Negative microfilm 64–12,663
received from university

REITER, Robert Edward, 1932–
IN ADAM'S ROOM. A STUDY OF THE ADAMIC TYPOLOGY OF CHRIST IN PARADISE REGAINED.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1964
Language and Literature, modern

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

IN ADAM'S ROOM

A Study of the Adamic Typology of Christ in Paradise Regained

by

Robert Edward Reiter

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in The
University of Michigan
1964

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Warner G. Rice, Chairman
Assistant Professor Edmund H. Creeth
Professor Frank L. Huntley
Professor George E. Mendenhall

PREFACE

Since so much of the following dissertation deals with biblical matters, a few words of explanation are in order here. The translation of the Bible used throughout (with one exception) is that of Msgr. Ronald A. Knox (New York, 1956), which, because it is based on the Vulgate, uses the Vulgate names for certain books and the Vulgate numbers for the Psalms. Where this might cause confusion, I have also included the more familiar names and numbers from the Authorized Version. Modern biblical studies have made it impossible for us to read the Bible, especially Genesis and Exodus, in the same way that the Church Fathers or Milton and his contemporaries did. On the one hand, one has to be aware of modern studies of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, and on the other to realize that these insights have nothing to do with Milton's interpretation of those chapters. Nevertheless, Adam is just as much a type of Christ to us as he was to St. Paul, St. Augustine, or Milton, though we might strongly dissent from their view of Adam in other respects. Therefore, in writing about Adam as though he were a historical person like Napoleon, I am not espousing a fundamentalist view of Scripture; instead, I am trying to adopt, as far as possible, the view of Milton's contemporaries.

The pleasant duty of thanking all the people who have helped me through this dissertation remains. My thanks therefore are extended to Professor Rice for many kind and courteous hours; to the other members of the Committee for their suggestions and patience; to Professor John Arthos, formerly a member of the Committee, in whose Seminar on the Renaissance the following pages began; to Professor G. B. Harrison,

whose friendly proddings kept me going; to my supervisors in the Office of Research Administration, Dr. B. A. Uhlendorf and Mr. Donald E. Thackrey, for their encouragement and support (financial and moral); to Miss Beatrice Finley for typing beyond the call of duty or of friendship; to Pastor Robert C. Seltz, of St. Luke's Lutheran Church, for help with Luther on Romans; to my good friends, the Reverend Professor Jerome A. Kelly, O.F.M., of St. Bonaventure University, and Dr. Rudolf B. Schmerl, of The University of Michigan, for their theological and stylistic advice and for their constant willingness to help; to my parents, my wife, and my children, who put up with it all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BIBLICAL TYPOLOGY	10
III.	MILTON AMONG THE FATHERS	34
IV.	BIBLICAL TYPOLOGY IN MILTON'S TIME	52
V.	BIBLICAL TYPOLOGY IN PARADISE REGAINED	74
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY		88

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Despite the steady annual flow of scholarly and critical publications about Paradise Regained, a basic question about it is still unanswered; indeed, it has never been properly asked. The question is: What is there about Christ's situation when he is tempted in the desert and defeats Satan there (the Gospel episode that Milton narrates) that justifies Milton in calling his poem about Christ's temptation Paradise Regained? The question is frankly theological. It seeks to determine the basis for the theological meaning that Milton saw in Christ's defeat of Satan, a meaning that allowed him to use this episode as the subject matter of a poem that is professedly about the recovery of paradise for all mankind. The answer to this question has many literary implications, for it should offer the scholar a better understanding of what Paradise Regained is really about, of Milton's purpose in writing it, and of its position in Milton's religious thinking, thereby enabling him to interpret individual lines and scenes within a conceptual framework that he has hitherto lacked for this poem. Theology here can become the handmaid of criticism. The first question gives rise to a second: What, consequently, is the relationship of Paradise Regained to Paradise Lost? These are the questions that the following pages seek to answer.

After Milton had given Thomas Ellwood, his former pupil, the manuscript of Paradise Lost to peruse, Ellwood returned it and "modestly, but freely" told Milton what he thought of it. Then Ellwood put to Milton the famous question: "Thou hast said much here of Paradise lost; but what hast thou to say of Paradise found?" Milton did not answer, but some time later he showed Ellwood Paradise Regained and said "in a pleasant tone" that "this is owing to you; for you put it into my Head, by the Question you put to me at Chalfont; which before I had not thought of."[1] Ellwood's question was a natural one; to a Christian the regaining of paradise is of far greater import than the losing of it. And certainly both the title of Paradise Regained and its opening lines, when compared with the title and opening lines of Paradise Lost, suggest that the later poem is to be read, in some measure, as a sequel to the earlier.

The title of Paradise Regained tends to lead the reader of Paradise Lost to expect a poem on the passion, death, or resurrection of Christ, since these are, in the traditional modes of theological thought, the events in Christ's life that brought salvation. One's discovery that it does not deal with these events comes as a kind of shock. Thirty years before Paradise Regained Milton had written a poem on the passion, but "finding [it] to be above the yeers he had, when

---

[1]From "The History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood," in John Milton, Works (New York, 1931-1938), XVIII, 385-386. The Columbia Edition is used for all citations from Milton, and will be cited in the text as Works.

he wrote it, and nothing satisfi'd with what was begun, left it unfinisht" (Works, I, 25). The failure of this poem, which was intended to fit into the cycle of poems on Christ's life begun with the Nativity Ode, is obvious. Although Milton attributes his failure to the fact that the subject was beyond him at the time—this judgment, incidentally, was made probably some fourteen years after the poem—one is free to suppose that actually the subject was simply uncongenial. Milton did not, as a matter of fact, return to the passion as a subject of poetry (save very briefly and perfunctorily in PL XII, 411-414), and it is fair to assume that his earlier experiences in poetry with Christ's passion may have contributed to his eliminating it from consideration as a subject for a poem on the regaining of paradise.

Another possible subject for a poem about regaining paradise is the resurrection. Although theologically the resurrection is the most dynamic event in the whole economy of salvation, poetically it would tend to be static unless the traditional episode of the harrowing of hell were attached to it. Milton, however, declined that possibility because he felt that the scriptural basis for the harrowing of hell was weak.[2]

Milton, then, in deciding to write a poem about the regaining of paradise, and faced with the difficulties of choosing for his subject the passion or the resurrection, "sought instead in Christ's life on

---

[2]Northrop Frye, "The Typology of Paradise Regained," MP, LIII (1956), 228.

earth the single episode which most clearly paralleled, and contrasted with, the crisis of the earlier epic, and this clearly was the Temptation in the Wilderness."[3] Professor Woodhouse, whose opinion this is, says in effect that Milton chose the temptation in the desert because it "most clearly paralleled" what he believes to be the central action of Paradise Lost. Other scholars have also suggested that the parallel between the fall and the temptations led Milton to his chosen subject for Paradise Regained. Alexander H. Sackton, for instance, states that

> the introductory lines to Paradise Regained develop an analogy with Paradise Lost which is obvious to all readers. Milton points to the contrast between "one man's disobedience" and "one man's firm obedience," between the setting in the Garden of Eden for the earlier poem and in the desert or wilderness for the later, and between the temptations central to each poem. The emphasis with which these contrasts are introduced suggests how much the artistic concept of the whole poem, even before the execution of the verse, is based on the sense which Milton had of parallelism and balance.[4]

Miss Mahood points out that "Milton, when he came to write of that promised recovery, chose the temptation as the symbol of Paradise Regained, since of all the events recorded in the Gospels it seemed to him the one best fitted to show Christ as the healer of the twofold harm done by Adam and Eve."[5] Christ's obedience, which is stressed throughout Para-

---

[3]A.S.P. Woodhouse, "Theme and Pattern in Paradise Regained," UTQ, XXV (1956), 167.

[4]"Architectonic Structure in Paradise Regained," The University of Texas Studies in English, XXXIII (1954), 34.

[5]Poetry and Humanism (London, 1950), p. 222.

dise Regained, "can be as well presented by the Temptation as by the Passion," according to Charles Williams.[6] Elizabeth M. Pope says that "since Milton was working on a poem deliberately designed as a sequel and companion-piece to Paradise Lost, it was perhaps inevitable that he should make some form of the triple equation the center of Paradise Regained."[7] Now the "triple equation" Miss Pope refers to is the "equation between the temptation of Adam, the temptations of Christ, and all the temptations of this world."[8] Such reasons for Milton's choice of the temptations in the desert are undeniably valid. The parallelism and contrast between Adam and Christ is most apparent in this episode, and the temptations do show Christ's obedience as well as the crucifixion does.

It is at this point that most critics and commentators stop. They feel that Milton was moved by literary and artistic reasons to choose the temptations of Christ and his reaction to them as a kind of parallel to the temptation of Adam and his reaction to it. There is a balance, it is argued, a symmetry, which makes the obedience of Christ a perfect sequel to the disobedience of Adam. Milton's choice, as it is usually described, was dictated solely by literary and esthetic reasons. No commentator has advanced the opinion to be presented here, that Milton

---

[6] The English Poetic Mind (Oxford, 1932), p. 139.

[7] "Paradise Regained": The Tradition and the Poem (Baltimore, 1947; reprinted, New York, 1962), p. 63.

[8] Ibid., p. 53.

had compelling theological reasons for taking the temptations of Christ to be the necessary complement to the temptation of Adam. These theological reasons derive from no less an authority than St. Paul, who, in his Epistle to the Romans, draws the comparison and contrast between Adam and Christ that provided Milton with the source of his parallel. There (Rom. 5:14) Paul calls Adam the type (tupos) of Christ. And upon the concept of Adam as a type of Christ rests the theological justification for titling a poem about the temptations in the desert Paradise Regained.

A knowledge of biblical typology, it is slowly being realized, is necessary to understand much of the literature of Western Europe from the fall of the Empire to the Enlightenment. The Bible is certainly the most important single influence on that literature, and typology was a standard, universally practiced way of reading both Testaments. The situation changed during the last two centuries. "Biblical typology," says Northrop Frye, "is so dead a language now that most readers, including scholars, cannot construe the superficial meaning of any poem which employs it."[9] In the last twenty or thirty years, however, biblical scholars and exegetes have rediscovered for themselves the great importance of typology for understanding the New Testament, for its authors understood the Old Testament typologically. Similarly, since about 1950, a few literary scholars and critics have tried to read Medieval and Renaissance poems in the light of biblical typology. They

[9] Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton, 1957), p. 14.

realize it is not enough to know, for instance, who Moses was; the scholar must also know how Moses was understood, interpreted, at the time of the poem under consideration. And this means an attempt to relearn the language that Professor Frye says is now "so dead." The attempt has been made with considerable success by Erich Auerbach, by Northrop Frye himself, and with rather less success by others. Nevertheless, neither Auerbach nor Frye has fully explained just what typology is, what its origins are, and how it developed. Thus literary students are still rather in the dark about the precise nature of typology, and they tend to confuse it with allegory, symbolism, and the various spiritual (or mystical) senses of Scripture.

Biblical typology is a useful tool for understanding older literature, but like all tools it must be kept sharp. When it is blunted by improper use, it becomes crude and disfigures the working surface. A precise definition of the term and clear distinctions from others with which it has been confused, along with a brief account of historical origins and developments, can be of assistance to all students of seventeenth-century literature. I have therefore begun with a chapter on biblical typology with a view toward limiting the use of the term in literary criticism to the meaning of the term in biblical exegesis.

Four articles have appeared in the past ten years on biblical typology in Milton's works. In the most recent of these, H. R. MacCallum's "Milton and Figurative Interpretation of the Bible," the author invites the student of Milton and other Renaissance poets to apply the

discoveries of biblical scholars about typology to literature.[10] Some attempts had already been made. In successive issues of PMLA in 1960 there were two articles about typology in Paradise Lost, neither of which, however, offered much help to the student of literature who is trying to make biblical typology one of his critical tools.[11] Professor Frye's article on "The Typology of Paradise Regained" is a notable accomplishment in reviving a dead language, but it is useful only if the reader already knows the language. Furthermore, Professor Frye misses the point of Milton's selection of the subject matter for Paradise Regained, a choice which it is the principal purpose of this dissertation to explain. A secondary purpose is to provide literary students, particularly students of Milton, with a grammar of and syntax for the language of biblical typology.

In the following study, after a consideration of biblical typology in general, two chapters are devoted to showing that Milton understood biblical typology and that he employed it in works other than Paradise Regained. Too often it is taken for granted that a given author knew

---

[10] UTQ, XXXI (1962), 414.

[11] Mother Mary Christopher Pecheux, "The Concept of the Second Eve in Paradise Lost," PMLA, LXXV (1960), 359-366; and William G. Madsen, "Earth the Shadow of Heaven: Typological Symbolism in Paradise Lost," Ibid., 519-526. See also Theodore L. Huguelet, "Milton's Hermeneutics: A Study of Scriptural Interpretation in the Divorce Tracts and in De Doctrina Christiana," DA, XX (1960), 2803.

and used typology without considering how he came to that knowledge. This assumption allows the scholar to roam freely through the Glossa Ordinaria and recondite treatises decently buried in the later volumes of Migne. In studying Milton one's method can be much more rigorous, for he left many direct evidences of his theological reading and thinking. Chapters II, III, and IV thus lead up to the last chapter, wherein the questions asked at the beginning of this chapter are answered in the light of what has gone before.

CHAPTER II

BIBLICAL TYPOLOGY

In biblical exegesis and scholarship, the study of the system of historical correspondences in the Bible between certain Old Testament persons, events, or things (types) which prefigure similar New Testament persons, events, or things is called typology.[1] The writers of the New Testament saw correspondences between the saving events they were writing about and the saving events of Israel's past. If the New Testament writers did not consciously intend to supplant the Scriptures of Moses and the prophets, they were very much aware that they were writing about a New Covenant that God had made with his people to replace the Covenant of Sinai (I Cor. 11:25; Mark 14:24; Matt. 26:28; Luke 22:20). St. Paul and the Evangelists, notably Matthew and John, show their awareness of the correspondences between Israel's history and New Testament events. Paul uses these correspondences in explaining the Old Testament and Christ, and the Evangelists use them as one way of structuring the Gospels and hence of understanding Christ. Typology, then, can be a way of exegesis or a way of writing. Both derive from a view of history and, since Scripture is the record or recital of God's saving acts for Israel

---

[1]Jean Daniélou, The Lord of History, trans. Nigel Abercrombie (London and Chicago, 1958), p. 214. K. J. Woollcombe, "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology," in Essays on Typology, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 22 (Naperville, Ill., 1957), pp. 39-40.

(Heilsgeschichte), from a view of Scripture as well.

The New Testament authors do not look upon history, specifically Israel's history, as something that happened once long ago with no further relevance, nor as a series of endlessly recurring cyles. History, rather, is meaningful, orderly, and progressive. Events happen by divine providence and, although the full salvific meaning of an event or person may not be apparent to contemporaries, this meaning can be understood by later men because the meaning is given by God.[2] The theological principle underlying this view is the Old Testament concept of God as a living God, one who can and does and did act decisively in time for the assistance of the people he made his own. The greatest intervention in history by the God of Israel was the Exodus from Egypt, which, along with the experiences of the forty years in the desert, formed the most meaningful part of the historical basis of the Old Testament religion. The Israelites lived through the Exodus, wrote about it, and liturgically celebrated it, not just as the pious memory of a great day (as, for instance, July 4 or 14), but rather as a remembrance of the precise historical event in which God manifested his power and his protection of Israel. It is this latter view that gave meaning to the Exodus and to all of Israel's history.

The call of Abraham, the Exodus, and the election of David, all of them decisive interventions in history and likewise treasured memories

---

[2]Rudolf Bultmann, History and Eschatology (Edinburgh, 1957), p. 59.

in Israel, made it apparent that God works in history for his people. The promise of a Messias, which took on greater cogency and force after the Exile, would be fulfilled in time with a similarly historical event. The early Christians, especially most New Testament authors, were brought up as Jews and therefore interpreted their history as pointing to and awaiting the Messias. But since these Christians now believed that the Messias had come, the New Testament looks upon Israel's history as a preparation for the Messias, ordered by God as prefigurement of the one historical event that gives everything its meaning. History, in the New Testament view, progresses from the beginnings toward Christ and thence toward the Parousia. The New Testament took over Old Testament history and made it part of its redemptive history.

The most obvious evidence that the New Testament writers accepted Old Testament history and prophecy as prefiguring Christ is to be found in the way they handled certain Old Testament events and prophecies.[3] By announcing that these prophecies had been fulfilled in Christ, and by their interpretation of certain events (notably the Exodus), the New Testament writers set forth that system of correspondences between the Testaments that we call typology. In the New Testament itself, rather than in Philo Judaeus or in rabbinic exegesis, we find the roots of the typology that was so deeply to influence theology and literature. To discover how the New Testament writers related the New to the Old, it might be helpful here to look briefly at some Old Testament prophecies

[3]Woollcombe, p. 49.

and events that are interpreted in the New Testament.

Since the Exodus was the supreme historical experience of Israel, it is not to be wondered at that the prophets of the Old Testament would refer to it as an analogue, foreshadowing, or type of a still more perfect liberation which God had in store for Israel. A clear example of this kind of prophecy, which Woollcombe calls "recapitulative prophecy,"[4] is found in Jeremias:

> A time is coming, the Lord says, when I mean to ratify a new covenant with the people of Israel and with the people of Juda. It will not be like the covenant which I made with their fathers, on the day when I took them by the hand, to rescue them from Egypt . . . No, this is the covenant I will grant the people of Israel . . . I will implant my law in their innermost thoughts, engrave it in their hearts; I will be their God, and they shall be my people . . . all will know me . . . I will pardon their wrongdoing; I will not remember their sins any more. (Jer. 31:31-34)

The Epistle to the Hebrews cites these verses from Jeremias to explain the New Covenant that Christ has established (Heb. 8:8-13), and interprets them as a prophecy of the New Covenant of Christ, thus perceiving a correspondence between the broken Covenant of Sinai and the New Covenant of Jesus Christ. Another example of recapitulative prophecy can be found in Osee (Hosea):

> It is but love's strategem, thus to lead her out into the wilderness; once there, it shall be all words of comfort. Clad in vineyards that wilderness shall be, that vale of sad memory a passage-way of hope; and a song shall be on her lips, the very music of her youth, when I rescued her from Egypt long ago. (Osee 2:14-15)

---

[4] Ibid., p. 44.

