野呂有子他　Yuko Kanakubo Noro, David L. Blanken, “Milton’s *Ad Patrem, De Idea Platonica,* and *Naturam non pati senium*:—From Praise to Exhortation—”『東京成徳短期大学紀要』第 26 号(1993)41−65.

Milton’s *Ad Patrem, De Idea Platonica,* and *Naturam non pati senium:* From Praise to Exhortation

Yuko Kanakubo Noro
David L. Blanken

De Idea Platonica, Naturam non pati senium and *Ad Patrem* were assembled and printed in 1645 in *The Poems of John Milton, Both English and Latin, Compos’d at several times*. “*Compos’d at several times*” has fueled disputes as to their dates and kindled explications as ingenious as various. The consensus has it that these poems were written in the 1630s, with *De Idea Platonica* and *Naturam non pati senium* also being assigned to the late 1620s and *Ad Patrem* to the early 1640s. Yet all such dating is finally speculative, likewise any literary theorizing too earnestly based on it. *De Idea Platonica*, probably the earliest, contains some 39 lines composed in iambic trimeter; the two longer poems are both in dactylic hexameter, with *Naturam non pati senium* spanning 69 lines and *Ad Patrem* running 120.

Milton’s choice of Latin for his vehicle may be a matter of personal whim—he is writing to please himself and a small academic audience—but his mastery of that vehicle is unquestioned. The three poems come replete with the allusions, literary devices and elaborate syntax that typify classical Greco-Roman poetry. Practised and stylized in form, they go beyond imitation or emulation to show that “Milton was the master Neolatinist of his time and country” with verse William A. Sessions describes as “exhibiting a sophistication of meter and caesura, of figure and verbal structure, and of allusion surely remarkable for any poet . . .”[1] Milton endows his Latin poems with a textual amplitude and ornateness reminiscent of his English poetry, not to mention prose.

If the mechanisms and effects in these three poems derive from classical sources,

[1] James A Freeman and Anthony Low, eds., *Urbane Milton: The Latin Poetry, Milton Studies* XIX (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984), x.
Sessions is referring specifically to *Naturam non pati senium*: William A. Sessions, “Milton’s Naturam,” in *Urbane Milton: The Latin Poetry, Milton Studies* XIX, ed. James A. Freeman and Anthony Low (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984), 53.

their themes are “Miltonic.” There is a consistency of subject matter and its treatment across most of his oeuvre. Examples of Miltonic subjects are the hero and gradations of heroism, often framed in contexts of mundane and heavenly patriarchy. A major topic is the social role of poetry and the political role of the poet—Milton’s Latin’s conscious concern with placing himself and his verse in a historical context. Nature—and the word shimmers with nuance in Milton’s Latin—affords him another motif for conceptualization. These three poems should be susceptible of topical groupings: *De Idea Platonica, Naturam non pati senium* and *Ad Patrem* deal with father-son antagonisms, with heroism in the sense of the poet as creator, and with how Milton relates godhead to both. They also evince a strong similarity of handling, in part due to Milton’s retention of many usages and techniques of Latin poetry. His overall treatment of these themes is mediated by a pattern of praise-exhortation that has oratorical flourishes lending each poem a contrapuntal movement.

This paper will concentrate on *Ad Patrem*’s treatment of prototypical Miltonic themes, with particular emphasis on the poem’s presentation of father-firstborn patterns and how they coexist, uneasily but intact. The context is that of Milton’s criteria for heroic action and how they pertain to father and son in the poem. It will examine the poem’s resemblance to a typical Ciceronian oration in the light of the latter’s oscillation from sections of praise to those of exhortation. It will relate *De Idea Platonica* and *Naturam non pati senium* to these, and analyze effects and devices—invoking the Muses is one such—common to all three poems. Finally, it will provide the Japanese and English translations of *Ad Patrem* that were made to accommodate the writing of this essay: English translation by David L. Blanken and Japanese by Yuko K. Noro.

Written in parodic invocational phrases, *De Idea Platonica* opens by asking who served as the original human ancestor (Quis ille primus cuius ex imagine Natura . . . Aeturnus, incorruptus, aequavus polo . . . lines 7, 9). It then lists some possible prototypes, and goes on to reject others in a barrage of classical erudition. The former examples occur in snippets of Aristotelian (15-18) and Platonic (19-20) philosophy that undermine their own positions by means of inordinate literal-mindedness. The latter examples are mythic or quasi-religious, and the narrator himself denies their veracity.[2]

[2] Most critics posit an Aristotelian narrator whose argument implodes on its excessive factuality. Platonism is upheld ironically and Aristotelianism derided. See Douglas Bush, *A Variorum Commentary on The Poems of John Milton,* Vol. 1, *The Latin and Greek Poems* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), 225-226.

He then adjures Plato to readmit poets into his ‘Republic’ or, failing that, to expel himself from it for having introduced such a philosophical archetype. Throughout the short poem the words “prototype” and “archetype” are synonymous with the Platonic concept of ideal forms.

The full title of the poem, *De Idea Platonica quemadmodum Aristoteles intellexit*, translates to “Of the Platonic Ideal Form as understood by Aristotle.” It adumbrates Milton’s wry portrayal of the pedantic narrator, and deconstructs his seemingly heroic quest for the archetypal man. His reliance on academic terms and thinking is targeted by Milton in this poem that most likely is an academic exercise itself. It is possible to construe *De Idea Platonica* as a caricature of the son in search of his father, here seen as the ultimate patriarch. It is equally feasible to consider the narrator and his plight mock-heroic: in a quest that consists entirely of verbal posturing, he resorts to issuing rhetorical threats. These orotund phrases create a poem that fails, incongruously, to find its subject. The narrator discovers neither creation nor creator (the archetypal man and Plato), so he castigates the latter, and falls into silence. The poem never quite moves beyond its invocation, which is all it is, finally.

