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SUMMARY
INTRODUCTION

The great epic "Paradise Lost" discloses a genius that has set its seal upon our English letters. We can realize the influence the poem had on contemporary writers when we find that one, Dryden, although he condemned the literary theory upon which Milton wrote, yet admired and praised the form which the execution of that theory produced. Dryden, while maintaining the theory that blank verse was impossible for drama, much less for an epic, extolled and delighted in the blank verse in which Milton wrote "Paradise Lost." Indeed, Milton's influence determined the trend of English versification and literature of his day.

Assuredly it could not have been otherwise, for "Paradise Lost" is an epic of art filled with classical and Renaissance learning. It is a work of art based upon a truth of human history and human nature known and believed by all nations and all peoples. It is a vision of beauty in a massive and strenuous strain, depicting deep and solemn scenes. It is a symphony of elevated and stately word music, relating in its harmonious rhythm the tale of the fall of man from grace to sin. What more poignant, what more awesome, what more suitable subject could supply inspiration for the remarkable passages that appear in this
great epic?

Milton was convinced of this great truth of the fall of man, which had been instilled into him in his youth. By birth and education he was a Puritan of the Established Church. His childhood was passed amid surroundings of grave Puritanic influence. His mother, a devout and charitable woman, seeing that her son acted as if guided by high ideals, early destined him for the Church. She accordingly employed the best Puritan teachers to instruct him at home until he reached his sixteenth year. Then he was sent to Christ's College, where he took both the B. A. and M. A. degrees. The more Milton studied the different religious questions that came up in the Church of England, the more was he disgusted with Bishop Laud's attempt to bring back papal ritual and ceremony into the church. He therefore abandoned the intention of becoming a clergyman. He clearly states his reasons for acting thus declaring that tyranny had invaded the Church and that, finding he could not honestly subscribe the oaths and obligations required, he "thought it better to preserve a blameless silence before the sacred office of speaking begun with servitude and forswearing" (8:48.) Considering these reasons, Milton much preferred to be among the laity of Puritanism than to be a member of what seemed to him a tyrannized hierarchy.
But it was a peculiar sort of Puritanism, if it was
Puritanism at all, to which Milton adhered. He seems to
have held to a combination of creeds belonging to different
sects. Apparently he accepted certain doctrines of the
Catholic church, although these were modified somewhat.
For example, his views on the creation of the world, and the
fall of man from grace and his salvation through the atoning
sacrifice of Christ are not puritanical. In the first he
becomes a materialistic Monist. In the second it appears
that he withdraws completely from the idea of man's intrinsic
worthlessness and stresses, to the point of fanaticism, the
high value of individual achievement. Finally, in the third
point he seems to hold to the extrinsic imputation of
Christ's merits as the source of man's salvation. Add to
this that with the Reformation thinkers he strongly rejects
the doctrines of purgatory, of the intercession of saints,
and of papal authority. Moreover, he departs from the
Anglican church in abandoning the idea of an ecclesiastical
hierarchy and in admitting no prescriptive form of worship.
Neither does he accept the Presbyterian doctrine of predesti-
nation and free will. All in all, Milton's Puritanism dis-
plays the most astonishing variety of doctrines that could
possibly be assimilated under the unifying influence of such
a virile and well-integrated personality. His was a well-
unified eclectic system of individualism labeled Puritanism.
Now, out of this background of training and various doctrines held together by the force of personality alone, there could not but be deep and burning convictions aroused in Milton on every question presented to him. These indelibly vital convictions had to find expression in politics, religion, literature, or whatever form of activity might enlist his interest. He tells us that in his youth he made a thorough study of the Old and New Testaments in their original languages, extracting as he went along certain scriptural passages that he thought might be useful later on. For this he first depended upon the shorter works of divines, but soon with increased confidence in himself he began to examine more copious theological treatises, paying especial attention to certain disputed points of faith. Little by little he came to the realization that these divines disagreed in many ways. In fact, he found some of them substituting errors and heresies for what he considered the truth. Milton then determined that neither his creed nor his salvation could be safely trusted to such guides. He accordingly thought it advisable to compile for himself, by his own labor and study, an original treatise which would be a reliable guide, for he would derive it solely from the word of God itself. The result of this work was his "Treatise on Christian Doctrine Compiled from the Holy
5. Scriptures Alone." From the time of the publication of "Paradise Lost" in the first half of the seventeenth century until that of Milton's "Treatise," there were many who believed the author to be heretical in some of his views, although it was difficult to select passages which would without doubt indicate that he was such. Up to the year 1825 the theology of the great epic was accepted as to the orthodoxy of its doctrines without a great deal of discussion, because there was not set forth in it any view so explicitly heretical as to warrant a condemnation of the writer. But in this year was published Milton's long-lost "Treatise," which once and for all gave the world his true opinions of his different scriptural interpretations as he had presented them in his "Paradise Lost" (20:1-3.) Oddly enough, there is both external and internal evidence to warrant us in saying that the "Treatise" and the epic are historically and intellectually related. The internal evidence is presented in the body of this thesis, whereas the external evidence is abundantly found in Hanford (11:167,177,178, 180,183) and Masson (18a:Vol.VI,817,823,826,829.)

Here, then, in the "Treatise on Christian Doctrine" are the matured ideas of Milton which developed out of the training of youth and early manhood. Thus we see the genesis of the influence which Milton impressed upon English literature.
But it is not of this influence upon English letters that we intend to deal in this discussion; it is rather with the nature of the truths upon which Milton held such strong convictions. That the truths which form the thesis of the epic are fit matter for Milton's hand is admitted by all. Who cannot see as he reads that the Trinity, that creation, that sin with its terrible consequences, that the origin of spiritual entities form matter sublime enough to reach the heights and depths of human appeal and hence are fit subject for an epic? We shall study Milton's views on these truths in relation to some set norms whereby his theology may be judged.

The theologies in the light of which we shall study Milton's position are two: the doctrines of Catholicism and Protestantism. The first has preserved a unity in the teaching of doctrine, while the second presents an ever-shifting and varying ground of doctrine. Yet in every sect we find, particularly during its earlier periods, something like a definite teaching on certain doctrines. The object of this thesis is to present first the Catholic doctrine, then the original or "first" Protestant conception, and finally Milton's own view. Particularly will a study be made of Milton's individual dissent from the independent Presbyterian sect which in
its doctrine combined something of both Anglicanism and Calvinism.
I
THE TRINITY

1. Various Trinitarian Doctrines

For man, in the normal order of things, to seek a something outside of himself as the object of His worship is as natural as to draw breath. He may be seeking himself, but it is under the guise of something else. The history of religion shows us the indomitable vitality of this innate tendency of human nature. As a consequence, whatever can be known or whatever is spoken with any semblance of rationality, dependent on the civilization in which he lives, concerning a Supreme Being is avidly received by most men. Any idea of God as Creator, of His interior life, of His perpetual activity unified with His eternal serenity, has an intense interest to all men. Those who wish to worship are delighted to know better that which they worship. They thrill in obtaining an inkling of what such a superior being may be doing. They drink in eagerly whatever drops of knowledge are to be had through reason or through revelation. The truth of this is evident in the life of Milton, whose ideas on the Trinity this chapter will endeavor to analyze. The whole of "Paradise Lost" shows the effect of the interest Milton carried in his mind concerning this problem. But Milton is only one case in thousands and
tens of thousands that substantiate the truth of the interest that the human race as a whole has had in God and whatever may be known of Him.

Throughout the first seventeen centuries of the Christian Era this interest in God displayed itself in various conceptions concerning the Trinity, which necessarily involved the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ. Although innumerable opinions have been set forth from time to time on this great question, it is not our intention to make a special study extending over this whole field. We are concerned here mainly with those ideas held by writers of the middle seventeenth century in so far as their beliefs affected Milton in his poetic productions. We know that the existence of the Trinity was at that time almost universally accepted by the peoples of Western Europe. Controversies concerning the Trinity had been engendered by the old doctrines of Arius, but these found a more fertile field in the East than in Western Europe. Only occasionally do we find followers of Arius in Western Europe. Therefore, if our task in this chapter is to trace the effect that these different views had on Milton, it seems advisable to present clearly, at least, the four fundamental views on the Trinity. These are the views expressed by the Arians, the Anglicans, the Puritans, and the Catholics.

As the latter view was the one first accepted by all
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As the latter view was the one first accepted by all
Christians, let us as briefly as possible state its position on the Trinity:

The Trinity, which is the central doctrine of the Christian religion signifies the union of three Divine Persons, really distinct and equal, in one Godhead. The term is employed to show that in God, in one Divine Essence, there are three Persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, really distinct, equal and of one substance. All things in God are common to the three Persons and are one and the same (15:153.) This doctrine is expressed very clearly in the Preface for the Feast of the Most Holy Trinity: "O holy Lord, Father Almighty, everlasting God, who with thine only-begotten Son and the Holy Ghost art one God, one Lord; not in the oneness of a single person, but in the Trinity of one substance. For that which we believe from Thy revelation concerning Thy glory, the same we believe of Thy Son, that same of the Holy Ghost, without difference or separation. So that in confessing the true and everlasting Godhead, we shall adore distinction in persons, oneness in being, and equality in majesty." Again it is stated explicitly in the Nicene Creed: "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten son of God, born of the
Father before all ages; God of God, Light of Light, True God of True God; begotten not made; Consubstantial with the Father, by Whom all things were made ..... And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified." This doctrine, which is a mystery (i.e., a truth which without revelation cannot possibly be known and even though revealed could not be demonstrated from principles of mere reason) can be analogically explained by the use of a three-leaved clover. The clover has but one stem from which proceed three separate, distinct, and substantially like leaves. Do we claim to have three clovers, or one? In an analogical way the clover conveys the idea of the word Trinity; three Divine Persons in one Divine Substance; all equal; all distinct. Such in brief is the doctrine expressed by the term Trinity.

The Anglican idea of the Trinity is surprisingly akin to the above development. In fact, it is so nearly like the Catholic doctrine that it is only the desire for thoroughness and clarity that leads one to set forth his idea. But have we the right to expose Anglican opinions on the Trinity as the orthodox Protestant conceptions of Milton's day? History surely warrants such a procedure. It is an historical fact that the state religion was Anglicanism. whose strongest supporter was Elizabeth. We know
that on her accession to the throne she was upholding the general belief of the Anglicans more through policy than through actual conviction, though conviction was not lacking. As Bishop Creighton says: "She was a Protestant chiefly because it was impossible for the daughter of Anne Boleyn to take her place as a Catholic sovereign" (13:94.) Hence her position as head of the church was more a political one than a religious one. Many of her subjects who had fled to other countries during Mary's reign now returned to England. They felt that the unity of doctrine to which they and Elizabeth adhered would be given freedom of expression under the new monarch. Though Elizabeth favored the same doctrines as the returning exiles, yet she preferred the more ancient rites and ceremonies. This preference for rites and ceremonies brought about much dissatisfaction during her reign. But Elizabeth overcame all obstacles and finally established by law the national English church. This consummation, however, was not realized until the end of her reign in 1603. Thus Milton was born to inherit the atmosphere of this set of religious opinions, though born in an environment at violent odds with the external rites connected to these opinions. Despite the growing popularity of Puritanism, it had not yet attained ascendancy until Milton was quite well advanced in life. Consequently, we say that the orthodox Protestant conceptions of Milton's day were those of the Church of England
supported by Elizabeth and the Parliament.

Now the Church of England had this doctrine on the Trinity in "The Theology of the Church of England:" "The nature of the Blessed Trinity is fully dealt with in the so-called Athanasian Creed. Article I sums up the position as follows: "And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost" (33:31.) "Article II lays stress upon the following before setting forth the doctrine of the Incarnation: 'The Son which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father.' Then is added: "Here is a truth of particular importance in these days, when liberal Protestantism is largely in favor of a humanitarian Jesus. The Church of England is definitely opposed to any such theories and stoutly maintains the Divinity of her Lord, as every prayer and thanksgiving throughout her formularies declare with no uncertain voice" (33:34.) Thus we see that the English Church has, at least in word, a very clear concept of what the Trinity is, of the attributes of the distinct persons, and of their unity in one Godhead.

Thus far we have treated of the Catholic and the Anglican views on the subject of the Trinity. But before attempting to expose the views of the Puritans, it will per-
haps not be amiss to see what religious opinions the Puritan sect then held, for Milton was closely allied to both. In fact, he was supposed to adhere to this sect.

Primarily the Puritan view sheds light on the question in so far as it shows us where the sect to which Milton adhered, at least nominally, differed from the established opinions of the land. Though it was but in the throes of a violent birth when Milton was in his youth, still Puritanism emerged into the full strength of individual personality while Milton was still comparatively young. Wherefore it is of historical interest to compare the doctrine "Paradise Lost" with that of the Puritans.

