

The Son as Collaborator in *Paradise Regained*

PATRICIA R. TAYLOR

Despite the recent attention paid to the material conditions of Milton's publishing practices, Milton's use of the word "publish" to describe the activities of the Son in *Paradise Regained* has been almost completely overlooked by scholars. The term is used once in a passage in which the narrator describes Jesus' thoughts as the Spirit leads him in the desert:

Musing and much revolving in his breast,
How best the mighty work he might begin
Of savior to mankind, and which way first
Publish his Godlike office now mature.¹

Scholars tend to use this passage to argue over the extent to which Jesus has or is aware of his divine nature. On one side, some see Jesus' "Musing and much revolving" as evidence that Jesus does not yet know or understand his divine nature or mission, and that throughout the poem he discovers his identity (primarily in the episode on the pinnacle of the temple); on the other, some point to the knowledge that his "Godlike office" is "now mature," and that the poem works out other issues besides the mystery of the incarnation.² Even those who are unconcerned with the question of Jesus' divinity cite the lines as evidence only that Jesus is about to embark on his public ministry, with one exception that I will address in a moment.³ Too little attention has been given to the possible implications of the word "Publish" for Milton's poem beyond the idea that Jesus is simply looking to make

Patricia R. Taylor is a PhD candidate in English at the University of Connecticut. Her dissertation considers the image of Christ as an author in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English Protestantism.

himself and his work public. While this is the primary meaning of the term, the connotations of authorship and printing suggest another way of reading the Son, in which the Son's construction of his kingship functions as an analogue for Milton's construction of his own authorship. By exploring a few aspects of Milton's conceptions of authorship, inspiration, and vocation, I will show that in *Paradise Regained* Milton constructs the Son as a type of author and publisher with whom he sees himself collaborating, and that the discussion of kingship in the poem works to provide a potent model for the possibility of political engagement through authorship.

Douglas Lanier's work is the one notable exception to the critical neglect of the term "publish," as he argues that we can see in *Paradise Regained* Milton's anxieties about public writing, anxieties that were the product of attacks on his character following the anonymous publication of his political pamphlets. For Lanier, Milton's anxieties about self-revelation are manifested in the Son's identity contest with Satan, in which Jesus must deflect Satan's attempts to pierce the ambiguity that surrounds his title of the "Son of God."⁴ Lanier concludes his discussion of publishing in *Paradise Regained* by claiming that the Son is constructed as Milton's "fantasy" of an "ideal author" who is completely autonomous: "nothing of the 'I' who initiates the poem will be revealed: this song, though 'mine,' is 'prompted ... else mute,' a product of inspiration. Throughout *Paradise Regained*, Milton presents the fantasy of a self heroically, miraculously in command of publication and reception, freed from the prisonhouse of the public word. In his last portrait of Christ, Milton imagines the savior of mankind as, among other things, an ideal author."⁵ Lanier's work, while important, is limited in that it only examines one possible ramification of the material considerations of publishing that may have influenced Milton's portrayal of a publishing Jesus in *Paradise Regained*. Milton published far more than just the anonymous political tracts—in fact, most of his writings were published under his own name—and Milton is far from absent in *Paradise Regained*, despite his emphasis on being divinely inspired. We also have a great number of Milton's thoughts on publishing available to complicate the possible connotations of the term "publish" for the poem as a whole. Moreover, we should question whether Milton's fantasy figure would have been an isolated author, free of outside influence.

Stephen B. Dobranski has argued that for Milton, collaboration in authorship and publishing is essential to the pursuit of

truth because the act of publishing a text requires the involvement of multiple individuals—authors, printers, booksellers—who all bear a certain amount of responsibility for the text’s content.⁶ Publishers and printers are not just passive tools by which authors propagate their ideas; rather, they are active participants in the process of creating the text. Although Barbara K. Lewalski’s reminder that Milton does not ever use the word “collaboration” to describe his own writing is important, Dobranski emphasizes that Milton’s works—and the independent persona that has dominated scholarly understanding of his works—were created with the help of his amanuenses, printers, correctors, publishers, licensers, and retailers, and that Milton defends such collaborative relationships in works such as *Areopagitica*.⁷

