

Milton and the Angels of *Paradise Lost*

By

Marina DeSantis

Thesis submitted to

The Honors Program, St. Peter's University

April 20, 2020

Marina DeSantis

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my professor and advisor, Dr. Rachel Wifall, for the support, guidance, and patience throughout this process.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Why This Matters.....	4
Chapter 1: Historical Background.....	9
Chapter 2: The Early Life of John Milton.....	14
Chapter 3: Milton's Later Life.....	23
Chapter 4: Angels' Physicality.....	28
Chapter 5: Hierarchies of Angels.....	33
Afterlives of <i>Paradise Lost</i>	41
Bibliography.....	43

Introduction: Why This Matters

Paradise Lost was written about 350 years ago in a society seemingly different from our own. Readers might wonder why scholarship around Milton endures? Or whether reading Milton today can be informative and relevant? When we look into the heart of *Paradise Lost*, it seems to be in essence a matter of a rebellious subject attempting to escape a tyrannical rule. Lucifer, the angel closest to God, wishes to escape from the authoritarian rule in Heaven, falling from Heaven into a sulfurous lake and creating Pandemonium. Milton, in describing Lucifer and his fallen angels, is highly political, as God:

Had cast him out from Heav'n, with all his Host
 Of Rebel Angels, by whose aid aspiring
 To set himself in Glory above his Peers,
 He trusted to have equal'd the most High,
 If he oppos'd; and with ambitious aim
 Against the Throne and Monarchy of God
 Rais'd impious War in Heav'n and Battel proud
 With vain attempt. Him the Almighty Power
 Hurl'd headlong flaming from th' Ethereal Skie
 With hideous ruine and combustion down
 To bottomless perdition, there to dwell
 In Adamantine Chains and penal Fire,

Who durst defie th' Omnipotent to Arms. (1.38-49)

Milton refers to the “throne and monarchy” of heaven, saying Satan, in rebelling, tried to “equal the most High” and become a god to his peers, the other fallen angels. He attempts to become like God in Pandemonium, believing it is “better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven” (1.263). Lucifer, now called Satan, wishes to be free from a higher authority, free from law itself. He calls God a tyrant, saying, “irreconcilable to our grand Foe/ Who now triumphs and in th’ excess of joy/ Sole reigning holds the tyranny of Heav’n,” using seductive and cunning language to convince both the fallen angels and the reader to be sympathetic towards him and his situation (1.122-124). But Satan is still evil, still morally wrong. He brings sin and death into the world and causes the fall of man. He waged war with God, undermining his absolute authority. Because of this sin, Satan suffers the consequences of his actions. Milton shows his suffering externally, as he is “racked with deep despare,” and showing “signs of remorse and passion” (1.619-20). He also is affected physically and suffers deterioration of his body, slowly transforming throughout the epic from a beautiful angel into something ugly, eventually ceasing to be human-like at all, becoming an “ugly Serpent” separated from the grace of God (9.540).

Satan, through the perversion of the heavenly order, through attempting to become God, is punished. He is not fit to become a God, to wield the authority that God has. Satan believes that he is “equal with gods,” believing God to be envious of his creations (4.24-525). However, God is “all-seeing,” “all-knowing,” and “all-powerful” (10.6, 10.277, 2.851). He created Satan and cannot be usurped by something he created.

Therefore, Satan, by attempting to reign in Pandemonium, is disrupting the chain of being that places God at the top.

Although Satan depicts God as a tyrant, Milton is not critical of God like he is of Satan. Readers are supposed to be critical of Satan because he disrupts this hierarchy, but God does not. Satan depicts God as a tyrant, he wants God to be a tyrant, but the reality is that God is not a tyrant. According to Milton, God is not human, or even human-like. He is not expected to be bound by human laws. Because he is “all-knowing” (10.277) and “all-seeing” (10.6), he does what he does in a way that may seem emotionless and tyrannical. However, in his *De Doctrina Christiana*, Milton asserts that God is the origin of all things: “Nor, lastly, can it be understood in what sense God can properly be called infinite, if he be capable of receiving any accession whatever; which would be the case if anything could exist in the nature of things, which had not first been of God and in God” (De Doctrina, 26-27). Because God is the creator, he himself cannot be a tyrant. It is his rule that angelic and earthly beings must follow.

According to Joan Bennett, Milton, in his *Eikonoklastes*, in which he justifies the execution of King Charles I, likens the struggle of Satan to that of the government during his time, saying that the monarchy is also disrupting this rightful order:

The right to exercise power, he [Milton] said, belongs to those whom nature has given power to exercise. God, since he created and sustains the universe, naturally has power over it; the sun by its nature imparts life-giving influence on the earth and so naturally controls her fertility; nature has given a father power to beget sons. But no one man can create or has been created as essential to the life

of all other men; and a king does not have the power to create his subjects.

(Bennett 443)

The king should not be allowed to tyrannically reign over his subjects, to place himself higher than they, because he is, like Satan, not omnipotent. It is not his place to interfere with people's personal liberties, both politically and religiously. Here Milton is adamantly anti-authoritarian.

Today, with the rise of authoritarianism¹, Milton's views are incredibly pertinent. He was an advocate of both a Parliamentary political system and individual conscience, politically and religiously. In many governments, democracy is slowly receding, replaced with pseudo-democracies where individual liberty is only a facade. For a true democracy "the state must allow free expression of opinion, a free media, impartial execution of election law, a universal adult franchise and the right of political competitors to obtain the resources they need" (Wolf). For pseudo-democracies, the election is predetermined, used to placate the population and maintain the visage of true democracy. The leaders of these pseudo-democracies often paint themselves as "populist": they "assert that the traditional elite is corrupt and incompetent," and yet they want to be granted vast powers, arguing that "they alone, once armed with extraordinary powers, can solve the country's problems" (Wolf).

Satan can be seen to fit this description, as he argues against God, the "traditional elite." He believes that God's envy is the root of his tyranny, his control a desperate ploy

¹ According to the Human Rights Foundation, which aims to distinguish democratic from authoritarian regimes, the world has 40 competitive authoritarian regimes that rule 1.2 billion people and 53 full-fledged dictatorships that oppress 2.8 billion people. 53% of the world's population is currently controlled by tyrants, absolute monarchs, military juntas or competitive authoritarians. (As of July 27, 2018)

to prevent his creations from overruling him: “Envious commands invented with design/ To keep them low whom knowledge might exalt/ Equal with gods...” (4.524-526). Satan asserts that it is not only he who believes this, but many other angels as well:

That with the Mightiest raised me to contend

And to the fierce contention brought along

Innumerable forces of spirits armed

That durst dislike His reign and, me preferring,

His utmost pow’r with adverse pow’r opposed

In dubious battle on the plains of Heav’n And shook His throne... (1.99-105)

Satan states that he is doing what the people want, effectively positioning himself as a populist, yet he wants to be in control. He believes that he can create a heaven in Pandemonium, but Milton maintains that this will never work. Milton was a voice for true democracy and even today his ideas are influential, seen through the worldwide reception of his epic and its many translations.

Chapter 1: Historical Background

1. Introduction to the Historical Moment

John Milton lived from 1608 to 1674, during a time of great political and religious upheaval. In the sixteenth century, a strict status hierarchy existed. According to

Lawrence Stone:

Though there existed a few completely non-integrated groups--artists and stage-players, for example--and four semi-independent occupational hierarchies, the vast mass of the population was fitted into a single hierarchy of status defined by titular rank, and to a certain extent by legal and fiscal privilege. The most fundamental dichotomy within the society was between the gentleman and the non-gentleman, a division that was based essentially upon the distinction between those who did, and those who did not, have to work with their hands. (Stone 17)

Up to 95% of the English population at this time consisted of these labourers, with very little upwards social mobility occurring, as they lived off the land, "tied to the soil by the needs of manual labour for food production and distribution" (Stone 20).

