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Abstract

This essay explores, in sequence, the event of Eve’s dream, Raphael’s visit to Eden, and Satan’s temptation as presented in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. To aid an interpretation of Raphael’s visit to Eden, in terms other than failure, is Edward Said’s seminal work, *Orientalism*. Said’s theoretical cruxes of “latent orientalism” and “narrative” propel an analytical reconfiguration of the events stated above. As Said’s claims work to question analyses of Raphael’s visit, present in scholarly discourse, Milton’s text works to reveal the analytical possibilities of Said’s work in ways that are otherwise absent from the discourse. By examining these moments in Milton’s text, Said’s claims also procure insightful dimensions and interpretations outside of their more theoretical and historical commonplace. Ultimately, Said’s main concern of the historical dynamics shaping the relationship between “east” and “West”, “Orient” and “Occident”, prove relevant to consideration of the dynamics of “earthly” and “heavenly”, God and man, in Milton’s epic poem.
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Edward Said’s seminal work, *Orientalism*, includes a chapter on the details of two ideas that he terms “Latent and Manifest Orientalism” (Said, 201). Said’s discussion treats the history of the Orientalist in the Orient, and the differences that mark latent from manifest Orientalism, according to Said, aid in tracing the developments of this relationship. While not necessarily offering a “postcolonial” reading of Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, per se, this essay will argue that Said’s concept of “latent Orientalism” in particular has much to offer to a consideration of Milton’s greatest poem.

Said clarifies what he means by “latent Orientalism” when he writes that “the distinction I am making is really between an almost unconscious (and certainly an untouchable) positivity, which I shall call *latent Orientalism*, and the various stated views about Oriental society, languages, literatures...and so forth, which I shall call *manifest Orientalism*” (Said, 206). In short, manifest Orientalism treats “[w]hatever change occurs in knowledge of the Orient,” in comparison to latent Orientalism, which is “more or less constant (Said, 206). Latent Orientalism yields “unanimity, stability, and durability,” according to Said (said, 206).

Allied to this conception of latent Orientalism is what Said, in a subsequent chapter of his work, refers to as “the defeat of narrative by vision” (Said, 239). Like latent Orientalism, vision both pursues and depends upon the consistency and success of “profoundly conservative” and “static” techniques (Said, 222,239). Narrative, by contrast,
is “a constant pressure” on static vision, for “if any Oriental detail [that] can be shown to move, or to develop diachrony is introduced into the system,” then “[w]hat seemed stable ... now appears unstable” (Said, 240). Narrative, in this account, stands in opposition to the “constant” or “static” nature of latent Orientalism and vision alike, and as such the perpetuation of Orientalism, and especially latent Orientalism, necessitates “the defeat of narrative by vision.”

Taking this concept of latent Orientalism first and “the defeat of narrative by vision” second, this paper will pursue an analysis of three key moments in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*: Eve’s dream (experienced in Book 4 and first recounted by Eve in Book 5), Raphael’s subsequent visit to Eden (which also commences with Book 5), and Satan’s ultimate temptation of Eve (in Book 9). Using Said’s theoretical claims, this paper will construct an analysis that positions Raphael’s visit in Eden as appropriately central to the poem, flanked by Eve’s dream on the one hand and Satan’s temptation of Eve on the other. Though some have read Raphael’s visit to Eden as a kind of long, extra-biblical digress, I will argue that this chronology of events is important because these moments in the poem precisely because they develop in accordance with Said’s conception of latent Orientalism and its relation to narrative. Yet I also mean to argue that these moments in Milton’s poem complicate Said’s presentation of that relationship as well. In particular, this paper will suggest that Said’s work has the power to bring a fresh perspective to the question of the “failure” of Raphael’s visit to Eden to prevent Adam’s and Eve Fall, but *Paradise Lost*, in turn, also has the power to raise questions about elements of Said’s own theoretical model, insofar as *Paradise Lost* works to resist aspects of that model even as it caters to others.
Before turning to *Paradise Lost*, however, it bears addressing a few other key features of Said’s concept of latent Orientalism. Said discusses the “unconscious (and certainly untouchable) positivity” and the “unanimity, stability, and durability” that latent Orientalism asserts with regard to the Orient. Furthermore, for Said, “enunciative capacities” represent one of the key vehicles that mobilize these characteristics into their respective role as a means to maintain the Orientalists’ control of the Orient. Said includes “enunciative capacities” in his account of the “two principal methods by which Orientalism delivered the Orient to the West in the early twentieth century” (Said, 221). This “delivery” was successful “by means of disseminative capacities of modern learning” which yielded “a cumulative vision ... a quintessential Orient;” it is this “doctrinal-or doxological-manifestation of such an Orient” that serves latent Orientalism (Said, 221). Enunciative capacities confirm latent Orientalism’s coherence; essentially, they are a way to confirm the success of the “disseminative capacities” that precede the enunciative moment. As Said states, “So far as anyone wishing to make a statement of any consequence about the Orient was concerned, latent Orientalism supplied him with an enunciative capacity that could be used, or rather mobilized, and turned into sensible discourse for the concrete occasion at hand” (Said, 222).