I believe we need to extend Dobranski’s recognition of the material realities of Milton’s collaborations to consider how Milton interacts with his biblical sources, especially in *Paradise Regained*. For Milton, an inspired collaboration is inherent in any interaction with biblical texts and is not necessarily subject to the same dangers as collaboration with other human beings. In *Christian Doctrine*, Milton discusses evidence for the divine inspiration of the biblical text: “The writings of the prophets, the apostles and the evangelists, since they were divinely inspired, are called THE HOLY SCRIPTURE; II Sam. xxiii. 2: *the Spirit of Jehovah spoke in me, and his word was on my tongue*; Matt. xxii. 43: *David, through the Spirit, calls him Lord, saying ...* ; II Cor. xiii. 3: *since you seek a proof of Christ speaking in me*; II Tim. iii. 16: *all scripture is divinely inspired*.”⁸ Although it seems unlikely that Milton thought his writings were inspired for the same purpose as scripture, he would certainly have regarded his reading of scripture, which he was rewriting in his epics, as inspired and collaborative: “Every believer is entitled to interpret the scriptures; and by that I mean interpret them for himself. He has the spirit, who guides truth, and he has the mind of Christ” (*Prose* 6:583). Milton here, as elsewhere, offers scripture as a rule of faith, but, as always, the Spirit of God accompanies the proper use and interpretation of it. Both reading and writing scripture were inherently collaborative for Milton because of their inspiration by the Holy Spirit.

This contrasts with the view of inspired writing held by such Reformation theologians as Johann Gerhardt, who deemed it necessary that God be clearly understood as the author and authority of the text, and, as a result, believed that there were no traces of the human author left in the text. Gerhardt wrote in *Loci Theologici* that the biblical writers were “amanuenses of

God, hands of Christ, notaries and secretaries of the Holy Spirit ... When, therefore, any canonical book is called Book of Moses, Psalter of David, Epistle of Paul, this is merely with the meaning of service, not with the meaning of principal cause."⁹ This excision of the human element from scripture seems roughly parallel to the view of inspiration that Lanier employs at the end of his essay to suggest that Milton is anxious that he might reveal himself as the author of his texts, using the claim of inspiration to mask or remove his own presence from the text.

However, many people—including Milton—resisted a doctrine that so clearly limited the human role in the mechanism of inspiration. John Calvin in particular avoided making such claims: "Whether God revealed himself to the fathers by oracles and visions, or, by the instrumentality and ministry of men, suggested what they were to hand down to posterity, there cannot be a doubt that the certainty of what he taught them was firmly engraven on their hearts, so that they felt assured and knew that the things which they learnt came forth from God, who invariably accompanied his word with a sure testimony, infinitely superior to mere opinion."¹⁰ Calvin raises multiple alternatives to the amanuensis view that allow for the possibility of human participation in the authorship of scripture. Many Protestants interpreted these possibilities to mean that God inspired all the words of the Bible, but the process or means of inspiration did not necessarily overwhelm the human author's personality or context, allowing for the possibility of a person's full participation as an author, not just as a scribe.

Milton seems to have followed Calvin's perspective: he says nothing about the means of inspiration of the Bible in *Christian Doctrine*, but only that scripture is inspired (*Prose* 6:574). However, the scripture he quotes to prove inspiration in the most general sense has a distinct emphasis on the human element in scripture. They are the writings of people—prophets, apostles, evangelists—who are divinely inspired, and Milton makes no move like Gerhardt's to qualify that the attribution of authorship is "merely with the meaning of service." By emphasizing the human element, Milton seems to move toward a collaborative view of the composition of scripture that parallels his use of collaborative elements in *Paradise Regained*.

Paradise Regained begins with an acknowledgement of the collaborative nature of the poem, opening with the very authorial presence that Lanier suggests Milton wants to hide:

I who e're while the happy Garden sung,
 By one mans disobedience lost, now sing
 Recover'd Paradise to all mankind.

(*Poetry* 1.1–3)

Milton is clearly the author and narrator here, both of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*. But the announcement of his presence is immediately followed by the acknowledgment of the presence of a spiritual coauthor: “Thou Spirit ... inspire / As thou art wont, my prompted Song else mute” (*Poetry* 1.8–12). Milton is explicit about his reliance on the inspiration of the Spirit. He will not allow us to see him as capable of writing this poem entirely on his own power, but neither will he allow his presence as narrator to be excised. These introductory lines establish the context of *Paradise Regained* as a collaborative text, dependent upon Milton’s relationship with God. Moreover, the emphasis on a divine collaborator removes the anxieties about fallibility and distortion that Milton may have experienced in working with human collaborators in writing and publishing his work.