This invocation opens in a straight-forward manner with an enumeration of the Muses and a posing of the question their petitioner wants answered (Lines 1-10). But then it dissolves into negative, interrogative and more negative protestations (11-34), and closes by wishing Plato out of his own Republic, should he fail to allow poets into it (35-39). Beneath the surface, however, reside several effects and nuances worth noting. Various “sons” are searching for their fathers-the narrator for archetypal man, Aristotle for Plato, and Milton (as creator of this satiric situation) for both. The antagonism of father towards son occurs by proxy and actually is only alluded to. Let Plato equal God and Milton His son; in opposition let Aristotle equal Satan and the narrator the anti-Christ. Thus Plato’s eviction of Milton the poet from the ideal Republic is reminiscent of the biblical banishment of Adam from Eden. This mock banishment in *De Idea Platonica* both antedates and anticipates Milton’s banishment of the sins in *Ad Patrem* and those Satan and later Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost* (1667).

Running roughly twice the length of *De Idea Platonica*, *Naturam non pati senium* matches that poem both in abstruse subject matter and in lively treatment, “with . . . flamboyant rhetoric and profusion of mythology.”[3] The critical consensus has it that Milton composed either or both in response to university requirements at Cambridge. Its

[3] John Carey and Alastair Fowler, eds., *The Poems of John Milton* (London: Longmans Green and Co Ltd., 1968), 211.

title intimates the contents of this second poem: “That nature does not suffer from old age” deals with the idea that nature is susceptible to decay, and not pure and immutable, an idea of great currency at the turn of the seventeenth century. Milton, resisting the concept, “asserts in mythological terms that the order and powers of nature are unimpaired and will continue to operate until the final conflagration of the world.”[4] His opposition is couched in the phrases of rhetoric and structures of oratory, which Sessions explains as follows:

> the theme of his work . . . is organized into four sections of proof: an *exordium* (1-7); a *reprehensio* (8-32); a *confirmatio* (33-middle of 65) with a *propositio* in the first four lines; and a *peroratio* (middle of 65-69). The larger structural division of the poem follows . . . [a] division into a negative response to the question at hand and then a full proposition and positive response . . .[5]

Thus, *Naturam non pati senium* exemplifies one sort of classical oratory, the *disputatio,* which Milton here confers a tight and compressed format. Though not couched in the praise-exhortation pattern of the Ciceronian *Ad Patrem*, the segments of this poem embody a similar fluctuation of contrary propositions. These sections are Milton’s extended inventory of images of nature in collapse in the *reprehensio*, the (even longer) catalogue of images of flourishing nature in the *confirmatio,* and its reversal into cataclysmic end in the *peroratio.*

Naturam non pati senium lacks a proper invocation to the Muses, nor does it have a central pairing of a father and son in adversary roles. Rather, it musters multiple references to several key Greek myths, in which the heroes were either sired or beloved by Olympian gods. The poem, moreover, is peppered with Latin words for son or boy (*proles*; *puer, filius*), and because these appear in tandem with their progenitors’ or lovers’, there is constant mention of patristic godhead (Jupiter, Phoebus, and Nereus, among others). In *Naturam non pati senium* Milton has arrayed myths that end in catastrophe, typically with a literal fall from grace and the consequent death of the hero-son. But these are the hypothetical images of rhetoric: no sooner does Milton recount all these falls in his *reprehensio* than he resurrects the many sons and heroes and freezes them in stasis in the *confirmatio.* The key lines are 60-30:

---

[4] *Ibid.*, 213.
[5] Sessions, “Milton’s Naturam,” 54.

> Sed neque Terra tibi saecli vigor ille vetusti
> Priscus abest, servatque suum Narcissus odorem,
> Et puer ille suum tenet et puer ille decorem
> Phoebe tuusque et Cypri tuus . . .
>
> Earth, you do not lack that primitive power you had in ages
> past: Narcissus is still fragrant: Phoebus, your boy was as
> handsome as ever. So, too. Cypris, is yours . . .

John Milton in *Ad Patrem* works at triangulating a relationship among himself and his father at the bases and his poetic art at the apex. He makes Milton senior the simultaneous subject and object of the poem, its very basis, through a clever appeal *ad hominem*.[6] To accomplish this appeal, the poem manipulates space and time alike, expressing each in terms of distance. The spatial distance is the gap in poetic appreciation between the two Miltons, which the poem seeks to close or, failing that, bridge. The temporal distance represents the time the father will need to acclimate himself to his son’s future verse, and the time which that verse will take to reach fruition. In *Ad Patrem* Milton is concerned with cajoling his father into greater receptivity to his poetry by means of compliments and blandishments. Here his acts of closure—his approach to this recollection—comprise a series of orthodox poetic stances and devices. The basic act of closure is the actual process of writing the poem, the poet’s assembling of what he says.

