

2003

“Guided by faith and matchless Fortitude”: Milton’s Portrayal of the Son in *Paradise Lost*

Ryan McCarty
Grand Valley State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mcnair>

Recommended Citation

McCarty, Ryan (2003) “Guided by faith and matchless Fortitude”: Milton’s Portrayal of the Son in *Paradise Lost*,” *McNair Scholars Journal*: Vol. 7: Iss. 1, Article 13.
Available at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mcnair/vol7/iss1/13>

“Guided by faith and matchless Fortitude”: Milton’s Portrayal of the Son in *Paradise Lost*



Ryan McCarty
McNair Scholar

ABSTRACT

Though he was Secretary of Language during Oliver Cromwell’s Puritan rule of England, John Milton never referenced the authoritarian figure in his greater works. Through examinations of texts discussing Paradise Lost in reference to seventeenth century British history, this essay seeks to show the placement of Cromwell as the Son. Although several dominant figures in the field of Milton studies have produced works that support this thesis, there has been no direct connection between the two militant figures of Christ and Cromwell. Investigating Milton’s philosophies regarding the timeless nature of his work, the significant anthropomorphic intentions of Paradise Lost become apparent.

Introduction

A self-perceived inability to talk about or assign characteristics to God was one of Milton’s principle concerns while he was composing *Paradise Lost*. He questions himself about this difficulty most overtly at the onset of book one and again in the beginning of book three. In tone and context, his famous “May I express thee unblam’d” is inherently pessimistic. He feared from the very beginning that the flaws of mortality would overcome every divine providence bestowed upon him and render his God and Heavenly Host less than divine. Strangely, the idea of the qualities of these figures – a more illusive topic than one investigating their actual portrayals – is addressed much more frequently. There is actually very little speculation on the literal portrayal of the Heavenly family that Milton presents in the text. While the general avoidance of God in dissection and criticism is understandable in its metaphysical density, there is less reason for speculation to be led away from Milton’s character of the Son, being presented as a type of human figure within the majority of the text. The Son – even in the strictly Christian sense, removed from the context of Milton and *Paradise Lost* – is a much fuller character than God. The most basic sense of this is the duality of his nature, between man and godhead. Being both limitless in his heavenly form and constrained in his human form, the Son becomes a more accessible character than God, reasonably so in his role as the intercessor for mankind.

As the true center of his religious system of beliefs, it is impossible to conceive of Milton not lavishing special thought and attention on the heavenly form of his Messiah. Through an investigation of a combination of texts discussing *Paradise Lost*, as well as several of Milton’s writings, an idea of anthropomorphic characterization becomes clearer – showing that Milton



Jim Persoon, Ph.D.
Faculty Mentor

drew a definite connection between the figurehead of his spiritual life and that of his material life. Portraying Oliver Cromwell as his military Christ-figure, Milton asserted his ideas of the Puritan elect as well as the timelessness of Man's historical-spiritual struggle against Satan, evil, and inherent sin. A dual motive of this nature has not previously been suggested of Milton's epic; however, there have been connections made between secondary characters and other political figures of his time. By combining current knowledge of historical events in the mid-seventeenth century, the similar themes in Milton's political tracts and pamphlets, and modern insight into *Paradise Lost* itself, the possibility of Milton inserting Oliver Cromwell as his Messiah figure is extremely pronounced.

Seventeenth Century English Views of Ireland

Catherine Canino, in a discussion of the anti-Irish sentiments of Milton and his peers, maintains that "the association of the Irish with the infernal had become the unofficial position of the Puritan government" (Canino 17). This idea, propagated initially by Milton's own disdain for the Irish, is visible in his *Observations upon the Articles of Peace*. (Canino 18) After the outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641, she asserts that Milton began collecting material from the events of the small but powerful insurgency in order to show the connection of "the diabolic nature of the Irish rebellion to its hellish origin" (Canino 18). This Gaelo-phobic instigation was undoubtedly easy to incite in the English due to the pagan and subsequent Catholic society of Ireland; therefore the portrayal of the Irish as the infernal host is, while surprising in modern criticism, not unlikely in the seventeenth century context. Having been traditionally less manageable than other subjugated

peoples of the Isles, the Irish faced heavily prejudiced Parliamentary measures at the hands of the English colonizers.