The reference to Egypt at the end of this passage makes it evident that the "wilderness" of verse 14 refers to a new sojourn of Israel in the desert to correspond with the events of the Exodus. Elsewhere, Osee says (8:13) that Israel must go again into Egypt, into slavery, which implies a new coming forth from Egypt, a new Exodus. In the prophecy of Isaias, too, there is recapitulative prophecy, harkening back to the old days and looking forward to a new covenant.

> Do not remember those old things, he [God] says, as if you had eyes for nothing but what happened long ago; I mean to perform new wonders . . . I mean to make a causeway over the desert, with streams flowing beside it in the waste. (Isa. 43:18-19)

The prophet recalls the great event of the past and prophesies another such event, of equal or greater importance, in the future.

These examples from Jeremias, Osee, and Isaias—and they are representative of others—with their analyses of contemporary events and prophetic warnings show that "the principles of typology were to be found already among these prophets."[5] When that future did come in the person of Jesus Christ, what more valid way of interpreting his life and actions than by relating them to the great events of Israel's past? Christ's life, death, and resurrection have the same determining importance for the New Testament writers that the Exodus had for the Old Testament writers.[6] By seeing in the life and works of Jesus certain correspond-

---

[5]Jean Daniélou, From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers, trans. Dom Wulstan Hibberd (London, 1960), p. 156.

[6]Harald Sahlin, "The New Exodus of Salvation According to St. Paul," in The Root of the Vine: Essays in Biblical Theology (Westminster, 1953), p. 91.

ences to and similarities with Israel's history, the New Testament writers developed typological writing and typological exegesis.

The most Jewish of the New Testament writers is Matthew, whose Gospel was written for an audience of Jewish Christians.[7] In Matthew, therefore, we might reasonably expect an extensive use of typology. This is not to maintain that every reference Matthew makes to the past is typological. Indeed, he often merely points out that Christ fulfills a prophecy, and not necessarily a recapitulative prophecy at that. At the beginning of his Gospel, intended for early converts from Judaism, Matthew stresses that Jesus fulfills the prophecy of Nathan (II Kings [II Samuel] 7:12-16) by being born of the house of David. Matthew quickly adduces two more prophecies about the birth of the Messias, Isaias 7:14 (Emmanuel) and Micheas 5:2 (Bethlehem). But these are not recapitulative prophecies nor is there typological writing here.

Then Matthew explicitly cites the flight into Egypt, an incident found only in his Gospel, as fulfilling the prophecy of Osee 11:1, "Away from Egypt I beckoned him." It is with this incident that Matthew begins to assimilate the life of Jesus to the history of Israel's deliverance from Egypt in the Exodus. Jesus' first public appearance in Matthew is his baptism. Having come out of Egypt, Jesus passes through water and God is manifested. Jesus then undergoes the forty-day fast, corresponding to the forty years in the desert (Exod. 16:35) and to the

---

[7]Alfred Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction, trans. Joseph Cunningham (New York, 1958), p. 195.

forty days that Moses spent on the mountain (Exod. 24:18; 34:28). After the fast, Jesus is tempted by Satan, whom he refutes out of the Old Law of Sinai. Perhaps the most extended piece of typological writing in Matthew is the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7). Jesus, having come out of Egypt, passed through water, and fasted forty days, delivers the New Law from a mountain. The correspondence of actual events is unmistakable. The Sermon on the Mount is the New Law, and the discourse, after the introductory beatitudes, begins with "Do not think that I have come to set aside the law and the prophets; I have not come to set them aside but to bring them to perfection" (Matt. 5:17). Following this statement, Jesus systematically revises (perfects) the Mosaic Law in a setting corresponding to that in which Moses originally proclaimed it. Jesus, the prophet promised to Moses (Deut. 18:18), fulfills the recapitulative prophecy of Jeremias (Jer. 31:31) after the new Exodus promised by Osee and Isaias. Moses and the Exodus are the principal Old Testament figures that Matthew draws on for his typology. It is through the implicit references to them that we can say that Matthew saw certain events in the early life of Jesus as corresponding to Israel's experience in the Exodus[8] and that he understood the Sermon on the Mount to be the New Testament counterpart to the giving of the Law from Sinai in the Old Testament. By grasping the correspondences between the events, Matthew shows "Christ as at once continuing and surpassing the outstanding events in the story of Israel

---

[8]See Sahlin, pp. 83 and 94.

at the time of Moses."[9]

Another Exodus theme that appears in the New Testament is the Paschal Lamb (Exod. 12), which can be conflated with the comparison of the Suffering Servant to a sheep already made in Isaias 53. St. Paul emphasizes the correspondence between the Paschal Lamb and Christ, "Has not Christ been sacrificed for us, our paschal victim?" (I Cor. 5:7). The blood of the Paschal Lamb spared the Israelites from the death of the first born in Egypt, and so too it is the blood of Christ, the new Paschal victim, that saves the believers, who are the new Israel (I Cor. 11:25; Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:23-24; Apoc. [Rev.] 5). Just as the New Testament writers interpreted the life of Jesus in the light of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaias, so too they interpreted the death of Jesus as the fulfillment of the promises implicit in the Paschal victim of Exodus 12. It is assuredly not without typological significance that Christ, the new Paschal Lamb, established the New Covenant in his blood and the new salvific ritual meal as a climax and complement to the Paschal meal of the Old Law (Matt. 26:17-28; Mark 14:12-25; Luke 22:7-20; I Cor. 11:23-25). Christ, therefore, was considered the reality of which the Paschal Lamb was the type.

The events of the Exodus served to weld Israel together into one people under the covenant of the one God. The life of Israel as a wandering desert community under the leadership of Moses came to be viewed

---

[9]Daniélou, From Shadows to Reality, p. 165.

as the ideal religious, communal life for Israel. St. Paul, writing to the Christian community in Corinth, recalls the desert past of Israel, not only to warn the Corinthians against idolatry, but also to remind them that they were "foreshadowed in these events" (I Cor. 10:6). And the foreshadowing is two fold: the desert community of Israel foreshadowed the present community of Christians in Corinth, which is to say that Israel foreshadowed the Church; and the cloud and the sea (Exod. 14:20-22) correspond to baptism (I Cor. 10:1-3), the prophetic food (Exod. 16:15) to the Eucharist (John 6:59), the prophetic water (Exod. 17:6) to the water from the side of Christ (John 19:34), and, finally and explicitly, the rock of Horeb (Exod. 17:1-7) to Christ (I Cor. 10:4). The typology here points to the correspondences between Israel and Christ and his Church.

Certain Old Testament persons, moreover, were understood to be types of Christ. These persons were connected with Jesus in the following ways: Adam, in that, like Christ, he was the head of the race (Rom. 5: 14; I Cor. 15:45, 47); Abel, in that he was a just man (Matt. 23:35) who offered an acceptable sacrifice (Gen. 4:4,5,10; Heb. 11:4; 12:24); Noe, in that he preached repentance, mediated a covenant between God and man (Gen. 9:8-17; Heb. 11:7), and built an ark (Gen. 6:14), which was a type of baptism (I Pet. 3:20-21); Melchisedech, in that he was a high priest who offered sacrifice of bread and wine, King of Salem (peace), and without generation (Gen. 14:18; Heb. 6:20-7:3); Moses, in that he proclaimed a covenant (Exod. 35:1-2; Matt. 5-7; 26:26-28), gave the people bread

(manna) to eat (Exod. 16:4; John 6:30-36, 48-51, 59) and water to drink (Exod. 17:6; John 7:37-38), and established a sacrifice (Exod. 24:6-8; Matt. 26:28; Heb. 9:11-28); David, in that he was born in Bethlehem (I Kings [I Sam.] 16:1; Matt. 2:1), was a king (I Kings [I Sam.] 16:13; II Kings [II Sam.] 5:12; Matt. 27:11), and was persecuted (Pss. 3, 21 [22], 108 [109]; Matt. 27:27-33); and Jonas, in that he was buried three days (Jonas 2:1; Matt. 12:39-40).[10] Of these types, Jesus applies only Jonas to himself. In the New Testament, Adam, Melchisedech, and Moses are the most important personal types of Christ.

The matrix of the scriptural development of typology is thus found in the New Testament itself. Various passages in the Old Testament prophets announced a new Exodus and a New Covenant. These prophecies were never interpreted to mean that the events of the Exodus of the Covenant would occur again just as they had before, as if the prophet were predicting a cyclical movement. Rather, in the course of progressing revelation (see Heb. 1:1-2 and I Pet. 1:20), it was revealed to certain men that God would act once more on Israel's behalf in a way very similar to that in which he had acted years before. Likewise, the lives and actions of certain Old Testament men were seen to have borne a special meaning in relation to the life and actions of Christ. The New Testament authors, particularly Matthew, John, and Paul, had diligently searched the Scriptures for passages relevant to the life of the Messias,

---

[10]Paul Heinisch, Christ in Prophecy, trans. William G. Heidt (Collegeville, Minn., 1956), pp. 217-225.

found there the recapitulative prophecies and the men and events of Israel's history, and incorporated them into their understanding of Christ.

Once the New Testament milieu had accepted recapitulative prophecy and had perceived, in the light of prophecy, correspondences between Old Testament history and the life and actions of Jesus, the way was open for later writers to detail the correspondences between the Old Law and the New, between the Old Covenant and New, between Adam, Abraham, Moses, David, and other Old Testament persons and Jesus the Christ, between events in the Old Testament and events in the life of Christ. The person, event, or thing in the Old Testament so interpreted is called the type, and that to which it corresponds in the New Testament is called the antitype. The antitype is consequently greater than the type. This terminology is found in the New Testament: Paul (Rom. 5:14) calls Adam the type (tupos) of Christ, and Peter (I Pet. 2:4) calls Christ the antitype (antitupos) of the rejected stone (Ps. 117 [118]:22; cf. Matt. 21:42-44; Acts 4:11, and Rom. 9:33). Types are also called figures, shadows, and prefigurations. The Old Testament types are real, historical persons, events, or things. In typological writing and exegesis, the Old Testament is taken seriously, and the types are not simply types but have their own validity and existence independent of the antitype. Indeed, only if the types are valid (i.e., historical)

can the antitypes be valid.[11]

Typology, moreover, must be distinguished from the fulfillment of prophecy and from allegory. In the Old Testament, a prophet was a man chosen by the Lord to proclaim his message to the people of Israel (see, for example, Jer. 1:9). The contents of the message varied. Sometimes the prophet called the people back to the ways of the Covenant, sometimes he warned them of an approaching dire event. On rare occasions, he spoke to them about their coming deliverance and the person who would deliver Israel from its troubles. This kind of prophecy, related to the deliverer or his mission, is known as messianic prophecy. The Hebrew term which is Anglicized as Messias and the Greek term Christos are semantically the same, both coming from the words in the respective languages that mean "anointed." Messianic prophecies were widely known in

[11]Woollcombe (pp. 39-40) says "typology, considered as a method of exegesis, may be defined as the establishment of historical connexions between certain events, persons or things in the Old Testament and similar events, persons or things in the New Testament. Considered as a method of writing, it may be defined as the description of an event, person or thing in the New Testament in terms borrowed from the description of its prototypal counterpart in the Old Testament." Type is defined in the Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (London, 1957) as ". . . the foreshadowing of the Christian dispensation in the events and persons of the OT . . . . A Christian type differs from an allegory in that the historical reference is not lost sight of." É. Amann in the Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique, XV (Paris, 1950), col. 1935 says that a type is "Terme technique par lequel on désigne un personnage, un événement, une institution de l'Ancien Testament qui annonce un personnage, un événement, une institution de Nouveau: Adame est le type du Christ; la traversée de la Mer Rouge par les Hébreux est le type du baptême; le rite sacrificiel du bouc expiatorie est le type de la passion rédemptrice de Jesus." On the superior dignity of the antitype, see Heinisch, pp. 212-214. See further, John Henry Newman, An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine (Garden City, N. Y., 1960), Part I, Chapter III, Section I, 4, p. 118.

the Palestine of New Testament times, and, it might be added, in the Diaspora as well, as Paul's letters and the Apostolic preaching in Acts show. St. Matthew cites ten of them to show that Jesus is the Messias, the Christ. St. Luke records that Jesus explained to two of the disciples on the road to Emmaus how Moses and the prophets applied to himself (Luke 24:27).

An illustration of the difference between mere fulfillment of a prophecy and a true example of typology can be drawn from a consideration of Micheas 5:2: "Bethlehem-Ephrata! Least do they reckon thee among all the clans of Juda? Nay it is from thee I look to find a prince that shall rule over Israel." These words were understood to mean that the Messias was to be born in Bethlehem; the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem was looked upon as the simple fulfillment of this prophecy. Matthew indicates as much. In his account of the coming of the Wise Men, he says that King Herod assembled the chief priests and learned men to ask them "where it was that Christ would be born." They answered Herod by saying "At Bethlehem in Juda; so it has been written by the prophet: And thou, Bethlehem, of the land of Juda, art far from the least among the princes of Juda, for out of thee will arise a leader who is to be the shepherd of my people Israel" (Matt. 2:4-7). Matthew had already recorded the fact that Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Juda (Matt. 2:1), and he takes this fact to be the fulfillment of the prophecy of Micheas. The birth of Jesus, in other words, is considered to be the fact foretold by Micheas.

Now, in an exegesis concerned with typology, the fact that Jesus was born in Bethlehem has a special significance because it was also the birthplace of King David (I Kings [I Sam.] 16:1). The angel's words to the shepherds call attention to this correspondence by referring to Bethlehem as "the city of David" (Luke 2:11). David and Jesus, therefore, are linked by the historical place of their birth. It is through real occurrences in time and place that David and Jesus are typologically connected. This is only one aspect of the correspondences between the two; upon all taken together there is built up the notion of David the King as a type of Christ the King. Prophecy, then, looks to the future for a fact that will constitute its fulfillment; typology, on the other hand, discovers that a fact of the past and a fact of the present so resemble each other that a contemplation of the correspondence deepens one's understanding of both facts.

Modern exegetes, as well as historians of exegesis, of dogma, and of literature, are unanimous in insisting that typology not be confused with allegory.[12] Allegory as here used signifies as allegorical inter-

---

[12]Jean Daniélou, "The New Testament and the Theology of History," in Studia Evangelica: The Four Gospels in 1957, ed. Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, Jean Daniélou, Harald Riesenfeld, and W. C. Van Unnik, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Vol. 73, 1959 (Berlin, 1959), p. 29. Woollcombe, p. 40. Heinisch, p. 213. R.P.C. Hanson, Allegory and Event (London, 1959), p. 7. Erich Auerbach, "Figura," in Scenes from the Drama of European Literature, trans. Ralph Manheim (New York, 1959), p. 54. Erich Auerbach, Mimesis, trans. Willard R. Trask, Doubleday Anchor ed. (Garden City, N.Y., 1957), p. 171. Erich Auerbach, "Typological Symbolism in Medieval Literature," Yale French Studies, No. 9 (1952?), 6.

pretation given to passages of Scripture over and above their literal meaning and quite independent of the intention of the writer himself. Allegory in this sense, therefore, is not to be identified with the allegorical interpretation of writings such as those of Langland, or Spenser, or Orwell. The first kind of allegory, with which we are concerned here, is altogether different from typology. Typology, as has been noted, is rooted in history, depends on history, and is necessarily faithful to it. Allegory, on the other hand, dispenses with history in favor of an interpretation of a passage suited to the exegete's temper. In Galatians 4, Paul presents an allegorical interpretation of the story of Abraham and his two wives and two sons. In fact, he describes his interpretation as an allegory. Sarah and Agar are quite arbitrarily looked on as the two dispensations (Gal. 4:24). Two historical persons are made to symbolize two historical covenants, and the historicity of both members of the allegory is of no importance whatsoever. The method was used on the same incidents by Philo Judaeus, who goes even further in disregarding historicity by making Sarah represent virtue and Agar, education. Abraham, who represents the mind, has virtue for his wife and culture for his concubine.[13] For Philo and for many Fathers of the Church, particularly those associated with Alexandria, the persons, places, or events in a passage to be interpreted became merely the jumping-off place for an interpretation which completely ignores the

---

[13] Woollcombe, p. 53.

historicity of the facts.

Paul's allegorical interpretation of Sarah and Agar should be contrasted with his typological interpretation, in Romans 5, of Adam's role; the contrast clarifies the difference between the two methods of exegesis.

