“Powerful Persuaders”: A Rhetorical Analysis of John Milton’s Characters in *Paradise Lost*

Live Hvalsbråten Knudsen

A Thesis Presented to

The Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Master’s of Arts Degree

Spring 2017

“Powerful Persuaders”:

A Rhetorical Analysis of John Milton’s Characters in *Paradise Lost*

Live Hvalsbråten Knudsen

2017

"Powerful Persuaders": A Rhetorical Analysis of John Milton's Characters in *Paradise Lost*

Live Hvalsbråten Knudsen

http://www.duo.uio.no

Print: Reprosentralen, University of Oslo

Abstract

The characters of John Milton's *Paradise Lost* are portrayed throughout large parts of the epic poem in acts of speaking. This thesis sets out to demonstrate how speech plays an essential part in the characterisation by the author's employment of a rich variety of classical rhetorical figures and devices. Analysing passages where the characters of Satan, God, Adam, Eve, the fallen and the unfallen angels are presented as speaking, this thesis argues that rhetorical figures are used with specific intentions for each character in that they reveal important traits telling of their nature. This analysis attempts to expand on the critical debates regarding Milton's view on rhetoric to encompass the complex stylistic richness in his epic characters. Scholarly discussions on Milton's use of rhetoric have often been centred around the infamous character of Satan. It is the contention of this thesis, however, that other major characters in *Paradise Lost* are equally complex in how rhetoric plays an essential role in rendering their important and revealing traits. To demonstrate this, selected passages will be analysed with regards to rhetorical figures and characterisation. Handbooks written by both Renaissance rhetoricians and contemporary scholars will serve as the main source for identification and names of the figures. In so doing, we may learn more of how Milton's employment of rhetoric affects the way we view the major characters and how it reveals important character traits reflecting vice or virtue.

Acknowledgments

I want to thank my advisor Tina Skouen, without whom this thesis would never have seen the light of day. First of all, thank you for introducing me to the wonderful world of classical rhetoric! Thank you for being so enthusiastic and positive throughout this process and for cheering me on every step of the way. It has been a great comfort knowing that I could always reach out to you with any questions or concerns I might have, fully confident that you would respond as quickly and thoroughly as possible. Thank you for sharing your boundless knowledge with me. Lastly, thank you for always pushing me to do my best.

To my parents – where do I begin? Thank you for always supporting me and for teaching me to chase my dreams and thank you for believing in them. Thank you for reassuring me that I could do this every time I began to doubt myself. Thank you for showing me unconditional and endless love. You are, and always will be, the most important people in my life. I hit life's jackpot as far as parents go and I will be forever grateful for that.

To my wonderful friends, thank you for keeping my spirits up during this process with your different, but equally ingenious methods. You have kept me sane with your words of comfort and encouragement. Thank you for believing in me and, more importantly, thank you for making me smile and laugh when I needed it the most.

Last but not least I want to thank my beautiful cat Nimbus, for always keeping me company during the writing of this thesis and for being my faithful study companion throughout my years as a student.

To my parents

List of Abbreviations

PL Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Alastair Fowler. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2007. Print.

FS Christiansen, Nancy L. *Figuring Style: The Legacy of Renaissance Rhetoric*. Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2013. Print.

SR *Silva Rhetoricae: The Forest of Rhetoric*. Brigham Young University, 2007. Web. 20 April 2017. <http://rhetoric.byu.edu/>.

CR Corbett, Edward P.J., and Robert J. Connors. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.

OED Online *Oxford English Dictionary: The definite record of the English language*. Oxford University Press, n.d. Web. 30 April 2017. <http://www.oed.com/>

Table of Contents

Introduction

A popular Renaissance proverb goes like this: *Loquere ut te videam*, "Speak, that I may see thee" (Jonson 100; see also Wright 106). This thesis argues that the characters in John Milton's *Paradise Lost* reveal themselves though their speech. By analysing Milton's use of rhetoric in passages where Satan, Adam, Eve, God, the fallen and unfallen angels appear to be speaking directly in their own words we can gain a better understanding of their characters as well as of the author's means of characterisation. The narrator of the poem proclaims his intention to "justify the ways of God to men,"[1] although critics have disagreed on the level of success of this bold aim. Introducing a vast range of well-known characters from the Bible in the form of an epic, a genre made famous by poets such as Virgil and Homer, Milton challenges his readers to distinguish true virtue from vice. Satan, typically seen as the epitome of evil, receives much attention in *Paradise Lost*. Many readers and critics have even argued for Satan and not Adam to be the hero of the poem. This interpretation and the critical debates created in its wake invite further exploration of these epic characters. The narrator, often regarded as Milton's mouthpiece (Fallon 3), signals when he is quoting the characters directly. One might describe this narrative strategy in terms of *mimesis*, involving representation of direct speech and imitation of action, as opposed to *diegesis* – the abstract form of telling a story (Rimmon-Kenan 107-08). Throughout a large part of the poem the characters are portrayed in acts of speaking. The language of each is an essential way of indirectly presenting character traits. This strengthens the connection between rhetoric and characterisation. The characters of *Paradise Lost* are brought to life through the narrator's attempt to portray their behaviour and language. Thus, rhetoric will be the most important focus of my reading of the poem in this thesis. Rhetoric pertains to language, written or spoken, as it is used either to inform or to persuade – the approach to persuasion and communication as an art form (Richards 3; Christiansen 4-5; Corbett and Connors 1). Direct speech is employed with great force in *Paradise Lost* to justify God to mankind. By studying the characters' reported utterances one may get a fuller understanding of how language is used in the poem to evoke different kinds of emotions. This can provide us with clues as to how one might interpret the characters, their ways of speaking revealing specific character traits like honesty and deceitfulness.

[1] John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Alastair Fowler, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2007), Book 1 line 26. Unless otherwise stated, all references are to this edition and will be cited as *PL* within the text with reference to book and core numbers.

This thesis will explore the rich variety of classical rhetorical figures and devices for the sake of demonstrating how speech plays an important part in the building of the characters of John Milton's *Paradise Lost*. If overlooked, important facets that add to the stylistic richness of the poem may be lost. The exceptional rhetorical skills that Milton demonstrates in this epic also deserve closer scrutiny. Critical debates have tended to focus on the character of Satan and his rhetoric. However, my contention is that other major characters of the poem are just as rhetorically complex. Thus, my thesis will encompass the rhetoric of several characters in addition to Satan.

Milton's portrayal of his epic characters has been a key focus of attention in the reception of the poem from early modern to contemporary criticism. In the early eighteenth-century, Joseph Addison claimed in *The Spectator* that Milton excelled in his portrayal of mankind's two states of innocence and sin and, more importantly, that his characters are relatable to the entire race of humans ("no. CCLXXIII" 1-2). Addison also wanted to demonstrate that Milton's epic was indeed as great, if not greater, than Homer's and Virgil's (Kolbrener 198). Addison claims in *The Spectator* that there are three factors that must be present for a poem to be considered an epic: it must focus on one act, the act should be depicted in full and lastly it should be of major importance ("no. CCLXVII"). In Addison's view *Paradise Lost* fulfils these criteria. Thus, according to this early critic and defender, Milton excels in both the epic genre and the characters. Later *Paradise Lost*-discussions have tended to revolve around the character of Satan. In 1793 William Blake famously claimed in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* that Milton's writing was at its most unconstrained when depicting Satan and the fallen angels and declared that Milton was "of the Devil's party without knowing it" (107; Kolbrener 201). It is not surprising that much of the scholarly debate surrounding the poem has been focused on whether Satan emerges as the hero. As pointed out by David Loewenstein, in light of the epic tradition, it is Satan who is cast as the character more reminiscent of Achilles and Odysseus from the classical epics (148). In other words, Satan can be seen to oppose a tyrannical king in Heaven. Debates have spun from this, and the historical and political contexts of Milton's epic writing have often been brought into the discussion, with contributions from scholars such as Christopher Hill (1977), David Norbrook (1999), David Loewenstein and Paul Stevens (2008). However, it is outside the scope of this thesis to consider the political and historical contexts of Milton's great epic, as my discussion will centre on how Milton's use of rhetorical techniques shapes the main characters. Still, the vigour of the various scholarly controversies serves to strengthen my

argument that the characters are so intricately presented that different interpretations of equal strength can be made.

The topic of *Paradise Lost* and rhetoric is by no means unchartered waters. Several scholars have contributed to this issue, among them Daniel Shore, Christopher Ricks, William Empson, Thomas O. Sloane, Stanley Fish, Lana Cable, William J. Kennedy, Brian Vickers, J.B. Broadbent and Ronald W. Cooley. Just as critics interested in the historical context have debated whether God is presented as a tyrannical king or not, those leaning more towards studying language and eloquence have largely concentrated on the question of whether Milton was for or against the use of classical rhetoric. Satan's verbose and grandiose way of expressing himself has led some critics to argue that Milton opposed heavy ornamentation and use of rhetorical figures. A recent contributor to this debate is Daniel Shore with his book *Milton and the Art of Rhetoric* (2012). Shore directly responds to earlier critics such as Stanley Fish and argues that Milton indeed employs rhetoric, although in a self-critical manner (3, 16). The latest contribution by Fish, *How Milton Works* (2001), finds unhindered divine testimony as opposed to rhetoric in Milton's writings (127). Fish belongs to the strand of critics subscribing to the idea that Milton was opposed to humanist rhetoric and thus that the characterisation of Satan is a negative one (Fish, *Surprised by Sin* 122-24; Sloane 249). In *Surprised by Sin* (1967), Fish argues that Milton constructs the poem so as to enable the reader to "fall again exactly as Adam did and with Adam's troubled clarity" (1). Also, Thomas O. Sloane in his book *Donne, Milton, and the End of Humanist Rhetoric* (1985), contends that one may observe a rejection of humanist rhetoric by Milton in his portrayal of Satan and that the reader will ultimately abandon the character based on this (250). Other critics have problematised the character of God in the poem. William Empson, in his book *Milton's God* from 1961, argues that Milton is attempting to portray God in a better light despite traditional Christian portrayals that show God as, in Empson's word, "wicked" (10-11). Significantly, questioning the character of God may lead us to view Satan more favourably and not just as the embodiment of evil and temptation. Empson argues that Satan should not be dismissed as wholly evil and one-sided, and emphasises that God appears spiteful and totalitarian (88-90,145-46).

There are also several Milton critics who maintain that Milton endorses a certain type of rhetoric but is clearly aware of its pitfalls. This interpretation sees Milton as an advocate for an improved type of rhetoric and for portraying the negative aspects of the art in Satan's eloquence. This view has been voiced by critics such as Ronald W. Cooley in his 1992 article "Reformed Eloquence: Inability, Questioning, and Correction in *Paradise Lost*" (232).

Another aspect of Milton's rhetoric is explored by Lana Cable (1995), who discusses what she terms "carnal rhetoric" in Milton's writings. Cable exemplifies this by mentioning a passage in Book X as the Son asks Adam why he decided to transgress in order to stay with Eve. According to Cable, the rhetoric in this passage is reminiscent of Milton's divorce tracts and "empyreal couplings" (91). J.B. Broadbent in his essay "Milton's Rhetoric" (1959) argues that the usage of rhetoric typical of Renaissance poetry is found throughout the poem. These encompass narrative, lyrical and dramatic contexts (Broadbent 224). Furthermore, Broadbent presents us with an analysis of the rhetoric used in some of Milton's major works such as *Samson Agonistes*, *Paradise Regained* and *Paradise Lost* (224-42). There is a long-standing tradition for discussing *Paradise Lost* in order to illustrate and exemplify Renaissance rhetoric as such. In his book *Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry* (1970), Brian Vickers includes several examples from *Paradise Lost* as he illustrates various figures of rhetoric (122). William J. Kennedy explores the connection between rhetoric and the genre of the epic poem as an aspect of rhetorical patterns in his book *Rhetorical Norms in Renaissance Literature* published in 1978 (166-88). More recently, Nancy L. Christiansen's short but detailed analysis of one of Satan's soliloquies from Book I in *Figuring Style: The Legacy of Renaissance Rhetoric* (2013) serves to exemplify the density of rhetorical figures found in that passage (187-91). Another brief but equally informative and noteworthy contribution to the ongoing discussion about rhetoric in *Paradise Lost* is Jennifer Richards' description of the type of deliberative oratory employed by the fallen angels as they debate in Book II, in *Rhetoric*, published in 2008 (38-41). This kind of deliberative oratory will be especially important to my discussion in the section exploring the fallen angels' rhetoric. Christopher Ricks' influential *Milton's Grand Style* (1963) does not concern itself with rhetorical analysis, but rather, as the title suggests, explains and defends the style employed by Milton, particularly in *Paradise Lost*. Ricks does not shy away from discussing the moments where the style falters, but favours the successful moments more (17-20). This brief survey of the existing scholarship shows that although there has been some close analysis of Milton's use of rhetoric in selected passages, the most prevailing interest has been in determining Milton's views on rhetoric. Significantly, Satan has often been highlighted as the character carrying the answer to this question. This thesis does not argue for one side of this debate. What I seek to achieve is to show that Milton's highly complex and advanced use of rhetoric throughout the poem is essential to the shaping of its major characters. By analysing the various rhetorical techniques used with each one, I want to argue that Milton's employment of rhetoric may reveal important character traits and trigger certain reactions in the reader.

Milton's accomplishment in this respect deserves more attention. By employing handbooks by several Humanist rhetoricians, I wish to demonstrate that each character's utterances reveal their strengths and weaknesses. Focusing exclusively on Satan's rhetoric renders an inadequate understanding of Milton's accomplishment. For that reason, I shall also analyse other characters that are represented in different ways in terms of rhetoric and style.

The practice of employing rhetoric had been a predominant aspect of Renaissance literature and culture. The art of rhetoric had flourished in ancient Athens and Rome and was revived and renewed during the Renaissance as a part of the rediscovery of the classics (Richards 65-66). The publication of works by Aristotle, Quintilian and Cicero during the fifteenth-century had a major impact on the art of writing, although alterations to fit the Renaissance period were made (Kennedy 11-12). Renaissance humanists were concerned with free will and the potential benefits of persuasion, and rhetoric and eloquence were thought to be vital aspects of society (Reid 9). Living between 1608 and 1674, Milton saw the end of the Renaissance, and lived through the Restoration period as the seventeenth-century progressed (Forsyth 15, 220). Milton was educated at St Paul's School and later at Cambridge (Worden 357). This meant that he had acquired extensive formal training in rhetoric and oratory as this was a key component in the classical curriculum (Chaplin 283-84; Vickers 54). The impact of rhetoric in English literature was enforced by the sheer number of books on rhetorical theory that were produced and published towards the end of the sixteenth-century (Vickers 44). Rhetorical training was given, albeit to male students mainly (Richards 70-71). There were several English handbooks that can be said to have worked as manuals on style that Milton's educated readership would have been familiar with, such as Henry Peacham's *The Garden of Eloquence* (1577) and *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589) by George Puttenham. Milton still wrote Latin poems for publication at a time when English had long since established itself as the standard language for printed poetry, and thus it has been argued that Milton was "the last of the Renaissance humanist poets" (Hammond 42).

It has been suggested that the Latin tradition and the domination of humanist rhetoric slowly began to wane in England from the 1650s onwards (Binns 391-92). We can find traces of this change in Milton's own writings, particularly in his *Art of Logic*, published in 1672 (Donnelly 353). In the preface to this work, Milton describes logic as "the first of all arts" and contends that rhetoric is the least important part of the traditional trivium consisting of grammar, logic and rhetoric (*Complete Prose Works* 211, 216). Milton's preference for logic appears closely linked to the Frenchman Petrus Ramus' proposed reform of education, commonly thought to have prioritised logic at the expense of rhetoric which was reduced to

an art of superficial ornamentation (Shore 12). However, the study of rhetoric was still an important aspect of Ramus' handbooks (Mack 142). At the time when Milton wrote *Paradise Lost*, there was also a growing tendency, especially among men of science and religion, to view stylistic embellishments as negative on the grounds that excessive use of figures and devices could distort the truth of the matter (Shore 12-13; Richards 72-74). Another fascinating aspect of the *Art of Logic* is a statement by Milton clearly contending that logic as an art form should not be applied too vigorously or too sparsely. He likens it, with a use of *simile*, to an excessive reliance on medicine and remedies as opposed to one's own natural strength (Milton, *Complete Prose Works* 211-12).

When *Paradise Lost* was first published in 1667 it only contained ten books. However, a new version appeared in 1674 and this time in twelve books. This immediately created the still prevailing impression that Milton wanted to emulate the twelve-book structure of Virgil's *The Aeneid.* This move tied Milton's poem to neoclassicism and the revival of classical works (Corns 119). Milton expands on the traditional notion that epic poems should be centred around national themes as he broadens it to encompass a universal subject (Loewenstein 148). As an epic poem *Paradise Lost* contains several components that are to be expected in this genre, such as the cataloguing of Satan's troops, combats, holy warfare and war councils (Welch 71). Satan and his crew are described in a more heroic mode as opposed to the georgic mode used with the unfallen Adam and Eve. The georgic elements of responsibility and labour and the heroic representations of bravery in the battlefield influence the way the characters are presented (Lewalski 117-18). This might indicate that their styles correlate to their respective roles within the epic. Given the genre, a grand style in the language of the poem is to be expected (Ricks 22). The notion of decorum is key to understanding how theories of style had been developed during the heyday of humanist rhetoric. Puttenham, for instance, provides an account of the three levels of style as well as decorum (148-53). The three levels of style can be described as high, middle and plain. The style corresponds to the subject matter of which one speaks. Therefore, the high style should only be employed when dealing with divine matters or noble and important people as well as pivotal historical events. Genres often associated with this style are hymns and writings of history. The middle style is associated with a more common mode of speech, not aspiring to relate divine matters but rather aspects concerning honest citizens. Comedies and love poetry were genres linked to this style. Lastly, the plain style is often associated with homely matters and is often employed in pastoral poetry, which is poetry that typically involves shepherds and the simple rural life. Failing to adhere to these rules of decorum would reveal one's lack

of eloquence and theoretical knowledge of rhetoric (Puttenham 152-53). Decorum pertains to adapting one's style according to the subject. One should also consider one's own standing and the audience (Puttenham 151). Decorum has a moral element to it as well. This was developed by Cicero and further emphasised by the humanists with a focus on the speaker's subjectivity and awareness (Hariman 204). Thus, how the characters adhere to decorum indicate traits revealing either honourable or dishonourable moral values. The theory of style and decorum was initially outlined in great detail by Aristotle and later Cicero (Kennedy 74). According to Aristotle's *The Art of Rhetoric*, one may seek to persuade the audience either through one's own strengths of character (*ethos*), by logical proofs (*logos*) or by stirring emotions in the audience (*pathos*) (74-75; Kennedy 8-9). Aristotle also discussed three modes of oratory that are transferable to written texts: forensic (for use in the courtroom), epideictic (for offering praise or blame in ceremonial settings) and finally deliberative (for use in political contexts). The idea was that one should fashion one's style according to the type of oration (Aristotle 80, 242-44). Cicero expanded on this in *De Oratore*, or *On the Ideal Orator,* and introduced the concept of virtues of style: speaking correctly and with clarity. Additionally, adapting one's speech appropriate to the specific situation is considered important. Finally, one should speak from knowledge derived from experience (Cicero 234-39). Quintilian, in *Institutio Oratoria*, or *The Orator's Education*, also argued for the orator adapting his speech to be more persuasive towards the audience, which would then be better equipped to understand (152). Authors such as Peacham and Puttenham expanded upon these ideas in ways that provide today's readers with useful information about the function of rhetorical figures from the period leading up to Milton's time.

Theory and method

In this thesis I shall be relying on both Renaissance and modern handbooks on rhetorical theory. Peacham's *The Garden of Eloquence* (1577) has proved useful in its description of the precise function of various figures. The author states in the dedication that his aim is to provide a book on eloquence in English (A2v). Another handbook that I shall be referring to is Puttenham's *The Arte of English Poesie* from 1589, which sets out to provide readers with explanations in English of the Greek and Roman names attributed to rhetorical figures (5-6). Using these handbooks to understand the function of various figures occurring in Milton's epic, I aim to demonstrate how rhetoric helps shape each character and our perception of them. Among modern scholarly handbooks of rhetorical terms, Nancy L. Christiansen's *Figuring Style* (2013) gives valuable information on Renaissance rhetoric and also contains

an extensive list of rhetorical figures (abbreviated as *FS* in subsequent chapters). I shall be taking advantage of Christiansen's list of figures, names and definitions to identify and describe my findings. Another handbook that will appear frequently throughout this thesis is Edward P.J. Corbett and Robert J. Connors' *Classic Rhetoric for the Modern Student* (abbreviated as *CR* in subsequent chapters). This book contains a comprehensive list of rhetorical figures. It also illustrates Cicero's notion of figures of thought (how one conveys an idea) and figures of speech (the way in which one forms a speech) from *De Oratore* (Cicero 287-289). Each figure of speech in Corbett and Connors' book is placed in one of two categories – schemes and tropes. Both are linguistic deviations: schemes relate to the arrangement of words and tropes to the meaning of a word (*CR* 379). This knowledge is particularly helpful when analysing the function of figures. The last source for definitions and naming of figures analysed is the online web resource *Silva Rhetoricae: The Forest of Rhetoric*, provided by Gideon O. Burton of Brigham Young University (abbreviated as *SR* in subsequent chapters). This web-based scholarly encyclopedia gives detailed explanations of every aspect of rhetoric, such as types of oratory and means of persuasion, and also offers a comprehensive list of figures. I shall refer to both the various explanations given of different types of rhetorical theory and the definitions of various terms to be found there. In using these handbooks and resources, I have sought to get a better understanding of the figure and its typical function. When conducting a close analysis of a selection of speeches and passages from the poem, I have attempted to identify the figures by name and explain their function in the specific poetic context. Because today's readers may not be familiar with the figures, I identify them by name and, at the first mention in each section, also by definition. Literary terms that are still widely known today, such as *anaphora*, *simile*, alliteration, metaphor and assonance, will only be defined once. When studying Milton's use of rhetoric more closely the number of devices identified may perhaps appear somewhat daunting, and because the same type of figure often occurs many times there is a risk that the naming of technical terms may appear repetitive. It is my hope, however, that the reader of this thesis will take these identifications as evidence of Milton's exceptionally nuanced employment of rhetorical figures in portraying his epic characters. Some sections of my analysis will contain a large number of references to various figures, my purpose then being to document how such abundance serves as a means of characterisation.

What can these rhetorical devices tell us about the characters? The extent to which Milton's use of rhetorical figures contributes to the characterisation of Satan and the others will be an essential part of my reading of *Paradise Lost*. The speaker of the poem goes to

great lengths to describe those deemed responsible for the fall of mankind. Even though narrative theory is most often applied to narrative prose, it may also prove useful in analysing epic poetry. As Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan explains in *Narrative Fiction*, indirect presentation displays character traits in terms of action, speech, external appearance and environment (61-67). These can all be found in *Paradise Lost* and they contribute to the reader's perception of the characters. Language is the most significant part of how we come to know them, but the other modes of presentation also deserve recognition. Although environment will not be a dominant element of my analysis, it is important to note that the narrator's description of an individual character's immediate surroundings and situation presents us with crucial clues. For example, the fiery lake that the narrator describes, on which the fallen angels lay chained, can be said to reflect the nature of the characters as well as their dire situation (*PL* I.52). Contrastingly, the physical surroundings of Adam and Eve in their prelapsarian state are reminiscent of pastoral scenes, especially evident in Book IV. In terms of speech, we are informed of whether to read the poetic characters' utterances as addressing an audience inside the poem, as a soliloquy or as part of a conversation. The way the narrator chooses to describe the physical state and external appearance of the character will direct us to read their speech in a specific way. Belial, for instance, is described as someone who is superficially eloquent, although his thoughts are vulgar (*PL* II.108-18). Inside the poem, the characters are described as entering into dialogues with each other, but also as addressing groups of listeners, whether large or small. This is described by the narrator and can be said to be designed to have an effect on the immediate audience inside the poem, on an implied readership and on the audience of actual readers. At the time of writing his epic Milton could count on his readers' familiarity with the Biblical characters. Depending on their degree of education, his seventeenth-century readers would also be familiar with techniques of persuasion that readers today generally have little knowledge about (Vickers 54). As such, this thesis documents the rhetorical techniques that Milton has used in building his characters.

Chapter overview

My thesis consists of three chapters that focus on different characters. Each chapter is made up of three sections in order to better argue for the rhetorical breadth and magnitude to be found in the author's portrayal of these characters. The different sections are not all structured identically, but will be explained at the start of each. The first chapter will focus entirely on Satan. I have chosen to dedicate a whole chapter to him as I think this may serve

as a useful starting point. Moreover, as an attempt to get a better understanding of the development of the style of Satan's rhetoric, I have chosen to structure the three sections according to passages occurring at the beginning, middle and near the end of Satan's part in the poem. Thus, each section will explore Satan's rhetoric in different settings and surroundings, as it is being related by the narrator. The first section will analyse Satan's initial speech, taking place in Book I. Here he is addressing an admittedly small immediate audience, his closest companion Beelzebub, trying to persuade him into wanting revenge. The next section investigates Satan's first soliloquy as he journeys towards the Garden of Eden. The main aim is to examine the way he talks when not speaking in front of a "live" audience. In the third section, I have chosen to analyse Satan's seduction of Eve in Book IX. I aim to demonstrate that the rhetoric applied with Satan is intricately adapted to different situations, but also to show that he commits rhetorical fallacies, revealing his role as the adversary and not the hero.

The second chapter will focus on the first human characters in the poem: Adam and Eve. The first section analyses Adam's narration of his first memory to Raphael in Book VIII. I shall then explore Eve's first memory as she relates it to Adam in Book IV. Here I will be looking at differences between the humans and Satan, but also between Adam and Eve as a man and a woman. The last section focuses on the human pair's conversations before and after the Fall. First I will analyse their squabble concerning their labouring in the garden and then contrast it with their postlapsarian argument the morning after the Fall. Both passages are to be found in Book IX. The third and last chapter will be dedicated to the rhetoric with characters residing in Heaven and Hell. The first section will focus on God's first speech in Book III. God's manner of speaking, although somewhat ornamented, differs greatly from Satan's embellished language in ways that reveal important traits in both characters. The second section looks at the unfallen angels Michael and Raphael as they appear throughout the entire poem, structured based on what I see to be important aspects of their rhetoric. Sent by God to educate and broaden Adam's and Eve's minds, the level of style the author has chosen for these angels seems particularly important in a poem that seeks to teach a moral lesson about the natures of virtue and vice, good and evil. The last section examines the fallen angels. I have chosen to look at the speeches made by Moloch, Belial and Mammon in Book II, as Satan and his crew debate the best way to avenge what they see as an injustice done to them by God. I have chosen not to include Beelzebub's contribution to the debate. The reason is that he only makes an argument that is thought out and planned by Satan

whereas the three speakers I concentrate on make their own cases, and I want to prove how their individual rhetoric is notably different yet telling of their grisly natures.

How does the variety of rhetorical figures and the different types of speech represented contribute to build and shape the characters of *Paradise Lost*?

1 “The infernal serpent”

1.1 Satan’s first speech

The character of Satan in *Paradise Lost* has been the subject of much debate and it is therefore fitting to begin my analysis with him. My exploration of Satan’s rhetoric will be structured by means of a close-reading of selected passages. To explore how Satan’s rhetoric evolves throughout the narrative I have chosen sections corresponding roughly to the beginning, middle and end of the poem. The first part of my analysis will be focused on Satan’s first speech in Book I (*PL* I.84-24). According to the narrator, of all the characters it is Satan who speaks first. Thus, the reader is immediately introduced to him and must form an impression of his character. Given that Satan has often been regarded as the heroic character in the epic, his style can be expected to be highly ornamental in order to move his audience. Taking into account his true nature, however, that level of style will in such case reflect Satan’s twisted sense of grandeur. In keeping with decorum, his ignoble intentions and hankering for lying should exclude him from employing the high style (Müller 748; Puttenham 151-52).

Actually, the narrator introduces the character of Satan before he is allowed to speak: “The infernal serpent; he it was, whose guile / Stirred up with envy and revenge, deceived / The mother of mankind” (*PL* I.34-36). Here, the narrator is reminding us to be cautious when it comes to the character of Satan. Furthermore, this description reveals that Satan is not truthful which in turn signifies that his style is not based on reason but purely on ornamentation. The use of the words “guile” and “deceive” should also warn us that this is a character who may fool us. One can also read this as a warning – his eloquence may be a way for him to persuade us in order to get his way. In other words, possible ulterior motives should be taken into consideration when we listen to him. Additionally, one could argue that the narrator in his introduction of Satan is discrediting the character’s *ethos*, the appeal of the personality or character of the speaker (*CR* 32). Significantly, the narrator tells us briefly about the events that preceded Satan beginning his narration. Hence, we get the seemingly truthful version first in order for the reader not to get fooled by Satan’s words. The opening of *Paradise Lost* begins right in the middle of events, *in medias res*, and corresponds to the structure of an epic poem. The reader is informed that Satan and his comrades have been expelled from Heaven after attempting to match God and also waging war (*PL* I.37-49).

Later, when Adam is conversing with Raphael in Book V, the reader gets a fuller picture of what led to Satan's fall. In Book I, however, there is the narrator's word for what happened and Satan's version as well. The speaker spends the first lines of the poem declaring his dependence on the "heavenly Muse" (*PL* I.6) and we can therefore assume that he is establishing his own *ethos* as someone who will be truthful and who has been guided by a divine spirit. In so doing, the narrator provides important information in order for the reader to make a decision as to whose version to believe. What about Satan then, who lies beaten and dumbfounded in Hell with his crew after being expelled from Heaven (*PL* I.51-53)? Satan recognises his right hand, Beelzebub, lying beside him and thus begins his first speech (*PL* I.78-83). It is the first utterance spoken by a character other than the speaker, but one must take into account that it is meant for several audiences. The utterance is spoken to Beelzebub, but also the speaker and the reader. Considering the structure of a classical oration one would normally start by establishing one's authority, thus persuading through *ethos* (*SR*, "Arrangement"). Is Satan establishing his authority with Beelzebub or the speaker and the reader? I argue mainly for the former, although the reader may also read this as an appeal to his "brave rebel" - character. Satan begins his oration by expressing shock and grief at the sight of his fallen comrade: "If thou beest he; but oh how fallen!" (*PL* I.84). He goes on to compare Beelzebub's new state to his former more glorious self. One may describe this way of speaking in terms of the figure *anamnesis* (Greek, "reminiscence") that pertains to the idea of calling something to mind (*FS* 263). This is considered a figure of *ethos* (*SR*, "Figures of *Ethos*"). In so doing, by recalling Beelzebub's former glory, Satan ensures his position as a reliable companion, but he also reminds Beelzebub of his position as Satan's ally. Satan uses several rhetorical devices in order to remind Beelzebub of their predicament. An important factor here is Satan's stress on the problem shared between them. I would argue that later in the same speech Satan contradicts himself to a certain extent in that his focus is then mainly on himself and how God will never make him submit to his rule (*PL* I.110-11). However, Satan initially describes their "equal hope / And hazard in the glorious enterprise" (*PL* I.88-89). The alliteration, the repetition of consonants in nearby words, on the H sounds in this phrase works to further emphasise the equality between the words "hope" and "hazard" (*CR* 388). Could this occurrence be described as excessive? By having the word "equal" and alliteration in the two words Satan wants to emphasise, "hope" and "hazard," one can argue that he could do without one of these. In that case, this constitutes an example of the figure *pleonasmus* (Greek, "superfluity"), which is a stylistic vice that consists of redundancy in the sense of including words and phrasal repetitions that

are unnecessary (*FS* 445; Peacham F2r). Here it pertains to the superfluous inclusion of the word "equal" when there is alliteration in the words he wants to equate. The fallacy Satan commits might also be characterised as *poicilogia* (Greek, "elaborately colored"). This figure pertains to the overuse of ornamentation (*FS* 446). The alliteration in the words Satan wants to emphasise, coupled with the word "equal," can be read as excessive. One may argue that this reveals a character flaw – that he is someone who deceives, who will embellish his language and forego the moral or cognitive aspects. Perhaps it shows Satan's flaws as a rhetorician as well, in that he is guilty of overusing stylistic devices. If we turn to the rest of the speech, Satan argues that Beelzebub joined him in this dangerous and ambitious mission which has led them to be "joined / In equal ruin" (*PL* I.90-91). The repetition of the words "equal" and "joined" in succeeding clauses enforces the impression of their equally dire situations. As such, this constitutes an example of the figure known as *conduplicatio* (Latin, "with doubling"). This figure conveys intensity by repeating a word or a phrase in consecutive clauses (*FS* 215). This strengthens the sense of joined misery that it seems Satan wants Beelzebub to feel. The figure occurs several times during the first part of the utterance when Satan is directly addressing Beelzebub. The exclamation "but oh how fallen! how changed" certainly helps Satan play the part of a worried friend (*PL* I.84). Furthermore, Satan says "into what pit thou seest / From what height fallen" (*PL* I.91-92). There are thus a few instances of figures of repetition to be found here. These are usually thought to belong to figures of speech, as opposed to figures of thought, which have to do with the specific way we express ourselves, thus placing the ornamentation on a linguistic level (*CR* 377; *SR*, "Figures of Speech/ Figures of Thought"). As Satan appears to embellish his language more than focusing on ideas, the intention seems to be to hide the fact that his ideas are selfish. Instead, the figures of repetition may dazzle the hearer. This way of persuasion is sure to cause a reaction in Satan's immediate audience, which is Beelzebub. Though I stated that, as in classical oratory, Satan's speech starts with an emphasis on the speaker's character, one can also find figures of repetition that aim at persuasion through *pathos*. This aberration could be part of the reason why so many readers empathise with the character of Satan. At the same time, one might argue that part of establishing one's character before an audience is to show kindness and to be trustworthy. As we read on we come to find that Satan needs Beelzebub to be at his side during the debate between the fallen angels.