Since the colonization of Ulster in the early seventeenth century, Catholic Anglo-Irish occupants had owned and controlled at least a third of the land in the region. Though the "Old English," as they were referred to, did not control the entire government outright, continued allegiance was recognized and appreciated by the powers in England (Perceval-Maxwell 6). However, with the growth of Protestantism in the Irish Parliament – encouraged by the increasing power of the Puritans in England – the allegiance of the weakening minority began to lose its prominence. As descendents of original colonists in Ireland, the Old English felt ignored and slighted by the new Parliamentary legislation that failed to adequately distinguish them from the Irish. Furthered by the anti-Catholic tactics employed in the late 1630s, the Old English first experienced the true disregard and indifference of the Puritan English Parliament, driving them toward a grudging unification of cause with the Irish locals in an attempt to block the efforts to transfer power into a Protestant Puritan parliament of Ireland.

In 1641, the bulk of the uprising known locally in Ireland and England alike as Sir Phelim O'Neill's Rebellion began, though there was little decisive quality to the skirmishes – the local Old English uniting with the Irish against the growing power of the English Parliament with marked hesitation (Moody 200). Such a combination of treason by Englishmen – along with Catholic Counter Reformation aid allegedly seeping in from Rome – no doubt influenced the early connections in the minds of the Puritans of the rebels with luring, satanic principles. The change in perception of Irish quality was instantaneous. Before the

revolution, there was little but base condescension given to the Irish – the general rhetoric of colonizers toward the colonized. Following the outbreak of the rebellion, the average English perception of the inhabitants of Ireland, particularly Ulster, was that they "owed their allegiance not simply to Rome and Spain but also to Hell itself" (Canino 15). After the reports of the massacre of several Protestant families near Ballaghonery Pass began circulating in England, the conflict quickly declined into base acts of violence on both sides with little decisive progress for either party.

With the removal of Charles I in 1649, Parliament was able to turn its full attention toward the situation in Ireland. When Cromwell personally landed in Dublin in 1649, the sweeping effects of his military prowess were instantaneous. The rebellion was decimated with such ferocity that it "became indelibly impressed upon the folk memory of the Irish." (Moody 202) In the same way that Milton's description of the fallen angel's fear "Of thunder and the Sword of Michael", the "Curse of Cromwell" became a rhetorical figure in Irish speech both in its recollection of the violence of the Puritan armies during the massacres in Drogheda and Wexford as well as in its lasting effects on practices related to the ownership of land in Ireland (Hunt 526).

Understanding Cromwell's decisive victory over the Irish is paramount in a discussion of his Christ-like person in the eyes of his Puritan followers. This victory, with respect to the war in heaven, was of a timeless nature. Upon both occasions, each faction deteriorated "to a common denominator of blind violence... until the decisive intervention of the Son" (Hill 362). Cromwell was likewise the conqueror of the essential third day of the rebellion. After indecisive fighting between the two factions, the figure of "matchless

Fortitude” overthrows the usurpers at the moment of his arrival. Prior to his arrival, the Irish had scored many small victories, although the singular event marking their progress was the defeat of the numerically superior Anglo-Scots soldiers by O’Neill at Benburb. Though this was a significant blow against the power of the English forces, they were able to maintain consistent victories as well – maintaining control over the significant strongholds of Derry and Carrickfergus. The English, through the Royalist Anglo-Irish, also maintained unofficial control over Dublin – although it was not a Puritan landmark.

