

The Significance of Satan:
Eikonoklastes as a Guide to Reading the Character in Milton's
Paradise Lost

Emily Chow

May 2012

Submitted to the Department of English at Mount Holyoke College in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honors.

Acknowledgements

It is with utmost gratitude that I acknowledge and thank the following individuals who have played a role in shaping my thesis:

Firstly, my academic and thesis advisor, Professor Eugene Hill, who introduced me to Milton and whose intellect and guidance proved invaluable throughout my thesis writing. All of this would not have been possible without you.

To Professor Bill Quillian and Professor Nadia Margolis, many thanks for being on my defense committee. Additionally, thank you to Professor Heidi Holder as well for helping with the thesis edits.

To LITS Liason Mary Stettner, my greatest appreciation for your help with references, citations, your patience and prompt email replies.

To Miss Caroline, for teaching a plebeian the meaning of “plebeian.”

To all of the amazing people who are my friends – of those here at Mount Holyoke to those scattered across the world from Canada to Australia, to the one who listened to my symposium presentation and the Little One who explained the Bible to me the best she could, from the one I’ve enjoyed conversations over beer and peanuts with to the one who kept me company online throughout those late nights, and finally to the one who indulged me with some Emily Chow time when it was much needed – I extend my sincerest and most heartfelt thank-yous.

My brother and my sister, my favorite people who have been my pillars of emotional support. The haw flakes helped a lot.

Last but not least, my parents, who have given me the opportunity to pursue the best education that a girl could ever ask for here at Mount Holyoke. The last four years of my life have been nothing short of incredible, and they wouldn’t have been possible without your support. Thank you, and to the both of you, this thesis I humbly dedicate.

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Chapter 1 <i>Eikonoklastes</i> : Role, Purpose and Milton's Intent	14
Chapter 2 The Doctrine and Tyranny in <i>Eikonoklastes</i>	35
Chapter 3 Language and Rhetoric of <i>Eikonoklastes</i>	57
Chapter 4 The Nature of Satan	76
Chapter 5 Satan: Origins and Sources	92
Chapter 6 In Between the Satanic Lines	108
Conclusion	125
Bibliography	131

INTRODUCTION

To regard Satan merely as a character in one of literature's greatest epic poems would be a severely limiting oversimplification. As the first character of John Milton's *Paradise Lost* to whom readers are introduced, Satan is undoubtedly crucial in the thematic development of the poem. He is the first character whose speech, thoughts and consciousness are revealed to readers, and it is through this disclosure of Satan's personality that readers understand how inconsistent he is. When Satan is first cast down from the heavens as a consequence of rebelling against God in Book I of *Paradise Lost*, he is depicted as a wretchedly glorified creature. After he "throws his baleful eyes / That witnessed huge affliction and dismay / Mixed with obdurate pride and steadfast hate" (I. 56 – 58), Satan then "with bold words / Breaking the horrid silence thus began" (I. 82 – 83) his speech to revive the spirits of his fallen crew and to reclaim heaven once more. Among all the evil spirits who

tumbled down from heaven and into hell, Satan speaks first; he is their leader and exercises undoubted power and influence over them as he leads them into council in the following book. At the council, Satan strikes an imposing figure, and with “transcendent glory raised / Above his fellows, with monarchical pride / Conscious of highest worth” (II. 427 – 429) speaks to his crew in Pandemonium. He is, in the first two books of *Paradise Lost*, depicted in a rather impressive manner:

. . . Darkened so, yet shone
 Above them all the archangel: but his face
 Deep scars of thunder had intrenched, and care
 Sat on his faded cheek, but under brows
 Of dauntless courage, and considerate pride
 Waiting revenge: cruel his eye, but cast
 Signs of remorse and passion to behold
 The fellows of his crime . . .

(I. 599 – 606)

The terms employed by Milton here prove contradictory; Satan has “dauntless courage” but at the same time, “considerate pride,” his eyes reveal cruelty yet they also “cast / Signs of remorse and passion.” The polarity of Satan’s nature is similarly evident when he arrives at the Garden of Eden in Book IV, and as he looks on at Adam and Eve, Satan’s rhetoric becomes a more melancholic and troubled one that expresses fear, envy, despair and resignation to evil and sin. His “conscience wakes despair / That slumbered, wakes the bitter memory / Of what he was, what is, and what must be” (IV. 23 – 25), as he regretfully laments that the sun only “bring[s] to my remembrance from what state / I fell, how glorious once above thy sphere; Till pride and worse

ambition threw me down” (IV. 38 – 40). Satan acknowledges his faults and calls himself “some inferior angel” (IV. 59); at the end of his sad speech, he resigns himself to the confinements of hell despite moving on with his plan to incite the fall of man: “Me miserable! Which way shall I fly / Infinite wrath, and infinite despair? / Which way I fly is hell; myself am hell” (IV. 73 – 75), and soon after resigns himself to evil as well: “So farewell hope, and with hope farewell fear, / Farewell remorse: all good to me is lost; / Evil be thou my good” (IV. 108 – 110).

Another aspect of Satan is his skill in manipulation and charisma, as seen in Book IX when he takes on the form of a serpent and tempts Eve to taste the forbidden fruit. He succeeds in doing so with the aid of his false flattery: “Into the heart of Eve his words made way” (IX. 550), calling Eve “A goddess among gods,” “resplendent Eve” and “Empress.” He deceives Eve into seeing no wrong in eating the fruit and, “making intricate seem straight” (IX. 632), manipulates the act of disobedience towards God into seeming like a “dauntless virtue” that “might lead / To happier life, knowledge of good and evil” (IX. 696 – 697). His distorted sense of logic in the questions posed to Eve makes her give in to the temptation of sin:

. . . wherein lies
 The offense, that man should attain thus to know?
 What can your knowledge hurt him, or this tree
 Impart against his will if all be his?
 Or is it envy, and can envy dwell
 In heavenly breasts?

(IX. 725 – 726)

Satan flees upon man's first disobedience, and his last appearance in *Paradise Lost* comes in Book X, where he victoriously returns to Pandemonium to boast of his success to his rebellious crew. His triumph, however, is short-lived, as he discovers that his crew has turned into hissing serpents and the fruits they bite into ashes and dust.

Satan's rhetoric takes on visible changes in each book in which he is depicted, moving and ranging from pride to despair, and back to being cunning and manipulative again. The apparent changes in his persona reveal the inconsistencies of his character, sparking much argument on how one should appropriately read the character of Satan and Milton's intentions for him. His contradictions make readers question Satan's role in the most fundamental way: is Satan a hero in *Paradise Lost*, or should he be typecast as the epic poem's antagonist? Can Satan be considered the poem's anti-hero, and should his fall from the heavens be seen as a tragedy? These are just the rudimentary questions regarding Satan's status in *Paradise Lost*. Other deeper and more contextual questions brought up in relation to Satan involve political tyranny and religious usurpation, which concerns monarchical figures, political events and religious doctrine to be examined and explored.

In the introduction to *Paradise Lost* in *The Complete Poetry and Essential Prose of John Milton* by Kerrigan, Rumrich and Fallon, it is said that "Milton deliberately places Satan in the roles occupied by classical epic heroes," and questions whether the appeal of Satan was meant to upset the "standard moral

balance of Christianity.”¹ Satan seems to have overturned the traditional sense of balance and logic by which the hero and villain are good and evil respectively, raising the question of what Milton’s stance was in regard to this while developing the character of Satan. William Blake mentions in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* that “The reason Milton wrote in fetters when he wrote of Angels & God, and at liberty when of Devils & Hell, is, because he was a true poet and of the Devil’s party without knowing it.”² Yet it can also be argued that the characteristics depicted in Satan are blurred: Satan’s vice of pride and rebelliousness is portrayed by Milton as bordering on heroism, of which the trait is considered to be “a main source of argument in modern Milton criticism.” At times, Satan’s “Heroic resistance... look[s] like habitual stubbornness,”³ making readers wonder if they should interpret Satan as being heroic or just plain obstinate. In *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in Paradise Lost*, Stanley Fish maintains that it is acceptable for readers to

. . . allow [for] heroic images of Satan to form in their minds, provided they are willing to sacrifice those images when the intentional meaning of the poem requires it (as it always will). Satan’s attractiveness is not an unconscious or unintended effect of some sort. Milton wanted his readers to entertain false ideas of Satan’s virtue.⁴

From Fish’s angle of the debate, Satan’s heroism is a false projection, but a necessary one that was intended by Milton. However, in searching for the

¹ Kerrigan, William, Rumrich, John and Fallon, Stephen M., *The Complete Poetry and Essential Prose of John Milton* (New York: Modern Library, 2007), 276.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, 277.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 277 – 278.

answers as to who or what Satan is, the question of how Satan was shaped must receive careful consideration.

Political and religious contexts are pertinent in exploring the nature of Satan and how his character came to be, as he is portrayed variously in the images of a tyrant, a monarch and God. When Satan presided over the council in Book II, he was:

High on a throne of royal state, which far
Outshone the wealth of Ormus and of Ind,
Or where the gorgeous East with richest hand
Showers on her kings barbaric pearl and gold,
Satan exalted sat . . .

(II. 1 – 5)

While Satan is depicted as a monarch on a throne here, he is portrayed as a tyrant elsewhere, for example, after he delivers a speech on deciding what the council's next step should be. Speaking with a "voice Forbidding," Satan "Thus saying rose / The monarch, and prevented all reply" from his council (II. 466 – 467). Aside from that, Satan is seen in the image of God as well: "Midst came their mighty paramount, and seemed / Alone the antagonist of heaven, nor less / Than hell's dread emperor with pomp supreme, / And God-like imitated state . . ." (II. 508 – 511). It is likely that Milton had specific references that influenced his idea and depiction of Satan, and as William Hazlitt remarked: "Milton has borrowed more than any other writer, and exhausted every source of imitation, sacred or profane . . ."⁵ Several

⁵ Kerrigan, Rumrich and Fallon, *The Complete Poetry and Essential Prose of John Milton*, 277.

components of *Paradise Lost*, such as the events that make up the plot, characteristics of Satan and the language employed in the poem, have their roots in the political and religious discourses of the seventeenth century, by which *Paradise Lost* was largely influenced. Hence, in trying to understand Milton's shaping of Satan's character and his reasons for doing so, political texts and backgrounds should be thoroughly examined and analyzed before coming to any kind of speculation or conclusion, and the political texts that are most useful in this regard are *Eikon Basilike* and *Eikonoklastes*.

Eikonoklastes (1649) is a political tract written by Milton in response to *Eikon Basilike*. The title "*Eikon Basilike*" means "The King's Image" and the text was written in defense of King Charles I, who ascended the throne in 1625. It was circulated shortly after his execution in an effort, as editors Daems and Faith Nelson suggest, "to embed the rhetoric of kingship into the minds of its early modern-readers, despite the physical absence of the king."⁶ Charles was executed in January 1649 following disputes and charges from his parliament, and he was perceived by his English opponents to be a political tyrant based on what they viewed as his desire for divine authority and kingly rule, as expressed throughout *Eikon Basilike*. It is noted for being a self-serving piece of work defending Charles from his errors as a monarch, promoting royalist propagandist intentions that aim to instill the concept of divine kingship in its readers.

⁶ Daems, Jim and Holly Faith Nelson, eds., *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes* (Ontario, Canada: Broadview Editions, 2006), 22.

Eikon Basilike enjoyed notable popularity and commercial success, and it helped to preserve Charles' identity as a martyred saint despite the ambiguity of the text's author even though it is written in the first-person narrative. Whether or not Charles himself wrote the text is highly debatable; while Milton wrote *Eikonoklastes* as countering Charles the author of *Eikon Basilike*, speculations as to a possible "ghost-writer" for the latter text emerged in 1690. Dr. John Gauden, Dean of Bocking and later on Bishop of Exeter and Worcester, is thought to have played a significant role in the writing of *Eikon Basilike*. Although Gauden only acknowledged his contribution of "the book and figure [frontispiece]" of *Eikon Basilike* as "wholly and only my invention, making and design,"⁷ as seen in his 1661 letter to Edward Hyde, the Earl of Clarendon, the publication of the Anglesey Memorandum in 1690 proved otherwise. A written note in the Earl of Anglesey's copy of *Eikon Basilike* confirmed that Gauden had authored the text as well, a piece of information that was relayed to the Earl by Charles II and the Duke of York. Although this indicates Gauden's involvement in the authorship of *Eikon Basilike*, authorial identity should not be of main focus when it comes to reading and interpreting the text, as emphasized by Milton, who advised readers to concentrate on the text at hand rather than the source: "But as to the Author of the soliloquies, whether it were the late King, as is Vulgarly believed, or any secret *Coadjutor*, and some stick not to name him, it

⁷ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 18.

can add nothing, not shall take any weight, if any be, or reason which he brings.”⁸

By appointment of the Council of State, Milton was assigned to write *Eikonoklastes* as the Secretary of Foreign Tongues in March 1649. Since its primary purpose was to counter *Eikon Basilike*, the text was written in English as it was intended for an English audience, and Milton’s effort is testament to his close focus on the text and its deducible intentions. As much as *Eikon Basilike* strives to promote a memorable image of the king, *Eikonoklastes* aims to shatter the king’s image. With its text title of the Greek word for “iconoclast,” which means “a breaker or destroyer of images” (Oxford English Dictionary, n., I), *Eikonoklastes* strips *Eikon Basilike*, as our editors note, of “its artful representation of privilege” and “its tyrannical grip on the imagination of its readers” by “unravel[ing] the rhetorical fabric of the text.”⁹ In fact, *Eikon Basilike* is fabricated from what editors Daems and Faith Nelson describe as “a curious hybrid of genres: political memoir, *apologia*, spiritual autobiography, martyrology, hagiography, meditation, and Psalter,” and with the manipulation of this “range of representational codes,” a “unitary image or iconic ‘portrait’ of the suffering Charles I”¹⁰ appears through the iconoclastic text. While it did not enjoy the same level of success that *Eikon Basilike* did, *Eikonoklastes* cleared for such readers as it attracted, the doubts

⁸ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 227.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 33.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 23.

and vagueness of Charles' rhetoric by demonstrating that it is "stuffed with naught else but the common grounds of Tyranny and Popery," suggesting that *Eikon Basilike* should be read as nothing more than "a posthumous 'useless bulk' of monarchy and royalism."¹¹

In considering the language and style of *Eikonoklastes*, it is clear that Milton's intentions were specifically aimed towards demystifying Charles' political misrepresentations and unveiling his real intentions. A close reading of the text enables one to understand how Milton employs linguistic methods to persuade his readers while integrating political references and biblical scripture in achieving his goal. If Milton had specific intentions to unmask Charles with *Eikonoklastes*, he also had specific intentions in portraying Satan the way he did in *Paradise Lost*, and understanding the contrasting stances between *Eikonoklastes* and *Eikon Basilike* adds a deeper and whole other dimension to interpreting Satan. Based on textual analysis, the two political tracts can be treated as necessary and even much needed aids to understanding the reasons behind Satan's multiplicity, for it is in all likelihood that Milton intended for the content and events surrounding *Eikonoklastes* to shape *Paradise Lost* and its characters. To read Satan in any other simplistic manner would be insubstantial, as his multi-faceted nature contributes to the richness and depth of his character, and subsequently to *Paradise Lost* as a whole.

¹¹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 30.

CHAPTER ONE
Eikonoklastes: Role, Purpose and Milton's Intent

Declaring that “I take it on me as a work assigned rather, than by me chosen or affected,”¹² Milton wrote *Eikonoklastes* as a textual response to Charles’ *Eikon Basilike*. Commissioned by the Council of State in March 1649,¹³ *Eikonoklastes* is a cautionary text against Charles’ dubious and manipulative rhetoric, targeted towards the English audiences who have been swayed by *Eikon Basilike*. Milton intended his text to be in the first instance an attack on Charles, but he also wanted it to be a source of public edification, providing in *Eikonoklastes* a chapter-by-chapter analysis of *Eikon Basilike* for his readers to realize the actual intentions of Charles. Both the texts can be

¹² Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 222.

¹³ *Ibid*, 29. Milton was Secretary of Foreign Tongues to the Council of State in March 1649 when *Eikonoklastes* was assigned to be written. While the job of the Secretary of Foreign Tongues involved preparing the council’s correspondence in Latin, however, *Eikonoklastes* was written in English. Milton was appointed to respond to *Eikon Basilike* because of his existing career in prose, and had been involved in several polemical debates since 1641.

viewed as a basis for the development of Satan, whose actions, speech and status among his rebellious crew reflect the content of the political tracts. While developing *Paradise Lost* between 1658¹⁴ and when it was first published as 10 books in 1667, Milton could very well have drawn from the political events and religious doctrine that were mentioned in *Eikonoklastes*. Thus, readers should be familiar with its content and language if they want to understand Satan's roots and character in a deeper sense. Since Milton does a thorough analysis of *Eikon Basilike* in *Eikonoklastes*, a close reading of the latter text is crucial for the comprehension of the two, and it is important to get a general understanding of the texts before coming to any conclusions about Satan.

As the Greek word for "iconoclasm," the title of *Eikonoklastes* gives a general idea of Milton's intentions and what the text is about: breaking the image. Milton clearly recognizes Charles' self-interests and duplicity in *Eikon Basilike*, thus making it his primary intent to expose Charles when writing *Eikonoklastes*. Since *Eikon Basilike* enjoyed tremendous success upon its publication¹⁵ and Milton was aware that a majority of its readers

¹⁴ Fowler, Alastair, Introduction, *Paradise Lost*, John Milton (Harlow, England: Longman, 2007), 5. According to the English author John Aubrey in Fowler's introduction, Milton began writing *Paradise Lost* in 1658, though early versions of the poem are attributed to a work of Milton's that was probably drafted in the early 1640s. Depicting the Fall of man in the Garden of Eden, it takes on the form of a tragic drama of four outlines, with the third titled "Paradise Lost," as stated in the introduction to *The Complete Poetry and Essential Prose of John Milton* (Kerrigan, Rumrich and Fallon, 252).

¹⁵ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 14. *Eikon Basilike* was said to be a commercial success at the time of its publication in 1649, with 35 editions of the book published in England and 25 in Europe.

would be bought over by its untruths, he points out that its content is merely a summary of Charles' misrepresentation of things. Instead of providing substantial explanations and reasoning for his actions, Charles creates excuses and diverts faults to various factors and people other than himself. Milton recognizes this diversion, and describes *Eikon Basilike* as a text in which "allegations, not reasons are the main Contents of this Book; and need no more than other contrary allegations to lay the question before all Men in an even balance,"¹⁶ revealing Charles' intentions of avoiding blame. In detecting all of the king's false allegations, Milton pinpoints all of the king's guises and tricks, recognizing that fear motivated Charles in making decisions rather than reason and justice.

An occasion that exemplifies all of these is seen in "2. *Upon the Earl of Strafford's death*," a section of *Eikon Basilike* in which Charles attempts to explain the execution of the Earl of Strafford. Milton counters this by calling upon the king's falsity and exposes him with his own account of the events surrounding Strafford's execution. Strafford, who was born Thomas Wentworth and served as the king's chief councilor, was made an Earl in January 1640 in light of Charles' deteriorating monarchy and political unrest in Ireland and Scotland.¹⁷ A contradiction, as identified by Milton, is seen

¹⁶ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 227.

¹⁷ Asch, Ronald G., "Wentworth, Thomas, first earl of Strafford (1593–1641)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29056>>. Strafford held considerable influence over Charles during his course of duty, and was charged with treason without trial by Parliament in April 1641 so that the House could exert more influence over Charles. Despite the charges of

when Charles attempts to explain his reasons for executing Strafford, claiming: “I was persuaded by those, that I think wished me well, to choose rather what was safe, than what seemed just,”¹⁸ before washing his hands clean by stating “I would not have had any hand in his Death, of whose Guiltlessness I was better assured, than any man living could be.”¹⁹ Even though he claims to have been persuaded into executing Strafford, Charles’ duplicity is explained by Milton as fear, pushing on indecisiveness and lacking strong justifications for actions:

For it was fear, and nothing else which made him feign before both the scruple and the satisfaction of his conscience, that is to say, of his mind: his first fear pretended conscience that he might be borne with to refuse signing; his latter fear being more urgent made him find a conscience both to sign and to be satisfied.²⁰

Milton identifies the false allegation in Charles’s statement, in which “no fears or respects whatsoever should make him alter that resolution founded upon his conscience,”²¹ and interpreted Charles’ words to reveal that:

. . . his resolution was indeed not founded upon his conscience . . . that it wrung his conscience to condemn the *Earl* of high Treason is not likely: not because he thought him guiltless of highest Treason . . . but because he knew himself a Principle in what the *Earl* was his accessory, and thought nothing Treason against the Common-wealth, but against himself only.²²

Based on Milton’s observation, Charles chose to sentence Strafford to death based on self-interest rather than his conscience despite Charles quoting

treason by Parliament, the death sentence could only be implemented by the king, who gave his approval for Strafford to be executed in May 1641.

¹⁸ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 54.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, 55.

²⁰ *Ibid*, 240.

²¹ *Ibid*, 238.