However, starting in the late sixteenth century, a new middle class, consisting mostly of merchants and specialized artisans, began to arise. "This was due partly to the increase of land in private ownership, partly to the abnormally high reproduction rate of the upper classes, partly to the generation of new wealth in trade, the law, office and

agriculture, and partly to the casual government attitude towards the inflation of honours” (Stone 24). With the invention of the printing press as well as the translation of the Bible into vernacular, the Bible was now available to those outside the Church, to this new middle class, who, because of their new social standing, had the time and resources to read it (Herman 4). This created a direct relationship between people and God, unmediated by any institution, allowing people to interpret scripture for themselves. People now realised that the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church were often not backed up by scripture. Luther’s *95 Theses*, written in 1517, is an example of this new dissatisfaction with the Church and its dogmatic authority.

In addition to religious dissatisfaction, many of the middle class were dissatisfied with political affairs as well. Because of their increased wealth, they believed that they should have more say in politics. Many members of the new middle class were elected to Parliament to appease this unrest (Herman 1-27). The monarch and Parliament were cooperative for many years, but dissent between the two began during the reign of King James VI (of Scotland)/I (of England).

2. Political Turmoil

James VI/I was King of Scotland from 1567-1625 and King of England from 1603-1625. He claimed that he had the divine right to rule, not subjected to any authority other than God, including Parliament and church officials. Due to this attitude, hostility began to sprout between James and Parliament, who believed they should have a say in governmental affairs. This hostility was also fueled by James' acceptance of Catholics, and his continued dissolving of Parliament upon disagreement. When King James became both King of Scotland and King of England, he attempted to unite both governments (Stephen 55-58). However, the two countries were very different when it came to doctrine and governance, leading to many issues.

After King James I was succeeded by his son Charles I, England's political climate became even more volatile. Charles also maintained the divine right of kings to rule, but took it further than his father by dismantling Parliament. In 1638, the contention in England between those that supported the King, the royalists, and those that supported Parliament, the parliamentarians, seemed to be reaching its peak. Because of the Scottish Rebellion that he was unable to suppress, Charles I had to reform Parliament, which was becoming more and more Puritan.² According to Philip Taylor in his book *Munitions of the Mind*, "It was during this Long Parliament, from 1640 to 1653, that all the ideological issues (merchants v. aristocrats, Puritans v. Anglicans, Parliament v.

² Puritans were a sect of English Protestants that believed the reformation of the Anglican Church to be incomplete. They valued local forms of worship and democratic practices over the hierarchical structures of more "high church" religions. Puritans sought to simplify forms of worship and believed that everyone should interpret scripture for themselves.

Royal Absolutism) came to a head” (Taylor 4). This Parliament was divided into royalist and parliamentary factions, with the latter growing more and more powerful, eventually driving Charles I out of England.

3. Religious Turmoil

In England, the Church of England was dominant, but a minority of Puritans controlled about one-third of Parliament, and Charles wished to subdue this minority. The Puritans in England believed that the Anglican Church was too similar to the Roman Catholic Church, specifically in regards to hierarchy and ceremony, and was not yet fully reformed (Spraggon 98). Following the teachings of John Calvin, Puritans also believed in the plain reading of the Bible, seeking to simplify religious practices and ceremonial rites found in Catholic and Anglican services. This dissent was only exacerbated when Charles married Henrietta-Maria of France, a Catholic princess, increasing Puritan suspicion that the king was sympathetic towards the Catholic Church.

Many Puritans believed that the dismantling of the hierarchical structure of the Anglican Church, in other words, the removal of bishops and the power that they held, would solve many of the political problems in England during this time. Much of this religious struggle was based on the authority, or lack thereof, of bishops within the Church. In the Greek translation of the New Testament, the meaning and equivalence of two words, *episcopos* (bishops) and *presbuteros* (elder), was a topic of contention

between presbyterians and episcopalians. The presbyterians argued that these words meant the same thing. Because there was no biblical basis for the system of bishops that existed within the episcopalian churches, presbyterians argued that bishops within the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches did not have the divine authority to be bishops, and therefore should not exist. This is also the stance which Puritans, some of the Parliamentary faction, and John Milton, took on this issue.

The episcopalians, on the other hand, argued that “*episcopi* referred to members of a separate and senior rank from the *presbuteroi*” (Poole 4). Because these two words had separate and distinct meanings, episcopalians believed that the structure of bishops had biblical backing. They maintained that bishops had the right to be in power. This issue, although it may seem antiquated, was of great importance given the larger political situation of the time. Because bishops, who had gathered much political power, ought not to exist according to the presbyterian faction, they argued that these bishops should have their power taken away from them.

It was during this tumultuous time that John Milton grew up and began writing, eventually completing his masterpiece *Paradise Lost* in 1667. Throughout this epic poem, Milton’s own political and religious leanings can be seen. Milton used *Paradise Lost* to promote Puritanism and discredit Catholicism and Anglicanism, specifically problematizing the Catholic and Anglican emphasis on ceremonial worship, as well as their hierarchical order of bishops and, ultimately, the king himself.

Chapter 2: The Early Life of John Milton

Milton's early life greatly influenced his composition of *Paradise Lost*. He was born in 1609 to parents John Milton and Sarah Jeffrey. Milton was baptised into the Protestant faith of the Church of England, and his parents were routinely engaged with church affairs. His father was educated and worked as a scrivener who routinely engaged in the performance and composition of music, much of it specifically for church services. Milton's father's father was a Catholic who condemned the Reformation and anything that had to do with Protestantism. Milton Sr., when he sought to learn more about Protestantism, and specifically Puritanism, was disowned by his father, resulting in his adherence to his faith and rejection of Catholicism (Lewalski 10). As a scrivener and professional composer, the elder Milton was able to provide an expansive formal education for the young Milton, including private tutors and prestigious schools. This exposed Milton to differing ideas of thought, both in politics and religion, facilitating the formation of one of the greatest minds of his time.

His early teachers can be seen to have profoundly influenced his scholarship. According to Jeffrey Miller, "from the very beginning, Milton was being shaped, literally, by the Puritans whose ranks he would ultimately join" (Miller 1). Milton's earliest teachers were Thomas Young, a home tutor hired by Milton's father, and Richard Stock, Milton's boyhood minister at All Hallows, a Puritan Church. Both of these men were what is known as "conformable puritans," and both were students of Thomas Gataker, a prominent Puritan minister during the time (Poole 12). Conformable Puritans were

those Puritans willing to conform to Anglicanism publically, even though they did not believe in every doctrine or tradition. They believed that Protestant unity was most important, and in order to stand against the Roman Catholic papists there could not be a splintering of different Protestant branches.

