

4-2016

Becoming Self: A Jungian Approach to Paradise Lost

Geoffrey Kishbaugh
Grand Valley State University

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



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

ScholarWorks Citation

Kishbaugh, Geoffrey, "Becoming Self: A Jungian Approach to Paradise Lost" (2016). *Masters Theses*. 808.
<https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/theses/808>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research and Creative Practice at ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

Becoming Self: A Jungian Approach to *Paradise Lost*

Geoffrey Kishbaugh

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

In

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Arts in English

Department of English

April 2016

Dedication

To my parents, who supported my academic meanderings and encouraged me to pursue my passions.

Acknowledgements

In all things, I thank God for the life He has bestowed upon me. I hope that my work brings Him glory and draws others towards His beauty as revealed in literature.

I owe an enormous amount to my family, who has supported me during this strenuous process. First and foremost, my wife Andrea, who deserves more appreciation than I am able to express. She willingly followed me across the country so I could pursue my studies and has worked tirelessly to support us financially. She has been encouraging when I needed encouragement; challenged me when my work was unsatisfactory; and patient when my studies occupied the forefront of my attention. I am also indebted, quite literally, to my parents who supported Andrea and I financially despite the fact that, by every right, I should be supporting us. My desire has always been to affirm their investment by producing the best work that I can.

I also want to thank Professor Benjamin Lockerd for mentoring me during these past couple years. He is wise beyond his station and his guidance in my studies has allowed me to grow in my understanding of Milton. He has opened both his office and his home to me, feeding both my mind and body. His work with Jung was a catalyst for my own pursuit into Jungian theory, and my thesis owes much to his influence on my studies.

Lastly, to my friend Brandon Muri, whose knowledge and wisdom far exceeds my own, and yet, who willingly shared of it. Brandon and I forged a bond in my first semester as students of the Bard, brothers in Christ, and seekers of the Truth.

Abstract

When addressing *Paradise Lost*, the reader is not encountering static characters but is interacting with and being acted upon by highly symbolic manifestations of the primitive condition of humanity's collective psyche. In dealing with the figures of Christianity's mythos, John Milton creates a text that stimulates the collective unconscious of the reader and draws out the primordial expressions of the *self*—archetypal manifestations. Subsequently, these manifestations are projected back onto the figures within the text and the reader engages in a dynamic relationship with the poem as both the reader and the figures of Adam and Eve experience the process of individuation alongside one another. Carl Jung's archetypal theory offers a comprehensive blend of psychology and cultural anthropology with which to observe the individuation process, a four-stage psychological journey that involves an encounter with three archetypal manifestations: the *shadow*, the *anima(us)*, and the *wise old man* or *great mother*. Each of the predominant characters of the text act as an external projection of these internal psychological forms as the reader, along with Adam and Eve, encounters first the *shadow* in the form of Satan, next the *anima(us)* in the form of the contra-sexual other—Eve for Adam and Adam for Eve, and finally the *wise old man* or *great mother* who is simultaneously a representation of the *self* in the figure of the triune God. In the end, Adam and Eve achieve a state of individuated *self*-hood through the union of God with man, which is realized in the figure of the Christ. This image is the final manifestation of the reader's individuated *self*, a psychological state of internal and external harmony.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	3
Acknowledgements.....	4
Abstract.....	5
Table of Contents.....	6
Chapter I: A Brief History of Jungian Theory.....	7
Chapter II: Rejecting the <i>Persona</i> : On the Border of Individuation.....	19
Chapter III: Satan: The <i>Shadow</i> of Paradise.....	25
Chapter IV: I, <i>Anim(-a/-us)</i>	50
Chapter V: The Eternal <i>Self</i> : God in Spirit and Incarnate.....	77
Work Cited.....	97

I: A Brief History of Jungian Theory

O'er my thoughts

There hung a darkness, call it solitude

Or blank desertion. No familiar Shapes

Remained [...]

But huge and mighty Forms, that do not live

Like living men, moved slowly through my mind

By day, and were a trouble to my dreams.

—William Wordsworth

When engaging *Paradise Lost*, the reader is not interacting with the static figures of an antiquated myth, remnants of a less enlightened generation of humanity; rather, in this story “Of Man’s first disobedience” (Milton P.L. I, 1), the characters transcend the material and don the mantle of archetypal manifestations. These manifestations stimulate the contents of the collective unconscious within the reader and bring to the surface primordial expressions of the self, which find a physical medium of expression through the textual characters. While the persons of the text represent the literal figures of the Christian mythos that Milton captures, they also function as screens upon which the readers’ psychic contents are projected, allowing the audience to experience the process of individuation simultaneously with Adam and Eve. Thus, a symbiotic relationship is formed between text and reader as the text stimulates the reader’s psyche, animating dormant contents, which are then projected back onto the text. By utilizing Jung’s archetypal theory, this essay will follow the figures of Adam and Eve undergoing the process of individuation, a transformational sequence of psychic steps that is mirrored in the readers.

Jung lived during and influenced the period of modernity, a reality reflected in his

philosophy and worldview; however, his theories address and depend largely upon concepts dating back to the primitive stages of human development. Thus, Jung represents a fusion of antiquity with modernity as he combines turn-of-the-century psychology with a wide variety of philosophies, writings, and artistic expressions from around the world and from virtually every century dating back to the cave paintings at Lascaux. Jung's theory of the collective unconscious represents the cornerstone of his scholarship and is based upon the premise that the human psyche is sedimentary in its makeup, meaning that the mind is layered in much the same way as the earth's crust—the deeper the layer, the more primordial the substance. The topmost layer of the human psyche is identified as the personal conscious, the part that humans use to make decisions, pursue intellectual endeavors like logic, arithmetic or music, register the outside world and, in general, comprehend their own being. Ironically, this is the level that humans are rarely self-aware of because it has become second nature through habitual usage. (People rarely contemplate the fact that they are thinking when they are in the process of thinking; they just think.) Beneath the personal conscious is a second layer called the personal unconscious, a psychic realm of content that has been lost to the conscious but not to the mind. Jung's colleague Freud was one of the first researchers to give the personal unconscious agency within the individual. Jung summarizes Freud's so-called "acting subject" (C.W., 9i: 2) as "really nothing but the gathering place of repressed or forgotten contents" (9i: 2). For Jung, the personal unconscious is a dumping ground for the personal conscious, a sort of psychic landfill into which is actively, through repression, or passively, through mere slippage, placed content no longer pertinent to the personal conscious.

The concept of the personal conscious and personal unconscious was empirically established before Jung began to make his impact in psychoanalysis. While Sigmund Freud

believed that the psyche “is of an exclusively personal nature” (C.W., 9i: 2), Jung’s fundamental contribution to psychology and the foundation for his later work is the theorization of a third and deeper layer of the human psyche, a collective layer. Despite his claims of an exclusively personal mind, Freud encountered experiences within the psychic realm that contradicted his theory. Reflecting upon these anomalies in “Approaching the Unconscious,” Jung wrote “these elements, as I have previously mentioned, are what Freud called ‘archaic remnants’—mental forms whose presence cannot be explained by anything in the individual’s own life and which seem to be aboriginal, innate, and inherited shapes of the human mind” (57). Jung also observed contents of a similar alien nature in the dreams of his patients and, through further study, developed a third layer of the psyche to explain these deviations from Freud’s theory:

This personal unconscious rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn. This deeper layer I call the *collective unconscious*. I have chosen the term “collective” because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche, it has contents and modes of behavior that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is, in other words, identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us. (C.W., 9i: 3)

Building upon and deviating from his predecessor’s work, Jung explained the archaic remnants found within both his and Freud’s patients as the contents of a collective realm within the human psyche. According to Jung, the deepest stratum of the human psyche is a universal realm, in which dwells an abyss of contents that find their origin, if indeed there is an origin, with the dawn of the human species itself.

Jung went to great lengths to establish himself as, first and foremost, “an empiricist” (Jung, *Psychology and Religion*, 1), and despite criticisms about his work being too philosophical, he took great care to support his theoretical claims with empirical evidence. Like every phenomenon in science, a hypothesis remains a hypothesis until tested and proven as verifiably consistent through a strict set of procedures. For Jung’s hypothesis to be considered a valid theory, he had to empirically observe the collective unconscious. This produced a complication since “psychic existence can be recognized only by the presence of contents that are *capable of consciousness*” (Jung C.W., 9i: 4). In essence, the psychic realm only becomes evident and observable when the contents are recognized within the first layer of the psyche, the conscious. The existence of the conscious and personal unconscious had been established scientifically before Jung began his work—the contents of the conscious are themselves conscious and thus always manifested consciously. Beneath the surface, the personal unconscious is composed of “chiefly the *feeling-toned complexes*” (9i: 4) representing unconscious leanings and feelings towards an external concept: opinions, emotions, values, beliefs. These are manifested consciously through exercises like word associations and thus consciously observable.

To establish the collective unconscious as more than a psychological hypothesis, Jung needed to empirically recognize conscious contents that originated from the collective unconscious. Jung’s first step was to identify a method of eliciting the unconscious content in an observable manner. He decided to use dream interpretation because dreams “have the advantage of being involuntary, spontaneous products of the unconscious psyche and are therefore pure products of nature not falsified by any conscious purpose” (C.W., 9i: 100). Jung had his patients record their dreams, which he would analyze afterwards. Through this process, he discovered

that the dreamers' psyches manifest certain symbols, the archaic remnants of Freud. These symbols are of an alien nature to the dreamer, but they function within specific patterns coinciding with historical, religious, and mythological sources. As Jung concluded:

From the unconscious there emanate determining influences which, independently of tradition, guarantee in every single individual a similarity and even a sameness of experience, and also of the way it is represented imaginatively. One of the main proofs of this is the almost universal parallelism between mythological motifs, which, on account of their quality as primordial images, I have called *archetypes*.
(9i: 118)

These personally unknown but universal images are the contents of the collective unconscious manifest into consciousness. Jung witnessed symbolic manifestations within his patients' dreams that had appeared thousands of years ago in an ancient civilization's mythology or a primitive tribe's rites of initiation. Many of these symbols were obscure, identifiable only through highly specialized knowledge. Jung concluded that his patients would never have had conscious exposure to the images. Thus, Jung established the theory of archetypes within modern psychology.

It is also important to distinguish the subtle difference between the archetype itself and the empirical evidence Jung gathered that proved existence of the archetypes. Far from being definitive entities, archetypes are nebulous concepts that defy definition. Jung wrote that "the ultimate core of meaning may be circumscribed, but not described" (C.W., 9i: 265). The inability to pinpoint what exactly the archetypes were is one reason for the plethora of definitions that Jung uses to describe them, definitions that are similar but different. Such definitions included comparisons and equivocations of the archetypes to "the Platonic eidos" (9i: 5), "the unconscious

images of the instincts” (9i: 91), or even more abstract “a *facultas praeformandi*” (9i: 155), which roughly translates to a pre-existent ability or force. The manifestation of an archetype, which was the evidence gathered by Jung, was properly called an archetypal image, and it was the archetypal image that was perceived by Jung in his patients and in the symbols of human civilization. While the archetype is purely collective and abstract e.g., the idea of courage, the archetypal image is tainted with personal content as it emerges e.g., Hector as a figure of courage to a western individual or Shaka Zulu to an African. Each figure is an individualized character that represents the ideal of courage in their culture’s context. What is ultimately observable is a personalized manifestation of the universal.

The archetypes became the parameters by which Jung interpreted the actions of humanity. Far from being a *tabula rasa*, Jung argues that humans have unconscious contents imprinted upon their psyche from their conception. The archetypes ‘are patterns of instinctual behavior’ (C.W., 9i: 91), and are “carried on by biological inheritance” (*Psychology and Religion*, 112). If, as Jung argues, these archetypes are established biologically and inherent to human experience then they must have existed since the origin of humanity. (The archaic nature of the archetypes is a crucial component in validating the use of Jung’s theories when interpreting literary works from an earlier age.) Far from creating or conceiving the archetypes, Jung merely expresses the concept in modern terminology and within the scope of modern psychological applicability.

Although thousands of archetypal images exist, Jung identified six generic figures as the common manifestations of the collective unconscious:

...there are human figures that can be arranged under a series of archetypes, the chief of them being, according to my suggestion, the *shadow*, the *wise old man*,

the *child* (including the child hero), the *mother*, ('Primordial Mother' and 'Earth Mother') as a supraordinate personality ('daemonic' because supraordinate), and her counterpart the *maiden*, and lastly the *anima* in man and the *animus* in woman. (C.W., 9i: 309)

These six archetypes are classified as motifs by the sheer volume of representation found in both dreams and historical sources; thus, they represent a type of common thread, which may have been adjusted slightly in a particular individual's dream or society's religion. The slight variations in how an archetype manifests are a product of the personal unconscious adding individual contents to the collective material; thus, these universal motifs appear in much the same context and manner but with subtly different qualities that reflect the psychic substrate of the society or individual. However, the core of these motifs appears with a pattern of regularity, and the archetypal image itself contains a pre-coded meaning that remains a part of the manifestation despite the individual contents added by the psyche. Thus, these images, although slightly different, contain near identical meanings as a result of their archetypal origin.

While Jung proposed a biological origin for the archetypes, the concept of an inherent pattern coincides with the Platonic Form, which Jung felt was a pre-cursor to his theory:

It was not too difficult to understand Plato's conception of the Idea as supraordinate and pre-existent to all phenomena. 'Archetype,' far from being a modern term, was already in use before the time of St. Augustine, and was synonymous with 'Idea' in the Platonic usage. When the *Corpus Hermeticum*, which probably dates from the third century, describes God as το αρχέτυπόν φως, 'the archetypal light,' it expresses the idea that he is the prototype of all light; That is to say, pre-existent and supraordinate to the phenomenon 'light'. (C.W.,

9i: 149)

Jung's terminology offers the most accessible means of articulating the forms of Milton's text for a contemporary audience. Far from being ignorant of universal symbols, Milton would have seen and understood a pattern of images and forms exhibited in the philosophy and poetry of antiquity up through the Renaissance. Lyndy Abraham addresses the presence of alchemical, and therefore hermetic philosophy, in Milton's *Paradise Lost*: "It is clear that the alchemical language in this poem is not used as mere decoration. Alchemical theory is central to Milton's view of cosmic, physiological, and moral processes, and permeates his language and vision" (276). She also addresses Milton's extensive connections with well-known alchemists Samuel Hartlib, John Winthrop Jr., and Dr. Nathan Paget to name a few (261). The same philosophy that would influence Jung in the composition of his theories, leading eventually to *Psychology and Alchemy*, similarly contributed to Milton's perception of the world. However, Milton, as a Christian, would have believed God to be the source of all archetypes. In contrast, Jung saw the archetypes as a product of biology and would have considered the notion of "God" as a product of the archetypes and not the source. This is not to say that Jung was anti-religion; on the contrary, he believed religion to be an indispensable part of society, using significant religious imagery to convey his ideas. However, despite this difference, Jung's theories offer a succinct framework for retrospectively analyzing *Paradise Lost*.

One of the questions that Jung grappled with is "what is the biological purpose of the archetypes?" (C.W., 9i: 272). Jung's answer to his question was the theory of individuation, of which he writes, "I use the term 'individuation' to denote the process by which a person becomes a psychological 'in-dividual,' that is, a separate, indivisible unity or 'whole'" (9i: 490). Jung believed that modern society had lost touch with the primordial layer of the psyche and was

suffering as a result. A psychic struggle was constantly being waged in which the ego-centric conscious was attempting to suppress the unconscious. The goal of individuation was to “forge into an indestructible whole, an ‘individual’” (9i: 522), which came about through the process of assimilating the two oppositional forces in the human mind. Achieving a status of *self*-hood involves embracing all layers of the psyche, including both the positive and negative attributes of each layer. Individuation became the process by which Jung propagated the idea of becoming a whole and mentally stable individual.

The process of individuation begins by acknowledging the presence of a realm of psychic activity within the mind that lies beneath the *persona*. This leads to the understanding of dual personalities: the ego and the unconscious. The ego is represented by the conscious, to which Jung denoted the term, “*persona*, the mask of the actor” (C.W., 9i: 43), which is the face an individual presents to the external world. This involves an encounter with the *self*, or rather the internal attitude, the unconscious aspects of the *self*. Often, this stage is initiated through the reflective qualities of a “mirror,” manifested in symbolic acts like confession, which force people to confront the truth that, despite striving for goodness in thought, word, and deed, they still commit immoral acts on a daily basis, and are thus flawed. This flaw points to an aspect of the person that desires or willfully commits “wrongful” acts. In acknowledging one’s unconscious capacity for “evil,” the individual encounters both the positive aspects that are often accentuated by the conscious *persona* as well as the negative aspects, which are repressed from society (e.g., sins).

In experiencing the unconscious aspects of the psyche and recognizing their presence as such, an individual moves to the next step of the individuation process, which is a confrontation with the *shadow*, “the ‘negative’ side of the personality, the sum of all those unpleasant qualities

we like to hide, together with the insufficiently developed functions and the contents of the personal unconscious” (qtd. in Storr 87). The *shadow* is the first archetype to be encountered because, unlike the other archetypes, it resides heavily within the personal unconscious as opposed to being wholly situated in the collective unconscious. Like most archetypes, the *shadow* is quite often projected onto an external concept or entity, who comes to represent the negative aspects of a person. The *shadow* forces an individual to confront the truth that within himself or herself exists the capacity to perform acts of good and evil, and that, despite a person’s best efforts, the negative capacities will spontaneously emerge when the conscious willpower of repression falters. The *shadow* necessitates a process of harmonization and assimilation that forces the individual to acknowledge their capacity for negative actions and to confront that potentiality as opposed to continually repressing it until it explodes outward in unpredictable and uncontrollable outbursts.

Once the *shadow* is successfully integrated into the conscious psyche, the next phase of the individuation process manifests as an encounter with the contra-sexual soul-image of the individual:

In the unconscious of every man there is hidden a feminine personality, and in that of every woman a masculine personality. It is a well-known fact that sex is determined by a majority of male or female genes, as the case may be. But the minority of genes belonging to the other sex does not simply disappear. A man therefore has in him a feminine side, an unconscious feminine figure—a fact of which he is generally quite unaware. I may take it as known that I have called this figure the ‘anima,’ and its counterpart in a woman the ‘animus.’ (C.W., 9i: 511-512)

Jung gives the manifestation of the *anima* or *animus* a biological *raison d’être*, but the concept of

an individual having both masculine and feminine qualities is also foundational in iconography. Jung observes, “Since time immemorial man in his myths always manifested the idea of a coexistence of male and female in the same body. Such psychological intuitions were usually projected in the form of the divine syzygy, the divine pair, or of the idea of the hermaphroditic nature of the creator” (*Psychology and Religion*, 34). The contra-sexual manifestation of the collective unconscious forces a man to confront the feminine internal attitude that complements the masculine external *persona* and vice versa in a woman. Like the *shadow*, the *anima(us)* is typically projected upon an external entity. This figure varies in accordance to the individual, but a deeply dependent bond is almost always the result of the projection. In rare cases, the *anima(us)* is not projected and the resulting condition is a form of psychic narcissism. Just as an unwillingness to accept the *shadow* causes psychic trauma as well as external sociocultural damage, so too does an inability to accept the contra-sexual aspects of an individual create an unhealthy mental and relational state.

