



1991

Review Essay: Philip J. Gallagher, *Milton, the Bible, and Misogyny*

Clement H. Wyke
University of Winnipeg

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/rmmra>

 Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [Philosophy Commons](#), and the [Renaissance Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wyke, Clement H. (1991) "Review Essay: Philip J. Gallagher, *Milton, the Bible, and Misogyny*," *Quidditas*: Vol. 12 , Article 36.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/rmmra/vol12/iss1/36>

This Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Quidditas by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

ceremony on St. George's Day, thus linking his celebrations to those of the saint. No other English monarch has ever been crowned on April 23.

Ogilby, who was in charge of the spectacle, seems to have relied on the account published by John Gaspard Gevaerts of Ruben's festival for the entry of Prince Frederick of Habsburg into Antwerp in 1641. This account was probably brought to his attention by Sir Balthazar Gerbier, an English traitor who had been suspended by Charles II from his position as master of ceremonies. The spectacle was organized around four triumphant arches, the original drawings of which are still extant. Much contemporary comment was made about the £ 11,000 spent on them, and they evoked the hostility of Venner's Fifth Monarch men, who had planned to burn them down.

Of the four arches, the first two receive extensive treatment in Knowles's introduction. His explanations are sometimes difficult to follow, but this is primarily because of the complexity of the material. The imagery from the *Aeneid* on the first arch lends a demonic dimension to the English rebels and represents Charles as the realization of the future promised to Aeneas. His arrival in London also parallels the return of Augustus to Rome. On the second arch Charles is praised as *Neptuno Britannico*, recalling John Selden's earlier arguments for English maritime supremacy.

This volume is a welcome addition to the facsimile series and will be of interest to all students of English festivals. Scholars also owe a debt to the Huntington Library for permitting this facsimile edition to be based on a microfilm of their copy of the *Entertainment*.

Retha M. Warnicke
Arizona State University

Philip J. Gallagher, *Milton, the Bible, and Misogyny*, ed. Eugene R. Cunnar and Gail L. Mortimer, University of Missouri Press, 1990, x, 185 pp., biblio., index, \$27.50

Philip Gallagher, recipient of the Milton Society's James Holly Hanford Award for the most distinguished article on Milton in 1980, attempts to exonerate Milton from the charge of misogyny in his interpretation and use of the Bible, particularly in *Paradise Lost* but also in *Samson Agonistes*. Gallagher argues that Milton rationally resolves biblical discrepancies and reshapes his source materials in a way that counters a view of woman which emerges from interpretations based on the concept of biblical inerrancy and which perpetuates misogyny. For Gallagher, not only medieval and seventeenth-century theologians have

adopted a misogynist approach to the Creation, Fall and regeneration, but this approach is accommodated by such contemporary scholars as James H. Sims and Leland Ryken, who study Milton within a "scriptural tradition" that assumes the unity and inerrancy of the Bible. In addition, anti-Miltonists, feminist critics, and promiscuous commentators are shown to be misguided in their representation of Milton.

Gallagher's hermeneutical method is perhaps the most distinctive feature of this book. He engages the text with intense rigor and closeness, bringing head-to-head biblical texts and the poetic lines and words of Milton. He depends heavily on interpolation, with the result that commentary intrudes into quotations from the primary source; at times the reader has difficulty distinguishing the voice of Milton from that of Gallagher. Often, instead of interpolation Gallagher uses italicization followed by the frequently used phrase "emphasis mine," which signals interpretative nuances sometimes questionably tied to the poet's own voice.

Gallagher admits that the source analysis he employs is risky (46), but he argues that Milton's method is like that of the modern practitioners of higher biblical criticism that have rationalized the cruxes of certain texts in order to substantiate their claims (47). But Gallagher can't have his cake and eat it too. He condemns James Sims and his type for their scriptural assumptions and methodology but borrows part of their approach himself to accomplish his major critical purpose in the study.

Plain bias is as distractingly evident in this study as the antipapist references in Luther's commentaries. Gallagher's tone becomes more acerbic and generalized in expressions like "the naked misogyny of the New Testament" and the "chauvinist etiologies" of Milton's "ancient source" (102). Gallagher can also be heavy-handed in his aspersions against certain theologians.

You cannot read this book quickly or passively. It confronts you with the text as well as with Milton's principal original source, the Bible. Despite your suspicions, you are compelled to follow the reconstructed process of thinking and composition, that Milton, the poet-polemicist, has revealed elsewhere in the theological passages of *De Doctrina Christiana*. We are also drawn into the contentious world of medieval and Renaissance theology with all the vigor of a textualist fired by a fondness for his subject. The book's three chapters will make you reexamine both the feminist and antimisogynist positions, despite its almost crusading bias and tone. Its substantial bibliography, its index, and its well-documented pages replete with line and book references are useful sources for the Miltonist concerned with male-female roles in Milton's works and with source analysis and textual exposition.

Clement H. Wyke
University of Winnipeg