Young began working as Milton's tutor in either 1617 or 1618; it is not known for sure as the only records of Milton and Young's relationship are correspondences between the two later in Milton's life. Milton and Young formed a close relationship during the time Young was Milton's tutor, and his teachings can be seen throughout Milton's own theology. Young's main beliefs were rooted in, "a zealous opposition to popery and an equally zealous commitment to Protestant unity" (Miller 84-85). Later in his life, Young's views became more radical, and his commitment to Protestant unity began to dwindle. He was a member of the Smectymnuus, a group of Puritan clergymen who provided leadership for the anti-episcopalian groups within the Anglican Church. Milton defended this group in two pamphlets he wrote: *Animadversions upon The Remonstrants Defence Against Smectymnuus* (1641) and *Apology for Smectymnuus* (1642). These pamphlets were written in response to Anglican bishop Joseph Hall's defense of Anglican church structure and show Young's influence on Milton, in his opposition of the hierarchical structures of both the Anglican and Roman Catholic churches (Lewalski 128).

Besides Thomas Young, Richard Stock was young Milton's other major religious influence. Stock defined himself as a conformable Puritan, but many of his writings and sermons lead scholars to question the accuracy of this claim. He was extremely

anti-papist and anti-Catholic, and his sermons talk about this in a violent way (Gordon 398). In one sermon at Paul's Cross on November 2, 1606, Stock said that no method is too severe when it comes to eradicating Roman Catholicism from England, including, "confiscation of goods, to imprisonment, to banishment, or death it selfe, according to the qualitie of their offenses" (Miller 76). Both Young and Stock had a lasting influence on Milton's personal theology, which can be seen throughout Milton's later works and his staunch following of Puritanism.

As a young adolescent, Milton attended a prominent school, St. Paul's, and was taught by Alexander Gil the Elder and his son, Alexander Gil the Younger, both scholars in their own right. However, Gil the Elder is thought to have had the most influence on Milton and his teachings of the classics, Latin and Greek languages, as well as biblical Hebrew can be seen throughout Milton's works. One such example can be seen through Gil's stance on how to spell English words. He taught his students to spell to the sound, which can be seen in Milton's first manuscript of *Paradise Lost*, where he "instructed his amanuensis to correct 'forbidden' and 'open' to 'forbidd'n' and 'op'n.'" (Poole 15). Another example of Gil's influence can be seen through his *Sacred Philosophie of the Holy Scripture*. This work, published in 1635 but begun in 1601, deals with the Apostle's Creed, using reason as well as scriptural authority to refute heresies as well as to defend the Apostles' Creed against nonbelievers (Clark). According to Poole, Gil was committed to, "finding rational support for revelation" in his *Sacred Philosophie* (Poole 16). Gil looked to scripture and interpreted it for himself, believing that God's wisdom was open to those who read the Bible for themselves. This may show the lasting

influence Gil had on Milton as a poet, and it can be assumed that many other idiosyncrasies Milton had may be a legacy of his education. Gil the Elder's son, Alexander Gil the Younger, was also a teacher at St. Paul's, and is seen to have sparked Milton's interest in poetry, as Gil the younger was distinguished for his Latin verse. Both Gil the Elder and the Younger were Anglicans, and exposed Milton to "high church" Anglicanism.³ Despite the Gils' influence in other aspects of his life, such as philosophy, rhetoric, and language, Milton refused to be influenced by their religious leanings, already from an early age a consistent supporter of Puritanism.

After Milton finished studying under the Gils' tutelage, he attended the University of Cambridge Christ's College. Before Milton attended, Christ's College was largely Protestant, housing major Calvinist supporters such as William Perkins, an important leader in the Puritan movement in the 1580's; George Downname, who, prior to becoming the Bishop of Derry in 1616, denounced the pope as the antichrist; and William Ames, perhaps the most famous theologian to graduate from Christ's College during this time (Kelly 53). Ames specifically had lasting influence on Milton, and the same discourse structure of one of Ames' works, the *Medulla Theologica*, can be seen in Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana*. In both of these works, "knowledge is organized by constant division and subdivision, with a broad concept steadily broken down by dichotomies until only the most basic constituent parts remain" (Fallon 36).

³ Although his parents were technically Anglican, they attended church services under minister Richard Stock, a Puritan, leading to some debate about their true religious leanings. The Gils were Milton's first experience with "high church" Anglicans, those who resisted modernization and strove to maintain many aspects of Roman Catholicism. (Lewalski)

When Milton was accepted to Christ's College, King James I appointed Valentine Cary, a royal chaplain, as the master of the school. Cary was an Anglican priest and a fellow of Christ's College. His appointment as Master of the college was contested by many of the faculty and students, who were mostly Puritan. Ames was still at Christ's College when Cary was appointed and strongly opposed his appointment. Cary required members of the College to wear surplices, a liturgical vestment of Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism. Ames refused to wear the surplice and also denounced many of the ornamental religious signs that Cary imposed. Ames was called in front of the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University who suspended him, "from the exercise of his ecclesiastical function and from all degrees taken or to be taken" (Margo 697-711). Ames fled to Holland, and his successor was Thomas Bainbridge, who was head of house during Milton's time at Christ's College.

Thomas Bainbridge was a relatively unimpressive man who did not hold strong beliefs on religion or politics. However, he did remodel the Christ's College chapel in Laudian style, drawing criticism from Puritans such as Milton. The Laudian Church was founded by Archbishop Laud in the early seventeenth century and was a high-church movement with religious doctrine between Anglicanism and Catholicism. Laudianism revered liturgical ceremony and clerical hierarchy, opposing the democracy of Puritanism. One of the main theological differences between Puritanism and Laudianism was the belief in predestination. Puritan followers believed that all events have been willed by God, especially in regards to what happens to an individual's soul after death. In other words, a person's decisions on earth do not determine their

salvation or damnation, and thus this salvation or damnation has already been decided by God (Levering 104). This is in direct contention to Laudianism belief, as Archbishop Laud maintained the doctrine of free will, allowing the possibility of salvation for all men, echoing the Roman Catholic belief of salvation in exchange for good works.

When Bainbridge remodeled Christ's College's chapel in the style of Laudianism, he arranged some elements in direct contradiction to Puritan views. Bainbridge moved the altar from the center of the chapel, placing it towards the east and railing it off from the congregation, emphasizing the sacerdotal nature of the clergy. Puritans believed the communion altar should be in the center of the congregation, emphasizing the democracy of worship. Bainbridge also introduced stained glass windows and icons, which hinted at popery and caused outrage by the Puritan faction of the college (Lewalski 18).

Milton grew to dislike his college, saying that he “never greatly admir'd” the school, finding faults with the educational system and the religious practices during his time there (*An Apology* 12-13). Although Milton was extremely popular with both his professors and peers, he was critical of the, “quality of teaching at Cambridge: logic poorly taught, metaphysics a ‘Lernian bog,’ natural philosophy afflicted with ‘monkish disease,’ mathematics declining into rhetoric, and law conducted in a language that Milton could only call ‘American’ (Poole 31). Because of a disagreement with his tutor, William Chappell, Milton was temporarily expelled from college and, upon his return, was transferred to Nathanael Tovey, a much milder mannered man than Chappell.

During his time at Christ's College, Milton began writing academic "prolusiones" (openings) which were mostly, "compulsory forms: 'exercises,' the scripted openings of what then turned into improvisatory duels or 'disputations' in college or in the higher arena of the university schools; 'act verses,' summarizing theses to be defended, again *viva voce*, by all university graduands; and 'declamations,' or orations on set themes" (Poole 31). In these forms, Milton's views on both political and religious issues are not evident, but he shows his broad knowledge of the Latin language and Roman and Greek classical texts. Because they were compulsory for his degree, Milton did not engage with politics or theological debate in these "prolusiones," and it can be seen that at this stage he had no problems writing these institutional pieces.

