

2016

A Quandary of Errors: The Problem of Innocence in Paradise Lost

Mandy Moore

Hollins University, mooreme@hollins.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.hollins.edu/researchawards>



Part of the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Moore, Mandy, "A Quandary of Errors: The Problem of Innocence in Paradise Lost" (2016). *Undergraduate Research Awards*. Paper 29. <http://digitalcommons.hollins.edu/researchawards/29>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship and Creative Works at Hollins Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Research Awards by an authorized administrator of Hollins Digital Commons. For more information, please contact vandalesa@hollins.edu.

Mandy Moore

Milton Seminar

Julie Pfeiffer

4 December 2015

A Quandary of Errors: The Problem of Innocence in *Paradise Lost*

When Milton's Adam and Eve fall in *Paradise Lost*, everything changes: the earth tilts, the animals begin to eat each other, Sin and Death enter into the world. The course of history for all of Adam and Eve's children depends on that single moment. Whether their Fall is fortunate or catastrophic, it does cost them not only their beautiful paradise but also their innocence, their pure existence. That they were innocent to start with seems obvious—Milton reiterates over and over, in as many ways as possible, that Adam and Eve remain innocent until they Fall. However, in several scenes throughout the poem, Adam and Eve are rebuked, Adam by the angel Raphael and Eve by Adam. These rebukes seem irreconcilable with a state of perfect innocence. How can Adam or Eve be reprimanded for doing wrong if they, by their very natures, do everything right? If they are truly, completely innocent of all sin, how do they make so many mistakes, even before eating the forbidden fruit? A closer analysis of these rebuke scenes through the lens of Milton's theology in *De Doctrina Christiana* reveals that it is indeed possible for Adam and Eve to make mistakes while maintaining their innocence because sin and error are not synonymous.

Although the word innocence can signify several related concepts, the prelapsarian Eden of *Paradise Lost* embodies the kind of innocence which equates to a complete absence of sin. Milton defines innocence in this way when referring to the angels who fought against Satan in the war of Heaven: "such high advantages their innocence / Gave them above their foes not to have sinned" (*PL* 6.401-2). The same definition can be applied to Paradise and to those who live

in it. God makes the earth “entirely good,” without a single trace of sin or evil (7.549). He also creates mankind to be “perfect,” “good,” “just and right” (5.524-5, 3.98). Adam and Eve live in “simplicity and spotless innocence,” unaware until Raphael tells them otherwise that sin could be an option (4.318). In their perfect garden, the concept of sin does not even cross their minds. They walk naked not only without shame but also without the slightest idea of what shame is, for “they thought no ill” (4.320). Their innocence serves as a “veil” to “shadow... them from knowing ill,” a veil they keep until they break God’s commandment not to eat of the Tree of Knowledge (9.1054-5). Right up until the moment when Eve decides to eat the forbidden fruit, she is “yet sinless” (9.659). In fact, as the moment of the Fall draws nearer, the word “innocence” shows up more and more often, appearing three times within one hundred lines. Adam tells Eve to go in her “native innocence” (9.373); the narrator bemoans the fact that Satan lies in wait to ambush Eve and leave her “despoiled of innocence” (9.411); Satan observes Eve walking in her “graceful innocence” (9.458). It is as if Milton is trying to emphasize that, although sin will soon enter the world through Eve’s decision, until that time, she remains stainless and pure. She and Adam both are innocent before the Fall—this much Milton makes clear.

