



PROJECT MUSE®

Typology, Politics, and Theology in *Paradise Regained* and
Samson Agonistes

Patrick J. McGrath

Studies in Philology, Volume 116, Number 4, Fall 2019, pp. 758-783 (Article)

Published by The University of North Carolina Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/sip.2019.0030>

Studies in Philology

DEAN BARNES, Editor
MARGARET M. DOUGLASS, Managing Editor

EDITORIAL BOARD
David J. Aronson, University of Michigan
C. David Benson, University of Michigan
James J. Bracken, University of Michigan
James J. Bracken, University of Michigan
James J. Bracken, University of Michigan

CONTENTS

RESEARCH NOTE "The 'Mystical' and 'Mystical'": Science and Literary Criticism in Thomas's <i>Paradise Lost</i> and <i>Paradise Regained</i>	758
FRANK R. BRADSHAW "The 'Mystical' and 'Mystical'": Science and Literary Criticism in Thomas's <i>Paradise Lost</i> and <i>Paradise Regained</i> "	760
WILLIAM J. BRYAN "The 'Mystical' and 'Mystical'": Science and Literary Criticism in Thomas's <i>Paradise Lost</i> and <i>Paradise Regained</i> "	762
ERIC FRENCH "The 'Mystical' and 'Mystical'": Science and Literary Criticism in Thomas's <i>Paradise Lost</i> and <i>Paradise Regained</i> "	764
ANDREW G. BUCKLEY "The 'Mystical' and 'Mystical'": Science and Literary Criticism in Thomas's <i>Paradise Lost</i> and <i>Paradise Regained</i> "	766
STEPHEN J. HARRIS "The 'Mystical' and 'Mystical'": Science and Literary Criticism in Thomas's <i>Paradise Lost</i> and <i>Paradise Regained</i> "	768
MARILENE C. CALDWELL "The 'Mystical' and 'Mystical'": Science and Literary Criticism in Thomas's <i>Paradise Lost</i> and <i>Paradise Regained</i> "	770

Published quarterly by
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS
CARRINGTON

➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/734422>

Typology, Politics, and Theology in *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*

by Patrick J. McGrath

This article contends that John Milton's use of reverse typology to connect Samson Agonistes and Paradise Regained has both theological precedent and historical implications. Reformed exegesis and Arianism provide theological contexts through which to understand Milton's placement of the New Testament Son before the Old Testament Samson. The complexity of Miltonic typology offers an implicit commentary on rapid Restoration typologies that mindlessly identify Stuart monarchs with Old Testament kings. Finally, the article shows that typology supplies a means by which Milton legitimates Samson's act of religious violence.

IN *Towards "Samson Agonistes"* (1978), Mary Ann Radzinowicz influentially declared the "failure of typological criticism to elucidate the relationship between *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*."¹ Some commentators of the 1980s and onward have tempered her statement by characterizing John Milton's own moves toward typology as diffident or indecisive. David Loewenstein maintains that "the argument for Christian typology in *Samson Agonistes* has been exaggerated since Milton makes no specific mention of Christ's persecution and crucifixion."² More recently, Noam Reisner has seen "incomplete Christian typologies" as linked to qualities of the tragedy; and Tobias Gregory argues that, while "Milton would have known about the tradi-

¹ Radzinowicz, *Towards "Samson Agonistes": The Growth of Milton's Mind* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978), 283.

² Loewenstein, *Milton and the Drama of History: Historical Vision, Iconoclasm, and the Literary Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 182n. See also Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 293.

tional typological association between Samson and Jesus," he "does not evoke it explicitly in either poem."³ Another school of thought renders *Samson Agonistes* either as antitypological or as employing typology in what Christopher Kendrick has called a "vexed and reflexive" way.⁴ In "Typological Impulses in *Samson Agonistes*," Kendrick describes a spectrum of such attitudes, ranging from the avowedly antitypological and/or historicist readings of Joseph Wittreich, Jason Rosenblatt, and Stanley Fish to those emphasizing the play's negotiation between "Old and New dispensations," viewing "the relation between them," and hence the role of typology, "as a matter of ongoing struggle and readjustment."⁵ Above and beyond these positionings, however, the main modern objection to bridging the two poems through typology lies in the much simpler matter of their physical arrangement. As Maggie Kilgour points out, an Old to New Testament sequence would have made critics' lives easier:

If *Samson* had been placed first in the volume, the two poems would have followed a neat typological sequence: we would read about the Old Testament man of action first and then move on to the new, improved New Testament story of heroic suffering. . . . But *Paradise Regain'd* precedes *Samson Agonistes* in the volume. The reading experience takes us backwards in time, undercutting typology and teleology in general.⁶

In Kilgour's account, the sequence of the poems actually precludes the coherence of a typological reading.⁷ Indeed, among critics who forego the typological question altogether, there is some consensus that the

³ Reisner, *Milton and the Ineffable* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 262; and Gregory, "The Political Messages of *Samson Agonistes*," *SEL* 50 (2010): 192.

⁴ Kendrick, "Typological Impulses in *Samson Agonistes*," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 84 (2015): 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 15. See Wittreich, Jr., "'Strange Text!': *Paradise Regained*. . . . To which is Added *Samson Agonistes*," in *Poems in Their Place: The Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections*, ed. Neil Fraistat (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 164–94. See also his *Interpreting Samson Agonistes* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), 226; and *Shifting Contexts: Reinterpreting Samson Agonistes* (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2002), 8. See Fish, *How Milton Works* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 391–431; and Rosenblatt, *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi: John Selden* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 93–110. For a more general discussion of critical interpretation, see Derek N. C. Wood, "Introduction: The Critics and Some Problems of Meaning," in *'Exiled from Light': Divine Law, Morality, and Violence in Milton's "Samson Agonistes"* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 3–26.

⁶ Kilgour, *Milton and the Metamorphosis of Ovid* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 299–300. See also Peter C. Herman, *Destabilizing Milton: "Paradise Lost" and the Poetics of Incertitude* (New York: Palgrave, 2005), 175.

⁷ Of course, not *only* typology can supply the poems with coherence. See Elizabeth Oldman, "Milton, Grotius, and the Law of War: A Reading of *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*," *Studies in Philology* 104 (2007): 340–75.

poems' contiguity is not substantive at all but accidental, born of external pressures upon Milton and his printer in 1671. According to this argument, the joint publication constituted either a means to escape censorship (hiding the offensively revolutionary Samson behind the offensively boring Son), or an inspired piece of salesmanship on the part of John Starkey, the stationer.⁸

In contrast to antitypological, quasi-typological, and accidentalist readings alike, this article seeks to affirm the broad-scale, substantive validity—theological, poetic, and historical—of interpreting the relationship of the two poems typologically. Drawing on Reformation theology as an ongoing presence in the political and religious context of Restoration England, I offer a rationale for what I term the poems' reverse typology. I use "reverse" advisedly. While some would agree that Milton's tendency is to complicate rather than to reject typological convention, my interest lies less in his metacritical and historiographic musings than in his direct confrontation of readers with the political valences of typological practice. Deliberately distorting standard typological associations—especially, though not exclusively, royalist ones—Milton also, in these poems, causes the most tried-and-true aspects of typological practice to seem etiolated and unnatural. We should not, in fact, expect the typological *tour de force* that these poems jointly accomplish to be either explicit or customary.⁹ Instead, their correspondences threaten to breach the two parameters of typology without quite doing so: that of chronology, whereby Old Testament referent precedes New, and that of analogy, whereby literal difference between type and anti-type emerges ultimately from the process as transcendent sameness. I

⁸ John T. Shawcross, "The Genres of *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*: The Wisdom of Their Joint Publication," *Milton Studies* 27 (1983): 226; and Gregory, "The Political Messages of *Samson Agonistes*," 191. See also Stephen Dobranski's discussion of the printing house context, in *Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 183–206.