In *Ad Patrem* the reader witnesses Milton’s awareness of himself as an epic poet, a sort of “pre-confirmation” of his commitment to that genre. In publishing his Latin and minor English poems until then (putatively 1632 or so), he certainly reviews what he has achieved and anticipates what he should next attempt. This poem presents this attitude of his clearly and dramatically. Milton is to be seriously involved in the Civil War and its accompanying political controversies, which comprise the so-called second phase of his life—though at this juncture it remains uncertain whether his cognizance of this is sharp. Yet in the poem he sites himself and his father in a line of heroes that begins with the two of them and proceeds on to Orpheus, Apollo, and Jupiter.

---

[6] The formula is this: the higher Milton senior’s degree of inclination towards poetry is, the greater the angle of inclination of the triangle and the loftier it apex. This apex is the locus of poetic artistry and paternal merit, which means the stature of the father causes and is caused by the status of the poem. Resisting the poem is tantamount to denying such stature; thus, much of the content of *Ad Patrem* is a seduction of the father’s opinions.

Since these acts are tantamount to establishing his heroic pedigree, Milton takes meticulous pains to choose poets and patrons of poetry from among his Greco-Roman paradigms. His reasoning is peculiarly Platonic at this juncture, as evidenced in lines 17-20:

> Nec tu vatis opus divinum despice carmen
> Quo nihil aethereos ortus, et semina caeli,
> Nil magis humanam commendat origine mentem,
> Sancta Prometheae retinens vestigia flammae.
>
> Do not spurn divine poetry. It still retains some
> vestige of Promethean fire, and nothing more truly
> proves our heavenly origins and seed, nor more
> suitably refines our human minds.

Milton here is evolving a definition of poetry akin to Plato’s own, one facet of which holds that poets are inspired, godlike oracles. However, he would oblige the poet to undertake heroic topics from the hero’s own perspective, in effect to function as the hero. [7] This definition, explicit in *Ad Patrem* and implicit in *De Idea Platonica,* extends across the entire canon of Milton, about which Irene Samuel argues:

> For both Milton and Plato, then, poetry is doctrine, whether true or false, with a fearful power of influence. Plato seems to stress the fearful side, Milton the power; and yet both see the same duty and the same danger. For both the poet is a teacher, not because they thought poorly of poetry, but because they thought astonishingly well of teaching. When Milton says “What religious, what glorious and magnificent, use might be made of poetry both in divine and human things . . .” he ascribes a didactic function to art as surely as Plato did.[8]

Aristotle defines a hero as a person who is like God. And the word “hero” derives from the original Greek “heros” [ηρως], which means “demi-god.” As the reader of

[7] This is a far cry from the conclusion of *De Idea Platonica,* where Milton humorously evicts Plato from his own *Republic*. But Plato himself did no less with poets, the banishment of poets from the perfect state being the obverse of Plato’s celebration of them as godlike.

[8] Irene Samuel, *Plato and Milton* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1947), 64.

Milton’s works, for example, *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio*, will soon realize, Milton manifests keen awareness in word derivations. In *Ad Patrem* he defines his hero as a poet. For one thing, the word ‘poet’ originally means “maker; creator.” Accordingly, poets are those who resemble God in “creating or making” poems. The hero sequence from the two Miltons to Jupiter mentioned above, simultaneously constitutes a divine patriarchy, because in his invocation to the Muses and the lines, “Nunc tibi quid mirum si me geniusse poritus/ Contigerit” (60-61), Milton here mythopoetically presents himself as the spiritual son of Apollo, and akin to Orpheus, since his spiritual mother, the epic muse Calliope, is also the mother of Orpheus. In the opening line in *Ad Patrem*, Milton dramatizes the situation where the baby Milton asks his mother, the muse, to suckle himself, “. . . totumque per ora/ Volvere laxatum gemino de vertice riverum . . .(2-3).” Not only the visual image, but even the bilabials [v] [m] and the liquid sounds [l] [r] contained in these lines clearly remind us of suckling. With the nourishment of mother’s milk he can grow up swiftly and create adventurous songs. Moreover, Apollo’s divinity is divided into the two Miltons: songs (poetry) to Milton the son and music to Milton the father. The poet’s attitude toward his own task in *Ad Patrem*, again, idiosyncratically, evinces Milton’s conception of heroism. In serving God, it is requisite for his heroes to conquer a pair of enemies: tyranny and superstition, respectively the outward enemy and the inward one. Both of them prevent the hero from accomplishing his divine task, utilizing his inward gift, the godhead. Milton therefore strives to persuade his father (his most potent hypothetical external enemy), repudiate his *own* fears and anxieties (his most powerful internal enemy), and stand before God as His ‘steadfast’ servant.

Milton’s oratorical way of praising the hero (in *Ad Patrem*, the hero praised is his father) and repudiating the antagonist or antagonistical party (here his inward fear and anxiety, and the other envious mobs) is modelled after Cicero’s original. Moreover, it is very prevalent among Milton’s contemporaries. The most typical Miltonic effect, however, occurs in the pattern of praise-exhortation. This pattern is often found in his works, for instance, in his sonnets to Fairfax and Cromwell, and in his invocation to the English people in *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* and *Defensio Secunda*.[9] These works manifest an almost invariable, formulaic recognition of the fact that it is his Puritanism

[9] For a fuller discussion of the works, see Yuko Noro, “Milton’s Heroism in *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio*,” Milton and His Influence in English Literature: In Commemoration of the 60th Birthday of Professor Akira Arai (Tokyo: Kinseido, 1992), 275-301.