The flow of events throughout the majority of the conflict is marked only by the initial imposition of the English forces upon the rebels in early 1642 – a period followed by more inconsistencies in successes for either side – and by O’Neill’s victory at Benburb in 1646. This, again, was followed by a period of indecisive fighting, until the arrival of Cromwell in 1649 (Moody 202). The similarity of the two conflicts from this perspective is striking in the distinctive use of three events: an initial point for the ruling force, an equal point for the rebellious force, and the complete victory of the ruling force upon the arrival of the powerful figurehead. The Son and Cromwell are the matching hinges to each of these occurrences. By being so fully linked to the historical episode, the action of *Paradise Lost* takes on a new archetypal flow; it is seen as the celestial model upon which all terrestrial events are based.

Seventeenth Century English Views of History

Milton faced a similar dilemma to that of Raphael when he attempted to relate “To human sense th’ invisible exploits/ Of warring Spirits.” The spiritual world is infinitely larger and more complex than the corporeal. As Raphael is descending from Heaven, “to all the

Fowles he seem/ A *Phœnix*”, he then is suggested to return “to his proper shape.” As he is no longer in the eternal world, but in the finite mortal world, he must adjust himself in order to fit contextually – the humanoid form he takes is a proper shape in the material world is. As he speaks with Adam, “as friend with friend,” Raphael reduces and reconfigures all aspects of himself and his narrative to fit the needs of Man’s limited perception. Adam is therefore conversing with what he feels is a divine, yet humanoid, being. This deliberate manipulation of human conceptualization by Raphael is apparent beyond the visible aspects of this self-presentation. Through the use of a human-styled model in his education of Adam, Raphael delivers a prefix to the base Christian instructional mannerisms utilized in the colonial actions of the seventeenth century missionaries. He tells the story of the War in Heaven through ideas with which Adam is familiar. Likewise, Milton presents the eternal events of heaven through a text utilizing aspects of ephemeral nature. By using the events he was most immediately immersed within, Milton managed to do as the archangel did and compare “spiritual to corporal forms.” These events include not only the actions of his immediate political peers, but also their similarity to those of the Biblical figures who Milton identified as essential portions of an understanding of creation.

The idea of Milton combining political figures of his time with Biblical characters is not strange or even particularly questionable. J.H. Hanford wrote that Milton “contemplated no activity as a poet which did not involve an intimate relation with the currents of life and thought in which he lived” (qtd. in Hill 7). As a politician and theologian, he was not an uncharacteristically original thinker. “He is unique only in the way he combined their ideas and

related them to the Bible” (Hill 6). For Milton, there was not a definite line between his political and spiritual convictions – one related to the other in a clear fashion. The Puritan Revolution was a revolution of God’s people against the tyranny of those with inferior belief systems as far as Milton was concerned. In *Eikonoklastes*, he openly attributes characteristics of Pharaoh and Satan to Charles I and also refers to the Catholic church and their marriage doctrines as the “Antichrist” in *Tetrachordon*. (Riverside 1032) He is, therefore, using the Bible in a strikingly symbolic sense, illustrating points about issues of his own time with canonical examples. In her comparison of political treatment in *A Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes* and *The Readie and Easy Way*, Mary Ann Radzinowicz addresses Milton’s spiritual and political congruencies. She asserts that Milton used the highly self-conscious nature of poetry to intermingle his political agenda (Radzinowicz 216). In the context of his use of biblical figures as contemporaries of his own political sphere, this was not an uncharacteristic maneuver by Milton. Neither was it particularly unprecedented for the royalist pamphleteers to do likewise, albeit on a smaller and simpler scale. Sharon Achinstein shows that in *Lucifer’s Lifeguard: Containing a Schedule, List, Scroll, or Catalogue* royalist propaganda writers associate leaders of the Puritan government with lines of historical evil figures. She states that this philosophy “insists that there is a correlation between the one who brought down Charles I and the one who brought down Christ.” (Achinstein 196). Read as a list of the alleged full paternal names of the Puritans, Cromwell is titled by the pamphlet as “Nimrod Herod Oliver Aeldama Cromwell”. (qtd. in Achinstein 196) This type of characterization was seemingly common in the seventeenth century English

pamphlet wars, using the power of religion to influence political ends – though not many would question the sincerity with which Milton spoke and wrote of the matters of his faith. In Protestant form, Milton treated the Bible as the center of Christian understanding. However, he saw that his contemporary Christians could learn from the modeled designs of the holy text. The stories contained within were individual instances of a larger pattern. It, therefore, becomes apparent that while Milton clearly acknowledged the Bible as the true Word of God, he also felt that it “contained fundamental truths about humanity” (Hill 342). Likewise, in specific actions within his greater epics, he sought to express what he saw as general truth.