Thus far the main focus in Satan's first utterance has been Beelzebub, but in line 93 he acknowledges God and the Son, though not directly: "so much the stronger proved / He with his thunder" (*PL* I.92-93). This is an interesting choice of words. It constitutes the figure

known as *metonymia* (Greek, "change of name"), which is the figure describing a thing by something to which it has some relation (*FS* 251). As the reader comes to learn in Book VI, the Son wielded thunder when he settled the war in Heaven (*PL* VI.764). The figure is named "the Misnamer" in English by George Puttenham who explains that it is helpful for conveying what the speaker intends to highlight (180-81). Here is a certain clue as to Satan's villainous character, as he makes it sound as if the Son, and ultimately God, came out victorious in this battle because of their strength as well as extraneous factors. As we are well aware, in this poem the character of God is omnipotent which invalidates Satan's exclamation. Satan has already disclosed his resistance to using proper names, as he called Heaven "the happy realms of light" (*PL* I.85). It shows perhaps Satan's rebellious nature, his problems with authority and certainly his un-Christian behaviour. What follows is a series of rhetorical questions. He asks, "till then who knew / The force of those dire arms?" (*PL* I.93-94). The general term for rhetorical questions is *erotema,* asking a question in order to prove your point (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). According to Puttenham who translated this figure into "the Questioner" in English, the figure can be used to ask something you could in reality assert firmly yourself (211). Henry Peacham argues that by employing this figure the speaker can strongly deny or affirm something (L3r). The figure can be helpful as a way to affect the audience's response (*CR* 404-05). In more specific terms, the question asked by Satan warrants the term *epiplexis*. This functions as a way to place blame elsewhere and excuse Satan for not knowing how great God's powers are (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). By so doing Satan reveals his lack of insight into God's powers, but he is also placing the blame elsewhere. It is worth mentioning that the word "dire" in order to describe God's powers is yet another clue for the reader not to take what Satan says for granted. Although the reader has already been given a hint by the narrator, Satan certainly gives the impression of rebelling against a most tyrannical leader. In his description of God's powers, alliteration occurs throughout in the words "thunder," "then," "the" and "those" (*PL* I.92-94). Depending on the audience, this could sound pleasing to the ear or alternatively rouse them to action. However, it could also be seen to be excessive. If so, one may characterise this occurrence as the figure of *tautologia* (Greek, "repeating what has been said"). This figure is a vice – the unnecessary repetition of words, ideas and sounds (*FS* 448). According to Peacham, this figure is "unprofitable" (F3r). This is an important aspect of Satan's rhetoric which I would argue is somewhat ambiguous –it is up to the reader to make up his or her own mind whether it is pleasing or bothersome. It does also seem as if Satan makes the suggestion that the outcome of the fight was uncertain and that God's powers were surprising. I would argue that

this shows his flawed reasoning, because God's omnipotence should have been evident. Thus, one may describe this way of speaking in terms of another figure of vice: *paralogismus* (Greek, "fallacious"). This figure pertains to wrong reasoning (*FS* 444). As mentioned earlier, Satan spends the first part of the utterance persuading through *ethos.* Now, as expected if we look at the classical way of arranging one's speech, Satan follows this by unfolding his version of what happened and his own reasoning for his actions. He is attempting to persuade through *logos*. This entails appealing to reason (*CR* 32).

According to classical rhetoric the middle part of the oration should be emphasising logical claims (*SR*, "Arrangement"). It appears that Satan runs into a few problems regarding his logical arguments and his appeal to reason. After dedicating nine lines to the concern of his friend Beelzebub, Satan now shifts the focus to himself, making sure to finally establish his character before moving on to the logical reasons. He says that neither God's surprising superiority nor his apparent rage-filled decisions will make him change his mind (*PL* I.94-96). Note how he attributes the decision of expelling Satan and his crew from Heaven to rage, thus hinting that God makes decisions while being clouded by overwhelming emotions. His choice of words adds to the picture Satan paints of a tyrannical leader who expels his inhabitants in a fit of rage and with no hesitation to use violent ends. He states that in spite of this he will not "repent or change, / Though changed in outward lustre" (*PL* I. 96-97). The words "change" and "changed" in this phrase constitute an example of the figure known as *polyptoton* (Greek, "with or in many cases"). This figure relates to applying a word repeatedly in varying forms (*FS* 222-23). Puttenham likens the use of this figure to how the tailor works with one type of material to produce various shaped garments (203-04). Satan appears a tragic hero who has been beaten down by a violent enemy, but who will not give up. He states that his "fixed mind / And high disdain, from sense of injured merit, / That with the mightiest raised me to contend" (*PL* I.97-99). It certainly sounds like he was forced to take action. In the subsequent clause Satan calls the fight a "contention" (*PL* I.100). The occurrence of the words "contend" and "contention" in close proximity may be described as the figure *homoioartron* (Greek, "beginning alike"). This phonetic device pertains to employing words with syllables that have the same beginning close to each other (*FS* 201). Thus, Satan's portrayal of the war in Heaven as a disagreement illustrates his delusion. Others who opposed God's reign were also brought into the fight, with Satan referring to them as those "that durst dislike his reign, and me preferring" (*PL* I.102). In this seemingly subtle subordinate clause the reader gets the reason for Satan's role as a leader, as he wants it to appear. Here is the evidence, as it were. Furthermore, this instance constitutes an example

of the logical figure *aetiologia* (Greek, "giving a cause"), as Satan is confirming a statement by giving evidence (*FS* 357). Puttenham calls this figure "the Tell cause" and argues that it provides credence because the application makes it seem as if the speaker discloses the real reason to the audience (228-29). He is confirming why the focus is on him and his "injured merit" (*PL* I.98). Yet what strikes me as particularly important about this statement is the brevity of the clause "and me preferring" and its placement (*PL* I.102). The clause is indeed very short, consisting only of three words and five syllables. As such, it warrants the term *comma* (Greek, "that which is cut off") in that it is a short clause or phrase consisting of less than twelve syllables (*FS* 231). It is in danger of being overlooked or at least receiving little attention as it is placed between longer clauses. It presents Satan as a chosen leader for a group of rebels who opposes an oppressor. Satan's statement has a clear democratic feel to it and it also makes him sound like a self-sacrificing figure. This helps establish his image as a brave hero. To the reader, Satan's involvement in the battle is explained very differently from the version Raphael relates to Adam in Book V. The impression of a group opposing a tyrannical ruler is emphasised, in contrast to just one unsatisfied figure who managed to bring together a crew to further his own cause. The long sentence ends thus: "His utmost power with adverse power opposed / In dubious battle on the plains of heaven, / And shook his throne" (*PL* I.103-05). The use of *diacope* emphasises the equality between the battling sides. This rhetorical figure repeats the same word with only a few other words in between (Peacham J3v). Its function is to strongly express feeling and it is therefore considered valuable in producing *pathos* (*SR*, "Figures of *Pathos*"). Though this is undoubtedly true, I would argue that an added effect in this speech concerns logic. If we consider Satan's words it sounds as if the sides are equal and that their powers are equally strong. Moreover, Satan uses the word "dubious" to describe the battle, thus confirming my point. The outcome of the battle, of course, was not in doubt. Neither were the powers of the fallen and unfallen angels of equal strength as the one side was God's side. Surely Satan would be aware of this, showing his delusions and thoughts of grandeur. Admittedly, for first time readers his manner of speaking may sound heroic and admirable. It is understandable that Satan often has been cast as the poem's surprising hero, considering how he appears on a superficial level if one takes his words at face value. One can also accuse Satan of fallacious reasoning when he states that he and his crew were so powerful that they shook God's throne, as it implies a greater power than they did possess. In Book VI Raphael tells Adam that the fallen angels shook "All but the throne itself of God" (*PL* VI.834). Hence, Satan is lying in this instance. He is making himself and his actions seem more powerful than they really are. One might

argue that this constitutes an example of the rhetorical vice *bomphiologia*, exaggerating his own role to seem more important (*SR*, "Stylistic Vices"). This figure is described as "Pompious speech" by Puttenham and is further explained as using too lofty words and showing poor rhetorical skills (259-60). It is fair to assume that Satan knows Beelzebub shares his delusions and will not find this inconsistency alarming. His speech here certainly shows that Satan is not concerned with telling the truth. What follows this dishonest statement is another rhetorical question: "What though the field be lost?" (*PL* I.105). Because Satan provides an answer himself the question can be characterised as the type of *anthypophora* (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). The answer is "All is not lost" (*PL* I.106). He then lists a number of things that are indeed not lost – will, want of revenge, hate and the courage to stand firm in your beliefs (*PL* I.106-08). The sentence ends with a new rhetorical question: "And what is else not to be overcome?" (*PL* I.109). Satan appears to be pondering the opportunities given their situation and what to do next, and this can be seen as an example of the figure known as *aporia* (Peacham M1v; *SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). The figure helps Satan appear complex, almost human, in his uncertainty. We also recognise the figure known as *anaphora* in the repetition of the word "And" at the beginning of consecutive clauses (*PL* I.107-09; *FS* 226). The listing of all the things, circumstances in this case, that are not lost can be said to constitute an example of *enumeratio* (*FS* 276). The function of this figure can be said to amplify what the speaker wants to convey (Peacham R3v). Yet again we can fault Satan for his rhetorical skills and blame him for employing too many figures at once.

This passage directly follows another where we know Satan is lying. Thus, shortly after making a false statement Satan proceeds to fill the next passage with several rhetorical figures. In this instance he appears to be guilty of using figures of speech more than figures of thought. It seems the purpose is ornamentation as opposed to exposing the truth. I would argue that this section appears to fit in with persuasion through reasoning, as Satan gives evidence to back up his argument that they cannot give up, however faulty his evidence may be on a closer inspection. I argued above that the rhetorical question that ends his list of things that are not lost is the type of *aporia*, as it seems as though he is deliberating the best way to proceed. However, this apparent uncertainty appears quite superficial. I would argue that Satan's mind has been made up all along. As he said earlier in the speech, his mind is "fixed" (*PL* I.97). What follow this rhetorical question are reasons for why fighting God's rule is the right thing to do. Satan's choice of words describing God's actions shines a light on the nature of his character. The word "glory" to describe the feeling God will get from subduing Satan which he, according to Satan, will do by "his wrath or might," makes the

character of God seem malicious, possessing several character traits similar to a tyrant (*PL* I.110). Moreover, God is again described as an emotional character. One may characterise Satan's way of speaking here in terms of the figure *electio* (Latin, "a choice"), that is demonstrating why it is necessary to do something (*FS* 275). Satan is explaining why he is choosing to oppose God. In this instance, Satan wants to make it clear why it was and still is impossible for him to subject himself to God's rule (*PL* I.111-13). Additionally, Satan argues that God feared for his kingdom, though interestingly he uses the word "empire" (*PL* I.113-14). This is not correct, as we know the outcome of the rebellion has always been evident to God. Here Satan is attempting to undermine God's powers and authority. This leads me to argue for an occurrence of the figure *antirrhesis* (Greek, "refutation") as it pertains to rejecting your opponent's authority (*FS* 367). *Conduplicatio* is to be found yet again when Satan says "that were low indeed, / That were an ignominy and shame beneath / This downfall" (*PL* I.114-16). His purpose seems to be to emphasise the feeling of injustice done to Satan and his crew and to that purpose *conduplicatio* is a fitting device. It also occurs in the following clauses as "since" is repeated twice when describing why the injustice done to the fallen angels is so grave (*PL* I.116-18). I would argue that Satan is now attempting to persuade his audience through appealing to their emotions, thus following the classical arrangement of an oration in which one concludes by using figures of *pathos* (*SR*, "Arrangement"). This mitigates that Satan may be seen to rely too heavily on repetitions, as *conduplicatio* is indeed a figure of *pathos* (*SR*, "Figures of *Pathos*"). His display of indignation could perhaps be seen as the figure *aganactesis* (*SR*, "Figures of *Pathos*"). Satan comes across as the wounded party entirely without blame, and this enforces his delusional character. As the utterance is nearing its end Satan brings us back to the beginning: "in foresight much advanced, / We may with more successful hope resolve / To wage by force or guile eternal war" (*PL* I. 119-21). In the beginning of the speech he talked about the hope which he and Beelzebub had for their plan (*PL* I.88). Here he is bringing Beelzebub and the fallen angels directly into his speech. Following his brief initial focus on Beelzebub, Satan has spent most of the time talking of himself. He is therefore bringing together points he has made during the speech in order to emphasise his argument. He talks once again of the hope that they, by their new insight, should be able to outsmart God, but also further emphasises the role of God as a tyrant who "Sole reigning holds the tyranny of heaven" (*PL* I.124). This is the end of the speech and a powerful punchline. By addressing arguments and points he made earlier in his speech Satan can be said to employ the figure *accumulatio*, as he is bringing together points to form a climactic end to the speech (*SR*, "Arrangement"). Called

"the Heaping figure" by Puttenham, this figure is further explained as useful for refreshing the audience's memory and making the speaker appear earnest and impassioned (236-37). By using the word "tyranny" to describe God's rule, Satan's role as a brave hero fighting an oppressor is further emphasised. The fact that many readers often empathise with Satan is therefore not incidental. Tyranny is a word which undoubtedly stirs up feelings in most audiences and certainly in Satan's immediate listener, Beelzebub. Satan has given him evidence that their newfound hope could guide them to end the, in their eyes, tyrannical rule in Heaven. Another important aspect of the closing lines of Satan's speech is the fact that he is echoing the narrator in the poem when he speaks of "our grand foe" (*PL* I.122). He is using this to describe God, and falling into his pattern when doing so refrains from actually acknowledging his proper name.

After analysing Satan's first speech there are many aspects that strike me as important regarding his rhetoric. Satan's words, grand and arousing, are repeated often for a pleasing effect. However, one can argue that his insistence on using figures of repetition may seem jarring. His speech is arranged according to classical orations – he begins his speech establishing his character – then proceeds with logical arguments and ends with an emphasis on emotional appeals. Yet there is some discord to the arrangement. I find the middle part of his speech concerning reason to be problematic. His arguments are often false, as the reader will find out later in the poem, and there are several stylistic vices he is guilty of using. Additionally, the logic of the speech is rather weak. Traditionally, the part concerning reasoning would be the longest and most detailed one (*SR*, "Arrangement"). In Satan's first oration however, the focus is on him establishing his authority and also on the appeal to emotions in his audience. By his insistence on being the victim of an injustice done by a tyrannical ruler, his authority as a brave hero is established and the audience is induced to feel sympathy for his cause. By avoiding to spend time deliberating the logical arguments, the speech is lacking in sophistication. It might be said to rely too heavily on *ethos* and *pathos* and not enough on *logos* which is the one of the three means of persuasion with the most prestige. This may seem to demonstrate that while the audience is preoccupied with feelings of injustice and anger towards tyranny, they may not pay as much attention to the flaws in the logical parts of the speech. The speech analysed in this section is the first encounter we as readers have with Satan, and in the following sections I wish to explore if his rhetorical strategies change as the narrative evolves.

1.2 Satan's first soliloquy in Book IV

In the previous section of this chapter we studied Satan's first speech in Book I. I would now like to turn to his first soliloquy in Book IV to compare and contrast the rhetorical figures found in the two different situations and stages of the poem. A soliloquy is spoken by a character alone and to himself. This speech functions as a device to reveal the inner thoughts of the character to the audience ("Soliloquy," def.), and therefore differs in several ways compared to Satan's first speech. The preceding section analysed the rhetoric used when Satan was performing a speech in front of an audience, albeit a small one. By so doing he was attempting to stir his trusted comrade to join him in action. In the soliloquy in Book IV, however, he is talking aloud to himself. Thus, his level of style should accordingly be less elevated. The narrator and the reader constitute a second layer of listeners to his utterance. When a speech such as this occurs in a narrative, the audience is allowed to listen in on the private thoughts of the speaker. Consequently, the reader is invited to judge the character based on his or her inner thoughts ("Soliloquy," def.). The speech could be read as Satan persuading himself to accept his fate, and as a consequence, the reader. An intriguing aspect of the utterance is that the reader gets a glimpse of the inner workings of the villain of the story. More importantly, the reader is presented with the motivations governing his actions and behaviour. Whereas the first speech focused on the wrongdoings that had been inflicted upon him, this lonely utterance has an altogether different tone. Here he is presenting a seemingly more truthful version of what happened. The way in which he presents the reasons for his actions is different from what one might possibly expect. The reader may find herself empathising with Satan after hearing his soliloquy. Some might even find his reasoning persuasive. Why this might be is the starting point for my analysis.

At this point in the story Satan and his comrades have decided upon a plan for corrupting God's newest creation – mankind. Satan has journeyed out through Hell and Chaos, and has his eyes set on Eden where the only living humans reside. I will start by analysing how the soliloquy is being introduced to us by the narrator. Satan is on his way to spy on Adam and Eve, though he has not yet seen them. The narrator describes Satan's actions as he is making his way to Eden, looking "Sometimes towards heaven and the full-blazing sun," when not looking in the direction of Eden (*PL* IV.27-29). His external appearance is explained as "grieved" and "sad" (*PL* IV.28). One might also wonder why Satan should look with sadness at Eden and the prospect of mankind. He has shown himself as a passionate character earlier, as my analysis demonstrated his fiery indignation over the injustice inflicted upon him by

God. The narrator describes "The hell within him" which he cannot escape (*PL* IV.20-23). As the narrator introduces Satan's soliloquy we are told he "thus in sighs began" (*PL* IV.31). I find the narrator's insistence upon repeating words with S sounds when describing Satan in the lines before his soliloquy highly significant, because it resounds with Satan's name (*PL* IV.23-31). Moreover, the play on S sounds also steers readers into making the connection between the character and the words "snake" and "sin."

Satan begins his solitary speech by addressing the sun: "O thou that with surpassing glory crowned, / Lookst from thy sole dominion like the God / Of this new world" (*PL*. IV.32-34). This passage can be characterised as the figure of *conformatio* (Latin, "shaping") because Satan is personifying the sun (*FS* 403). It could also be described as *animatio* (Latin, "animating"), and both figures of personification belong to the larger group of rhetorical devices of discourse, namely *prosopopoeia*. This rhetorical strategy expands on the idea of dramatising parts of the speech pertaining to persons or ideas by invented writing (*FS* 402-03). George Puttenham nicknamed the figure as "the Counterfeit in personation" – human attributes are transferred to and dramatised in inanimate things (239). This sort of impersonation is used to comment on the character of the object of the personification. The device is a dramatic one as it involves dialogue (*SR*, "Impersonation"). Furthermore, the speech directed at the sun starts with the exclamation "O" (*PL* IV.32). This constitutes an example of *desperatio,* a figure of discourse that expresses despair, either true or false (*FS* 385). The reader is informed that Satan is sad and grieved as he begins his speech. We are also given an indication of his tone of voice as he "in sighs began" (*PL*. IV.31). Satan thus begins his speech in apparent despair. Whether this despair is true or not must remain up to the reader to decide upon. However, the narrator has given us many clues as to Satan's internal hell, which he cannot escape. The character of Satan is thus presented as an emotional one. Furthermore, on a morphological level, the use of the word "Lookst" warrants the term *syncope* (*FS* 204). This device refers to the method of omitting the middle syllable in a word (*CR* 380). One can extend this further to also mean omitting the middle letter of a word (*FS* 204; *SR*, "Figures of Omission"). By omitting the middle letter "e" and thus the second syllable, the line is now in iambic pentameter. This makes Satan sound urgent and passionate, adding to his dramatic persona. Satan makes the sun sound eerily like a tyrant: "whose sight all the stars / Hide their diminished heads" (*PL* IV.34-35). Satan directly addresses the sun, "to thee I call, / But with no friendly voice" (*PL* IV.35-36). One can make the connection to Christ in this passage, considering the phonetical similarities between the words "sun" and "son." From this point on Satan's tone becomes slightly more aggravated.

The second exclamation further stresses this change in mood. Satan says, while addressing the sun directly: "and add thy name / O sun, to tell thee how I hate thy beams" (*PL* IV.36-37). This exclamation can be described as the type of *execratio* (Latin, "a curse") and portrays hate (*FS* 391). Two exclamations occurring near to each other that have different rhetorical purposes emphasise the fickleness of Satan's state of mind. Employing exclamations to first portray desperation which then leads to an exclamation of hate, one might say the readers are persuaded through *pathos* – through our emotions – as we feel empathy. Some readers may even be tempted to sympathise with the Devil. After expressing his hate towards the sun, Satan explains why it is present within him: "That bring to my remembrance from what state / I fell, how glorious once above thy sphere" (*PL* IV.38-39). Having such a clash of feelings within the character adds to Satan's complexity. This might be one reason why so many critics and readers have sided with this character as the hero of the poem. However, one must of course take into consideration whether the despair is actually real or simply intended as a means to instil sympathy in the reader. We have already been warned by the narrator that the character is deceitful. As stated earlier, this passage might persuade the readers by appealing to their own emotions. Yet one might also argue that Satan is persuading his readers through the authority of his character as a complex and suffering figure. When Satan recalls his past glory, he is employing the rhetorical device *anamnesis* (Greek, "reminiscence"), which involves calling something to mind (*FS* 263). *Anamnesis* is normally applied in order to establish the authority of the speaker (*SR*, "Figures of *Ethos*"). Satan gives a reason for his fall which is quite different from what he stated in Book I. He now attributes his fall to his own "pride and worse ambition" (*PL* IV.40). It is important to keep in mind, however, that Satan often changes his mind. This might imply Satan really taking the blame for his fall or a statement intended to make him seem credible. He does call God "heaven's matchless king" (*PL* IV.41). This is remarkable, or at least seemingly humble, for the adversary of mankind to say. Still, it can be read as a way of undermining God's authority as he is not simply a king, but the creator of all. One could describe this in terms of the figure *meiosis* (Greek, "diminishing"), and it is a way of subtly scoffing at an adversary or a rhetorical vice because it can reflect meagreness (*FS* 272, 443). What follows is another exclamation: "Ah wherefore! He deserved no such return / From me, whom he created what I was / In that bright eminence" (*PL* IV.42-44). This exclamation seems to me as another outcry of desperation. Thus, as in the beginning of his soliloquy, one can note another instance of *desperatio* and the tone of the soliloquy changes. However, with three exclamations in the beginning of the speech the impression of a profoundly emotional character is intriguing. It

makes Satan seem almost human in his flaws. However, as he is indeed an angel this might give us a clue as to his true nature. The reader is then presented with what appears to be an explanation of God's role and what he demanded of Satan. Satan even admits to being created by God – "me, whom he created" (*PL* IV.43). He admits that God's service was not hard (*PL* IV.45). Satan provides all the reasons for why he should not have fallen, and more importantly, reveals God's expectations of him. This strategy can be characterised as the figure known as *apantesis.* This pertains to displaying your opponent's claims which you will subsequently discredit (*FS* 367). It is important to recognise that Satan does not directly name God after calling him a king, but uses personal pronouns instead. *Conduplicatio* (Latin, "with doubling"), the repetition of a word in consecutive clauses, can be found in Satan's description of what God expected of him (*FS* 215) as the words "he" and "his" are repeated twice in the passage (*PL* IV.42-45). This serves to highlight the dependency which Satan will later reveal bothers him. One can note this in the following verses too, with the repetition of the word "him" in "What could be less than to afford him praise, / The easiest recompense, and pay him thanks, / How due!" (*PL* IV.46-48). I think it shows Satan's vicious feelings towards God and the refusal to be indebted to him. Indeed, he called God a king a few lines earlier, but this insistence on improper salutation shows Satan's rejection of God's powers. The exclamation of "How due!" at the end of the sentence strikes me as full of hatred and despair (*PL* IV.48). One may characterise this is as the rhetorical figure of *deinosis,* a forceful expression of hatred, envy and madness (*FS* 383). Furthermore, one might read this expression as Satan's despair at his own fault to express gratitude towards God. It can also be seen as a bitter exclamation, thus emphasising Satan's hate. Furthermore, one could say that what Satan is also doing in this passage is to foreshadow possible claims his opponents could use to their advantage. I would also argue that Satan is admitting his actions towards God were indeed low and petty. However, what comes next is a justification for his actions. Thus, one may describe this strategy in terms of *dicaeologia* as he admits his flaws, but later excuses them. It is a figure of self-justification either by excuses or by necessity (*FS* 385). Puttenham terms this "the Figure of excuse" in English and argues that the application of this figure can be seen to turn an unfortunate situation – being pressed to admit a flaw – into a profitable one by excusing it (230). According to Henry Peacham, this figure expands to involve defending our cause, either by an invented reason or as a necessary course of action (M4v). It may seem as if Satan is admitting his faults, but as we carry on reading it appears he has an excuse for it. Satan says, "Yet all his good proved ill in me, / And wrought but malice; lifted up so high / I sdeigned subjection" (*PL* IV. 48-50). God's goodness, Satan then

argues, is the reason why he could not do what in his words he should have done – subjected himself to God's rule. "Sdeigned" can be said to be a version of the Italian word *sdegnare* instead of using the word "disdained" as noted by Alastair Fowler in the footnotes to his edited version of *Paradise Lost* (218, n. *50).* As such, this can be an example of the type known as *poieticon* (Greek, "poetic vocabulary"). This figure pertains to borrowing poetic words and vocabulary (*FS* 222). On the other hand, one could argue that this occurrence warrants the term *permutatio.* This figure implies borrowing words from other languages into the speech (*FS* 220). Either way, the inclusion of this word in Satan's utterance serves as a figure of speech. It adds to the ornamentation of the language, as well as creating alliteration in "sdeigned subjection" (*PL* IV.50). Yet this use of such a word can also be said to be a rhetorical fallacy, namely *barbaralexis* (Greek, "using foreign words"). If one is guilty of employing this rhetorical vice one incorporates foreign words inappropriately in one's own speech (*FS* 436). Puttenham deemed improper usage of foreign words one of the gravest errors one could commit (250-51). Thus, Satan's rhetoric can often seem ambiguous – it can be seen as either successful or inadequate. It is then up to the reader to decide. The specific intention is impossible for us to know. I would argue that, paired with Satan's flawed logic, his rhetorical devices that may be seen as a vice should indicate his flawed and fallen nature. In the passage "lifted up so high / I sdeigned subjection, and thought one step higher / Would set me highest" one might observe figures of repetition, more specifically the type known as *polyptoton* (*PL* IV.49-51). This figure is termed "the Translacer" by Puttenham and relates to repeating variations of a word (203-04; *FS* 222). By structuring the repetition as "high," "higher," "highest" the readers can climb up to great heights along with Satan. This instance may be described as the figure *climax* because the arrangement involves three words to heighten the importance of the message (*CR* 393-94). Alternatively, it can be described in terms of *incrementum* (Latin, "growth") because of the increase in degrees (*FS* 287). Puttenham explained this figure to be highly ornamental and efficient (218). The essence of what troubled Satan before he fell becomes clear: "and in a moment quit / The debt immense of endless gratitude" (*PL* IV.51-52). Satan continues to list how this debt troubles him (*PL* IV.53). This can be described as *enumeratio* (Latin, "a counting up") and its function here appears to be to amplify the disadvantage of the debt (*FS* 276). Satan goes on seemingly admitting his flaws: "Forgetful what from him I still received, / And understood not that a grateful mind / By owing owes not, but still pays" (*PL* IV.54-56). In this passage we can observe the figure known as *anaclasis* (Greek, "reflection"). Belonging to the broader type *antanaclasis* which deals with puns, *anaclasis* entails twisting a word into an opposite

meaning (*FS* 213-14). Satan does this in the clause "By owing owes not" (*PL* IV.56). This is an example of his refusal to be indebted to and serve God.

Satan ends his explanation of the gratitude he argues he ought to be in possession of with a rhetorical question: "what burden then?" (*PL* IV.57). This rhetorical question is the type of *anthypophora,* as Satan immediately answers, and is termed the "Figure of response" by Puttenham (204; *SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). His answer to his own question is "Oh had his powerful destiny ordained / Me some inferior angel, I had stood / Then happy" (*PL* IV.58-60). Following Satan's logic, it is God who is to blame for his fall. The exclamation seems to be of the type of *desperatio.* One may note another occurrence of *dicaeologia* as Satan admits his flaws, which he then justifies by excusing himself – God created him so great that Satan had no chance to submit himself. Alliteration is to be found in the words "happy," "hope" and "had" in the following lines (*PL* IV.60-61). This emphasises the fact that his ambition was induced as a result of hope and innate greatness and that he seemingly would have wanted to have been created without this. Another rhetorical question, also an example of *anthypophora,* follows: "Yet why not?" (*PL* IV.61). Satan provides his own answer: someone else might have risen to equal greatness which would have led Satan to follow (*PL* IV.61-63). It may be apt to mention that Satan seems to think grandly about his own powers. He is certainly augmenting the description of himself, and one may therefore characterise this as the type *amplificatio* (*FS* 262). Surely his description of his own greatness could also be seen as a vice, through a figure known as *hyperbole* (Greek, "excess"). This figure pertains to exaggeration (*FS* 442). *Conduplicatio* is found in this passage, its function appears to be to indicate pity but also Satan's grandiose idea of himself and his powers. Satan argues that "Some other power / As great" might have replaced him if he himself had not been so great (*PL* IV.61-62). With only one clause in between he repeats this phrase with only a slight variation when saying "but other powers as great / Fell not" and can be characterised as *diacope* (*PL* IV.63-64). This figure relates to the repetition of words with only a few other words in between (*FS* 215; Peacham J3v). *Diacope* occurs in the following clause: "but stand unshaken, from within / Or from without, to all temptations armed" (*PL* IV.64-65). By having so much repetition Satan is using quite a lot of words to get his message across, which has a jarring effect.

