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Introduction

A Study of the Interpretation of
the God’s Pronouncement in *Genesis* iii. 15.

Not only has the Bible been one of the most popular books in the world, but also it has been regarded as the collection of God’s words, which are truth itself. Above all, the Book of Genesis, especially the first three chapters containing the two great stories of God’s creation of the world and of the Fall of Adam and Eve, has interested the Hebrew priests, the Fathers of the Church, poets, and others, and, therefore, have been one of the most disputed parts in the Bible; for they are literally the genesis from which all things concerning us sprung.

In fact, there seems to be few stories in Western Europe which have been more effective and more powerful than that of the Fall of Man. ‘It has,’ as Professor Evans pointed out, ‘been one of the dominant themes of our theology, literature and art for nearly two thousand years, the subject of commentaries from Philo to Dietrich Bonhoeffer, of poems and plays by writers from Orudentius to Bernard Shaw, and of pictures by artists from the anonymous painter who decorated the crypt of San Gennaro in Naples to Marc Chagall.’

‘The reasons for its enduring vitality are many,’ he continued, ‘but perhaps the most potent of them is to be found in its nature as a myth. For it is a myth not only in

---

the strictly anthropological sense of that term, but also in the vaguer poetic sense, defined by C. S. Lewis as a narrative sequence having “a value in itself—a value independent of its embodiment in any literary work.” ²

I agree fully with him. Because the story of Adam and Eve has worked on, and will be working on, our minds, for it is deeply rooted in our everlasting themes as human beings; why we must labour to eat, why woman must suffer in child-birth, why there are evil and misery in the world, why we must die, and so on. Another characteristic of the story is the simplicity and plainness of the narrative. While it deals with the grave problems about human beings, the method of its narrative is exceedingly simple and the whole story is rather short.

The simplicity and the shortness, on the other hand, have been the cause of many disputes in the field of theology. The Book of the Bible, being the collection of the God’s words, must contain all and the only truth. The story of the Fall of Man must, of course, tell the truth in that sense. But it is too short and simple to clarify the points in question—for example, how the serpent spoke, where Adam was what he did when his wife was tempted, whether the serpent walked before the God’s curse, why God prohibited them to eat of the tree of good and evil, and so on. In fact, for about two thousand years or more, it has been the task of priests and the Fathers of the Church to answer these problems and interpret the mysterious words of God for the common people so that they were able to receive the meaning plainly.

Milton, as a poet, must have been stricken with the gravity of the Fall story, then tried to make an epic ‘No less but more heroic than the wrath of stern Achilles. . . on range / Of Turnus for Lavinia. . . .’³ based on the story as a framework. On the other

² Evans, p. 9.
³ John Milton, Paradise Lost, IX, 11. 14-17. As for the spelling I follow the edition of
hand, as a self-conscious priest, he tried to answer the same problems which had
troubled his predecessors. In *Paradise Lost*, he made efforts to integrate these two tasks
as poet and priest, and he succeeded in it.

This paper aims to make clear how he integrated his theological interpretation and
the poetical scheme in *P. L*. However, there are all kinds of interpretations and schemes.
So, here we select the passage, *Genesis* iii, 15, as the central point of our study and
investigate how Milton treated the curse of God upon the serpent in *P. L*.
Chapter I
Milton’s Concept of ‘the Woman’s Seed’

And I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.4

Modern Biblical scholars have generally agreed that the Fall story ‘began as a straightforward aetiological myth, designed to explain why a man cleaves to his wife and why he is the senior partner in the union, why he has to labour in the fields and she in childbirth, why we wear clothes, why we dislike snakes, and why they crawl on their bellies.’5

But, it is clear that for about two thousand years, people had been treating the story otherwise: the bulky volumes of date plainly show the fact, which contain the exceedingly various, theological, and earnest commentaries on the story. Though modern scholars regard the passage cited above as only showing the general hatred of man towards the serpent, and conclude that ‘it does not justify eschatological connotation’,6 adding that ‘we must not read into more than they contain’,7 many theologians and priests have been finding the sign of God’s will in it, and Milton was one of them. From now on we shall see briefly how he interpreted and treated the passage in his works.

The first lines referring to the passage are ll. 175-181 of Book X in Paradise Lost, where the Son in behalf of God descends to the earth, hears of the course of events from Adam and Eve, and sentences the serpent at first:

---
4 Authorized Version, Genesis iii, 15.
Because thou hast done this, thou art accurst
Above all Cattle, each Beast of the Field;
Upon thy Belly groveling thou shalt go,
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.

In the following lines we readers are informed that ‘this Oracle’ is to be verified

When Jesus son of Mary second Eve,
Saw Satan fall like Lightning down from Heaven,
Prince of the Air; then rising from his Grave
Soil’d Principalities and powers, triumph
In open show, and with ascension bright
Captivity led captive through the Air,
The Realm itself of Satan long usurpt,
Whom he shall tread at last under our feet.  

and in the next line describing the Son as ‘hee who now foretold his fatal bruise’ the poet lays emphasis on the point that the Son shall be incarnated as Christ to save his people: in short he suggests us that ‘her (the Woman’s) Seed’ means Christ, the Son.

\[8\] *P. L.*, X. 183-190.
This becomes clearer in the Argument of Book XII. It tells that the angel Michael, in the mention of Abraham, ‘comes by degrees to explain, who that Seed of the Woman shall be, which was promised Adam and Eve in the Fall; his Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension; the state of the Church till his second Coming.’ The angel renews the promise implicit in the curse on the serpent by promising Abraham that

... all Nations of the Earth

Shall in his Seed be blessed by that Seed

Is meant thy great deliverer, who shall bruise

The Serpent’s head;\(^9\)

Then he clarifies to Adam that ‘the Woman’s Seed’ which is foretold to him is the same as is foretold to Abraham, adding that he shall be descended from David:

... the like shall sing

All Prophecy, That of the Royal Stock

Of David (so I name this King) shall rise

A Son, the Woman’s Seed to thee foretold,

Foretold to Abraham, as in whom shall trust

All Nations and to Kings foretold, of Kings

The last, for of his Reign shall be no end.\(^{10}\)

---

\(^9\) *P. L.*, xii. 147-150.

\(^{10}\) *Ibid.* xii. 325-330.
and about in the middle of Book XII, Adam himself, at last, understand clearly that ‘the Woman’s Seed’ obscurely foretold is his Savior and Lord:

O Prophet of glad tidings, finisher

Of utmost hope: now clear I understand

What oft my steadiest thoughts have search in vain

Why our great expectation should be call’d

The seed of Woman: Virgin Mother, Hail,

High in the love of Heav’n, yet from my Loins

Thou shalt proceed, and from thy Womb the Son

Of God most High; So God with man unites.

Needs must the Serpent now his capital bruise

Except with mortal pain:¹¹

In those lines cited above, we see Adam, by degrees, comes to learn that God’s curse upon the serpent in Book X contains the promise to deliver mankind from the seizing hands of Sin and Death, and that the promise is fulfilled in ‘the woman’s seed’, which means the great Deliverer Christ being foretold to Abraham and David.

In *De Doctorina Christiana*, we find Milton’s basic idea of ‘the woman’s seed’ expressed more clearly and directly. In the explanation of the grace of God, he refers to his promise:

---

Even before man had, properly speaking, confessed his guilt, that is, before he had avowed it ingenuously and in the spirit of repentance, God nevertheless, in pronouncing the punishment of the serpent, previously to passing sentence on man, promised that he raise up from the seed of the woman one who should bruise the serpent’s head, *Gen.* iii. 15. and thus anticipated the condemnation of mankind by a gratuitous redemption.\(^{12}\)

Then in Chapter VII, where the Creation is the main theme, he declares who is ‘the woman’s seed’.

Heb. vii. 10. “Levi was in the loins of Abraham”: whence in Scripture an offering is called “seed”, and Christ is denominated “the seed of the woman.” \(^{13}\)

Again in Chapter XXVI we see the passage, *Gen.* iii. 15., cited as for the grace of God.

The Covenant of Grace itself, on the part of God, is first declared *Gen.* iii. 15. “I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel”, compared with *Rom.* xvi. 20. “the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.” *1John* iii. 8. “for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.”\(^{14}\)

---


\(^{13}\) *CE*, xv, 45.

\(^{14}\) *CE*, xvi, 99.
Milton clearly thought that the first covenant of God was found in the passage, *Gen.* iii. 15., and it was fulfilled in ‘the woman’s seed’, which denominated Christ. (However it is noteworthy that the expression is used in two ways: one denominates Christ as an individual, the other means his race as a whole.)

Concerning the problem why he is called ‘the woman’s seed’, the following citation is a most useful:

> With regard to the soul of Christ, it will be sufficient to answer that its generation was supernatural, and therefore cannot be cited as an argument in the discussion of this controversy. Nevertheless, even he is called “the seed of the woman, the seed of David according to the fresh”; that is, undoubtedly, according to his human nature.  

This problem is discussed further in Chapter XIII:

> Two points are to be considered in relation to Christ’s character as Redeemer; his nature and office. His nature is twofold; divine and human, *Matt.* xvi. 16. “the Christ, the Son of the living God.” *Gen.* iii. 15. “the seed of the woman.” *John.* i. 14. the Word of God . . . and the word was made fresh.” iii. 13 “he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man that is in Heaven.” v. 31. “he that cometh from above . . . he that cometh from heaven.” *Acts.* ii. 30. “of the fruit of the loins of David, according to the fresh.” See also *Rom.* i. 3. viii. 3. “God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful fresh.” . . . *1 Cor.* xv. 47. “the second man is the Lord

---

8. “but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of the servant, and was made man—.” *Heb.* ii. 14. 16. “he also himself took part of fresh and blood . . . he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham.”

From the passages above, it is clear that Milton regarded ‘the woman’s seed’ as indicating the distinctive feature of Christ as a man: he ‘disdained not to begin / Thenceforth the form of servant to assume’ 17 ‘being made of a woman’. Secondly Milton identified ‘the woman’s seed’ with the seed foretold by God to Abraham, and with the seed promised to David. In Miltonic saying the three unite in one ‘who shall bruise the Serpent’s head.’

This view, however, was not original with him. H. R. MacCallum makes the point that ‘There was general agreement among Protestant commentators that, as Mother put it, the first gospel light was preached to Adam in that great and blessed Promise, that the seed of the woman should break the Serpent’s head.’ 18 though among them there were slight differences – for example, between Luther and Calvin, (as for this problem, we shall discuss later.) But this view was not original with protestant commentators, either. It was closely allied to so-called ‘Protevangelium’ theory, which is ‘applied to the passage in the Old Testament, *Genesis* iii. 15., in which theologians see the first announcement of the coming of Messiah.’ 19

---

16 *CE*, xv. 259-261.
17 *P. L.*, x. 213-214.
19 *The Encyclopedia Americana.*
From now on we shall see briefly (1) the historical process of the interpretation of the passage in theology and (2) its dramatic treatment in several works.

Evans has contributed largely to the study of the theological tradition of *Genesis* and its relationship with *P. L.* in *Paradise Lost* and the *Genesis Tradition*, and Watson Kirconnell presents us bulky literary materials of the Creation and the Fall story, then analyzes them in reference to *P. L.* in his *the Celestial Cycle* (New York: Gordian Press, 1967).

These two critics, however, hardly refer to the peculiar point I am now setting on. Consequently, this approach to the Messianic interpretation from the literary side may be done for the first time. It may be defective in many points, but I hope my paper serves as preparatory step for further study.