However, if Adam and Eve are truly sinless, truly innocent, why are they sometimes rebuked and reprimanded for their actions? Even before the Fall, Raphael corrects Adam’s way of thinking when he starts asking too many questions. Adam is curious about the cosmos: why there are so many stars to light just one earth and whether or not the all the heavenly bodies move around the earth (*PL* 8.15-38). Rather than answering his questions, Raphael instructs Adam, correcting his approach to the problem. The angel demonstrates that Adam has not fully considered all the possible factors in God’s design of the universe. For example, even though the

earth is, “in comparison of heaven, so small, / Nor glistering,” it may still be important in God’s grand scheme, perhaps containing more “solid good” than the sun (8.92-3). Perhaps God constructed all the heavens specifically to remind men of their place in the universe: “a small partition, and the rest / Ordained for uses to his Lord best known” (9.105-6). Maybe the sun rests in the center of the heavens, with the earth as the seventh planet to revolve around it (9.122-32); maybe there exists a great “nocturnal and diurnal rhomb” which spins around the universe to create night and day (9.134). Raphael even posits the possibility of life on the moon or on other planets with their own stars (9.140-52). The angel’s long list of what-if’s serves to remind Adam that, as a mere human, he cannot possibly imagine the full extent of God’s knowledge or the reasons God might have for doing anything.

While Raphael understands Adam’s curiosity, he cautions Adam here to “dream not of other worlds” (*PL* 9.175). It might be nice to know “whether the sun ... / Rise on the earth or earth rise on the sun,” but the answer does not actually matter (9.160-1). “Heaven is too high” for Adam to fully comprehend, even if Raphael were to explain everything to him (9.172). What matters is that God understands how the universe works and can worry about the physics of the cosmos. If God does not readily provide the answers to such questions, he has his own reasons which surely work for the benefit of all. Adam can “leave [these matters] to God above,” focusing instead on Paradise and his wife, “contented” with what knowledge he is given (9.168, 171-2, 177). It is a gentle rebuke, but a rebuke nevertheless: human curiosity must be limited to that which is both beneficial and possible for humans to know. Adam realizes his mistake and says that Raphael has taught him to seek not “things remote / From use, obscure and subtle, but to know / That which before us lies in daily life” (9.191-3). Raphael’s reprimand implies that the

knowledge Adam was seeking before—the “things remote”—reflects an incorrect behavior, an overly curious way of thinking.

A little later, Raphael scolds Adam more strongly about his attitude towards his wife. Towards the end of their conversation, after Adam relates his own creation story, he explains to his angelic guest that he feels “weak” in the face of Eve’s beauty (*PL* 8.532) In everything else, Adam is “superior and unmoved,” but he feels powerless “against the charm of beauty’s powerful glance” (8.532-3). He wonders if his nature is faulty in this weakness, or if perhaps Eve’s nature is the defective one, giving her “too much of ornament, in outward show / Elaborate” (8.538-9). He then goes on to praise Eve in a manner dangerously close to how he spoke of God not two hundred lines before, referencing her “loveliness so absolute” and saying that she seems “in herself complete” (8.547-8). This is reminiscent of how he told God, “Thou in thyself art perfect” (8.415). Adam also claims that his wisdom falls apart in the face of such beauty, that “all higher knowledge in her presence falls / Degraded” (8.551-2). Raphael, “with contorted brow,” rebukes Adam, reminding him to “accuse not nature” (7.560-1). Adam has allowed Eve’s outer beauty to confuse him, and Raphael must bring him back in line, explaining that Adam’s love for his wife should concern her higher virtues, not her appearance. Adam is indeed “half-abashed” and concedes that Raphael knows better (8.595). Again, Raphael’s reprimand implies that Adam erred in his thinking, that despite his sinless nature, Adam has done something wrong.

Eve also experiences a rebuke (or at least, an *attempted* rebuke) from her husband in the separation scene of Book IX. When Eve suggests that they will distract each other from doing their work in the garden, Adam tries to explain that their love for each other—“this sweet intercourse / of looks and smiles”—cannot be a distraction since God created them to delight in

each other's company (*PL* 9.238-9). He then cautions her, as Raphael cautioned him, to beware of Satan, who may appear at any moment and try to tempt them away from God. He attempts to follow Raphael's advice to act as the "head" in the relationship, telling Eve that a wife "safest and seemliest by her husband stays, / Who guards her or with her the worst endures" (8.574, 9.268-9). As Eve continues to argue, Adam responds more and more "fervently," revealing his desperation to show her the lapses in her reasoning (9.342). His counterarguments start to sound less like a loving husband disagreeing with his wife and more like a superior correcting his subordinate: "O woman, best are all things as the will / Of God ordained them" (9.343-4). Adam's rebuke does not succeed in the same way that Raphael's did, perhaps because Eve has valid points or because Adam lacks the heavenly knowledge and understanding of an angel. However, even if Adam's advice goes unheeded by his wife, this moment illustrates what seems like incorrect behavior even more strongly than the conversations with Raphael.