However, after graduating Christ's College in 1632, Milton began expressing his radical views in both politics and theology. He moved from Cambridge into his family's suburban home in Hammersmith, and then into their country estate in Horton, Buckinghamshire, in 1635, where he spent six years in self-guided study. During his time spent as an autodidact, Milton studied theology, philosophy, history, science, mathematics, and literature, preparing himself for an eventual career as a poet (Lewalski 103). He wrote both sonnets and lyrics during this time, as well as the masques *Comus*, which petitioned for the virtues of chastity and temperance, and *Arcades*, written to celebrate Alice Spencer, the Countess Dowager of Derby, on her 75th birthday, which were performed in 1632 and 1634 respectively. In 1637, Milton wrote the pastoral elegy "Lycidas," one of his first works to have been written in English. Lycidas' poetry style resembles an Italian "canzone" or ballad, showing Milton's interest

in Italian poets and poetry. This fascination led Milton to prepare himself for a trip to the continent, specifically to Italy, as he was enthralled with Italian poets such as Dante, Petrarch, and Ariosto. According to William Poole, a Milton scholar and historian, “Milton was extremely wary of French literary culture, and he all but ignored the more northern nations,” which were predominantly Protestant (Poole 42). Although these authors were Roman Catholic, Milton believed that these Italian poets were forerunners to the Protestant Reformation, and that their ideas showed a discontent with Roman Catholicism and, specifically, the pope (Wooten 742). These three poets are referenced in Milton’s *Of Reformation*, where Milton says that he will use “the opinion of three the famousest men for wit and learning, that Italy at this day glories of, whereby it may be concluded for a receiv’d opinion even among men professing the Romish Faith, that Constantine marr’d all in the Church,” referring to Dante, Petrarch, and Ariosto (*Of Reformation*, 24). By explaining excerpts from these three men, he shows how they were unhappy with Roman Catholicism, despite each of them being Catholic.

In 1638, Milton left England and headed for the continent. He intended to tour both France and Italy, and it is believed that he remained on this tour until 1639. Milton arrived in Calais and then Paris, eventually reaching Florence in July 1638. It was in Florence where he met Galileo, and he recalls this meeting in his treatise *Areopagitica*, in which he defends free speech. Galileo himself was convicted of heresy by the Roman Catholic Church because of his views on heliocentrism, and Milton possibly admired this. Milton says of Florence in his *Defensio Secunda*,

In [Florence], which I have always admired above all others because of the elegance, not just of its tongue, but also of its wit, I lingered for about two months. There I at once became the friend of many gentlemen eminent in rank and learning, whose private academies I frequented—a Florentine institution which deserves great praise not only for promoting humane studies but also for encouraging friendly intercourse. (Vol. IV part I. pp. 615–17)

Galileo is also referenced in *Paradise Lost*: “Through optic glass the Tuscan artist views,” and, “As when by night the Glass / Of Galileo, less assur'd, observes / Imagind Lands and Regions in the Moon” (1.288, 5.262). He is the singular contemporary that Milton mentions by name in his epic, showing the influence he had on Milton.

During his time in Florence, Milton participated in academic symposia, including the *Svogliati* (The Will-less) and the *Apatisti* (The Unruffled). It was uncommon for an Englishman to become so involved in these Florentine literary academies, but Milton, “possessed the fluency, the talent, and the credentials to participate” (Poole 44). Members of these societies wrote tributes to Milton, and in these tributes it can be seen that Milton portrayed himself to the Florentine people as an epic poet, even though he had not started writing *Paradise Lost* yet. Milton’s trip to Florence fed into his desire to write an epic poem, and he was inspired by stories he heard, particularly tragedies, evident in his commonplace book, in which he wrote down ideas for tragedies of his own after returning home to England. These ideas included writings on the fall of man, which led to the writing of some verses of *Paradise Lost*.

Chapter 3: Milton's Later Life

Milton's travels in Europe were cut short, and he returned to England in the summer of 1639 because of the "sad tidings of civil war in England" (*Defensio Secunda*, Vol. IV part I pp. 618–19). Milton began to tutor privately in his home, becoming the teacher of the children of some of the wealthiest and highest ranking families. "Over the 1640s, these included the aristocrats Richard Barry, who became second Earl of Barrymore in late 1642, Thomas, later Sir Thomas, Gardiner of Essex, and Richard Jones, son of the boorish first Viscount Ranelagh and his literary wife, Lady Katherine Boyle, herself sister to the famous chemist and philosopher Robert Boyle" (Poole 49). Milton taught his students in a peculiar way, teaching a rigorous curriculum heavy with obscure works of Latin, Greek, and Italian origin. Edward Phillips, a pupil of Milton, maintains that although the curriculum was punishing, it was superior to others of the time. According to Poole,

If we compare, say, the Cambridge don Richard Holdsworth's "Directions for a Student in the Universitie," prepared for Milton's student contemporaries, it would have seemed preposterously elementary for a pupil who had passed through Milton's hands—Holdsworth's students stick to little systems and Latin authors, only stumbling into the Greek of Demosthenes and Homer at the end of their degree. Milton advertised, and rendered, a superior service. (Poole 51)

Milton was a strict tutor, and the week was rendered full of the study of classics and the *trivium*: logic, rhetoric, and debate. There was little study of theology during the week,

but Milton did not decline to teach his students this. Milton says in his *Of Education*, “The end then of learning is to repair the ruins of our first parents by regaining to know God aright” (*Of Education* 2); amid his secular curriculum, Milton attempted to make a “connection to remote Paradise, its loss, and perhaps its partial recapture through education” (Poole 56). Sundays, therefore, were reserved for biblical study. Milton taught his students how to read and understand the Bible, but did not focus on theological arguments. He had his students read the Pentateuch in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek, aiming to allow them to understand and establish the meanings of the biblical texts through comparisons of the differing translations (Poole 56). He allowed his students to come to realize the meaning of the texts on their own, and besides philological instruction, Milton was relatively hands off in other aspects of theological instruction. Allowing his students to determine biblical meanings through their own interpretation of the text was largely in line with Milton’s personal theology. Predominantly Puritan, Milton believed in the plain reading of the Bible, and the only way to find God was “in the Holy Scriptures alone and with the Holy Spirit as guide” (*De Doctrina* Ch 1).

During his years as a private tutor, Milton married Marie Powell in 1642. This marriage was short lived, possibly due to the number of pupils Milton had living with him and his inability to manage his household (Lewalski 156). During this time, Milton wrote pamphlets on marriage and divorce, specifically advocating for divorce on the grounds of mental incompatibility. His main pamphlet was *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, which caused him considerable trouble with the orthodox Presbetyrian

authorities: “The fervently Presbyterian Edwards had included Milton's divorce tracts in his list in *Gangraena* of heretical publications that threatened the religious and moral fabric of the nation; Milton responded by mocking him as ‘shallow Edwards’ in the satirical sonnet ‘On the New Forcers of Conscience under the Long Parliament’, usually dated to the latter half of 1646” (McDowell 1). Many authorities now considered Milton a heretic, and he became a notorious and prominent figure in society. Milton’s poem “*Lycidas*” did not help the situation, as it foretells the fall of the bishops and shows his anti-hierarchical attitude.

In order to restore his reputation, Milton decided to publish his poems as well as rekindle his relationship with the Royalist and Anglican icon Henry Lawes. Despite his desire to get back into the good graces of the authorities by having some of his works set to the music of Lawes, many of Milton’s poems were anti-hierarchical. “In writing against the bishops he had realized that he (had always) believed people ought to work out their own forms of worship; experiencing disaster in marriage he realized that he (had always) thought that people had misunderstood Christ’s briefing on the topic; and as he had indeed always been a poet, perhaps he need not be too ashamed about what he had written when and for whom” (Poole 69).