Yet, like Gerhardt, Milton associates the inspiration of the biblical text not only with the Holy Spirit, but also with Christ. As we see in Milton’s quotation of II Cor. 13:3, Milton recognizes Christ’s participation in the inspiration process, as Christ spoke through Paul, and he also recognizes “the mind of Christ” as an integral part of the process of interpreting scripture (*Prose* 6:583). Milton’s collaborative writing acts (especially those such as *Paradise Lost* or *Paradise Regained*, which might be understood as collaboration with scripture, and thus with God) are thus complicated as they indicate a mimetic participation that is in both imitation of and collaboration with Christ. Milton collaborates with Christ exactly as he collaborates with the Spirit, but he also imitates the Jesus he presents in *Paradise Regained*, who is himself led by the Spirit.

As is well-known, pre-Romantic poets generally saw imitation as a necessary part of being a poet. Ben Jonson, for example, saw in a true poet the ability “to convert the substance, or Riches of an other *Poet*, to his owne use. To make choise of one excellent man above the rest, and so to follow him, till he grow very *Hee*: or, so like him, as the Copie may be mistaken for the Principall.”¹¹ Milton did not set out to imitate many human authors, although Virgil was the most obvious exception. Instead, he sought to establish himself as what Richard Helgerson has termed a “laureate poet.”¹² The call to imitate Christ as a poet likely would still have

been powerful, especially given the strong precedent in Renaissance literary theory, in which Christ was considered a type of poet. Sir Philip Sidney used Christ as one example of the value of teaching and delighting; Sir John Harrington used Christ as an example of the highest form of fiction and invention: “He that was all holiness, all wisdom, all truth used parables, and even such as discreet poets use, where a good and honest and wholesome allegory is hidden in a pleasant and pretty fiction.”¹³ This is not just a defense of fiction by the example of Christ as poet, but rather a suggestion of a model for poets. According to this conception, Christ is the ultimate standard of all Christian behavior, including authorial behavior.

Milton clearly builds on these sixteenth-century ideas: his highest priority is to imitate God, and the Son is the manifest image and glory of God, and should, thus, be imitated. In *Of Education*, Milton argues that learning is meant to “repair the ruins of our first parents by regaining to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love him, to imitate him, to be like him, as we may the nearest by possessing our souls of true vertue, which being united to the heavenly grace of faith makes up the highest perfection” (*Prose* 2:366–7). In *Paradise Regained*, Milton’s imitation of the Son is expressed in the Son’s collaboration with the Spirit. We see the same Spirit that inspires Milton’s song leading Jesus into the desert, where he muses about how best to “Publish his Godlike office” (*Poetry* 1.187). The concept of collaboration immediately extends beyond Milton the narrator to the Son, who

One day forth walk’d alone, the Spirit leading;
And his deep thoughts, the better to converse
With solitude, till far from track of men,
Thought following thought, and step by step led on,
He enter’d now the bordering Desert wild.

(*Poetry* 1.189–93)

In this passage, Milton’s language consistently moves between Jesus’ isolation and his guidance by the Holy Spirit: Jesus is thinking in solitude, but the parallel language for thoughts and steps suggests the Spirit’s guidance in these aspects of his life as well.

Georgia B. Christopher argues that the Holy Spirit functions as the “secret agent” of *Paradise Regained*, participating in Christ’s temptations by acting as the source of Christ’s “wisdom, power, [and] intent” (*Poetry* 4.528).¹⁴ Christopher notes that employing

the Holy Spirit as the source of Christ's power is "brilliantly tactful ... because it sidesteps the categories of 'God' and 'man' and all metaphysical analysis based on 'hypostasis,' an approach which Milton denigrated."¹⁵ She argues that Milton replaces thinking of Christ as coessential with God with "see[ing] him as possessing the Holy Spirit without measure."¹⁶ In this view, Milton's Jesus in *Paradise Regained* receives much, if not all of his power through collaboration with the Holy Spirit, as he, like Christ in *Christian Doctrine*, has emptied himself of his own divine power (*Prose* 6:434). This makes the *imitatio Christi* aspect of the poem all the more powerful, for now Jesus is a figure that can be imitated despite his divine nature.¹⁷ As the Son points out in one of his rebukes to Satan,

God hath now sent his living Oracle
 Into the World, to teach his final will,
 And sends his Spirit of Truth henceforth to dwell
 In pious Hearts, an inward Oracle
 To all truth requisite for men to know.

(*Poetry* 1.460–4)

Just as Jesus can be led by the Spirit, so too can Christians now have the same guidance— including Milton.