⁹ One often reads that there is nothing "explicit" about typology in *Samson Agonistes* or about typological connections between it and *Paradise Regained*: even F. Michael Krouse, who argues wholly in favor of typological interpretation, cautions that "[t]here is but one shred of palpable internal evidence to suggest that Milton intended the poem to call to mind the age-old correspondence between Samson and Christ" (*Milton's Samson and the Christian Tradition* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1949], 120). See William G. Madsen, *From Shadowy Types to Truth: Studies in Milton's Symbolism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1968), 187; Barbara Lewalski, *Milton's Brief Epic: The Genre, Meaning, and Art of "Paradise Regained"* (Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 1966), 172; Gregory, "The Political Messages of *Samson Agonistes*," 192; and Phillip J. Donnelly, *Milton's Scriptural Reasoning: Narrative and Protestant Toleration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 207.

argue that Milton intended typology after the 1671 volume, like epic after *Paradise Lost*, to be forever changed, and that this formal renovation had a pointedly political purpose. Milton deploys a highly intellectual typology against the easy, vulgar, and *explicit* Royalist penchant for conflating Old Testament king with Stuart monarch. The temporal and analogic complicatedness of Milton's typology served as a corrective to the crudely promotional ends of its Royalist use. The precedence of Christ before all created things—a principle made manifest in the placement of *Paradise Regained* before *Samson Agonistes*—inveighs against the political abuse of correlative typology: could Charles I or II honestly claim such priority? By denaturalizing the customary relation of type to antitype, and by amplifying the paradoxes requisite to their union, Milton makes conspicuous the mindless ease with which monarchists and Established Churchmen deployed typological parallels. Far from rejecting typology, he renovates it, seeking to revitalize its creative and polemical powers. The poetic coherence, polemical intentionality, and heterodox theology of such a typological renovation constitute more than an "impulse." Milton's exegetical renewal menaces royalist triumphalism with the threat of renewed violence.

Milton's chief innovation is to link the poems typologically through the deceptively simple means of verbal parallels: echoed names, phrasings, and syntactic structures. In creating these links, he transfers to the two poems a Reformed exegetical practice that legitimates typology through verbal commerce between testaments. In Samuel Mather's *The figures or types of the Old Testament* (1683), one of a limited number of typological handbooks compiled in the seventeenth century,¹⁰ identifying verbal parallels represents for the faithful one of three ways to prove a typological relation between Old and New Testaments: "the Scripture is the best Interpreter of it self. We cannot judg [*sic*] of these legal Shadows but by Scripture-light. If either express words, or change of Names, or a clear analogy and proportion do appear; these are Intimations of the Mind of God, that such things are Types."¹¹ Milton's take on this is more elaborate: in *Samson Agonistes* and *Paradise Regained*, the "express words" variously reflect, refract, and distort Samson as a type of Christ. There are no easy ratios of 1:1.

The adamant literalism of Milton's typological method does something interesting—perhaps even irreverent or perverse—with typologi-

¹⁰ Paul J. Korshin, *Typologies in England, 1650–1820* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), 36.

¹¹ Mather, *The figures or types of the Old Testament* (Dublin, 1683), 78.

cal norms. It instances an unease with allegorical exegesis and an ingenious rethinking of it. Allegory often points beyond the letter and above the literal. Milton's insistence on verbal parallels as the primary conduit of typological meaning brings allegorical abstraction *down* to the literal and *back* to the letter. In this way, the allegorical literalism of Miltonic typology pacifies the "distrust of figurative modes of expression" that H. R. MacCallum finds central to Milton's exegesis.¹² Some fifty years ago, Barbara Lewalski cautioned against "a too facile restriction of typological symbolism to medieval literature and biblical exegesis, on the assumption that Renaissance textual scholarship and the biblical literalism of the Reformation undercut all varieties of allegory."¹³ Lewalski's soft opposition between literalism and allegory receives more recent and ossified articulation according to Kendrick: "Because the play's historicism keeps vividly to the fore the difference between Old and New Testament regimes, indeed the cultural difference of the Judges period, it can be said to rule out easy typological readings, if it does not positively encourage the audience to rest in a literal reading."¹⁴ But what about a typology that does rest in just such a literal reading? As this essay will argue, Milton's typology has it both ways: it at once undercuts and reifies biblical modes of allegoresis, treating syncretically what Lewalski and Kendrick find largely antithetic. It turns that typological convention on its head. Of all the examples of unconventional typology, the ordering of the 1671 poems represents the most flagrant. Whereas that sequence has been found to preempt a typological reading, a closer examination of Reformed exegesis reveals how it invites it.

I. TYPOLOGY AND REFORMED EXEGESIS

The Son's precedence over Samson puts *Paradise Regained* in a position to comment on—perhaps even gloss—*Samson Agonistes*.¹⁵ Reformed methods of exegesis conceived of a dynamic interrelationship between

¹² MacCallum, "Milton and the Figurative Interpretation of the Bible," in *Milton and Questions of History: Essays by Canadians Past and Present*, ed. Feisal G. Mohamed and Mary Nyquist (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 65.

¹³ Lewalski, *Milton's Brief Epic*, 167.

¹⁴ Kendrick, "Typological Impulses," 5.

¹⁵ See Anne K. Krook, "The Hermeneutics of Opposition in *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*," *SEL* 36 (1996): 137. For further commentary on the New Testament illuminating the Old in Milton's works, see Mary Ann Radzinowicz, *Milton's Epics and the Book of Psalms* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989), 48.

testaments that might allow for this commentary. For example, Martin Luther states, “we illuminate the Old Testament by the Gospel, not vice versa.”¹⁶ Milton makes a similar claim in *De Doctrina Christiana*: “the light of the gospel should be used to illuminate the obscurity and the figurative language of the prophets.”¹⁷ In Luther’s writings, the illumination of the Old Testament by the New finds dramatic expression in his 1513 *Psalter*. None other than Jesus Christ authors its preface: “Praefatio Ihesu Christi, filii dei et domini nostri, in Psalterium David.” About this remarkable attribution, Siegfried Raeder writes,

The authors of such introductory texts were human beings, e.g. Jerome or anonymous persons. But Jesus Christ never appears in the role of an author of a biblical preface. Luther intends to say this: It is not any man, who teaches the reader to understand the Psalms, it is Christ himself, the son of God, who is speaking in the Psalter.¹⁸

Christ’s authorship of the preface establishes His presence throughout the testaments and, more broadly, salvation history. It effectively makes *praesentia Christi*—Christ’s ubiquity in scripture—“exegetically vivid.”¹⁹ For Martin Bucer, Milton’s erstwhile ally in the divorce wars, that ubiquity derives from Christ’s status as “the primordial event that determines entirely the character of the history of salvation.”²⁰ Christ’s originality enables the unity of the Old and New Testaments that Reformed exegesis sought to affirm.²¹

Typology is especially capable of elaborating “the interdependent architectural design of Old and New Testaments.” It illustrates, as Kevin Killeen argues, the following: “While the Old Testament required the new, equally, the Gospels needed the Old Testament . . . for the full

¹⁶ Siegfried Raeder, “The Exegetical and Hermeneutical Work of Martin Luther,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation, II: From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, 3 vols., ed. Magne Saebø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996–2015), 2:377. For discussion of the Calvinist adoption of this method of exegesis, see Johann Anselm Steiger, “The Development of the Reformation Legacy: Hermeneutics and the Interpretation of the Sacred Scripture in the Age of Orthodoxy,” in *ibid.*, 2:691–753.

¹⁷ Don M. Wolfe, ed., *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, 8 vols. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1953–82), 6:255. All citations from Milton’s prose works are from this edition and will be noted parenthetically within the text by the following: *The Reason of Church Government* [RCG]; and *De Doctrina Christiana* [DDC].

¹⁸ Raeder, “The Exegetical and Hermeneutical Work of Martin Luther,” 2:371.