According to Allan Miller, Milton could most accurately be described as a “conformable Puritan” at this time, especially because his early teachers, Young and Stock, were both conformable Puritans. This would explain the drastic diversity in his poems and pamphlets, as “a conformable puritan can write an elegy for a scholar-bishop and yet be far from thereby endorsing Laudian reform” (Poole 69). However,

this classification soon falls apart as Milton became increasingly radical, publishing both theological and civil reform pamphlets.

Milton's radical views were further encouraged with the outbreak of the English Civil War in 1642. In 1649, Milton published two works that supported regicide--one implicitly, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, and one explicitly, *Eikonoclastes*. *Eikonoclastes* (meaning "image breaker") specifically was in direct response to the *Eikon Basilike* (meaning "Royal Image"), the supposed autobiography of King Charles I that portrayed him as an innocent Christian martyred by Parliament (Nelson 19-20). Milton served in the civil service under the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, and was appointed as Secretary for Foreign Tongues by the Council of State in March 1649. His main duties included translating the foreign correspondences into Latin, producing propaganda, and censoring material (Sullivan Ch.2). In 1652 and 1654, respectively, Milton published two defences of the protectorate that helped establish his reputation as a learned man throughout Europe.

During this time, Milton slowly lost his sight. Beginning in the 1640's first his left eye then this right went blind, and by 1652 Milton was completely blind. Although the cause of his blindness was debated for many years, current physicians believe that Milton suffered from intermittent close-angle glaucoma (Poole 129). In *Paradise Lost*, during an invocation to the muse "Holy Light," Milton talks about what happened to his eyes: "So thick a drop serene hath quencht thir Orbs, / Or dim suffusion veild" (3.24-26). Soon after Milton went completely blind, he lost his wife, Mary Powell, to childbirth, to whom he was still married, despite her desertion and his attempts at

divorce. Milton married Katherine Woodcock in 1656, who also died due to complications from childbirth, leaving behind three daughters for the blind Milton to care for on his own.

In 1658, Oliver Cromwell died and the English Republic collapsed. In 1660, Charles II was restored to power, and Milton went into hiding, as a warrant was issued for his arrest (Lewalski 191-202). Throughout England his writings were burned and, although an act of free and general pardon was issued by the King, which pardoned all treasons and offenses committed between January 1, 1638, and June 24, 1660, Milton was arrested (Davies 352). Released shortly thereafter, Milton retired to his home living quietly without writing many political works. He married Elizabeth Minshull in 1663, who was 31 years younger than he.

It was during this time that Milton began writing *Paradise Lost*. Although he began writing bits as early as 1639, he did not start writing it in earnest until at least 1658, and depended upon the “often unsatisfactory help of students, friends, and amanuenses” (Lewalski 442). The first edition was published in 1664.

Chapter 4: Angels' Physicality

Paradise Lost was heavily influenced by the social and political climate of its time. Milton's stance on religion is depicted throughout the entirety of the poem, and he uses the poem to call attention to the differences between his own personal theology and that of Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism.

Milton problematizes these religions with how he depicts the physicality of angels in *Paradise Lost*; however, upon first glance at the angels, they seem to be in line with both Protestant and Catholic angelologists. For example, in both his *De Doctrina Christiana* and *Paradise Lost*, Milton maintains that angels are spirits and the sons of God, they sit around his throne praising him only able to see him dimly, and that the angels are in a sort of order, which is maintained among the fallen, true of both Protestant and Catholic views (West 135). Milton drew his angelological traditions from both Protestant and Catholic theologians. During Milton's time, two Angelological approaches were mainstream: one from Tertullien, an early Christian author, that was generally accepted by Calvinist theologians, and one from St. Thomas Aquinas, a thirteenth-century Italian philosopher and church father, which was accepted by the Catholic Church. These two angelologies focus on the question of whether angels have bodies, can eat, or, in essence, what angels truly are. Tertullien, in his argument against Marcion, argues that it would be easy for God to give angels a body made of whatever, as he did it for humans, but:

It was truly human flesh, and yet not born. It was truly human, because of the truthfulness of God, who can neither lie nor deceive, and because (angelic beings) cannot be dealt with by men in a human way except in human substance: it was withal unborn, because none but Christ could become incarnate by being born of the flesh in order that by His own nativity He might regenerate our birth, and might further by His death also dissolve our death, by rising again in that flesh in which, that He might even die, He was born. (Tertulien 112)

In this argument, Tertullien says that angels truly have a body, and because of this, they are able to actually eat. Tertullien's argument, although accepted by many Calvinist theologians during Milton's time, was not without flaws, and is almost directly countered by St. Thomas Aquinas' argument that an angel was an intelligent being without a body, but with a power to "assume" a body for apparition by shaping elementary materials (*Summa Theologica* Question 51, Article II, III). Aquinas maintained that angels, because they only "assumed" a body, were not able to eat. Instead, any images of angels eating were mirages, visions produced by the angels in order to better relay their messages to the prophets. These two arguments may seem similar in appearance, but they are rather different from each other.

Milton mentions in *Paradise Lost* that angels eat and have sex like humans do. Although John Calvin, and most Protestants, did say that angels ate because the Bible explicitly says they did, he adamantly denied angels' ability to propagate because it does not have basis in scripture. In Chapter 18 of Genesis, Abraham hosts three angels of the Lord:

And the LORD appeared unto him in the plains of Mamre: and he sat in the tent door in the heat of the day; And he lift up his eyes and looked, and, lo, three men stood by him... And he took butter, and milk, and the calf which he had dressed, and set it before them; and he stood by them under the tree, and they did eat.

(Gen 18: 1-8)

This verse of scripture clearly shows angels eating. However, this is an interesting topic of contention since in his *De Doctrina Christiana*, a doctrine outlining Milton's personal theology, Milton does not reference this heresy at all.

In Book five of *Paradise Lost*, Milton explicitly states that angels eat:

Therefore what he [God] gives
 (Whose praise be ever sung) to man in part
 Spiritual, may of purest Spirits be found
 No ingrateful food: and food alike those pure
 Intelligential substances require
 As doth your Rational; and both contain
 Within them every lower facultie
 Of sense, whereby they hear, see, smell, touch, taste,
 Tasting concoct, digest, assimilate,
 And corporeal to incorporeal turn. (5. 404–13)

This correlates with the Puritan tradition at the time, as angels eating appears in the Old Testament. Because Milton advocated for the plain reading of the Bible and scripture, it makes sense that his angels would eat as illustrated in Genesis. This is directly against

Catholic teachings, as Catholic theologians, namely Aquinas, took the book of Tobit to be sacred scripture. In Chapter 12 of the book of Tobit, Raphael says to Tobit, “All these days I did appear unto you; but I did neither eat nor drink, but ye did see a vision” (Tobit 12:19). Because Protestants do not take the Apocrypha to be sacred scripture, Milton rejects this view of the angels.