The Spirit is, for Milton, one participant in a much larger collaborative effort that allows human beings to work toward knowledge of truth. In *Areopagitica*, Milton argues for a development of truth that comes through collaborative cultural efforts. In it, his most detailed examination of what publishing has the potential to be and do, he argues for the freedom of the press because conversation and debate are necessary for the discovery and dissemination of truth. Milton highlights the combination of reason with collaboration as necessary for the author who "writes to the world": "he summons up all his reason and deliberation to assist him; he searches, meditates, is industrious, and likely consults and confers with his judicious friends" (*Prose* 2:532). Milton suggests that bringing together knowledge from a variety of sources, both false and true, is necessary for the pursuit of truth. Describing a text by a member of Parliament, he writes of "Mr. *Selden*, whose volume of naturall & national laws proves, not only by great authorities brought together, but by exquisite reasons and theorems almost mathematically demonstrative, that all opinions, yea errors, known, read, and collated, are of main service & assistance toward the speedy attainment of what

is truest" (*Prose* 2:513). Here, Milton sees the value of the text in the reason of the author combined with the writings of others, the "authorities brought together." The errors are both discovered and made to service the "speedy attainment of what is truest" by their compilation. The discovery and pursuit of truth is inherently collaborative, marked by the simultaneously personal and cultural efforts to work out the relationships between "all opinions, yea errors" and the truth itself.

Traditionally, scholars have understood the relationship between Milton and the Son not as one of collaboration, but rather as one of identification. Perhaps drawing on Milton's own critical appreciation for his poem, scholars such as Don M. Wolfe and Roy Flannagan (among others) have chosen to see the Jesus of *Paradise Regained* as a substitute or parallel for Milton's presence in the poem.¹⁸ Much of this criticism emphasizes Milton's sense of failing or disappointment after the Restoration. For example, Regina M. Schwartz suggests that Christ's renunciations of power and worldly knowledge in *Paradise Regained* are actually Milton's way of expressing his despair after the Restoration, and John X. Evans argues that Milton's "representation of Jesus is errant and indefensible" because there is more of Milton in it than the Jesus of the Gospels.¹⁹ Extending Louis L. Martz's claim in *The Paradise Within* and Christopher Hill's in *Milton and the English Revolution* that Milton is "disillusioned" by the time of writing *Paradise Regained*, Evans claims "that we discover more about Milton than Milton intended to reveal, primarily, a harsh and embittered poet who condemned humanity through the Christ of his poem while assuming that the celestial Christ was speaking through him."²⁰ Milton may have been disillusioned by the failure of the Commonwealth, but the picture painted by critics of a Milton with an overwhelmingly negative view of politics, the people, and the future of England seems to fly against what other scholars such as David Loewenstein have seen as the poem's engagement with the "the radical religious world of mid-seventeenth-century England."²¹ Although scholars have often read Milton's depiction of the Son who has withdrawn into the wilderness as a parallel for Milton's withdrawal from politics, Loewenstein argues against seeing Milton or the Son as withdrawn from the political realm. Like Loewenstein, I believe Milton's Son does not simply withdraw from public life. His withdrawal is in preparation for entering the public life, and he is concerned with how to do so, in part, as an author or publisher. For Milton, the Son is an image of authorial engagement that he can both appropriate for himself and offer to others as a model for proper Christian behavior.

The identification of the Son with Milton in scholarship often begins with Jesus' description of himself as a child; the Son does not play, for his mind "was set / Serious to learn and know, and thence to do / What might be publick good" (*Poetry* 1.203–4), and he is "born to promote all truth, / All righteous things" (*Poetry* 1.205–6). Milton's description of his own childhood in *A Second Defense of the English People*, in which he is a serious and studious child, bears a striking resemblance to the Jesus presented above, especially in how his "father destined me in early childhood for the study of literature, for which I had so keen an appetite that from my twelfth year scarcely ever did I leave my studies for my bed before the hour of midnight" (*Prose* 4:612). However, as Walter MacKellar has cautioned, "resemblance is not identity," and for Milton to "identify himself with Christ ... even in his human nature, would be the greatest violation of decorum."²² Yet MacKellar perhaps forgets or ignores that most of what we know of Milton's childhood was constructed by Milton himself in his writings. In other words, the sense of identification here is not the product of the biographical fallacy. It is not simply that those who would see Milton and Christ identified overstate the resemblance; rather, Milton constructs his own remembrance of his childhood in imitation of Jesus' childhood. As Stephen Fallon points out, the "choice of the twelfth year [for Milton's self-description] may owe as much to Luke 2 as to any precise or unmediated recollection on Milton's part."²³ It is not that scholars have read Milton into the Son, but that Milton represents himself, both in *Paradise Regained* and in other texts, as an imitator of Jesus.