¹⁹ Quoted in Steiger, “The Development of the Reformation Legacy,” 2:733.

²⁰ R. Gerald Hobbs, “Pluriformity of Early Reformation Scriptural Interpretation,” in Saebø, ed., *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, 2:480.

²¹ For later examples, see Thomas Taylor, *Christ revealed* (London, 1635), 2; and Benjamin Keach, *Troposchemalogia* (London, 1682), 4v.

sense of either to emerge."²² The salvation history that typology constructs is one in which "early events of salvation point to later ones, while the later are to be understood as their fulfillment in such a way that they contain these elements in themselves and now bring them to their full truth."²³ In volume one of *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*, the Catholic theologian Hans Urs von Balthasar discusses the paradoxical nature of typological signification in establishing testamental unity:

What is important in the first place is the promise's character as image as compared to the fulfillment's character as reality: There is a dimension to the fulfillment which is lacking in the image, a dimension which, precisely, does not derive its reality from the image. When this image or type is called a 'prototype' this is not done in the sense of an archetype or model from which a copy would later be made. 'Prototype' is here meant in the unique sense that the image or type comes 'before' the reality as a first (protos) sketch, as a foreboding and an intuition. We say that here this meaning is unique because in every other case the image or type comes ontologically after the reality which it copies. This characteristic is proper to the Biblical image only in so far (here again in a unique way) as the later reality that fulfils it is the ontological ground for the earlier images: 'Before Abraham was, I am' (Jn 8.58). Thus, the actual temporal descent is founded on a reversed relationship.²⁴

The salient points in Balthasar's analysis are that the later reality (antitype) fulfills the earlier promise and image (type). In the words of Peter Opitz, the antitype brings the type to its "full truth." The early image seeks fulfillment from that which is also its ontological basis. The fulfillment that is sought accounts for the reversal Balthasar identifies. As the vision presses toward fulfillment, prefiguration explodes into realization. All of its momentum is forward moving. But at that moment of realization, it lurches backwards: the antitype, this object of foreshadowing desire, back-shadows as the type attains its truth too. Typology moves both forwards and backwards.²⁵

²² Killeen, *The Political Bible in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 37.

²³ Peter Opitz, "The Exegetical and Hermeneutical Work of John Oecolampadius, Huldrych Zwingli, and John Calvin," in Saebø, ed., *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, 2:446.

²⁴ Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*, vol. 1, *Seeing the Form*, trans. Erasmo Leiva-Merikakis (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1982), 624.

²⁵ For another example of this backward movement, see Enrico Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans. Ronald E. Lane (Collegeville, MI: Liturgical Press, 1995), 95. For discussion of Miltonic types exhibiting this movement, see Lynn Veach Sadler, "Regeneration and Typology: *Samson Agonistes* and Its Relation to *De Doctrina Chris-*

The movement emphasizes the inseparability of the testaments, and it could also result in complex constructions of time. In *Anachronic Renaissance*, Alexander Nagel and Christopher S. Wood identify typology as theology's contribution to the "time-bending operation" they find fundamental to Renaissance culture.²⁶ "Sometimes types," Paul J. Korshin explains, "look backward and forward simultaneously."²⁷ And they even look more ways than that. As Lewalski discusses, John Donne's exegesis of Hosea 2:10 ("And I will marry thee unto me for ever") in his Washington marriage sermon "uncover[s] in [the text] all the typological associations between the marriages of Adam and Eve, of Christ and the soul, and of the Lamb and his Bride."²⁸ Donne's typology looks retrospectively (Adam and Eve), prophetically (the Lamb and his Bride), and contemporaneously (Margaret Washington and her husband). It is also possible for the type and antitype to exist at the same time, as David Berkeley shows.²⁹

Typology has a capacity to contain different temporalities, for the type to look backward, forward, and adjacent. It does not represent a static, one-directional movement from old to new. In so far as it manifests the Reformed attempt to demonstrate scriptural unity, it animates *all* of scripture with the *praesentia Christi* and the primordial status of Christ in salvation history. Christ's originality leaves everything in that history subsequent to Him. The placement of *Paradise Regained* before *Samson Agonistes* is symptomatic of—not inimical to—the originality of Christ in typological interpretation. It is also in this originality that Miltonic typology finds a heterodox potential.

tiana, Paradise Lost, and Paradise Regained, *SEL* 12 (1972): 141–56. For another examination of Miltonic types and temporality, see David S. Berkeley, "Some Misapprehensions of Christian Typology in Recent Literary Scholarship," *SEL* 18 (1978): 3–12. The heretical and political dimensions of Miltonic typology have recently been explored by Matthew Neufeld, "Doing without Precedent: Applied Typology and the Execution of Charles I in Milton's *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 38 (2007): 329–44; Neil D. Graves, "Typological Aporias in *Paradise Lost*," *Modern Philology* 104 (2006): 173–201; and Marshall Grossman, "Poetry and Belief in *Paradise Regained*, to which is added, *Samson Agonistes*," *Studies in Philology* 110 (2013): 382–401.

²⁶ Alexander Nagel and Christopher S. Wood, *Anachronic Renaissance* (New York: Zone Books, 2010), 10.

²⁷ Korshin, *Typologies in England*, 6.

²⁸ Barbara Lewalski, "Typological Symbolism and the 'Progress of the Soul' in Seventeenth-Century Literature," in *Literary Uses of Typology from the Late Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Earl Miner (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977), 84.

²⁹ Berkeley, "Some Misapprehensions of Christian Typology in Recent Literary Scholarship," 6.

II. MILTONIC TYPOLOGY

The complex temporal constructions of Reformed exegesis and its use of Christ as an “immanent criterion” suggest a provenance for Milton’s reverse typology. Origins for the reversal also lie in Milton’s heterodox theology and his politics. Examining the deployment of typology in some of Milton’s other writings provides an indication of those origins as well as important points of contrast by which to assess the originality and innovation of the 1671 poems.

Polemical exigency informs Milton’s attitude toward typology in the fourth of his anti-prelatical tracts, *The Reason of Church Government* (1642). At one point in the tract, Milton focuses on James Ussher’s claim in *Certain Briefe Treatises* (1641) that “the ground of Episcopacy is fetched partly from the patterne prescribed by God in the Old Testament: and partly from the imitation thereof brought in by the Apostles and confirmed by Christ himselfe in the time of the New.”³⁰ The continuity that Ussher posits between Old and New Testaments leads Milton to emphasize the difference between the two dispensations. Milton often derogates the Law in relation to the Gospel: “How then the ripe age of the Gospell should be put to schoole againe, and learn to governe her selfe from the infancy of the Law” (RCG 1:763). An imitation of the Law — what Milton calls a “foule relapsing to the old law” (1:776) — will “inferre Popedome all as well” (RCG 1:773). The Law constitutes a “sandy bottome” on which to establish contemporary practices (RCG 1:775). The fundamental disparity between Law and Gospel causes Milton to disable the continuity typology might establish between Old and New Testaments. The Gospel “does not therefore imitate the law her underling, but perfect her” (RCG 1:764). As we will see later in this essay, Milton places Samson and Christ in an imitative relationship through verbal parallels; allusions *do* cause the figures to echo (imitate) each other. By contrast, in *The Reason of Church Government*, type perfects and supersedes antitype:

The whole ceremoniall law, and types can be in no law else, comprehends nothing but the propitiatory office of Christs Priesthood, which being in substance accomplit, both law and Priesthood fades away of it selfe, and passes into aire like a transitory vision, and the right of Kings neither stands by any type nor falls. (1:771)

³⁰ *Certain briefe treatises* (Oxford, 1641), 51–52.