²² *Ibid*.

contrary-wise in *Eikon Basilike*. This only serves to demonstrate that *Eikon Basilike* holds much implicit meaning and intent within its text to mislead its readers, as Charles tries to conceal the true motivations for his actions. This reveals a sense of duplicity about Charles that is identified through his contradictory statements; where Charles is vague and misleading in his words, Milton is explicit in his intentions and writing, making *Eikonoklastes* a corrective text exposing the king's hidden motives and deviousness. Milton utilizes *Eikonoklastes* to expose the king's pretense to readers who might otherwise be manipulated by the inconsistent rhetoric of *Eikon Basilike*, questioning "why did he [Charles] seem resolved by the Judges and the Bishops? And if by them resolved, how comes the scruple here again?" before concluding that "It was not then, as he now pretends, *The importunities of some and the fear of many* which made him sign, but the satisfaction given him by those Judges and Ghostly Fathers of his own choosing." Milton's questions prompt further inquiry: "Which of him shall we believe? For he seems not one but double . . ." ²³ He makes it unmistakable to readers of *Eikonoklastes* that the contradictions of Charles stem from his "building upon false and wicked premises, which deceive the Common Reader not well discerning the antipathy of such connections," ²⁴ and further elaborates on it to shake the basis of the king's carefully scripted text.

²³ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 238.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 239.

The title of *Eikonoklastes* reads like its purpose as well: Milton's text was written to break the carefully constructed image of the king. In a very basic sense, the aims of *Eikon Basilike* and *Eikonoklastes* oppose one another: Charles' defense serves to construct a false image or representation of the king, whereas Milton wrote *Eikonoklastes* to directly counter Charles by destroying the false image that was built. Yet *Eikonoklastes* in all its reasons should not be limited to mere iconoclasm, for it also serves educative, political and spiritual purposes to readers. In *Eikonoklastes*, Milton explicitly states that Charles "goes on building upon false and wicked premises, which deceive the Common Reader not well discerning the antipathy of such connections . . ."²⁵ From the statement, it is seen that while Charles does have deceitful intentions of "building upon false and wicked premises," it is clear that readers are also deceived because they do not "well discern" the "antipathy of such connections." Audiences play a significant role in determining whether or not the king is falsely represented, hence Milton's focus on educating the reader through *Eikonoklastes*.

This statement is reiterated by Scott Cohen in his article "Counterfeiting and the Economics of Kingship in Milton's *Eikonoklastes*," where he mentions that "even if Charles was not the author of *Eikon Basilike*, the book still held value to royalist supporters whose sentimental attachment to the idea of the king as a martyr could endure questions about the text's production

²⁵ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 239.

history.”²⁶ Like Milton, Cohen holds the reader responsible for attributing value to any text at hand, hence bringing value into context as a social idea. This makes the validity of *Eikon Basilike* akin to the notion of counterfeit currency, as asserted by Cohen in his article. Just as a counterfeit coin imitates a real coin, Charles tries to pass himself off in the image of Christ, and readers who are persuaded by Charles’ falsity are likened to those who give value to a counterfeit coin. The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) defines “coin” as “to stamp or figure in or on a coin” or “to make, devise and produce” (OED, v.1, IV). It also carries the meaning “to fabricate or invent, to make up something pretentious and counterfeit in a bad or depreciatory sense” (OED, v.1, V). *Eikon Basilike*, with all of Charles’ acts and prayers, is thought to be a counterfeit of true spirituality and a pretense of Christ, not unlike a counterfeit coin being taken for one of value. As a king’s portrait is minted and represented on one side of a coin, Charles had intended for *Eikon Basilike* to “offer a portrait of Charles I that would dominate cultural discourses and inform the prevailing cultural memory of the king” the way a coin would.²⁷

According to Cohen, Milton utilizes a comparison such as this to reveal Charles’ false allegations in *Eikonoklastes*, employing a rhetoric of coinage and counterfeiting for an easier portrayal of Charles as the “counterfeit and the

²⁶ Cohen, Scott, “Counterfeiting and the Economics of Kingship in Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 50.1 (Winter 2010), 161.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 159.

counterfeiter”²⁸ and forming a parallel between Charles’s false spirituality and the value of a counterfeit coin. “Counterfeit” refers to making anything in fraudulent imitation of something else, and passing it off as genuine, or to forge, imitate, copy, pretend or simulate with intent to deceive and “to put a false or deceiving appearance upon, to disguise and falsify” (OED, v). Moreover, it is understood to mean “made to a pattern, fashioned, wrought.” Apart from conveying meanings in regards to items, the word “counterfeit” also refers to “forged, not genuine, spurious” for writings, and of a person, “pretending to be what he is not, someone false and deceitful” (OED, adj.). Milton’s rhetoric implies these meanings when opposing Charles’, reinforcing the idea of *Eikon Basilike* as a “counterfeit” text. In describing the “substance of his first Section,” Milton refers to it as a piece of lip-work that was “clapped together, and quilted out of Scripture phrase,”²⁹ as the king had “knit contradictions as close as words can lie together” in forming his text. In “building many fair and pious conclusions upon false and wicked premises,”³⁰ Charles intentionally seeks to deceive his readers and attempts to be Christ-like in *Eikon Basilike*, elevating his status from that of an earthly monarch to a heavenly God.

Additionally, this notion of counterfeit currency as a comparison to Charles’ portrayal of a false, Christ-like image takes after the verse from

²⁸ Cohen, “Counterfeiting and the Economics of Kingship in Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*,” 161.

²⁹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 234.

³⁰ *Ibid*, 239.

Genesis on the creation of man in the image of God: “And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness . . . / So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them” (Genesis 1:26 – 27). *Eikon Basilike* presents a false spiritual depiction of the king that was created to portray a similarity and likeness to Christ, and the comparison of this false and literal image of a monarch on a counterfeit coin also employs the context of the verses. In utilizing the idea of counterfeit coins to expose Charles’ intentions and in drawing from these verses, Milton implies that the king misused Scripture in generating a false God-like image to convince his readers of his goodness and innocence, hence writing the political tract to eradicate that false image of Charles.

Eikonoklastes should not however be viewed solely as an iconoclastic text for there exist political and spiritual aspects to Milton’s piece of work, as asserted by Cohen who states that Milton’s prose has a twofold purpose of calling out Charles’ counterfeit while serving as an iconoclastic text. While maintaining that *Eikonoklastes* is a text of counterfeit portrayal, Cohen also regards it as a text that “deploys” the “tactics of classical and Protestant iconoclasm.”³¹ While iconoclasm is limited to “branding something an idol worthy of destruction,” Cohen defines calling out counterfeit as an act that “entails the devaluation and destruction and the subsequent reallocation of authority . . . to the non-counterfeit.” Since it “relies on the dialectical

³¹ Cohen, “Counterfeiting and the Economics of Kingship in Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*,” 149.

constitution of value . . . and the value garnered through circulation or exchange,” “to recognize the counterfeiting of the king” was to “recognize that the power of Royalist imagery was found in its *circulation*.”³² In examining the question of counterfeit in relation to iconoclasm, Cohen said the “entire signifying system” or coinage circulation is examined, whereas iconoclasm is merely the gesture of attacking the icon to “diminish its influence over the viewer.”³³ Hence, calling out a counterfeit is more effective in that it calls for the reallocation of authority while iconoclasm is confined to breaking an existing image and is specific in its relocation of authority in God. However, despite the distinct definitions of both iconoclasm and calling out counterfeit, they share similar goals. Hence, and especially so in the case and purpose of Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*, they are “mutually reinforcing strategies”³⁴ employed to complement one another.

Apart from being an iconoclastic text, spiritual aspects exist in *Eikonoklastes* as well. When Milton corrects “*Eikon Basilike*’s misuse of spirituality as political propaganda,” he does so through spiritual reading, as mentioned by David Ainsworth in “Spiritual Reading in Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*.” Ainsworth defines spiritual reading as “a process of critical reading that prioritizes spiritual concerns and sacred truths over worldly

³² Cohen, “Counterfeiting and the Economics of Kingship in Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*,” 166.

³³ *Ibid*, 164.

³⁴ *Ibid*, 166.

philosophy and politics,”³⁵ and believes in a higher purpose and meaning to *Eikonoklastes*. Since Charles abused religious scripture and spirituality in his argument, Milton wrote *Eikonoklastes* in a fashion that called for spiritual reading to counter the king, encouraging discerning readers to avert Charles’ falsehood and manipulation. Milton aimed to correct Charles’ misled audiences through educative and critical methods, and advocated for spiritual means to “counter [*Eikon Basilike*’s] promotion of an uncritical sort of reading, which endangers not only the Commonwealth but also the souls of its citizens.”³⁶

Yet, although Milton had spiritual and political intentions in writing his text, it is important for *Eikonoklastes* not to be mistaken for political propaganda. It is distinguished from *Eikon Basilike* in that both their rhetorical styles and intentions are significantly different; where propaganda aims to influence and convince, Milton’s prose is different as it contains logically formed arguments that aim to educate its readers by teaching them how to think critically before making sound judgments for themselves. Since Charles misuses religious contexts and scripture in attempts to be more persuasive and Christ-like, Milton counters him in writing to uncover “the spiritual danger that the king’s impious prayers and glosses represent,”³⁷ making *Eikonoklastes* more than just mindless political propaganda. Charles’

³⁵ Ainsworth, David, “Spiritual Reading in Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 45.1 (Winter 2005), 158.

³⁶ *Ibid*, 158.

³⁷ *Ibid*, 160.

language in *Eikon Basilike*, however, intentionally connotes God or Christ-like associations; for example, he presents an image of God in light of himself when he speaks of duty and obligations to “My own and My Children’s Interests.”³⁸ Charles also uses scripture that depicts himself as Christ-like, such as when he mentions the Irish rebellion whom Milton accuses Charles of inciting.³⁹ When Charles speaks of the rebels, or those who aided the rebellion, he likens them to “that of the rebuked Disciples, who would go no lower in their revenge, than to call for fire from Heaven upon whole Cities, for the repulse of neglect of a few.”⁴⁰ This derives from the verses of Luke 9:51 – 56 that relate how Jesus disapproved of disciples James and John for wanting to destroy a village that did not welcome Christ’s messengers. In likening the rebels to the disciples, and disapproving of the rebels by calling them “preposterous,” with an “un-evangelical Zeal . . . like that of the disciples,” Charles attempts to create a parallel situation to compare himself to Christ. Aside from these comparisons, Charles models *Eikon Basilike* into resembling a religious text or doctrine by including adapted psalms and prayers at the end of each section, thus manipulating the explanations for his political actions into a religious guide through this method of imitation.

³⁸ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 51.

³⁹ Asch, “Wentworth, Thomas, first earl of Strafford (1593–1641),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. The 1641 Irish rebellion witnessed tensions that arose between the Irish Catholics and the English Protestants when land for plantation purposes transferred ownership from the Irish to the English.

⁴⁰ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 104.

In understanding the imitation that Charles attempts, Milton rips this notion of false religiousness apart in his counterargument, calling it a “holy theft” in which *Eikon Basilike* is a text “borrow[ed] to a Christian . . . Prayers offered to a Heathen God.” Milton views Charles as someone with “so little fear in him of the true all-seeing Deity, so little reverence of the Holy Ghost” and “so little care of truth in his last words, or honour to himself” that Charles would turn *Eikon Basilike* into “a prayer stolen word for word” and an “Idolised Book”⁴¹ to defend himself and deceive his readers. This goes back to the notion of Milton’s intent to educate readers on methods of discerning reading through *Eikonoklastes*, thus making it an educative text on top of being spiritual and politically charged. In support of this crucial intention of Milton’s, Ainsworth even goes on to argue that Milton intended for *Eikonoklastes* to be read spiritually first and politically second:

Milton’s polemical strategy in *Eikonoklastes* is to provide his readers with the skills of discernment which some of them seemed to lack, primarily to turn them away from what he considered the deep-rooted and serious spiritual errors of Charles’s book, and only secondarily to shore up support for the Republic’s Parliament.⁴²

It can be said that Milton’s professed primary intention is to enlighten his readers before taking political affiliations into account, making this the main difference between *Eikon Basilike* and *Eikonoklastes*. While Milton aims to educate readers by building his texts up in a way that fosters spiritually

⁴¹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 235 – 236.

⁴² Ainsworth, “Spiritual Reading in Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 166 – 167.

independent thinking, Charles simply makes excuses for himself in attempts to erase his faults and errors, hence the underlying difference between the two texts. *Eikonoklastes* is therefore not a text of propaganda that is similar to *Eikon Basilike*, but an educative tool to bring to light the falsities of Charles and awareness to readers of both the texts. To quote Ainsworth again: “As propaganda, Milton’s work failed, while *Eikon Basilike* retained its remarkable propagandistic appeal . . . Where *Eikon Basilike* offers the comforts of father/king/God, *Eikonoklastes* places responsibility, struggle, and difficulty directly in the hands of its readers.”⁴³ Milton intended for his readers to ask questions and struggle while reading *Eikonoklastes* more so than *Eikon Basilike*, and he does so because he had in mind for his text to be healing and educative, in which Milton himself takes on the role of both doctor and teacher to fulfill its purpose.

Milton primarily targets the type of audience who is likely to be corrupted and tainted by Charles’ deceptive self-portrayal, and analogizes his readers to be one of two things: sick or uneducated. The king’s text is the reason why his readers are sick, and uneducated readers remain that way because it is far from being educative. Milton employs a rhetorical style that better serves his role as a doctor and a teacher, perhaps because sickness and ignorance are easier things to correct or cure as opposed to political and religious trains of thought. This is a more accessible way of Milton’s in reaching out to readers,

⁴³ Ainsworth, “Spiritual Reading in Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 183.

regardless of their status or education levels, and this analogy makes it easier for him to persuade readers into understanding his side of the argument, as health and education are basic things that everyone should want and need. Also, it is through this context that Milton shapes his argument: that critical and discerning reading so as to not be fooled by Charles's manipulation is as important as being healthy and getting schooled.

Milton's intent for his role in *Eikonoklastes* is seen in a statement from the text's preface: "I take it on me as a work assigned rather, than by me chosen or affected."⁴⁴ While the common perception of the meaning for "assign," as defined by the OED, is "an appointment, command," or "one who is appointed to act for another, a deputy, agent, or representative" (OED, n.) the word means "to point out exactly, designate, specify and show" or "to exhibit, display, present" (OED, v., II) as well. In taking on a "work assigned," Milton takes it upon himself to show and point out to his readers the manipulations of Charles, the way a teacher would show or teach a student a particular teaching, method or skill. In addition to that, "affected" is a deliberate choice of word by Milton. "Affect" means "the manner in which something is physically affected or disposed" (OED, n., VII), and "to have an effect on, either materially or otherwise," also in the sense of "a disease, to act on, lay hold of, or attack a person or organ contagiously" (OED, v.2, I). In referring to "senses relating to the body," it means "afflicted or tainted by

⁴⁴ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 222.

disease,” and can be attributed to “an abnormal state of the body, a disease or disorder” (OED. adj.2). *Eikonoklastes* is Milton’s handbook as a teacher of the masses, whose duty is to teach since he is not “affected” by the contradictions and duplicities of Charles.

Through his rhetorical methods throughout *Eikonoklastes*, Milton establishes Charles as being struck with disease and illnesses, hence readers who are taken in by the king’s manipulations are as infected as he is. Milton depicts Charles as being infected and parasite ridden, referring to those “nearest to this King and most his Favourites . . . men whose chief study was to find out which way the King inclined, and to imitate him exactly” as “Parasites,” who took “industriously from his own words and actions,”⁴⁵ fitting in with its definition of “a person whose behaviour resembles that of a plant or animal parasite, a sponger” (OED, n., I.a). Charles is parasite ridden, and to avoid becoming infected by Charles, readers are advised to follow the consultations of Milton.

Not unlike a doctor, Milton observes and identifies Charles’ faults as if diagnosing an illness, using terms that express the ill health of the king.

Milton, in speaking of Charles’ conscience, states:

But to a conscience with whom one good deed is so hard to pass down, as to endanger almost a choking, and bad deeds without number though as big and bulky as the ruin of Three Kingdoms, go down currently without straining, certainly a far greater woe appertains. If his conscience were come to that unnatural dyscrasy, as to digest poison and to keck at wholesome food, it was not for the Parliament, or any of his Kingdoms to

⁴⁵ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 228.

feed with him any longer.⁴⁶

Based on the excerpt, Milton makes it seem like Charles is the disease himself, seeing as the king has become unnatural to the point where his conscience is an “unnatural dyscrasy,” able to digest poison but to “keck at wholesome food instead.” Charles has “turned bad” or “become rotten,” in a sense, for he is able to consume volumes of bad deeds easily rather than good deeds.

Milton also uses words that reflect upon the human physiology; “dyscrasy” in the sixteenth century context, for example, is known as a bad or disordered condition of the body that arises from the disproportionate mixture of the “humours” (OED, n.) that were once thought to affect a body’s temperament and health, although in modern context it now refers to a malfunction or abnormal condition, especially an imbalance in the constituents of the blood. “Keck” also refers to the sound made “as if about to vomit or retch,” “to feel an inclination to vomit, hence to reject food or medicine with loathing,” used to express a strong disliking or disgust as well (OED, v., I.a). From these word choices by Milton, it is as if Charles has deteriorated to the point of no return. Charles’s illness cannot be treated, therefore he cannot be saved. His readers, on the other hand, can still be cured by reading *Eikonoklastes*.

Words that fit into a “medicinal” context are also utilized by Milton, for example in the sentence: “And as it is not difficult to discern from what

⁴⁶ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 240.

inducing causes this insurrection first arose, so neither was it hard at first to have applied some effectual remedy, though not prevention.”⁴⁷ Although “applied some effectual remedy” refers to the Irish rebellion, the words carry additional meaning apart from that. “Applied” means “to put to practical use” (OED, adj., III.a), whereas the root word “apply” refers to the condition or the state of something (OED, n., I). “Apply” also means “to place or spread an ointment, remedy or dressing on the skin or other body surface,” and later on, “to administer a treatment” (OED, v., II.a). This is as if Milton is addressing remedies to cure Charles, and is applying his knowledge in the treatment of the king, for “apply” is indicative of “a rule, test or principle brought into contact with facts, to bring to bear practically, or to put into practical operation” (OED, v., VI.a) as well. The phrase “effectual remedy” also reinforces this, as “remedy” refers to “a cure for a disease, disorder, injury” or “a medicine or treatment that promotes healing or alleviates symptoms” (OED, n., II). Milton sought to “heal or cure” Charles, with every intention to “put right, reform or make good” (OED, v., II) the infected monarch through *Eikonoklastes*. The word “effectual” before “remedy” further highlights this, as “effectual” means “powerful in effect” (OED, adj., I) therefore laying stress on how powerful and effective the text of *Eikonoklastes* is as a “medicinal” remedy to “cure” the minds that were contaminated after reading *Eikon Basilike*. Should readers become infected by the delusions of Charles, the

⁴⁷ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 245.

same curing efforts should be taken by them as well by reading Milton's "medicinal" text. From the language and terms employed, it is seen that Milton interprets *Eikon Basilike* and analyzes Charles as if he were a sick patient, first establishing his role as a physician who takes on the "work assigned" to cure Charles, before examining him to identify his "unnatural dyscrasy." The approach is very methodical, not unlike how a physician would thoroughly examine an infected patient that needed to be cured.

Besides taking on the role of the doctor in *Eikonoklastes*, Milton also takes it upon himself to educate his readers through the methods of a teacher. As supported by Ainsworth who maintains that Milton's text aimed to educate readers to read discerningly, Milton additionally drew from historical and literary examples to bring his readers to enlightenment. He elaborates on several examples of tyrannical rulers who fail to deceive their people despite being well read and eloquent. For example, Milton speaks of the Byzantine emperor Andronicus Comnenus, who "though a most cruel tyrant, is reported by *Nicetas* to have been a constant reader of Saint *Paul's* Epistles" that "incorporated that phrase and style" of the Apostle into his letters, making "the imitation . . . vie with the original." In drawing from a lesson to learn from history, Milton goes on to say that "this availed not to deceive the people of that Empire" who "tore him to pieces for his Tyranny."⁴⁸ Milton alerts his readers to the dangers of fanciful words by citing historical examples that

⁴⁸ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 234.

have happened before, implying that they too should learn from past events as to not repeat mistakes, such as in a history lesson.

Stylistically, Milton also resembles an investigative scholar who educates his students through the use of logic in the analysis of *Eikon Basilike*. For example, seeing as the Irish were not “supported with any other strength their own” to “begin a War so desperate and irreconcilable against both England and Scotland at once” in regards to the Irish rebellion, Milton comes to the conclusion that there was an interference from “some authority or some great assistance promised them from England,” and that it was “the assurance which they had in private . . . was one of the chief reasons that drew on their undertaking.” With this in mind, Milton proceeds to the next step in logically and intellectually determining who incited the rebellion: “Seeing then the main incitement and authority for this Rebellion must be needs derived from *England*, it will be next inquired who was the Prime Author.”⁴⁹ The word “inquire” means “to search into, seek information or knowledge, to investigate or examine,” or “to seek knowledge of a thing or person by putting a question, to ask about, request to be told or to ask something or someone” (OED, v.). Hence, the context of this word reflects Milton’s educative train of thought, one that he conveys to his readers by encouraging them to curiously seek enlightenment and “inquire” the way students do in gaining more knowledge and information.

