

Religious Implications in John Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan*

A reflection of the seventeenth century religious and political relationship as represented by John Milton and Thomas Hobbes', and their contradictory illustrations of human behavior as typically demonstrated in terms of instinct, will, and reason.

MAJLINDA VOKSHI

SUPERVISOR

Michael John Prince

University of Agder, 2022

Faculty of Humanities and Education

Department of Foreign Language and Translation

Innholdsfortegnelse

Abstract.....	3
Acknowledgments.....	Feil! Bokmerke er ikke definert.
Introduction.....	5
Of Milton and Hobbes' Politics.....	8
Of Liberty: The Politics of Freedom.....	10
Chapter I.....	13
I. Of Milton's Religious Jurisdiction.....	13
II. Of Hobbes' Subordinate Religion.....	16
III. Of Milton's Only Authority.....	18
IIII. Of Hobbes' War of All Against All.....	21
Chapter II.....	26
I. Of Milton's Defense of God to Man.....	26
II. Of Milton's Reason: Adam and Eve's Disobedience.....	30
III. Of Lost Liberty: A Submission to Servitude.....	32
IIII. Of Milton's Redemption.....	36
Chapter III.....	41
I. Of the First Sin: A Disobedience of the Sovereign.....	41
II. Of Hobbes' Civil Conscience.....	42
III. Of Cain and Abel, and Hobbes' Three Reasons for Conflict.....	45
IIII. Of the Mosaic Justification for the Sovereign.....	48
Chapter IIII.....	54
I. Of The Fall.....	54
A. Of Adam and Eve's Self-Realization.....	54
B. Of Milton's Freedom of Choice.....	57
II. Of Milton's Natural Condition of Man.....	60
A. Of Milton's Light and Sight.....	60
B. Of the Tree of Knowledge.....	62
Conclusion.....	65
Works Cited.....	68

Abstract

This thesis aims to demonstrate the opposing religious and political standards in John Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667) and in Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan* (1651). A comparison of the two respective authors illustrates seventeenth-century responsiveness to the implicit religious and political ideas of English authority at that time. This process unfolds itself through an investigation of Milton and Hobbes' opinions on human freedom, and how it should be organized to maintain peace.

Following the English revolution, Milton and Hobbes witnessed a longing for a social order. Milton expressed his solution to the problem as complete individual, freedom without external interference from the state. Hobbes, on the contrary, believed that a concentration of power in an absolutist sovereign is what will accommodate social welfare.

Further, an analysis of Milton's epic poem, with its genesis of the first disobedience, presents the deeply instinctual differences between Milton and Hobbes' fundamental beliefs about the natural human condition. A thorough examination of Milton's religious ideology is revealed through the poem's characters Adam and Eve, and deals with the freedom of choice that led them to Fall in the Garden of Eden. This perspective allows me to introduce the falling nature of mankind that is established through Hobbes political doctrine in *Leviathan*. After reviewing the relationship between the two seventeenth century philosophers, I was able to formulate a conclusion based on the method that has the most promise for a safe performance of human freedom, and of religion as politics.

Acknowledgments

I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Michael J. Prince, who without my completion of this thesis would not have been accomplished. The patience, enthusiasm, and endless knowledge in his guidance is what has sustained me throughout this project. I am unable to express my indebtedness for his assistance, and so I offer my sincerest thanks for the countless meetings, calls, and unsought visits that I could not have made it without.

In addition, I wish to offer my infinite appreciation for my family and friends, who have shown me boundless support and love. Lastly, a special thanks to my sister, to whom I owe a debt of gratitude for her constant demonstration of confidence and faith in me.

Introduction

As the tide rises and falls, the wind blows where it wishes, and the dusk turns to dawn; nature will continue to do as she pleases, and ultimately, human beings will become subject to change. What remains consistent for humankind, is the need for a society to organize itself in a useful way. In this thesis, I will focus on the implications of religion in the seventeenth-century worldview, and how it reflects human behavior contributing to, and detracting from social order. Echoes of past words continue to be repeated and brought to life into the present, and one document in particular is especially relevant for English speaking civilization, the Holy Bible. Using spiritual sensibilities current in seventeenth century England, I will discuss the notions of reason, will and morality as exemplified by John Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667): Further, I will examine one of Milton's contemporaries, Thomas Hobbes, to see how his philosophical perspectives from *Leviathan* (1651) agree with and differ from the implicit ethical and religious standards in *Paradise Lost*.

John Milton's means of communication has contributed to the English language literary traditions. Milton's language, often described as biblical and divine, demonstrates a continuous hope for the individual. In 1667, he began writing his most important work, *Paradise Lost*, a poem created as a utopian from the tip of a idealists' pen. "*Paradise Lost* is, among other things, a poem about a civil war. Satan raises 'impious war in Heav'n' (I 43) by leading a third of the angels in revolt against God" (*PL*, Leonard, John; XXIII). In the discussion of Adam and Eve, the fall of mankind and the first disobedience in the Garden of Eden, I find that Milton attempts to present and explain the human experience of the divine. Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan* (1651) is primarily a political document where he challenges the tradition of having religion as a foundation which society is built upon, and offers, in his opinion, a more stable political approach. I wish to investigate these two points of view about humanity and what the respective authors consider to be the best social arrangement to accomplish peace. I will demonstrate how individual interests affect the collective public, and how *Paradise Lost* and *Leviathan* contribute to this discussion.

This discussion will include a thorough disclosure of Milton and Hobbes' definitions of humanity in terms of instinct, liberty and obedience. I will, in description of their many contradictions, demonstrate arguments of how they wish to mobilize society from both

Paradise Lost and *Leviathan*. Further, offer a comparative performance of inspection to validate the materialistic ethics of Hobbes, and to use his politics of an absolutist sovereign to view Milton's principal understandings of unlimited freedom.

To understand the seventeenth century which heavily influenced Milton and Hobbes, one must fathom the relationship between political and religious aspects that were fundamental for the setting of the English revolution. The Thirty Year's War (1618-1648) in England anticipated the forthcoming changes and the decay of a societal structure, but still challenged perspectives that had previously been accepted. In the introduction of "*England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*", Glenn Burgess writes, "the problem of religion – howsoever that is defined – continues to be central to discussions of the Civil Wars" (xiv). With a military defeated, a weakened monarch, and a population unable to escape the wounds of the following consequences of the religious English civil wars, a conflict between state and church increased, and an enlightened period began its course.

Out of a shattered civility, emerged a demand for a morality that would redeem the natural order which had been lost to war. Burgess states that "Enthusiasm – the 'fanatical spirit' – was let loose in the English Revolution, and it was not a pretty sight to behold" (1, 3). He argues that the result of this was that fanatical spirit would discourage civil obligation because of its impure ambition. This remains one of the most important points of Hobbes' philosophy, which I will return to later. Burgess implies a relationship between the machinery of the state and the religious forces which control it, as can be evidenced in the events of the seventeenth century. Both religion and state, as history demonstrates, have had men fall victim to terrible events and incidents, either led on by faith or by force. Faith and force, both provide an incentive for parties with liberty as their goal, and yet the outcome has proven to be equally violent.

Burgess explains that the seventeenth-century English Revolution was, especially in the nineteenth century, commonly regarded as a "Puritan revolution", and that it was frequently referred to as 'the last of the religious wars' (1, 17). The term religious wars includes a discussion of the execution of Charles I, which was heavily motivated by the religious idea that the government should not interfere with the personal beliefs of civilians. In the introduction of *Paradise Lost*, written by John Leonard, it is stated that Milton, unlike Hobbes, "applauded the English people for having the courage to depose and execute King Charles I." (*PL*, XXIII). Milton denied the authority of anyone but God. Such a variety of opinions which was demonstrated around the monarchy raises awareness of the intermingled relationship between religious and political culture. This diversity is, amongst other things,

what led England to the unsettling state of the seventeenth century. Burgess concludes, “For radical Puritans like Lilburne and Milton and Sidney, the Civil War was more than a conflict between true and false religion” (12, 276). I desire to answer then, how society selected between the word of the law, and the word of God, when they are not in agreement, and how should one best balance these power structures to accomplish peace?

To discuss the implications of religion in the seventeenth-century notion of human nature, I will present research on where John Milton and Thomas Hobbes agree with and differ from one another, through a revision of the works of *Paradise Lost* and *Leviathan*. This process will include contrasting definitions of their respective terms of will, reason, and choice, which remain vital for their political arguments. In addition, I will exemplify their opinions by Biblical extracts that are available in their works. Further, I will compare the individual impacts of religion to the collective, in terms of closing arguments in justification of the evidence that I will present.

It seems plausible that at the time there was a need for an honest, spiritual, and personal relationship with God. I will demonstrate later the morality and freedom of choice which Milton explicates in *Paradise Lost*, and how his poem reflects a fundamental wish for an individual connection to God. Milton’s arguments for individual choice also have implications for the political ideas which set the ground for his definitions of freedom. Not only did Milton prefer and encourage an individual and personal practice of religion, but he publicly rejected the orthodox doctrines, which again made him more inclined to support the Protestants. Further, I will demonstrate by the story of Adam and Eve how Milton explains the human desire to live in accordance with Gods laws. It is important to define his understanding of religion as an ideology, and how it is woven into the religious aspects of politics in the seventeenth century.

Amidst the mayhem of the English Civil War, Thomas Hobbes presents the *Leviathan*, the name of his most important work extracted from the Biblical story of the sea serpent, in demonstration of the monstrous ways of an anarchist society. With a pessimistic belief that humans will not share moral instructions without having them as enforced laws or social contracts, Hobbes desired a powerful sovereign in the form of an absolute monarch, which would prevent man from descending into a world led primarily by his natural instincts.

These natural instincts consist of egoism and would therefore lead men into a world of violence. Men’s natural instincts, in Hobbesian terms, are what ensure that they need protection from each other. One will always aspire to dominate over others in order to self- preserve, and will therefore need a concentration of power, such as the power and order of a sovereign, to

ensure security from one another. To understand Hobbes, and to be able to compare his doctrine to Milton, I will discuss the same terms of freedom and will, but with definitions from Hobbes' *Leviathan*. Using the Biblical stories of Abraham and Moses, Hobbes demonstrates what he means by social law.

Of Milton and Hobbes' Politics

I wish to establish where Milton and Hobbes differ in matters of religious ideology and political doctrine. To demonstrate this contradiction, I have found an essay to assist me in the explanation of how ideology can, and has, mobilized both religion and politics. The essay, "Ideology and Religion" written by Cyril Hovorun, explores the origin of terms such as ideology, conservatism, and liberalism. This will allow me to place Milton and Hobbes on different sides of such terms, and assist me to visualize that Hobbes' and Milton stand in utter disagreement. This essay presents a quote by Isiah Berlin, where it is explained that these movements and terms, began as simple ideas in the minds of people who then transformed them into visions, and finally succeeded to realize their ideas; "above all of the prophets with armies at their back" (24). The word "armies" implies a violent transformation, and I will demonstrate in a later section the many incidents of carnage and slaughter which have been made in support of an interpreted truth.

I use the term interpreted truth in respect to the definition of ideology which Samuel Huntington offered in 1957, where he defined ideology as "a system of ideas concerned with the distribution of political and social values acquiesced in by a significant social group" (26). By this definition, I find that the explanation for the term varies in accordance with how a society, or a group, reflects upon itself and furthers this reflection until it embraces their understandings of social, religious, and political concerns. To explain this in detail and through evolutionary changes of ideology, I will make use of the definitions that are offered between liberals and conservatives. These two contradictory definitions strongly resemble the two opposite poles where I can place Milton on the liberal left, and Hobbes on the conservative right. I will exemplify this further below with examples from each of them drawn from *Paradise Lost* and *Leviathan*.

I begin with the most obvious definition, where the article states that "liberalism is that all individuals are in theory free and equal, and therefore refuses to accept that repressive hierarchies are natural" (27), a statement which strongly aligns with Milton's views on freedom as exemplified in *Paradise Lost* (III, 95-99, 124, IX 350-353). This would also

support Milton's critique of hierarchy, and the power that was established by the church, which in his opinion, abused the freedom which God had intended for humans to have.

Conservatism on the other hand, later formulated by British philosopher Edmund Burke, believes that "most people need strong leaders, firm laws and institutions, and strict moral codes to keep their appetites under control. According to the conservative credo, conventional norms and practices are essential to human wellbeing» (27). This goes hand in hand with Hobbes, when he claims, "Hereby it is manifest, that during the time men live without a common Power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called Warre; and such a warre, as is of every man, against every man" (*Lev.* 13; XII, 70). The article makes this division clear by painting the liberalist, which contains traits of Milton, as "open", and contrary to this calls the conservative, where there are traits of Hobbes, as "closed" (27).

Additionally, these differences can be exemplified by their descriptions and views on human nature and behavior. Milton's philosophy evolves around his belief that humans have a divine guidance within them that has been implanted directly by God. This guidance, which I will carefully explain later, is what grants humans the opportunity to choose a virtuous life. This opinion has previously been expressed by Thomas Aquinas, who believed that while one must "recognize the impact of original sin on human nature, considered nature to be more integral and capable of acting in accordance with natural law" (27). Milton, similarly, believes that there is an understanding of natural law as a choice and that it is in a human's natural inclination to strive towards the good. "And out of good still to find means of evil" (*PL*, I, 7), writes Milton, and I recognize his understanding of humanity's failure with past sins, but also his belief that one can still choose to be good. In other words, Milton does not believe that man needs the state nor the Church to interfere with personal belief nor growth. Man is, then, capable to control this God-given freedom without outwards assistance, because this freedom is part of the kernel of human nature.

Hobbes, on the other hand, shared Augustine's more pessimistic and "closed" idea of human nature. Augustine typically described human nature as "deeply corrupted by sin" and "radically disabled in exercising its activities in a proper way." (27). Hobbes also firmly believed that humankind needs to have an established and absolutist sovereign to preserve human security. Free men are simply men with the capability to be dangerous, and therefore, men who need moral restrictions.

Without these moral restrictions, power - even if it is of pure intent - will serve as a means for personal gain, which has often been the case with religious leaders. Religious leaders, pastors, prophets, etc., are not immune to sinful human nature and the natural egoistical will. Hobbes even claims that religion has been corrupted and tangled with, “nourish, dresse, and forme it into Lawes; and to adde to it of their own invention”, and that it served a power for selfish men who used it to falsely “govern others” (*Lev.* 11; XI, 59).

To contrast the conservative and pessimistic belief of Hobbes’, the article introduces the monk, Maximus the Confessor, who makes the case that it is not human nature that is to blame for sin, but rather, the will of the person who commits it. “Thus, the corruptness of human nature is concentrated in the deciding and willing part of it, where freedom resides. Nature in total, however, remains a good creature of God. By putting the gravity to make mistakes on the human will (not to be confused with freedom!” (28). To further demonstrate similar approaches that share Milton’s ideas, I will also mention other liberals that were included in the article. For instance, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius Constantinople, who supported that “human nature does not require the intervention of the divine in order to be sound” and believed that human beings can achieve peace if they follow the word and example of Jesus Christ. An opinion that “would be appreciated by Rosseau and his confederates” (29). This resembles Milton’s ideas of freedom as something valuable, and that should be completely left without constraint and interference. Such freedom does not to be handled or protected by any power but one’s own. My claim, which I will proceed to discuss in the next section, is that Hobbes did not cherish personal freedom any less than Milton. Rather, Hobbes distrusted the individual’s ability to control this freedom without a responsible authority to overlook it. In conclusion, the article sums up ideology as a function that in theology, will “stereotype the truth; make it more comprehensible and translatable into social and political action” (32).

Of Liberty: The Politics of Freedom

I would like to make it clear that Hobbes did not oppose personal freedom, and discuss some of the political points that he introduces in *Leviathan* that elaborate on this. The controversy around Hobbes as a liberal has been much discussed, and I would like to unravel the complications of his statements. In doing so, I will be able to discuss his political notions of reason, freedom and will more freely. J. Judd Owen has devoted an entire essay, “The

Tolerant *Leviathan*: Hobbes and the Paradox of Liberalism”, that focuses on Hobbes’ paradoxical ideas about liberty. The main idea is that a sovereign will not limit personal freedom, but rather that it is required for men to explore the experience of it securely.

Owen states, “Hobbes sought to secure the greatest possible scope for private liberty, or as we would now call it, toleration, which requires in the first place the peace and security that only a sovereign can allow” (131), an opinion which has secured Hobbes reputation as an absolutist. Toleration then, in view of Hobbes’ politics, is required for a rational, obedient, and orderly society. If one were to live after free and liberal morality alone, human nature would leave mankind in a state of war. Hobbes concludes; “amongst masterless men, there is perpetual war of every man against his neighbor, no inheritance to transmit to the son or expect from the father, no propriety of goods of lands, no security, but a full and absolute liberty in every particular man” (*Lev.* 21; XXI, 119).