On the one hand, Adam's failed rebuke could function in the same way as the angel's successful one; he corrects his wife, implying that something in her behavior needed correcting. Eve states a number of beliefs in this passage that prove dangerous later on in the same book. Working apart from Adam and testing her virtue "alone, without exterior help sustained" turned out not to be the best ideas, as evidenced by the disastrous results of their separation a few hundred lines later (*PL* 9.336). According to the marital hierarchy set up in the poem, the very fact that Eve is not acting submissively to her husband in this conversation might be cause for a rebuke. On the other hand, perhaps there is nothing wrong with Eve's behavior in this scene; perhaps Adam is the one who needs correcting. He implies that if Satan tempts Eve, it will mark her faith with "dishonor foul" even if she resists, an idea that goes against his earlier claims in Book V that evil can pass through their minds and "so unapproved... leave / No spot or blame

behind” (9.297). Furthermore, if Eve ought to submit to Adam in this moment, he also carries some responsibility to fulfil his role as husband and head of the marriage. For a while, he does indeed act as the head, trying to correct his wife using the information Raphael has passed on to him. However, by the end of the conversation, he not only gives Eve permission to do as she wants and work alone, he actually commands her to leave, trying to be assertive but actually acting in submission to her desires: “Go; for thy stay, not free, absents thee more” (9.372). It appears that at least one—if not both—of our first parents behaves incorrectly in this scene, a fact seemingly incongruous with their innocence. How can they be both sinless and in error?

Some critics, like C. S. Lewis, have denied or ignored the errors of Adam and Eve, insisting upon their complete state of innocence before the Fall. Lewis accepts Milton’s insistence that sin does not enter Paradise until Eve disobeys without further discussion of the rebuke scenes. He analyzes sexuality and hierarchy before and after the Fall, ignoring any prelapsarian moments where Adam appears to experience lust or Eve seems to be wrongfully insubordinate, instead focusing on the “greatness of both personages”—their majestic original natures which were lost in the Fall (Lewis 115). Lee M. Johnson does not ignore the possibility of error, but claims that any instance which appears to muddy Adam and Eve’s prelapsarian innocence depends on the fallen reader’s interpretation of a poem in fallen language. Using Eve’s dream, another scene which arguably introduces error into Paradise, Johnson shows that while the words themselves may indicate that something is wrong, Milton’s symmetric and circular verse create a kind of symbolic innocence which supersedes the sinful connotations of a fallen language (50-1, 53). His method of formal analysis can point to a symbolic innocence in later scenes as well, but does not explain why Raphael would reprimand Adam or why Adam would try to do the same to Eve.

Other scholars argue an opposite claim: that Adam and Eve are not truly innocent until the Fall, that their prelapsarian errors demonstrate a gradual movement from perfection to sinfulness over the course of the whole poem rather than a sudden change in that single moment of eating the forbidden fruit. E. M. W. Tillyard calls this Milton's way of "faking"—"attributing to Eve and Adam feelings which though nominally felt in the state of innocence are actually not compatible with it" (10-11). Using Eve's dream, Adam's conversation with Raphael, and the separation scene, Tillyard makes the claim that by the time Satan comes to tempt them, Adam and Eve are already "virtually fallen" (13). Millicent Bell takes this argument a step further, positing that Adam and Eve have always been sinful and that their Fall is a necessary "climax of self-realization" (878). The only way for mankind to escape the consequences of their already-tainted nature is by falling, an act which places them on the path to redemption. This reading of the poem leads to a myriad of fascinating questions about Adam and Eve's humanity and the fortunate fall, but does not leave room to believe Milton's insistence on their innocence in the earlier books.