⁴⁹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 245.

From a close reading, it is clear that *Eikonoklastes* was written with very specific intents to cure and educate readers mentally and spiritually.

Eikonoklastes should be interpreted as a multi-purpose text that encompasses all the above mentioned aims while employing iconoclastic methods to convey his message, as limiting Milton's text to a single purpose would be limiting the scope of his capabilities, and consequently Satan's nature as well. In summing up the role and purpose of *Eikonoklastes* as stated by Ainsworth, "By shaping his polemic along pedagogical lines, not simply propagandistic ones, Milton writes in order to correct 'ignorance without malice' and shock some small portion of his audience out of a threatening 'servility,' which does not suit them as it does the 'Image-doting rabble.'"⁵⁰

⁵⁰ Ainsworth, "Spiritual Reading in Milton's *Eikonoklastes*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 184.

CHAPTER TWO

The Doctrine and Tyranny in *Eikonoklastes*

As one of the functions of Milton's multi-purpose text, *Eikonoklastes* serves to educate his readers not only to read discerningly but also to look beyond what the text presents. In doing so, Milton assimilates his rhetoric to that of a teacher, utilizing questioning methods and historical references to communicate his points to the reader. Since he views *Eikon Basilike* as a text that employs manipulative methods as distractions and to divert blame, Milton takes on the role of an educator to instruct readers how to interpret Charles' words effectively. As part of his instructive techniques, Milton comes up with historical references and religious doctrine as evidence of his claims to highlight and reinforce his points. Since *Eikonoklastes* was written by "shaping his polemic along pedagogical lines, not simply propagandistic

ones,” Milton “writes in order to correct . . . and shock some small portion of his audience out of a threatening ‘servility’”⁵¹ as stated by Ainsworth.

Part of Milton’s educative treatment includes making his readers question Charles’ capabilities as an effective ruler, as he explicitly reveals his distaste towards the king in *Eikonoklastes*. He cautions readers against being easily persuaded by the content of *Eikon Basilike*, asserting that “he who from such kind of Psalmistry, or any other verbal Devotion, . . . can be persuaded of a zeal, and true righteousness in the person, hath much yet to learn” as he “knows not that the deepest policy of a Tyrant hath been ever to counterfeit Religious.”⁵² The “Psalmistry” or “verbal Devotion” that Milton speaks of is in reference to Charles’ misuse of religious doctrine in hopes of having *Eikon Basilike* resemble scripture, and pass off as a body of text that is as reliable as the holy doctrine. Milton labels this as an act that is characteristic of all tyrants, therefore implying that Charles is not unlike a tyrannical ruler as well. By taking on the role of a teacher, Milton educates his readers by citing examples of previous tyrannical rulers as points of reference, linking Charles’ act of imitating scripture to the Byzantine emperor Andronicus Comnenus:⁵³

Andronicus Comnenus the *Byzantine* Emperor, though a most cruel Tyrant, is reported by *Nicetas* to have been a constant reader of *Saint Paul’s* Epistles; and by continual study had so incorporated the phrase and style of

⁵¹ Ainsworth, David, “Spiritual Reading in Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 184.

⁵² Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 234.

⁵³ Choniates, Niketas. *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, trans. Harry I. Magoulias (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984), 153. Andronicus Comnenus, or Andronikos Komnenos, ruled as an emperor during the Byzantine empire from the year 1183 to 1185 C.E.

that transcendent Apostle into all his familiar letters, that the imitation seemed to vie with the Original. Yet this availed not to deceive the people of that Empire; who not withstanding his Saint's vizard, tore him to pieces for his Tyranny.⁵⁴

Despite Andronicus' intentions to fool his people through misappropriating the doctrine of Saint Paul in his works, Niketas⁵⁵ documents these efforts as futile, as the "people of that Empire" had recognized his tyranny before overthrowing him as a ruler.

Milton chose to adduce Andronicus as an exemplar of tyranny because of the traits that both Charles and Andronicus share. In fact, Milton speaks of recognizable characteristics of tyrants, including the ability to "counterfeit Religious" with "special craft" and the tendency to use "pious words" to conceal true intents. In *Eikonoklastes*, Milton sourced *O City of Byzantium*, *Annals of Niketas Choniates* to reveal the similar characteristics of Andronicus and Charles in educating his readers. Like Milton in describing Charles' inconsistency, Niketas portrays Andronicus as "a twig that is forcibly bent, but then springs back to its original position when released," implying falsity and insincerity in his character, before going on to mention that Andronicus deviates "even more from his previous behavior; so that he should not appear to be the most unstable of men, suffering from an inconstancy of

⁵⁴ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 234.

⁵⁵ Niketas, *Introduction, O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, ix. Nicetas or Niketas Choniates, a historian who chronicled periods of Byzantine history, documented the rulers after the death of Emperor Alexios I Komnenos, between 1118 and 1207. His text, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, details the tyrannical leadership of Andronicus Comnenus.

character even in matters of little consequence . . .”⁵⁶ As Niketas recounts the actions of Andronicus during his reign, the ruler’s duplicity and inconsistent nature is revealed. This is not far from Milton’s intent in *Eikonoklastes*, indicating Niketas as a very likely source of Milton’s when preparing his political tract.

As a text to which Milton alludes, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates* is also seen as a source in identifying Charles as a tyrant. Milton recognized that both Andronicus and Charles share close similarities in speech, thus reinforcing his claim and viewpoint of the king to be no more different than the tyrant. Andronicus’ “eagerness to inflict punishment”⁵⁷ for example, contradicts with the false and empty claims he makes pertaining to the men that he sentences to death: “. . . he said that he deemed them worthy of pity, weeping as he spoke, and asserted that the severity and authority of the law were stronger than his own impulse and disposition to do otherwise and that the judges’ sentence superceded his own choice of action.”⁵⁸ His falsity is evident from his statement: under the pretense of the law, Andronicus justifies his actions in making it seem as if the killings were not of his choice, but rather an action that he was regretfully forced to take in abiding by the law before his interests. This diversion by Andronicus is created in hopes of shifting the focus away from the inhumane acts of his

⁵⁶ Niketas, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, 153.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 163.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*.

tyranny, and in all likelihood to avoid taking the blame for his wrongdoings. Charles' rhetoric in *Eikon Basilike* closely resembles this diversion as well, with the English monarch claiming to have the interest of his people before his own, deciding "to choose what was safe, than what seemed just; preferring the outward peace of My Kingdoms with men, before that inward exactness of Conscience before God."⁵⁹

Along with the shared manner of their rhetoric, Milton also identifies similar characteristics of tyranny between Charles and Andronicus. As described by Niketas, Andronicus lacks courage as a ruler, choosing to employ cunning and deceptive methods instead. An example of his "fox cunning" would be when the Nicaean citizens, "inclining towards the cause of peace," voluntarily surrendered their city to Andronicus when "the city was deluged by the waves of battle." In response to their actions, "having no lion skin to put forth, he donned the fox skin, pretending to receive them gladly and nearly shedding tears. This was an old trick of Andronikos to conceal the truth." Andronicus deliberately takes on a false image in this role of duplicity to conceal his true intentions, which, according to Niketas, did not last for long: "But he did not play the role for long. Soon he cast off his soft words . . . and openly demonstrated to the Nicaeans . . . his rancor, hatred, and malice smoldered,"⁶⁰ resulting in many of the Nicaeans becoming fugitives and suffering horrible deaths. In recognizing Andronicus' act of "donning the fox

⁵⁹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 54.

⁶⁰ Niketas, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, 158.

skin,” Milton describes Charles in the same manner as well, since the king also employed a cunning, fox-like duplicity when dealing with the Scots: “He wonders, Fox wonder, how we could so much *distrust God’s assistance*, as to call in the Protestant aid of our Brethren in *Scotland . . .*”⁶¹ Here, “Fox wonder” refers to Charles’ fox-like cunning, with “fox” meaning someone likened for craftiness to a fox with allusion to its artfulness and cunning (OED, n.), and “wonder” as a deed or surprising incident that causes astonishment, and to be struck with surprise and astonishment (OED, v.). This implies that Charles’ actions were unexpected of his character, however, because of that, his craftiness indicates ulterior motives and hidden intentions. Later on in *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, Niketas confirms this as a characteristic of tyrants as seen in Andronicus: “He comforted the indigent with gifts, especially if there was some hope that the suppliant was not terrified by Andronikos’ crimes and did not violently hate him, and this was like finding a highly prized panacea and salutary antidote in the flesh of that serpent [Satan].”⁶²

Another indication that the text by Niketas was a likely source of Milton’s in identifying Charles as a tyrant is Andronicus and Charles’ misuse of scripture. Both of the rulers utilize biblical verses in their arguments in attempts to increase its authenticity and to be more convincing, for example

⁶¹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 257.

⁶² Niketas, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, 179.

Andronicus comparing his actions to God's covenant.⁶³ According to Niketas, Andronicus is quoted as comparing his acts of cruelty to God's punishments, whose rainbow in the sky symbolizes His promise to never destroy the earth to reproach man again. For those who disobey Andronicus' orders, however, they

. . . shall be suspended from the mast of the ship, and should the roaring waves have swept it away, on a hilltop near the sea, he shall be fastened to a huge upright beam hewed from the nearby mountains, so that he may be clearly visible to all those sailing the boundless seas like a sail displayed from the yardarm and like a man shipwrecked on land.⁶⁴

His punishments are senseless and have no purpose, and unlike God's intention and reason in imparting a lesson to those who have sinned, Andronicus merely inflicts horror and cruelty on those who "disobey [his] command" as a "manner of exacting satisfaction." The tyrant's misinterpretation of God's covenant is seen when he makes the claim that those who disobey him ". . . shall stand as a symbol that no one should ever again dismantle ships and plunder their cargoes, in the same manner that God stretched his bow in the sky as a sign that never again shall there be water for

⁶³ The story of God's covenant is told in Genesis 9:13 – 16; after flooding the earth to destroy and cleanse the sins of mankind, God set a rainbow in the sky as a symbol of his promise to never flood the earth again:

¹³ I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth.

¹⁴ And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud:

¹⁵ And I will remember my covenant, which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh.

¹⁶ And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth.

⁶⁴ Niketas, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, 181.

a deluge.”⁶⁵ He turns his victims into symbols of his tyranny, and inappropriately twisting the meaning of scripture to justify his vicious acts. In efforts to portray his actions as permissible, Andronicus makes his tyrannical actions seem akin to God’s covenant, attempting to portray himself as God-like and his actions legitimate. Niketas identifies this misuse of scripture and concludes that “he [Andronicus] was not inhuman in all things, but like those creatures fashioned of double natures, he was brutal and human in form,”⁶⁶ exemplifying his cunning and duplicity in trying to misrepresent scripture. With this as a guide, Milton recognizes the misuse of biblical verses in *Eikon Basilike* by Charles, who implies his presence or being as God-like as well when speaking of his actions or kingly duties and obligations to “My own and My Children’s Interests.”⁶⁷ In justifying his act of sentencing the Earl of Strafford to death, Charles states that it be “*Better one man perish (though unjustly) than the people be displeased, or destroyed,*”⁶⁸ paraphrasing the verse of John 18:14 which reads “Now Caiaphas was he, which gave counsel to the Jews, that it was expedient that one man should die for the people.” Besides misusing scripture in explaining his actions, Charles gives the impression that his act was not unlike God’s in sending Christ down to earth to atone for the sins of humanity.

⁶⁵ Niketas, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, 181.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 195.

⁶⁷ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 51.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, 55.

Besides using, or misusing, the verses to resemble God, Andronicus also employed specifically the doctrine of Paul in his writing: “Andronikos gave himself over to the epistles of Paul the divine herald. Continually taking his fill of their trickling honey, he composed excellent letters embellished with incontrovertible arguments which he derived from this source.”⁶⁹ Both rulers utilize the verses and concepts of the Pauline doctrine in their writings, and a specific example of this is seen in the words of Andronicus. Niketas identifies parts of Romans in Andronicus’ words, particularly in regards to two lines in Romans 7: “For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do” (Romans 7:19) and “But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members” (Romans 7:23). Niketas recognizes the two verses as misused by Andronicus, and quotes the tyrant’s paraphrasing of the verses into one sentence as follows: “The good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do, since my enemies are warring against me and bringing me into captivity to act contrary to my will.” This was a method in which Andronicus “sought to remedy in the evil”⁷⁰ in justifying his misdoings and to shift the blame away from himself. Perhaps Andronicus chose to misuse the above mentioned Pauline verses because they concern the notion of original sin. Saint Paul’s passages in Romans 7 explain man’s inherent sin as a “natural or innate disposition” that naturally “dwelleth in me . . . in my

⁶⁹ Niketas, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, 194.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 185.

flesh” (Romans 7:17 – 18). To Paul, sin, in its natural sense, exists in every man and cannot be helped; it opposes the law, for law was introduced to curb sin, hence the reflection of this internal struggle through the verse of Romans 7:23.

Similarly, Charles distorts this concept of sin in his writings as well, as is prominently seen in *Eikon Basilike* and corrected by Milton later on in *Eikonoklastes*. Like Andronicus who blames his enemies of “warring against me and bringing me into captivity to act contrary to my will,” Charles accuses “those, that I think wished me well, to choose rather what was safe, than what seemed just”⁷¹ for persuading him to sign the bill for the Earl of Strafford’s execution. In fact, Charles avoids shouldering blame and the consequences of his own actions for the most part, such as in regards to the Irish rebellion and the Scots coming, and the distortion of the two Romans verses also resonate throughout *Eikon Basilike*. Hence, besides studying the epistles of Saint Paul to detect scriptural misuse in Charles’ words, Milton uses the doctrine of Paul as a source to counter Charles and build his argument in *Eikonoklastes*. Since Milton strives to educate his readers on how to read discerningly, the main concepts in the doctrine of Paul that he utilizes are the ones on interpreting the law and the letter, which can be seen in the books of Romans, Galatians and Corinthians in the New Testament.

⁷¹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 54.

The concept of the law is explained by the *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* in three contexts, of which the law is understood to be “a procedure or practice that has taken hold as a custom, rule, principle, or norm; the constitutional or statutory legal system; or a collection of Holy writings precious to God’s people, a sacred ordinance.”⁷² An example of the understanding of the law as a practice that has become a principle or rule is explained in the lexicon as a custom “in accordance with the rule of an external commandment, to observe an established procedure or principle or system (Romans 7:21),” with “principles” as “an unwritten rightness of things.” The mentioned principle of Romans 7:21 reads “I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me,” and refers to the fact that there will always be a constant struggle between the law and sin in man, as depicted in Romans 7:23. Following that, the verses then continue on to question: “who shall deliver me from the body of this death? / I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin (Romans 7:24 – 25) and that “For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death” (Romans 8:2).

At this point, the verses state that despite man’s inherent sin and apart from the law, redemption is still possible through faith in Christ, as the law is also seen as “a system of conduct that constitutes an unwritten tradition under the

⁷² Arndt, William, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 3rd edition (2000), 677 – 678.

leadership of Jesus Christ” in which the gospel is “a law or system requiring faith,” and as stated in Romans 3: “Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith” (Romans 3:27). Faith still seems to be the central and core concept that is of utmost importance despite the significance of the law, as mentioned in the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (ODCC): “Paul’s picture of human existence outside Christ is negative . . . (Yet) he is able to insist on the positive function of the Law without loosening his central conviction that faith in Christ is alone decisive for salvation of Jews and Gentiles alike.”⁷³ Several Pauline verses reflect this as well, one of which mentions that “For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love” (Galatians 5:6). As explained in the verse, Paul believes that there is more value in having faith over obeying the law through mere actions, as represented by the act of circumcision in the verse above. Romans 3 also places emphasis of faith in Christ over the law, as seen in “But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; / Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe” (Romans 3:21 – 22). This is explained in the ODCC that “Justification occurs ‘apart from law’ (3:21) by the ‘righteousness of God’ which is revealed in the Gospel of his Son.”

⁷³ Cross, Frank Leslie, and Livingstone, Elizabeth A., *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd edition (Oxford University Press, 2005), 1245.

Besides the emphasis he places on faith over the law, Paul speaks of the law in the context of the New Testament, which is also known as a collection of “Holy writings precious to God’s people and a sacred ordinance . . .” In the strict sense, it is the law or work of Moses, the lawgiver. Additionally, the law is referred to as the Holy Book, with the first book of Corinthians containing verses that are specific towards laws. The lexicon cites “Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? / For it is written in the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen?” (1 Corinthians 9:8 – 9) and “Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law” (1 Corinthians 14:34) as several examples of law specific verses, and in accordance with this Romans verse, these laws must be obeyed: “. . . what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God” (Romans 3:19). While it is clear that Paul’s epistles were to educate and pass on the importance of the law, he also intended to convey that there is a deeper significance in the obedience of it, such as mentioned by the ODCC: “What the law achieves is to bring human sinfulness to light.”⁷⁴ However, besides the law being a reflection of human sin, the law is a means in attaining faith and justification: “Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto

⁷⁴ Cross, Frank Leslie, and Livingstone, Elizabeth A., *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 1421.

Christ, that we might be justified by faith” (Galatians 3:24). The ultimate goal in the process of obedience to the law though, is to reach Christ, for at the end of the law, “Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth” (Romans 10:4).

Following his concept of the law, Saint Paul’s treatment of the letters is similar to what is understood of the law. A letter, referred to as an epistle in the *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* as well, is understood to be the medium in which one educates, instructs or learns (OED, v.). The definitions of an epistle are more specific, however; aside from it referring to “a letter from an apostle, forming part of the canon of Scripture,” it is also stated that an epistle is “a communication made to an absent person in writing, chiefly applied to letters written in ancient times, especially to those which rank as literary productions, or to those of a public character, or addressed to a body of persons” (OED, n.).

These definitions correlate with the lexicon’s explanations of a letter or an epistle, one of which is a function “on the specific type of administrative communication,”⁷⁵ among others. The work of a letter is seen in the verse “Let such an one think this, that, such as we are in word by letters when we are absent, such will we be also in deed when we are present” (2 Corinthians 10:11). The letter is symbolic of the writer, as Paul’s epistles are representative of him. Moreover, the lexicon mentions epistles in the context

⁷⁵ William, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 381.

of “letters of recommendation,” which reflects Paul’s view of them through the first three verses in 2 Corinthians 3.

¹ Do we begin again to commend ourselves? or need we, as some others, epistles of commendation to you, or letters of commendation from you?

² Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men:

³ For as much as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.

(2 Corinthians 3:1 – 3)

In these verses, Paul refers to “letters” or “epistles” of commendation, which usage highlights both Paul’s and the epistle’s role. “Commend” is associated with the phrases of “commend to memory,” “commend to paper” and “commend to writing,” and in regards to a person, it is “especially used of committal to the divine keeping, to commit with a prayer or act of faith” (OED, v.). To Paul, these letters or epistles fulfill his role of committing to divinity and is an act of Paul’s faith in his absence.

When Paul states that the epistles are “written in our hearts, known and read of all men” in the second Corinthian verse, it is reminiscent of his view on Natural Law being written in the hearts of the Gentiles: “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves / Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another” (Romans 2:14 – 15). This characteristic is shared by both the epistle and the law, specifically the natural law, as seen in these verses. In the non-natural sense,

Paul views the law in a similar light to letters and epistles as well, with laws referring to “the constitutional or statutory or legal system . . . likely the Mosaic law” as stated by the lexicon, in which the Mosaic law is explained as the law received by Moses from God and “is the standard according to which membership in the people of Israel is determined.” The third Corinthian verse above mentions that the epistle is “written not with ink” and “not in tables of stone,” but written “with the Spirit of the living God . . . in fleshy tables of the heart.” The verse reflects that it is more important for the words of the epistle to be demonstrated through the Spirit of God and the flesh of the heart rather than written in ink. This concept is an image of Paul’s interpretation on the law, as seen in the verse from Romans: “Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith” (Romans 3:27). As this verse concludes that faith is more important than mere acts in accordance to the law, so does the Corinthians verse on the epistle in reinforcing that the weight of a letter or an epistle is seen in spirit and faith more so than its written form. Although a main characteristic of a letter or an epistle is that it is a written script in place of someone absent, its form is largely symbolic and bears more significance when carried out in spirit. Hence, in extracting the prominent points of Paul’s concept on the law and the letter, it can be said that Paul stresses on seeking the meaning behind abiding by the law and the letter over reading and understanding it for its literal meaning. This is a concept that Milton strives to convey to his readers

through *Eikonoklastes*: to read between Charles' lines perceptively to get to the underlying meaning behind it the way scripture should be read with a higher purpose.