This doctrine is colored very much by Calvinistic Presbyterianism, and for two reasons. First of all there is the genetic reason. During the period of "Bloody Mary" many English exiled reformers spent their time on the Continent, especially at Geneva. There they learned the doctrine and the simple practices of Calvin's followers. When they were able to return home, they brought with them these new ideas of religion. Hence there was nothing more natural than that the Puritanism which they injected into the doctrine of the Church of England should be heavily saturated by Calvinistic tendencies.

Secondly, much of Puritanism was concerned with mere externals of propriety at divine services. This was decid-
edly true in the beginning. Now, all this was of the same trend of Calvinism. Simplicity of service to the extinction of it was characteristic of Calvin's rigid demand for the abolishment of all ecclesiastical pomp and display. The same thing appearing in English Puritanism, especially when considered in connection with the influence of Calvinism noted above, gives fair warrant to say that Calvinistic Presbyterianism formed a large part of the foundation for Puritanism.

If the above be true, as it appears to be, the Puritan doctrine as doctrine might very well be the same as Anglicanism. But emotion and feeling drew Puritan leaders so powerfully to the Calvinistic Presbyterian idea of religion that it were well to consider Calvin's doctrine of the Trinity to see its effect, if any, on Puritanism, Anglicanism, and Milton's own ideas. Consequently, for a clearer understanding of Milton's position, Calvin's idea is here presented.

Calvin expresses himself very clearly in his "Institutes" on this subject: "I doubt the propriety of borrowing similitudes from human things to express the force of the distinction .... yet it is not right to be silent on the distinction which we find expressed in the Scriptures; which is this -- that to the Father is attributed the principle of action, the fountain and source of all things;
to the Son, wisdom, counsel, and the arrangement of all operations; and the power and efficacy of the action is assigned to the Spirit. Moreover, though eternity belongs to the Father, and to the Son and Spirit also, since God can never have been destitute of his wisdom or his power" (3:Vol.I,134-35.) Again: "Wherefore it would be a detestable sacrilege for us to call the Son another God, different from the Father; because the simple name of God admits of no relation; nor can God, with respect to himself, be denominat-ed either the one or the other" (3:Vol.I,136.) This, then, in brief is the conception of the Trinity according to the Geneva Creed. It will be well to keep this creed in mind as a factor in Puritanism. Though here is seen a great similarity to the Anglican Creed, yet there is more distinction and clarity than in the latter.

But by far the most unorthodox conception of the Trinity is that of Arius. As related by the followers of Arius we find that Christ, though noblest of all created beings, was not the Eternal Son of God nor of the same substance as the Father. Such is the gist of the Arian doctrine.

But it is vastly more interesting and enlightening to see these doctrines in their original setting at the time of Arius. We find that he complained of the perse-
cation which he had suffered at the hands of Alexander, who had driven him and his adherents out of the city as impious men or atheists merely because they did not agree with the public declaration that the Son is as eternal as the Father. Arius seems to have felt very much abused at this, and his resentment expresses itself in these words: "These blasphemies we cannot bear to hear even; no, not if the heretics should threaten us with ten thousand deaths. What, on the other hand, do we maintain? That the Son is not unoriginate, nor part of the unoriginate, nor made of any previously existing substance, but that by the will and purpose of God, He was in being before time, perfect God, the only begotten; that before this generation or creation He was not."

These words of Arius appear in a much clearer light if we consider them in a summarized form. As the "Americana" has it:

1. Son was created out of nothing and is therefore different in essence from the Father. He is the Logos, Wisdom, Son of God and not in and of himself.

2. There was a time (before time began) when he was not; that he is a finite being.

3. He was created before everything else and through him the Universe was created and is administered.

4. The Logos became the soul of the historical Christ and the human elements in the character of Jesus belonged
5. Although the incarnate Logos is finite and hence is not God, he is to be worshipped since he is exalted far above all other creatures, and is both ruler and Redeemer.

Here the only apparent addition to the words of Arius himself is that the "Americana" seems to stress the word, Logos. The "Americana" has warrant for the use of this word in that Arius uses it copiously in his writings. It is a word of Greek origin descriptive of Christ, the Divine Word. The Arians consider this word—thought to mean the Wisdom, the Son of God, and not a substance in and of itself. According to this doctrine the Logos is finite and hence is not God. Consequently we see here the definition of Arianism, that Christ, though noblest of all created beings, was not the Eternal Son of God nor of the same substance as the Father.
2. Milton's Trinitarian Views
   a. Paradise Lost

It is quite apparent, then, that these different views on the Trinity could have influenced Milton in his belief. But of this we cannot certify until we make an inquiry into "Paradise Lost," which furnishes ample material to give us a clue to what he really believes. Therefore we shall briefly consider his views of the Trinity as developed in his great epic.

The reading of "Paradise Lost" impresses one with the fact that Milton believes thoroughly in the unity of God. His enunciations compel us to classify him as a Unitarian. For him there is no Trinity in one substance, for he does not admit of three co-eternal, and co-equal, distinct persons in one Godhead. Nothing could more clearly present this idea to us than to see Adam ask God for a human consort on the plea that he is alone to enjoy the bounties, beauties, and luxuries of Paradise. The Almighty gives him this answer:

Seem I to thee sufficient possessed
Of happiness or not? Who am alone
From all eternity, for none I know
Second to me, or like, equal much less.
How have I then, with whom to hold converse
Save with the creatures which I made, and those
To me inferior? (23: Bk. VIII; 404-10.)

Clearly, Milton admits of no other persons in the Godhead. He makes the Almighty stand alone. There is
no one second or like or equal to him. But Adam insists on his demand. He explains to God that since He is a Supreme Being, He is in Himself perfectly complete and that no deficiency can be found in Him. He argues, however, that such is not the case with man; that there is a desire in every human being to converse with his like or equal so that he may find comfort in social communication. Adam sums all his feelings up into a confession of the absolute unity of God.

No need that thou
Shouldst propagate, already infinite
And through all numbers absolute, though one (23: Bk. VIII; 419-22.)

Again we note from this that Milton refers to only one person in the Trinity represented by God the Father, Milton finds innumerable means to convey to his readers this idea of the unity of God. In one quotation that smacks considerably of Pantheism, we find that "God shall be all in all." Milton represents God as the Father who announces to the Angels the birth of Christ, His son on earth, His work of redemption, and finally His coming for the general judgment, when the bad shall sink beneath His sentence and the just shall dwell in a new heaven and earth.
With joy and love triumphing, and fair truth
Then thou thy regal sceptre shalt lay by
For regal sceptre then no more shall need;
God shall be all in all (23: Bk. III; 338.)

Just what is meant by this last line, "God shall be all in all?" From the context and from parallel ideas it appears that Milton wishes to convey the idea of unity. It may be that Milton meant that all the created beings of the world emanated from the one Godhead and that after the general judgment all will return in Him making Him "all in all." So undivided does Milton make the Godhead that even a reference to the Spirit of God shows no division.

On thee
Impressed the effulgence of his glory abides;
Transfused on thee his ample Spirit rests (23: Bk. III; 388.)

Here we see the Son endowed with the Spirit of God, but without showing the least division in the Godhead. For after all it is not really and truly a separate entity that the Son receives, nor is it a distinct substantial entity proceeding from Himself, that God gives, it is only the abiding of "the effulgence of his glory" in His son. A transfused quality is seen in the Son, but not as an intrinsic part of the Son's essence. No, God is not divided; He has merely extended Himself to include His Son in His glory. Can the reader do otherwise than conclude with us
that Milton was a staunch believer in the unity of the Godhead? These are only a few quotations, and yet how potently they argue Milton's position!

Unitarian Milton undoubtedly was. But was he a Trinitarian? Did he also hold to the belief that had most generally prevailed during the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era? "Paradise Lost" leaves no doubt in the readers mind. Milton does treat of the three persons, Father, Son and Spirit. But so scanty and so obscure are his references to the Spirit that it may be just as well to refer the reader to his idea of it in his "Treatise on Christian Doctrine." His opinions concerning the Son, however, are in the main very illuminating.

O Son, in whom my soul hath chief delight, 
Son of my bosom, Son who art alone 
My word, my wisdom and effectual might, 
All hast thou spoken as my thoughts are, all 
As my eternal purpose hath decreed (23: Bk. III, 168-73.)

If Milton believed that the Son was co-eternal to the Father, why then should he say "All hast thou spoken as my thoughts are?" Could two co-eternal persons have different thoughts? Especially is this true when we consider that there could not be two eternal persons except they partake and be of the same substance. Thus, if they were co-eternal persons, they must have had eternal thoughts concerning all
things knowable. Consequently, Milton certainly intends us to know that these persons were not co-eternal when he speaks of one expressing the thoughts granted by another. But if this is not very clear, perhaps the fact that Milton uses the term "word" may show that the two are not co-eternal. What kind of "word" is the Son, if the Father has other thoughts? He can be "my word" in the sense of our human enunciation of an idea, which is only an articulate sound and no person. In that sense the Son is not co-eternal with the Father. Or he can be "my word" in the original sense of the term as used by primitive christian writers, Logos. But, if he is the "Logos" of the Father, then he is the idea, the substantial infinite concept of the Father. That is what the Greek term conveyed. But if the Son be the substantial, infinite concept of the Father, then must he be co-eternal with the Father. But Milton, though very obscure in this passage, really meant to convey the idea that the Son is not co-eternal. From parallel passages we find that the birth of the Son in time appears after the creation of the Angels. Milton presents God as speaking to the Angels of the Son as being "begotten" on the very day He speaks to them. There can be no mistake in his meaning here.
Hear all ye angels, progeny of light
Thrones, dominations, princedoms, virtues, powers,
Hear my decree, which unrevoked shall stand.
This day I have begot whom I declare
My only Son, and on this holy hill
Him have anointed, whom ye now behold
At my right hand; your head I him appoint,
And by myself have sworn to him shall bow
All knees in Heaven, and shall confess him Lord (23:
Bk. V; 600-09.)

Behold, God makes a decree, or so Milton implies,
which is newly coined and which "unrevoked shall stand."
Is it not peculiar that Milton should present us with the
origin of the Son after the Angels were created? Milton
really adds clarity to the fact that the Son is not co-
 eternal when he says:

"Thee," next they sang, "of all creation first
Begotten Son" (23: Bk. III; 383.)

No matter how we might endeavor to draw from the two
preceding quotations evidence that Milton believed the Son
co-eternal with the Father, here it is lucidly and openly
asserted that the Son is "of all creation first," and there-
fore, being created, is not co-eternal. Not satisfied with
this, Milton shows the Father openly asserting:

Who am alone
From all eternity, for none I know
Second to me, or like, equal much less (23: Bk. VIII;
405-08.)

Indeed, Milton missed no opportunity to show a grada-
tion in authority, glory, and being between Father and Son.
Consequently, it seems that further elaboration of this
point would be futile. Milton unmistakably tells us that Father and Son are not co-eternal persons.

With Milton's belief on the co-eternity of persons, also appears his opinions on their co-equality. We find certain passages in which the subordination of the Son to the Father is so clearly stated that no comments are needed. If we underline the meaningful words, the thought of Milton is certainly clear.

Who am alone
From all eternity, for none I know
Second to me, or like, equal much less (23: Bk. VIII, 401-04.)

Again:
He to appease thy wrath, and end the strife
Of mercy and justice in thy face discerned,
Regardless of the bliss wherein he sat
Second to thee, offered himself to die
For man's offence (23: Bk. III, 406-10.)

Divine Similitude
In whose conspicuous cont'nance, without cloud
Made visible the Almighty Father shines,
Whom else no creature can behold (23: Bk. III, 385-87.)

Surely the Son cannot be equal to the Father if He is the only creature that can behold God. He is superior to the other creatures, but a creature withal.

Meanwhile the Son
On his great expedition now appeared,
Girt with omnipotence, with radiance crowned
Of majesty divine (23: Bk. VII, 192-95.)

On his right
The radiant image of his glory sat
His only Son (Bk. III, 62-64.)
As a sacrifice
Glad to be offered, he attends the will
Of his great Father (23: Bk. III, 269-72.)

Can we want more potent proof of the inequality of
Father and Son? The Father girds His Son with omnipotence,
makes him an image of His glory, and even offers His will
for the Son to follow. What manner of Son can this be,
who has neither power, glory nor will of His own? He
certainly is not like our human sons. Of all the
ephemeral shadows that mind can devise, Milton certainly
went a long way in declaring in verse form his opinion
that Father and Son are not equal in substance, essence,
or being. In fact, what other conclusion can we draw
from:

O Son in whom my soul hath chief delight
Son of my bosom, Son who art alone,
My word, my wisdom, and effectual might
All hast thou spoken as my thoughts are, all
As my eternal purpose hath decreed (23: Bk. III,
168-72.)