The point of reverse typology, in placing *Paradise Regained* before *Samson Agonistes*, is that the Old Testament dispensation does not fade away. It is at once fulfilled and, in that fulfillment, sustained. Milton's typology in the 1671 poems accommodates—in a way that *The Reason of Church Government* clearly does not—Balthasar's conception of typology in which the antitype, this object of foreshadowing desire, back-shadows as the type attains its truth. The violence of Samson is not absolved and pacified in an irenic Christ, one consequence of moving from Old Testament to New. Rather, Milton makes the savage violence a permanent partner in his vision of Christian history. The limited conception of typology and testamental unity in *The Reason of Church Government* seems quite distant from the later innovations.

Paradise Lost moves closer to them. While the epic does not contain the same dramatic statement of reverse typology as the 1671 poems, it does include moments of typological reversal that suggest an exegetical provenance for the later audacity of "to which is added." During Michael's relation of biblical history to Adam in books 11 and 12, he famously offers this reflection on the movement of that history: "So law appears imperfect, and but given / With purpose to resign them in full time / Up to a better covenant, disciplined / From shadowy types to truth, from flesh to spirit."³¹ The shadowy types lead up to and are completed by truth. Raymond Waddington has recently observed, though, how, during Michael's relation of Abel's murder in book 11, Milton reverses that movement. He alters his depiction of Cain murdering Abel to invoke the death of Judas in Acts 1:18–19, thereby rendering Cain as Judas and Abel as Christ. In other words, Milton's reading of the New Testament account of Judas determines his depiction of the Old Testament Cain: "Reading backwards, from truth to shadowy type, suggests that Milton has devised a parallel between the deaths to reinforce the typological relation."³² The backward movement of Milton's typology, and the persistence of the type it occasions, contrasts with the type that "passes into aire like a transitory vision" in *The Reason of Church Government*.

We can glimpse something of the complex pressure typology exerts

³¹ Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Alastair Fowler, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2007), 12.300–303. All subsequent citations from Milton's *Paradise Lost* [hereafter *PL*] are from this edition and will be noted parenthetically within the text by book and line.

³² Waddington, *Looking into Providences: Designs and Trials in Paradise Lost* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 156.

on time in Genesis 3:15's centrality to the last three books of *Paradise Lost*. The protevangelium occupies a place of signal importance. God refers to it directly in book 10 while passing judgment on the serpent: "Between thee and the woman I will put / Enmity, and between thine and her seed; / Her seed shall bruise thy head, thou bruise his heel" (PL 10.179–81). The protevangelium is referred to at least nine more times, making it echo like a refrain throughout the poem's conclusion.³³ The last words spoken by a character refer to it: "Such favour I unworthy am vouchsafed, / By me the promised seed shall all restore" (PL 12.622–23). And then, five lines later, Milton describes the cherubim "Gliding metéorous, as evening mist / Ris'n from a river o're the marish glides, / And gathers ground fast at the labourer's heel / Homeward returning" (PL 12.629–32). During one allusion to Genesis 3:15 in book 10, Adam acknowledges that in a fallen world "with labour I must earn / My bread" (PL 10.1054–55). The laborer's heel at which the mist nips may be Adam's, in which case these lines obliquely allude to—or rather apply—the protevangelium.³⁴ The poem cannot get away from it. The significance of the centrality of Genesis 3:15 to the final three books of *Paradise Lost* is that it performs the kind of anachronism that typology exhibits in the 1671 poems. In the words of Mather, Genesis 3:15 constitutes "the first Gospel Sermon that ever was preached," and it leads Francis Roberts to declare "the old Testament is full of Gospel": "The Gospel was anciently preached even unto Abraham. . . . This is not a novell, but an Ancient, an everlasting Gospel."³⁵ Having the first Gospel sermon preached in Genesis accomplishes the temporal involution of Christ preceding Samson. In the protevangelium, as well as working from truth to shadowy types, *Paradise Lost* anticipates the typological inversions of poems 1671.

Milton has a strong heterodox inducement for these inversions in both 1667 and 1671: Arianism.³⁶ Arianism inflects the typological relationship Milton constructs between the Old and New Testaments in *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*. Typology serves as a vehicle for articulating heterodox views. *Paradise Lost*, which is equally influ-

³³ PL 10.1031, 11.116, 11.155, 12.327, 12.379, 12.388, 12.430, 12.454, and 12.623.

³⁴ See William Kerrigan, John Rumrich, and Stephen M. Fallon, eds., *The Complete Poetry and Essential Prose of John Milton* (New York: Modern Library, 2007), 629n.

³⁵ Mather, *The figures or types of the Old Testament*, 8; Roberts, *Mysterium & medulla Bibliorum* (London, 1657), 350.

³⁶ A connection exists between religious heterodoxy and inventive typology. See William Penn and George Whitehead, *The Christian-Quaker* (London, 1674), part 1, 96; and Francis Bampfield, *Septima dies* (London, 1677), 85.

enced by Arianism, contains some typological reversals but not to the extent of the 1671 poems. The majority of the epic antedates the institution of typological interpretation with the protevangeliem in book 10, explaining the limited employment of typology as an Arian vehicle. By contrast, the publication sequence of the 1671 poems makes a concerted effort to uncover the Arian implications of typology. It shows how a fundamental tool of biblical exegesis, when taken to the logical conclusion of the *praesentia Christi*, propends Arianism.³⁷

The Son of *Paradise Regained* precedes the story of Samson, the Old Testament history he represents, and the story of creation in Genesis. The Son's priority, and that to which he is prior (namely, creation), have Arian connotations. In *De Doctrina Christiana*, Milton emphasizes the Son's preliminariness as a way of proving that he is not eternal and was created within time. About that which is eternal, Milton writes, "everyone agrees that nothing can properly be called eternal unless it has no beginning and no end" (*DDC* 6:143). The primacy of the Son demonstrates his existence within—not outside of—a temporal frame. To maintain the conventional ordering of Old and New Testament would tacitly assent to the Trinity presiding over the dispensations *sub specie aeternitatis*. The temporal disruption forcibly injects the Son into a chronology: he *has* a beginning. As Milton adamantly states about the Son's creation, "*In the beginning*, it says, not from eternity" (*DDC* 6:238–39).³⁸ Passages commonly adduced to confirm the Son's eternity (e.g., John 1:1 and 1 Corinthians 8:6) only "prove that the Son existed before the creation of the World but not that his generation was from eternity" (*DDC* 6:206).³⁹ A fragment of Arius's *Thalia*, preserved in Athanasius's *De synodis*, makes a similar point while affirming the Father's preeminence over the Son: "We sing his praises as without beginning because of the one / who has a beginning. / We worship him as eternal because of him who was born in / the order of time."⁴⁰ The priority of the Son to created things also matters: "it is as plain as it could possibly be that God

³⁷ For recent discussion of Arianism in *Paradise Regained*, see Rachel Trubowitz, "As Jesus Tends to Divinity in *Paradise Regained*: Mathematical Limits and the Arian Son," in *Milton Now: Alternative Approaches and Contexts*, ed. Catharine Gray and Erin Murphy (New York: Palgrave, 2014), 109–28.

³⁸ All italicizations are original.

³⁹ See also *DDC* 6:261. Milton adopts the language that Zacharius Ursinus attributes to anti-trinitarians. See Michael Bauman, *Milton's Arianism* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987), 103.