“Profoundly conservative”, a version of Said’s “enunciative capacities,” one can see employed by Raphael as he works to restabilize Eden and its inhabitants following the event of Eve’s dream. And yet, Raphael ultimately strays from the “conservative” bounds that rehearse and relate God’s “unconscious and untouchable positvity.” Embedded in Eve’s dream are images and occurrences that test the stability of *Paradise Lost* as it is maintained in the early books of Milton’s text. Eve’s dream is an early
source of chaos and disarray in Eden that calls God’s “positivity,” as well as the latent Orientalism on which such positivity and its relation to Eden depends, into question.

Reaction to Eve’s dream displays the limits of man’s knowledge as well as revealing the level of comfort enjoyed by Adam and Eve in Eden. Raphael does revive God’s glory through his conversation with Adam, speaking within the limits of “enunciative capacities” through “sensible discourse” for the specific occasion. What persists and challenges Raphael’s victory is the capacity of Eve’s dream to present images and ideas that cannot be properly categorized and treated by Raphael. This failure of Raphael to impose his (or at least God’s) conservative strictures and fully reclaim Adam and Eve’s diligent obedience reflects the appeal of the manifested ideas depicted in Eve’s dream. These possibilities stand apart from the “doxological” praises sent up to the Creator. In this way, Eve’s dream implants the appeal of other possibilities in Adam’s and Eve’s mind. The change prompts us to look past Raphael’s conservative statements and search for the meaning of the fleeting and animated images related by Eve in the beginning pages of Book 5.

If Raphael’s visit to Eden, in other words, evinces Said’s concept of “latent Orientalism” in action, then Eve’s dream nonetheless exposes latent Orientalism’s fragility, a possibility for which Said’s work does not necessarily allow. Eve’s dream obstructs the mechanical back and forth between the Creator and mankind, as new images exercise their appeal and explicitly challenge the “unanimity, stability, and durability” that was once sole victor in Eden. Eve’s dream, as such, offers evidence of the human pair’s initial compliance to what had been a conservative mode of existence but also of possible resistance to that model by the very beings subjected to it.
At first, the presence of any sort of variation serving to challenge or oppose the limits of their strictly doctrinal existence is not met with curiosity but dismissed by Adam and Eve; the pair recoil in the face of “evil sprung” and “in fit strains pronounced or sung / Unmeditated, such prompt eloquence / Flowed from their lips” (5.98, 148-150).

Claiming Adam and Eve’s “prompt eloquence” in opposition to the unbridled images of Eve’s dream exposes the conservative nature of Said’s latent Orientalism and serves as an example of “enunciative capacities” at play. What unfolds in Milton’s text is an event, like that engendered by the Orientalist who wishes to speak of the Orient: Adam and Eve offer sensible discourse in response to the occasion of Eve’s dream. Yet complicating the situation and challenging the guarantee of success is evidence of lingering ideas that explicitly compromise the future of the sort of latent Orientalism that exists in Eden.

The degree of Eve’s innocence is displayed at the moment she relates her dream to Adam, stating she has “dreamed, not as I oft am wont, of thee, / Works of day past, or morrow’s next design, / But of offense and trouble, which my mind knew never till this irksome night;” (5.32-35). In listing the normal content of her dreams, Eve establishes the limits of her knowledge as being directly connected to her existence in Eden. What complicates this particular dream is the presence of “offense and trouble,” and in relating the rest of her dream these elements collect more significance and breed sophisticated ideas that eliminate the possibility that Eve will relate a dream about normal and blissful edenic life. Indeed, “trouble and offense” eliminate the possibility that this moment in Milton’s text will follow the pattern that serves Milton’s God.

Images without precedent flood Eve’s relation of her dream and blur the line that distinguishes good from evil, heavenly from unheavenly, and ultimately latent from
manifest Orientalism. Such categories mingle in the context of Eve’s dream. “One shaped and winged like one of those from Heav’n / By us oft seen” is said to sit beside the tree of forbidden knowledge, and the Heavenly figure is found entertaining barred thoughts: “Forbid who will, none shall from me withhold / Longer thy offered good, why else set here?” (5.55-63). Eve continues from there, and in telling the rest of her dream the degree of her innocent and conservative existence is drawn out further: “This said he paused not, but with vent’rous arm / He plucked, he tasted; me damp horror chilled / At such bold words vouched with a deed so bold:” (5.64-66). Eve’s dream not only moves past the restraints of language in what is said by the “heavenly” figure, but spirals out of control through actions and results that leave Eve in disarray.

The human pair’s innocence has been extensively covered by modern scholarship on *Paradise Lost*. However, examining the factors that utterly shock Eve reveals not only prelapsarian innocence but a response to the simple mechanics of cause and effect, the joining of word and deed. The figure of Eve’s dream questions, judges, and acts, and this linear development confirms the power of Milton’s God in Eden and the limits of Adam and Eve’s knowledge. In this way Eve’s dream stands as a direct challenge to figures of authority, the Orientalist in Said’s text and God in *Paradise Lost*. Eve’s dream develops like a story: she “Forthwith up to the clouds / With him I flew, and underneath beheld / The Earth outstretched immense, / And various” (5.86-89). As authority figures, the Orientalist and the Creator are not subject to these limits because the Orientalist serves a personal and global agenda and all possibilities are accessible to the Creator. Eve’s dream represents latent Orientalism but also complicates the model as it exists in Said’s own
work. For Said, latent Orientalism perpetually succeeds, and there is no way to hinder the reality of its success.