When acceptance and union of the contra-sexual aspects of the individual are realized, the next archetypes to manifest are of a same-sex nature: in men the *wise old man* and in women the *great mother*. The purpose of these figures is twofold: to act as a guide to aid the individual in an understanding of his or her relation to the natural as well as the spiritual, and to complete the “*marriage quaternio*” (Jung C.W., 9ii: 42), which is composed of the external *persona*, (corresponding to the sex of the subject); the partner of the subject, who is of the opposite sex; the internal attitude or *anima(us)*; and the final element, the *wise old man* or *great mother*. For Jung, the quaternity is of immense symbolic significance. In *Psychology and Alchemy*, Jung quotes the Axiom of Maria: “One becomes two, two becomes three, and out of the third comes the one as the fourth” (qtd. in C.W., 12: 26). The marriage, which becomes a quaternity from its

trium state, derives the fourth element from the *wise old man* or *great mother*, which is also the *self*. This fourth and final piece of the quaternity is also representative of the marriage as a whole. While the individuated *self* is always manifested in a same-sex image, the *wise old man* or *great mother* can play a role in the individuation of either gender; thus, a fully individuated man will always manifest his psyche as the *wise old man*, but he may still be assisted in the individuation process by the *great mother*, and vice versa for a woman. While the *wise old man* represents full individuation for a man, the figure in women “corresponds to the so-called ‘positive’ animus who indicates the ability of conscious spiritual effort” (C.W., 9i: 396). A similar corollary holds true for the *great mother*, who represents the individuated *self* of the woman, but “for a man the mother typifies something alien, which he has yet to experience and which is filled with the imagery latent in the unconscious” (9i: 192). It is only after individuals have come to accept their existence as both a spiritual and natural being, of both feminine and masculine qualities, and capable of both good and evil that the unity of the *self* is achieved. The *self*, according to Jung, “is a God-image or at least cannot be distinguished from one” (C.W., 9ii: 42).

Jung describes the process of individuation in a rather linear manner, going from *persona* to *shadow* to *anima(us)*, to *wise old man/mother* to *self*. This method provides a comprehensive model for the reader to understand the theory; however, rarely does individuation happen in such a clean and progressive manner. How each phase of individuation emerges and is played out differs for each individual, and sometimes, the phases overlap so that one begins before another fully ends. The variable nature is expected given the nebulous inconsistency of these concepts and the intangible quality of the psyche from which these archetypes manifest. This analysis strives to synchronize Jung’s theory with Milton’s text without distorting the reality and integrity

of either work. *Paradise Lost* will highlight the elasticity of some of Jung's nebulous concepts, a plasticity that is observed in the nuances of the individuation process as seen in the differences between Adam and Eve's projections and reactions. Jung's model offers more of a guiding framework than a letter of law. Within individuation, there is a plethora of responses and manifestations of these archetypes.

Obviously, when discussing the process of individuation, it is impossible to state with certainty that Milton intended to convey such a relationship between his reader and the text. Milton preceded Jung while simultaneously anticipating him since Milton wrestles with these "archetypes" before Jung established his theories. Because of this, Milton is both in agreement and at odds with Jung since Jung redefined certain elements of what the word "archetype" signified. Not only would Milton have been at odds with Jung's belief in God as a projection of the psyche, but, for Milton, the notion of achieving *self*-hood would not have been an individual psychic journey but a faith journey, beginning with the justification of an individual through the saving grace of Christ and a continuing spiritual development through sanctification. It would only be at the new creation that the full *self* would have been achieved as an act of God not man. In many ways, Milton's Christian worldview and Jung's process of individuation only differentiate from one another semantically. Within the text, both Adam and Eve can be seen encountering the Jungian archetypes, ultimately coming to a place of harmony despite their fallen nature. Moreover, while the various figures represent an archetype in the process of individuation for Adam and Eve, so too do the figures bear a symbolic import for the reader, who is given the opportunity to individuate alongside our first parents.

II: Rejecting the *Persona*: On the Border of Individuation

Milton's epic presents a more intimate reading experience for contemporary audiences

than the epics of antiquity. This familiarity is due, in large measure, to the similarities between the present and the essence of the era that Milton is trying capture. Since modern Western readers tend not to find their beliefs reflected in the Greek or Roman worldviews, with regards to the spirituality and culture of the ancients, the classical epics are more reminiscent of a bygone age, predecessors to the enlightened present. The immediacy of Milton's epic is more palpable because of its link to Christianity. Despite the decline of active Christians within the Western world, the roots of cultural Christianity are deeply ingrained in Western society. Within society, certain symbolic actions are still performed that find their source in Christian beliefs: witnesses in court still takes an oath with their hand upon a Bible, presidential candidates feel compelled to associate themselves with Christianity (a practice that is becoming out of vogue), the public expects prominent figures who have committed immoral acts, "sins," to make public statements of confession and penitence (Tiger Woods, Bill Clinton, Alex Rodriguez). While these activities do not imply that modern Western cultures feel an affinity towards Christian theological or doctrinal beliefs, the roots of many modern Western cultures still show past associations with Christianity.

The concept that certain acts are fundamentally immoral and require recompense implies a social contract that should be adhered to by everyone within the society. And since people are capable of immorality, there must be something wrong with humanity—something that allows evil to be a part of the human experience. C.S. Lewis lays out this very argument in his work *Mere Christianity* when he addresses the Law of Nature: "First, that human beings, all over the world, have this curious idea that they ought to behave in a certain way, and cannot really get rid of it. Secondly, that they do not in fact behave in that way. They know the Law of Nature; they break it" (22). Christians find their answer to this dilemma in original sin, but modern scientists

have found supposed empirical answers that reach the same conclusion—that something is inherently wrong with humanity. Richard Dawkins wrote a book titled *The Selfish Gene*, where he discusses the dominant characteristic of selfishness in a gene. This selfishness is a factor that contributes to the survival and subsequent reproduction of that gene; thus evolution promotes the survivors—i.e. selfishly driven beings. Within *Paradise Lost*, modern readers, regardless of religious affiliation, interact with a mirror that reveals a truth about humanity—that they are in some manner fallen.¹

The purpose of literature is believed to be twofold: to instruct and to delight. In instructing the reader, *Paradise Lost* functions as a mirror. In the Medieval and Renaissance eras, most texts functioned on multiple levels, as both literal stories but also morally or allegorically, with the intention of instigating a moralizing process within the audience. In his seminal work *Surprised by Sin*, Stanley Fish reflects on the linguistic techniques that Milton uses to transform his text into a mirror. When laying out his interpretive approach, Fish writes,

¹ Words like “fallen,” “wrong,” and “evil” all suggest a certain religious worldview. The scientific community terms the human condition as selfish for the sake of survival. From a materialist perspective, there is nothing wrong with this selfishness; however, culture has created a code by which selfishness is restricted to maintain a system of order dictated by more than strength and animal law. Sigmund Freud addresses this notion in his work *Civilization and Its Discontents* when he says:

Human life in common is only made possible when a majority comes together which is stronger than any separate individual...The power of this community is then set up as ‘right’ in opposition to the power of the individual...The members of the community restrict themselves in their possibilities of satisfaction...The first requisite of civilization, therefore, is that of justice. (49)

There is an underlying current that the selfishness of humanity, despite being an attribute of survival, is neither ideal nor productive in the long term. What results from this materialist perspective is the same social condition as the spiritual explanation, that humans are inherently selfish or fallen and require an outside system to keep the fallen or animal nature of humanity—selfishness—from dominating the way of life. The materialist refuses to acknowledge a spiritual existence but is brought to the same truth as a spiritualist, so instead of arguing semantics, the language used within this essay will be of a spiritual nature in regards to the negative capacities of humanity.

the poem's centre of reference is its reader who is also its subject; Milton's purpose is to educate the reader to an awareness of his position and responsibilities as a fallen man, and to a sense of the distance which separates him from innocence once his; Milton's method is to re-create in the mind of the reader (which is, finally, the poem's scene) the drama of the Fall, to make him fall again exactly as Adam did and with Adam's troubled clarity, that is to say, 'not deceived.' (1)

Fish thus argues that Milton intentionally creates a mirroring effect so that the readers experience and understand their fallen nature by re-visiting their fall in its original context. While Fish advocates that people are not consciously aware of their fallen nature and that Milton, knowing the ignorance of his audience, purposefully creates linguistic traps, Jung would argue that people know that they are capable of negative actions and repress this potentiality within the personal unconscious. Thus, each person is presenting a conscious *persona*, an ego-consciousness, as their whole *self*. What Milton's text accomplishes is not providing a revelation for the audience by eliciting an epiphany through repeatedly leading the readers astray and then reprimanding them, but rather, *Paradise Lost* is a reflective surface that perceives the readers' *persona* and offers the opportunity to explore the repressed elements of the *self*.

Milton's opening lines act as the initial glimpse of the *self*; a glance that bypasses the conscious *persona* and addresses the repressed negativity within the unconscious. He asks his heavenly muse to sing "Of Man's first disobedience and the fruit / Of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste / Brought death into the world and all our woe" (P.L. I, 1-3). In the context of *Paradise Lost*, the word "Man" is understood to reference the race of humanity; thus, the human species is and has been fallen since the first man, and that fallen nature has been passed down to

the present since we collectively share in it— “all our woe.” However, the phrase “of man’s first disobedience” is also of a personal nature being the singular form of the noun “man,” and also because individuals become aware of their capacity to sin when they first commit a conscious act of immorality—their “first disobedience.” It is the realization that an individual’s action, in being evil and not good, produces “death” or an ill effect that the *persona* begins to develop as the negative capabilities are repressed. Thus, Milton establishes the collective nature of humanity as fallen precisely because each individual is fallen. Milton’s text reveals a knowledge of the reader’s negative capacity, and makes that awareness known to the reader.

Milton then invites readers to experience the repressed portions of their nature: “Say first what cause / Moved our grand parents in that happy state / Favored of Heav’n so highly, to fall off / From their Creator and transgress His will” (P.L. I, 29-32). The reader, who is aware of their capacity for evil and, out of fear or social conventions, have repressed that potential, are given an opportunity to understand and come to terms with the dualistic nature of the *self*. For perhaps the first time, the conscious *persona* is discouraged, and we, as readers, are able to explore the depths of our nature. These lines represent the border of individuation. In continuing, the reader will be forced to experience figures that stimulate the collective unconscious. Regardless of audience willingness, *Paradise Lost* becomes a visceral text that evokes strong emotions in the reader. The readers, therefore, have the invitation to experience the process of individuation through the characters of Adam and Eve and their encounter with various figures in the story of the fall of man, or they can be passive agents, who are unable to disentangle the text from personal biases. Just as each character represents a physical manifestation of an archetype for both Adam and Eve, so too do various figures personify the archetype for the reader: first the *shadow* in the figure of Satan, who is also the shadow for Adam and Eve; then the

anima/animus, who is either Adam or Eve based on the reader's gender; and finally the *self*, experienced through the revelations of the *wise old man* or *great mother*, who is symbolic of God.

As this essay deals with the intricacies of the Trinity both within *Paradise Lost* and within Christian doctrine as defined by a) orthodox tradition and b) Milton, who is not always in agreement with tradition, it is necessary to elaborate on the perception of the Trinity in each of these three sources: *Paradise Lost*, the Nicene Creed, and *De Doctrina Christiana*. The Nicene Creed was the result of the council of Nicaea's codification of the early Church's beliefs. As the church grew in the Roman empire, various factions sprouted and the church convened to create an ordered system of beliefs that approved certain teachings and denounced others. One such teaching was the nontrinitarian view held by Arius and his supporters that Jesus was the Son of God, created by God, and both distinct and subordinate to the Father. The council of Nicaea denounced this teaching; thus, the Nicene Creed reads:

I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ,
The Only Begotten Son of God,
Born of the Father before all ages.
God from god, Light from Light,
True God from true God,
Begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father...(5-10)

The orthodox view claimed the Son to be begotten of God as opposed to created and of the same substance and therefore of equal standing. Milton did not adhere to the Nicene Creed but believed in Arius' teachings. In *De Doctrina Christiana*, Milton writes:

For he is called the own Son of God merely because he had no other Father

besides God...he [God] was properly the Father of the Son made of his own substance. Yet it does not follow from hence that the Son is co-essential with the Father, for then the title of Son would be least of all applicable to him, since he who is properly the Son is not coeval with the Father, much less of the same numerical essence, otherwise the Father and the Son would be one person. (85)

While Milton was an Arian, his beliefs did not necessarily transfer over into *Paradise Lost*. As an epic, the text is encyclopedic beyond the personal beliefs of Milton and is not designed to be his personal theological manifesto, which is the purpose of *De Doctrina Christiana*. In commenting on the theology of *Paradise Lost*, C.S. Lewis writes: “Only one topic falls under this heading [doctrines which are heretical and occur in *De Doctrina*, but not in *Paradise Lost*]. Milton was an Arian; that is, he disbelieved in the coeternity and equal deity of the three Persons” (*A Preface to “Paradise Lost”* 85). When discussing elements of the text, Milton is asserting orthodox views as opposed to his own. In some instances, this essay will quote Milton’s own theological manifesto when he adheres to orthodox Christianity; other times, this essay will adhere to Christian doctrine outside of Milton’s own beliefs because those are the beliefs conveyed in his work.

III: Satan: The *Shadow* of Paradise

The process of individuation, when reduced to its most basic form, consists of an individual encountering and harmonizing the presence of three oppositions within the psyche: good and evil, male and female, and nature and spirit. Good and evil, or positive and negative capabilities represents the initial confrontation due to its psychic location: “the most accessible of these [the archetypes], and the easiest to experience, is the *shadow*, for its nature can in large measure be inferred from the contents of the personal unconscious” (C.W., 9ii: 13). The *shadow*

is composed, in its majority, of repressed content, psychic material that was, at some point, conscious but actively suppressed and relegated to the dumping ground that is the personal unconscious. Thus, before a person can address, in its entirety, the deepest strata of the mind—the collective unconscious—the individual must first encounter the intense mingling of personal unconscious with collective unconscious. Jung explains this as an initiation process of sorts: “If the encounter with the *shadow* is the ‘apprentice-piece’ in the individual’s development, then that with the anima is the ‘master-piece’” (C.W., 9i: 61). The *shadow* acts as a gateway through which the individual must pass before encountering the remaining archetypes of individuation. Oftentimes, due to the numinous and powerful quality of the archetype, the individual will develop a coping mechanism to confront his or her internal condition in an external environment. This is what Jung describes as projections—the process of manifesting externally in a pre-existent physical medium. Sometimes these projections can take on a collective appearance and produce an archetypal shadow that defines a society. In *Paradise Lost*, the manifestation of the negative human capacity is Satan.

It is important to distinguish how Satan functions as the shadow of Adam and Eve given their perfect nature. Jung’s *shadow* is a psychic component of the individual, representing everything negative about that person. Adam and Eve are incapable of having an internal and immediate psychic *shadow* because they are perfect. However, just as Satan may represent a projection of the reader’s internal *shadow*, his personification as an entity in *Paradise Lost* represents the potentiality of Adam and Eve. This concept is explained by Raphael in Book V when he says, “God made thee perfect, not immutable / And good he made thee. But to persevere / He left it in thy pow’r, ordained thy will / By nature free, not overruled by fate” (P.L. V, 524-527). Their ability to remain good is conditional upon their continued obedience to God; if they

transgress his will, their perfect nature will become marred. This is the same conditionality given to Raphael and all angels alike: “Myself and all th’ angelic hosts that stand / In sight of God enthroned our happy state / Hold as you yours while our obedience holds, / On other surety none” (V, 535-538). Raphael says that angels and humans share a similar, created nature and a similar opportunity to remain perfect in their nature. Thus, Satan represents the negative capabilities of Adam and Eve in that despite his original status as an angel, he chose to disobey God.

The concept of Satan as the *shadow* of *Paradise Lost* is not a novel idea. James P. Driscoll, in his work *The Unfolding God of Jung and Milton*, interprets the Godhead in *Paradise Lost* through Jung’s analysis of the Godhead in his work *Answer to Job*. Driscoll ignores Milton’s Christian worldview to make his interpretation cohesive, arguing that the trinity in *Paradise Lost* is actually quaternary with each element of the Godhead corresponding to a Jungian psychical element:

The Father’s stage, we learn in Jung’s visionary masterwork, *Answer to Job*, is an undeveloped state of prereflective consciousness, the rude beginning of individuation. In the stage of the hostile brothers, the Son and Satan, or ego and *shadow*, consciousness advances through a war of opposites. The highest stage, symbolized by the Holy Spirit or Paraclete, transcends and harmonizes duality and warring opposites through mediation of Sophia, the divine anima. (Driscoll 28)

However, Driscoll’s portrayal of Satan as the *shadow* of the Godhead and the opposite of the Son is theologically unsound. He bases his interpretation on Jung’s gnostic, alchemical, pseudo-theology rather than Milton’s own manifesto, *De Doctrina Christiana*. This disregard of Christian theology results in a textually inaccurate reading since he ignores theological passages

in *Paradise Lost* that contradict his work. The concept of the hostile brothers is an old mythological archetype seen in figures like Osiris and Seth or Ohrmazd and Ahriman. These brother deities are engaged in a constant war with one another, negative potentiality versus positive potentiality. However, these brothers are not only of the same substance but ultimately originate from the same point of creation. In Christianity, Satan is never given the same designation as the Son in regards to his origin or substantiation. Satan is a fallen angel and composed of angelic substance; the Son is begotten by the Father, and thus of God's substance, simultaneously co-existing with the Father since time immemorial. Simply put, Satan is God's creation and the Son is God himself. While Milton's own personal theology holds an Arian viewpoint that the Father is eternal and his first act of creation was begetting his Son, Milton defends the traditional Christian belief in *Paradise Lost* when Abdiel confronts Satan and his rebel host: "Shalt thou give law to God, shalt thou dispute / With Him the points of liberty who made / Thee what thou art and formed the pow'rs of Heav'n" (P.L. V, 822-824). Satan is clearly designated as one of God's creatures while the Son is given the credit for the act of creating the angels. As Abdiel says, "Equal to him, begotten Son, by whom / As by His Word the mighty Father made / All things, ev'n thee" (V, 835-837). Secondly, Christian doctrine establishes Satan as created perfectly good but fallen through his choice of evil. The Son is God and therefore wholly good as well as immutable; therefore, he cannot choose evil because it is contrary to his nature. This belief is articulated in Book III when Milton describes the Son's nature as "equal to God and equally enjoying / God-like fruition" (III, 306-307). Lastly, the idea of hostile brothers portrays a sort of ongoing struggle, but the Son is not only unthreatened by Satan but is presented with no resistance when he casts Satan out of Heaven: "Yet half his strength he put not forth but checked / His thunder in mid volley for He meant / Not to destroy but root them out of Heav'n"

(VI, 853-855). Moreover, the fallen angels, led by Satan, throw themselves from Heaven in fear of the Son: “headlong themselves they threw / Down from the verge of Heav’n” (VI, 864-865). Ultimately, Satan is of less concern to the Son than an insect to a human. In contrast, Satan is portrayed as an opposing force against Adam and Eve and their offspring. The Son declares, “between thee and the woman I will put / Enmity and between thine and her seed” (X, 179-180). Ultimately, it is because Satan is the *shadow* of Adam and Eve that he is able to function as the reader’s *shadow*, for the *shadow* of God would still be an aspect of God, which would result in Satan functioning as a different archetype in the process of individuation. Thus, Driscoll is correct in saying that Satan is the *shadow* of *Paradise Lost*; however, he is incorrect in asserting that Satan is the *shadow* of the Godhead. Instead, Satan is the shadow of Adam and Eve.