⁴⁰ Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, rev. ed. (1987; Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2001), 102.

voluntarily created or generated or produced the Son before all things" (DDC 6:211); "Finally it should be noted that Christ is not called merely the *beginning of creation*, but the *beginning of God's creation*, and that can only mean that he was the first of the things which God created" (DDC 6:303). The Son's priority before creation recalls His status as something made. Creation brings to mind his created-ness. Arius argued that "the world of ideas of forms is not intrinsic to the being of God: God is *God* independently of there being a creation, and thus independently of his being creator."⁴¹ By attaching the Son to the creation of the world, Milton emphasizes the creation of all things *through* Him; the Son surrenders the independence vis-à-vis creation—the omnipotent and infinite remoteness—Arius attributes to God.⁴²

In the capacity for typology to bend scriptural time—to make Christ present in the Old Testament and even antecedent to it—Milton finds an Arian potential. Typology elevates Christ into an "immanent criterion"; he is an *a priori* hermeneutic principle. Christ's authorship of Luther's *Psalter* represents the most dramatic example of this immanence. Milton turns the interpretive precedence that such exegesis affords Christ into his primacy, effectively using the exaltation to accomplish the demotion (i.e., his lack of parity with the Father). This is a complex means of covering his Arian tracks. An open declaration of anti-trinitarianism could be dangerous.⁴³ By disguising the demotion as exaltation, Milton's Arianism avoids explicit avowal. In this way, it conforms to the theological heresy John Rumrich finds articulated in *Paradise Lost*: "Arianism is implicit, not effaced, in Milton's epic and consistent with his political ideology and view of apocalyptic history."⁴⁴ That Milton's Arianism treads a fine line between exaltation of the Son and demotion cautions against interpreting it as derogation. I agree with Neil D. Graves that "Milton's destabilization of traditional biblical typology expresses his unorthodox theology." I disagree that this represents a character assassination of the Son.⁴⁵ It is based, after all, on Christ's immanence throughout scriptural history. As Rowan Williams argues, the Arian project is "not a gratuitous derogation from the Son's dignity, but an explanation of

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 196. Original emphasis.

⁴² See DDC 6:301–3.

⁴³ See Stephen M. Fallon, "Milton, Newton, and the Implications of Arianism," in *Milton in the Long Restoration*, ed. Blair Hoxby and Ann Baynes Coiro (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 323.

⁴⁴ John P. Rumrich, "Milton's Arianism: Why It Matters," in *Milton and Heresy*, ed. Stephen B. Dobranski and Rumrich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 89.

⁴⁵ Graves, "Typological Aporias in *Paradise Lost*," 174 and 200.

the fact that he stands in need of grace if he is to perform the function for which God has brought him into being."⁴⁶ In the complex balancing act between demotion and immanence, Milton avoids such derogation.

III. ROYALISM AND TYPOLOGY

Milton's typological inversions serve a heretical purpose. But they also satisfy a political agenda. His typological innovations subtly combat the uses of typology by Restoration royalists. Employing the seemingly innocuous vehicle of typology as a form of political opposition shows Milton "contemplat[ing] the appropriate nature of political resistance that would have been familiar to a nonconformist audience required to submit to the Anglican church and swear obedience to the king."⁴⁷ Mobilizing typology as a means of dissent illustrates how "under a regime, as well, of censorship and surveillance, Milton's literary texts take on multiple meanings, working through allusion and indirection, metaphor and paradigm."⁴⁸ In particular, Milton's typology resists the depictions of Charles I and Charles II as antitypes of Old Testament kings.

The application of biblical figures to "contemporary and future history" constitutes one of the ways in which Protestant reformers innovated traditional typology: "This analogizing, which some students of the seventeenth century call *correlative typology*, most commonly involves implied parallels between such Old Testament figures as Moses, Joshua, and David, and contemporary monarchs, statesmen, and other worthies" (original emphasis).⁴⁹ This "typology purported to discover the conjoined nature of historically disparate events or figures."⁵⁰ Such a wide scope could admit comparisons not strictly Christocentric: "What occurs in Protestant typology is a shift of emphasis, modifying the medieval focus upon Christ's life and death as the primary antitype to which all the Old Testament types refer, by developing a further focus upon the contemporary Christian as an antitype."⁵¹ Correlative typolo-

⁴⁶ Williams, *Arius*, 106.

⁴⁷ Joad Raymond, "The Restoration," in *Milton in Context*, ed. Stephen B. Dobranski (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 468.

⁴⁸ Laura Lunger Knoppers, "'Englands Case': Contexts of the 1671 Poems," in *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*, ed. Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 583.

⁴⁹ Korshin, *Typologies in England*, 31.

⁵⁰ Killeen, *Political Bible in Early Modern England*, 35.

⁵¹ Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Donne's "Anniversaries" and the Poetry of Praise: The Creation of a Symbolic Mode* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973), 160.

gies of Charles I and Charles II emphasize the extent of the parallels between the lives of the monarchs (antitype) and biblical figures (type). As a result of these thoroughgoing comparisons, authors simply equate Charles I or Charles II with a biblical figure.

In a Martyr's Day sermon from 1661, John King illustrates how the Restoration witnessed a renewal of mourning for Charles I; King simply reprints Bishop Juxon and Robert Brown's *The subjects sorrow* (1649).⁵² The sermon states, "we have had a *British Josiah*, whose Graces and Privileges fully answered the proportion and size of their pattern."⁵³ In William Hampton's Martyr's Day sermon, also from 1661, Hampton asserts that Josiah constitutes "the fittest parallel I can find in the whole sacred book, for our Martyred Sovereign [*sic*]."⁵⁴ For several pages in the sermon, he presents a quality of Josiah and then coordinates it with a character trait that Charles shares, driving home the concinnity between the two figures.⁵⁵ Nathaniel Hardy's Martyr's Day sermon of 1662 also stresses the manifold similarities between the life of Josiah and Charles I. Hardy urges his auditory to "see how clearly the various lineaments of the one are to be discerned in the other."⁵⁶ Hardy's sermon rather spectacularly claims that Charles's murderers are "more inexcusable" than Christ's. He then proceeds to equate Charles with both Josiah and Christ.⁵⁷

Instead of Josiah, Charles II is often depicted as a present-day David.⁵⁸ Again, authors point to the striking, and even uncanny, resemblance between type and antitype. Clement Ellis equates David's return to the throne of Israel with Charles II's restoration to the English throne: "We have heard of the *Day* which the LORD once *made* for *Israel*, let us now descend to consider the *Day* the LORD hath lately *made* for *England*: where it would be very easie, would it not be too tedious, almost in every particular to shew you, how *King David* and his *Day* is parallell'd by *King CHARLES the Second* (to whom God make many long

⁵² The length of King's sermon accords with Brown's version.

⁵³ King, *A sermon on the 30th of January* (London, 1661), 45. For earlier comparisons of Charles I and Josiah, see Walter Montagu, *Jeremias redivivus* (London, 1649); and *The martyr of the people* (London, 1649), which compares Charles to both Josiah and David.

⁵⁴ Hampton, *Lacrymae Ecclesiae* (London, 1661), 1. A later sermon by John Overing is largely a paraphrase of Hampton's work. See Overing, *Hadadrimmon* (London, 1670), 3.

⁵⁵ Hampton, *Lacrymae Ecclesiae*, 24–30. See Overing, *Hadadrimmon*, 20–24.

⁵⁶ Hardy, *A loud call to great mourning* (London, 1662), 28.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 39 and 42.

⁵⁸ For the suggestion of Charles II as Zerubbabel, see Henry King, *A sermon preached at White-Hall on the 29th of May* (London, 1661), 35.

and happy *Dayes*) and *his Day*.”⁵⁹ The parallels are so extensive as to be tedious in their recitation. Sermons by John Philips, Richard Allestree, and John Allington also highlight the strong correspondence between Charles II and David (Allington presents Charles as a type of Christ).⁶⁰

In contrast to the Davidic representations of Charles II, John Bird’s *Ostenta Carolina* (1661) focuses on Charles as Josiah: “So shall King CHARLES II. prove unto us the best of *Englands* Kings, and the expresse Antitype unto good *Josiah*.”⁶¹ Bird also presents Charles II as a type of earlier British and French Kings, including Edward the Confessor and Clovis (d. 511).⁶² During his argument that Charles II is a type of Clovis, Bird introduces an interesting means to establish typological relation:

Beside in the very letters of their *names* [Clovis and Charles II] there is a *parity* between the Type and Antitype (and this sometime happeneth, not by chance but providence, as when *Mary Aarons* Sister a virgin, and *Jesus Moses* successor *prefigured* in deed and names the *virgin Mary*, and *Jesus* our Savior) betwixt *Clovis* and C and *Lovis*, as to note, those great evils shall be taken away when C and *Lovis* meet, as now they do.⁶³

Both Charles and Clovis start with the letter “C.” The banal simplicity of this argument makes Bird’s typological impulse seem more like pathological desperation. *Anything*—even the most rudimentary of connections—provides evidence of a providential, typological plan. The simplicity (what one might uncharitably call the absurdity) of Bird’s claim reflects two of the prevailing features of the correlative typology we have examined: its tendency to uncover a plethora of connections between type and antitype; and, in consideration of those connections, to assert the identity of type and antitype. Bird’s reliance on the most haphazard of parallels offers the *reductio ad absurdum* of these tendencies.