Henri de Lubac's *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture* serves as a useful methodology in analyzing the false misrepresentations of Charles, as the text relates methods of discerning reading in interpreting scripture and its significance. *Medieval Exegesis* gives readers a Christian account of scripture and the various interpretations or meanings that are derived from it, and several chapters of the text are dedicated to explaining scripture, its relation to the law and how they are viewed by both Christians and Jews. In explaining the four methods for interpreting Scripture, de Lubac quotes from *Clavis Scripturae* by Flacius Illyricus that "it was a quite acceptable practice for many to devise four senses for the Scriptures . . . They said that the first of these was literal, the second moral or tropological, the third allegorical, and the fourth anagogical. . ." Most mentions of the "literal" refer to the Scripture being interpreted in the first literal sense, and the anagogical sense refers to a spiritual interpretation of the Scripture. It is this "mystical sense" that leads to "spiritual understanding," and while all these senses are required in order to "read the Scriptures historically, interpret them morally, and understand them spiritually,"⁷⁶ de Lubac explains the Christian tradition of understanding

⁷⁶ De Lubac, Henri, *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*, trans. by Mark Sebanc, E. M. Macierowski, 3 volumes (Grand Rapids, Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998-2009), Vol. I, 96.

Scripture in two ways: in its literal meaning and its spiritual meaning, and that “these two meanings have the same kind of relationship to each other as do the Old and New Testaments to each other.”⁷⁷

In dealing with the relation between the literal and the law, de Lubac describes Scripture’s “mystical meaning hidden as by a veil beneath its letters,” with “letters” referring to the Law. Thus, in connecting the literal to the letter, or in other words, Scripture to the law, a “historical understanding” of the Holy Scripture is “linked to the letter,”⁷⁸ for the law “must be considered not only historically, but also in accordance with a mystic sense, which is to say spiritually.”⁷⁹ Both the literal and the law should be interpreted literally and spiritually in order to be wholly understood, according to de Lubac. Like Scripture, the law is perceived in a twofold manner, and interpreting them both ways is necessary in the Christian faith. The importance of this is stressed when de Lubac states that “the spirit of the letter is Christ,”⁸⁰ and that the law is contained in the body of Christ. However, de Lubac maintains later on in *Medieval Exegesis* that it is not merely enough to have a spiritual understanding of Scripture, but it is also important to understand it in the “correct” sense. Otherwise, it would be of no use to the believer, as he quotes Saint Augustine who advised readers to obtain the correct sense of the Scripture and not mistakenly “substitute his own sense for

⁷⁷ De Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis*, Vol. I, 225.

⁷⁸ *Ibid*, 96.

⁷⁹ *Ibid*, 106.

⁸⁰ *Ibid*, 237.

the sense of Scripture.” It is clearly stated that readers should not understand God’s Law according to one’s mind:

. . . if we should read from thence any writings, even the divine, which can show up with various senses consistent with the faith with which we were imbued, let us not hurl ourselves head over heels into asserting any of these [senses] lest, . . . we should fall; . . . in such fashion that we may have wanted our sense to be the sense of Scriptures, when we ought rather to want that of the Scriptures to be our own.”⁸¹

When contrasting the way Scripture and law is viewed by both Christians and Jews, de Lubac quotes a passage from Saint Paul’s sermon: “If anyone wants to hear and understand these things according to the letter alone, he ought to have a hearing with the Jews rather than with the Christians. But if he wants to be a Christian and a disciple of Paul, let him hear him saying ‘since the law is spiritual.’”⁸² This seems to be the key difference between the Christian and Jewish understanding of scripture, and it is the spiritual understanding of both scripture and the law that de Lubac explains. The spirit must exist along with the letter, it cannot exist without the letter and “nor is the letter devoid of the spirit . . . Each needs the other” even though they are distinguished from one another. De Lubac then elaborates that in order to understand Scripture in the spiritual sense, one must understand it in its literal sense first: “The spiritual sense is also necessary for the completion of the literal sense, which latter is indispensable for founding it.”⁸³ There is a clear association between the two, for one interpretation or sense cannot exist

⁸¹ De Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis*, Vol. III, 78.

⁸² *Ibid*, Vol. II, 5.

⁸³ *Ibid*, 26.

without the other. Yet as much as the spiritual sense is dependent on the literal sense, de Lubac also lays stress on the importance of the literal. Unlike his description of Judaism later on in saying that “to stop short at the letter would have been to return to Judaism,” de Lubac advocates, through the words of Ulrich of Strasbourg, for Christians to be “zealous for the truth of the literal sense, because without this foundation it is impossible for anyone to become perfect in the spiritual sense.”⁸⁴ De Lubac stresses the importance of this co-existing relationship between the literal and the spiritual in order to get a complete and comprehensive understanding of Scripture.

Hence, Judaism is regarded to be a literal practice of the law without any spiritual understanding, contrasting with the Christian ideology of interpreting Scripture in the spiritual sense. De Lubac quotes other authors in light of this, for example Origen, who describes the Jews as people who “after the coming of Christ, still obstinately read everything ‘secundum litteram,’” with the Latin “secundum litteram” roughly translating to “according to the letter.” The portrayal of Jewish Law here is that of the emphasis on understanding and obeying the literal rather than the spiritual, as stressed by de Lubac through a quote by Saint Ambrose, who said that “the Jews do not know how to read the holy Books, because ‘they want God to have written in ink instead of with the spirit.’”⁸⁵ De Lubac also compares Christian scripture interpretation to obtaining nourishment from grain, Christians being those

⁸⁴ De Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis*, Vol. II, 50 – 51.

⁸⁵ *Ibid*, Vol. III, 74.

who “nourish themselves on the pith that they have taken in due time from the shell,” whereas the Jews, who remain “blind to the transformations that were the work of God, are always banging against the hardness of the shell; rejecting the nourishing grain, they remain encumbered with that which . . . is now no more than straw.”

Based on this difference of scripture interpretation, Jews are described as lacking spiritual nourishment, always “following merely the straw of Scripture by always reading,” and their refusal to “allegorize” and to “grow through the Gospel to the size of a full-grown man” results in them retaining “only a ‘puerile’ sense of the great divine Plan.”⁸⁶ Jews are also “unwilling to understand the Spiritual Law spiritually” because they were “puffed up with the observance of the Law,” resulting in “the proud minds of the Hebrews remaining in faithlessness.”⁸⁷ This “Jewish faithlessness” and infidelity is described as “perfidia” by de Lubac, which he explains as “infidelitas” or “the contrary of ‘fides,’” which approximately translates to both “disbelief” and “faith” respectively. “Perfidia” is an absence of faith rather than an antithesis of faith, thus associated and “often applied to the pagan or the heretic.”⁸⁸ From here, de Lubac links this characteristic of “perfidia” to apostasy amongst the Jews, as he describes the Jewish belief as one that “refuses to go all the way to its very end,” referring to the acceptance of Christ and Christianity.

⁸⁶ De Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis*, Vol. III, 107.

⁸⁷ *Ibid*, 127.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, 117.

Rather, it is “going to change direction . . . to turn back into its contrary” with the rejection of Christ. “He thus passes into *perfidia* under the appearance of literal and unchanged fidelity, as an element of ‘rebellion’ and apostasy: ‘apostate Jews,’” not unlike Satan the apostate angel. De Lubac cites the example of Lucifer as possessing this “perfidus” trait, since Lucifer is known for turning against God, relating back to the character of Satan in *Paradise Lost*: “The most emphatic type of the ‘perfidus’ is Lucifer, the ‘apostate angel’: in the great heavenly combat, ‘the faithless apostate angel violently pursues the faithful servant of God.’”⁸⁹

Both de Lubac’s account of scriptural reading in *Medieval Exegesis* and Saint Paul’s interpretive methods of the letter and the law help in understanding why Milton placed such an emphasis on discerning reading. This is particularly relevant in comprehending Milton’s aims and methods in reading *Eikon Basilike*, followed by his analysis and counter argument in *Eikonoklastes*. Since Milton recognized the king’s deliberate style of rhetoric to manipulate his audiences, he employed historical references and scripture to further reinforce his attack on Charles to enlighten readers, who would also benefit from utilizing exegesis to read through the lines of *Eikon Basilike*.

⁸⁹ De Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis*, Vol. III, 123.

CHAPTER THREE **Language and Rhetoric of *Eikonoklastes***

Milton establishes very clearly in *Eikonoklastes* the importance of discerning reading, so as not to be fooled by Charles' false and manipulative words. He uses aids such as historical references and religious doctrine in helping to convey his emphasis on perceptive reading, and is also carefully deliberate in wording the text of *Eikonoklastes*. Paying special attention to his rhetoric, Milton utilizes specific words and phrases in forming the language of his text as one of his methods in revealing Charles' true nature, intentions and deciphering what the king really means. Milton's linguistic techniques are also reflective of his intended role for *Eikonoklastes* to expose the king's duplicity, and his language contrasts greatly with Charles' tautological rhetoric upon examination.

As a way of conveying to readers how he views the text of *Eikon Basilike*, Milton selects specific words that draw comparisons between Charles' text or actions and an object created, for example, when Milton comments on "1. Upon the King's calling this last Parliament." He begins with "THAT which the King lays down here as his first foundation, and as it were the head stone of his whole Structure, that He called this last Parliament,"⁹⁰ making it seem as if the king's actions were akin to constructing a building or creating a structure. Calling for the last parliament was the king's "first foundation," the frontal "head stone of his whole Structure;" apart from meaning "building or construction, the way in which an edifice, machine, implement, is made or put together" (OED, n., II) the OED defines "structure" with "reference to a literary composition, a verse or sentence, a language" (OED, n., III.d) and "in a wider sense: A fabric or framework of material parts put together" (OED, n., VI). The term "surface structure" is used to elaborate on the meaning of the word "structure," in which it refers to "the syntactic elements forming an utterance or sentence, contrasted with the 'hidden' or not immediately recognizable logical form underlying such elements" (OED, n.) in linguistic terms. Based on the word "structure," Milton implies that Charles' actions are constructed attempts to defend himself through the usage of words, or a "literary composition" of which he hopes to only reveal the surface structure of things, thereby indicating a covering up of underlying elements. According

⁹⁰ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 228.

to Milton, however, this only led to “. . . the downfall of his whole Fabric” which “hardly could have come into his mind.”⁹¹ “Fabric” is another word of Milton’s that indicates a front Charles tried to present. Besides meaning “an edifice” or “a building” (OED, n., I), fabric is “to construct, fashion, frame; to fabric up, to fabricate” (OED, v.). The word further reinforces *Eikon Basilike* as a constructed text, patched together by Charles in order to defend himself.

The idea of Charles’ words or of *Eikon Basilike* as a “fabricated” text is further reinforced with Milton’s depiction of it: “[It was] modeled into the form of a private Psalter . . . the lip-work of every Prelatical Liturgist, clapped together, and quilted out of Scripture phrase.”⁹² Milton describes the text almost as if it were a piece of artwork through using the terms “modeled,” “clapped together” and “quilted.” “Model,” typically meaning “plans or designs for a projected building or other structure” (OED, n., I.a) or “something which accurately resembles or represents something else” (OED, n., II.a) also indicates “an object of imitation; a person, or a work, that is proposed or adopted for imitation; an exemplar” (OED, n., IX.a). The usage of that word implies the king’s desire to imitate a better, higher being than he is, namely God, hence the portrayal of him as the “channel of communication” between God and mankind. Besides meaning “a small portrait, as on a medal; (hence also) a medal” (OED, n., III), Milton’s usage of “model” conveys the king’s desire to glorify himself by painting a self-portrait through *Eikon*

⁹¹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 228.

⁹² *Ibid*, 234.

Basilike as well. Apart from that, “clapped together” implies a convening of two ends, referring to the fact that Charles merged his own words with that of scripture throughout his text. The term “clap” indicates “noisy talk, chatter,” and is a term for an instrument: “A rattle used to summon people to church on the last three days of the Holy Week when the bells were not rung, a flat instrument of iron, resembling a box, with a tongue and handle, used for making proclamations instead of a drum or hand-bell” (OED, n.1, II.d). Milton compares Charles to an inanimate object, only capable of making noises that do not carry any weight in particular, thus reinforcing Milton’s statement of the king who only makes “fair and specious promises . . . to contain nothing in them much different from his former practices.”⁹³ Next, “quilt” also implies something similar; aside from its definition of “to fasten together (two pieces of fabric) by stitches or lines of stitching so as to hold in position a layer or cotton, wool, or other soft material placed between them” (OED, v.1, II.a), it also describes a compilation of literary works: “To compile (a literary work) out of extracts from various sources, to join together (passages of texts)” (OED, v.1, II.b). Again, Milton implicitly brings up the fact that Charles misuses biblical verses in *Eikon Basilike* by incorporating them into his own words while misrepresenting them at the same time. Milton, however, is not deceived and views *Eikon Basilike* as nothing more

⁹³ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 234.

than a mere fabrication, a piece of work created as a shield in defense of the king himself.

Another word that Milton uses in the context of art is “craft,” when he speaks of the “special craft”⁹⁴ that political tyrants have. “Craft” here takes on two meanings, since Milton previously used artisan terms such as “modeled” and “quilted.” The first meaning indicates “intellectual power, skill, art” (OED, n., II.a), going along with Milton’s analogy of *Eikon Basilike* being the king’s piece of crafted artwork. The underlying meaning of “craft,” however, in association with being crafty, is “a skill or art applied to deceive or overreach in a bad sense; deceit, guile, fraud, cunning” (OED, n., IV.a).

While all these terms are used by Milton to describe how Charles developed his text, Milton makes it seem as if *Eikon Basilike* is Charles’ piece of artwork or a structure that he built with his skill of rhetoric. Besides referring to “skill in the practical application of the principles of a particular field of knowledge or learning” (OED, n.1, II), the term “art” is defined as “a practical pursuit or trade of a skilled nature, a craft; an activity that can be achieved or mastered by the application of specialist skills” (OED, n.1, III.b), and also “to make artificial” (OED, v.2, II). Charles’ text can be seen as the product of his skill in rhetoric, as he crafts out a verbal defense and resembles an “artificial” text from misquoting scripture. “Art” also means “to constrain, compel, oblige, or urge (a person) to do something; to bind (a person) to an action, obligation”

⁹⁴ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 234.

(OED, v.1, II.a) and “to urge, incite, or induce” (OED, v.1, II.b), bearing resemblance to Milton’s claim of Charles’ actions in regards to the Irish rebellion.

Another instance where Milton implies this “craft” and “skill” of Charles is in “12. *Upon the Rebellion in Ireland*,” in which he states that “. . . it cannot be imaginable that the Irish guided by so many subtle and *Italian* heads of the Romish party, should have lost the use of reason, and indeed of Common Sense . . . to begin a War so desperate and irreconcilable against both England and Scotland . . .”⁹⁵ Milton claims there is no other reason for the rebellion except that the Irish were incited into doing so, and then goes on to accuse Charles of being the “main incitement and authority for this Rebellion” through the use of the word “subtle.” Its definition, according to the OED, is “fine or delicate, to such an extent as to elude observation or analysis” (OED, adj., VI), or when describing a craftsman or person, “skillful, clever, expert, dexterous” (OED, adj., VII.a) and “crafty, cunning; treacherously or wickedly cunning, insidiously sly, wily” (OED, adj., X.a). There is an implication of an exterior involvement in the rebellion, as if this was an organized movement, as subtle also goes on to mean “of things: Characterized by cleverness or ingenuity in conception or execution; cleverly designed or executed, artfully contrived” (OED, adj., VIII), “working imperceptibly or secretly, insidious,” and “to devise subtleties or subtle distinctions cleverly, to argue subtly” and

⁹⁵ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 245.

“to scheme, plan craftily” (OED, v.). Again, Milton implies here that it was a cleverly and subtly devised scheme, “artfully contrived” like a piece of work.

Another assertion that Milton makes is that there was a source that ignited the Irish rebellion, namely Charles: “Seeing then the main incitement and authority for this Rebellion must be needs derived from England, it will be next inquired who was the prime Author.”⁹⁶ By using the word “incite,” Milton clearly indicates that this was sparked from something planned, an “authority” who “authored” the rebellion. “Incitement” refers to “the action of inciting or rousing to action; an urging, spurring, or setting on; instigation, stimulation,” or “that which incites or rouses to action; an inciting cause or motive; stimulus, incentive, ‘spur’” (OED, n.). Additionally, the word “incite” goes along the lines of “to urge or provoke some action” (OED, v.). Milton’s clear implication here is that Charles had urged and spurred the rebellion by orchestrating the whole event. The king was the “authority” of the rebellion, with “power or right to enforce obedience; moral or legal supremacy; the right to command, or give an ultimate decision; in possession of power over others” (OED, n., I). Milton uses the word “authority” to convey that Charles “possessed” the Irish and was capable of commanding them to do what he wanted at his will. “Authority” also means the power to influence the conduct and actions of others, as well as the opinions of others through authoritative opinion or intellectual influence (OED, n., V). This fits

⁹⁶ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 245.

into the context of Charles convincing the Irish into rebellion through his title, status and power. Being the authority, he “authored” the rebellion, with Milton choosing to use the word because of its definition: “An inventor, constructor, or founder; the Creator” and “one who begets; a father, an ancestor” (OED, n.); in other words, the Author is the Creator, God Himself. Milton employs the word “author” also because of the king’s constant portrayal of himself as God-like in *Eikon Basilike*, but Milton inverts Charles into a creator of chaos and rebellion resembling Satan as opposed to the Heavenly Father. Other definitions of “author” solidify Milton’s claim of Charles as the “authorizer or instigator” of the rebellion: “He who gives rise to or causes an action, event, circumstance, state, or condition of things,” while “one who sets forth written statements; the composer or writer of a treatise or book” (OED, n., III.a) undoubtedly refers to *Eikon Basilike*. While Milton does not explicitly say so, he heavily implies that Charles attempts to imitate scripture by authoring *Eikon Basilike* in a way that resembles it through misquoting it and integrating it into his own words.

Though the word “implicate” is not used by Milton throughout the text, the meaning of the word, both in its seventeenth century and modern usage, resonates in the section on the rebellion. The OED defines “implicate” as “to entangle mentally, to confuse” (OED, v., I.b) or “entanglement, confusion” (OED, n., I). “To involve in its nature or meaning, or as a consequence or inference; to imply; to comprise” (OED, v., II.a) is among its definitions as

well, along with “intertwined, twisted together; wrapped up with” (OED, adj., D). Milton implies that Charles is involved in the rebellion, intertwined and entangled with the Irish. The current definition of “implicate” is “to imply as a necessary circumstance, or as something to be inferred or understood,” or “to connect or relate to intimately.” Charles had that intimate connection with the Irish, hence his successful persuasion that led to the rebellion. Other current definitions of “implicate” include “to show, to be also involved, usually in an incriminating manner: to be implicated in a crime” and “to fold or twist together; intertwine; interlace,” all relating back to the king’s involvement with the rebellion. Thus, it is through the usage of specific words such as these that Milton solidifies his assertions on Charles’ character and intentions, which he purposefully reveals to readers through *Eikonoklastes*.

Furthermore, Milton depicts the double nature of the king through the use of paradoxical phrases in describing Charles’ actions, such as “wilful mistake” and “false virginity.” These sets of contradictory words serve to prove Milton’s point in that while Charles portrays himself as one being, his nature is actually that of another upon careful scrutiny. When commenting on “13. *Upon the calling in of the Scots and their coming*,” Milton describes Charles’ act as a “wilful mistake.”⁹⁷ The phrase “wilful mistake” is in itself a contradiction, with the definitions of each word defying one another. The

⁹⁷ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 254.

general definition of “wilful,” as assigned by the OED, is “having the will *to do* something; purposing, intending; wishful, desirous” (OED, adj.1, II) and “done on purpose or wittingly; purposed, deliberate, intentional; not accidental or casual” (OED, adj.1, V). Other meanings to the word include “involving unfettered exercise of will; arbitrary; wilful empire, absolute sovereignty, autocracy” (OED, adj.1, IV.b) and also “crafty, wily” (OED, adj.2), fitting Milton’s depiction of Charles as a crafty and dubious ruler. The placement of “wilful” and “mistake” reinforces this; “wilful mistake” seems like an oxymoron at first, for it is contradictory for an action to be both purposeful and an error at the same time. The general use of the word “mistake” is “misapprehension, misunderstanding; error, misjudgement” (OED, n.) and “to transgress, offend, do wrong” (OED, v., II.a). Yet this inserted phrase is intentional, for Milton indicates that no action of the king’s really is a mistake, and that the actions and words of the king are as contradictory as the phrase “wilful mistake” itself.

In addition to that, “mistake” means “to be under a misconception as to the identity or nature of; to take to be somebody or something else” (OED, v., VIII.a). Milton picks up on this seventeenth century meaning of the word, which can also be read as “mis-take,” and also comments on the king’s “mis-take” further on in the text: “And the whole Nation is not easily to be thought so raw, and so perpetually novice after all this light, as to need the help and

direction of other Nations . . .”⁹⁸ Charles makes two mistakes here; he wrongly but “willfully” calls in the Scots and “mis-takes” his nation to be undeveloped in thought, or in other words, “raw.” While most definitions of “raw” refer to unfinished, unprocessed or unripe items, ranging from fabric to pottery and food (OED, adj., I), it refers to people and actions too: “Of a person: inexperienced; unskilled, untrained” and “of a thing, quality, action; indicative or characteristic of inexperience” (OED, adj., IV). Since “raw” is also understood as “uncivilized, coarse, brutal” (OED, adj., V), Charles underestimates his people in expecting them to be that inexperienced and naive as to believe his reasons for calling in the Scots.