Adam and Eve exist in a state of perfect innocence, guiltless of any fault. This state of goodness makes the recognition of the *shadow* impossible without an outside influence, because the concept of negativity is unknown to them. Jung elaborates on the process of *shadow* realization and the nature of the *shadow*, calling it

a moral problem that challenges the whole ego-personality, for no one can become conscious of the shadow without considerable moral effort. To become conscious of it involves recognizing the dark aspects of the personality as present and real. This act is the essential condition for any kind of self-knowledge, and it therefore, as a rule, meets with considerable resistance. (C.W., 9ii: 14)

Adam and Eve have never encountered a moral problem. In the garden, there is one form of immorality, disobedience, and only one way for disobedience to occur, eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The pair’s first encounter with Satan illustrates their lack of exposure and knowledge to a *shadow* concept: “Squat like a toad close at the ear of Eve /

Assaying by his dev'lish art to reach / The organs of her fancy and with them forge / Illusions as he list, phantasms and dreams" (P.L. IV, 800-803). It is particularly interesting that the first manifestation of the *shadow* is in a dream since dreams were the medium through which Jung began to establish his empirical evidence for the existence of the collective unconscious.

Satan, as the archetypal manifestation of the *shadow*, exhibits his nature as a problem to human morality by addressing the one command given to Adam and Eve by God. Satan appears as a disembodied voice within Eve's dream that awakens her sleeping consciousness:

Why sleep'st thou, Eve? Now is the pleasant time,
The cool, the silent, save where silence yields
To the night-warbling bird that now awake
Tunes sweetest his love-labored song. Now reigns
Full orb'd the moon and with more pleasing light
Shadowy sets off the face of things—in vain
If none regard! Heav'n wakes with all his eyes
Whom to behold but thee, Nature's desire,
In whose sight all things joy with ravishment,
Attracted by thy beauty still to gaze. (P.L. V, 38-47)

Satan is purposefully attempting to excite feelings of vanity and pride in relation to Eve's created purpose, to attract. His argument conveys the notion that the created world's gaze is directed upon her, and it is her beauty that gives joy, an obvious misconception since "nature's desire," as Satan phrases it, is fulfilling the role prescribed for them by God. Eve's beauty is itself not a negative quality, but the potential inversion of humility into vanity is a threat to Eve's goodly nature. Arguably, Satan's initial sin was propelled by an inward sense of vanity—"He of the

first / If not the first archangel great in pow'r, / In favor, and preeminence, yet fraught / With envy against the Son of God" (V, 659-662). Satan was envious because he, up until the point that God revealed the Son, is the most glorious in Heav'n of God's created beings, but when God honors the Son and not him, he "could not bear / through pride that sight and thought himself impaired" (V, 664-665). Thus, Satan is returning to his own sinful roots and the cause of his fall, identifying the same potentiality in Eve, and hoping to replicate the consequences of his sin in her.

Following his initial assault on Eve's unconscious, Satan continues to weave the dreamscape for her, leading her to the spot where morality is endangered: "To find thee I directed then my walk / And on methought alone I passed through ways / That brought me on a sudden to the Tree / Of interdicted Knowledge" (P.L. V, 49-52). As the representation of negative capabilities, Satan strives to endanger the morality of Adam and Eve, which requires being within the vicinity of the tree of knowledge. To Eve's credit, she is searching for Adam in her dream, seeking to reunite with him, as oppose to reveling in her separation. In bringing Eve to the tree of knowledge, Satan's fall is again mirrored in Eve's circumstance. Satan was given obedience to God as his code of morality, and he had one command, to worship the Son. Rebelling against his command to obedience, Satan attempts to recreate a situation in which Eve rearticulates his fall.

Throughout Eve's dream, Satan's attack on her is a return to his moment of separation from good, furthering his personification as the representation of Adam and Eve's negative capabilities. At the tree, Eve watches as an angel eat of the fruit, and after eating, the angel delivers a benediction to the tree, remarking:

O fruit divine,

Sweet of thyself but much more sweet thus cropped,
Forbidden here, it seems, as only fit
For gods yet able to make gods of men,
And why not gods of men since good the more
Communicated more abundant grows,
The Author not impaired but honored more?
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. (P.L. V, 67-78)

In tempting Eve, Satan projects his own reasons for not worshipping the Son, a desire for deification; although, he makes the motive for deification sound benevolent: to honor God all the more. This passage underscores a theme throughout Satan's speech, where he utilizes the word "gods" to describe God's created work in an attempt to decenter the structure of Heaven and the Godship of the Father. Satan, whether or not he truly believes himself God's equal, is driven by a pride that desires equality with God. This is seen in such petty actions as building his palace in Heaven as an imitation of God's holy mountain: "(Affecting all equality with God / In imitation of the mount whereon / Messiah was declared in sight of Heav'n)" (V, 763-765). Satan projects his own sins onto Eve in hope that he might excite in her fancy a desire to obtain godship.

The similarities between Satan's own fall, and the methods he uses to try and seduce Eve to disobedience are addressed by Don Parry Norford, who analyzes three oppositions in *Paradise Lost*—good and evil, male and female, spirit and matter—in relation to the idea of *coincidentia*

contradictoria. He argues that Milton's cosmos is kept in order through a careful balancing of the oppositions, which is based on the hierarchy of being. He pairs good, male, and spirit together as the positive forces and evil, female, and matter together as the negative forces although each is necessary in maintaining the cosmic order. Norford's argument runs into some theological issues with Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana* when addressing God's role in these binaries, particularly with reference to good and evil in relation to matter. He references Eve's dream sequence as an example of how Eve and Satan share a similar mold: "In her dream Eve's aerial flight and descent mirror Satan's aspiration and overthrow" ("My Other Half" 32). Norford addresses a pattern of similarities that is worth heeding but he goes too far in equating Eve's creation scene with Satan's love of Sin: "Eve's narcissistic love for her reflection duplicates Satan's attraction to Sin" (Norford 29). The similarities between Eve's dream sequence and Satan's own fall are a result of Satan's role as the architect of the dream, not an innate correlation between Satan and Eve.

When Eve wakes from her dream, she is deeply troubled by the content as well as the dream's origin. As a perfectly good being, she is incapable of comprehending evil and to witness it causes deep psychic distress. While she is not capable of pinpointing the exact details, Eve is aware that her dream contained notions that were unwholesome. Adam is similarly affected when he hears the dream relayed to him and begins to make the effort to understand the source of these thoughts, a process that is resisted initially by his own pre-lapsarian limitations. He tells Eve,

Nor can I like

This uncouth dream, of evil sprung I fear.

Yet evil whence? In thee can harbor none

Created pure. But know that in the soul
Are many lesser faculties that serve
Reason as chief. Among these Fancy next
Her office holds. Of all external things
Which the five watchful senses represent
She forms imaginations... (P.L. V, 97-105)

In attempting to understand Eve's dream, Adam uses the word "evil," his first usage of the word to designate something in the text. It is likely that this incident is Adam's first exposure to the effects of evil and his basis on which he relies is limited by his lack of knowledge in relation to Satan as the source of evil. Adam is only able to deduce that Eve's dream is uncharacteristic of her and therefore cannot be of a goodly nature; but, he faces the resistance that accompanies an individual's efforts at confronting the *shadow*. What he is analyzing is the temptations of the *shadow* and not the *shadow* itself. Adam eventually recognizes a capacity within humanity to allow appetite to overcome reason, the very shift that Satan allowed to occur in his sin, but Adam fails to identify the source of the evil because he is, as of yet, unaware of Satan's existence as a person or concept.

Adam and Eve's first exposure to the *shadow* is strikingly different from the reader's first encounter with Satan. The reader is already fallen which means his or her negative capacity, which is what the *shadow* personifies, is internalized; this is a direct contrast to Satan's role as an external form with regards to Adam and Eve. Satan's role in the text, in regards to the reader, is as a projection of that internal negativity. In the same way that Satan functions as an unknown evil in his initial contact with Eve, and through Eve, Adam, Satan represents a moral problem for the reader that is unrecognized as a problem despite the reader's knowledge of the *shadow*. The

morality that Adam and Eve adhere to is, especially in modern society, rejected as antiquated. From an orthodox perspective, Satan is recognized as the personification of evil, but if religious morality is rejected in favor of a more materialistic standpoint, Satan and God do not clearly represent evil and good respectively; rather, God can appear as a legalistic tyrant. This explains why recognizing Satan as the *shadow* is so difficult; because his negative attributes are seen as heroic rather than sinful. Percy Shelley put it best when he said,

Nothing can exceed the energy and magnificence of the character of Satan as expressed in *Paradise Lost*. It is a mistake to suppose that he could ever have been intended for the popular personification of evil....Milton's Devil as a moral being is as far superior to his God as one who perseveres in some purpose which he has conceived to be excellent in spite of adversity and torture. (Shelley 605)

Shelley's comment can be interpreted twofold. One interpretation corresponds to the difference in moral vision between the reader and the Christian morality given by Milton to Adam and Eve. Thus, Satan becomes a rebel for independence against a tyrant in the sky. C.S. Lewis argues that the perception of Satan as a positive force in *Paradise Lost* is, not always but sometimes, a reflection of personal bias projected upon the text: "many of those who say they dislike Milton's God only mean that they dislike God" (*A Preface to "Paradise Lost"* 130). Joseph Campbell likewise argues that "Anyone unable to understand a god sees it as a devil" (J. Campbell 92). On the other hand, Shelley's argument can exhibit a deficit in the construction of the Father. If Milton's poetic conception of the Father is flawed, then Satan, in comparison, would appear to be the superior figure. In either case, for followers of Shelley, it is not that Satan is necessarily good, but that the Father is bad, either poetically or morally, and Satan, in his resistance to the Father, is heroic by comparison.

Shelley's articulations about Satan's superiority can be seen in essays like "On the Margin of God: Deconstruction and the Language of Satan in *Paradise Lost*." In this essay, Andrew Martin argues that Satan's rhetoric represents a decentering of the Logos as defined by the Father (The term "decentering" is used in the context of Derrida's theory of the center.) Martin's argument begins by defining the struggle of Satan against God by noting the parameters of the center that Satan, as a deconstructionist, works against. "The everlasting Word, or Logos, at once both sets and signifies the determinate form of things. This 'Omnific Word' (VII, 217) is the all-making, all-meaning center of the language. This is the center that Satan struggles against through-out the epic" (Martin 43). With God as the center, Martin argues that "he [Satan] works outside the system, on the fringes of differentiae, to undermine the relations that function there" (43) and by doing so "brings us naturally to the question of power. If language can be made to open up this prevailing play of difference, subservience to a logos can be severed and language can take on its own power" (44). Essentially, Martin argues that Satan's language is used to consistently decenter the Logos of the text. While Satan's rhetoric appears to achieve this goal, Martin fails to address Milton's continual undercutting of Satan's lies. Milton repeatedly references Satan's subservience to God in all things, which means that any agency that Satan appears to have and any decentering effect his words appear to have are always and only allowed and controlled by the center Himself. Thus, Satan can only function within the center. When presented with an argument that promotes Satan's ability to supersede the Father, either morally or linguistically, it further demonstrates that either a) Milton's portrayal of the Father is flawed and such an argument is justified based on the text or b) the critic is ignoring textual material to promote a reading that does not work. Either way, Martin's argument illustrates the difficulty a reader has in identifying the *shadow* of the text.

While the reader requires aid in identifying Satan as the *shadow* because of the internalized and repressed nature of his or her own psychic *shadow*, Adam and Eve require an outside figure to aid in the process of *shadow* recognition because to them the *shadow* does not exist. Due to the immense difficulty of understanding forces so completely foreign to them, the Father sends Raphael down to explain the existence of the shadow.

Go therefore: half this day as friend with friend
Converse with Adam...
And such discourse bring on
As may advise him of his happy state—
Happiness in his pow'r left free to will,
Left to his own free will, his will though free
Yet mutable. Whence warn him to beware
He swerve not too secure. Tell him withal
His danger and from whom, what enemy (P.L. V, 229-239)

The intervention of the Father, who is the voice of Truth, is necessary in conveying the knowledge of the shadow to Adam and Eve. Just as Jung discusses the considerable moral effort involved in an individual's attempt to encounter the *shadow*, often discovered only through the use of a "mirror," like this text, so too does it require the action of a tutelary figure for Adam and Eve to recognize their dark potential. Recognition of the *shadow* requires the ability to perceive the *shadow*, and the knowledge provided by Raphael is necessary for Adam and Eve to perceive the *shadow*.

Although Adam and Eve have encountered the *shadow*, albeit subconsciously, they are still unable to grasp the concept that Satan represents their own potential state. When warned

about the chance of falling from grace, Adam's response is one of confusion: "What meant that caution joined, 'if ye be found / Obedient'? Can we want obedience then / To him or possibly His love desert?" (P.L. V, 513-515). Knowledge of the shadow, although subtly manifested and recognized by Adam in his use of the word "evil" to describe Eve's dream, still evades them. Jung explains that of the *shadow*: "There are certain features which offer the most obstinate resistance to moral control and prove almost impossible to influence. These resistances are usually bound up with *projections*, which are not recognized as such, and their recognition is a moral achievement beyond the ordinary" (C.W., 9ii: 16). What Adam recognizes in Eve's dream is the influence of negative capabilities, but he believes that these are just imaginings of the Fancy and does not fathom that Reason can ever be subverted by Fancy: "Evil into the mind of god and man / May come and go, so unapproved, and leave / No spot or blame behind" (P.L. V, 117-119). Adam, although recognizing evil, very possibly through the differentiation of this dream from the waking reality of goodness that surrounds them in paradise, is unaware of their own capacity to disobey God in action and not just in a dream. He cannot comprehend Satan, a creature who disobeyed God, and thus cannot comprehend the same disobedience in himself.

This feature of the shadow, the inversion of Reason by Fancy, is both the instigator of the shadow and the very order of rule under which Satan is subjected. Northrop Frye writes, "in the soul of man, as God originally created it, there is a hierarchy. This hierarchy has three main levels: the reason, which is in control of the soul; the will, the agent carrying out the decrees of the reason, and the appetite" (Frye 60). In Adam and Eve, the reason controls the will and has control over the appetite, but in Satan it is the opposite. Satan has allowed his appetite to dictate his will and repress his reason. Jung explains:

Closer examination of the dark characteristics...reveals that they have an

emotional nature...Emotion incidentally is not an activity of the individual but something that happens to him...On this lower level with its uncontrolled or scarcely controlled emotions one behaves more or less like a primitive, who is not only the passive victim of his affects but also singularly incapable of moral judgment. (C.W., 9ii: 15)

The shadow is thus less an act of negativity than a submission to negativity. This is exactly the view that Milton adheres to with regard to the doctrine of sin: “It is called Actual Sin, not that sin is properly an action, for in reality it implies defect; but because it commonly consists in some act. For every act is in itself good; it is only its irregularity, or deviation from the line of right, which properly speaking is evil” (*De Doctrina Christiana* 199). For both Jung and Milton, the *shadow* or sin is a result of passive release, a giving up of agency to the primitive components of man—the emotions or appetites. Therefore, Adam and Eve, who represent a proper ordering of the soul with reason controlling will, have difficulty identifying a figure like Satan, who represents spiritual corruption, the appetite ordering the will.