Further, Owen writes that “There are external restraints on their ability to satisfy their appetites, and in that respect they are radically unfree, if not lacking right, in the state of nurture” (134). Men, even if they were left to govern themselves, would remain unfree from their appetites, and from the danger of their neighbors. Hobbes wishes to create a secure environment to satisfy such appetites, where man is free to do as he pleases, so long that his doing does not bring consequence upon another.

To create this sort of governance, one must trust in a reasonable sovereign to uphold human rights, and believe that if one surrenders to the sovereign’s protection, it will prevent mankind from further chaos, war, and ultimately death at the hands of one another. If this trust is broken, the people are not obligated to abide the sovereign. Hobbes explains that their power lasts only “by which he is able to protect them. For the right men have by Nature to protect themselves, when none else can protect them, can by no Covenant be relinquished.” (*Lev.* 21; XXI, 123). Through submission and obedience to a worthy sovereign, one can achieve protection and freedom. Only then, will man truly be free from the fear of another man’s human instincts, instincts which will allow him to raise his sword at any man; “yet is it in their own nature, not only subject to violent death, by foreign war; but also through the ignorance, and passions of men” (*Lev.* 21; XXI, 124).

Hobbes fundamentally believes that mankind, if led by free human nature alone, is inclined toward self-interest and rebellion. Therefore, one must prioritize the safety of the public, and not the liberty of the individual. Hobbes wishes for this power to be absolute and without limit, and believes that it will rightfully generate human liberty and behaviour. He writes, “For it has been already shewn, that nothing the Sovereign Representative can doe to a

Subject, on what pretence soever, can properly be called Injustice, or Injury” (*Lev.* 21; XXI, 119). The sovereign intends to preserve peace, and in doing so must follow reason and what is best for the public. Therefore, Hobbes is certain, that civil law will not act in contrast with what is right for the common good, or perform injustice.

On this note, I would like to point out that Hobbes is strictly making the case for political restraint of action, and not of the demise of personal thought or belief. The conflicts and the events of slaughter which occurred under a regime strongly influenced by the Roman Church, however, exceeded beyond individual liberty and disrupted the public order. As Hobbes explained it, chaos erupted in pretense that; “the Kingdome of God to be of this World, and thereby have a Power therein, distinct from that of the Civill State” (*Lev.* 47; XLVII, 399). If people agree to invest in a civil state, based on rational civil laws, a sovereign would free men from manipulators of power, superstition, and religion. If men were removed of their “superstitious fear of Spirits”, believed Hobbes, they would not depend on dreams, false prophecies, and the lies of “ambitious persons abuse” to regulate their behavior. People would, without the superstitious fear that religion and “ambitious persons” generate, “be much more fitted than they are for civill Obedience” (*Lev.* 2; II, 12).

To conclude, I have made it evident that Hobbes believes in social contracts and laws in order to protect man from his own, natural self-interest. Power should be focused upon a sovereign that can determine what is best for the common good. Owen writes, “Locke says that not only is the magistrate ‘probably ... as ignorant of the way [to salvation] as my self, but he ‘certainly is less concerned for my salvation than I myself am’” (145). In other words, Locke is expressing a belief he shared with Hobbes about self- preservation as an instinctual characteristic of human nature. Rather than searching for peace and goodness in “dreams and false prophecies”, one ought to leave such invisible powers behind. Instead of grasping for answers from an intangible God and claiming a fear of the unknown, Hobbes desired a submission to a sovereign that would grant men their passions within a reasonable order.

Chapter I

I. Of Milton's Religious Jurisdiction

During the English civil war, a clear division between those who supported the English monarch, and those who supported the Parliamentary party became apparent. I will now present some of Milton's founding beliefs about humanity and of liberty, and reveal how his politics for individuality would be problematic in context with Hobbes' politics of a sovereign. This diversity resulted in the overthrow and execution of King Charles I in 1649. As John Witte writes in "Magna Carta, Religion, and the Rule of Law" (2015), "the Church of England was formally disestablished" (3). Milton was bold in his pursuit of the individual's development of the human relationship with the divine through a connection with God. Even in his early years, Milton was frank about his opinions and of his allegiance to the Reformation, and of his rejection of the public services of the Roman Catholic Church. Born the 9th of December 1601, Milton did not escape the wounds of the English Civil War nor the damages that followed the Thirty Year' War, and with many controversial publications, is not a poet who has easily accumulated the respect that now comes with the mention of his name.

Several biographies have been written about his life, and the early stages of his life especially which have contributed to shaping his thoughts - and his poetry - into the revolutionary literary figure that he has become. Gordon Campbell and Thomas N. Corns write in their book, *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought*, that "He argued that governments have no business meddling with the religious beliefs of their citizens" (20), which is one of the many occasions where Milton has denied the machinery of the state and their right to decide what should be printed, censored, and read.

"I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and sees her adversary but slinks out of the race, where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat. Assuredly, we bring not innocence into this world, we bring impurity much rather: that which purifies is trial, and trial is by what is contrary (Ibid, vol 2, pp 514-517, 527-528.)" A virtue unexercised, writes Milton, cannot be praised. This suggests that the human interaction with temptation is necessary to detect true virtue. Men who have not been confronted with temptation, have not experienced the choice between good and evil, and therefore have not exercised their virtue. True virtue, then, is achieved when one is exposed to such provocations of evil, and has been able to reject it.

God has, in Milton's poem and opinion; "made them free, and free they must remain" (*PL*, II, 124). Men are free to choose sin over reason, and men are free to live a virtuous life, which is the equivalent of rejecting sinful choices. Adam and Eve, in the garden of Eden, were free to fall because of free will, "whose fault but his own" (*PL*, II, 96-97). Adam and Eve have been created with free will, and therefore, have the choice to both accept and to reject Satan's temptations. Adam and Eve chose to accept it, and hence they can be held responsible for their actions and their choice to sin.

God made Adam and Eve, as Milton beautifully writes; "Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall" (III, 99). Man has fallen by his own free will. Adam and Eve acted freely when they decided to eat from the forbidden Tree of Knowledge, and were not predestined to sin due to Satan's temptations. Milton writes, "When will and reason (reason also is choice)" (*PL*, II, 108), and suggests that following reason is an individual choice. Reason, which I briefly mentioned in the introduction of this thesis, is something that has been "implanted in us by God". Milton considers this reason, implanted in him by God, as something that one might call a conscience that guides the free will. Humans have, according to Milton, this conscience of right reason, an access within themselves to the laws of God. Witte writes, "By this law, each person knows the duties owed to God neighbor and self" (7). This is Milton's idea of natural freedom, which he argues for in *Paradise Lost*, as he ponders the consequence of the original sin where Adam and Eve chose their passion over their reason.

"Authority usurped, from God not giv'n: He gave us only over beast, fish, fowl Dominion absolute; that right we hold by his donation, but man over men He made not lord: such title to himself Reserving, but human left from human free" (*PL*, XXI, 66-71). Milton rejects the sovereign state's implicit and explicit power structures, where man can rule over another man, as that is an authority only God should have. Mankind was permitted to command the beasts, the fish, and the animals, but never other humans. Milton continues, stating that "Since thy original lapse, true liberty Is lost, which always with right reason dwells" (XXI, 83-82). Adam and Eve rejected their inner and natural reason, and chose to use their free will to sin, therefore, true liberty has been lost. Because man chose sin over obedience, this is considered a failure from within.

Milton explains; "And upstart passions catch the government From reason, and to servitude reduce Man till then free. Therefore since he permits within himself unworthy powers to reign Over free reason, God in judgment just Subjects him from without to violent lords" (XXI, 89-93). Man has, by his own choice, lost his natural freedom. Due to this failure of

obedience from within, men have been reduced to servitude, and therefore also become subjects to outward obedience that demands constraint from the likes of kings.

“His outward freedom: tyranny must be, Though to the Tyrant thereby no excuse” (XXI, 95-96), Milton is arguing that freedom – and paradise – lost, is a consequence of the first sin, the original disobedience that made Adam and Eve reject their reason, and that proved to God that they cannot govern themselves. In saying this, Milton implies that there is something about human nature, perhaps an impulse, or a narcissistic trait, that will inevitably lead men to choose to fall, even when there exists an alternative to the outcome. Not only does this resemble Hobbes’ beliefs, but much of Milton’s descriptions of human nature contradict his beliefs of its being naturally good. It often seems, as I will discuss below, that Milton himself believes that humans need supervision.

Milton often suggests in *Paradise Lost* that one can and should continue to strive towards redemption. This is done through the guidance of the Spirit that can only be received directly, and individually, without the interference of a church or any other outwards intrusion. He writes, “So clomb this first grand thief into God’s fold: So since into his Church lew hirelings climb Thence up he flew, and on the Tree of Life, The middle tree and highest there that grew.” (IV, 192-195). A parallel is being drawn between the workings of the Church, and that of the devil which lured Adam and Eve to eat the forbidden fruit. If the Spirit is what guides man, then it remains unreasonable to lean upon an outward source to hear God’s true word. According to Milton, God communicates directly, making the institutional church unnecessary for inner workings of faith.

Witte also mentions some critiques of the English church courts, mostly Milton’s statement that “the magistracy and church have confuse[d] their jurisdictions”. As a consequence of the “conflated” powers between state and church, Christianity has become a pretend religion. Institutionalized religion brought forth poisonous inflation of wars, bloodshed and horror, “with the spoils of civil power, which it has seized unto itself contrary to Christ’s own precept’ (13). He also mentions that the state is to deal “exclusively with ‘the body and external faculties of man’, ‘his life, limbs, and worldly possessions’” (9), which again, would agree with Hobbes’ political ideas of a sovereign that includes preserving the peace.

“Milton allowed, for ‘without magistrates and civil government there can be no commonwealth, no human society, no living in the world’. But nothing in Romans 13

‘gives judgment or coercive power to magistrates ... in matters of religion’. Indeed, a whole series of biblical passages state the exact opposite. Just read John 4:21–23, Romans 14:5, 9–10, 1 Corinthians 7:23, 9:19, 2 Corinthians 3:17, Galatians 2:16, 4:3, 9–10, 26, 5:13–14 and Colossians 2:8, 16, 23, among many other texts, Milton urged. The force of all these biblical texts read together is that we must obey magistrates, but only so long as they hold to their political contract and stay within their civil jurisdiction (Wittes, 10).

Civil jurisdiction, argues Milton, has no authority in matters of religion. This is a direct objection of the English Church and the politics it practiced, which Milton saw as greedy. This perception only motivated his belief that church and state should be separated. He makes the argument that even in the Bible it is stated that “Christ’s kingdom is not of this world” (13), and the likeness of his kingdom should not be imitated on earth. The conflict, which I mentioned in the introduction of this section, becomes clear when religion and individual politics are reduced to a part of a bigger society. Religion remains an undeniably essential part of human society, and must, therefore, be governed by the sovereign as any other factor of the social order. Hence, the explanation for Hobbes’ claim that religion, due to its political influence, should be restrained by the sovereign as any other political component of the commonwealth.

II. Of Hobbes’ Subordinate Religion

Hobbes’ most important work, *Leviathan*, was written during his time in France (Parker 155; Skinner, "Ideological" 288) whilst exiled during the English Civil War. *Leviathan* is primarily a political document where Hobbes carefully unwraps his attitudes towards the government, the Church and Christianity, which is precisely what I intend to do in this section. Hobbes argues that an individual, a member of the church or even the church itself, when distinct or not subordinate to the government, can be prone to rebel against secular authorities, and be justified of such rebellion by their belief in God. Many of the conflicts in England, including the beheading of King Charles I, have been described as religious acts, or suspected to have been motivated by religious protests against the current political structures. Hobbes argues that instead of looking towards religious guidance, one should follow the civil law, as it holds the same degree of rightfulness as the law of nature. He explains the civil law to be an index of good, because the law serves as a public conscience

that commands obedience, and not faith. These laws are conclusions drawn from what is logical, and are therefore, the right reason.

Many critics have commented on Milton's rejection of a church, and his idolization still of a God often regarded as a tyrant himself. One can even point to the introduction of *Paradise Lost*, where it is written by Robert Fallow, "God may certainly be said to keep his word and so may be absolved of arbitrariness; but the same may be said of any tyrant" (xxiv). Hobbes has some ideas that will contrast with Milton's, and I will discuss these further.

"For should man finally be lost, should man thy creature so loved, thy youngest son Fall circumvented thus by fraud, even though joined with his own folly? That be far from thee, That be far from thee, Father, who art judge Of all things made, and judgest only right" (*PL*, III, 150-155). Milton has created a scenario here, where Jesus reminds his father, God Almighty, that man has been deceived by evil and that it is unlike God to act merciless, "That be far from thee, Father". In having to remind God of this, Milton is indeed contradicting himself when he says that God "judgest only right". Already, Milton is making contradictive statements about his God. Not only does this exemplify that God is, even to Milton, unpredictable, but it also strengthens Hobbes' argument that religious ambition is too uncertain. Further, Hobbes has voiced his concerns about religion formed and interfered with politics. Religion, he explains, is formed when a people collectively believe that one man is capable to ensure their happiness. This one man is regarded as a holy man, chosen by God "to declare his will supernaturally". This is how a government of religion is formed, without the revelation of any divinity, yet the religion is to be treated as "suspected likewise; and (without the feare of the Civill Sword) contradicted and rejected" (*Lev. XXI*; 13, 66.)

Faith has been placed upon a common man, and through this belief in him as a holy man, a people will grant him an authority that could excuse said man from "the Civill Sword". When faith substitutes the law, for a common man's word without proof of his holiness indeed, the law becomes less authoritative than this man's personal words. Because of this religious authority, one suddenly finds the right and will to rebel against secular authority. This growth of religious power, followed by rebellion against the state, is precisely what led to the beheading King Charles I, and why the incident is commonly demonstrated as a religious act. When this holy man gains the power to terrorize and frighten people with punishments of the afterlife, and makes promises for reward and redemption as he pleases, the civil power which should have been the source of punishment and reward, is suddenly lost and placed in the hands of spiritual men who may misuse it.

“And in this last sense only it is that the Church can be taken for one Person; that is to say, that it can be said to have power to will, to pronounce, to command, to be obeyed, to make laws, or to doe any other action whatsoever” (*Lev. 39; XXXIX, 263*). His claim is supported by the idea of a Church and that of its members, is an assembly which threatens the civil sovereign. Since there is no universal Church, all churches will be considered as different persons, all bound to obey different authorities. Hobbes therefore claims that the pastor, and the Church as a house itself, must be subordinate to the state; “Who that one chief Pastor is, according to the law of Nature, hath been already shewn; namely, that it is the Civill Sovereign” (*Lev. 39; XXXIX, 264*).

To control these actions that might spring out from religious doctrines, Hobbes suggests that the churches obey the civil sovereign. He suggests that the story of Abraham will vouch for his claim, explaining that Abraham was much like a civil sovereign in the Scripture. If we look at chapter XL, “Of the Rights of the Kingdome of God, In Abraham, Moses and the High Priests, and the Kings of Judah” (*Lev: 40.*) Hobbes writes that “They to whom God hath not spoken immediately, are to receive the positive commandments of God, from their Soveragin; as the family and seed of Abraham did from Abraham to their Father, and Lord and Civill Sovereign” (265).

God has covenanted with Abraham, and his family is bound to obedience, and he claims this by referring to the Bible directly, showing that in Gen. 18:18-19., it is written; “All the nations of the Earth shall be blessed in him, For I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord.” Therefore, if Abraham should forbid something, the family will understand and follow his rules of what is unlawful, and he will rightfully be able to punish those who oppose him and break such laws. They way of the Lord, which God trusted that Abraham would keep in his household after him, demonstrates Hobbes’ sovereignty. Man, as someone who God has not spoken to directly or supernaturally, has been granted an example to follow. Hobbes, in conclusion, argues that this system of laws which Abraham has in his family, is similar to the civil law which takes place in the Commonwealth; both promote a system of security that enables man to live in common peace.

III. Of Milton’s Only Authority

In this section, I will focus on John G. Peters essay, “Father, King, and God: John Milton’s Prose Response to Monarchy”, which reflects Milton’s psychological, political and social ideas

in more depth. I have yet to demonstrate the reason behind his rejection of the monarch, and of the public interference of personal matters, which is what I have devoted this section to. Peters writes, “Supporters of the monarchy argued that the king was divinely appointed, carrying out the will of God and benevolently presiding over the citizens of the realm” (228). As I have previously mentioned, Milton directly opposed the divine power which King Charles I was anointed with. I will demonstrate, by help of John G. Peter’s article, how Milton thought that rejecting the king was an act that could be justified by God’s will.

Peter cites Richard F. Hardin, and his explanation of the supporters of the King, “Hardin notes, ‘Monarchists took pleasure in associating the fatherly role of the king with the first person of the Trinity as well as the ordinary human father’” (230). In Christian terms, one cannot be justifiably a person of the Trinity as well as an ordinary human. This exception of the king then, proves how strong the monarchical view of the King as a divine figure truly was and connects the monarchical order to a divine one. Peters explains that when Henry VIII separated from the Roman Catholic Church, the English monarchy “became the literal head of the Church of England, such that church and state merged” (231).