This singular characterization is fully applicable to the greater realm of human history, showing the use of biblical and Miltonic characters as parts of this larger continuum of history. Christopher Hill extensively dissects this aspect through investigation of the metaphysical Miltonic civil war, inferring connections between historical and fictional characters in order to show the direct relationship between the war in heaven and the Puritan war against the Royalists in England (Hill 350). He addresses the issue of postlapsarian history as a simultaneous continuation of this one great conflict. Stanley Fish asserts that according to Milton, “all history is a replay of the history he is telling, all rebellions one rebellion, all falls one fall, all heroisms the heroism of Christ” (Fish 35). Besides supporting the idea of a multiple occurrence of heroic Christ-figures, this also implies that all infamy is the infamy of Satan. To Milton and his contemporaries, the original events of the Bible are reoccurring events – perhaps the essence of the only possible flow of history. For instance, Moloch, at the instant of the Fall, is also tempting Solomon “by fraud to build/ His temple

right against the temple of God”, while simultaneously committing numberless other atrocities before mankind. Radzinowicz suggests that all postlapsarian falls, such as that of Nimrod, also extend the context of historical continuity into a series of infinite falls (Radzinowicz 217). Likewise, the Son is perpetually hurling Lucifer from the heavens and creating Satan. Due to the boundless nature of God, all events may occur or be referential actions in relation to each other. This truism is applicable to Milton’s epic as well, as is evident in the re-use of the Easter resurrection sequence in the War in Heaven. It is suggested that the Son is absent until “the third sacred Morn” in both occasions, until he makes his triumphant victory over Death and Satan. If one instance of the victory of the Son may be seen as a re-telling of the other, it stands to reason that the pursuit of God’s kingdom on Earth during the Puritan overthrow is only another extension of the Son’s battle against the conflicting parties.

Though this philosophy would ideally apply to all of humanity, it is more immediately associated with the leaders of Christ’s community in this world. Hill concludes that Milton finds all great men to be a piece of the Christ-body, and acting on behalf of humanity in its continual process of loss and salvation. This is the action upon the material world of the Son, as he progresses through time unconstrained. Throughout his works, Milton’s portrayal of the Son is uniform in several manners – the most important of these being an aspect that is arguably inherent in the Biblical figure as well. As well as being linked in Miltonic philosophy to humanity through the great men of history, the Son is depicted as an omnipresent force in Heaven. He embodies all of the faithful angelic host as well: “His Armie, circumfus’d on

either Wing,/ Under thir Head imbodyed all in one.” The Son therefore really embodies all of creation – he is at once every faithful aspect of Heaven and Earth. By the command of God, all of heaven shall “Under his great Vicegerent Reign abide/ United as one individual Soule”.

Though encompassing all creation, the figure of the Son is himself, already clearly divided into pre and post-transfiguration states through a strict use of naming – the heavenly figure as “the Son” and the messianic figure as the various names associated with the living body of Jesus Christ. Further suggesting a multiplicity in the Son, Milton attributes divine qualities in historically great men to the subtle presence of the divine essence (Hill). By embodying the struggle for salvation in an unending line of Christ figures, Milton has differentiated further between the complete heavenly essence of the Son and the mortal figure of Jesus Christ. This is the manner in which Milton begins to illuminate his inclusive godhead. During the revelation of the future of mankind in the final books of *Paradise Lost*, Michael shows Adam that “much more good thereof shall spring” through the actions of the Son. In this speech, he relates the stories of the greatest prophets of the Bible – showing their unanimously humble beginnings, each immersed in cites of Man. Revealing the rise of each man to the cause of God, the figures each are shown as steps in the process necessary to bring Man back to redemption. Each becomes a part of the messianic process, their interconnectedness with Christ being best illustrated in “Joshua whom the Gentiles *Jesus* call.” Both words literally mean “savior” (Shawcross 509). Christ’s resurrection is obviously the largest piece of this process, however it is clearly not the final step in Man’s redemption.