Recall that, according to Said, latent Orientalism, as “profoundly conservative” and effective through “enunciative capacities,” enabled the long-standing success of Orientalism: “transmitted from one generation to another, it was part of the culture ... Orientalism staked its existence ... on its internal, repetitious consistency about its constitutive will-to-power over the Orient. In such a way Orientalism was able to survive revolution, world wars, and the literal dismemberment of empires” (Said, 222). Said’s text lays out the inability to halt Orientalism’s control over the Orient. Eve’s dream, however, explicitly challenges the “repetitious consistency” of latent Orientalism and the consistent success of “enunciative capacities.” The fleeting images of Eve’s dream, the “bold words vouched with a deed so bold” and the “vent’rous arm” confront the conservative banner of latent Orientalism. Any sort of capacities and strongholds are disposed of and the mother of mankind flies up into the sky beholding “a prospect wide / And various” (5.88-89). What transpires in the pages leading up to Raphael’s visit is Adam’s effort to make sense of the dream in terms of what he knows and in relation to the latent model of God’s glory.

Adam’s response displays the interplay between the images of the dream and the “profoundly conservative” nature of latent Orientalism. This exchange, however, is short-lived, and Adam and Eve offer praise to the Creator, exhausting the features of latent Orientalism that are “unanimity, stability, and durability.” To begin, Adam claims the dream to be “lesser faculties that serve / Reason as chief; among these Fancy next / Her office holds;” and states that Eve’s dream “Ill matching words and deeds long past or
late. / Some such resemblances methinks, I find / Of our last evening’s talk, in this thy
dream, But with addition strange” (5.101-116). Adam’s response makes sense of parts of
Eve’s dream, but “addition strange” will hold in Adam’s mind when he converses with
Raphael. The additions of the dream will shift the goals of God’s command to Raphael,
and Adam will show curiosity to know more and hear the full relation of Satan’s
rebellion.

Assuring Eve that her dream does not compromise her love for God, Adam ends
his response in stating, “Be not disheartened then, nor cloud those looks / That wont to be
more cheerful and serene” (5.122-123). Recourse to the “wont” is excessive in Book 5
and readily available in a moment of exhaustive prayer that fixes Adam and Eve in the
conservative mode of Milton’s text: praises to God “Him first, him last, him midst, and
without end” (5.165). This moment of prayer in Book 5, like Eve’s dream, adds
dimensions to Milton’s text and serves as a point in Paradise Lost that explicitly
evaluates mankind and the repetitive mode of prayer. Adam and Eve act in accordance
with “their maker;” “lowly they bowed adoring, and began / Their orisons, each morning
duly paid” (5.145-148). The text confirms the success of “unconscious and untouchable
positivity”: “So all was cleared, and to the field they haste,” but God “beheld / With
pity” and sees fit to send Raphael in response to Eve’s dream. God’s command suggests
the seriousness of the dream and is a call to action; Raphael must refresh man’s
perspective and restore God’s presence in Eden.

Concerned with the influence of Eve’s dream on the human pair, Milton’s God
does not simply accept their praise but realizes the danger of new knowledge and ideas.
The dream and specifically the magnitude of “ill matching words and deeds” disrupts the
mechanical back and forth that appears in others forms and contexts in Milton’s work. The sort of “successful,” perpetual encounter in Orientalism that finds the Orientalist exercising “enunciative capacities” ultimately fails in Eden. Eden, in terms of latent Orientalism, transforms into an Oriental space that has been exposed to other forms of knowledge. Milton’s God realizes this change and the changed state of his creation. The text sees this change as a form of movement that deviates from the preferred model of habitual positivity. God tells Raphael, “thou hear’st what stir on Earth / Satan from Hell scaped through the darksome gulf / Hath raised in Paradise, and now disturbed / This night the human pair” (5.224-226). The need to eliminate the effects of the dream also manifests itself in a desire to eliminate the experience as a whole. This recalls another example that Said shares of how the West perceived the Orient. “What these widely diffused notions of the Orient depended on,” Said observes, “was the almost total absence in contemporary Western culture of the Orient as a genuinely felt and experienced force” (Said, 208). Said’s claim offers a context for considering God’s command, for it is evident that “movement” or change is not imagined by God for Eden. Eden, however, proves to be a space that breeds feelings and experience, and this is evident not only in Adam’s and Eve’s reactions but through analysis of Adam’s questioning of Raphael. Furthermore, these moments explicitly challenge a state of normalcy that praises the Creator. As such, God’s command is wholly concerned with reversing the effects of the dream and renewing a state absent of change. Raphael’s relation of Satan’s rebellion itself reflects this, for it is rooted in stagnant language, and this is evident through repetition of words like “hold” and “stood” (5.537-568).
In his essay “Transported Touch: The Fruit of Marriage in *Paradise Lost*,” John Rogers discusses what he terms “Milton’s earthly polity” and the issues that present themselves in Eden, including the preexisting tensions that are further complicated by the event of Eve’s dream. Rogers argues that “the situation” in Eden “is untenable; the contradictory social formations of paradise, inherently unstable” (Rogers, 125). God’s command would seem to corroborate Rogers’s claim, as the dream works to test the existing model, even to the point of confirming its failure. Examining the dream and Book 5 through Said’s latent Orientalism provides another way to assess Eden as a space. In addition to the social and sexual structures studied by Rogers, there is the mode of communication that gives meaning and perhaps further complicates Rogers’s analysis of Eden. Latent Orientalism and its features work to make the situation more problematic and add limits to a space that already fosters contradictions.