---

20 As for this point, however, Evans comments a little on Irenaeus in *The Genesis Tradition*, p. 85.: The one distinctively Christian comment on this part of the story related to God’s instigation of the future enmity between Adam’s offering and the serpent: ‘For from that time, He who should be born of a woman, namely from the Virgin, after the likeness of Adam, was preached as keeping watch for the head of the serpent.’ *Against Heresies*, v, xxiii. 2. Beneath the curse lay the promise of Man’s ultimate salvation.
Chapter II

The Brief Survey of Historical Process of the Messianic Interpretation.

John Skinner, in ‘A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis,’ The
International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), p. 81-82, points out that the Messianic interpretation of ‘God’s curse upon the serpent appears in the Targum of Onkelos, (2 A.D.) and the Targum of Jeruschlami,’ where ‘the verse is explained of the Jewish community and its victory over the devil “in the days of King Messiah.”’ Concerning this, E. C. Baldwin also makes a comment that ‘The rabbi also represented Adam as having been the first to receive the promise of the resurrection. In the Apocalypse of Moses, XXVIII. 3-4, it is said that when Adam, about to be expelled from Paradise, asked, to be allowed to eat of the tree of life, “Then have the Lord spake to Adam, ‘Thou shalt not take of it now, for I have commanded the cherubim with the flaming sword that turneth every way to guard it from thee that thou taste not of it, but thou hast the war which the adversary hath put into thee, yet when thou art gone out of paradise, if thou shouldst keep thyself from all evil, as one about to die, when again the resurrection hath come to pass, I will raise up then there shall be given to thee the tree of life.’”

The later rabbi also affirmed that to Adam was given the promise of resurrection. In the Midrash Bereshith Rabba, XXI., commenting upon the statement (Gen. 3. 22.) “He is become as one of us,” the rabbis quote Psalm 17: 15 as applying to Adam, explaining the meaning thus: “When he who is created in Thy likeness (i. e. Adam)
shall awaken, then will he (Adam) show forth Thy likeness in righteousness. . . . Then will he be “as one of us.””\textsuperscript{21}

It was Irenaeus (c. 130-c. 200?) that made the reference to the person of Christ. He was the first great Catholic theologian and much weight should be put on the point ‘unlike Clement of Alexandria, he opposes Gnosticism, not by setting up a rival Christian Gnosis, but by emphasizing the traditional elements in the Church . . . and, so far as such already existed, the religious and theological tradition. . . . He goes behind the Apologist of the middle of the 2nd cent. to Ignatius at its beginning in his insistence in Christian Monotheism, on the unity of Father and Son in the works of Revelation and the Redemption, and on the fullness of the Incarnation of Christ.’\textsuperscript{22}

In his Against Heresies, we realize the interpretation of the passage, \textit{Gen.} iii. 15. (especially the phrase, ‘the woman’s seed’), is the keynote of asserting his theology against Gnosticism.

In his detailed attack upon Gnosticism, the first reference to the Fall and the promise of God appears in Book III, Chapter xxiii:

\begin{quote}
 Wherefore also He cast him out of Paradise, and moved him to a distance from the Tree of Life: not grudging him the Tree of Life, as some dare to sat, but in pity to him, that he might not last for ever as a sinner; and that the sin which was in him might not be immortal, and an infinite and incurable evil. But He forbade to transgress, bringing in death as a check, and causing sin to cease, in that He put an
\end{quote}

end to it by the dissolution of the flesh which should take place on earth: that man, ceasing some day to live unto sin, and dying thereunto, might begin to love unto God.

For which cause He put enmity between the serpent, and the woman with her seed, the two watching one another suspiciously: so that on the one part, He whose foot is bitten, hath power even to trample on the head of the enmity: and that the other should bite, and slay, and impede the man’s approaches, until the coming of the seed predestined to trample on his head: which seed was offspring of Mary. . . .

It is certain that writing these passages he recalled what was written in the preceding chapter where he asserted that

And the Apostle Paul too in the Epistle to the Galatians saith expressly, ‘God sent forth His Son, made of a woman.’ And again in that to the Romans he says, ‘Concerning His Son Who was made indeed of the seed of David according to the flesh, Who is foreordained the Son of Gog with power, according to the Spirit of Sanctification by the Resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord.’

Then, his concept of the woman’s seed is brought together in Book V, Chapter xxi,

24 Ibid., p. 294.
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Thus gathering all into one, He was Himself gathered into one – both stirring up warfare against our enemy, and forcing him out, who at first had led us captive in Adam, and trampling on his head: as thou hast it in *Genesis*, how that God said to the Serpent, ‘And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: he shall mark thy head, and thou shalt mark His heel.’ For of Him Who had to be born of a Virgin woman in the likeness of Adam, it [her seed] was announced as “marking the Serpent’s head.” And this is the seed, of which the Apostle in the Epistle to the Galatians saith, ‘That the Law of works was appointed, until the Seed should come to Whom the promise was made. And yet more clearly hath he set it forth in the same Epistle, thus saying,’ But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent His Son, made of a woman. For the enemy would not have been fairly overcome, had not his conqueror been a man born of a woman. For by a woman he ruled over man from the beginning, when he act himself against mankind. For this cause the Lord also professes Himself the Son of Man; gathering up into Himself that original man, of whom the formation of the woman took place: that as by a conquering Man again we might go into life: and that as by a man Death received the palm against us, so we on the other hand by Man receive the palm against Death.\(^{25}\)

In the citations above almost all the essentials are presented concerning the Messianic interpretation which forms the keynote of Milton’s concept of the woman’s seed. Here, however, I have no intention of emphasizing the direct relationship between Milton and Irenaeus, because ‘there was general agreement among Protestant commentators. . . the

\(^{25}\) *Against Heresies*, p. 497.
first gospel light was preached to Adam in that great and blessed Promise.  

But, when we recall the fact that since his childhood Milton had studied hard with intention of entering the priesthood on his father’s recommendation, we easily imagine that he might have been familiar with the writings of Irenaeus. In fact the reference to the Catholic theologian is found in the writings of Milton – for example in Areopagitica though it is not done concerning the Messianic interpretation.  

Apart from MacCallum’s suggestion of ‘the general agreement’, however, it may be possible to suppose that Milton found a sort of a model of Christian soldier in Irenaeus, who fought against heresies.

Irenaeus’ interpretation of ‘the woman’s Seed’ as Christ was never so generally accepted in the Church as the kindred idea that the serpent is the instrument of Satan. St. Augustine, who is one of the greatest’ Doctors of Church; and exercises a great influence upon John Calvin and some of the other Reformers,  

for example, gives no comment on ‘the woman’s seed’ as far as the most celebrated books, the ‘Confession’ and the ‘City of God’ are concerned. In the commentary of the Psalms, however, he refers to the passage, Gen. iii. 15.:  

But why is it against pride that Psalmist says: ‘There the workers of iniquity are fallen? Because every wicked man today has fallen through pride. Hence when warning the Church to be vigilant, the Lord spoke thus: ‘She shall watch thy head, and thou her heel.’ The serpent is watching when the foot of pride approaches you, so that when you falter he may throw you headlong. But do you keep your eye on

---

26 MacCallum, p. 154.

27 CE, IV. 312.

28 The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church.
his head: ‘pride is the beginning of all sin. There the workers of iniquity are fallen:
they are cast out and could not stand.’

It is clear that here the passage is used metaphorically and regarded entirely as God’s
warning to Man against pride. Even the slightest sign of revelation is not suggested by
Augustine. Additionally we note that in this allegorical treatment of the sentence ‘the
woman’s seed’ is indicated by the feminine pronoun ‘she’, and the general employment
of the Vulgate in those days may explain this phenomenon.

St. Jerome, the editor of the Vulgate, refers to the passage in question allegorically
in the letter to Damascus:

For he has lost the dignity of s bridegroom. He could not celebrate the passover
with bare feet. These are the shoes of which the Load says: ‘And I shoed thee with
violet-colored shoes. And shoes on his feet,’ lest anywhere a lurking snake might
attack the sole of his foot as he walked, and that he might tread upon serpents and
scorpions, that he might be prepared for the gospel of peace, no longer walking
according to the flesh but according to the spirit. . ..

Medieval exegetes, also relying on the Vulgate, applied ‘the woman’s seed’
directly to the Virgin Mary. By linking the expression with her, they concluded that
there would be held a flight between Satan and her, then she herself – not Christ – was
to be honoured as the victor.

29 Scholastica Hebgin and Felicitas Corrigan, tr. and an., Ancient Christian Writers,
30 See the Vulgate, ‘Ipsa conteret.’ – She shall bruise.
31 A. C. W., XXXIII, 122.
In regard to this point, Martin Luther makes a protest as follows:

The villainy of the more recent ones is familiar. They even falsified this passage and changed the pronoun “He” to the feminine “she,” and with obvious malice they twisted this passage into a reference to the Blessed Virgin. I am excusing Lyla, who appears to have been a good man but yields too much to the authority of the fathers. And so he allows himself to become involved through St. Augustine in a most absurd allegory, which Gregory also adopts in his *Moralia*. The woman must be taken to mean the lower reason; her seed, to mean its good working; the seed of the devil, his corrupt prompting. Moreover, the words of the Lord, “I shall put enmity between you and her seed,” must be understood of that conflict which occurs when the devil, by means of his devil prompting, assails the lower reason, which is the woman. If she should yield to her lusts, then through her Satan hopes also to topple the man, that is, the higher reason. Furthermore, this is said to be the meaning of the statement that the serpent is lying in wait for the heel; for Satan does not make his attacks except from below, by setting before the senses the things that delight them.\(^{32}\)

He regards the Medieval interpretation as a ‘villainy’ done ‘with obvious malice.’ Even the allegorical interpretation of St. Augustine is ‘absurd’ for him.

Rejecting that reference, he develops his own interpretation of the passage:

Thus the sun of comfort, previously enveloped by black clouds, rises above the clouds and with its most welcome light shines on their frightened hearts. For Adam and Eve not only do not hear themselves cursed like the serpent; but they even hear themselves drawn up, as it were, in battle line against their condemned enemy, and this with the hope of help from the Son of God, the Seed of the woman. Forgiveness of sins and full reception into grace are here pointed out to Adam and Eve. Their guilt has been forgiven; they have been won back and from death and have already been set free from hell and from those fears by which they were all but slain when God appeared. 33

He points out the first gospel light ‘shines’ one the frightened hearts of the fallen couple in this passage, then establishes openly the identity of ‘the Seed of the woman’ by putting the phrase in apposition to ‘the Son of God.’ He continues discussing the point that

Moreover, the main point of the comfort is this: Although this enemy fights with cunning and treacheries, the Seed will be born who will crush the head of the serpent. These words point to the ultimate destruction of Satan’s tyranny, although it will not pass away without a most bitter conflict being fought for man.

But see now uneven the outcome of the battle is. The human being’s heel is in danger, but his head is uninjured and undefeated. On the other hand, it is not the tail and not the belly of the serpent but the head itself, that is to be crushed and trodden underfoot by the Seed of the woman.

33 ‘Lectures on Genesis’, 190.
Now we see that Luther falls in with Irenaeus’ opinion fundamentally: both identify ‘the woman’s seed’ with the Son of God, Jesus Christ, and affirms his victory over Satan in the fight.

However, they differ, at least, in one point. That is Adam’s realization of the promise of God. In the writings of Irenaeus it matters little whether the first man himself found out the promise of revelation in the curse of God upon the serpent. On the other hand, it holds an important position in Luther’s explanation of the passage. He reiterates that

In this manner Adam and Eve understood this text. Their consolation against sin and despair was their hope for this crushing, which was to be brought about in the future through Christ. And through the hope based on this promise they will also rise up to eternal life on the Last day.

