

## The Shadows of the Future: Michael's Typological Vision of History in *Paradise Lost* Books 11-12.

The Shadows of the Future: Michael's Typological Vision of History in *Paradise Lost* Books 11-12. In: *Esemény és költészet. Az irodalomértés kortárs horizontjai a magyar és a nemzetközi tudományban. Tanulmányok Kovács Árpád hetvenedik születésnapjára*. Pannon Egyetem, Modern Filológiai és Társadalomtudományi Kar, Veszprém, 2014, 452-465

Typology, or figural interpretation is both a figure of speech and a view of history. Eric Auerbach defined it as follows:

Figural interpretation establishes a connection between two events or persons, the first of which signifies not only itself but also the second, while the second encompasses or fulfils the first... Both, being real events or figures, are within time, within the stream of historical life. Only the understanding of the two persons or events is a spiritual act, but this spiritual act deals with concrete events whether past, present or future... since promise and fulfilment are real historical events, which either have happened... or will happen. (Auerbach, 1959, 16)

Critics such as William Madsen (1960, 1968), H.R. MacCallum (1962), Barbara Kiefer Lewalski (1963) and most recently Regina Schwarz (1988) have explored various aspects of this hermeneutical as well as a literary tradition in Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Within the present paper I wish to demonstrate that Milton's *Paradise Lost* is a typologically structured poem by analysing (1) the first six lines of the Invocation (1.1-6); (2) Michael's narrative and visions to Adam on the Hill of Paradise in Book 11; 3) Michael's narrative and visions continued in Book 12 through the lenses of the *crux interpretum* in 12.300-314.

### 1. The Invocation

Milton's *Paradise Lost* cannot be separated from its sequel, the brief epic *Paradise Regained*. Therefore, it is worth juxtaposing the beginning of each poem.

Paradise Lost (1-6)	Paradise Regained (1-7)
<p>Of mans 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 heav'nly Muse...</p>	<p>I who erewhile the happy garden sung, By one mans disobedience lost, now sing Recovered Paradise to all mankind, By one man's firm obedience fully tried Through all temptation, and the tempter foiled In all his wiles, defeated and repulsed, And Eden raised in the waste wilderness.</p>

In the Invocation of *Paradise Lost* Milton follows the tradition of Homer and Virgil but his muse is not the classical muse of the epic but the "heav'nly Muse" who inspired Moses, David and the prophets, i.e. the Holy Spirit (Kerrigan et al. 294). Despite the initial ambiguity, it becomes obvious in line 17 where Milton directly addresses the Spirit.

Milton announces that the subject matter of his poem is going to be man and his disobedience which brought death and woe into this world. However, he immediately adds that this tragedy is not the end of the story because “one greater man” restored humanity and “regained the blissful seat”. Right in the beginning Milton juxtaposes “man” and the “greater man”; the former disobeyed and its consequence was the loss of Paradise. However the “greater man” “restored us” and “regained” Paradise for humanity. It becomes obvious from the very beginning of *Paradise Regained* that Paradise was “recovered” and “Eden [was] raised in the waste wilderness” “[b]y one man’s firm obedience”.

We have a parallel between the “man” and the “greater man”, however, their behaviour is antithetical. Their situation is parallel as both are placed into the context of temptation but the first man, by disobedience, yields to the temptation while “the greater man, by firm ”obedience”, resists the temptation. As a consequence Paradise is lost in the first case and is regained in the second case. The first man is a tragic loser and the greater man is victorious.

The Hebrew word for generic man and human kind is Adam (Kerrigan et al. 293). Milton follows the biblical account of Genesis 1-3 and also the Pauline interpretation of the Torah. It is worth mentioning that the Pauline interpretation of the Genesis story of creation and the fall is not to be found in the Gospels. The first crucial passage is in Rm 5, 14 when Paul says that human kind “sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come”. In Greek it is *typos tu mellontos* ; the Vulgate says *forma future*. The future “greater” man is, of course, Christ who is not only a “second Adam”, or a “new Adam”, but he is *the* man that God had originally planned as he created man in his own image, this is what Adam was and should have remained had he not disobeyed. Both Adam and Christ as “one” man stand for one species of human kind respectively: “Then as one man’s trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man’s act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men” (Rm 5,18, RSV). Adam and Christ stand for death and life; they are the progenitors of two races of men: “For since by man *came* death, by man *came* also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive” (1 Cor 15, 21-22).