In an attempt to fulfill the requirements of God’s command in Eden, Raphael extols the image of Heavenly angels standing in obedience to God. Raphael proves temporarily successful in this, as Adam responds by saying that “my constant thoughts / Assured me, and still assure” (5.552-553). In saying this, however, Adam then asks a question that pushes beyond Raphael’s telling of things already known to a desire that yearns for more. Adam’s questions continue to reveal his curiosity and the futility of Raphael’s success in celebrating the “unanimity, stability, and durability” of God’s glory. In *Milton’s Words*, Annabel Patterson touches on the futility of “enunciative capacities,” and this aids in showing how the images of Eve’s dream prove more powerful in comparison to the more consistent and rehearsed ideas of Milton’s text.
Patterson treats the development of “death” in *Paradise Lost*, and the more conservative trajectory of the term stands in stark contrast to the potency of an image like “bold words and bold deeds.” As Patterson argues, *Paradise Lost* begins “by starting with the abstraction in its direst form, and then, by repeating the word *Death* as the name of a puzzle set by God that humans must learn to solve,” the poem ultimately ends by “returning it at last to the status of a natural event, something unfearful, something even to look forward to” (Patterson, 98). Cataloguing the many contexts that include what Patterson call the “D-word”, death, in comparison to “one famous moment—famous at least in literary criticism—when the D-word asserts itself” in Book 2, Patterson states that the passage shows “two ideas not presentible but by language, and a union of them great and amazing beyond conception.” “Whoever attentively considers this passage in Milton,” she continues, “will find that it does not in general produce its end by raising the images of things, but by exciting a passion similar to that which real objects excite by other instruments” (102). Considering Patterson’s analysis in relation to “vent’rous arm” and “plucked and tasted”, phrases which usher in the horror of “bold words vouched with a deed so bold”, displays how the dream finds common ground with an idea that is consistently discussed in *Paradise Lost*: namely, “death” and its relation to Adam and Eve’s existence.

Although Patterson works with another passage in Milton’s text, the idea of the poem’s “raising the image of things” bears on the passage that treats Eve’s dream. In Eve’s dream, the ominous consideration of the tree of forbidden knowledge is challenged and, one could argue, eliminated. The joining of words with action does more than “raise[] the image of things” and “excite passion.” Unlike “death”, the dream displays a
completed action that eliminates the process of development that Patterson’s argument must follow. The “D-word” displays different forms, possibilities, and outcomes across the poem in comparison to these things being fully encapsulated and made available in the context of Eve’s dream in less than ten lines.

Tracking the the use of “death” in Milton’s text, Patterson writes the following:

Eve’s next speech, congratulating [Adam] on his fidelity to her, uses the D-word no less than 5 times in thirty lines, emptying it still further of content with each reiteration. In all, of the 120 appearances of the D-word in the poem, 23 occur in Book 9, the Book of the Fall. But, we might say, it’s just the word. All talk and no action. Nobody dies (106).

The “emptying” out of the D-word suggests the disposal and precarious nature of an idea that is meant to be consistent. Death, in Paradise Lost, measures man’s obedience to God and as an outcome should only claim one form and one possible result. Like Rogers, Paterson is attentive to “apparent contradictions”, revealing a mismatch between what is said of “death” and what actually occurs. Taking a moment from Book 10, Patterson offers an example of a contradiction that pertains to “death” in Milton’s text: when Adam “considers the apparent contradictions between the original decree, which implied that the punishment for disobedience would be immediate, and the manifest fact that he and Eve are still alive” (Patterson, 107). Patterson’s analysis, and particularly her notion of “emptying out” a term or idea through “reiteration”, adds new dimensions to Raphael’s relation of Satan’s rebellion. The significance of the image of “all th’ angelic host that stand / In sight of God enthroned” takes different forms in Raphael’s conversation and is ultimately “emptied” of its initial meaning (5.535-36). And here, analysis of Raphael’s visit to Eden, with special attention to the trajectory and ultimate failure of his and God’s
latent Orientalism, will necessitate consideration of Said’s notion of “the defeat of narrative by vision” as well (Said, 239).