. . . Adam and Eve were encouraged by this promise. Wholeheartedly they grasped the hope of their restoration; and, full of faith, they saw that God cared about their salvation, since He clearly declares that the male Seed of the woman would prostrate this enemy. The order of words in this sentence is very forceful.\(^{35}\)

\(^{34}\) *Ibid.*, 190-191.

\(^{35}\) ‘Lectures on *Genesis*,’ 191-193.
These words of Luther are very important and exceedingly suggestive for our study of the Milton’s epic, because it is not too much to say that the process of Adam’s realization of the promise is the theme of the last two books of *Paradise Lost*.

After emphasizing Adam’s discovery of the promise of revelation, Luther explains the effectiveness of the ambiguous passage on the side of Satan:

Thus this promise and this threat are very clear, and yet they are also very indefinite. They leave the devil in such a state that he suspects all mothers of giving birth to this Seed, although only one woman was to be the mother of this blessed Seed. Thus because God is threatening in general when He says “her Seed,” He is mocking Satan and making him afraid of all women.36

This account reminds us of the Satan’s soliloquy in the opening scene in *Paradise Regained*, Book I, 47-56.:

. . . well ye know

How many Ages, as the years of men,
This Universe we have possest, and rul’d
In manner at our will th’ affairs of Earth,
Since Adam and his facile consort Eve
Lost Paradise deceiv’d by me, though since
With dread attending when that fatal wound
Shall be inflicted by the Seed of Eve

---

36 ‘Lectures on *Genesis*,’ 193.
Upon my head, long the decrees of Heav’n

Delay, for longest time to him is short:

Milton as well as Luther thinks that the obscurity of the sentence is effective in increasing Satan’s care and worry.

Then, Luther emphasizes the point that ‘the Seed of the woman’ is the same promised to Abraham and David:

Woman gave birth up to the Flood and later until the time of Mary; but their seed could not in truth be called the Seed of the woman, but rather the seed of a man. But what is born from Mary was conceived by the Holy Spirit and is the true Seed of Mary, just as the other promises given to Abraham and David testify, according to which Christ is called the Son of Abraham and the Son of David.37

Modern Biblical scholars who deny the Messianic interpretation in ‘the seed of the woman’ point out that in Hebrew the word corresponding to the ‘seed’ was used normally in the collective sense of progeny.38 And Luther also refers to the point:

But I return to the text. This very clear promise is at the same time also very obscure, because God speaks in general of ‘the Seed of the woman.’ Thus at the same time He makes all women suspect to Satan and worries him with endless concern and care. It is, therefore, an amazing instance of synecdoche. “The woman’s Seed,” He says. This means all individuals in general; and yet He is

37 ‘Lectures on Genesis’, 194.
38 Speiser, p. 24.
speaking of only one individual, of the Seed of Mary, who is a mother without union with a male.\(^{39}\)

He does not overlook the obscurity, but instead of reconstructing his theory, he tried to save the phenomenon according to the established theory. Here his attitude towards the Bible is clearly represented. For him, it is the principle that ‘scriptura scripturae interpres,’ and it may be true ‘the emphasis on the contents makes him indifferent with respect to formal matters such as the authorship of the Biblical books.’\(^{40}\) In a sense, his method of reading Scriptures is akin to that of Milton, who asserts in *De Doctorina Christiana*

Under the gospel we possess, as it were, a twofold Scripture; one external, which is written word, and the other internal, which is the Holy Script, written in the hearts of believers, according to the promise of God, and with the intent that should by no means be neglected.\(^{41}\)

Unlike Luther, Calvin was ‘purely a Biblicist. He interprets Scripture literally with a lawyer’s precision and usually resists the temptation to impute to the author of an Old Testament passage a deeper meaning than the words themselves warrant.’\(^{42}\)

With regard to the feminine gender ‘she’ of the passage, *Genesis* iii. 15., he reproaches his predecessors more unsparingly than Luther did:

---


\(^{41}\) *CE. XVI*, 273.

This passage affords too clear a proof of the great ignorance, dullness, and carelessness, with have prevailed among all the learned men of the Papacy. The feminine gender has crept in instead of the masculine or neuter. There has been none among them who would even consult the Hebrew or Greek codices, or who would even compare the Latin copies with each other. Therefore, by a common error, this most corrupt reading has been received. Then, a profane exposition of it has been invented, by applying to the mother of Christ what is said concerning her seed.43

Then, referring to the interpretation of ‘the woman’s seed,’ he remains accurate:

There is, indeed, no ambiguity in the words here used by Moses; but I do not agree with others respecting their meaning; for other interpreters take the seed for Christ, without controversy; as if it were said, that some one would arise from the seed of the woman who should wound the serpent’s head. Gladly would I give my suffrage in support of their opinion, but that I regard the word seed as too violently distorted by them; for who will concede that a ‘collective’ noun is to be understood of one men only? Further, as the perpetuity of the contest is noted, so victory is succession of ages. I explain, therefore, the seed to mean the posterity of the woman generally.44

44 Loc. Cit.
Unlike Irenaeus and Luther, Calvin refuses to regard ‘the woman’s seed’ as denoting Christ, being based on the fact that word ‘seed’ in Hebrew goes a collective noun. But, unlike modern Biblical commentators, he applies the Messianic interpretation to the passage: he admits that in the passage as a whole there is a sign of revelation:

I interpret this simply to mean that there should always be the hostile strife between the human race and serpents, which is now apparent; for, by a secret feeling of nature, man abhors them. It is regarded, as among prodigies, that some men take pleasure in them; and as often as the sight of a serpent inspires us with horror, the memory of our fall is renewed. . . . Meanwhile, we see that the Lord acts mercifully in chastising man, who he does not suffer Satan to touch except in the heel; while he subjects the head of the serpent to be wounded by him. For in the terms head and heel there is a distinction between the superior and the inferior.⁴⁵

He gives further reference to this point as such:

But since experience teaches that not all the sons of Adam by far, arise as conquerors of the devil, we must necessarily come to one head, that we may find to whom the victory belongs. So Paul, from the seed of Abraham, leads us to Christ; because many were degenerate sons, and a considerable part adulterous, through infidelity; whence it follows that the unity of the body flows from the head. . . . In the meantime, we must keep in mind that method of conquering which the

⁴⁵ Ibid., 167-168.
Scripture describes. Satan has, in all ages, led the sons of men “captive at his will,” and, to this day, retains his lamentable triumph over them, and for that reason is called the “prince of the world,” (John xii. 31) But because one stronger that he has descended from heaven, who will subdue him, hence it comes to pass that, in the same manner, the whole Church of God, under its Head, will gloriously exult over him. To this the declaration of Paul refers, “The Lord shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly,” (Rom. xvi. 20.) By which words he signifies that the power of bruising Satan is imparted to faithful men, and thus the blessing is the common property of the whole Church. . . .

Now it is clear that Calvin asserts that the passage is a promise of victory over the devil to mankind, united in Christ its divine Head. He regards the expression, ‘the woman’s seed,’ as distinguishing righteous men from the rest.

We see that Milton interprets the expression into such a meaning as Calvin does:

All Nations they shall teach; for from that day
Not only to the Son’s of Abraham’s Loins
Salvation shall be preacht, but to the Sons
Of Abraham’s Faith wherever through the world;
So in his seed all Nations shall be blest.  

Both agree in that the expression in question functions as selecting righteous people, ‘the Sons of Abraham’s Faith,’ from general men, and at the same time it suggests

---

46 Ibid., 170-171.
47 Paradise Lost, XII. 446-450.
The first restoration of corrupted man, and the renewal in him of the divine image, and the reconstruction of the ruined church occurred in the promise of the coming seed (Gen. 3. 15.) of the woman, which should crush the serpent’s head. This seed is principally Jesus Christ, and he is called the seed of the woman because he was promised to Adam and Eve by God and is, according to the flesh, born of a woman (Matt. 1: 25; Luke 2: 7). For although Mary conceived in the Holy Spirit and brought him forth as a pure maiden, she is nevertheless called a woman in the Scriptures (Luke 2:5; Gal. 4: 4), and in the same way Christ is also called her seed and in the fruit of her body . . . . Besides this, all believers are the seed of the spiritual Eve, just as the unbelievers are the seed of the crooked old serpent, and that in a scriptural sense.48

One of the difference between Milton or Philips the younger and Calvin (and this may be put a special emphasis in the historical explanation of Biblical commentaries) is that while the former identifies the phrase, ‘the seed of the woman,’ with Christ the person, Calvin never regards it as applied directly to the Son of God.

As for Calvin’s view of glad tidings, there is an another which should not be omitted in relation with the epic of Milton. It is that in the Bible he recognizes the process in which God’s promise of salvation to men gets clearer and clearer as the narrative goes on. See the following citation from his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Book II. x. 20;

The witness of the prophets to immortality. Coming down to the later prophets, we can walk freely, as it were, in our own field. For, if we proved our point without difficulty as far as David, Job, and Samuel were concerned, in the Prophets it is much easier. The Lord held to this orderly plan in administering the covenant of his mercy: as the day of full revelation approached with the passing of time, the more he increased each day the brightness of its manifestation. Accordingly, at the beginning when the first promise of salvation was given to Adam Gen. 3: 15 it glowed like a feeble spark. Then, as it was added to, the light grew in fulness, breaking forth increasingly and shedding its radiance more widely. At last – when all the clouds were dispersed – Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, fully illumined the whole earth cf. Mal., ch. 4.49

John T. McNeill, the editor of this book, also admits that ‘In this remarkable passage, and frequently elsewhere, Calvin states forcibly his view of progressive nature of revelation. For the reference to the growing light of meaning, cf. Comm. Gal. 3:23. . . .’50

The splendid passage cited above reminds us of a verse in *Paradise Lost*:

49 *Ibid.*, xx, 446.
50 *Loc. Cit.*
I have no intention, of course, to insist that the similarity of the two shows the Milton’s
direct borrowing from Calvin; for the imagery above seems to be fundamental in human
nature, and it might play a specially important role in the writings of Milton’s days, for
‘enlighten’ means for them literally ‘to give light to.’

In the previous chapter, we saw that Adam’s progressive realization of the promise
is the theme of the last two books in *Paradise Lost*. In this sense, Calvin’s view of
progressive nature of revelation is keenly alike to Milton’s view realized in the

51 XI. 412-418.
education of Adam. But we keep in mind that it does not matter for Calvin whether Adam becomes aware of the Messianic meaning. It is Luther who attaches importance to that point and reiterates that Adam realized it as we have seen before.

It may be said that Milton owes to Luther in that Adam’s understanding is the main theme of the last two books in *Paradise Lost* and at the same time he owes to Calvin in that the progressive nature of revelation is used as the framework. However the views of Luther and Calvin have an antipathy to each other; because Luther, identifying ‘the woman’s seed’ with Christ, emphasizes Adam’s realization, while Calvin, rejecting the point, states the view of progressive nature of revelation. The two views being contrary to each other, it is impossible to make a compromise in the theological field. Even if our epic poet is inspired from Luther and Calvin, it is by no means a mere patchwork what he does in the epic. He reaches beyond those disputes by the method which integrates these problems and competes a new world in literature – that is, to represent Adam as the representative of mankind, and make him know the promise of God through vision and discourse.

In conclusion, I should emphasize Milton’s finding of the integration of Adam’s awareness with the progressive nature of revelation, and the method shows his originality and ingenuity.
Chapter III

A Short Study on the Dramatic Treatment of the Messianic interpretation.