As I have previously mentioned, Milton wished that the nurturing of religious beliefs would not interfere with the public way of government, however many, such as John Gauden and William Prynne, opposed Milton’s opinion, and even regarded the execution of Charles I as a “sacrilegious act” (231). William Prynne even wrote in *A Briefe Memento to the Present Unparliamentary Junto* that, “And for a Reforming Protestant Parl, pretending the most of any to piety & Religion, to stan their profession or honour by the deposition, or defile their hands with the blood of a Protestant King, or for an army of Saints to do it” ... “would be such an unparalleled scandal to the Protestant Religion & all professors of it” (12). He also wrote several other documents in defense of the King, and drew many parallels between the King and the likes of Christ.

Milton realized that in deposing the king, the people would sense a loss of security in their society, primarily because of a strong connection and obedience to the monarch. Naturally, people longed for “a return of order”. Social order, in the most familiar form, was the monarchical rule of King Charles I. The longing for a return of order, then, describes a longing for safety. Safety, familiarly in the form of a king, would return the order “and thereby avert the possibility of a chaotic universe” (235). Milton defines the need for a king as a psychological consequence that is a result of years of a government of monarchy. Milton saw this as a people choosing to enslave themselves. Confused by the comfort of false

security, people became accustomed to public protection, and to “confounding divine appointment with divine essence”, which is demonstrated in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates, A Defense of the People of England, the Ready and Easy Way to a Free Commonwealth*. To free the people, and remove their deeply rooted need for a king, Milton wanted to replace the people’s faith in the king with faith in God.

“Our fathers begot us, but our kings did not, and it is we, rather, who created the king. It is nature which gave the people fathers, and the people who gave themselves a king; the people therefore do not exist for the king, but the king for the people” (236). Milton is methodically discrediting the King and exposing the falsehood of his acclaimed divine power, making the king appear like a tyrant instead of the protector that he was believed to be. Due to people’s submission to kings and “magistrates”, the people have chosen to remain slaves. Milton writes that no man would be so stupid that he denies his natural freedom. Humans, different from the other creatures who were not created in God’s image, were not born to obey other humans (Complete Prose, 3; 198-99).

In accepting and submitting to a human king, man is thereby rejecting the divinity of “spiritual kingdoms” (240). Peter explains that the beheading of King Charles was not, according to Milton, a sacrilegious act because, “God would not allow the wrong outcome to result. In this case, the same kind of reasoning exists in Milton’s assuming that if God had not wanted Charles I deposed and executed, then it would not have happened” (239). Milton even creates a connection between King Charles and the devil, “who usurped ‘over spiritual things ... beyond his sphere” (Complete Prose, 3: 502). Milton does not think that a man, even if he holds the status of a king, should not hold “a position analogous to that of God” (41).

Not only does Milton attempt to change the perception that people have of King Charles I, but he wants to replace the way that the king is admired and obeyed, and place this admiration unto God. Peter concludes, “What Milton offers is a society that recognizes the valuable as God’s gift of human freedom and the valueless as slavery to a mere equal (the king” (241) A mere equal here means a mere human, a mortal being equal to all humans, with no exceptional right or divinity to rule over another. To conclude, Milton explains that one cannot both be submissive to a king and obedient to God, because it “is contrary to the plaine teaching of Christ, that *No man can serve two Masters*, but, if he hold to the one, he must reject and forsake the other. If God then and earthly Kings be for the most part not several only, but opposite Masters, it will as oft happen, that they who will serve their King must forsake their God” (Complete Prose, 3: 581; cf. Matthew 6: 24). Milton is making it clear that one cannot worship a man, or a king, and should only be worshipping God. One must not

balance the faith between mortal kings and God, but shift the faith entirely onto the one and only God.

III. Of Hobbes' War of All Against All

Milton strongly advocated an individual and personal freedom of faith, which was evidenced in his disapproval of the monarch and of the state meddling of religious affairs that I expressed in the previous section. What I will discuss now, based on Hobbes' desire for an authoritarian state and his view of it as a necessity, are examples of past religious or religion related events. Compared to Milton's urgency to live on personal and individual will alone, I believe this demonstration of past religious history will help provide support for Hobbes' case of a society based strictly upon civil law. Hobbes believed that only in a secure society, founded upon civil law, will humans be able to truly experience freedom in its prime.

If one does not have these restrictions and laws that are invented to prevent further disorder, it will result in chaos as demonstrated by the English Thirty Years' War. A sovereign wishes to enhance the peace, and without one, it will cause a decrease in man's already troubling morality, and ultimately, end in a fatal direction towards violence. Instead of focusing on Milton's ideas about personal religion, I will in this section turn my attention to events that have occurred due to personal religious interpretations and beliefs which have led to public slaughter, including briefly the seventeenth-century English Civil War, a short review of the Puritans, and the witch trials, all which have in common that these incidents led to the murder of innocent people and bred superstition in a society that should have followed reason. I suggest that this will help to understand Hobbes' inquiry to restrain human nature, and thereby confine human religion, to keep personal interpretations from interfering with how one governs politics.

To accomplish this, I will make use of John Adair's book, *Puritans; Religion and Politics in Seventeenth Century England and America*, and the article "Witchcraft and Evidence in Early Modern England" by Malcom Gaskill. In a Hobbesian view, such nourishment of private religion will result in rebellion against the state, and lead to public chaos. Adair writes about the church of England, that it "gradually developed a unique ethos or personality of its own, one which would be called 'Anglican' in the next century" (88). He speaks of the Puritan practice of the Old Testament, and how their laws and values reflect reason and common sense, and ties this statement to Milton, and his belief in "Englishmen as

noble creatures, possessed of reason and ‘so pliant and prone to seek knowledge’” (213), and even names John Milton a supreme Puritan poet.

In *Politics and Religion in the United States*, Michael and Julia Mitchell Corbetts make an interesting observation; “Based on Calvinism, the Puritans believed that some people – the elect – had been elected by God to receive regeneration and that others had been passed over.” (34). This election had nothing to do with the individual. Salvation, according to this theory, could not be earned through behavior. The elected had already been chosen, “regardless of their actions”, and “became a community of living saints and were under a sacred obligation to act accordingly” (34). Puritan thought founded itself on their understanding of Adam and Eve’s original sin, and similar to Hobbes, on the belief that human nature is sinful. This is the explanation for their strict conformity, and their lack of toleration for religions which did not share their truth. Such religions, according to the Puritans, were not representative of God’s word. The Corbett’s’ even go as far as to say, “They were the new chosen people in the new Israel” (36), and establish that the Puritans believed they had a divine covenant with God as the elected, which would allow them to discipline law, not only spiritually, but politically. Hence, the seventeenth century practice of human divine power erupted rapidly, and is commonly related with the seventeenth century witch trials.

Hobbes writes, “For as for Witches, I think not that their witchcraft is any reall power; but yet that they are justly punished, for the false believe they have, that they can do such mischief; joined with their purpose to do it if they can: their trade being neerer to a new Religion; than to a craft or Science” (*Lev. 2; II, 11*). In persuading such superstition and “divine law”, both in practicing it and in persecuting it, one strays away from reason and wastes time on cultivating ideologies. Gaskill defines the witch trials as they “began due to a temporary weakness of state authority and ended when authority was reasserted” (35), which supports the argument of Hobbes’ fear that when allowed to, humans will turn to violence and chaos, led on by natural instincts.

The aftermath of rebellion against the state caused a population astray from reason and civil law. This led men, in blind faith, to commit slaughter of people based on proof that was not, and cannot be evidenced through science; “The ramifications of this transition reached beyond debates about demonology and jurisprudence, touching fundamental questions about truth and knowledge of the world in the second half of the seventeenth century” (37). The death of the monarch allowed for the chaos within man, which had until now been concealed, to be unleashed and cause a violence that served no purpose, and was motivated neither to

gain nor obtain the peace. Instead of finding proof of injustice, desperate men found support for what they already believed to be true and executed discriminatory cruelty.

“Church and state associated both these practices with forbidden priestly rituals, but also recognized that access to the law might encourage superstitious habits of mind” (41); the trials led to a confusion between what is power of the law and that of the spiritual power. Religious power had now infiltrated the state, and bred unreasonable habits instead of focusing on a secure governing of the population. “By the accession of Charles I legal and religious opinion had converged to a point of extreme wariness” (44).

Without official instructions from the state to handle such manners, and to determine whether or not one is guilty of being a witch, people will take such state matters into their own hands. As a result of human nature, “Thirty-four women were imprisoned at Colchester” (48), and “Across East Anglia, Hopkins and Stearne assisted in the interrogation of three hundred suspects of whom a third were hanged” (49). When accused with the charges of having interacted with the devil, torture was advocated as a means to separate the suspect from being innocent or guilty, and even reduced the trials to “‘fleeing upon the water’ as a ‘providential sign’ (52) of witchcraft. Without state authorities to govern such affairs, man will erupt in rebellious and self-appointed chaos. With a lack of civil law, there is no need for the devil to provoke humans into consulting with evil; natural instinct will lead man to such acts willingly. Ultimately, the witch trials were a sign of abandoned political power that was in desperate need to be restored.

John Stearne insisted in 1648 that, “‘what hath been done, hath been done for the good of the commonwealth’ But the overlords of that commonwealth now demanded a return to order and an end to abuses of authority” (59). The commonwealth gained nothing by poisoning the law with superstitions, and of the slaughter of a people not guilty of committing crimes. Luckily, the “Scientific Revolution influenced the decline of witch-trials” (62), and it was finally understood that the personal quest for the truth must never overrule the public need for order.

Milton would argue that these events were not actions based in search of true religion. Milton himself rejected both the monarch and the church, and saw the king as a representation of a neglected freedom, which denied his personal religious practice. Adair writes of an equal evil that was executed by the King himself, including the beheading of Catherine of Aragon, Sir Thomas More and John Fisher, the Bishop of Rochester. Further, “one of Catherine of Aragon’s confessors. He bravely endured a horrible death by being slowly roasted in chains.”

Multiple Protestants and Catholics were punished, tortured, and publicly “hanged, drawn and quartered for treason” (63).

Despite Hobbes’ confidence in a sovereign that will ensure the security of those who submit to it, and of his despise of the ones that refuse, I cannot dismiss Milton’s critique of government which has expressed an evil that is equal to the religious party. Adair introduces the case of William Tynsdale, who was denied permission to translate the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament into English. Determined to translate the Scriptures into English, regardless of King Henry’s religious policy, Tynsdale found his way abroad and was assisted by many collaborators to translate the Bible, and lastly, “carried back into the country the first of some forty editions of Tyndale’s New Testament” in 1525. This act ensured Tynsdale’s arrest, and he was burned at the stake, uttering as his memorable last words: ‘Lord, open the King of England’s eyes.’” (64). In an attempt to spread truth and salvation, Tyndale, and many others, found that they were met with violence as a response.

Milton probed how a King could take it upon himself the right to take away a freedom which was granted to humans by God. Hobbes discredits the rejection of a monarch, and is certain that one must constrain those who wish to violate and manipulate others based on personal interpretations. Indeed, the monarch, as well as other sovereigns, have turned to cruel punishments. However, such punishments have been a means of punishments for those who have broken the King’s public laws, and thus, are not based on personal beliefs, which has often motivated most of the occurred religious issues.

“To make Covenant with God, is impossible, but by Meditation of such as God speaketh to, either by Revelation supernaturall, or by his Lieutenants that govern under him, and in his Name; For otherwise we know not whether our Covenants be accepted, or not” (*Lev. 14; XIV, 77*). Hobbes’ asserts that humans no longer can rely on a Covenant with God, nor that such human divinity it is even possible. If one must do by Godly example, the story of Abraham, as I have previously mentioned, provides a reasonable image of a just sovereign which society can recreate. If God justly can punish Adam and Eve for their sins, and Abraham justly can punish those who do not abide by him, then a sovereign or king can justly punish citizens who break the civil law. After all, man left unattended, as Hobbes has explained, is in a condition of war against each other. This is how Milton’s liberal ideas of individual politics contradict and are in conflict with Hobbes’. Their differences are based on their disagreement of the foundation of humanity, and if man is instinctively good (Milton), or bad (Hobbes). To protect society from such a terrible condition of war, urges Hobbes, a civil

state bound by civil laws that are provided by the sovereign, will set equal punishments for any man who refuses to follow such laws, and the sovereign can punish disobedience. Then, without having to rely on supernatural revelations, men can themselves, as is the goal of the sovereign and that of a monarch, attain peace. This is the purpose of Hobbes' doctrine of civil obedience.

Chapter II

I. Of Milton's Defense of God to Man

I find that much of Hobbes' justification for the sovereign authoritative power in *Leviathan*, corresponds with Milton's way of justifying the ways of God to men in *Paradise Lost*. I will in this section demonstrate a comparison between Milton and Hobbes around the story of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. I wish to show that God's punishment of Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost* establishes God as a sovereign, and in this manner, Milton unknowingly exhibits a political logic similar to Hobbes' defense for a sovereign. "That to the heighth of this great argument I may assert Eternal Providence, And justify the ways of God to men" (*PL*, I, 24-26), is Milton's goal with the epic poem. With such bold statements, harsh critique surely followed. It is written in the *Paradise Lost* introduction, under 'Milton's God', that "Critics have long wrestled with the question of why an antimonarchist and defender of regicide should have chosen a subject that obliged him to defend monarchical structure" (Leonard; XXIII). Critique of Milton's poem include that of William Epton, Arthur Lovejoy, and others whose discussions I will briefly respond to with lines that are drawn directly from *Paradise Lost*. Firstly, I must stress again that the exercise of free will and the ability of choice is the primary source of Milton's fundamental faith.

In *Paradise Lost*, Milton has based the poem on his own recreation of the Genesis, a perspective that he believed would work in God's favor. Through the events which ensured the rise of evil and Satan, and the fall of mankind, one is able to experience the biblical stories through a series of humane choices. This process unfolds throughout the poem, through man's exploitation of free will that led to severe consequences, as Milton desired that it would, to demonstrate that God's punishment of Adam and Eve was fairly executed.

In "The Religion of Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost*", James Nohnberg presents a thought-provoking perspective on Milton's perception of religious practice. He writes about the "unfallen man's apparent lack of certain formal, foundational prerequisites for religion – a priesthood, liturgical scripts, scriptures, ritual practices, a history of striking inaugural events, new enlightenment, or revelation" (161). Not very surprising then, considering this lack of formal religious practices, that Milton was primarily focused on personal experiences with God, and that he opposed the institutional teachings of the Church. One incident, one choice, representing the basis of both sin and of redemption, is observed in the act of eating a forbidden fruit. This small act proved to have an eternal influence on mankind. There has been

various critique on account of Adam and Eve's disobedience, and of God's reaction to it, and I will now unravel what I find to be the most important discussions.

Michael Bryson and Arpi Movsian make some interesting comments on this, and mention some of the more controversial responses to God's punishment in their essay, "Love in Eden, and the Critics who Obey". "If the Fall is explained or 'understood' it is no longer free, but the result of some analyzable 'process' which attracts to itself a part of the guilt. Thus freedom of will is denied, the obloquy of the action returns to God (who set the process in motion), and again reason – the reader's reason – has given law to God ..." (477). Adam is perceived as selfish, and he chose to sin with Eve not for love, but for a fear of loneliness. If Adam's fear of loneliness motivated his choice to sin, then this is purely a selfish decision.

This statement urged other readers to comment on Adam's behalf, pondering what other options of choice he possibly had in the situation. His choice, as often concluded, consisted of either to disobey God, or to reject and be separated from his wife. Dennis Danielson suggests that, "Adam could have offered to take the punishment of fallen humanity on himself, to fulfill exactly the 'law of God'" (478). Bryson and Movsian stress that the story itself nor the outcome should be altered, for it would lose not only its moral purpose, but also the example of how sacrificial true obedience can be, and how terrible the consequences of defiance of authority is.

Others have criticized Adam for his distrust in a God that has shown himself to be both good and merciful (480). Some critics, such as David Quint, showed concern for Adam's humane loneliness. As it is written in the Holy Bible, "And the rib, which the LORD God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought for her unto the man" (Genesis, 2:22). Quint argues that perhaps, before this creation of the woman Eve, Adam had experienced a loneliness that he did not want to return to. Or perhaps it was "the force of his love that causes Adam to stay by Eve's side" (480). In attempting to find the answer to explain such sins, the mind is being encouraged to find a reasonable answer to accommodate for man's mistakes. Hobbes would argue that there is no reasonable explanation, but of man's own nature which is intrigued by temptation, and ensures that human values will continue to be in conflict unless there is a sovereign to govern them.