Intent on steering the direction of the utterance in his desired way, Satan in addition takes advantage of *anthypophora* in the verse: "Hadst thou the same free will and power to stand?" (*PL* IV.66). As usual with this type of rhetorical question Satan answers it himself immediately: "Thou hadst: whom hast thou then or what to accuse, / But heaven's free love

dealt equally to all?" (*PL* IV.67-68). This passage constitutes an example of *antimetabole*, the repetition of words in subsequent clauses, but in reverse grammatical order (*CR* 394). Puttenham points out that this figure adds liveliness to one's utterance (208). Additionally, the repetition of "hadst" and "hast" may be characterised as *polyptoton* as the same word is repeated in varying degrees. Satan has once again answered his own rhetorical question with another. The type of rhetorical question is *epiplexis* as it appears he is trying to blame his inner desires on the free love he was offered (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). The blame is placed upon God, because it is he who instilled free will in his creations. Satan thus shows himself to be aware of his maker and his own free will. However, he does not take full responsibility for his actions, as his rhetorical questions emphasise. Satan considers himself doomed, "since love or hate, / To me alike, it deals eternal woe" (*PL* IV.69-70). *Polyptoton* is yet again to be found in subsequent sentences: Satan calls God's affection "love accursed," in one sentence, but begins the next one with "Nay cursed be thou" (*PL* IV.69-71). Another exclamation heightens the passionate speech: "Me miserable!" (*PL* IV.73). This strikes me as an emphatic exclamation and thus warrants the term *exclamatio* (Latin, "a crying out") which serves to function as an interjection (*FS* 391). Puttenham fittingly coins this "the Outcry," citing that it conveys the speaker's passion (212-13). This exclamation is followed by another rhetorical question: "Which way shall I fly / Infinite wrath, and infinite despair?" (*PL* IV.73-74). This is the type of *aporia* as it appears that Satan is deliberating what to do next in a doubtful manner (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"; Peacham M1v). *Diacope* occurs in the repetition of the word "infinite" twice with only two words in between. There is another figure to be found in this passage: *epitheton.* The figure is named "the Qualifier" by Puttenham and is applied by combining a noun and an adjective so that they function as one unit (176; *FS* 216). In this instance "infinite wrath" and "infinite despair" each becomes a unit. Hell gets another symbolic meaning for Satan: "Which way I fly is hell; myself am hell" (*PL* IV.75). It is no longer just the place to which he has been banned, but also a representation of his inner turmoil. Thus, the word "hell" is applied to convey the wider context of suffering and torment. Consequently, it is an example of *metonymia* as the word describes Satan's sufferings and substitutes cause for effect (*FS* 251). The figure is called "the Misnamer" by Puttenham who explains that it can be used to convey the speaker's intention through his portrayal of someone, whether he uses the right or wrong word (180-81). *Conduplicatio* occurs in the verses just discussed through the recurrence of many of the words. An instance of *polyptoton* is to be observed in the passage "And in the lowest deep a lower deep / Still threatening to devour me opens wide," as variations of the same word are

repeated (*PL* IV.76-77). One may also note another example of *diacope* by repeating the same words with only two other words separating them. Alliteration is to be found in the repetition of "hell" and in "lowest" and "lower." The sheer number of figures of repetition listed above signifies emotional persuasion. The clause "To which the hell I suffer seems a heaven" constitutes an example of *antiphrasis* (*PL* IV.78), as "heaven" is used contrary to its meaning (*FS* 255). Puttenham describes this figure as a "plaine and flat contradiction" (191). Another verbalisation of despair follows, characterised as *desperatio* and formulated as a rhetorical question: "Oh then at last relent: is there no place / Left for repentance, none for pardon left?" (*PL* IV.79-80). There is alliteration in the words "relent" and the twice repeated "left". This constitutes an example of *conduplicatio* which emphasises the urgency of Satan's words. The rhetorical question, the type of *anthypophora*, is answered by Satan himself. This enforces the view that Satan thinks he knows all the answers, but more importantly, that he wants to steer the listener in a specific direction as stated above. Rhetorical questions may serve as a way for the orator to lead his audience into a desired response (*CR* 404-05). The answer, which again repeats the word "left," reveals that Satan sees submission as the only solution for repentance and that is something he cannot do (*PL* IV.81-82).

As Satan talks about submission, there is alliteration – the repetition of S sounds in two or more words: "submission," "shame," "spirits," "seduced," "submit," and "subdue" (*PL* IV.81-86). Satan thus talks of seducing his fellow fallen angels. Another expression of despair, *desperatio*, can be found in his utterance "Ay me, they little know / How dearly I abide that boast so vain" (*PL* IV.86-87). His misery is clear as his despair grows. Satan then asks, with the use of *conduplicatio*, "But say I could repent and could obtain / By act of grace my former state" (*PL* IV.93-94). Satan's rhetoric emphasises the opportunity he is pondering – he only wants to repent if it would bring him back to his former glory. However, now the hopelessness of the situation is dawning on him: "Would height recall high thoughts" (*PL* IV.95). The instance of *polyptoton* in this phrase reminds the reader that Satan thinks his former greatness will once again lead him to transgress. Satan realises that his hate is too deep for repentance, "Which would but lead me to a worse relapse" (*PL* IV.100). He admits that God is aware of this inevitable fact (*PL* IV.103). Satan's mind is now made up: "So farewell hope, and with hope farewell fear, / Farewell remorse: all good to me is lost" (*PL* IV.108-09). One may observe several figures of repetition in this passage: *conduplicatio* and *diacope* as many of the words are repeated with just one or two words in between. There are also quite a few instances of alliteration occurring throughout these verses. By having so many repetitions one might accuse Satan of excessive ornamentation in this part of the

speech. This way of speaking is an example of the rhetorical vice known as *poicilogia* – excessive embellishment (*FS* 446). Satan goes on to personify evil: "Evil be thou my good; by thee at least / Divided empire with heaven's king I hold / By thee" (*PL* IV.110-12). As such, this passage constitutes an example of *conformatio* because Satan personifies evil, thereby confirming his chosen path. The *polyptoton,* the repetition of words with shared root, by repeating "thou" and "thee" underlines this. Satan ends his soliloquy by prophesising that mankind soon will know of his sinister plan (*PL* IV.113). This can be said to be an assertion, and indeed a confident one, which might be characterised as the type of *asseveratio* (Latin, "a vehement assertion"). This figure can be applied to convey a confident statement (*FS* 379).

Satan's soliloquy is noteworthy in many respects. The reader is presented with his inner thoughts and conflicting feelings. To enhance this there are plenty of rhetorical figures employed. Satan's reputation as a passionate character is certainly enforced in this soliloquy by the frequent use of exclamations of desperation, but also of anger. This conveys an impression of a highly passionate speaker whose mood changes frequently and which makes him easier to relate to for the reader. However, it is important to bear in mind that while these exclamations may be used truthfully, they can also be used on false pretences. Furthermore, I find the frequent use of figures of repetition to emphasise Satan's message, although this may also be seen as an exaggeration – that the language is too ornamented. The main figure of thought seems to be for Satan to admit to his own flaws, but then to excuse them and to place the blame elsewhere. He may therefore appear saddened by his dire circumstances, but his soliloquy leads him to acknowledge that his hate for God and the free will instilled in him are enough to motivate him to corrupt mankind. The exclamations appear less frequently towards the end of the speech. This may be a reflection of Satan's hardened heart – that his inner turmoil is turned into evil resolve. His admission of his own flaws and God's love may also seem to serve as a way to get the audience to feel sympathy for him. However, he refuses to assume any blame because his free will, instilled by God, denies him a chance of happiness. This should tell us about his failure to take responsibility for his actions.

In the next section I want to focus on his interactions with Eve in Book IX. In the first speech he spoke to one listener only, if we disregard the narrator and the reader. In the soliloquy Satan reasoned aloud and to himself. The aim of my analysis in the next section will be to explore if the rhetoric changes when he is interacting with another important character: the mother of mankind.

1.3 Satan's seduction of Eve

Whereas the previous sections analysed Satan's means of persuasion in a speech and a soliloquy, let us now consider the methods used to seduce Eve in Book IX. To what extent does Satan change or adapt his rhetoric in response to Eve? In order to answer this question, it is necessary to study Satan's various approaches in some detail, from his first encounter with her to the point where she finally appears to surrender. This moment, where Satan succeeds in persuading Eve to defy God's commands, represents the climax of Satan's grand plan and revenge. In such a context, the style of Satan's language has to be forceful and can thus be expected to be grand. This will in turn accentuate his excessive and manipulative nature. I wish to begin my analysis as Satan makes eye contact with Eve and begins his temptation (*PL* IX.527-31). Satan here emerges in the shape of a serpent. We will come to learn that this is a strategic choice on his part that is also in accordance with his rhetoric. As in Book I, the narrator warns the reader of Satan's true nature and of his "fraudulent temptation" before Satan is allowed to speak (*PL* IX.531).

Satan initiates the conversation with Eve by anticipating her apprehension about being approached by a serpent: "Wonder not, sovereign mistress, if perhaps / Thou canst, who art sole wonder, much less arm / Thy looks, heaven of mildness, with disdain" (*PL* IX.532-34). Satan is making good use of a device known as *ploce* (Greek, "twisting"). This is a figure of repetition where the same word is repeated in close proximity, but with a change of meaning (*FS* 221). In this case it is the word "wonder." At the first mention, the word is used as a verb, the "wonder not" assuring Eve that she need not be in doubt. The word is then used as a noun, to flatter her as representing a "wonder," implying admiration (*OED Online* wonder, n.I.1.c). Satan is thus employing figures of repetition from the first verses of his prepared speech. He is heavily praising Eve, calling her a wonder and a queen. Satan also echoes Adam's address to Eve that he overheard in Book IV, where Adam calls Eve "Sole partner and sole part of all these joys" (*PL* IV.411). Thus, Satan presents himself to Eve as credible, eloquent and someone who can be relied on for support. He is therefore persuading her through *ethos*. The fact that he is in the shape of a serpent with the ability to speak and his use of rhetoric amplify his intended message: that the fruit from the Tree of Knowledge has great powers. One may describe his way of complimenting Eve in terms of *adulatio* (Latin, "adulation) as this term involves flattery (*FS* 303). Calling Eve "sovereign mistress" is another aspect of Satan's flattery, but also a sign of his exaggeration. As we are well aware at this point in the epic, Eve is not sovereign and neither is Adam. Sovereignty in *Paradise Lost*

belongs to God. One may therefore argue that *hyperbole* (Greek, "excess") is to be found in this passage. The figure can be read here as a vice, a rhetorical fallacy, as *hyperbole* can be used for deception (*FS* 442). George Puttenham specifies that this figure should be applied discreetly and that its function is either to belittle or to praise a person or thing (191-92). Satan continues with flattery and figures of repetition as he justifies why he is approaching Eve. In the passage "Displeased that I approach thee thus, and gaze / Insatiate, I thus single, nor have feared / Thy awful brow, more awful thus retired" one can observe an occurrence of a type known as *diacope* (*PL* IX.535-37). The figure of *diacope* (Greek, "a cutting through") is achieved by the repetition of the word "awful" as the recurrence happens with only a few words in between (*FS* 215). Satan is establishing authority through his character, appearing honest and urgent, by his admittance of gazing at Eve. In other words, he appears to be speaking candidly and this strategy can be described in terms of *parrhesia* (Greek, "freedom of speech"). The figure involves begging the audience for the chance to speak freely or simply doing so without asking (*FS* 324-25). According to Puttenham, who named this figure "the Licentious," it can be applied when the orator plans to proceed to say something that may be perceived as scandalous or vulgar, as a way of excusing himself (227). Satan further flatters Eve by commending her virtues – "Fairest resemblance of thy maker fair" (*PL* IX.538). This can be characterised as the type of *comprobatio.* This figure is applied by commending virtues with a particular focus on the audience, and is often employed in order to establish one's character and appear generous (*SR*, "*Comprobatio*"; Peacham L2v). Yet another figure of repetition can be found in the same verse – *polyptoton.* This figure relates to the repetition of the same word, but in varying forms (*CR* 395). One may observe this figure as the words "Fairest" and "fair" are to be found near each other. The adulation continues before Satan pauses to let Eve reply. He continues with a long proclamation of Eve's beauty in which one may observe a plethora of figures of repetition. Alliteration is used in the passage "Thee all things living gaze on, all things thine / By gift, and thy celestial beauty adore / With ravishment beheld" (*PL* IX.539-41). An occurrence of *conduplicatio* can also be found in the phrase "all things." This figure pertains to the repetition of the same phrase or word in consecutive clauses for vehemence (*FS* 215). The variations of the word "thee" in "thine" and "thy" constitute another example of *polyptoton*. By including figures of repetition to such an extent, Satan could be seen to almost lull his listener into believing him. Alternatively, his speech can be read as consisting of too much repetition and consequently one might describe this in term of the stylistic vice known as *tautologia* or "the figure of selfe saying" as Puttenham dubbed it (254). This rhetorical fallacy relates to the exaggerated

repetition of the same words, ideas and sounds (*FS* 448). According to Henry Peacham, this figure is an unprofitable one, the repetition appearing wearisome only to the audience (F3r-v). In the lines that follow, Satan plays on the consonant sounds again in the words "beauty," "beheld," "best," "but," "beasts" and "beholders" (*PL* IX.540-44). *Conduplicatio* is also to be found in the twice repeated "beheld." One can argue that *polyptoton* too occurs in this passage as the words "beheld" and "beholders" occur almost right next to each other, juxtaposing Eve's current situation with the one with which he wants to tempt her. By telling Eve that all things are hers and that she is "universally admired" Satan is being false (*PL* IX.539-40, 542). Thus, Satan can be accused of false reasoning or *paralogismus* (Greek, "fraudulent reasoning," *FS* 444). In these seemingly subtle phrases, Satan is talking about Eve in a highly elevated manner, perhaps as she would secretly wish was true. Shrouding his false reasoning and lies in repetition after repetition might be a strategy to keep Eve distracted from picking up on this. The device *meiosis* (Greek, "to make smaller") is used in the passage "but here / In this enclosure wild" (*PL* IX.542-43), its effect being to treat Eden in an intentionally understated manner (*SR*, "*Meiosis*"). The function of this figure can, according to Puttenham, be to diminish your opponent (219). The way that Satan refers to the Garden of Eden as a savage and restricted area should warn both Eve and the reader of how disrespectful he is towards God. As the first communication from Satan draws to an end, he implicitly refers to Adam. This occurs when Satan is lamenting the injustice done to Eve by only being seen by wild beasts (*PL* IX.543-46). Satan asks "Beholders rude, and shallow to discern / Half what in thee is fair, one man except, / Who sees thee?" (*PL* IX.544-46). This rhetorical question is of the type *anthypophora* because Satan immediately provides an answer, this taking the form of yet another question of the type *anthypophora*. (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"): "(And what is one?) Who shouldst be seen / A goddess among gods, adored and served / By angels numberless, thy daily train" (*PL* IX.546-48). As stated by Puttenham, *anthypophora* can serve to avoid an opponent attacking you by asking the question yourself and then answering it so as to amplify your own statement and control the direction of the speech or discussion (204-06). The passage also contains an example of the type known as *parenthesis*, which can in a short and abrupt manner reveal the thoughts of the speaker in a subtle way (*CR* 385). In so doing, Satan can be said to undermine Adam and instil a need for admiration in Eve. He ends his first statement by saying that Eve should be regarded as a goddess and that she should be "served / By angels numberless" (*PL* IX.547-48). In this context, the word "numberless" should tell us that Satan is flattering Eve to an extreme extent. This can again be characterised as the rhetorical fallacy of excessive

exaggeration – *hyperbole.* From analysing the first glimpse Eve gets of Satan and his rhetoric, one can argue that he relies heavily on flattery as a way to establish his character in order to persuade her through *ethos*. Eve has earlier in the poem been shown to possess some degree of vanity. She had to be guided away from her own reflection in the water. Like Narcissus, she was quite entranced by her own image, although not aware of it being herself at the time (*PL* IV.460-75). Satan takes advantage of this seemingly inherent quality in Eve. This may be why his words appear to resonate with her as she encourages him to carry on and the narrator indicates that Eve's interest has been kindled (*PL* IX.550-52).

Eve, her curiosity aroused, asks Satan to tell her how he came to possess the ability to speak: "Say, for such wonder claims attention due" (*PL* IX.566). Eve's rhetoric will be analysed in the next chapter, but it is worth mentioning her use of the word "wonder." Satan began his utterance with this word. Eve's echoing of Satan might be a sign of her falling for his temptation, perhaps only subconsciously. Satan does as Eve asks and tells her a story of how he, the serpent, came to be in possession of powers such as speech and reasoning. The reader, who has followed Satan since he hatched his sinister plan, knows that he is lying. In this part he is trying to persuade Eve though *logos* – logical evidence. His main argument is how a snake could improve himself from muteness to eloquence. Following the structure of a classical oration, Satan goes to great lengths to explain how this came to be (*SR*, "Arrangement"). He begins by first enforcing the view of Eve as "Empress of this fair world" (*PL* IX.568). He continues with his application of figures of repetition in this passage. Both alliteration and *conduplicatio* occur by the repetition of the word "thee," and the twice repeated "thou" (*PL* IX.569-70). Satan then begins to tell Eve his fabricated story about his previous state of existence. This is all according to the structure of a classical oration in which, after introducing the purpose of the utterance, one proceeds to provide an explanation of the case. Accordingly, Satan's strategy can be characterised as the rhetorical device *narratio* (*SR*, "Arrangement"). In other words, this figure may function as the exposition (*FS* 370). Satan carefully tells Eve that he, the serpent, used to be just like other beasts (*PL* IX.571-74). He continues by relating how he saw "A goodly tree far distant to behold / Loaden with fruit of fairest colours mixed" (*PL* IX.576-77). This part of Satan's oration lacks the amount of ornamentation found elsewhere in his rhetoric. This enforces the impression that he is simply stating facts to Eve, though the reader knows the truth. It may also indicate that Satan is aware that the middle part of the oration should focus on persuasion through *logos* and thus keep ornamentation to a minimum (*SR*, "Arrangement"). He talks of being persuaded by his thirst and hunger for the fruit, calling them "Powerful persuaders" (*PL*

IX.587). By tying his need to taste the fruit to primal appetites such as hunger and thirst, Satan makes this seem as something that comes naturally or at least not stemming from greed or vanity. Furthermore, he calls the fruit "alluring" (*PL* IX.588). In that sense, Satan tries to divert Eve's attention from his own temptation of her to the fruit. He includes Adam as well into his logical reasoning for eating the fruit: only the two humans and Satan would be able to physically reach it. He says "For high from ground the branches would require / Thy utmost reach or Adam's" (*PL* IX.590-91). The other beasts would envy their accomplishment, which is what Satan falsely explains happened when he seemingly ate the fruit: "All other beasts that saw, and with like desire / Longing and envying stood, but could not reach" (*PL* IX.592-93). By so doing Satan includes Eve in the prestige of eating the fruit, thus hoping to instil a feeling of aspiration in her. In this context one may argue that Satan shifts the focus from merely stating facts, though untrue, to ornamentation. As his narration draws to an end, Satan falls back to his usual pattern in the reappearance of figures of repetition, although this can be argued to be in accordance with the structure of classical orations. His narration could also be seen as increasing the relevance to his audience by first talking of himself, but then about Eve and Adam and other beasts. This can be described as the rhetorical device *climax* (Greek, "a staircase") as this syntactical figure escalates the subject matter by degrees (*FS* 230). Called "the Marching figure" by Puttenham, this figure is applied by doubling the intensity of one's words (207-08). In the very moment Satan as the serpent admits to eating the fruit, he starts ornamenting his language again. The alliteration in the words "fill," "for," "feed," "fountain" and "found" can be seen to signify the consequence of eating the forbidden fruit – the Fall (*PL* IX.595-97). Satan's carefully laid plan for mankind to fall is revealed through his choice of words here. As a consequence, one might accuse him of not being in control of his emotions. Additionally, the foundation for persuading Eve is deception. His skills as a rhetorician are therefore flawed. In the next sentence one can also observe an instance of *polyptoton*: "Sated at length, ere long I might perceive / Strange alteration in me" (*PL* IX.598-99). Relating how he experienced feeling the capacity to reason as well as the ability to speak, Satan returns to his flattery of Eve. With his new abilities he "Considered all things visible in heaven" (*PL* IX.604). Thus, his thoughts landed on Eve: "all things fair and good; / But all that fair and good in thy divine / Semblance" (*PL* IX.605-06). *Conduplicatio* is to be found in the repetition of the phrase "fair and good." *Ploce* can also be said to occur by the instance of "fair" in "fair and good" and in the following clause by "no fair to thine / Equivalent or second" (*PL* IX.605, 606, 608-09). *Ploce*, called "the Doubler" by Puttenham, is the repetition of a word, but with a change in meaning (201; *FS* 221). In the first two

instances "fair" could refer to beauty whereas the last pertains to injustice. This may indicate Satan's corrupted sense of right and wrong. In his seduction of Eve, he is no stranger to figures of repetition. One could argue that this reflects Satan's view of Eve – that he only needs to ornament his language in order to persuade her. However, when he was telling Eve about the events that allegedly led up to his discovery of the fruit, his language was uncharacteristically void of ornamentation, perhaps to make it appear as though he was simply stating facts. Satan uses Eve's extraordinary beauty as an excuse to approach her. He says it "compelled / Me thus, though importune perhaps, to come / And gaze" (*PL* IX.609-11). The phrase "though importune perhaps" is wedged in between Satan's flattering words. It is an admission of guilt, though not really as he adds the word "perhaps." This opens up for a clearing of his guilt. The clause is short with only six syllables and can be described as the rhetorical figure *comma* (Greek, "that which is cut off"), a syntactical figure that pertains to clauses shorter than twelve syllables (*FS* 231). This is a strategic move from Satan as the shortness of the clause drowns it in the sea of words that flatter and tell fantastic tales. Specifically, what should be a red flag for Eve, being approached in that manner, is barely touched upon. We can also accuse Satan of obscuring the meaning of his words by partially admitting a mistake and then questioning it. One may argue that Satan is guilty of the vice known as *enigma* (Greek, "a riddle"), that is concealing the meaning (*FS* 441). Satan ends his explanation by a substantial bout of flattery. As well as gazing at Eve he wanted to "worship thee of right declared / Sovereign of creatures, universal dame" (*PL* IX.611-12). Satan again lies: Eve is not sovereign of creatures – she is not even the most powerful human. Though she is the first woman, this should warn both her and the reader of Satan's deceptively hyperbolic form of praise. Satan's explanation is based on lies and false reasoning, making him guilty of *paralogismus*.

Seemingly unaware of Satan's lies, Eve asks where the Tree of Knowledge can be found and Satan promises to lead the way (*PL* IX.626-30). In the five-line reply Satan yet again calls Eve "Empress" (*PL* IX.626). He consistently implies her sovereignty, which we know is a lie. Alliteration with the use of the words "flat," "Fast" and "fountain" is also employed– perhaps signifying the inevitable fall which will happen if he takes her there (*PL* IX.627-28). As the two of them approach the tree Eve immediately responds by saying that she cannot eat from it – "God so commanded" (*PL* IX.652). Satan now must assemble all his rhetorical skills for his plan to succeed. He asks the rhetorical question "Indeed?" (*PL* IX.656). This is the type of *pysma* in that it is immediately followed by another question: "Hath God then said that of the fruit / Of all these garden trees ye shall not eat, / Yet lords declared of all in earth

or air?" (*PL* IX.656-58). By asking questions one after the other in order to intensify one's speech, the listener would have to produce a complex reply (*FS* 330). Peacham explains the figure as a way to make the orator appear passionate and animate the oration (L4r). Eve duly replies that she and Adam may eat from all the trees except the Tree of Knowledge (*PL* IX.660-62). The narrator describes in some detail Satan's preparations for his grand finale in the following lines. Comparisons are drawn to "some orator renowned / In Athens or free Rome" (*PL* IX.670-71). Satan's assuming the role of a classical orator is now directly addressed by the narrator. However, we are warned of his deceptive nature. He only has "show of zeal and love / To man" (*PL* IX.665-66).

Satan begins his lengthy and final attempt to seduce Eve with an *exclamatio* (Latin, "a crying out"): "O sacred, wise, and wisdom-giving plant, / Mother of science" (*PL* IX.679-80). While addressing the tree Satan claims to feel its power within him, his exclamation thus serving as an interjection describing his inner emotions (*FS* 391). Puttenham calls this figure "the Outcry" and highlights that the employment of this figure helps the speaker to convey extreme passion and overwhelming affection (212). The pragmatic device *apostrophe* (Greek, "a turning away") is also to be found because Satan shifts to address another audience, more specifically the tree that he has personified (*FS* 309). This figure is useful to create variation in your speech and thereby render the persuasion more animated, according to Puttenham (237-38). Furthermore, *apostrophe* is often employed as a figure of *pathos* as it can stir feelings in the audience by making things come alive before the reader's inner eye. It can also often be combined with *exclamatio* (*SR*, "Figures of *Pathos*"). As I emphasised above, Satan does indeed use this figure and in that way tells us that he is trying to appeal to Eve's emotions. In his apparent worship of the Tree of Knowledge Satan would seem guilty of idolatry. Although only a part of his cunning plan, this would be another sign of his sinful nature. He then returns to address Eve, but this time he is calling her "Queen of this universe" which constitutes another example of *adulatio* (*PL* IX.684). The intensity of his praises increases: from "Empress" to "Queen of this universe" (*PL* IX.626, 684) and warrants the term *incrementum* as there is a culmination of degrees (*FS* 287). This figure is highly efficient, according to Puttenham (218). Satan proceeds to tell Eve that she should not believe the warnings and that she and Adam will not die by eating the fruit (*PL* IX.684-85). He goes on to ask more of rhetorical questions known as *anthypophora* (involving providing answers oneself), as a way of eliminating the reasons why eating the fruit will be the end for Adam and Eve. In his replies to the questions "By the fruit?" and "By the threatener?" we see Satan beginning to refute his opponent's claims (*PL* IX.686-87). Traditionally, the purpose of this

part of an oration, referred to as *anasceue* (Greek, "demolish"), is to discredit one's opponents and their arguments (*FS* 365). In this context we can see that Satan tries to contradict God by telling Eve that he, the serpent, ate from the tree and lived to tell the tale. Not only that, but he also assures her that it expanded his mind. By so doing, Satan asks Eve how she can believe God when there is actual evidence to contradict him. There are some figures of repetition at the beginning of this part of his utterance, though not as much as I have noted earlier. In the lines "Look on me, / Me who have touched and tasted, yet both live, / And life more perfect have attained" there are instances of repetitions (*PL* IX.687-89). As the word "me" is repeated without any other words in between one can describe this in terms of *epizeuxis* (*FS* 216). Puttenham likens this figure to that of a cuckoo who sings a one-noted song (201). Its function here is to enforce Satan's view of his own grandeur. Alliteration can also be found in the words "touched" and "tasted." One might argue that in this context the rhetorical purpose is to coax Eve into both touching and tasting. It will not do just touching the fruit, Eve must also taste it. Satan asks another rhetorical question: why mankind should not be allowed to elevate their status when this is possible for animals (*PL* IX.691-92). He continues to yet again paint God as a tyrant by stating to Eve the unlikeliness of God to "incense his ire / For such a petty trespass, and not praise / Rather your dauntless virtue" (*PL* IX.692-94). He is trying to make the crime of eating the fruit seem like a positive thing – a sign of her ambition. This can be characterised as the rhetorical vice *paradiastole,* which pertains to calling a vice a virtue (*FS* 444). As a consequence, this can be applied with flattery as the intended result (*SR*, "*Paradiastole*"). Peacham stresses the danger of this figure – to excuse virtues as a way to defend ourselves or someone else (N4v). Puttenham, however, sees it more as a figure to be used in order to make the best of an unfortunate situation (184-85). Satan wants Eve to think this trespass is an admirable move on her part. As Satan proceeds to question the very concept of death he employs several instances of repetition: one may observe an instance of *conduplicatio,* as "death" is repeated twice within the same line (*PL* IX.695). There is also alliteration in the words "dauntless," "death," "denounced" and "deterred" (*PL* IX.694-96). The alliteration in this part of the speech where death is questioned may be in order to lessen its importance – to drown it in the surrounding sounds and words. Consequently, the meaning of death is obscured to Eve. Additionally, Satan is fully aware of death and thus tries once more to persuade Eve with fallacious logic or *paralogismus.*

Continuing his attempt at deconstructing God's rule about the Tree of Knowledge, Satan yet again asks rhetorical questions, this time two in succession: "knowledge of good and evil;

/ Of good, how just? Of evil, if what is evil / Be real, why not known, since easier shunned?" (*PL* IX.697-99). The first seems to be the type of *aporia* as Satan appears to be contemplating the consequences for Eve of eating the fruit (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). He is asking how it is possible to be fair if one denies someone the knowledge of good (*PL* IX.698). The rhetorical question that follows is of the type *anthypophora* as the question is immediately answered. He makes the point of knowing evil to be an asset as it can more easily be avoided if it is known to you (*PL* IX.698-99). His answer to his own question is that "God therefore cannot hurt ye, and be just; / Not just, not God; not feared then, nor obeyed" (*PL* IX.700-01). *Diacope* can be found in the repetition of the words "just" and "not" with only one other word in between. Alliteration in the words "not" and "nor" further emphasises Satan's argument that God cannot punish Eve for eating the forbidden fruit. It can also be seen to show Satan's rejection of God's authority. The line that immediately follows, "Your fear itself of death removes the fear," constitutes *polyptoton* when seen in connection with the preceding verse because the words "feared" and "fear" are repeated (*PL* IX.702). Having an abundance of repetitions in his reasoning helps Satan to lull Eve into accepting his words and even spur her into action.

It is once again up to the reader to decide whether his repetitions are excessive or not. Satan can be said to employ figures of repetition successfully or he can be accused of *tautologia,* excessive use of repetitions. Satan then asks another rhetorical question: why this knowledge was denied Adam and Eve (*PL* IX.703). This question is yet again of the type *anthypophora* because Satan provides the answer himself, as is his custom. His answer is "Why but to awe, / Why but to keep ye low and ignorant, / His worshippers" (*PL* IX.703-05). The word "why" begins two successive lines and three consecutive clauses and thus constitutes an example of *anaphora*. Taking the preceding rhetorical question into consideration as well, the word "why" is repeated three times. As a consequence, this instance can be characterised as *conduplicatio*. The repetition of the word "why" can be said to further amplify Satan's wish to make Eve question God's command, and to incite a feeling of injustice by deliberately being denied the possibility to achieve more in life. Satan telling Eve that God knows that if she and Adam eat the fruit they will be as gods, can be interpreted as *calumnia*. Latin for "a misinterpretation," this figure typically involves a deliberate choice to misinterpret the opponent's arguments (*FS* 439).

Well on the way to persuade Eve, the final part of Satan's speech relies less on figures of repetition but rather on rhetorical questions. Admittedly, there are some instances of repetition, but not to the same extent as before. The biggest difference is that there is not as

much alliteration as we have gotten used to with Satan. We can, however, find *diacope*, *conduplicatio* and *polyptoton*. *Diacope* occurs in the passage "since I as man, / Internal Man, is but proportion meet, / I of brute human, ye of human gods" (*PL* IX.710-12). The repetition of "human" in two successive clauses constitutes an example of *conduplicatio*. *Polyptoton* occurs yet again in the repetition of the words "die" and "death" as Satan tells Eve that death cannot bring anything else than Adam and Eve achieving higher status (*PL* IX.713-16). Satan is, as we know, lying and his logic here is clearly faulty as he is guilty of *paralogismus* yet again. Another rhetorical question follows: "And what are gods that man may not become / As they, participating godlike food?" (*PL* IX.716-17). His choice of using the word "gods" instead of "angels" should warn the reader and Eve of Satan's true nature and disrespect for Christianity. As per his custom, Satan provides his own answer which warrants the label *anthypophora*. He answers by mockingly stating that the so called "gods" are more important than mankind, but then adds "I question it" (*PL* IX.720). Following this attempt at dismantling God's rules, Satan then proceeds to deliver his final blows to God and his doctrine. This is done in a series of four rhetorical questions, although the last question can be seen as two in one. Satan asks these without any breaks so as to stun Eve by his arguments. By asking several questions in a row Eve would need time to process them, but would also have to give an intricate reply. Satan therefore applies the rhetorical device *pysma*. There is not much repetition in these questions, but an instance of *conduplicatio* can be found in the question "Or is it envy, and can envy dwell / In heavenly breasts?" (*PL* IX.729-30). His punchline, as it were, comes in the second to last sentence. Satan says "These, these and many more / Causes import your need of this fair fruit" (*PL* IX.730-31). The reason why he does not answer his own questions is because he wants Eve to think that she must eat the fruit in order to answer them. He even brings up the possibility of there being more questions to which she may need answers. The emphasis is further highlighted by *epizeuxis*. In this instance the word in question is "these," which makes the matter even more pressing. His ends his whole utterance with "Goddess humane, reach then, and freely taste" (*PL* IX.732). This sentence consists of three short clauses, all of which are less than eight syllables each. Thus, *comma* occurs throughout this sentence. This can be seen to be riling Eve into action, the short clauses emphasising the simplicity of what Satan wants Eve to do – reach and taste. Satan ends his final argument with a lie: Eve cannot "freely taste" the fruit (*PL* IX.732). One can say that, within God's doctrine, this is an example of *oxymoron* (Greek, "pointedly foolish"), a device by which one presents a compressed paradox (*FS* 342-43). This may be achieved by placing two opposing words or ideas next to each other (*SR*,

"*Oxymoron*"). Puttenham calls this figure "the Cross-couple" and illustrates it by likening it to the tying of two contrasting words and forcing them to appear as a couple (206). The way Satan applies *oxymoron* in this context fits in with his shrewd and cunning nature, as he is well aware that the choice of freely eating the fruit is not possible.