> It was through one man that guilt came into the world; and, since death came owing to guilt, death was handed on to all mankind by one man. (All alike were guilty men; there was guilt in the world before ever the law of Moses was given. Now, it is only where there is a law to transgress that guilt is imputed, and yet we see death reigning in the world from Adam's time to the time of Moses, over men who were not themselves guilty of transgressing a law, as Adam was.) In this, Adam was the type of him who was to come. Only, the grace which came to us was out of all proportion to the fault. If this one man's fault brought death on a whole multitude, all the more lavish was God's grace, shewn to a whole multitude, that free gift he made us in the grace brought by one man, Jesus Christ. The extent of the gift is not as if it followed a single guilty act; the sentence which brought us condemnation arose out of one man's action, whereas the pardon that brings us acquittal arises out of a multitude of faults. And if death began its reign through one man, owing to one man's fault, more fruitful still is the grace, the gift of justification, which bids men enjoy a reign of life through one man, Jesus Christ.
>
> Well, then, one man commits a fault, and it brings condemnation upon all; one man makes amends, and it brings to all justification, that is, life. A multitude will become acceptable to God through one man's obedience, just as a multitude, through one man's disobedience became guilty. The law intervened, only to amplify our fault; but, as our fault was amplified, grace has been more amply bestowed than ever; that so, where guilt held its reign of death, justifying grace should reign instead, to bring us eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. (Rom. 5:12-21)

The correspondence set up here between Adam and Christ is so grounded in historical facts about each that the elimination of any of these facts

demolishes the relation between the two persons. Paul compares and contrasts Adam and Christ, but he does not proceed in a notably orderly manner. After separating the comparison from the contrast and determining the basis for each, we will have a clearer understanding of this key passage for the interpretation of Paradise Regained.

The argument begins in verse 21: through one man guilt and death entered the world. The one man is Adam, "who was the type of him who was to come" (verse 14: tupos tou mellontos; forma futuri). Verses 13 and most of 14 (save for the final words) are parenthetical. Ignoring for the purposes of rhetorical exposition the parenthetical verses, we see that Paul begins his comparison in verse 12, but breaks off to deal with another issue. Knox's translation and punctuation clear up some of Paul's loose grammar but obscure the fact that a comparison begins in verse 12. The point is clearer in the Authorized Version: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." One now expects the second member of the comparison, Christ. Instead there is the parenthesis followed by "Adam was the type of him who was to come." The only possible foundation for this typology thus far mentioned is oneness. There was one man, Adam, who acted with a certain result applicable to all mankind; in this he was a type of Christ, of him who was to come.

At this point Paul utterly breaks off the comparison and begins contrasting Adam and Christ. This makes his argument difficult to follow, so we will go on to conclude the comparison and return to the con-

trast. The core of the comparison or parallel is verses 18, 19, and 21. In verses 18 and 19 Paul emphasizes that one man performs an act which has consequences for all. Adam's fault brings condemnation to all; Christ's amends brings justification to all (v. 18). In verse 19, all become acceptable through one man's obedience, just as all had become guilty through one man's disobedience. The stable center of these comparisons is one man's action. The natures of the two acts, as well as their results, are complete opposites. Paul, however, is concerned with pointing out that there is a basis of comparison. The last verse of the chapter (v. 21) concludes the comparison with grace from Christ and guilt from Adam.

The contrast between Adam and Christ occupies verses 15, 16, and 17. The operative words in these verses are "not," and "more" or "all the more." It would seem from verse 15 that Paul was unwilling to compare Christ and Adam as he had begun to do without making it perfectly plain that there was also a vast difference between them. Adam, Paul says, is a type of Christ in that he was the one man whose act affected all people, although the relationship between death from Adam and life from Christ is "out of all proportion" to the relationship shown in the comparison of them. Grace and life in Christ are of a far higher order than simple recompense for sin and death. That is why Paul says that "the grace which came to us was out of all proportion to the fault" (v. 15).

To conclude, Adam is a type of Christ, according to St. Paul, in his oneness. Upon him, as head of the race at the time of temptation, depended the future of mankind; so too upon Christ, the new head of the race (Eph. 1:10 and Col. 1:15-20) at the time of temptation, the future of men depended. The one man making such an action is the type of the other. Adam's disobedience and sin are not a type of Christ's obedience and justice. That is manifestly impossible. But since the typological relationship exists, and since Paul does write of obedience and disobedience in one of his comparisons (v. 19), then it is only to be expected that the contrasting ideas of obedience and disobedience were always associated with the Adamic typology of Christ. But does the fact that Paul specifically contrasts Adam and Christ negate the idea of the antitype fulfilling the type? No, for the antitype is always greater than the type, and in the case of Adam and Christ the antitype completely fulfills the type because Christ acts perfectly in spurning the temptations that Adam succumbed to. The results of Christ's action reverse the results of Adam's action, but the strictly typological relationship in Romans 5 lies in the persons, their oneness, their situations, and their actions. It is precisely because there was <u>one</u> through whom <u>guilt</u> entered the world, and through guilt <u>death,</u> and thus death pervaded <u>all mankind</u> that a prefiguring can be seen of the <u>one</u> man, Jesus Christ, through whom came <u>grace</u> and <u>life</u> to a whole <u>multitude</u>.

Here in Romans 5, as always in typology, history is the keystone; in allegory, history is merely the point of departure. This insistance

upon history is possibly the richest, most valuable aspect of typological exegesis. By using a typological exegesis, the New Testament writers and the Fathers of the Church preserved for us Old Testament history and rendered the world an enormous service, for an allegorized Old Testament would soon have been forgotten as worthless, but an Old Testament whose history is preserved and taken seriously remains with us today.

In the years after the close of the canon of the New Testament, typological exegesis was widely applied by those theologians and exegetes whom we call the Fathers of the Church. Just as in the New Testament typological exegesis and typological writing rests upon a certain way of looking at the Old Testament, so in Patristic writing typological exegesis posits a view of the Old Testament. The great theological problem of the second century was the Old Testament. The distinction between Christian and Jew, which began with the baptism of Cornelius (Acts 10), became final after the fall of Jerusalem and after the Gentile converts outnumbered the Jewish Christians. The primitive apostolic kerygma delivered to Jews, however, included a summary of Israel's religious history as leading up to Jesus (Acts 2:14-26; 3:12-16; 7:2-53; 13:16-41). But for Gentiles this aspect of the kerygma was not understood, although it obviously was always a part of the Gospel message. Israel's religious history could not mean to a Greek slave in Rome what it meant to Saul of Tarsus. To preserve this feature of the apostolic preaching, therefore, while at the same time caring for the Gentiles who had

never heard of Moses and the Exodus, some way had to be found to keep the Old Testament but not the full rigor of the Law.

Various solutions were offered. The most radical was that of Marcion, a heretic of the early part of the second century, who interpreted the Old Testament literally and found it completely opposed to the Gospel. He accepted no allegorical or typological interpretation of the Old Testament.[14] As a result of his literal interpretation of the Old Testament he held that "there must be two Gods, a lower Demiurge who created the universe (i.e., the God of Judaism), and the supreme God made known for the first time by Christ."[15] This Demiurge was not, however, evil. Marcion held an extreme anti-Judaism which rejected the Old Testament and set up instead a truncated New Testament canon, including only Luke and ten Pauline epistles (omitting the Pastorals and Hebrews), from all of which, moreover, he excised, according to his light, the "Judaizing" passages. Marcion's extreme rejection of the Old Testament, in effect, denied the teaching that Jesus was the Jewish Messias and the culmination of Israel's religious history.

Whereas Marcion rejected the Old Testament as fruitless for Christians, the Gnostics accepted it, but wholeheartedly allegorized it.[16] There is no one Gnostic system and Gnostics disagreed among themselves.

---

[14]Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma, trans. Neil Buchanan from 3rd German ed. (London, 1894), I, 269.

[15]J.N.D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines (New York, 1958), p. 57.

[16]Harnack, I, 226-27; 231. Kelly, pp. 26, 67.

"To judge by what has come down to us it was incredibly tedious and repetitive and the modern reader can reconstruct their bizarre and complicated systems only by an expenditure of intellectual energy which they certainly do not merit."[17] Some Gnostics attributed the creation and the Old Testament to an evil Demiurge, others to a good Demiurge. The Gnostics generally claimed the existence of a secret tradition of teachings handed down to them from the Apostles, a tradition which, however, was at variance with and superior to the open tradition of the Church. No Gnostic sect ever accepted the Old Testament and the Mosaic Law as the work of the same good God who in the New Testament is the Father of Jesus. The Old Testament therefore was allegorized on the basis of an exceedingly intricate collection of ideas and fancies.

Opposed from its very beginnings to any wholesale rejection of the Old Testament, to any attempt at separating the God of Abraham from the God of Jesus, and to any secret tradition of teachings only for an elite, the Church followed the mind of Jesus, of Paul, and of Peter in its use of the Old Testament, whose importance as a doctrinal norm in the primitive Church cannot be exaggerated.[18] The Law of Moses and the grace of the New Testament were both given by the same God, though adapted to different conditions. The Old Law gives way to the New, not because it was evil or because it was delivered by a Demiurge, but be-

---

[17]F. L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers (London, 1960), pp. 30-31.

[18]Kelly, p. 23.

cause it is perfected by the New. The Law and the prophets, the men and events of the Old Testament, prepared the way for the New Testament and dimly foreshadowed it. Thus it follows that for the Church the Old Testament cannot be rejected, but must be treasured and explained in the light of Christ and the New Testament. One way to do this and not to interpret the Old Testament in either a slavishly literal or a wildly allegorical manner is to employ typology, for by treating the men and events of the Old Testament as types of Christ and his Church, the Church preserved both their historical reality and the greater perfection of the New Covenant. Typology is the Church's answer to both extremes, to Marcion and to the Gnostics. Typological exegesis is in full conformity with the mind of the Church and constitutes, as Daniélou says, the "essential, permanent element of patristic exegesis."[19]

The typological view of historical reality, especially of Old Testament history, was, as Erich Auerbach has demonstrated, the prevailing view from late antiquity through the Middle Ages and down to the sixteenth century.[20] And this view has its importance for literature. For centuries poets infused their works with typology. As examples of this, Auerbach details the typology—he calls it "figural interpretation"[21]—in the Chanson de Roland, the Mystere d'Adam, and the Divine

---

[19]Jean Daniélou, Historie des Doctrines Chrétiennes avant Nicée, Vol. II, "Message Évangélique et Culture Hellénistique aux II^e et III^e Siècles" (Tournai, 1958), p. 184.

[20]Mimesis, pp. 171, 279, 490.

[21]Ibid., pp. 13, 42-43, 64-66.

Comedy.[22] For many English poets of the seventeenth century, whose education, theology, or inclinations linked them, through the Christian Middle Ages, to the Patristic and Apostolic periods, Christ was still the dominant event in world history and in their poetry. Among these poets surely are John Donne, George Herbert, and John Milton. Milton caps the story of the Fall in Paradise Lost with a resume of Heilsgeschichte centering upon Christ, and builds Paradise Regained, his poem about salvation, on a typological foundation, in fact upon the typology of Adam that St. Paul explains in Romans 5.

---

[22] Ibid., pp. 83-101, 124-141, 151-177.

CHAPTER III

MILTON AMONG THE FATHERS

When John Milton returned from the Continent in the summer of 1639 and settled in London, he found a pamphlet war raging there over church organization, specifically over the question of bishops. In less than a year, Milton published four pamphlets on this topic: Of Reformation (May, 1641), Of Prelatical Episcopacy (July, 1641), Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence (July, 1641), and The Reason of Church Government (January or February, 1642). To engage in these disputes over church organization meant arguing from Scripture and from the Fathers of the Church. Arguing from the Fathers, especially Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Justin Martyr, and Irenaeus, was not entirely congenial to a man of Milton's theological temperament, for he preferred to base his religion and church organization solely on Scripture. Nevertheless, because supporters of episcopacy based parts of their arguments on the testimony of the early Fathers, he was forced both to employ the Fathers when they could be made to agree with him and to repudiate their writings when they could not. The rather extensive Patristic learning that Milton displays in his prose was not, however, the result only of his pamphleteering activities, for his Commonplace Book offers definite evidence that he commenced his reading of the Fathers while preparing his mind for writing epic poetry during the quiet of the Horton period. If, therefore, the ideas about typology and the typological exegesis of

Scripture set forth in the previous chapter are found also among the Church Fathers that Milton read, it will be both clear evidence that he was familiar with such ideas and further justification for offering an interpretation of Paradise Regained that is built upon typology.

In his four anti-episcopal tracts of 1641-42, Milton faced the task of refuting his opponents' arguments from the Fathers while at the same time denying that those arguments had any value at all. In Of Reformation, Milton sets out his position against Patristic testimony: "1. The best times were spreadingly infected. 2. The best men of those times fouly tainted. 3. The best writings of those men dangerously adulterated" (Works, III, 20). This argument has a theological as well as a philological cast. To question the orthodoxy of the Fathers, he asks, "who is ignorant of the foul errors, the ridiculous wresting of Scripture, the Heresies, the vanities thick sown through the volums of Justin Martyr, Clemens, Origen, Tertullian and others of eldest time?" (Works, III, 21). To cast doubt on the authenticity and integrity of the texts themselves and thus to stand in the line of Renaissance critical philology, he asks, "who knows not how many surreptitious works are ingraff'd into the legitimate writings of the Fathers, and of those Books that passe for authentick who knows what hath bin tamper'd with-all, what hath bin raz'd out, what hath bin inserted?" (Works, III, 22). His clinching argument against the Fathers indicates his distinct preference for Scripture: "the Fathers referre all decision of controversy to the Scriptures, as all-sufficient to direct, to resolve, and to

determine" (Works, III, 30).

It is not surprising, then, that in later works he ridicules the Fathers and their works. Thus he calls the Fathers an "indigested heap, and frie of authors . . . whatsoever time, or the heedlesse hand of blind chance, hath drawne down from of old to this present, in her huge dragnet, whether Fish, or Sea-Weed, Shells, or Shrubbs, unpickt, unchosen" (Works, III, 82). The Fathers are "more ancient than trusty" (Works, III, 139), and their works are "the obscure and intangled wood of antiquitie" (Works, VI, 95), "an intangl'd wood which the Papist loves to fight in" (Works, VI, 165). Although Milton's most pungent and quotable comments on the Fathers are all deprecatory, the many times that he cites the authority of Augustine, Cyprian, Eusebius, Jerome, Lactantius, or Tertullian to confirm a statement is ample proof that he could use the Fathers for his own benefit.

In Of Prelatical Episcopacy Milton explains how and why a good Protestant should undertake Patristic studies:

> He that thinks it the part of a well learned man, to have read diligently the ancient stories of the Church, and to be no stranger in the volumes of the Fathers shall have all judicious men consenting with him; not hereby to controule, and new fangle the Scriptures, God forbid, but to mark how corruptions, and Apostacy crept in by degrees, and to gather up, where ever wee find the remaining sparks of Originall truth, where with to stop the mouths of our adversaries, and to bridle them with their own curb, who willingly passe by that which is Orthodoxall in them, and studiously cull out that which is commentitious, and best for their turnes, not weighing the Fathers in the ballance of Scripture, but Scripture in the ballance of the Fathers, if wee therefore making first the Gospell our rule, and Oracle shall take the good which we light on in the Fathers,

> and set it to oppose the evill which other men seek from them, in this way of Skirmish wee shall easily master all superstition, and false doctrine; but if we turne this our discreet, and wary usage of them into a blind devotion towards them, and whatsoever we find written by them, we both forsake our owne grounds, and reasons which led us at first to part from Rome, that is to hold to the Scriptures against all antiquity; wee remove our cause into our adversaries owne court, and take up there those cast principles which will soone cause us to soder up with them again, in as much as beleeving antiquity for itself in any one point, we bring an ingagement upon our selves of assenting to all that it charges upon us.
>
> (Works, III, 101-102)

Although he might have read the Fathers so that he could "stop the mouths of our adversaries" in disputations and pamphlet wars, nevertheless it is "part of a well learned man . . . to be no stranger in the volumes of the Fathers." Surely this was as important a motivation to Milton's Patristic studies as the more pragmatic one. Milton was, after all, a cultured man of the seventeenth century, a time when some Patristic learning was part of a cultured man's accomplishments.

Patristic studies, however, apparently were not part of the formal curriculum at seventeenth-century Cambridge.[1] The needs of most divinity students were filled by a good glossed Bible, such as that issued by Erasmus in 1516 (with subsequent editions), or by a running commentary (catena) composed of quotations from various Fathers. Milton, however, was not content with the glosses and catenae that he mocks in Areopagitica.

---

[1]There is no mention of Patristic studies in the relevant parts of William T. Costello, S. J., The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), pp. 108-128 or of Harris Francis Fletcher, The Intellectual Development of John Milton, Vol. II, "The Cambridge University Period" (Urbana, 1961), pp. 195-200, 273-288.

He was a learned man who read the full texts. True, a few of his Patristic citations are derived from Erasmus (e.g., Works, IV, 195, 212; VI, 17), but by and large there is ample evidence that he read a goodly number of Patristic works, though his Patristic learning is neither prodigious nor systematic. It does not rank with that of, say, Joseph Scaliger or Isaac Casaubon, but Milton was not a professional scholar. Milton's Commonplace Book, which covers the period from 1635-38 to 1658-60,[2] contains his notes from twelve Fathers, and his prose works show that he read carefully Augustine's City of God, Cyprian's letters, Chrysostom on Romans, and Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, to mention only a few important authors. Before 1639 he had read the early Fathers, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Justin Martyr. His early Patristic studies were the outgrowth of his private religious concerns. He read here and there as interests or needs of scholarship or religion dictated. His first-hand knowledge of the Fathers was greater than that of most ordained ministers, although not so great or deep as to class him with the great seventeenth-century scholars.

In his prose works, Milton refers to or cites by name the following Fathers: Ambrose, Athanasius, Athenagoras, Augustine, Basil, Bede, Chrysostom, Clement of Alexandria, Clement of Rome, Cyprian of Carthage, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius, Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzenus, Gregory of Nyssa, Hermas, Hilary of Poitiers, Ignatius of Antioch, Irenaeus,

---

[2] James Holly Hanford, "The Chronology of Milton's Private Studies," PMLA XXXVI (1921), 260-285.