that makes him admonish the persons whom he has praised. To paraphrase Max Weber’s clarification, being aware of one’s inward divinity and trying to keep using it one behalf of the public is the Puritan spirit. Constantly, Milton reverts to emphasizing that the heroes he praises have utilized their inward gift from God. But, he cautions, should they be satisfied with what they did, and not try to continue utilizing the godhead in them, they thus break the covenant with God and from that very moment they are no longer worthy of the appelation “hero,” whereupon they spiritually degenerate like Satan. In order for them to continue as heroes, they must keep endeavouring to use their divinity within.[10] This is why Milton admonishes after praising, and this aspect is quintessentially Miltonic.[11]

As indicated above, in the first stanza (we basically follow Mary Ann Radzinowicz’s structural analysis and the Columbia edition),[12] Milton presents himself as a suckling baby of the Muse: the inspiration from the Muse is depicted in the metaphor of mother’s milk. Then as the poem progresses, the hero—“the implied poet”—matures swiftly and dramatically. In the third stanza, his father and he are represented as young brothers pursuing the sister Muses, “Cognatas artes studiumque affine sequamur . . . (63),” “Tu tamen ut simules taneras oddisse Camenas . . . (67).”

With the final three lines of the fourth stanza, which some critics cite for their grotesque imagery,[13] a possibility of troth between the poet and “Scientia” is suggested: “Dimotaque venti . . . sit libasse molestum . . . (90, 92).” Now he has apparently gained the self-confidence of full adulthood, for in the next stanza, he soon renounces his evil enemies. Furthermore, in the last stanza, his “juvenilia carmina” are presented as his children and progeny. At the outset of the poem the poet was an infant, but he has by now evolved into “dominus et pater.” He was nurtured by the hands of Mother Poetry, aged and matured, and now exists as the Father of Poetry. Here we get the spectacle of

---

[10] *Ibid*., pp. 78-80.

[11] Whenever we read one of his works, he is quick to prophesy that his next will be a more adventurous work. This is also demonstrated as a salient Puritanic feature of his. *Ibid.,* pp. 80-82.

[12] This structuring of the poem proceeds in this manner:

Stanza 1: lines	1-16 (16 lines)	Stanza 5: lines	93-110 (18 lines)
Stanza 2: lines	17-55 (39 lines)	Stanza 6: lines	111-114 (4 lines)
Stanza 3: lines	56-66 (11 lines)	Stanza 7: lines	115-120 (6 lines)
Stanza 4: lines	67-92 (26 lines)		

[13] Whether there is a grotesque image in these lines or nor, it is certain that the poet is now at quite a high point in “climbing Mt. Parnassus,” so his “would-be” love is close to him.

the chain-of-being ladder system in human being’s growth from child to parent. Moreover if his poems become an *exemplum* and spiritual father to the poems of the future ages, as the poet assures in *Ad Patrem*, accordingly his father becomes the father of fathers, a “paterfamilias” or “pater universalis” like Jupiter. And his son, the poet, already is assimilated with Apollo. Here in the world of poetry the noblest father-son relationship is remodeled between the two Miltons along the lines of the archetypal Jupiter and Apollo one. This is his mythopoetical approach toward the most effective way of concluding the poem at its climactic peak.

Ad Patrem, while being a poem addressed to the poet’s father, nevertheless begins with a prayer or invocation to his spiritual mother, the heavenly Muse.[14] The poet asks the assistance of this surrogate mother to persuade his father. Is it conceivably a somewhat effeminate, or at least an anticlimactic, comical effect? Hardly, for as we have already discerned, a sensual atmosphere prevails throughout the poem. Milton treats a highly spiritual subject, his gratitude, praise and admonition to his father and the defence of poetry, and he adopts the prominently sensual images of maternity and matriarchy. Here we may again appreciate his sophisticated contrapuntal and architectonic mastery of poetry. There also occurs a reiteration of ladder imagery in the gravitation from the sensual lower to the spiritual higher.

In *Ad Patrem* the process of poet’s spiritual growth is visualized in the image of “climbing Mt. Parnassus.” (cf. lines 2, 15, 74, 109-110) In his ascent, the poet-hero refines his ability at the same time, because his father is always depicted in the image of accompanying and encouraging the poet. He continues walking and climbing higher and higher, at first with Apollo and later alone. (cf. lines 76, 104 and 109-110) This image reminds us of Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost*: after the fall they learn about their future, are escorted to the gates of Eden by certain Angels, whereupon they are commanded to walk alone into the Wilderness. Now we know that the Puritan spirit lies in endeavouring to continue utilizing the divinity in each man’s mind, and the predominant image of “continuing to walk aiming at a higher level” in *Ad Patrem* symbolizes this spirit. Professor Akira Arai states in discussing *Paradise Lost*, “For Milton, “hero’ doesn’t mean a military man with tales of bravery, but the human–being “adham,” who starts into this world though in anxiety, yet confirmed by his [/her] belief in his [/her] godhead implanted in him [/her]self.” The archetypal conception of this is already

[14] This device is reminiscent, anticipatory rather, of similar usage(s) in *Paradise Lost*: it occurs there in Books 1, 3, 7, and 9, and plays a predominant role in that poem’s structure and dramatization.

embedded in *Ad Patrem*. Moreover, many of the main conceptions, patterns and devices in *Paradise Lost* appear in this poem: examples include the Neo-Platonic idea, patriarchy, praise-exhortation, and invocations to the Muse. In order for Milton to integrate these elements into the later major works, however, he himself had to walk into the real wilderness, the Civil War, and to continue striving for loftier goals. Toward the climax of *Ad Patrem* he renounces avarice, calumny and jealousy (among others): this action constitutes a literary transcending of human frailty. It remains for Milton to reencounter these and others far worse in the real world, reexperience them, before he feels capable of depicting evil (In Satan, his minions, Adam and Eve, et al.) in *Paradise Lost*.