Raphael successfully counteracts “what stir on Earth” and talks, extensively, of man’s obedience to God, thus renewing all positivity in Eden. However, Raphael’s success is short-lived; indeed, existing scholarship has been virtually uniform in regarding Raphael’s visit to be an overall failure, in light of the ultimate ineffectiveness of his warning of Adam and Eve of Satan’s plans. Analyzing Raphael’s time in Eden through the lens of Said’s aforementioned concepts complicates this conventional critical reading. Kimberly Johnson’s essay, “Raphael’s ‘Potent Tongue’: Power and Spectacle in Paradise Lost” provides one such opportunity for considering the “Orientalist” dimension to Raphael’s visit to Eden. To begin, Johnson notes the danger posed by Raphael’s focus on spectacle rather than the details of his task to warn Adam and Eve. Johnson explains Raphael’s narration to Adam and Eve in terms of “blockbuster priorities”, “vigorous storytelling”, and “re-prioritizing of values” (Johnson, 206-7). These characteristics are admittedly present when Raphael relates the details of Satan’s rebellion. However, Raphael does adhere to his task by dwelling, quite extensively, on man’s unfaltering obedience to God. Raphael’s shift away from the comforts of latent Orientalism occurs as a result of Adam’s insistence to hear “the full relation” from Raphael and to move past Raphael’s conservative rubric.

Raphael tells of “those / Who dwell in Heav’n, whose excellence he [Adam] saw / Transcend his own”, but in asking “yet what compare?”, Adam is resolved to serve more than just the role of audience to Raphael’s discourse (5.456-67). Adam’s questions and Raphael’s answers display a back and forth that exceeds the limits of “enunciative
capacities” and offers agency to the Orientalist’s audience. By asking how Heavenly life compares to Earthly existence, Adam inserts himself into the event and adopts a proactive role. Raphael introduces the topic of man’s obedience to God and finishes in stating “Meanwhile enjoy / Your fill what happiness this happy state / Can comprehend, incapable of more” (5.503-5). Raphael’s response fixes the limits of man’s existence, but Adam inquires, “what meant that caution joined” and reorients the conversation so that he is more than a figure of agreement. Raphael’s response sets new limits and through reiteration empties out the image of unfaltering and rooted obedience to God. The mechanisms of reiteration, exercised by Raphael, do not suffice in his encounter with man.

Attentive to what is new in Raphael’s discourse, Adam’s question finds Raphael delineating a space for man to exercise his obedience, stating, “therein stand”, “Hold, as you yours, while our obedience holds; / On other surety none; freely we serve, / Because we freely love, / in this we stand or fall” (5.522-40). Adam is content but nonetheless bent on hearing “the full relation”, and Raphael prefaces his relation of rebellion by stating, “how without remorse / The ruin of so many glorious once and perfect while they stood”, and again when God begins appointment of the Son, “Hear my decree, which unrevoked shall stand” (5.565-603). Raphael is reluctant to tell of “warring spirits”, as this will challenge the preferred image of both heavenly angel and man, displaying a rooted and stagnant position in sight of God (5.566). Like the repetitions of “death”, “stood” does not serve its expected end but will be realized in terms of its contradictions and shortcomings. Said’s discussion of “the defeat of narrative by vision” clarifies why
Adam is interested in the full and complete relation and reveals connections between Satan’s exit from Heaven and Eve’s decision to eat the forbidden fruit.

Narrative in Said’s text takes the form of “constant pressure”; it “asserts the power of men to be born, develop, and die, the tendency of institutions and actualities to change” (Said, 240). As Said continues, “Narrative, in short, introduces an opposing point of view, perspective, consciousness to a unitary web of vision” and regards “the complex dynamics of human life” (Said, 240, 247). Satan’s rebellion as narrative is challenged by the mechanics of vision. God’s appointment of the Son manifests Said’s vision, as the “decrees” promote the “static”, “permanent”, and “stable” eternality of Heaven. Raphael describes Heavenly celebrations following the appointment of the Son, and this part of the story justifies a reading of Satan as the figure of “pressure” at the moment of rebellion and in Milton’s text in general.

Raphael describes the circumstances that come with challenging the appointment: “cast out from God and blessed vision, [Satan] falls / Into utter darkness, deep engulfed, his place / Ordained without redemption, without end” (5.613-15). God’s words reveal not only expulsion from Heaven but the “static” and eternally miserable state of those who find fault in God’s decree. Raphael shares the response of Heaven’s majority, and this serves to qualify the force of Satan’s dissent: “they eat, they drink, and in communion sweet / Quaff immortality and joy, secure / Of surfeit ... Celestial tabernacles, where they slept / Fanned with cool winds, / Melodious hymns about the sov’ reign throne / Alternate all night long” (5.637-57). Raphael characterizes Satan’s “envy” by saying that Satan “could not bear / Through pride that sight, and thought himself impaired” by the evidence of a new and pressing reality in heaven: “All seemed
well pleased, all seemed, but were not all” (5.617). Considering Said’s idea of narrative in relation to Satan’s rebellion and his speech to his fellow fallen angels establishes a new perspective of the rebellion and undermines Heaven’s flawless reputation.