Does not the word "my" imply superiority, nay more,
ownership complete and exclusive of the qualities innumer-
ated? What is mine is not yours. The Father has the
properties, and the Son can have them only through con-
descension. But what is surprising is that Milton should
have the Father speak of the Son as a "Second Omnipotence"
(23: Bk. VI, 675.) How can there be two omnipotences,
and yet one be less than the other? or how can there be
two omnipotences and yet only one God? Still, Milton insists on inequality of persons.

Of all things, to be Heir and to be King
By sacred unction, thy deserved right (23: Bk. VI; 709.)

Here Milton speaks of the Son of God as an heir and king. Inferiority is shown again, for to be heir implies an inheritance that is to be transmitted from parent to child. Thus we might go on indefinitely only adding unnecessary evidence of the fact that Milton maintains the inequality of Father and Son.

That Milton believed in one God, that he believed the persons in that God to be other than the Father not only in substance, but also in glory and power, that he expressed these beliefs in a very guarded language of poetic beauty, these are the facts that our investigation of "Paradise Lost" has thus far revealed. But there appears a quotation that seems to throw doubt on this whole field.

Thus measuring things in Heaven by things on earth,
At thy request, and that thou mayst beware
By what is past, to thee have I revealed
What might have else to human race been hid (23: Bk. VI, 893.)

So did the angel Raphael speak to Adam. Now, what are we to think of what Milton said concerning God? Was he using mere figures of speech? It was his privilege to do just this thing. But if he did then we are left in obscurity as to his exact meaning. Moreover, to determine
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b. Treatise on Christian Doctrine

Because of the many doubts that Milton's exposition of the Trinity arouses when he writes on the subject in 'Paradise Lost,' we shall now look more closely into his mind as revealed in the "Treatise on Christian Doctrine." In this treatise he carefully unfolds his views. However, he first gives us a clue to his procedure in the Preface of Dedication. "But since it is only to the individual faith of each that the Deity has opened the way of eternal salvation, and as he requires that he who would be saved should have a personal belief of his own, I resolved not to repose on the faith or judgment of others in matters relating to God; but on the one hand, having taken the grounds of my faith from divine revelation alone, and on the other, having neglected nothing which depended on my own industry, I thought fit to scrutinize and ascertain for myself the several points of my religious belief, by the most careful perusal and meditation of the Holy Scriptures themselves" (20:2.) Out of such a well-thought out background there surely must appear clear conceptions concerning the Unity, Co-eternity and Co-equality of the Godhead.

Without doubt, Milton believes in the Unity of God. In the words of Isai, (V,22) "I am God, and there is none else," Milton gives us his belief. By this Milton means that there is no spirit, no person, no being beside Him who is God.
Accordingly, then, God is numerically only one. This position, Milton substantiates by many direct scriptural texts. His point, however, is greatly illuminated by the consideration of three distinct Persons in his concept of this God. The consideration of the co-eternity and the co-equality of God in the three distinct Persons will bring this out.

Milton claims that the efficiency of God is either internal or external. The former is that which is independent of all outside action; such, for example, are the decrees of God. The latter consists in the execution of these decrees by means of foreign agencies. This external efficiency comprises generation, creation, and the government of the universe. As a matter of course, generation means that God has begotten his only Son; hence God is called Father. From this Milton concludes that the Father and Son are different Persons. He also states that divines themselves acknowledge as much who argue that there is a certain emanation of the Son from the Father, for though they teach that the Spirit is co-essential with the Father, they do not deny its emanation, procession, spiration, and issuing from the Father (20:79.) Now with this they also hold that the Son is co-essential with the Father and generated from all eternity. They base their proof, Milton says, on the fact that as Christ is our mediator he has been generated from all eternity (20:80.) This Milton does not approve, for he found
It impossible to prove the eternal generation of the Son from any text in all Scripture. He admits that the Son existed in the beginning, under the name of the Logos or Word, and was the first of all creation. He very ingeniously brings this thought to light in "Paradise Lost" (23: Bk. III, 383-86.) He also concedes the truth of this scriptural text from John I, 3: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." But he claims that these passages prove the existence of the Son before the world was made, but they conclude nothing respecting his generation from all eternity (20:31.)

As to the co-equality of the Father and the Son, Milton openly refutes it. He begins by proving that Father and Son are not of the same essence, because the Son must have always been as he is now, separate from the Father, self-existent and independent. At any rate, he claims that all will acknowledge that now the Son differs numerically from the Father. If they differ numerically, then they must differ in essence. Hence it follows that Father and Son are not of the same essence (20:132.) From this it follows that they are not co-equal. For Milton argues thus: "Christ therefore received all these things (Divine attributes and gifts) from the Father, and 'being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' because he had obtained them by gift, not by robbery. For if this
passage imply his co-equality with the Father, it rather refutes than proves his unity of essence, since equality cannot exist but between two or more essences" (20:145.)
3. An Explanation of Divergent Views

We have only presented the facts or opinions on which a judgment of Milton's orthodoxy is to be based, and already we see innumerable points of divergence and conflict. Hence, for a few moments let us consider a possible cause for such a variety of opinion.

It is not surprising to find conflicting ideas on the trinity in the various opinions we have enumerated in this chapter. By the very fact that there exists a diversity in the religious sects, it would naturally follow that the opinions of these sects on fundamentals are bound to be at variance with each other sooner or later. If this be true in the opinion of the group, how much more so is it in the different individuals! This conflict of opinions among individuals leads us to some considerations that throw light on the genesis of the conflict. The cause of the conflict may first of all be due to a difference of point of view in the problem under consideration. Certain minds seems to have a tendency to submit to authority without even inquiring into the why and wherefore of things, while others, being of a more inquiring constitution, make reason paramount in all their judgments, even to the exclusion of authority. They will take nothing for granted, and their thoughts often delve to such depths that they obscure rather than clarify their
ideas. This taking of a different point of view appears to have some close connection, probably that of effect to cause, in the different methods by which things are examined. On the one hand a person making use of the subjective method relies fully upon his own conception of things, and in the extreme case does not pay attention to reality. He decides everything for himself by the way he desires it, and is inclined to be more independent in his views. This independence, of course, is not an independence from the judgments of others only, but an independence that separates the individual from the external world. On the other hand, in the objective method the judgment is formed by the observation of exterior facts. A view or a decision made by this method is dependent and submissive in the sense that it relies and conforms itself to reality, to facts. Such a method approximates more closely the scientific method of to-day. Which shall be used depends very much upon the constitution of the mind that uses them. Now, these may be the underlying principles that have produced the conflicts in the opinions that we have seen above.

Applying these principles to Milton, we conclude after a close study of "Paradise Lost" that Milton appears to depend in the formation of his judgments predominantly on reason. His seems to be a subjective attitude under the guise of
objectivity. He himself gives us evidence of this by his method of treating the scriptural quotations in the "Treatise on Christian Doctrine." "The generation of the divine nature is described by no one with more sublimity and copiousness than by the apostle to the Hebrews 1,2,3, 'whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person.' It must be understood from this, that God imparted to the Son as much as he pleased of the divine nature, nay of the divine substance itself, care being taken not to confound the substance with the whole essence, which would imply, that the Father had given to the Son what he retained numerically the same himself; which would be a contradiction of terms instead of a mode of generation. This is the whole that is revealed concerning the generation of the Son of God. Whoever wishes to be wiser than this, becomes foiled in his pursuit after wisdom, entangled in the deceitfulness of vain philosophy, or rather of sophistry, and involved in darkness" (20:85.) Without the least suspicion that the terms, essence and substance, might mean something other than he implies, Milton goes on, sublimely disregarding the possibility of the truth of other views, to the apodictical conclusion that things are just as he says they are and nothing else. From his reading of
scripture and other books he has conceived certain notions, which he presents as conclusive facts without even presenting the possibility of a problem's existing where he deems the fact to be. It is this frame of mind that we consider as subjective, as not testing its conclusions by the hard norm of reality. It is this frame of mind that we deem predominantly dependent on reason to the exclusion of authority. But we need not merely infer that Milton was influenced by such a mind. We have his own views on this subject in his "Treatise." "But since I enroll myself among the number of those who acknowledge the word of God alone as the rule of faith, and freely advance what appears to me much more clearly deducible from the Holy Scriptures than the commonly received opinion, I see no reason why any one who belongs to the same Protestant or Reformed Church, and professes to acknowledge freedom, particularly as I impose my authority on no one, but merely propose what I think more worthy of belief than the creed in general acceptation. I only entreat that my readers will ponder and examine my statements in a spirit which desires to discover nothing but the truth, and with a mind free from prejudice. For without intending to oppose the authority of Scripture, which I consider inviolably sacred, I only take upon myself to refute human interpretations as often as the occasion requires, conformably to my right, or rather to my duty as a man" (20:78.) Thus
we see that Milton is determined to form his own judgment even when there is question of the interpretation of Scripture. The best proof that we can advance for his subjective point of view, however, is that he often contradicts himself. One of many examples is here presented (23: Bk. III, 62-64.)

On his right
The radiant image of his glory sat
His only Son.

Now compare this quotation with the following:

Beyond compare the Son of God was seen
Most glorious; in him all his Father shone
Substantially expressed (23: Bk. III, 138-40.)

Now if the Son is merely an "Image" of the Father, he cannot do what Milton says: "In him all his Father shone substantially expressed." If the Son is the substantial expression of the Father, then He is not the "Image" of the Father.

Surely, Milton's preconceived ideas have led him into difficulty; his subjective attitude has become the rock of destruction to the ship of truth. Unguided reason has fallen victim to prejudice and sentiment. The principles of subjectivity and disregard for authority have wrought havoc with Milton.
4. Orthodoxy of Milton

The facts of the case have been presented. We have the norms by which Milton is to be judged orthodox or otherwise, and we have his opinions on the Trinity. Knowing what was believed in the middle of the seventeenth century, we are now ready to discuss the orthodoxy of Milton's views on the Trinity.

Since Milton was generally classed as a Puritan, it may be more interesting to contrast first his own views on the Trinity with those of his sect. To do this let us re-capsitulate the exact belief of the Puritans of the time. It was that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are distinct, co-eternal persons, one and the same God. This doctrine in appearance may easily lead one to believe that it corresponds with the older accepted doctrine, but on closer examination we find that certain essential factors are not even mentioned. For example, the Puritans do not refer in any way to the substance or essence of God. Is this implied in their belief or do they purposely refrain from entering into such a discussion? Milton, however, does not hesitate to speak of substance, essence, co-equality, co-eternity, oneness, trinity. The full terminology of Christian doctrine is included, but what of the interpretation? He clearly states that there is but one God. However, this
one God is not one in three distinct Persons, neither are these Persons co-equal nor co-eternal. As to the Son, Mil- 
ton repeatedly places him, both in "Paradise Lost" and in the "Treatise on Christian Doctrine," second in rank, there- 
by showing His inferiority to the Father. Hence we conclude that, since Milton agrees with the Puritan belief in only one instance, that there is but one God, he is unorthodox to his own Puritanic doctrine.

His attitude towards the general Protestant views of the day is also peculiar. Their view is summarized thus: The Trinity signifies one Godhead in three distinct Persons of one substance, power, and eternity. What is Milton's attitude towards this doctrine? Far from agreeing with it, he differs in regard to the number of Persons in God. According to him there are not three Persons but only one Person in one God, God the Father. Since the Son is be- 
gotten from the Father, then, the Son is necessarily in- 
erior to the Father and not eternal. As the Father and Son are two separate Persons, They cannot be one and the same substance. Hence They are not equal. Milton's almost total disagreement with the Protestant concepts of the Tri- 
unity makes him here also unorthodox when judged by the standards of his own sect.
The third conception on the Trinity to be contrasted with that of Milton is the Catholic doctrine. A brief exposition of its tenets will reveal that which was the only accepted doctrine for the first three hundred years of the Christian Era. It is as follows: The Blessed Trinity is the union of three divine, distinct, co-eternal, co-equal Persons in one God, one substance, and one essence. From a close perusal of his "Christian Doctrine," we gather that Milton believes in one Supreme Being endowed with all the divine attributes. This being is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He is known by three names which seem to intimate his nature; Jehovah, Jah, and Ehie (20:20.) He is but one Person, one God. According to Scriptures (2 Kings, V, 22): "I am God, and there is none else" ... that is, "no spirit, no person, no being beside him is God; for none is an universal negative" (20:25.) Is it possible that Milton did not know that there is a difference between "person" and "being" and "spirit?"