To My Father
(A Translation of *Ad Patrem*)

Let the Pierian springs now divert their channels through my heart, and may each drop that trickles down from the twin peaks course from my lips, enable my Muse to take flight on daring wings, ignore all petty songs, and render duty and honor to my worthy father. She is embarked on this poem of mine, a small offering: no matter how you judge it, I simply cannot conceive a more fitting gift to repay your own gifts to me. Yet not even my greatest gifts could ever repay yours, let alone the empty words of barren gratitude match all you have given me. Still, this page presents what I do have: my wealth is tallied on this sheet, and all of it is merely what golden Clio has granted me, the fruit of my dreaming in a remote cavern, of laurel groves in a holy wood, and of the shady groves on Parnassus.

Do not spurn divine poetry. It still retains some vestige of Promethean fire, and nothing more truly proves our heavenly origins and seed, nor more suitably refines our human minds. The celestial gods love poetry, with its power to thrill the trembling depths of Tartarus and yoke the infernal gods. Poetry grasps the unfeeling ghosts with triple bands of steel. Priestesses of Apollo and quaking Sybil with pale lips use poetry to reveal the secrets of the remote future. The priest who offers sacrifice standing before the ceremonial altar mouths poetry whether he smites the bull that tosses its gilded horns or, as skilled prophet, he parses the hot entrails for the secrets of fate, seeking destiny’s will in the steaming guts. And when returning to our native Olympus as eternities of time stand still, we shall stroll through the heavenly realm bedecked with gold, wedding our sweet airs to the gentle-sounding strings, and the stars and poles of

both the hemispheres will reply with music of their own. Even now my fiery spirit, hurtling round the whirling spheres and starry choirs, is singing an undying melody, a song beyond description at which the glowing serpent stifles its hissings, while savage Orion, staying his sword, becomes serene, and Maurusian Atlas feels the weight of the stars no longer.

It was the habit in old times for songs to adorn royal feasts, when luxury and gluttony’s insatiable maw were still unknown, and the tables but moderately foamed with wine. Then the poet had a customary place at the festive banquet, his uncut hair garlanded with oak leaves, where he sang of heroic deeds and exploits worth imitating, of chaos and the broad foundations underpinning the world, of gods who crept and lived on acorns, of the lightning bolt still unsought from Etna’s cave. And, really, what good is one’s voice if it only mouths an inspired tune with no words, or their rhythms and meanings? That sort of song is tailored to woodland choruses, but not to Orpheus, whose singing voice rather than his lute, gave ears to oak trees, cast a spell on streams and forced lifeless ghosts to tears: his reputation he owes to his singing.

I ask you not deride the holy Muses, nor judge them worthless or futile. Through their gifts you yourself are able to craft a thousand notes to proper rhythms and prove adroit at tailoring your melodic voice to a thousand tunes, which makes you the rightful heir to Arion’s fame. Is there any wonder then that it’s your good fortune to beget me, a poet, or that we, so closely bound by ties of blood and affection, should undertake sister arts and kindred studies? Wishing to share himself between us two, Phoebus gave me one batch of gifts and my father another, so that father and son each possess half of a god. You may well pretend to despise the delicate the Muses, yet I can’t believe you truly hate them. For you never instructed me, Father, to take the wide open road, where the terrain favors the fortune-hunter and the golden hope of amassing money shines steadily and sharply. Nor do you haul me off to legal matters and have me study our country’s ill-kept statutes, condemning my ears to such tasteless clamor. Rather, you have led me far off from urban noise to this deep solitude so as to enrich my mind even further, and allowed me to walk at Apollo’s side, his happy companion amid the agreeable charms of the Aionian spring.

Nor will I speak of the favors every kind father grants his son; larger things compel my attention. Best of fathers, it was at your expense that the eloquence of the Roman language, with all its graces, and the exalted words of the noble Greeks, words that

become the vast lips of Jupiter himself, were made available to me. At your persuasion I added the proud flowers the French tongue boasts of, the language that the modern Italian exudes from his degenerate mouth (his words attesting to barbarian invasions), and further the mysteries Palestinian prophets articulate. Through your efforts in fact, if I so choose, I have the opportunity of knowing about whatever exists, whether in the sky, on Mother Earth beneath it, the air streaming between them, or concealed below the waves, the heaving marble ocean surface. Science enters into view as the clouds part, then, naked she bends her bright face for my kisses, unless I wish to flee, or find it irksome to taste hers.

Why not amass your wealth, any of you with an unhealthy craving for the royal heirlooms of Austria or the kingdoms of Peru? What greater treasures could have been given by a father, or for that matter by Jove himself, had he bestowed the whole world, heaven alone excepted? No finer gifts, even if they had been safe, were furnished by that father who entrusted to his young son the universal light of mankind and Hyperion’s chariot with the reins of day and the tiara coruscating with lambent rays. Therefore, as I already have a place (though a lowly one) in the coteries of the learned, I shall yet sit among those wearing the ivy and laurel crowns, no more to mingle with the mindless mobs; my steps will avoid all vulgar eyes. Off with you, sleep-stealing worries, and with you, complaints, and the leering and crooked eye of envy. Heartless calumny, do not stretch your snake-filled jaws at me. None of your foul crew can defile me, for I am beyond your power; I shall stride forward with an untouched heart, raised high above your viper-stings.