Milton has recreated man's first disobedience, and in Adam and Eve's decision to sin, I find that it is natural to try and understand, or even explain, their choices. In wanting to defend human decision, Milton has allowed room for interpretation where one can find sympathy for the characters, and find what serves as a reflection of humanity in both Adam

and Eve. Bryson and Movsesian recall, “That we seem to have forgotten, or deliberately elided, Milton’s status as a revolutionary – not a stiff-collared Puritan or a humorless William Prynne-Style ideologue who never met a human joy he did not condemn – is an ironic testament in the increasingly authoritarian political character of our own time” (482). Milton surely has experienced the compelling temptations of sin himself. He does not deny, nor belittle, the difficulties which may occur in having to consistently choose God, which is evidenced in his description of the troubled Adam and Eve.

Bryson and Movsesian propose another pressing topic; namely, the matter of authoritarian tendencies which are attached to the idea that Adam must choose God over his wife, to meet the standard of Milton’s “good”. Many critics have claimed that Adam should have submitted to the authority, that is God, instead of submitting to love, that was Eve. (484). I could think of no better circumstance to demonstrate how challenging it is to constantly chose to live in obedience, than the story of the first humans and their first disobedience. Ludwig Feuerbach, which the essay calls the “great nineteenth-century critic of Christianity (478) writes that such sacrifices show exceptional circumstances, and that the demonstration of obedience in this situation would have shown great honor (479). Human sacrifice, the sacrifice of the human heart, was in this case indeed an exceptional circumstance which caused a conflict between reason and passion. According to religious thinking and to Milton’s own perspective, the human heart is constantly in danger of being influenced by temporal circumstances. The heart, and the person to whom it belongs, can easily drift away from God, and in this distance, loose reason and make incorrect choices. Bryson and Movsesian include a paragraph from the Jehovah Witnesses’ Watchtower, which I find to be a straightforward explanation of Adam’s mistake. To put it simply, Adam should not have placed his loyalty to God as subordinate to that of his wife:

“Adam decided to accede to the wishes of his wife, who had already chosen to eat from the forbidden tree. His desire to please her was greater than his desire to obey his Creator. Surely, upon being presented with the forbidden fruit, Adam should have paused to reflect on the effect that disobedience would have on his relationship with God. Without a deep, unbreakable love of God, Adam was vulnerable to pressure, including that from his wife” (*Watchtower*, 129: 19, 1 October 2008, 27).

Adam and Eve, instead of building a personal and stable connection to their creator, created such bonds with each other. In their devotion to one another, they lost sight of their relationship with God. An eternal, unbreakable love for God, was set aside for a human satisfaction of temporal temptation. If Adam and Eve had not distanced themselves from God, they would have found the solution in their conscience, where God has granted them a reason to differentiate right from wrong, and the outcome would have turned out different. Thus, the lack of a strong relationship with God, which must come from within, is what has led humans to make unreasonable choices.

“For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another” (Rom. 2:14-15). This passage from the Holy Bible refers to the Jews in the wilderness, previous to the revelation of Moses. For the sake of argument on Milton’s instinctual morality, I wish to apply it to the first humans as well. The law, that is written in Adam’s heart and conscience, made itself visible to him, as is observed in the poem when he questions his choice. This is Milton’s proof that even if humans, through free will, often tend to choose incorrectly, have a divine guidance within themselves that has been ignored. Had Adam not ignored his instinct and reason, and chosen to reflect on his relationship with God, not only his wife, Milton believes, his solid connection with God would have led him to the right reason and decision. Instead, Adam participated in temptation, and willingly followed his wife into a choice of sin and that led to eternal damnation.

I would like to approach this from another angle, with a rather controversial comparison of Milton’s God and that of his punishment on Adam and Eve. Bryson and Movsian have already pondered the necessity of abandoning a wife in order to obey a God, or rather, as I will now refer to Him for political purposes, a “ruler”. Bryson and Movsian now wonder why the criticism of Milton typically includes political right views of authority for “submission and power” (484). In using the terms authoritarian and submissive, Bryson and Movsesian insinuate that Adam chose the most humane decision that was available to him. They believe that it is unimaginable, if not cruel, that he would rather have chosen to sacrifice his wife only to abide by God’s commands. Bryson and Movsesian even go as far as to call Adam’s human choice “a noble enterprise worth rooting for” (489).

Further, they make a comparison to God’s extreme degree for obedience to the regime of North Korea, where “They recognize each other’s human worth by measuring and examining the depth, breadth, and above all, authenticity of the loyalty shown to the sovereign

Leader” (495). As mentioned in *Watchtower*, Adam was vulnerable to pressure from his wife. If Adam and Eve had been united and equal in their faith, it would have been visible in their obedience to God. This would have led them to reject sin and temptation, and remain loyal to God.

However, I strongly believe that this comparison of Milton’s God to the regime of North Korea is farfetched. There was, perhaps, an expectance of Adam to remain faithful to God, but it derived only from his own conscience. God, according to Milton, would not deprive one of a family life if it were not a source of terrible influence, and even then, one would have the free will to remain with such a family still. Further, an “authoritarian reverence for submission and power” does not comply with the poem’s description of a fair God. God granted Adam and Eve free will, well knowing that they could chose to disobey him, which represents not a desire for power, but rather a hope for obedience. Adam and Eve did not, in fact, choose “a life of love rather than an existence of obedience” (499). Adam and Eve would have the equal amount of love in the Garden of Eden had they not chosen to fall victim to temptation. This shows that it was not love which inspired Adam to eat the forbidden fruit, but rather it was “passion in him move” (*PL*; VIII, 585), or as Hobbes would define it; the instinctual, human desire to indulge in temptation.

II. Of Milton’s Reason: Adam and Eve’s Disobedience

A commonly discussed issue with *Paradise Lost* remains the topic of human freedom. To understand Milton’s justification of God’s punishment and of Adam and Eve’s freedom of choice, I must first defend freedom as Milton’s natural right. Epton famously attempted to discredit Adam and Eve’s free will, and argued that they were never truly free nor able to make choices for themselves as Milton claims in his poem. God, the all-knowing, has already foreseen the Fall, which means that the Fall itself is already a certainty simply waiting to happen. The claim here is that God not only allowed for the Fall, but planned for it, and awaited the disobedience of man all along. Milton’s reply to this is solid. “Their own revolt, not I: if I foreknew, Foreknowledge had no influence on their fault” (*PL*; III, 117-119). If God indeed had foreseen the fall and the undesired disobedience on his behalf, it means that he allowed for this incident to unfold itself. God warned Adam and Eve about the consequences of eating the fruit, of this they were all aware, and still made the decision to eat it. God, equally aware of their choice, allowed them to proceed with their choices. Critics have

wondered why God would allow his own creation to submit to self- destruction. “I formed them free, and free they must remain (*PL*; III, 124).

Despite the fact that God has foreseen the fall, He has not forced nor prevented Adam and Eve from making their own choices. God gifted them with the free will to use as they please, knowing they would abuse it despite his warnings not to. This great gift of freedom, which humans can use as they please, either to resist temptation or succumb to it, greatly represents the selfless God in Milton’s poem. Adam and Eve could have resisted the devil’s temptations, and considering the outcome of their decision perhaps should have, and aided their free will in accordance with reason. Reason would have detected Satan’s provocations to be nothing but false claims. However, they rejected the conscious direction within them which separates the good from the bad, and disobeyed God’s laws, aware of the consequences that would follow. Therefore, in their persistence to ignore both their moral conscience and God’s direct laws,

“Not what they would? What praise could they receive. What pleasure I from such obedience paid, When will and reason (reason also is a choice) Useless and vain, of freedom both despoiled” (*PL*; III, 106-109); Milton unravels his simple understanding of God’s punishment. In short, God has made it clear that he will grant praise and rewards for those who abide by his commandments, and punishment for those who do not. Then, God has allowed Adam and Eve to choose which of these they wish to have. True reason, which Milton believes ‘also is a choice’, is achieved when one lives in accordance with God’s wishes. God did not wish for Adam and Eve to eat from the forbidden Tree of Knowledge, and yet they committed this rebellious act well knowing of his wishes, and of the following consequences.

By a Hobbesian logic, they are deserving of the punishment that was unleashed upon them. Adam and Eve, as all humans created in Gods image, have the opportunity to make better choices: “To prayer, repentance and obedience due, Though but endeavoured with sincere intent, Mine ear shall not be slow, mine eye not shut. And I will place within them as a guide My umpire conscience, whom if they will hear” (*PL*; III, 191-195). Adam heard this guide from within, and was conflicted in proceeding with his sinful decision, and yet carried it out. Adam and Eve demonstrate a human tendency to ignore the moral compass within and repent only after the consequences of sin have proved to be true. The consequences of the sin proved that Adam and Eve’s punishment inflicted not only them, but all of their descendants; “The fellows of his crime, the followers rather (Far other once beheld in bliss) condemned For

ever now to have their lot in pain, Millions of Spirits for his fault amerced” (*PL*; 1, 606-609). Sin can only generate more sin, and therefore man continues to be impure and ignore the reason inside him which awaits divine providence. Milton concludes that God is not at fault, and places the blame entirely on the eaters of the forbidden fruit; “And of their doings God takes no account” (*PL*; IV, 622).

One cannot reject temptation if one has not been exposed to it. To truly validate whether a human choice is in accordance with God, it must be measured by the level of which it has been challenged. It is how one handles this challenge, and temptation, that demonstrates the stability of one’s relationship with God. Milton believes that all humans have the option to listen to this natural reason. If Adam and Eve had followed their natural instincts, they would not have sinned; “But God left free the will, for what obeys Reason, is free, and reason he made right” (*PL*; IX, 351-352). What is reason, is right, and therefore God wishes for man to follow reason. This will result in an overall good.

In conclusion, I have demonstrated that Milton, similar to how Hobbes argument for the civil law as a totem of reason and as a defendant of the common good, argues that God’s will is a representation of what is good. What is good will not and cannot contradict what is right, and therefore God’s will is the definition of reason. God’s law should be the sole direction for moral judgement. In becoming vulnerable to pressure, as Adam was to his wife, humans can continue to lead one another into further corruption and sin. “But of this tree we may not taste nor touch; God so commanded, and left that command Sole daughter of his voice; the rest, we live Law to ourselves, our reason is our Law” (*PL*; IX, 651-654).

God allowed Adam and Eve to be free, and granted them an entire paradise for their obedience, until they willingly decided to explore the taste of disobedience. “God made thee of choice his own, and of his own To serve him; thy reward was of his grace; Thy punishment then justly is at his will. Be it so, for I submit, his doom is fair” (*PL*; X, 766-769). God did not neglect nor unfairly punish Adam and Eve, but rather, argued Milton, gave them an endless freedom to find love and joy, which they instead used to seek sin. Their sin, as Milton has attempted to explain, is what has caused man to be of inward and outward servitude; “The solace of their sin, till dewy sleep Oppressed them” (*PL*; IX, 1044-1045).

III. Of Lost Liberty: A Submission to Servitude

This oppression that Milton speaks of has, and that I have previously mentioned in terms of free will, has been demonstrated in different forms of lost liberty. I will now re-discuss these

terms in light of Adam and Eve's disobedience. Milton passionately advocated and demanded individual freedom, despite the use which Adam and Eve made of it. It was, after all, not the freedom in itself that was wrong, nor Adam and Eve abused it, but rather it was the gap in their hearts that should have been filled with a relationship to God.

Milton argues that a sovereign, other than God, opposes such personal will and leaves man enslaved to a system which does not support his natural right to make his own decisions. As I have previously mentioned, Milton believed that men have the right to dominate over beast, fish, and animals, "but man over men He made not lord; such title to himself Reserving, human left from human free" (*PL*; XII, 68-72).

Milton openly rejects the idea of a King having jurisdiction and control over a freedom that mankind was born with. Milton firmly states that a man has no right to rule over another man. Such power is reserved for God, and therefore Milton feels no obligation to follow what he considers to be a false authority. Milton compares systematic dominance to the likes of "prison of his tyranny who reigns" (*PL*; I, 371). He argues that the powers men have granted to the government, reduces man and makes him inferior to a leadership that deprives him of natural rights. This, Milton explains, is a consequence, similar to that of Adam and Eve, of a choice to ignore the inner reason within. True liberty, therefore, has not only been lost inwards as exemplified by Adam and Eve's suppression of their inner reason, but is also visible outwards in man's acceptance of societal tyranny:

“Reason is man obscured, or no obeyed,
Immediately inordinate desires
And upstart passions catch the government
From reason, and to servitude reduce
Man till then free. Therefore since he permits
Within himself unworthy powers to reign
Over free reason, God in judgement just
Subjects him from without to violent lords;
Who oft as undeservedly enthrall
His outward freedom: tyranny must be,
Though to the tyrant thereby no excuse,
Yet sometimes nations will decline so low
From virtue, which is reason, that no wrong,
But justice, and some fatal curse annexed

Deprives them of their outward liberty”

(*PL*, XII, 86-100)

Instead of striving towards a divine connection with God, man has yielded, and submitted himself to servitude for an unworthy equal. This was, to Milton, proof that men had lost their freedom, as they willingly reduced themselves to submission of unworthy rulers. The decision to reject freedom and choice, only to replace the unlimited love from God with a tyrannical King, represents the length of which men have drifted away from reason. “Will ye submit your necks, and choose to bend The supple knee?” (*PL*; V, 786-788), asks Milton, and ridicules the choice to serve a man no more superior nor divine than any other, and mocks the sacrifice of natural right for the sake of a simple man’s false and temporal laws.

“By none, and if not equal all, yet free,
Equally free; for orders and degrees
Jar not with liberty, but well consist.
Who can in reason then or right assume
Monarchy over such as live by right
His equals, if in power and splendour less,
In freedom equal? Or can introduce
Law and edict on us, who without law
Err not, much less for this to be our Lord,
And look for adoration to th’ abuse
Of those Imperial titles which assert
Our being ordained to govern, not serve?”
(*PL*, V, 791-805).

Milton argued that men in the seventeenth century had forgotten that they were born equal and free. No one, in right mind, would accept to submit himself a slave when he can live free. Hence, reason, and thereby true liberty, is lost. Milton stresses the importance of finding spiritual wisdom within oneself, and through one’s own conscience and divine reason, find Gods guidance which awaits. This is visible in Milton’s line, “who without the law Err not”, which demonstrates his unwavering belief that humans can guide themselves. Humans should not depend or rely on other equals, nor an institutional church or government, to convey the words of God when the access to such words are implanted in oneself. Otherwise, one will

fall victim to man's exploitations of God's words, and of man's falsely created religions and their impure practices. "Glory of him that made them to transform Oft to the image of a brute, adorned With gay religions full of pomp and gold, And devils to adore for deities" (*PL*; I, 370-373). One needs not external practices nor reattainments, for it is within oneself that God rests. Until man accepts this reason within himself, he will continue to move further away from God and towards sin.

The introduction of *Paradise Lost* introduces Robert Fallon, one of Milton's more popular critics, who makes a point of Milton's contradicting politics. He claimed, "God may certainly be said to keep his word and so may be absolved of arbitrariness; but the same may be said of any tyrant" (Leonard, XXIV). Fallon illustrates the irony of Milton to declare kings as tyrannical, and yet worshipping a tyrannical God himself. Further, Leonard has included another opinion; "'The reason why the poem is so good', announces William Empson, 'is that it makes God so bad'" (XXIV). As Hobbes' has made clear, in his description of a necessary jurisdictional authority, a successful sovereign demands that one must be able to punish those who break the law. Milton, then, at least according to this description, has to some extent succeeded in justifying God's ways to men. Considering Hobbes' commands for a successful sovereign, I find that Milton believes God to be the only true sovereign, and his words, from the Holy Bible, to be the law. Equally so, God's punishment of Adam and Eve was a demonstration of an authority that executed a fair punishment.

"But listen not to his temptations, warn Thy weaker; let it profit thee to have heard By terrible example the reward Of disobedience; firm they might have stood, Yet fell; remember, and fear to transgress" (*PL*; VI, 907-912). Such a terrible outcome, the Fall of mankind, was not an outcome caused by a tyrannical God. A tyrannical God would not have allowed Adam and Eve to decide on their own. Therefore, this terrible outcome of damnation was caused by Adam and Eve, and their disobedience towards a fair God which allowed them to choose their own fate. Adam and Eve made the conscious decision to defy God, and by conscious I mean despite not only their inner reason advising them against it, but also in ignoring what God promised of their punishment.

Walter S.H. Lim, in the essay "Adam, Eve, and Biblical Analogy in *Paradise Lost*" includes the lines from the poem: "Evil into the mind of God or Man May come and go, so unapprov'd, and leave No spot or blame behind" (*PL*; V, 117-19). These lines attempt to explain that evil can easily enter the mind, but it can just as easily leave it. Milton is aware of the constant temptations which surrounds humans at all times, and that it is difficult to resist the participation in evil. If such thoughts only linger within the imagination, it cannot do any

harm, nor can it leave behind “no spot or blame”: However, once such desires and passions exceed the imagination, and have not been controlled or challenged, men will them into action. This is the illustration of human interaction with freedom, and where true danger lies, on a fine line which demands the strength of only a personal choice not to cross it. For once crossed, this process of allowing temptation to move into action, can be as brutal as when Adam and Eve move from Paradise in the Garden of Eden, and into eternal damnation.