With this understanding, the text of *Paradise Lost* can be seen as a microcosm of timeless creation according to seventeenth century and more specifically, Miltonic philosophy, with the understanding that history reveals itself in its entirety through the actions and reactions of the Fall. Singular characters in the text are seen as a multitude of historical figures. Working as both a didactic text and as a prophesy, *Paradise Lost* illustrates the transgression of Man, but it also suggests that this transgression may become part of an effort towards transcendence – therefore the smaller acts of Man are put into focus as steps toward a return to the confidence of God. (Radzinowicz 218)

This suggests that there is a spiritual evolution in what very much appears to be an early Christian version of the *Übermensch* – that humanity is being directed back toward heavenly ways by the influence of the greater men. These greater men flow in a continuum from Adam and continue through Christ and into the modern world, each contributing a piece of themselves toward the furthering of God's people. Perceiving Cromwell – in his role at the head of his Puritan reformation – as a steward of God's kingdom on Earth, Milton undoubtedly found him to be another piece of this spiritual progression.

Cromwell and Jesus

As two separate historical events taking place in roughly the same time, the Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the English Civil War are distinctive sources for the historical precedents within the action in *Paradise Lost*. Both contain the fundamental elements of philosophical-religious difference and a desire by the subject for emancipation from their subjugators. Though both of these rebellions, as well as the nature of their revolutionaries, were of a similar basis, each was specifically applied to either

the portrayal of the infernal or heavenly hosts by seventeenth century English writers and philosophers. Being the central figure in both of these events, Cromwell joins the historical narratives together in his dual participation. As the defater of perceived villainy and impurity in Ireland, and conversely, as the Puritan figurehead who fights to lead his people to the Promised Land, he is certainly the only reasonable historical individual that can be really imagined in Milton's illustration of "the chariot of paternal Deity", trampling over the "Exhausted, spiritless, afflicted, fall'n."

Plainly observed, there is only this slight piecing together of modern historical-literary insight necessary before finding the connection between Cromwell and the Son. When Harold Bloom asks, "Are we to be content with Jesus as a heavenly Rommel or Patton, victoriously leading the... attack", the answer is certainly in the negative (Bloom 6). This militant figure of Cromwell is, to Milton, the quintessential biblical-style leader of his time. Since the legalization of Christianity in the Roman Empire, most of the great historical figures had been Catholic. Still in its infancy, Cromwell was one of the first heroes of Protestant Puritanism. Through these military actions, Cromwell acts both as the leader and defender of the Commonwealth – in one aspect, by organizing the Puritan Parliament into a reformist force, and in the other, by overturning a threat to their national sovereignty by contrary ideologies.

Milton's address to Cromwell in *Sonnet 16* is delivered as a plea for both peace and a continuance of strength during the years following the overthrow of the Royalist state and the beheading of Charles I. By requesting that the Lord Protectorate show his strength of character before the "new foes" and their "secular chains", Milton bestows upon him the task of preserving the new

commonwealth from what he feels is a misguiding faction of the Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel (Shawcross 229). However, this sonnet also functions as a prefix to the presentation of authority in *Paradise Lost*. As an interior member of the Puritan government from its early stages, Milton worked in close connection with Cromwell and held him in authoritarian respect. It seems unlikely that Milton would give so little praise to Cromwell by only embodying him in a simplistic sonnet, a style of disregard Milton rather fawned on the disappointing figure of Fairfax. By placing the later Puritan figurehead with the other great leaders of men, he dually served the cause of the Commonwealth and furthered the idea of God in Man. As Noah and Moses had taken their people out of evil lands and times, towards the Promised Land, so Cromwell figuratively lead England out of the monarchial rule of Charles I and into the Commonwealth. Similarly, as Abraham had been a conqueror of the Hebrews, so was Cromwell a military hero of the new Puritanism. The emphasis of thought was not on being the entire embodiment of the Son, but a flawed and human portion of Him.