Milton lays himself open to the accusation of confusing entirely different genera and then attributing to all something that is true only of one. Moreover, the Son "existed in the beginning, and was the first of the whole creation by whose delegated power all things were made in heaven and earth; begotten, not by natural necessity,
but by the decree of the Father, within the limits of time; endued with the divine nature and substance, but distinct from and inferior to the Father; one with the Father in love and unanimity of will, and receiving everything in his filial as well as in his mediatorial character, from the Father's gift" (20:XXIX.) Again we see the same mode of reasoning. Lump all the attributes of the Father together, give them to the Son, and then predicate something of the Father that is not true of the Son, or vice versa. Such is Milton's effective reasoning to prove that the Son is not God. He tells us that the Son was not "begotten, by natural necessity" and then blandly continues to tell us that He is "one with the Father in love and unanimity of will." The Son is further the maker of all things by "delegated power," yet He is the first of all creation." Under such a doctrine of the Trinity the Father could not even decree anything but that the Son decreed it also, for the Son ... and even Milton says so ... is the Logos, the idea of infinite concept of the Father. A decree could not go forth until there was something to put forth, and if the son was "begotten, not by natural necessity" as Milton tells us, then there would be no decree, and there would be no Son, and there would be no discussion of this same topic of
which we are now treating. Moreover, how does anyone be-
come the Creator by "delegated power," and still remain
the "first of all creation?" Did the Son create Himself?
Milton elsewhere says no. Still, here he admits or de-
mands rather that He should have created Himself. Some-
thing is amiss. However, this summary is sufficient to
show that Milton ascribed to the Son of God as high a
share of divinity as was possible without admitting His
co-equality, co-eternity, and co-essentiality with the
Father. He makes Christ, not a God, but a creature. Hence
his belief is totally at odds with the Catholic conception
and is unorthodox when judged by this standard also.

Thus far we have found Milton to be unorthodox. But
perhaps there may be salvation for his doctrine, for we
have yet to examine His opinions in relation to Arianism.
We know from preceding statements that Arius denied that
the Son was co-eternal with the Father and of one substance
with Him. In following up Milton's views on these sub-
jects, we find what has already been fully stated in one
of our previous explanations of Milton's conceptions con-
cerning the unity, co-eternity and co-equality of the God-
head (20:81,145.) On all three of these points Milton
holds a doctrine that is most closely related to Arianism.
A simple glance at the exposition given earlier in the
chapter will substantiate this fact. Consequently, we find that Milton is orthodox when judged by Arianism.
5. Opinion of Milton's Orthodoxy

The well known English professor, Hanford, has told us that Milton's "Treatise on Christian Doctrine" is the best guide to the intellectual fabric of "Paradise Lost." (11:177.) Milton himself says: "I have chosen to fill my pages even to redundance with quotations from Scriptures, so that as little as possible, might be left for my own words; it has also been my object to make it appear from the opinions I shall be found to have advanced, of how much consequence to the Christian Religion is the liberty not only of winnowing and sifting every doctrine, but also of thinking and even writing respecting it, according to our individual faith and persuasion" (20:6.) As an explanation to this, Sumner, the editor, quotes from Milton's "Prose Work" Vol. II, p. 475: "For me, I have determined to lay up as the best treasure and solace of a good old age, the honest liberty of free speech from my youth, where I shall think it available in so dear a concernment as the church's good." Being the individualist that he has shown himself, we are satisfied with Milton's assertion that he will interpret Scriptures literally. In fact, Hanford tells us that Milton used the literal interpretation of Scripture (11:178.) The words of Milton himself, which we quote here out of their context, but
whose context warrants us in saying that Milton interpreted the Scriptures literally, lead us to the same conclusion. "Let us be convinced that those who have acquired the truest apprehension of the nature of God who submit their understanding to his word; considering that he has accommodated his words to their understandings, and has shown what he wishes their notion of the deity should be" (20:17-19.)

Though Milton interprets the Scriptures literally, the question arises as to what is meant by a literal interpretation. Evidently, it means that the sense of the text will be gathered from the evident and common meaning of the words of the text. Does it not imply that the sense of the text shall be not only the exact meaning of the word itself, but also the meaning of the words according to the accepted meaning these words had at the time that they were written? Very clearly, the meaning of the Scriptures will be vastly different as the interpretation is made in accord with the current meaning of the words when they are read or when they were written. Now, does Milton interpret the Scriptures in the sense that the words convey at the time he read them, or in the sense that the words convey at the time they were written? In many instances, he seems to give the meaning of the Scriptural texts according to what the words meant to him at the time
If Milton, by the manner in which he handles certain texts of paramount importance, had not led us to doubt the truth of his statement that he interprets Scripture literally, we should be satisfied to accept his conclusions from these texts as the literal meaning. But now that doubt has been cast on this meaning, the reader may be interested in seeing the foundation for our doubt. Consequently, we shall present two or three texts dealing with the Trinity, especially with the Son, who occupied such a tremendous share of Milton's thoughts in the Trinity, and we shall test the validity of Milton's conclusions, thereby presenting our own conclusion and estimate of Milton's orthodoxy in reference to the Trinity.

Concerning the passage, "I and my Father are one" (John 10, 30,) Milton says that the Father and the Son are "one in essence, as it is commonly interpreted" (20:92.) But he refuses to decide rashly on any points relative to the deity, and goes on to say that two things may be called one in more than one way. He claims that they are one in as much
as they speak and act with unanimity, but he tries to give a proof that the Father and Son are not one in essence. He insists on this the more because he believes that "certain commentators conjecture" as to their conclusion. Milton declares that Christ has not left us to conjecture concerning the mode of being of the Father and the Son. In John, X, 29, Milton reads: "My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all," but the true text of this verse, taken from the original, reads, "That which my Father hath given me, is greater than all." Evidently, Milton was misled by a poor translation or wilfully omits something of the text. It is clearly stated that what is "greater than all" is not "My Father," but the words "that which." Now, what do these words refer to? From the context the words refer to "my sheep," which in turn are found to mean from the rest of the chapter the souls of men. What, then, can Milton make of this context? The only rational meaning that we can see just now is, that the souls of men which the Father gave to the Son to save are "greater than all" created beings. Besides the fact that the context does not warrant Milton in determining two distinct essences in the Father and Son, his principle of literal interpretation should have led him to see that the words, "I and my Father are one," meant just that - unity of being. In the original the words leave no chance to quibble about person or nature;
they refer to oneness and that in respect to nature. From scripture, therefore, Milton should have derived the truth that the Father and the Son are one in nature, essence, substance, or any other word that he employs to convey the same idea. Moreover, when Milton maintains that Christ denied this unity by saying "far less;" "say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" (John X, 36,) he is presuming a great deal. For Milton must have known, and he says as much in his "Treatise on Christian Doctrine" (20:17 sq,) that God must speak to men in a way that they understand. The Jews understood what the wonder-worker, Christ, meant under the generic term, "Son of God," but they did not understand in its full sense what was meant by "I and my Father are one." Now, if Christ was accommodating himself to the understanding of his auditors, and a study of the Scriptures proves that He was, then we cannot agree with Milton that six verses after Christ made one statement He denies it or even retracts it in part. If Christ spoke the truth in the first instance, then the second statement must mean something that is in accord with the first; it cannot deny the first as Milton maintains (20:92.) Otherwise, Christ would be a liar, and Milton would be entirely foolish to seek truth from His lips.
Having quoted John X, 36, Milton proceeds to lay down his own deep-seated convictions: "This must be spoken of two persons not only not co-essential, but not co-equal." Here we have the root of what drove Milton to derive what he considered truth from the above texts. Evidently, since the texts do not mean what Milton thought they did, his conclusion that the words of Christ "must be spoken of two persons not only not co-essential, but not co-equal" is false. The weakness of his position may have been suspected by Milton himself, for he immediately presents an objection that is not well-founded. He asks the question: "Now if the Son be lying down a doctrine respecting the unity of the divine essence in two persons of the Trinity, how is it that he does not rather attribute the same unity of essence to the three persons? Why does he divide the indivisible Trinity" (20:93?) The answer to Milton's questions are simply that he, Milton, presumes that the Son is not attributing unity of essence to the three Persons. Christ was speaking of Himself and His Father only. If Christ deemed it necessary to speak as He did, does His silence mean that He meant the Holy Ghost to be of another essence than the Divine? Milton should know that an argument from silence is a dangerous argument. Moreover, Christ does not leave
us in doubt, but He speaks in so sufficient a number of other passages that had Milton not been blinded by the pre-conception of a non-Trinitarian God, he would have seen that to the Trinity is attributed by Christ a unity of essence. Besides, where does Milton find that Christ divides "the indivisible Trinity?" If Milton's presumptions were well founded, he might be able to say that Christ divides the Trinity; but Milton was thinking in opposition to some of the totality of the facts to be found in Scripture, and as he himself says, "there cannot be unity without totality." That is true of the truth as well as of the Trinity. He should have examined the "totality" (20:93.) So all that we can conclude from Milton's interesting discussion of the text, "I and my Father are one," is that Milton took certain texts out of their contexts and molded their meanings in such a way that he inevitably came to erroneous conclusions. For in showing the error of Milton, it has been clear that this text refers to the unity of essence in Father and Son, whereas the other texts quoted disclose the distinction of person.

Another passage the treatment of which shows that Milton is not to be trusted in his supposed literal interpretation, is that of John, I, 1; "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God." Milton says
of this passage: "It is not said, from everlasting, but in
the beginning. The Word, ... therefore the Word was audible. But God, as he cannot be seen, so neither can he be heard. The Word therefore is not the same essence with God" (20:109.) Where did Milton learn that God could not be heard? Did he not read the Scriptures where they relate the story of Christ’s baptism, the story of Tabor, and the story of the conversion of Paul? Besides, is the reader ready to admit that every word he thinks is audible? That is what Milton says above. Milton goes on: "The Word was with God, and was God' ... because he was with God, that is, in the bosom of the Father. Does it follow therefore that he is one in essence with him whom he was? It no more follows than that the disciple who was lying on Jesus' breast was one essence with Christ. Reason rejects the Doctrine, Scripture nowhere asserts it; let us therefore abandon human devices, and follow the evangelist himself, who is his own interpreter" (20:110.) Indeed, why did not Milton follow his own advice and "follow the Evangelist himself?" Had Milton considered the following three verses, his horizon might have been enlarged. As the Evangelist says: "All things were made by him: and without him was made nothing that was made." If this is true, and it is if we "follow the evangelist himself," then the words "in the beginning" must mean before creation. How, then, could the Word be a
creature as Milton asserts in "Paradise Lost?" If the Word made all things, as is asserted by the Evangelist, then was He not made; He is eternal, not having been made, not having a beginning as a creature. Nor could He have one as a Creator; the fact of being Creator excludes such a thing. Milton accepts the other quality of the Word which the Evangelist discloses, but he will not admit the conclusion of the Evangelist. When he says that "the Word was God," Milton says the Word was God because He was with God. That is not what the Evangelist said. Milton then bases the distinction of essences in the Word and the Father upon an analogy. As usual the analogy limps, and presented as it is to illustrate something about the Trinity, it not only limps but is completely helpless. St John was something outside of Christ, while the Word was and is within God. He is the thought, the concept of God, which produced an image of His divine substance, an image of perfect resemblance, a substantial image of great beauty, of infinite perfection. This substantial image is in reality a person, for we find nothing imperfect in God. It is a person, as God the Father is a person. It is distinct, for it receives life from God the Father; it is equal to Him for it receives this life in its fulness, in its entirety. This substantial image, this person is the Son of God, it is His
it is another Himself. Indeed, Milton could have told the truth had he merely stated "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." That is all that the text means.