The complexity of Milton’s typology at the very least interrogates and at most disarticulates the typologies used to depict Charles I and Charles II in Restoration culture.⁶⁴ Milton assiduously avoids the

⁵⁹ Ellis, *A sermon preached on the 29th of May 1661* (Oxford, 1661), 24–25.

⁶⁰ Philips, *God and the King* (London, 1661), 22; Allestree, *A sermon preached at Hampton-court on the 29th of May, 1662* (London, 1662), 34–35; and Allington, *The period of the grand conspiracy* (London, 1663), 67 and 92.

⁶¹ Bird, *Ostenta Carolina* (London, 1661), 21.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 73.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 88.

⁶⁴ Milton had previously seen, and excoriated, the use of correlative typology by his political opponents. See *Eikonoklastes*, in *Complete Prose Works*, 3:365, 3:381–82, 3:484, 3:555, and 3:567.

superficial similarity that Bird exploits. In typological comparisons of Samson and Christ, the meaning of Samson's name supplied an elementary parallel.⁶⁵ During a comparison of the two in *Moses unuailed* (1620), William Guild observes that Christ "is our Sunne of righteousness" (Malachi 4:2).⁶⁶ Mather discusses the similar appellation under "the first Analogy between Christ" and Samson: "then Sampson arose like a little Sun, as his Name imports [Hebrew alphabet] Soliculus or Sol parvus, from Shemesh, Sol, and gave them some dawns of the Day, some beginnings of Light and Liberty in that deep night of Darkness and Bondage." Mather adds that "Answerably Jesus Christ appeared . . . then did this true Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in his Wings."⁶⁷

In Milton's poem, Samson's opening complaint allows for the possibility of a pun and the typology that goes with it: "O dark, dark, dark, amid the blaze of noon, / Irrecoverably dark, total Eclipse / Without all hope of day! . . . / The Sun to me is dark."⁶⁸ "The Sun to me is dark"; "Sun" can pun on "Son."⁶⁹ At this point in the drama, Samson's spiritual condition stands in a parlous state. Languishing in prison, full of blame for God and capable of exquisite self-pity, Samson's spiritual alienation is reflected in his typological remoteness from Christ (i.e., a dark sun/Son). When Samson describes a dark sun, that statement redounds typologically in part because of Samson's own name. We have, though, received some instruction on this point, especially if a reader peruses *Paradise Regained* before *Samson Agonistes*. In the brief epic, Milton in fact acknowledges the pun on sun/Son.

After Satan afflicts Jesus with a horrendous storm, the narrator describes the entrance of morning:

Thus pass'd the night so foul till morning fair
Came forth with Pilgrim steps in amice gray;
Who with her radiant finger still'd the roar
Of thunder, chas'd the clouds, and laid the winds,

⁶⁵ See Barbara Harrell Carson, "Milton's Samson as *Parvus Sol*," *English Language Notes* 5 (1968): 171–76.

⁶⁶ Guild, *Moses unuailed* (London, 1620), 156.

⁶⁷ Mather, *The figures or types of the Old Testament*, 132.

⁶⁸ Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, in *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*, ed. Stella Revard (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), lines 80–86. All subsequent quotations of Milton's *Samson Agonistes* [hereafter SA] and *Paradise Regained* [hereafter PR] are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically within the text, unless otherwise noted.

⁶⁹ For reading Samson's blindness as exegetical commentary, see Jane Melbourne, "Biblical Intertextuality in *Samson Agonistes*," *SEL* 36 (1996): 111–27 and 119–20. For Samson's bondage as exegetical commentary, see Samuel S. Stollman, "Milton's Understanding of the 'Hebraic' in 'Samson Agonistes,'" *Studies in Philology* 69 (1972): 334–47.

And grisly Spectres, which the Fiend had rais'd
 To tempt the Son of God with terrors dire.
 And now the Sun with more effectual beams
 Had chear'd the face of Earth.

(PR 4.426–33)

The pacifying effects of the sun on nature—cheering the face of the earth, drying the plants, inducing the birds' gratulation after such a dreadful night (4.433–38)—reflect the Son's equanimity as he sits "unappall'd in calm and sinless peace" (PR 4.425). These su(o)ns radiate serenity. These would seem the perfect conditions for a pun. Since Milton has connected the words' meanings, it would be easy for one homonym to suggest the other. Not only does Milton not remove one of the words, but he places them—almost defiantly—squarely on top of each other, as if disdaining the pun.⁷⁰ If the dynamic driving a pun is suggestive absence (sun suggesting an absent Son or vice versa), here we have conspicuous presence paraded before us. The insistently plain style of *Paradise Regained* does not so much pun on the two words as recognize the possibility of doing so. A pun at this moment would seem too obvious (perhaps garish), but not punning might seem equally daft. What is the poem to do? Recognize the pun's possibility, alert the reader to that recognition (i.e., place the words on top of each other), but all the while eschew the pun.

Milton wants us to know that *he knows* about this conventional typological reading before he refuses it. He may find its crude simplicity too neat, too rudimentary, and too like the easy parallels Royalists were drawing between Old Testament kings and Stuart monarchs. Typology should be harder won than the C's of Charles and Clovis or sun/Son and sol parvus. Milton has something more difficult to say about Christian history, about how typology can both enclose and narrate that history, that the violent conclusion of *Samson Agonistes* articulates.

IV. TYPOLOGY AND RELIGIOUS VIOLENCE

Typology can offer insight into the relationship between *Paradise Regained* and religious violence in *Samson Agonistes*.⁷¹ It provides a crucial

⁷⁰ See John Leonard's discussion of Milton's "anti-puns," in *Faithful Labourers: A Reception History of Paradise Lost*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 2:576.

⁷¹ For a cogent summary of the critical debate about this violence, see Ryan Netzley, "Reading Events: The Value of Reading the Possibilities of Political Action and Criticism in *Samson Agonistes*," *Criticism* 48 (2006): 509–33.

means by which to connect, question, and ultimately understand how a violent Samson relates to a seemingly irenic Son. I have written “seemingly” because vital to that understanding—to drawing some sort of coherent parallel between these apparently incommunicable extremes—is interrogating an uncomplicated view of the Son’s pacifism.

Throughout *Paradise Regained*, the Son spurns the use of arms. That produces a corollary with an unarmed Samson. “Weaponless himself,” Samson “Made Arms ridiculous” (SA 130–31).⁷² Samson’s rejection of conventional weaponry anticipates his account of killing one-thousand Philistines with the “trivial weapon” (SA 142) of an ass’s jawbone. The “hammer’d Cuirass” of line 132 may even glance at this feat; the jawbone does indeed ridicule (“Arms ridiculous”) customary arms and armor. But it is obviously one thing to celebrate the killing of one thousand men with a jawbone as a triumph of disarmament and another to regard any use of force as a failure of reason and faith. What unarmed means to the Son, and what it means to Samson, are two entirely different things.⁷³ Does disarmament bring Samson and the Son together only to drive their respective violence and pacifism farther apart?