W. Kirconnell’s *The Celestial Cycle*, embodies a great amount of information concerning the various kinds of literary works based upon the Creation and the Fall story, (not all of them are presented without any abbreviation.)

In this book several writers refer to God’s sentence upon the serpent and man after the Fall in various ways. From now on we shall see, picking out some of them, how they refer to and treat it in their work. Then we investigate then in relation to the method of Milton.

In the collection of Kirkconnell, the first reference of the God’s pronouncement appears in Avitus’ *Poemata* (A.D. 507). Concerning the point in question, however, what Avitus says is too short:

God passes sentence on the serpent, Eve and Adams, and foretells disasters to come. 52

So it may be sure, at least, that the topic is not so much of importance in this Sumerian story.

52 *The Celestial Cycle*, p. 16.
An Anglo-Saxon poem, the ‘Cademian’ Paradise Lost, which is supposed to be written between 700-850 A.D. by an anonymous writer, presents us information more fully than Poemata about the curse of God: after he heard Eve’s side of the story, God sentenced the serpent at first thus:

Evilly hast thou been author of sin;
Therefore this wife by the will of high heaven
Shall tread thy foul head with the tramp of her foot.
In wait shalt thou lie with new war for her heel.
Between thine and her seed shall be set equal war
While the ball of this earth shall aside under heaven.
Evil foe of all souls, thou art certain indeed,
Thou knowest the life thou shalt lead in the land. 53

This anonymous writer treats the sentence as the prophecy of the fight between the serpent and mankind in general, and at that the fight is not to take a turn favorable to mankind: it is ‘equal war’. This treatment is akin to that of modern Biblical scholars.

Du Bartas is the first in the book of Kirkconnell who refers to the revelation of man in the Fall. In La Seconde Semaine we meet across the passage as follows:

For thou complainest of Gods grace, whose Still
Extracts from dross of thine audacious ill,

53 The Celestial Cycle, p. 42.
Three unexpected goods; praise for his name;
Bliss for thy self; for Satan endless-shame;
Sith, but for sin, Justice and Mercy were
But idle names: and but that thou didst erre,
CHRIST had not come to conquer and to quell,
Upon the cross, Sin, Satan, Death, and Hell;
Making thee blessed more since thine offence.
Than in thy primer happy innocence. . . \(^{54}\)

In the citation above, the concept of ‘the Fortunate Fall’ appears, on which Arthur Lovejoy comments nicely.\(^ {55}\) It is certain that Du Bartas found in the Fall of man the revelation of God, for the Incarnation and the Redemption could have never occurred but the fall of Adam.

It is, however, not in connection with the passage, Gen. iii. 15., that he refers to Redemption of Christ. He gives no special comment in the passage; he talks of the curse of God only as follows:

\[\ldots\text{ then (God) with just indignation,}\]
\[\text{Pronounced thus their dreadful Condemnation . . . .}\]
\[\text{I'le kindle war between the Woman's seed}\]
\[\text{And thy fell race; hers on the head shall ding}\]
\[\text{Thine: thine againe hers in the hell sting: }^{56}\]

\(^{54}\) \textit{Ibid.} p. 74.
\(^{56}\) \textit{The Celestial Cycle}, p. 72.
It is true that he found the sign of the revelation in the Fall, but it is because he
regarded the Fall as the precondition of the Incarnation and the Redemption of Christ.
Unlike Du Bartas, Milton finds in the woman’s seed itself the promise of God, as we
have seen before. In this point Milton differs from Du Bartas.

Hugo Grotius, as Kirkconnell makes the point, thought of his own *Adamus Exul* so
poorly that he did not include it in his collected works.\(^57\) It is not a great work, indeed,
but its vitality and freshness is undoubted.

Kirkconnell asserts that Milton should have been familiar with the play, and it is
rendered externally probable by his personal acquaintance with Grotius, whose quest he
was in Paris in 1638.

As for the internal evidence, after he eliminated certain elements which both might
have drawn from *Genesis*, he finds the five features in *Adamus Exul* that are woven into
the ampler pattern of *P. L*. Those are (1) Satan’s arrival in Eden after his fight from Hell
and his soliloquy, (*A. E.*, Act I and *P. L.*, Br. IV, (2) and angel’s discussion with Adam of
the Creation and of the heavenly bodies and his warning with regard to Satan, (*A. E.*, 
Act II. and *P. L.*, Br. V), (3) the chorus of angels on duty in the Garden, (*A. E.*, *passim*;
and *P. L.*, Br. IV. lines 776 *ad fin.*), (4) Satan’s entering into the serpent and his way of
inducing Eve to eat of the forbidden tree, (*A. E.*, Act IV. and *P. L.*, Br. ix), (5) Adam’s
consentment of eating, out of passionate love for Eve, the entering of guilt despair,
complaint, and violent counsels, and the divine intervention at least, (*A. E.*, Act V; *P. L.*, 
Bks. X-XII.).\(^58\)

---
\(^{57}\) *The Celestial Cycle*, p. 583.
As a conclusion, Kirkconnell points out that the debt of Milton to Groutius seems to be general rather than specific. As the eternal evidence of this, he refers to the fact that when Milton began serious work on his great epic in 1658, he had already been blind for six years. As has been pointed out by Christopher Charles Love . . . there are marked parallels between the careers of the two men. Each wrote a poem on Adam (Adamus Exul and Paradise Lost), a poem on Christ (Christus Patiens and Paradise Regained), and a poem on an Old Testament character (Sophompaneas and Samson Agonistes) with autobiographical overtones; each wrote a Latin work (De Veritate Religions Christianae and De Doctrina Christiana) setting forth his theological position; each was a Christian humanist, a rationalist; and Arminian; and each played a considerable part in public affairs. That Milton, the twenty-five years younger, should have taken Groutius as a sort of Renaissance model is at least a plausible sort of theory.  

Evans also treats the structural relationship between Adamus Exul and Paradise Lost and makes another step in this study. He emphasizes that the relationship is primary a structural one, and assumes a critical attitude towards those source critics who still concentrate on explicit verbal parallels.  

Fundamentally I meet the two critics on the same ground. Apart from the structural problem, however, here I emphasize the relationship between P. L. and A. E. is found in regard to the Messianic interpretation of the God’s pronouncement.  

In the tragedy, Grotius presents us clearly his way of interpreting the curse on the serpent.

---

59 Kirkconnell, p.585.  
60 The Genesis Tradition, pp. 212-216.
Wars, everlasting wars, the woman and thyself
Shall wage with mutual hate; that fire myself shall kindle;
I, in the female mind, whose nature is to hold
With dark tendency a hated deep conceived,
Shall thrust in hostile frenzies and sow bitter feuds
That she shall nourish fiercely nor allow to cool.
I shall prolong that conflict down throughout all ages,
So that her heirs may arm themselves against thy race.
And wars of her posterity vex thine in turn.\(^{61}\)

We should not forget god uttered these words cited above with a preface that ‘In human minds I’ll cherish sparks of former light, / Forerunners of salvation, cover’d.’ Then God’s voice went on:

HIMSELF shall come, for God shall take on human flesh,
By mankind not begotten, yet from woman’s seed,
Born of a Virgin’s womb, the Saviour of mankind,
And He as Conqueror shall bruise thy haughty head,
And tramp triumphantly on both thy venom’d temples.
Often, with Him their head, the just, with armed hand
Shall bring back *spolia opima*, routing thee.\(^{62}\)

To put it in strict terms, the Messianic interpretation of Grotius is slightly different from that of Milton as far as this drama is concerned. He does not identify ‘HIMSELF’

\(^{61}\) Kirkconnell, p. 213.
\(^{62}\) *Loc. cit.*
with ‘the woman seed’. It is supposed that he treats ‘the woman’s seed’ as the righteous
people and Christ is ‘their Head’ In this point, he is more akin to Calvin that Milton. But, 
apart from details, his interpretation is closer to that of Milton than any other cited in 
this chapter.

Unlike the others, he does not regard the sentence as suggesting the mere fight 
between man and the serpent. He admits the curse on the side of the serpent is the sign 
of salvation on the side of mankind. He also differs from Du Bartas, who thought 
merely the Fall itself contained the sign of revelation in that it prepared for the 
Incarnation and Redemption of Christ.

Grotius lays importance on the Fall of man not only because it prepared for the 
Redemption but the sentence after it promised the salvation to man, especially the 
promise was to be fulfilled in ‘the woman’s seed.’

However, in Adamus Exul the promise of God to Man is not fully dramatized. 
Though the voice of God was heard to Adam, he did not think over the words and, 
lamenting the ‘threatening penalty of fate; he and his wife departed the paradise. 
Moreover, his last speech shows us that ‘swooning Langour, Fever’s horrid 
paroxysms. . . Toil and Pain and storm clouds of impending Woe,’ were the ‘guides’ of 
this ‘mournful exile!’

This scene of A. E. is quite different from the last scene of P. L., where Adam and 
Eve fully understand the Messianic meaning of God’s will by the help of Michael, and 
‘though sorrowing yet in peace’ leave the paradise, and ‘their guide’ is, not such a 
miserable one as those of A. E. , but the ‘Providence.’

63 Kirkconnell, p. 220.
64 P. L., xi, 117.
65 Ibid., xii, 647.
In the tragedy of Grotius, God showed his grace to man, but the grief at the moment stroke down the couple so bitterly that they hardly paid attention to the promise. They were just mourning over their fate. The special judgement of God meant nothing for Adam and Eve. In other words, at the crucial point in the drama, God’s promise to man cannot heighten the dramatic effect. Consequently it becomes loosely connected with the rest of the play. Then the drama ended leaving something quite unclear to our mind.

This feeling is caused by the fact that Grotius could not deal with his theological interpretation of the sentence efficiently in the literary work. This is explained mainly from the two points: in the first place God himself clarified the meaning of the sentence unreservedly, so the drama lost the feeling of suspense at that spot; secondly the negative reaction in Adam reduces the gravity of the words of God.

Milton is different from Grotius in this point. He treats the sentence otherwise. At the time of the judgement, the salvation is promised in the vague, mysterious words, so Adam does not understand the real meaning. But he does not give up the problem, he continues exercising and learning, and at least he realises God’s promise by the help of the archangel Michael.

It is not too much to say that the last two books of Paradise Lost are written for Adam’s education. He disobeyed God and fall as well as Satan. But he found the sign of revelation in ‘the woman’s seed’ and came to learn how to live as a Christian. We find in his treatment of the God’s promise to man Milton’s originality and ingenuity. On this subject, however, we shall make further research in the following chapter.
Joost Van Den Vondel is ‘to the Netherlands what Shakespeare is to England, although in dramatic and poetical rank he is closer to Dryden than to Shakespeare.’ He wrote thirty-two tragedies in verse, and all of them keep the classical unities of time and place, and are written on the fixed model of five acts, with choral interludes between the acts. *Lucifer* (1654) is regarded as the greatest of his dramas.

The probable relationship between Vondel and Milton is minutely investigated by George Edmund in his *Milton and Vondel*. He compares *Paradise Lost* with Vondel’s *Lucifer*, *John the Messenger*, *Reflections on God and Religion*, and *Adam in Banishment*, pointing out the relationship by drawing various lines which was supposed to witness the correspondence. As far as Edmund’s illustration is concerned, it may be sure that Milton was inspired by Vondel in some extent—especially in forming the character of Satan.

However nothing is described by Edmund as for the relationship between the interpretation of Vondel and of Milton about the God’s curse upon the serpent. Now, it is our business to see how Vondel treated the topic and how he integrated it in *Lucifer*. Then, we shall examine the possibility of Milton’s debt to Vondel in this respect.