Although readers are fallen and possess an innate knowledge of their own psychic *shadow*, they still require an outside guide to alert them to the designation of Satan as the *shadow* and not as the hero. Stanley Fish argues that Milton purposefully creates linguistic traps into which the reader falls, only to be reminded by Milton that Satan is evil. “When the reader has (predictably) acquiesced in the illusion, if only by failing to struggle against it, he [Milton] then reminds him of the truth he ought to have remembered, but *somehow*, in the isolating persuasiveness of the seemingly self-contained experience, forgot” (Fish 19). While Fish utilizes these traps to promote his argument, which is that the readers are unconscious of their own fallen nature and requires these traps to remind them that they are indeed fallen, another reason for

these traps can be inferred; The reader needs these linguistic traps to be reminded that Satan is not a positive force. Milton's voice constantly appears through the text to re-orient the reader and correct any misconceptions about the Father and Satan's roles. Often, Milton adds a couple lines after Satan's magnanimous speeches to highlight his vaunted boasts in the context of his powerlessness in relation to God. Percy Shelley is not wrong when he describes the energy and magnificence of Satan. Milton portrays Satan, not as the deformed devil of medieval Christendom but as the recently fallen angel, still retaining a measure of his glory. Satan is described like the "Titanian or Earth-born that warred on Jove, / Briareos or Typhon" (P.L. I, 198-199).² Satan matches his imposing physical prowess with a charismatic rhetoric akin to the best speakers of antiquity. Satan has a manner of addressing his legions that makes them feel capable even when they are defeated. He consistently uses phrases like "Princes! Potentates! Warriors!" (I, 315-316) or "Pow'rs and Dominions, deities of Heav'n" (II, 11). These phrases represent linguistic means of restoring the fallen angels to their status of angelic glory. The readers find themselves attracted to the leadership of Satan, the heroic victim of a tyrant king, who tricked the fallen angels into war:

But He who reigns
Monarch in Heav'n till then as one secure
Sat on His throne upheld by old repute,
Consent or custom, and his regal state
Put forth at full but still his strength concealed,
Which tempted our attempt and wrought our fall. (I, 637-642)

What Satan says is true, that the Father sat in all His glory upon His throne and commanded

² Briareos and Typhon are monstrous Titans of classical mythology, boasting ancient parentage.

obedience, without show of arms, which up until Satan's rebellion He never needed. Historically, the readership of *Paradise Lost* has struggled with the figure of the Father, not entirely because of pre-conceived biases, but also because of Milton's flawed portrayal. Lewis attributes Milton's inadequate presentation of the Father, not "to Milton's religious defects or...in giving us a cold, merciless, or tyrannical Deity" ("*A Preface to Paradise Lost*" 130) but rather because "Milton has failed to disentangle himself from the bad tradition of trying to make Heaven too like Olympus. It is these anthropomorphic details that make the Divine laughter sound merely spiteful and the Divine rebukes querulous" (131). Satan's rhetoric portraying himself and his legions as the unfortunate victims, furthers the difficulties of stomaching the Father, who is already perceived as self-justifying and seemingly cold in demeanor.

Throughout the text, whenever we, as the reader, find ourselves in support of Satan, Milton's subtle voice emerges to remind us that Satan is the *shadow*, personifying everything that the subject refuses to acknowledge about himself and yet is always thrusting itself upon him directly or indirectly—for instance inferior traits of character and other incompatible tendencies" (C.W. 9i: 513). Milton acts as a guide for the reader, in much the same manner as Raphael educates Adam and Eve, consistently undermining what Satan says to illustrate that he is the *shadow*. Yes, Satan is an imposing physical titan, but with all his strength, he is only able to move with God's permission:

So stretching out huge in length the Arch-fiend lay
Chained on the burning lake. Nor ever thence
Had ris'n or heaved his head but that the will
And high permission of all-ruling Heav'n
Left him at large to his own dark designs. (P.L. I, 209-213)

And despite his claims of God holding his throne based on old repute and not inherent right, Satan fails to mention that God holds his throne because the angels are God's creation, a telling show of God's strength if the angelic strength is a measure of the Creator: "Shalt thou give law to God, shalt thou dispute / With Him the points of liberty who made / Thee what thou art and formed the pow'rs of Heav'n" (V, 822-824). Milton acts as a guide to show how Satan and everything that the figure of Satan represents culturally, historically, and religiously, constantly imposes itself upon the reader, not as the hero but as the *shadow*. The reader is constantly reminded by Milton that Satan represents all things evil, all the negative capabilities of an individual manifested and vaunted by this figure, and to whom Milton appears first to give charisma and agency, but who in reality represents lies and deceit.

The reader's inability to identify Satan as the *shadow* without Milton's authorial intrusions represents the potential danger of the archetype. While repression of the unconscious is unhealthy because it results in uncontrolled outbursts and fits of negativity, confronting the *shadow* has the inherent risk of failure in relation to the harmonizing process. This can result in an external *persona* that is overwhelmed by the *shadow*. It takes a large measure of self-control and moral fortitude to encounter the shadow and integrate the negative successfully without falling. Just as the reader often succumbs to Satan's appeal, so too do Adam and Eve fail to encounter and integrate their conscious *shadow* without falling first. It is significant that Satan hides himself in the guise of a serpent, which coincides with Jung's idea about the shadow being primitive as well as making it much more difficult to recognize the moral problem he represents. Adam and Eve are educated to expect a fallen angel, not the usurpation of one of God's created beings for evil. Milton remarks on the inability of created beings to perceive another's inward hypocrisy and lies when Satan masks his identity from Uriel, "the sharpest sighted spirit of all in

Heav'n" (P.L. III, 691). "For neither man nor angel can discern / Hypocrisy, the only evil that walks / Invisible except to God alone" (III, 682-684).

This inability to discern hidden evil is evidenced in Eve's second encounter with Satan. Adam and Eve are accustomed to the beastly innocence of the animals, and Eve never questions the goodness of the snake during their conversation. Satan's second encounter with Eve transpires in much the same way as the dream he evoked in her mind in Book IV—the same pattern of temptation can be observed. Satan begins by appealing to Eve's beauty: "Fairest resemblance of thy Maker fair, / Thee all things living gaze on (all things thine / By gift) and thy celestial beauty adore" (P.L. IX, 539-541). This is the same flattery that Satan whispered into her subconscious as she dreamed, that she is the fairest of nature's creations and all the created works gaze upon her in adoration. One of the reasons that Satan's rhetoric is so strong is that he masks his lies behind general truths. Eve's beauty is highlighted by Milton, who describes her as "the fairest of her daughters" (III, 324), meaning that she is the fairest woman of women and if man, as in humanity, is the crown jewel of creation then Eve is the fairest of creation. What Satan does is take this truth and conceal his lie behind it, that all living things gaze and adore her, when in reality all of creation worships the Father. Throughout their encounter, Satan will weave a verbal tapestry of flattery to exalt Eve. Satan declares that she should be "a goddess among gods adored and served / By angels numberless" (IX, 547-548). Again, Satan is seen using the plurality of gods to distort the notion of God as the one, true God.

Satan's flattery does not pass unnoticed by Eve and she remarks that "thy overpraising leaves in doubt / The virtue of that fruit in thee first proved" (P.L. IX, 615-616). Eve rejects his compliments with a wary response. It is not her pleasure at Satan's praise that retains her attention and keeps her conversing with the serpent; and she questions the goodness of the fruit

since it is producing language that is uncomfortably like idolatrous worship. However, her curiosity at a serpent, who can talk and reason, outweighs her intuitive sense of misgiving about the snake: “What may this mean? Language of man pronounced / By tongue of brute and human sense expressed” (IX, 553-554). Eve’s curiosity more than her vanity allows Satan the opportunity to fabricate a tale about how he was given the power of speech by partaking of a particular tree’s fruit. This is the natural progression of Satan’s temptation, coinciding with the dream, where he brings Eve to the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. Eve naturally wishes to see this tree that is capable of giving reason to animals. Again, this location is essential in the functioning of the shadow for only at this spot can Satan threaten Eve’s morality.

Satan’s temptation of Eve revolves around his own original sinful motivations, self-deification. Satan believed himself equal to God and therefore, a god in his own right. This is the phraseology that he uses throughout his conversation with Eve as he attempts to subvert God’s authority by rejecting the notion that God is the only god. Satan begins to create his argument around the notion of Eve becoming like God: “Queen of this universe, do not believe / Those rigid threats of death! Ye shall not die. / How should ye? By the fruit? It gives you life / To knowledge. By the Threat’ner? (P.L. IX, 684-687). As Satan continues to glorify Eve by calling her Queen of the universe, he begins to subtly debase God by calling him a threatener. This is a distinct characteristic of Satan and the fallen angels, who alone use negative phrases to describe the Father, and it is worth noting that Eve never speaks in defense of God during this interaction and remains a passive listener. Satan is attempting, through his rhetoric, to reduce God’s character so that He appears fallible, more like a jealous tyrant who is threatened by the potential of Adam and Eve and holding back from them as a consequence of that fear: “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” (IX, 697-700). Satan questions how God can be just if he punishes Adam and Eve for wanting to know the difference between good and evil so that they can avoid evil. Eve seems to misunderstand the function of the Tree of Knowledge and Satan takes advantage of that to project a sort of mystical value to the fruit, when in reality the fruit is just fruit. Knowledge of good and evil does not come from the fruit but from the act of disobedience. Adam and Eve will know evil when they eat the fruit not because the fruit is an edible source of knowledge, but because they have sinned. Satan declares “ye shall be as gods / Knowing both good and evil” (IX. 708-709). Again, Satan highlights the idea of self-deification, projecting the circumstances of his sin onto Eve, hoping for the same result. Eve, failing to realize Satan for what he is, her shadow, takes of the fruit and eats, thus falling from her state of perfect goodness and internalizing the negative capabilities that Satan represents.

Eve’s fall marks a turning point in the function of Satan as the shadow. In recognizing and becoming victim to the externalization of her negative capabilities, Eve internalizes Satan. Adam is therefore tempted not by the external figure of Satan, but by the internalized Satan in Eve. This does not mean that Eve is herself Satan but that Satan’s best attack against Adam is simply to allow Eve to show her post-lapsarian self to Adam. While Satan uses the same temptations that he succumbed to on Eve, the internalized Satan utilizes a different tactic on Adam, namely, the near-uxoriousness he bears for Eve. Adam’s love for Eve can be seen in his discussion with Raphael when he says:

Her loveliness so absolute she seems
And in herself complete so well to know
Her own that what she wills to do or say
Seems wisest, virtuous, discreet, best.

All higher knowledge in her presence falls
Degraded. Wisdom in discourse with her
Loses discount'nanced and like folly shows. (P.L. VIII, 547-553)

Adam is infatuated with Eve, elevating her nature above that which she actually is given. It is not that Adam has failed to guide Eve as his position dictates, but he is in danger of abandoning his role. Raphael chastises Adam for his lack of Reason saying:

Do thou but thine and be not diffident
Of Wisdom! She deserts thee not if thou
Dismiss not her when most thou need'st her nigh
By attributing overmuch to things
Less excellent. (VIII, 562-566)

Adam attributes to Eve a status that she does not meet in reality and in doing so is in danger of allowing his passions to dictate his will as oppose to his Reason. This is why Satan's attack on Adam is accomplished through the person of Eve. For Adam, his weakness is emotional, and so great is his weakness that Eve's fall is all that is required of Satan to also doom Adam. Adam's failure to ensure Eve's own protection not only condemns her but also him.

So forcible within my heart I feel
The bond of nature draw me to my own,
My own in thee, for what thou art is mine.
One state cannot be severed. We are one,
One flesh: to lose thee were to lose myself. (IX, 955-959)

Thus, Adam succumbs to sin and, in the process of both disobeying God, and subverting his role as the leader of Eve, internalizes Satan. Claudia Champagne uses Lacanian psychoanalysis to

analyze Adam's relationship with Eve, his 'other self,' and she addresses the motivation for Adam's choice to fall: "Adam's fantasy of Eve as woman, whom he must believe in so that he may believe in himself, has distorted his understanding of the world, of his place within it, and of God" ("Adam and His 'Other Self,' 56). While, Champagne is adamant that Adam's "love" for Eve is a form of narcissism, she maintains that it is this pseudo-love for her which propels his actions. Adam falls because his perception of himself is dependent upon Eve; thus, without Eve, Adam loses his own sense of identity.

At this moment in the narrative, the reader and Adam and Eve share a similar psychic state. All three persons have an internal shadow that represents all the negative attributes that come with allowing the primitive appetites to overcome Reason. The reader witnesses Adam and Eve give in to their lustful passions and only afterward realize that their actions are no longer pure, as they once were: "Soon found their eyes how opened and their minds / How darkened" (P.L. IX, 1053-1054). Adam and Eve realize that they are naked and feel shame, eventually hiding from God. Their first psychic action upon internalizing the shadow is to create a physical *persona* that can hide their shame, a concrete manifestation of their psychic process of trying to repress the negative capacity that now resides in them. William John Silverman Jr. addresses the concept of shame and guilt, arguing that "there is an inherent sense of conscience, a programmed sense of shame and remorse, that arms man and woman with the ability to choose right from wrong" (74). Silverman observes "At this point [after the Fall], hiding themselves from God and feeling shame for their nakedness symbolizes that spiritual death, death being the ultimate separation from God" (98). The once externalized shadow is now internalized by both Adam and Eve, resulting in a psychic state akin to Satan's own mental Hell. Satan himself had earlier given the necessary framework in one of his monologues. Upon arriving on earth, he says, "which way

I fly is Hell, myself am Hell” (P.L. IV, 75). Satan represents the external manifestation of the shadow because his psyche is wholly shadow. He has fully succumbed to his negative capabilities, no longer capable of moral decisions, but every thought and action he perpetuates is a further distancing of himself from the Father. Thus, Satan creates his Hell with every action. Adam and Eve, likewise, are now in a constant struggle between their love for God and their self-destructive actions that draw them to Hell. Thus, the negative capacities that lead towards Hell are Satan himself in them because Satan is Hell.

For the subsequent books, X-XII, of *Paradise Lost*, the text is unique in that both the reader and Adam and Eve are instructed in how to accept and control the internalized Satan within them. Michael is sent down and shows Adam history as it is to unfold and Adam sees first-hand the destruction that will be caused by the sin of man. It becomes evident that no cleansing or legislation of morality will work to repress the evil that now inhabits man, the very methods that humans attempt to use to repress the psychic shadow. In fact, what legislation does is define evil more clearly, further accentuating the fact that man is capable of both good and evil actions. Milton articulates this when he talks about the law being given to the Israelites says:

...Sin

Will reign among them as of thee begot

And therefore was the Law giv’n them to evince

There natural pravity by stirring up

Sin against Law to fight that when they see

Law can discover sin but not remove. (P.L. XII, 285-290)

The role of the law is not to save but to show people that they need a savior because they cannot save themselves. What the law does is very similar to Jung’s concept of repression; repression

only acts to further accentuate negative tendencies because they exist outside of the accepted social norms and are subsequently isolated as taboo. People become increasingly aware of their capacity for “evil” because “evil” has been clearly demarcated as such by culture.

Jung believed that to achieve individuation, the encounter with one’s shadow had to result in not only an acceptance of the shadow but a harmonizing of the shadow with the rest of the person’s psychic state. In this way, the negative capacities could be controlled and regulated as opposed to the uncontrollable outbursts that resulted from attempting to repress the shadow. Through the death of Jesus, Adam sees that sin and death defeat themselves and through Jesus’ resurrection, mankind is redeemed. Adam’s response is similar to Jung’s belief: “O goodness infinite, goodness immense! / That all this good of evil shall produce / And evil turn good more wonderful” (P.L. XII, 469-471). Harmonizing the *shadow* does not negate the presence of negativity in an individual but allows good to be produced from the bad that was previously repressed. God becomes flesh, which necessitates the acceptance of the negative capacity that resides in all of humanity, and allows the presence of the *shadow* to produce the necessary environment for the salvation of man. It is by becoming man, and successfully obeying the law, the tool that contributes to humanity’s psychic repression, that man does not need to repress the shadow because it no longer has authority. The role of repression, like the law, is to legislate behavior so that a group of individuals can live in relative peace without fear of evil befalling from an uncontrolled *shadow*. Jesus’ death and resurrection offers another option: *shadow* harmonization. This harmonization reasserts the natural order of the soul so that reason is once more in control of the will. When the appetites are no longer the dominant force, which requires constant suppression, an individual no longer has to repress the appetites but can trust in a dominant reason to incorporate the appetites in a healthy manner. Thus, salvation allows man to

accept the shadow as an element of the psyche, knowing that it has no power outside of that which is given to it by the rest of the psyche.

IV: I, *Anim(-a/-us)*

Following the initial encounter with and subsequent harmonizing of the shadow, the reader proceeds to the second of the archetypal encounters, which addresses the duality of masculine and feminine qualities that reside in each individual. The concept of sexual unity within one entity has often been personified in the archetypal image of the syzygy, which Jung explains as a hermaphroditic being or parental imago. In *Paradise Lost*, Adam and Eve exist as a representation of the syzygy image found in Christian mythology. That is, while Adam and Eve exist on a physical level within the text, they also exist as manifested contents of the collective unconscious (i.e. archetypes). As psychic personifications, they represent the contra-sexual element that characterizes their internal attitude—Adam being Eve’s *animus* and Eve being Adam’s *anima*. As the pair continues to experience the process of individuation, they must learn to exist in a state of healthy relationship, which personifies the process of harmonizing. While this stage of the individuation process is less intuitive for readers, in comparison to the *shadow* encounter, they too continue on their psychic journey as they encounter the *anima(us)* archetype.

Before beginning the textual analysis, a note on attitudes towards gender in the 21st century is necessary. The post-modern worldview on gender and sexuality represents a shift from the cultural norms of Milton’s Reformation era English society and even Jung’s early modern German-Swiss context. Many of Milton and Jung’s comments represent traditional view worldviews, now deemed antiquated by many, and have thus become the target of criticism from groups striving to break gender boundaries and stereotypes. The *anima(us)*, as put forth in Jung’s theories, hinges on the traditional conception of gender roles and characteristics. While Jung’s

perspective works well in an analysis of Milton's work, given their similar cultural environments in relation to gender, it lacks progressive awareness. However, to critique Jung's theories or Milton's writing due to a lack of post-modern perspective is to ask Jung and Milton to have operated from a 21st century mindset, an impossibility given their frame of reference. Thus, a level of historical sensitivity is required to read this analysis as well as an understanding that the progressive mind is just that, progressive.

While Jung articulates the process of individuation as occurring linearly, the following analysis highlights the nuanced nature of the archetypes and the individuation process. As was stated in the introduction, the archetypes are not easily defined nor are they definitive forms that follow a set structure; rather, they are amorphous and abstract. While Jung describes the start of the *anima(us)* manifestation as occurring after the close of the shadow encounter, the application of the theoretical model into a literary scenario reflects the complexity of the psyche and individuation. In *Paradise Lost*, the process of *anima(us)* assimilation runs in tandem, and even is intertwined, with the shadow encounter. The manner in which Adam and Eve attempt to integrate their contra-sexual soul images will mirror their negative potentiality that Satan attempts to exploit as their *shadow*.