My analysis of Satan's seduction of Eve, which ultimately leads to the fall of mankind, has showcased Satan's rhetorical skills as he is truly put to the test. His plan depends critically on getting Eve to eat the forbidden fruit. As a consequence, Satan's rhetoric in this part of the poem is urgent and passionate, but at the same time pretends to be filled with reason. The readers and the narrator know that the reasons Satan gives are untrue, but this does not apply to Eve to the same extent, although there are several red flags. Satan's excessive use of flattery is clearly aimed at Eve's inherent vanity. He also plays to her ambitious side, in that she wants to be Adam's equal. By ornamenting his language to an almost excessive amount, Satan makes his words sound hypnotic, urging Eve to comply. His use of alliteration and repetitions during crucial parts of the speech amplifies this. Similarly, his use of rhetorical questions as a way to stun Eve makes his evidence seem overwhelming. Communicating with Eve in the shape of a serpent helps back up his logical arguments and to tear apart God's laws. His physical appearance and his use of rhetoric are what ultimately persuade Eve to eat the fruit. Satan's flaws as a rhetorician shine through at certain points, as when he uses mainly words that start with the F sound when he describes the eating of the forbidden fruit. This indicates that he loses his composure as he appears to be preoccupied with the thought of the fall of mankind. He is persuading Eve by riling her into action, without being truthful. In other words, he simply aims to persuade in order to get his way and he uses plenty of lies to get there. One can therefore assume that his skills as a rhetorician are not meant to be seen as admirable. Throughout his seduction, Satan persuades through *ethos* by pretending to be a living testimony to the great powers of the forbidden fruit. He also tries to persuade through *logos* by giving Eve the logical reasons for why she should want to elevate her status and how her fears about the consequences of eating the fruit are unsubstantiated. Lastly, Satan combines the logical reason with a final and intense attempt at persuasion through *pathos*. He urges her to realise that she must eat the fruit in order to get the answers she needs. His rhetoric proves successful as Eve does indeed eat the fruit.

In the next chapter I will analyse the rhetoric used in connection with Adam and Eve, focusing on how these human characters come across as opposed to Satan, as well as on how they compare with each other. The character of Satan and the rhetoric employed in his

speeches will provide a valuable point of reference as I explore the other selected characters in Milton's epic poem.

2 “Our grand parents”

2.1 Adam

I will now turn to Adam and Eve in order to compare them to the infamous character of Satan. The previously mentioned association of Adam and Eve with pastoral scenes may lead us to expect a plain style. Their opposite genders might also influence their language. This chapter is made up of three sections, and we shall start with Adam’s persuasive skills and his recollection of his first memory. Adam relates this in Book VIII during his long conversation with the archangel Raphael. The latter explains events prior to mankind’s existence and the workings of the universe. I have chosen this part of the poem to analyse Adam’s rhetoric because his narration is a lengthy one with many components that are worth exploring in detail. The reader was first introduced to Adam and Eve in Book IV, where Eve told Adam of her own recollection of first waking up. Adam, by contrast, reserves this for Raphael. I will analyse Eve’s rhetoric in the second section of this chapter, while the third will be dedicated to Adam and Eve’s rhetoric during their quarrels before and after the Fall. In terms of style, Adam’s rhetoric should reflect his standing as a human compared to the divine creatures. However, he is also the first man created and, more importantly, there is another human being of the other gender portrayed as well. A main topic in this section will be whether Adam’s rhetoric reflects his position above Eve but below the divine characters. In the passage I will explore, Adam is explaining and narrating his first memory to Raphael. Thus, his intention is to inform, which would indicate a plain style. One may argue that his intention is to delight Raphael as well, which in turn would point to a middle style (Müller 748).

Up until this part of the poem, Adam’s rhetoric has been relatively unornamented compared to that of Satan. There are a few exceptions, the most noteworthy being his way of addressing Eve. His style is then quite florid: “Sole partner and sole part of all these joys, / Dearer thyself than all” (*PL* IV.411-12). The conversation with Raphael, however, shows Adam in a different light. Not only is he relating his own thoughts and experiences, but he also paraphrases his communications with God and Eve. Adam begins his speech by asking a rhetorical question, a strategy one may recognise from Satan, only that with Adam it suggests humility: “For man to tell how human life began / Is hard; for who himself beginning knew?” (*PL* VIII.250-51). In the first utterance one may also observe examples of both alliteration

and *polyptoton,* adding to the characterisation of Adam's seemingly humble persona. *Polyptoton* is applied by repeating words with the same root (*CR* 395). By having the words "began" and "beginning" in the same question, Adam emphasises the fact that he will be telling Raphael what he remembers about his beginnings. However, he is also foreshadowing possible critique by admitting that he cannot possibly know everything. One can therefore argue that this constitutes an example of *procatalepsis* (Greek, "annulling beforehand"). This device is applied by answering possible objections before they have been put into words (*FS* 297). George Puttenham calls this figure "the preventer" and describes it as useful to get the upper hand in an argument (231-32). In so doing Adam tells Raphael that he is indeed eloquent and knowledgeable, yet aware of his own limitations. Consequently, he is trying to establish authority by his own character, thus following the pattern of a classical oration where one begins persuading through *ethos*. Adam's rhetorical question can be described as *anthypophora*. The inclusion of this type of rhetorical question in one's speech serves a specific purpose as the speaker answers it immediately (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). Adam's purpose is revealed through his answer: "Desire with thee still longer to converse / Induced me" (*PL* VIII.252-53). The desire to have Raphael's company a little while longer is Adam's way of justifying why he wants to tell his story. He proceeds to describe his first memory with a *simile*, which means "like" in Latin and is applied by straightforwardly comparing things with words such as "like" and "as" (*SR*, "Schemes and Tropes"). Accordingly, Adam compares the experience to waking up from deep sleep (*PL* VIII.253-56). This passage contains alliteration in the words "soundest," "sleep," soft," "sweat," "sun" and "soon," emphasising his pleasant experience when waking up and indicating his natural tendency to appreciate God. I also see a direct reference to Satan and the soliloquy I analysed earlier in my thesis. Adam mentions the sun as he remembers waking up: "In balmy sweat, which with his beams the sun / Soon dried" (*PL* VIII.255-56). This is a stark contrast to Satan and his desperate exclamation of "O Sun, to tell thee how much I hate thy beams" (*PL* IV.37). It illustrates the difference in attitude between Adam and Satan when it comes to a central part of God's creation. Adam continues his narration with the discovery of his surroundings and his ability to stand upright (*PL* VIII.257-61). Listing what he sees, Adam says that "about me round I saw / Hill, dale, and shady woods, and sunny plains, / And liquid lapse of murmuring streams" (*PL* VIII.261-63). This suggests the figure *hirmos* (Greek, "series"), a way of presenting ideas by listing several things unordered in a sentence (*FS* 235). Alternatively, the occurrence might be described as the rhetorical figure *enumeratio,* in that Adam does indeed lump together the different sights he experiences. *Enumeratio* (Latin, "a counting up") can be

applied with or without numbering the parts which one lists or without numbering (*FS* 276). Adam's listing of sights amplifies the magnitude of Eden and God's creation. Prior to this speech, Adam has employed this rhetorical device on several occasions. He lists the different tasks that need to be taken care of in Eden in Book IV and this strengthens the importance and urgency of it (*PL* IV.625-29). As Adam continues to describe the experience of seeing the wonders around him for the first time, he lists the different ways the animals around him behave: "Creatures that lived, and moved, and walked, or flew" (*PL* VIII.264). *Hirmos* is applied as Adam lists things in a non-hierarchic manner which conveys his amazement at the scene before him. This further emphasises the wonder Adam felt by experiencing God's creation. So far in the speech Adam is careful to show Raphael that he is humble and aware of his limited knowledge.

As Adam goes on describing the discovery of his surroundings and himself, there are several occurrences of figures of repetition, although not to the same exaggerated extent as in Satan's case. In the phrase "Myself I then perused, and limb by limb / Surveyed, and sometimes went, and sometimes ran / With supple joints, as lively vigour led" there are instances of alliteration and *diacope* (*PL* VIII.267-69). *Diacope*, the repetition of the same word with only a few words in between can be found in the repetition of the words "limb" and "sometimes" (*FS* 215). One can note an example of *polyptoton* in the phrase "to speak I tried, and forthwith spake" with the words "speak" and "spake" in close proximity (*PL* VIII.271). Describing speaking for the first time, Adam makes use of two figures: *enumeratio* and *apostrophe*, emphasising his admiration and innate knowledge. He turns away from addressing Raphael and instead reconstructs how he named everything he laid eyes on: "Thou sun, said I, fair light, / And thou enlightened earth" (*PL* VIII.273-74). Speaking to the personified sun and the earth, Adam relies on the figure of *apostrophe*, addressing another audience that can be absent or present (*FS* 309). Adam addresses several personified things: the sun and the earth, but also "Ye hills and dales, ye rivers, woods, and plains, / And ye that live and move" (*PL* VIII.275-76). In this phrase *enumeratio* is to be found as Adam lists the things and creatures he sees and names. Adam goes on to ask a rhetorical question, albeit to the animals he just named: "tell, / Tell, if ye saw, how came I thus, how here?" (*PL* VIII.276-77). As "tell" is repeated without any other words in between one can characterise this as the figure *epizeuxis* (Greek, "fastening together"), conveying his urgency to know his origin (*FS* 216). The rhetorical question is the type of *anthypophora* as Adam answers it himself in the following sentence: "Not of myself; by some great maker then, / In goodness and in power pre-eminent" (*PL* VIII.278-79). One may argue that the function of this rhetorical question is

to highlight that Adam needs to answer it himself because the animals cannot. This places man above other earthly creatures and, more importantly, demonstrates Adam's solitude. The words "great" and "goodness" in the same sentence show us yet another example of *polyptoton*. Furthermore, *conduplicatio* is also applied by the repetition of "how" in subsequent clauses where Adam implores the animals to tell him about his maker (*PL* VIII.280-82). *Conduplicatio* (Latin, "with doubling") involves repeating the same phrase or word in consecutive clauses (*FS* 215). These figures further emphasise his desperate need to get to know his creator. *Conduplicatio* is also employed as the word "I" is repeated several times in Adam's recollection of stumbling around looking for answers (*PL* VIII.280-85). The intention might be to show Adam's solitude in Eden and how isolated he is amongst the animals.

Alleviating Adam of his predicament, God now makes his presence known to him: "When suddenly stood at my head a dream, / Whose inward apparition gently moved / My fancy to believe I yet had being" (*PL* VIII.292-94). We must from now on take into consideration that it is Adam's and not God's words we will hear, as Adam is simply remembering what God said. Adam is here employing the rhetorical device *sermocinatio* (Latin, "a conversation") by imitating conversation between people (*FS* 333). Puttenham specifies that if one is to include another person's speech, one must do so as accurately and appropriately as possible for it to have any effect (235). As Adam recounts God's words to him there are instances of figures of repetition. However, this follows mostly Adam's own pattern of speaking that we have seen earlier in the speech. *Polyptoton* occurs as well, such as God's utterance "First man, of men innumerable ordained / First father" (*PL* VIII.297-98). *Anaphora* also appears in the use of the word "First" at the beginning of two succeeding lines. Both function to establish Adam's role in God's universe. The initial address by God, related by Adam, is short. As Adam resumes his own words, ornamentation in terms of alliteration occurs repeatedly through the repetition of S sounds in the words describing how God helps Adam move along above the ground (*PL* VIII.300-02). As Adam is being shown the trees in Eden we can also recognise alliteration in the phrase "Each tree / Loaden with fairest fruit" (*PL* VIII.306-07). Both instances of alliteration can allude to the fact that the fruit is forbidden or the consequence of eating it – Original Sin. Thus, Adam's language and rhetoric reminds us of his transgression, certainly a damning character flaw. As Adam once again turns to relate God's words the amount of alliteration decreases. There are instances of repetitions, although in an organised manner which contributes to clarity, an essential character trait of God. Adam's imitation thus appears respectfully faithful to the origin. Adam

tells Raphael, and the readers, how God delivers his rule about the Tree of Knowledge (*PL* VIII.319-33). This passage is consistently lacking in ornamentation. However, there is an instance of *conduplicatio* as God tells Adam "Remember what I warn thee, shun to taste, / And shun the bitter consequence" (*PL* VIII.327-28). This occurs in the repetition of the word "shun" which enforces the absoluteness of God's rule. God tells Adam that he has made Adam and his race the masters of the earth (*PL* VIII.338-39). Furthermore, "and all things that therein live, / Or live in sea, or air, beast, fish, and fowl" (*PL* VIII.340-41). One can say that God thus applies *enumeratio* as he explains the earthly hierarchy. However, this is Adam recounting God's words. One cannot attribute this directly to the character of God, but rather to Adam as they are his words. As my analysis of this speech has shown, Adam does use this figure several times to convey his disposition to marvel at God's power. Adam also reveals how he echoes God as he continues with his utterance. When describing how Adam will name the animals living in Eden, God says "In sign whereof each bird and beast behold / After their kinds; I bring them to receive / From thee their names" (*PL* VIII.342-44). Thus, one can note another instance of alliteration in God's utterance as recounted by Adam. As Adam turns away from narrating God's words and back to his own as he begins naming the animals, he tells Raphael "each bird and beast behold / Approaching two and two" (*PL* VIII.349-50). Here Adam copies God's way of speaking. This could be another sign of mankind being made in the image of God, as the narrator tells us in Book IV: "for in their looks divine / The image of their glorious maker shone" (*PL* IV.291-92). It could also reveal how impressionable mankind is, as Satan's seduction of Eve in Book IX shows. Rhetorically speaking, Adam can be said to borrow from God's poetic vocabulary. This constitutes an example of *poieticon* (Greek, "poetical vocabulary"), which is applied by the employment of poetic language (*FS* 222). Conversely, it could simply be an example of Adam's limited skills as an orator in that his vocabulary is limited. Satan also borrows words albeit from a foreign language, and this could be seen as a sign of disrespect (*PL* IV.50). Adam's use, on the other hand, shows respect and reverence for God. Adam then comes to the part of his utterance where he directly addresses God and even makes a request. In his address to God Adam uses an exclamation: "O by what name, for thou above all these, / Above mankind, or aught than mankind higher, / Surpassest far my naming" (*PL* VIII.357-59). This exclamation is the type of *admiratio* as it shows Adam marvelling at his creator. This figure can be applied to convey a sense of wonder (*FS* 376). His submission and admiration causes him to cry out for God. An instance of *conduplicatio* is to be found in the repetition of the word "mankind" in two successive clauses. This illustrates Adam's awareness of his own race and

its place in the hierarchy between beasts and God. As Adam praises God, his language is ornamented with some figures of repetition, but this is kept to a minimum. However, Adam asks God a question: "In solitude / What happiness, who can enjoy alone, / Or all enjoying, what contentment find?" (*PL* VIII.364-66). As Adam provides an answer himself, in God's words, one can classify this rhetorical question as *anthypophora*. In other words, he does not expect Raphael to answer it for him. In the question to God, the use of the words "enjoy" and "enjoying," can be characterised as *polyptoton*, thus enforcing Adam's feeling of solitude and how his hope for enjoyment is tied to the thought of company. Adam relates God's answer, which is seemingly not entirely positive to Adam's request, claiming Adam should be satisfied with what he has been given (*PL* VIII.369-78). In response to this Adam asks two rhetorical questions without giving God the chance of replying to them. This signifies Adam letting his emotions get the best of him as he is in desperate need for company. Thus, like Satan, Adam here wants to nudge God in his desired direction. These are the type of *erotema*, which is the general term for rhetorical questions that are employed to assert or renounce a point (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). Adam attempts to deny God's argument and further his own. He asks if he is not God's "substitute" and furthermore, how God can expect him to enjoy the company of those below himself (*PL* VIII.381-84). God retorts back with his own pair of rhetorical questions to Adam (*PL* VIII.403-05, 408-11). God, as Adam narrates it, thus uses the figure known as *dianoea* – dynamic answers and questions in your argument (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). The second question is left for Adam to reply to. Consequently, Adam's way of narrating his first memory is balanced and clear in that both characters ask two questions, perhaps illustrating how Adam is made in God's image and the privilege of his prelapsarian state. Adam continues the discussion, arguing that God should not need to reproduce, as he is "infinite" (*PL* VIII.419-20). However, he claims that man should "beget / Like of his like, his image multiplied" (*PL* VIII.423-24). One can note *diacope* in the repetition of the word "like" with only two words in between. Adam argues that what he has in mind requires "Collateral love" (*PL* VIII.426). During his argument Adam employs the figure *hyposchesin* (Greek, "undertaking"), that is speaking modestly about yourself to further your argument (*FS* 319). Adam claims that God does not require company in the same way he does. Adam cannot make the animals around him talk and is thus in need of company equal to himself (*PL* VIII.427-33). According to Adam, God reveals that he has been testing Adam and is pleased with the arguments of his first human: "I, ere thou spak'st, / Knew it not good for man to be alone" (*PL* VIII.444-45). As we approach the end of God's conversation with Adam, God's final words are "What next I bring shall please thee, be assured, / Thy

likeness, thy fit help, thy other self, / Thy wish, exactly to thy heart's desire" (*PL* VIII.449-51). One can note an example of *anaphora* in this passage. As the word "thy" is repeated in the last clause we can say that *conduplicatio* is also to be found. What strikes me about the use of these devices here is that they enforce the view of Adam as the sole and first human with the highest status. It could also be read as Adam's excitement about where his story is going: the discovery of Eve. One may read it as his excitement spilling over in his imitation of God's words to him. Whether Adam is sufficiently in control to rein in his own enthusiasm for Eve or not remains debatable.

The last part of Adam's narration concerns the discovery of his companion, Eve. He describes how he falls asleep, yet with his "internal sight" sees God removing one of Adam's ribs (*PL* VIII.461, 462-66). In his description, there are instances of alliteration as words beginning with the letter S are repeated throughout. This might be a way of indicating his rising spirits and his excitement. As I mentioned in the chapter analysing Satan's rhetoric, his excessive use of repetitions could be interpreted as a vice – the rhetorical fallacy being *tautologia.* One can also blame Adam for being guilty of this vice as he is using plenty of alliteration when telling the story of how Eve came to be. However, it could alternatively be read as a virtue, as successful ornamentation, and it is up to the reader to decide. His reliance here on figures of repetition can be read as a positive aspect of his rhetoric. This would suggest the figure *parechesis* (Greek, "succession of similar sounds") which is a broad rhetorical term for alliteration and also assonance – the repetition of similar vowel sounds (*FS* 202; *CR* 389). According to Puttenham, the figure is especially pleasing to the ear if not used too excessively (174). One factor speaking in Adam's favour as opposed to Satan is that Adam does not employ additional figures of repetition in the passages otherwise peppered with alliteration. As Adam describes how God created Eve from his rib we can note organised alliteration: "wide was the wound, / But suddenly with flesh filled up and healed: / The rib he formed and fashioned with his hands" (*PL* VIII.467-69). The balance and organisation of alliteration in these verses can point to Adam's innate eloquence: he ornaments his language, albeit systematically and without excess in this instance. Adam's description of Eve, as he sees her for the first time, is "so lovely fair, / That what seemed fair in all the world, seemed now / Mean" (*PL* VIII.471-73). The phrase "lovely fair" constitutes an example of *epitheton* (Greek, "a putting upon") and is applied by attaching an adjective in front of a noun which renders them one unit (*FS* 216). Puttenham calls this figure "the Qualifier" and explains that one can convey one's opinion of a person or a thing by adding an adjective to signify a quality, either good or bad (176). The repetition of the word "fair" close

together leads me to argue that Adam is also employing *ploce*, called the "Doubler" by Puttenham (201). This device is applied by repeating the same word in close proximity, but with a change in meaning (*FS* 221). Adam first uses the word with the intention of describing Eve's physical appearance, whereas the second time the word is intended to imply goodness. Furthermore, the phrase "lovely fair" points to Adam's complete infatuation and admiration, which will later be an important factor in the pair's transgression. *Conduplicatio* is to be found in the following clauses "or in her summed up, in her contained / And in her looks," as the phrase "in her" is repeated (*PL* VIII.473-74). Thus, the rhetoric in this passage enforces Adam's deep and passionate feelings towards Eve. Adam's love for Eve is an important reason for him deciding to eat the forbidden fruit later in the poem, because he cannot bear to be without her. It is therefore important at this stage of the poem to establish Adam's feelings. As Adam describes waking up from his dream, he sees Eve being led along by God (*PL* VIII.478-90). In this passage, there are not much ornamentation to be found except a few instances of alliteration and *conduplicatio*. An example of both can be found in the line "Grace was in all her steps, heaven in her eye" (*PL* VIII.488). The function might be to enforce Eve's purity at this point in the poem: the repetition of the word "her" and words beginning with the letter H such as "heaven." Adam then tells Raphael how he turned his attention to thank God (*PL* VIII.491-94). As he addresses God we can note a few instances of figures of repetition. In the passage "Giver of all things fair, but fairest this / Of all thy gifts" the words "fair" and "fairest" constitute an example of *polyptoton*, and we can observe the alliteration in "Giver" and "gifts" (*PL* VIII.493-94). This suggests that Adam is balancing his excitement over his companion and his admiration for God. One can also note *conduplicatio* in the passage "I now see / Bone of my bone, flesh of my flesh, myself / Before me" (*PL* VIII.494-96). Within each clause *diacope* is to be found as the words "bone" and "flesh" are repeated with only two words in between. The inclusion of the words "my," "myself" and "me" can be characterised as *polyptoton* as they all share the same root. Adam gives Eve the name woman and proceeds to declare their unity. *Conduplicatio* and *anaphora* are applied in the passage "And they shall be one flesh, one heart, one soul" (*PL* VIII.499). The function of the figures in this passage seems to be to enforce the unity between Adam and Eve – which again will be important when Adam makes the decision to commit the Original Sin to be able to follow Eve. Adam describes how the scene unfolds when Eve first spots him. First, she turns to leave, but "with obsequious majesty approved / My pleaded reason" (*PL* VIII.509-10). In the passage describing this event one can note several instances of figures of repetition, although in a balanced and clear manner. The lines "Her virtue and the conscience

of her worth, / That would be wooed, and not unsought be won, / Not obvious, not obtrusive" illustrate this (*PL* VIII.502-04). The repetition of "her" in the first line is the general way of repeating a word – the figure called *palilogia* (*FS* 218). In the second line, alliteration occurs in the same sound at the beginning of the words "would," "wooed" and "won." The third line mentioned displays *anaphora* through the word "not" in the beginning of two successive clauses.

My analysis of Adam's speech has proven to give valuable insight as to the development of the character. Adam's use of rhetoric enforces the view of him as an eloquent character who remains calm and collected except on instances that mainly involve Eve. The frequency of figures of repetition increases during these passages and this might indicate that Adam loses his self-control. In the analysis of Satan's rhetoric, I noted the excessive use of repetition and how this indicated Satan's impassioned state. By having Adam display the same pattern only when talking about Eve, the readers are being prepared for what is to come – the reason why Adam also falls in *Paradise Lost*. The use of rhetoric in the character of Adam helps paint him as being made in the image of God. To a large part, Adam absorbs God's words, which in turn is an indication of the purity of his character. Adam's rhetoric is consistently balanced with few instances of several figures employed together except when Eve is involved. Adam is also careful not to appear too sure of himself to Raphael: he justifies his reason for telling his story by the desire to have Raphael as company for a while longer. Throughout the story Adam tells Raphael, he is also imitating God's words as he describes how lonely he felt amongst the animals. When his story reaches the point where Eve enters, however, Adam does not mimic her words. Whether one feels that Adam's figures of repetition when describing Eve are excessive is up to the reader. However, I would argue that his use of rhetoric is an indication as to his main weakness: the effect Eve has on him. To that extent, Adam's rhetoric in this speech represents a foreshadowing of what is to come in the following book: the Fall. The next section will be dedicated to Eve and the rhetoric employed with that character.

2.2 Eve

Whereas the character of Eve has been silently present in my analysis thus far, it is now natural to dedicate a section solely to the "Mother of human race" (*PL* IV.475). As when analysing the character of Adam, I have decided to focus on Eve's account of her first memory, namely waking up after being created by God. The previous section argued that by

studying Adam's rhetoric one may detect a character flaw through his rhetoric as his style reveals signs of extreme passion and weakened logic whenever Eve is involved. As my analysis of Satan showed, Eve was indeed seduced by the serpent's eloquence. The following close-reading of Eve's rhetoric will attempt to disclose if any flaws or warnings thereof might be discernible to the reader. Eve's recounting of her first memory takes place in Book IV, after the reader has travelled along with Satan towards Eden and become accustomed to his tormented soliloquies. Adam makes a short speech before Eve, but he does not share his first memory with her. We are therefore presented with Eve's version of their first encounter before Adam's. This might be in order to present the complexity of the character of Eve. An important aspect of her first speech is the revelation to Adam that she has learned a lesson, although she does not so much admit that she was at fault as claiming she was uninformed. The story she tells Adam, and subsequently the narrator and the reader, is highly significant, as she reveals aspects of her character that might explain why she is ultimately persuaded by Satan to eat the forbidden fruit in Book IX. We must also keep in mind that Satan witnesses her speech as well. As we shall see, what Eve says here gives Satan plenty of ideas for his seduction of her.

Adam is the first of them to speak in the poem (*PL* IV.411-39). He informs Eve about some points of doctrine which they must adhere to, including the one about the forbidden fruit. The reader is thus presented with all of the reasons for why Eve should not even want to eat the fruit. Adam's manner of speaking is simple and straightforward, and his intention seems to be to educate Eve. For this reason, one may argue that these passages are held in the plain style, as was traditionally considered appropriate among rhetoricians when offering instruction (Müller 748). During Satan's seduction of Eve, the style employed was more in the vein of the grand style, as his intention more often than not appeared to be to rouse his listeners, or himself, into action (Müller 748).

Eve begins with an exclamation: "O thou for whom / And from whom I was formed flesh of thy flesh" (*PL* IV.440-41). She is expressing her admiration for Adam, which suggests that this exclamation is of the type known as *admiratio* or alternatively, *thaumasmus*, which means "marvelling" in Greek (*FS* 376). Furthermore, in the second verse there is heavy alliteration on fricative sounds in the words "from," "formed," and "flesh." The twice repeated "whom" in "for whom / And from whom" and "flesh" in "flesh of thy flesh" constitutes an example of *diacope*, that is, the repetition of identical terms with only a few words in between them (*FS* 215; Peacham J3v). Eve continues the sentence with "And without whom am to no end, my guide / And head, what thou hast said is just and right" (*PL*

IV.442-43). Repeating the word "And" at the beginning of three consecutive lines Eve employs yet another figure of speech, *anaphora*. In other words, she employs plenty of schemes, that is, variations in normal word arrangement. Just like Satan, but unlike Adam, Eve can be seen to use several figures of repetition at once. Admittedly, the fifth virtue of style is ornateness, but the second is clarity. One must be careful not to ornate one's language too much as this would run the risk of obscuring the meaning, thereby committing a stylistic vice (Müller 745-746). To accuse Eve of this after only a few verses is perhaps unfair, but it may be an indication as to Eve's flawed morals and, furthermore, her inferiority to Adam. In what immediately follows, Eve applies the device of *affirmatio* (Latin, "affirmation"): "For we to him indeed all praises owe, / And daily thanks" (*PL* IV.444-45). This pertains to the speaker's making an assertion in an approving manner (*FS* 377). Eve is here affirming, by using the word "indeed," Adam's insistence that they must praise God (*PL* IV.436). Nonetheless, what is striking about her affirmation is how quickly she turns the focus over to herself: "I chiefly who enjoy / So far the happier lot, enjoying thee / Pre-eminent by so much odds" (*PL* IV.445-47). Repeating the word "enjoy" in the form of "enjoying," she employs the device *polyptoton*, which involves play on words with the same root (*SR*, "Schemes and Tropes"). Eve concludes by saying that "while thou / Like consort to thyself canst nowhere find" (*PL* IV.447-48), in other words, that she got the better bargain. What I find thought-provoking about this assertion is how brief her attention to God is and how quickly she turns to Adam and herself. Immediately before this, Adam emphasised God's greatness through his goodness to them and revelled in the prospect of being able to show his gratitude by tending to the garden with Eve (*PL* IV.436-39). Eve, on the other hand, focuses her gratitude on her superior mate, Adam. Her gratitude to God is based on this. One may argue that she reveals herself through her choice of words that subtly shifts attention from God's greatness to her gratitude towards Adam. The syntax of a sentence can have a special rhetorical effect as it can be structured to both emphasise and deemphasise phrases and words (*CR* 356). This is what happens here when Eve reveals her moral outlook and priorities. She appears to appreciate God first and foremost for granting her the company of Adam.

The question naturally then arises whether Eve is content with being Adam's inferior. Her desire to acquire more knowledge and to be equal to Adam is what eventually leads Eve to commit the fatal error of eating the forbidden fruit. As she muses to herself whether to eat the fruit or not in Book IX, she finally convinces herself: "Here grows the cure of all, this fruit divine, / Fair to the eye, inviting to the taste, / Of virtue to make wise" (*PL* IX.776-78). As she reaches out to pluck the fruit she asks herself "what hinders then / To reach, and feed at

once both body and mind?" (*PL* IX.778-79). Whether her thirst for knowledge and power can be attributed solely to Satan corrupting Eve's dreams at the end of Book IV or if this was a pre-existing desire within her remains unsettled. The angels Ithuriel and Zephon find Satan, in the shape of a toad, sitting by Eve whispering to her as she and Adam are sleeping (*PL* IV.799-809). Knowing this might lead the reader to think that Eve's decision to eat the fruit was directly connected to this. However, what is subsequently revealed in the passage makes this interpretation more complex. In the sentence where Eve thanks God, she also praises Adam, employing *comprobatio* (Latin, approbation") meaning that one compliments one's audience (*FS* 311). As mentioned by Henry Peacham, this figure signifies the generosity of the speaker (L2v). This is clearly what Eve is doing when she tells Adam that he will never enjoy the company of anyone equally superior. At the same time, Eve is indirectly expressing modesty of her own behalf by indicating that she is inferior to Adam. This strategy is reminiscent of Adam and his imitated conversation with God in his speech to Raphael, as analysed in the previous section. One may describe this way of speaking in terms of *hyposchesin*, which involves talking about oneself in a modest manner (*FS* 319). By so doing, Eve further emphasises the very point she is making, namely that she is the humble and submissive mate to Adam. Eve's reasoning is similar to that of Adam when he argues for why God should create a companion for him (*PL* VIII.412-33). This reflects the hierarchy of men and women, but also of mankind and God because Eve is inferior to Adam as he is to God.