Isidore of Seville, Jerome, Justin Martyr, Lactantius, Origen, Polycarp, Prosper of Aquitaine, and Tertullian. Twelve of them are cited in the Commonplace Book: Augustine, Basil, Bede, Chrysostom, Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Ignatius, Justin, Lactantius, and Tertullian. The list of Fathers that Milton read and quoted extensively is somewhat shorter. To judge from the frequency of citation, the number of different works cited, and the apparent familiarity with the author, Milton knew best the Fathers quoted in the Commonplace Book plus Ambrose, Athanasius, Clement of Rome, Irenaeus, and Jerome. Milton used Bede and Eusebius as historians, not as theologians or exegetes. All the Fathers that Milton read are of the first rank; there is no question here of obscure learning. Of the seventeen Fathers that Milton knew best, Irenaeus, Chrysostom, and Augustine will be examined to illustrate Patristic typological exegesis.

In the works of St. Irenaeus (130?-203?), Bishop of Lyons, the Adamic typology of Christ was most fully developed. He was a disciple of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, who was traditionally a disciple of St. John the Apostle. His witness to the Apostolic traditions figured largely in the episcopal controversies that Milton entered. The great work of Irenaeus is a long, rambling treatise in five books called the Unmasking and Refutation of the False Gnosis, which tradition (and the Latin translation) has fortunately shortened to Adversus Haereses (Against Heresies). Another work, much shorter, called the Proof [or, Presentation; or, Demonstration] of the Apostolic Preaching was not

discovered until 1904. Its doctrine and typological exegesis are very similar to those of the Adversus Haereses. Irenaeus takes the Adamic typology of Christ as found in Romans 5 and in I Corinthians 15 and blends it with Paul's doctrine of recapitulation (Eph. 1:10). His doctrine may be summed up in this passage from the Proof of the Apostolic Preaching:

> And because, being all implicated in the first formation of Adam, we were bound to death through disobedience, the bonds of death had necessarily to be loosed through the obedience of Him who was made man for us; because death ruled in the body, it was necessarily through the body that it should be done away with and let man go free from its oppression. So the Word was made flesh, in order that sin, destroyed by means of that same flesh through which it had gained the mastery and taken hold and lorded it, should no longer be in us; and therefore our Lord took up the same first formation for an Incarnation, that so He might join battle on behalf of His forefathers and overcome through Adam what had stricken us through Adam.[3]

There are very few pages of the Adversus Haereses that do not contain references to or explanations of the doctrines of the second Adam or the recapitulation. Extensive quotation is out of order here. One passage, which links the Adamic typology with the temptations in the desert, will suffice:

> He has therefore, in His work of recapitulation, summed up all things, both waging war against our enemy, and crushing him who had at the beginning led us away captives in him . . . .For indeed the enemy would not have been fairly vanquished, unless it had been a man [born] of a woman who conquered him. For it was by means of a woman that he got the advantage over man at first, setting himself up as man's opponent . . . . Now the

---

[3] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, trans. Joseph P. Smith, S. J., Ancient Christian Writers, No. 16 (Westminster, Md., 1952), 31, p. 68.

> Lord would not have recapitulated in himself that ancient and primary enmity against the serpent, fulfilling the promise of the Creator, and performing His command, if He had come from another Father. But as He is one and the same, who formed us at the beginning, and sent His Son at the end, the Lord did perform His command, being made of a woman, by both destroying our adversary, and perfecting man after the image and likeness of God. And for this reason He did not draw the means of confounding him from any other source than from the words of the law . . . . Fasting forty days, like Moses and Elias, He afterwards hungered, first, in order that we may perceive that He was a real and substantial man--for it belongs to a man to suffer hunger when fasting; and secondly, that His opponent might have an opportunity of attacking Him. For as at the beginning it was by means of good that [the enemy] persuaded man, although not suffering hunger, to transgress God's commandment, so in the end he did not succeed in persuading Him that was an hungered to take that food . . . . And thus, vanquishing him for the third time, He spurned him from Him finally as being conquered out of the Law; and there was done away with that infringement of God's commandment which had occurred in Adam, by means of the precept of the law, which the Son of man observed, who did not transgress the commandment of God.[4]

This passage contains the germinal idea of Paradise Regained. St. Paul had already seen the typological relationship between Adam and Christ. St. Irenaeus perceives further that there must be a similar relationship between the temptations, for Adam's disobedience occurred in the course of Satan's tempting him to eat whereas in a similar situation Christ stands obedient. This is precisely the situation that Milton selects for Paradise Regained and precisely the virtue that he emphasizes. And this is possible only because Adam was a type of Christ.

---

[4] Against Heresies, trans. Alexander Roberts and W. H. Rambaut, The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1956), V, 21, pp. 548-549 (J.-P. Migne, Patrologia Graeca [Paris, 1857-1866], 7:1179-1181 [hereafter cited as MG]). Milton cites Adversus Haereses, V, 19, unfavorably in Of Prelatical Episcopacy (Works, III, 94).

St. John Chrysostom (354-407), a contemporary of Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome, has long been widely studied in the Western Church. Milton cites him by name fifteen times, chiefly in his political works, The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates, Of Civil Power, and Defensio Prima, drawing upon Chrysostom's homilies on Romans for his material. Chrysostom delivered a series of thirty-two homilies on Romans, in the tenth of which he explains why Adam is a type of Christ:

> Now this is why Adam is a type of Jesus Christ. How a type? it will be said. Why in that, as the former Adam became to those who were sprung from him, although they had not eaten of the tree, the cause of that death which by his eating was introduced; thus also did Christ become to those sprung from Him, even though they had not wrought righteousness, the Provider of that rightenousness which through His Cross He graciously bestowed on us all. For this reason, at every turn he [Paul] keeps to the "one," and is continually bringing it before use . . . . And Christ did not merely do the same amount of good that Adam did of harm, but far more and greater good.[5]

Chrysostom is actually content to do little more here than expand slightly on Paul's original text. Adam is a type of Christ because the effects of a certain deed carry over to others who have not themselves done the deed. Another way of stating the same idea is to say that Adam and Christ is each the head, or father, of the race, and upon their actions the subsequent history of the race depends. Now this idea is bound up with the concept of "one," which, as Chrysostom notes, Paul emphasizes. The oneness of Adam and Christ is stressed, and the effects

---

[5] Homilies on the Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Romans, trans. J. B. Morris, Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, Vol. VII (Oxford, 1841), pp. 150-152 (MG 60:465-467).

of the one's dead radiate out to the many dependent on him. And the deed flows from obedience or disobedience. From the scripturally established basis for comparison in terms of "one," it was natural to bring in, as Chrysostom does, a subtle allusion to the tree and the Cross. Chrysostom sticks closely to the Pauline text, as one would expect of the most notable of the Antiochene exegetes, and emphasizes what Paul emphasized: Adam and Christ, death and life, disobedience and obedience, sin and grace.

Even in his own lifetime, the influence and authority of St. Augustine was great, and it continued to increase throughout the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the Reformation. All parties of the Reformation that were seriously concerned with theology—Rome, Geneva, Wittenberg, Canterbury—sought his authority for their doctrines.[6] Milton, too, cites his authority in De Doctrina Christiana. Nearly thirty explicit references to St. Augustine—more than to any other Father—in Milton's works testify to his esteem for the Bishop of Hippo.

Typological exegesis assumes, as we have seen, that the events recorded in the Old Testament really happened. Augustine is quite emphatic in defending the reality and historicity of Old Testament persons and

---

[6] See, for example, Luchesius Smits, O.F.M. Cap., Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin, Dissertationes . . . in Facultate Theologica, Series III, Tomus 4, Partes 1 et 2 (Louvain, 1956, 1958). Peter Fraenkel, Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon, Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, XLVI (Geneva, 1961). S. L. Greenslade, The English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church (Oxford, 1960).

events. "The promises of the old covenant are earthly promises," Augustine notes, "earthly and temporal, good things of this corruptible flesh, even though they may be figures of the eternal and heavenly goods belonging to the new covenant."[7] The "good things of this corruptible flesh" surely are real. Indeed, the figure is not truly a figure unless it is real. More specifically, in a discussion of things said in the Old Testament about Jerusalem, Augustine defends the position that "there are some relating to the earthly Jerusalem, some to the heavenly, and some to both."[8] He anachronistically interprets the prophecy of Jeremias 31 about a New Covenant as referring to Solomon's temple, but notes that "these things both happened in the earthly Jerusalem, as history shows, and were types of the heavenly Jerusalem." Augustine thinks that those are "very daring who contend that the whole gist" of prophecies "lies in allegorical significations." On the other hand, he does not "blame those who may be able to draw out of everything there a spiritual meaning, only saving, first of all, the historical truth."[9] These passages show that he firmly held that the events of the Old Testament really

---

[7] The Spirit and the Letter [De Spiritu et Littera], trans. John Burnaby, in Augustine: Later Works, The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. VIII (London, 1955), 36 (xxi), pp. 221-222 (J.-P. Migne, Patrologia Latina [Paris, 1844-1855], 44:222 [hereafter cited as ML]).

[8] City of God, trans. Marcus Dods (New York, 1950), XVII, 3, p. 570 (ML 41:525).

[9] Ibid., XVII, 3, p. 571 (ML 41:526). Augustine is apparently thinking about the quotation of Jer. 31 in Heb. 8:8-10, where the prophecy is cited in the course of an explanation of the priestly and ceremonial types of the Old Law. Hence, perhaps, Augustine's incorrect application of Jer. 31 to Solomon's temple.

happened. He even goes so far, in fact, as to defend the historicity of the details of Noe's ark:

> Not even the most audacious will presume to assert that these things were written without a purpose, or that though the events really happened they mean nothing, or that they did not really happen, but are only allegory, or that at all events they are far from having any figurative reference to the church . . . we must rather believe that there was a wise purpose in their being committed to memory and to writing, and that they did happen, and have a significance, and that this significance has a prophetic reference to the church . . . .[10]

The position that Augustine holds so firmly is basic to typological exegesis. Events did happen, and they have a significance pointing toward the future.

Augustine, along with most Fathers, then goes on to state that all the Old Testament was written to prefigure and to prophesy Christ. What "lay hidden in the Old Testament . . . is revealed in the gospel of Christ, according to that perfectly ordered dispensation of history by which the wisdom of God disposes all things in their time."[11] Indeed, Augustine declares that "for no other reason were all the things that we read in the Holy Scriptures written before our Lord's coming than to announce His coming and to prefigure the Church to be."[12] This purposeful activity encompasses both the events themselves and the writings about them.

---

[10] Ibid., XV, 27, pp. 519-520 (ML 41:476). See also XVI, 2, p. 523 (ML 41:477-479) and Reply to Faustus the Manichaean [Contra Faustum Manichaeum], trans. Richard Stothert, Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. IV (Buffalo, 1887), XXXII, 14, p. 337 (ML 42:504-505).

[11] Spirit and Letter, 27 (xv), p. 216 (ML 44:217).

[12] The First Catechetical Instruction [De Catechizandis Rudibus], trans. Joseph P. Christopher, Ancient Christian Writers, No. 2 (Westminster, Md., 1947), 3(6), p. 23 (ML 40:313).

The well-known formula, "the New reveals what the Old conceals," is often attributed to Augustine. The idea is certainly Augustinian, but the precise formulation has not been found in his works.[13] One does find, however, such statements as these:

> Therefore, in the Old Testament the New is concealed, and in the New the Old is revealed.
>
> Not only was the Old Testament given to them [Israel], but also the New was prefigured in the Old.
>
> For what does the term Old Covenant imply but the concealing of the New? And what does the term New Covenant imply but the revealing of the Old?
>
> . . . whether for those things that lay hid in the Old Testament before the New was revealed, or for those that, now being revealed in the New Testament . . . belong to Christ.[14]

These statements, which sum up the typological approach to Scripture, span the middle years of Augustine's episcopate, from De Catechizandis Rudibus and Contra Faustum Manichaeum of 400 to De Civitate Dei, which was completed in 426.

Augustine's approach to the two Testaments, which had also been the teaching of the Church against both Marcion and the Gnostics, is fundamental to typology. "All or almost all of the deeds which are contained

---

[13] Hugh Pope, O.P., Saint Augustine of Hippo (Garden City, N.Y., 1961), p. 172.

[14] Catechetical Instruction, 4(8), p. 29 (ML 40:313). Reply to Faustus, XII, 3, p. 184 (ML 42:255). City of God, XVI, 26, p. 549 (ML 41:505). City of God, XVII, 12, p. 593 (ML 41:546).

in the Old Testament are to be taken figuratively as well as literally . . ."[15] for ". . . in all these things there are signified spiritual mysteries closely associated with Christ and the Church . . ."[16] ". . . but a veil is set over the reading of the Old Testament, until we pass over unto Christ and the veil is taken away"[17] and we see that "the whole contents of these Scriptures are either directly or indirectly about Christ."[18]

True to his principles, Augustine finds types of Christ and the Church all through the Old Testament. But even he realizes that he cannot "refer, however briefly, to all the figurative predictions of Christ which are to be found in the law and the prophets."[19] Even the details of Noe's ark are typologically explained, replete with the symbolism of numbers, as a splendid, defiant gesture of orthodoxy against the Manichees.[20] Admittedly, much of this exegesis would not be favorably received today. Augustine, however, is simply extending the original typological exegesis of St. Peter (I Pet. 3:20). It is Augustine's

---

[15]Christian Doctrine [De Doctrina Christiana], trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. (New York, 1958), III, xxii, 32, p. 98 (ML 34:78).

[16]Catechetical Instruction, 19(33), p. 85 (ML 40:335).

[17]Spirit and Letter, 30(xvii), p. 218 (ML 44:219).

[18]Reply to Faustus, XII, 7, p. 185 (ML 42:257).

[19]Ibid., XII, 37, p. 195 (ML 42:273-4).

[20]City of God, XV, 26-27, pp. 516-520 (ML 41:472-476), and Reply to Faustus, XII, 14-23, pp. 188-190 (ML 42:262-66).

understanding of the typology of Adam, Moses and the Exodus, David, and the ceremonial law of the Old Covenant that is important for the intellectual and scriptural framework of Paradise Regained.

Paul's comparison and contrast of Adam and Christ in Romans 5 became a classic text for the doctrine of original sin, and it is in this context that Augustine generally comments on it. Augustine knows, of course, that Adam is a type of Christ; in fact, "the whole narrative of Genesis, in the most minute details, is a prophecy of Christ and of the Church."[21] He discourses of the earthly and the heavenly man (I Cor. 15:45-49) in the City of God, XIII, 23. Since St. Paul had almost preempted the typological exegesis of Adam by explaining it fully himself, Augustine can do little more than offer animadversions on Paul. He does this, for instance, in the City of God:

> For as Abraham's obedience is with justice pronounced to be great, because the thing commanded, to kill his son, was difficult, so in Paradise the disobedience was the greater, because the difficulty of that which was commanded was imperceptible. And as the obedience of the second Man was the more laudable because He became obedient even "unto death," so the disobedience of the first man was the more detestable because he became disobedient even unto death.[22]

In Romans, Paul writes about Abraham's faith, Adam's disobedience, and Christ's obedience. Augustine simply follows the classic rule of interpreting Scripture by Scripture and discusses the reactions of Adam, Abraham, and Christ to the will of God. It is certainly important for

---

[21] Reply to Faustus, XII, 8, p. 186 (ML 42:257-8).

[22] City of God, XIV, 15, p. 463 (ML 41:423).

understanding the linkage between Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained to realize the theological importance of obedience in Adam and in Christ.

The whole history of Israel furnishes many types of Christ and the Church for Augustine. As befits a man trained in the classical and pagan culture, Augustine does not fail to adduce the "spoils of the Egyptians" (Exod. 3:22; 11:2; 12:35-36) as a type of the Christian assimilation of classical culture. He realizes, however, that there are other lessons to be drawn from the Exodus, for he offers this explanation "without prejudice to any other equal or better understanding."[23] Augustine sees in Esau and Jacob types of the Jews and the Christians;[24] the same, too, in the sons of Joseph, who is himself a type of Christ.[25] Moses, of course, is pre-eminently the type of Christ.[26] Symbolically the richest type of Christ that comes from the Exodus is the Paschal Lamb, "which is so completely a type of Christ" because it is a type of Christ in his Passion.[27] Crossing the Red Sea is a type of baptism.[28] The ceremonial laws of the Old Covenant are "tokens of spiritual things

---

[23]Christian Doctrine, II, xl, 61, p. 76 (ML 34:63).

[24]City of God, XVI, 42, p. 565 (ML 41:520).

[25]Reply to Faustus, XII, 28, p. 192 (ML 42:269).

[26]Ibid., XVI, 15, pp. 224-225 (ML 42:324-25).

[27]City of God, XVI, 43, p. 566 (ML 41:522), and Catechetical Instruction, 20(34), p. 87 (ML 40:335).

[28]Catechetical Instruction, loc. cit.

relating to the Lord Jesus Christ and to the Church."[29] "And so through many and diverse tokens of things to come, which it would be a long task to enumerate in full, and which we now see fulfilled in the Church, that people was brought all the way to the land of promise, there to reign in a temporal and carnal manner according to the measure of its longing; which earthly kingdom was, nevertheless, a figure of the spiritual kingdom."[30] Once Israel was settled in the promised land, "many things were done for a type of the Christ to come and of the Church."[31] Of all the events of the earthly kingdom of Jerusalem which prefigured the royal Messias, "King David stood out most prominently,"[32] for he was a "shadow of that which was to come [umbra futuri]."[33]

By touching on a few of Augustine's remarks about history and the relation between the two Testaments, we see that he is in accord with both modern and older theorists of typology. Typology plays a large part in his exegesis of Scripture, especially with regard to Adam and to the Exodus, for there St. Paul had already indicated the direction that traditional Christian exegesis was to take.

Irenaeus and John Chrysostom, two Fathers that Milton read, can

---

[29] Ibid., 20(35), p. 89 (ML 40:336).

[30] Ibid., 20(36), p. 89 (ML 40:336).

[31] Ibid., 20(36), p. 91 (ML 40:336).