This parallel yet antithetical typology is characterized by Leonhard Goppelt as follows:

In their acts and in the effects they have on others, Adam and Christ are related to one-another as a photographic negative to its positive print or as a mould to the plastic shaped by it. As the mould determines the shape of the casting, so from Adam’s power over the human race comes Christ’s mission and work, his death and his resurrection (Goppelt 129).

This how we can sum it up:

TYPE	ANTITYPE
Adam	Christ
Situated in Temptation	Situated in Temptation
Disobedience	Obedience
Paradise Lost	Paradise Regained
Death and Woe	Life and Victory

As disobedience was a synonym for fall and sin for Milton; so obedience is almost a synonym for restoration and salvation. At the end of *Paradise Lost* Adam learns from Michael that Christ fulfilled the law “[B]oth by obedience and by love” (12.403). Thus when Michael

finishes his instructions Adam's final conclusion that "I learn, that to obey is best..." (12.561).

In summary, with all this in mind we can apply here Auerbach's quoted definition of typology: figural interpretation establishes a connection between two persons; i.e. Adam and Christ, the first of which (Adam) signifies not only itself but also the second (Christ), while the second (Christ) encompasses or fulfils the first (Adam)... Both, being real figures, are within time, within the stream of (imagined) historical life. Only the understanding of the two persons (Adam and Christ) is a spiritual act, but this spiritual act.

## 2. Michael' Narrative and Visions on the Hill of Paradise in Book 11.

Having heard the penitent prayers of Adam and Eve through the intercession of the Son, the Father commissions the Archangel Michael "to reveal / to Adam what shall come in future days" (11.113-114; 11.356-358). While Raphael was an "affable Arch-angel" (7.41; 8.648) and "sociably mild" (11.234), Michael was "solemn" and "sublime" (11.236) more stern and instructive though not unkind. He takes Adam up to the highest hill of Paradise (11.378) where he "purged with euphrasy and rue / [t]he visual nerve" of Adam (11.413-414). Euphrasy and rue were herbs used in the treatment of eyesight which Milton himself might have taken while he was getting blind (Kerrigan et al. 597). Moreover, "three drops" from the well of life are instilled, his eyes are enforced to close and thus "all his spirits became entranced" (11.419).

When Adam reopens his eyes a series of vision are concerning the future, are shown to him. Michael functions as the *angelus interpres*, the interpreting angel who teaches Adam the art of seeing or the art of understanding. Adam is the student and Michael is the master. The more he sees the more he needs to understand the meaning of these visions.

The first vision is that of a "sweet reaper" and the "more meek" "shepherd" each offering sacrifice, however the first one's was not accepted. As in an Elisabethan "dumb-show" we see the reaper i.e. Cain killing his brother the shepherd Abel. To Adam's dismay the *angelus interpreter* explains the meaning of the vision: "There are two brethren, Adam and to come / Out of thy loins; the unjust the just has slain" (11.44-455).

There has been a tradition of Christian historiography going back to St Augustine and his 4<sup>th</sup> century contemporary the Donatist Tyconius that there has been a duplicity in the church, in the "bipartite body of the Lord" which goes back to the archetypal fight of the two brethren either of Cain and Abel or of Esau and Jacob. For Augustine Cain is the founder of *civitas diaboli* and Abel is the *civitas dei* (Augustine, DCD xv.v.). This idea of duplicity is typological: Cain is the antitype or the fulfilment of Satan while Abel is the prefiguration of Christ. For Tyconius the double nature of the church was prefigured by the fighting of the twins Esau and Jacob in the womb of Rebekkah. The „two in one body" („*duo in uno corpore*") are a „figure of the double line of Abraham's descendants". „Two peoples wrestling in the one womb of their mother, the church. The one, chosen on the basis of foreknowledge, is loved, the other by the choice of its own will, is evil." (Tyconius: Liber Regularum, Rule 2.)

Now in a series of visions of deaths famines and wars Michael shows the sons of the children of Satan and Cain. The idea of sonship and fatherhood is also a means of expressing akin spiritual, i.e. typological relationships in the Bible (Mt 23,32: „Fill ye up the measures of your fathers"; Jn 10,44: „Ye are of *your* father the devil".) Leonhard Goppelt writes:

In the Bible, the terms - 'father' and 'children' (seed) - which describe a natural relationship defined by blood and by law become expressions for the interrelationship of type and antitype in redemptive history. In this relationship to God, Abraham is, in the fullest sense of the word, a type of all Christians in their relationship to God; consequently the promise of innumerable descendants that was made to Abraham is fulfilled in the gathering of the church (Goppelt 223).