Diane Kelsey McColley proposes another interpretation in her essay "Free Will and Obedience in the Separation Scene of *Paradise Lost*," constructing her argument in opposition to those of Tillyard, Bell, and other similarly minded scholars. For McColley, to challenge the prelapsarian innocence of Adam and Eve is to undermine Milton's purpose in justifying the ways of God to men (106). She instead claims that our first parents "are engaged in the process of growing by making responsible choices in a world of limitless potentiality," a process which may include a "risk of error" but which is necessary for man to have free will (106). As Adam and Eve learn and grow "in understanding and exercising the responsibilities of free will," they sometimes need instruction from Raphael or each other (108). This learning does not indicate a

fallen nature but rather points to their glorious creative freedom and the joyful possibilities of their innocence. McColley's claim justifies the presence of error in Adam and Eve's prelapsarian behavior but is not enough to prove them sinless. When her points are considered alongside the definitions Milton provides in *De Doctrina Christiana*, however, an answer to this paradox begins to emerge.

Milton explains innocence in *Paradise Lost* as being without sin, but this serves to imbue innocence with an empty or negative signification rather than a substantive or positive one; the concept can only be defined as a lack of its opposite. On its own, innocence means nothing, since without evil or corruption, there is nothing to be innocent of. In order to understand the innocence of Adam and Eve, we must first understand what terrible thing they were missing: sin. In *De Doctrina Christiana*, Milton claims that the Biblical definition of sin is "the transgression of the law" (179). There are two kinds of laws which can be broken to create sin. One kind includes all direct commandments from God—instructions, prohibitions, etc.—but this sort of law is secondary, especially before the Fall. The primary prelapsarian law also comes from God, but resides in the human conscience: an understanding of right behavior which is "innate, and engraven upon the mind of man" (*De Doctrina* 179-81). In Paradise, this internal reasoning suffices for most decisions, functioning as a perfectly balanced moral compass. Prelapsarian humans do not need many direct commandments because they already understand what God expects of them. In fact, God gives Adam and Eve only one specific prohibition:

But of this tree we may not taste not touch;
 God so commanded and left that command
 Sole daughter of his voice; the rest, we live
 Law to ourselves; our reason is our law. (*PL* 9.651-4)

That single command is arbitrary; there is nothing inherently special about the tree or its fruit, despite Satan's assumptions about its power to give knowledge (4.514-520). God forbids it solely as a "sign of [their] obedience" to him, for any other command would be superfluous next to their innate understanding of the law (4.428). These two kinds of laws—God's prohibition of the Tree of Knowledge and the law they know inwardly through their reason—coexist in Eden, and in order for Adam and Eve not to sin, they must not break either one.

Right up until the Fall, Adam and Eve keep both the command and the law of their reason, preserving their innocence. They avoid, of course, eating from the forbidden Tree of Knowledge until they are tempted to do so by Satan and fall. They also understand, through their reason, other laws of nature without being told. When Adam is first created, he instinctively knows that he should have a partner and continues to ask God for "fellowship," even when God tests him by questioning his logic (8.384). After Adam proves himself, God explains the test, congratulating Adam for his self-awareness and for "expressing well the spirit within thee free, / My image" (8.440-1). Adam's innate understanding of the laws and principles on which God founded the universe are one way that he is created in God's image, and he uses this understanding to figure out that he is not meant to be alone. Once God creates Eve, she, too, possesses this automatic knowledge. Upon hearing Adam speak, she immediately understands that his "manly grace / And wisdom" are worth following (4.490-1). The two of them praise God every morning and evening without specific instructions to do so, their songs flowing out "unmeditated" and with "prompt eloquence" (*PL* 5.149). They understand how to have non-sinful sex within the boundaries of their marriage, retiring to their bower to observe the "rites / Mysterious of connubial love" in a marriage bed still "undefiled and chaste" (4.742-3, 761). God

never expressly taught them any of these morals or practices because his expectations were already engraved on Adam and Eve's hearts.