In the last scene of Act V of *Lucifer*, we find the comment of Gabriel on the God’s curse as such:

. . . the Snake, for guilt
With its sly tongue, shall creep upon its belly
And live in wretchedness on dust and earth.

---

66 Kirkconnell, p. 628.
But that the man might have firm consolation
In such distress, god promised faithfully
To raise up, from the woman’s seed and blood,
The Mighty One, who through ancestral hatred
Shall bruise the Dragon and the Serpent’s head,
And though the fall Beast bite him near the heel,
The hero shall be victor in this fray. 67

Gabriel, who is ‘herald and interpreter of God’s mysteries’, shows that the latter part of the sentence upon the serpent is the God’s encouragement to man, so that he may have ‘firm consolation’ in the miserable state: ‘The Mighty One’ shall rise up from ‘the woman’s seed’ and he ‘shall be victor’ in the fight between him and the Dragon.

Vondel was clearly conscious of the sign of the salvation in the curse upon the serpent and regarded ‘the woman’s seed’ as the key words in its fulfillment.

The second reference to the sentence is pointed out in the last lines of the following speech of Michael:

Meanwhile the promised Seed shall reconcile
The wrath of God, and shall restore with love
All that was lost in Adam’s bitter fall. 68

Then responding to this, Chorus brings the drama to a finish:

67 Kirkconnell, p.419.
68 Kirkconnell, p.420.
Vondel as well as Grotius found the suggestion of the Resurrection in God’s curse upon the serpent, and utilized the messianic interpretation as a key point in dramatization. However he was far more skillful and ingenious that Grotius in its treatment. He knew clearly what he himself wanted to emphasize in his drama and had ability to put his theory in practice. He set the comment on the promise at the last part of the play and repeated it threefold through three persons: the words of God are interpreted by Gabriel in the first place, then assured by Michael, and lastly generalized by Chorus. Thus, given the dignity, the pronouncement of God appeals to the audience.

Vondel’s method, however, is quite different from that of Milton. First of all, in *Lucifer* Adam never appears on the stage: he is touched indirectly in angel’s speech. Consequently, it does not matter whether he understand the words of God rightly or not. It may be said that *Lucifer* and *Adamus Exul* resemble in this sense. On the other hand,

---

in *Paradise Lost* we see that the process of Adam’s realization of God’s mystery is represented with persuasive power in the last two books.

The claim that Vondel omitted the realization of Adam willingly because the hero of this play is Lucifer is not satisfactory enough; for we see that he shows no interest in Adam’s lessons as well in *Adam in Ballingshap* (1664), though the hero of the play is Adam himself.

It is Uriel who sentences the serpent in *Adam in Ballingshap*. This ‘angel of Justice’, however, unlike Gabriel in *Lucifer*, only gives sentence and makes no comment:

```
Justice divine
    Shall raise up inextinguishable hate,
    Even between the woman’s Seed and thee
    For He shall crush thy head, though in the strife
    ‘Twill be thy lot to bite Him in the heel.\(^{70}\)
```

It is clear that nothing is explained to Adam though the capital letters of ‘Seed’, ‘He’, and ‘Him’ suggest the identity (i.e. God).

In conclusion, I admit the probable relationship between Vondel and Milton in the Messianic interpretation of God’s curse upon the serpent in *Genesis* iii. 15. But I should emphasize that there is a great difference in their treatment of the topic; Vondel paid no

\(^{70}\) Kirkconnell, p. 478.
attention to Adam’s understanding of the mystery, while Milton laid emphasis on it.

However urgently should critics assert Milton’s debt to Vondel, I declare that in Vondel’s works there is no line corresponding to the lines in *Paradise Lost* which express the progress of Adam’s education through the Revelation in the latter part of Book X, and whole of Book XI, XII, where the poet demonstrates his ability.

In addition, I suggest that the difference illustrates above between Milton and Vondel may be closely connected with the problem of genre: in regard to the epic tradition, education based on the exemplum is one of the main components of epic.

After learned the way of living as a Christian, that is, to live patiently with belief in salvation, Adam says

```plaintext
Henceforth I learn, that to obey is best,
And love with fear the only God, to walk
As in his presence, ever to observe
His Providence, and on him sole depend,
Merciful over all his works, with good
Still overcoming evil, and by small
Accomplishing great things, by things deem’d week
Subverting worldly strong, and worldly wise
By simply meek; that suffering for Truth’s sake
Is fortitude to highest victory,
And to the faithful death and Gate of Life;
Taught this by his example whom I now
```
Furthermore it is noteworthy that many of the contemporary writers with Milton treat the Fall story as tragedy – for example, *Adam in Ballingshap* is subtitled as ‘Tragedy of all tragedies’; *the Lucifer*, a tragedy; *Adamo Canto, Tragedia* (1643); *Adamus Exul, Tragedia*; while Milton completes it into an epic.

---

71 *P. L.* XII, 561-573.
J. Martin Evans, in his commentary on Book X of *Paradise Lost*, says that ‘After the intensity of Book IX, the explosive variety of Book X threatens to burst the poem open at the seams. The dramatic unities which had governed events in Eden suddenly disintegrate; time ceases to be continuous, slipping backwards with each ‘meanwhile’ (I, 229, 585) to bring another aspect of the story up to date; place jumps from heaven to earth hell and back again as the repercussions of the fall spread to the limits of the universe; action splits into a series of overlapping episodes which hustle all the major characters on and off stage in less than 600 lines. It is as if the violent forces released by Adam’s sin had invaded the structure of narrative itself. . . .’

His comment seems to be the point. It is true that we get the sense of disorder when we read the book for the first time. And the comment above may be a very good answer to the question why we get such a feeling.

But we here ought to have in mind that even if we get the sense of disorder or fear, we cannot say it is because the author writes disorderly or his mind is full of fear. On the contrary, the sense we have is elaborately calculated in the author’s attentive mind and expressed skillfully. So, Evans saying, ‘As one of the sons Adam expects to curse him (733-6), Milton may well be angry with his ancestor.’, is not so proper.
The sense acquired is not an actual one, but ‘virtual’ one as Susanne Langer calls. The author must impress readers with the virtual sense, and, at the same time, he must not let them realize that the sense is virtual. In order words, though it goes with saying, all the time he must not gorger himself and be calm and set to the work he wants to let them feel something. Otherwise, not only may he fail in the attempt, but also the he wrote may be mere utterance of his passion, and readers, being confused, will stop reading and give it up forever.

Remembering this, let us look at Book X once more, and we shall find another aspect of the book. It is the structure which is admirably elaborated and, at the same time, which is not expressed beyond the due limit.

My aim is now discussing the minute and dynamic structure of Book X in the thematic point of view in terms of ‘the woman’s seed’. The claim to analyze Book X in the light of the theme, of course, is not a new one. Moreover, as for the term, ‘the woman’s seed’, Joseph H. Summers neatly deals with mainly in the point of view of the poetic sounds. However, no one as far as I know has examined the structure of Book X in the particular light of the term, ‘the woman’s seed’, which is closely connected with concerns itself with the whole framework of P. L.

Book X consists of three parts, (11. 1-228, 11. 229-584, 11. 585-1104). This structural division is grounded on the word, ‘meanwhile’, which occurs in the book three times and makes ‘time’ cease ‘to be continuous’, as Evans says. George M. Muldrow, also, divides Book X into three parts, though his way of dividing is slightly

---

different from mine. As one of the basic reasons of this division, he talks of ‘the effects of the Fall, first in Heaven (11. 1-238), then in Hell (11. 239-584), and finally on earth (11. 585-to the end).’ However, anyone who reads the book will find soon that not only Heaven but also the earth plays an important part as for the effect of the Fall in the first structural division; so, it may be improper to analyze the book in the relation of each division to one place. It may be more proper to see each part in the light of the dynamic movement, that is, the shifting vision from one place to another in each part. About present it is enough to show that Muldrow is not so persuasive in explaining his method of dividing the book.

1. The Sentence and the Son of God

The main point of the first part is clear in the argument of Book X:

Man’s transgression known, the Guardian Angels forsake Paradise, and return up to Heaven to approve their vigilance, and are approv’d, God declaring that The entrance of Satan could not be by them prevented. He sends his Son to judge the Transgressors, who descends and gives Sentence accordingly; then in pity clothes them both, and reascends.

God sent his Son, who is the man’s ‘Mediator’, and ‘Redeemer’, to judge the fallen pair with ‘Mercy colleague with Justice.’ God’s way to Man is not only ‘just’ but also

---

77 Perhaps it may be caused by the misprints, because the line 238 contains no period nor any mark of ending the sentence. This may be supported by the fact that the book contains many misprints.
78 P. L., X. 59.
merciful. As for the serpent, however, He tells the Son that ‘the third (= the serpent) best
absent is condemned / Convict by flight, and rebel to all law / Conviction to the serpent
none belongs.’

The Son descends from Heaven to the earth, and sentences the serpent at first and
says

“Because thou hast done this, thou art accurst
Above all Cattle, each Beast of the Field;
Upon thy Belly grovelling thou shalt go,
And dust shalt eat all the days of thy Life.
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.”

In this sentence two things are expressed; the one is the fate of the serpent, and the other
is the combat between the serpent and ‘the woman’s seed’.

Here we should notice that these words of the Son is uttered ‘in the ‘mysterious
terms, judged as then best’ and ‘this oracle’ is then ‘justified / when Jesus Christ son
of Mary second Eve, / Saw Satan fall like lightning down from Heaven . . . .’ In De
Doctorina Christiana, as we have seen, Milton makes clear the point that the sentence is
a curse upon the serpent, at the same time, it is ‘the covenant of grace itself on the part
of God’ to Man. When the Son sentenced this, however, neither Adam nor Eve cold

79  Ibid., X. 82-84.
make sense of what is really meant, whether it is because of their ‘dark’n’d’ mind or it is because the speech was in the mysterious words. They only listened and took the words as they were.

It is important that here Milton deviates from scripture in representing God as delegating to the Son the pronouncement of sentence. It seems strange for us that the Son, who is incarnated as Christ born of a woman, appears in the world of the Old Testament. But it might not be so queer for Milton living in the world where dominant was the tradition of appreciating the Old Testament within the scope of the New Testament: there all the persons and the accidents in O. T. were regarded as prefiguring those in N. T.

By introducing the Son in the scene and imposing him the very office to give sentence, Milton emphasizes that the Son himself promised man to deliver him from sin and death. This may be a powerful evidence how he places great importance on the first covenant in the woman’s seed. And it is more interesting that the pattern in which the Son descends to earth, clothes the fallen men with the garment of salvation, and ascends to Heaven, prefigures the pattern of Christ’s Incarnation, the Passion for man’s deliverance, and the Resurrection and Reascension to heaven. In this point Milton treats God’s promise of man’s salvation in the threefold way: the interpretation of the woman’s seed, the Son’s intervention, and the pattern.