So far Eve has been careful to signal her submissiveness to Adam, which directly pertains to her status as a woman. This leads me to argue that she is persuading through *ethos*. Eve now gets to a point in her speech where she reveals crucial character traits. It also gives Satan an important clue as how to best persuade Eve to eat the forbidden fruit. This is when Eve starts telling the story of when she woke up for the first time. I want to argue that she uses *adnarratio* here, which can be seen as a kind of digression whereby one adds a narrative in order to strengthen one's argument (*FS* 365). Eve's most obvious purpose is to make it appear that she fully accepts being inferior to Adam. While Adam and Eve both compare the feeling of waking up for the first time to that of awakening from sleep, there are some striking differences in terms of syntax and the use of tropes and schemes. Eve states that "That day I oft remember, when from deep sleep / I first awaked" (*PL* IV.449-50). Adam's version is very similar: "As new waked from soundest sleep / Soft on the flowery herb I found me laid" (*PL* VIII.253-54). Their styles differ, however, in that Adam employs a trope, more specifically a *simile*, to describe his experience. Tropes have to do with semantics and

the substitution of regular terms with figurative ones (Müller 746). The word "as" in Adam's narration thus likens the experience to waking up as if from a deep sleep. By contrast, Eve bluntly states that she did in fact wake up from sleep. These details may give readers vital insight into Adam's and Eve's characters. Adam, who supposedly inhabits more knowledge is perhaps humbler and aware of all the things he does not know. Eve, on the other hand, is presumably not as knowledgeable and is therefore prone to making assumptions. One might argue that this may serve as a harbinger of things to come. Despite having heard and agreed to Adam's positive take on the laws of God, Eve still convinces herself she may eat the forbidden fruit. Her limited understanding makes it easier for Satan to sow doubt in Eve's mind about God and his laws. This example of their different use of rhetoric therefore illustrates strengths and weaknesses in their characters. As Eve continues to describe the experience of waking up, the language is largely unornamented. We can, however, find alliteration in the words "wondering," "where," "what," "was" and "whence" (*PL* IV.451-52). This occurs when Eve talks about her initial desire to know what and who she is. I am tempted to suggest that the repetition of the letter W resonates at a subconscious level with the word "woman." For it may well be that Adam has already told Eve that this is the name he gave to describe her kind. If so, the alliteration might serve to emphasise Eve's gender and position beneath Adam. This part of the utterance is otherwise lacking in ornamentation. The style may be described as plain, in keeping with her position as a woman and communicating with her husband in a domestic setting (Puttenham 152). However, we must also take into consideration that there are other audiences involved, both inside the poem with Satan and the narrator representing different types of witnesses, and outside the fictional universe as the poem is being read. All are left with valuable bits of information about Eve. She describes how she heard the sound of water that led her to a lake (*PL* IV.453-59). The way Eve describes the lake is worth closer scrutiny as we are presented with two different portrayals. The first is "a liquid plain, then stood unmoved / Pure as the expanse of heaven" (*PL* IV.455-56). We should here recognise the first trope in Eve's speech – a *simile* as she compares the lake to the sky. One may also argue that the phrase "liquid plain" is another rhetorical device, namely an *oxymoron*. This figure belongs to the category of tropes as it pertains to the meaning of the sentence. *Oxymoron,* or the "Cross-couple" as George Puttenham termed it, is applied by employing two terms normally thought of as contrasting (206; *CR* 407). Eve describes approaching the water "With unexperienced thought" (*PL* IV.457). She notes how she lays down "to look into the clear / Smooth lake, that to me seemed another sky" (*PL* IV.458-59). Eve now describes the lake with the correct term, indicating that Milton has

sought to present Eve in a way that allows her choice of language to reflect her knowledge at the time of the experience. On the other hand, the different words used to describe the lake could be meant to create variation for the sake of pleasing the audience. There is also the possibility that Eve is repeating what she said a few lines earlier when she first described the lake, but in other words. Whether Eve is guilty of employing a rhetorical vice, however, remains debatable. We may say the sentence I have just discussed is characterised by *macrologia* (from greek, "speaking at length"), a vice of long-windedness, described by Peacham as an addition to our utterance that is not necessary (F2v; *FS* 443).

Eve continues to explain what happened when she bent down to look into the water: "A shape within the watery gleam appeared / Bending to look on me, I started back, / It started back" (*PL* IV.461-63). *Conduplicatio* occurs for the first time as she repeats the phrase "started back" in two successive clauses. This figure can be employed for intensity, the word itself meaning "a doubling" in Latin (*FS* 215). Another figure of speech, this type of repetition pertains to the word order of the sentence, but it does not, however, interfere with the meaning of the words. The employment of *conduplicatio* reinforces the fact that what she sees is her own reflection, although being unaware of this at the time. One may argue that another figure of speech is employed as well: *asyndeton*. This figure is applied by consciously omitting conjunctions between clauses (*CR* 387). Puttenham states that the figure can be applied in order to make the clauses seem equal (175). The word itself means "without connection" in Greek (*FS* 228-29). The figure aids in conveying Eve's surprise at seeing a shape in the water, and one that echoes her movements. Moreover, it can be said that Eve, by ending two successive clauses with the same words, employs *epistrophe*. Meaning "turning about" in Greek, this figure of repetition pertains to ending clauses and sentences with the same syllables or words, although it can also apply to similar ideas (*FS* 234; *SR*, "Schemes and Tropes"). Puttenham warns that the figure is not often used in English and that it is difficult to do so successfully (198-99). By including several figures such as *conduplicatio* and *epistrophe* as well as omitting conjunctions, Eve presents this experience in a highly intensified manner. The reader will most likely perceive Eve as lively and passionate from the way she speaks. In the same vein, one can argue that her style here is the type of *akme*. This is the vigorous and lively style with which one talks of important matters straightforwardly (*FS* 407). Fear soon turns into fascination for Eve as she narrates how she regarded the shape in the water: "pleased I soon returned, Pleased it returned as soon with answering looks / Of sympathy and love" (*PL* IV.463-65). *Conduplicatio* occurs yet again in the repetition of the words "pleased" and "soon." Another figure of repetition that is also

used in these verses is *diacope*, in the successive use of the word "returned." What is striking about Eve's utterance is how the arrangement of words makes it seem as if the shape returned because she returned. Thus, she believes the shape was smitten by her. This may be evidence to her seemingly vain nature. Nonetheless, it establishes her as the passive and submissive part in any relationship. Though she desires what she sees in the water, Eve puts the emphasis on what she thinks is another being. In that way, I would argue that Eve once again employs the rhetorical figure of *hyposchesin*, talking modestly about herself. It is the reflection that was pleased by Eve's return, not the other way around. Eve then makes a startling revelation: "there I had fixed / Mine eyes till now, and pined with vain desire, / Had not a voice thus warned me" (*PL* IV.465-67). This description sounds similar to that of the story of Narcissus who fell in love with his own reflection, to be found in *Metamorphoses* by Ovid (112-13). It is an intriguing aspect of Eve's first memory. While Adam immediately assesses his surroundings and names the creatures around him, Eve instead pines and yearns for her own reflection, indicating her need for divine guidance.

Eve now comes to the part involving God. Just as Adam does later in his speech to Raphael, Eve chooses to imitate God's words to her. Yet their narrations differ in one respect. Whereas Adam employs *sermocinatio* by imitating dialogue between himself and God, Eve simply imitates God's words. This implies that the two did not have a conversation. She then employs *mimesis*, which is a rhetorical term for imitating someone (*FS* 323). The difference in figures employed by the two characters seems to serve a specific function. In Eve's case God appears more distant and prohibiting than what is the impression we get from Adam. Eve tells Adam that God warns her "What thou seest, / What there thou seest fair creature is thyself, / With thee it came and goes" (*PL* IV.467-69). In Eve's memory, God employs several figures of speech. *Conduplicatio* can be found in the repetition of the words "What," "thou," and "seest." Additionally, the words "thou," "thyself," and "thee" constitute another instance of *polyptoton* – play on root form. Alliteration occurs in the words "thou," there," "thyself" and "thee." God could be said to employ several figures in order to move Eve into action. Thus, the style can now be recognised as high which is the style one strives for when the desired effect is to move an audience (Müller 748). Because Eve is imitating God, a high style would be appropriate as he is considered the omnipotent creator with the highest of standings (Puttenham 151-53). God tells Eve to follow him so she can meet Adam, "he / Whose image thou art" (*PL* IV.469-72). Eve's future is finally revealed to her: "to him shalt bear / Multitudes like thyself, and thence be called / Mother of human race" (*PL* IV.473-75). In Eve's imitation, God keeps using *polyptoton* as words such as "thou," "thee," "thy,"

"thine" and "thyself" can be found throughout (*PL* IV.467-75). This can be said to enforce his appeal to Eve and to drag her away from her reflection in the water. Alternatively, it could be Eve's own excitement that shines through in her imitation of God's words. He is after all, in her words, relating her origin, future and fate, and her excitement at hearing this might manifest itself through her use of these figures.

As Eve's imitation of God's words ends, she asks a rhetorical question for the first time: "what could I do, / But follow strait, invisibly thus led?" (*PL* IV.475-76). This question is the type of *aporia* as Eve deliberates what is the best way for her to face this dilemma (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). Puttenham calls this figure "the Doubtfull" and explains it as to give the impression of seemingly being in doubt (226) Eve describes seeing Adam for the first time, "fair indeed and tall" with the use of several schemes (*PL* IV.477). In her first impression of him one may note the figure of *conduplicatio* in the repetition of the word "less": "yet methought less fair, / Less winning soft, less amiably mild, / Than that smooth watery image" (*PL* IV.478-80). The effect of this device is to emphasise the differences between Adam and Eve. In other words, Eve is about to learn why it is a good thing that Adam lacks these qualities. She relates how she turns to leave, but Adam follows and calls to her (*PL* IV.480-81). *Mimesis* is applied yet again as Eve proceeds to imitate Adam's words. Adam comes through as desperate to persuade Eve to stay and he begins with a rhetorical question: "Return fair Eve, / Whom fly'st thou?" (*PL* IV.481-82). This question is the type *anthypophora* as a reply is supplied immediately (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"): "Whom thou fly'st, of him thou art, / His flesh, his bone; to give thee being I lent / Out my side to thee" (*PL* IV.482-84). There is alliteration in "him" and "his," as well as *diacope* in the repetition of "his" with only one word in between. Adam emphasises his generosity and his affection for Eve: "nearest my heart / Substantial life, to have thee by my side / Henceforth an individual solace dear" (*PL* IV.484-86). One could say Adam is exaggerating here, as it was God who created Eve out of Adam's rib. Adam's whole utterance can be characterised as a type of *auxesis* (from Greek, "increase"), a figure of amplification which makes something appear greater (*FS* 255). Eve narrates how Adam ends his speech with a firmness that she cannot resist: "Part of my soul I seek thee, and thee claim / My other half" (*PL* IV.487-88). Except for the *diacope* in the repetition of the word "thee," Adam's punchline is largely devoid of ornamentation. However, the phrase "other half" is the type of metaphor or *metaphora* (Greek, "transference"). This is a trope pertaining to an implied comparison between two things (*FS* 249; *CR* 396). The "other half" refers to how Adam claims Eve as his wife. Eve now starts addressing Adam directly: "with that thy gentle hand / Seized mine, I

yielded" (*PL* IV.488-89). The passive voice of this sentence enforces the view of Eve as submissive. The clause "I yielded" is in itself a rhetorical device – *comma*. This device is employed by having a clause or phrase with few syllables (*FS* 231). The rhetorical purpose of this might be to place less emphasis on the clause as it presents Eve as needing to be led by hand in order for her to come to Adam. This is achieved by placing the clause between other and longer clauses. As Eve's speech draws to a close she returns to the topic with which she began, namely that of Adam's superiority. She says: "and from that time see / How beauty is excelled by manly grace / And wisdom, which alone is truly fair" (*PL* IV.489-91). By telling Adam her first memory she has also explained how she came to learn that he is superior to her. This is a rhetorical device, *antanaclasis*. One may employ it to bring a digression back to the main point of one's speech (*FS* 366). As I mentioned earlier in this section, Eve employs *adnarratio* when she includes a narrative in her speech. This has the effect of strengthening her argument. Thus, by returning to her point after the digression, the character of Eve shows her skills as an orator with an awareness to figures of thought. Her explanation can be seen as a persuasion through *logos*, offering the reasons for why she is inferior to Adam. Her final utterances after she has returned to her main point can further be seen as an attempt to stir Adam's feelings. He can, according to this speech, rest assured that Eve has learnt her lesson. This would then qualify as a persuasion through *pathos*.

My analysis of Eve's first speech has illustrated why her character is a complex one to interpret. Whether she is inherently vain or not remains unclear. However, the difference between Eve's reaction to waking up compared to that of Adam gives us insight into her character. She does not go out to seek companionship, but rather falls in love with her own reflection. Whereas Adam has a conversation with God, Eve needs to be persuaded and taken away from her reflection. The character of Eve employs figures of speech more than tropes, thus ornamenting her language in a syntactical manner as opposed to a change of meaning. Adam only imitated God's words and not Eve's in his speech, while Eve imitates both. This reflects hierarchy – Eve is inferior to both and it is therefore appropriate for her to relate the others' words directly as opposed to paraphrasing them. Adam, on the other hand, sees himself as superior to Eve and paraphrases his first meeting with her in his own words. The fact that Eve only offers reports of what others have said without any replies by her, enforces an understanding of her playing a submissive role in *Paradise Lost*. The increased employment of figures and tropes in the parts of the speech where Eve is imitating God or Adam only further proves this. She is only receiving commands and requests – not participating in dialogues at this point. This implies that Eve is granted with the gift of

eloquence and that she is able to adjust the style in accordance with who she is quoting. Eve learns that it is wisdom and the other qualities Adam possesses which make him superior. This leaves her an easy target for Satan who has listened to the whole speech. He lures her with the prospect of improving her abilities and acquiring more knowledge. Given Eve's attitude, one can to a certain degree understand how she could persuade herself to eat the forbidden fruit. We are given what might be perceived as an ominous warning from the narrator as he describes how Eve ends her speech: "So spake our general mother" (*PL* IV.492). Earlier in Book IV, the narrator describes the end of Satan's soliloquy in very similar terms: "So spake the fiend" (*PL* IV.393). The rhetoric used with the character of Eve thus casts her as a submissive woman. At first glance it might appear that Eve is fighting this stereotype as she initially wants to stare at her own reflection rather than go with Adam. However, looking closely at this section, I found that even in the communication with her own reflection Eve is still the submissive part. In the last section I want to investigate what happens when the two characters interact. More specifically, I will close-read and analyse sections both before and after the Fall. My aim is to discover whether the rhetoric employed with the characters changes after they commit the Original Sin.

2.3 Adam and Eve's rhetoric before and after the Fall

We shall now turn our focus to differences in the way in which Adam and Eve interact before and after the Fall. This will tell us something about the author's use of rhetoric before and after the transgression of mankind as well as the dynamics between the characters. Will the way the characters employ rhetorical figures be indicative of their new fallen state, and will the argument Adam and Eve have before the Fall give us any indication as to their character's flaws and limitations? These are some of the questions this part of the chapter will try to answer. The conversations I will explore are to be found in Book IX. Firstly, when Adam and Eve discuss whether or not they should work separately or not and secondly, their quarrel after having committed the Original Sin.

On the morning of the Fall, Adam and Eve enter into a discussion as to the safest and most effective way to labour in light of the news that danger is lurking. Eve initiates the discussion with the suggestion that they work separately in order to be more effective. Adam argues against this, claiming they are better suited to fend off a potential foe together. Ultimately, this discussion and their decision to work apart from each other lead to their fall. The rhetoric here will be worth exploring in order to see how each character tries to persuade

the other. Considering it is Eve who eventually wins the argument, I will keep a close watch on the means which she employs to persuade Adam to see her point. Attention will also be paid to Adam, on the losing side of the argument, and to which factors are at play as Adam is seemingly the superior of the two.

Eve starts by addressing Adam directly: "Adam, well may we labour still to dress / This garden, still to tend plant, herb and flower, / Our pleasant task enjoined" (*PL* IX.205-07). An important aspect here is the lack of salutations in her address. Instead of opening her statement by expressing her admiration for Adam, Eve immediately gets to the point. Thus, it seems she is addressing Adam as an equal. This could be an indication of her flawed nature as it is presented in the poem: her refusal to accept her inferiority to Adam. It could also be because Satan's influence on her has made its mark. While Eve does not shower Adam with words of admiration, she does sugar the pill to an extent by describing their current work situation as "Our pleasant task enjoined" (*PL* IX.207). Still, the word "enjoined" signals a sense of passiveness and of being commanded to perform the otherwise "pleasant task." Indicative of Eve's need to assert herself, the word negates to an extent the pleasant aspect of their collective labour. The passage is relatively lacking in both tropes and schemes. However, the repetition of "still" warrants the term *conduplicatio* as the word can be found in two successive clauses (*FS* 215). Thus, Eve continues her habit of applying schemes. In this instance, the repetition of "still" serves to portray Eve's restlessness with their situation due to the magnitude of their task. The heaping together of "plant, herb and flower" constitutes an example of *synonymia* (Greek, "sameness of meaning"; *FS* 223). A figure of amplification, *synonymia* can add emotional force (*SR*, "Figures of Amplification"). George Puttenham calls this "the Figure of store" and states that it does indeed enlarge the matter of which one speaks (214-15). As such, Eve's style already conveys her need to persuade and be heard.

Eve quickly moves on to what she sees as the problematic aspect, namely that the work will be too much for the two of them until more hands arrive (*PL* IX.207-09). As Eve continues to present her case, one can argue that *enumeratio* occurs in the phrase "what we by day / Lop overgrown, or prune, or prop, or bind" (*PL* IX.209-10). *Enumeratio*, which is Latin for "a counting up," consists of a numbering of effects or characteristics in order to emphasise your point. This can also be applied, as Eve does here, without numbering each part, the correct term then being *aparithesis* (*FS* 276). Henry Peacham states that the function of this figure is to amplify (R3v-4v). There is also an instance of *anaphora* in the repetition of "or" at the beginning of three consecutive clauses. The *aparithesis* and *anaphora* further emphasise a sense of dreariness and futility on Eve's part and a desire for a change of pace. It

will not matter how hard they work – as long as it is just the two of them it will be too much. The eloquence in Eve's words testifies to this through her emphasis on the overwhelming amount of work for only two pairs of hands. As it appears here, Eve is stating what she sees to be the problem and the facts. Thus, one can describe this as *narratio*, as Eve has dedicated this part of her utterance to stating of facts (*FS* 371). The crux of her point becomes clear as she utters "Let us divide our labours" (*PL* IX.214). As Eve goes on to divulge her plans on how to do this, her language is to the point as she asserts her need for independence. From the way she is portrayed, the reader gets a sense that she has given her arguments a great amount of thought, including to divide the tasks between herself and Adam. Eve keeps the rhetorical figures to a minimum, other than examples of both alliteration and assonance, in the phrase concerning her ideas about Adam's tasks: "thou where choice / Leads thee, or where most needs, whether to wind / The woodbine round this arbour" (*PL* IX.214-16). She goes so far as to suggest their working closely together might even affect how much they get done in a day (*PL* IX.220-25). Regarding terms of style, one might label Eve's here as plain as it is relatively free of ornamentation (Müller 748). Her aim seems to be to inform Adam of their current problem and how best to solve it. However, as Eve consistently employs the plain style throughout the presentation of her suggestion, the ending is not as forceful as it might have been. According to classical theory, when concluding a speech, one should typically employ the high style as this is aimed at moving the audience (Müller 748). Thus, the end of Eve's delivery, although to the point and clear, might have been more effective if she had employed a higher level of style. This allows Adam to retort back and counter her arguments.

Adam declares, "Sole Eve, associate sole, to me beyond / Compare above all living creatures dear" (*PL* IX.227-28). The difference in their respective salutations is telling. Whereas Eve simply addresses him by his name, Adam addresses Eve in a more complimentary way. However, his repetition of the word "sole" in two consecutive clauses, an example of *conduplicatio*, echoes the beginning of Eve's speech with her repetition of the word "still." Adam's habit of including the word "sole" when addressing Eve is not new as the first words he ever utters in *Paradise Lost*, to be found in book IV is: "Sole partner and sole part of all these joys" (*PL* IV.411). Adam is prone to describe Eve as a part of him and in so doing to show his devotion to her. He thus dedicates the first part of his contribution to their conversation by complimenting Eve and proceeds to acknowledge the effort Eve has made by presenting her idea to him (*PL* IX.229-32). Ending the bout of flattery with a firm reminder of Eve's role in God's universe, Adam says: "for nothing lovelier can be found / In

woman, than to study household good, / And good works in her husband to promote" (*PL* IX.232-34). One may describe this way of speaking in terms of *comprobatio* (Latin, "approbation"), as it pertains to complimenting one's audience (*FS* 311). In so doing, Adam follows the classical pattern of structuring one's oration by dedicating the first part to establish his authority through *ethos* (*SR*, "Arrangement"). The rationale behind this is that *comprobatio* can be seen as a figure associated with persuasion through *ethos*, as the orator presents himself as respectful and tolerant towards his audience (*SR*, "*Comprobatio*"; Peacham L2v). The different ways in which Adam and Eve structure the beginning of their utterances indicate their different characters. The *comprobatio* strongly enforces the notion that Eve is inferior to Adam and, though gently, is symbolic of Adam's disapproval of her suggestion. He continues to refute her arguments, claiming that God has not forbidden them to eat or interact in between labouring in the garden, as these activities are what separate them from the animals (*PL* IX.235-43). He is not attacking Eve and her arguments, but is explaining why, in his opinion, they hold no worth. This type of refutation can be described as *elenchus* (Greek, "cross-examination") as it pertains to logical refutation (*SR*, "Figures of Refutation").

Throughout his refutation, Adam employs some rhetorical figures but keeps them to a minimum. There is a figure of repetition, *conduplicatio*, in the phrase "for smiles from reason flow, / To brute denied, and are of love the food, / Love not the lowest end of human life" (*PL* IX.239-41). Moreover, the twice repeated "love" and the once repeated "lowest" emphasise the L sound which perhaps serves to highlight Adam's love for Eve. Adam keeps this section relatively free of figures as is prudent when the intention is to inform the audience, in accordance with plain style. Adam then understands Eve's motive and says, however disheartened, "but if much convérse perhaps / Thee satiate, to short absence I could yield" (*PL* IX.247-48). Heavy alliteration occurs in the next sentence: "For solitude sometimes is best society, / And short retirement urges sweet return" (*PL* IX.249-50). The alliteration ominously augurs the sin they are about to commit.

Adam's argument is impaired and perhaps weakened by his overwhelming feelings for Eve. He ends his counterargument by saying that he is afraid of Eve being exposed to danger if she is by herself, outlining ways a foe could intercept them (*PL* IX.251-65). Alliteration on S sounds is to be found throughout, especially when describing the foe's desires: "seeks to work us woe and shame / By sly assault; and somewhere nigh at hand / Watches, no doubt, with greedy hope . . . " (*PL* IX.255-57). The short clause "no doubt" can be described in terms of the figure *comma*, which pertains to clauses consisting of less than twelve syllables

(*FS* 231). The rhetorical function here may be to make such a bold statement seem less blatant, as Adam is not omnipotent and cannot know this for sure. By ensconcing the clause between longer utterances, he is able to make a bold statement covertly. As Adam nears the end of his argument he pleads, "leave not the faithful side / That gave thee being, still shades thee and protects" (*PL* IX.265-66). The *conduplicatio* in the repetition of "thee" makes it apparent that Adam is attempting to persuade Eve by stirring her emotions. Adam is instilling a sense of obligation on Eve's part to listen to and stay with him, because he is responsible for her existence. As we know, this is an exaggeration, as it was God who created Eve. His punchline, "The wife, where danger or dishonour lurks, / Safest and seemliest by her husband stays, / Who guards her, or with her the worst endures" shows the shortcomings of his argument and his tendency to try and persuade Eve through guilt and duty (*PL* IX.267-69). The alliteration in the phrase "Safest and seemliest" suggests an explicit message to Eve: Adam wants her to be safe, but it is just as important for her to behave according to her gender.

Eve returns with a more passionate and emotional response. Her mode of address is entirely changed from earlier, now addressing Adam as "Offspring of heaven and earth, and all earth's lord" (*PL* IX.273). One could argue that Eve is adapting her argument to her opponent by upping the style of her language. In order to fully persuade Adam, Eve must elevate her style. Eve reveals that she overheard Raphael's warning to Adam about a foe wishing them ill (*PL* IX.275-78). This echoes Satan's overhearing of Adam and Eve in Book IV, and this similarity can hardly be positive for the characterisation of Eve (*PL* IV.396-408). Showing disappointment in Adam's fears, Eve states "His fraud is then thy fear, which plain infers / Thy equal fear that my firm faith and love / Can by his fraud be shaken or seduced" (*PL* IX.285-87). There are instances of alliteration here with the focus on F sounds as well as S sounds, the latter in keeping with Adam's use of this figure. In Eve's case, this could signify the impending fall and seduction. Additionally, the *conduplicatio* in the repetition of both "fear" and "fraud" seems targeted to attack Adam and his fears. One may argue that Eve reveals her opinion that Adam should be braver because he is her husband and superior, as he himself just articulated to her. This suggests that Eve has limited understanding of their relationship, as bravery in this context is not simply about being bold and daring, but also involves caution when the situation so requires. The instances where schemes, alliteration and *conduplicatio* are employed can also be seen to portray the passionate element in Eve's speech. Eve ends her rebuttal with "Thoughts, which how found they harbour in thy breast, / Adam, misthought of her to thee so dear?" (*PL* IX.288-89). We can note an instance of

wordplay in "misthought" and a rhetorical question of the type *epiplexis*, as it functions as a way for Eve to express anguish. Rhetorical questions and wordplay belong to the category of tropes (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions," "Schemes and Tropes"). Peacham explains that the function of rhetorical questions is to appear vehement and better convey our intended message (L3r). This emphasises Eve's interpretation of Adam's argument as a criticism aimed at her character, one with which many might agree. By having her language almost unornamented in terms of schemes, but instead ending her statement with tropes, Eve manages to hold her own during the argument. Though modern readers may find her assertions valid, her disapproval of Adam's arguments could signify her refusal to follow God's decree and be her husband's inferior.

Adam replies with yet more flattering names when addressing her, noting that she is "from sin and blame entire" (*PL* IX.292). His reply is mostly concerned with justifying himself. Thus, one can say that he is employing rhetorical figures such as *electio* and *proecthesis*. The former pertains to explaining why one has to do something out of necessity, while the latter is about responding to accusations (*FS* 275, 401). The reason Adam provides is "Not diffident of thee do I dissuade / Thy absence from my sight, but to avoid / The attempt itself, intended by our foe" (*PL* IX.293-95). The assonance in "Thy" and "my" enforces Adam's view of himself and Eve as one, whereas Eve speaks more in terms of individuality. Adam argues that they can best beat temptation together, citing that Eve gives him strength and wisdom by simply being near him (*PL* IX.309-12). Adam employs several instances of repetition throughout the passage. The figure most used is the type known as *polyptoton* (Greek, "with or in many cases"), that is the repetition of a word in different forms (*FS* 222). As Puttenham describes the figure, it can be used just like a tailor would fashion a garment into many shapes. This in turn emphasises the very core of what one is repeating (Puttenham 203-04). We can observe an example of this figure in the passage "For he who tempts, though in vain, at least asperses / The tempted with dishonour foul" (*PL* IX.296-97). By contrast, an instance of *diacope*, the repetition of a word with only a few in between (*FS* 215) is to be found in the passage "in thy sight / More wise, more watchful" (*PL* IX.310-11). *Conduplicatio* occurs in the passage as well. The use of figures of repetition is there to emphasise certain aspects Adam wants Eve to pay attention to. The style can be labelled as plain as the ornamentation is sparse. Perhaps this is Adam's mistake. As he aims to inform Eve, a higher level of style might have moved her into action.

Eve is able to hit back and this time she employs several rhetorical questions. Arguing that they are being dictated by a foe, Eve asks: "How are we happy, still in fear of harm?"

(*PL* IX.326). This rhetorical question is the type of *anthypophora* as Eve provides an answer in the following sentence: "But harm precedes not sin" (*PL* IX.327; *SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). Termed the "Figure of responce" by Puttenham, *anthypophora* is said to function as a form of amplification in that it enlivens the speech as well as hinder one's opponent from asking the same question. According to Puttenham, by asking and answering your own questions, the argument can be controlled better than leaving yourself open for the opponent to attack (204-05). The answer evolves into another question, which suggests that their foe's temptation will dishonour him instead of them, "then wherefore shunned or feared / By us?" (*PL* IX.331-32). As Eve responds to it herself yet again, contending that they will receive "Favour from heaven" for withstanding temptation, the question is the type of *anthypophora* (*PL* IX.334). What follows is a third question: "And what is faith, love, virtue unassayed / Alone, without exterior help sustained?" (*PL* IX.335-36). This series of rhetorical questions constitutes an example of *pysma*. This figure would require an intricate response on Adam's part (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). The function of this figure, according to Peacham, is to overwhelm the hearer with a number of questions so that he will forget one or simply give up trying to answer them all. It can also function to convey a sense of intensity such as in lamentations (Peacham L4r-v). As such, Eve can be seen to overwhelm Adam with a series of questions very much like Satan does with Eve later in Book IX. Her reasoning bears some resemblance to Milton's argument in *Areopagitica* (1644) that "cloistered virtue" is not commendable (*Complete Poems and Major Prose* 728). Eve, at this point in *Paradise Lost*, is still in her unfallen state, and one might argue that her argument is untimely. Eve ends her statement with an instance of *ploce* in the passage: "Frail is our happiness, if this be so, / And Eden were no Eden thus exposed" (*PL* IX.340-41). *Ploce* (Greek, "twining") pertains to adjacent repetition of a word with different meaning at each occurrence (*FS* 221). Puttenham calls this figure "the Doubler," and Peacham explains that the importance lies more on the different meanings than the repetition itself (201; J2r-v). In this case, Eden means on the one hand the actual place in which Adam and Eve live and on the other hand happiness.

We have now reached Adam's last response, where he continues with his pattern of starting by addressing Eve. This time he says "O woman," which implies intensity (*PL* IX.343). This exclamation is the type of *exclamatio* as it conveys the impression that Adam is crying out (*FS* 391). Puttenham calls this figure the "Outcry" and describes it as conveying "extreme passion" (212). Adam's response is embellished by figures of repetition while arguing that God gave them free will and how easily reason can be manipulated. One can note instances of *epizeuxis*, the repetition of a word with no words in between (*FS* 216) as

well as *conduplicatio*, *polyptoton* and *diacope*. Again, Adam tries to enforce his points by using figures of repetition and aims towards emotional rather than logical persuasion. As his will weakens he asks Eve a rhetorical question, his first during this conversation: "Wouldst thou approve thy constancy, approve / First thy obedience; the other who can know, / Not seeing thee attempted, who attest?" (*PL* IX.367-69). This is also the type of *aporia* as it seems Adam is doubting Eve (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). The figure is called "the Doubtfull" by Puttenham and explained as a purposeful doubt (226). Adam continues with his final sentence and thus gives in, granting Eve the permission to walk off. He ends his statement with "rely / On what thou hast of virtue, summon all, / For God towards thee hath done his part, do thine" (*PL* IX.373-75). The end to Adam's response can thus be characterised as *adhortatio*. A figure of *pathos*, this device pertains to moving one's audience by either commands or warnings (*SR*, "Figures of *Pathos*"). Peacham explains that this figure can be applied if one hopes to be rewarded or, alternatively, is afraid of shame (L1r-v). Both of these can be said to be relevant to Adam's position. Eve's final response before walking off on her own towards the fall of mankind is short, free of ornamentation and ominously confident. Stating that she does not "expect / A foe so proud will first the weaker seek" Eve lets go of Adam's hand and walks away, ultimately the winner of the argument (*PL* IX.382-86).