That we may see more clearly how Milton was not interpreting the Scriptures literally, nor in any way but that which would bring about conclusions to support his position, which was the outcome of a bitter political struggle, we shall now see one more discussion of a text. Milton desires to find the testimony of the Father concerning the Son; wherefore he quotes from Matt. XI, 27; "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." (20:147.) Now that we find Christ Himself saying that "no man knoweth the Son, but the Father," Milton then quotes "this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son," I John, V, 9. He adds: "Here the Father, when about to testify of the Son, is called God absolutely; and his witness is most explicit" (20:147.) Then follow a group of scriptural texts all tending to show that Christ is the Son of God in the sense that a boy is the son of his father. Milton concludes the argument: "If, then, he be the Son of the Most High, he is not himself the Most High" (20:148.) There is the argument and there is the conclusion. The only
difficulty is that in the collection of the texts upon which the conclusion is based everything is confused. Some texts that from their context clearly refer to the Son as man are indiscriminately referred, with other texts referring to him as the Word, to the Word. It is no wonder that Milton concludes as he does. We might almost conclude that the Son was not even a living being were we to tear texts out of their contexts and were we to avoid what is sometimes the clear and unmistakable literal meaning of the texts as Milton does. If Milton takes the text of John to refer to "God absolutely," well and good. Milton admits that the Father is God absolutely, but why does he not admit it also for the Son? The same quotation that tells him that "no man knoweth the Son, but the Father;" also tells Milton that "neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Now, accepting the testimony of the Father concerning the Son just as Milton tries to do, we find that the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul are replete with statements to the effect that "God raised Him up." Is not that also testimony on the part of the Father? If the Father only is "God absolutely," what does Milton do with the testimony of the Father as evidenced by the Resurrection of the Son? He does not even consider it. Nowhere in these texts do we see the least trace of an allusion
to such testimony (20:147-48.) Yet that testimony of the Father, the fact of the Resurrection, tells the world, tells all who read with an open mind that the Son was the authorized messenger of the Father, that the Son was approved in the fulfillment of His mission. Why does not Milton accept this testimony? We do not know. We do know, however, that with this testimony of truthfulness and validity behind it, the above quotation of Milton states that the Son alone knoweth the Father, and they to whom He shall reveal the Father. What can Milton make of the whole text? It is evident that the Son is of such a nature that only an infinite being, the Father, can know Him, and that again the Son is of such a nature that He in turn is the only being capable of Himself of knowing the infinite Father directly. Others may know something of the Father, but only in so far as the Son reveals it to them. Did not this text suggest something new to Milton? It could not, for he was looking for something else. Now, if logical thinking can draw any other conclusion from the fact that the knowledge of the Son is the knowledge of the Father - in other words, that the Son is omniscient as well as the Father - than that the Son is also infinite, it is time for that thinker to come forward and declare the truth. Equality of knowledge asserted in this text by the Son,
and the truth of this equality vouched for by the Father in the testimony of the Resurrection, demand unity of essence. Only an infinite being can compass the infinite, yet Milton gives us a quotation where is clearly stated that the Son compasses the Father, as the Father compasses the Son. Milton himself, by the use of the Scriptures, tells us that the Son is God in essence as well as in attributes, and then he gives the lie to his text by saying: "If, then, he be the Son of the Most High, he is not himself the Most High" (20:148.) As Milton says of another text, and repeats of several doctrines, "Reason rejects the doctrine, Scripture nowhere asserts it;" (20:110.) Reason indeed, rejects the doctrine, but as in the other instances, Scripture everywhere asserts it. Which are we to take, Milton's erroneous reason, for so we have seen it to be, or the conclusion of Scripture? Hence, we conclude from this discussion that as the Father is Divine, so is the Son Divine in the same sense.

The reader by this time will have seen why we stated earlier - that Milton appears to give at times anything but the literal interpretation. He will also have seen from the discussions that we have given that the least any thinking individual can do is to scrutinize Milton's
conclusions on the Trinity with painstaking care. Moreover, it has become very evident that we are convinced by the most cogent reasoning at our command of the truth of the Catholic opinion on the question of the Trinity, though we have presented a "reason for the faith that is in us" concerning the Son only. The reasons for the rest are not lacking, but they would probably be mere tiresome reading after all that has been said. Besides, Milton places most of his emphasis on the condition of the Son, and we have met him on that ground. Should the reader object that this chapter began with the avowed purpose of estimating the orthodoxy of Milton on the Trinity according to his statements in "Paradise Lost," and that we have discussed things mostly from Milton's views in the "Treatise on Christian Doctrine," let the reader consider that we have not lost sight of the teaching of Milton in "Paradise Lost," but that it was necessary to throw light upon the doctrine expressed in the poem by a study of Milton's position as copiously elaborated in the "Treatise on Christian Doctrine."

Convinced as we are, therefore, of the truth of the Catholic faith, we shall place before the reader a succinct summary of our faith as taken from the Athanasian Creed and compare Milton's belief. "The Catholic Faith is this, that
we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity.
Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Sub-
stance. For there is one Person of the Father, another
of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the God-
head of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is
all One, the Glory Equal, the Majesty co-eternal. Such
as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy
Ghost. The Father Uncreate, the Son Uncreate, and the
Holy Ghost Uncreate. The Father Incomprehensible, the
Son Incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost Incomprehensible.
The Father Eternal, the Son Eternal, and the Holy Ghost
Eternal, and yet they are not Three Eternals but One
Eternal. As also there are not Three Uncreated, nor
Three Incomprehensibles, but One Uncreated, and One In-
comprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the
Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty. And yet they
are not Three Almightyes but One Almighty.

"So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy
Ghost is God. And yet they are not Three Gods, but One
God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and
the Holy Ghost Lord. And yet not Three Lords but One
Lord. For, like as we are compelled by the Christian
verity to acknowledge every Person by Himself to be God
and Lord, so are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion
to say, there be Three Gods, or Three Lords. The Father
is made of none, neither created, nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father, and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.

"So there is One Father, not Three Fathers; one Son, not Three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts. And in this Trinity none is afore or after Other, None is greater or less than Another, but the whole Three Persons are Co-eternal together, and Co-equal. So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity" (4:Vol.II,33.)

Milton's belief, as the reader will recall from the section of "Paradise Lost," is diametrically opposed to the above, Indeed, we found Milton to be an orthodox Arian, and Arianism is the doctrine that Athanasius was opposing. Consequently, where we believe in Unity in Trinity, Milton believes in Unity without Trinity. Where we believe in Co-eternity of Three Persons in one God, Milton repeatedly states the Son is not co-eternal with the Father. Where we believe in the Co-equality of the three Persons in One God, Milton clearly maintains that They are not equal. Where we believe in the Trinity as laid down in the above Creed, Milton believes the opposite and clearly maintains the
opposite in "Paradise Lost." Shall we, then, declare Milton to be anything but unorthodox? In the most emphatic sense, Milton is most decidedly unorthodox in his doctrine of the Trinity. That is the only conclusion to which we can come, Milton is a heterodox Trinitarian.
II
SIN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

1. Milton's Views

In considering the different theological doctrines dealt with in "Paradise Lost," we find that next to that of the Trinity, the most vital to us is undoubtedly that of sin and its consequences. The history of this problem is rather an interesting one, for not only one, but all, individuals come into personal contact with it. Are we not daily, even hourly, reminded of these consequences? At any rate, whether one subscribes to the theory that sin is the source of our daily trials, or whether one has a better theory, the fact remains that to Milton sin and its consequences was of great importance.

That Milton believed Adam to be guilty of a grievous sin that brought punishment upon himself and his whole posterity is very apparent from the text of "Paradise Lost." In fact the content of the opening lines of that great epic is the key-note to the whole poem.

Of Man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste
Brought death into the World, and all our woe,
With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
Sing, Heavenly Muse, (23:Bk. I, 1-6.)
Thus we see that Milton believes the sin of Adam to be one of disobedience and inheritance. He goes so far as to classify the kind of sin it was.

Earth trembled from her entrails as again
In pangs, and nature gave a second groan;
Sky loured; and, muttering thunder, some sad drops
Wept at completing of the mortal sin
Original" (23:Bk.IX,1000-1004.)

This quotation would fully satisfy us as to Milton's belief in original sin did we not know his own opinion of this as expressed in his "Christian Doctrine." "Others define original sin to be the loss of original righteousness, and the corruption of the whole mind. But before this loss can be attributed to our first parents, to whom, as was argued before, original sin could not attach; in them therefore it was what is called actual sin, which these divines themselves distinguish from original sin. At any rate it was the consequence of sin, rather than sin itself; or if it were sin, it was a sin of ignorance; for they expected nothing less than that they should lose any good by eating the fruit or suffer harm in any way whatever" (20:261.) Just what does Milton mean when he says: "If it were sin, it was a sin of ignorance?" "If!" Does Milton doubt? Then he says, "It was a sin of ignorance." According to the above statements, these following passages from "Paradise Lost" are fully contradictory.
For know,
The day thou eat'st thereof, my sole command
Transgressed, inevitably thou shalt die,
From that day mortal; and this happy state
Shalt lose, expelled from hence into a world
Of woe and sorrow (23:Bk.VIII,328-33.)

And again:

For still they knew, and ought to have still
remembered
The high injunction not to taste that fruit,
Whoever tempted; which they not obeying,
Incurred (what could they less?) the penalty,
And, manifold in sin, deserved to fall (23:Bk.X,
12-17.)

Now, which is the opinion of Milton? The thought
taken from the "Treatise on Christian Doctrine" or the
thought contained in "Paradise Lost?" Can lines 328-33
of Book VIII be interpreted in any way to lead us to
believe that there was doubt or ignorance in the mind
of our first parents when they committed their sin? In
these five short lines, we find clearly and explicitly
stated the command, the condition and the penalty should
they violate the command. Milton tells us elsewhere
that Adam before his sin was endowed with the gift of
knowledge. Could it be possible that Adam did not
understand these three clearly defined stages or steps
when explained to him by the Almighty? "A sin of ignorance?"

Our second quotation as stated above proves beyond a doubt
that there was no ignorance, as far as Milton is concerned
in "Paradise Lost," in the commission of this sin, "For
still they knew." Can a person know a thing and be ignorant of this same thing? This is hardly possible and somehow, to be logical, we must admit that Milton contradicts himself at times.

Suppose that the sin of our first parents had been just a sin of ignorance, why should the consequences have been so severe? Milton himself gives us the words of the Angel Michael depicting the effects of it:

Adam, now ope thine eyes, and first behold
The effects which thy original crime hath wrought
In some to spring from thee, who never touched
The excepted tree, nor with the snake conspired,
Nor sinned thy sin, yet from that sin derive
Corruption to bring forth more violent deed (23:Bk.XI, 423-28.)

And what pitiful lamentations do we not hear from Adam:

Oh, miserable of happy! is this the end
Of this new glorious world, and me so late
The glory of this glory, who now become
Accursed, of blessed? Hide me from the face
Of God, whom to behold was then my height
Of happiness! Yet well, if here would end
The misery; I deserved it, and would bear
My own deservings; but this will not serve:
All that I eat or drink or shall beget
Is propagated curse. 0 voice, once heard,
Delightfully, 'Increase and multiply,'
Now death to hear! For what can I increase
Or multiply but curses on my head?
Who, of all ages to succeed, but, feeling
The evil on him brought by me, will curse
My head?" (23:Bk.X,720-35.)
The above words "All that I eat or drink or shall beget, is propagated curse" show us what weighty responsibility Adam assumed in disobeying the command of God. But, how is it a "propagated curse?" Is it by the imputation of Adam's guilt or by the inheritance of Adam's sin? Milton is not very clear on this point in "Paradise Lost." His belief, however, is clearly expressed in his "Treatise on Christian Doctrine." Milton believed that immediately after the fall of our First Parents they were involved in guiltiness, but that this guiltiness is not so properly sin, as the imputation of sin. Hence their posterity were involved in this same guilt. It is this imputation of sin in Adam's descendants that Milton calls Original Sin. By regeneration this guiltiness is taken away but the Original Sin remains (20: 261.) Surely, to the sin of Adam and Eve, Milton leaves us in no doubt as to the fact that there were consequences, and grave consequences both for them and for their posterity.

Now, let us examine just what Milton considered. First of all we learn that Adam and Eve were endowed with Divine grace, which rendered their souls pleasing and agreeable to God, Milton attributes this gift to them and puts the following conversation on the lips of the Archangel Raphael:
Nor are thy lips ungraceful, Sire of Men,
Nor tongue ineloquent; for God on thee
Abundantly his gifts hath also poured,
Inward and outward both, his image fair.
Speaking, or mute, all comeliness and grace
Attends thee, and each word, each motion forms (23:
Bk.VIII,218-24.)

As soon as our first parents committed their act of
disobedience, they lost this Divine grace; they underwent
a spiritual death, which took place not only on the very
day but at the very moment of the fall. Milton and many
divines believe that several sins were included in this
one act of eating the forbidden fruit, and that for such
complicated guilt Adam deserved to fall from his happy
state (20:254.) What a change took place after this trans­
gression! We find them both in Paradise hiding from the
Father Almighty, Who had come as a judge and intercessor
to sentence Man. Contrary to Adam's usual custom he had
to be called to appear in the Divine Presence, whereas of
old he had always come joyfully, of his own accord, to
meet Him. Milton paints a fine word picture of this trans­
formation that had already taken place interiorly and ex­
teriorly in our first parents.

Love was not in their looks, either to God
Or to each other, but apparent guilt,
And shame, and perturbation, and despair
Anger and obstinacy, and hate and guile (23:Bk.X,
111-15.)

Not only did the above passions arise in their breast but
deep remorse took hold of them at the thought that they had lost that great supernatural gift, which caused Adam to weep and express himself in the following plaint:

O miserable mankind, to what fall reserved:
Degraded to what wretched state
------------------------------ Can thus
The Image of God in man, created once
So goodly and erect, though faulty since
To such unsightly sufferings be debased
Under inhuman pains (23:Bk.XI,500-11.)