Milton also describes his angels as having the ability to have sex. In the Bible, Genesis says, “The Nephilim were on the earth in those days and afterward, when the sons of God went to the daughters of men and had children by them. They were heroes of old, men of renown.” (Genesis 6:4). The Book of Enoch uses this passage of the Bible to explain the fall of angels; the “sons of God” can be interpreted as righteous and good angels who have become seduced with human bodies and have partaken in sex with them. Many early Christian theologians believed that this was the correct interpretation of the verse, but St. Augustine, a Roman Catholic, held that these “sons of God” were merely the descendents of Seth, the third son of Adam and Eve. This interpretation of the passage was taken to be the correct interpretation during Milton’s time for both Protestant and Catholic theologians (West 129). The sons of God can be interpreted as angels in this passage, and Milton would have almost certainly been familiar with it, possibly leading to Milton’s description of the angels as “Spirits embrace, / Total they mix, Union of Pure with Pure / Desiring; nor restrain’d conveyance need / as Flesh to mix with Flesh, or Soul with Soul” (8. 626-629). Milton here is saying that angels embrace as humans do, have sex as humans do. This is completely against what both Catholic and Protestant, both Anglican and Puritan, theologians argue.

By showing that angels have the ability to eat and have sex, Milton is establishing a connection between the human and the divine. He is likening angels to humanity, thus criticizing the Catholic reverence and veneration of the angels, and to some extent Anglican veneration as well. To Milton, angels were not perfect, they did not have all-knowing superior intellects, and were subject to human desires and necessities. Catholics, by placing something that was not God on a pedestal, and venerating and praying to these angels, were wrong in Milton's eyes. Milton problematizes this aspect of Catholicism, drawing attention to this issue.

Chapter 5: Hierarchies of Angels

Paradise Lost illustrates two dramatic and irreversible falls: that of the angels and that of humanity. The way Milton describes the hierarchies of angels can be seen as his way to problematize both the hierarchical nature of the Anglican Church as well as the authority of the King of England.

According to many Christian theologies, there are different orders of angels, each with their unique responsibilities and closeness to God. These traditional orders of rank are known in the Catholic tradition as the Dionysian scheme, which is attributed to Pseudo-Dionysius, an unknown fifth-century theologian upon whose philosophy the Catholic church still bases most of its angelologic tradition. His work, *The Celestial Hierarchy*, describes the angels and their hierarchical relationship to God. Dionysius as a man is largely unknown, although he himself in his works names himself to be Dionysius the Aeropagite. Dionysius the Areopagite is mentioned in the New Testament: “Some of the people became followers of Paul and believed. Among them was Dionysius, a member of the Areopagus, also a woman named Damaris, and a number of others”(Acts 17:34). The Dionysius that Acts mentions was a member of the first century Athenian judicial council known as the “Areopagus” and was converted by St. Paul (Corrigan). Scholars now believe that Pseudo-Dionysius was not Dionysius the Areopagite, as evidence suggests authorship dating from the 5th century C.E., and not from centuries earlier, when St. Paul would have been alive. However, even though it is

false, this claim had a significant impact on the early church, leading many theologians of the Roman Catholic Church to give his works much authority (Franke 158-160).

According to Pseudo-Dionysius, Angels are ordered as such: Seraphim, Cherubim, Thrones, Dominions, Virtues, Powers, Principalities, Archangels, and Angels, with Seraphim being the closest to God and the most powerful. Thomas Aquinas also follows this hierarchy in describing the seraphim as "the highest of all angels, who excel in their immediate union with God and their flaming love for him [...]. Next are the Cherubim with the plenitude of wisdom which their name indicates, excelling in the knowledge of the divine secrets, the wisdom of divine providence" (Farrell 402). Both the Seraphim and Cherubim are associated with worship in the Catholic tradition. The duty of the Seraphim is to "sing without ceasing to God, celebrating above all the other attributes the Holiness of God, a perfection which characterizes all of God's attributes" (Parente 65). The Cherubim are the "heavenly custodians and protectors of holy places and holy things [..., and] the throne-bearers of Almighty God" (Parente 67). The Archangels, on the other hand, play a more ministerial role in this Dionysian hierarchy. They are responsible for the delivery of divine messages to man: "the Archangels'... work is the announcement of great things to men and the care of goods that are at the same time general and particular, such as the truths of faith and the divine cult" (Farrell 403). Many instances in *Paradise Lost* suggest this Dionysian scheme. In Book I, God has given power to the angels "to rule, / Each in his Hierarchie, the Orders bright" (1.737). Raphael speaks of "Angels of Imperial summons call'd.../ Under thir hierarchs in orders bright" (5.585). The ranks are mentioned specifically as well, "Ten thousand thousand

Ensigns high advanc'd,... / and for distinction serve / Of Hierarchies, of Orders, and Degrees" (5.589-591). Both of these examples refer to hierarchies within the heavenly angels, a structure that almost perfectly resembles Dionysius's scheme.

But despite this apparent adherence to the Dionysian scheme, Milton plays with this structure throughout *Paradise Lost*. According to Robert H. West, a prominent Miltonian angelology scholar, "Milton uses the terms of rank so fluidly that no one has been able to organize his use of a consistent pattern" (West 134). Milton names Raphael as both a Seraph and a Virtue (5.227,371). Giving both names to the angel seems to indicate the unimportance of the angel's title. Milton also places Cherubim closest to the Garden of Eden and humanity, using them to force Adam and Eve out of the Garden (12.628) and biblical sources support this: "He drove out the man, and at the east of the Garden of Eden he placed the cherubim and a flaming sword that turned every way to guard the way to the tree of life" (Genesis 3:24). However, Milton also calls these angels Powers, again seeming to blatantly ignore the traditional Catholic tradition (11.221).

Milton can be seen to subvert the traditional order so that Archangels are closest to God and Seraphim and Cherubim are farthest away. Satan, disguised as a "stripling Cherub," shows ignorance to Uriel, an archangel, asking him where he can find Adam and Eve:

In which of all these shining Orbs hath Man
His fixed seat, or fixed seat hath none,
But all these shining Orbs his choice to dwell;
That I may find him, and with secret gaze,

Or open admiration him behold
 On whom the great Creator hath bestow'd
 Worlds, and on whom hath all these graces pour'd;
 That both in him and all things, as is meet,
 The Universal Maker we may praise (3.668-76)

Uriel responds, “thy desire which tends to know / The works of God, thereby to glorify / The great Work-Master [...] merits praise” (3.694-697). If following the traditional Dionysian scheme, Satan, disguised as a Cherub, should have more knowledge than an Archangel, especially concerning the works of God. However, Satan acts like Uriel knows more than he, displaying the hierarchical difference between the two. This can also be seen when Satan bows before departing from Uriel’s presence, indicating Uriel is superior to him. This is clearly non-Dionysian in that an Archangel is instructing a Cherub.

In Book 3, the Archangels, which reside in God’s inner circle, are praised for carrying out divine providence:

Th' Arch-Angel Uriel, one of the sev'n
 Who in God's presence, nearest to his Throne
 Stand ready at command, and are his Eyes
 That run through all the Heav'ns, or down to th'Earth
 Bear his swift errands over moist and dry,
 O'er Sea and Land. (3. 648-653)

Milton promotes the ministerial archangels to the top of the divine hierarchy and places the worshipping seraphim and cherubim to the bottom. By doing this, Milton creates a heaven where ministration has greater importance than divine worship. According to Michael Walzer, the importance placed on the angels' ability to serve God's will is characteristic of Puritan angelology: Puritans tended to praise the angels not for their purely intellectual being, but only for... the "quick dispatch of the angels in their business." They "are so prepared for the performance of God's commands," Calvin had declared "that he has no sooner signified his will than they are ready for the work." Angels were superior to men... because they obeyed more willingly and more speedily; they were more "serviceable." (Calvin qtd. in Walzer 163)

Milton accepts this Puritan view and problematizes the Catholic and Anglican emphasis on ceremonial worship, as well as their hierarchical order of bishops. "By undermining the Catholic heavenly hierarchy in this manner, he simultaneously undermines the ecclesiastical hierarchy upon which it is modeled and eliminates Catholic forms of ceremonial worship from the presence of God" (Mohamed 5).