[32] Ibid.

[33] City of God, XVII, 14, p. 595 (ML 41:547).

serve as examples of typological exegesis by the Fathers, but Augustine stands out as Milton's favorite among the Fathers. In various works of Augustine can be found the principles and applications of typology previously detailed in Chapter II. So much, then, for the intellectual background of typology that lay wholly in past history to Milton. What now of men of his own day, whose sermons he perhaps heard or whose books he read as "modern" writing—men such as Richard Hooker, John Donne, Lancelot Andrewes, and Jeremy Taylor?

CHAPTER IV

BIBLICAL TYPOLOGY IN MILTON'S TIME

The typological exegesis of Scripture was as widely known and practiced in Milton's time as it was in the Patristic period. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century preachers, exegetes, and theologians employed it as a means of understanding the Old Testament, just as their predecessors had done from the time of St. Paul. Moreover, one finds the typological approach to the Old Testament not only in seventeenth-century sermons and religious treaties, but also in the poetry of the period as well. Some examples of the widespread use of typology follow to show that the concepts explained in Chapter II were widely known in Milton's time, that other poets employed typology, and, finally, that Milton used typology in works other than Paradise Regained.

John Calvin, whose importance in Milton's intellectual development is undoubted, expresses the classic typological view of the Old Testament in his statement that "the gospel points out with the finger what the law foreshadowed under types."[1] That is, the gospel "confirmed and satisfied whatever the law had promised, and gave substance to the shadows."[2] Calvin assumes, of course, that God purposely caused cer-

---

[1] Institutes of the Christian Religion, ed. John T. McNeill and trans. Ford Lewis Battles, Library of Christian Classics, Vols. XX and XXI (Philadelphia, 1960), II, ix, 3.

[2] Ibid., II, ix, 4.

tain Old Testament persons, events, and things to have a Christic significance which, though it was perhaps unknown in Old Testament times, became obvious after the coming of Christ. For Calvin an important difference between the two Testaments consisted precisely in figures, for "in the absence of reality," the Old Testament "showed but an image and shadow in place of the substance; the New Testament reveals the very substance of truth as present."[3] This difference, which is fully discussed in Hebrews, can be understood, says Calvin, in this way:

> . . . the Old Testament of the Lord was that covenant wrapped up in the shadowy and ineffectual observance of ceremonies and delivered to the Jews; it was temporary because it remained, as it were, in suspense until it might rest upon a firm and substantial confirmation. It became new and eternal only after it was consecrated and established by the blood of Christ.[4]

To read and to understand the Old Testament thus is not to indulge in ingenious mental exercises, such as the finding of allegories came to be, but rather to read the Old Testament as a man of faith, a New Testament faith to be sure, a faith common to Christendom which Milton shared.

Among the English divines of Milton's time the same attitude toward the Old Testament prevailed. Richard Hooker in Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity gives little attention to typology as such, but he does hold to the standard view of the Old Testament. He says, for instance, that the differences between the Testaments consist "in this, that the Old did make wise by teaching salvation through Christ that

---

[3] Ibid., II, xi, 4.

[4] Ibid.

should come, the New by teaching that Christ the Saviour is come, and the Jesus whom the Jews did crucify, and whom God did raise again from the dead, is he."[5] Later, in the fifth book, Hooker states plainly the traditional view, fortified with quotations from Justin Martyr and Augustine.[6] A treatise by Bishop Lancelot Andrewes called A Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine, which perhaps represents his own method of catechizing students at Pembroke Hall, explains that "as the Law is nothing else but the old gospel, so the gospel nothing but the new law; the Law evangelium reconditum, 'the gospel under veil,' the gospel lex revelata, 'the law unveiled'."[7] In the works of Hooker and Andrewes just quoted, these statements about the two Testaments, or the Law and the Gospel, occur as passing remarks rather than as propositions laboriously to be demonstrated. Such treatment in theological treatises emphasizes the unexceptional quality of the statements. They are part of the common Christian hermeneutic.

The sermons of John Donne, as religious literature, are very different from Hooker's treatise or Andrewes' catechizing. Whether Donne preached to the benchers of Lincoln's Inn, to the court at Whitehall (headed by a theologian-king), to the fashionable congregation at St. Paul's, or to the parishioners at St. Dunstan's, he addressed himself

---

[5] Works, ed. John Keble, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1845), I, 270 (I, xiv, 4).

[6] Ibid., II, 74-76 (V, xx, 6).

[7] Works, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (Oxford, 1854), VI, 47.

to a wider, more varied audience than that of Hooker or Andrewes. Yet here, too, we find the generally accepted view of the relationships of the two Testaments, stated simply sometimes, sometimes elaborated. In a sermon preached at Whitehall in 1618, Donne says that "all the word of God then conduces to the Gospel; the Old Testament is a preparation and a paedagogie to the New," for we find God's "promises in the Old Testament, his performance in the New Testament."[8] When Donne reads the Bible, he knows that "the subject of the Word of God, of all the Scriptures, of all that was shadowed in the Types, and figur'd in the ceremonies, and prepared in the preventions of the Law, of all that was foretold by the prophets" is Christ, who is "the foundation of all those Scriptures . . . the burden of all those Songs."[9] To the parishioners of St. Dunstan's Donne explained in 1624 that "we determine the Old Testament, in the New, and that we prove the New Testament by the Old; for, but by the Old, we should not know, that there was to bee a New, nor, but for the New, that there was an Old; so the two Testaments grow one Bible."[10] The classic Christian concept, forged in the battles with the Gnostics and Marcionites, that the subject (and object) of both Testaments is Christ and that the Old prepares for and prefigures the New is derived, of course, from the Evangelists and St. Paul. Upon

---

[8] Sermons, ed. Evelyn M. Simpson and George R. Potter (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1953-1962), I, 291-292.

[9] Sermons, I, 287-288.

[10] Sermons, VI, 112.

one of these classic texts from St. Paul, "the Law was a schoolmaster unto Christ" (Gal. 3:23), Donne descants in a Lenten sermon preached at Whitehall in 1628/29:

> The Jews were as School-boys, always spelling, and putting together Types and Figures; which things typified and figured, how this Lamb should signifie Christ, how this fire should signifie a holy Ghost. The Christian is come from school to the University, from Grammar to Logick, to him that is Logos it self, the Word; to apprehend and apply Christ himself.[11]

There is no claim made here that Milton heard or even read Donne's sermons. The point is simply that a popular preacher interpreted the relationship between the two Testaments in the traditional manner of typology and that therefore the typological exegesis of the Old Testament was a commonly accepted method.

Naturally this way of reading the Old Testament is tied up with the question of the different senses of Scripture. The Western Church has always been firmly committed to the primacy of the literal sense.[12] In the face of typological and even allegorical interpretations, this commitment is likely to be misunderstood. Jeremy Taylor explains "that not only the grammatical or prime signification of the word is the literal sense; but whatsoever is the prime intention of the speaker,

---

[11] Sermons, VIII, 351.

[12] See the convenient collection of texts prepared by John P. McCall in William F. Lynch, Christ and Apollo (New York: Mentor-Omega Books, 1963), pp. 217-254.

that is the literal sense."[13] This literal sense can be "either natural or figurative."[14] The latter is the same as the typological sense. "And the nature of types is, in shadow to describe by dark lines a future substance."[15] In The Worthy Communicant, Taylor offers thirteen "types and umbrages of this holy sacrament."[16] The whole tenor of Taylor's random comments on exegesis tends toward a very sober and traditional view. Especially in his sermon on "The Minister's Duty in Life and Doctrine" he was obviously trying to guard the literal and figurative senses from flights of sheer hermeneutic fancy from the pulpit, and to do so he preached to his clergy the traditional doctrines.

To illustrate a flight of homiletic fancy, even on so sober a theme as the relationship of the Covenants, we can turn to a passage from a sermon of Henry Hammond, published in 1664. Dr. Hammond, a royalist and cavalier divine, explains

> . . . that the whole Old Testament is a Mystical Virgin Mary, a kinde of Mother of Christ; which by the Holy Ghost, conceived him in Genesis, chap. iii. 15. and throughout Moses and the Prophets carried him in the Womb, and was very big of him: And at last in Malachi, chap. iii. 4. was in a manner delivered of him. For there you shall finde mention of John Baptist, who was, as it were, the Midwife of the Old Testament, to open its Womb, and bring the Messias into the world. Howsoever, at the least it is plain, that the Old Testament

---

[13] Works, ed. Reginald Heber, rev. and corr. Charles Page Eden (London, 1859), VIII, 521.

[14] Works, V, 414.

[15] Works, II, 230.

[16] Works, VIII, 62.

> brought him to his birth, though it had not strength to bring forth; and the Prophets as Moses from Mount Nebo, came to a view of this Land of Canaan.
>
> For the very first words of the New Testament, being, as it were, to fill up what only was wanting in the Old, are the Book and History of his generations and birth, Matth. i.[17]

Hammond's basic principle in this passage, that the Old Testament was designed to bring forth Christ, is traditional enough. His expression is somewhat strained: Taylor would not have approved; Donne would have done it better. It is the expression and not the underlying doctrine that strikes a false note. That this is so illustrates again that the view of the Old Testament upon which typology rests is part of the common tradition of Christendom and therefore available to Milton not only from learned readings in the Church Fathers but also from the writing and preaching of his contemporaries.

The great English divines did not, of course, confine their typological exegesis only to general, almost theoretical, statements about the two Testaments. They followed tradition in interpreting many Old Testament persons and events as types of New Testament persons or events. The Passion narratives in the four Gospels, for instance, show that the Evangelists, particularly John, understood and interpreted that event as fulfilling the prophecies of the Suffering Servant and

---

[17] Sermons (London, 1664), p. 55. Henry Hammond (1605-1660) was a chaplain to Charles I and uncle to Sir William Temple, whose early education he supervised. He was educated at Magdalen College and was a Fellow there from 1625 to 1633. He was a prolific author, and carried out his ministry both in parish work and among the royalist forces.

as fulfilling the type of the Paschal Lamb. Henry Hammond, for example, in a less flamboyant passage from the sermon quoted earlier, says that the Passover was "a most significant representation of the incarnate and crucified Christ." In the Paschal Lamb Christ "was more than promised, [he was] almost exhibited."[18] And John Donne in his last sermon says that Moses "in passing Israel out of Egypt through the red Sea, had foretold in that actual prophesie Christs passing of mankind through the sea of his blood . . . ."[19]

Donne's prose is full of typology. The nineteenth of his Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions contains many passages about the two Testaments, the senses of Scripture, and individual types. Circumcision, he says there, is a type of baptism, and the ship from which Christ preached is a type of the Church.[20] In his Essays in Divinity there is the germ of a profound meditation on the Exodus at more than one level of meaning.[21] Donne's sermon on Psalm 38:4, preached at Lincoln's Inn, shows how he interpreted a text: "First then, all these things are literally spoken of David; By application, of us; and by figure, of Christ. Historically, David; morally, we; Typically, Christ is the

---

[18]Sermons, p. 51.

[19]Sermons, X, 244.

[20]ed. John Sparrow (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 114 and 116; see also pp. 113 and 119.

[21]ed. Evelyn M. Simpson (Oxford, 1952), pp. 74-75.

subject of this text."[22] In his previous sermon, on Psalm 38:3, Donne had explained that he would first consider the words of the text

> . . . as they are historically, and literally to be understood of David; And secondly, in their retrospect, as they look back upon the first Adam, and so concern Mankind collectively, and so you and I, and all have our portion in these calamities; And thirdly, we shall consider them in their prospect, in their future relation to the second Adam, in Christ Jesus, in whom also all mankinde was collected, and the calamities of all men had their Ocean and their confluence, and the cause of them, the anger of God was more declared, and the cause of that anger, that is sin, did more abound, for the sins of all the world were his, by imputation; for this Psalm, some of our Expositors take to be historicall, and personall Psalm, determin'd in David; some a Catholique, and universall Psalm, extended to the whole condition of man; and some a Propheticall, and Evangelicall Psalm, directed upon Christ. None of them inconveniently; for we receive help and health, from every one of these acceptations; first, Adam was the Patient, and so, his promise, the promise that he received of a Messiah, is our physick; And then David was the Patient, and there, his Example is our physick; And lastly, Christ Jesus was the Patient, and so, his blood is our physick. In Adam we shall finde the Scriptum est, the medicine is in our books, an assurance of a Messiah there is; In David we shall find the Probatum est, that this medicine wrought upon David; and in Christ we finde the receit it self; Thus you may take this physick, thus you may apply it to your selves. In every acceptation, as we consider it in David, in our selves, in Christ . . . .[23]

These passages from the openings of two of Donne's Lincoln's Inn sermons, which were preached to an educated congregation, are fine examples of the traditional method of dividing the text. They show an acute awareness of the importance of the literal sense, and an awareness like-

---

[22] Sermons, II, 97.

[23] Sermons, II, 75.

wise that there is more to the text than the literal meaning. This additional meaning may be one drawn out of the text and applied to us, the moral meaning; or it may be one built into the text or its subject, the typological meaning. To treat an Old Testament text in this way is not to display recondite learning or esoteric erudition. It is part and parcel of that same Christian tradition to which Milton was heir.

Most typological exegesis is concerned with finding types of Christ in the Old Testament, but occasionally a theologian seeks also types of New Testament events or things. In his treatise on The Worthy Communicant (1660) Jeremy Taylor has a remarkable passage listing many Old Testament types of the Eucharist. He observes that there are

> . . . in the Old testament thirteen types and umbrages of this holy sacrament; eleven of them are of meat and drink: such are,--the tree of life in the midst of paradise,--the bread and wine of Melchisedec,--the fine meal that Sarah kneaded for the angels' entertainment,--the Manna,--and the roasted paschal lamb,--the springing rock,--and the bread of proposition to be eaten by the priests,--the barley cake in the host of Midian,--Samson's father's oblation upon the rock,--the honeycomb that opened the eyes of Jonathan,--and the bread which the angel brought to Elijah, in the strength of which he was to live forty days; all this to shew that the sacrament is the life of the spiritual man and the food of his soul, the light of his eyes and the strength of his heart. . . .[24]

Some of these types might seem to us a little far-fetched, but if pressed Taylor could undoubtedly show how each is a type, "whose nature is, by a likeness of matter or ceremony to represent the same mystery," for the "nature of a type is, in shadow to describe by dark lines a future

---

[24] Works, VIII, 62-63.

substance."[25] Milton, who was not sacramentally or liturgically minded, would probably have paid little heed to Taylor's catalogue of Eucharistic types, but Taylor found them worth stating in this modest devotional work.

To the reader of Paradise Regained the most important type of Christ is Adam. Since the typological relationship of Adam and Christ is explicitly stated in the New Testament (Rom. 5:14; I Cor. 15:22, 45-49), it became part of traditional Christian typology and as such was well known and widely applied in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

We find, for example, that Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, who preached seven sermons on the temptation in the desert (first printed in 1592 under the title The Wonderfull Combate), says that all Christ's work "was to this end, that He might restore the work of God to his original perfection." Thus it was necessary "that the head of the serpent, by whose means it was violated and defaced, should be bruised." Since Satan's first action after his fall was to tempt Adam and Eve, "Christ therefore beginneth with the overcoming of that; and for that purpose He is here led forth to be tempted, that so being tempted He might overcome."[26] The purpose of Christ's temptations, then, is to clear away the residue of Adam's fall, to restore man to a more perfect re-

---

[25]"The Great Exemplar," Works, II, 229. The second of these quotations is translated from St. Ambrose by Taylor.

[26]Works, V, 479.

lationship with God, for then it will be possible to work the redemption. All this Andrewes explains in the first sermon. In the second, he parallels the temptations of Adam and Christ more closely:

> These three are a brief abridgement of all His temptations. As it is true that Paul saith, that Christ resembled Adam, and was made a "quickening Spirit," as Adam was "a living soul" . . . so may Christ and Adam be compared in these three temptations. For they both were tempted with "concupiscence of the flesh, concupiscence of the eye, and pride of life" I Joh, 2:16. In Adam the devil first brought him into a conceit that God envied his good, and of purpose kept him hood winked lest he should see his goods, as we see falconers put hoods over hawks' eyes, to make them more quiet and ruly. Secondly, he lulls him on to a proud conceit of himself, by persuading him that by eating he should be like God. Thirdly, he sheweth the fruit, which was pleasant. So in Christ's temptation: first, he would have brought Him to murmur against God; secondly, to presume; and thirdly, to commit idolatry. . . .[27]

This kind of parallelism rests upon typology and it is clear that the parallel between Adam and Christ in their temptations is not presented as an unusual piece of exegesis. The audience heard this as a part of common Christian teaching.

The urge to improve on St. Paul and to make detailed parallels between Adam's temptations and Christ's was strong. Donne and Taylor did not succumb to it, nor did Milton. To see how the initially sound typological interpretation can be distorted, the works of minor authors are useful. In "Michael and the Dragon, or, Christ tempted, and Satan foyled," one of Daniel Dyke's Two Treatises published in 1631, the plain Pauline typology is very simply stated, but then we find

---

[27] Works, V, 496-497.

that Christ fasted "to show, that as Adam begun our wo with eating, so he contrarily our weale and salvation, with abstinence."[28] Furthermore, Christ was hungry "to show his strength above the first Adam, who in Paradise a place of all abundance, without the necessity of hunger, was provoked to eat by Satan unlawfully, whereas this second Adam in the desart, and hungry too, would not so be overcome by him."[29] This kind of exegesis is not satisfied with typology as part of salvation history, as illustrating the Lord of history; it always tends toward a moral meaning, and the typology itself (not just the type) becomes a starting point for moral and practical applications. Richard Ward's comments on Matthew 4:3 are similarly inclined to use typology for moral applications:

> Sathans first temptation is the desires of the belly, which is both most present (because meat must be had) and most powerful and strong, because venter non habet aures, the belly will take no denyall, but like the horsleeches daughter cryes, give, give where wee may observe how he begins with the second Adam, as he did with the first, at the Belly.[30]

Dyke and Ward are not quoted here to argue that they were wrong about

---

[28]"The fift impression" (London, 1631), p. 228. Danniel Dyke, according to DNB, was an un-ordained puritan divine who preached in and around London at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and became a Fellow of Sidney Sussex College in 1606. He died in 1614.