Besides the employment of the term “willful mistake,” Milton uses “false virginity,” another contradictory phrase, in describing Charles to further establish the king’s inconsistency: “. . . his reason, his conscience, and his honour, became so straightened with a kind of false virginity . . .”⁹⁹ While virginity means “the condition of being or remaining in a state of chastity; abstinence from or avoidance of all sexual relations” (OED, n., I), it refers to the appearance of virtue or integrity, innocence and inexperience” (OED, n., III.b) as well. The word “false” before it creates a contrast, for false carries a negative connotation meaning “wrong, not according to correct rule or principle” and “contrary to what is true” (OED, adj.). “False” is the opposite to the implication of innocence in “virginity,” as “false” also means

⁹⁸ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 257.

⁹⁹ *Ibid*, 254.

“defective, not firm or solid” and “mendacious, deceitful, treacherous” (OED, adj., VIII). It is a pretense, to betray and deceive, fallacious and deceptive. The OED explains it as “prefixed to personal designations, especially in false god, false prophet” (OED, adj., XIII). Milton could have also chosen to use the word because of this specific implication, as Milton makes clear distinctions between the status of God and king in *Eikonoklastes*: “Christian liberty purchased with the death of our Redeemer . . . is not now to depend upon the doubtful consent of any earthly monarch; nor to be again fettered with a presumptuous negative voice, tyrannical to the Parliament, but much more Tyrannical to the Church of God.”¹⁰⁰ The voice of the “earthly monarch” has taken over the role of the church, and Milton tries to reverse this by making his readers aware of Charles pretending to be a false God by portraying himself as one. Milton points out that the king inverted his role from a monarchical ruler to that of a worshipped God, for “false” additionally means “of a medium of vision: that distorts the object looked at” (OED, adj., XII), something that Milton intended to correct through his writings in *Eikonoklastes*.

Despite all that Charles does to redeem himself through false depictions, Milton sees through *Eikon Basilike* and views these defenses as doing more harm to Charles than good. He points out the king’s faults in regards to his actions on the church, claiming: “It is not the part of a King, because he ought

¹⁰⁰ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 257.

to defend the church, therefore to set himself supreme head over the Church, or to meddle with Ecclesial Government, or to defend the church otherwise than the church would be defended; for such defence is bondage . . .”¹⁰¹ The king’s defense is a failed attempt, and ironically bonds him instead of freeing him from blame. The OED defines “defence” as “a speech or argument in self-vindication” and “guarding or protecting from attack, protection” (OED, n., VI) while bondage is “the condition of being bound or tied up, that which binds” and a “subjection to some bond, binding power, influence, or obligation” (OED, n., III.a). “Bondage” also refers to slavery, it is “the position or condition of a serf or slave; servitude, serfdom, slavery” and “to enslave” (OED, n., II.a). Even though Charles asserted many untruths in regards to several occasions to untangle himself from his involvement, Milton fathoms that it did no good, and only served to “bind” him into “servitude,” which led to the king’s eventual death sentence.¹⁰²

While effective in conveying his depiction of Charles and his actions through carefully chosen words, Milton employs psychological methods in his rhetoric to convince his readers of the king’s faults, as discussed by Daniel Shore in “‘Fit Though Few’: *Eikonoklastes* and the Rhetoric of Audience.” Shore describes Milton as writing to a targeted audience of specifically two

¹⁰¹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 256.

¹⁰² Kishlansky, Mark A. and Morrill, John, “Charles I (1600 – 1649),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5143>>. Charles was brought to trial and executed in January 1649 following the sentencing by the English Parliament, whereby prosecutors charged him for having “governed by will and not by law (tyranny), and had ‘traiterously’ levied war ‘against the present parliament and the people there represented.’”

groups: “Those who disagree with Milton are portrayed as near illiterates who judge according to custom and prejudice; those who entertain the truth of his argument fare much better.” Milton intentionally categorizes his audiences or readers into distinctive groups so that they would form an opinion on Charles, making readers of Shore’s article see that setting out such a distinct target audience is Milton’s way of implementing psychological conditions on his readers: “Milton uses praise or blame to urge us to take action into becoming a certain kind of reader – the kind that will receive his arguments favorably.”¹⁰³ This technique makes “. . . readers aware of themselves as part of an audience [that] allows him [Milton] to employ a wide variety of social controls for his own rhetorical purposes,”¹⁰⁴ hence “social control” as a key phrase in Milton’s efforts to gain authority over his readers through *Eikonoklastes*. Shore highlights another psychological method that Milton employs in convincing his readers; the phrase “Fit Though Few” seen in the article’s title depicts Milton’s elitist impulse, described by Shore as Milton’s “most powerful social control he employs for rhetorical purposes.” This is used in order to make readers want to be part of the elite crowd that understood Milton’s viewpoint on the king, implying an additional sense of exclusivity that Milton employed. This is done so Milton’s readers would want to “disassociate themselves from the many to join the elite few,”¹⁰⁵ almost as if it is a privilege to be in the

¹⁰³ Shore, Daniel, “‘Fit Though Few’: *Eikonoklastes* and the Rhetoric of Audience,” *Milton Studies* 45 (2006), 132.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 134.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 135.

group of the select few who can see the implicit actions and words of Charles, rather than the others who are deemed as too ignorant to interpret the king's words. In other words, Milton employs this sense of exclusivity to make readers feel the need to be included in the group of "select" readers.

Milton also employs this "inclusive" tool to gain social control over his readers with the usage of the pronoun "we." It "allows him (Milton) to involve his readers directly," and to quote Ainsworth, Milton employs "frequent questions in order to force his readers to participate actively in the process of reading and questioning *Eikon Basilike*"¹⁰⁶ discerningly. In reading and questioning *Eikon Basilike*, Milton leads his readers to make a forced choice in deciding which "group" they want to belong to. Shore's article initially mentions that Milton portrays two groups or types of readers, the ignorant and the learned. Part of Milton's use of social control is when he gives the two groups separate treatment, according to Shore, and "those who disagree with Milton are portrayed as near illiterates who judge according to custom and prejudice" while "those who entertain the truth of his (Milton's) argument fare much better." Readers are given a choice as to which group they want to be associated with, but this is a forced choice since they will be criticized and belittled if they choose not to see things Milton's way. Through this method of reverse psychology, readers will not only question Charles' actions and intentions, but decide as well "who they want to be and how they

¹⁰⁶ Ainsworth, "Spiritual Reading in Milton's *Eikonoklastes*," 165.

want to be treated,” as “Milton uses praise and blame to urge us [readers] to take the action of becoming a certain kind of reader – the kind that will receive his arguments favorably.”¹⁰⁷ In other words, Shore is saying that Milton imposes a forced choice upon his readers to agree with *Eikonoklastes* as opposed to *Eikon Basilike* through his psychological rhetoric and tactic of praise and blame.

Charles’ language stands in stark contrast to Milton’s psychological rhetoric in *Eikonoklastes*, which aimed to reveal the dubious nature of the king’s words. In *Eikon Basilike*, Charles engages in what Ainsworth regards as a tautological equation, whereby Charles deliberately confuses his readers by repeating himself in different ways and speaking in contradictory fashions. In remarking upon the king’s rhetoric, Ainsworth states that “Charles’s protest that he called Parliament from choice and on the advice of others collapses into a tautology where that external advice stems from the king’s choice,”¹⁰⁸ as can be seen in the section of “2. *Upon the Earl of Strafford’s death.*” The king’s contradictory nature is explicitly seen at the beginning of the section, in which Charles declares Strafford’s innocence while not approving of all that the earl did: “Though I cannot in My Judgment approve all he did . . . I could never be convinced of any such criminousness in him, as willingly to expose his life to the stroke of Justice, and malice to his enemies.”¹⁰⁹ Later on,

¹⁰⁷ Shore, “‘Fit Though Few’: *Eikonoklastes* and the Rhetoric of Audience,” 132.

¹⁰⁸ Ainsworth, “Spiritual Reading in Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*,” 180.

¹⁰⁹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 54.

Charles lapses into illogical reasoning again when speaking of his involvement in the Earl of Strafford's death sentencing. While proclaiming that "I would not have any hand in his Death, of whose Guiltlessness I was better assured, than any man living could be," Charles was at the same time apologetic for sentencing Strafford to death, praying for God's mercy to be "sanctified so to Me, as to make Me repent of that unjust Act," hoping that "God hath forgiven Me and them, [for] the sinful rashness of that business." He needlessly repeats his contradictions throughout the section in justifying his act as well, first explaining that "I was persuaded by those, that I think wished me well, to choose rather what was safe, than what seemed just; preferring the outward peace of My Kingdoms with men, before that inward exactness of Conscience before God," before making the adverse claim that "the best rule of policy is to prefer the doing of Justice, before all enjoyments, and the peace of My Conscience before the preservation of My Kingdoms."¹¹⁰

In comparing Charles' tautological language to Milton's, Ainsworth states that "Milton writes for those 'mised'" by Charles's tautological logic to "bethink themselves and recover,"¹¹¹ and argues that "Milton presents his own analytic procedures in *Eikonoklastes* as an example of discerning reading and encouraging his readers to follow that example."¹¹² It is seen in the language of *Eikonoklastes* that Milton employs a methodical system of analyzing and

¹¹⁰ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 54 – 55.

¹¹¹ Ainsworth, "Spiritual Reading in Milton's *Eikonoklastes*," 161.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 164.

dissecting Charles' text before posing questions to challenge the king.

Milton's logical and organized method reveals the problems within *Eikon Basilike*, as can be seen from an example of his analysis and critique from *Eikonoklastes* in regards to Charles' calling for Parliament:

*He hoped by his freedom, and their moderation to prevent misunderstandings. And wherefore not by their freedom and his moderation? But freedom he thought too high a word for them; and moderation a word too mean for himself: this was not the way to prevent misunderstandings.*¹¹³

Milton immediately poses a question following Charles's statement, and maintains this constant method of questioning throughout *Eikonoklastes*. Through his repetitive questioning, perhaps Milton hopes for his readers to detect this and begin to question Charles themselves. After posing the question, Milton answers it by explaining the true thoughts of the king's calling of the Parliament, that Charles thought of freedom as "too high" and moderation "too mean." With intentions to enlighten readers on Charles' illogical reasoning, Milton utilizes this methodical language and process of analyzing Charles's words to reveal the true nature of *Eikon Basilike's* language.

In summarizing the chapter, it can be deduced that the rhetorical style of both Milton and Charles indicate very different purposes of each respective text, Charles' to confound and conceal and Milton's to clarify and reveal. While the intentions of the authors may be explicit in some regards, many

¹¹³ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 231.

aspects of their argument are subtly embedded between the lines and within the words of *Eikonoklastes* and *Eikon Basilike*, hence the need for readers to dissect the texts thoroughly in order to fully comprehend their value and substance.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Nature of Satan

The comparative analysis of both *Eikon Basilike* and *Eikonoklastes* provides readers a comprehensive overview of Milton's frame of reference in shaping Satan's character in *Paradise Lost*. Aspects ranging from the language and rhetoric of the texts to Milton's employment of historical and religious doctrine form the foundation of how Satan is depicted, for Milton intended to portray Satan in a light similar to that shone on Charles in *Eikonoklastes*. Satan the character and Charles the monarch share vital characteristics and attributes, and actions of one can be seen or are reflected in the other. This is not to say, however, that the character of Satan is entirely based on Charles, neither are both of them meant to be seen as direct parallels of each other; rather, a study on the king and the events surrounding him provide a good foundation in understanding Satan and his actions. Once

readers fathom the relevant historical events, background information and the laws of the doctrine that Milton was likely to have used as sources in composing *Eikonoklastes*, interpreting Satan can be done in a deeper and more comprehensive manner, allowing for the reader to fully contemplate Milton's intentions in thus shaping Satan.

Satan is generally understood to be the fallen angel, symbolic of sin, and is commonly depicted as a devilish figure who retaliates against God. The Satan of *Paradise Lost*, however, is a character that is far more complex than the generic idea of him as Milton's antagonist. Being the first of all characters to be introduced to the reader in *Paradise Lost*, Satan is depicted in Book I as "The infernal serpent":

The infernal serpent; he it was, whose guile
 Stirred up with envy and revenge, deceived
 The mother of mankind, what time his pride
 Had cast him out from heaven, with all his host
 Of rebel angels, by whose aid aspiring
 To set himself in glory above his peers,
 He trusted to have equaled the most high,
 If he opposed; and with ambitious aim
 Against the throne and monarchy of God
 Raised impious war in heaven and battle proud
 With vain attempt.

(I. 33 – 44)

His faults of "aspiring / To set himself in glory above his peers" and of opposing "with ambitious aim / Against the throne and monarchy of God" are immediately made known to readers, giving the impression of Satan as the fallen rebel angel. He is the "infernal" serpent, with infernal meaning "of or belonging to the world or 'regions' below, to the realm of the dead in ancient

mythology, or the abode of evil spirits in Jewish and Christian belief” (OED, adj., I) and “of the character as having some of the attributes of hell, hellish, diabolical, fiendish, devilish” (OED, adj., II). The word solidifies the impression of Satan as an evil spirit belonging in hell, with pride as his cardinal sin, “Mixed with obdurate pride and steadfast hate” (I. 58) and “Stirred up with envy and revenge” (I. 35).

Yet, in his first speech given to rally the fallen angelic host, Satan speaks of the contention between him and God as if it were a war. Satan proclaimed to the rest of the fallen angels that:

. . . from sense of injured merit,
That with the mightiest raised me to contend,
And to the fierce contention brought me along
Innumerable force of spirits armed
That durst dislike his reign, and me preferring,
His utmost power with adverse power opposed
In dubious battle on the plains of heaven,
And shook his throne.

(I. 98 – 105)

In this excerpt of his speech, God is likened to a reigning monarch on a throne that Satan “with adverse power opposed / In dubious battle on the plains of heaven.” God and Satan as spiritual and hellish entities are depicted in a political context with Satan and his “spirits armed” waging war on God the monarch in order to adversely challenge the order of power and authority.

This is further reinforced in a later part of Satan’s speech, who said he

Doubted his empire, that were low indeed,
That were an ignominy and shame beneath
This downfall; since by fate the strength of gods
And this empyreal substance cannot fail,

Since through experience of this great event
 In arms not worse, in foresight much advanced,
 We may with more successful hope resolve
 To wage by force or guile eternal war
 Irreconcilable to our grand foe,
 Who now triumphs, and in the excess of joy
 Sole reigning holds the tyranny of heaven.

(I. 114 – 124)

Satan refers to his army of spirits as “empyrean substance[s],” which is pertaining to the “sublime, elevated, superior, rare,” the empyrean or highest heavenly substances that angels are made of. The word “empyrean” puns on the word “imperial,” indicating that Satan views his angelic host as a body of spirits pertaining to an empire (OED, adj., I), or himself as an emperor that “has a commanding quality, demeanour, or aspect; majestic, august, lofty, exalted; domineering and imperious” (OED, adj., V.a). This strongly indicates political implications hinting at events of the seventeenth century that Milton witnessed during his lifetime, which prompted him to write *Eikonoklastes* as a response to Charles’ *Eikon Basilike*. By framing the fall of Satan and his ambition to challenge God at a political angle, Milton invites comparisons between Satan’s attributes and Charles’, which simultaneously allows for the events surrounding Satan to be examined in relation to the developments involving Charles.

From Satan’s first speech, it is seen that he possesses the skill of diversion, as he successfully avoids the usage of God’s name, referring to Him instead as “our grand foe” and the “tyranny of heaven” in his initial speech. Satan does this throughout *Paradise Lost*, also using “the almighty” (I. 623), “the

thunderer” (II. 28) and “heaven’s supreme” (IX. 125) when mentioning God. Satan’s cunning attributes are seen as well when conversing with Gabriel, as he avoids the archangel’s questioning evasively. Gabriel questions Satan directly as to his reasons for spying on Adam and Eve in Eden, asking “Why satst thou like an enemy in wait / Here watching at the head of these that sleep?” (IV. 825 – 826), only for Satan to answer Gabriel with another question: “Know ye not then said Satan, filled with scorn, / Know ye not me?” (IV. 827 – 828). Satan continuously avoids answering Gabriel and even comments on the archangel’s lack of knowledge for asking the question: “Not to know me argues yourselves unknown, / The lowest of your throng; or if ye know, / Why ask ye, and superfluous begin / Your message, like to end as much in vain?” (IV. 830 – 833). Satan’s tactics of deviation are further seen when he tries to avoid admitting his mistakes by claiming its benefits, for example, when speaking of his fall in his first speech of *Paradise Lost*. Asserting that their failed attempt at revolting against God could provide them with experience and foresight for their next attempt, Satan argues that

Since through experience of this great event
 In arms not worse, in foresight much advanced,
 We may with more successful hope resolve
 To wage by force or guile eternal war
 Irreconcilable to our grand foe,

...

(I. 114 – 124)

Satan’s claim here is similar in nature to one of Charles’ defenses in *Eikon Basilike*, where he strays away from the topic at hand the way Satan does.

When elaborating on his calling of the last Parliament¹¹⁴ in “1. *Upon the King’s calling this last Parliament*,” Charles deviates from discussing the matter at hand and states that the effects and consequences of his actions were of God’s will: “The miseries which have ensued upon Me and My Kingdom, are the Just effects of thy displeasure upon us; and may be yet (through thy mercy) preparatives of us to future blessings, and better hearts to enjoy them.”¹¹⁵ Instead of explaining himself, Charles asserts that the “Just effects” of his actions were “preparatives” for “future blessings,” almost as if it was a necessary decision that had to be made. Not unlike Satan’s justification of rebelling against God for a cause, Charles’ reasoning indicates a style of rhetoric similar to Satan’s. The king stated that he made the decision to dismiss Parliament based on his good judgment and conscience, even though it was explicitly wrong: “I resolved to reform, what I should by free and full advice in Parliament be convinced to be amiss; and to grant whatever My Reason and Conscience told Me, was fit to be desired . . .”¹¹⁶ In recognizing Charles’ method of false justification as an attempt of self-defense, Milton could very well have incorporated the king’s style of manipulative rhetoric into Satan’s, such as when Satan attempts to justify why he escaped from Hell and fled to Eden. In speaking to Gabriel, who questions,

¹¹⁴ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 228. Assembled in February 1626, Charles abruptly dissolved Parliament to halt the impeachment proceedings against the Duke of Buckingham, George Villiers. Buckingham had significant influence over the king, and the charges against him included the poisoning of James I.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 53.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 52.

Why hast thou, Satan, broke the bounds prescribed
 To thy transgressions, and disturbed the charge
 Of others, who approve not to transgress
 By thy example, but have power and right
 To question thy bold entrance on this place;
 Employed it seems to violate sleep, and those
 Whose dwelling God hath planted here in bliss?
 (IV. 878 – 884)

Satan evades the topic the same way Charles did when confronted, avoiding the question by answering:

Gabriel, thou hadst in heaven the esteem of wise,
 And such I held thee; but this question asked
 Puts me in doubt. Lives there who loves his pain?
 Who would not, finding way, break loose from hell,
 Though thither doomed?
 (IV. 886 – 890)

Satan twists his words so that they substantiate his reasons for escaping from Hell, and even goes so far as to assert that Gabriel would have done the same: “Thou wouldst thyself, no doubt / And boldly venture to whatever place / Farthest from pain, where thou mightst hope to change / Torment with ease, . . .” (IV. 890 – 893).

Another Satanic characteristic that is likely to have been adopted from Charles is his manner of avoiding blame and shifting it elsewhere. Most of Charles’ rhetoric in *Eikon Basilike* consists of false assertions and excuses to cover up the king’s real intentions and to avoid shouldering the consequences of his actions, an example being his defense in “2. *Upon the Earl of Strafford’s death.*” Although Charles was responsible for signing Strafford’s death sentence, he still maintained that he was “persuaded by those, that I

think wished me well, to choose what was safe, than what seemed just; preferring the outward peace of My Kingdoms with men, before that inward exactness of Conscience before God.”¹¹⁷ Charles blames his actions on the influences of those who “wished him well,” and that the “unjust” decision in executing Strafford that was done in favor of his kingdom’s peace over his conscience was the fault of others. Similarly, Satan too blamed God for his own downfall after choosing to rebel against the heavenly Father instead of admitting to his own mistake. The devilish fiend claims:

. . . But he who reigns
 Monarch in heaven, 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)

According to Satan, the “regal state” and “strength concealed” of the “Monarch in heaven” “tempted our attempt” to overthrow God and “wrought our fall,” hence the portrayal of Satan as pushing the fault of his own mistakes over to God. In fact, Satan even goes so far as to distort the events that had taken place; while he was initially the one who tempted the fallen angelic host into rebelling along with him, and later on is the one to tempt Eve and Adam into consuming the forbidden fruit, Satan distorts this truth into claiming that God “wrought” their fall by tempting them into going against God. As “wrought” means “created, shaped, moulded” (OED, adj., I.a) or “artificial,

¹¹⁷ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 54.

specially prepared” (OED, adj., II), Satan implies that God had planned the rebellion and the downfall. In actual fact, however, Satan had tempted the fallen angels himself with “superior voice,” “His name,” “His countenance” and had “allured them” with his lies (V. 705 – 709), with “allure” meaning “to attract by the offer of some advantage or pleasure; to tempt by something flattering or acceptable; to entice or to win over.” However, God sees through this guise, and identifies Satan as being “so bent . . . / On desperate revenge, that shall redound / Upon his rebellious head” (III. 84 – 86), and sheds light on Satan’s accusations of causing the rebellion:

. . . so will fall
 He and his faithless progeny: whose fault?
 Whose but his own? Ingrate, he had of me
 All he could have; I made him just and right,
 Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall.
 . . .
 They therefore as to right belonged,
 So were created, nor can justly accuse
 Their maker, or their making, or their fate;
 As if predestination overruled
 Their will, disposed by absolute decree
 Or high foreknowledge; they themselves decreed
 Their own revolt, not I: if I foreknew,
 Foreknowledge had no influence on their fault,
 Which had no less proved certain unforeknown.