When they do disobey God's direct command, however, they immediately begin to break the innate law as well. As Milton asks in *De Doctrina Christiana*, "What sin can be named, which was not included in this one act?" (181). In order to disobey that one prohibition, Adam and Eve must also commit a variety of sinful activities which were never expressly forbidden but which Adam and Eve still know to be wrong. They trust Satan rather than God; they are guilty of "gluttony," "sacrilege," "deceit," "pride, and arrogance" (*De Doctrina* 183). C. S. Lewis even claims that Eve, in choosing to give Adam the fruit and risk his punishment of death rather than die alone and be replaced by "another Eve," actually commits the first murder (Lewis 121; *PL* 9.828). Directly after the Fall, Adam and Eve continue in their sinning spree, engaging in lustful sex, lying, and blaming each other. Their veil of innocence disappears and they find "their minds / How darkened" with knowledge of evil and shame (*PL* 9.1053-4). Their Fall includes breaking both kinds of the law, but before that time, neither Adam nor Eve actually sins, maintaining complete innocence.

Furthermore, Milton explains in *De Doctrina Christiana* that sin itself has two parts: "evil concupiscence, or the desire of sinning, and the act of sin itself" (193). This division can be considered "gradations" of sin or "in the light of cause and effect" (193). Either way, the two parts are deeply intertwined. Sin does not just happen; someone has to desire sin first. In fact, the allegorical presentation of sin in *Paradise Lost* directly involves desire. When Satan creates Sin from his head in the same way that Zeus birthed Athena, she appears in the form of a woman full of "attractive graces," a woman that Satan desires so much that he impregnates her with Death (*PL* 2.762). Desire for something which contradicts the laws of God (either specified or innate) is

essential for sin to occur. Before the Fall, Adam and Eve have no desire to break either kind of law, meaning that in order to pervert Paradise, Satan must not only cause them to sin, he must also persuade them to *want* to sin. His speeches to Eve are designed to convince her that she desires the fruit and the supposed knowledge or power it contains. With these definitions of sin and the law in mind, the errors made by our first parents begin to look less like a contradiction to their innocence and more like the sometimes-mistaken efforts of two people trying to follow exactly the laws of God, even when they do not know how.

The mistakes that Adam and Eve make, both during the conversation with Raphael and during the separation scene, fall into the category of actions which were never forbidden by any direct command. In order to navigate these two situations, Adam and Eve must rely on their reason to decide the right course of action; in doing so, they sometimes behave incorrectly and must be reprimanded. However, even though Adam and Eve err in attempting to follow their reason, they do not sin because they do not actually break that innate law, nor do they *want* to. Their errors represent not a conscious, desired transgression of the law but rather an exploration of the law within a reasonable boundary of freedom. God grants them the ability to make good choices, for “reason also is choice” (*PL* 3.108). In using their reason, Adam and Eve are faced with a series of decisions in which they know their desired outcome—following the laws of God—but not necessarily which choice will lead to that outcome. They exercise their God-given free will in making these decisions, since, as Adam explains to Eve, “God left free the will, for what obeys / Reason is free, and reason he made right” (9.351-2). Their reason may be right, but life can become complicated, even in Eden, and God gave them perfect reason without perfect knowledge. Sometimes in deciding how to accomplish what they know to be right, this lack of perfect knowledge causes them to err. McColley’s argument in “Free Will and Obedience”

supports this reading: in order for Adam and Eve to have free will in their obedience to inner reason, they have to be able to make mistakes, to figure out what the correct behavior is through trial and error (118). Even with an innate comprehension of God's expectations for them, our first parents do not always have easy choices. They have an inner understanding of the right thing to do—as well as a desire to do it—but they do not always see one clear, correct path to accomplishing it. Their mistakes are not sins, however, because even in the most complicated of decisions, they never *choose* to do what they know to be wrong.