Now that we have studied Adam and Eve's rhetoric and argumentation before the Fall, it is time to explore whether there are any differences in their manner of expression after. We shall concentrate on the first conversation between the two poetic characters in their newly fallen state at the end of Book IX, after the parents of mankind wake up from a night of sinful behaviour. Having decided to cover themselves up with fig leaves because their new state involves the feeling of shame, the couple starts quarrelling. Adam begins this time by placing the guilt on Eve: "Would thou hadst hearkened to my words, and stayed / With me, as I besought thee, when that strange / Desire of wandering this unhappy morn" (*PL* IX.1134-36). The assonance in the words "me" and "thee" yet again enforces the view of unity that Adam seems to have in that Eve belongs to him and that she should have stayed. He then makes the accusation "I know not whence possessed thee; we had then / Remained still happy, not as now, despoiled / Of all our good, shamed, naked, miserable" (*PL* IX.1137-39). Adam is not being entirely truthful as Eve explained to him what her mind-set was before she went off. The heaping of the words at the end of the phrase can be described rhetorically in terms of *enumeratio*, because Adam is listing up the effects from the Fall and their new state. At the same time one may also argue that the short clauses constitute examples of *comma*. Adam is

thus employing both a figure of amplification as well as a figure that illustrates their dire situation that he argues Eve is responsible for. Because Adam is placing the blame entirely on Eve and shows his disdain for her actions, one can characterise this as *fastidium*. A way of addressing an opponent, this figure pertains to arrogant and disdainful behaviour (*FS* 318). This is quite a departure for Adam, who earlier internalised and concealed his shock and horror before addressing Eve after he realised that she had eaten the forbidden fruit (*PL* IX.895-959). As a fallen man, however, Adam spares nothing for Eve's sake.

Eve's response is focused on self-justification, and she employs several rhetorical figures throughout. Addressing her husband as "Adam severe," Eve appears melancholy and guilt-ridden, but clear headed (*PL* IX.1144). In the phrase: "Imput'st thou that to my default, or will / Of wandering, as thou callst it" one may, however, observe the discord between them (*PL* IX.1145-46). Eve picks up on Adam's use of the word "wandering" and by employing alliteration creates a phrase that conveys her indignation in an effective manner. The short clause "as thou callst it" in between other longer clauses is yet another example of the rhetorical figure *comma*. Here one might argue its function has to do with its placement within the sentence. Because it is flanked by other clauses, it might seem less important. However, choices one makes about syntactic structure and grammar also have a rhetorical function, and as such the clause does convey a sense of indignation and possibly even contempt on Eve's part (*CR* 356). Eve proceeds to state that the very same "might as ill have happened thou being by, / Or to thyself perhaps" (*PL* IX.1147-48). The words "thou" and "thyself" close together may be regarded in terms of *polyptoton*, because they have the same root. Rhetorically, Eve is taking the guilt Adam placed on her and lays it back on him. Furthermore, Eve states that "hadst thou been there, / Or here the attempt, thou couldst not have discerned / Fraud in the serpent" (*PL* IX.1148-50). The repetition of the word "thou" in consecutive clauses creates an effect of *conduplicatio* and highlights Eve's frantic self-justification.

Eve is thus employing several figures of repetition which can be described as schemes, and the reader may get the impression that she is indeed scheming a little herself. The consistency of the repetitions signals persuasion aimed at arousing emotions in her audience, which is Adam (*SR*, "Figures of *Pathos*"). Eve then asks a rhetorical question, the type being *anthypophora* as she provides an answer: "Was I to have never parted from thy side? / As good have grown there still a lifeless rib" (*PL* IX.1153-54). This is quite remarkable for Eve to say, admitting that she was not happy to stay by Adam's side. Of course, one must take into consideration that it is now the fallen Eve who is speaking, but it does shine a light on

the complexity of the character. Another rhetorical question is asked directly afterwards: "Being as I am, why didst not thou the head / Command me absolutely not to go, / Going into such danger as thou saidst?" (*PL* IX.1155-57). As Eve is looking to place blame elsewhere, the question qualifies as the type of *epiplexis*. Eve now blames Adam for not stopping her, although in the previous rhetorical question she vocalised her opposition to being "a lifeless rib" (*PL* IX.1154). Hence, there is an inconsistency in Eve's reasoning, her rhetorical questions making this evident. The use of tropes here thus falls flat. She ends her reply with the damning "Hadst thou been firm and fixed in thy dissent, / Neither had I transgressed, nor thou with me" (*PL* IX.1160-61). The alliteration in "firm and fixed" bears a striking resemblance to Adam's "Safest and seemliest" when describing Eve's role as his wife during their argument before the Fall, as mentioned above (*PL* IX.268). This might then be Eve's response – what she perceives as Adam's role as her husband. Furthermore, the alliteration plays on words beginning with F sounds, perhaps signifying the Fall. The continued repetition of "thou" throughout the end of her utterance is seemingly intended to make Adam feel guilty. As such, because the repetition is consistent throughout one can label this as another rhetorical figure: *traductio*, the repetition of a word throughout an utterance (*FS* 224). The exchange between Adam and Eve thus far pertains to placing the blame on the other and shows the meaninglessness of their quarrel.

Adam's response, the last part of Book IX, is equally impassioned and indignant. Adam exclaims: "Is this the love, is this the recompense / Of mine to thee, ingrateful Eve, expressed / Immutable when thou wert lost, not I" (*PL* IX.1163-65). One can note the *diacope* in the repetition of the words "Is this" with only two words in between, making Adam seem disappointed and exasperated. The short clause "not I" ensconced between longer ones conveys a passive aggressive tone. Thus, as per their new fallen custom, *comma* is found yet again in this quarrel. Adam asks: "And am I now upbraided, as the cause / Of thy transgressing?" (*PL* IX.1168-69). Another rhetorical question immediately follows: "Not enough severe, / It seems, in thy restraint: what could I more?" (*PL* IX.1169-70). The former can be said to be the type of *epiplexis*, as the intended goal seems to be to criticise Eve. The latter, however, can be said to be the type of *anthypophora* because we are provided with an immediate answer by Adam himself: "I warned thee, I admonished thee, foretold / The danger, and the lurking enemy / That lay in wait" (*PL* IX.1171-73). The *diacope* in the repetition of each of the words "I" and "thee" serves to reprimand Eve, but also to amplify Adam's efforts. Furthermore, Adam states that he could not have done more as "beyond this had been force, / And force upon free will hath here no place" (*PL* IX.1173-74). The *diacope*

in “force, / And force” accentuates the unfeasibility of Eve’s allegations, according to Adam. As Adam’s speech comes to an end he states that his fault was to think Eve incapable of falling (*PL* IX.1179-80). This suggests a use of *confessio* as Adam is admitting fault, although the fault he admits reflects poorly on Eve as well (*FS* 313). As such, Adam’s admission negates to an extent the severity of his fault. His anger culminates as he states “but I rue / That error now, which is become my crime, / And thou the accuser” (*PL* IX.1180-83). Furthermore, Adam now shifts his focus from Eve to all women, even though Eve is still the only woman alive: “Thus it shall befall / Him who to worth in women overtrusting / Lets her will rule” (*PL* IX.1182-84). This utterance can be described in terms of the rhetorical figure *admonitio*, as it pertains to warnings and admonitions (*FS* 377). Adam’s misogyny becomes clear as this part of the poem draws to a close: “restraint she will not brook, / And left to herself, if evil thence ensue, / She first his weak indulgence will accuse” (*PL* IX.1184-86). There is not much ornamentation to Adam’s language as we are about to leave the unhappy couple and move on to Book X. With apparently no desire to persuade the other with logic, but simply lashing out, the parents of mankind omit higher levels of style. One can also argue that their new fallen state renders them incapable of purer means of persuasion.

My analysis of the rhetoric in the exchanges between Adam and Eve has made their most damning character flaws apparent. There is also a distinct difference between the style before and after the fall of mankind. Adam’s most serious flaw in the argument before the Fall might be that he was too rigid in his responses. He kept his style plain with the intention of teaching Eve. Eve, on the other hand, had more logical reasons for her argument – a solution to increase their productivity. She did, however, display a naïve attitude to the world and the dangers in it, although this could be seen as a testament to her prelapsarian innocence. Eve’s straightforwardness, her lack of salutations to Adam for the most part, might signify a flaw which can be said to be her rebellion against her role as a woman. As Adam’s husband, she should be susceptive of Adam’s informing style. After the Fall, the rhetoric changes drastically. They are now mainly concerned with hurling accusations at one another as well as placing blame, thereby exposing their guilt-ridden souls. Their refusal to accept blame makes their arguments hollow and spiteful. Adam fully accuses Eve for their fall, though he admits towards the end that his fault lies in trusting Eve too much. Eve, on the other hand, first argues that the same thing would have happened regardless of the distance between them, but then changes to criticise Adam for not being firm enough with her. Her use of rhetorical questions in this part reveals her confused state of mind. Their reliance on figures of repetition shows how impassioned they both are during the postlapsarian quarrel. By

contrast, figures of repetition are less frequent in their prelapsarian rhetoric. Using the figure *comma* to include snide insults, the moral purity of their rhetoric before the Fall seems to be gone forever. Thus, the change in moral values are displayed through their speech.

My chapter concerning the humans in *Paradise Lost* has now come to an end and I will turn my focus to the inhabitants of Heaven and Hell. The last chapter of my thesis will explore the rhetoric of God, the unfallen and fallen angels in order to contrast the way in which Satan, Adam and Eve are portrayed through speech.

3 The inhabitants of Heaven and Hell

3.1 God

We shall now turn to the inhabitants of Heaven and Hell, exploring the rhetoric used with God, the unfallen and the fallen angels. God has been silently present throughout my discussion, for example when Adam paraphrased his words and when Eve imitated him. Satan also referred to him on various occasions. Whereas Satan, Adam and Eve are presented to the reader in great detail, the character of God is portrayed differently. In his book *Milton's God*, William Empson states: "I think his treatment of God so strange that it rewards inquiry" (91). Indeed, God might be described as distant and unemotional in *Paradise Lost*. It is for that very reason that I think exploring the rhetoric used with this character is especially important, as it can tell us more about how he is portrayed in the epic. God, as the omnipotent character in *Paradise Lost*, towers above all the others in terms of rank and knowledge. George Puttenham declares that "The matters therefore that concerne the Gods and diuine things are highest of all other to be couched in writing" (152). As such, one can expect God's style to reflect his supreme standing. Whether or not the language of the character in fact conveys this superiority will be a main focus as I explore the rhetoric that Milton has attributed to this character.

The passage I have chosen to close-read, which is to be found in Book III, is the very first utterance by God. Observing Satan's escape from Hell and his approach towards earth, God tells the Son about the impending fall and what mankind must do to receive grace. God's utterance may be described as a speech, as the narrator of the poem makes it clear that God has an audience which, more importantly, includes the Son: "on his right / The radiant image of his glory sat, / His only Son" (*PL* III.62-64). Up until this point in the poem the reader has encountered Satan and his fallen comrades only. Compared to the heavy ornamentation in Satan's language, God's eloquence may be perceived as a breath of fresh air for the reader, supposedly free of conceit and guile.

God begins by addressing Christ as his "Only begotten Son," which confirms what the narrator has just informed us, namely that the Son is the image of God and created by him alone (*PL* III.80). This simple fact can be seen as flattery. This represents a stark contrast to Adam and Eve's intense form of flattery in their addresses to each other. God's way of speaking to his son can be described as constituting the second virtue of style, namely clarity.

This is accomplished by the use of unambiguous words which leave the reader with a firm understanding of what the orator is talking about (Müller 745). The word "begotten" is a fascinating choice as John Milton, in *The Christian Doctrine*, points to the Bible for this description of the Son (*Complete Poems and Major Prose* 934). God observes Satan's approach towards the newly created world as he speaks to his son: "seest thou what rage / Transports our adversary" (*PL* III.80-81). One may argue that the description of Satan's movements is metaphorical in the comparison between emotion and physical movement. Because God states that it is rage that fuels Satan's movements, the reader will understand the extreme physical and emotional meaning behind the words. It seems significant that God resorts to this metaphor to describe Satan, because it is aptly and concisely fitting. This figure also reveals God's omnipotence as he proves himself aware of the inner turmoil Satan is experiencing. The reader, after spending two books in Satan's company, will know the truth in God's observation.

In what follows God uses plenty of figures, all of which agree with the grand style. *Conduplicatio*, the repetition of the same word in consecutive clauses in order to increase intensity (*FS* 215), can be found in the passage that follows: "whom no bounds / Prescribed, no bars of hell" (*PL* III.81-82). *Anaphora*, the repetition of a word in the beginning of a clause, occurs as the sentence progresses: "nor all the chains / Heaped on him there, nor yet the main abyss / Wide interrupt can hold" (*PL* III.82-84). The *conduplicatio* and *anaphora* enforce the metaphor mentioned above: despite everything that holds Satan back he still breaks free from his confinement in Hell. God concludes his first sentence with "so bent he seems / On desperate revenge, that shall redound / Upon his own rebellious head" (*PL* III.84-86). The phrase "desperate revenge" suggests an occurrence of the rhetorical figure *epitheton* (Greek, "a putting upon") as the noun "revenge" has the adjective "desperate" attached. This makes the two words appear as one unit (*FS* 216). Puttenham calls this figure "the Qualifier" and states that it could be employed in order to give a thing or person a quality which can be good or bad (176). Thus, God is belittling Satan's quest for revenge by characterising it as desperate. The *epitheton* will ring true for the reader and will strengthen God's credibility. One can argue that God is here establishing his authority through his character, or *ethos*, by showing that he is all-knowing. He is disclosing both the intent of Satan's quest and also his emotional state. The reader will recognise Satan's desperation. Whether this information is intended for the Son, the other inhabitants of Heaven or possibly even the reader is up for interpretation. The alliteration in the words "revenge," "redound" and "rebellious" emphasises the futility of Satan's endeavours. This is because the alliteration makes the

words appear linked and thereby ominously allude to what is awaiting Satan. The phrase "rebellious head" may suggest another example of *epitheton*, which conveys Satan's disregard for God's rule and heavenly conduct. Furthermore, it describes Satan as an inferior opponent: he is simply rebellious and disobedient. God continues to remark upon Satan's approach towards Heaven and the newly created world, noting "And man there placed, with purpose to assay / If him by force he can destroy, or worse, / By some false guile pervert; and shall pervert" (*PL* III.90-92). The short clause "or worse" constitutes an example of the rhetorical figure *comma*, because there are only two syllables to be found in the clause (*FS* 231). God lets it be known, in a subtle manner, that mankind being perverted by Satan would be worse than being destroyed by him. The phrase "pervert; and shall pervert" warrants the term *diacope* (Greek, "a cutting through"). This figure involves the repetition of a word with only a few others in between (*FS* 215). In this instance, the verb "pervert" is echoed with only two words in between. This can be seen as a way to communicate the severity of man's transgression. One can also argue that the figure helps instil an emotional response, the foreboding of the Fall, in the reader because of the severity and the assuredness with which God states this. The cause of man's fall, as God argues here, may even add a sense of guilt in the reader. The phrase "pervert; and shall pervert" can also be described in terms of *epistrophe* (Greek, "turning about"), because the word "pervert" ends two successive clauses (*FS* 234). This emphasis on the word "pervert" conveys a sense of shame. The focus has now gradually turned from Satan to humankind.

When God brings up mankind as an aspect of Satan's revenge, he delivers a devastating but well known fact: "For man will hearken to his glozing lies, / And easily transgress the sole command, / Sole pledge of his obedience" (*PL* III.93-95). *Diacope* occurs in the repetition of "sole" and can be said to function as a way to emphasise that Adam and Eve only had to comply with one single command to prove their faith. Furthermore, they will "easily transgress" the only rule presented to them. Instilling guilt or even shame in the audience might be an intended rhetorical goal. Indeed, God is here passing judgment. Thus, one may describe this way of speaking in terms of *epicrisis* (Greek, "judgment") because of his evaluation and judgment of mankind (*FS* 388). It is important to note that the repetition of the word "sole" is also being echoed by Adam several times in the poem, as in Book IV where Adam calls Eve "Sole partner and sole part of all these joys" (*PL* IV.411). One could argue that Adam possesses some of God's eloquence as he is created in his image. As discussed above, the *diacope* in these verses spoken by God enforces the failings of mankind

and potentially evokes guilt. Adam does the same to a certain extent when he attempts to persuade Eve by emphasising that she is a part of him.

As God continues with his description of mankind's impending fall, the direction of his oration takes an unexpected turn. God asks his first rhetorical question: "so will fall, / He and his faithless progeny: whose fault?" (*PL* III.95-96). This question constitutes an example of the type known as *anthypophora* as God provides an answer immediately (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"): "Whose but his own?" (*PL* III.97). God's response, his second rhetorical question, may be described as an example of *aporia* (Greek, "perplexity"), because it appears as if God is deliberating with himself or expressing wonder (*FS* 307). This suggests that the function of the second question is to express astonishment as to how there could be any doubt concerning who else but man should be blamed for the transgression. Rhetorical questions belong to the category of tropes that has to do with a departure from the normal meaning of a word. They can be highly persuasive as the orator can steer the audience towards the kind of response he or she is aiming for. Such questions can also indicate strong emotions in the orator (*CR* 404-05, 379). Perhaps God is not entirely devoid of emotion after all. His rhetorical questions can be said to express disappointment and frustration with humankind. The reader is being guided into forming an impression of an impassioned God in this passage, and the language he uses plays an important part in this. There are several instances of figures of repetition that assist in conveying God's disappointment. The alliteration in the words "fall," "faithless" and "fault" bleakly lumps together mankind's future (*PL* III.95-96). The repetition of the words "He" and "his" warrants the term *polyptoton* (Greek, "with or in many cases") as the two words are variations of the same root form (*FS* 222). In so doing, God transfers the blame from the original sinners to their offspring, including the whole race of humankind in his judgement. A continued instance of *polyptoton* occurs in the phrase that follows the second rhetorical question: "Ingrate, he had of me / All he could have; I made him just and right, / Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall" (*PL* III.97-99). The use of this figure throughout such a long passage enforces what his rhetorical questions suggested, namely that the fall of mankind rests entirely upon the shoulders of the human race. God refuses to accept any blame and it is perhaps surprising that God should feel the need to justify himself. His justification can also be seen as an example of the rhetorical figure *aetiologia* (Greek, "giving a cause"), because God is confirming his assertion that man is solely to blame by providing sufficient reasons (*FS* 357). *Aetiologia* is a figure of reasoning and is useful for persuasion through *logos* (*SR*, "Figures of Reasoning"). As a consequence, whereas God employs logical means of persuasion, the figures of repetition throughout might

be a way to imbue a sense of guilt in the reader regardless of time and place, as the whole of mankind is encompassed by God's judgment.

Thus, an important aspect of God's eloquence is reason or *logos*. Emotional persuasion is also to be found, but in contrast to other characters discussed in this thesis such as Satan, God's emotional persuasion consists in evoking feelings of culpability and shame in the audience. He does not follow Satan in attempting to make the audience emphatic towards his endeavours. God's tendency to inculcate guilt can also be found in Adam's eloquence. In the previous chapter I observed several instances where Adam attempts to persuade Eve by making her feel guilty. This is yet another example of Adam's innate eloquence as an image of his maker. Adam's eloquence is focused on his wife, whereas God works on a much larger scale. The difference in style between the two is therefore in accordance with their subject matter. As I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, according to Puttenham, the orator's rank and subject matter constitute an important part regarding the extent to which he should ornament his language (151). In the phrase "Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall" one can note an instance of the type known as *ison* (Greek, "equally distributed"). This figure involves creating a parallel either between words with a similar number of syllables or sets of words, phrases or clauses (*FS* 217). God equates the words "stood" and "fall" to highlight that he gave humans an equal chance to either resist or succumb to temptation. The principle of free will is therefore emphasised, which clears God of all blame.

The reader learns that free will was granted to angels too, as God continues his oration: "Such I created all the ethereal powers / And spirits" (*PL* III.100-01). As a consequence, Satan's fall was entirely by his own accord. God states that "both them who stood and them who failed; / Freely they stood who stood, and fell who fell" (*PL* III.101-02). God characterises the rebel angels as failed in the first clause and as fallen in the second. Is the reader supposed to cast this aside as a slip of the tongue? Surely God is not capable of such a mistake. As the two words are placed at the end of two successive verses one can argue that the function is to equate failing with falling: if you fall of your own free will, you are failing God. There are several instances of parallelism in this passage, which enforce God's point about falling being the individual men or women's fault and not his. The passage as a whole provides examples of the type known as *ison*, that is, several sets of words and phrases appearing very similar such as "them who stood" and "them who failed" (*PL* III.101). The same can be said of the phrases "stood who stood" and "fell who fell" (*PL* III.102). This accentuates that God is placing blame elsewhere and is logically trying to persuade his audience that he is free from blame. God has given all his creatures an equal chance of

withstanding temptation or to fall for it. It is up to each and every one to prove their faith. One may also describe the repetition of several words with only a few in between that is to be found throughout this passage as *diacope*. As a figure that conveys strong emotion, *diacope* aids the orator in persuading his audience through *pathos*.

God continues his speech by asking yet another rhetorical question: "Not free, what proof could they have given sincere / Of true allegiance, constant faith or love?" (*PL* III.103-04). What is particularly noteworthy about this passage is the way in which God follows up directly with another rhetorical question: "Where only what they needs must do, appeared, / Not what they would, what praise could they receive?" (*PL* III.105-06). It appears God is expressing wonder and his strategy may therefore be described as *aporia*. God asks his rhetorical questions in pairs, just as he did only a few verses earlier. One may term this method as the type of *pysma* (Greek, "question"), because several questions are being asked in succession almost as to overwhelm the hearer (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). The two questions are almost void of figures of repetition, except that the word "they" is repeated throughout. This occurrence can be characterised as *traductio* (Latin, "a leading along") in that the same word is being repeated in a passage (*FS* 224). Henry Peacham describes the function of this figure as making sure that there is a common thread throughout the utterance (J3v). It leaves the reader in little doubt as to who God is blaming for mankind's failings. By not having other figures of repetition the focus lands on the word "they," and this is in keeping with the clarity of God's style. However, one could argue that there is an underlying meaning to be grasped, which is the self-justification and vindication of God. The short phrase "appeared" constitutes another example of *comma*, and the rhetorical function might be to insert a scornful definition of false religious behaviour. God's utterance then takes a surprisingly personal turn as he states: "What pleasure I from such obedience paid" (*PL* III.107). In what follows, he further clarifies his stance with regards to such disobedience: "When will and reason (reason also is choice) / Useless and vain, of freedom both despoiled, / Made passive both, had served necessity" (*PL* III.108-10). One can observe an instance of a type known as *parenthesis* (Greek, "putting in beside"), which serves as an insertion in the sentence (*FS* 241). Puttenham fittingly termed this figure "the Insertour" in English (169). As a rhetorical figure, *parenthesis* can function as a way to insert a brief utterance that may be unrelated to the syntax of the sentence. This is thought to provide an emotional aspect to the utterance by adding additional commentary by the speaker (*CR* 384-85). God can here be seen to provide yet another piece of evidence that mankind is fully equipped to withstand temptation and to obey him. Using lack of reason as an excuse for making poor decisions is

not acceptable to God. Another figure found in this passage is *epizeuxis* (Greek, "fastening together"), in that the word "reason" is repeated without any other words in between (*FS* 216). The effect might be to intensify the proclamation that reason is indeed a choice. Furthermore, the *conduplicatio* in the twice repeated "both" in the phrase "of freedom both despoiled, / Made passive both" creates a heightened sense of vehemence: obedience through force or by pretence is wasted on God: obedience must come from the free will of the individual. God's emphasis on the negative aspects of forced behaviour is to be found in the character of Adam as well. Defending why he did not more firmly insist that he and Eve should labour together in Book IX, Adam states: "beyond this had been force, / And force upon free will hath here no place" (*PL* IX.1173-74). This is yet another example of Adam possessing some of God's eloquence. Furthermore, God's exposition of the aspect of free will justifies why Adam did not press Eve further, even though Eve herself blamed him for this after their transgression. God ends by returning to the starting point: stating that he does not receive any pleasure from false and dishonest religious behaviour (*PL* III.111). This way of formulating one's speech can be described in terms of *narratio*, understood as a statement of facts (*FS* 371). God has dedicated a solid part of his oration to describing the concept of free will. Following this, God returns to explain why mankind is entirely to blame for falling: "They therefore as to right belonged, / So were created, nor can justly accuse / Their maker, or their making, or their fate" (*PL* III.111-13). There are several rhetorical figures in this passage: *polyptoton*, *anaphora* and *dicope*. The *polyptoton* can be found by the repetition of the words "They" and "Their" as the two words share the same root. These words equate mankind, "They," with the consequences of their actions, "their," in addition to emphasising who created them in the first place. *Anaphora* occurs as the word "or" begins two consecutive clauses. The thrice repeated "their" with only two words in between in the last line warrants the term *diacope*. I would argue that the amount of figures of repetition in this passage creates an impression that God has ample evidence in support of his argument that mankind is solely to blame for their transgression. It can almost be seen as an exhaustive list of proof provided for the audience of readers. Moreover, by employing figures of repetition so densely, the aim of God appears to be to make the audience react to his words. Satan's reliance on figures of repetition when he is attempting to seduce Eve in Book IX may resemble God's style here. The difference is that the reader, with the help of the narrator, is made aware that Satan attempts to persuade on false pretences and, by contrast, that God explains and justifies his decrees. Satan's style sometimes reveals his odious intentions whereas God's style is consistently clear.

God persists in his argument that he is not to blame for what is about to happen, and the consistency with which the word "foreknowledge" occurs throughout the passage constitutes another example of *traductio* (*PL* III.116-21). One can also observe *polyptoton* in this passage as the word "foreknowledge" is repeated in different forms such as "foreknew," "unforeknown" and "foreseen." The effect is to underline that God's omnipotence and foreknowledge could not change the fate of mankind. Moreover, employing words with similar sounding beginning syllables in close proximity may be described in terms of the phonetic figure *homoioartron* (Greek, "beginning alike") as the word "foreknowledge" is repeated in various forms (*FS* 201). God thus explains the principle of foreknowing and it is possible that this also serves to foreshadow criticism. His immediate audience are the Son and the unfallen angels, but it appears as though God still deems it necessary to explain how his power manifests itself to them and subsequently to the reader. God's preventive strike, as it were, may be described as *prolepsis* (Greek, "anticipation"). This figure relates to anticipating possible objections and answering them before they have been voiced (*FS* 297). The figure was termed "the Propounder" in English by Puttenham and explained as a means of both introducing and explaining possible criticism (167-68). This might remind the reader of the narrator's aim in the poem: to "justify the ways of God to men" (*PL* I.26). That God feels obliged to do so may at first seem strange, but the narrator has provided sufficient evidence as to why this is necessary. There are instances of alliteration in this passage in the repetition of words beginning with the F sound, which may signify the impending fall. *Conduplicatio* can be found in the phrase "So without least impulse or shadow of fate, / Or aught by me immutably foreseen, / They trespass" (*PL* III.120-22). The effect here seems to be to intensify God's blameless role in humankind's transgression. The parallelism in the phrase "authors to themselves in all / Both what they judge and what they choose" constitutes another example of *ison* (*PL* III.122-23). The sets of words "they judge" and "they choose" are of equal weight and, more importantly, they emphasise the concept of free will. The same insistence can be found in the following phrase "for so / I formed them free, and free they must remain, / Till they enthrall themselves" (*PL* III.123-25). The repetition of the word "free" with only one word in between warrants the term *diacope*. The alliteration in the words "formed" and the twice repeated "free" within the same verse connects and amplifies the impression that humankind owes God for creating them and, significantly, for creating them free. *Polyptoton* occurs in the phrase "I else must change / Their nature, and revoke the high decree / Unchangeable, eternal" as the word "change" and "Unchangeable" are variations of the same form (*PL* III.125-27). The function can be said to be to highlight the

impossibility for God to change humankind's nature. Closing his explanation of the divine decree God says "which ordained / Their freedom, they themselves ordained their fall" (*PL* III.127-28). The repetition of the phrase "ordained their" can be described as *conduplicatio* which again steers the attention towards the concept of free will and the fact that humankind was created fully equipped to withstand temptation. As such, God can be seen to have presented his audience with yet another piece of evidence that supports his claim that he is not to blame. The phrase can also be characterised as a type of *electio* (Latin, "a choice"), as God explains why he cannot revoke the decree (*FS* 275). As God's first speech in the poem draws to a close, he returns to what he initially commented upon: Satan and the revolting angels: "The first sort by their own suggestion fell, / Self-tempted, self-depraved" (*PL* III.129-30). Even though he is not directly named, the alliteration on S sounds throughout this phrase clearly indicates that God is talking about Satan. Furthermore, the *anaphora* in the two clauses "Self-tempted, self-depraved" explains why Satan and his crew will not be treated in the same way as the fallen humans. One may describe the way God has structured his speech and how he returns to his initial focus in terms of *digressio* (Latin, "a going aside"), because he does make a digression when explaining at length the creation and decree of mankind before returning to Satan (*FS* 369). God deliberates briefly on why humans will receive grace and the rebel angels will not: "man falls deceived / By the other first: man therefore shall find grace, / The other none" (*PL* III.130-32). The *anaphora* in the first two clauses of this passage continues to ensure lucidity in the utterance, by simply and logically explaining why humankind will obtain grace. God refuses to give Satan a name and that appears to distance both God and the reader from him. His choice also diminishes Satan's accomplishments and shows God's disregard for him as an adversary to be fearful of. One can compare this to Satan's own refusal to call God by his name, as he describes him mostly by pronouns (*PL* I.103). The two characters both refuse to acknowledge the other, although in Satan's case his refusal can be read as blasphemous. God ends by concluding: "in mercy and justice both, / Through heaven and earth, so shall my glory excel, / But mercy first and last shall brightest shine" (*PL* III.132-34). Thus, God enforces the view that he is benevolent and forgiving despite the transgression that mankind will commit. Withholding his verdict of the human race's fate warrants the term *sustentatio* (Latin, "a deferring"). This figure involves consciously creating a sense of anticipation by not revealing information until the end (*FS* 301). God speaks of mankind's fall early on, but does not reveal why and how they will find grace until the very end. God's account of the fall of mankind as a whole can be described as straightforward. One may therefore characterise this strategy as *illustris explanatio* (Latin,

"clear explanation"). The device relates to providing an explanation in a clear manner (*FS* 286).

My analysis of the rhetoric used with the character of God has shown that his eloquence is indeed made to appear different from that of Satan, Adam and Eve, although there are some significant similarities. God spends most of his first speech justifying why he is not to blame for the fall of mankind. The style of his language serves this purpose by highlighting specific points, such as the concept of free will and the decreed freedom that he cannot revoke. By consistently using figures of repetition that emphasise mankind's guilt and extending this to the whole race of humanity, the persuasion can be said to appeal to the audience's emotions. Furthermore, God dedicates a good portion of his speech to justify his choice not to stop Satan's revenge. Perhaps it appears strange that God chooses to do this in front of the Son and the angels of Heaven, but when one remembers that the narrator wants to explain and justify God to the human race, God's self-justification is understandable. By studying the rhetoric found in God we find similarities with the rhetoric of Adam. However, one must take into account that Adam is below God in rank, and his style, though similar to God's, is aimed at Eve and their marital squabbles. God, on the other hand, must deal with the possible criticism aimed at him. Similarities can also be found between God's and Satan's rhetoric through their employment of figures of repetition. However, in God's speech the figures are applied to clarify the point he is trying to make. Furthermore, the main focus seems to be to explain himself and thus persuading through reason. The emotional aspect of God's utterance, emphasised by figures of repetition, involves moving the audience by creating a sense of guilt and responsibility in the reader. As a consequence, God provides logical reasons and reminds the reader that his speech includes them as well. In the next section, I will turn my focus to the unfallen angels.