As the consistent figure through each of these veins of historical-authoritarian investigation, as well as being perceived as a definitively active pursuant of the restoration of God's people, Cromwell eventually can easily be recognized as a basis for Milton's character of the Son – in the inherent similarities there can be little doubt that in some way the figure of Cromwell influenced Milton enough to noticeably shape the portrayal. However, the assumed resolution of the question as to whether or not Milton *would* depict Cromwell as the Son does not fully acknowledge all aspects of doubt in this issue.

Doubt regarding the topic at hand may be explicitly found in Milton's

varied disappointment with the leaders of the Commonwealth once they took power. By the time Milton completed his epic, he had seen the abuses of power by the heads of the Reformation – dissatisfaction was suggested to have begun growing as early as late 1649. The simplest means of investigating Milton's preliminary ideas in this area are found within his own works. Similarly, resolution of modern critical ideas regarding the underlying philosophies of *Paradise Lost* and Milton in general, can often be found within themselves as well.

The act of placing Cromwell into a Christification mold is one that Milton had experimented with slightly in earlier creative works. *Sonnet 16* is concerned with the portrayals of authority, or at least as a prefix to the use of authority in *Paradise Lost*. First, it must be clarified that Milton made a specific effort not “to sing high praises of heroick men or famous Cities, unless he have in himselfe the experience and the practice of all which is praise-worthy.” (Milton qtd. in Radzinowicz 206) The inference of heroism or spiritual valor is not one that Milton lightly confers – being much more practiced in the personification of his adversaries as Satan, as is shown above. When Milton asserted in the sonnet that Cromwell was “Guided by faith and matchless Fortitude”, he does not insert the obligatory exception of God – a clarification he otherwise does not neglect to make. Clearly, these are descriptions that Milton would reserve for Christ, if any man. Being otherwise so conscious of aspects such as this, it is unlikely that Milton would place Cromwell in the role of “cheif of men” without prior reasoning and intent.

Through this same strain of thought also runs the question of how Milton could have accounted for the perceived shortcomings in Cromwell's personal character before deciding upon him as a Christ-figure. This is a sentiment due to

a modern construct of the Son, conceiving of him as a steward of peace and life. However, the idea of him as a warrior is explicitly set forth in the text, as he tells God “whom thou hat'st, I hate, and can put on/ Thy terrors”. Cromwell's personal shortcomings also make him consistent with the ideas above, relating the philosophy that great men are portions of the eternal body of the Son – not miniature versions of the larger figure. This is true for Christ as well, in that each “great man” constitutes a portion of the progression toward the movement to “regain the blissful Seat”. This is best shown in the assertion that it was Christ's “profest method not to teach them [his disciples] all things at all times, but each thing in due place and season”. (Milton qtd. in Fish 21) Like Christ's method of teaching, each of the pieces of the greater body of the Son has been assigned a specific task in the restoration of Man. Like the other great leaders of men like Moses, Noah, and Elijah, Cromwell was suited for his own contribution – though deficient in other aspects. Such an assertion lessens Cromwell's culpability in its similarity to all other men, allowing such praise of him as to be personified as the Son. He is not and was not divine or divine-like. However, in this simplicity, he acted in life his portion of the scheme Milton saw as God's eternal foresight.