Concerning the representation of God as delegating the condemnation of Adam and Eve to the Messiah, E. C. Baldwin makes a comment that ‘the rabbis also affirmed that God spoke to Eve at least, not directly, but through an interpreter.82 ‘Rabbi Joshua in the name of Rabbi Eleasar has said: ‘Never has the Holy One, praised be He! entered

81 Ibid., IX. 1054.
82 Midrash Tehillim Psalm IX.
into converse with any woman except with that righteous one\textsuperscript{83} -- and then only on a particular occasion.\textsuperscript{84}

Apart from the semantic influence, however, it is noticeable that Milton has a consistent idea to represent God as delegating the accomplishment of his great works to the Son. We remember the scene of Heavenly war between God and Satan in Book VI:

\begin{quote}
. . . . Yet the Tumult not so ending, God on the third day sends Messiah his Son, for whom he had reserv’d the glory of that Victory: Hee in the power of his Father coming to the place, and causing all his Legions to stand still on either side, with his Chariot and Thunder driving into the midst of his Enemies, pursued them unable to resist towards the wall of Heaven; which opening, they leap down with horror and confusion into the place of punishment prepar’d for them in the Deep: Messiah returns with triumph to his Father.\textsuperscript{85}
\end{quote}

After the expelling of Satan and his followers out of Heaven, God declared to create another world and sent his Son to perform the work of Creation in six days. Then, ‘Angels celebrate with Hymns the performance thereof, and his reascension into Heaven.’\textsuperscript{86}

God spoke to his Son who returned victoriously with his saints that

\begin{quote}
Meanwhile inhabit lax, ye powers of Heaven,

And thou my word, begotten Son, by thee

This I perform, speak thou, and be it done:
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[83] The reference is to Sarah.
\item[85] \textit{P. L.}, VI. The Argument.
\item[86] \textit{Ibid.}, VII. The Argument.
\end{footnotes}
My overshadowing Spirit and might with thee

I send along, ride forth, and bid the Deep

Within appointed bounds be Heav’n and Earth,

Boundless the Deep, because I am who fill

Infinitude, nor vacuous the space.  

What is Baldwin going to say about the consistency of the Son’s performance in the great works and the pattern of his departure from God, the performance of some great works, and the returning to his Father? Is there any coincidence in the extra-Biblical works of Rabbi? Perhaps, the answer may be ‘No.’ I regard the consistency and the pattern as constituting a characteristic feature of Milton’s Messiah.

The Son appears three times in *P. L.* and performs three great works in behalf of God: the expelling of Satan out of Heaven, the Creation of the new world and the promise of revelation to man. All of three in agreement foreshadow and prefigure Christ’s great achievement in *Paradise Regained*.

2. Satan and the Curse of God

So far we have seen what means the sentence of God and the role of the Son in the first division in *Paradise Lost* and in the relationship between *P. L.* and *Paradise Regained*. Now, we study how Satan heard of and reacted the sentence and what it means in the whole framework.

About the middle of the second structural division, Satan

---

87 VIII. 162-169.
. . . after Eve seduc’t, unminded slunk
Into the Wood fast by, and changing shape
To observe the sequel, saw his guileful act
By Eve, though all unwitting, seconded
Upon her Husband, saw their shame that sought
Vain covertures; but when he saw descend
The Son of God to judge them, terrifi’d
Hee fled, not hoping to escape, but shun
The present, fearing guilty what his wrath
Might suddenly inflict; that past, return’d
By night, and list’ning where hapless Pair
Sat in their sad discourse, and various plant,
Thence gather’d this own doom, which understood
Not instant, but of future time.\(^88\)

As God remarked in the first division Satan fled away in the presence of the Son and was absent when the sentence was pronounced. He did not return by night, and when he returned, it was after the Son had ascended to Heaven. He listened to what the unhappy pair talked of ‘in their sad discourse, and various plant’ and ‘gathered his own doom’ which he at least ‘understood / Not instant, but of future time.’

Here, we should not overlook the two points: the one is that Satan was not present at the court, and accordingly he did not directly hear of the decision upon him; secondly

---

\(^88\) X. 332-345.
he had to gather his own doom by listening secretly to the discourse of Adam and Eve, who were, at that time, not aware of the real meaning and, therefore, over by despair.

Then, Satan ‘With joy’ hurried to Hell. The contrast between Man and Satan is brought onto clear relief by the two words, ‘sad’ and ‘joy’: while our ancestors were thrown into the ‘sad’ condition, Satan was hurrying home with ‘joy’. His joy increased when he met his family, Sin and death, and saw the huge bridge made for him:

Great joy was at their meeting, and at sight
Of that stupendous Bridge his joy increas’d.  

The image of joyful condition of Satan continues for a while and it heightens the dramatic effect.

To the speech of Death,

... the Prince of Darkness answer’d glad.

and after he ‘ascended his high Throne’ invisibly and ‘appear’d’ from a Cloud his fulgent head / And shape Star bright’.

Forth rush’d in haste the great consulting Peers
... and with like joy
Congratulatant approach’d him...

---

89 X. 345.
90 X. 456-458.
91 X. 383.
92 X. 445-450.
'The triumphant to which Satan returns in Hell’, however, ‘of course, is only illusory.’ As Muldrow points out.\(^94\) By the ironical use of blissful condition of Satan, Milton prepares for ‘the grand finale of the one-man show’\(^95\) Satan has been giving ever since Book I.

At the summit of his prosperity, Satan refers to the sentence upon him:

\[
\ldots \text{he (= God) threat}
\]

Both his beloved Man and all his World,
To Sin and Death a prey, and so to us,
Without our hazard, labour, or alarm
To range in, and to dwell, and over Man
True is, mee also he hath judg’d, or rather
Mee not, but the brute Serpent in whose shape
Man I deceiv’d: that which to me belongs,
Is enmity, which he will put between
Mee and Mankind; I am to bruise his heel;
His seed, when is not set, shall bruise my head:
A World who would not purchase with a bruise,
Or my performance: What remains, ye Gods,
But up and enter now into full bliss.\(^96\)

\(^{93}\) X. 456-458.
\(^{94}\) The Drama of the Soul, p. 64.
\(^{95}\) Evans, Paradise Lost: Books IX-X, p. 45.
\(^{96}\) P. L., X. 487-503.
His attitude towards the sentence is more than ‘mockery and flippancy . . . boastful speech and then in a flippant tone.’ as is commented on by Muldrow.97 Evans’ explanation may be fitter, that ‘Satan realizes at once that the curse applies to him, but he clearly thinking of a physical bruise when he jokes about it with his followers in hell.’98 though it is also insufficient. The self-complacent speech of Satan demands a more careful analysis of us to explain it fully.

As we have seen before, he accepted the sentence of God, not directly, but indirectly through the discourse of Adam and Eve, who were not at all aware of the promise made to them. In other words, he could not take the words of God as they were, and as the result his words about the sentence is different from those of God. Let us see the God’s words again and compare it with those of Satan:

“Because thou hast done this, thou art accurst

Above all Cattle, each Beast of the Field;

Upon the Belly grovelling thou shalt go,

And dust shalt eat all the days of thy Life.

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.”

In comparison with this, Satan’s interpretation of the curse shows three characteristics. In the first place, he distinguishes himself from the serpent ‘in whose shape’ he deceived ‘Man’, then he is thinking that the first four lines of the curse are

97 *Loc. cit.*
applied only to the ‘brute serpent,’ This fact is clear from the lines, ‘. . . mee also he hath judg’d, or rather / Mee not, but the brute Serpent in whose shape / Man I deceived.’ The following speech, ‘that which to me belongs / Is enmity . . . ’ also affirms that Satan thinks only the latter part of the sentence is applied to him. Secondly, he uses the words, ‘man’ and ‘mankind’ which have a function of generating for both sexes, and makes no distinction of gender. Satan says that he deceived ‘Man in the shape of the serpent, but, strictly speaking, it is not ‘Man’ but ‘Woman’ who was deceived by Satan in the shape of the serpent: Man was

. . . not deceiv’d

But fondly overcome with Female charm. (IX. 998-999.)

Furthermore, God put enmity between the serpent and ‘the Woman’ and Between the serpent’s seed and ‘her Seed’. But Satan says that enmity is put between him and ‘Mankind’ and between his seed and ‘His seed’. For Satan it is the seed of Mankind that shall bruise his head, though God declared that the woman’s seed shall bruise eliminates the words denominating female sex from the speech of Satan. He shows us, by using general ‘man’, Satan overlooks the special meaning contained in ‘the Woman’. As the third of his characteristics, his misunderstanding of the quality of the fight is pointed out. At first, he distinguished himself from the serpent, then he overlooks the special meaning imposed on the female sex, and as the result, he takes the fight for general one between man and him, and physical one at that. Therefore he continues boastfully, ‘A world who would not purchase with a bruise, / Or much more grievous pain?’
Satan misunderstands God’s will and feels as if in the seventh heaven of joy because, he thinks, the penalty imposed on him is far lighter than he had expected. Here Milton very skillfully presents us Satan’s limitation and his desperate condition. His helplessness is not only suggested in the curse of God but also clarified by his limitation of the power. He cannot see through the mysterious words nor find God’s will. He merely overlooks them and therefore does not provide for the new fight. He is only intoxicated with the illusion of victory. While he feels himself at the highest point of ‘full bliss’, he, in fact, falls into the lowest and farthest beyond the reach of the grace of God.

He may well be satisfied with the sentence if it were really as he fancies, for he was not overcome with his ‘fall from Heav’n, a deadlier bruise.’ (XII. 391.) Milton, however, shows us by degrees how Satan deceives himself and how God takes revenge on him.

God treats the adversary serpent with equally adverse way to what Satan thought of. While Satan distinguished himself from the serpent, God identified him with it. Secondly, Satan generalized for both sexes by using male gender, but God imposed a special, Messianic meaning on female gender. Lastly Satan thought of the physical fight in future, but it is a spiritual one verified when

\[ \ldots \text{hee, who comes thy Savior, shall recure,} \]
\[ \text{Not by destroying Satan, but his works} \]
\[ \text{In thee and in thy Seed: (XII. 393-395)} \]
As for the first two characteristics, I have more to say. That is the adverse patter of Satan's way of thinking. He need not have distinguished himself from the serpent, but he did. Then he generalized for two sexes when he used 'man', but in this very point he must have selected 'the Woman' from the general 'man'. He selected things where there was no need, while he did not select where he should.

This pattern has been repeated since Book I. After the Fall from Heaven, he said,

The mind is its own place, and in itself
Can make a Heav'n of Hell, a hell of Heav'n.
What matter where, if I be still the same,
And what I should be, all but less than hee
When Thunder hath made greater? Here at least
We shall be free. (I. 254-259)

In this book he was already ignoring the distinction between Heaven and Hell. He thought that he was the same with him before the Fall and, therefore, Hell and Heaven was the same for him. He did not select rightly though in this scene his speech had something striking us.

This pattern is found in several times – for example, in Book II. 263-268; 450-456, Book IV. 69-78., and adapted also by Death, the seed of Satan, when he answered to Sin:

“To me, who with eternal Famine pine,
Alike is Hell, or Paradise, or Heaven,
There best where most with ravin I might meet. . . .”

\[(X. 597-599)\]

The tendency to generalize where selection should be done is one of the characteristics of Satan, and this is opposed to one of the most dominant ideas in Milton’s doctrine. That is ‘choosing’ rightly.

In the famous lines in Areopagitica Milton affirms

when God gave him reason, he gave him freedom to choose, for reason is but choosing;\(^99\)

It goes without saying that he laid much importance to ‘choosing’. In the Cain’s murder scene he makes clear why God did not get the offering from Cain while he got from Abel:

\[\ldots\] thither anon

A sweaty Reaper from his Tillage brought

First-Fruits, the green Ear, and the yellow Sheaf,

Uncull’d, as came to hand; a shepherd next

More meek came with the Firstlings of his Flock

Choicest and best: (XI. 432-437)

\(^{99}\) CE., IV, 319.
God did not accept from Cain because the offering was not selected and he accepted from Abel because it was the ‘Choicest and best.’