Because I am powerless, dear father, to repay you in any way you deserve, or to do anything to balance your gifts, let it suffice that I have mentioned them, that I tally them in heartfelt gratitude, that I shall store them away in my memory.

And you youthful poems of mine, my diversions, if only you quest for immortality to outlast your master’s funeral pyre and gaze on the light, perhaps then, so long as black oblivion does not hurl you beneath the crowded underworld of Orcus, you may safeguard this accolade and my father’s name, here eulogized, as an example for the distant future. (Translation by David L. Blanken)

父にあてて

願わくは、ピエリアの泉よりわきいづる霊感よ、[15]
怒涛のごとく押し寄せよ、わが胸に。

二峰(ふたみね)の、かの母なる山よりしたたり落ちる 乳(すずく) のすべてが、[16]
わが唇からほとばしりでるように。

さすれば、わが詩女神(ムーサ)は稚拙(つた)なき歌忘れ、大胆なる飛翔を試み、

敬愛するわが父に栄誉(ほまれ)をあたえてくれよう。

わが詩女神(ムーサ)が胸に秘めるは、敬慕の的たる父上よ、貧弱なる企てにすぎず、
あなたを満足させるにはほど遠きものなれど、
そもそも、あなたの大恩に報いることは、はなからかなわぬこと。
最大の贈り物をもってしても、結果は同じ。
あなたからわたくしが賜ったものの偉大さは、ささいな、実りなき感謝のことばとは
比ぶべくもないのでありますから。とはいえ、この頁に書きつけた、
わが資産目録をご覧ください。
わが富のすべてはこの紙に書きつけてあります。
というのも、わが富とは、黄金のクリオより譲られた、[17] パルナッソスの山影の、
月桂樹の茂みの陰の、はるかなる洞窟の夢が結んだ、
聖なる果実にほかならないのでありますから。
願わくは、〔父上よ、〕詩人の業(わざ)たる、神性を宿す詩歌を軽んずることのなきように。
詩歌こそは、プロメテウスの火炎の花を内に秘め、天よりいずる人間(ひと)の精神(たましい)の
比類なき精華(はな)。人間(ひと)が天上に生まれ、天より降(くだ)ってきたことのまぎれもなき証(あかし)。
高きにまします神がみが愛(め)でた詩歌こそは、
かの恐ろしきタルタロスの深淵を揺り動かし、
三重のアダマントで、[18] 猛々(たけだけ)しき影を縛ったのであります。
詩歌によって、ポイボスの巫女たちと、[19] 震えるシヴィルは、[20] 青ざめた面もちで
はるかなる未来の秘事を予言したのであります。
詩歌は、祭壇で燔祭を捧げる祭司により創(つく)造られました。

---

15 ムーサのすみかの一つとされる。
16 パルナッソス山のこと。
17 歴史をつかさどるムーサ。
18 なにものにも侵されない堅い物質。ダイアモンドと同一視された。ゼウスがタイタンを幽閉したところ。
19 太陽神アポロの別名。
20 アポロに仕えた巫女の名。

金メッキした角を振り上げる雄牛を屠殺るときにも、
また、湯気の立つ肉のうちに眼光鋭く運命の秘密を見据え、
温かき内臓のうちに運命を読むときにも。
やがて、われわれが故郷のオリンポス山にもどり、
未来永劫に変わらぬ永遠の時代が確立されるとき、
黄金の冠を頂いたわれわれは天の寺院をぬけて歩きながら、[21]
竪琴の妙なる調べに合わせ、甘美なる詩歌を歌うでありましょう。
すると星ぼしがこれに唱和して、天空は極から極まで響きわたるのであります。
いまもなお、速やかに回転する天球層を天翔る、[22] 火炎のごときわが精神は、
星ぼしの合唱に和して、不滅の旋律を奏で、
えもいわれぬ詩歌を歌うのであります。
一方で、輝く蛇座は火の息をひそめ、
荒ぶるオリオンは心和らぎ、剣を落とし、
モーリタニアのアトラスはもはや天を重荷とは感じないのであります。
いまだ奢侈と底無しの貪欲が知られてはいなかったころ、
詩歌は国王の食卓に精華を添えるのを常としたのでありますが、
そのときリュアイオスは、[23] 宴の節度ある杯のなかで
きらめきを放っていたのであります。
すると詩人は陽気な宴の輪に座して、長髪に樫の葉の冠を頂き、
英雄たちの勲と比類なき功績や、混沌や、地球を支える広い礎について、
また、神がみの糧を求めて地をはって木の実を捜したこと、
主神の雷電がいまだエトナの火口の深みから捜し出されていなかったこと
などについて歌うのを常としていいたのでありました。結局のところ、
ことばも意味も雄弁の調子ももたぬ虚ろな響きの旋律に
喜びが見いだせましょうか？　そのような音楽は
森のなかの合奏にこそふさわしきもの。なれど、木琴の力ではなく、
詩歌の力で川の流れをあやつり、樫の木ぎを動かし、その歌声で、
黄泉の国の死者たちを奮い立たせ、涙させたオルフェウスには
ふさわしきものではない。詩歌こそかれの栄誉のよりどころなのであります。