To which Michael made answer:

Their Maker's image, answered Michael, then
Forsook them, when themselves they vilified
To serve ungoverned Appetite, and took
His image whom they served, a brutish vice,
Inductive mainly to the sin of Eve,
Therefore so abject is their punishment
Disfiguring not God's likeness, but their own (23:Bk.XI, 514-21.)

What image, after all, is "their own?" Where did our first parents earn or derive "their own" image? If their image was not earned or derived from themselves, how could "so abject a punishment" disfigure "not God's likeness, but their own?" However, when Milton says "Their Maker's image .......... forsook them," we can see from this and previous quotations that Milton refers to something more than natural .......... something we call sanctifying grace. Now, if sanctifying grace, in the mind of Milton, comprises all of "their Maker's image," we agree with him that "so abject a punishment" disfigures "not God's likeness but their own," for that is all there is left to disfigure. Consequently,
it appears that Milton had a clear concept of the gift and the loss of Divine grace.

As a consequence of the loss of Divine grace, or should we say concomitantly with it, Milton tells us that Adam and Eve were deprived of the preternatural gifts. Until now, through the possession of a special gift, they had all their passions subjected to reason, but after the fall they began to feel the effects "of foul concupiscence."

Since our eyes
Opened we find indeed, and find we know
Both good and evil, good lost and evil got
Bad fruit of knowledge if this be to know
Which leaves us naked thus, of honour void
Of innocence, of faith, of purity
Our wonted ornaments now soiled and stained
And in our faces evident the signs
Of foul concupiscence, whence evil store,
Even shame, the last of evils; of the first
Be sure then (23:BK.IX,1070-1080.)

Milton leaves us in no doubt as to what this "good lost and evil got" was. Those very qualities of nature which they had before the fall were still theirs after the fall, but how different were their effects upon Adam and Eve, for Adam himself says, "Our wonted ornaments are now soiled and stained." Thus Milton tells us that at one time before the fall our first parents were complete masters of their own nature, but after their sin this order of things was completely reversed. To the dismay of Adam and Eve, and to the discomfort of all their posterity,
humanity had lost integrity.

What a striking contrast to our first parents' concupiscence was their great gift of knowledge, but this also was diminished when ignorance darkened their understanding as a result of their sin. How beautiful it would be to contemplate this knowledge as it first came from God!

Not only these fair bounds, but all the Earth To thee and to thy race I give; as lords Possess it, and all things that therein live, Or live in sea or air, beast, fish, and fowl. In sign whereof, each bird and beast behold After their kinds; I bring them to receive From thee their names, and pay thee fealty With low subjection. Understand the same Of fish within their watery residence, Not hither summoned, since they cannot change Their element to draw the thinner air. As thus he spake, each bird and beast behold Approaching two and two - these cowering low With blandishment; each bird stooped on his wing. I named them as they passed, and understood Their nature; with such knowledge God endued My sudden apprehension (Bk.VIII, 338-54.)

An interesting passage is given us in "Paradise Lost" telling us how grateful Adam is to the Angel Raphael for imparting to him knowledge.

What thanks sufficient, or what recompense Equal have I to render thee, divine Historian, who thus largely hast alloyed The thirst I had of knowledge, and vouchsafed This friendly condescension to relate Things else by me unsearchable, now heard With wonder, but delight, and, as is due, With glory attributed to the Creator? (23:Bk.VIII, 5-13.)
Indeed, Adam could be grateful for this gift of knowledge; but alas, what a change after his spiritual death: His reason was greatly obscured, so that he was no longer able to discern immediately the chief and greatest good in which consisted the life of the understanding (20:265.)

Not only did concupiscence and ignorance affect our first parents now, but an heretofore unknown feeling of sadness seized them at the realization that through their own fault they had forfeited their right to that free gift of happiness which had brought them so much joy in their paradise of bliss. The thought of leaving this heavenly spot with which was associated innumerable happy memories overwhelmed them with such great sorrow that Adam is forced to give vent to his feelings in these doleful accents:

Gently hast thou told
Thy message, which might else in telling wound,
And in performing end us. What besides
Of sorrow, and dejection, and despair,
Our frailty can sustain, thy tiding bring --
Departure from this happy place, our sweet Recess, and only consolation left
Familiar to our eyes; all places else,
In hospitable appear, and desolate,
Nor knowing us, nor known. And if by prayer
Incessant I could hope to change the will
Of him who all things can, I would not cease
To weary him with my assiduous cries (23:Bk.XI, 298-310.)

Adam is bearing the full weight of his sorrow. Not only is he leaving his first home, but he is also accepting and submitting to the physical punishment imposed upon him
and his posterity. What are these physical evils that they were to undergo? Milton sets them forth thus:

Thy sorrow I will greatly multiply
By thy conception; children thou shalt bring
In sorrow forth; and to thy husband's will
Thine shall submit: he over thee shall rule."

On Adam last thus judgment he pronounced:
'Because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife,
And eaten of the tree concerning which
I charged thee, saying, "Thou shalt not eat thereof,"
Cursed is the ground for thy sake: thou in sorrow
Shalt eat thereof all the days of thy life;
Thorns also and thistles, it shall bring thee forth
Unbid; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;
In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread (Bk. X, 193-209.)

These, then, were the physical ills, and these the sorrows that Adam and Eve were to bear as punishment for their sin. No longer was the sheer joy of living to be theirs. They must needs bow to the necessities of unruly nature and take back again the disorder that they had introduced into nature.

But beyond these ills, they dreaded far more that supreme evil of life --- death. Undoubtedly the unheeded command which they had first heard from the almighty rang in their ears ----:

For know,
The day thou eat' st thereof, my sole command
Transgressed, inevitably thou shalt die
From that day mortal; and this happy state
Shalt lose, expelled from hence into a world
Of woe and sorrow (23:Bk.VIII,328-33.)

The full realization of the great loss that they had
so carelessly incurred filled their souls with a mortal sadness. For behold! the words "From that day mortal" told them unmistakably that were they to remain in their pristine state they should never die. Immortality was theirs for a price, but they failed to pay the price. Death was now added to all the other ills; not only death of the body but death of the soul (20:270.) Their woe was extreme, but it was not without hope. As they began to analyze the great problem confronting them, they caught at every stray shred of comfort. Had not God given them something on which to base their hopes when He cursed the serpent for his evil doing? If the flowing stream of sorrow that engulfed them had not dulled their wits, they would have remembered,

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 (23:Bk.X,179-82.)

Hope is born in their breasts. A new era opens; the dawn breaks before their eyes and the first glimmerings of a new and glorious dispensation presents itself. No wonder Milton makes Adam say:

We expected Immediate dissolution, which we thought Was meant by death that day; When lo! to thee Pains only in child-bearing were foretold, And bringing forth, soon recompensed with joy, Fruit of thy womb. On me the curse aslope Glanced on the ground. With labor I must earn
My bread; what harm? Idleness had been worse,
My labour will sustain me; and, lest cold
Or heat should injure us, his timely care
Hath unbesought, provided, and his hands
Clothed us unworthy, pitying while he judged (23:
Bk.X,1048-1059.)

What is a little labor and sorrow, Milton seems to
say, when compared with the promise of a redeemer. Ah,
what glorious promise for the future shall attend Milton's
protagonists on their exile from Paradise!
2. Orthodoxy of Milton

Milton's ideas of the nature of sin with its fatal consequences have found clear delineation in "Paradise Lost." With the additional light thrown on them by his "Treatise on Christian Doctrine," we are now ready to estimate the orthodoxy of these views.

Our first inquiry will then be, how do Milton's views on the fact of sin or existence compare with the accepted contemporaneous doctrines? Milton, the Puritans, the Lutherans, the Anglicans, and the Catholics admitted that there exists such a thing as original sin. We find Milton speaking of it in "Paradise Lost:"

And nature gave a second grow,

........................ some sad drop,
Wept at completing the mortal sin
Original (23:Bk.IX,1002.)

Though the Lutheran preceded the Anglican doctrine some years historically, still the two are at agreement on the fact of original sin, for we find that the Anglicans derived from the second article of the Augsburg Confessions, which was the official creed of the Lutherans, their ninth article on original or birth-sin (1:243.) Since Milton was first an Anglican, and had later freely imbibed the doctrines, at least the externals, of Calvinism, we will expose the views of the latter with those of the Anglicans as the Puritan view, for it was out of these
two, as we said in the last chapter, that Puritanism took its source. The Puritans, out of their composite deposit of belief, held that original sin existed, for as we saw above the Anglicans held that belief and likewise did the Calvinists (2:229.) The ancient doctrine, out of which all the above sects were protesting dissenters, was that of the Catholics. All the Doctors and the defined doctrines of the Catholic Church are united in stating the fact that there is original sin (4:Vol.XI,312.) Thus we see that as far as the belief in the existence of original sin is concerned all sects agree. In consequence, Milton is orthodox on this point when judged by all the above opinions.

But as to the kind of sin that it is, we find different opinions expressed. It will be interesting to define this term as it is understood in each of the above-named authorities. Milton then gives us three definitions of what he or others of his time understood it to be. Original sin to them is "the general depravity of the human mind and its propensity to sin" (20:260.) It "is specially guiltiness, but guiltiness is not so properly sin as the imputation of sin .... whereby sinners are accounted worthy of death, and become guilty before God and are under sin" (20:261.) It is also defined "to be the loss of Original Righteousness, and the corruption of the whole
In the above definitions, it is peculiar that "guiltiness" is "the imputation of sin" rather than "properly sin," and still "Sinners are accounted worthy of death." Was not the sentence of death pronounced on the "transgression" and not on the imputation of the "transgression?" Milton himself makes God say, as we saw before,

For know,
The day thou eat' st thereof, My sole command
Transgressed, inevitably thou shalt die,
From that day mortal (23:Bk.VIII,328-31.)

Besides, how can one be "guilty before God and under sin" when the sin is only "imputed" to him? Does Milton believe that God is deceived by the "imputation of sin?" or that regeneration, by taking away the "imputation" and leaving "original sin," makes one not "guilty before God?" Does God blink at the evil, when it is only covered over? If He is God, He is omniscient, and "imputation" or no "imputation" will not make a man, who has not sinned, guilty in His eyes. Unfortunately, Milton, though he ascribes this to Augustine as the source, yet gives it his own interpretation. However, we may use one of the above definitions, preferably the last, as Milton's definition and compare it with the opinions of his time. To the Anglicans, with whose opinions Milton originally agreed, "Original Sin was the loss or privation of Original Righteousness, and man was an object of God's displeasure, not as possessing what was
offensive to God, but as wanting in that which was pleasing to Him. The body was infected by the fall, whether from the poison of the forbidden fruit or from whatever cause; but the soul suffered only as deprived of that which Adam possessed, the presence of God and supernatural righteousness, and as having the imputation of sin derived from Adam" (1:243.) In the foregoing we note that both Milton and the Anglicans believed that original sin was a "privation of original righteousness," which inclines us to believe and study confirms our inclination that Milton was orthodox with the Anglican doctrine. Moreover, since Milton believes original sin to be "privation of original righteousness" and the Catholics believe it to be the loss of "original justice," appearances would lead us to believe that Milton is orthodox in regard to Catholic doctrine; but from the above definitions by Milton as to what original sin is we may safely infer that "original righteousness" did not mean to him what "original justice" means to the Catholics. A careful examination of the chapter "Of Sin and Its Punishment" in Milton's "Treatise on Christian Doctrine," wherein he proposes to tell us what he means by righteousness (20:261.) reveals to us what the Catholics understand by "integrity." We read: "The second degree of death is
Spiritual Death by which is meant the loss of divine grace and that of innate righteousness, wherein man in the beginning lived unto God" (20:264.) It is evident that Milton makes a distinction between "divine grace" and "righteousness;" the one is not equivalent to the other. The Catholics on the other hand mean "divine grace" by the term "justice." Besides, since "righteousness," in the eyes of Milton, is that "wherein man ... lived unto God," it appears to be equivalent to "integrity" in the Catholic system by which they mean the subordination of the lower to the higher elements of man's nature, and all ordered to the living "unto God." Since by original sin Catholics believe in the "privation of justice" or of "divine grace," and since Milton means the "privation of righteousness" or in the terms of the Catholic opinions, "integrity," we are permitted to accuse him of heterodoxy in so far as "integrity" is not "divine grace." The two are very closely linked, in fact, inextricably connected in the primitive condition of Adam and Eve so that the loss of one meant the loss of the other, but the two are not the same, identical thing; they are distinct. The one is that "wherein man in the beginning lived unto God" whereas the other is that by which "their Maker's image" (23:Bk.XI,514) resides in them. If Milton had defined original sin to mean the loss of divine grace and righteousness, we might
be tempted to admit his orthodoxy in the present instance, but Milton did not do this. Consequently do we reiterate the truth that Milton is not orthodox when he defines original sin as the "loss of Original Righteousness" even with the explanation that he gives of "original righteousness:" he is not orthodox in the light of the doctrine of the Catholics.