Having seen Cain and Abel Michael shows Adam the horrible consequences of his sin: death, false, pagan harmony “unmindful of their maker” (11.611) and war in the context of a degenerative view of history due to, “man’s effeminate slackness” (11.634). However, amidst the millions of corrupt beings, emerges from time to time “the only righteous man”. Such was Enoch (Gen 5, 21-24) who was said to have walked with God (Gen 5,24) and thus he was “[e]xempt from death” (11.709).

The next vision is about “luxury and riot, feast and dance / [m]arrying or prostituting” (11.715) i.e. lasciviousness which God cannot tolerate and therefore decides to destroy by flood. There is only “a reverend sire” (11.719) who “to them preached / [c]onversion and repentance... “[b]ut all in vain” (11.23-24, 26). Then this man “ceased / [c]ontending” and began to build an ark.

Adam is again dismayed by the vision and asks Michael: “unfold, celestial guide, / And whether here the race of man will end” (11.785-787). Michael’s answer is that in this degenerate and depraved world, there is “one just man” (11.818) who sheltered his family in an ark during the deluge.

This “only man” whose name, like Enoch’s, is not even mentioned by Michael, is Noah (Gen 6-9). The dove’s return with an olive-leaf, “the pacific sign” (11.860) to the ark was the sign of their salvation and the colourful rainbow, of the “brow of God appeased” (11.880), i.e. the new covenant. Now Adam rejoices as he understood something from God’s salvation-history:

Far less I now lament for one whole world  
Of wicked sons destroyed, than I rejoice  
For one man found so perfect and so just,  
That God vouchsafes to raise another world  
From him and all his anger to forget. (11. 774-778)

The heavenly instructor affirms the theologically accurate observation of his student and reiterates that if „one just man” is found God will „not blot out mankind” (11.891) and he „calls to mind his covenant” (11.898) that he will not destroy the world; there will be day and night, seed time and harvest, heat and frost „till fire purge all things new / Both heaven and earth, wherein the just shall dwell” (11-900-901).

By now Adam has learned and appropriated the law and nature of the world’s history. Though human kind, in its innate wickedness, always tends to deviate from God and therefore makes them worth for destruction. However, in the vast sea of wickedness suddenly the „one just man”, whether Enoch or Noah, emerges; and God is so gracious that with regard to the one man he not blot mankind out from the book of life will and he even proposes to make a covenant with them.

It is obvious that deluge is a type of the final judgement and salvation history usually tends to be narrowed down to the „one just man” (Enoch and Noah). If there is just „one” who is just, God covenants himself to save the ones who belong to him. The „one just man” is, it is now obvious, the type of the Son of God, who in his intercessory prayer at the beginning of Book 11, offered himself to be advocate and propitiation:

Accept me, and in me from these receive  
The smell of peace towards mankind, let him live  
Before thee reconciled... (11.37-39)

However, the „one just man” is only a type, a shadow, of *the* just Man, or the „one greater man” (1.4) and the rainbow of the covenant is an anticipation, a type of the final Sabbath-rest. Adam has to understand that shadows, though real as they are, point also towards their fulfilment, the „truth” will qualitatively be different. This „course” of Adam, with Archangel Michael on the hill of paradise must be continued. This is the subject of Book 12.

### **3. Michael’s Narrative and Visions Continued in Book 12 and the *Crux Interpretorum* (12.300-314)**

Before human history begins (“The world was all before them” 12.646) we are given a compressed version of the biblical narrative from Creation until the Last Judgement in Books 11 and 12. It is, of course, history interpreted by Michael. However, the Jewish and the Christian view of history has always been an interpreted history; for the Jewish and the Christian mind history has always been a hermeneutical construct, inseparable from meaning. Israel’s history in the Tanach, as Christians call it the Old Testament, has been characterised by scholars as “deuteronomistic history” suggesting that when Israel is destroyed it is because it has failed in its covenant with God (Vanhoozer, 170). In the New Testament we have versions of the Christian view of history in Stephen’s narrative (Acts 7, 1-53) and in the narrative of Hebrews (11, 1-39). History is always told and retold, thus the past is always present at least in the mind of the narrator and the addressee.

