
Albert C. Labriola, ed. *Milton Studies XLIII*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2004. 260p.

KIRK G. RASMUSSEN
UTAH VALLEY STATE COLLEGE

Like earlier volumes in this series, *XLIII* is presented without editorial apparatus, which is more irritating than problematic since the variety of the articles is wonderful, ranging from *raisons d'être* for Milton's apparent waffling on some personal, political, and religious issues to theories regarding the disposition of his bodily remains.

David V. Urban, in "The Talented Mr. Milton," addresses the parable of the laborer (Matt. 20:1-16) and the parable of the talents (Matt. 25:14-30) as Milton's justification for his delay in entering the ministry, using Sonnet 19 and others, and *Ad Patrem*. Urban determines that Milton allows his speakers to succumb to God's decree to exonerate them from the "burdensome relationship" (16) implied by the parables.

Beth Bradburn's "Bodily Metaphor and Moral Agency in *A Masque*: A Cognitive Approach" shows that Milton's use of metaphors linked to the Lady's body do not abrogate but in fact promote her "moral agency" (21). Of particular interest is Milton's structuring of sensual images hierarchically, from sight to touch (from the immaterial to the material).

Thomas Festa's "Repairing the Ruins: Milton as Reader and Educator" examines Milton's marginalia and finds (in opposition to Samuel Johnson's casual dismissal) that it reveals Milton's desire to "repair the ruins" of our postlapsarian fallen and imperfect knowledge by textual interaction. Festa also studies Milton's apparent consciousness of a future reader, as well his use of the marginalia and extensive cross-references to illustrate methods of textual exegesis for his students.

In "The Concept of the 'Hireling' in Milton's Theology," David Hawkes notes that in addition to the general charges he lays against the established church's practices of avarice ("luxury") and its intolerance of "trade preaching," Milton objects to the concept of the "hireling" priest in "the clerical market" (69) who for wages takes "compulsory tithes" (71), a "commodification of salvation" (65). Milton also takes issue with the fact that priests are paid at all, to him a form of sin and idolatry even without accompanying avarice (64).

Bryan Adams Hampton discovers in the leviathan metaphor of Book One of *PL* (ll. 180, 185) a parable to the "mooring" of the ignorant on Satan instead of God. His "Milton's Parable of Misreading: Navigating the Contextual Waters of the 'Night-Founder'd Skiff' in *Paradise Lost*, 1.192-209" looks at "theological, contemplative, and homiletic" aspects of the metaphor to reveal the "spiritual implications of Milton's parable" (87).

In “‘His Tyranny Who Reigns’: The Biblical Roots of Divine Kingship and Milton’s Rejection of ‘Heav’n’s King,’” Michael Bryson takes the position that there are two Miltons at work: the “political thinker” and “the orthodox Christian.” Milton’s representations of kingship are enhanced by his attempts to harmonize his attacks on Charles I as king (*Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*) with his praise of God as a king (*Paradise Lost*) (111). Ultimately, Milton rejects all kingship as tyranny. Bryson points out that while Satan rightly fears God as a *king*, Christ sees Him as “kingly” (141), a significant thematic difference.

Erin Murphy’s “Milton’s ‘Birth Abortive’: Remaking Family at the End of *Paradise Lost*” argues that the final two books of *PL* separate the concept of family (in terms of its domestic and reproductive aspects) from its usual political context, thus excising the “paternal rule” (153) from the relationship rather than subordinating it to the monarchy: “patriarchalism” (165).

Phillip J. Donnelly’s “*Paradise Regained* as a Rule of Charity: Religious Toleration and the End of Typology” defines Milton’s concept of charity as “a synonym for sanctification... (for example, *PL* 12.581-87) ...[and a concept used] to indicate divine ‘Love without end’ [given] to all creatures by the Son” (172). The final two books of *PL* use biblical typology to attack religious intolerance, and *PR* re-engages the attack, again using the typology to interpret “the Christocentric poetic of the longer epic” (173). *PR* thus interprets the “rule of charity” for *PL*.

Finally, Carol Barton’s “‘Ill Fares the Hands that Heaved the Stones’: John Milton, A Preliminary Thanatography” departs in kind and spirit from the preceding articles by examining the facts, surmises, and questions surrounding Milton’s death, funeral service, burial at Bunhill Fields in Islington—“interred next to, or on top of [the coffin] of his father” (199)—the subsequent controversial disinterment of the coffin in August, 1790, and desecration of his body.

Each article is interesting and easily readable, though I cringe a little at phrases such as “a visual feast for the reader’s hungry eyes” (86), which dimly recalls a San Francisco nightclub frequented by such mid-century icons as Mort Sahl, Phyllis Diller, Bill Cosby, Lenny Bruce, Jonathan Winters and other “hungry intellectuals,” and “our gaze’s consumption” (87), which must satisfy that hunger, or something. But, that forgiven, this volume succeeds in offering an enlightening and nicely eclectic group of articles. ✱