3.2 Raphael and Michael

Up until this point in my thesis the only angel I have been discussing has been Satan. It is now time to turn my attention to the unfallen angels of *Paradise Lost*. As inhabitants of Heaven, the unfallen angels may be expected to possess divine eloquence. As argued in the previous section, God's rhetoric is logical and somewhat distant whereas Satan's is emotional and exaggerated. In the divine hierarchy the unfallen angels are positioned below God but above Adam and Eve in rank, and this can be expected to be reflected in their style. This section will focus on Raphael and Michael, both of whom are sent by God to communicate

with Adam and Eve. Raphael's role is to warn the yet unfallen Adam of Satan's vengeful plans in Book V. Michael is given the task to escort the fallen Adam and Eve out of Paradise as well as showing the future of humankind to Adam in Book XI. These interactions are given a fair amount of attention in the poem as the angels communicate with Adam and Eve both before and after the Fall. The extent to which their rhetoric will reflect this turn of events is worth exploring. Raphael and Michael explain matters of divine nature to Adam. This would undoubtedly qualify as a highly important subject matter deserving to be treated in a grand style according to the hierarchy of styles described by Renaissance rhetoricians such as George Puttenham (152). Puttenham insists on the importance of respecting decorum: "the stile ought to conforme with the nature of the subiect" (151). Yet, the intended aim of the conversations with Adam and Eve rather seems to be to inform Adam in particular of God and his works. This in turn points to a style that is largely void of ornamentation, otherwise known as plain style (Müller 748). I have chosen to analyse the rhetoric of Michael and Raphael throughout the poem. The structure of this section will be based on important aspects of their style, functions and how the figures are applied in order to close the gap between divine matters and a low style. There are of course many other figures worth exploring with Raphael and Michael, but within the scope of this thesis I have selected figures and examples that highlight this specific purpose, such as salutations, rhetorical questions, *parenthesis*, *simile* and amplification.

As a start, the way Raphael and Michael approach Adam and Eve in terms of salutation reflects how rhetoric can accentuate the state of mankind. Raphael's initial salutation to the first humans contrasts the two genders. Adam is simply addressed as "Adam" (*PL* V.372), whereas Eve receives a more formal greeting: "Hail mother of mankind" (*PL* V.388). Raphael's way of greeting Adam and Eve can be described in terms of the figure known as *comprobatio* (Latin, "approval"). The figure involves the orator praising his audience (*FS* 311). Henry Peacham argues that its function can be said to be to portray the speaker as noble-minded, because it shows how the orator recognises and applauds commendable virtues in the audience (L2v). As such, it can be seen as a figure of *ethos* (*SR*, "*Comprobatio*"). Raphael's greeting reflects how Adam is the head and therefore does not need any other form of praise. Eve, below Adam in rank, is commended by her role as the future mother of humankind. The *comprobatio* thus enforces the inequality between the genders in that Eve must be complimented by her function in God's universe and not by her own person. The alliteration in "mother of mankind" firmly reinforces the importance of Eve's role. She remains a silent presence until she excuses herself from the party in Book

VIII. Raphael, when speaking to Adam, is more generous with his salutations. He calls Adam "Son of heaven and earth" a little later in Book V (*PL* V.519). Adam is also hailed as "O prime of men" (*PL* V.563). *Comprobatio* can therefore be said to enforce the differences between Adam and Eve. When greeting both humans together Raphael commends Adam by his person and Eve by her function as humankind's mother. Thus, when addressing Adam only, Raphael is more charitable in his salutations.

Michael has a different approach to the fallen humans when he first approaches them in Book XI. He too calls Adam by his name, but there is one notable difference in his and Raphael's first greeting of Eve: Eve listens in on Michael's conversation with Adam, where it is revealed that they will no longer be living in Paradise (*PL* XI.251-62). In what follows, Eve, burdened with grief, laments having to leave. Michael then speaks to her, reminding her that her place is not a fixed one, but wherever Adam is (*PL* XI.287-92). More importantly, he simply calls her "Eve" without any forms of compliments (*PL* XI.287). Michael continues to refer to Adam by his name only throughout his narration of the future of mankind. The difference in the rhetoric before and after the Fall highlights the sombre reality that now has befallen Adam and Eve. Eve's role as the mother of mankind is not something to compliment her on after the Fall, but rather a way for her to rectify her faults. Adam, on the other hand, is now responsible for inflicting mortality upon his future offspring and is not eligible to be praised as the superior man he was before the Fall. Accordingly, after the Fall Michael's way of complimenting Adam is more equal to his way of complimenting Eve. This may be because the human pair must both atone for their sins.

Another figure consistently applied by Michael and Raphael throughout their conversations with Adam is the rhetorical question. Its proper term being *erotema*, this figure belongs to the category of tropes. The function can be to evoke a desired response in the audience and also signify an enlivened speaker (*CR* 404-05). I would argue that rhetorical questions serve a specific purpose in Raphael's and Michael's eloquence. As Raphael explains obedience to Adam, one may note an instance of a rhetorical question when Raphael inquires in what way "hearts, not free, be tried whether they serve / Willing or no, who will but what they must / By destiny, and can no other choose?" (*PL* V.532-34). As such, Raphael explains obedience to God in a way similar to what God himself did in Book III. The question can be further characterised as the type known as *epiplexis*, where the function is to criticise or to lecture (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). Raphael is lecturing Adam on this subject and can be seen to indirectly criticise Satan for his disobedience. One may observe an instance of the figure *polyptoton* in the phrase "Willing or no, who will but what they must"

(*PL* V.533). *Polyptoton* (Greek, "with or in many cases") occurs when a word is repeated in various forms close together (*FS* 222). Here Milton's use of this figure highlights the difference between the concepts of free will and predestination. Furthermore, the word "heart" can be described in terms of the rhetorical trope *metonymia* (Greek, "change of name"), or alternatively *synecdoche* (Greek, "understanding one thing with another"). The boundaries between these are not set in stone, but *metonymia* relates to the substitution of cause for effect whereas *synecdoche* is described as the substitution of parts for the whole (*FS* 251-253). Puttenham terms *synecdoche* as "the Figure of quick conceite" and explains that the hearer is forced to imagine what is meant as opposed to it being explicitly expressed (195). I would contend that "heart" in this context represents "man," and that the intended aim is to associate obedience to God with love. What Raphael says a few verses later, relating to angelic obedience, seems to justify this interpretation: "freely we serve, / Because we freely love" (*PL* V.538-39). Moreover, the way in which rhetorical questions are applied in the unfallen angels' style signifies the difference between humans and angels. Adam asks if Raphael can recount to him "The full relation" of what transpired in Heaven (*PL* V.556). In Raphael's answer one can observe an occurrence of *aporia* (Greek, "perplexity"), because he seems to be doubting how to proceed (*FS* 307): "how last unfold / The secrets of another world, perhaps / Not lawful to reveal?" (*PL* V.568-70). Puttenham dubs this figure as "the Doubtfull" and states that it can be applied in order to make something straightforward seem doubtful (226). Raphael decides to go on disclosing to Adam what spurred Satan's fall, but stresses the difficulty of "likening spiritual to corporal forms" (*PL* V.573). Yet another instance of *aporia* can be found in Raphael's musings: "what if earth, / Be but the shadow of heav'n, and things therein / Each to other like, more than on earth is thought?" (*PL* V.574-76). Raphael's deliberation should serve as a reminder to Adam and Eve that they are ranked below the angels and that their knowledge of the universe is limited. Furthermore, Raphael appears as a complex character in that he seems to be in doubt as to how to explain something of high subject matter to beings of lower standing. As well as making the character more sympathetic, the *aporia* here enforces the view that there are matters the human mind cannot grasp. Raphael's use of this figure is echoed by Adam in Book VIII in his narration of his first memory, as analysed in the previous chapter. There Adam begins by deliberating how he can best describe his first memory with his limited knowledge (*PL* VIII.250-51). Accordingly, Adam to an extent absorbs Raphael's style.

Throughout Raphael's narration of the war in Heaven, one can observe how rhetorical questions convey his impassioned speech and reveal the great toil the war took upon

Heaven's inhabitants. Describing the fallen angels' unrelenting reaction to Christ appearing on the third day of the battle, Raphael asks two questions: "In heav'nly spirits could such perverseness dwell? / But to convince the proud what signs avail, / Or wonders move the obdúrate to relent?" (*PL* VI.788-90). These questions may be described in terms of *epiplexis* because Raphael appears to express grief. Thus, he seems to be capable of deep feelings which will most likely evoke an emotional response in the hearer. By comparison, Michael tends to combine rhetorical questions with other types of figures. In Book XII he describes to Adam the events that will come to pass after the Flood. When describing the idol worship Abraham resists, Michael asks: "oh that men / (Canst thou believe?) should be so stupid grown" (*PL* XII.115-16). This rhetorical question can be described as the type of *anacoenosis* (Greek, "communication") because Michael is asking for his audience's opinion, although the immediate audience consists only of Adam (*FS* 311). Puttenham explains its function to be to imply that an opinion other than the one voiced by the orator would be improbable or wrong (227). As such, Michael conveys the importance of knowing that idolatry is reprehensible, and his use of the *anacoenosis* rules out other opinions on the matter. Emphasising man's stupidity is a way of subtly instilling a sense of shame in Adam, who is ultimately to blame for mankind's depravity. Thus, Michael is giving Adam no other option than to accept the consequences of his actions and acknowledge that mankind's flaws are due to his and Eve's transgression.

The way in which this particular rhetorical question is phrased has another fascinating aspect deserving of closer inspection. It can be described as the figure known as *parenthesis* (Greek, "putting in beside," *FS* 241) as in the phrase "(Canst thou believe?)" (*PL* XII.116). The function of this figure can be to throw the reader off a little and also convey commentary by the speaker. This adds emotion to the utterance (*CR* 384-85). Puttenham coins this term in English as "the Insertour" and claims its function is to insert an interjection that is not required to understand the meaning of the sentence. Instead of harming the utterance, the figure rather adds another element to it (Puttenham 169). As such, Michael's insertion in the sentence is not required for the reader to understand the meaning: "oh that men / (Canst thou believe?) should be so stupid grown" (*PL* XII.115-16). What the *parenthesis* does is to add an emotional dimension. Michael appears frustrated and saddened by the fact that mankind will become so senseless. The figure serves to convince the reader that Michael is capable of feeling sorrow and despair. The tragedy of Adam and Eve's transgression is thus amplified through the archangel's reaction, thereby showing clearly how dreadful the consequences are. Michael's speech is enlivened by his comments during the narration of humankind's future.

This is achieved by the addition of moral elements to accompany the various milestones the human race will go through. The figure of *parenthesis* occurs consistently throughout the appearances of both Raphael and Michael, although perhaps to a greater extent in the latter. The figure serves to instruct the hearer and this fits in with the plain style of rhetoric, as the intended aim is to inform. *Parenthesis* belongs in the category of schemes, which one would employ if one were to give a speech in the plain style, as opposed to the category of tropes, which are more frequently found in speeches with higher levels of style (Müller 748). The function of *parenthesis* can be further illustrated by Michael's description of the line of David. He says "that of the royal stock / Of David (so I name this king) shall rise / A son" (*PL* XII.325-27). This insertion is not important for the meaning of the sentence, but it does add a layer of complexity because Michael asserts his powerful knowledge as an archangel. Furthermore, Michael can be seen to make complex matters more straightforward for Adam to understand. *Parenthesis* occurs in sections pertaining to Raphael where the function appears to be instructive, as with Michael's rhetoric. There is yet another instance of *parenthesis* in the phrase where Raphael describes how change of time in Heaven is reflected in the sky as "To grateful twilight (for night comes not there / In darker veil) and roseate dews disposed / All but the unsleeping eyes of God to rest" (*PL* V.645-47). The insertion is not a crucial point in relation to the meaning of the sentence, but it does educate Adam and the reader on matters supposedly surpassing their human understanding. Remembering Raphael's apparent concern regarding how to best describe divine issues to one of the human race, one may argue that the *parenthesis* helps to better explain this to Adam. When Raphael attempts to properly describe the artillery created by Satan and his crew during the war in Heaven in Book VI, the *parenthesis* provides an additional comment to spark Adam's imagination. Calling cannons "pillars," Raphael adds a long parenthetical insertion: "(for like to pillars most they seemed / Or hollowed bodies made of oak or fir, / With branches lopped, in wood or mountain felled)" (*PL* VI.573-75). Raphael is commenting upon his choice of words to describe cannons and the comparisons he makes are specifically targeted to Adam. Working in the garden of Paradise, Adam would be expected to be familiar with this type of imagery. Raphael can therefore be said to try to explain the concept of artillery in Adam's language, in a way that would make sense to him. As such, the figure serves to explain a complicated matter in a more straightforward manner.

In accordance with characteristics of the plain style, Raphael keeps his language informal throughout (Müller 748). His intended goal does not appear to be to move Adam into action yet, but rather to educate him in the works of God's universe. At Adam's request Raphael,

after disclosing the details of the war in Heaven, moves on to explain how God created the universe (*PL* VII.86-108). However, as he progresses from the subject of Satan to God's plan to create a new race, Raphael calls Satan by the name Lucifer and adds, with another *parenthesis*: "(So call him, brighter once amidst the host / Of angels, than that star the stars among)" (*PL* VII.131-33). The figure adds useful information for Adam and the reader, because it is revealed that Satan was indeed powerful in Heaven before the Fall. As a consequence, Raphael appears somewhat sentimental about the fall of such a mighty figure. He tries to stress the importance of taking the threat seriously. Satan was powerful and is therefore not to be shrugged off as a simple threat.

Another important aspect of Raphael's and Michael's rhetoric is their application of the figure known as *simile*. Belonging to the rhetorical device *similitudo* (Latin, "likeness"), *simile* occurs when there is a comparison within a sentence (*FS* 346). The figure is coined as "the Resemblance" in English by Puttenham and seen as an important figure of persuasion because it animates utterances (240). As a figure belonging in the category of tropes (a deviation from the ordinary meaning of a word), *simile* relates to comparing two unlike things that, despite their differences, have some qualities in common (*CR* 379, 396-97). The employment of this figure by the two angels suggests yet another strategy for humanising divine matters so that Adam will understand what Raphael and Michael attempt to tell him. As Adam and Eve are not capable of fully grasping celestial phenomena, the two angels must find a way to define high subjects in a way that will be appreciated by them. Another example of this is when Raphael gives an account of the event that first sparked Satan's envy and anger: God's introduction of the Son (*PL* V.600). It is worthwhile noticing that Raphael, Adam and Eve all recount God's words through the method of impersonation known as *prosopopoeia* (Greek, "the representing of a person"). When one is reproducing direct speech, the method could be described in terms of the figure known as *sermocinatio* (*FS* 402-03). God's sovereignty is indeed enforced through the direct impersonation. Adam paraphrases Eve's words, whereas Eve directly quotes Adam, thus enforcing the interpretation that direct quotation reflects the highest rank. Before reproducing God's speech, Raphael describes the scene to Adam: "the Father infinite, / By whom in bliss embosomed sat the Son, / Amidst as from a flaming mount" (*PL* V.596-98). The *simile* serves to concretely explain such an abstract description of being "in bliss embosomed." The figure also emphasises the differences between heaven and earth and how Raphael must adapt his language to explain these matters to a human being. The Son comes across as a force of nature as Raphael yet again uses natural elements to communicate with Adam.

A similar instance of *simile* occurs in Michael's explanation of the concept of old age and temperance. In order to argue that by eating and drinking to nourish and not give in to gluttonous appetites one may live a long life and experience a non-violent death, Raphael says "So mayst thou live, till like ripe fruit thou drop / Into thy mother's lap, or be with ease / Gathered, not harshly plucked, for death mature" (*PL* XI.535-37). This phrase is another example of how familiar language and imagery are used to enlighten Adam. Because he is familiar with picking fruit, this comparison must be easy for Adam to grasp. By comparing an untimely death to the picking of unripe fruit, Michael enforces the morality of the issue because the plucking action appears violent and immoral. However, the concept of death is explained in terms of decaying and ripening fruit. This adds to the tragedy of mankind's transgression and enforces how humans are now firmly planted on the ground together with animals and vegetation as opposed to the divine world above them. My last example of consistent use of *simile* in order to explain celestial matters to humankind, is to be found in Book VII, when Raphael depicts God's dwelling (*PL* VII.574-81). Raphael describes the path leading towards God's house as "A broad and ample road, whose dust is gold / And pavement stars, as stars to thee appear, / Seen in the galaxy" (*PL* VII.577-79). The abstract qualities of heaven are therefore explained in terms understandable for Adam and Eve. Notwithstanding the tangible example of stars to describe the pavement, Raphael's way of enlivening his language with this *simile* functions to heighten the sense of divinity beyond human comprehension. Another instance of *simile* is to be found in Raphael's specification of his comparison: "that Milky Way / Which nightly as a circling zone thou seest / Powdered with stars" (*PL* VII.579-81). This suggests that Raphael is attempting to speak to the humans by using tangible evidence such as sights on the night sky. The figure also serves to convey the grandness of God's creation, as the very scale is baffling and almost incomprehensible to the human mind.

This leads me to the last type of devices recurring in the rhetoric of Raphael and Michael: figures of amplification. As a general category, *amplificatio* (Latin, "increasing"), alternatively *auxesis* (Greek, "growth") pertains to augmentation (*FS* 262). According to Puttenham, who dubs *auxesis* as "the Avancer" in English, this method of writing helps augment the matter which one wishes to convey in an ornamental and effective manner (218). Figures pertaining to amplification may serve as an emotional addition to one's utterance with figures such as *climax,* the arrangements of words in increasing importance. Another figure of amplification is *enumeratio* (*SR*, "Figures of Amplification"). This figure can be described in terms of the numbering of effects, parts or things adjoined. One may number

these specifically, the strategy then termed *arithmesis*. By contrast, foregoing the explicit numbering warrants the term *aparithesis* (*FS* 276). Michael's and Raphael's persistent inclusion of the latter in their conversations with Adam suggests that the function is to enforce the importance of God's commands and powers. When Adam laments leaving Paradise in Book XI, an instance of this figure is to be found in Michael's attempt at reassurance as he explains that God is everywhere: "his omnipresence fills / Land, sea, and air, and every kind that lives, / Fomented by his virtual power and warmed" (*PL* XI.336-38). *Aparithesis* appears as Michael lists all the places in which God is sovereign. However, the arrangement of the words "Land," "sea," "air" and "every kind that lives" suggests an occurrence of another figure known as *incrementum* (Latin, "augmentation"), because the arrangement is structured as to culminate in Michael's disclosing that God fills every living being (*FS* 287). Peacham describes this figure in terms of placing the word with the most significance last in order to amplify the speech (Q2v). Thus, Michael's utterance illustrates that God is present everywhere, but more importantly that he resides within living creatures as well. This is an important foreshadowing to Michael's final advice to Adam upon leaving Paradise: that he should not dread leaving the physical place, "but shalt possess / A paradise within thee, happier far" (*PL* XII.586-87). In the rhetoric of Raphael one may note an instance of *enumeratio*, or more specifically *aparithesis*, in his description of the unfallen angels' unified march to fight Satan and his crew during the war in Heaven (*PL* VI.61-73). Raphael describes their movement, stating that "nor obvious hill, / Nor strait'ning vale, nor wood, nor stream divides / Their perfect ranks" (*PL* VI.69-71). The effect of this indirect numbering is to augment the power of the unfallen angels. The *anaphora* in this passage further enhances the magnificence of the angels and therefore adds to the emotional charge to be found in the passage. Figures of amplification are applied by Raphael and Michael, like the other figures discussed in this section, to make difficult and unfamiliar matters understandable to the human mind.

The analysis of the rhetoric found in the passages involving Michael and Raphael has rendered important information about the characters' complexities. The angels are sent by God to inform Adam and Eve of divine matters and this is reflected in their rhetoric. Adam and Eve are presented with grand and abstract ideas and phenomena, but the two angels attempt to bring it down to a human level. With the use of rhetorical questions the angels provide extra commentary and also involve their hearers. Furthermore, *parenthesis* adds to the educational aspect of the conversation which renders the first humans even more culpable for falling. I also found several occurrences of the figure *simile*. The function of this figure

appears to be to better illustrate celestial elements. Figures of amplification further convey the magnitude of God's powers to Adam and Eve. By using figures such as these the audience becomes aware of the great power of God and in a way that is tangible for them as mere humans. Raphael and Michael do not ornament their speech in terms of figures of schemes to a great extent, but rather employ tropes in order to better explain matters to Adam and Eve. Tropes are not applied to make their speech appear more sophisticated, but rather to bring high matters down to an understandable level. Raphael's insistence upon comparing celestial to earthly elements supports this interpretation. This analysis has merely scratched the surface of the speeches of Raphael and Michael in terms of the rhetorical figures employed. The ones that have received closer inspection have been included in order to show how the two powerful angels attempt to solve the problem of bridging the differences between heaven and earth. In the last section of this chapter my focus will shift from the unfallen angels to the fallen ones.

3.3 Moloch, Belial and Mammon

The last part of the thesis will explore the rhetoric used with the fallen angels. More specifically, we shall close-read and contrast sections involving Moloch, Belial and Mammon. The reader is introduced to these characters in Book I when the narrator is listing the fallen angels as they approach Satan, although they are not allowed to speak until Book II. This takes place during the debate in Hell where the derelict crew is deliberating the next step. The three fallen angels that are the focus of my analysis do not communicate with Adam and Eve, but rather present their argument at the debate. Their ways of speaking are like orations in that the speakers make an attempt at persuading a "live" audience inside the poem. This persuasion is directed at the other fallen angels as well as Satan who, unbeknownst to them, has already made up his mind to avenge God by corrupting the newly created mankind. Given that these characters are attempting to persuade an audience one can expect the high style, because the desired effect is an emotional response (Müller 748). Be that as it may, the narrator makes sure to provide the reader with sufficient information regarding the underlying intention. The speakers are revealed to be self-centred as they present their arguments. Satan opens the debate, disclosing that the goal is revenge and that the discussion will revolve around the best way to achieve this, "Whether of open war or covert guile" (*PL* II.41). The topic for the debate is future action, and this type of speech may best be described in terms of deliberative oratory. That is, the oration concerns future events

and the most advantageous or disadvantageous way of approaching these (*SR*, "Branches of Oratory"). Aristotle, in *The Art of Rhetoric*, states that the topics best suited to this type of orations are related to profit, warfare and defence of territory (84-86). As we come to learn, the fallen angels are indeed mostly concerned with such matters.

Let us begin the discussion with Moloch, the initial speaker at the debate as well as the one being called first to approach Satan in Book I during the cataloguing of Satan's crew (*PL* I.376-92). The etymology of his name can be traced back to a Hebrew meaning of "king" and indicates the character's greatness before the expulsion from Heaven (*OED Online* moloch, n.). Moloch opens his speech directly responding to Satan by saying: "My sentence is for open war: of wiles, / More unexpert, I boast not" (*PL* II.51-52). The narrator has informed us a few lines prior to this that Moloch has grown fearless, but also hopeless, as a result of their gruelling and humiliating defeat in Heaven (*PL* II.43-50). His opening statement may be regarded in terms of *epagoge* (Greek, "induction") because he is basing his argument on a comparison (*FS* 350). This strategy is in accordance with deliberative oratory, as Moloch argues that war is advantageous whereas cunning behaviour is not. Moloch continues to say that "them let those / Contrive who need, or when they need, not now" (*PL* II.52-53). This passage contains the figure *correctio* because of the correction of his own words (*FS* 315). The function of this figure appears to be to highlight that now is not the time for shrewd persuasion but rather for action. The *clausula*, that is the final clause of the sentence, is considerably shorter than the previous clauses in the passage (*FS* 230). This serves to firmly admonish the party from what he deems a weak endeavour. The repetition of the word "need" as the closing word of two successive clauses creates an effect of *epistrophe* (Greek, "turning about," *FS* 234-35). If one observes this figure in addition to the alliteration in the *clausula*, "not now," the effect appears to be to convey a sense of unworthy behaviour: a petty need that should be disregarded at such a critical stage. The last clause also consists of two syllables only, which in turn may be described as the figure known as *comma* in that the number of syllables is less than eight (*FS* 231). Thus, Moloch dismisses what he calls cunning behaviour while simultaneously delivering a metaphorical blow to those who support it. He continues to argue why war is the best option and his strategy constitutes an example of *antithesis* (Greek, "opposition"), in that his argument involves contraries and these in turn enforce both the favourable and disadvantageous course of action (*FS* 336-37). This is achieved by first comparing the two alternatives. Describing his fellow fallen angels with opposing views as passively "sit contriving," Moloch's unfavourable opinion becomes evident (*PL* II.54). Contrastingly, those who share his views are described as "the rest, /

Millions that stand in arms, and longing wait / The signal to ascend" (*PL* II.54-56). The contrast between the verbs Moloch applies here, "sit" and the active "stand" further emphasises his point of view. To end the passage, Moloch asks his first rhetorical question regarding whether those who wish to fight shall have to "sit lingering here" (*PL* II.56). Furthermore, should they "Accept this dark opprobrious den of shame, / The prison of his tyranny who reigns / By our delay?" (*PL* II.58-60). The question can be said to constitute an example of *epiplexis* as Moloch condemns this strategy (*SR*, "Rhetorical questions"). Contrasted with the other fallen angels, Moloch's approach of condemning harshly those with opposing views does not portray him as particularly eloquent or persuasive. Rather, his desperate need to prove his strength as equal to the unfallen angels is shining through his rhetoric. Deliberative oratory is about persuading one's audience to be either for or against a proposal by arguing which option is the more beneficial. As Moloch tends to instead persuade through placing blame, he leans more towards epideictic oratory (*SR*, "Branches of Oratory"). His disorganised use of oratory styles may give us an indication as to his desperate state of mind and why his speech fails to make a big impression. Moloch's rhetorical question can alternatively be said to be of the type *anthypophora* because he provides an answer immediately (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"): "No, let us rather choose / Armed with hell flames and fury all at once / O'er heaven's high towers to force resistless way" (*PL* II.60-62). Moloch here proceeds to the second part of *antithesis*: to contrast what he has previously argued to be the weaker course of action – to cunningly plot revenge, with what he thinks is the best option – open war (*PL* II.60-70). Being equipped with fury as a weapon can be regarded as an example of metaphor or *metaphora*. George Puttenham terms this figure "the Figure of transporte" and points out that it can be applied in order to highlight a word (178-80). The figure conveys a sense of extreme force and intensity in Moloch's proposal. However, he can easily be attacked by an opponent, as we shall see later in Belial's speech. Moloch ends his proposal by anticipating possible criticism: "But perhaps / The way seems difficult and steep to scale / With upright wing against a higher foe" (*PL* II.70-72). This passage constitutes an example of the figure known as *prolepsis* (Greek, "anticipation") or alternatively *procatalepsis* (Greek, "annulling beforehand"), because Moloch attempts to gain the upper hand by anticipating arguments that he thinks his opponents might use against him (*FS* 297). His solution is, contrary to his rejection of cunning behaviour earlier, to "Let such bethink them" (*PL* II.73). Revealing his overwrought state of mind, Moloch suggests that they should plan an attack on God under the pretence that they are still being incapacitated by their fall from Heaven (*PL* II.73-74).

Moloch's pride was wounded as a result of their defeat and this becomes more evident as his oration progresses. He asks his audience whether they too felt the indignity and "With what compulsion and laborious flight / We sunk thus low?" (*PL* II.80-81). The question conveys a sense of shame and exasperation. This can be described in terms of *exuscitatio* because the speaker's own feelings are meant to rile the audience into a reaction (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). The core of Moloch's desperate attempt to argue for war is revealed as he states that they should not be afraid of any consequences because "what can be worse / Than to dwell here, driven out from bliss, condemned / In this abhorrèd deep to utter woe" (*PL* II.85-87). The word "worse" is repeated throughout the passage and may be regarded as an example of the figure *traductio* (Latin, "a leading along") in that one word occurs throughout (*FS* 224). The function appears to be to try to impart the hopelessness of their current situation.

Moloch fills the final part of his speech with three rhetorical questions in a row (*PL* II.85-95). This strategy creates an effect of *pysma* (Greek, "a question") as a way to express intensity and also to overwhelm the audience (*FS* 330; *SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). Thus, Moloch's main argument appears to be that nothing can be worse than their current state, and that should be enough to spur the fallen angels into action: they will either perish or simply remain in their already horrible state (*PL* II.96-101). As Moloch ends his speech he admits that his suggestion may not provide victory, but that it "is yet revenge" (*PL* II.105). This leaves him vulnerable to Belial's shrewd mind. Additionally, the phrase "and his look denounced / Desperate revenge" is used by the narrator to describe Moloch after he concludes his oration (*PL* II.106-07). "Desperate revenge" is exactly the same phrase that God applies when he describes Satan (*PL* III.85). As such, God and the narrator bring him down to the level of the other fallen angels, as Satan is portrayed just as desperate as Moloch.

Belial is an altogether different orator than Moloch. Instead of following Satan in discussing only two courses of action, Belial slithers away from this and rather introduces a new option: to do nothing. Belial's name can be traced to mean "destruction" and is also heavily associated with evil (*OED Online* belial, n.). The narrator dedicates a number of verses to describe this character (*PL* II.109-18). The reader is warned that Belial appears graceful, but the truth is that he is a liar and a lazy one at that, "to nobler deeds / Timorous and slothful: yet he pleased the ear" (*PL* II.116-17). Belial is more long-winded than Moloch, but wastes no time in attacking him. This can be seen as a strategy to divert attention away from the fact that he is not responding to their leader's two options, but rather suggesting a third option that suits him better. Belial opens by stating that "I should be much for open war,

O peers, / As not behind in hate" (*PL* II.119-20). The clause "O peers" can be described in terms of *conciliatio* (Latin, "the gaining over or winning of hearers"), because Belial is making an effort to show that he regards himself and his listeners as equals which can be seen as flattery (*FS* 313). At the outset, one may note that Belial appears more preoccupied with flattering and persuading his hearers than Moloch. Moving forward, Belial continues to deconstruct and damage Moloch's claims: "if what was urged / Main reason to persuade immediate war, / Did not dissuade me most" (*PL* II.120-22). The words "persuade" and "dissuade" are antonyms. Furthermore, the two words both share the same end syllable, creating an effect known as *parisonomata* (Greek, "comparable words," *FS* 202). The figure here serves to weaken Moloch's attempt at persuading the crowd of fallen angels. Belial attacks the very core of Moloch's arguments and turns them against him. What follows is Belial's rather personal slander of Moloch's character (*PL* II.122-26). We may observe that Belial targets Moloch's main weakness when he states that Moloch "grounds his courage on despair / And utter dissolution" (*PL* II.126-27). This constitutes an example of *convinciari* (Latin, heckling") in that Belial is ridiculing his opponent (*FS* 314). As the reader is aware, Moloch's main fear is to appear weak and by attacking him in such a personal way Belial's base thoughts are revealed. Belial spends a great amount of time tearing apart Moloch's points and this can be described in terms of the figure known as *anasceue* (Greek, "demolish"). As its name implies, this involves refuting the points made by our opponents (*FS* 365). After condemning Moloch's reasons for desiring revenge, Belial asks "First, what revenge?" (*PL* II.129). This rhetorical question constitutes an example of *subjectio* (Latin, "an annexing"), in that Belial is objecting to Moloch's claims by raising questions to which he will provide answers in his favour (*FS* 333). Belial studiously dismantles Moloch's arguments, pointing out that ambushing God is useless and impossible (*PL* II.129-46).