Northrop Frye has noticed the “repeating *mythos* of the apostasy and the restauration of Israel” (Frye, 169); the series of descents and ascents of what he called the “U-shape”, i.e. comic structure of the entire Bible. Eden, the promised land, Jerusalem, the rebuilt Temple etc. are on the upward side of the chart and wilderness, Egypt, Babylon, Rome are in the bottom. The negative, typologically identical sides stand for captivity and oppression while the ideal states of deliverance, also typologically identical, stand for freedom and happiness.

Re-reading Michael’s narrative in the terms of Frye’s chart we may observe that Michael’s postlapsarian narrative began with the fratricide of Cain and Abel and its consequences: war, famine, etc.; however Enoch was introduced as the ideal type of “one true man”. But then this world got wild again until Noah, the next “one man” appeared. There is typological identity between the fratricide, the wicked and the wild world as well as between Enoch and Noah.

In continuing his narrative in Book 12 Michael makes it even more explicit that there is a category he calls “man from a second stock” (12.7) or “second source of men” (12.13) who are characterized by “fearing Deity” because the dread of judgement past remains / [F]resh in their minds” (12.12-13) and thus they and their descendants live happily (12.13-23). (This is again the upper position on the up-and-downs pattern of history.)

The descendants of Noah live happily until “one shall rise / [o]f proud ambitious heart, who not content / [w]ith fair equality, fraternal state, / [w]ill arrogate dominion undeserved / [O]ver his brethren (12, 24-28). The name of this man is Nimrod who was a “mighty hunter before the Lord (Gen 10, 9). Extra-biblical sources such as Josephus (*Ant.*1.4.2) identify him as the builder of Babel whose name is sometimes associated with the Hebrew word *marad*

("to rebel"): "from rebellion shall derive his name" (12.36; Kerrigan 612). He is the representative of the empire-building tyrant; whose ambition, arrogance, rebellion, marching with his crew etc. make him a human antitype of Satan or the apocalyptic Antichrist of human history (Fowlers, 647) whose building was Babel sometimes called as "Confusion" (12.62). Adam is truly horrified by this example of tyranny and Michael confirms that : "true liberty / [is] lost, which always with right reason dwells / [t]winned..." (12.82-84).

While withdrawing his presence from the wicked, God chooses "one peculiar nation" (12.111), a "nation from one faithful man". This man is Abraham whom God blesses "that in his seed / [a]ll nation shall be blest" (12.126-127). Michael explains that "by that seed / [i]s meant thy deliverer, who shall bruise / [t]he serpent's head" (148-150) referring to Christ in the *protoevangelion* (Gen 3,15. He reminds Adam that Abraham belongs to the "second stock of man", i.e. the type of Christ as he is a man of faith (12.128).

However, his grandson's descendants will become slaves in Egypt. But two men, Moses and his brother Aaron, sent from God, will claim the chosen people and with God miraculous help they deliver them from their captivity. They will lead them through the desert. On Mount Sinai God will

Order them laws: part such as appertain  
To civil justice, art religious rites  
Of sacrifice, informing them, by types  
And shadows, of that destined seed to bruise  
The serpent, by what means he shall achieve  
Mankind's deliverance. (12.231-235)

Some of the laws belong to civil life but some of them to religious rites. Christians have believed that these religious rites were given to foreshadow the deliverance of human kind from the captivity of sin. It means they are not local but universal and temporally they are prophetic as they point to the future. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath *days*: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body *is* of Christ" (Col 2, 16-17).

There is no direct access to God ("the voice of God / [t]o mortal ear is dreadful" - 12.235-236) thus Moses's office will be that of a mediator.

Moses is a type or figure not as a deliverer but as a mediator. When the idolatrous people of Israel made a golden calf and thus offended God, Moses offered to make an atonement and this is what he said to the Lord: "Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin--; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written" (Exod 32,32). God does not require this atonement from Moses. According to the New Testament it was the Son who not only offered but he did make an atonement by giving his own life and praying for his enemies: "Forgive them for they do not know what they are doing" (Lk 23,34). The type, though relevant in its own time, is *also* a shadow, it points to its fulfillment, the antitype which is on a higher level of salvation history: there is *Steigerung* involved: a 'leap forward', 'like a shift of music into a new key as it crescendoes to a climax'" (Fabiny, 47). If a figure is said to be a "shadow"; it is not to be understood as "only" a shadow but "also" a shadow; its historical reality does not cease with carrying a "surplus of meaning" through the retrospective lenses of Christian history.