Loewenstein’s discussion of the “inward politics” of *Paradise Regained* and Milton’s *A Treatise of Civil Power* (1659) is especially helpful in addressing this question:

The vision of that late tract—with its unusual emphasis on “the spirit . . . of God within us,” on “the inward man” and the private, individual conscience, and on God’s “inward power” and kingdom—is itself close to the radical Quaker notion that the kingdom of Jesus would come “not by an outward visible shining body, quelling and over-awing the enemies of his Kingdom, but by his inward and invisible Power in the hearts of his People.”⁷⁴

Loewenstein’s quotation of the Quaker John Crook’s *A defence of the true church called Quakers* (1659) directly pertains—at least in its terminology—to *Samson Agonistes*. If “quelling” is a word that denotes an external and martial ethic, then Samson no doubt exudes it. After Samson criticizes the men of Judah for “ingratitude” (SA 276), the Chorus compares Judah’s treatment of Samson to the Ephraimites conduct toward Jephtha. In the end, Jephtha’s “prowess quell’d [the Ephraimites] pride” (SA 286). Later in the poem, after Harapha leaves his confrontation with

⁷² Another indication of the Son’s presence in these lines may be the description of Samson’s enemies as “Adamantean Proof” at line 134. Satan refers to the Son as “Proof against all temptation as a rock / Of Adamant” in book 4 (533–34).

⁷³ See John Carey’s discussion of this in his *Milton* (London: Evans Brothers, 1969), 138.

⁷⁴ Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution*, 258.

Samson “somewhat crest-fall’n” (SA 1244), the chorus crows over Hara-
pha’s tongue-lashing:

Oh how comely it is and how reviving
To the Spirits of just men long opprest!
When God into the hands of thir deliverer
Puts invincible might
To quell the mighty of the Earth, th’ oppressour.
(SA 1268–72)

In *Samson Agonistes*, quelling is associated with the violent resistance and/or deliverance of Jephtha and Samson. Prowess and invincible might quell. That accords with Crook’s opposition of external and forceful quelling with an inward persuasion of hearts. It also describes, as Loewenstein observes, the Son’s rejection of force for “attract[ing] the Soul” and “Govern[ing] the inner man” in *Paradise Regained* (2.476–77). At one point early in the epic, the Son considers forceful action using *quell*, identifying the word as an index of martial sentiment: “victorious deeds / Flam’d in my heart, heroic acts, one while / To rescue Israel from the Roman yoke, / Then to subdue and quell o’re all the earth / Brute violence and proud Tyrannick pow’r” (PR 1.215–19). Instead, the Son decides “By winning words to conquer willing hearts” (PR 1.222).

At the conclusion of *Paradise Regained*, however, the Son does indeed quell: “Hail Son of the most High, heir of both worlds, / Queller of Satan” (4.633–34). Adding force to these lines, the Son has quelled Satan before. In book 5 of *Paradise Lost*, the Son anticipates the crucial part he will play during the War in Heaven, when he will be called upon to “quell” the “pride” of the rebel angels (PL 5.740). In the brief epic, the application of this word to the Son’s victory over Satan denotes the internalization of external force, its recasting in the fight against sin and death. That is not an abandonment of a martial ethos so much as its recontextualization: *Paradise Regained* moves the goalposts on what it means to be forcefully combative, but it retains the same playing field (the one Satan tried before in heaven). “Quell” becomes an index of this redefinition, while “Queller” indicates that the wholesale supersession of militarism is not what takes place. That word—and the concepts it is made to represent in the Son’s book 1 speech and *Samson Agonistes*—remains relevant. An unarmed Samson could have been an opportunity to establish a direct typological parallel with an unarmed Son. That doesn’t happen, but it doesn’t entirely *not* happen, as the Son turning Samson’s *quell* inside out—instead of rejecting it outright—indicates.

The example of “quell,” coming in the last line of *Paradise Regained*, raises the issue of whether other parallels exist between Samson and the Son at the conclusion of each poem. In many ways, the condition of the two heroes couldn’t be more different. The Son returns home to his mother’s house; Samson is dead, covered in gore, and a mass murderer. And yet despite these insurmountable differences—or perhaps because of them—various descriptive similarities keep bringing a comparison of Samson and the Son into and out of focus.

The Son’s final temptation and Samson’s final act are both exercises in patience. The Son is the “patient Son of God” who “stoodst / Unshaken” by the storms Satan creates (*PR* 4.420–21). Samson is “patient but undaunted” wherever the Philistines lead him (*SA* 1623). He patiently endures Philistine mockery and, perhaps, waits patiently for his opportunity to shake (*SA* 1650; “shook”) the pillars. Pillars shake not only in *Samson Agonistes*, but also in *Paradise Regained*. The “two massie Pillars” (*SA* 1633 and 1648) that Samson tugs correspond to Satan’s description of the storm as “dangerous to the pillard frame of Heaven” (*PR* 4.455). While Satan contends that the storms shaking the pillars “Are to the main . . . inconsiderable,” the pillars Samson shakes “to the arched roof gave main support” (*SA* 1634). After Manoa hears about the roof collapsing on Samson and killing him, he bemoans his inability to ransom and free his son: “What windy joy this day had I conceiv’d / Hopeful of his Delivery, which now proves / Abortive as the first-born bloom of spring / Nipt with the lagging rear of winters frost” (*SA* 1574–77). In *Paradise Regained*, the narrator describes the storm that the Son endures as one in which “the Clouds / From many a horrid rift abortive pour’d / Fierce rain with lightning mixt, water with fire / In ruine reconcil’d” (4.410–13). These lines do double intertextual duty, for they also establish an echo with the response of the Philistines upon seeing the enslaved Samson: “At sight of him the people with a shout / Rifted the Air clamouring thir god with praise” (*SA* 1620–21). After this clamoring, as destruction falls on the “choice nobility and flower” of “each Philistian City round” (*SA* 1654–55), something choice celebrates the flora and fauna in *Paradise Regained*:

the birds
Who all things now behold more fresh and green,
After a night of storm so ruinous,
Clear’d up their choicest notes in bush and spray
To gratulate the sweet return of morn.

(4.434–38)

There is terrible beholding in *Samson Agonistes*: “Now of my own accord such other tryal / I mean to shew you of my strength, yet greater; / As with amaze shall strike all who behold” (1643–45). While Samson and the Philistines behold “Ruin, destruction at the utmost point,” these songsters behold the “sweet return of morn” after a “night of storm so ruinous.”

None of these verbal parallels yields the straightforward typological meaning found in an account such as Thomas Taylor’s: “[Christ] was the true Sampson that overcame many enemies, and slew heaps upon heaps.”⁷⁵ A number of these parallels work along a negative gradient, at once differentiating and connecting the two figures: the Son is unshaken; Samson prepares to shake. Others show us the Son in miniature: pillars of a theater, pillars of heaven (deliverer of Israel, deliverer of the world). And certain verbal parallels connect the experiences of Samson and the Son: horrid rifts pour down rain or blasphemous aspersions against the one true God. Still others seem merely incidental and incapable of yielding a coherent meaning no matter how hard they are pressed: Manoa’s abortive hope, an abortive rift in the sky. Whatever kind of meaning they yield, the shared phrasings establish *some* connection—no matter how asymmetric—between the poems.