[29]Ibid., p. 234.

[30]Theologicall Questions, Dogmaticall Observations, and Evangelicall Essays, upon the Gospel of Jesus Christ according to St. Matthew (London, 1640), part I, p. 96.

typology or that typology must not be so used. They represent, rather, merely a development of typology which the historian observes. It shows again that the typological interpretation of the Old Testament was widespread and, in a practical way, useful to moralists. There is a certain austerity and simplicity about the typological exegesis of Paul or Augustine or Calvin that is missing in lesser men, who fritter away their words on minor parallels while ignoring the deeper implications of the great parallel.

If, then, the typological exegesis of the Old Testament was part of traditional Christian practice and common to both the Roman and the Reformed Churches, and if this kind of exegesis was commonly employed by English divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it is reasonable to expect that the religious poetry of that time (some of it written by those very divines) will also display elements of typology. It would require a separate study to detail all the types and typological passages in the poems of Southwell, Donne, Herbert, Herrick, Quarles, Marvell, Vaughan, Traherne, and Taylor. As part of an attempt to show the availability to Milton of a living tradition in poetry of typological exegesis and writing, a few selected examples of the ways that Southwell, Donne, and Herbert use typology will serve as illustrations.

The concept of Mary as the second Eve is a typological commonplace. Although not specifically elucidated in the New Testament, it is the natural complement to the Adamic typology of Christ and it was

widely employed. Even Milton uses it in Paradise Lost.[31] Robert Southwell, a Jesuit martyred in 1595, wrote a series of poems on the life of the Blessed Virgin Mary, two of which use the Eve-Mary relationship. "The Virgin Maries conception," a poem about Mary's sinlessness, opens by calling her "Our second Eve." Another poem, "The Virgins salutation," plays on the anagram of Eva, which is Ave:

> Spell Eva backe and Ave shall you finde,
> The first began, the last reverst our harmes,
> An Angels witching wordes did Eva blinde,
> An Angels Ave disinchants the charmes,
> Death first by womans weakenes entred in,
> In womans vertue life doth now begin.[32]

This, the first third of the poem, sets the scene for Southwell's Christocentric meditation on the Annunciation. In neither example quoted is the typology the structural determinant of the poem; it is rather a graceful, literate, and traditional way of introducing the importance of Mary in the economy of salvation.[33]

John Donne, who has many spiritual affinities with Southwell and

---

[31] PL V, 385-387; X, 183. See Mother Mary Christopher Pecheux, O.S.U., "The Concept of the Second Eve in Paradise Lost," PMLA LXXV (1960), 359-366.

[32] The texts of Southwell's poems are those printed in Louis L. Martz, ed., The Meditative Poem (Garden City, N.Y., 1963), pp. 38 and 40.

[33] It should be noted that the passage from Irenaeus (Contra Haereses, V, 19 [MG 7:1175-1176]) that Milton attacks in Of Prelatical Episcopacy (Works, III, 94) is one of the earliest expositions of the Eve-Mary parallel. Ideas that Milton denigrates in his prose could still be put to good use later in his poetry.

few with Milton, employs in his "Hymne to God my God, in my sicknesse" a decorative (and exegetically extravagant) use of the same Adamic typology that Milton was to use so soberly in Paradise Regained. The stanza of Donne's "Hymne" is derived, ultimately, from St. Paul (Rom. 5 and I Cor. 15), but the intervening centuries expanded Paul's simpler notions:

> We thinke that Paradise and Calvarie,
> Christs Crosse, and Adams tree, stood in one place;
> Looke Lorde, and finde both Adams met in me;
> As the first Adams sweat surrounds my face,
> May the last Adams blood my soule embrace.[34]

Imagination impelled by a desire for symmetry supplies the connection between the Cross and the tree. By Donne's time, of course, it had become a commonplace.

George Herbert's extensive use of typology is the subject of Professor Rosemond Tuve's A Reading of George Herbert (Chicago, 1952). Although her use of the term "typology" is not as rigorous as one might wish, she has amassed considerable evidence to demonstrate that many of the Old Testament references in Herbert's poems are to be understood typologically. Miss Tuve relies very heavily on the typology in the

---

[34] The Divine Poems, ed. Helen Gardner (Oxford, 1952), p. 50. See also Miss Gardner's Appendix F, "Paradise and Calvarie," pp. 135-137. Medieval artistic representations of this idea are treated by Emile Mâle, The Gothic Image, trans. Dora Nursey (New York, 1958), pp. 186-188. Probably the commonest expression of the basic idea is found in the Roman Missal's Preface of the Holy Cross: ". . . tibi semper et ubique gratias agere . . . Deus: qui salutem humani generis in ligno Crucis constituisti: ut, unde mors oriebatur, inde vita resurgeret: et, qui in ligno vincebat, in ligno quoque vinceretur . . . ."

liturgies of the Western Church, particularly the Sarum Use. Her point is undoubtedly proved, for there is ample evidence that Herbert read the liturgical and devotional works and saw the windows and wood cuts which she uses to support her thesis. The many poems of Herbert's in which Miss Tuve rightly sees typology at work—particularly in the long poem called "The Sacrifice"—are further evidence that the poets of Milton's time freely employed the traditional Old Testament types in their poems.

We can assume that because types are definitely and explicitly found in the New Testament (Rom. 5:14, I Pet. 2:4; 3:20-21) Milton knew what typology is. We cannot assume that Milton knew the passages from the Fathers and the English divines that I have quoted, unless he specifically says so. The last link in the chain of argument leading up to Paradise Regained, therefore, is to demonstrate conclusively that Milton knew and used typology in writings other than Paradise Regained. This is easily done.

Milton mentions types, in the way that we have been using the word, in Animadversions Upon the Remonstrants Defence (Works, III, 154), The Reason of Church Government (Works, III, 197, 201-202), Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce (Works, III, 435), and Readiest Means to Remove Hirelings (Works, VI, 55, 61). These are, in general, passing references to types in argumentative writings. Melchisedec is the only personal type of Christ mentioned, and this parallel is firmly grounded in Scripture (Works, VI, 55; Heb. 7:1-3). The prose work that

makes the fullest use of typology is, as one would expect, De Doctrina Christiana.

There are twelve explicit references to types in De Doctrina Christiana. Typology, as we have seen, is closely bound up with a view of the Old Testament and thus with the question of the senses of Scripture. Milton treated this latter question in a partly traditional way:

> No passage of Scripture is to be interpreted in more than one sense; in the Old Testament, however, this sense is sometimes a compound of the historical and typical, as in Hosea xi. 1. compared with Matt. ii. 15. "out of Egypt have I called my son," which may be explained in a double sense, as referring partly to the people of Israel, and partly to Christ in his infancy. I, 30 (Works, XVI, 263)

Matthew had assimilated the life of Christ to the life of the people of Israel. Both were called from Egypt, passed through water, and spent a period of forty (days, years) in the wilderness. Thus Israel is a type of Christ, and Christ is the New Israel. Milton emphasizes that the historical and typical senses go together, just as Matthew and Paul had done implicitly and Augustine explicitly. Milton's understanding of the historical and typical senses is very similar to Donne's: ". . . the literall sense of every place, is the principall intention of the Holy Ghost . . . And his principall intention in many places, is to expresse things by allegories, by figures; so that in many places of Scripture, a figurative sense is the literall sense. . . ."[35] Unless the passage of Scripture bears both a literal and a figurative

---

[35]Donne, Sermons, VI, 62. See further, H. R. MacCallum, "Milton and Figurative Interpretation of the Bible," UTQ, XXXI (1962), 404-406.

sense there can be no typology properly speaking, for when the literal (historical) sense is ignored we get allegory. Milton, along with Donne and Taylor, stands solidly with the traditional Christian method of discerning the Old Testament types.

Although the distinction is not expressly drawn in De Doctrina Christiana, it may be inferred that Milton distinguishes three kinds of types in the Old Testament. First, there are the large, general types of Christ in the Old Testament: Melchisedec (I, 5; Works, XIV, 5), Moses (I, 15; Works, XV, 287), and the Passover (I, 28; Works, XVI, 169). Second, there are the types of New Testament sacraments (baptism and the Eucharist) before the Law. Before the Law baptism was typified by Noah's ark (I, 28; Works, XVI, 197). Third are the types of the sacraments under the Law. Then baptism "was typified by the cloud. I Cor. x. 2." and "the Lord's Supper was typified by the manna, and the water flowing from the rock. I Cor. x. 3, 4" (I, 29; Works, XVI, 191, 197).

In his doctrinal work, then, Milton displays the traditional Christian principles of typological exegesis. His care in distinguishing between types before and those under the Law shows the critical intelligence he brought to bear on his Bible reading.

The ceremonial laws of the Old Testament were commonly interpreted as types of the New Covenant. This aspect of typology finds its fullest New Testament expression, as Calvin notes,[36] in the Epistle to the

---

[36] Institutes, II, xi, 4.

Hebrews. In the last book of Paradise Lost Milton thrice enunciates the doctrine that the Old Covenant was "wrapped up in the shadowy and ineffectual observance of ceremonies" whose "fulfillment had been, so to speak, held in suspense until the appearance of Christ."[37] Thus we can use Calvin to explain Michael's words to Adam in Paradise Lost:

> God from the Mount of Sinai, whose gray top
> Shall tremble, he descending, will himself
> In Thunder Lightning and loud Trumpets sound
> Ordaine them Lawes; part such as appertaine
> To civil Justice, part religious Rites
> Of sacrifice, informing them, by types
> And shadowes, of that destind Seed to bruise
> The Serpent, by what meanes he shall achieve
> Mankinds deliverance. But the voice of God
> To mortal eare is dreadful; they beseech
> That Moses might report to them his will,
> And terror cease; he grants what they besaught,
> Instructed that to God is no access
> Without Mediator, whose high Office now
> Moses in figure beares, to introduce
> One greater, of whose day he shall foretell,
> And all the Prophets in thir Age the times
> Of great Messiah shall sing.
> . . . . . .
> And therefore was Law given them to evince
> Thir natural pravities, by stirring up
> Sin against Law to fight; that when they see
> Law can discover sin, but not remove,
> Save by those shadowie expiations weak,
> The bloud of Bulls and Goats, they may conclude
> Some bloud more precious must be paid for Man.
> . . . . . .
> So Law appears imperfet, and but giv'n
> With purpose to resign them in full time
> Up to a better Cov'nant, disciplin'd
> From shadowie Types to Truth, from Flesh to Spirit,
> From imposition of strict Laws, to free
> Acceptance of large Grace, from servil fear

---

[37] Ibid., II, xi, 4 and IV, xiv, 24.

To filial, works of Law to works of Faith.
And therefore shall not Moses, though of God
Highly belov'd, being but the Minister
Of Law, his people into Canaan lead;
But Joshua whom the Gentiles Jesus call,
His Name and Office bearing, who shall quell
The adversarie Serpent, and bring back
Through the worlds wilderness long wanderd man
Safe to eternal Paradise of rest.
(PL XII, 227-244; 287-293; 300-314)

To interpret the Old Law, and in particular its ceremonies, as types which were fulfilled in the New Law of Christ is as traditional and common a part of Christian exegesis as the personal types of Christ. Moses, whose office as law giver and as mediator between Israel and God made him a type of Christ, is one of the pre-eminent Old Testament types. Joshua, whose name was transliterated in the Septuagint as Jesus, is another type of Christ because he led Israel into the promised land as Jesus Christ led the new Israel to redemption (cf. De Doctrina Christiana, I, 26; Works, XVI, 110). Milton, through Michael, here looks beyond the vision of Old Testament history to the New Testament, and explains, by a happy coincidence of transliteration and typology, that Jesus shall quell the serpent and "bring back/Through the worlds wilderness long wandered man/Safe to eternal Paradise of rest." It is worth noting that Milton associates the hill from which Adam sees his vision of the future with the mount on which Christ is tempted:

Not higher that Hill nor wider looking round,
Whereon for different cause the Tempter set
Our second Adam in the Wilderness,
To show him all Earth's Kingdoms and thir Glory.
(PL XI, 381-384)

In this chapter we have seen that typology formed part of the common, traditional Christian Biblical inheritance, that Calvin and many English divines of Milton's time applied typological exegesis just as the Fathers did, and that poets of Milton's time also employed it. Milton, too, was heir to this tradition and used it in prose and verse. To employ typology in explaining Paradise Regained, therefore, is not to lose ourselves in misty realms or esoteric tomes of which Milton may very well have been ignorant. Rather, by adhering to the common Biblical traditions of Christendom we place ourselves, finally, in a position to understand the theological reasons for Milton's choice of the temptations in the desert as the subject of Paradise Regained.

CHAPTER V

BIBLICAL TYPOLOGY IN PARADISE REGAINED

The foregoing pages have fully demonstrated that Biblical typology, strictly defined, was part of Milton's intellectual heritage and that he was familiar with its uses. Since this is true, I can now proceed to answer my two questions about Paradise Regained: what is Milton's theological justification for calling a poem about the temptations in the desert Paradise Regained; and what, consequently, is the relationship between Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained? It is necessary first, however, to examine typology in Paradise Regained by pointing out the various types and determining their function in the poem.

The principal person in Paradise Regained is Jesus Christ (though Milton never uses the Greek form of the messianic title in that poem), whom the Old Testament types foreshadow and point to as their antitype. The New Testament itself, whether implicitly or explicitly, adduces Adam, Moses, and David as types of Christ. Later, the Fathers of the Church saw in Job a type of Christ. These four Old Testament persons are the principal types of Christ in Paradise Regained.

The forty years that Israel wandered in the desert and the forty days that Moses and Elijah fasted are types of Christ's forty days of fasting in the wilderness. In Paradise Regained, Christ recalls Moses and Elijah:

in the Mount
Moses was forty days, nor eat nor drank,
And forty days Eliah without food
Wandred this barren waste, the same I now.
(PR I, 351-354)

Here typology rests on two items: the period of forty days (PR I, 303) and the identity of place. Milton has Christ himself make the identification of time and place. The period of forty days (or years) is important in typology. Moses was hidden on Sinai for forty days without food (Exod. 24:18), after which he promulgated the Law (Exod. 34:27-32). Christ also spends forty days fasting before promulgating the New Law from a mount (Matt. 4:2; 5:1). These same fasts of Moses and Elijah are mentioned again in Book II, 14-15. More important than the linking of Christ with Moses by means of the forty days' fast is Satan's oblique reference to the prophet promised in Deut. 18:18, which occurs in Book IV:

there was found [Jesus]
Among the gravest Rabbies disputant
On points and questions fitting Moses Chair,
Teaching not taught.
(PR IV, 217-220)

By referring to Jesus in this way, Satan is made to imply that Jesus is the prophesied successor to Moses. Jesus, however, is not only this prophet; he is the living antitype of Moses, as is shown by the references to the forty days of fast. Jesus' forty days' fast has another typological significance, for Milton correlates it with the forty

years that Israel spent in the desert.[1] Jesus is the new Israel, and we saw earlier that certain experiences of the old Israel served as a typological framework for parts of Matthew's Gospel. The typology of the forty days is important in Paradise Regained because it helps to establish necessary connections between Old Testament and New Testament events, thus making the reader aware that such connections are significant to Milton.

King David is another Old Testament person linked to Christ in both prophecy and typology. Nathan's prophecy (II Kings [II Sam.], 7: 16), Jesus' Davidic ancestry, and the common birthplace in Bethlehem are the important scriptural facts. Jesus is of the house of David (Matt. 1:1-17; Luke 3:23-38) and the royal antitype of David (Matt. 27:11, 37; Mark 15:2, 26; Luke 23:1-3, 38; John 18:33-37, 19:14, 19-22). David is the Old Testament person most frequently referred to in Paradise Regained. The temptation of the kingdoms of the world is underscored by the typology of the kingship to which Jesus is the true heir. During the long episode of this second temptation, twelve explicit references are made to David as a royal person: three by Jesus (PR II, 438-439; III, 404-405) and nine by Satan (PR III, 152-153, 169, 282, 353, 357, 383; IV, 107-108, 378-379). Satan's frequent use of "thy Father David's throne" (or some similar phrase) in the context of the second temptation gains force and irony when he speaks, because

---

[1] Northrop Frye, "The Typology of Paradise Regained," MP LIII (1956), 229.

the reader knows that David was a type of Christ. Christ is "Israels true King" (PR III, 441).

Contrary to expectations, there are only six references to Job in Paradise Regained (I, 146-147, 368-369, 424-425; III, 60-67, 95). Three of these are clustered in Jesus' speech on glory in Book III. All six refer to Job's having been tempted by the same Satan who is now tempting Christ, or to Job's patience. The principal figures in Paradise Regained—Christ (PR I, 424-425; III, 60-67, 95), Satan (PR I, 365-369), and God the Father (PR I, 146-147)—all imply that Job's situation was a foreshadowing of Jesus' situation and hence that Job was a type of Christ. God the Father points out that Satan

> might have learnt
> Less over-weening, since he fail'd in Job,
> Whose constant perseverance overcame
> Whate're his cruel malice could invent.
> He now shall know that I can produce a man
> Of female Seed, far abler to resist
> All his solicitations.
> (PR I, 146-152)

This typology is, however, more decorative than structural, for although the typology depends on the common situation of temptation, Job's temptation had nothing to do with the gaining or losing of paradise. Within the action of Paradise Regained Job in his temptations and his patience is a type of Christ. God the Father, Christ, and Satan confirm this in their separate references to Job.