Michael shows Adam the mercy-seat, the gold covering the ark which was believed to be the seat of God and tells him about the victory of God's people. At this point Adam who, thanks to Michael's careful explanations finds his "eyes true opening" and his "heart much eased" (12. 274) is asking the question why God is in need of so many laws to orient mankind. In his reply Michael explains that law has some didactic functions as it meant to

manifest sin: it can “discover sin, but not remove” (12.290). However, he believes that “the shadowy expiations weak” may provoke the beholder to believe so that “they conclude / [s]ome blood more precious must be paid for man, / [j]ust for unjust” (12.292-294). This is a fine summary of the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith.

And here comes the *crux interpretum* - the essential, somewhat puzzling passage which becomes the central point of Milton’s typological argument. A *crux interpretum* demands a resolution. This is what we attempt to do in the rest of our paper.

So law appears imperfect, and but giv'n [ 300 ]  
 With purpose to resign them in full time  
 Up to a better cov'nant, disciplin'd  
 From shadowy types to truth, from flesh to spirit,  
 From imposition of strict laws, to free  
 Acceptance of large grace, from servile fear [ 305 ]  
 To filial, works of law to works of faith.  
 And therefore shall not Moses, though of God  
 Highly beloved, being but the minister  
 Of law, his people into Canaan lead;  
 But Joshua whom the Gentiles Jesus call, [ 310 ]  
 His name and office bearing, who shall quell  
 The adversarie serpent, and bring back  
 Through the worlds wilderness long wanderd man  
 Safe to eternal Paradise of rest. (12.300-314)

Here is the schematic structure of Michael’s binary opposites.

“OLD”, “TYPE” (past)	“NEW”, “ANTITYPE” (future)
LAW („old covenant”, „imperfect”)	BETTER COVENANT („perfect”)
SHADOWY TYPES	TRUTH
FLESH	SPIRIT
STRICT IMPOSITION	FREE ACCEPTANCE OF GRACE
SERVILE WILL	FILIAL
WORKS OF LAW	WORKS OF FAITH
MOSES, MINISTER OF LAW	JOSHUA/JESUS

We have found that Moses was a type of Christ; and now it is said that Moses was just a type of the law while Joshua was the type of Christ. Is this not a contradiction? No it is not, as we have emphasized that Moses’ function as a mediator was a foreshadowing or adumbrating the function of Christ as a mediator between the Father and the people. And there are several acts and gestures of Moses that are rightly seen as the types of Christ: the best known example, confirmed by Christ, is the lifting up of the brazen serpent in the wilderness: “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up. That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life” (Jn 3,14-15). In this case the *tertium comparationis* is the faith in the uplifted object i.e brazen serpent in case of Moses and the cross in case of Christ.

But in the context of the above *crux interpretum* Moses, whose name was associated with the imperfect law, was not allowed to lead the chosen people into the land of Canaan, a symbol of perfection by Christ. It is Joshua whose name etymologically means the same as

the name of Jesus: “God is deliverer”, it is him who can lead the people into the new land of milk and honey.

Jean Danielou in his *From Shadows to Reality* (Sacramentum futuri), still classic book on patristic typology (1960) devotes the last part of his book to “The Cycle of Joshua”. Danielou argues the Joshua typology is not as frequent as the Isaac or Moses typology. He says that one of the main themes in Genesis is *immolatio*, i.e. the younger takes the place of the elder: as Isaac replaces Ishmael (See Gal 4), as Jacob takes the place of the firstborn will Esau, as Ephraim takes the place of Manasse, likewise Joshua displaces Moses who could not enter into the “rest”.

HAGAR + ISHMAEL	SARAH + ISAAC
SINAI (Moses)	JERUSALEM (Christ)
OLD COVENANT	NEW COVENANT
ESAU	JACOB
MANASSE	EPHRAIM
MOSES	JOSHUA

The *Letter to Barnabas* provided an allegorical typology of the fight with the Amalek (Ex 17, 12-7-10) where Moses’ arms were said to have prefigured the cross, Joshua adumbrating Jesus and the Amalek “shadowing” Satan (Danielou 232). For Origen, as Danielou pointed out, Joshua portrays the mysteries (*sacramenta*) of Christ; his succession of Moses is the type of the Gospel succeeding the law. Eusebius said that Moses was inspired by the divine spirit when he called the son of Nave Jesus: “for a truth Jesus the Son of Nave himself bore the image of our Saviour, who after Moses transmitted, succeeded to the Headship of a pure and true religion” (Danielou, 242).