In the previous section, the *shadow* was diagnosed as a projection of the negative potentialities that are repressed by an individual. The *shadow* can take on a collective form, most often a form that receives its image from society, in Milton's context the devil. The *anima(us)* represents the positive and newly integrated negative capabilities of an individual, the entirety of a person or the soul of an individual—the soul being the internal qualities of a person that are not externally manifested. When speaking of the *anima(us)*, Jung writes, “The complementary character of the *anima* also affects the sexual character...A very feminine woman has a

masculine soul, and a very masculine man has a feminine soul” (qtd. in Storr 101). In Western cultures, the term “soul” is most often associated with the Christian meaning of soul. When Jung says that the soul and *anima(us)* are one and the same he is referring not to a spiritual factor inside an individual, but rather “a clearly demarcated functional complex that can best be described as a ‘personality’” (97). Jung further differentiates the idea of the soul into an inner and outer soul: “The inner personality is the way one behaves in relation to one’s inner psychic processes; it is the inner attitude, the characteristic face, that is turned towards the unconscious. I call the outer attitude, the outward face, the *persona*; the inner attitude, the inward face, I call the *anima*” (100-101). The *anima(us)* is then a personified representation of an individual’s internal qualities, how a person reflects or feels. The external *persona*, which often conforms to gender expectations and societal norms, is complemented and completed by the internal characteristics that are unconsciously repressed but still used. Perhaps the concept is most easily visible in the the symbol of the *yin yang*. Jung talks about this symbol as “classical Chinese philosophy, where the cosmogonic pair of concepts are designated *yang* (masculine) and *yin* (feminine)” (C.W. 9i: 120). The circular image of the *yin-yang* melding together in a perfect balance is an apt visual image of the idealized goal of unity between the two sexes in one body. For a man, the *yang* would correspond to the external *persona* and the *yin* to the internal attitude and vice versa in a female. Thus, each individual, while consciously aware of one *persona* harbors a second personality that completes the nature of the individual.

Milton’s account of Adam and Eve before they are joined together, when each of them is in an environment dominated by a single conscious sex, illustrates an understanding of the necessity of *anima(us)* integration. In Book VIII, Adam is relating his first experiences as a created being to Raphael. There is something inherently wise in Adam’s nature that is manifested

instinctually as he begins to encounter the world. He is gifted with a perfect understanding of the created world that is translated through his ability to truly name each object; “To speak I tried and forthwith spake: / My tongue obeyed and readily could name / whate’er I saw” (P.L. VIII, 271-273). Not only is Adam able to understand the nature of the world around him but he has an innate sense that the created world is the product of a supraordinate being: “Tell if ye saw how came I thus, how here. / Not of myself: by some great Maker, then, / In goodness and in pow’r preeminent” (VIII, 277-279). Adam’s nature as a perfectly created being is conveyed by this knowledge; however, after naming the animals, Adam feels himself lacking, or rather his relational circumstances lacking: “But with me / I see not who partakes. In solitude / What happiness? Who can enjoy alone / Or all enjoying what contentment find?” (VIII, 363-366). In his own state of natural existence, Adam recognizes a deficiency, not in himself, but in his external relationship with creation. Each animal has a companion of like nature with which to enjoy life, but Adam understands that his nature is of a higher type than the animals and that he has no equal companion. The defect then is the lack of a complementary figure, one who, as Adam expresses it, is “fit to participate / All rational delight” (VIII, 390-391). Finally, Adam understands that without a companion of like nature he is unable to reproduce his image upon the earth: “like of his like, his image multiplied / In unity defective which requires / Collateral love and dearest amity” (VIII, 424-426). His state of existence lacks the ability to fulfill his God-given mandate to procreate. From a physical standpoint, Adam’s single sex environment has only one inevitable end, Adam alive but incomplete forever, a world of both physical and psychic sterility.

Milton’s portrayal of Adam, pre-Eve, is a reflection of the external-*persona*-dominated individual. The unity of the masculine and feminine psychic qualities is not an essential element

to life, just as Adam is capable of living without a female companion; however, as long as his masculinity is the only consciously manifested personality, his life is characterized by an emotional, psychical, sexual, and intellectual inequality and deficiency. He is incapable of having a relationship with the animals outside of a master-subject role and his relationship with God is that of a creature to his creator. While recognizing a lack of wholeness, Adam cannot remedy his situation. As a part of the collective unconscious, the *anima* can only emerge into consciousness through the use of external stimuli that allows the archetype to manifest as an image. Thus, the creation of Eve necessitates a force outside of Adam, one that can unlock the feminine from within his psyche.

From her Lacanian perspective, Champagne addresses this stage of Adam's existence in a similar manner: "Adam is born into the realm of the Symbolic, of language and authority" (Adam and 'His Other Self' 49). This realm is a place where "God gives Adam the power to create a language system in which the relationship between the signifiers...and signified...is not arbitrary" (50-51) and this dominance over language creates a reality where "Adam's relationship with his world [is] as its lord or 'Author' (P.L. VIII 317)" (50). While Lacanian psychoanalysis is its own distinct branch of psychoanalysis, Jung's framework is a predecessor, and thus, the two have similarities. If achieving *self-hood* is the optimization of the human experience, then the recognition and assimilation of the *anima(us)* is necessary. Adam recognizes a lack in his relationship to the world because he is un-individuated and needs a companion of the opposite sex upon which to project his *anima*. Ultimately, Adam will move beyond his *anima* but Eve is a necessary and healthy piece in the process. Lacan does not discuss the archetypes, but he deals with the idea of the self. Champagne perceives Adam's lack as a product of his reversal of the stages of development. While a normal infant undergoes the mirror and then

symbolic stage, Adam experiences the symbolic then the mirror, which results in “an arresting of his development at the narcissistic mirror stage” (51). Adam’s lack is not due to psychic disharmony but rather an inability to identify himself as an independent person without a companion. In both cases, Adam needs a companion for him to understand his nature and progress towards a state of independent *self*-ness.

For the process of creating Eve, God puts Adam into a state of semi-consciousness: “Of sleep which instantly fell on me, called / By nature as in aid, and closed mine eyes. / Mine eyes He closed but open left the cell / Of fancy my internal sight” (P.L. VIII, 458-461). For a second time, the reader encounters an episode in *Paradise Lost* where an archetype is manifested in a dreamlike state. In Book IV, Eve encounters her shadow in a dream. The importance of dreams in Jung’s theory is summarized by M.L. Von Franz, who writes: “The realm of dreams is the psychic area where we most frequently encounter archetypal themes” (“The Process of Individuation” 127).³

Once asleep, Adam witnesses the creation of Eve from his own body, the feminine from the masculine, another sex from the same substance:

Mine eyes He closed
.....
Who stooping opened my left side and took
From thence a rib with cordial spirits warm
And life-blood streaming fresh. Wide was the wound

³ Although Milton wrote his work long before Jung’s theories were published, *Paradise Lost* contains a pattern of dream sequences that coincide with the appearance of archetypal images. This was seen in the previous section when the *shadow* is first revealed to Eve in a dream. This pattern of archetypal meetings in dream sequences will continue throughout the individuation process of Adam and Eve.

But suddenly with flesh filled up and healed.
The rib He formed and fashioned with His hands,
Under His forming hands a creature grew,
Manlike but different sex, so lovely fair
That what seemed fair in all the world seemed now
Mean—or in her summed up, in her contained,
And in her looks, which from that time infused
Sweetness in my heart, unfelt before,
And into all things from her air inspired
The spirit of love and amorous delight. (P.L. VIII, 460-477)

The creation of Eve from the body of Adam is a physical representation of the masculine and feminine *personae* originating from one source and co-existing in one body but manifesting as two separate entities—the male and the *anima* or the female and the *animus*. In this scene, God acts as a physical representation of the external stimulus that awakens the *anima* within the collective unconscious. Psychically, Eve is Adam's internal attitude, all the feelings and complexes that are not manifested in his external *persona* but that are necessary in creating a whole and unified individual. While Champagne's argument contains similar threads to a Jungian interpretation, her analysis of Eve's creation sequence distinguishes the two psychoanalysts in dramatic fashion. Champagne writes "In order to 'generate Eve, Adam forfeits his rib and therefore symbolically his phallus...in other words, Adam's phallus becomes Eve. In asking for a companion, Adam has in effect asked God to castrate him" ("Adam and His 'Other Self'" 52). While Champagne interprets Eve's creation as having a crippling effect, Jung would argue that Eve, as the *anima*, is necessary for Adam to become a fully individuated *self* and

therefore has a beneficial effect.

The manifestation of Adam's *anima* in the form of Eve and Adam's subsequent interaction with her represents one of the two possible reactions an individual can have when encountering the *anima(us)*. Jung writes "If the soul-image is projected, the result is an absolute affective tie to the object" (qtd. in Storr 105). Adam is immediately infatuated with Eve, experiencing a whole new spectrum of human emotion upon his exposure to her created figure, most notably "sweetness" an emotion commonly designated as feminine. From the beginning of Adam's *anima* encounter, his relationship towards Eve can be seen as a mirror of his shadow. Adam's negative potentiality that Satan eventually exploits is his love of Eve, a love that borders uxoriousness and comes close to idolatry because it threatens his view of creation and God's order.

While Adam represents the result of external *anima(us)* projection, Eve exhibits a second response: "If it [the soul-image] is not projected, a relatively unadapted state develops, which Freud has described as *narcissism*" (qtd. in Storr 104). In Book IV, Eve tells Adam about her first conscious experiences after her creation. "I first awaked and found myself reposed / Under a shade of flow'rs, much wondering where / And what I was, whence brought and how" (P.L. IV, 450-452). Again, the language of dreams and awakenings is used furthering the tie between Milton's work and Jung's theories. The most striking difference between Adam and Eve in their external *persona* is that Eve does not exhibit the same intuitive knowledge of the world. Instead Eve hears the sound of water and finds herself drawn towards the source:

As I bent down to look, just opposite
A shape within the wat'ry gleam appeared
Bending to look on me. I started back,

It started back, but pleased soon returned
Pleased *it* returned as soon with answering looks
Of sympathy and love. There I had fixed
Mine eyes till now and pined with vain desire
Had not a Voice thus warned me... (IV, 460-467)

While Adam reacts to his environment with deliberate actions and words, Eve seems to respond to random sensory information, “with unexperienced thought” (IV, 457). Eve’s characterization in this scene conveys a sense of naiveté and wandering, almost childish. With Adam, the reader perceives his intuitive wisdom despite Adam being a newly created being. Eve’s experience lacks that sense of inherent wisdom, and she does not seem to experience the same feelings of external deficiency. Rather, she is content to gaze upon herself in the pool. While this initially creates a perception that Milton is commenting on the inferiority of the feminine to the masculine, Adam and Eve’s different responses suggests the principle of complementaries.

Eve’s unprojected state creates an unhealthy situation, one exemplified in the Narcissus myth. There is an implication in the text that Eve, without a guide, would have met the same unfortunate end as Narcissus, absorbed in her own image. Thus, God appears and instructs Eve in her created purpose:

A Voice thus warned me: ‘What thou seest,
What there thou seest, fair creature, is thyself:
With thee it came and goes. But follow me
And I will bring thee where no shadow stays
Thy coming and thy soft embraces. He
Whose image thou art, him thou shalt enjoy

Inseparably thine. To him shalt bear

Multitudes like thyself.' (P.L. IV, 467-474)

Both Adam and Eve are deficient, not their intrinsic nature, but in relation to their external environment. The difference is that Eve is unaware that she is deficient. It takes an external source to explain what her created purpose is and how she can fulfill her role. Following the guiding voice, Eve encounters Adam, but instead of projecting her *animus* upon him, she finds herself in a state of narcissism: "Yet methought less fair, / Less winning soft, less amiably mild / Than that smooth wat'ry image: back I turned" (IV, 478-480). Without a guide, Eve reverts to her unadapted state of self-projection until Adam fulfills his role as the head and is able to instruct her in their nature: "With that thy gentle hand / Seized mine, I yielded, and from that time see / How beauty is excelled by manly grace / And wisdom which alone is truly fair" (IV, 488-491). In the figure of Adam, Eve's *animus* is projected unconsciously but the initial self-projection continues to haunt Eve throughout the text. Her inclination towards narcissism represents her successive shadow struggle.

The difference between Adam and Eve's nature has raised criticism from many scholars. Milton's treatment of Eve has been criticized by feminist critics as misogynistic, and, while that term may be overly aggressive, there is some initial consternation at particular passages about Eve. While an extremist view reduces Milton's poem to "summarizing a long misogynistic tradition" (Gilbert and Guber 188), more moderate views consider "the account of Eve's creation, her role in the fall and her psychological kinship with Satan...as clear evidence for Milton's uncompromising patriarchalism" (Graham 134). Anna K. Juhnke argues that Eve's portrayal is not the focal point of Milton's misogyny but the other female characters, Sin and the Daughters of Cain, represent the wicked feminine: "Milton carefully cleared Eve from such

loathing, but he displaced it onto the ready-made allegorical figure of Sin” (Juhnke 54). Taken as a representational sample of hundreds of critics who have commented on the issue of gender in Milton’s work, these three serve to illustrate the tension felt by Milton’s distinction between masculine and feminine characters. It certainly raises the question of whether complementarity can be achieved when Eve receives such an unequal treatment.

The difference between Adam’s intuitive nature and Eve’s lack of knowledge can be looked upon as implying a level of intellectual deficiency in Eve that Adam does not exhibit. In Book IV, Milton writes that Adam was created “For God only, she for God in him” (IV, 299). This line implies that Eve was created in the image of Adam and not the image of God, meaning that Adam is the only true image of God. Arguably, this passage hinges on an inaccurate interpretation of the Hebrew word “*ha-adam*” found in Gen 1:27⁴, and readers of *Paradise Lost* should feel discomfort at Milton’s statement. The second difficulty is Eve’s apparent vice of vanity, especially when Milton writes “There I had fixed / Mine eyes till now and pined with vain desire” (IV, 465-466). Eve is created without sin but her vanity appears sinful in that she would have stared at her reflection forever if given the option. With regard to these two issues, Jung’s theory offers a level of understanding that may contribute to providing an adequate response to these issues.

Eve’s created nature is often critiqued as inferior to Adam’s. Milton’s poem can be uncomfortable in some instances, such as the line above, where he seems to demote Eve to a lesser nature than Adam. However, *Paradise Lost* contains some lines that challenge this

⁴ The Hebrew word “*ha-adam*” translates to the word mankind or humanity as oppose to “*adam*,” which is translated to Adam. Gen 1:27 says “So God created man in His own image; in the image of God he created him; male and female He created them” (Gen 1:27 NKJV). The English word man is translated from the Hebrew word “*ha-adam*” and as such should be read as mankind and not the gender specific word “man” to denote the masculine gender.

assumption. Although Milton comments that Eve is created for the image of God in Adam, he ascribes the actual image of God to Eve earlier in Book IV:

Two of far nobler shape erect and tall,
Godlike erect with native honor clad
In naked majesty, seemed lords of all.
And worthy seemed for in their looks divine
The image of their glorious Maker shone. (P.L. IV, 287-291)

Milton is clear that both Adam and Eve are the image of God. His praise is of the created glory of both without distinguishing one as higher than the other. From a Jungian perspective, the role of the *anima(us)* is to complement the individual's outer *persona*. Jung writes, "everything that should normally be found in the outer attitude, but is conspicuously absent, will invariably be found in the inner attitude" (qtd. in Storr 102). The internal attitude and external *persona* make up a single whole entity. Adam and Eve as an archetypal syzygy represent two equal parts that complement each other to form a whole. In Book IV, Milton describes Adam and Eve as a complementary pair: "For contemplation he and valor formed / For softness she and sweet attractive grace" (P.L. IV, 297-298). M.L. Von Franz talks about the idea of complementarity in relation to Jung, writing "Jung saw that the relationship between the conscious and unconscious mind also forms a complementary pair of opposites" ("Science and the Unconscious" 382). This concept of complementarity was developed by Jung and his students based upon his earlier concept, *coniunctio*, which is the idea of the masculine and feminine uniting into a single whole. Adam and Eve, as the personification of psychic forms, require an equality of substance and being for them to achieve the complementary effect of the parental imagos.

Other scholars have articulated Eve's equality through various mediums. Patrick J.

McGrath analyzes the linguistic qualities of Eve's end speech in relation, or rather as an allusion, to various speeches Adam has already made, exhibiting a level of intellectual equality with Adam. McGrath gives an example of this technique:

For Adam in Book 9, staying against one's will is like having already left; for Eve in Book 12, staying alone is like leaving against one's will. Showing considerable verbal facility, Eve appropriates, and almost arithmetically redistributes, the terms (leaving, staying against one's will) in Adam's previous equation. The formal ingenuity of such a revision performs the immensely important task of expressing the truth of intersubjectivity, mutuality, and companionship that the paradise within requires. (74)

McGrath goes on to analyze the complexity of Eve's lexical choices in her phrases (76), the connotative depth of her words (75), and her attainment of knowledge (78). While not dismissing the topic of gender in Milton, McGrath remarks that "the regularity of gender hierarchy is punctuated by occasional instances of collapse. This collapse does not, it should be noted, suggest a feminist Milton; it merely suggests the difficulty of discussing Milton and gender in such exclusivist terms as 'feminist' or 'antifeminist'" (72). McGrath's observation highlights the passages of Milton's text that seem to contradict one another. How can Eve be both in the image of God but also the image of Adam? The gender hierarchy in *Paradise Lost* seems to be porous, and Eve seems both unequal and equal while always remaining complementary to Adam.

The second difficulty is Eve's apparent "sin" in her vanity. Eve appears to be acting upon her sinful potentiality in that she is disobeying her created nature to be Adam's companion. However, Jung found, through years of patient studies, that "water is the commonest symbol for the unconscious" (C.W. 9i: 40). Eve's first "random" experience is a remarkable

portrayal of the exploration of the unconscious. Although Eve does not appear to be aware of herself in the same way manner as Adam, she shows an instinctual attraction towards the water, towards her own unconscious. It is as if instinct, which is one of Jung's definitions of the archetypes, is drawing Eve towards the sound of water. The pool has the potential to act as a subsequent mirror, which has an important role in Jung theories that is similar to his observations about water, in that it provides a glimpse of the soul image:

True, whoever looks into the mirror of the water will see first of all his own face. Whoever goes to himself risks a confrontation with himself. The mirror does not flatter, it faithfully shows whatever looks into it; namely, the face we never show to the world because we cover it with the *persona*, the mask of the actor. But the mirror lies behind the mask and shows the true face (9i: 43).

In her newly created state, Eve is seeking conscious self-knowledge, something that Adam does not have to seek because he is born with it. Eve's natural inclination is to find a guide to help her understand herself, arguably an action that fits within her created nature. Within Milton's text, Adam was created to be the head of Eve, which means that Eve's intuitive response to seek out an external source to reveal internal or unconscious knowledge is in line with her nature. Lacking Adam's presence, she seeks another means of guidance, a reflection of her unconscious, which is the deeply ingrained instinct that draws her towards the water. Arguably, in the lake, Eve glimpses her figure and is caught in the numinosity of her glimpsed *persona*. Her initial draw towards the lake was not an act of disobedience against her created purpose, but an interpretation of her created purpose, in that the lake was meant to reflect knowledge that she did not possess. In lieu of Adam, Eve still seeks a guide.