願わくは、父上よ、聖なる女神たちを軽蔑ることのなきように。不毛な、価値のなきもの

---

21 この詩の“implied author”たる“hero”は「パルナッソスの山を登っていく」イメージで提示されている。以下、邦訳、15 行、74 行、90 行〜91 行、104 行、109 行、110 行を参照されたい。

22 各層が回転し、触れ合って妙なる調べを奏でると考えられた。

23 酒神バッコスの別名。

と考えることのなきように。女神(ムーサ)たちがあなたに
幾千もの音を調和させ、軽妙なる旋律を創造(つく)りだし、様ざまな抑揚で
歌の調べを変化させる才能を与えたがために、あなたはアリオンの名の、[24]
正統なる後継者となったのでありますから。
わたくしは生まれたときから詩人となるべき定めにあったのでありますから、
血という縁(えにし)によってかくも堅く結びつけられたわれわれが、〔詩歌と音楽という〕姉妹の芸術、同族の趣味を追及したとてなんの不思議もないではありませんか。
ポイボスみずからが自分を二つに分けて、われわれ二人のうちに入りたいと望み、
才能のいくぶんかをわたくしに、また別の才能をあなたに与えたのでありますから、
われわれ父と子は、分かたれた神の財産を分け合って所有しているのであります。

父上よ、あなたは、艶(あで)やかな女神たちを嫌うふりをなさるかもしれない。
だが、わたくしには、あなたが心底嫌っているとは信じがたいのであります。
なぜなら、あなたは、容易に金儲けができる道が大きく広がっているところや、
大金をつかみたいという黄金への渇望が照り輝き、その渇望が満たされるところへは
進めとは命じなかったし、国法が蔑(ないがし)ろにされる法曹界に行けとも強要しなかったし、
わが耳を不合理な騒々しさで悩ませることもなかったのであります。
そのかわり、慈(いつく)しみ育ててくださったわが精神(たましい)がいっそう豊かにはぐくまれるようにと
市街の喧騒からは遠い、アオニアの流れのほとり、[25] 高き隠れ家の
喜ばしき余暇の生活へと導いてくださったのであります。そして至福を受けた
話し相手としてわたくしがポイボスの傍らを歩く許可を与えてくださいました。
わたくしは父親の〔子にたいする〕常の務めについて語るつもりはありません。
というのも、いっそう偉大な仕事がわたくしには課せられているからであります。[26]
敬愛する父上よ、あなたは、わたくしがロムルスの言語・ラテン語の優美さと、
ジョーヴの唇にこそふさわしき、雄大なギリシア語の高雅な話法を修得した後も、
さらに、フランス語の誇りとする麗(うるわ)しき精華(はな)を究め、
現代イタリア語の堕落した口から流れでる雄弁さ——その口調は
野蛮な戦争を有利に運ぶのに役立ったが——を究め、
パレスティナの予言者が〔ユダヤ語で〕語る神秘を究めるようにと励まし、

---

24 ヘロドトスは、詩人アリオンが海でイルカに救助されたのは、イルカが七弦の竪琴の音に魅せられたからだとしている。

25 ムーサとアポロのすみかの一つとされる。

26 この行は、「フェアファックスへのソネット」（1648）と「クロムウェルへのソネット」（1652）の後半、賞賛から勧告に転調した六行連句の冒頭の部分、及び『イングランド国民のための第一弁護論』(1651) のイングランド国民にたいする勧告の部分を想起させる。神からの贈り物たる「内なる神性」を世のために役立てようと、常に、より一層の努力を重ねようと志向する、ピューリタン詩人ミルトンの「英雄像」の内実が示されている。

そのための援助は惜しまないと、説き勧めてくださったのであります。
そして、いま、寛大にもあなたは、わたくしが望みさえするなら、
われらを生んだ天と地のすべて、空の下、天地の間を流れる空気、
流れ、そして波立つ海の表面(おもて)が覆(おおい)いつくす、すべてのものを知るすべを、
わたくしに与えてくださるというのであります。
雲間から、いま、＜知識(スキエンテア)＞の女神が裸体のままで現れて、接吻を受けようと
わたくしにむかって身をかがめるのであります。わたくしが
彼女のさしだす快楽を厭(いと)い、逃げだしてしまわぬように。

ならば、行って、富を集めるがよい。なんじら、古代のオーストリアの秘宝や
ペルーの黄金を渇望してやまぬ金の亡者どもよ、
父が、いや、ユピテルその人が、すべてを——天界を唯一の例外として——
与えてくれるというのに、これ以上に偉大な贈り物を望むことなどありえようか？
若き息子に公共の光——すなわち、ヒゥペリオンの戦車、[27] 昼の手綱と、
栄光の輝きがほとばしりでる光輪を——与えた主神は（これらが無害の
贈り物だったとしても）これ以上、偉大な贈り物を与えはしなかったのである。
ならば、学識ある人びとのなかで、いまわたくしの占める位置が
いかに低いものであるにせよ、わたくしは必ずや、
勝者の徴(しるし)たる蔦(つた)と月桂樹の冠をかぶって座すことになろうぞ。
もはや、わたくしは、烏合(うごう)の衆(しゅう)に混じって無名のままでいることはなく、[28]
汚らわしい人の目を避けて、一人、歩を進めることになろうぞ。
去るがよい、なんじら、眠りを知らぬ＜妄想＞と＜不満＞よ。
山羊のごとく流し目で見る、ねじれた＜嫉妬＞のまなざしよ。
口を開けるな、大蛇のごとき＜中傷＞よ。忌むべき群れよ、
なんじらにわたくしを傷つける力などありはしない。なんじらの
支配など受けない。なんじらの吐く毒息の届かぬ高みに引き上げられて
わたくしは心安らかに歩を進めることになろう。