III. Of Milton’s Redemption

“But being slaves within doors, no wonder that they strive so much to have the public State conformably govern’d to the inward vicious rule, by which they govern themselves. For indeed none can love freedom heartilie, but good men; the rest love not freedom, but license; which never hath more scope or more indulgence then under Tyrants.” (90) Anthony Low included this paragraph written by Milton in his Essay “Milton’s World View”. I find that it provides a firsthand understanding of Milton’s political views on freedom. I have demonstrated Milton’s different ideas of oppression as a rejection of God’s guidance, and I will in this section introduce his hope for redemption, through a comparison of Scriptural passages and lines from *Paradise Lost* that support Milton’s claims.

Low explains that politics and hierarchical systems of authority can only be abolished when humans are ready to be free of them, and replace the external discipline with an discipline from within (88). Milton has expressed himself plainly. Inward and personal reason has been replaced for the comfort of outward rules, and in this false safety net, men lost sight of the conscience where one can find God. One has not found God, or has been to consumed by temporal passions to search for Him, and internal freedom has continued to be surpressed by external discipline. This is how, Milton claims, a continuous enslavement to an unfair and unholy hierarchy keeps humans bound to misery.

He writes, “Threatening to bind our soules with secular chaines: Helpe us to save free Conscience from the paw Of hireling wolves whose Gospell is their Law (92). The desperation in Milton’s words is obvious. Low demonstrates that word “Helpe” urges the reader to make a choice, “to perform an act of moral and intellectual discrimination” (92). Help us save free conscience, writes Milton, and illustrates that it is not too late to accomplish salvation. Milton’s determination to convince his fellow men about the urgent matter of right choices, has not gone unnoticed in this thesis. I have repeatedly made a point of his desire for human acheivement of divine providence. Low explains that Milton believed choosing was

the primary task of life, and that grace and virtue is developed as product of making “a series of right choices.” (89). As I have mentioned already, Milton strongly advised to create a personal and conscious relationship with God. This means that through such a series of good choices one becomes aware, choice by choice, and through the guidance of the individual conscience, that the human and the divine are indeed connected. Milton’s search for God relies almost entirely on personal decisions and an individual practice of religious spirituality.

“Satan falls as a result of his deliberate commitment to evil: pride, envy, self-love; Adam falls when he puts a relative good – human sociability in its highest form, married love – above a still greater good – love of God” (Low, 95). Having been free to both stand and to fall, Milton determines that created out of God’s kindness, the natural conditions of Adam and Eve would have led them to obedience. However, with the interference of Satan, they were too tempted to choose a virtuous life. In *Paradise Lost*, Milton writes, “And out of good still to find means of evil” (I, 165). Milton perfectly describes Adam and Eve’s decision to sin, and to bring a serpent’s evil into God’s Garden of perfection.

Satan, on the other hand, “seeks to pervert God’s creation and turn good into evil, so God determines to repair the damage and brings good out of evil” (Low, 99). God’s kindness and goodness has no end. Milton believes that in spite of such terrible choices, and a continuous series of wrong decisions, God allows men to steer the free will as he wishes, in hope that it leads man to redemption. “Adam and Eve repent and begin the process of regeneration: they carry with them into the fallen world of the essentially Christian message of salvation through the incarnate Son, the Messiah” (Low, 99). The hope for salvation, redemption, and divine providence. These are some of the representative Christian messages which Milton has integrated in his poem. Further, I will exemplify Milton’s persistent wish to justify the ways of God to man, through the immense Scriptural inspiration that he has gained from the Holy Bible.

For instance, if I present to you this passage from Romans that I have previously used, 2:14-15; “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another”. These lines, as I have mentioned, represent a natural conscience for human conditions. Not only has this demonstrated Milton’s belief in an internal liberty free from exterior authority, but these lines heavily imply a moral compass within man. This moral compass, the conscience which Milton urges others to listen to, is

man's true reason, and what will lead him to grow in virtue. Similarly, such lines can be found in Milton's poem, where the inspiration is reassured: "we live Law to ourselves, our reason is our law" (*PL*; IX, 653-654). The sole command of choices belongs to man himself, and if in need of guidance, he can turn inwards to reason, in himself and his connection with God.

"Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's" (Exodus, 20:12-17). Milton has been persistent that the natural conditions of man are good and reasonable. Here, in the commandments of God as observed in the Exodus, the Bible clearly generates a practice of peace, and I would argue, the same foundation for safety which the civil laws are based on. This serves as a verification, at least from a Miltonist perspective, that the inner reason, in sight of such Biblical Scriptures, will lead to a safe society in which there would be no need for a human authority. These commandments in Exodus from the Holy Bible, as Milton would explain, are equal to ones which can be found in the inner reason. The outcome of living according to this inner reason would be peaceful, and it would be so without the need for a forceful and a human hierarchy to enforce it. The intervention of violent human authority and rulers only complicates the matter. In the Holy Bible, one finds that:

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, not serve the: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments" (Exodus, 20:3-6).

God is a jealous God, and Milton equally disapproves of human imitations of gods. Rulers which seek to imitate the "likeness of" God, or the "heaven above", are mere frauds. Milton therefore refuses to "bow down thyself to them", as commanded, and plainly rejects a monarchical rule which attempts to bear likeness to God's superiority. In *Paradise Lost*, he writes, "Of servitude to serve whom God ordains, Or Nature; God and Nature bid the same

When he who rules is worthiest, and excels Them whom he governs. This is servitude” (VI, 175-178). No human, king or other, can bear likeness to his superiority. God is beyond human comprehension, and true servitude is to trust his judgment.

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Will thou then not be afraid of the powers? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same” (Romans, 13:1-3). The resistance of God’s power, and a disobedience of his orders, will lead to damnation. Milton attempts to make this clear with the loss of paradise in his poem. Adam and Eve demonstrate Milton’s point. The eternally damned couple prove God’s honesty. Adam and Eve disobeyed God in eating from the forbidden fruit, and received their eternal punishment, as God had warned them that they would. “Where all life dies, death lives, and nature breeds, Perverse, all monstrous, all prodigious things, Abominable, unutterable, and worse” (*PL*, II, 624-626). Milton refers to the forbidden fruit. In eating it, Adam and Eve lost their immortality, and gained eternal death, hence the line, “life dies, and death lives”. “And knew not eating death” (*PL*, IX, 702); Adam and Eve distrusted the word of God, but trusted the serpents promises of ambition, which ensured their death.

In Acts, 5:27-29, it is written; “And when they had brought them, they set them before the council: and the high priest asked them, Saying, Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man’s blood upon us. Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men”. As Adam and Eve were fooled by the evil whispers of the serpent, Milton demonstrates that men similarly are persuaded by false authority. Both the Church and the Monarch, Milton assured, wrongfully abused God’s name for selfish and unnatural purposes.

As I have demonstrated, Milton clearly rejected the idea that man can take superiority upon himself over another. Man cannot rule over another man. Adam and Eve were taught an eternal lesson, the consequences of endless death, and yet men continue to follow in their sinful footsteps. “And Chaos, ancestors of Nature, hold Eternal anarchy, amidst the noise, Of endless wars, and by confusion stand” (*PL*, II, 895-897). It is not man’s nature, rather it is man’s resistance of God’s will, that is keeping man at a constant state of war against all.

“I come no enemy, but to set free From out this dark and dismal house of pain” (*PL*, II, 822-823). Bodily imprisonment and chains put upon oneself are the most difficult to escape from. This enslavement man has brought upon himself represents Milton’s “house of pain”. Yet, God wishes to set mankind free. He continues to show goodness, and hopes that man will find a way out of evil within himself, in the divine access which he possesses in his conscience. Milton believes that redemption will allow man out of his own prison, and ultimately, free him from external chains. “It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life” (John, 67:63). One cannot profit from bodily accomplishments, from flesh and temporal pleasures when God has promised true profit through obedience. Milton believes that such temporal matters, “Will either quite consume us, and reduce To nothing this essential, happier far Than miserable to have eternal being Or if our substance be indeed divine, And cannot cease to be” (*PL*, II, 96-100). Adam and Eve allowed themselves to be consumed by temptation, and reduced themselves from godlike and perfect, to sinful humans. The potential which God has granted man with, cannot cease to be. It can, however, be suppressed and reduced, as Milton has proved, but through the right choices and in freedom, man can find himself redeemed.

Chapter III

I. Of the First Sin: A Disobedience of the Sovereign

“By attending two particular features of the Edenic discourse that Hobbes sought to negate – the language Adam spoke and the knowledge he possessed and transmitted to his posterity – important connections are made with Hobbes’s general theory of signs and his absolutist theory of sovereignty” (243), writes Pat Moloney in “Leaving the Garden of Eden: Linguistic and Political Authority in Thomas Hobbes”. Moloney allows me to interpret the divine experiences in the Garden of Eden in a human, and particularly *political* manner. Even in present time, the story of Adam and Eve manages to make claims about the natural falling characteristics of humans. These characteristics resonate with Hobbes’ ideas of the self-indulgent instincts which drive mankind, and I will demonstrate how Milton’s poem of human disobedience can support Hobbes’ political ideas of a sovereign.

Moloney explains that the interaction between human nature and human divinity was considered under three separate states of condition. The first is the perfect human state in the garden of Eden, the second is the fallen human state in the exile from the garden, and the third, is “our future state of glory” (244). In Hobbesian terms, one can regard these three distinct regimes according to the shifting political and authoritative power which is represented through Adam; “Human beings lived in the direct presence of God. In the Garden, He spoke to them in a viva voce, a living voice. Adam, infused as he was with divine and human knowledge, was the special conduit through whom the rest of the species was instructed” (245). This direct presence of God changes with the falling state of humans, and the exile of Adam and Eve. God’s presence then shows itself rather silently and authoritatively through several covenants and prophets in the Holy Bible. With the terrible conditions of “war of all against all” which Hobbes speaks of, this dreamlike state of life in Eden becomes “a possible world in which to test the implications of human nature” (245) as it was also demonstrated in the seventeenth century political and religious mayhem.

Moloney explains the divine authority from Genesis, “Adam imitated God’s creative power by naming them – expressing his wisdom and demonstrating his authority over them” (246). It is this wisdom which “was handed down, in corrupted form, to later generations” (248). The word corrupted implies something which used to be in a solid form and now has been changed into something unbalanced. For instance, Adam and Eve, fallen from their perfect state. Adam’s wisdom is a representation of a time, before the Fall of human beings,

when men “needed no laws as being incapable of sinning” (249). Adam was being directly communicated with through the presence of God. In the absence of this direct communication, God’s presence could no longer reach him. Adam succumbed to temptation, and this results not only in, as Moloney puts it, the demonstration of Adam as representative of a universal monarch (252), but also the destruction of such a sovereign. Adam has fallen, and man’s trust to the authoritative power has been broken. Hobbes philosophy anticipated this outcome. Man, when left unattended - and without a present, powerful sovereign to ensure his residence within the laws only – will continue to seek where he may until he finds sin. This is demonstrated by Adam and Eve’s decision to eat the forbidden fruit from the perfect Garden of Eden.

“Making oneself the final judge of moral questions was the first step towards the usurpation of sovereign power. Hobbes maintained that the very first regime, the divinely governed existence of Paradise, was brought down because its subjects assumed to themselves judgement of good and evil” (263). Hobbes is denying the human capability to separate good from evil for themselves. Right and wrong, according to Hobbes, are terms that are strictly conventional. The decision to do good can never be universal because everyone has a different view about what is “good”. Therefore, Hobbes concludes, that the sin was not in Adam and Eve’s eating of the fruit, but it was in their disobedience to the sovereign, God.

Moloney exhibits a perception of Genesis that demonstrates that disobedience of the sovereign, and not an obedience *to* the sovereign, is what is considered the first sin. “Adam’s assumption to himself of the judgement of good and evil was the original error that made possible a split between the dictates of conscience and the commands of the legitimate sovereign” (263). Adam and Eve disobeyed the sovereign, and allowed their moral compass to guide them, knowing that man on his own is inclined to be persuaded by own, selfish interests. Milton, in this particular circumstance, is showing the same characteristics as Adam in his demonstration of disobedience to the sovereign. Adam and Eve, to Hobbes, prove that rather than reliance on individual choices alone, one requires a powerful sovereign to ensure that such choices will lead to the best outcome for the collective. A good, moral judgement is no good if it is subject to one man alone. Hobbes would aim to ensure the safety of the society, rather than the individual.

II. Of Hobbes’ Civil Conscience

I desire to expand on the notion of conscience according to Thomas Hobbes. There remains an emphasis on his argument that men cannot be left to rule over themselves, and I wish to demonstrate exactly why Hobbes believes this is the case. To do this, I will in this section make use of the essay, “Hobbes on Conscience Within the Law and Without” by Edward G. Andrew, which I briefly introduced in the previous section that discussed Adam and Eve.

Andrew calls the seventeenth century the “Age of Conscience”, and explains that it was typically taught that the human conscience, not self-preservation, that was the foundation of “social and political order” (203). As I have already established, this is completely contrary to what Hobbes has claimed in *Leviathan*. Hobbes viewed the human conscience to be conventional, and able to only judge what is temporarily right, only for man himself under specific circumstances. Relying on a human conscience, which can therefore never be universally right nor introduce a right choice for the collective, will prove to be chaotic. “Hobbes supported conscience within the framework of law” (210); a conscience within the framework of law is what Hobbes calls a public conscience, a collection of rules which would benefit the plurality of people.

To demonstrate the diversity of consciousness which deeply troubled Hobbes, Andrew introduces several issues with multiple interpretations of the Holy Bible, which he argues, has often been used to advocate some sort of personal gain for the individual. For Hobbes, who was an absolutist and a monarchist, this interference of religion in political law disrupted his desired order. He writes,

“For after Bible was translated into English, every man, nay every boy and wench, that could read English, thought they spoke with God Almighty, and understood what He said, when by a certain number of chapters a day they had read the Scriptures once or twice over. The reverence and obedience due to the Reformed Church here, and to the bishops and pastors therein, was cast off, and every man became a judge of religion, and an interpreter of the Scriptures to himself” (211).

Private interpretations, equal to what Milton would describe a guidance through the individual conscience, have caused conflict which involved the entire populations. Hobbes does not share Milton’s belief of the individual and divine conscience. Rather, if every individual, who is always different from another, was to follow his own will, which then is also different from every other, it remains clear to Hobbes that it would lead to a state of war.

This interaction of private interpretations in the public politics is evidenced in the seventeenth century religious civil wars of England. The rebellion against the monarch, Hobbes would claim, was rooted in the silent and growing focus on the personal conscience. Andrew explains that the focus on personal conscience made it “lawful” to resist not only the king, but the laws, if they were to contradict the commands of God. If every man can take it upon himself to judge the meaning of the Bible, then no life nor any kingdom, “can be long secure” (212). Hobbes has concluded that there can be no solid authority when the primary power allows the growth and support of conflicting diversity. The consciences of the individuals are never in agreement and will undermine the law. Andrew demonstrates that Martin Luther even claimed, “No law, whether of men or of angels, may rightfully be imposed upon Christians without their consent, for we are free of all laws” (212).

I dare conclude then, that Hobbes was certain that following the individual conscience would have a man in conflict with another man, who, equal to himself, is following his own individual conscience. These two men, if they find themselves crossing paths, will both take it upon themselves to make judgements on what is right and what is wrong, and find that both men will be in favor of only themselves. Again, I stress Hobbes’ argument that one cannot depend on personal moral guidance alone, for such guidance is always conventional for the individual, and judges only right for oneself, and never what is right for all. Hobbes clarifies; “And last of all, men, vehemently in love with their own new opinions, (though never so absurd,) and obstinately bent to maintain them, gave those their opinion also that revered name of Conscience, as if they would have it seem unlawfull, to change or speak against them, and so pretend to know that they are true, when they know at most, but that they think so” (*Lev. 7; VII, 36*).

Instead of men relying on a temporal conscience which will serve only the individual, Hobbes suggest that men support each other collectively, in placing their trust in the sovereign. The sovereign, based on civil law, will never fault or waver due to the influence of personal interpretation nor individual moral judgment. Hobbes verifies, “From the definition of Punishment, I interferre, First, that neither private revenges, nor injuries of private men, can properly be stiled Punishment; because they proceed not from publique Authority” (*Lev. 28; XXVIII, 174*). The sovereign is required to decide punishments only after public trials taken place, and in this manner, attempts to ensure that no innocent man will be punished, nor wrongly judged. Such incidents, which would occur had man been left on his own, are contrary to the sovereigns intention, which is to maintain the peace.