Milton was writing *Paradise Lost* during a time of radical political, social, and theological change. By subverting traditional ideas of hierarchies within his works, Milton made sure that those who read him, even those who did not read his explicitly political treatises, were made aware of both his theological and political leanings. Milton used *Paradise Lost*, specifically the angels within the work, to comment upon England's political situation. Although it seems like purely a theological debate, Milton's problematization of Catholic and Anglican ceremonial worship, the order of

bishops, and the veneration of angels, goes beyond theology. Milton's England was a country where politics and religion were closely intertwined, making this theological debate a political one as well. Milton's attack on the hierarchical structure of the bishops did not only attack Anglican theology, it attacked the royalists and the king. This challenge to the king continues as Milton likens humans to God, seen in how Adam rules the beasts of the world, although his status can never be truly equal to God's. Adam describes to Raphael what he remembers of his creation, saying:

Thou in the secrecy although alone,
 Best with thyself accompanied, seekest not
 Social communication, yet so pleased
 Canst raise thy Creature to what height thou wilt
 Of union or communion, deified;
 I by conversing cannot these erect. (8. 427-432)

King Charles I and rulers before him believed that they were given the divine right to rule; they established a divine connection between them and God, effectively construing a sense of credibility to their reign. Milton establishes a connection between God and all of humanity, discrediting this claim. This can also be seen in Milton's theology, in which he advocated for the plain reading of Scripture. He maintained that each and every person must read and understand the scriptures for themselves, effectively eliminating the need for the interpretation of the Scriptures by a higher authority. By doing this Milton undermines the authority of both the Catholic and Anglican Church and their leaders, including the King of England.

The figure of Satan plays a pivotal role in establishing the King of England as a tyrant. In his *Eikonoklastes*, which was a direct response to the *Eikon Basilike*, the supposed autobiography of King Charles I that portrayed him as an innocent Christian martyred by Parliament, Milton directly links Satan and King Charles: "He [King Charles] calls the conscience Gods sovranitie, why then doth he contest with God about that supreme title...usurping over spiritual things, as Lucifer beyond his sphere" (Nelson 19-20)(*Eikonoklastes* 501-02). In Milton's eyes, both Satan and Charles attempted to lay claim to something that was not theirs, namely God's power. Milton describes Satan as an eclipsing sun, imagery that holds political significance:

As when the Sun . . .from behind the Moon
 In dim Eclipse disastrous twilight sheds
 On half the Nations, and with fear of change
 Perplexes Monarchs (11. 594-99)

Milton links the imagery of the sun with that of earthly rulers, showing the connection between the two. By using this imagery, Milton is directly referencing the *Eikon Basilike*, where Charles is likened to the sun, "Compar[ing] his royal prerogative to the sun's light" (Bennett 443). By the King using this imagery, Milton believes he is directly turning against the chain of being, as he is claiming himself to be a god. Royalists argued that a king had the divine right to rule, intrinsic within this supreme chain of being; just as God rules over the world, a king should rule over his country, namely England. However, Milton believed that this logic was incorrect:

The right to exercise power, he [Milton] said, belongs to those whom nature has given power to exercise. God, since he created and sustains the universe, naturally has power over it; the sun by its nature imparts life-giving influence on the earth and so naturally controls her fertility; nature has given a father power to beget sons. But no one man can create or has been created as essential to the life of all other men; and a king does not have the power to create his subjects.

(Bennett 443)

According to Milton, Charles, by breaking this chain of being, thought himself a god: “Nay that his reason is as Celestial and life-giving to the Parliament, as the Suns influence is to the Earth: What other notions but these, or such like, could swell up Caligula⁴ to think himself a God” (*Eikonoklastes* 467). By establishing this relationship between Satan and King Charles, Milton shows how Charles is a tyrant, again undermining his authority and his right to rule.

⁴ Gaius Julius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, commonly referred to as Caligula, was the third Roman Emperor ruling from 37 to 41CE. During his reign, he worked to increase the personal power of the Emperor. Sources from the later part of his reign describe him as a tyrant, focusing on his cruelty, extravagance, and sadism.

Suetonius, *The Lives of Twelve Caesars*, “Life of Caligula”

Afterlives of *Paradise Lost*

In the over 350 years since this poem appeared it has served as a call to arms of sorts for people under authoritarian regimes. It has reached people around the world and it has been translated into many popular languages.⁵ In many of these instances, governments have been directly involved in the censoring of these translations. For example, in Japan, a nation largely defined by its population's willingness to conform, "culture has established a history of assimilation and domestication in translation" (*Milton in Translation* 463). This was largely due to the rising nationalist movement before World War II in Japan where students were taught to adore the Emperor as a living god. Therefore, according to Hiroko Sano, most Japanese translations favor intelligibility over original meaning in order to make them "palatable to Japanese readers," losing much of the anti-authoritarian sentiment in the process.

In 1963, the South Korean government also translated *Paradise Lost*, being one of the latest countries to do so. Like Japan, the Korean government required its translators to change important aspects of the epic, downplaying its anti-authoritarian views. In the introduction to both translations, Milton is described as non-political, and in the texts Satan's heroism is suppressed: "the Arch-Enemy" becomes a "ringleader of the enemy" and "His utmost power" is instead "the power of disobedience" (Kim Hae Yeon 490). In the time these two translations were published--ten years after the end of the Korean War--the South Korean government wanted to display its anti-authoritarian

⁵ According to Islam Issa, an editor of *Milton in Translation*, *Paradise Lost* has been translated more than 300 times into at least 57 languages

agenda, thus the publication of the translations of *Paradise Lost*, but it also did not want its own people to become too political, thus this censoring.

During the 1980's, Milovan Djilas translated *Paradise Lost* to a very different effect. He was the first translator of the epic into Serbian, and he was a member of the illegal Communist party. Forced into prison and tortured for refusing to name his Communist allies, he eventually switched sides, becoming an influential member of the Partisan resistance against Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy (Lowenthal 45). During this time in prison, Djilas wrote books about the communist regime and how it had created a privileged bureaucratic class. During a second stint in prison for again writing anti-communist books, he began translating *Paradise Lost* into Serbian, writing on prison toilet paper. Djilas writes on September 24, 1964 in his journal, "I finished the ninth chapter of the third part of the second book [of *Paradise Lost*] on page 3126 of toilet paper" (Strojan 365). In this translation, Satan's speeches are much more combative than the original, clearly showcasing both his and Milton's anger against authoritarian regimes.

It is through these translations that Milton's voice can be heard around the world, as diverse individuals and organizations use the epic to either accept or reject his anti-authoritarian views. Milton was an advocate of discovering the truth for oneself, seen in his treatise *Areopagitica*, which opposed censorship and promoted freedom of speech. These translations, whether they promote or criticise his views, would be seen by him as a form of censorship, as they all in some way twist the meaning of the original text. Despite this, these translations show how influential *Paradise Lost* was and still is.