But the Puritan view, derived from both Anglicanism and Calvinism, throws more light on the orthodoxy of Milton's view of the kind of sin that was original. Calvin would have us know that original sin is an "hereditary pravity and corruption of our nature, diffused through all parts of the soul, rendering us obnoxious to the divine wrath, and producing in us those works which the Scripture calls "works of the flesh" (2:229.) Calvin based his opinions expressed in the above definition upon the Scripture itself by quoting St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest; which are fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury, hatred, murder, revellings and such like" (Gal, V, 19.) Here is not a definite, clear-cut definition of original sin, but merely a very good inference of what it is. Further in his text, after speaking of "works of the flesh," Calvin says that since God cannot accept anything but righteousness, we are
then justly condemned in His sight (2:221.) If, as Calvin says, God cannot accept anything but righteousness, and since God had accepted Adam and Eve before the fall, it becomes evident that Calvin defines original sin as an "hereditary pravity and corruption of our nature" in the sense that it was the loss of original righteousness."

But this is also what Milton says. In consequence, we conclude that Milton, being orthodox when judged by Anglican and Calvinistic views, had to be a true Puritan in his views, for the Puritan view is derived from those sources. Finally, Luther defines original sin as a quality with which men are born "without the fear of God, without trust in God and with Concupiscence; and that this disease or vice of origin is truly sin, even now condemning and bringing eternal death upon those not born again through Baptism and the Holy Ghost" (The Augsburg Confession.)

Since before the fall Adam and Eve were not under condemnation of death, and that now men are born "without the fear of God and with Concupiscence" which is "even now condemning and bringing eternal death upon those not born again through Baptism and the Holy Ghost," it is plain that formerly Adam and Eve lived in the love of God and without Concupiscence. In other words, they were endowed with what Milton calls "divine grace" and "righteousness,"
"wherein man in the beginning lived unto God." Since Luther's definition corresponds essentially with Milton's idea, we conclude that the latter is orthodox when judged by Luther's conception of the kind of sin that was original. Thus we have seen that Milton holds opinions on what kind of sin this original sin is that are practically the same as all the current opinions of his time, except for the deviation noted from the Catholic doctrine.

Orthodox as to the fact of original sin, and nearly orthodox as to what constituted this sin, is Milton orthodox in his views on the consequences of Adam's sin? These consequences, we learn from Milton, are both spiritual and physical (20:263.) They affected both our First Parents and their posterity. From the various quotations from "Paradise Lost" we derive a clear concept of the spiritual effects of sin in Adam and Eve. In one place we read:

Can thus
The Image of God in man, created once
So goodly and erect, though faulty since
To such unsightly sufferings be debased
Under inhuman pains (23:Bk.XI,507-11.)

Surely, "the Image of God in man," relates to the life of the soul of man, and as a result of Adam's sin it has become "faulty." So "faulty" did this "Image of God" become by sin, that even the bodies of Adam and Eve fell under the law of punishment and were "debased under
inhuman pains." No wonder they were "debased under inhuman pains," for previous to the fall they had lived in a perfectly well ordered state in consequence of which they were continually happy (23:Bk.VIII,331.) But now sin had reversed that order, and as Milton tells us, they were no longer masters of their own nature (23:Bk.IX,1070-1080.) No longer were they the possessors of the bodily and mental well-being that spelt happiness to them (23:Bk.XI, 298.) Nor was their understanding darkened (20:265,) and death was become their portion (23:Bk.VIII, 328-33.) "Inhuman pains" were bound to be theirs after such a loss, for they were not accustomed to purely human existence as became their portion. The Anglicans believed all that Milton has told us above concerning Adam and Eve. They believed that Adam and Eve had lost the grace of God and natural innocence, by which they were masters of their own natures. Not only this, but "the body was infected by the fall, whether from the poison of the forbidden fruit, or from whatever cause; but the soul suffered only as deprived of that which Adam possessed, the presence of God, and supernatural righteousness, (1:243-45.) Thus we see that the Anglicans and Milton very much resemble each other in both the spiritual and physical effects of original sin in Adam and Eve. While Milton is more detailed
in the enumeration of the lost gifts, the Anglicans comprise them all into one short sentence "the body was infected by the fall ---- but the soul suffered only as deprived of that which Adam possessed" (1:243.)

So far Milton's doctrine, as viewed in the light of Anglicanism, dealt with the consequences of sin as affecting Adam only, but now let us see what effects original sin had upon his posterity. The Anglicans believe that Adam's loss of "Original Righteousness" brought guilt not only upon him, but also on all his descendants, so that they also are without "righteousness." They contract this guilt from imputation of Adam's guilt and not from inheritance of Adam's sin (1:244-45.) Can the consequences of this imputation of Adam's guilt upon his posterity be estimated? We know that the Anglican church teaches that a part only of the infection contracted by original sin and the condemnation due to original sin are remitted to all who believe and are baptized. But even in the regenerate, the infection, showing itself in the way of concupiscence, remains, and has of itself the nature of sin (1:248.) Milton similarly leads us to understand in his "Christian Doctrine" that the guiltiness which is transferred to Adam's descendants "is not so properly sin
as the imputation of sin" and that "that guiltiness is taken away from those who are regenerate, while original sin remains" (20:261.) Milton, then, believes that even after baptism, although the guilt is removed, the original sin remains. Is not this, as I stated before, similar to the Anglicans, who believe that after baptism "although there is no condemnation" attributed to the regenerate still a part of the infection remains and "has of itself the nature of sin?" In both cases the sin is imputed to the regenerate, and although a part of the guilt is removed, there is still left some remnant of sin. All of which shows that Milton and the Anglicans have the common belief that the posterity of Adam suffered spiritually the loss of "righteousness" and physically they retained a part of the infection, "concupiscence," pain, ignorance, death. Since, therefore, both hold the same views on the consequences of sin in Adam and Eve and their posterity both spiritual and physical, are we not warranted in declaring Milton an orthodox Anglican?
Milton might also have been an orthodox Puritan. But to determine that we must know that he believed as both the Anglicans and Calvinists believed, for the Puritans had no other belief than an eclectic group of doctrines derived from these two sects. Milton, we know, was an orthodox Anglican on the question of the consequences of sin. Was he an orthodox Puritan? If the Puritans believed on this point just as the Anglicans, we could say that Milton is orthodox, for we know what Milton believes and what the Anglicans believe. But the difficulty is that the Calvinists do not believe what the Anglicans believe, and should the Puritans have derived some ideas on this subject of the consequences of sin from them, which we seriously doubt, they would hold a doctrine at variance with Milton's. However, that the reader may be able to judge for himself, we find that "at no time did Calvin grant that Adam's transgression was due to his own free will" (4:Vol.3,199.) If the above statement is correct, then we cannot understand how Calvin can imagine that there were any consequences of sin for Adam, since he could not have sinned under necessity. Sin implies the use of free will. Under these circumstances, if the Puritans subscribed to the ideas of Calvin on the question, then did they deny what Mil-
ton affirmed; - that there were spiritual and physical consequences to the sin of Adam for Adam and Eve. For consequences of sin can only follow upon sin, and after Calvin enunciated his principles, there could not have been any sin (2:229.) From all this it would logically follow that there could be no consequences of sin, either spiritual or physical, to Adam's posterity. Yet we read in Calvin's Institutes that there were consequences (2:229.) A distracting peculiarity of these consequences is that they do "arise not from the delinquency of another; for when it is said that the sin of Adam renders us obnoxious to the divine judgment, it is not to be understood as if we, though innocent, were undeservedly loaded with the guilt of his sin; but, because we are all subject to a curse, in consequence of his transgression, he is, therefore, said to have involved us in guilt. Nevertheless, we derive from Adam not only the punishment, but also the pollution to which the punishment is justly due" (2:229.) How different is this from what Milton says! To him it was imputed guilt; to Calvin it was involved guilt, yea, even inherited pollution. Now, we see clearly that Milton is unorthodox if his Puritanism is to be judged by Calvinistic principles. But it seems to us that we may infer from both historical and religious conditions of England at the
time of Milton, that such a doctrine of Calvin had not much popularity and would in consequence not find favor with the Puritans. From what we have read of Puritan theology, it would also appear that this doctrine was not in the Puritan group of doctrines. Consequently we believe that the reader will admit our contention when we declare Milton unorthodox from the standpoint of the Calvinists, but an orthodox Puritan on the question of the consequences of sin to Adam and Eve and their posterity.
When we turn from Milton’s Puritanic orthodoxy, we find another influential and effective group of opinions on the consequences of sin, the Lutheran doctrine. We find that the Lutherans "condemn the Pelagians and others, who deny that the vice of origin is a sin, and who, to obscure the glory of Christ’s merit and benefits, argue that man can be justified before God by his own strength and reason" (Augsburg Confession.) We also note the following in Milton’s "Paradise Lost:"

Son of Heaven and Earth, Attend! That thou art happy, owe to God; That thou continuest such, owe to thyself, That is, to thy obedience; ..............

And good he made thee; but to persevere He left it in thy power (23:Bk.V,519-27.)

Out of one man a race Of men innumerable, there to dwell, Not here, till, by degrees of merit raised, They open to themselves at length the way Up higher, under long obedience tried, And Earth be changed to Heaven, and Heaven to Earth, One kingdom, joy and union without end (23:Bk.VII, 155-62.)

So did the angel answer Adam when he asked what meant "If ye be found obedient," and so spoke the Father to the Son at the prospect of man’s redemption. It begins to appear suspiciously like the argument of the Pelagians referred to by the Lutherans, "that man can be justified before God by his own strength and reason." Out of such a seeming difference of opinion, shall we find Milton in
agreement with the Lutheran doctrine on the consequences of sin? The Lutherans maintained that "the vice of origin, is truly sin, even now condemning and bringing eternal death upon those not born again through baptism and the Holy Ghost." The above statement evidently infers that the soul is in spiritual death before baptism, if until then it is condemned "to eternal death." This condition, the Lutherans tell us, is the spiritual consequence of the fall of Adam in himself and his posterity. That "also they (the Churches) teach that since the fall of Adam, all men begotten according to nature, are born with sin, that is, without the fear of God, without trust in God, and with Concupiscence" would lead us to believe that there were certain physical effects as a consequence of sin in Adam and his posterity. When Luther further stated that concupiscence had the nature of sin and that the infection though not the imputation of sin remained even in the baptized and regenerate, we wonder where this infection remained if it was not in the physical nature of man. Indeed, if the "vice of origin" is "even now condemning and bringing eternal death upon those not born again through baptism and the Holy Ghost," original sin must have vitiated our human nature to its very core.

Luther does tell us that man can do no morally good act before justification, all he does is sin; man is essential-
ly evil and all because of original sin. Can such total corruption avoid showing itself physically? Does not Luther thereby tell us that Adam's sin had physical consequences to himself and his posterity? Though he does not define the exact results, the fact that man is "without the fear of God, and without trust in God, and with Cupiscence" requires that there be physical evils somewhat akin to what we read in Milton's "Paradise Lost:"

Love was not in their looks, either to God
Or to each other, but apparent guilt,
And shame, and perturbation, and despair
Anger and obstinacy, and hate and guile (23:Bk.X,111-15.)

In the absence of further detail from Luther, in the Augsburg Confession, we must conclude that he accepted the current opinions, in which Milton concurs, that the physical consequences to Adam and Eve and their posterity were ignorance, unhappiness, subjection to concupiscence and condemnation to death. According to the evidence we have adduced, which is the best evidence we presently have, Milton and the Lutherans agree. Both declare that the spiritual consequence was spiritual death and the physical consequences were those enumerated above.
Now, if we can find that Milton is orthodox with the last of the four norms to which we are comparing him, we shall have found Milton altogether orthodox on the question of the consequences of sin to Adam and his posterity. To do this we must see what the Catholic doctrine is and how it compares, or rather how Milton’s views compare with it. As we previously saw, Milton tells us that the spiritual consequences to Adam and Eve and their posterity was “Spiritual Death by which is meant the loss of divine grace, and that of innate righteousness, wherein man in the beginning lived unto God” (20:264.) A former discussion in this chapter showed that by “righteousness” Milton meant the same thing as the Catholics mean by “integrity.” To the Catholics the spiritual consequences of Adam’s sin to himself and his posterity was the loss of “original justice.” Our first parents had received from God a free supernatural gift, sanctifying grace which is called “original justice.” This gift gave them a right to the clear immediate vision of God. Indeed, it is the result of that same supernatural gift, which rendered their souls holy and pleasing to God, and enabled them to do good works which would merit them eternal life (15:371.) So we see that “original justice” means what Milton meant by “divine grace,” for in both cases it was “their Maker’s
image" dwelling in the soul of Adam and Eve, and their posterity. Milton differs from the Catholic position only in adding "original righteousness" as a part of the spiritual death of Adam and his posterity. The Catholic position further states what the physical consequences of original sin is to Adam and Eve and their posterity. These consequences are involved in the loss of what the Catholics call Preternatural Gifts, which had been gratuitous gifts accompanying "divine grace." Specifically, these lost gifts were four in number.