(III. 95 – 119)

God’s clarification of Satan’s false claims can well be seen as being akin to Milton’s analysis on *Eikon Basilike*’s “2. Upon the Earl of Strafford’s death.” While Charles claims “not to have had any hand in his Death,”¹¹⁸ Milton refutes the lie by explaining that Charles made that false claim “not because

¹¹⁸ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 55.

he thought him [Strafford] guiltless of highest Treason, . . . but because he knew himself a Principle in what the Earl was but his accessory, and thought nothing Treason against the Common-wealth, but against himself only.”¹¹⁹

Apart from that, both Charles and Satan are revealed to be inconsistent in nature, as seen from their rhetoric and actions. Satan’s physical form, for one, keeps changing throughout *Paradise Lost*, first from a spirit to a “four-footed kind” of creature (IV. 244), then “squat like a toad” (IV. 269) and finally to a serpent that though was previously “Prone on the ground,” later on could “on his rear, / Circular base of rising folds, that towered / Fold above fold a surging maze” (IX. 497 – 499). Satan’s attitude is also as inconsistent as his form, since his emotions range from one to another in each book. When he first lands in hell, Satan is portrayed as a wretched but glorified creature, who “throws his baleful eyes / That witnessed huge affliction and dismay / Mixed with obdurate pride and steadfast hate” around (I.56 – 58). As the self appointed leader of the fallen angels, Satan gives a speech to revive and exercise his power over them, and with “transcendent glory raised / Above his fellows, with monarchical pride / Conscious of highest worth” (II.427 – 429), speaks to his crew in Pandemonium. Satan’s attitude changes drastically later on, falling into despair and losing hope, declaring “Farewell remorse: all good to me is lost; / Evil be thou my good . . .” (IV. 109 – 110). “While he spake, each passion dimmed his face / Thrice changed with pale, ire, envy and

¹¹⁹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 238.

despair” (IV. 114 – 115), revealing an inconsistent character that is not unlike Charles’. In *Eikon Basilike*, the king is inconsistent in his claims, such as in “2. *Upon the Earl of Strafford’s death.*” In the same sentence, he mentions “Though I cannot in My Judgement approve all he did . . . yet I could never be convinced of any such criminousness in him, as willingly to expose his life to the stroke of Justice, and malice of his enemies.” He explains his decision in executing Strafford to be “I was persuaded by those, that I think wished me well, to choose rather what was safe, than what seemed just,” yet later on declared “I would not have had any hand in his Death, of whose Guiltlessness I was better assured, than any man living could be.”¹²⁰ There exists the same kind of inconsistency in the rhetoric of both Satan and Charles, making it very likely that Milton chose to mimic Charles’ speech through the character of Satan.

Another significant comparison can be made between Charles and Satan. When Satan contemplates repentance even though he doesn’t follow through with it in the end, Satan wonders if he should “. . . repent or change, / Though changed in outward lusture, that fixed mind / And high disdain, from sense of injured merit . . .” (I. 96 – 98). Though the idea of repentance is brought up again in light of Satan when he questions: “Oh then at last relent: is there no place / Left for repentance, none for pardon left?” (IV. 79 – 80), he never does repent for his sins. Similarly, Charles brings up the notion of repentance in

¹²⁰ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 54 – 55.

“1. *Upon His Majesty’s calling this last Parliament,*” but never actually does repent even though he speaks of his regret. Charles explicitly states that even though there is “*want of timely repentance of our sins,*” he still asserts that “*I do not Repent of My calling this last Parliament; because, O Lord, I did it with an upright intention, to Thy Glory, and My People’s good.*”¹²¹ Although both Satan and Charles acknowledge their mistake and dabble with the idea of repenting, they refuse to do so in the end.

Despite all of their false assertions, inconsistencies and duplicity in nature, it is noted that fear is the underlying nature of Charles’ and Satan’s character, as seen by Milton and the angel Zephon in each respective figure. When challenged by Zephon to a duel, Satan claimed that “If I must contend, said he / Best with the best, the sender not the sent, / Or all at once; more glory will be won, / Or less will be lost” (IV. 851 – 854). Zephon sees through Satan’s pretense of pride and courage, recognizing him instead as a mere coward who is weak: “Thy fear, said Zephon bold, / Will save us trial what the least can do / Single against thee wicked, and thence weak” (IV. 854 – 856). Likewise, Milton also recognizes traces of fear in Charles’ rhetoric in *Eikon Basilike*, and he points this out in the following passage when commenting on Charles’ sentencing of Strafford to death: “For it was fear, and nothing else which made him feign before both the scruple and the satisfaction of his conscience, that is to say, of his mind: his first fear pretended conscience that he might be

¹²¹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 52 – 53.

borne with to refuse signing; his latter fear being more urgent made him find a conscience both to sign and to be satisfied.”¹²² While it is undeniable that Satan is depicted in light of Charles, as seen through several of their similar attributes, Satan is not meant to be a parallel of Charles, but rather a character that hints at the political figure through the portrayal of shared characteristics.

Apart from Satan and Charles sharing similar characteristics, several incidents of *Paradise Lost* do intentionally reflect the text of *Eikon Basilike*. When he changes form into a toad and whispers into Eve’s ear while she sleeps, Satan forges illusions and phantasms in making Eve dream about the forbidden fruit. Milton depicted Satan as “Squat like a toad, close at the ear of Eve; / Assaying by his devilish art to reach / The organs of her fancy, and with them forge / Illusions as he list, phantasms and dreams . . .” (IV. 800 – 803). With the general meaning of images and illusions, the word “phantasms” is defined as “a deceptive appearance” (OED, n., I.a) or “an illusory likeness of an abstract concept; a counterfeit; a sham; an inferior or false copy or semblance” (OED, n., I.d). It is also in reference to “a person who is not what he or she appears or claims to be, or in other words, an impostor” (OED, n., I.d). Thus, Satan whispering such phantasms into Eve’s ear to create illusions resembles *Eikon Basilike* as a text scripted to create a fake image of the king, or Charles as a false representation of God. As demonstrated previously in Chapter One and as stated by Cohen in his article,

¹²² Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 240.

Charles utilized his text as a type of counterfeit currency to circulate around the falsely portrayed image of the king. With the title of *Eikon Basilike* translating to “The King’s Image,” the text resembles a counterfeit form of spirituality that offers “a portrait of Charles I that would dominate cultural discourses and inform the prevailing cultural memory of the king”¹²³ the way a coin would, and aids Charles in imposing as a false God through scriptural misuse.

Another instance of *Eikonoklastes* being a reflective text for *Paradise Lost* is seen in Milton’s critique on the section “27. Entitled to the Prince of Wales” in *Eikon Basilike*. Here Milton accuses Charles on not upholding freedom and honor despite preaching so:

He commends also *Parliaments held with freedom and with Honour*. But I would ask how can that be, while he only must be the sole free Person in that number; and would have the power with his unaccountable denial, to dishonor them by rejecting all their Counsels, to confine their Law-giving power, which is the Foundation of our freedom, and to change at his pleasure the very name of a Parliament into the name of a Faction.¹²⁴

Milton likens Satan to Charles in the context of the king curbing the freedom of Parliament. In *Paradise Lost*, Satan gathers the host of fallen spirits and they convene to decide what their next step will be after being thrown out of heaven. Despite various suggestions at the “solemn council” in Pandemonium among the “high capital / Of Satan and his peers” (I. 755 – 757), Satan opted to go with Beelzebub’s proposal, which was actually “first devised / By Satan,

¹²³ Cohen, “Counterfeiting and the Economics of Kingship in Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*,” 159.

¹²⁴ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 269.

and in part proposed: for whence / But from the author of all ill could spring /
 so deep a malice . . .” (II. 379 – 382). Having planned this all along, Satan
 then asks the crew of spirits:

But first whom shall we send
 In search of this new world, whom shall we find
 Sufficient? Who shall tempt with wandering feet
 The dark unbottomed infinite abyss
 And through the palpable obscure find out
 His uncouth way . . .

(II. 402 – 407)

Satan asks this as a pretense even though he had already decided that he
 himself would go “in search of this new world.” Like Charles, Satan worked
 under the cover of democracy and held a council for discussion even though
 Satan had already made the decision on his own. In “12. *Upon the Rebellion,
 and troubles in Ireland*,” Charles states the reason for his not going to Ireland
 in the following words: “. . . some men were either afraid I should have any
 one Kingdom quieted; or that any should have the glory of my destruction but
 themselves” despite him “offer(ing) to go my self in Person upon that
 expedition . . .”¹²⁵ The tone in these words are similarly echoed in Satan’s
 speech when questioned by Gabriel, hence Milton could have adapted the role
 of Satan in accordance to Charles. When Gabriel questions Satan on the
 whereabouts of his army and sarcastically calls Satan a “Courageous chief, /
 The first in flight from pain” who “To thy deserted host this cause of flight”

¹²⁵ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 104.

(IV. 920 – 922), Satan argues the inexperience of his crew, attempting to depict true leadership as not to endanger any of his crew:

But still thy words at random, as before,
 Argue thy inexperience what behoves
 From hard assays and ill successes past
 A faithful leader, not to hazard all
 Through the ways of danger by himself untried.
 I therefore, I alone first undertook
 To wing the desolate abyss, and spy
 This new-created world,
 . . .

(IV. 930 – 937)

The excuses and reasoning echoed by Satan are not unlike those of Charles: they both snake around topics and avoid addressing their respective issues and responsibilities. Hence, it is likely that Milton mirrored Charles in Satan's character, possibly shaping the developments in the plot of *Paradise Lost* around the events during the reign of the king in the seventeenth century, intentionally reflecting his opinion of him through Satan.

CHAPTER FIVE

Satan: Origins and Sources

While penning *Eikonoklastes* as a response to *Eikon Basilike*, Milton utilized historical sources and religious doctrine, such as *O City of Byzantium*, *Annals of Niketas Choniates* and the epistles of Saint Paul, to strengthen his claims. Milton's assertions in *Eikonoklastes*, which employ historical and religious references, include his identification of Charles as a political tyrant and the king's manipulation of the Pauline doctrine in defending himself. It could very well have been Milton's intention to use his sources for *Eikonoklastes* in *Paradise Lost*. With *O City of Byzantium*, *Annals of Niketas Choniates* as Milton's source in identifying tyranny, for example, Milton intended for authoritarianism to be seen in Satan, hence Satan bearing the same characteristics as both Charles and the Byzantine emperor Andronicus Comnenus. In regards to his religious sources, however, Milton takes things a

step further by incorporating concepts of the Pauline doctrine into *Paradise Lost*, as seen in Satan's rhetoric, his methods of reasoning and course of actions.

Milton is specific and explicit in portraying Satan as a political tyrant, for instance when Satan gathers the fallen spirits to assemble together after their fall from heaven. He calls for council to discuss what step to undertake next in announcing "Whether of open war or covert guile, / We now debate: who can advise may speak" (II. 41 – 42). Yet after listening to characters such as Moloch, Belial and Mammon make their argument, Satan concludes at the end of the council that they would: ". . . confound the race / Of mankind in one root, and earth with hell / To mingle and involve, done all to spite / The great creator. . ." (II. 382 – 385). Following that, without taking further consideration from his rebellious crew, Satan decided that

. . . I abroad
 Through all the coasts of dark destruction seek
 Deliverance for us all: this enterprise
 None shall partake with me. Thus saying rose
 The monarch, and prevented all reply.
 (II. 463 – 467)

As mentioned in the previous chapter, this course of action had already been decided on by Satan, who made the decision alone. Through the following lines, Milton portrays him as a political tyrant that his council is afraid of:

. . . lest from his resolution raised
 Others among the chief might offer now
 (Certain to be refused) what erst they feared;
 And so refused might in opinion stand
 His rivals, winning cheap the high repute

Which he through hazard huge must earn. But they
 Dreaded not more the adventure than his voice
 Forbidding; and at once with him they rose;
 Their rising all at once was as the sound
 Of thunder heard remote.

(II. 468 – 477)

This depiction of Satan resembles Charles as seen in Milton's rebuttal of the king's text. In spite of Charles lauding of "*Parliaments held with freedom and with Honour*," Milton describes the king's attitude toward Parliament as the "sole free Person" who "would have the power with his unaccountable denial, to dishonour them by rejecting all their Counsels, to confine their Law-giving power, which is the Foundation of our freedom, and to change at his pleasure the very name of Parliament into the name of a Faction."¹²⁶ The word "faction" as utilized by Milton refers to "A party in the state or in any community or association, always with opprobrious sense, conveying the imputation of selfish or mischievous ends or turbulent or unscrupulous methods" (OED, n.1, III.a), and is carried forward when constructing Satan's speech in speaking of heaven and hell:

. . . The happier state
 In heaven, which follows dignity, might draw
 Envy from each inferior; but who here
 Will envy whom the highest place exposes
 Foremost to stand against the thunderer's aim
 Your bulwark, and condemns to greatest share
 Of endless pain? Where there is then no good
 For which to strife, no strife can grow up there
 From faction; for none sure will claim in hell
 Precedence. . .

(II. 30 – 33)

¹²⁶ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 269.

In speaking to his fallen crew, Satan distorts the benefits and disadvantages of heaven and hell, telling them that envy might arise from being in heaven while no strife comes from being in hell. In using the word “faction” to state that “no strife can grow up there / From faction . . . ,” Satan politicizes the states of heaven and hell, for “faction” implies a party in a community or association in an opprobrious sense. Since heaven is said to be “the happier state” that “follows dignity,” with “dignity” meaning “an honourable office, rank, or title; a high official or titular position; a degree of estimation, rank” (OED, n., III.a) as well as “the quality of being worthy or honourable; worthiness, nobleness and excellence” (OED, n., I.a), Satan depicts heaven to be a place of political and religious hierarchy.

The method of scriptural misuse as employed by Andronicus and Charles is also seen in the character of Satan. Both Andronicus and Charles misrepresent religious contexts to elevate their status from that of an earthly ruler to a divine God, which is an attribute characteristic of tyrants that Satan takes on as well. In seeing himself the way Andronicus and Charles portrayed themselves, Satan raises himself to a God-like stature through his self-appointment as leader of the rebel angels, physically elevating his position too:

. . . and Satan to his royal seat
 High on a hill, far blazing, as a mount
 Raised on a mount, with pyramids and towers
 From diamond quarries hewn, and rocks of gold,
 The palace of great Lucifer (so call

That structure in the dialect of men
 Interpreted), which not long after, he
 Affecting all equality with God,
 In imitation of that mount whereon
 Messiah was declared in sight of heaven,
 . . .

(V. 756 – 765)

Milton's portrayal of Satan on "a mount / Raised on a mount" is seen with "pyramids and towers / From diamond quarries hewn, and rocks of gold," associating Satan with symbols of glory and wealth. Satan, who set his palace so "In imitation of that mount whereon / Messiah was declared in sight of heaven," aimed to "affect(ing) all equality with God" in order to achieve a divine status. This, however, is carefully worded by Milton in revealing Satan's tyrannical deceit, as "affect" also means "to assume a false appearance of; to put on a pretence of, to counterfeit or pretend (OED, v.1, V.a).

In her efforts to "demonstrate the consistency that exists between Milton's interpretation of the monarchy of Charles I and his portrayal of the tyranny of Satan,"¹²⁷ Joan Bennett elaborates that "because the prose and poetry are both informed by the same political vision and by the same dramatic imagination," readers can refer to Milton's prose works as "a valuable literary gloss" on the poem. Bennett discusses Satan's character in relation to Charles as a tyrant in "God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton's Royal Portraits," bringing up the idea of "false heroism" as a common tyrannical characteristic. She claims it is through the portraits of both Charles and Satan we "discover behind the false

¹²⁷ Bennett, Joan S., "God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton's Royal Portraits," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 92.3 (May 1977), 441.

idea of a governor a corrupted idea of heroism”¹²⁸ that inspires to seek self-glorification instead of service to God. Satan’s false heroism is similar to Charles’ criminality, and the differences between false heroism and true service to God is seen in a more distinct manner when these elements are brought into *Paradise Lost*. This is among many characteristics of a tyrant that might not have been visible without a comparison between Satan and Charles, and Bennett is careful to indicate the differences between the two. Despite their similarities, one is not a complete image of the other and the character of Satan is similar to Charles only because “a tyrant like Charles was for Milton literally an imitator and servant of the devil.”¹²⁹

Apart from giving readers an insight into the personality of a tyrant, Bennett also points out how comparisons between Satan and Charles’ tyranny reveal political perspectives. What a comparison like this does for readers, Bennett says, is that not only does it sharpen our poetic perceptions but also further illuminates Milton’s “thematic conception of true political liberty”¹³⁰ that is highlighted in *Paradise Lost*. In his prose works, Milton studies and argues about the relationship between law and liberty, in which Bennett says he “gave dramatic focus in his accounts of Charles and Satan and their followers.” Bennett then goes on to say that this “will not only correct misleading historical assumptions but also sharpen our awareness of the

¹²⁸ Bennett, “God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton’s Royal Portraits,” 444.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 442.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*

political dynamics of the poem, among the fallen angels and within the mind of Satan.”¹³¹ An example of this in Bennett’s article would be when she states: “Milton’s analysis of Charles’ claim in the Eikon that he had been a defender of the people’s liberties is paralleled with the portrayal of Satan’s claim to have revolted against God in order to gain freedom for his angel followers; and it shows the relationship between civil and philosophical liberty.”¹³² The focus of Bennett’s message is that the parallels between Charles and Satan serve to highlight the relationship between civil and philosophical liberty, rather than the two characters having similar attributes.

Another mentioned instance is the visible difference between the concept of title and law. Bennett states that “the first and archetypal instance of the necessary separation, by law, of power from the persons who hold it”¹³³ is witnessed when Satan’s angelic host in *Paradise Lost* willingly accepted his argument that titles assert the right to rule and govern rather than law, portrayed as such when “His [Satan’s] name, and high was his degree in heaven; / His countenance, as the morning star that guides / The start flock, allured them . . .” (V. 607 – 709). Bennett points out the problem of placing the ruler and his title above the law; not only does this reflect Charles’ refusal to “obey the laws of Parliament,” as mentioned by Bennett, but this also reflects a deeper problem of “the historical argument for the divine right of

¹³¹ Bennett, “God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton’s Royal Portraits,” 449.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 450.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 451.

kings.”¹³⁴ This is an issue Milton grapples with in regards to Charles when writing *Eikonoklastes*, and is reflected in Satan’s speech when he speaks to his angelic host.

Who can in reason then or right assume
 Monarchy over such as live by right
 His equals, if in power and splendour less
 In freedom equal? Or can introduce
 Law and edict on us, who without law
 Err not, much less for this to be our lord,
 And look for adoration to the abuse
 Of those imperial titles which assert
 Our being ordained to govern, not to serve?
(V. 794 – 802)

Satan questions the divine right and power of a monarch to rule based on title rather than freedom and law, and uses this as his argument in convincing the fallen angels to go along with his disobedience towards God. While it is not likely that Milton intended for his questioning of the divine right of kings to be directly paralleled with Satan’s challenge of God as a monarchical ruler, it is nonetheless a question that Milton raises through the rebellious nature of Satan.

Despite Bennett’s focus on Satan in relation to the tyranny of the king during his reign, she acknowledges that even though there are close similarities between Satan and Charles, it is neither her nor Milton’s aim in proving that Satan’s character is directly based on or paralleled with Charles. Rather, Bennett senses that these comparisons are included in *Paradise Lost* because Milton wanted his readers to understand the deeper, underlying

¹³⁴ Bennett, “God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton’s Royal Portraits,” 451.

meaning of the political implications Charles' actions had in a ruled society. The comparison between Satan and Charles and the political incorporations seen in *Paradise Lost* are merely the surface of what Milton is trying to get at, and Bennett elaborates on the poet's intentions in her article. Her explanations provide an insight into the social and political conditions of Milton's time, and in another article, claims "what Milton learned about tyranny during the English revolution entered into his depiction of Satan's rebellion."¹³⁵ Her reasons for acknowledging the consistencies between Charles and Satan were not merely for symbolic representation's sake, but to help "correct misleading historical assumptions" and "sharpen our awareness of the political dynamics" of *Paradise Lost*, making readers think about their "fundamental thematic issue of their beliefs about the governing power they seek." Bennett's argument allows readers to gain access to the perceptions of the society that incited Milton to write *Eikonoklastes*, thus making them think about *Paradise Lost* and Satan in a wider political context, and to see Satan as more than just a literary figure or a mere antagonist in Milton's epic poem.