Bibliography

- Aquinas, Thomas. *The Summa Theologica*. Catholic Way Publishing, 2014.
- Barker, Arthur Edward. *Milton and the Puritan Dilemma, 1641-1660*. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1942. Print.
- Bennett, Joan S. "God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton's Royal Portraits." *PMLA*, vol. 92, no. 3, 1977, pp. 441–457. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/461707.
- Clark, Donald Lemen. "Milton's Schoolmasters: Alexander Gil and His Son Alexander." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 9, no. 2, 1946, pp. 121–147. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3815696.
- Corrigan, Kevin and Harrington, L. Michael, "Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = [<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/pseudo-dionysius-areopagite/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/pseudo-dionysius-areopagite/).
- Davies, Godfrey. "Milton in 1660." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 18, no. 4, 1955, pp. 351–363. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3816346.
- Fallon, Samuel. "Milton's Strange God: Theology and Narrative Form in *Paradise Lost*." *ELH*, vol. 79, no. 1, 2012, pp. 33–57., www.jstor.org/stable/41337578. Accessed 14 May 2020.
- Farrell, Walter. *A Companion to the Summa*. Sheed and Ward, 1985.
- Franke, William, editor. "Dionysius the Aeropagite, Divine Names, Chaps. I and VII, 3; Mystical Theology." *On What Cannot Be Said: Apophatic Discourses in Philosophy, Religion, Literature, and the Arts*. Volume 1. Classic Formulations, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 2007, pp. 158–180, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvpj741c.18.
- Gardiner, Anne Barbeau. "Milton's Parody of Catholic Hymns in Eve's Temptation and Fall: Original Sin as a Paradigm of 'Secret Idolatries.'" *Studies in Philology*, vol. 91, no. 2, 1994, pp. 216–231. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/4174484
- Gil, Alexander, et al. *The Sacred Philosophie of the Holy Scripture*. Printed by Anne Griffin for Joyce Norton, and Richard Whitaker, and Are to Bee Sold at His Shop in Pauls Church-Yard, at the Signe of the Kings-Armes, 1635.
- Gordon, Alexander. "Stock, Richard." *Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by Sidney Lee, vol. 54, 1898, p. 398.

- Gregory, Tobias. "How Milton Defined Heresy and Why." *Religion & Literature*, vol. 45, no. 1, 2013, pp. 148–160. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/24397814
- Huckabay, Calvin., Stevens, David Harrison, and Fletcher, Harris Francis. *John Milton: An Annotated Bibliography, 1929-1968*. Rev. ed. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969. Print.
- Kelly M. Kopic, Randall C. Gleason, *The Devoted Life: An Invitation to the Puritan Classics*, p. 53.
- Lewalski, Barbara K. "Milton and Idolatry." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 43, no. 1, 2003, pp. 213–232. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/4625064
- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *The Life of John Milton : A Critical Biography*, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2001. ProQuest Ebook Central, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/stpu/detail.action?docID=351571>.
- Levering, Matthew. *Predestination: biblical and Theological Paths*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Lowenthal, R. "Djilas and the Yugoslav Dilemma." *Encounter*, vol. 49, 1957.
- Margo, Todd. *Providence, Chance and the New Science in Early Stuart Cambridge*, *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 3. Sep. 1986.
- McDowell, Nicholas. *Family Politics; Or, How John Phillips Read His Uncle's Satirical Sonnets*, *Milton Quarterly* Vol. 42 Issue 1, pp. 1–21. Published online: 17 April 2008.[dead link]
- Miller, Jeffrey. "Milton and the Conformable Puritanism of Richard Stock and Thomas Young." *Young Milton: the Emerging Author, 1620-1642*, by Edward Jones, Oxford University Press, 2013, pp. 72–95.
- Milton, John. *An Apology*. London, 1642
- Milton, John, and Anna Baldwin. *Paradise Lost*. Oxford University Press, 2008
- Milton, John, and Frank Allen Patterson. *Defensio Secunda*. Columbia University Press, 1933.
- Milton, John, and Kathleen M. Lea. *Areopagitica, and, Of Education*. Clarendon Press, 1973.
- "Milton's Angelology: Intelligential Substance in Paradise Lost." "Matter of Glorious Trial": Spiritual and Material Substance in "Paradise Lost", by N. K. SUGIMURA,

- Yale University Press, New Haven; London, 2009, pp. 158–195. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5vm487.10.
- Milton, John. *Complete Prose Works of John Milton* Vol I ed. Don Wolfe. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Mohamed, Feisal G. “‘Paradise Lost’ and the Inversion of Catholic Angelology.” *Milton Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2002, pp. 240–252. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/24465049.
- Nelson, Holly Faith, and Daems, Jim. *Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of His Sacred Majesty in His Solitudes and Sufferings: with Selections from Eikonoklastes*. 2006.
- Patrides, C. A. *Milton and the Christian Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon P., 1966. Print.
- Parente, Pascale. *The Angels in Catholic Teaching and Tradition*. TAN Books, 2013.
- Pettegree, Andrew. “History - The English Reformation.” BBC, BBC, 17 Feb. 2011, www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/tudors/english_reformation_01.shtml.
- “Political Regime Map.” Human Rights Foundation, hrf.org/research_posts/political-regime-map/.
- Poole, William. *Milton and the Making of Paradise Lost*, Harvard University Press, 2017. ProQuest Ebook Central, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/stpu/detail.action?docID=5109991>.
- Robins, Harry F. *If This Be Heresy: a Study of Milton and Origen*. University of Illinois Press, 1963.
- Sewell, Arthur. *A Study in Milton's Christian Doctrine*. Archon Books, 1967.
- “Seventeenth Century Conflicts.” *The Metaphysical Passion: Seven Modern American Poets and the Seventeenth-Century Tradition*, by SONA RAIZISS, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1952, pp. 79–102. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv51363q.9. Accessed 17 Apr. 2020.
- Sims, James H. *The Bible in Milton's Epics*. University of Florida Press, 1962.
- Stephen, Jeffrey. “Scottish Nationalism and Stuart Unionism.” *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 49, no. 1, Jan. 2010, pp. 55–58.
- Stone, Lawrence. “Social Mobility in England, 1500-1700.” *Past & Present*, no. 33, 1966, pp. 16–55. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/649801. Accessed 14 May 2020.

Spraggon, Julie. *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War*. Boydell Press, 2006.

Sullivan, C. "Milton and the Beginning of Civil Service." *Literature in the Public Service*. 2013, Ch. 2.

Tertullien, and Peter Holmes. *The Five Books of Quintus Sept. Flor. Tertullianus against Marcion*. T. And T. Clark, 1868.

"The English Civil War (1642-6)." *Munitions of the Mind: A History of Propaganda*, by Philip M. Taylor, Manchester University Press, Manchester; New York, 2003, pp. 117–120. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt155jd69.19.

"The Religious Precept." *John Milton: The Self and the World*, by John T. Shawcross, University Press of Kentucky, 1993, pp. 247–259. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt130j3qw.18.

Walzer, Michael. *The Revolution of the Saints*. New York: Athenum, 1968

West, Robert H. "Milton's Angelological Heresies." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 14, no.1, 1953, pp. 116–123. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/2707498.

Wolf, Martin. *The Rise of the Populist Authoritarians*. Financial Times, 22 Jan. 2019, www.ft.com/content/4faf6c4e-1d84-11e9-b2f7-97e4dbd3580d.

Wooten, John. "From Purgatory to the Paradise of Fools: Dante, Ariosto, and Milton." *ELH*, vol. 49, no. 4, 1982, pp. 741–750., doi:10.2307/2872895. Accessed 13 2020.