The pattern of the thinking way of Satan and his followers is that they do not choose, or even if they choose it is in adverse way. Milton affirmed that reason was but choosing. Then right reason is nothing but choosing rightly. The pattern of Satan shows he does not choose rightly. He does not have right reason.

Satan distinguished himself from the serpent and thought that the former part of the curse was applied only to the brute serpent. But in the following scene, he himself

... supplanted down he fell

A monstrous Serpent on his Belly prone, (X. 513-514.)

then,

... but taste

Deceiv’d; they fondly thinking to allay
Their appetite with gust, instead of Fruit
Chew’d bitter Ashes... (563-566)

Satan falls from the summit of prosperity to the helpless depth of the curse of God.

Some say that ‘In comparison with that spiritual victory this physical vengeance is petty as well as unnecessary. The Almighty did not have to be so literal.’ 100

100 Evans, p. 45.
But they do not understand the sarcasm of Milton at all. This scene shows a bitter irony of Milton to Satan. He treats ‘the adversary Serpent’ in the equally adverse way. Moreover, the scene is necessary in clarifying the role of Satan as an ironic hero and ‘mock saviour’ transmuted to ‘the serpent the real saviour will bruise.’ Since Book I Satan has been carrying some heroic character, and Denis Saurat says that ‘Paradise Lost is built round two great themes which are harmoniously balanced: the fall of the angels and the fall of man.’ But his role as an hero has been limited more and more as the narrative goes on, and at this point of Book X it disappears completely.

As for the dynamic movement, he descends from the earth to Hell physically. Inwardly he ascends the highest point of the ‘full bliss’ by misunderstanding the curse of God, which is fulfilled in the woman’s seed, but by the Will of God he falls down unto the shape of the serpent. While in the first division the ascension of the Son is emphasized, here the descent of the Satan is made into a clear relief.

3. Man and the Promise of Revelation.

In the first structural division, as we have seen, Adam and Eve were sentenced directly by the Son, but at that point they were not aware of the grace of God suggested in that sentence. Even if they caught something from the words of God, it might be only the superficial meaning as was the case of Satan. Therefore, in the third division we are faced with Adam, who is thrown into the death of despair. He

---

101 P. L., XII. 312.
102 Evans. p. 47.
laments the miserable condition of his own and regrets that the curse is extending over all the descendants of him:

O miserable of happy! is this the end
Of this new glorious World, and me so late
The Glory of that Glory, who now become
Accurst of blessed, hide me from the face
Of God, whom to behold was then my heighth
Of happiness: yet well, if here would bear
My own deservings; but this will not serve;
All that I eat or drink, or shall beget,
Is propagated curse. O voice once heard
Delightfully, Increase and multiply,
Now death to hear! for what can I increase
Or multiply, curses on my head?
Who of all Ages to succeed, but feeling
The evil on him brought by me, will curse
My Head, ‘Ill fare our Ancestor impure,
For this we may thank Adam’; but his thanks
Shall be the execration; so besides
Mine own that bide upon me, all from mee
Shall with a fierce reflux on mee redound,
On mee as on their place. (X, 720-741.)
He admits that he must accept the curse because he disobeyed God. That is inevitable that the curse extends over and affects them.

Ay me, that fear
Comes thund’ring back with dreadful revolution
On my defenseless head; both Death and I
Am found Eternal, and incorporate both,
Nor I must leave ye, Sons; O were I able
To waste it all myself, and leave ye none!
So disinherited how would ye bless
Me now your Curse! Ah, why should all mankind
For one man’s fault thus guiltless be condemn’d
If guiltless? (X, 813-824.)

He answers his own question one after another, falls into a vicious circle, and is driven to further despair:

Thus what thou desir’st
And what thou fear’st, alike destroys all hope
Of refuge, and concludes thee miserable
Beyond all past example and future,
To Satan only like both crime and doom.
O Conscience, into what Abyss of fears
And horrors hast thou driv’n me; out of which
I find no way, from deep to deeper plung’d:

(X, 837-844.)

Not knowing what to do with himself, he wreaks his anger on Eve, who comes near to console him:

Out of my sight, thou Serpent, that name best
Befits thee with him leagu’d, thyself as false
And hateful; nothing wants, but that thy shape,
Like his, and colour serpentine may show
Thy inward fraud, to warn all Creatures from thee
Henceforth; least that too heav’nly form, pretended
To hellish falsehood, snare them. But for thee
I had persisted happy, had not thy pride
And wand’ring vanity, when least was safe,
Rejected my forewarning, and disdain’d
Not to be trusted, longing to be seen
Though by the Devil himself . . . .(X, 866-878.)

He names her ‘Serpent,’ insisting that he might not have fallen, nor would his offering have suffered from the curse in future, but for her. Then, he dares to ask why God made such a creature as woman:

O why did God,
In the citation above, Adam severely disparages the woman, and it is said that he ‘has just been expressing the most extravagant hatred of women.’ But I do not agree with those who regard the verses as a powerful evidence that Milton suffered much from his first marriage with Mary Powell and the unfortunate experience made him hate woman. We should keep in mind here that the view of women is not that of Milton but that of Adam. Furthermore, at this point he utters these words, governed by ‘passion.’ When Adam’s lamentation is introduced, we are informed that he is tossed ‘in a troubl’d Sea of passion.’ And Eve approaches to assa[y] soft words ‘to his fierce passion.’

---

105 *P. L.*, X, 718.
Before commenting on his reproach on women, we should remember that Milton has never countenanced the supremacy of ‘passion’ over man – for example, in Book VIII, lines 579-594, Raphael gives warning to Adam fascinated by Eve, saying

But if the sense of touch whereby mankind
Is propagated seem such dear delight
Beyond all other, think the same vouchsaf’t
To Cattle and each Beast; which would not be
To them made common and divulg’d, if aught
Therein enjoy’d were worth to subdue
The Soul of Man, or passion in him move.
What higher in her society thou find’st
Attractive, human, rational, love still;
In loving thou dost well, in passion not,
Wherein true Love consists not; love refines
The thoughts, and heart enlarges, hath his seat
In Reason, and is judicious, is the scale
By which to heav’nly Love thou may’st ascend,
Not sunk in carnal pleasure, for which cause
Among the Beasts no Mate for thee was found.

Then, emphasizing this point, he brings the conversation to a finish:

Furthermore, in the scene immediately after the Fall the word, ‘passion,’ plays an important role in representing the disorder of Adam’s mind:

They sat down to weep, nor only Tears
Rain’d at their Eyes, but high Winds worse within
Began to rise, high Passions, Anger, Hate,
Mistrust, Suspicion, Discord, and shook sore
Their inward State of Mind, calm Region once
And full of Peace, now tost and turbulent:
For understanding rul’d not, and the Will
Heard not her lore, both in subjection now
To sensual Appetite, who form beneath
Usurping over sovran Reason claim’d
Superior sway: (IX. 1121-1131.)

Now it is clear that in the scene of Book X, Passion makes Adam confused and prevents him from judging things in the light of reason: if he rightly accepted God’s grace

indicated in the mysterious words, he would not rage so much, for His promise shall be fulfilled in the Christ’s victory over Satan and he is none other than ‘the Seed of the woman.’ In other words, Christ shall be born of the Virgin Mary, ‘second Eve,’ ‘the woman.’ Moreover, the virgin is one of the offerings of Adam and Eve.

Faced with his ‘fierce passion,’ she, ‘Not so repulsed,’ ‘fell humble’ at his feet,’ and ‘embracing them’ asks permission. The following is one of the most famous parts of the epic:

Forsake me not thus, Adam, witness Heav’n
What love sincere, and reverence in my heart
I bear thee, and unwitting have offended,
Unhappily deceiv’d . . .
While yet we live, scare one short hour perhaps
As joined in injuries, one enmity
Against a Foe by doom express assigned us,
That cruel Serpent: (X. 911-927.)

J. h. Summers claims in his analysis of the sound effect, that Eve is represented as a type of redeemer in this scene, and I support him in the terminological point of view. In the first place, the scene where she ‘at his feet / Fell humble, and embracing them . . . ‘reminds us of the line, ‘As when he (=the Son) washed his servant’s feet.’ Secondly when she cries

---

The sentence from thy head remov’d may ‘light
On me, sole cause to thee of all this woe,
Mee mee only just object of his ire. (X. 934-936.)

it re-echoes the plea of the Son in Book III, lines 236-238

Behold mee then, mee for him, life for life
I offer, on mee let thine anger fall;
Account mee man;

then the echo resounds back to us when he asks his Father

I go to judge
On earth these thy transgressors, but thou know’st
Whoever judg’d the worst on mee must ‘light
When time shall be, for so I undertook
Before thee; (X. 71-75.)

Furthermore, the phrase, ‘light on mee,’ is repeated by Adam in Book XI. Lines 767-768,

The burd’n of many Ages, on me ‘light
At once. . .
Apart from Summers, it is important that the same phrase is repeated by the Redeemer, Eve, and Adam. It suggests man’s repentance is completed and, at the same time, the relationship between God and man, though in a part, is restored.

The plea of Eve is generally accepted as the turning point of *Paradise Lost*, and I agree in the view. But it is dangerous to put too much emphasis on the part, because man’s repentance and renovation is not accomplished yet.

She asks him not to bereave her of his aid and counsel in this utmost distress. Then she proposes to join one enmity against the serpent. It is appropriate she reminds him of it because the enmity was to be put specifically between ‘the woman’ and the serpent. Here she makes a hint for the assurance of salvation through she is not aware of the fact.

The effect of her speech is immediate on her husband: being made for God in him, her renovation cannot go without reconciliation to him.

Empson ironically makes the point, ‘Here Milton happily forgets his theories of the predominance of reason, and the influence of “female charm” on Adam is this time his salvation.’ He seems to be the point. But, in fact, his observation is superficial; he does not recognize that ‘passion’ and ‘love’ is quite different in Milton. Moreover, Milton admits ‘female charm’ as far as it is in the office of love. It is clear that, asking earnestly for his forgiveness, she is full of love because she is represented in the image of the Redeemer, as we have seen, though she is ‘Unwary, and too desirous, as

---

111 Radzinowicz, p. 171.
Furthermore Adam is not overcome by passion; he becomes aware of the office of love by Eve, who is in good earnest. This point is also made clear in his answer to her. He ‘upraised he soon’, ‘with peaceful words’:

But rise, let us no more contend, nor blame
Each other, blam’d enough elsewhere, but strive
In offices of Love, how we may light’n
Each other’s burden in our share of woe;

(X. 946-961)

Here, the relationship between man and woman seems to be restored, but in the end of this passage he gives vent to his despair in short words:

And to our Seed (O hapless Seed:) . . .

(X. 965.)

At this point, he is not yet aware of the sign of revelation contained in the curse of the serpent. It is not until he is faced with the second crisis for mankind that he finds the grace of God in ‘the Seed of the woman,’ though vaguely.

Eve hears him lamenting the fate of their ‘Seed,’ realizes her powerlessness in spite of her hearty love for him, and makes a suggestion thus:

If care of our descent perplex us most,

\[113 \text{ P. L., X. 947.}\]
Which must be born to certain woe, devou’rd

By Death at last, and miserable it is

To be others cause of misery. . . .

Childless thou art, Childless remaine: So Death

Shall be deceiv’d his glut. . . .

But if thou judge it hard and difficult,

Conversing, looking, loving, to abstain

From Love’s due Rites, Nuptial embraces sweet . . . .