Milton's imitation (or representation of imitation) of the Son has at its base a particular typological reading of Christ. As a variety of scholars have demonstrated, Milton's reading of the Bible is inherently typological, "subjecting the Old Testament to a Christian hermeneutic, according to which events and persons of the Old are seen as foreshadowing or predicting those of the New Testament."²⁴ Yet, for many Protestant readers during the Renaissance, typological interpretation would have led naturally to a tropological interpretation that would apply to their own lives. Tropological exegesis, as Calvin used it for example, interpreted the scriptures not only literally and typologically with reference to Christ, but also in relationship to the contemporary church and the individual believer. Although a tropological reading of the Bible often resulted in ideas such as the political correlations between Israel and England as the Nation of God, individuals were also encouraged to see themselves as another fulfillment of the scriptures. According to Lewalski, "Christians were invited to

perceive the events and personages of Old and New Testament salvation history not merely as exemplary to them but as actually recapitulated in their lives, in accordance with God's vast typological plan of recapitulations and fulfillments. This new, primary focus upon the individual Christian does not of course replace the traditional recognition of Christ as the antitype who fulfills all the types *forma perfectior*," however.²⁵ Christians, then, in addition to Christ, were the antitype or fulfillment to the figures and types laid out in the Old Testament. In seeing themselves in Old Testament figures, they could also—and were required to—see their own actions as they were fulfilled in Christ. Moreover, Christians could see their own lives directly fulfilled in Christ, becoming the type to which Christ is the antitype. Milton would have seen such tropological interpretations not just as an impetus to imitate Christ, as most Christians did, but also as a reason why he could construct his own history in imitation of Christ, as well as create details describing Jesus' life that seem reminiscent of his own life.

Yet Milton's imitation of the Son is not obviously focused on authorship or publishing within the poem; the lack of scholarly debate on the connotation of the word "publish" for the poem leaves no doubt that publishing, for both Milton and the Son, can only be part of a larger whole, a means of achieving a larger end of making something public. Laura Lunger Knoppers has argued that *Paradise Regained* exists in part as a response to the typological construction of the idea of royal martyrdom in *Eikon Basilike* following the execution of Charles I. She claims that Milton's creation of a "private, unemotional Son of God" in *Paradise Regained* was "a response and challenge to the Stuart deployment of Christic martyrology" in *Eikon Basilike*, and that the poem "provides a model by which the saints can internalize their warfare, can turn to new weapons in a spiritual battle ... to vindicate King Jesus."²⁶ Because so much of *Paradise Regained* centers on the question of kingship and rule—and the proper expression of such rule for the Son—it seems clear that the Son's "Godlike office" that he is publishing is, at least in part, his kingship. *Christian Doctrine* clearly identifies Christ as a king, both in the hearts of Christians and in the eventual millennial rule after the second coming (*Prose* 6:435–7), but *Paradise Regained* confronts the question of what part(s) of his kingship ought to be made public at a particular moment, in the time leading up to and including the Son's death on the cross.²⁷

The term “publish” suggests that the Son already knows the ultimate goals of the text that he is going to make public, but it is also clear that he has not yet planned how to achieve his goals, nor has he decided if his entire kingship ought to be revealed at once. We cannot see the line that he is about to “Publish his Godlike office” as merely an indication that the Son is about to embark on his public ministry, as we are told that in some ways Jesus’ office has already been made public: he has started choosing his disciples, who recognize him as “Messiah,” and the disciples say that John the Baptist “to us reveal’d him / ... In publick” (*Poetry* 2.50–2). Yet existing as the “Saviour to mankind” in a public way is not enough (*Poetry* 1.187); the Son must decide whether it would be better to publish “victorious deeds” (*Poetry* 1.215) and “heroic acts” (*Poetry* 1.216), or “At least to try, and teach the erring Soul / Not willfully mis-doing, but unaware” (*Poetry* 1.224–5). The distinction between what is heroic and what is “more humane, more heav’nly” does not suggest a change in ultimate goals, but rather a different methodology (*Poetry* 1.221).