Andrew demonstrates that the trials are publicly evaluated by a thorough analysis of twelve men, who address the facts and the causes of the accused. In a “spiritual court”, however, there is only one judge to determine all the matters of the case. (220). Such a multitude of men, twelve men to be exact, will confirm the chosen verdict has been reached justly, without spiritual manipulation or superstition to have influenced its result. Hobbes compares his desired political procedure to that of a religious method, which he describes can often be wrongly disputed:

“And consequently, when wee Believe that the Scriptures are the word of God, having no immediate revelation from God himself, our Beleeefe, Faith and Trust is in the Church; whose word we take, and acquiesce thereign. And they that believe that which a Prophet relates unto them in the name of God, take the word of the Prophet, do honour to him, and in him trust, and believe, touching the truth of what he relateth, whether he be a true, or a false Prophet.” (*Lev. 7; VII, 37*).

A practice which forces men to place their faith and liberty in the hands of a Prophet, not knowing whether he be true or false, seems to Hobbes much more unreasonable than to place trust in a sovereign which is visibly human. The sovereign, therefore, in representing the mere human, will provide an equality between itself and the citizens. What is right for the sovereign, will then always resonate with what is right for the people. Hobbes, in conclusion, applauded a conscience “institutionalized within the law”, and strongly advised for a separation of State and Church. This would guarantee a reduce of personal, and therefore also religious, influence on matters which concern the overall public.

III. Of Cain and Abel, and Hobbes’ Three Reasons for Conflict

Helen Thornton has published an essay, “Cain, Abel, and Thomas Hobbes” (2001), where she considers the Latin version of *Leviathan*, in which Hobbes included the Biblical story of Cain and Abel. The purpose of this story is to assist and defend Hobbes’ statement that a fear of God does not ensure peace in a society, if there is no further authoritative present. Even if the English version of *Leviathan* does not include this particular story of Cain and Abel, I will include it in this section of my thesis for the purpose of emphasis on Hobbes’ arguments, which I will set against Milton belief in human moral judgement. I will demonstrate that in Hobbes’ Latin version of *Leviathan*, he makes an example of Cain’s

murder of Abel, his brother, to prove that man indeed lives in a condition of war against all. Thornton writes that Cain would not have dared to kill Abel if there was “a common power which could have punished him” (611), and thus, presents Hobbes’ idea simply; the fear of God is not enough to keep humans neither good to one another, nor safe from one another. Men continue to prove that they need a human power to keep them in order.

God delivered an immediate punishment for Cain after he committed the crime on his brother, which proves that God had indeed declared it unnatural to hurt, or in this case, kill others. This would confirm that God, having delivered both the command and the punishment, was the common power of the people at the time. Hobbes view of the story demonstrates that “if human beings were as they should have been – in other words, if they could have ruled themselves – there would have been no need for a human coercive power” (613). If God was enough to keep men in check, Hobbes ponders why natural conditions of humans continue to demonstrate hostility. If God was enough to keep men in order, Cain would not have killed Abel.

“The first and most frequent cause of quarrel was competition, whereby men invaded for gain, to acquire dominion over other men’s persons and prosperity (*Lev.* 13, XIII, 70)”. Thornton explains that if two people desire the same thing, and this thing is not something that can be shared by both, then it naturally leads to a competition between the two where the strongest of them wins this certain thing for themselves, by winning over the other. (615)

The second cause of quarrel is described as “diffidence (distrust), whereby men invaded for safety, to defend their persons and property against invasion of others” (617); Again, this is Hobbes’ theory of natural dominion. The human instinct is self-preservation, and will therefore firstly act to defend himself, even if the consequence is to attack another.

“The final cause of quarrel between individuals in the state of nature was glory, whereby men invaded for reputation, ‘for trifles, as a word, a smile, a different opinion, and any other sign of undervalue, either direct in their persons, or by reflection in their kindred, their friends, their nation, their professors, or their name (618). Hobbes was, to put it mildly, aware of the high regard which humans have for themselves. Reputation remained vital for a man’s honor. Therefore, if someone were to disrupt or threaten this reputation, or even if another man’s reputation simply exceeds that of your own, it would be natural to seek this glory for yourself.

This division of three quarrels; competition, distrust, and glory, Hobbes has made it apparent that most, if not all, individual have or will come across one of these natural human

reasons for quarrel. Without a common power to justly solve such issues, men will turn to themselves for solutions, and find that violence be the most effective. These three reasons for conflict become apparent in the Biblical story of Cain and Abel. Thornton points out that the two brothers both made sacrifices to God, and that it is implied that Cain is the eldest when he displayed emotions of anger at the sight of God's grater regard for his brothers sacrifice than his own (619). Since both brothers made a sacrifice, I conclude that it was not by their actions that God honored Abel's offering more, but rather because God could see his pure intentions and faith. As Thornton writes, "Only God knew whether human beings were good or evil, because only God could look into their hearts and see their intentions" (622), which further explains that even if Cain honored God by his offering in action, his intentions showed another aim.

Thornton, through Hobbes' analysis of the story, begins to wonder if Cain dared to murder his brother, Abel, because he did not believe there was a power to punish him for it. (263). Hobbes' three reasons for conflict - competition, distrust, and glory – are all evident. It is clear that Cain did feel belittled on all three accounts, especially in comparison to God's reaction to the offerings of the brothers. First, Cain shows signs of feeling superior to his younger sibling, which resembles the quarrel of competition. Second, distrust or diffidence is detested when, "Cain feared that his younger brother would take his birth-right, and in order to prevent this, he murdered him" (626). Thirdly, glory was another cause for Cain to harm Abel, considering that he felt "undervalued or had a difference of opinion", and Thornton further explains, Cain murdered Abel "in order to secure his reputation" (626). It is thereby manifest that this story of Cain and Abel succeeds in meeting all three of Hobbes' claims about human nature, as typically seen in quarrels about competition, distrust, and glory, are simply descriptions of a natural human condition, as is described to be a war against all. As Thornton concludes, that the story of the brothers demonstrates on Hobbes' behalf that Cain's intention was indeed war, and "then he put his intention into action by killing Abel" (624).

"And the LORD said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not; Am I my brother's keeper?" (Genesis; 4, 9). This citation from the King James Bible demonstrates that Cain not only lies to God about the whereabouts of his brother, but in doing so expresses a denial 'in his heart that God was present in all places and saw all things' (627). In other words, if Cain denied God's knowledge of all matter and things, this suggests that Cain did not fear God's punishments, and "did not recognize any power (even God) with the ability to punish him" at all (630).

As Thornton intended in her essay, using Hobbes' effective retelling of the scriptural story of Cain and Abel, it becomes apparent that the fear of God was indeed not enough to prevent humans, in their natural order, from committing sin. "The scriptural account demonstrated that the fear of God was not sufficient to prevent Cain from killing Abel, but after the fratricide Cain feared that other men would kill him. In doing so it also demonstrated why human beings need a visible coercive power to maintain order" (631); Cain was not afraid of God's power, and therefore, in conclusion, Abel was not safe from Cain under God's power. Such a visible, coercive power in demand is what Hobbes would prefer: an absolutist sovereign. A sovereign, "whether it be crown, parliament or people" (Andrew, 221), would save man from falling into a natural condition of self-preservation.

III. Of the Mosaic Justification for the Sovereign

"And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the Lord will not hear you in that day" (1. Sam, 8:18). Not unlike the Israelites, the divided people of England have suffered through many different leaders, and such traumas have Milton convinced that men must be freed from external powers. There have been kings, and priests, and yet, Thomas Hobbes was convinced that a sovereign was the ultimate solution to ensure peace amongst the people. During the Reformation, England made many claims in favor of the Hebrew Bible, and looking towards the Israelites as a model for authority became the norm. In this section, this model will function to represent Hobbes' concern about how the personal interpretations of Scriptural texts influenced society. This demonstration will function as a rejection of Milton's reliance on individual guidance only.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth century, there was a sudden and growing belief that through reading the Scriptures, one could achieve salvation. This led to several translations of the Holy Bible being produced, including the authorized King James in 1611, which I already have and will continue to refer to. When one must translate such a Holy Scripture, suspicions of incorrect translations can appear and develop. People will practice what these words preach, and therefore one must stress the importance of such translations to be accurate. However, translation is done through interpretation, and interpretations can lead to different doctrines. Even if such interpretation are all Christian, there will still be differences in the results of Christian understandings. This can be exemplified with the mention of Vulgate and the acceptance of its authority, which the Catholics approved of, whilst the Protestants did not.

Confrontations grew as this contact with the Holy Bible and its audience became more personal, and more visibly direct in society than it had been previous of the war.

The repetitive argument which Hobbes makes remains that to live peacefully, there must be a stable government in place, which is not divided, and, “whom you yourselves have chosen”. This demonstrates a monarchist perspective. In “Religion and Rhetoric Hobbes’ Political Thought”, Alison McQueen writes, “Defenders of the monarchical power and royal supremacy over the church looked to the period of the Davidic kings to ground their claims” (3). Charles I, as a representative then for David, “King David Psalms”, was offered an almost sacred and holy authority of the realm. Meanwhile, the Parliamentarians would use the same passage to defy the monarchical rule and King Charles. This exemplifies the diversity of interpretations from the Holy Bible. The Israelites had demanded a king, which eventually led them to terrible circumstances and slavery, something that has typically been regarded as a punishment for having asked for a king when they already had a covenant with God. In this division of interpretation, what is found is an equal usage of the Scriptures, and yet as history demonstrates, such usage led to different outcomes. Hobbes remains certain that a divided government, as seen between the Catholics and the Protestants, will lead to rebellion and war, and he has experienced the proof of it firsthand. Much of Hobbes’ political argument relies on the denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and I will rely on the following chapters, 12, 15, 20, 31-34, 40 in *Leviathan* for my discussion. Hobbes writes,

“And first, for the *Pentateuch*, it is not argument enough that they were written by Moses, because they are called the five Books of Moses; no more than these titles, The Book of *Joshua*, the Book of *Judges*, The Book of *Ruth*, and the Books of the *Kings*, are arguments sufficient to prove, that they were written by Joshua, by the Judges, by Ruth, and by the Kings. For in titles of Books, the subject is Marked, as often as the writer.” (*Lev. XXXIII*; 33, 214)

This is very important to investigate to understand Hobbes’ argument for a civil sovereign, and he argues that the kingdom over the Israelites was indeed a sovereign. Moses had a divine right, with commandments directly from God and therefore was not “subject to any human power”, writes McQueen (20), meaning that Moses only had political power on the behalf of God. Still, the people wished for a human king, which can be read as a rejection of a Godly government. Hobbes explains; “they deposed that peculiar Government of God” (*Lev. XL*; 40,

267), and therefore rejecting God himself. McQueen writes that, “When God granted this request, he ceased to be the Israelites’ civil sovereign and, from then on, ruled them as he did all other people—by natural reason alone.” (21).

Hobbes argues that authority is rightful when it has been chosen out of consent from the majority, had thus a sovereign will gain jurisdiction of civil matters. “For there was no other Word of God in that time, by which to regulate Religion, but the Law of Moses, which was their Civill Law” (*Lev. XL 40, 270*). Hobbes is making the case that in the absence of God, the regulation of religion should back into the hands of reason. Reason is embedded in the civil laws, and a sovereign will be able to handle such matters peacefully, as is the sovereign’s purpose.

Further, Hobbes’ questions that God has spoken only to Moses, and stressed the fact that it is a people’s consent and not a divine right that needs to be the foundation of a sovereign. If this divine right ceases to exist, then the stability of a sovereign will crumble when the people eventually stop believing a silent God; “the people were obliged to take him for Gods Lieutenant, longer than they beleevd that God spake unto him” (*Lev. XL; 40, 266*). Because God spoke only to Moses, he had sole authority over the people, and if God had not solely spoken to him, the people would feel no obligation to follow his rules nor the sovereign. To make the case even clearer, Hobbes points to the Holy Bible for confirmation, and quotes “To Moses, the children Israel say thus. (*Exod. 20.19*) *Speak thou to us, and we will heare thee, but let not God speak to us, lest we dye.* This is absolute obedience to Moses” (*Lev. XXXII; 20, 114*). The rest of the people, who God has not shared neither his will nor divine right, do not know this to be neither truth nor false. Hobbes argues that people who claim that God has spoken to them in their dreams, is the same as to have dreamed that God spoke to them, which should not be believed by any man (*Lev. XXXII; 32, 210*).

The Scriptures in the Bible, as expressed earlier in the texts, are open to different interpretations and translations, and Hobbes believes that they can only be trusted if the civil sovereign was to interpret it. He points to other Biblical incidents where one has gained political power and thus, I will now introduce Hobbes’ point of false religion. The Catholics and Protestants, amongst others, practiced what Hobbes’s would claim to be false religion with the intention of gaining private benefits and rewards. Hobbes explains that there are two sorts of men in regards of religion, each with a seed. One that;

“have nourished, and ordered them, according to their own invention. The other, have done it, by Gods commandment, and direction: but both sorts have done it, with the

purpose to make those men that relyed on them, more apt to Obedience, Lawes, Peace, and Charity, and civill Society. So that the religion of the former sort, is part of humane Politiques” (*Lev. XII; 12, 62*).

Hobbes is recognizing religion as politics, and how rulers have based their selfish actions upon religious and Godly arguments, much like the “Founders of Common-Wealths”. One sort of religious man has made commands of his own invention, and the other has done it to satisfy his followers, but both men, observes Hobbes, have done it to gain obedience from the people. He also recognizes that Moses and Abraham were simply acting out of obedience and in accordance with reason, society and law, and are therefore “Of the later sort, were Abraham, Moses, and our Blessed Saviour” (62).

In introducing such a detailed and critical reading of the Scripture, Hobbes encourages a skeptical analysis of the Holy Bible, and the words of God. He questions who the original writers of several of the Books in the Holy Bible were, and claims that no evidence, other than historical proof, has been provided of the facts. Reason, Hobbes claims, “nor can be by any arguments of natural Reason: for Reason serves only to convince the truth (not of fact, but) of consequence.” (*Lev. XXXII; 33, 214*) If one cannot trust that the divine power of prophets is not truth nor fact, then one cannot trust in the commandments that they introduce,. By which authority, then, are men required to believe in them and possibly call such uncertain commandments for laws?

Reason, as I have repeatedly explained, dictates man in the direction which will benefit his own good. (*Lev. XV; 15, 81*). Men who, in pursuit of power over other men, and motivated by personal gain rather than the good of the collective, will see fit to use divine right as a tool for their own, selfish winnings. The calculated outcome of this reason results in sin, and therefore, Hobbes assumes that God’s will cannot be revealed immediately nor internally through reason. He doubts, in the same manner, that prophets then can receive God’s commandments. Their reason display that they know not “when he is to obey, or not obey his Word, delivered by him, that says he is a Prophet” (*Lev. XXXII; 31, 211*) This type of critical thinking towards the Scriptures was not something that was common in England before the Civil Wars. These points of the Scriptures that Hobbes speaks of and openly challenges, were previously considered factual and rarely questioned. However, the importance of such critical thinking is necessary. After all, as Hobbes reminds us; “Of 400 Prophets, of whom the K. of Israel asked counsel, concerning the warre he made against Ramoth Gilead, only Micaiah was a true one” (211).

Hobbes introduces several issues that makes him skeptical about the Mosaic authorship, including the “last chapter of Deuteronomic, verse 6.” (*Lev. XXXIII; 33, 214*). He mentions that no one knows of Moses’ “sepulcher” and therefore, assumes that the words of Moses were written after his burial. “Moses spake of his own sepulcher (though by Prophecy)” when he was alive. He also mentions Genesis, chap 12; 6, where it is written; “*And Abraham passed through the land to the place of Sichem, unto the plain of Moreh, and the Canaanite was then in the land; which must needs bee the words of one that wrote when the Canaanite was not in the land; and consequently, not of Moses, who dyed before he came into it.*” Hobbes attempts to demonstrate that the five books of Moses were written after his time, “though how long after it be not so manifest.” (*Lev. XXXIII; 33, 214.*) It is clearly stated that it is only the last chapter, and “not the whole Pentateuch, was written by some other man”. Hobbes was aware that it was openly discussed whether Moses did write the Books all by himself, and further mentioned his awareness that the books have indeed possibly been edited. Yet, he remains skeptical that Moses has written all that is believed to have been written by him, which this is evidenced in the passage below:

“But though Moses did not compile those Books entirely, and in the form we have them; yet he wrote all that which hee is there said to have written: as for example, the Volume of the Law, which is contained, as it seemeth in the 11 of *Deuteronomie*, and the following Chapters to the 27, which also commanded to be written on stones, in their entry into the land of Canaan. And this did Moses himself write, and deliver to the Priests and Elders of Israel, to be read every seventh year to all Israel, at their assembling in the feast of Tabernacles. And this is that Law which God commanded, that their Kings (when they should have established that form of Government) should take a copy of from the Priests and Levites; and which Moses commanded the Priests and Levites to lay in the side of the Arke; and the same which having been lost, was long time after found again by Hiliah, and sent to King Joasias, who causing it to be read to the People, renewed the Covenant between God and them.” (*Lev. XXXIII; 33, 215.*)

Hobbes denies the authorship of Moses, but still manages to recognize and applaud the status which Moses has gained, and especially the obedience he has created, which serves to Hobbes a model for a civil sovereign. Hobbes’ clearly makes a distinction between Moses, and other

the other prophets that are mentioned in the Holy Bible, and demonstrates a comparison of the two in the case of credibility.