With regard to warning Adam and Eve of Satan, Johnson considers Raphael’s failure to be his discourse of power and spectacle. Raphael does fail, but when considering Satan’s speech and logic in the last lines of Book 5, Johnson’s argument of power and spectacle is challenged by the elements that reflect Said’s conception of narrative: that is, reaction to the “profoundly conservative” nature of Heavenly life, in the form of pressure. Johnson’s concern with power and spectacle does not attend to how Raphael’s storytelling ultimately serves as the vehicle that benefits and liberates Adam and Eve from latent Orientalism and the constraints of what Said would call “vision”.

Johnson examines “the Satan of Raphael’s epic tale in Book 5 and 6”, stating, “This is a Satan of ‘bold discourse’ and ‘superior voice’, who, after initially gathering his followers together under false pretense, dispenses with ambiguity and exhorts them to open insurrection” (Johnson, 210). Yet Johnson’s analysis is insular because consideration of Satan in this way does not regard his “bold discourse” as a simple response to the forces of vision. Examining Satan’s speech in its relation to Said’s conception of narrative and not in terms of moral and ethical value sheds light on Eve’s own connection to and defeat over vision. While part of Raphael’s account, Satan’s “bold discourse” and “superior voice” needs to be consideration outside the narrow terms of Raphael’s embellished and failed visit to Eden. Before speaking to his legions, Satan shares his logic with his “companion dear”, Beelzebub: “New laws thou seest imposed; / New laws from him who reigns, new minds may raise / In us who serve, new counsels”
Noury 19

(5.679-81). At this moment, Satan’s speech is in conversation with Said’s notion of “opposing perspective and consciousness to a unitary web of vision” (240). Satan, in exemplifying awareness of and against the decree, avoids the concerns of spectacle.

Johnson characterizes Satan further by stating that “Raphael’s Satan is distinct not only for his forthrightness but also for the way he puts proof to his bold words by bold deeds ... In Raphael’s epic, Satan is a hero marked by his straightforwardly brave words that correspond to straightforwardly bold actions” (Johnson, 211). Yet a reading of the text in light of Said’s work puts into a new perspective both these “bold deeds” and “straightforwardly bold actions.” Satan’s success, as discussed by Johnson, is vital because possibilities not acquired by the Orient in Said’s analysis are evident and prove to flourish in Milton’s text. In this way Johnson’s concern for epic style in Raphael’s account takes on different forms, for Satan’s speech is both sensible and justified in terms of narrative: “Receive him coming to receive from us / Knee-tribute yet unpaid, prostration vile, / But what if better counsels might erect / Our minds and teach us to cast off this yoke?” (5.781-86). Satan’s appeal and the conclusion of his speech differs monumentally from the repeated and rehearsed statements of Raphael’s earlier conversation with Adam. By overwhelming the limits and scope of “enunciative capacities”, Satan eliminates the latent model and its respective features. The pioneer of Said’s conception of narrative, Satan’s ability to develop the pressure of narrative will be present and take new forms at the moment of the temptation.

To argue the ultimate elimination of latent Orientalism in Paradise Lost and the development of Said’s conception of narrative in the poem, I now mean to examine two specific moments in Book 9, the book of the Fall: the temptation and the immediate
aftermath of the Fall. Specifically, these moments convey the finality of “enunciative capacites”, as God’s positivity is overwhelmed with layers of narrative qualities. A reading of the Fall in light of Said’s work will again reveal how Raphael’s relation of rebellion informs Said’s notion of the “complex dynamics of human life.” In this way, Raphael fails to warn Adam and Eve but succeeds in introducing the possibilities of narrative.

William Poole’s *Milton and the Idea of the Fall* includes a chapter entitled “Paradise Lost IV: Fall and expulsion”. In this chapter, Poole is attentive to an argument that traces the explicit changes that are displayed by Adam and Eve in the moments that precede the Fall and those that follow. Poole’s analysis is particularly helpful because Said’s own analysis of Orientalism is suggested by it. Poole takes Eve’s idea of separation, “till more hands / Aid us, the work under our labor grows,” and argues that “this at once shows that Eve is still thinking ahead.” In tracing development of the conversation, Poole states, “Adam discourses, but Eve argues, wresting control of their conversation from him” (Poole, 185; *Paradise Lost*, 9.207-8). Poole’s characterization of Adam and Eve reveals how the human pair, in the space of Eden, has grown both in knowledge and experience.

It is new information offered by Raphael in Books 5 through 8 that alters Adam’s perspective of Eve and vice versa. Poole cites Adam’s admission in Book 8 where the first of mankind “confesses that one thing does rock his calm: his wife” (Poole, 182). Raphael, as advisor to Adam, is another moment in Milton’s text that speaks to Said’s support of narrative and the conflicts of vision. Raphael’s extensive time in Eden eliminates strict adherence to the model of latent Orientalism as well as the forces of
vision. Comfort in vision, before Raphael, is last seen in the human pair’s unequivocal turn to worship after Eve’s dream. Of this change, Pool writes that it “gestures towards the internal quiescence the prelapsarians had hitherto possessed and are now moving beyond” (186).