Having occupied the promised land the Israelites soon prospered and set up a kingdom under David whose seed had been prophesied to be the Messiah.

David’s ideal kingship will be followed by kings “[p]art good, part bad, of bad the longer scroll” (12.336) and their idolatries will “expose their land, / [t]heir city, his temple and his holy ark” (12.339-340) to the “proud city” of Babylon, the town of confusion. After seventy years the Jews are permitted to return to their homeland and re-build their temple. However, soon internal conflicts within the priesthood; “their strife pollution brings / [u]pon the temple itself” (12.356-357) and instead of the Davidian king a “stranger” (Herod) will be elected a king.

But this is the time when the Messiah is born of a virgin. Adam rejoices to hear that the ancient prophecy concerning the seed of a woman is eventually fulfilled. When Adam is excited to see the fight between the seeds of the serpent and of the woman, Michael cools him down that this will not be a spectacular fight but the Son will destroy the works of Satan *within* human kind. He will achieve this by “obedience to the law of God” (12.397) and “his obedience / [i]mputed becomes theirs by faith” (12.408-409). “For this he shall live hated” (12.411) and “nailed to the cross / [b]y his own nation, slain for bringing life” (12.413-414).

Milton is sometimes charged not to have attributed as much importance to Christ’s victory on the cross as to his overcoming the temptation in the desert. However, a close reading of Michael’s “catechism” in 12.386-465 of the significance of the Christ as “satisfaction” (12.419), “ransom paid” would, in my view, undermine that popular argument. Within these eighty lines we are given a theologically orthodox view of the passion, death and resurrection of Christ and its significance for human kind. This “Godlike act” (12.427) “[s]hall bruise the head of Satan, crush his strength / [d]efeating Sin and Death, his two main arms” (12.430-431). What is that if not victory?



Michael then goes on describing the vivid spread of the Gospel following the resurrection and the ascension; his vision encompassing the time until the second coming (12.436-465). Then Michael “paused / [a]t the world’s great period” (12.66-467) so that he would let Adam to express again his slightly evangelically naïf enthusiasm concerning the *felix culpa* (12.469-478). But his next question concerning the future of the “faithful, left among the unfaithful herd” (12.481) reveals a sense of realism and this promises that he will not be swallowed up by his incipient evangelical dizziness.

This is a good occasion for Michael to share his last vision with Adam. This vision is not an optimistic vision of a victory, nor a pessimistic vision of a defeat but a fearfully realistic picture about the future of the church (12.486-551). This is to illustrate what the 4<sup>th</sup> century Donatist Tyconius called the “bipartite church”: now the two “stocks” (12.7) or “sources” (12.13) of men will not be so easily separable as earlier, i.e. within and outside the people of God; but from now onwards, both stocks, sources, lines, etc. will be, though invisibly, within the church. The Christian Church is a *corpus mixtum* containing both the saints and the wicked; it is amazingly beautiful and horrifyingly ugly at the same time. Michael first describes the beauty of the victorious church, the *ecclesia triumphans*: the wonderful workings of the Holy Spirit (12.485-507). However, a longer vision is devoted to the description of the “wolves” : “[w]olves shall succeed for teachers; grievous wolves” (12.508); the hypocrites *within* the church who will be ambitious, proud and mix truth with superstition. They will deceive the people joining their titles with secular power “feigning still to act / [b]y spiritual” (12.17-518). They will create a symbiosis of the worldly and the spiritual, an alliance of the throne and the altar. Moreover, they will force spiritual laws “by carnal power... / [o]n every conscience” (12.521-522). By doing this they will bind liberty, the freedom of thought and speech. This period of ecclesiastical tyranny will result in the persecution, under Christian flag, of the pure believers in the Gospel: “persecution shall rise / [o]n all who in the worship persevere / [o]f spirit and truth” (12.531-533). This is the period of the *ecclesia militans* though these suffering churches will not be allowed to be called churches. Only the Second Coming of Christ will put an end to this period of great deception.