Noel K. Sugimura offers an intriguing argument about Eve's experience in gazing upon

her reflection. Sugimura asks “is her [Eve’s] absorption in, and wonder at, her own reflection a narcissistic activity that constitutes a dangerous prolepsis of the Fall, or does it emphasize instead, the response beauty elicits in a yet innocent creature?” (2) What Sugimura proceeds to argue is that Eve’s reflection evokes a feeling of sublime wonder. This is an interesting notion in relation to Jung’s archetypes, which he often describes as numinous and dangerously attractive. She first differentiated Eve’s experience from Narcissus by a) Eve’s innocence and b) Eve’s dynamic interaction. While Narcissus was a worldly man, who succumbed to his image and became static, Eve is an innocent creature, who interacts with her reflection. She proceeds to invoke the Neoplatonic and Augustinian understanding of a mirror as drawing the gazer closer to God. This begins to tie in with Jung’s theory of the mirror revealing the *self*, which will ultimately be seen in the final section of this paper as God. Sugimura argues that Eve’s fault is then in attempting to re-create her initial wonder. While interpreting this particular scene of the poem with a different theoretical model, Sugimura arrives at a similar conclusion, where Eve is able to gaze upon her reflection and be attracted without sinning—but the episode acts as a further temptation for her later in the poem.

Through this stage of the individuation process, the reader must sift the content of *Paradise Lost* more carefully to discern his or her own process of *anima(us)* integration. Just as recognition of the shadow is easier because of its predominantly personal nature, so too is the shadow easier to recognize because of what it represents. It is impossible for people to avoid the feeling that humanity is in some way damaged. War constantly ravages some part of the globe, murder, rape, theft, and all other manner of crimes are committed every day. When it comes down to it, the shadow is easily known because it is consciously recognized and repressed. The recognition of the *anima(us)* is significantly harder for an individual to encounter consciously

not only because of its location in the collective unconscious but also because it represents a part of the psyche that is not actively repressed. Jung gives two reasons, apart from the psychic location of the content that contribute to the difficulty of *anima(us)* recognition: “Firstly, there is no moral education in this respect, and secondly, most people are content to be self-righteous and prefer mutual vilification (if nothing worse!) to the recognition of their projections” (C.W., 9ii: 35). At a conference hosted by the C.G. Jung Institute of Los Angeles, Gareth Hill addressed the issue of openly discussing the concept of the masculine and feminine residing in both men and women. He writes,

Women are determined, with a marvelous ferocity that is providing the heat for a socio-cultural transformation, to realize their full potentialities for expression in the non-domestic world and, by that, to be fully *Woman*. To suggest that that is being more masculine is profoundly offensive to many. And men, on the other hand, tend collectively to be absolutely terrified of the suggestion that they should be more feminine. (Hill 2)

The idea of hyper-masculinity for both men and some women or hyper-femininity for both women and some men is propagated by the cultural influences around each individual. It is ironic that in the past gender roles have been more rigid, and yet, the enlightened minds have promoted the idea of a balanced harmony of masculine and feminine in an individual. Even a patriarchal voice like Milton’s remarks on the complementary aspects of the masculine and feminine. Jung’s theory may propagate the male/female binary but it harmonizes both sides of the binary, thus hoping to equalize both sides of the spectrum.

Given the pressure placed on the reader, Milton’s voice provides a medium through which these rather ancient ideas are conveyed. The idea of having the masculine and feminine as

originating from one source and existing in one body represents a way of approaching the self that is rather counter-cultural. For the reader to begin a process of *anima(us)* integration, the first step is understanding why the *anima(us)* is a necessary component of the *self*. Adam and Eve serve as an illustration for why a single-sex *persona* does not establish a complete person but is a character defect.

In their pre-fallen state, Adam and Eve appear to have a complete sense of union. Adam now has a companion to help rule over and care for the created world, a companion of equal substance and being, and Eve has a companion for which her grace and attraction will find a fit reaction. The issue is that even in their pre-fallen state, Adam and Eve's *anima(us)* either a) projected unconsciously upon the other or b) remains unprojected. In Adam, this produces a state of total dependence and in Eve a state of narcissism. The second issue is that the soul image, although inevitably projected, needs to be recognized so it can be dissolved and the internal attitude integrated. Jung says that "projections should be dissolved, because it is wholesomer that way and in every respect more advantageous" (qtd. in Storr 114-115). It is only through a conscious recognition of the *anima(us)* and a dissolution of the projection that an individual can move to the next stage of the individuation process.

The effects of unconscious projection can be seen in Book VIII when Adam describes his love of Eve to Raphael in language that is uncomfortably close to idolatry:

Here passion first I felt,
Commotion strange! In all enjoyments else
Superior and unmoved, here only weak
Against the charm of beauty's powerful glance.
Or nature failed in me and left some part

Not proof enough such object to sustain
Or from my side subducting took perhaps
More than enough... (P.L. VIII, 530-537)

Adam is explaining how the enjoyment that he received from nature and the world around him pales in comparison to the pleasure that he feels in Eve's presence; he insists that she was the first person to instill passion in his being. Eve has become the source of utmost enjoyment for Adam, and he wonders if too much of himself was given to Eve, resulting in her being better than him. Adam's projection of his *anima* onto Eve is twisting his perception of himself as a perfectly created being, in and of himself, and Raphael addresses his need to dissolve his fantastical image of Eve. "Be strong, live happy and love, but first of all / Him whom to love is to obey, and keep / His great command! Take heed lest passion sway / Thy judgement..." (VIII, 633-636). Raphael is not condemning his love of Eve but warning him against absolute attachment to her. Adam needs to dissolve his unhealthy projection, which has become, as Jung warned, an *enantiodromia* or a force that has nullified his external *persona* (qtd. in Storr 103). Adam's masculinity is becoming deficient by his inability to harmonize his *anima* with the rest of his psyche. Champagne uses the term "castration" (52) to describe this relationship. Jung, instead of using the term "castration," would use the phrase *anima*-possessed to designate a male who succumbs wholly to the internal feminine.

While Adam represents an unhealthy attachment to his projected *anima*, Eve's struggle with her *animus* occurs in a different manner. Eve exhibits what Jung calls *anima(us)*-possession: "this transformation of personality gives prominence to those traits which are characteristic of the opposite sex; in man the feminine traits, and in woman the masculine" (C.W. 9i: 223). Hermine Van Nuis argues:

Considered from a Jungian perspective, the entire labor debate presents a critical juncture in the individual, as well as reciprocal, individuation of both Adam and Eve. This debate presents, in fact, a beneficial as well as necessary stage in their psychological development; for the *separation* which results needs to occur if both are to acquire fuller awareness of themselves. (48-49)

Rather than arguing that Adam and Eve are each other's *anima(us)*, Hermine interprets this scene as Eve's "leap first to become a differentiated self" (54). She views Eve as Adam's projected *anima* and Eve's decision to go off on her own as her step towards breaking away from Adam and his "psychological constraint" (50). Hermine reflects the idea of Adam's *anima*-possession but fails to identify Eve's psychological danger. What she interprets as a chance for Eve to develop her *self* is in reality a state of *animus*-possession. Jung describes a total *anima(us)* possession in the following way: "Men can argue in a very womanish way, too, when they are anima-possessed and have thus been transformed into the anima of their personal vanity and touchiness (as if they were females); with women it is a question of power, whether of truth or justice or some other 'ism'" (qtd. in Storr 111). When Adam cautions Eve about the dangers of leaving, she replies "Thy equal fear that my firm faith and love / Can by his fraud be shaken or seduced!— / Thoughts which, how found they harbor in thy breast, / Adam, misthought of her to thee so dear" (P.L. IX, 286-289). Adam does not doubt Eve but says that staying together is the easiest way to avoid the issue of temptation altogether. Van Huis argues that Adam's argument "reveals, increasingly, more insecurities about himself" ("Animated Eve" 52) but also that his logic is flawed and argument inconsistent. She asserts "Nor, of course, is Adam being logical when he claims that Eve's suggestion to work alone is her intentional desire to seek temptation" (53). While this scene does exhibit some of the psychic tension in Adam, especially relating to

his increasing submission to his *anima*, it also shows Eve's continued progression towards *animus*-possession. Her argument is characterized by notions of trust and power. She may not be intentionally seeking temptation, but she fails to recognize the danger of separating from her other half.

The division of labor argument can appear to place greater fault on Eve but that is an illusion created by her agency in relation to Adam's passivity. Adam's *anima*-possession creates an increasingly passive state, in which his faculties of logic and reason give way to emotional upheaval, seen in frustration as he gives in to Eve: "Go, for thy stay, not free, absents thee more. / Go in thy native innocence, rely / On what thou hast of virtue, summon all, / For God towards thee hath done his part: do thine!" (P.L. IX, 372-375) Adam gives in, an action that is in direct conflict with his ordained role in their relationship.

The culmination of Eve's *animus* possession is observed in her fall. In the sequence of Eve's disobedience, her projected image shifts so that she is no longer in a state of attachment to Adam but to herself. The concept of narcissism conveys this shift as Eve's masculine soul possesses her consciousness. Upon eating the apple, Eve begins to debate whether or not she should tell Adam of her actions.

But to Adam in what sort
Shall I appear? Shall I to him make known
As yet my change and give him to partake
Full happiness with me? Or rather not,
But keep the odds of knowledge in my pow'r
Without copartner so to add what wants
In female sex, the more to draw his love

And render me more equal and perhaps,

A thing not undesirable, sometime

Superior... (P.L. IX, 816-825)

Eve's indecision centers on the issue of power, of her perceived inequality as a female, and her desire to be superior to Adam. Her perception of superiority is based upon keeping the knowledge of good and evil that she believes is superior to Adam's wisdom to herself. Eve argues that Adam would find her more appealing if she shared in the masculine traits with which Adam was created, i.e. knowledge and leadership. Eve exhibits a misunderstanding of her role in her relationship with Adam. It is her feminine qualities that Adam loves and needs and he cannot be fulfilled by Eve's companionship if she chooses to adopt the qualities of a masculine companion. Jung writes that "in the state of possession both figures lose their charm and their value" (C.W. 9i: 223).

Ultimately, Eve decides to share the fruit with Adam not out of love, but rather out of selfishness.

But what if God have seen

And death ensue? Then I shall be no more

And Adam wedded to another Eve

Shall live with her enjoying, I extinct:

A death to think! Confirmed then I resolve

Adam shall share with me in bliss or woe.

So dear I love him that with him all deaths

I could endure, without him live no life. (P.L. IX, 826-833)

Eve's selfishness is rationalized by her supposed love, by her desire to be with Adam, but her

true reasoning is jealousy towards an imagined second Eve, one to take her place if God punishes her for disobeying Him. What Eve takes for granted is that Adam would willingly share in her fall or that she has the power to convince him. Eve is relying on a thoroughly masculine characteristic to make herself more appealing to Adam. In her state of *animus*-possession, Eve no longer looks upon Adam as an equal companion but a pawn whom she can manipulate through her newfound power and knowledge.

While Eve adopts a hyper-masculine quality upon her fall, reverting back to her narcissistic potentiality, Adam continues in his unconscious *anima* projection, exhibiting his total dependence to Eve: “How can I live without thee, how forgo / Thy sweet converse and love so dearly joined / To live again in these wild woods forlorn?” (P.L. IX, 908-910). Adam cannot comprehend an existence without Eve, so totally has he become infatuated with her presence. Adam considers the prospect that God could once again create a companion for him but he rejects the idea of another Eve. “No! No! I feel / The link of nature draw me, flesh of flesh, / Bone of my bone thou art and from thy state / Mine never shall be parted, bliss or woe” (IX, 912-915). Adam’s unconscious projection has given Eve the numinous quality of the *anima* archetype and he perceives her as his complementary counterpart. In his moments before the Fall, Adam adopts a complete passivity in which Eve becomes the head, representing a psychic role reversal of the pair and contributing to Eve’s *animus*-possession. While Eve’s *animus*-possession is manifested as an internal projection, Adam’s totality of dependence on his external projection causes him to become *anima*-possessed. Eve gives Adam the fruit and he “scrupled not to eat, / Against his better knowledge, not deceived / But fondly overcome with female charm” (IX, 998-1000). Adam knowingly submits to Eve, willingly subverting the natural order of *Paradise Lost*, and placing Eve above him as the dominant member of the pair.

Once both Adam and Eve are fallen, there is a perceivable rift in their relationship, and the union of masculine and feminine is visibly sundered as both Adam and Eve shift between various stages of unhealthy *anima(us)* projection and relation. The ensuing interactions between the two represent a blurring of gender roles and incompatible gender relations. Sexually, where Adam once viewed Eve as an equal companion, he now sees her as an object to fulfill his sexual desires and vice-versa:

But that false fruit
Far other operation first displayed
Carnal desire inflaming. He on Eve
Began to cast lascivious eyes, she him
As wantonly repaid: in lust they burn. (P.L. IX, 1011-1015)

Adam and Eve's love is transformed to lust. Where Adam and Eve's sexual encounters have previously been described in lofty, obscure language, "the rites / mysterious of connubial love" (IV 742-743), Adam's language conflates the appetites so that sex and hunger are described as equivalents:

Eve, now I see thou art exact of taste
And elegant of sapience no small part
Since to each meaning savor we apply
And palate call judicious. I the praise
Yield thee, so well this day hast thou purveyed.
Much pleasure we have lost while we abstained
From this delightful fruit, nor known til now
True relish tasting. (IX, 1017-1024)

Adam has reduced sex to a completely sensory experience. Eve is a meal for Adam to consume when his sexual desires are aroused. Eve, in turn, welcomes this objectification since her response to Adam is suggestive, sexual body language. “So said he and forbore not glance or toy / Of amorous intent, well understood / Of Eve whose eye darted contagious fire” (IX, 1034-1036). Eve encourages Adam’s lust by returning his sinful passion with her own lust, herself objectifying Adam as an object to satisfy her gaze.

After sating their lust, Adam and Eve shift from an expression of hyper-masculinity to a state of hyper-femininity. Upon realizing that the fruit has reduced their nature and cursed them with shame and guilt, their response is to hide in the woods, hoping to avoid God’s presence. As they hide, their emotions become the dominant force in their being:

Nor only tears
Rained at their eyes but high winds worse within
Began to rise, high passions—anger, hate,
Mistrust, suspicion, discord—shook sore
Their inward state of mind, calm region once
And full of peace, now tossed and turbulent:
For Understanding ruled not and the Will
Heard not her lore, both in subjection now
To sensual Appetite who from beneath
Usurping over sov’ reign Reason claimed
Superior sway. (P.L. IX, 1121-1131)

Adam and Eve are reduced to creatures of uncontrollable passions. Their internal state is characterized by passivity, and neither desires to reprise the role of leader that Adam was created

to fill and Eve desired to attain after the Fall. Both have elected a role of subservience, and, without a leader, both find themselves reacting to the whims of their emotions. Their emotional subservience is followed by what Jung describes as “argu[ing] in a very womanish way” (qtd. in Storr 111). Both try to assign blame to the other, thus saving their own vanity from the responsibility of ruining their blissful state. Adam blames their fallen state on Eve’s desire to split up that morning, and Eve blames Adam for not fulfilling his role as the head and ordering her to stay with him. This argument continues to spiral downward: “Thus they in mutual accusation spent / The fruitless hours, but neither self-condemning, / And of their vain contest appeared no end” (IX, 1187-1189). As Adam and Eve reprise the same gender roles, their relationship is unable to work, resulting in an inability to come to terms with their situation.

Jung often talks about the numinous quality of the archetypes, which represents their danger to an individual. In a summary of Jung’s theories, Jolande Jacobi writes, “the archetype presents itself as numinous, that is, it appears as an experience of fundamental importance. Whenever it clothes itself in the appropriate symbols, which is not always the case, it puts the individual into a state of possessedness, the consequences of which may be incalculable” (Jacobi 44). When an individual going through the individuation process encounters these primordial images, they are often far more powerful and enchanting than an individual is prepared to handle. There is a tension between needing both gender elements but not allowing the unconscious soul to overpower the conscious *persona*. Adam and Eve exhibit the tenuous prospect of attempting to assimilate the two into one and their failure to do so, even in a state of perfect nature, illustrates the difficulty of such a task.

Adam and Eve require spiritual guidance to help remedy their psychic struggles and come to a healthy balance of *anima(us)* relationship. The Son comes down to judge Adam and

Eve and in the process re-establishes their proper order.

Was she thy God that her thou didst obey
Before His voice? Or was she made thy guide
Superior, or but equal, that to her
Thou didst resign thy manhood and the place
Wherein God set thee 'bove her, made of thee
And for thee, whose perfection far excelled
Hers in real dignity? Adorned
She was indeed and lovely to attract
Thy love, not thy subjection, and her gifts
Were such as under government well seemed,
Unseemly to bear rule, which was thy part
And person hadst thou known thyself aright. (P.L. X, 145-156).

The Son reminds Adam of his role as the leader and of Eve's created purpose, that she was made to fill a specific void in Adam. Adam was created as the head and Eve his companion, for him to lead and her to follow. Eve as the physical personification of Adam's *anima* represents the characteristics that his external *persona* lacked, but he was not meant to submit to them, rather to assimilate them harmoniously. In turn, the Son reminds Eve, "To thy husband's will / Thine shall submit: he over thee shall rule" (X, 195-196). This divine intervention represents a psychic re-ordering, a chance for Adam and Eve to dissolve their projected soul images and successfully integrate their internal attitude and external *persona*.

Once a semblance of order is re-established, Adam and Eve begin to re-integrate the other in a more cautious manner. Initially, both over-compensate by emphasizing their external

personas. When Adam addresses Eve with the words “Out of my sight, thou serpent!” (P.L. X, 867), he is exhibiting hyper-masculinity. Similarly, Eve’s response is hyper-feminine through her expression of high submission: “with tears that ceased not flowing / And tresses all disordered at his feet / [she] Fell humble and embracing them besought / His peace” (X, 910-913). There is a considerable difference in how they relate towards each other in their fallen state then from their initial encounter but they slowly assume a healthy relationship. Adam, instead of being infatuated by Eve’s external appearance is touched by Eve’s feminine qualities of submission.

His life so late and sole delight
Now at his feet submissive in distress,
Creature so fair his reconciliation seeking,
His council whom she had displeased, his aid.
As one disarmed his anger all he lost. (X, 941-945)

Adam has dissolved his projection of Eve that demanded his total dependence and instead begins to relate to Eve as was her created purpose. So too does Eve come to understand her relationship with Adam as she says “But now lead on. / In me is no delay. With thee I go” (XII, 614-615). Eve learns to relate with her *animus* as it was designed, to fill her gaps.