Adam, the fourth principal type of Christ in Paradise Regained, is the most important, for this typology is the basis for Milton's select-

ing the temptations in the desert as the Gospel episode for a poem about the regaining of paradise. Adam, the head of the race, the one man upon whom all depended, was tempted by Satan, fell, and lost paradise. To him was promised a redeemer (Gen. 3:15 and PL X, 179-181), a promise which was more detailed later in the Old Testament (PL XI and XII, passim). Jesus Christ, the new (or second) Adam (I Cor. 15:45), is the new head of the race (Eph. 1:10). It is precisely in this capacity, as St. Paul says (Rom. 5:14), that Adam is a type of Christ.

From time to time throughout the first book of Paradise Regained references are made to the temptation in Eden. Satan's speech to the infernal council twice mentions Adam. As he prepares to set forth again to tempt a man, he confers with his fellow fallen angels, and reminds them of his earlier success:

> well ye know
> How many Ages, as the years of men,
> This Universe we have possest, and rul'd
> In manner at our will th' affairs of Earth,
> Since Adam and his facile consort Eve
> Lost Paradise deceiv'd by me.
> (PR I, 47-52)

He opens his speech with this reminder of his success, and closes it with another:

> I, when no other durst, sole undertook
> The dismal expedition to find out
> And ruin Adam, and the exploit perform'd
> Successfully; a calmer voyage now
> Will waft me; and the way found prosperous once
> Induces best to hope of like success.
> (PR I, 100-105)

It is part of Milton's plan in Paradise Regained to shape its action to correspond with that of Paradise Lost, and by showing Satan in a situation similar to that of the earlier poem, he enhances the structural parallelism necessary for the success of Paradise Regained.

Before changing the scene from the infernal to the celestial council, Milton inserts a paragraph of transition in which the present endeavor is compared to the previous work of Satan,

> whose attempt
> At first against mankind so well had thriv'd
> In Adam's overthrow.
> (PR I, 113-115)

It is not enough, however, for Satan and the narrator to refer to the two actions. Milton also includes mentions of the twin actions in the celestial council. In Paradise Lost, sin and death, both allegorized, come into the world after Adam's fall (cf. Rom. 5:12). St. Paul specifically mentions the overcoming of death by Christ (Rom. 5:15, 17, 21; I Cor. 15:55, 56). In Paradise Regained, God the Father says,

> But first I mean
> To exercise him in the Wilderness;
> There he shall first lay down the rudiments
> Of his great warfare, ere I send him forth
> To conquer Sin and Death the two grand foes,
> By Humiliation and strong Sufferance.
> (PR I, 155-160)

Apparently it is the divine plan that by conquering Satan in the wilderness, Christ will prove himself fit for the coming battle which leads to the crucifixion. It appears from this passage that the regaining of paradise in the desert is different from the Redemption proper. The

temptations in the desert and the regaining of paradise are only a prelude to Christ's real earthly mission, which is the salvation of all men. Therefore, although the temptations are part of the economy of salvation, they do not themselves bring about that salvation.

In the second Book of Paradise Regained there are two references to the parallel of Adam and Christ. Once again Satan reminds his council of his previous attempt, but in his present effort he finds

> Far other labor to be undergone
> Than when I dealt with Adam first of Men,
> Though Adam by his Wife's allurement fell.
> (PR II, 132-134)

In the first Book, as he addressed his companions, he recognized the similarity of the tasks; he now sees the differences and the difficulties. Satan still knows, however, that there is a parallel between what he is doing now and what he did then. Later, in the description of the banquet that Satan spreads before Christ, Milton remarks

> Alas how simple, to these Cates compar'd,
> Was the crude Apple that diverted Eve!
> (PR II, 348-349)

Adam and Christ are both tempted by food, and since their temptations are being compared, therefore the means of temptation are likewise compared. Such a comparison is natural once the typology established by St. Paul is remembered.

In the last Book of Paradise Regained, Milton makes two quick references to the previous action which he is here paralleling, both of which are to Eve. As Satan is being defeated in the midst of the sec-

ond, the largest temptation in Milton's version, the poet comments that Satan's rhetoric

> won so much on Eve,
> So little here, nay lost; but Eve was Eve.
> (PR IV, 5-6)

Later, as Christ rebuffs Satan's temptation to use the power of the world to establish his kingdom, Jesus says that Satan is

> now more accurst
> For this attempt bolder than that on Eve,
> And more blasphemous.
> (PR IV, 179-181)

Since Milton had focused the ninth Book of Paradise Lost on Satan's climactic encounter with Eve, he therefore refers from time to time to Eve's part in the earlier action. The reader of Paradise Regained could be expected to have read St. Paul and to recognize in these lines a poetic embellishment of Paul's original insight.

The last reference to the Adamic typology comes in the hymn sung by the angelic choirs after Christ's victory over Satan. Adam, in whose power had lain the future of the race, had lost the fight, but Christ, fighting the good fight, avenged him, and, taking Adam's place as the new head of the race, defeated the old foe and made the redemption possible. The angels sing directly to Christ, praising him, saying,

> now thou hast aveng'd
> Supplanted Adam, and by vanquishing
> Temptation, hast regain'd lost Paradise.
> . . . . . .
> A fairer Paradise is founded now
> For Adam and his chosen Sons, whom thou
> A Saviour art come down to re-install.
> . . . . . .

> Hail Son of the most High, heir of both worlds,
> Queller of Satan, on thy glorious work
> Now enter, and begin to save mankind.
> (PR IV, 606-608; 613-615;
> 633-635)

This hymn is most important for understanding Paradise Regained. It forms, in fact, the final comment upon the action of the poem. Since it is angelic, one can assume that it presents a true appraisal of the action just completed. That the regained and fairer paradise is spoken of twice in connection with Adam is surely significant. This battle that Christ has just won was necessitated by Adam's fall, and Christ, "by vanquishing Temptation . . . regained lost Paradise." Without the typology of Adam and Christ that is elucidated in Romans 5 the action of Paradise Regained could not have this meaning. The concluding lines of the angelic hymn, which indicate that the temptations in the desert are but a prelude to Christ's "glorious work" of salvation, also point to the Adamic typology; for just as Adam was placed in paradise as a test of his obedience for a subsequent life with God (PL V, 469-543), so too Christ is led into the desert as a test of his obedience for his subsequent mission. Christ passes the test, avenges Adam, and demonstrates himself to be the Saviour. The Father explains (PR I, 163-167) that the temptations which Jesus is about to undergo are intended as a means of demonstrating the virtue of the man he had chosen "to earn Salvation for the Sons of Men." Jesus is now become the one man through whom life and grace enter the world, the antitype of the one man through whom entered sin and death.

Of all the references to Adam in Paradise Regained, however, the most important is in the opening lines of the poem:

> I who ere while the happy Garden sung,
> By one mans disobedience lost, now sing
> Recovered Paradise to all mankind,
> By one mans firm obedience fully tri'd
> Through all temptation, and the Tempter foil'd
> In all his wiles, defeated and repulst,
> And Eden rais'd in the wast wilderness.
> (PR I, 1-7)

With these lines must be compared the opening of Paradise Lost:

> Of Mans first Disobedience, and the Fruit
> Of that Forbidd'n Tree, whose mortal tast
> Brought Death into the World, and all our woe,
> With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
> Restore us, and regain the blissful Seat . . . .
> (PL I, 1-5)

Though neither is mentioned by name, Adam and Christ are obviously the principal figures in the poems. At the beginning of Paradise Regained Milton directly recalls to the reader his previous poem, states that this new poem is about "Recover'd Paradise," and says that the lost happy garden is to be recovered "by one mans firm obedience fully tri'd/ Through all temptation." The disobedience of Adam is set over against the obedience of Christ. What one lost the other recovers. The uniqueness of the roles of Adam and Christ in the economy of salvation is emphasized by the use of "one" in both openings. The comparison of Adam and Christ in terms of "one," and the contrast of their actions (disobedience and obedience) and of the results of these actions (loss of Eden and recovered Paradise) include the points of comparison and contrast that Paul employed in Romans 5 to show that Adam was a type of

him who was to come.

These opening lines state the theme of Paradise Regained ("Recovered Paradise to all mankind,/By one mans firm obedience"), the persons ("one man" and "the Tempter"), the action ("all temptation, and the Tempter foil'd"), and the consequences ("the Tempter . . . defeated . . . and Eden rais'd in the wast wilderness"). But unless Adam is a type of Christ—unless, that is, the relationship between Adam and Christ forms part of the economy of salvation—Milton would have no theological justification for calling a poem about the temptations in the desert Paradise Regained. It is obvious, moreover, simply from the words used in the first seven lines of Paradise Regained that the reader is to recall the fifth chapter of Romans and Paul's exposition there of the relationship between Adam and Christ. Therefore it can be said that Milton builds the opening lines of Paradise Regained upon Romans 5; not just upon its rhetoric but rather upon its theology. Adam's role and action prefigured those of Christ, and by foiling the tempter Christ fulfills the type. The fact that Adam is a type of Christ allows Milton to call his poem Paradise Regained.

Adam's typological relation to Christ and the similarly typological relation of the two series of temptations allowed Milton to take the incidents of Christ's temptations as the subject of his poem about recovered paradise. If we were mentally to remove the Adamic typology from Paradise Regained, all that would be left would be a longish narrative about one incident in Christ's life, not a poem about paradise

regained. But Milton, who formerly sang lost paradise, wanted to write a poem about the undoing of Adam's fall. The New Testament incident that offered the closest parallel to that action—and one which, incidentally, contained one of his favorite motives, temptation—was the temptations in the desert. These temptations, though interesting in themselves, have no relation to the economy of salvation apart from their relationship to Adam's temptations. Therefore, to make his poem bear the weight of the salvific content that he needed, Milton deliberately constructed his opening lines on Romans 5, thus recalling to the reader the theme (life and grace) and the typology of that passage. With Paul's authority behind him (and apparent to the reader), Milton proceeded to write a poem on a New Testament episode rarely associated (save by Irenaeus) with the economy of salvation.

The theological justification for selecting this Gospel episode for Paradise Regained is, therefore, that it is precisely the New Testament action that restores what was forfeited in Paradise Lost. By standing "in Adams room/The Head of all mankind" (PL III, 285-286) and defeating Satan, Christ brings life and grace to the world to replace the sin and death that entered through Adam. The title of Paradise Regained indicates that Milton wanted to parallel the two poems. But to regain lost paradise is not the same as the redemption of mankind (PR IV, 634-635), and therefore Milton did not have to compose a poem on the difficult subjects of the passion, death, and resurrection. The New Testament episode that offered the best literary parallel to Paradise

Lost was the temptations, and it is fortunately the best theological parallel as well. Because Adam is a type of Christ, Milton was theologically justified in calling his poem Paradise Regained. The paradise that was regained through Christ's victory, which demonstrates him to be the saviour, is a "fairer Paradise" (PR IV, 613). It can, indeed, be equated with the "paradise within thee, happier farr" (PL XII, 586) that was promised to Adam if he would live a virtuous life (PL XII, 552-586). That life can now be lived because of Christ's victory. The reason that Milton is able to attach so much meaning to Christ's defeat of Satan in the wilderness lies in the typological relationship between Adam and Christ.

Now if Paradise Regained is a poem about regaining paradise, and if it does this by virtue of typology, then Paradise Regained is a true sequel to Paradise Lost. The earlier poem is about "Mans first Disobedience," and the "loss of Eden." That disobedience "Brought Death into the World, and all our woe." Man's situation remained one of subjection to sin and death "till one greater Man Restore us." Thus Milton in the invocation to Paradise Lost. The same ideas are found in Romans 5. "It was through one man that guilt came into the world; and, since death came owing to guilt, death was handed on to all mankind by one man" (Rom. 5:12). But to do away with the reign of death there comes "a reign of life through one man, Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:17). Now Paradise Lost does not end with the act of disobedience. A redeemer is promised to Adam (PL X, 179-181; Gen. 3:15), and Adam is shown a

vision of the future of the world, including the life and death of Christ (PL XII, 360-445). Nevertheless, Paradise Lost ends with "loss of Eden" and expulsion from it as Adam and Eve "with wandring steps and slow,/Through Eden took thir solitarie way." The poem concludes on this note of patient resignation, not on a note of restoration. It remains for Paradise Regained to restore man to Eden by regaining paradise through the temptations in the desert. And since Paradise Regained does this, we can say that it is a true sequel to Paradise Lost, for it continues in directly presented action the biblical scheme of salvation that extends from Paradise Lost to Paradise Regained, from Adam to Christ.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This list of works includes only those which were directly used in writing this dissertation. A complete bibliography of Paradise Regained is not included because it is already available in the standard bibliographic guides to Milton and in the annual bibliographies of literary scholarship. The standard theological references and encyclopedias, biblical concordances and commentaries, and collections of the Fathers employed are similarly omitted.

Adam, Karl. The Christ of Faith. Translated by Joyce Crick. New York, 1957.

Adamson, J. H. "Milton's Arianism," Harvard Theological Review, LIII (1960), 269-276.

Allen, Don C. The Harmonious Vision: Studies in Milton's Poetry. Baltimore, 1954.

Altaner, Berthold. Patrology. Translated by Hilda C. Graef. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1960.

Andrewes, Lancelot. Works. 10 vols. Oxford, 1854.

Auerbach, Erich. Scenes from the Drama of European Literature. Translated by Ralph Manheim. New York, 1959.

--------. Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Garden City, N. Y., 1957.

--------. "Typological Symbolism in Medieval Literature," Yale French Studies, No. 9 (1952?), 3-10.

Augustine. The City of God. Translated by Marcus Dods, George Wilson, and J. J. Smith. New York, 1950.

--------. Faith, Hope and Charity. Translated by Louis A. Arand. Ancient Christian Writers, No. 3. Westminster, Md., 1947.

--------. The First Catechetical Instruction. Translated by Joseph P. Christopher. Ancient Christian Writers, No. 2. Westminster, Md., 1947.

Augustine. On Christian Doctrine. Translated by D. W. Robertson, Jr. New York, 1958.

--------. Reply to Faustus the Manichaean. Translated by Richard Stothert. Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. IV. Buffalo, 1887.

--------. "The Spirit and the Letter," in Augustine: Later Works. Translated by John Burnaby. Library of Christian Classics, Vol. VIII. London, 1955.

Bale, John. A brefe Comedy or Enterlude concernynge the temptacyon of our lorde and sauer Jesus Christ by Sathan in the desart. Edited by Paul Schwemmer. Nuernberg, 1919.

Banks, Theodore H. "The Banquet Scene in Paradise Regained," PMLA, LV (1940), 773-776.

Barr, James. Biblical Words for Time. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 33. Naperville, Ill., 1962.

Barth, Karl. Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5. Translated by T. A. Smail. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 5. Edinburgh, 1956.

Bate, H. N. "Some Technical Terms of Greek Exegesis," Journal of Theological Studies, XXIV (1922), 59-66.

Bentzen, Aage. King and Messiah. London, 1955.

den Boer, W. "Hermeneutic Problems in Early Christian Literature," Vigiliae Christianae, I (1947), 150-167.

Bouyer, Louis. The Meaning of Sacred Scripture. Translated by Mary Perkins Ryan. Notre Dame, Ind., 1958.

Bultmann, Rudolf. History and Eschatology. Edinburgh, 1957.

Burke, Kenneth. The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology. Boston, 1961.

Cairns, E. E. "The Theology of Paradise Lost," Bibliotheca Sacra, CV (1948), 478-491 and CVI (1949), 106-118.

Calvin, John. Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. Translated by John Owen. Edinburgh, 1849.

Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion.. Edited by John T. McNeill. Translated by Ford Lewis Battles. Library of Christian Classics, Vols. XX and XXI. Philadelphia, 1960.

Campbell, Lily B. "The Christian Muse," Huntington Library Bulletin, No. 8 (1935), 29-70.

--------. Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth-Century England. Cambridge, Berkeley, and Los Angeles, 1959.

Carlisle, A. I. "Milton and Ludwig Lavater," RES, V (1954), 249-255.

Chadwick, Nora K. Poetry and Letters in Early Christian Gaul. London, 1955.

Cleveland, Edward. "On the Identity Motive in Paradise Regained," MLQ, XVI (1955), 232-236.

Condee, Ralph W. "The Formalized Openings of Milton's Epic Poems," JEGP, L (1951), 502-508.

Conklin, George Newton. Biblical Criticism and Heresy in Milton. New York, 1949.

Corwin, Virginia. St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch. New Haven, 1960.

Costello, William T., S.J. The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., 1958.

Cox, Lee Sheridan. "Food-Word Imagery in Paradise Regained," ELH, XXVIII (1961), 225-243.

Cross, F. L. The Early Christian Fathers. London, 1960.

Cullmann, Oscar. Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia, 1950.

Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper. Edited by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder. New York, 1962.

Curtis, Mark H. Oxford and Cambridge in Transition, 1558-1642. Oxford, 1959.

Daiches, David. Milton. London, 1957.

Daillé, John. A Treatise on the Right Use of the Fathers in the Decision of Controversies Existing at this Day in Religion. 2nd American edition. Philadelphia, 1856.

Daniells, Roy. Milton, Mannerism and Baroque. Toronto, 1963.

Daniélou, Jean, S.J. Advent. Translated by Rosemary Sheed. New York, 1951.

--------. "The Conception of History in the Christian Tradition," Journal of Religion, XXX (1950), 171-179.

--------. From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers. Translated by Dom Wulstan Hibberd. London, 1960.

--------. Histoire des Doctrines Chrétiennes avant Nicée. 2 vols. Tournai, 1958, 1961.

--------. The Lord of History: Reflections on the Inner Meaning of History. Translated by Nigel Abercrombie. London and Chicago, 1958.