Poole’s claim of Adam and Eve’s movement away from “internal quiescence” connects with Said’s model of latent Orientalism as “an almost unconscious (and certainly an untouchable) positivity” that shows little to no variation at the moment of enunciation. The event of the separation in Milton’s text exercises the limits of enunciation only to challenge and question them. Of the Orientalist, Said states that “latent Orientalism supplied him with an enunciative capacity that could be used, or rather mobilized, and turned into sensible discourse for the concrete occasion at hand” (Said, 22). Concerning the event of the temptation as well as the aftermath of the Fall for Eve and Adam respectively, Said’s claim will take new forms as these moments not only exemplify Said’s idea but work to exhaust its fluidity.

Satan’s temptation is initially countered by the lingering fragments of latent Orientalism displayed by Eve. Satan must shape his temptation for the specific “occasion at hand” and remain aware of certain capacities while adding his own appeals as well as the mechanisms of what Said defines as narrative. The temptation offers an embellished and multi-dimensional execution of Said’s enunciative capacities. And, of course, Satan’s temptation is also a very obvious moment of intense pressure in Eden. However, this fact, joined with Said’s conception of pressure as narrative, solidifies Satan’s argument and furthers the development of that argument in a more potent way.
Satan in serpent form and in the space of Eden manifests the pressure of narrative through the mechanisms of “enunciative capacities.” The text situates Satan in Eden – “He bolder now, uncalled before her stood” – and his presence gains Eve’s attention. It is Eve’s “wonder” that generates Satan’s ability to maintain her attention and shows Satan’s ultimate success. In Eden, Satan represents not only the sophistications of narrative but also validates the shortcomings of latent Orientalism. Satan is the figure of narrative while Eve is found grasping onto the conservative qualities of latent Orientalism. This tension is present through Eve’s initial responses to Satan, but it is ultimately eliminated through Satan’s capacity to introduce new ideas and possibilities. In “Not so much a Teaching as an Intangling”, Stanley Fish discusses “Milton’s poetic technique” as “he leads us to feel again and again the conflict between the poem’s assumed morality and our responses, and to locate the seat of that conflict in our fallen nature and not in any failure in composition” (Fish, 210). Fish’s claim is relevant when considering the temptation scene and tracing the elimination of latent Orientalism due to the exposure of narrative, for the temptation is perhaps the most powerful example of disrupted cyclicality in the text. The conflict between Eve’s “assumed morality” and Satan’s words covers a vast part of Book 9 and ultimately obliterates the repetition of ideas that proved consistent before the Fall.

The text follows the developments of Satan’s temptation and Eve’s responses. Satan’s first words to Eve evidence embellished and appealing language: “So glozed the tempter, and his proem tuned; / Into the heart of Eve his words made way”, while Eve “Not unmazed she thus in answer spake” (9.549-52). Satan maintains control while Eve’s wonder grows. “So talked the spirited sly snake; and Eve / Yet more amazed unwary thus
replied”, Milton writes, and at the site of the tree “of prohibition, root of all our woe”,

Satan proves still more capable and interrupts Eve’s responses:

She scarce had said, though brief, when now more bold
The Tempter, but with show of zeal and love
To man, and indignation at his wrong,
New parts puts on, and as to passion moved
Fluctuates disturbed, yet comely and in act
Raised, as of some great matter to begin (9.664-69).

Recourse to what she knows, the limits of her knowledge, and the constancy of all elements of latent Orientalism are eliminated by Satan as his words “replete with guile /
Into her heart too easy entrance won:”(9.733-34). At this point, Eve no longer holds agency, as her voice and responses are no longer present; “fixed on the fruit she gazed, which to behold / Might tempt alone, and in her ears the sound / Yet rung of his persuasive words, impregned / With reason, to her seeming, and with truth” (9. 735-38).

Satan is the last to speak before Eve eats the forbidden fruit, and this indicates the failure of her conservative approach against Satan. This failure permits Eve to reflect Said’s claim about narrative as “an opposing point of view, perspective, consciousness to a unitary web of vision.” Satan alludes to these principles at the moment of rebellion, and Eve mirrors this change, conscious of the “reason and truth” of Satan’s words. Further, Satan’s change in perspective is explicit when he leaves Heaven, and Eve also displays an explicit change: “from the Tree her step she turned / But first low reverence done, as to the power that dwelt within” (9. 834-36). In this way Satan and Eve show interest and investment in a model that is not of God but the ever-changing model of mankind. Satan’s jealousy of man, “pleasure not for him ordained”, and his overall endeavor to destroy God in man links Satan to mankind and Said’s conception of narrative (9.470).
Elaborating on Eve’s immediate changes following the Fall is evidence suggesting a transformation of Adam and Eve’s relationship and specifically their mode of communication. In the context of Book 5, Adam and Eve display a shared and unequivocal loyalty to God’s doctrine and vision of man. Eve’s “thinking ahead” separates the human pair, but the pressure of the temptation and Eve’s changed state complicates her return to Adam. The innocence of their relationship before the Fall is no longer appropriate or dominant, and Eve questions, “But to Adam in what sort / Shall I appear? Shall I to him make known / As yet my change,” (9.816-17). Eve decides to share her knowledge with Adam, but what unfolds between Eden’s couple is the repetition of indecision and criticism that develops as a pattern of asides on the part of Eve and Adam. Evidence of alternative sentiments and perspectives triggers the possibility of disagreement in a space and situation that once comprised pleasure and perfection.