It is significant to note that Adam and Eve are reconciled before witnessing God’s plan for the future. Jeanne Clayton Hunter suggests that “without first turning back again to Eve, he [Adam] could not turn to God” (115). There is a sense that Adam and Eve have to harmonize their *anima(us)* before progressing further into their journey both literally and psychically.

Jung saw this stage of the individuation process as the *dénouement* of becoming a united *self*. Although it is not the last stage of the journey, it is the masterpiece. Milton’s work illustrates the struggle of confronting the internal soul and, again, there is a sense that the

achieving of self-hood is only through the aid of God. It takes several interventions from the divine for Adam and Eve to achieve a place of harmony in their relationship. Milton's Christianity emphasizes a point in Jung's theories that the final manifestation of the *anima* is "Sapientia, wisdom transcending even the most holy and the most pure" (The Process of Individuation 195) and the *animus* is revealed last as "the incarnation of *meaning*" (206). In the Christian doctrine, God is the source of wisdom and meaning. It is through his intervention that Adam and Eve can find concord between their masculine and feminine qualities. The close of the poem reflect the renewed complementarity achieved through God's intervention. Adam shows a more moderate temperament when he acknowledges Eve's final comments without speaking: "So spake our mother Eve and Adam heard / Well pleased but answered not" (P.L. XII, 624-625). In the earlier books, Adam dominates the conversation with Raphael and Eve, but in this instance, Adam seems to accept that Eve's words do not require any additional comment. But, this action is not an act of submission since Eve, in her final comments submits to Adam's leadership: "But now lead on. / In me is no delay. With thee to go / Is to stay here hence unwillingly" (XII, 614-616). Adam is confident in his position as leader without feeling the need to add to Eve's comments. The union of their persons as a couple is solidified by the last two lines: "They hand in hand with wand'ring steps and slow / Through Eden took their solitary way" (XII, 648-649). They are physically joined through their hands but the word "solitary" conveys a oneness as if they are now a single entity. This final image reflects the syzygy image of Book IV: "So hand in hand they passed, the loveliest pair / That ever since in love's embraces met" (IV, 321-322). Through God's instruction, or as Milton says "Providence their guide" (XII, 647), Adam and Eve achieve a harmony that harkens back to their paradise lost.

V: The Eternal Self: God in Spirit and Incarnate

Throughout the individuation process, the individual is addressing natural dualities i.e., the positive and negative capabilities of the person, the masculine and feminine qualities of the psyche, and the mingling of the natural and spiritual inside a person. The shadow may be projected as something supernatural, but the source of the evil is within, a part of the animalistic nature of humanity. Jung describes the masculine and feminine as deriving from a majority and minority of masculine and feminine genes respectively in a man or vice versa in a woman. While this claim is dubious in correlation to the internal attitude, the *anima(us)* is the soul of a person, not in the spiritual sense of the word “soul,” but in the psychic sense of the word— “internal personality” perhaps being a more accurate phrase. Although not as animalistic as the shadow, the *anima(us)* is still a part of the natural composition of the human mind. The third and final archetypal encounter in the individuation process is with a figure that transcends the natural and initiates a person into a knowledge of the spiritual, both externally and internally. This final archetype takes the form of the *wise old man* for a male and the *great mother* for a female. By coming to a place of psychic balance with the *anima(us)*, the soul-image reverts to a same-sex figure. This archetypal manifestation represents a fulfillment of the *self*. While Milton and Jung differ on how a fully integrated *self* would emerge, through the grace of God as opposed to the self-deification of man through psychic processes, this final archetype finds a form in the figure of God in *Paradise Lost*.

Of all the archetypes, the *wise old man* and *great mother* were the least developed by Jung. To a certain extent, his attempts to define the *self* remained abstract. That being said, the following interpretation of the *wise old man* and *great mother* within *Paradise Lost* seeks to evolve his ideas albeit in a manner that fits well within Jung’s work. The notion of bringing the two archetypes to bear under one figure was not observed in Jung’s work; however, the two are

not mutually exclusive if evoked in a figure of neutral sexuality. The non-sexuality of God allows two figures that share much in common but are separated by gender to come together cohesively. One such similarity is the archetypes representation of the ideal of wisdom. Both the *wise old man* and *great mother* epitomize spiritual wisdom, which descends upon the individuating individual through this external source. That notion is evolved a step further, with the ideal of wisdom being the end result of individuation, in that the reader achieves wisdom by becoming a unified whole through the reading of *Paradise Lost*.

Jung's use of the *wise old man* and *great mother* to symbolize both a blending of natural and spiritual as well as the psychic completion of an individual requires an understanding of Jung's concept of the *self*. The *self* is the complete synthesis of the various contents of an individual's conscious and unconscious psyche. It is both the final archetype as well as a culmination of the other archetypes. I discussed this concept briefly through Jung's terminology of the *marriage quaternity*, but it requires further elaboration. According to Jung, "the self...is the archetype of unity and totality" (qtd. in Storr 20). Jung relates the symbolism of four with the concept of the *self* through the symbol of the quaternity: "the four achieves its ultimate fulfillment only in the manifestation of the one" (Jacobi 170). For Jung, the four comprises an *eidos* (Platonic wholeness), which is also what the *self* can be understood as: "the *self*...proves to be the *eidos* behind the supreme ideas of unity and totality" (C.W. 9ii: 64). Thus, the concept of a whole being divisible into four parts is the basis for Jung's philosophy behind the *self*. As stated in the introduction, the *marriage quaternity* is composed of the external *persona*, which corresponds to the sex of the subject, the partner of the subject who is of the opposite sex, the internal attitude or *anima(us)*, and the final element: the wise old man or mother. There exist four components that compose the one, whole *self* of an individual.

Jung relates his *self* image directly to concepts of God. In *Psychology and Religion*, he writes “The idea of those old philosophers was that God manifested himself first in the creation of the four elements. They were symbolized by the four partitions of the circle” (70). The image is of a circle divided into four equal quadrants with God at the center representing the quintessence. While not a Christian, Jung describes the figure of Christ as the Western image of the *self*. Jung writes that “the spontaneous symbols of the *self*, or of wholeness, cannot in practice be distinguished from a God-image” (C.W. 9ii: 73). To understand Jung’s *self*, it is imperative to understand his conception of the Christ figure. Jung believed “the original Christian conception of the *imago Dei* embodied in Christ meant an all-embracing totality that even includes the animal side of man” (9ii: 74). In Christ is the perfect blending of matter and spirit, good and evil, and masculine and feminine achieved. The *self* is the achievement of the God-image through psychic assimilation. By achieving *self*-hood, an individual achieves the harmony of being represented by a figure like Christ, in the West, or Buddha, in the East.

Milton and Jung’s portrayal of this final archetype differs to a certain extent. According to Jolande Jacobi, a student of Jung, his theory of individuation is “a process of psychic development that aims at the broadening of the field of consciousness and a maturation of the personality” (Jacobi 113). If the un-individuated individual is compared to an infant, each archetypal encounter is a milestone in the development of the child into an adult. As the last step into maturity, the *wise old man* or *great mother* would be the manifestation of the individual’s psyche as a fully functional and mature adult. As the final step in a process of psychic ascension, these images represent a wholeness and completeness of being and therefore “they are often represented by the figures of gods or by symbols of the indestructible” (114-115). Herein lies the connection between Jung’s theories and Milton’s text. Milton, in *De Doctrina Christiana*, views

the restoration of the individual as a work of God. The putting off of the old flesh and donning the new, is akin to the recognition of the external *persona* and beginning the developmental process of individuation. Milton writes, “The *restoration of man* is the act whereby man, being delivered from sin and death by God the Father through Jesus Christ, is raised to a far more excellent state of grace and glory than that from which he had fallen” (*De Doctrina Christiana* 382). For Milton, this initial act on the part of an individual of acknowledging the fallen-ness of the human condition and the need for a savior is followed by the process of sanctification:

The intent of *supernatural renovation* is not only to restore man still more completely than before to the use of his natural faculties, as regards his power to form right judgment, and to exercise free will; but to create afresh, as it were, the inward man, and infuse from above new and supernatural faculties into the minds of the renovated. (*De Doctrina Christiana* 442)

For Milton, the process of becoming a whole being is inseparable from the intervention of God and the salvation achieved through his Son’s death and resurrection. The final *self* is found in a union of the individual with God, the self becoming like the Son. Jung and Milton come to a nexus with regards to the exemplified *self*—Christ. Jung saw in the figure of Christ a harmony between the dualities of man while Milton’s Christianity sees Christ as the fusion of God and man. It is through the incorporation of the spiritual component that an individual becomes fully individuated; the spiritual being manifested in the *wise old man* or *great mother*. In *Paradise Lost*, Milton’s God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—can be seen as distinctive elements of the *wise old man* or *great mother* archetypes with all three adopting various elements of the archetype.

The *wise old man* and *great mother* manifest differently due to Jung’s view of gender

roles and characteristics; however, they exist within a similar pattern, much like the *anima* and *animus* and their relation to one another. While the *wise old man* is a masculine figure, Jung asserts that “He is the father of the soul, and yet the soul, in some miraculous manner, is also his virgin mother” (C.W. 9i: 74). There is a cyclical image of the father begetting the soul, who in turn births the father much as Mary birthed Jesus, her God. Just as the *wise old man* is the spiritual teacher, representing “knowledge, reflection, insight, wisdom, cleverness, and intuition on the one hand and on the other, moral qualities such as goodwill and readiness to help” (9i: 406), so too is the *great mother* associated with “maternal solicitude and sympathy; the magic authority of the female; the wisdom and spiritual exaltation that transcends reason; any helpful instinct that fosters growth and fertility” (9i: 158). The relationship between the *wise old man* and the *great mother* is like that between the *anima* and *animus* in the sense that it is complementary. The individuated man and individuated woman together form a unified whole. As complementary figures, the *wise old man* and *great mother* find their origin and substance in a single source, two manifestations of a single entity. Thus, Milton’s God, who is everything, would be this source from which everything finds its being. Raphael, clarifies this, saying “O Adam! One almighty is, from whom / All things proceed and up to Him return” (P.L. V, 469-470).

While the *wise old man* or *great mother* can appear in many guises, Jung expresses a feeling of ethereality that surrounds the figures in their humbler visage. Jung writes that “the figure of the superior or helpful old man tempts one to connect him somehow or other with God” (C.W. 9i: 412). That is, in its numinosity, it creates an atmosphere of the divine. While God is often masculine in description, God is not sexed male in the same way as Jesus for, God is beyond the concept of sexual identity, capable of representing all the qualities of both a father

and a mother. In *Paradise Lost*, the Father is never portrayed as a masculine entity apart from the tradition of using masculine pronouns to describe Him. In Book V, Milton describes the Father in a rather Platonic sense:

...in orbs
Of circuit inexpressible they stood
Orb within Orb, the Father Infinite,
By whom in bliss embosomed sat the Son
Amidst as from a flaming mount whose top
Brightness had made invisible... (P.L. V, 594-599)

Rather than expressing the Father as a masculine figure, he gives God a shape, specifically a circle, which is highly symbolic. In *Psychology and Religion*, Jung writes, “They [the ancients] knew in those days that the circle meant the deity...The image of the circle—regarded as the most perfect form since Plato’s *Timaeus*, the prime authority of Hermetic philosophy—was also given to the most perfect substance, to the gold, to the *anima mundi* or *anima media natura*, and to the first created light” (66-67). This description also calls forth the symbolism of the nature of God: “The centre within a circle is a very well-known allegory of the nature of God” (C.W. 12: 137). Jesus, as the center of the circle that is the Father, is the physical manifestation of the Father’s nature. This tradition is reflected by Milton’s predecessor Dante Alighieri in *Paradiso*:

The order in the natural spheres that stills
The central point and moves, round that, all else,
Here sets its confine and begins its rule.
This primal sphere has no “where” other than
The mind of God. The love that makes it turn

Is kindled there, so, too, the powers it rains.

Brightness and love contain it in one ring,

As this, in turn, contains the spheres below.

And only He who binds it knows the bond.

(*Paradiso* Canto XXVII, 106-114)

For Milton, as for Dante, God is capable of representing the source from which the masculine and feminine derive, and thus the *wise old man* and *great mother* are two manifestations of His qualities.

Aside from the Father's immaterial description, *Paradise Lost* describes the third person of the trinity, the Holy Spirit as a feminine entity. At the very beginning of the poem, Milton invokes the "Heav'nly Muse" (P.L. I, 6), which in the epic tradition was typically Calliope. The Muses are female figures, daughters of Zeus and patronesses of the arts. The Holy Spirit, by replacing Calliope, is adopting the role of inspiring the poet and the characteristics that are typically represented by the Muses. In Book I, the Holy Spirit is portrayed in both a motherly image as well as a paternal image: "Dove-like sat'st brooding on the vast abyss / And mad'st it pregnant" (I, 21-22). The Spirit is portrayed as a female bird nesting her eggs, or rather nesting the emptiness before time, preparing to birth creation as it simultaneously impregnates creation. This alludes to the hermetic philosophy of God being of both and neither sex. In Book VII, Milton again addresses his Muse, this time by the name Urania, the muse of astronomy, to guide him as he recalls the creation of the Universe. During the Renaissance, Urania was considered the Christian muse and became associated with the Holy Spirit, as Lily B. Campbell writes,

...However, at the very moment when the hosts of Christendom were capturing the classical epic and turning it to new divine uses, there appeared on the scene a

Christian muse—one to whom the formal invocation of the Christian epic might appropriately be addressed. The muse was Urania, and she was introduced to the world of divine poetry in a work entitled *La Muse Chrétienne* and published in 1574. (37)

And Lastly, in Book IX, Milton articulates the nightly phenomenon that bestows upon him the verses for his poem: “Of my celestial patroness who deigns / Her nightly visitation unimplored” (P.L. IX, 21-22). Milton explicitly refers to the Holy Spirit as a patroness, further cementing this notion that the Spirit is a feminine person. Regardless of the perception of the Father as a masculine figure, the Holy Spirit largely adopts the maternal qualities of the Muses and allows for the masculine and feminine to be perceived in one entity.

Just as the two genders find reconciliation in the figure of God, so too does the notion of spirit and matter. Jung, in perceiving the duality that exists in all archetypes, separated the figure of both the *wise old man* and the *great mother* into two personalities. In his essay “Phenomenology of The Spirit in Fairytales,” Jung emphasizes the different manifestations that the *wise old man* can take: “sometimes the part is played by a ‘real’ spirit, namely a ghost of one dead, or, more rarely, by grotesque gnomelike figures or talking animals” (C.W. 9i: 396). The *wise old man*, while representing meaning and spirit, thus appears in various guises that unite the material and immaterial. Similarly, the *great mother* is subdivided from the overarching title of “the *mother*” (9i: 309) into the two categories of “(‘Primordial Mother’ and ‘Earth Mother’)” (9i: 309). These two subcategories represent the elements of the spirit/matter binary. For Jung, “the Earth Mother is always chthonic” (9i: 312) while the Primordial Mother is not as definitively expressed but it is often associated with the Mother of God image. This distinction is used to differentiate between the spiritual mother and the chthonic mother. In a similar manner, God is

separated, in *Paradise Lost*, into two persons, one representing his wholly incomprehensible spiritual nature (i.e., the Father) and the second his agency, represented by a physical form that would later be incarnate in flesh (i.e., the Son). Milton consistently juxtaposes the Father and Son in a manner that highlights the Son's role as the physical manifestation of the Father. In Book III, Milton writes:

Beyond compare the Son of God was seen
Most glorious. In Him all His Father shone
Substantially expressed and in His face
Divine compassion visibly appeared:
Love without end and without measure grace. (P.L. III, 138-142)

This same notion is reflected in Book VII, a repetition that cements the idea that the Son is the substantial expression of the qualities of the Father. Not only is the Son a physical entity, but he becomes a material being when he is incarnated on Earth. This notion is foreshadowed when the Son offers himself as a sacrifice to save humanity: "Their nature also to Thy nature join / And be Thyself man among men on Earth, / Made flesh" (III, 282-284). The Son simultaneously exists as both God, a spiritual presence, and substance, representing like the *wise old man* and the *great mother* the two harmonizing of spirit and matter.

The appearance of the *wise old man* or *great mother* often coincides with a time of difficulty for the individual. Jung writes that "the old man always appears when the hero is in a hopeless and desperate situation from which only profound reflection or a lucky idea—in other words, a spiritual function or an endopsychic automatism of some kind—can extricate him" (C.W. 9i: 401). This trend of apparition is mirrored in *Paradise Lost* as God appears to guide Adam and Eve when they are in need. God is seen as a figure of agency, helping Adam and Eve

in their growth and education, and ultimately becoming the necessary component for them to become their full *self*. The text illustrates the working of the *wise old man* and the *great mother* archetypes throughout the individuation process in various guises; these become progressively more substantial as the deeper strata of the mind are experienced. In Milton, we observe a non-linear progression of individuation in practice as opposed to the linear model proposed in theory by Jung. God is seen propelling the individuation process forward until he appears in his most substantial form to finish the maturation of Adam and Eve, the Son.

The first foundational moment of Adam and Eve's existence is their creation. The typical birth of an individual is accompanied by the protective nurturing and education by the parents or a parental figure. Without this, the child has very little chance for survival. Adam and Eve are unusual in their creation, being able-bodied and capable adults who have certain innate functions and knowledge that take most individuals years to develop. Despite their status as adults, their condition requires a guiding figure to create order and purpose for them. Adam's innate wisdom has already been remarked on in the previous section, but despite the knowledge of his external lack (not having a partner), he is unable, by his own power, to remedy his solitude. Adam is equally unable to formulate his purpose without guidance from above. Into this vacuum of completion and purpose, God comes down to Adam and instructs him in his created purpose:

Not only these fair bounds but all the Earth
To thee and to thy race I give. As lords
Possess it and all things therein live,
Or live in sea or air, beast, fish, and fowl,
In sign whereof each bird and beast behold
After their kinds. I bring them to receive

From thee their names and pay thee fealty
With low subjection. (P.L. VIII, 338-344)

Adam has several roles that God has ordained for him: firstly, the entirety of the world is purposed as a home for Adam and his descendants to “till and keep and of the fruit to eat” (VIII, 320); secondly, Adam and his kindred are to rule over the world and the lesser species, but in a respectful manner, which includes naming and maintaining the animal populations; and finally, since the two commands above are in the plural, Adam is meant to populate the Earth with his own children. Yet, the commands are only manageable if Adam is able to procreate his image to help with the workload; otherwise the tasks appointed him are impossible. It is in this first situation of impossibility that God as the *wise old man* formulates a solution. In response to Adam’s insistence about his need for a helper, God creates Eve in order to aid Adam in his obligations to God: “What next I bring shall please thee, be assured, / Thy likeness, thy fit help, thy other self, / Thy wish exactly as thy heart’s desire” (VIII, 449-451).