The verbal parallels occur with the greatest frequency in relation to Samson’s final act and its aftermath. And that is significant. Through these parallels, the poems force the reader to confront the following: at the moment when the violent Samson seems least like the nonviolent Son, they are ineluctably joined. Nor do we need the vantage point of secular humanism to perceive a potential irreconcilability. It is there in *Paradise Lost*, evidenced by any reader who has felt uneasy with how the poem places the Son’s benevolence alongside God’s petty vindictiveness. Such a discordant juxtaposition informs the tragedy. The frenzied screams of the “choice nobility and flower” harmonizing with the delicate notes of choice birdsong produce a strange symphony of dreadful noise. “Choiceness” is the pivot upon which this dark burlesque turns. But in its awful notes we can hear the hard truth of typology, of Christian salvific history: Samson’s actions are correspondent to the Son’s (just as the vindictiveness is to the benevolence). Though we might want to ignore that fact, momentarily forgetting that the Law’s brutality foreshadows and encloses the pacific Gospel, these parallels prevent it. Milton reclaims typology’s capacity for forging connections between

⁷⁵ Taylor, *Christ revealed*, 56; see also 58.

apparently dissimilar things. He asserts a typology that finds similarity on the far side of difference. While Joseph Wittreich might argue that the contrast between the Son and Samson is so great as to break typological bonds, these poems challenge us to assert them in the full disclosure of their disparateness.⁷⁶ Samson's savagery, the Son's pacifism, are both complicatedly and contradictorily true. We have come far from any straightforward typology, one that would focus on obvious, uncomplicated similarities. Milton establishes similarities between Samson and the Son, but they are fully conscious of profound differences. Some of the similarities are direct, but others are accidental and potentially distracting. It is not difficult to see how Milton would have little patience with the crude simplicities of typologies that make the type wholly answerable to the antitype.

In *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity*, Debora Shuger discusses Hugo Grotius's analysis of human sacrifice in *De Satisfactione*: "What is missing in Grotius's argument," she writes, "is typology. Traditional Christian theology, both Roman and Reformed, always considers Old Testament sacrifices as types of the Crucifixion, muffling the strangeness of these ancient rituals by treating them as signs rather than actual practices." By omitting typology, Shuger claims, "the movement of the passage on human sacrifice enacts this progressive realization of one's own uncomfortable proximity to all that seems barbaric and foreign."⁷⁷ *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*, I argue, achieve a similar discomfort *through* typology. If you are looking for the absolution of Samson's violence in the Son, you will not find it. If you are looking for the type to dissolve into—and be absorbed by—the antitype, that is not what happens. Conventional typology, or a straightforward ordering of the poems, might blunt the "actual practices" in the "signs," resolving Samson's violence in the Son's pacifism. But the complexities of Milton's reverse typology make visible—no, they make unavoidable—a dialectic between type and antitype. The Son and Samson are at once startlingly discordant and inescapably conjoined.

And they are conjoined, finally, in a way that relates to the critical controversy over a regenerate Samson. In *Paradise Regained*, the Son is "Sung Victor" (4.637–39) as he returns "Home to his Mothers house."

⁷⁶ See Wittreich, *Shifting Contexts*, 168–69.

⁷⁷ Shuger, *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 83.

Samson, we are told by Manoa, will be returned “Home to his Fathers house,” where a monument will be built and laurel and “branching Palm” planted around it (SA 1733–35).⁷⁸ Stella Revard observes in her notes that “both laurel and palm symbolize victory.”⁷⁹ Identical phrasing (“Home to his Mothers house”; “Home to his Fathers house”) celebrates Samson and the Son as victors. The Son’s triumph over Satan, Samson’s triumph over the Philistines, represent the bases of their respective victories. For Mather, Samson’s “Strength and Victories over his Enemies” constitute one of the four ways in which he was a “Type of Christ.”⁸⁰ In a discrepancy requisite to the persons being compared, the narrator (not to mention hosts of angels) authorizes the Son’s victory, while Manoa does the same for Samson’s. But the typology joining the two poems means that the Son as victor also authorizes Samson’s victory. The final victorious association of Samson and the Son decides in favor of Samson’s divine impulsion. Were *Samson Agonistes* in serious doubt about the morality of and motivations for Samson’s action, it would not invoke a typological comparison with the Son that is about as close to equivalence as this poem gets. “Home to his Mothers house” and “Home to his Fathers house,” with their shared terminology and even metrical stress, seem the stuff of outright parity and not ironic disparity. And so, as Manoa strenuously affirms that God had “not parted from” Samson (1719), his claim receives typological support.⁸¹ The Son inhabits—intertextually at least—the drama’s end.

Many have written about the “overt idolatry” of Manoa’s plan to return Samson’s body to his home, construct a monument honoring it, and plant it round with laurel and palm.⁸² Early modern definitions of idolatry often say something about regarding the creature over the Creator.⁸³ As Manoa’s actions point beyond the creature to the Creator, as they look over and through Samson to Christ, the idolatrous potential of this moment is surely muted if not entirely avoided. Despite his idola-

⁷⁸ See Maggie Kilgour’s discussion of this moment and its relation to *Lycidas* (“Heroic Contradictions: Samson and the Death of Turnus,” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 50 [2008]: 224).

⁷⁹ Revard, ed., *Samson Agonistes*, in *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*, 511n.

⁸⁰ Mather, *The figures or types of the Old Testament*, 131.

⁸¹ See also R. W. Serjeantson’s discussion of Manoa’s claim in “*Samson Agonistes* and ‘Single Rebellion,’” in McDowell and Smith, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Milton*, 629.

⁸² See Wittreich, *Shifting Contexts*, 235; and Vanita Neelakanta, “*Theatrum Mundi* and Milton’s Theater of the Blind in *Samson Agonistes*,” *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 11 (2011): 53.

⁸³ See for example John Bastwick, *The answer of John Bastwick* (Leiden, 1637), C2v.

trous intentions, Manoa is part of a larger history, an epic story, that assimilates and alters his intent, turning it toward a providential use.

An overarching intertextual design explains why the terminology the poems share becomes more alike at the conclusion of *Samson Agonistes*. The verbal parallels *Samson Agonistes* establishes with *Paradise Regained* come in the brief epic during book 4, but at two distinct moments. Samson's violence recalls a span of lines from roughly 4.410 to 4.438. These parallels are, as I have shown, a mixed bag in terms of their exactness; some details in *Samson Agonistes* resonate clearly and logically with *Paradise Regained*, while others seem incongruous or incapable of yielding a coherent meaning. The other verbal parallels in *Samson Agonistes* recall the very end of *Paradise Regained*, in particular lines 637–39. These parallels, we have seen, are much more direct (“Home to his Mothers house”; “Home to his Fathers house”). The reason for the fuzziness and the clarity has to do with an intervening event. Lines 560–95 depict Satan's final temptation of the Son, when Satan places the Son on the “highest Pinnacle” of the temple (*PR* 4.549). After this moment, as the Son stands and Satan falls, Satan becomes convinced of the Son's identity as the prophesied Messiah. As the Son's identity as the Christ becomes increasingly clear, the typology exhibits more exactness as well. The connections between Samson and the Son are more distinct and clearer at the revelation of the Son as the Christ. An elusive and asymmetric typology yields to a straightforward one.

That unconventional typology, this essay has argued, enables Milton to infuse a basic tool of exegesis with heretical potential. It also serves two important political purposes. Typological innovation injects a complexity—temporal, comparative (between type and antitype)—into Restoration typologies that raises the threshold for establishing typological bonds. If the typological relationship between Christ and Samson can be this complex—if it can raise such metaphysical questions about salvific temporality, Christology, and the relation between types and antitypes—then all other typological relationships must be subject to greater scrutiny. Typology cannot be taken for granted, applied willy-nilly. Milton's typological intellections in *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes* fairly blow the *C*'s of Charles and Clovis out of the water. The second political message is more unsettling. As a result of reverse typology, Milton does not absolve Samson's violence in Christ's pacifism. By joining Christ after his endurance of the storm and Samson following his mass slaughter, Milton makes patient suffering and

violent resistance equal partners in his vision of Christianity. As the type resides still in the antitype, so too does the violence abide within—rather than being superseded by—the peace. Typology allows Milton to sustain that potentially explosive contradiction. His violent vision of Christianity, expressed through anti-Royalist typology, stands poised to sanction resistance to the new regime in ways more than exegetical.

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

Copyright of Studies in Philology is the property of University of North Carolina Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.