While Bennett's article examines Satan in relation to Charles as a political tyrant, Jason Rosenblatt in his book *Torah and Law in Paradise Lost* explores the religious elements that shaped Satan, and establishes that Milton was very much influenced by the Pauline doctrine in his writings. Rosenblatt reveals how the poet explores and debates on several aspects of Paulinism through his

¹³⁵ Hyman, Lawrence W., "Satan and Charles I," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 93.1 (Jan 1978), 120.

poetry and prose, and in a particular section pays close attention to how the Pauline epistles shaped *Paradise Lost*, with an emphasis on Satan's speech in Book IX. He recognizes that the Epistles of Saint Paul influenced the shaping of Satan and the events surrounding him; thus, Satan is likely to have been portrayed so by Milton in light of the apostle. Seeing as both "Satan and Paul are themselves converts,"¹³⁶ (Rosenblatt, 183), Satan's move towards sin is an inverse reflection of Paul's conversion experience, which occurred on the way to Damascus.¹³⁷ Rosenblatt states that the accounts "employ the imagery of light and darkness that is standard in conversion,"¹³⁸ and this notion of conversion is brought forward in *Paradise Lost* although in an inverse fashion, such as when Satan "mediates on the law"¹³⁹ before choosing to rebel against God. Satan has a "grieved look" which "he fixes sad" upon "heaven and the

¹³⁶ Rosenblatt, Jason P., *Torah and Law in Paradise Lost* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994), 183.

¹³⁷ Paul's shift from darkness to light is told in the Acts of the Apostles, whereby God appeared to Paul in a flash of light from heaven:

³And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven:

⁴And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?

⁵And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.

⁶And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.

⁷And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man.

⁸And Saul arose from the earth; and when his eyes were opened, he saw no man: but they led him by the hand, and brought him into Damascus.

(Acts 9:3 – 8)

¹³⁸ Rosenblatt, *Torah and Law in Paradise Lost*, 182.

¹³⁹ *Ibid*, 183.

full-blazing sun” (IV. 28 – 29), and in his soliloquy, “evinces indecision although the decision has already been made”¹⁴⁰ before his conversion away from the “light” towards “darkness.” In other words, Milton employed Saint Paul’s experience of conversion in creating central themes of *Paradise Lost*, in this case inverting it to Satan’s fall from light to darkness.

This idea of conversion from darkness to light, as seen in Saint Paul, can also be viewed as a sort of “‘Internal’ transformation” that is conveyed through Satan’s persuasive speech in tempting Eve, as argued by Rosenblatt. With the word “internal” referring to “the inner nature of man, pertaining to the mind and soul” (OED, adj., III), Satan promises Eve an “‘Internal’ transformation,” that when “Ye eat thereof, your eyes that seem so clear, / Yet are but dim, shall perfectly be then / Opened and cleared” (IX. 706 – 708). Upon tasting the fruit, Satan asserts “That ye shall be as gods, since I as man, / Internal man, is but proportion meet,” (IX. 710 – 711). Rosenblatt recognizes this part of Satan’s speech in the “Pauline promise of ‘Internal’ transformation” from 1 Corinthians: “It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. / And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. / Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual” (1 Corinthians 15:44 – 46). Satan’s speech is reminiscent of the Corinthians verse, as it is

¹⁴⁰ Rosenblatt, *Torah and Law in Paradise Lost*, 183.

likely to have been adapted into Satan's logic in order to persuade Eve to disobey God's orders.

The teachings of Saint Paul are also seen through Satan's speech in a manipulated form, such as when he converses with Eve. According to Rosenblatt, "Satan abuses Pauline doctrine by denuding it of its Christological import and by linking it to mechanical process," citing 1 Corinthians 15:53 as an example: "If 'this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality' (1 Corinthians 15:53), it is only because Christ, the life-giving spirit, dies to redeem the sin of the first Adam." Satan takes this verse out of its context and, according to Rosenblatt, "distorts every Pauline echo in this passage" while conversing with Eve. Satan tempts Eve to toy with the idea of death, for "mortal must put on immortality," and then bridges the gap between God and man by suggesting to her that it is only the intake of food that distinguishes God from man. This runs parallel with Rosenblatt's commentary that "The common theme that runs through all Pauline verses . . . becomes in Satan's mouth an exhortation to attain godship."¹⁴¹ Apart from that, Milton also borrows a Pauline doctrine from Colossians, which reads "Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all" (Colossians 3:11). In explaining the non-discriminatory nature of Christ, Satan distorts this to confound the "necessary distinctions between

¹⁴¹ Rosenblatt, *Torah and Law in Paradise Lost*, 179.

human beings and God,”¹⁴² as seen when Satan tempts Eve into eating the fruit. Satan twists the message of this verse into something corruptible, first hinting at confounding the differences of God and man by comparing the mortal Eve to a goddess. He addresses her as “A goddess among gods, adored and served / By angels numberless, thy daily train” (IX. 547 – 548) and as a “Goddess humane” (IX. 732), elevating the status of man and condescending the position of God all at once.

Another distortion of Saint Paul’s epistles is seen when Satan convinces Eve that there is no harm in eating the fruit from the tree of knowledge. In her initial speech, Eve maintains her obedience to God by observing His order to not taste the fruit:

But of this tree we may not taste nor touch;
 God so commanded, and left that command
 Sole daughter of his voice; the rest, we live
 Law to our selves, our reason is our law.

...

. . . God hath said, Ye shall not eat
 Thereof, nor shall ye touch it, lest ye die.

(IX. 651 – 663)

Her notion of obeying God and following the law is reminiscent of two Pauline verses from Galatians and Romans, which respectively read “For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God” (Galatians 2:19) and “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves:” (Romans 2:14). While Eve had every intention of preserving the

¹⁴² Rosenblatt, *Torah and Law in Paradise Lost*, 179.

law as her reason “unto herself” so that she “might live unto God,” Satan had other plans, and in order to successfully manipulate her, replies Eve with the following speech:

. . . do not believe
Those rigid threats of death; ye shall not die:
How should ye? By the fruit? It gives you life
To knowledge.

...

. . . whatever thing death be,
Deterred not from achieving what might lead
To happier life, knowledge of good and evil;
Of good, how just? Of evil, if what is evil
Be real, why not known, since easier shunned?
God therefore cannot hurt ye, and be just;
Not just, not God; not feared then, nor obeyed:
Your fear itself of death removes the fear.

(IX. 684 – 702)

Satan’s line “Your fear itself of death removes the fear” carries a paradox, one that is not unlike Paul’s: “For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God” (Galatians 2:19). Although Paul’s verse and Satan’s line are similar in the sense that they are paradoxical, Satan’s line is again an inversion of the Pauline verse. Paul’s verse is an urge to live for God; Satan’s words are an encouragement for Eve to challenge God.

Both the concepts of sin and knowledge are also central to *Paradise Lost*, since “For both Milton and Paul the law is a schoolmaster, it brings knowledge of sin, and it is an indissoluble unity.” Apart from mirroring Paul’s verses into the lines of Eve and Satan, Milton incorporates the theme of law and sin into Satan’s speech through the concepts of Paulinism. In the quote above, Rosenblatt identifies Paul’s interpretation of the law in that

having a law introduces the concept and “theoretical knowledge of sin,”¹⁴³ which is demonstrated in Romans: “What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet” (Romans 7:7). This verse is utilized by Milton in forming the arguments of Satan when tempting Eve to eat the fruit. It is a concept that Satan understands, who says that Eve should be: “Deterred not from achieving what might lead / To happier life, knowledge of good and evil; / Of good, how just? Of evil, if what is evil / Be real, why not known, since easier shunned?” (IX. 696 – 699). Satan knows that the law brings about the knowledge of sin, and he uses this to tempt Eve into obtaining this knowledge regarding sin. Milton forms a comparison between Paul and Satan through the concept of theoretically knowing sin through the law, as Rosenblatt points out that “What Paul did for Christianity in his mission to the gentiles, persuading them to be dead to sin by being dead to the law, Satan did for Eve.”¹⁴⁴ Paul’s concept of knowing law and sin is that since introducing law is introducing sin, by avoiding law, one would avoid sin, as mentioned in Romans. This Pauline verse from Romans is craftily manipulated by Satan to trick Eve; in applying it to convince Eve to taste the fruit, Satan essentially conveys that it is acceptable to eat the fruit and disregard God’s law because by acknowledging His law, Eve would be accepting sin. Hence, to disregard sin, Eve should disregard God’s law.

¹⁴³ Rosenblatt, *Torah and Law in Paradise Lost*, 35.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 182.

Although Milton employs a verse from Paul for this portion of Satan's speech, it is Satanic logic that Milton creates, implying a very deformed image of Paul in Satan.

Milton created Satan in the image of a tyrannical Charles and a spiritually distorted Saint Paul. He did not portray Satan as identical to Charles, but as being best understood by way of the analysis of Charles as developed in *Eikonoklastes*. Readers of Milton's 1667 epic could find in the mid century prose volume a lucid guide to the misrepresented self-image of the demonic tempter.

CHAPTER SIX In Between the Satanic Lines

In *Eikonoklastes*, Milton develops a specific rhetoric geared towards countering the manipulations and distortions of *Eikon Basilike*. He undertakes the task of educating his readers who might otherwise be swayed by the fraudulence of Charles, and utilizes language to his advantage in conveying his argument to his readers. While addressing specific comments or decisions that were undertaken by Charles, for example, Milton uses several words in particular that treat Charles' defense in *Eikon Basilike* as being akin to fake currency, an artistic creation and an imitation of scripture or God. Paradoxical phrases and rhetorical styles that employ psychological methods are also woven into the text of *Eikonoklastes*, revealing Charles' false mannerisms and to give readers a better understanding of what *Eikon Basilike* really is. Since *Eikonoklastes* can be seen in light of *Paradise Lost*, and Satan can be

understood and interpreted in light of Charles among other figures and concepts, it is only natural that Milton's language is translated into *Paradise Lost* as well. Since Milton addresses similar concerns in the poem as he did in the prose, resemblances are seen between both the texts, and even reaffirms that the epic poem, and Satan in particular, was written and portrayed in regards to Milton's intent for *Eikonoklastes*.

As an orator, Satan is eloquent, persuasive and manipulative all at the same time. In fact, Milton likens him to a great orator when describing his methods of conversation when speaking with Eve:

She scarce had said, though brief, when now more bold
The tempter, but with show of zeal and love
To man, and indignation at his wrong,
New part puts on, and as to passion moved,
Fluctuates disturbed, yet comely, and in act
Raised, as of some great matter to begin.
As when of old some orator renowned
In Athens or free Rome, where eloquence
Flourished, since mute, to some great cause addressed,
Stood in himself collected, while each part,
Motion, each act won audience ere the tongue,
...

(IX. 664 – 674)

Satan, likened to “some orator renowned / In Athens or free Rome, where eloquence / Flourished,” demonstrates his theatrical skills in convincing Eve of the knowledge and wisdom she would attain if she ate the fruit. Following the quoted description, Satan begins his speech in tempting Eve:

O sacred, wise, and wisdom-giving plant,
Mother of science, now I feel thy power
Within me clear, not only to discern
Things in their causes, but to trace the ways

Of highest agents, deemed however wise.

(IX. 679 – 683)

Satan sings high praises of the tree of knowledge, regarding its fruit as emitting a “savoury odour” that was “Grateful to appetite, more pleased my [Satan’s] sense / Than smell of sweetest fennel, or the teats / Of ewe or goat dropping with milk” (IX. 579 – 582), allegedly giving Satan the power and wisdom to “discern / Things in their causes” and “trace the ways / Of highest agents.” Satan’s false regard for the tree of knowledge and its fruit resembles what Milton identifies as tyrannical rhetoric. In *Eikonoklastes*, Milton mentions that: “From Stories of this nature both Ancient and Modern which abound, the Poets also, and some English, have been in this point so mindful of *Decorum*, as to put never more pious words in the mouth of any person, than of a Tyrant.”¹⁴⁵ Milton speaks of poets who have always depicted tyrannical characters as being overly pious in speech, and while “pious” is pertaining to “an action, thought or resolve, characterized by, expressing, or resulting from true reverence and obedience to God; devout, religious” (OED, adj., I.a), it also means “of a fraud or deception, practised for the supposed benefit of those deceived, or to further what is considered a virtuous aim; (in negative sense) intended to exploit religious credulity” (OED, adj., III). Satan’s intention of deceiving Eve fits the latter definition of the word “pious,” as he deceives her into believing in the benefits of eating the fruit while exploiting her credulity and naivety.

¹⁴⁵ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 235.

Satan is also known for his fraudulent speech and sly actions that manipulate the fallen angelic host and Eve. Seen when speaking with Eve again, Milton describes Satan as “. . . he glad / Of her attention gained, with serpent tongue / Organic, or impulse of vocal air, / His fraudulent temptation thus began” (IX. 528 – 531). In the form of a serpent, Satan tricks Eve with his speech of “fraudulent temptation;” according to the OED, “fraudulent” refers to the “wrongs [of] another person by false representations; cheating, deceitful, dishonest; guilty of or addicted to fraud” (OED, adj., I.a). The fraudulence or false representations that Satan projects is also seen in Charles, as identified by Milton who describes the king’s text as “falsely or fallaciously representing the state of things, to the dishonour of this present Government, and the retarding of a general peace.”¹⁴⁶ The false representations of both Charles and Satan are made clear by Milton, who, through the use of the word “fraudulent” in describing Satan’s speech, projects Charles’ deceit through the serpentine character of *Paradise Lost*.

Milton uses specific words to correctly identify and describe Charles’ nature in *Eikonoklastes*, and those words appear again in regards to Satan throughout *Paradise Lost*. In “12. *Upon the Rebellion in Ireland*,” Milton establishes that the king was responsible for the rebellion as he had incited it, inquiring “Seeing then the main incitement and authority for this Rebellion must be needs derived from England, it will be next inquired who was the

¹⁴⁶ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 221.

prime Author.”¹⁴⁷ As Milton takes Charles to be the author or instigator of the rebellion, he also characterizes Satan specifically as the author of the rebellion against God. In him “Deep malice thence conceiving and disdain” sprung (V. 666), of which prompted Satan to his revolt, also causing the archangel Michael to recognize Satan as the “Author of evil” (VI. 262). Satan is seen as the author of evil as well when assembling his council in Book II:

. . . Thus Beelzebub
 Pleaded his devilish counsel, first devised
 By Satan, and in part proposed; for whence
 But from the author of all ill could spring
 So deep a malice, to confound the race
 Of mankind in one root, and earth with hell
 To mingle and involve, done all to spite
 The great creator?

(II. 378 – 385)

Satan as “the author of all ill” contrasts with the mentioning of God as “The great creator,” with author meaning “He who gives rise to or causes an action, event, circumstance, state, or condition of things” (OED, n., I.c), “to be the author of an action; to originate, cause, occasion” (OED, v., I) or referring to the Creator (OED, n., I.b). Throughout *Paradise Lost*, Satan is mentioned numerous times more as the “author” of the rebellion and Milton is particular about the word because of its association with Charles, the author and instigator of the Irish rebellion. Satan also intended for “earth and hell / To mingle and involve,” another verbal implication of Charles by Milton. “Involve” is best understood here as “to contain implicitly; to include as a

¹⁴⁷ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 245.

necessary (and therefore unexpressed) feature, circumstance, antecedent condition, or consequence; to imply, entail” (OED, v., VI.c), reminiscent of Milton’s assertion of Charles’ involvement with the Irish rebellion since the word “involve” suggests “implicate.” While Milton never uses the word “implicate” in *Eikonoklastes*, as previously explained in Chapter Three,¹⁴⁸ it has its relevance concerning both Satan’s “authorship” of the rebellion and Charles instigating the Irish rebellion, hence Milton’s association of the rebellion in the poem with the one of the prose.

In convincing his readers of *Eikon Basilike*’s falsity, Milton likens the king’s text to a creation or invention of Charles’, as if it were something assembled or built to serve the king’s own interests instead of a truthful account. Words utilized by Milton to convey this include “structure” and “foundation,” as well as “modeled” and “craft,” as seen below in the two excerpts from “1. Upon the King’s calling this last Parliament” in

Eikonoklastes:

THAT which the King lays down here as his first foundation, and as it were the head stone of his whole Structure, that He called this last Parliament. . .¹⁴⁹

And this is the substance of his first section, . . . modelled into the form of a private Psalter . . . the lip-work of every Prelatical Liturgist, clapped together, and quilted out of Scripture phrase . . . But he who from such a kind of Psalmistry, or any other kind of verbal Devotion, . . . knows not that the deepest policy of a Tyrant hath been ever to counterfeit Religious.

¹⁴⁸ Implicate: “To involve in its nature or meaning, or as a consequence or inference; to imply; to comprise” is among its definitions, along with “intertwined, twisted together; wrapped up with” (OED), thus corresponding with Milton’s claim that Charles incited the Irish rebellion.

¹⁴⁹ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 228.

And *Aristotle* in his *Politics*, hath mentioned that special craft among twelve other tyrannical *Sophisms*.¹⁵⁰

Milton chooses to depict Satan's plans for corrupting man in the same way he viewed Charles' intentions in fabricating excuses and false allegations, indicating Milton's deliberate portrayal of Satan as a deceiver just as much as the king was seen as one. In revealing his plans, Satan proclaims:

Oh fair foundation laid whereon to build
 Their ruin! Hence I will excite their minds
 With more desire to know, and to reject
 Envious commands, invented with design
 To keep them low . . .

(IV. 521 – 525)

Satan's plan involved laying out a "foundation" the way Charles' did as interpreted by Milton, expressed by Satan to be "invented with design" not unlike the text of *Eikon Basilike*, and "modelled into the form of a private Psalter . . . the lip-work of every Prelatical Liturgist, clapped together, and quilted out of Scripture phrase."¹⁵¹ Milton again indicates, through the use of the same specific words, the similarities between Satan's and Charles' motives, thus portraying the fallen archangel's self-contrived plan for rebellion in light of the king's fabrication of *Eikon Basilike*.

Apart from word usage to indicate resemblances as seen between Satan and Charles, Milton also integrates the notion of *Eikon Basilike* as a false image of the king in the character of Satan. Before taking the form of a serpent to

¹⁵⁰ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 234.

¹⁵¹ "Modelled," "clapped together" and "quilted" as Milton's terms indicating the deliberate creation of *Eikon Basilike* serving the self-interest of Charles.

tempt Eve into disobeying God, Satan is seen to be contemplative, reflecting on his pride, considering repentance and resigning himself to hell all at once.

Throughout Satan's monologue, the devilish fiend is depicted as the following:

Thus while he spake, each passion dimmed his face
 Thrice changed with pale, ire, envy and despair,
 Which marred his borrowed visage, and betrayed
 Him counterfeit, if any eye beheld.

. . .

. . . Whereof he soon aware,
 Each perturbation smoothed with outward calm,
 Artificer of fraud; and was the first
 That practised falsehood under saintly show,
 Deep malice to conceal, couched with revenge:

(IV. 114 – 123)

His inconsistency is seen through his face that “Thrice changed with pale, ire, envy and despair,” which “betrayed / Him counterfeit, if any eye beheld,” the phrase “borrowed visage” indicating a false face or appearance. This is highly relevant to Milton's intention of writing *Eikonoklastes*: to shatter the illusion created by *Eikon Basilike*. As explained in Chapter One,¹⁵² Milton treated *Eikon Basilike* as a deceptive text that circulated around a false image of the king, not unlike counterfeit currency, hence the writing of *Eikonoklastes* to reveal what Charles was concealing beneath his created image. Here, Satan “smooths” each “perturbation” with “outward calm,” indicating the existence of something “hidden or concealed,” “couched.” In other words, Satan's

¹⁵² Cohen's article had discussed *Eikon Basilike* as being akin to counterfeit currency; with Charles's misused prayers and psalms, it is viewed by Milton as a counterfeit of religious text and spirituality. According to Cohen, the king's text “offer[ed] a portrait of Charles I that would dominate cultural discourses and inform the prevailing cultural memory of the king” (Cohen, 159) the way a monarch's portrait minted and represented on a coin would.

appearance is nothing but a false representation or a counterfeit the way *Eikon Basilike* is.