1. Integrity, which means freedom from concupiscence. The whole nature of our first parents was under the control of their rational will, wherein any suggestion could be accepted or rejected at once. They were not, as we know, exempt from temptation though there was not that struggle in the temptation as we now undergo. That is what is meant by "freedom from concupiscence." From our previous discussion in this chapter on these words of Milton in "Paradise Lost:"

;since our eyes
Opened we find indeed, and find we know both good and evil, good lost and evil got
Bad fruit of knowledge if this be to know Which leaves us naked thus, of honor void
Of innocence, of Faith, of Purity,
Our wonted ornaments now soiled and stained
And in our faces evident the signs
Of foul concupiscence whence evil store,
Even shame, the last of evils; of the first
Be sure then (23:Bk.IX,1070-1080.)
we learn that Milton has the same idea as that expressed by the Catholic doctrine. Milton is also in accord with the Catholic idea of the loss of knowledge, for the Catholics hold that Adam and Eve possessed knowledge in a very high degree. In fact, Hunter states that: "This sense (meaning) has always been ascribed in the Church to a passage of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, from which we learn that the creator furnished man with all that was necessary to enable him to do the work for which he had been called into being, and this is to praise God. The words are: 'He gave them counsel, and a tongue, and eyes, and ears, and a heart to devise; and he filled them with the knowledge of understanding. He created in them the science of the spirit, He filled their heart with wisdom and showed them both good and evil ...... that they might declare the glorious things of his works' (Ecclus. XVIII,53.) In the light given by this passage, we can appreciate the greatness of the knowledge implied by the fact that Adam gave names to every bird and beast, which names doubtless were not merely arbitrary and devoid of suitable, but expressed in some manner ...... the essential nature of the beings to which they were applied." (15:383.) The reader can see for himself, from what has already been said on this subject, that Milton believed just this and says so in "Paradise Lost;"
I named them as they passed, and understood their nature; with such knowledge God endued my sudden apprehension (23:Bk.VIII,352-54.)

He not only says what Adam and Eve enjoyed, but he also believed them to have lost this gift (20:265.) With knowledge also went happiness, and Adam and Eve were left with sorrow and sadness. This happiness, which the Catholics say was lost, consisted in freedom from all those sufferings and infirmities, which are the harbingers of death, and from all sorrows (14:344.) So Milton thought happiness to be, and its loss he labels a "prelude" to the "death of the body" (20:268.) A "harbinger of death," indeed, is sorrow. For the Catholic doctrine tells us that Adam and Eve and their posterity lost immortality. They had initially been given a perpetual right to life, that is, life of the body, for the soul is immortal (14:278.) They were not to be subject to death. They were to pass from this terrestrial life to the heavenly life without the repugnant incident of death (14:339.) Milton, too, confesses the loss of immortality in Adam and his posterity (20:268.) He does even more. He confesses, nay he asserts in the face of opposition, the mortality of both body and soul. "Inasmuch, then, as the whole man is uniformly said to consist of body, spirit and soul, I shall first show that the whole man dies, and secondly
that each component part suffers privation of life" (20:271.) This is so astounding, when viewed in the presence of Milton's so great orthodoxy in other points, that it would seem that he meant merely a spiritual death or what is understood by sin. However, that Milton meant death, not merely in the sense of sin, we learn from his refutation of that position held by the spiritualists. "On the other hand, those who assert that the soul is exempt from death, and that when divested of the body, it wings its way, or is conducted by angels, directly to its appointed place of reward or punishment where it remains in a separate state of existence to the end of the world, found their belief principally on the following passages of scripture" (20:277.) Then follow a full array of texts, which Milton presents and comments upon. The result is that the soul meets with the same dissolution as the body, for in Milton's eyes it appears "purely human" and seems subject to division and dissolution just as the material body.

Yet one doubt
Pursues me still, lest all I cannot die;
Lest that pure breath of life, the spirit of man
Which God inspired, cannot together perish
With this corporeal clod: then in the grave
Or in some other dreadful place, who knows
But I shall die a living death? Oh thought
Horrid, if true! Yet why? It was but breath
Of life that sinn'd; what dies but what had life
And sin? The body properly hath neither.
All of me then shall die: Let this appease
The doubt, since human reach no further knows (23:Bk.X, 782.)

The only difficulty with the conclusions of Milton is that he has failed once again to observe his own well conceived principle that the unity of truth lies in the totality. Had he recalled the text of the King of prophets rather than the texts of the prophets only, he might have been more chary of such a definitive conclusion. Surely, when one considers that Christ was speaking to the materialistic Sadducees and that He told them "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living" (Matt. XXII,32;) and when one considers that these men, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, were dead bodily and that the Sadducees knew it; surely, I say, Milton must be bold to contradict the word of Him, Whom he pretends to be interpreting literally. Without boring the reader here with a detailed examination of the texts that Milton adduces (20:277-84) let it suffice to say that a thorough examination of them literally, contextually and by comparison with parallel passages will reveal Milton to be without foundation in many instances, if not in all, for his conclusion. Still, while the fact that Milton treats both soul and body as material elements subject to death of an identical kind proves Milton to be thinking of the soul as material, it
also discloses the truth that Milton considers this mortality of soul and body as a physical consequence of sin (20: 263.) Consequently, the reader readily sees that Milton does not agree in its entirety with the Catholic view on the physical consequences of sin to Adam and Eve and their posterity. Summing up, therefore, the orthodoxy of Milton on the consequences of sin, both spiritual and physical, to Adam and his posterity, we find that Milton is orthodox as to integrity, knowledge and happiness, but is unorthodox as to the spiritual consequences and as to the mortality of the body and soul.
3. Cause of Conflict

The reader might now be interested to know what was the cause of all this turmoil that gave Milton matter for "Paradise Lost" and presents us with the daily difficulties that surround us. Milton was interested in the cause of all this evil, and he very deliberately retails it to us in the beginning of "Paradise Lost:"

Say first -- for heaven hides nothing from thy view, Nor the deep tract of hell -- say first what cause Moved our grand parents, in that happystate, Favored of heaven so highly, to fall off From their creator, and transgress his will For one restraint, lords of the world besides. Who first seduced them to that foul revolt? The infernal serpent; he it was whose guile, Stirred up with envy and revenge, deceived The mother of mankind, what time his pride Had cast him out from heaven, with all his host Of rebel angels, by whose aid, aspiring To set himself in glory above his peers, He trusted to have equaled the Most High (23:Bk.I, 27-41.)

So we see that Milton places pride at the head of all the evil; here is the fountain-head, here the hidden spring whence flows the broad river of evil, sorrow, sickness and death. Milton tells us that it is a pride that "trusted to have equaled the Most High." Yes, it must be that by which the Pelagians, referred to by the Lutherans in this chapter, believed themselves able by "their own strength and power" to attain their destined end, the eternal vision of God. Milton places this same pride in much great-
er contiguity to the sin itself, when he makes Adam reproach Eve:

But for thee
I had persisted happy, had not thy pride
And wandering vanity, when least was safe,
Rejected my forewarnings, and disdained
Not to be trusted -- longing to be seen,
Though by the devil himself (23:Bk.X,873-78.)

No doubt can remain, therefore, that pride is the cause of all our woe, though it produced its effects through "Man's first disobedience, and the fruit of that forbidden tree."
4. Our Opinion of Milton's Orthodoxy

Out of this background, the reader may be curious to know what our opinion is of Milton's orthodoxy on the question of sin and its consequences. We have no other opinion than that founded upon twenty centuries of intense, vigorous activity and experience in the civilization of the world, that confessed and defined by the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Milton declares that the death inflicted upon mankind is death—such as comes to the body—to both soul and body (20:271.) Our opinion of that is "If any one do not avow that the first man, Adam, when in paradise he transgressed the command of God, at once lost the holiness and justice which was his condition, and by this act of evil incurred the anger and indignation of God, and that death with which God had threatened him, and along with death subjection beneath the power of him who is the lord of death, that is, the devil; and that the whole Adam, through that evil doing, was changed for the worse both in body and soul, let him be Anathema" (15:373.) Milton tells us that original sin in the words of some is "especially guiltiness," but he continues from this to give his idea of it and he calls it "imputation of guilt" rather than "properly sin" (20:261.) We say "If any one assert that the sin of Adam hurt himself alone, and not his offspring, and that
the holiness and justice which he has received from God was lost to himself alone and not also to us, or that he, being defiled by the sin of disobedience, has only transfused death and pains of the body into the whole human race, but not also, which is the death of the soul, let him be Anathema" (15:373.) Milton likewise tells us that "besides, guiltiness is taken away in those who are regenerate, while original sin remains" (20:261.) But if "sin remains," how can the merits of Christ obtain for us "justice, sanctification, and redemption?" Hence, we assert that "If any one assert that this sin of Adam ---- which in its origin is one, and being transfused into all by propagation, not by imitation, is in each one as his own --- is taken away either by the powers of human nature, or by any other remedy than the merit of the one Mediator Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath reconciled us to God in His own Blood, made unto us justice, sanctification, and redemption; or if he deny that the said merit of Jesus Christ is applied, both in adults and to infants by the Sacrament of Baptism rightly administered in the form of the Church, let him be Anathema" (15:398.) A brief study of the dictionary shows that, when Milton states that regeneration takes away the guilt but leaves original sin, he is only stating that both guilt and sin remain, for
"guiltiness" cannot be wiped away without sin and vice versa. Since Milton does assert that baptism takes away "guiltiness" but not "original sin" (20:261,) we gladly declare with the Ecumenical Council of the one church: "If any one deny that by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in Baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted; or even assert that the whole of that which has the true and proper nature of sin is not taken away, but say that it is only canceled, or not imputed; let him be Anathema" (15:399.) Now, there can be no doubt in the readers mind that on the spiritual consequences of sin, as well as on the loss of immortality, as believed by Milton, we hold widely divergent views and consider him completely unorthodox.
SUMMARY

As an epitome to this thesis I shall state briefly the orthodoxy of Milton's theology concerning first the Trinity and secondly Sin and its Consequences.

The Trinity:
1. The Anglicans, Puritans and Catholics asserted the co-eternity of three persons in God.
2. Milton in agreement with Arius asserted that no one is co-eternal with the Father.
3. The Anglicans, Puritans and Catholics taught the Co-equality of three Persons in God.
4. Milton and Arius agree that there is no one who is Co-equal to the Father.
5. The Anglicans, Puritans and Catholics believe in One God in Three Divine Persons.
6. Milton agrees with Arius that there is not One God in Three Divine Persons.
7. Milton is orthodox in regard to the unorthodox Arian conception.
8. Milton is unorthodox in regard to the Anglican, Puritanic and Catholic positions.
9. Milton is a heterodox trinitarian.

Sin and its Consequences:
1. Milton agrees with the Anglicans, Calvinists, Lutherans and Catholics that Original Sin is a
fact.

2. Catholics hold that Original Sin was the loss of "Original Justice" or "Divine Grace."

3. Milton holds with the Anglicans, Calvinists and Lutherans that it was the loss of "Divine Grace" and "Original Righteousness."

4. Milton with the Anglicans and Lutherans believed that the posterity of Adam, through imputed sin, lost "Original Righteousness" and the gifts of integrity, happiness, knowledge and immortality of body and soul.

5. Catholics believe that the posterity of Adam, through sin and not by imputation, lost "Original Justice" and the gifts of integrity, knowledge, happiness and immortality.

6. Milton is orthodox as to the fact of Original Sin.

7. Milton is orthodox with the Anglicans, Calvinists and Lutherans, but unorthodox with the Catholics as to the kind of sin that was Original.

8. Milton is orthodox with the Anglicans and Lutherans, but unorthodox with the Calvinists and Catholics as to the manner in which this sin descended to the posterity of Adam.
9. Milton is completely orthodox with the Anglicans, Calvinists and Lutherans as to the spiritual and physical consequences of Original Sin to Adam and Eve and their posterity.

10. Milton is orthodox with the Catholic opinion as to integrity, knowledge and happiness as the consequences of sin to Adam and his posterity, but unorthodox in the spiritual consequences and the mortality of the body and soul.
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