A closer examination of the rebuke scenes also supports this reading. For example, when Adam begins asking questions about the organization of the cosmos, Raphael corrects Adam's thought process but not his underlying desires. "To ask or search I blame thee not," the angel says, "for heaven / Is as the book of God before thee set / Wherein to read his wondrous works and learn" (*PL* 8.66-8). Adam is right to be curious; God wants him to learn and grow by exploring the universe around him. His reason tells him in this scene to learn as much as he can from God's messenger, furthering his education just as God intended. After all, Raphael was sent down to give him more knowledge and has so far explained events far beyond Adam's imagination, including the war in Heaven. Why should he not continue to ask and learn? The answer lies in information that Adam cannot possibly know: God's motives for obscuring the organization of the universe. Even Raphael does not have all of this information, for "the rest / From man or angel the great architect / Did wisely to conceal" (8. 71-3). According to Raphael, God has his reasons for keeping the details of the cosmos a mystery, reasons that Adam cannot even begin to comprehend. Rather than correcting his desire for knowledge, Raphael is showing Adam a different way to think about his curiosity, reminding him how little he knows about the universe to demonstrate that worrying about such matters is pointless. The angel says, "Whether

heaven move or earth / Imports not if thou reckon right,” and he then shows Adam exactly how to “reckon right” (8.70-1). He instructs Adam to be “contented that thus far hath been revealed” and to focus on understanding the world around him, the world he *can* comprehend (8.177).

Adam knows that he is supposed to learn; Raphael teaches him the best way to do so by showing him the boundaries of human understanding and appropriate curiosity.

When Raphael reprimands him a second time, now in reference to Eve, again it serves to educate Adam on the best way to follow his innate reason rather than to point out any sinful behavior. Adam’s thoughts towards his wife widely miss the mark, but they stem from his desire to follow the God-given order of the universe rather than a desire to go against the laws of God. Adam expresses an internal conflict: he knows that he is meant to be slightly superior to Eve and that she is “of nature... inferior in the mind / And inward faculties” (*PL* 8.541-2). However, he also has experienced feeling weak when confronted both by her beauty and by her self-confidence, for Eve appears “so well to know / Her own, that what she wills to do or say / Seems wisest, virtuousest, discreetest, best” (8.548-50). His admiration for his wife, although not inherently bad and in fact a good emotion to have, presents an apparent conflict with the hierarchy he knows God intended for their marriage and their species. While Adam’s confusion causes him to say things which are clearly incorrect—exaggerating his praise for Eve so that it sounds like praise meant only for God, implying that her beauty can undercut his wisdom, downplaying her qualities as an intellectual and emotional match while overstating her physical merits—he speaks from a desire to do right in this marriage rather than a desire to break his innate law of reason. Raphael once again corrects his way of thinking by showing him a different point of view. The angel explains that Adam should worry less about Eve and more about his own role in the relationship: “she hath done her part; / Do thou but thine” (8.561-2). Adam must

focus on his own “self-esteem grounded on just and right / Well managed,” trusting in his own wisdom and virtue (8.572-3). The more he values himself, the more Eve will “acknowledge [Adam] her head” (8.574). This reprimand is less an accusation and more a lesson for Adam, a way to better understand how his relationship is meant to work. As with the earlier issue of curiosity, “Raphael’s rebuke and Adam’s response to it are a step in his growth” and his education (McColley 112). Adam is able to learn from Raphael’s greater knowledge and understand how to follow the guiding impulses of his reason. The errors in this passage are not a sin but rather a mistake on Adam’s part, a mistake which Raphael quickly corrects.