As Belial comes to the main part of his argument, he starts to question whether their current situation can truly be said to be the worst one imaginable. This is emphasised by a long series of rhetorical questions. The first includes the hearers as Belial asks who would forego staying in their current alive state and risk being "swallowed up and lost / In the wide womb of uncreated night, / Devoid of sense and motion?" (*PL* II.149-51). The question can be termed *anacoenosis* as Belial is asking for the opinion of the audience and implying their shared interest in the matter (*SR*, Rhetorical Questions"). Including the other fallen angels in this manner suggests that Belial is making an attempt at emotional persuasion by pointing out the consequences of Moloch's arguments. Belial asks whether or not God actually can kill them and, more importantly, why God would end their suffering so quickly instead of letting

them suffer for eternity (*PL* II.151-59). An occurrence of the figure *apantesis* is to be found as Belial briefly sums up Moloch's arguments, and his phrasing serves to diminish Moloch and eventually to directly refute him (*FS* 367). The mock flattery in "they who counsel war" (*PL* II.160), an indirect addressing of Moloch, can be said to constitute an example of *adulatio* (Latin, "cringing flattery"). The function seems to be to flatter his opponent only to subsequently undermine his arguments (*FS* 303). Arguing that Moloch believes in a predestined fate, Belial asks: "what can we suffer more, / What can we suffer worse? Is this then worst, / Thus sitting, thus consulting, thus in arms?" (*PL* II.162-64). We may observe the *anaphora* in the last line in that the word "thus" occurs at the beginning of three consecutive clauses. The figure accentuates the positive aspects of their situation, as Belial sees them. Another series of questions follows when Belial emphasises the horror of being thrown out of Heaven and how they found refuge in Hell and broke free from the chains on the flaming lake (*PL* II.165-69). Asking several rhetorical questions to convey intensity or to overwhelm the audience as Belial does here, is another example of the figure *pysma*. The function is for Belial to persuade the audience into seeing his point of view (*CR* 404-05). Belial relies heavily on this figure as he turns the debate from the question of war versus covert deceit to his own completely different solution. He is apparently anticipating emotional responses from his audience. When Belial introduces the possibility of something worse awaiting the angels, he clearly wants to scare the audience into agreement. Belial provides the audience with several detailed examples of scenarios that could be worse than their present one. This can be described in terms of *congeries* (Latin, "a heap"), because Belial is amplifying his argument by serving several examples in a bundle (*FS* 268). The horrors of what might await them will surely resonate with the fallen angels. By beginning the questions with "what if," the uncertainty of the situation is enhanced, which in turn weakens Moloch's argument (*PL* II.170, 174).

As a last effort to destroy the idea of waging war, Belial describes their possible dreadful future as "Unréspited, unpitied, unreprieved" (*PL* II.185). This verse is striking in many ways. One may observe an instance of the figure *asyndeton* (Greek, "without connection") in the omission of conjunctions (*FS* 228-29). Dubbed "the Loose langage" by Puttenham, this figure conveys a sense of earnestness and intensity (174-75). Thus, Belial's use of the figure heightens the gruesome scene he is trying to illustrate. Furthermore, the figure *homoioartron* (Greek, "beginning alike") occurs in the verse as well, because the words all start with the same syllable (*FS* 201). The effect appears to be to heap together these unfortunate outcomes as direct consequences of battle. All in all, Belial's point is amplified by these figures,

although the reader is aware that he is just as much in the dark as Moloch as to the probabilities of what he is stating so assuredly. The criticism of Moloch's argument is consistent throughout Belial's speech. Belial echoes Moloch in the repeated inclusion of the word "worse" during the whole of his oration, here functioning as a direct attack (*PL* II.169, 186, 196). Thus, the repetition of this word warrants the term *traductio* as we also noted in Moloch's speech. The opposite figure to *asyndeton*, *polysyndeton* (Greek, "many connections"), can be found later in the speech. This occurs when Belial mocks those who pretend to be strong warriors, while at the same time shrink away from their punishment "to endure / Exile, or ignominy, or bonds, or pain, / The sentence of their conqueror" (*PL* II.206-08). It is because each clause is connected by conjunctions that we may describe this passage in terms of *polysyndeton* (*FS* 245). Here it serves to amplify the magnitude of their punishment and also to ridicule those who shy away, thereby indicating cowardice. As Belial's speech draws to a close, the audience is presented with his game plan: to endure their current situation and hope that in time the punishment will become less painful (*PL* II.209-14). What he presents to his audience is almost a fantasy-like scenario: "This horror will grow mild, this darkness light" (*PL* II.220). This passage can be regarded in terms of the figure *zeugma* (Greek, "a yoking"). This is because the second clause is without a verb, but the meaning is nonetheless understood thanks to the verb in the first clause (*FS* 211). Termed "the Single supply" by Puttenham, *zeugma* functions to connect the meaning of the clauses (163). In this way, Belial attempts to argue for a potentially brighter future. Ending the speech, urging his fellow fallen angels to simply stay put, Belial says "since our present lot appears / For happy though but ill, for ill not worst, / If we procure not to ourselves more woe" (*PL* II.223-25). The repetition of the word "ill" with only one word in between can be described in terms of *diacope* (*FS* 215; Peacham J3v). By contrasting the words "ill" and "worst," Belial clearly argues that his proposition represents the lesser of two evils and also effectively berates Moloch one last time.

We have now reached the last fallen angel making his own independent case in the debate. Mammon receives an introduction which stresses his lust for riches and wealth and for taking advantage of anything of worth to be found in the world (*PL* I.678-88). The name itself has often been associated with greed, possession and wealth (*OED Online* mammon, n.). Mammon, like Belial, chooses to ignore Satan's two alternative courses of action, opting instead to present another: peace. This may be seen as a surprising suggestion coming from a fallen angel, but Mammon proposes to accept their situation and find ways to make life in Hell easier. Thus, he is stepping away from Moloch's warmongering and Belial's suggestion

to simply do nothing. Mammon instead prefers to endeavour to turn their situation into a profitable one. The suggestion of waging war is immediately addressed by Mammon, who says "Either to disenthrone the king of heaven / We war, if war be best, or to regain / Our own right lost" (*PL* II.229-31). The *diacope* in the repetition of the word "war" introduces what Mammon intends to discuss. The clause "if war be best" creates an effect of the figure *comma* because it consists of only four syllables. As discussed previously, syntactical decisions have rhetorical functions (*CR* 356). On that account, the placement of the short clause serves to convey Mammon's disapproval. Following the purposes of deliberative oratory, Mammon makes it clear that he advises against war and instead prepares the audience for what he sees as the advantageous option. However, Mammon commits a rhetorical fallacy as he wrongly argues that "him to unthrone we then / May hope, when everlasting fate shall yield / To fickle chance, and Chaos judge the strife" (*PL* II.231-33). This fallacy, *paralogismus*, pertains to false reasoning (*FS* 444). As we are aware, Milton's God is omnipotent and the result of the war in Heaven and any other wars is decided by him alone. Mammon proceeds to ask his first rhetorical question: "for what place can be for us / Within heaven's bound, unless heaven's lord supreme / We overpower?" (*PL* II.235-37). This may be regarded as a case of *anthypophora* in that Mammon provides an answer to his own question. He does this by indirectly following up Belial's brief suggestion of the possibility of God easing their punishment, although taking it a step further to reveal the negative aspects. He brings up the possibility of the fallen angels receiving mercy "on promise made / Of new subjection" (*PL* II.238-39). This is a shrewd addition to his argument because, as the reader knows, the fallen angels (and Satan in particular) abhor being subordinate to God. In so doing, Mammon has effectively crushed the arguments of his opponent. Nevertheless, he spends time explaining in detail the horridness of the possibility of once again being under God's direct command. One may describe Mammon's strategy here in terms of the figure known as *commoratio* (Latin, "dwelling on a point"), because he goes into great detail in his explanation (*FS* 268). This figure is given the English name of "the figure of abode" by Puttenham who states that its function is to enhance one's strongest argument by spending more time on this than anything else (232). There is another figure in the passage that illustrates the possibility of renewed subordination, namely *epitheton* (Greek, "a putting upon"). The figure is applied by adding an adjective before a noun in order to make the words into one unit (*FS* 216). There are several instances of this, such as in the phrase "and receive / Strict laws imposed" (*PL* II.240-41). Puttenham states that the figure is useful to convey attributes to the subject in question, regardless of it being positive or negative (176).

The *epitheton* in this example thus serves to highlight that God's laws are too strict for the fallen angels to accept. As Mammon moves on to what he sees as the advantageous option, the figure is once again applied in order to strengthen his argument. In the phrase "preferring / Hard liberty before the easy yoke / Of servile pomp" we can observe three instances of *epitheton* (*PL* II.255-57). The figure contrasts the lazy and unworthy behaviour of servitude as compared to the worthy activity of hard work. Additionally, serving God is described as "pomp" which enforces the disrespectfulness of the fallen angels. Mammon urges his comrades to instead attempt "Our own good from ourselves, and from our own / Live to ourselves, though in this vast recess, / Free" (*PL* II.253-55). In this passage, we may note instances of the figures *polyptoton* (Greek, "with or in many cases") and *conduplicatio* (Latin, "with doubling"). The former is achieved through the repetition of a word in varying forms, while the latter pertains to the repetition of a phrase or a word in subsequent clauses in order to convey intensity (*FS* 222, 215). The *conduplicatio* here in the form of the repetition of the phrase "our own" serves to speak to the audience's desire for independence. The *polyptoton* occurs in the words "our" and "ourselves" and can be seen to enforce Mammon's insistence that the fallen angels should help themselves and not rely on outside factors. As Mammon's speech nears the crux of his argument so does the frequency with which his rhetorical questions appear, as when he presents his solution – that they can "Thrive under evil, and work ease out of pain / Through labour and endurance. This deep world / Of darkness do we dread?" (*PL* II.261-63). The question may be described in terms of the figure known as *ratiocinatio*, in that Mammon first makes a statement and then asks a question to which he himself proceeds to reply (*SR*, "Rhetorical Questions"). The answer, according to Mammon, is that Heaven too had moments of darkness and cloudiness, similar to Hell (*PL* II.263-68). Mammon then attempts to put a logical spin on his argument by asking "As he our darkness, cannot we his light / Imitate when we please?" (*PL* II.269-70). Mammon contends that Hell's soil is filled with materials for the fallen angels to take advantage of with their capabilities (*PL* II.270-73). He asks "what can heaven show more?" (*PL* II.273). This comparison creates an effect of *comparatio* (Latin, "comparison") in that Mammon is comparing Heaven and Hell in order to show that they can indeed make a life for themselves in Hell (*FS* 338). Mammon asks four rhetorical questions in a row during this passage, and this can be characterised as another example of *pysma* because it would require an intricate response in return. Rhetorical questions signify an involved speaker and can function to discreetly nudge the hearer into responding in the way the orator wishes (*CR* 404-05). The general term for the rhetorical question is *erotema*, nicknamed "the Questioner" in English by

Puttenham, and further explained as asking questions without looking for answers (211). Thus, Mammon's persistent use of this figure can be seen to more vividly illustrate his point and also to include his audience in the presentation of his argument. Closing his speech, Mammon opens up for the possibility of change, in that the fallen angels will adapt to their environment which will render their pain bearable (*PL* II.274-83). His solution: "how in safety best we may / Compose our present evils, with regard / Of what we are and where" (*PL* II.280-82).

My discussion of the rhetoric found with the three selected fallen angels has demonstrated three orations that are all in their own way indicative of the flawed nature of their speakers. Moloch, both hope- and fearless, desperately urges open war. His vulnerable state leaves him open for the more shrewd Belial to counter his argument. Lastly, Mammon urges acceptance and hard work. Though not included in my discussion, Beelzebub wins the debate, but with arguments thought out and planned by Satan. He suggests that one volunteer should avenge God by corrupting his newest creation, namely mankind (*PL* II.344-78). As it turns out, Satan is the only one volunteering for this role, which has been his plan all along (*PL* II.445). Neither of the three speakers chooses to acknowledge their own part in the misfortune they find themselves in. With eyes fixed exclusively upon the future, the angels reveal their refusal to admit guilt or to change their behaviour. Thus, their evil nature is still intact. The type of oratory Belial, Mammon and Moloch carry out is deliberative. They are focused on the future and on vengeance and prosperity. However, Moloch's agitated and desperate state of mind does not stay completely within the bounds of deliberative oratory, because he is also blaming those with opposing views. His speech attains a more desperate feel and therefore lacks the successful persuasiveness a skilled orator would aim for. Belial's long and verbose speech is essentially an imploration of idleness, but much of the time it is dedicated to verbally attack Moloch. Mammon also responds to his opponents, but in a less personal manner. There are some similarities, however, between the three different speeches. They all rely heavily on series of rhetorical questions when reaching crucial parts of the arguments. The speakers are attempting to steer their audience into seeing their point, but also to overwhelm them with so many questions that the audience inside the poem may ultimately be left stunned. All three speeches also depend on comparisons to further prove their point. The purpose may be to leave the listener with a feeling of having to choose the lesser of two evils as opposed to making an informed decision based on logical reasons. The angels all speak of a future in which nothing is certain, yet pretend to know the answer. This illustrates the absurdity and the insignificance of their contribution to the debate. Satan has already settled

on a solution. Letting the fallen angels contribute to the debate appears only as a show of good faith to make his solution seem to be elected by the majority.

Conclusion

In *Paradise Lost* John Milton presents the reader with an arsenal of well-known characters, some hated, some loved and some worshipped. Their complexity challenges the reader to identify redeeming or condemning character traits. Because of the imitation of direct speech throughout a great part of the poem, the impression we form of the characters relies to a large extent on their language. To be sure, Milton is careful to lead us into a desired direction as he painstakingly outlines their true intentions by the help of his epic narrator. The reader must wander through a labyrinth, as it were, and stay vigilant so as not to be fooled by a dead end of lies carefully obscured by emotional persuasion. By having the narrator describe the fall of mankind by the use of imitation of speech and behaviour, the function of each character's way of speaking plays an essential role in the author's characterisation. Rhetoric pertains to language that is employed to persuade an audience. I set out in this thesis to demonstrate just how nuanced and advanced Milton's use of rhetoric is in the poem. To achieve this I decided to discuss the shaping of the major characters through their manner of speech, building on the poem's rhetorical complexity. This is an aspect of *Paradise Lost* that is often overlooked in the midst of the prevailing debates on Milton's views on rhetoric. Thus, I wanted to contribute to this debate by expanding it to encompass Milton's highly dynamic characterisation in terms of the rhetoric. Another aspect prevalent in Milton criticism is that Satan is often at the receiving end of the attention. The inclusion of other major characters in my analysis served to further illustrate that one can indeed find highly complex and revealing rhetoric in all of them and not just Satan. What is more is how the rhetoric aids the reader's understanding of the various characters' flaws and roles in the epic.

The most infamous character of the poem is undoubtedly Satan. Seen as the epitome of evil, a rebellious republican, a brave hero or even a sacrilegious aspiring king with a striking resemblance to King Charles I, Satan served as the starting point of my analysis. He has often has been cast as Milton's rebel hero and this interpretation suggests a way of speaking based on emotional persuasion that would lead us to empathise with him. I found that he does indeed consistently employ a high style throughout the narrative in the passages I analysed. This can be seen as a sign of his disrespectful behaviour and his villainous character. As the preeminent enemy in a Christian epic, Satan is certainly not at liberty to use the high style reserved for only the highest and noblest matters. Another important element to consider is having the narrator describe Satan, his state of mind and physical appearance, before letting him speak. This serves to give the reader an inkling of Satan's deceptive way of speaking.

Satan's language is highly ornamented, which may leave the reader lulled into a sense of false understanding. What is striking about Satan's rhetoric is that it is lacking in morals. His version of the Fall and his way of relating to the truth can serve as a testimony not only to his delusion, but also his flippancy and disrespect towards God. Thus, I found that Satan's language represents rhetoric in its most shallow form, that is, ornamentation and manipulation without logic as the foundation. Milton expressed the view that logic and reason were both more important than what he described as rhetoric, which he regarded as being concerned only with style and performance. Satan relies heavily on figures of repetition, but the sheer amount and the different types employed at once signify someone out of control and without a sense of decency and respect for decorum. Thus, Satan's refusal to comply with decorum is an indication of his nefarious character. Moreover, the heavy ornamentation may function as a decoy to take the attention away from his faulty logic. As Satan speaks to Beelzebub in his very first utterance in the poem, he refuses to call neither God nor the Son by their names, opting instead to employ *metonymia* – calling them by names associated with their attributes. This reveals his lack of respect because he chooses words that signify sheer force and pettiness as opposed to divinity. Satan persistently employs rhetorical questions in his speeches. His use of *anthypophora* (providing an answer to his own question) and *pysma* (asking many questions in a row) in particular, shows that he wants to control the direction of his speech and how the audience should react. Thus, the reader is encouraged to follow his line of thought without questioning it, and the sheer number of questions function to stun and overwhelm the audience. In Satan's seduction of Eve, he confounds her with several questions in a row. He also provides answers so as to guide her into believing him. The only time he does not, however, is when he sees that Eve is starting to listen to him. By not answering his rhetorical question at that point, Satan enforces the argument that Eve must eat the forbidden fruit to be able to find the answers herself. In the soliloquy I analysed, the first in Book IV, Satan does not rely on lies as much as in the other passages I analysed. He appears aware of his flaws, but his use of figures such as *dicaeologia* (which typically serves to admit to a fault, but then excuse it) shows that he is more concerned with self-justification than taking responsibility for his actions. Figures of amplification, such as *enumeratio,* aid Satan in magnifying his own person and strengthening the reasons for his choices. When reasoning to himself, Satan's language is filled with exclamations – the reader may recognise despair, hatred, self-pity, envy and sorrow. These exclamations signify an impassioned speaker, but also someone very human. That is, of course, a tell-tale sign of Satan's flawed character: he is not human – he is an angel and

should not display such feelings. Because his rhetoric reveals such human qualities, the reader may find it easy to relate to him, that is, if one does not take into consideration his lies and self-aggrandisement. Conversely, it may be precisely because of these very human flaws that some can be lead to emphasise with him. Satan's composure slips during a crucial moment in his seduction of Eve: the occurrence of figures of repetition increases and he seems unable to stop himself from using words beginning with the letter F which I think signifies the Fall. There is a wistful tone in Satan's language when he is alone until his heart hardens and he is consumed with hatred and vengeance. Towards Beelzebub, Satan plays the part of the brave rebel who takes responsibility for their company. When it comes to Eve, Satan plays to her vanity by taking advantage of his eavesdropping and snooping. Assuming the shape of the serpent, Satan can prove in a logical way why Eve should eat the fruit – to attain wisdom and eloquence to match Adam. Satan's logic is based on lies, but is used with great success to persuade Eve. Satan shows capability of adapting his style and language to his audience. The narrator is an important influence as he persistently warns us about Satan's sinister motives. It appears as if the worry is that the reader will indeed find Satan's rhetoric persuasive and must be reminded of the danger of Satan's seductive way of speaking. Figures of repetition are highly effective rhetorical techniques and serve to explain why Satan has been viewed as particularly persuasive because they are such a big part of his style. He does indeed employ the style and language of a hero, but closer inspection proved his logic to be based on lies, blasphemy and delusion.

Satan exemplifies many qualities that are admittedly painfully human, perhaps a sign of his fallen state, although he did possess many of these prior to his expulsion from Heaven. The actual humans in the poem, as Joseph Addison pointed out already in the early eighteenth-century, are portrayed in two states: unfallen and fallen. Furthermore, there is a representation of both genders in terms of rhetorical skill. In Adam's rhetoric, like in Satan's, one may observe an abundance of rhetorical questions. These have vastly different functions as in Adam's case they serve to reinforce his humble and respectful nature in that he proves aware of his own limitations. As outlined above, in Satan's case they rather signify his need to control and manipulate as he answers the questions himself or asks so many in a row that the listener is left feeling overpowered. The style of the passage I analysed, Adam's first memory that he shares with Raphael, carefully establishes Adam as aware of his position beneath the divine creatures, albeit crucially above Eve. In the company of God and Raphael, Adam speaks modestly of himself and employs figures of amplification to convey his admiration for God's creation. The use of *anthypophora,* Adam answering his own rhetorical

questions, highlights his loneliness among the animals and his innate desire for a partner. Adam colours his narrative with imitated dialogue between himself and God, employing the figure *sermocinatio*. Implying an actual conversation between Adam and God, this figure contrasts with Eve's recollection of her first memory. Instead of marvelling at God's creation, Eve wanders towards a pond where she is ensnared by her own reflection. She must be commanded away by God and led to Adam before finally relenting to his pleas to make her choose to stay with him. This shows Eve seemingly not qualified to converse with God. As Adam directly imitates God and paraphrases Eve's words, Eve's role as inferior to Adam is made clear. This is also supported by Eve using direct imitation to relate both God's and Adam's words, as she cannot be trusted with anything other than quotations. Adam's eloquence is focused on the unity between himself and Eve. Both accounts of their first memory also foreshadow what is to come in terms of rhetoric. Whenever Adam speaks of Eve the number of figures of repetition increases drastically. I see this as a sign of his overwhelming love for Eve. He also sees her as a part of him, a view that he refuses to readjust. Thus, he is unable to see that Eve has a need for independence. Eve's first memory serves as a lesson of her inferiority. It is used as a deliberation as to why Adam is her superior. The question remains whether she truly learns her lesson or not, although her failure to withstand Satan suggests the latter. Adam makes a fatal mistake in his discussion with Eve before the Fall. Whereas she has prepared and planned her arguments carefully, Adam is adamant in persuading Eve through the reminder of her place by his side in times of danger. Eve, stubbornly and naively, desires to go off on her own and does not grasp the graveness of Satan's plan. Eve's argument is based on reasons that Adam quickly can discredit due to her gender and gullibility. Her style is leaning towards plain and thus lacking in strength to persuade Adam. Adam, however, keeps flattering Eve, refusing to change his way of articulating himself. He gives up in the end and loses the argument. After the Fall, Adam and Eve's rhetoric is aggravated and filled with exclamations as they hurl accusations at one another in order to place blame. They reveal contempt and indignation in ways similar to Satan. The difference is that Satan will not receive grace or guidance while Adam and Eve will. Figures such as *traductio* maintain the blame the couple places on each other. Eve's rhetorical questions illustrate her confusion, expressing the desire to wander off but also blaming Adam for not stopping her. Adam's warning to all men of not trusting women too much shows his hopeless despair. Thus, their postlapsarian rhetoric betrays their confused and egotistical new selves that are desperately in need of divine intervention. At the same

time, their prelapsarian rhetoric reveals Adam to be too rigid in his argumentation and Eve to rely on logical arguments that go against her role in God's universe.

The rhetoric found in the divine creatures of *Paradise Lost* also acknowledged important aspects of characterisation. God's use of figures of repetition in his first speech shows clarity in that they studiously highlight specific aspects of his speech that will stand out to the reader. The use of *epicrisis* (a dogmatic evaluation) shows judgement of the human race, and the shame in its transgression is presented in a way that thoroughly involves the reader. An unexpected facet of God's rhetoric is the emphasis on self-justification. Surprising perhaps, considering the character's omnipotence and standing among his immediate audience – consisting of the Son and the unfallen angels. However, the narrator has already disclosed the poem's intention to explain God and his ways. Thus, God must justify his reasons for letting mankind fall. This is achieved with the character presenting a number of reasons to show that humans were indeed fully equipped to withstand Satan's temptation. Figures of parallelism, such as *ison*, illustrate this by correlating clauses and word structures. These reasons can be seen as an exhaustive list of proofs with a heavy emphasis on persuasion through *logos* or reason. The figures of repetition that are sprinkled evenly throughout the utterance serve to make the reader aware of his or her own involvement in mankind's fallen state. Thus, the persuasion through *pathos*, emotional response from the reader, is focused on instilling shame instead of creating sympathy for God. The rhetorical questions serve to highlight God's power: *anthypophora* is often used because only God can truly answer any question in the poem. *Pysma* is also found in God's rhetoric, as a part of his overwhelming amount of evidence concerning his blamelessness in the transgression by Adam and Eve. As such, the character may appear unsympathetic, cold even. I argue that this appears to be the author's intention, as a means to emphasise the difference between God and everyone else, whether they be angels or humans. Raphael and Michael were selected to exemplify the rhetoric used with the unfallen angels. Both were sent by God to educate and aid the unfallen as well as the fallen Adam and Eve. I wanted to show how rhetorical style is used purposely to bridge the gap between divine matters and human comprehension. The unfallen angels' task is to educate and the appropriate level of style should therefore be plain. However, they both apply tropes such as *similes*, rhetorical questions and amplification in addition to schemes such as *parenthesis*. I found a common function for these figures: a tool for the unfallen angels to best explain difficult matters in a language that Adam would understand. Thus, the unfallen angels adhere to decorum by informing the first humans of divine matters in an appropriate way. *Parenthesis* serves as a way for them to add comments and therefore helps Adam

understand phenomena foreign to him. The figures also serve to paint the two characters as mildly passionate in that their speeches convey heartfelt emotion, albeit in a controlled manner. On the other hand, the fallen angels Mammon, Belial and Moloch reveal yet again how rhetoric can be employed without truth as all of them refuse to accept any blame. They also present arguments based entirely on selfish reasons, although their style of execution differs. This lays bare different ways in which rhetoric can be abused. Moloch's rhetoric is desperate and ill planned, making him an easy target for Belial's smooth and unscrupulous style. The latter's speech is an attack on Moloch and relies on intense application of *pysma* to stun his audience. His eloquence warrants a warning from the narrator as to his real and base nature. Mammon's speech relies heavily on *commoratio*, the dwelling on disadvantageous consequences that he argues may occur if they do not follow his plan. Mammon too relies on *pysma* to sell his argument, as opposed to logical reasons that God was shown to rely on. All three speeches convey a sense of choosing between two evils as opposed to being presented with solid argumentation. The fact that Satan already has made up his mind of what to do shows their rhetoric to be as pointless as their contribution to the debate.

The rhetorical analysis of these major characters thus reveals that the language and style used are important means of characterisation. By studying their manner of speaking, one may observe several important character traits that play a huge part in how we perceive them. Satan appears brave if one forgets to listen to his reasoning. To be sure, the level of ornamentation does make it challenging for the reader. That may very well be the intention as the reader must learn to not become blinded by distractions, and rather learn to identify true piety. Adam is an image of his creator, but he has a weakness: Eve, who is beyond his control. Vanity and the need for independence is her weakness within God's universe. God may appear unyielding and distant, but his eloquence is based on logic and thus exemplifies a more appropriate application of rhetoric. The unfallen angels' language illustrates the challenge for the human mind to fully understand the grandness of God's ways. By contrast, the fallen angels reveal how empty and futile rhetoric may be when it is based on egotistical reasons and lies.

My analysis of Satan, Adam, Eve, God, the fallen and unfallen angels have sought to illustrate how differently their speech is portrayed to reveal essential character traits. Adherence to decorum is proved to be an important element in their characterisation. Thus, I have high hopes that this thesis shows that rhetoric is instrumental in the building of the characters in *Paradise Lost*.

Works Cited

Addison, Joseph. "Number CCLXVII… Saturday, January 5. 1712 [in, The Spectator]." *The Spectator* (1712): n.pag. *Literature Online*. Web. 21 February 2017.

---. "Number CCLXXIII… Saturday, January 12. 1712 [in, The Spectator]." *The Spectator* (1712): 1-2. *Literature Online*. Web. 20 February 2017.

Aristotle. *The Art of Rhetoric*. Trans. H.C. Lawson-Tancred. 1991. London: Penguin Books, 2004. Print.

Binns, J.W. *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: The Latin Writings of the Age*. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1990. Print.

Blake, William. *The Poems of William Blake*. Ed. W.H. Stevenson. Text. David V. Erdman. 1971. London: Longman, 1977. Print.

Broadbent, J. B. "Milton's Rhetoric." *Modern Philology* 56.4 (1959): 224-42. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 March 2016.

Cable, Lana. *Carnal Rhetoric: Milton's Iconoclasm and the Poetics of Desire*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995. Print.

Chaplin, Gregory. "Education." *Milton in Context*. Ed. Stephen B. Dobranski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 281-91. Print.

Christiansen, Nancy L. *Figuring Style: The Legacy of Renaissance Rhetoric*. Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2013. Print.

Cicero. *On the Ideal Orator (De Oratore)*. Trans. James M. May and Jakob Wisse. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. Print.

Cooley, Ronald W. "Reformed Eloquence: Inability, Questioning, and Correction in *Paradise Lost*." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 62.2 (1992/93): 232-55. *Project Muse*. Web. 3 March 2016.

Corbett, Edward P.J., and Robert J. Connors. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student.* 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.

Corns, Thomas N. *Regaining Paradise Lost*. London: Longman, 1994. Print.

Donnelly, Phillip J. "Logic." *Milton in Context*. Ed. Stephen B. Dobranski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 349-60. Print.

Empson, William. *Milton's God*. 1961. Westport: Greenwood, 1978. Print.

Fallon, Stephen M. "Milton as Narrator in *Paradise Lost*." *The Cambridge Companion to Paradise Lost*. Ed. Louis Schwartz. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 3-16. Print.

Fish, Stanley. *How Milton Works*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001. Print.

---. *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in Paradise Lost*. 2nd ed. 1997. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998. Print.

Forsyth, Neil. *John Milton: A Biography*. Oxford: Lion, 2008. Print.

Hammond, Paul. *Dryden and the Traces of Classical Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.

Hariman, Robert. "Decorum." *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Ed. Thomas O. Sloane. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. 199-209. Print.

Hill, Christopher. *Milton and the English Revolution*. London: Faber and Faber, 1977. Print.

Jonson, Ben. *Timber, or Discoveries: Being Observations on Men and Manners*. 1898 London: Dent, 1951. Print. The Temple Classics.

Kennedy, William J. *Rhetorical Norms in Renaissance Literature*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978. Print.

Kolbrener, William. "Reception." *The Cambridge Companion to Paradise Lost*. Ed. Louis Schwartz. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 195-210. Print.

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. "The genres of *Paradise Lost*." *The Cambridge Companion to Milton*. Ed. Dennis Danielson. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 113-29. Print.

Loewenstein, David. "The seventeenth-century Protestant English epic." *The Cambridge Companion to the Epic*. Ed. Catherine Bates. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 146-66. Print.

Loewenstein, David, and Paul Stevens, eds. *Early Modern Nationalism and Milton's England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008. Print.

Mack, Peter. *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380-1620*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. Print. Oxford-Warburg Studies.

Milton, John. *Complete Poems and Major Prose*. Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. 1957. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2003. Print.

---. *Complete Prose Works of John Milton, Volume VIII, 1666-1682*. Ed. Maurice Kelley. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982. Print. Vol. 8 of *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*. Don M. Wolfe, gen. ed. 8 vols. 1953-82.

---. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Alastair Fowler. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2007. Print.

Müller, Wolfgang G. "Style." *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Ed. Thomas O. Sloane. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.745-57. Print.

Norbrook, David. *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Print.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Trans. David Raeburn. London: Penguin Books, 2004. Print.

Oxford English Dictionary: The definite record of the English language. Oxford University Press, n.d. Web. 30 April 2017. <http://www.oed.com/>

Peacham, Henry. *The Garden of Eloquence*. 1577. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1971. Print.

Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie*. 1589. Ed. Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker. London: Cambridge University Press, 1936. Print.

Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria: Book 2.* Ed. Tobias Reinhardt and Michael Winterbottom. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.

Reid, David. *The Humanism of Milton's Paradise Lost*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993. Print.

Richards, Jennifer. *Rhetoric*. London: Routledge, 2008. Print. The New Critical Idiom.

Ricks, Christopher. *Milton's Grand Style*. 1963. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001. Print.

Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2002. Print. New Accents.

Shore, Daniel. *Milton and the Art of Rhetoric.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Print.

Silva Rhetoricae: The Forest of Rhetoric. Brigham Young University, 2007. Web. 20 April 2017. <http://rhetoric.byu.edu/>.

Sloane, Thomas O. *Donne, Milton, and the End of Humanist Rhetoric*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985. Print.

"Soliloquy." *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. 3rd ed. 2008. Print.

Vickers, Brian. *Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry*. London: Macmillan, 1970. Print.

Welch, Anthony. "Poetic tradition, epic." *Milton in Context*. Ed. Stephen B. Dobranski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 68-77. Print.

Worden, Blair. *God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell*. 2012. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Print.

Wright, Thomas. *The passions of the minde in generall In sixe bookes By Thomas Wright*. *Early English Books Online*. ProQuest, 1620. Web. 30 April 2017.