--------. "The New Testament and the Theology of History," Studia Evangelica: The Four Gospels in 1957, edited by Kurt Aland, et al. [Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, LXXIII (1959)], 25-34.

--------. Origen. Translated by Walter Mitchell. New York, 1955.

D'Arcy, Martin C., S.J. The Sense of History, Secular and Sacred. London, 1959.

Daube, David. "Three Notes on Paradise Regained," RES, XIX (1943), 205-213.

Davies, William David. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. 2nd edition. London, 1955.

Dix, Gregory. Jew and Greek: A Study in the Primitive Church. Westminster, 1953.

Dodd, C. H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. London, 1932.

Doeve, Jan Willem. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Assen, 1953.

Donne, John. Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions. Edited by John Sparrow. Cambridge, 1923.

--------. The Divine Poems. Edited by Helen Gardner. Oxford, 1952.

--------. Essays in Divinity. Edited by Evelyn M. Simpson. Oxford, 1952.

--------. Sermons. Edited by Evelyn M. Simpson and George R. Potter. 10 vols. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1953-1962.

Dyke, Daniel. Two Treatises: The One of Repentence, the Other, of Christs Temptations. Fifth impression. London, 1631.

Dyson, A. E. "The Meaning of Paradise Regained," Texas Studies in Language and Literature, III (Summer, 1961), 197-211.

Ellis, E. Earle. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh, 1957.

Esch, Arno. "Paradise and Calvary," Anglia, LXXVIII (1960), 74-77.

--------. "Structure and Style in Some Minor Religious Epics of the Seventeenth Century," Anglia, LXXVIII (1960), 40-55.

Essays in Christology for Karl Barth. Edited by T.H.L. Parker. London, 1956.

Figgis, John Neville. The Political Aspects of S. Augustine's "City of God." London, 1921.

Fink, Zera. "The Political Implications of Paradise Regained," JEGP, XL (1941), 482-488.

Fixler, Michael. "The Unclean Meats of the Mosaic Law and the Banquet Scene in Paradise Regained," MLN, LXX (1955), 573-577.

Fletcher, Harris Francis. The Intellectual Development of John Milton. 2 vols. Urbana, Ill., 1956, 1961.

Flesseman-van Leer, E. Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church. Assen, 1954.

Florovsky, Georges. "Eschatology in the Patristic Age: An Introduction," Studia Patristica, edited by Kurt Aland and F. L. Cross, Vol. II [Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, LXIV (1957)], 235-250.

Fraenkel, Peter. Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, XLVI. Geneva, 1961.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism. Princeton, 1957.

--------. "The Typology of Paradise Regained," MP, LIII (1956), 227-238.

Frye, Roland M. God, Man, and Satan. Princeton, 1960.

George, Charles H. and Katherine. The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570-1640. Princeton, 1961.

Gilbert, Allan H. "The Qualities of the Renaissance Epic," South Atlantic Quarterly, LIII (1954), 372-378.

--------. "The Temptation in Paradise Regained," JEGP, XV (1916), 599-611.

Gilson, Etienne. The Christian Philosophy of Saint Augustine. Translated by L.E.M. Lynch. New York, 1960.

Gottfried, Rudolf. "Milton, Lactantius, Claudian, and Tasso," SP, XXX (1933), 497-503.

Grace, William J. "Orthodoxy and Aesthetic Method in Paradise Lost and the Divine Comedy," CL, I (1949), 173-187.

Grant, Robert M. The Letter and the Spirit. London, 1957.

Greenslade, S. L. The English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church. Oxford, 1960.

Greer, Rowan A. Theodore of Mopsuestia: Exegete and Theologian. Westminster, 1961.

Groom, Bernard. The Diction of Poetry from Spenser to Bridges. Toronto, 1955.

Hammond, Henry. Sermons. London, 1664.

Hanford, James Holly. "The Chronology of Milton's Private Studies," PMLA, XXXVI (1921), 251-314.

Hanson, R.P.C. Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture. London, 1959.

Harnack, Adolph. History of Dogma. Translated by Neil Buchanan. Vol. I. London, 1894.

Hartwell, Kathleen Ellen. Lactantius and Milton. Cambridge, Mass., 1929.

Heinisch, Paul. Christ in Prophecy. Translated by William G. Heidt, O.S.B. Collegeville, Minn., 1956.

Hooker, Richard. Works. Edited by John Keble. 3rd edition. 3 vols. Oxford, 1845.

Houssiau, Albert. La Christologie de Saint Irénée. Dissertationes. . . in Facultate Theologica . . . Series III, Tomus I. Louvain, 1955.

Hughes, Merritt Y. "The Christ of Paradise Regained and the Renaissance Heroic Tradition," SP, XXXV (1938), 254-277.

--------. "Milton and the Sense of Glory," PQ, XXVIII (1949), 107-124.

Huguelet, Theodore Long. "Milton's Hermeneutics: A Study of Scriptural Interpretation in the Divorce Tracts and in De Doctrina Christiana," unpub. diss., University of North Carolina, 1959, DA, XX (1960), 2803.

Hunter, William B., Jr. "Milton on the Incarnation: Some More Heresies," JHI, XXI (1960), 349-369.

--------. "Milton's Arianism Reconsidered," Harvard Theological Review, LII (1959), 9-35.

The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East. Edited by Robert C. Dentan. American Oriental Series, Vol. 38. New Haven, 1955.

Irenaeus. Against Heresies. Translated by Alexander Roberts and W. H. Rambaut. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1956.

--------. Proof of the Apostolic Preaching. Translated by Joseph P. Smith, S.J. Ancient Christian Writers, No. 16. Westminster, Md., 1952.

Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenberg. Edited by Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson. New York, 1962.

John Chrysostom. Homilies on the Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Romans. Translated by J. B. Morris. Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, Vol. VII. Oxford, 1841.

Jones, Charles W. "Milton's 'Brief Epic'," SP, XLIV (1947), 209-227.

Kelley, Maurice. "Milton's Debt to Wolleb's 'Compendium Theologiae Christianae'," PMLA, L (1935), 156-165.

--------. "The Theological Dogma of Paradise Lost III, 173-202," PMLA, LII (1937), 75-79.

--------. This Great Argument. Princeton Studies in English, Vol. 22. Princeton, 1941.

Kelly, J.N.D. Early Christian Doctrines. New York, 1958.

Kermode, Frank. "Milton's Hero," RES. IV (1953), 317-330.

Kerrigan, Alexander, O.F.M. St. Cyril of Alexandria: Interpreter of the Old Testament. Analecta Biblica, No. 2. Rome, 1952.

Klausner, Joseph. The Messianic Idea in Israel. Translated by W. F. Stinespring. New York, 1955.

Kliger, Samuel. "The Urbs Aeterna in Paradise Regained," PMLA, LXI (1946), 474-491.

Krouse, F. Michael. Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition. Princeton, 1949.

Lampe, G.W.H., and K. J. Woollcombe. Essays on Typology. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 22. Naperville, Ill., 1957.

Larkin, Edward. Speculum Patrum: A Looking-Glasse of the Fathers. London, 1659.

Leigh, Edward. A Systeme or Body of Divinity. London, 1654.

--------. Critica Sacra. 2nd edition. London, 1646.

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. "Theme and Structure in Paradise Regained," SP, LVII (1960), 186-220.

The Living Milton. Edited by Frank Kermode. London, 1960.

Luther, Martin. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Translated by J. Theodore Mueller. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1954.

Lupton, Donald. The Glory of Their Times, or The Lives of the Primitive Fathers. London, 1640.

Lynch, William F., S.J. Christ and Apollo: The Dimensions of the Literary Imagination. New York, 1963.

MacCallum, H. R. "Milton and Figurative Interpretation of the Bible," UTQ, XXXI (1962), 397-415.

Mackinnon, James. Luther and the Reformation. 4 vols. New York, 1962 (repr.).

MacLure, Millar. The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534-1642. Toronto, 1958.

McNamee, Maurice B., S.J. Honor and the Epic Hero. New York, 1960.

Madsen, William G. "Earth the Shadow of Heaven: Typological Symbolism in Paradise Lost," PMLA, LXXV (1960), 519-526.

Mahood, M. M. Poetry and Humanism. London, 1950.

Manning, Stephen. Wisdom and Number. Lincoln, Nebr., 1962.

Marilla, E. L. "Paradise Regained: Observations on its Meaning," Studia Neophilologica, XXVII (1955), 179-191.

Marrou, H. I. A History of Education in Antiquity. Translated by George Lamb. New York, 1956.

Martz, Louis L. The Meditative Poem. Garden City, N. Y., 1963.

--------. "Paradise Regained: The Meditative Combat," ELH, XXVI (1960), 223-247.

--------. The Poetry of Meditation. Revised edition. New Haven, 1962.

Masters in English Theology. Edited by Alfred Barry. London, 1877.

Melito of Sardis. "Homily on the Passion," edited and translated by Campbell Bonner, Studies and Documents, XII (1940).

Menzies, W. "Milton: The Last Poems," Essays and Studies, XXIV (1938), 80-113.

Milburn, R.L.P. Early Christian Interpretations of History. London, 1954.

Milton, John. Complete Prose Works. Edited by Don M. Wolfe, Ernest Sirluck, and Merritt Y. Hughes. 3 vols. New Haven, 1953, 1959, 1962.

--------. Works. Edited by Frank Allen Patterson, et al. 18 vols. New York, 1931-1938.

Moreau, Jules Lawrence. Language and Religious Language. Philadelphia, 1961.

Mueller, William R. John Donne: Preacher. Princeton, 1962.

Muir, Kenneth. John Milton. London, 1955.

Musurillo, Herbert, S.J. Symbolism and the Christian Imagination. Baltimore, 1962.

Newman, John Henry. An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine. Garden City, N. Y., 1960.

Nicholas, Constance. "The Edition of the Early Church Historians Used by Milton," JEGP, LI (1952), 160-162.

Origen. Contra Celsum. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge, 1953.

Parish, John E. "Pre-Miltonic Representations of Adam as a Christian," Rice Institute Pamphlet, XL, No. 3 (1953), 1-24.

Parker, William R. "On Milton's Early Literary Program," MP, XXXIII (1935), 49-53.

Pecheux, Mother Mary Christopher, O.S.U. "The Concept of the Second Eve in Paradise Lost," PMLA, LXXV (1960), 359-366.

Pépin, Jean. Mythe et Allégorie: Les origenes Grecques et les contestations Judéo-Chrétiennes. Paris, 1958.

Polman, A.D.R. The Word of God According to St. Augustine. Translated by A. J. Pomerans. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961.

Pope, Elizabeth M. "Paradise Regained": The Tradition and the Poem. Baltimore, 1947.

Pope, Hugh, O.P. Saint Augustine of Hippo. Garden City, N. Y., 1961.

Prat, Fernand, S.J. The Theology of St. Paul. Translated by John L. Stoddard. 2 vols. Westminster, Md., 1950.

Preiss, Theo. "The Vision of History in the New Testament," Journal of Religion, XXX (1950), 157-170.

Pritchard, John Paul. "The Fathers of the Church in the Works of John Milton," Classical Journal, XXXIII (1937), 79-87.

--------. "The Influence of the Fathers upon Milton, with Especial Reference to St. Augustine," unpub. diss., Cornell, 1925.

Rajan, B. Paradise Lost and the Seventeenth Century Reader. London, 1947.

--------. "Simple, Sensuous and Passionate," RES, XXI (1945), 289-301.

Reason and Imagination: Studies in the History of Ideas, 1600-1800. Edited by Joseph A. Mazzeo. New York, 1962.

Rice, Warner G. "Paradise Regained," Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters, XXII (1936), 493-503.

Roberts, Francis. Clavis Bibliorum: The Key of the Bible, Unlocking the Richest Treasury of the Holy Scriptures. 3rd edition. London, 1665.

Robbins, Frank E. The Hexaemeral Literature: A Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis. Chicago, 1912.

Robins, Harry F. If This Be Heresy: A Study of Milton and Origen. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, No. 51. Urbana, Ill., 1963.

The Root of the Vine: Essays in Biblical Theology. Edited by Anton Fridrichsen, et al. Westminster, 1953.

Rust, E. C. The Christian Understanding of History. London, 1947.

Sackton, Alexander H. "Architectonic Structure in Paradise Regained," University of Texas Studies in English, XXXIII (1954), 33-45.

Saillens, Emile. John Milton: Poète Combattant. Paris, 1959.

Schultz, Howard. "Christ and Anti-Christ in Paradise Regained," PMLA, LXVII (1952), 790-808.

Scott-Craig, Thomas S. K. "The Craftsmanship and Theological Significance of Milton's Art of Logic," HLQ, XVII (1953), 1-16.

Sensabaugh, George F. "Milton on Learning," SP, XLIII (1946), 258-272.

Sherrard, Philip. The Greek East and the Latin West. London, 1959.

Simon, Marcel. St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church. London and New York, 1958.

Simpson, Evelyn M. A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne. 2nd edition. Oxford, 1948.

Sims, James H. The Bible in Milton's Epics. Gainesville, Fla., 1962.

Smits, Luchesius, O.F.M. Cap. Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin. Dissertationes . . . in Facultate Theologica . . . Series III, Tomus 4, Partes 1 et 2. Louvain, 1956, 1958.

Spicq, C., O.P. Esquisse d'une Histoire de l'Exégèse Latine au Moyen Age. Paris, 1944.

Steadman, John M. "Adam and the Prophesied Redeemer (Paradise Lost, XII, 359-623)," SP, LVI (1959), 214-225.

--------. "Heroic Virtue and the Divine Image in Paradise Lost," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXII (1959), 88-105.

Stein, Arnold. Heroic Knowledge: An Interpretation of "Paradise Regained" and "Samson Agonistes." Minneapolis, 1957.

--------. "The Kingdoms of the World: Paradise Regained," ELH, XXIII (1956), 112-126.

--------. "Satan: The Dramatic Role of Evil," PMLA, LXV (1950), 221-231.

Summers, Joseph H. The Muse's Method: An Introduction to "Paradise Lost." London, 1962.

Svendson, Kester. "Milton's Aerie Microscope," MLN, LXIV (1949), 525-527.

Swardson, Harold R. Poetry and the Fountain of Light: Observations on the Conflict Between Christian and Classical Traditions in Seventeenth-Century Poetry. London, 1962.

Taylor, Dick, Jr. "Grace as a Means of Poetry: Milton's Pattern for Salvation," Tulane Studies in English, IV (1954), 57-90.

--------. "Milton and the Paradox of the Fortunate Fall Once More," Tulane Studies in English, IX (1959), 35-51.

--------. "Milton's Treatment of the Judgment and the Expulsion in Paradise Lost," Tulane Studies in English, X (1960), 51-82.

--------. "The Storm Scene in Paradise Regained: A Reinterpretation," UTQ, XXIV (1955), 359-376.

Taylor, George C. "Some Patristic Conventions Common to Shakespeare and Milton," SP, XXVIII (1931), 652-656.

Taylor, Jeremy. The Whole Works. Edited by Rt. Rev. Reginald Heber, revised and corrected by Rev. Charles Page Eden. 10 vols. London, 1859.

Thornton, L. S. "St. Irenaeus and Contemporary Theology," Studia Patristica, edited by Kurt Aland and F. L. Cross, Vol. II [Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, LXIV (1957)], 317-327.

Tillyard, E.M.W. "The Christ of Paradise Regained and the Renaissance Heroic Tradition," SP, XXXVI (1939), 247-252.

--------. The English Epic and its Background. London, 1954.

--------. Milton. London, 1930.

--------. Studies in Milton. London, 1955.

Tuve, Rosemond. A Reading of George Herbert. Chicago, 1952.

Vann, Gerald, O.P., and P. K. Meagher, O.P. The Temptations of Christ. New York, 1957.

Venning, Ralph. Mysteries and Revelations: or, The Explication and Application of Several Extra-Essentiall and Borrowed Names, Allusions, and Metaphors in the Scripture. London, 1652.

Ward, Richard. Theologicall Questions, Dogmaticall Observations, and Evangelicall Essays, upon the Gospel of Jesus Christ According to St. Matthew. London, 1640.

West, Robert H. "Milton's Sons of God," MLN, LXV (1950), 187-191.

Whately, William. Prototypes, or, The Primarie Precedent Presidents out of the Book of Genesis. London, 1640.

Whiting, George W. "Christ's Miraculous Fast," MLN, LXVI (1951), 12-16.

--------. "The Father to the Son," MLN, LXV (1950), 191-193.

--------. Milton and this Pendant World. Austin, Tex., 1958.

--------. Milton's Literary Milieu. Chapel Hill, N. C., 1939.

--------. "Milton's Taprobane (Paradise Regained, IV, 75)," RES, XIII (1937), 209-212.

Wikenhauser, Alfred. New Testament Introduction. Translated by Joseph Cunningham. New York, 1958.

Williams, Arnold. The Common Expositor: An Account of the Commentaries on Genesis, 1527-1633. Chapel Hill, N. C., 1948.

--------. "Milton and the Renaissance Commentaries on Genesis," MP, XXXVII (1939), 264-267.

--------. "Renaissance Commentaries on Genesis and Some Elements of the Theology of Paradise Lost," PMLA, LVI (1941), 151-164.

Williams, Charles. The English Poetic Mind. Oxford, 1932.

Wingren, Gustaf. Man and the Incarnation: A Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus. Translated by Ross Mackenzie. Philadelphia, 1959.

Wolfe, Don M. "The Role of Milton's Christ," Sewanee Review, LI (1943), 467-475.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. The Philosophy of the Church Fathers. Vol. I, "Faith, Trinity, Incarnation." Cambridge, Mass, 1956.

Woodhouse, A.S.P. "Theme and Pattern in Paradise Regained," UTQ, XXV (1956), 167-182.

Wright, G. Ernest. God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 8. London, 1952.