Adam’s encounter with the *wise old man* is paralleled by Eve’s post-creation experiences. Eve’s experience at the lake has been addressed above but the focus shifts from the pool as a mirror to the role of God as a guide for the endangered Eve. In her isolated state, Eve finds herself left to interpret her life and purpose without divine aid. This leads her to the mirror which engages her attention. In her infantile state, the fate of Narcissus looms like a shadow over her destiny, which she expresses after the fact to Adam: “There I had fixed / Mine eyes till now and pined with vain desire” (P.L. IV, 465-466). In this desperate situation, God’s voice comes down to instruct Eve, to provide the parental figure that she lacks.

A Voice thus warned me: “What thou seest,
What there thou seest, fair creature, is thyself:

With thee it came and goes. But follow me
And I will bring thee where no shadow stays
Thy coming and thy soft embraces. He
Whose image thou art, him thou shalt enjoy
Inseparably thine. To him shalt bear
Multitudes like thyself and thence be called
Mother of human race.” (IV, 467-475)

Like Adam, Eve is given the task of bearing children and the title “mother of human race,” a task that she cannot meet without another. Since Eve is not aware of her ordained purpose, she is given direction when she is in danger of misinterpreting her role in the world. Eve is “called” in this moment to her destiny, a thought mirrored in Joseph Campbell’s work *Hero with a Thousand Faces*: “what such a figure [the wise old man or old crone] represents is the benign, protecting power of destiny” (J. Campbell 71). God, as the figure of spiritual enlightenment and divine aid instructs Eve about her vocation, which alone she cannot hope to fulfill.

These two particular encounters represent a disembodied form of the *wise old man* or the *great mother*. While the archetype is often manifested as a physical projection, this early in Adam and Eve’s existence, the *wise old man* or the *great mother*, as the final archetype, is not consciously manifested. Jung writes, “It is always the father-figure from whom the decisive convictions, prohibitions, and wise counsels emanate. The invisibility of this source is frequently emphasized by the fact that it consists simply of an authoritative voice” (C.W. 9i: 396). Although the individuation process is not as linear in *Paradise Lost* as Jung describes it in theory, Adam and Eve are not at a point in their self-initiation that allows them to manifest the *wise old man* or the *great mother* in a physical manner. Instead, the Voice of the Father acts as a proto-

manifestation that acts according to the role of the *self* but is still deeply unconscious.

The appearance of the *wise old man* or the *great mother* in the infantile stages of Adam's and Eve's lives follows in accordance with Jung's thoughts on the development of a child. This *mother* archetype is always present in a child despite their un-individuated state, and it is unconsciously projected onto the strong maternal figures in a child's life.

First in importance are the personal mother and grandmother, stepmother and mother-in-law; then any woman with whom a relationship exists—for example, a nurse or governess or perhaps a remote ancestress. Then there are what might be termed mothers in a figurative sense. To this category belong the goddess, and especially the Mother of God, the Virgin, and Sophia. (C.W. 9i: 156)

These mother figures are not special in a divine sense rather they achieve a level of numinosity from the unconscious archetype finding a surface upon which to project itself. Like the mother role described by Jung, God acts as a mentor to instruct His or perhaps Her children. And just as a child is unaware of any individuating process, the mother is nonetheless granted a status above her humanity. The *mother* or *wise old man* archetype, as a symbol of the individuated *self*, is always at work on some deeply unconscious level in the psyche, always pushing an individual towards an awareness of wholeness of being. Jung comments on the agency of the unconscious even before individuation takes place. In the essay "Conscious, Unconscious, and Individuation," Jung describes the unconscious as *in potentia*:

The thought we shall think, the deeds we shall do, even the fate we shall lament tomorrow, all lie unconscious in our today. The unknown in us which the affect uncovers was always there and sooner or later would have presented itself to the conscious. Hence we must always reckon with the presence of things not yet

discovered. (9i: 498)

It is this state of potentiality that is constantly asserting itself upon the conscious:

“consciousness succumbs all too easily to unconscious influences, and these are often truer and wiser than our conscious thinking. Also, it frequently happens that unconscious motives overrule our conscious decisions, especially in matters of vital importance” (9i: 504). As this process is initiated, the *self* begins to guide the individual in a more direct or conceivable manner.

However, the final manifestation is not visible until the other archetypes are encountered and harmonized.

As Adam and Eve begin the individuation process and encounter their first archetype, the shadow manifested in Eve’s dream in Book V, they stumble upon another moment in their maturation process that requires spiritual guidance. As was observed in the first section, Adam has a sense of the malignancy of Eve’s dream but is unable to pinpoint the source since he does not have a knowledge of Satan or evil as a concept, aside from the notion that evil is what is not present in their good selves and environment. As Adam and Eve become more individuated, the figure of the *wise old man* and the *great mother* becomes increasingly material. This seems logical since the process of individuation requires an awareness of the psyche and the influences therein, which only become more prominent the more individuated a person becomes. To aid Adam and Eve, the Father sends Raphael, a seraph to help them understand the spiritual world outside of Eden:

Go therefore

.....

And such discourse bring on

As may advise him of his happy state—

Happiness in his pow'r left free to will,
Left to his own will, his will though free
Yet mutable. Whence warn him to beware
He swerve not too secure. Tell him withal
His danger and from whom, what enemy
Late fall'n himself from Heav'n is plotting now
The fall of others, from like state of bliss. (P.L. V, 229-241)

Raphael represents another proto-form of the fully manifested *wise old man*, or perhaps more precisely, a surrogate figure, who, in being sent by the Father, accepts the mantle of the guide. Raphael is not wholly spiritual or material, but represents a merging of the two; in this manner he is not a fully differentiated and dualistic archetypal manifestation. This form of existence can be classified as ethereal. Raphael explains to Adam and Eve his own being as a blend of spiritual and material essence when he describes the hierarchy of being:

one first matter all
Endued with various forms, various degrees
Of substance and in things that live of life,
But more refined, more spirituous and pure
As nearer to Him placed or nearer tending... (V, 472-476)

All created beings are a blend of spirit and matter but the degrees to which the two elements are mixed in an entity varies on the entities proximity to God. Raphael, as a Seraph, is more spirit than chthonic but still has a measure of the chthonic in him since only the Father is fully spirit. While Raphael is himself not God and therefore not the *wise old man* nor the *great mother* from a *self* association standpoint, he is a creation of the archetype, a perspective of God that Adam

and Eve can comprehend. Although Raphael is capable of filling the educational role of the *wise old man* and the *great mother*, he does not represent the *self* from a Christian perspective because he is a creature of God and not God.

Raphael as an agent of the Father, the *wise old man*, represents the tutelary quality surrounding this archetypal manifestation. Jung says that “the *wise old man*, the superior master and teacher, the archetype of the spirit, symbolizes the pre-existent meaning hidden in the chaos of life” (C.W. 9i: 74). Throughout Books V-VIII, Raphael fulfills the role of teacher to Adam and Eve as he helps them to understand the world around them, in particular fulfilling his duty to educate them on the shadow. Raphael’s appointment was to reveal the existence of Satan as well as the events that transpired in Heaven, which produced Satan in his shadow form. With such a task, Raphael feels a tension in having to relay the spiritual to the natural:

Sad task and hard, for how shall I relate
To human sense th’ invisible exploits
Of warring spirits, how without remorse
The ruin of so many glorious once
And perfect while they stood, how last unfold
The secrets of another world perhaps
Not lawful to reveal? (P.L. V, 564-570)

Although Adam is born with inherent wisdom, his knowledge is not complete and he requires an external source to “compensate this state of spiritual deficiency by contents designed to fill the gap” (C.W. 9i: 398). Raphael expresses insecurities about relaying the spiritual to the earthly because of the difficulty of translating the Heavenly into language suitable for Adam and Eve.

The third manifestation of the *wise old man* and *great mother* appears in the aftermath of

Adam and Eve's sin and fall. They are doomed to die and be separated from their creator forever, when God in the form of the Son comes down. It is important to distinguish the Son as he appears in this context from the Son as he will appear in the vision Michael gives Adam in Book XII. While the Son will come to represent the perfect *self*, fully God and fully man, this Son is still fully God and has yet to adopt the nature of humanity. This intervention of the Son occurs at a moment when the *self* is in its greatest turmoil. Adam and Eve have internalized the shadow and face a lifetime of inescapable temptation; their internal attitude and external *personae* are in a constant state of flux and they are unable to reconcile each other. However, at the moment when a guiding figure is most necessary, they are least desirous for the aid: "Love was not in their looks either to God / Or to each other but apparent guilt / And shame and perturbation and despair, / Anger and obstinacy and hate and guile" (P.L. X, 111-114). There is a sense that Adam and Eve, in confronting the manifestation of their potential *selves*, hate what they see because of what they could have become and what they threw away.

The Son's response to Adam and Eve's sin exhibits one of the dichotomies of the nature of God. In the face of their sin, the Son is required to mete out a punishment as is required by his just nature; however, the Son also extends his grace. To each perpetrating party, the Son administers a just sentence: "To judgment he proceeded on th' accursed / Serpent" (X 164-165), "And to the woman thus his sentence turned" (X, 192), "On Adam last thus judgment he pronounced" (X, 197). Upon Adam and Eve, a punishment is assigned that makes fulfilling their purpose more difficult. In sinning, Adam and Eve corrupted their created purpose and their roles on Earth are thus corrupted. Eve's role as Adam's partner is made painful in relation to populating the Earth. Adam's task of subduing and caring for the Earth is rendered excruciating as nature rebels against him. However, within the confines of this judgment, the Son weaves the

Father's plan for redemption. "Between thee and the woman I will put / Enmity and between thine and her seed: / Her seed shall bruise thy head, thou bruise his heel" (X, 179-181). There remains the promise of hope that Adam and Eve can still ascend to their intended *self*-ness.

Beginning with the anticipation of redemption, Milton reaches the end of individuation in a manner different from Jung. Throughout the text, Adam and Eve have matured through exposure to their psychic manifestations but ultimately fall. Adam and Eve join the audience as fallen and sinful people. Jung argues that the process of individuation is the psychic journey that an individual must undergo to overcome the limitations of their person. The effort, even for Jung, to become a fully integrated and healthy *self* is not something that an individual can achieve in an isolated and self-contained environment. The archetypes, the primitive concepts of humanity's collective unconscious, emerge to help an individual face different debilitating aspects of themselves. It is only through the interference and assimilation of the archetypes that an individual becomes the *self*. For Milton, it comes full circle. God is the creator of the archetypes as well as the fully individuated *self*.

This revelation of God as the source and the end result is seen in the vision that Michael shows Adam before his exile from Eden. Michael shows Adam the future of mankind, all the woes and ills that result from Adam and Eve's sin. It is towards the end of the vision that the Son is manifested in his fully archetypal role as *the wise old man*: "A virgin is His mother but His sire / The Pow'r of the Most High. He shall ascend / The throne hereditary and bound His reign / With earth's wide bounds, His glory with the Heav'ns" (P.L. XII, 368-371). The culmination of the archetypes in the *self* is seen in the merging of God with man, a blending of all the dualities that the individuation process addresses. In the Son is the fully harmonized shadow, the masculine and feminine encompassed in psychic balance, and the spiritual and natural fully

present.

The final step of individuation for humanity is the merging of man with God as seen in the vision of the Son as the person of Jesus Christ. Michael foretells of the Holy Spirit: “The promise of his Father, who shall dwell / The Spirit within them and the Law of Faith, / Working through love, upon their hearts shall write / To guide them in all truth” (P.L. XII, 487-490). In every human, the spiritual and material merge and form a unified *self* but only in those who have accepted the grace and salvation of the Son. This state, as a justified Christian, is for Milton the fullness of *self*. After showing Adam this last hope for mankind, the union of God in each individual, Michael proclaims, “this having learned thou hast attained the sum of wisdom” (XII, 575-576). As was observed in the quotes from Jung about the *wise old man* and *great mother*, wisdom was the defining characteristic that brought the two gendered figures to a common point. This is Milton’s proclamation to the reader, to those who have followed the individuation journey of Adam and Eve and have been similarly effected. The *self*, the benchmark of a unified and complete individual is seen in a union with God through Christ. This is the totality of wisdom.

Works Cited

- Abraham, Lyndy. "Milton's *Paradise Lost* and 'The Sounding Alchymie'." *Renaissance Studies* 12.2 (1998): 261-276.
- Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Campbell, Lily B. "The Christian Muse." *The Huntington Library Bulletin* 8 (1935): 29-70.
- Champagne, Claudia M. "Adam and His 'Other Self' in *Paradise Lost*: A Lacanian Study in Psychic Development." *Milton Quarterly* 25.2 (1991): 48-59.
- Dawkins, Richard. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Driscoll, James P. *The Unfolding God of Jung and Milton*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1993.
- Fish, Stanley. *Surprised by Sin*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Franz, M.L. Von. "Science and the Unconscious." Jung, C.G., et al. *Man and His Symbols*. New York: Dell Publishing, 1964. 375-387.
- Franz, M.L. Von. "The Process of Individuation." Jung, C.G., et al. *Man and his Symbols*. New York: Dell Publishing, 1964.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. New York City: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc, 1961.
- Frye, Northrop. *The Return of Eden: Five Essays on "Paradise Lost."* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- Gilbert, Sandra M and Susan Gubar. "Milton's Bogey: Patriarchal Poetry and Women Readers." Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979. 187-192.

- Graham, Elspeth. "'Vain Desire', 'Perverseness' and 'Love's Proper Hue': Gender, Sexuality and Feminist Interest in *Paradise Lost*." *Critical Survey* 4.2 (1992): 133-139.
- Hill, Gareth. "Men, the Anima, and the Feminine." *The San Francisco Jung Institute Library Journal* 17.3 (1998): 49-62.
- Hunter, Jeanne Clayton. "Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost*." *PMLA* 91.1 (1976): 115-116.
- Jacobi, Jolande. *Complex/Archetype/Symbol In the Psychology of C.G. Jung*. Trans. Ralph Manheim. New York: Pantheon Books, Inc, 1959.
- Juhnke, Anna K. "Remnants of Misogyny in *Paradise Lost*." *Milton Quarterly* 22.2 (1998).
- Jung, C.G. "Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self." Jung, C.G. *Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. Ed. Sir Herbert Read, et al. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2. Vol. 9. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Jung, C.G. "Approaching the Unconscious." Jung, C.G., et al. *Man and His Symbols*. New York: Dell Publishing, 1964. 3-94.
- Jung, C.G. "Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious." Jung, C.G. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. Ed. Sir Herbert Read, et al. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2. Vol. 9. New York: Princeton University Press, 1968. 1-86.
- Jung, C.G. "Archetypes: Shadow; Anima; Animus; the Persona; the Wise Old Man." Storr, Anthony. *The Essential Jung*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983. 87-127.
- Jung, C.G. "Concerning Rebirth." Jung, C.G. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. Ed. Sir Herbert Read, et al. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2. Vol. 9. New York: The Princeton University Press, 1969. 113-147.
- Jung, C.G. "Concerning the Archetypes and the Anima Concept." Jung, C.G. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. Ed. Sir Herbert Read, et al. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2nd. Vol. 9. New

- York: Princeton University Press, 1969. 54-72.
- Jung, C.G. "Conscious, Unconscious, and Individuation." Jung, C.G. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. Ed. Sir Herbert Read, et al. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2. Vol. 9. New York: Princeton University Press, 1968. 489-524.
- Jung, C.G. "Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype." Jung, C.G. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. Ed. Sir Herbert Read, et al. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2. Vol. 9. New York: Princeton University Press, 1968. 148-198.
- . *Psychology and Alchemy*. Ed. Gerhard Adler. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2. Vol. 12. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- . *Psychology and Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.
- Jung, C.G. "The Phenomenology of the Spirit in Fairytales." Jung, C.G. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. Ed. Sir Herbert Read, et al. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2. Vol. 9. New York: Princeton University Press, 1969. 207-254.
- Jung, C.G. "The Psychological Aspect of the Kore." Jung, C.G. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. Ed. Sir Herbert Read, et al. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2. Vol. 9. New York: Princeton University Press, 1968. 306-383.
- Jung, C.G. "The Psychology of the Child Archetype." Jung, C.G. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*. Ed. Sir Herbert Read, et al. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2. Vol. 9. New York: Princeton University Press, 1968. 259-305.
- Lewis, C.S. *A Preface to "Paradise Lost."* London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- . *Mere Christianity*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers Inc., 1952.
- Martin, Thomas L. "On the Margin of God: Deconstruction and the Language of Satan in *Paradise Lost*." *Milton Quarterly* 29.2 (1995): 41-47.

- McGrath, Patrick J. "Formal Resistance: Gender Hierarchy and Eve's Final Speech in *Paradise Lost*." *Milton Quarterly* 47.2 (2013): 72-87.
- Milton, John. *De Doctrina Christiana*. Ed. Frank Allen Patterson. Trans. Charles R. Sumner. Vol. 15. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933.
- . *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Gordon Teskey. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc, 2005.
- The New King James Version*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1995. Print.
- Nicene Creed. 325
- Norford, Don Parry. "Lost, My Other Half The Coincidence of Opposites in Paradise." *Modern Language Quarterly* 36.1 (1975): 21-53.
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe. "A Defense of Poetry." *The Norton Anthology of Theory & Criticism*. 2. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc, 2010. 595-613.
- Silverman, Willian John Jr. "*Paradise Lost* and the Cultural Genetics of Shame, Remorse, and Guilt." *LATCH: A Journal for the study of the Literary Artifact in Theory, Culture, or History* 1 (2008).
- Sugimura, Noel K. "Eve's Reflection and the Passion of Wonder in *Paradise Lost*." *Essays in Criticism* LXIV.1 (2014): 1-28.
- Van Nuis, Herman. "Animated Eve Confronting Her Animus: A Jungian Approach to the Division of Labor in *Paradise Lost*." *Milton Quarterly* 34.2 (2000): 48-56.
- Wordsworth, William. "The Prelude." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. 8th. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006. 1552-1592.

Works Referenced

- Lockerd Jr., Benjamin G. *The Sacred Marriage: Psychic Integration in "The Faerie Queene."*

London: Associated University Press, 1987