The question of method rather than final goal suggests that the Son’s kingship is thus a vocation, one that parallels Milton’s own construction of his vocation as an author as a calling that comes from outside himself and that cannot simply be fulfilled whenever he (either the Son or Milton) chooses. As Lewalksi has demonstrated, Milton’s sense of authorship as vocation appears across his works, but he emphasizes that his vocation is primarily that of a poet, even when he writes prose.²⁸ In *Reason of Church-Government*, Milton says he takes on the “unlearned drudgery” of prose—even as he establishes himself as a poet—precisely because “God by his Secretary conscience” commands him to (*Prose* 1:822), and he famously identifies prose as the work of his left hand, and poetry as the work of his right (*Prose* 1:808). Milton seems to have spent significant time pondering how and why he must achieve his ends in different ways at different points, distinguishing between his prose and his poetry.

The Son’s responses to the temptations presented by Satan offer a similar working out of three possible methods of “publishing” the Son’s kingship. Before Satan returns to tempt Jesus in the second book, Milton reminds us of the Son’s purpose in the desert. He has

Into himself descended, and at once
All his great work to come before him set

How to begin, how to accomplish best
 His end of being on Earth, and mission high.
 (Poetry 2.111–4)

The Son here recognizes that his primary goal in his appearance on earth at this time is the redemption of man on the cross, the “end of being on Earth,” but also that there is a proper order of events, moving from beginning to end in a particular way. Satan’s temptations, in turn, reflect the open nature of the Son’s goals. Satan, for the most part, does not try to tempt the Son into a clear disobedience of God’s will, but instead offers things that are already promised to the Son or desired by him. They seem designed to goad the Son into acting prematurely, or by the wrong means, or by the right means to the wrong ends, rather than into simply acting sinfully.²⁹

Jesus continually counters Satan’s temptations through references to future events. When he is tempted by the banquet, he responds with the knowledge that “I can at will ... as soon as thou, / Command a Table in this Wilderness” (Poetry 2.383–4), and while he never requests food explicitly, by the end of the poem he is eating at a table in the wilderness, complete with the “swift flights of Angels ministrant” (Poetry 2.385). Satan’s offer of power to feed the crowds prefigures Christ’s feeding of the five thousand, and even Satan’s offer of a crown is turned around by the Son to prefigure his eventual death on the cross. When the Son responds to Satan as he refuses the crown, he compares it to “a wreath of thorns,” and says that it

Brings dangers, troubles, cares, and sleepless nights
 To him who wears the Regal Diadem
 When on his shoulders each mans burden lies;
 For therein stands the office of a King,
 His Honour, Vertue, Merit and chief Praise,
 That for the Publick all this weight he bears.
 (Poetry 2.460–5)

The Son turns the crown that Satan offers into a metaphor for the Son’s eventual sacrifice in taking on the sins of the world. There could be no better description of Christ’s passion, or of Milton’s conception of proper kingship: a king who serves the people.

The Son thus discards the pursuit of a physical crown at this moment not only because it is Satan who offers it, but also because it is not yet time for him to accept a crown as the sign

of his office. Instead, he turns to a second sort of kingship: the kingship of self-rule, which he uses to counter Satan's claims to rule the world: "Yet he who reigns within himself, and rules / Passions, Desires, and Fears, is more a King" (*Poetry* 2.466–7). This is the type of kingship that Satan cannot offer to the Son (for, as MacKellar has noted, in *Paradise Lost*, Satan "admitted the anarchy, the hell, within him, ruled as he is not by reason but lawless passion"), but that the Son can—and does—offer to human beings, and is achieved by "every wise and vertuous man" (*Poetry* 2.468).³⁰ Knoppers has identified this model of kingship as "an alternative model for dissent," and it is the kingship of self-rule that Jesus must use in response to Satan's temptations to express his power and position prematurely, and that he can then offer to other human beings.³¹

The third sort of kingship is what the Son has already declared is to be his "humane" and "heav'nly" action:

But to guide Nations in the way of truth
By saving Doctrine, and from error lead
To know, and knowing worship God aright,
Is yet more Kingly, this attracts the Soul,
Governs the inner man, the nobler part,
That other o're the body only reigns.