Satan's deliberate deception is further exemplified by Milton when Satan "lays the groundwork" or "foundation" in tempting Eve. Satan utilizes the art and illusion of deception when whispering falsities into her ear while she sleeps: "Squat like a toad, close at the ear of Eve; / Assaying by his devilish art to reach / The organs of her fancy, and with them forge / Illusions as he list, phantasms and dreams . . ." (IV. 800 – 803). Besides creating deceiving appearances while in conversation with Eve later on in the form of a serpent, Satan also forges "illusions," "phantasms" and "dreams" in Eve's mind, causing her to dream of a creature "One shaped and winged like one of those from heaven" (V. 55) who encouraged her to taste the "fruit divine" (V. 67). This "devilish art" of Satan's was his first step in ingraining the idea of the fruit's power in Eve's mind, an illusion that Eve would mistakenly perceive to be true later on. In examining this further, "illusion" refers to "the fact or condition of being deceived or deluded by appearances; a mental state involving the attribution of reality to what is unreal; a false conception or idea; a deception, delusion, fancy" (OED, n., II.b), while "phantasm" carries the meaning of illusion and deceptive appearance as well, "a thing or being which apparently exists but is not real" (OED, n., I.b), "a person who is not what he or she appears or claims to be; an impostor" (OED, n., I.c) or "an illusory likeness of an abstract concept; a counterfeit; a sham; an inferior or

false copy or semblance” (OED, n., I.d). The words utilized by Milton here aptly reflect *Eikon Basilike* and Charles as the “counterfeit” and the “counterfeit-er” respectively; the text only serves to delude its readers by bringing about false conceptions about the king, and according to Milton, Charles is clearly not what he appears to be as he resembles an imposter in many aspects and regards.

From the selected words in *Eikonoklastes* that were carried over to *Paradise Lost*, it is evident that Milton had very specific intentions for the portrayal of Satan’s character, which was to project him in the image of Charles as a political tyrant. Hence, Satan is also conveyed as an “Idol of majesty divine” (VI. 101), with the term “idol” reflecting much of how Milton viewed *Eikon Basilike*. Here, Milton chose to picture Satan as a monarch or “majesty divine,” sitting “enclosed / With flaming cherubim, and golden shields; / Then lighted from his gorgeous throne” (V. 101 – 103), resembling an “idol” that refers to “Any thing or person that is the object of excessive or supreme devotion, or that usurps the place of God in human affection; in scriptural language, a false god or a fictitious divinity.” Hence, the usage of “idol” here is in explicit reference to *Eikon Basilike*, which Milton regarded as a text that depicted Charles in a God-like manner with its scriptural misuse. “Idol” also relates in meaning to “A false mental image or conception; a false or misleading notion; a fallacy” (OED, n., VI.b), and also “A fictitious personation; a counterfeit, sham; a pretender; imitation” (OED, n., VII). In

indicating to readers the essence of Satan's "fictitious personation" and his "counterfeit" character, Milton associates the idea of Satan with Charles, as the king is seen to mislead his readers with his misrepresentations the way Satan misled Eve into eating the fruit and the other angels into rebellion.

Milton's usage of paradoxical phrases in commenting on Charles is noted as well; for example, phrases such as "false virginity" and "wilful mistake" are used to describe Charles' rhetoric and actions. The words that Milton chooses to juxtapose create a contrast, serving to highlight the king's duplicitous nature to readers. In *Paradise Lost*, Milton plays with the concept of paradox in forming Satan's speech and characteristics. When Satan and his angelic host tumble down from heaven, for example, the environment of hell is observed by Satan to be a paradoxical place.

. . . round he throws his baleful eyes
That witnessed huge affliction and dismay
Mixed with obdurate pride and steadfast hate:
At once as far as angels' ken he views
The dismal situation waste and wild,
A dungeon horrible, on all sides round
As one great furnace flamed, yet from those flames
No light, but rather darkness visible
Served only to discover sights of woe,

...

(I. 56 – 64)

The depiction of hell is a contradiction, correlating with the inconsistency of Satan's character. Although "flames" and fire surround the regions of hell, hell is still engulfed in "darkness visible" despite the raging flames. Yet it is this "darkness visible" that enables Satan to "discover sights of woe."

Another instance of paradox is seen in Satan's speech when speaking to a fellow cherub, as he clearly highlights his vision and aims as the leader of the underworld. Satan announces:

To do aught good never will be our task,
 But ever to do ill our sole delight,
 As being the contrary to his high will
 Whom we resist. If then his providence
 Out of our evil seek to bring forth good,
 Our labour must be to pervert that end,
 And out of good still to find means of evil;

(I. 159 – 165)

Favoring the option of doing ill as opposed to good, Satan declares it to be the “task” and “sole delight” of the angelic host, further explaining his intents in all its contradictions. In acting defiantly against God, Satan aims to “pervert” God's providence of “bring[ing] forth good” out of their evil, and intends to do so by finding a “means of evil” “out of good.” Satan's perception of creating evil out of good is a contradiction, and can also be viewed as a method of distorting something from being good to evil, or truth to illusion, a distortion which intentionally mirrors *Eikon Basilike* and its purpose.

Apart from the usage of specific words and the contradictions that are reflective of *Eikonoklastes*, several of Satan's speeches are highly reminiscent of Milton's political prose as well in terms of rhetoric. In Chapter Three, it is discussed that Milton employs psychological methods to prove his points and convince readers of Charles' falsity, as supported by claims of both Ainsworth and Shore as well. As mentioned in Shore's article, Milton's psychological

tactic of praise or blame has a large effect on his readers,¹⁵³ as Milton praises his readers and classifies them as “elite” and educated readers when they agree with his argument as opposed to Charles’.¹⁵⁴ This method of praise is also seen in Satan’s rhetoric, although he uses it for self-motivated purposes unlike Milton’s efforts in educating the public. When Satan tempts Eve to eat the fruit, he begins by singing his praises of her and elevating her status to that of a higher being:

Fairest resemblance of thy maker fair,
Thee all things living gaze on, all things thine
By gift, and thy celestial beauty adore
With ravishment beheld, there best beheld
Where universally admired; . . .

(IX. 538 – 542)

By further calling her “Empress of this fair world, resplendent Eve” (IX. 568), Satan attempts to buy Eve with his false flattery and praise as a psychological method of swaying her into believing his argument. While Milton uses both praise and blame to affect the psychological condition of his readers, Satan only relies on praise as a method, but not without reinforcing his reasons and explanations with a distorted sense of logic. In his speech following all his

¹⁵³ Shore, “‘Fit Though Few’: *Eikonoklastes* and the Rhetoric of Audience,” 132: “Milton uses praise or blame to urge us to take action into becoming a certain kind of reader – the kind that will receive his arguments favorably. . . .” making readers “aware of themselves as part of an audience [that] allows him [Milton] to employ a wide variety of social controls for his own rhetorical purposes.”

¹⁵⁴ Shore, “‘Fit Though Few’: *Eikonoklastes* and the Rhetoric of Audience,” 135: “The elitist impulse is perhaps the most powerful social control he [Milton] employs for rhetorical purposes. He brings readers to a consciousness of audience only so that they can immediately surpass and disassociate themselves from the many to join the elite few.”

flattery, Satan engages in what seems like perfectly justified reasoning, first beginning by questioning

. . . will God incense his ire
 For such a petty trespass, and not praise
 Rather your dauntless virtue, whom the pain
 Of death denounced, whatever thing death be,
 Deterred not from achieving what might lead
 To happier life, knowledge of good and evil;
 Of good, how just? Of evil, if what is evil
 Be real, why not known, since easier shunned?
 (IX. 692 – 699)

Satan reduces the act of disobedience towards God into “a petty trespass,” hence claiming no wrong in it since it is an act that “might lead / To happier life . . .” before questioning the harm in exploring the knowledge of evil, since it exists as well as good does. From there, Satan deduces that there is no reason for Eve to fear the almighty God, and examines the reason behind His forbiddance in eating the fruit:

God therefore cannot hurt ye, and be just;
 Not just, not God; not feared then, nor obeyed:
 Your fear itself of death removes the fear.
 Why then was this forbid? Why but to awe,
 Why but to keep ye low and ignorant,
 His worshippers; he knows that in the day
 Ye eat thereof, your eyes that seem so clear,
 Yet are but dim, shall perfectly be then
 Opened and cleared, and ye shall be as gods,
 Knowing both good and evil as they know.
 (IX. 700 – 709)

Milton is seen incorporating his psychological methods of rhetoric from *Eikonoklastes* into Satan’s language, who in following his rhetoric of flattery and praise, distorts God’s actions into selfish motives of wanting to “keep ye

low and ignorant.” While Milton’s methods of praise implements psychological tactics to convince readers over to his side of the argument, Satan’s flattery plays on Eve’s doubts, and he convinces her through using a manipulative sense of logic.

Satan also exploits the doubts of the angelic host into rebelling against God with him, and plants doubt in their minds by questioning God’s position and His right to rule as the heavenly king:

Who can in reason then or right assume
 Monarchy over such as live by right
 His equals, if in power and splendour less,
 In freedom equal? Or can introduce
 Law and edict on us, who without law
 Err not, much less for this to be our lord,
 And look for adoration to the abuse
 Of those imperial titles which assert
 Our being ordained to govern, not to serve?
 (V. 794 – 797)

Despite Satan’s eloquent and planned efforts, one angel did not fall prey to his verbal manipulations: Abdiel identifies the rebellious intent in Satan’s speech, and straightens out his warped sense of logic and justification for wanting to revolt against God. In arguing against Satan, Abdiel challenges him by calling his claims against God unjust:

Canst thou with impious obloquy condemn
 The just decree of God, pronounced and sworn,
 That to his only Son by right endued
 With regal scepter, every soul in heaven
 Shall bend the knee, and in that honour due
 Confess him rightful king? Unjust thou sayst
 Flatly unjust, to bind with laws the free,
 And equals over equals to let reign,
 One over all with unsucceeded power.

Shalt thou give law to God, shalt thou dispute
 With him the points of liberty, who made
 Thee what thou art, and formed the powers of heaven
 Such as he pleased, and circumscribed their being?
 (V. 813 – 825)

At the end of Abdiel's speech, he points out with simple logic that since God created "All things . . . all the spirits of heaven" (V. 837), He would be the one whose laws become our laws:

. . . But to grant it thee unjust,
 That equal over equals monarch reign:
 Thyself though great and glorious dost thou count,
 Or all angelic nature joined in one,
 Equal to him begotten Son? By whom
 As by his word the mighty Father made
 All things, . . .
 . . .
 But more illustrious made, since he the head
 One of our number thus reduced becomes,
 His laws our laws, all honour to him done
 Returns our own.
 (V. 831 – 845)

After he identifies the flaw in Satan's logic and argument, Abdiel disassociates himself from Satan and the rest of the rebellious crew, "Unshaken, unseduced, unterrified" (V. 899). Abdiel's success in recognizing Satan's distorted logic resembles what Milton aims for in writing *Eikonoklastes*: for readers to not be easily swayed by Charles' manipulative rhetoric, as it is twisted logic that the king employs in justifying his wrongful actions. Milton incorporates Abdiel's perceptive sense of judgment into *Paradise Lost* as a necessary inclusion to reflect the significance of discerning reading and interpretation, as emphasized by him as well in *Eikonoklastes*.

In examining the language utilized by Milton in both *Eikonoklastes* and *Paradise Lost*, it can be deduced that Milton had intended for the rhetoric of his prose to be discernible in his poem, thus linking the two in terms of concepts and substance. In applying the mentioned themes and concepts to Satan, Milton utilized the character as a mouthpiece to convey and reiterate in *Paradise Lost* the context and importance of the prose, at times altering and manipulating it into different forms to add layers to the text's significance. The ideas and concepts stressed in *Eikonoklastes* are implicitly reflected in Satan's own rhetorical intentions, which is strongly intended to be as thus. Milton's incorporation of *Eikonoklastes*' crucial thematic ideas into *Paradise Lost* adds depth to both Satan and the text, and, with richer political and literary values, turns the epic poem into more than just a biblical story of good versus evil.

CONCLUSION

In answering the initial question raised in this study as to how readers should read and interpret the character, it would be rather restricting and, to borrow a word from Satan, “unjust” to read him through a single approach due to his varied and inconsistent nature. While reading Satan in light of Charles reveals implicit messages and the political context in which the character was depicted, the source of Satan’s nature should not be limited to Charles and *Eikonoklastes* alone, and neither should the study of *Eikonoklastes* and its commentary on Charles be limited to understanding Satan. Characteristics of the other fallen angels can be traced back to Charles as well, as depicted by Milton in Book II of *Paradise Lost*.

Following the descent into hell, Satan calls for council with his angelic host to plot their next step. Speeches are given by Moloch, Belial, Mammon and Beelzebub, as they stake their respective claims on what the most

appropriate course of action is. Each one of the fallen angels has different opinions, ranging from waging a second war against God to forming their own empire in hell. Following the suggestion of battling God again, as put forth by Moloch, Belial asserts that remaining in Hell would be the better choice for he has hope that “the never-ending flight / Of future days may bring, what chance, what change / Worth waiting,” (II. 221 – 223). Belial’s rhetoric, as depicted by Milton, has a “persuasive accent” and whose speech “pleased the ear” (II. 117 – 118), is reminiscent of a tyrant’s, or in other words, Charles’:

. . . he seemed
 For dignity composed and high exploit:
 But all was false and hollow; though his tongue
 Dropped manna, and could make the worse appear
 The better reason, to perplex and dash
 Maturest counsels: for his thoughts were low;
 To vice industrious, but to nobler deeds
 Timorous and slothful: . . .

(II. 110 – 117)

Despite speaking convincingly and persuasively, Milton elaborates that Belial’s words are “false and hollow” that could “make the worse appear / The better reason.” The description of his empty rhetoric is not unlike that of Charles in *Eikon Basilike* as well, who creates excuses as reasons for his actions and errors, such as when he defends himself for sentencing Strafford to death. Rather than admit his faults, Charles invents a “better reason” for his doing, explaining that it was “*Better one man perish (though unjustly) than the people be displeased, or destroyed.*”¹⁵⁵ Belial’s speech is also portrayed

¹⁵⁵ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 55.

as “clothed in reason’s garb” (II. 226), speaking as if “his tongue / Dropped manna,” indicating that his fancy rhetoric is merely decoration, imposing as something divine and miraculous to cover up what he really means. Apart from that, Belial’s reasoning is akin to both Charles’ and Satan’s with its ability to “perplex and dash / Maturest counsels,” and its association to Charles’ diseased language is seen in the above excerpt as well. Milton’s speaking of *Eikon Basilike* as an “unnatural *dyscrasy*” is reflected in Belial’s speech with the description of “To vice industrious, but to nobler deeds / Timorous and slothful,” comparable to the king’s condition of “digest[ing] poison and to keck at wholesome food.”¹⁵⁶

Mammon’s method of speaking in contradictions imitates that of Charles and Satan as well, seen when he speaks of creating their own space in hell. Milton employs a myriad of paradoxes in Mammon’s speech, in which he describes living in Heaven as a task: “. . . how wearisome / Eternity so spent in worship paid / To whom we hate” (II. 247 – 249). Rather than reclaiming their status back in Heaven, Mammon thinks it better to

. . . seek
 Our own good from ourselves, and from our own
 Live to ourselves, though in this vast recess,
 Free, and to none accountable, preferring
 Hard liberty before the easy yoke
 Of servile pomp.

(II. 252 – 257)

¹⁵⁶ Daems and Faith Nelson, *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*, 240.

Mammon presents a distorted idea of Heaven, in which “Strict laws” (II. 241) and “Forced alleluias” (II. 243) are imposed. Mammon also utilizes paradoxical phrases in his rhetoric, such as “Hard liberty,” “easy yoke” and “servile pomp.” “Hard liberty” and “easy yoke” are a pair of contradictory terms; “liberty” and “yoke” are as oppositional as “hard” and “easy” are, with “liberty,” in a general sense referring to freedom, while “yoke” in this context means to “bring into or hold in subjection or servitude, to subjugate or to oppress” (OED, n.1, III.a). The words of the phrases each contradict one another, suggesting a duplicitous nature that is reflected in his speech. Following this, he also speaks of the potential things the fallen angelic host could do in regards to living in hell:

Our greatness will appear
 Then most conspicuous, when great things of small,
 Useful of hurtful, prosperous of adverse
 We can create, and in what place so e'er
 Thrive under evil, and work ease out of pain
 Through labour and endurance.

(II. 257 – 262)

Mammon intends to create “great things of small,” “Useful of hurtful” and “prosperous of adverse,” and this idea of creating something from its opposite resembles Satan’s vision of creating “a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven” (I. 255). Thus, since Mammon’s rhetoric bears similarities to Satan’s in that they both employ the language of paradox, it can be said that the rest of the fallen angelic host embody traits from Charles as well, or that Milton utilized the

same elements of the political tracts to shape the character of Satan as well as the other rebel angels.

Milton's depiction of Beelzebub also comes close to resembling a majestic monarch. As Satan's second in command, Beelzebub sits at the highest point in council following Satan, and is depicted as Satan's dependable "pillar of state; deep on his front engraven / Deliberation set and public care" (II. 302 – 303). Here, Beelzebub is glorified as a majestic leader who attracts attention with his presence:

And princely counsel in his face yet shone,
Majestic though in ruin: sage he stood
With Atlantean shoulders fit to bear
The weight of mightiest monarchies; his look
Drew audience and attention . . .

(II. 304 – 308)

In his speech, he speaks of an "easier enterprise" (II. 345) that can be undertaken instead of being resigned to hell or waging war against God in heaven, which is the plot to exact revenge on the divine ruler by corrupting mankind. Beelzebub then deliberates "how attempted best / By force or subtlety" (II. 357 – 358) to undertake this "enterprise," with "attempt" meaning "To try with temptations, try to win over, seduce or entice, to tempt" (OED, v., V.a) apart from "To make an effort, to use one's endeavour to do or accomplish some action, to seek to influence or try to move" (OED, v, I.a). The definition of "attempt" could be a revisit of Charles' "attempt" to influence and buy his readers over with his false rhetoric in *Eikon Basilike*,

implying that Milton had in mind his iconoclastic text when formulating Beelzebub's speech.

The preceding analysis suggests that *Eikonoklastes* influenced more than just the character of Satan in *Paradise Lost*, as it is likely that Milton used the concepts of the political prose to shape many aspects of the poem. While this study examines how *Eikonoklastes* shapes *Paradise Lost* in regards to Satan, influences over the character should not be limited to just the political prose. In quoting Bennett once again, "Because the prose and poetry are both informed by the same political vision and by the same dramatic imagination, we can, without seeking allegorical keys to literal history, find in the prose works a valuable literary gloss on the poetry,"¹⁵⁷ it is obvious that *Eikonoklastes* largely influenced Milton in depicting Satan, who extracted core concepts and ideas from the prose to incorporate into the portrayal of the fallen angel. In all of Satan's inconsistency, this duplicitous image is deliberately intentional, as Milton had conceivably wanted readers to acknowledge Satan's false front in order to truly understand the nature of tyrannical rulers such as Charles. With all of the implicit meanings and references to the political text in Milton's epic poem, readers might encounter shifting perceptions of Satan that elicit questions about his nature as they peruse through *Paradise Lost*, prompting them to both discover and uncover the construct of Satan in all of his significance.

¹⁵⁷ Bennett, "God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton's Royal Portraits," 441.

Bibliography

Books

- Arndt, William. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. 3rd ed. 2000. Print.
- Choniates, Niketas. *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*. Trans. Harry I. Magoulias. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984. Print.
- Daems, Jim and Holly Faith Nelson, eds. *Eikon Basilike with selections from Eikonoklastes*. Ontario, Canada: Broadview Editions, 2006. Print.
- Fowler, Alastair. Introduction. *Paradise Lost*. By John Milton. Harlow, England: Longman, 2007. Print.
- Kerrigan, William, Rumrich, John and Fallon, Stephen M. Foreword. *The Complete Poetry and Essential Prose of John Milton*. John Milton. New York: Modern Library, 2007. Print.
- Lubac, Henri de. *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*. Trans. Mark Sebanc, E. M. Macierowski. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998-2009. Print.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Alastair Fowler. Harlow, England: Longman, 2007. Print.
- Cross, Frank Leslie, and Livingstone, Elizabeth A. *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 3rd ed. Oxford University Press, 2005. Print.
- Rosenblatt, Jason P. *Torah and Law in Paradise Lost*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994. Print.
- The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments and the books called Apocrypha, translated out of the original tongues and with the former translations diligently compared and revised by His Majesty's special command. Appointed to be read in churches. Authorized King James Version*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 197-. Print.

Journal Articles

- Ainsworth, David. "Spiritual Reading in Milton's *Eikonoklastes*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 45.1 (Winter 2005): 157 – 189. Print.
- Bennett, Joan S. "God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton's Royal Portraits." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 92.3 (May 1977): 441 – 457. Print.
- Cohen, Scott. "Counterfeiting and the Economics of Kingship in Milton's *Eikonoklastes*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 50.1 (Winter 2010): 147 – 174. Print.
- Hyman, Lawrence W. "Satan and Charles I." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 93.1 (Jan 1978): 118 – 120. Print.
- Shore, Daniel. "'Fit Though Few': *Eikonoklastes* and the Rhetoric of Audience." *Milton Studies* 45 (2006): 129 – 148. Print.

Online Sources

- Asch, Ronald G. "Wentworth, Thomas, first earl of Strafford (1593–1641)" *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Ed. Lawrence Goldman. Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009. Web. 12 Feb 2012. <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29056>>.
- Kishlansky, Mark A. and Morrill, John. "Charles I (1600–1649)" *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Ed. Lawrence Goldman. Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2008. Web. 5 April 2012. <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5143>>.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press. 2012. Web. 26 Sept. 2011. <www.oed.com>.