だが、親愛なる父上よ、わたくしの力ではいかなる褒美をもってしても
あなたの勲功に報いることはできず、いかなる行ないもあなたの贈り物に
匹敵することはないのでありますから、願わくは、わたくしが、いつも変わらぬ
あなたの寛大さを感謝をこめて思い起こし、語り、忠誠をこめて書き記(しる)すことで
ご満足いただけますように。

---

27 太陽神アポロと同一視される。
28 原語は‘populo . . . inerti’。後にミルトンは『イングランド国民のための第一弁護論』において‘vulgus’と‘populus’を厳密に区別するにたる。

野呂有子他　Yuko Kanakubo Noro, David L. Blanken, “Milton’s *Ad Patrem, De Idea Platonica,* and *Naturam non pati senium*:—From Praise to Exhortation—”『東京成徳短期大学紀要』第 26 号(1993)41−65.

そして、そなたたち、わが喜びたる稚拙なき詩歌よ。もしも一途に、不滅の生命を
望むなら、主人〔たるわたくし〕の葬儀の積み薪のかなたに、一目、光を見たい
と望むなら、もしも忘却の暗闇がそなたたちを黄泉の群衆のなかに払い落とさなければ、
この賛歌は残り、わが詩歌が寿ぐ父の名は、はるか後世にいたるまで、
範例としてとどまることになるであろう。（野呂有子訳）　120

List of Works Consulted

Arai, Akira. *Milton: Portrait of an Epic Mind.* Tokyo: Kenkyusha Press, 1980. 邦題『ミルトンの世界——叙事詩性の軌跡——』（研究社印刷株式会社，1980 年 3 月）

Noro, Yuko. “Milton’s Heroism.” *The Bulletin of Tokyo Seitoku College*, 11 (1978): 37-44. 邦題「Milton の英雄観」『東京成徳短期大学紀要』第 11 号（昭和 53 年 4 月）

——. “Milton’s Heroism Part II.” *The Bulletin of Tokyo Seitoku College*, 12 (1979): 35-39. 邦題「Milton の英雄観，その 2」『東京成徳短期大学紀要』第 12 号（昭和 54 年 4 月）

——. “Milton’s Heroism Part III: Sonnets and the Major Works.” *The Bulletin of Tokyo Seitoku College*, 16 (1983): 23-32. 邦題「Milton の英雄観, その 3——ソネットと後期の作品」『東京成徳短期大学紀要』第 16 号（昭和 58 年 3 月）

——. “Liberty and Slavery in *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio.*” In *Milton and Bunyan in the English Revolution*. Tokyo: Ochanomizu Shobo, 1991: 275-301. 共著『イギリス革命におけるミルトンとバニヤン』〔邦題〕（御茶ノ水書房書房発行，平成 3 年 8 月）

——. “Milton’s Heroism in *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio.*” In *Milton and His Influence in English Literature: In Commemoration of the 60th Birthday of Professor Akira Arai.* Tokyo: Kinseido, 1992: 72-85. 共著『新井　明還暦記念論集　ミルトンとその光芒』〔邦題〕（金星堂発行，平成 4 年 1 月）

Bush, Douglas. *A Variorum Commentary on the Poems of John Milton.* Vol. 1. *The Latin and Greek Poems.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.

Carey, John, and Alastair Fowler, eds. *The Poems of John Milton*. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1968.

Columbia University Press. *The Works of John Milton*. Vol. 1, part 1. New York: Columbia University Press, 1931.

Daiches, David. *Milton*. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1957.

Fink, Z. S. *The Classical Republicans*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1945.

Freeman, James A., and Anthony Low, eds. *Urbane Milton: The Latin Poetry, Milton Studies XIX.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984.

野呂有子他　Yuko Kanakubo Noro, David L. Blanken, “Milton’s *Ad Patrem, De Idea Platonica,* and *Naturam non pati senium*:—From Praise to Exhortation—’’『東京成徳短期大学紀要』第 26 号(1993)41−65.

Gilbert, Sandra M., and Guber, Susan. *The Madwoman in the Attic——The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination.* New York and London, Yale University Press, 1980.

Hughes, Merritt Y., ed. *John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose*. New York, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1957.

Kennedy, William J. “The Audiences of *Ad Patrem*,” *Urbane Milton: the Latin Poetry*, *Milton Studies XIX*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984

Masson, David. *The Life of John Milton: Narrated in Connexion with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of his Time*. Vol. 1. 1608-1639. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1965.

Parker, Willian Riley. *Milton: A Biography*. Vol. 1. *The Life*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1968.

Patrick, J. Max, ed. *SAMLA Studies in Milton: Essays on John Milton and his Works*. Gainsville: University of Florida Press, 1953.

Radzinowicz, Mary Ann. *Toward Samson Agonistes: The Growth of John Milton’s Mind.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Samuel, Irene. *Plato and Milton*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1947.

Tillyard, E. M. W. *Milton.* London: Chatto and Windus, 1930.

Woodhouse, A. S. P. *The Heavenly Muse: A Preface to Milton*. Edited by Hugh McCallum. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

英語訳　pp.216-19

日本語訳 pp.219-23