In modern understanding of the text, there are certain amounts of uneasiness with the thought of portraying divinity through use of familiar human figures. Unable to account for this, many great Miltonists have taken to ignoring or refusing ideas relating to the embodiment of Heavenly characters in humanistic forms, while simultaneously supporting this idea within their work. In one instance, Stanley Fish contends that Milton is able to avoid what he calls “the falsification of anthropomorphism” – but in the preceding sentence, he speaks of Milton “forcing upon his

reader an awareness of his limited perspective”. (Fish 38) This is a slight contradiction insomuch as such an embodiment of the Son would be the most apparent way to remind readers of their inability to comprehend elements beyond the linear, human sphere. Also, the widely quoted “all the characters are on trial in any civilized narrative”, reinforces the reminder to the reader that as an imperfect being, Man is only capable of creating a character of flawed likeness to God. (Empson 94) Therefore, since simplification is the only applicable method available to Man, truth can only be discerned by “beginning with the text and dividing it and sub-dividing it until nothing remains to be explained”, as Fish claims is the choice method of the Puritan preacher (Fish 52). The reasonable outcome of such a simplification and familiarization of the Son is to eventually portray him as a man. However, the utilization of Christ for these purposes would be hardly helpful, as the Biblical character is nearly as inaccessible for portrayal as His celestial self. Instead, there Milton would have needed a tangible hero – hence the interjection of the head of his political life, Oliver Cromwell.

Conclusion

Much more than the overthrow of Charles I, Milton used the events in Ireland as a starting point for his celestial revolution – thereby illustrating the figure of Cromwell principally in the role of a defeater of tyranny and evil. This facilitated an easy propagation of Puritan doctrine in *Paradise Lost*. However, there was an inherent danger in the treatment of the topic. A considerable amount of caution went into the division of the differentiation of rebellion in the text, insisting that rebellion against an unworthy tyrant was much different than against that of Christianity and God himself. This may

have been due to the sensitive parallels between the monarchical qualities of his God and the Royalists – Milton was, after all, a rebel himself and was well aware of the precarious nature of any given perception of revolution. Despite the obvious contradictions, Milton succeeded in the portrayal of the Irish as villains and Cromwell as a heroic Christ-figure, largely because of reasonably broad support for the Puritan reformists and the intolerance of Roman Catholicism – not because of the rebellion of the Irish against English subjugation.

By following the somewhat linear path laid out above, it becomes clear that Milton used Cromwell in this role for both the propagation of the Good Old Cause, as well as the illustration of his philosophy regarding the essence of the Son. This is first done through the use of the Irish and Royalists as figures of evil in opposition to God. If the Puritan government acknowledged the Irish as an entity motivated by Satan, they likewise would see themselves as those who oppose evil – the people of God. As their leader initially as head of the Puritan army and later as Lord

Protectorate, Cromwell filled the Miltonic and seventeenth century English expectations of a Christ-figure – in the same way that Charles I adequately upheld the Puritan's ideas regarding Satan. Ultimately – though significant evidence exists beyond it – this dichotomy alone provides sufficient reasoning to illustrate Milton's portrayal of Cromwell as the Son.

Works Cited

- Achinstein, Sharon. *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader*. Princeton UP, 1994.
- Bloom, Harold. *John Milton's Paradise Lost*. Chelsea House, 2000.
- Canino, Catherine. "The Discourse of Hell: *Paradise Lost* and the Irish Rebellion" *Milton Quarterly* 32 (1998): 15-23.
- Empson, William. *Milton's God*. Norfolk, 1961.
- Fish, Stanley. *Surprised by Sin*. Harvard UP, 1997.
- Flannagan, Roy, ed. *The Riverside Milton*. Houghton Mifflin, 1998.
- Hill, Christopher. *Milton and the English Revolution*. Viking, 1977.
- Hunt, Lynn, ed. *The Making of the West*. Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001.
- Perceval-Maxwell, M. *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641*. McGill-Queens UP, 1994.
- Radzinowicz, Mary Ann. "The Politics of *Paradise Lost*" *The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*. Sharpe, ed. (1987): 204-229.
- Shawcross, John, ed. *The Complete Poetry of John Milton*. Anchor Books, 1971.