Then both ourselves and Seed at once to free

From what we fear for both, let us make short,

Let us seek Death, or hee not found, supply

With our own hands his Office on ourselves;

Why stand we longer shivering under fears,

That show no end but death, and have the power,

Of many ways to die the shortest choosing,

Destruction with destruction to destroy.

(X. 979-1006.)

At first she suggests him to be childless, and talks of suicide at last. Thus she again
becomes a temper to Adam unconsciously. Evans also makes the point that ‘From this
point on she serves a different function, that of devil’s advocate. For once again they
will lead to disaster should Adam accept them.’

---

But, this time, having learned his lesson from the transgression, he rejects her offer: he, 7with such counsel nothing sway’d’ raises ‘To better hopes his more attentive mind’ and tells Eve that to remain childless or to commit suicide would be ‘acts / Of contumacy’ and offers her:

Then let us seek

Some safer resolution, which methinks

I have in view, calling to mind with heed

Part of our sentence, that thy Seed shall bruise

The Serpent’s head; piteous amends, unless

Be meant, whom I conjecture, our grand Foe

Satan, who in the serpent hath contriv’d

Against us this deceit: to crush his head

Would be revenge indeed; which will be lost

By death brought on our-selves, or childless days

Resolv’d, as thou protestest; so our Foe

Shall ‘scape his punishment ordain’d, and wee

Instead shall double ours upon our heads.

(X. 1010-1040.)

Unlike Satan, Adam identifies the serpent with Satan, Then he is convinced that he who is called ‘the woman’s Seed’ shall bruise the head of Satan though he does not know at this point who he is. But he knows at least if he remains childless or commits suicide the promise will never be fulfilled and his Foe will escape the revenge.
By rejecting the proposal of woman, he overcomes his ‘effeminate slackness’\textsuperscript{115} and restores his authority he has lost when he let her go alone in Book IX.

This scene reminds us of the passage in Book IV, lines 295-299, where the true relationship between man and woman is represented:

\begin{quote}
Whence true authority in men; though both
Not equal, as their sex not equal seem’d;
For contemplation hee and valour form’d,
For softness shee and sweet attractive Grace. . .
\end{quote}

Now we realize that man’s repentance did begin when Eve approached Adam to assay ‘soft’ words to his fierce passion, and it was accomplished through the ‘contemplation’ of Adam, who raised ‘To better hopes his more attentive mind.’ He never calls ‘our seed’ the one who shall bruise the Serpent’s head: he calls him ‘thy Seed’ speaking to Eve, ‘the woman,’ which corresponds to ‘the woman’s Seed’ in the sentence of God. Satan, on the other hand, carelessly calls him ‘his seed’ which means ‘the seed of mankind’ in the context. At this point, it is clear that man rightly accepts the words of God and, though vaguely, finds the sign of salvation.

In \textit{Poetics}, 11, Aristotle refers to ‘A Peripety,’ which is ‘the change of the kind described from one state of things within the play to its opposite. . .’ and explains it in the case of \textit{Oedipus}. He also explains a discovery which is, ‘as the very word implies, a change from ignorance to knowledge, and thus to either love or hate, in the personages

\textsuperscript{115} \textit{P. L.}, XI. 634.
marked for good or evil fortune.’ Then, he affirms that ‘The finest form of Discovery is one attended by Peripetics, like that which goes with the Discovery in Oedipus.’ Also in this scene of Paradise Lost, the finest form of Discovery attended by Peripetics exists. At the crisis, Adam discovered the mysterious words are ‘the Covenant of Grace’ on the part of God, and by discovering the fact, the sad situation under which he had been suffered turned to the happy one. In this sense, this scene should be regarded as a completion of the starting point of man to renovation, which was worked by Eve’s plea at first.

I should emphasize that both man and woman are indispensable to arrive at this point: it would not do if either the softness of woman or the contemplation of man lacked in this case; Eve’s softness makes it an occasion to change direction, then Adam’s contemplation decides on their right course.

Now the distinction between Adam and Satan becomes apparent. It is not until the devil is transfigured into the serpent that he realizes God’s will contained in ‘the Seed of the woman,’ while man becomes aware of the sign of salvation in it. Man as well as Satan did not know the significance when he heard the son sentence them, but, unlike Satan, he accepted them as they were and persevered with the second temptation, that is, to commit suicide to escape from the curse assigned as the penalty, then, at last, he found the promise of revelation in the words of God. He regained his footing to the grace of God. In this structural division, the inward movement of Adam from despair to hope of salvation is the main theme, and it is elaborately constructed centering around the phrase, ‘the woman’s seed.’

At the beginning of this chapter, we saw that Evans comments on Book X, pointing out the seeming looseness and lack of dramatic unities in the structure. But now it is
clear that his comment is not quite to the point, because this book has a solid structure concerning the sentence of God. In the first structural division, the Son in behalf of his Father descends from Heaven to the earth to pass sentence on the devil and the fallen couple. He himself prefigures his victory over Satan in the mysterious words and ascends to Heaven. In the following two divisions, the reaction and the result on both sides of Satan and Adam are represented in striking contrast. Satan, misunderstanding the curse on him, feels triumphant over the illusory victory and descends to Hell hurriedly. But right after the public-speaking of the illusory victory, he falls down into the shape of the serpent, and it is brought home to him that the will of the Lord is immeasurable. He falls from the highest point of his joy to the lowest of despair. On the contrary, man and woman are inwardly carried from the bottom of despair to the hope of salvation when they become aware of the correct meaning of the sentence though vaguely. This is what I called ‘dynamic movement’ in this paper in the page 46. The descending and ascending movement of the Son in the first divisions: Satan’s descending movement from the top of pride to the bottom of despair and Adam’s ascending movement from despair to the hope of revelation. The external movement of the Son is repeated in the internal movement of the fallen angel and the fallen couple, and as the whole the dynamic movement foreshadows the spiritual victory of Christ over the Devil, which is accomplished in Paradise Regained.
Conclusion

1. The Messianic interpretation of ‘the seed of the woman’ in *Genesis* iii. 15. Had been accepted from very early age, and the reference of the person of Christ was taught by the Irenaeus. Though this view had been not so popular in the Church during Medieval Age, Protestant commentators regarded it as important because they thought the first gospel light was preached to Adam in the curse upon the serpent. Moreover, they regarded the fight prophesied in the sentence as the spiritual one. They fundamentally agreed in these two points while they differed in other respects. One of the most important differences is pointed out between Luther and Calvin concerning the identity of ‘the seed of the woman.’ Luther regarded the expression as directly applied to Christ and insisted that Adam and Eve fully understood the grace of God when they left the paradise. On the other hand, Calvin gave much consideration to the fact the word, ‘seed,’ in Hebrew functions as a collective noun and concluded that the passage was a promise of Victory over the devil to mankind, united in Christ its divine Head. He did not identify the phrase with the person of Christ and its matters little whether Adam realized the promise or not. Then, he pointed out that the promise of salvation got clearer and clearer as the day of full revelation approached with the passing of time. This view of progressive nature of revelation constitutes the core of his theology.

These problems are discussed in *De Doctorina Christiana*. As for the identity of the expression in question, he agreed with Luther. He declared that Christ was denominated as ‘the woman’s seed’ according to his human nature. Then, he made clear the point that ‘the promise was not to all the seed indiscriminately, seeing that it was not even to the “seed of Abraham” according to the “fresh,” but only to the “Children of
God,” that is, to believers, who alone under the gospel “are the children of the promise,” and “are counted for the seed.” Calvin also thought that the phrase distinguished righteous men from the rest. Luther, Milton, and Calvin agreed in this point.

These principles are adopted in *Paradise lost*, and both the prose work and the poem share the fundamental convictions. Adam’s realization of the grace of God is the theme of the last three books. There, the expression is used to point out righteous men and the person of Christ as their Head. However, the epic is not mere embodiment of the principles in theology: they are skillfully integrated into the literary work.

By adopting the progressive nature of revelation, he succeeded in heightening the dramatic effect of Adam’s realization of God’s grace. When the Son sentenced, the first man did not know what it meant. However, he noted the sign of the promise when he overcame the second temptation, that is, to commit suicide to escape from the penalty extending over his offspring. As he saw the vision and heard the discourse of future, he came to realize the exact meaning of the promise by degrees, and at last he knew the true meaning, learning the lessons from the archangel Michael. The process of Adam’s awareness is expressed very strikingly, and the ‘argument / not less but more heroic’ is accomplished.

Several writers contemporary with him treated the Fall story in their literary work, and some of them tried to integrate the promise of Resurrection into the work. Though Hugo Grotius did not succeed in it so much, Vondel managed it all right. But it matters little in their works whether Adam realized the promise. Consequently, the process of Adam’s renovation is out of the question for them. Moreover, while many dramatists treated the story as the tragedy, Milton represented it in the form of Epic, and treated the

---
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process of Adam’s education through the promised seed, regarding it as the main theme of the last part of the epic. Here lays his originality and ingenuity.

2. Some critics claim that Book X seems to lose dramatic unities and to have a loose structure reflecting the disorder of macrocosm and microcosm after the Fall. I should emphasize that this is mere appearance and, in fact, this book has a solid structure deeply allied with its theme. Book X consists of three parts, (1-228, 229-584, 585-1104). This structural division is fundamentally grounded on the word, ‘meanwhile,’ while occurs three times in the book. In the first division, the Son’s intervention between God and man is represented through God’s sentence on the serpent and the fallen couple. He descends from Heaven to the earth, sentenced man and the serpent in the mysterious words which is verified when Christ overcomes Satan in future, and ascends to Heaven. In the second division, the illusory victory of Satan and his transfiguration into the serpent is expressed. Because he was absent at the court and the sentence was given in the mysterious words, Satan misunderstands the meaning and hurries to Hell with joy. On his way home he meets his family, sin and Death, and notes the huge bridge made by them between the Hell and the earth. His joy increases. But he is transmuted into the serpent right after his victorious speech. God’s punishment falls on him rightly. In the third division, man’s lament over the penalty and their awareness of the promise of God are represented concerning ‘the seed of the woman.’ At first, man never finds the true meaning connected in the mysterious words. They take the words as they are, and they are thrown into the bottom of despair. However, they endure the miserable state, and at last become aware of the sign of salvation, that is ‘thy (the Woman’s) Seed. Now it is clear that Adam’s inward movement from despair to the hope
is the main theme of this book. The first part serves as the introduction, the second as
the burlesque, and the third as the finale. Moreover, the descending and ascending
movement of the Son prefigures the fall of Satan from the illusory victory into the
serpent and the ascending movement of man from despair to the hope. Thus both the
theme and the structure share the fundamental conviction of the hopeful condition of the
fallen pair. Book X has an elaborated structure by itself as a piece of literary work. On
the other hand, this book has an important position in the epic. First of all, the Son
appears three times in the epic, and performs the last and the most significant work of
the three. That is to promise the revelation to man and, at the same time, to curse upon
Satan. Moreover, it should be noted that his last work in *Paradise Lost* prefigures most
forcibly his victory over Satan in *Paradise Regained*. Secondly, the second division of
Book X is the last stage for Satan in this poem. Since Book I Satan has been carrying
some heroic character, but his role as an hero has been limited as the narrative goes on,
and at this point it disappears entirely. Betraying himself as an ironic hero who shall be
bruised by the real hero, he retires from the stage. Moreover, his transmutation to the
serpent and exit from the stage in the shape prefigures his defeat in the fight with Christ
in *Paradise Regained*. Lastly, Adam’s awareness of the promise introduced the reader
into the climax of the epic in Book XI and XII. Thus, Book X is one of the most
splendid books in *Paradise Lost*. 
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