(*Poetry* 2.473–8)

Milton constructs the Son's responses to Satan on the question of kingship in light of the questions and issues that confronted his own time. Loewenstein has pointed out that the disciples' prayers "for deliverance from earthly monarchies and ... for the coming of the Messiah and his kingdom ... simultaneously evoke mid-seventeenth-century radical religious millenarian yearnings and the crisis of the godly in the Restoration."³² The need to redefine political action and power in light of the failure of the Commonwealth was clear, and the model of kingship demonstrated by Jesus, both in the Gospels and in Milton's poem, provided the opportunity for just such a redefinition: "This more internal, spiritual kingship does not result in his complete retreat from the world: there the inward-oriented saint remains a prophetic figure who guides 'nations in the way of truth' by challenging temporal kingship and human authorities, as well as the political language and symbolism which sustains them ... In his own quiet way, the inward Jesus of Milton's poem is himself engaged polemically in turning the world upside down by drastically reconceiving the

very terms and authority of kingly government.”³³ Loewenstein demonstrates the clear, radical, political praxis that both Jesus and Milton enact in *Paradise Regained*. Yet I believe his argument can and should be taken one step further when we consider the issue of authorship: by “publishing” his kingship, including its redefinition of earthly power, the Son argues for the power of authorship and publishing to change political realities. The Son in *Paradise Regained*, like the Christ of the Gospels, is “the Word,” whose words have power, and this power, like the kingship of self-rule, is extended to all Christians. Milton, by extension, in publishing *Paradise Regained* participates in the power of the Son’s publishing efforts through his own poetic vocation.

The heroic action of the Son is in his publishing of truth, the ruling of minds instead of bodies. Just as Milton suggests others ought to think in terms of imitating Christ’s spiritual warfare without physical force, he constructs his own idea of authorship and publishing to focus on the pursuit of truth and the ruling of the mind. In turn, the publishing in the poem for Jesus then reflects the considerations of publishing for Milton, as Milton articulates his own typological identification with Christ. Milton, like the Son, is writing “to the world.” He, like the Son, is attempting to “promote all truth,” and “from error lead / To know, and knowing worship God aright.” Their publishing efforts in this poem are, thus, inextricably intertwined. Milton does imagine the Son as an ideal author, as Lanier suggests, but not because the Son’s presence suppresses and supplants all other presences, including Milton’s own authorial identity. Milton imagines the Son as an ideal author for precisely the opposite reason: Milton is allowed and encouraged to collaborate, through the Spirit, with the author above all authors, the Word of God himself. Just as “the mind of Christ” inspired the authors of biblical texts, Milton is inspired without losing his authorial voice. Because of this fact, there is no easy way to distinguish the voice of Milton from that of the Son, but neither can we say that the Son is Milton’s voice. Milton did not simply construct Jesus in imitation of himself and his own political situation, but his Jesus is the product of a typological construction of both Milton’s and Christ’s authorial identities. Milton constructs himself and his ideals as a product of his reading of the Christ of the Bible, and then in turn constructs the Son of *Paradise Regained* to reflect those ideals.

NOTES

¹ Milton, *Paradise Regained*, in *The Complete Poetry of John Milton*, ed. John T. Shawcross (New York: Anchor, 1971), 1.184–7. Subsequent references to *Paradise Regained* are from this edition and will appear parenthetically in the text as *Poetry*, by book and line number. The issue of what to call the main character of *Paradise Regained* is complex. Older critics—and even many recent ones—refer to him as Christ, despite the fact that Milton never refers to him by this title in *Paradise Regained*. Milton identifies him as Jesus, Messiah, Savior, or the Son of God. For the purposes of this essay, I will refer to the character by these names/titles, except to reflect a critic's position or term of choice, Milton's use of the title in other texts such as *Christian Doctrine*, or the figure of the biblical narrative.

² For scholarship that uses the passage to argue against the Son's knowledge of his divine identity or mission, see John C. Ulreich, "Substantially Express'd": Milton's Doctrine of the Incarnation," *MiltonS* 39 (2000): 101–28, 114–5; and Daniel T. Lochman, "Conflicts of Authority: Interpretation of Events in *Paradise Regained* and *Sampson Agonistes*," in *Spokesperson Milton: Voices in Contemporary Criticism*, ed. Charles W. Durham and Kristin Pruitt McColgan (Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna Univ. Press; London and Toronto: Associated Univ. Presses, 1994), pp. 165–78, 166–7. For those who use it to support the idea that the Son does not come to a progressive understanding of his divine identity, see Ashraf H. A. Rushdy, "Of *Paradise Regained*: The Interpretation of Career," *MiltonS* 24 (1988): 253–75, 259; Regina M. Schwartz, "Redemption and *Paradise Regained*," *MiltonS* 42 (2002): 26–49, 30; and Joseph G. Mayer, *Between Two Pillars: The Hero's Plight in "Samson Agonistes" and "Paradise Regained"* (Lanham MD: Univ. Press of America, 2004), p. 179. It should be noted that both Rushdy and Mayer focus on the "Musing and much revolving," but still argue that Jesus does not come to a progressive understanding of his divine identity.