The separation scene also represents Adam and Eve’s attempts to follow their reason, erring but not sinning. They each try to deduce the right thing to do in the situation—stay together or go their separate ways—by following two different priorities, each of which corresponds to a purpose their innate reason tells them is correct. Adam wants to stay with his wife, working together both to maintain the garden and to resist temptation. Eve wants to separate, arguing that they will accomplish more work and have the chance to prove their individual virtue against temptation without outside help. As David Quint puts it in his book “*Inside Paradise Lost*,” Adam is thinking horizontally about his relationship with Eve and their life together while Eve is thinking vertically about her relationship with God (156). They both desire to do the work that God has given them: Eve wants to focus on one task assigned by God—maintaining the garden—while Adam wants to focus on another task ordained by God—their marriage. They both also desire to follow principles that order God’s universe. Eve comprehends that she was created “sufficient” to stand against Satan whereas Adam, remembering his conversation with God before Eve was created, knows that his one “deficiency” is in solitude (*PL* 3.99, 8.416; Quint 154-5). This creates a conflict of two equally valid claims

about how they should proceed, and in trying to navigate that conflict, Adam and Eve step outside of the marital hierarchy they are supposed to follow as Eve continues to argue against her husband's wishes and as Adam acts in submission to her. They also make points which might cause Raphael to contract his brow—Eve that it is a good idea to go out alone and face temptation, Adam that to merely encounter temptation would be a stain on her honor. If a more knowledgeable creature, such as an angel, had been present, perhaps he could have corrected these errors. He could not, however, accuse them of sin, because they neither broke the law nor desired to do so. They simply made a few mistakes in trying to decide which of them had the better understanding of how to fulfill God's purposes.

All of the rebuke scenes point to a lack of sinfulness in Adam and Eve before the Fall. Their gaps in knowledge sometimes create gaps in their logic, even when they understand what God expects them to do and when they deeply desire to follow his will, but they never willfully transgress or even wish to transgress the laws engraved in their hearts. Their lack of sin does not equate to immunity from making mistakes; they err in trying to do the right thing without doing the wrong thing. In this way, Adam and Eve do maintain their perfect innocence while also maintaining their freedom to learn and make decisions, sometimes erring but never sinning. When they do sin and fall, the repercussions extend far beyond their immediate circumstances, altering the presence of sin and the law on earth. Milton's female, allegorical representation of Sin actually enters the world, followed by her brother-son Death. The "evil concupiscence" (desire for sin) that Adam and Eve once lacked is now the inheritance they pass on to their children; because they first wanted to break the laws of God, the entire human race after them contains "an innate propensity to sin" rather than an innate sense of reason (*De Doctrina* 193). Their inherent understanding of God's expectations is tainted and no longer sufficient for

following the law. After the Fall, they will never again live in a world where a single, arbitrary prohibition about a tree is enough to show them how not to sin. God must provide humanity with more direct commandments, eventually handing down the laws of Moses (*De Doctrina* 181).

The joyful, creative freedom to make mistakes without sinning that Adam and Eve knew in their innocence is lost to them until the end of days, when mankind can once again live in Paradise.

Works Cited

- Bell, Millicent. "The Fallacy of the Fall in *Paradise Lost*." *PMLA* 68.4 (1953): 863-83. *JSTOR*.
Web. 20 Oct. 2015.
- Johnson, Lee M. "Language and the Illusion of Innocence in *Paradise Lost*." *Of Poetry and Poetics: New Essays on Milton and His World*. Ed. P. G. Stanwood. Binghamton, New York: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1995. Print.
- Lewis, C. S. *A Preface to Paradise Lost*. London: Oxford UP, 1942. Print.
- McColley, Diane Kelsey. "Free Will and Obedience in the Separation Scene of *Paradise Lost*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 12:1 (1972). 103-20. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 Oct. 2015.
- Milton, John. *De Doctrina Christiana*. Trans. Charles R Sumner. *The Works of John Milton*. Ed. James Holly Hanford and Waldo Hilary Dunn. Vol. 15. New York: Columbia UP, 1933. Print.
- . *Paradise Lost*. Ed. David Scott Kastan. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2005. Print.
- Quint, David. "Getting What You Wish For: A Reading of the Fall." *Inside Paradise Lost*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2014. 153-96. Print.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. "The Crisis of *Paradise Lost*." *Studies in Milton*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1951. 8-52. Print.