The temptation unfolds the defeat of vision, as the pressure of Satan’s temptation works to overwhelm Eve’s recourse to God’s Orientalist model for man. This same process is evident and complicated in the aftermath of the Fall. In the context of the temptation, Satan is consistent in his role as tempter and Eve maintains the role of hearer. The exchanges between Adam and Eve are capricious and bloated with emotion and tension. These exchanges end with a moment of closure in the last lines of Book 9 where the text offers a snapshot of mankind without the force of doctrine, the principles of the model of latent Orientalism, or the Orientalist figure. Poole notes the changes that speech assumes in the book of the Fall, and this furthers an Orientalist reading of the Fall and, more specifically, the disposal of enunciative capacities: “During and after the Fall,
however, speech gains new movement and independence. Adam’s first soliloquy is not a reasoned debate with himself, but an imagined address to Eve; Eve’s first speech to Adam after the Fall is quick, paratactic, elliptical” (Poole, 186). Recalling the “profoundly conservative” theme of enunciative capacities in conjunction with Poole’s insight finds Adam and Eve retreating from the stagnant goals of latent Orientalism.

When Eve meets Adam for the first time after the fall her “count’nance blithe her story told; But in her cheek distemper flushing glowed”; her character is marked not only by what she says but as displaying markers of human inhibition and emotional valence. This difference is repeatedly emphasized in the book of the Fall, and Poole labels Eve’s speech as “neglecting the careful syntactic structuring of unfallen discourse, but nonetheless activated in a manner previously lacking” (Poole, 186). The elimination of “careful syntactic structuring” noted by Poole also embodies the elimination of Said’s “sensible discourse” as it is contained and perfected by the Orientalist. The nature of the Fall necessitates not only a change in speech but separates outward speech from internal soliloquy: Adam “first to himself he inward silence broke” (9.895). These changes only prove to multiply and assert themselves further in the aftermath of the Fall.

Adam agrees to fall with his wife and she “tenderly wept, much won that he his love / Had so ennobled”, and “they their fill of love and love’s disport / Took largely, of their mutual guilt the seal” (9.991-1042). However, “mutual guilt” fades, and sitting in silence “confounded long they sat, as stricken mute”, Adam speaks and “at length gave utterance to these words constrained”(9.1066). This moment of “constrained” speech not only validates dismissal of the fluidity of “unfallen discourse” but welcomes the diversity of human emotion. Eve responds with shock: “What words have passed thy lips, Adam
“severe,” she exclaims, and this exchange between the human pair shows that one consistent concern of Milton’s text is the sensitivity of words and speech. Now exchanging words solely with one another, the human pair can no longer dispense with the doctrinal and doxological model. After the fall, Adam and Eve cannot offer glory to God and must come to terms with moments of “constraint” and calculate what will be said.

The last pages of Book 9 catalogue Adam and Eve’s changed state and narrate the story of two new characters who can claim experience and the pursuit of knowledge: “Of honor void, / Of innocence, of faith, of purity / O how unlike / To that first naked glory / Their inward state of mind, calm region once / And full of peace, now tossed and turbulent (9.1074-126). These attributes, highly despairing in the context of Paradise Lost, are vital for the acquisition and success of Said’s conception of narrative. This “constant pressure” that challenges vision takes different forms in Milton’s text.

From Eve’s dream to Raphael’s account of rebellion and finally the temptation, narrative is present and only differs in degree and persistence. The images of the dream plant themselves in Adam and Eve’s mind, and Adam reveals his curiosity of Heavenly life and shows persistence in hearing “the full relation.” Raphael errs in warning the human pair and proves vulnerable to the pressure of narrative. His failure is the failure of latent Orientalism, yet it is also, in this, the foundation of what culminates as the rejection of vision. By revealing the details of rebellion, Raphael commits to the elements of Said’s narrative. Consideration of such moments of the poem in relation to these elements of Said’s work reshapes how Raphael’s visit has previously been discussed and evaluated by modern scholarship. Said’s theoretical concepts are relevant in the context of Raphael’s
visit but are themselves complicated at the moment of the temptation. Satan’s temptation of Eve stands as a sophisticated and powerful execution of narrative, as the text narrates his dominance over Eve’s orthodox mode.

Viewing the temptation in a favorable or constructive way is not exclusive to an Orientalist reading of *Paradise Lost*, for it finds common ground with Stanley Fish’s work: “The temptation is good because by means of it the secret corruption within is exposed, and consequently we are better able to resist the blandishments of less benevolent tempters. In the struggle against sin, no weapon is more effective than a knowledge of the areas likely to be under attack” (Fish, 210). The notion of “the struggle against sin” is expanded to mean “the power of men to be born, develop, and die, the tendency of institutions and actualities to change” in Said’s text. The Fall begins with movement in speech and quickly leads to movement in communication and perspective. Now matching bold words with bold deeds, Adam and Eve are thrust into the whims of what might be called the human model, as opposed to latent Orientalist one: sharing the aftermath of the Fall in “mutual guilt” at one moment and finding fault in one another, with “mutual accusation”, the next (9.1043-187).
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