milton’s sonnets receive most attention; five of the seven articles in this category focus on them. Of the remaining two, one discusses “L’Allegro” and “Il Penseroso,” and the other, “Lycidas.” Kurt Heinzelman (“‘Cold Consolation’: The Art of Milton’s Last Sonnet,” X) and John Spencer Hill (“‘Alcestis from the Grave’: Image and Structure in Sonnet XXIII,” X) contribute useful insights into one of the most moving of Milton’s minor poems. The former provides an eminently sensible and sensitive analysis of the simile structure of the poem, and concludes that “Milton was able to manage the inferences behind his similes so that, in effect, he could imagine unspeakable heaven by explicitly not likening it too much” (p. 124). The latter, though one feels at times that the author protests rather too much, makes the interesting point that “the subject of Sonnet XXIII is . . . Milton’s own growth toward vision — a growth described in a symbolic ascent from pagan myth to Christian truth; it follows . . . that the structure of the poem mirrors its theme, and that the sonnet is itself an analogue of the very experience it records” (p. 136).


The first sees Pauline didacticism in Sonnet XIX. Milton, not given to stupidity or illogicality, is not the speaker in the octave, but objectifies the experience as another’s. Milton appears to Professor Stringer to identify himself with Paul and his “thorn in the flesh” (2 Cor. xii: 9) and provides support for the idea from other works of the time which consider Paul’s “affliction.” He offers a comment on the dating of the sonnet, interpreting “half my days” as “half my working days” a period which at the time was considered as the years between 30 and 70. Hence Sonnet XIX fits into the 1650’s without strain. Stephen Wigler takes a different tack, suggesting that both reader and protagonist are led from foolish questioning of God and accusatory grumbling implications to an acceptance of, and resignation to his will, to “patience.” In contrast, Satan in Book VI resists the force of the Word and creates in language a resistance to it which, like his behaviour, reveals the destructive character of his “creativity” that in turn manifests a temper, unlike Man’s, not to be moved to repentance and recognition of its own folly. The last of the three sees Sonnet XVIII as broader than a response to the single event it so forcibly laments; “it deals with a specific example of the efficacy of faith in relation to wisdom and zeal” (p. 167). The analysis of the sonnet rather subjectively traces the movement of the sonnet from passionate anger to wisdom.

We are left with Norman B. Council’s paper “L’Allegro, Il Penseroso, and ‘The Cycle of Universal Knowledge,’” and Mother M. Christopher Pecheyux’s “The Dread Voice in *Lycidas*,” both of which appear in Volume IX. Professor Council sees L’Allegro and Il Penseroso as “two leaves of a diptich” which, complementing one another, “provide the picture of Milton’s ‘cycle of universal knowledge’” (p. 218).
An extensive introductory section demonstrates Milton’s idea of education as revealed in Ad Patrem, Of Education, the Third and Seventh Prolusions, and even Paradise Lost. L’Allegro and Il Penseroso suggest the “Life” Cebes postulates (in The Table of Cebes, to which Milton refers in Of Education), through which journeymen are led to gain universal experience. This clearly written exposition gives an interesting reading of the two poems to add to an already rich collection of interpretations, attesting the continuing appeal and potential of these apparently “light” poems. The Lycidas article is a well documented discussion of the Pilot of the Galilean Lake as a composite figure representing Moses, St. Peter, and Christ. Using largely biblical evidence, Mother Pecheux explains “shrank thy streams” in terms of the story of Moses and the Red Sea incident. The author is carefully objective, persuasively suggesting her interpretation as a possibility. Her good sense is reflected in her final sentence: “Perhaps we shall never solve [Lycidas’] problems, but with each fresh insight into its possibilities we may hear with a more sensitive ear the nuances which underlie its ultimate harmony” (p. 239).

Volume XI is entitled The Presence of Milton and is intended, as B. Rajan, the guest editor, says in his introduction, to be a contribution towards a necessary reassessment of “the Miltonic continuity,” which takes account “both of changing understandings of Milton and of changing understandings of the nature of influence itself” (p. vii). The book consists of six essays which look at the work of seven writers of the first rank from Milton’s time to the present in order to determine the extent and nature of Milton’s “presence.” This focus and the consistent high quality of the material make this the most interesting and significant of the three volumes under review.

Earl Miner provides an interesting study of Dryden’s comments on Milton and on his “use” of Milton, as well as of his eventual display of his own individual genius. Dryden draws “on Milton as a classic representing essential values, yet he does so after the Miltonian manner, finely replacing or wholly revising what he has respectfully borrowed” (p. 14). Barbara K. Lewalski reveals the extensiveness of Pope’s “borrowings” from Milton, and the miraculous capacity to adapt them to his own literary enterprises. Pope’s obvious admiration for and use of Milton represent a tribute that emphasizes “the daring and splendor of Milton’s vision of the boundless creativity and dynamic ordering power of God, man, and poetry” (p. 47). Joseph Anthony Wittreich, Jr. considers Blake’s Milton. Analyzing with close scrutiny and illuminating references to the Bible, Blake’s illustrations as well as text, Professor Wittreich in a lucid essay shows how, for Blake, Milton is “the model of the true prophet” and the Revelation of St. John the Divine, “a model for his art” (p. 55). Blake sees in Milton “the divine countenance more distinctly...than in any other hero” (p. 76). Edna Newmeyer separates Wordsworth from the satanists in the Romantic age by analyzing his early comments in The Convention of Cintra, his agreement with Coleridge, and descriptive images where first Robespierre and later Napoleon are linked with Satan. Douglas Bush considers Milton in the development of the art and thought of Keats and Arnold. The article offers little that is new or illuminating but has the expected virtues of precision, clarity, directness and economy. The final essay is by the guest editor, B. Rajan, and is a fitting close to a most useful compilation. The author points out that Eliot’s prose utterances are not the only clue to his feelings for and about Milton, and discusses with great effectiveness East
Coker, Little Gidding, and passages from other works including the plays. The pervasiveness of Milton's "presence" in the texture of Eliot's art is revealed in prose that is itself an objet d'art. Professor Rajan's writing sparkles with bright apt images of great range and variety.

If this volume is, as Professor Rajan says in the introduction, only "a beginning" in the process of reassessing "the Miltonic continuity" (vii), it is a most impressive and evocative start.

J. deBRUYN, University of British Columbia