In the essay, “Hobbes’ Use of the Bible in *Leviathan* in the Context of the English Civil War”, the author Takuya explains this as Hobbes making a clear distinction of Moses from other prophets (138). She writes that Hobbes considered the falsification of the Scriptures, but in the end dismissed it, and rather focused on people that were in a position of power and with the opportunity to exploit such power, such as “pretended prophets” (139).

I have in this section intended to demonstrate a foundation where one can make religion into a civil and obedient part of society, or rather, Hobbes’ desire to make religion subordinate to a sovereign. He dreams of a unity, an establishment where one does not distinguish between human and divine politics, but where the absolutist sovereign is in position of the power altogether. The Mosaic authorship is a key factor in the Holy Bible, and its claim for justification for power. Moses serves as a measure for human authority of a divine power, but Hobbes wished to discredit this, so it became visible that this power belongs to a human, sovereign state power. In asserting his politics with the use of Biblical Scriptures, Hobbes is honoring both the aspects of the divine and of the scientific commitments by intertwining them. In the words of Hobbes himself, it is important to resonate on these things, “For, whosoever hath a lawfull power over any Writing, to make it law, hath the power also to approve, or disapprove the interpretation of the same” (*Lev. XXXIII; 34, 220*).

Chapter III

I. Of The Fall

A. Of Adam and Eve's Self-Realization

I have carefully introduced Hobbes' ideas of instinctual humanity, and I will now use these descriptions and ideas to unravel not the Fall of Adam and Eve, but rather the different aspects of their human nature which led to the Fall. I wish to discover how these silent, yet decisive, incidents will explain Adam and Eve's falling human nature in a way which reasons with Hobbes' definitions of humanity. Millicent Bell, in "The Fallacy of the Fall in *Paradise Lost*", will demonstrate several motivations which will support the theory of man's nature to be concerned with primarily egoism and self-preservation.

"The mind cannot accept the fact that perfection was capable of corruption without denying the absoluteness of perfection" (863), writes Bell. The Fall is often considered to be divided into two periods of "before" and "after", where one regards humans as making a shift, before the sin and after, to changing from perfect to imperfect. Here, Bell suggests that there can be no such division, and provides curiosity not only to why Adam and Eve failed to listen to God's warnings, but how they were even able to. "For all possible temptations – those traditionally offered and any we might add – appeal to impulses characteristic of fallen mankind" (863); It is heavily implied that the traits of unfallen humans - characteristics that resemble Hobbes' instinctual egoistical human nature – which indeed are made very visible by Adam and Eve after their Fall, were already present in both Adam and Eve previous to the Fall, and that these traits were only less visible. This statement functions as a rejection of Milton's claim that Adam and Eve's unfallen nature was a consequence of their disobedience to God.

Bell claims that temptation, represented as a bridge, describes Adam and Eve's unfolding realization of their human instincts. Unchanged from before the Fall, and enhanced after the Fall, Adam and Eve move across the bridge and realize the nature of their humanity. Their humanity is best explained by characteristics that can be defined as "ambition, curiosity, gluttony, or lust." This bridge that Bell speaks of, is the representation of Adam and Eve's subconscious process to realize their fallen nature (863). If Adam and Eve visibly demonstrate such characteristics of a falling human nature, even before committing the sin and creating the Fall, there is then no true difference of humanity before the Fall and after it. Then, how could there be a "Man's lapse from perfection" (863) at all?

Characteristics, as typically described unfallen, include an appetite for passion and an undisciplined will, which can be observed in Milton's descriptions of Adam and Eve before Fall. This determines that this fallen human nature indeed did exist in Adam and Eve before they chose to disobey God's commands. The Adam and Eve before the Fall, as described by Milton in his poem *Paradise Lost*, are characterized in a "state of fallen Man – Man as he knew him" (865). Milton did indeed write Adam and Eve in a way that can only be described as unquestionably human. Namely, Hobbes' would add, falling humans, meaning naturally sinning humans; concluding that the past man is unchanged from the present man, who still remains in a natural state of falling.

Bell understands that *Paradise Lost* attempts to demonstrate plainly, in "the most universal and most useful than can be imagined, that the obedience to the will of God makes men happy and that the disobedience makes them miserable" (866). Milton has, in his poem, attempted to demonstrate the consequences of choosing passion over reason, but it seems that the situation is more complex. The eating of the forbidden fruit then, is nothing but a "empathetic stage in the process already begun". Adam and Eve move further across the bridge, and illustrate the passions that has entered their will. The "human heart" (867) reveals itself to be easily tempted. The eating of the apple was not the sin, but rather represented a shift from intention to action, a difference of simple temptation to an actual performing of a choice. The desire to sin, however, was already suggested, and implies that the falling aspect of human nature was indeed not a consequence of the fall. This is exemplified by Milton's description of Eve's dream, where she is tempted to eat from the forbidden Tree and is "no longer compatible with a state of innocence" (867). This lack of innocence, as I wished to demonstrate, was visible before Eve committed her sin, after the Fall, it was instead enhanced through her nakedness. Milton makes Eve's temptation evident; "Here, happy, creature, fair angelic Eve, partake thou also; happy though thou art, Happier thou may'st be, worthier canst not be: Taste this, and be henceforth among the gods Thyself a goddess, not to earth confined" (*PL*, V, 74-78).

This narrative, along with these lines; "Even to my mouth of that same fruit held part Which he had plucked; the pleasant savoury smell So quickened appetite, that I, methought, Could not but taste" (*PL*, V, 84-85), represents an already intact humanity which is corrupt and contains a curiosity for desire and sin. This is not a sign of disbelief of the punishment which they have been promised by God if they disobey, but rather a wish to disobey in spite of it. Adam and Eve are tempted with falling human characteristics such as ambition and

glory, as Hobbes has named one of the three natural human reasons for quarrel. As much has been proved by Eve's desire to be "among gods Thyself a goddess". Eve was, before eating the forbidden fruit, visibly arrogant and ambitious for personal gain, and yet she is typically separated from this natural falling state and after the actual Fall "Eve and Adam are changed from ideal prototypes" (869), writes Bell, as a consequence after committing the first disobedience, when in fact, the disobedience was only a consequence of their egoistic human nature.

"Till warned, or by experience taught, she learn" (*PL*, VIII, 190), writes Milton, admitting that Eve could not have learned by God's warnings alone, but had to commit the sin in order to fully understand the consequences. Granted, it is implied that Eve did not even understand what death was. "Of death denounced, whatever thing death be" (*PL*: IX, 595), and perhaps insinuates that she did not understand the depth of the consequences.

"That Which before us lies in daily life, Is the prime wisdom; what is more, is fume, Or emptiness, or fond impertinence, And renders us in things that most concern Unpracticed, unprepared, and still to seek" (*PL*, VIII, 195-197). Prime wisdom has been learned through experience, and Adam and Eve have learned in giving into their appetites and passions, and yet, they will continue to seek after such passions even after the Fall. Bell writes about Adam, "He wonders if this again does not indicate some weakness in him, whether Nature failed in him, leaving him unable to stand "against the charm of Beauty's powerful glance" (872). Adam here is questioning whether he was "Not proof enough to such object to sustain" (*PL*, VIII, 535), and in doing so, doubting his own virtue, and whether God's creation of human substance is indeed divine (*PL*, II, 99).

In recollection of the earlier description of Adam and Eve which was offered by Milton, Adam and Eve were described as "Godlike erect, with native honour clad In naked majesty seemed lords of all, And worthy seemed, for in their looks divine, the Image if their glorious Maker shone, Truth, wisdom, sanctitude severe and pure" (*PL*, IV, 289-291). In this description, Adam and Eve can be seen in the Maker's image as they were intended, with wisdom and visibly pure. However, in the passage above, Milton claims that such wisdom must be gained through experience, and through sin. Bell makes an interesting observation about Adam's sinful love, which makes him choose passion over reason, and in eating the apple he "represents the mind of fallen Man" (873). The choice which represents the fallen man, is Adam's choice to fall into desire, not in the actual eating of the apple, which is only a representation of Adam's decision to sin. Therefore, Bell concludes, that Adam and Eve

learned nothing from committing their sin, and of eating the strange fruit, “except the nature of their own Hearts. And this they learned from themselves, from the act of fulfilling their own desires to the final degree” (876).

From a Hobbesian perspective, Milton’s poem serves as an example of how man, even if regarded “unfallen” and created pure in the image of God, is fated to fall in the end when left to himself. Adam and Eve represent a human weakness which is bound to sin. Their sinful nature existed before the Fall, but was fulfilled by eating the apple. “Their self-consciousness has been purchased by the fulfillment in action of what has hitherto laid hidden in the mind” (876), concludes Bell. In other words, the sin which led to the Fall did not make human beings fallen, but rather, it enhanced and proved Adam and Eve’s already fallen human nature. Bell offers a refreshing perspective to the issue, presenting a view where the concept of the Fall as a climax was necessary. She writes about Adam and Eve’s self-realization that from their sinful human state, they can still move towards redemption and have the freedom to conquer evil. Bell claims that Adam and Eve, due to their unawareness of their own characteristics, “repeat though they might the academic lessons concerning the relation of the Will, and Reason, and Passion.” Adam and Eve, as a consequence of their sinful choices, are demonstrated to lack this “inner regulator” of their conscience, which Milton claimed would guide them towards right Reason. Rather, Adam and Eve prove the opposite. Namely, because “Their redemption involves the awareness that for them virtue can never be instinctive” (828).

In conclusion, Adam and Eve, as Milton describes them in his poem, and the present fallen man, could realize that there was never an unfallen man at all. Through their self-realization, Adam and Eve were able to accept themselves and their true human nature. This human nature, Hobbes would agree needs a structure, because “virtue can never be instinctive”. This reassurance that man was never truly unfallen, can still with great responsibility strive for redemption and live a virtuous life true to himself, and more importantly, in a society which attempts this collectively.

B. Of Milton’s Freedom of Choice

Allan H. Gilbert similarly introduces an enlightening issue with *Paradise Lost*, as expressed in his article, “The Problem of Evil in *Paradise Lost*”. Here he discloses that one cannot make factual statements from what is drawn from the epic poem, because it indeed is a poem and in no position to be used as a piece of argument. It is, “hence an imaginative work which cannot prove anything” (175). Gilbert adds, “that the first sin originated not alone ‘in instigation of the

devil,' but also 'in the liability to fall with which man was created'" (178), which was demonstrated in the discussion of my previous section.

Man will always be exposed to temptation and sin. This is constant, and Gilbert expresses curiosity in the character of Satan as demonstrated in *Paradise Lost*. He concludes, "if evil was to be personified at all, it must be by a character who expressed its nature; hence Milton's Satan – the embodiment of the troubles which afflict mankind" (1809). As I mentioned earlier, in the traits which Bell clearly observed to be typical of the fallen human, are similar to the characteristics which are found in Satan in the poem. In other words, the evil qualities that are found in Milton's Satan – qualities that resemble egoism, glory, competition – are qualities which are considered to be natural human emotions, and these same qualities can be observed in Adam and Eve as well. Again, proving that the "troubles which afflict mankind", are traits demonstrated by Satan as a new evil or originated as a consequence of his temptations, when in fact such troubles have been shown to exist in Adam and Eve

"Yet in spite of his adequate equipment, man will be deceived. And because he is deceived and has not, like the devils, deliberately resolved on evil, he can be restored to his normal and natural state of goodness. Yet this restoration, like the fall, depends on man's choice" (182), states Gilbert. He claims that the restoration of fallen man, depends on choice, and therefore, depends on the same qualities which made man fall in the first place. The focus here is on choice, similar to Milton's philosophy. Even if man chose to sin, man can still chose to live virtuously and redeem himself. "So Heav'nly love shall outdo Hellish hate, Giving to death, and dying to redeem" (*PL*, III, 298-299). By gaining death, Adam and Eve lost their immortality, and yet were able to live and strive for redemption. A further analysis of these lines could be that even if Adam and Eve abused their freedom of choice, and decided to indulge in evil rather than goodness (as humans tend to). After all, Milton would rather allow men explore their natural freedom, even if some of them are lost to sin and damnation, so long that a few prove themselves truly virtuous. It was also better, writes Gilbert, "than that they should be virtuous by compulsion" (191).

I have previously mentioned in this thesis that Milton was specific about true virtue, and demanded that humans need to be exposed to temptations. In short, virtue reached without challenges, is not true virtue accomplished. Anthony Low explains this in the best way possible, in his essay "Milton's World View", where he writes that God has surrounded men with temptations. To resist these temptations, will provide a growth in strength. One cannot make a person virtuous by shielding him from temptations; virtue comes from within and can only be achieved in this fallen world by confronting and overcoming trials and

difficulties. Low exemplifies this with the ability to interpretate the Bible. He says that one can draw evil from it, or one can draw good. It all depends on the will of the individual, and his ability to separate good and evil, “in a world in which the two are inextricably mixed – and choice – preferring the better and condemning the worse” (88).

Milton is excluding the aspect of the individual in his own way, which is very different from Hobbes, in hope of a greater and bigger picture. Milton is aware of the danger that free will might lead to, and that many, if not most, will be lost to sin. However, in his opinion, this fear of damnation should not triumph the natural right humans have. The opportunity to achieve good moral judgement on their own, not because of a lack of temptations, but in spite of them, and motivated by the personal choice to overcome them.

This perspective, which shares the belief of humans that are capable to depend on their conscience alone is a fundamentally Christian perception. Milton believes that through obedience, one can achieve true victory and love. That is the grand reward God will grant those who endure and fulfill his commandments. Throughout his poem, Milton relies on the Biblical Scriptures and integrates them in his lines. “Adam soon repealed The doubts that in his heart arose: and now Led on, yet sinless, with desire to know What Nearer might concern him, how thus this world Of heav’n and earth conspicuous first began” (*PL*, VII, 59-63).

Neil Forsyth offers a great understanding to these lines in his essay, “*Paradise Lost* and the Origins of Evil: Classical or Judeo-Christian?”, and concludes that Adam indeed was greatly concerned with the troubles Satan had caused in Heaven, and at the same time demonstrates complete ignorance to his own “desire to know” which is causing him to be “led on” towards sin. Forsyth explains that Adam has not understood “the point of the war narrative”, because it was supposed to show Adam that the same evil and “enemy is now threatening him” (520).

Forsyth confidently states that Adam and Eve, “like Satan’s in Milton’s, needs to be held in check by explicit moral assertion” (530), which resonates with Hobbes’ belief that the conceptual fear of God and his punishments are not enough to ensure moral judgement in human behavior alone. Forsyth writes that the complicity of the characters in Milton’s poem, “is nowhere more obvious or more disturbing in the face of this primal innocence” (546), which Bell argued was necessary for Adam and Eve to fully accept their human sinning nature.

II. Of Milton's Natural Condition of Man

A. Of Milton's Light and Sight

With the declaration of ambivalence that Milton has provided for the evil character of Satan, which I discussed in the previous section, I will now move on to discuss the moral ambivalence of Milton's God. William Blake even claimed that Milton "was of the Devil's party without knowing it (c. 1790/1956, p. 221)". The moral lesson of the poem, according to C.S. Lewis, remains to prove that obedience of God will ensure men's happiness, and that disobedience will lead them to misery (*A Preface to Paradise Lost*). Similarly, Hobbes believed that obedience to the sovereign would keep men safe, and disobedience would lead them to danger. Milton's desire to justify the ways of God can be directly conceived in this sentence alone. Further, Peter L. Rudnytsky writes, in "Freud as Milton's God", that it is rather peculiar that Milton felt the need to put God "on trial" in his poem, instead of accepting it as "essence of Truth" (259). Milton is, without intending to, doubting the very God he is attempting to defend.

In referring to God's rule as "Heaven's awful Monarch" (*PL*, IV, 960), Milton is subconsciously creating a sympathetic narrative for the reader, where Satan can be empathized with as a victim to a hierarchical rule, where he must always remain inferior to his own desires and inferior to his Father, or decide to rebel against him. The decision, as is universally known, resulted in war: "If he opposed, and with ambitious aim Against the throne and monarchy of God Raised impious war in Heav'n and battle proud" (*PL*; I, 41-43). The descriptions of the ambitious attempt to dismiss a throne and monarchy, resembles Milton's personal encouragement of the beheading of King Charles I. Not only does Milton's own personal rebellion and ambition become clear in the poem, but he is ironically integrated in the character of Satan, and therefore I find that Milton, perhaps more visibly than ever, appears to be 'on the devil's side', in applauding Satan's "courage never to submit or yield" (*PL*; I, 108). Not only does Milton's ambivalence in the characters confuse the reader, but it even demonstrates some contradictory understandings of Milton's explanations of morality.