Though Milton does not say it explicitly; according to the inner typological logic of Michael’s vision: this period is again the type of Satan. Typology is not only about prefiguration but also about postfiguration. As the period of the Holy Spirit after the ascension of Christ was postfiguring or the type of Christ; the “period of the wolves” is a postfiguration, or reincarnation of the body of Satan, this time not outside but within the church. Figuration is also imitation; it is not the same whether we have to do with *imitatio Christi* or the *imitatio diaboli*.

The Bible, Milton and Michael believe that this great struggle or controversy beginning in pre-historical past, running through the ups and downs of human history, will be culminated and consummated at the end of human history, when we, after our individual, historical and cosmic drama, will enter into the “rest”, the eternal bliss and Sabbath of new heavens and new earth when “God shall be all in all” (3.341) or, as the Son says at the end of Book 6: “Thou shalt be All in All, and I in thee / For ever, and in mee all whom thou lov’st” (6,732-733).

Until then, according to Michael it is Adam, or, according to Milton it is the reader (or the audience) who must appropriate and interiorize this lesson of the typological vision of history so that, though paradise “up there” now being lost, it can still be rebuilt and experienced within human hearts.

## APPENDIX

### The Typological Ups and Downs of Salvation History in

## Michael's Narrative (PL, 11-12).

Before History Abdiel 5.803-907	0. Eden Adam and Eve 1.		2. Abel 11.436-447				6. Enoch 700-710		8. Noah 719-901		10. Abraham 11-153	
Satan	Adam and Eve 2.	1. Cain 11.429-449		3. Sickness, Death 466-479	4. False happiness 556-627	5. War 638-673		7. Sin Before Flood 711-807		9. Nimrod and Babel 12.29-110		11. Egypt 154 Pharao 193-916

12. Moses 170-309	13. Joshua 310-314		15. David 326-328		17. Re building the Temple 350		19. Messiah born and his ministry 359-385		21. Holy Spirit and the apostles 436-507		23. Second Coming 12.541-550	24. Eternal Rest Sabbat "All in all" 3.341 6.732-733
		14. Enemies 318		16. Babylon 336-338		18. Priestly Factions 351-358		20. Messiah's Crucifixion 413-433		22. Wolves 508-539		

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AUERBACH, E. 1959. 'Figura', trans. Ralph Manheim, in *Scenes from Drama of European Literature*, New York, Meridian. First published in German in *Archivum Romanicum*, 1938.
- AUGUSTINE, St. 1987. *Concerning the City of God Against the Pagans*. A New Translation by Henry Bettenson, London, Penguin Books.
- DANIELOU, J. 1960. *From Shadow to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, London: Westminster, Newman. [French: *Sacramentum Futuri*, 1950].
- FABINY, T, 1992. *The Lion and the Lamb. Figuralism and Fulfilment in the Bible, Art and Literature*. Macmillan, St. Martin's Press.
- FOWLER, A. ed. 1997. Milton. *Paradise Lost*. Second Edition, Harlow, Pearson, Longman. [First Edition, 1968.]
- FRYE, N. 1982. *The Great Code. The Bible and Literature*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- GOPPELT, L. 1982. *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, trans. Donald H. Madvig, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. [The first edition is in German in 1939].
- LEWALSKI, B.K. 1963. "Structure and Symbolism of Vision in Michael's Prophecy, *Paradise Lost*, XI-XII. In, *Philological Quarterly* 42 (1963), 25-35.
- KERRIGAN, W. et al. 2007. *The Complete Poetry and Essential Prose of John Milton*. New York, The Modern Library.
- MADSEN, W.G. 1960. "Earth the Shadow of Heaven. Typological Symbolism in *Paradise Lost*", in, *PMLA*, 75 (1960): 519-26.
- MACCALLUM, H. R. 1962. "Milton and the Figurative Interpretation of the Bible", *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 31 (1962): 397-415.
- MADSEN, W. G. 1968. *From Shadowy Types to Truth: Studies in Milton's Symbolism* New Haven, Yale University Press.
- SCHWARTZ, R. 1988. "From Shadowy Types to Shadowy Types: The Undendings of *Paradise Lost*", in, *Milton Studies*, 24 (1988), 123-139.
- TYCONIUS (ed. Babcock W.S.) 1989, *The Book of Rules. Liber Regularum*. Atlanta, Scholars Press.
- VANHOOZER, K. et al. eds. 2005. *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*. SPCK, Baker.