³ Stephen Fallon, *Milton's Peculiar Grace: Self-Representation and Authority* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 2007), p. 245. For another who uses the passage without discussion of either the term "publishing" or the divine nature of Jesus, see Richard Helgerson, *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1983), p. 245.

⁴ Douglas Lanier, "'Unmarkt, Unknown': *Paradise Regained* and the Return of the Expressed," *Criticism* 37, 2 (Spring 1995): 187–212, 199.

⁵ Lanier, pp. 206–7.

⁶ Stephen B. Dobranski, *Milton, Authorship, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999), p. 181.

⁷ Barbara K. Lewalski, "Milton's Idea of Authorship," in *Milton in the Age of Fish: Essays on Authorship, Text, and Terror*, ed. Michael Lieb and Albert C. Labriola (Pittsburgh: Duquesne Univ. Press, 2006), pp. 53–79, 68; Dobranski, p. 181.

⁸ Milton, *Christian Doctrine*, in *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. Don Marion Wolfe, 8 vols. (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1953–1982), 6:574. Subsequent references to *Christian Doctrine* and other prose works are from this multivolume collection and will appear as *Prose*, by volume and page number.

⁹Johann Gerhardt, qtd. in Kemper Fullerton, "The Reformation Principle of Exegesis and the Interpretation of Prophecy," *The American Journal of Theology* 12, 3 (July 1908): 422–42, 433.

¹⁰John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1989), p. 65.

¹¹Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford, Percy Simpson, and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols. (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1925–52), 8:638.

¹²Helgerson, p. 4.

¹³Sir John Harrington, "A Brief Apology of Poetry (1591)," in *Sidney's "The Defence of Poesy" and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Gavin Alexander (London: Penguin Books, 2004), pp. 260–73, 269.

¹⁴Georgia B. Christopher, "The Secret Agent in *Paradise Regained*," *MLQ* 41, 2 (June 1980): 131–50, 131.

¹⁵Christopher, p. 149.

¹⁶*Ibid.*

¹⁷In the context of Philippians 2, the *imitatio Christi* aspect is even more pronounced, given Paul's call to imitate Christ's humility.

¹⁸Don M. Wolfe, "The Role of Milton's Christ," *Sewanee Review* 51, 4 (October 1943): 467–75, 474; Roy Flannagan, ed., *Riverside Milton* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998), p. 711.

¹⁹Schwartz, p. 45; John X. Evans, "The Imitation of Self: Milton and the Christ of *Paradise Regained*," *ReAr* 7, 4 (2003): 439–63, 441.

²⁰Louis L. Martz, *The Paradise Within: Studies in Vaughan, Traherne, and Milton* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1964), p. 190; Christopher Hill, *Milton and the English Revolution* (New York: Viking, 1977), p. 426; Evans, p. 439.

²¹David Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and his Contemporaries* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001), p. 243.

²²Walter MacKellar, introduction to *Paradise Regained*, vol. 4 of *A Variorum Commentary on the Poems of John Milton*, ed. MacKellar, 4 vols. (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1975), 4:1–44, 38.

²³Fallon, p. 244.

²⁴Mary Ann Radzinowicz, "How Milton Read the Bible: The Case of *Paradise Regained*," in *The Cambridge Companion to Milton*, ed. Dennis Danielson (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989), pp. 207–23, 208. See also Lewalski, *Milton's Brief Epic: The Genre, Meaning, and Art of "Paradise Regained"* (Providence RI: Brown Univ. Press, 1966); and Northrop Frye, "The Typology of *Paradise Regained*," *MP* 53, 4 (May 1956): 227–38.

²⁵Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1979), pp. 131–2.

²⁶Laura Lunger Knoppers, *Historicizing Milton: Spectacle, Power, and Poetry in Restoration England* (Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1994), pp. 11, 133.

²⁷Christ's office is usually threefold—prophet, priest, and king—and Milton refers to all three in both his poem and *Christian Doctrine*; however, for the purposes of this paper, I will be focusing on kingship because it is by far the most prominent in *Paradise Regained*.

²⁸Lewalski, "Milton's Idea of Authorship," p. 56.

²⁹ In “The Typology of *Paradise Regained*,” Northrop Frye outlines the typological interpretations of Old Testament events that would have led Christ to such an understanding of these temptations, p. 228.

³⁰ MacKellar, p. 140.

³¹ Knoppers, p. 124.

³² Loewenstein, p. 252.

³³ Loewenstein, p. 259.