For instance, when Milton writes; "They who neglect and scorn, shall never taste; But hard be hardened, blind be blinded more" (*PL*; III, 199-200), it is important to mention that Milton himself was completely blind when writing *Paradise Lost*. In stating that "hard be hardened" and that the "blind be blinded more", Milton could be using his own blindness to address the darkness within his eyes, or rather the darkness that has lingered from his past.

Similarly, he offers a paradox in writing, “No light, but rather Darkness visible” (*PL*, I, 63)”, explaining that he can see darkness. Both literally, and perhaps in the moral loss of judgement in the world. This complex contradiction can be issued with Milton’s God, as Forsyth writes:

“God either wishes to take away evils, and is unable; or He is able, and is unwilling; or He is neither willing nor able, or He is both willing and able. If he is willing and is unable, He is feeble, which is not in accordance with the character of God; if He is able and unwilling, He is envious, which is equally at variance with God; if He is neither willing nor able, He is both envious and feeble, and therefore not God; if He is both willing and able, which alone is suitable to God, from what source then are evils? Or why does He not remove them?” (522).

These contrasting traits, derived from Milton’s God, share the similar paradox as Milton’s reference to his own blindness. Either God can help, and is unwilling, which does not fit with the character typically described as God. Or, God cannot help, which would mean that God indeed is not almighty. “He is both envious and feeble, and therefore not God”, such a statement can be argued with. If I refer back to the Holy Scriptures, and recall my previously used passage, which now would prove otherwise. “Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am an a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me” (Exodus, 20:5), here it evident that God is indeed a “jealous God”, and contradicts the claim that an envious God, can not be God.

In addition, by offering this completely different reliance of the Biblical Scripture, it strengthens Hobbes’ arguments. Using the Holy Bible to demonstrate false religion serves as a paradox in itself, and addresses the issue of using personal interpretations to define conventional truths. This opposes Milton’s reliance of the individual guidance, and of the religious scriptures, and confirms Hobbes’ theory that men will instinctively define a thing as “good” or “bad” depending only on how they benefit from it. To discredit Milton’s statements further, I point to another line which I find an obvious point that Hobbes would oppose and argue against. “God their Creator, and th’ invisible Glory of him that made them transform” (*PL*; I, 369-370). I have clearly established what Hobbes has to say about invisible powers. “And this Feare of things invisible, is the natural Seed of that, which every one in himself calleth Religion: and in them that worship, or feare that Power otherwise than they do, Superstition” (*Lev. XI*; 11, 59). When observing these very opposite opinions next to

each other, it becomes clear that Milton's faith in this invisible power, is mere superstition in Hobbes' reason.

Hobbes insists that one should not build a society upon invisible powers. The foundation of society needs to be visible, graspable, and based upon civil laws which does not allow for personal interpretations to disrupt the benefits of the collective. As Milton wrote, "He also against the house of God was bold: A leper once he lost and gained a king" (*PL*; I, 470-471). The covenant with God could no longer hold, and Hobbes was certain that in the seventeenth century a strong monarch or sovereign would be the solution.

B. Of the Tree of Knowledge

Lastly, I will refer to an issue with the story of the Genesis as presented in Milton's *Paradise Lost*. This will not involve the fruit nor Adam and Eve's eating of the fruit, but rather the tree of which the fruit grows on; the "Tree of Knowledge" of good and evil. Specifically, three times is this tree mentioned in a way which is especially open for critical interpretation, and if I may say so, for conflict. As I have demonstrated, the tree and its fruit has been openly debated about the meaning it represents. I have argued that the eating of the fruit could mean several different things for Adam and Eve, but I would now like to discuss what interpretations of the tree of Knowledge can be understood as through Milton's epic poem. I begin with these lines from the ninth part of *Paradise Lost*:

"By thee communicated, and our want;
For good unknown, sure is not had, or had
And yet unknown, is as not had at all.
In plain then, what forbids he but to know,
Forbids us good, forbids us to be wise?" (*PL*; IX, 755-759).

Satan has successfully intrigued Adam and Eve in the eating of a fruit which will grant them what they desire, and it is revealed that this fruit is that of the forbidden tree "of reason in my inward powers, and speech" (*PL*, IX, 600). They begin to wonder why God would neglect them of such reason and knowledge, and conclude that God may wish to keep them ignorant.

"Deterred not from achieving what might lead
To happier life, knowledge of good and evil;

Of good, how just? Of evil, if what is evil
Be real, why not known, since easier shunned?
God therefore cannot hurt ye; and be just;
Not just, not God; not feared then, nor obeyed
Your fear itself of death removes the fear.
Why then was this forbid? Why but to awe,
Why but to keep ye low and ignorant,
His worshippers” (*PL*; IX, 696-705).

God had said, “Ye shall not eat Thereof, nor shall ye touch it, lest ye die” (IX, 62-63). Of all the fruits in all the growing trees in the Garden of Eden, God commanded that Adam and Eve could not eat from this particular tree, and warned them that if they did, they would die. Satan assures Eve that he has not been harmed by the fruit himself, but rather has gained a life even more spectacular than what he was fated to live. He says, “How could ye? By the fruit? It gives you life To knowledge. By the Threat’ner? Look on me, Me who have touched and tasted, yet both live, And life more perfect have attained than Fate Meant me” (IX, 686-690). Satan questions her further, making her unsure of God’s determination, inquiring whether God would doom her “for such a petty trespass, and not praise Rather your dauntless virtue” (IX, 693-694). He manages to persuade her, and convinces her that the fruit will merely open her eyes to see “That ye should be as gods” (IX, 710). As I have demonstrated from the lines of Exodus, God is an envious God, and even Eve is confused by the idea of such an unfair God can be, as Satan continues to feed her insecurities and ambition; “Or is it envy, and can envy dwell In Heav’nly breasts?” (IX, 729-730). And thus, a confused Eve with a lack of understanding of God, and with an appetite for Satan’s knowledge growing, was at last compelled.

“Forbidden them to taste: knowledge forbidd’n?
Suspicious, reasonless. Why should their Lord
Envy them that? Can it be sin to know,
Can it be death? And do they only stand
By ignorance, is that their happy state,
The proof of their obedience and their faith?” (*PL*; IV, 515-520)

Eve struggles to understand how the serpent can be reasonable, can live, and disclose such amazing qualities after eating the intellectual food. “Irrational till then. For us alone Was death invented? Or to us denied This intellectual food, for beasts reserved?” (IX, 766-678). The beasts, she observes, seem to be with joy. This fear of death, not quite understanding what death is, grows on her conscience as she ponders whether the cure to her ignorance will be the divine fruit. Thus, I can safely conclude, that the tree, in the case of Adam and Eve, represents an obedience which is due to a lack of knowledge. Satan has successfully portrayed Adam and Eve to be obedient only because of their fear and ignorance, not out of faith, and sinful not as a consequence of disobedience, but as a consequence of their sinning human nature.

Conclusion

In this thesis, I desired to examine the notions of reason, will, and morality as they are typically illustrated through human behavior. Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Hobbes' *Leviathan* provide two contradictory representations of this. I have succeeded in differentiating Hobbes' philosophical reflections from that of Milton's, and in this process, I discovered several not only religious, but instinctual standards, which place these two seventeenth century writers in comprehensive disagreement from one another.

John Milton intended to defend God's ways to man in his beautiful and epic poem, *Paradise Lost*, and the accomplishment of his attempt has been a topic of discussion since its publishment. Milton, unceasing in his faith, of both God and man as His creation, prospered in maintaining hope for mankind under circumstances where it deserved otherwise. In Milton's loud demands for freedom, I discovered his fundamental belief in mankind as deserving of true liberty. Marjorie H. Nicolson clarifies the matter in the essay "Milton and Hobbes", where it is plainly written: "Milton, as to the English Platonists, the natural was good: Nature, matter, instincts, are of God, and hence cannot be evil" (413).

Throughout this thesis I have, through inspection of both Milton and Hobbes, proposed several chapters on the issue of human will, and how it is best organized when it becomes subject to change and challenges. Milton was confident that the good which lies in man, "may be discerned" (416), but his instinct, nevertheless, remains unchanged. Reason, naturally "becomes dim only when man allows his passions to usurp the authority of reason" (418). Reason, Milton believed, could be confronted with temptations and passions that are sinful, but through faith in God, and therefore faith in a divinity in oneself, man is always able to resist such appetites if he desires to. If one does not submit to temporal temptations, the consequences have proven to be dreadful. Marjorie explains that when man gives into appetite rather than will, reason is lost, "and man, the image of God, becomes no more than beast. (418). This becomes visible by the Fall, where Adam and Eve subjected themselves to their animal instincts; 'For Understanding ruled not, and the Will heard not her lore, both in subjection now To sensual appetite, who from beneath, Usurping over sovran Reason, claimed Superior sway (*PL*, IX, 1127).

Fall, the first disobedience of man, proved to be essential to Milton in understanding human behavior, and in God's just punishment of such behavior. Not only have I presented multiple different analyses of the poem, and of the falling Adam and Eve, but I have

challenged Milton's ambivalent descriptions of his characters of God and Satan. His point stands solid regardless of the critique, and he firmly believes that; "Things are good and bad in themselves; and Reason, governing the passions, sees through the apparent to the reality beneath" (419). Man, after all, was created free. This is Milton's principal argument for human nature. God created man free, and if man wishes to be consumed by passions, he is free to do such. However, "God did not make man to fall" (428). Rather, in this freedom, Milton wishes that man finds salvation and at last, achieves divine providence.

Hobbes has, undeniably, contributed with *Leviathan* to the English philosophical and political ideas which have aided the organization of society. To accomplish a secure performance of freedom, Hobbes has established that man needs a concentration of power that will dominate what behavior is tolerated. Civil law, then, must not be represented around Milton's hope of how man can choose to be, but around the factual evidence of man as he is. Marjorie explains that Hobbes denied the existence of an "inner principle" in man that would provide an outcome of peace. He believed that only "external law, with its foundation in external authority" (408) could guarantee the safety of man and society. Without a universal and definitive moral compass to guide man, he will act out of instinct, and Hobbes assures that this instinct will lead him to behave on behalf of his own interests.

Man, no more than beast, remains an instinctual creature, "desiring above all else self-preservation." This is how Hobbes explains the endless human longing for power, and claims that to achieve his own desires, humans will "go to any length – not only will, but, according to the frankly materialistic ethics of Hobbes, should do so". Goodness, after all, is to all humans what they desire it to be, and what men is "life above all". Therefore, "Choice then, in Hobbes's system, lies in an action of the will, moved by instinct, toward what seems good to the individual" (415). Humans, in Hobbes' understanding, will instinctively follow passion which will, ultimately, result in a collision with another man's passion. Reason cannot, in this manner, be a natural indication of good and wrong, but will merely decide whether a thing is good or evil by the circumstances which presents them. "As men differ in 'constitution', says Hobbes, they will differ in regard to what they consider good and evil" (420). A thing, therefore, can never in itself be described to be neither good nor bad. Man simply yields the thing towards good or bad in accordance with the purpose it serves himself, and the value, "is given to the thing by the will of the man who chooses to have it" (416).

Milton argued that man had become no "more than beast" in submitting to his appetites, however, Hobbes argues that such appetites express the natural condition of man. Mankind

alone, cannot control such passions, and need a firm sovereign and civil laws to ensure their welfare. This is Hobbes understanding of the Fall, and of Adam and Eve's natural falling behavior. "Adam's nature led him to take delight in sensuous beauty; by 'following nature' he would, on this occasion, have erred" (417).

In conclusion, I recognize and praise Milton's enduring faith in humanity. However, I have presented enough material for it to be manifest that the relationship between religion and politics, has proven itself too complex to be mobilized around individual wishes alone. Hobbes has explored such liberalism and deemed it unfit to distribute a collective wellbeing, as has been demonstrated by the English Wars of Religion. Both Hobbes and Milton outlived the shatters of a destructed civility, and yet, their understandings of the causes which led to such terrible conditions, resulted in complete contradiction. I deem Hobbes' desire for a united sovereign plausible and I believe that it will lead to far more attainable results.

Milton's paradise was indeed lost, but Hobbes' *Leviathan* provides methods to create a new utopia that will not waver, so long as man does not rely on himself alone – or that of a divine spirit - to be the judge of good and evil; but rather, the solid civil laws.

Works Cited

Adair, John, *Puritans; Religion and Politics in Seventeenth Century England and America*. 1998, Sutton Pub.

Andrew, G. Edward. "Hobbes on Conscience within the Law and without". *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 1999, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 203-225. Canadian Political Science Association.

Bell, Millicent, "The Fallacy of the Fall in *Paradise Lost*". *PMLA*, 1953, Vol. 68, No. 4, pp. 863-883. Modern Language Association.

Bejan, M. Teresa. "Teaching the 'Leviathan': Thomas Hobbes on Education". *Oxford Review of Education*, 2010, Vol. 36, No. 5, Political and Philosophical Perspectives on Education. P. 1, PP. 507-626. Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Brown, R. Mary. *'Paradise Lost' and John 15: Eve, the Branch and the Church*. *Milton Quarterly*, 1986, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 127-131. Wiley.

Bryson, Michael. Movesian, Arpi, *Love and its Critics*. "Paradise Lost: Love in Eden, and the Critics who Obey", Chap. 10, pp. 468-500, 2020. Open Book Publishers.

Burgess, Glenn. *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*. 2011, Routledge.

Campbell, Gordon. Corns, N. Thomas. *Milton: Life, Work, and Thought*. 2008, 488 pp. Oxford University Press.

Corbett, Mitchell. Julia, Michael. *Politics and Religion in the United States*. 1999, Taylor & Francis. Chap 3. Vol. 1197.

Forsyth, Neil. "Paradise Lost and the Origin of Evil: Classical or Judeo-Christian?" *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 2000, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 516-548. Springer.

- Gaskill, Malcolm. "Witchcraft and Evidence in Early Modern England". *Past & Present*, 2008, No. 198, pp. 33-70. Oxford University Press on behalf of The Past and Present Society.
- Gilbert, H. Allan, "The Problem of Evil in 'Paradise Lost'". *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 1923, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 175-194. University of Illinois Press.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan* (1651)
- Hovorun, Cyril. *Ideology and Religion*. *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal* 3, 2016, pp. 23-35. National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.
- Huntington, Samuel. "Conservatism as an ideology". *American Political Science Review*, 1957, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 454-473.
- Lim, S.H. Walter, "Adam, Eve, and Biblical Analogy in Paradise Lost". *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 30, No. 1, *The English Renaissance*, pp. 115-141. Rice University.
- Low, Anthony. "Milton's World View". 3.17, New York University, NY, U.S.A, pp. 84-102. <https://www.utpjournals.press/doi/pdf/10.3138/uram.9.2.84>
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost* (1667) Edited with an Introduction and Notes by John Leonard.
- Moloney, Pat. "Leaving The Garden of Eden: Linguistic and Political Authority in Thomas Hobbes". *History of Political Thought*, 1997, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 242-266. Imprint Academic Ltd.
- Nohrnberg, James. "The Religion of Adam and Eve in 'Paradise Lost'". *Religion & Literature*, 2013, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 160-179. University of Notre Dame.
- Nicolson, H. Marjorie, "Milton and Hobbes". *Studies in Philology*, 1926, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp-405-433. University of North Carolina Press.

Okada, Takuya. "Religious Liberty and Authority: Hobbes's Use of the Bible in Leviathan In the Context of the English Civil War". MPhil, degree.

Owen, J. Judd, "The Tolerant Leviathan: Hobbes and the Paradox of Liberalism". *Polity*, 2005, Vol. 37, no. 1, Fashion for Democracy, pp. 130-148. The University of Chicago press on behalf of the Northeastern Political Science Association.

Peters, G. John. *Father, King, and God: John Milton's Prose Response to Monarchy*. *The Midwest Quarterly*, 2008 49, (3), pp. 228-44. University of North Texas.

Prynne, William, *A Briefe Memento to the Present Unparliamentary Junto*. 1648.

Rudnytsky, L. Peter, "Freud as Milton's God". *American Imago*, Vol. 71, No. 3, 2014, pp. 253-287. The John Hopkins University Press.

Skinner, Quentin. "The Ideological Context of Hobbes' Political Thought." *The Historical Journal*, 1966, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 286-317. Cambridge University Press.

Thornton, Helen. «Cain, Abel and Thomas Hobbes». *History of Political Thought*, 2002, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 611-633. Imprint Academic Ltd.

The Holy Bible, King James Edition, 1611.

Urban, V. David. "The Falls of Satan, Eve, and Adam in John Milton's Paradise Lost: A Study in Insincerity." *The Conference on Christianity and Literature*, 2017, Vol. 67, p. 89-112. Calvin College, Us.

Watchtower, 129: 19, 1 October 2008, 27.

Wilson, Peter. "The Causes of the Thirty Year War 1618-48". *English Historical Review*, Jun. 2009, Vol. 124, No. 502, pp. 554-586. Oxford University Press.

Witte, John. "Magna Carta, Religion, and the Rule of Law *Journal of Law and Religion*, 2015, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 428-445. Cambridge University Press.