Beelzebub: Satan's Consort in John Milton's Paradise Lost

Beth Tippenreiter

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/etd

Part of the English Language and Literature Commons
MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY

BEELZEBUB: SATAN'S CONSORT IN JOHN MILTON'S PARADISE LOST

by

Beth Tippenreiter

A Master's Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Montclair State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Arts

May 2015

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

English

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Jeffrey Miller, Thesis Sponsor

Dr. Adam Rzepka, Committee Member

Dr. Patricia Matthew, Committee Member
Abstract

This thesis contends that Beelzebub is the erotic and political consort of Satan in John Milton’s 1667 poem, *Paradise Lost*. Chapter one first examines Milton’s relative contemporary, Christopher Marlowe, and his play *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*. Within Doctor Faustus, we find not only an earlier representation of the erotic and political consort relationship between Beelzebub and Satan, here named Belzebub and Lucifer, but that the primary purpose of Marlowe’s Belzebub is to be Lucifer’s consort. Chapter two’s section one focuses on the erotic consort relationship between Milton’s Beelzebub and Satan. Questions and concerns of intimate language and sexual sodomy are examined. Section two focuses on the political aspects of the consort relationship, including questions of political sodomy based on angelic rank. Section three examines Satan’s “‘situational’” sexuality in relation to Beelzebub and Eve as well as questions of sexuality and beauty. Section three determines that Satan is not attracted to Eve because he is jealous of Adam or of the relationship between Adam and Eve. Section three contends that when Satan witnesses erotic intimacy between Adam and Eve, he is grieving over his lost relationship with Beelzebub. Thus, this thesis seeks to restore to Paradise Lost studies, an erotic Beelzebub and sympathy for Satan, specifically through his intimate relationship with Beelzebub.
BEELZEBUB: SATAN'S CONSORT IN JOHN MILTON'S *PARADISE LOST*

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree of Master of Arts

by
Beth Tippenreiter
Montclair State University
Montclair, NJ
2015
Acknowledgements

Thank you to my parents for all their love, support, and encouragement. Thank you to my committee for all of their amazing work and support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: Bring in the Devil, Bring in Beelzebub</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1: Where Damned Angels Dare to Tread: Christopher Marlowe’s</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belzebub and Lucifer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2: One Sodomic Flesh: The Erotics and Politics of the Beelzebub</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Satan Consort Relationship in John Milton’s <em>Paradise Lost</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion: Return of the “Bold” Consort (1.127)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Cited</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction: Bring in the Devil, Bring in Beelzebub

This thesis contends that Beelzebub, the fallen angel “next himself in power and next in crime,” is the simultaneous (homo)erotic and political consort of Satan in John Milton’s 1667 epic poem *Paradise Lost*. Milton introduces Beelzebub in Book I as follows: Satan “soon discerns and weltering by his side / One next himself in power, and next in crime / Long after known in Palestine, and named / Beelzebub” (1.78-81). Beelzebub reveals that Satan “led the embattled seraphim to war [in Heaven] (1.129). Beelzebub next appears in Book II during the Council of Pandemonium. Beelzebub suggests that in order to work against God, to ruin Man, the fallen angels should “Seduce them to our party, that their God / May prove their foe, and with repenting hand / Abolish his own works” (2. 368-70). It is Satan whom Beelzebub strongly implies should enact the seduction, quickly convincing the other fallen angels to stand behind Satan’s seduction. Beelzebub is seen for the final time in Book V during the archangel Raphael’s account of the battle in Heaven. Not only is the pre-lapsarian Beelzebub shown gathering

---

1) See 1.79 of *Paradise Lost* for the full quote. 2) The syntax is borrowed from Alastair Fowler’s reflection that “Eve is first a consort [to Adam], only secondly for race” (422). 3) The definitions for consort n[oun] 1, all from the *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, which readers should keep in mind are: “la. A partner, companion, mate; a colleague in office or authority. OBs.,” and “3a. A partner in wedded or parental relations; a husband or wife, a spouse. Used in collocation with some titles, as queen-consort, the wife of a king; so king-consort, prince-consort (the latter the title of Prince Albert, husband of Queen Victoria).” The definitions for consort v[erb], again all from the *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, which readers should keep in mind are: “I.2. ‘To be a consort or spouse to, to espouse; to have sexual commerce with. Obs.,” and “II.5c “To have intercourse with.”

2) Merritt Y. Hughes notes the following in the 1962 edition of *Paradise Lost* in relation to Beelzebub’s introduction: “For Milton’s readers Beelzebub was vaguely the prince of the first order of demons that Burton made him in the Anatomy...or the monarch of flaming hell that Marlowe made him in Faust’s first invocation in Doctor Faustus” (8). In his updated annotated edition of Paradise Lost, Alistair Fowler historicizes for these same lines (1.78-81), that Milton “would know Beelzebub’s anthropological background in cults of deliverers from insect pests---eg [John] Selden-----but preferred to use Jerome’s allegorization” (65).
the soon-to-be fallen angels, the pre-lapsarian Beelzebub is also shown in bed with the pre-lapsarian Satan. At that time, to Beelzebub, about Beelzebub, Satan states his most erotic line in the poem: “Both waking we were one” (5.678).

Critics, however, have generally focused on Adam and Eve when studying sexuality and erotics in *Paradise Lost*. Critics, such as James Grantham Turner, Peter Lindenbaum, and Edward Le Comte have argued for an active sexuality of Eve and Adam presented by Milton, whereas Kent Lehnoff has contended in favor of a virginal sexuality between Adam and Eve, and James W. Stone has contended that the sexuality between Adam and Eve is “dangerous” for the former and “advantageous” (34) for the latter. When critics have analyzed Satan’s sexuality, it has almost invariably been in conjunction with Eve. Katherine O. Ascheson, Alastair Fowler, James Grantham Turner, Peter Lindenbaum, James W. Stone, Edward Le Comte, and Kent Lehnoff have all contended for Satan’s sexual attraction to Eve; the majority of the above critics have also contended that Satan is jealous of Adam and/or of the relationship between Eve and him.

This thesis seeks to recover the erotic as well as the political Beelzebub, and his relation to Satan’s sexuality. Critic Nancy K. Barnard stipulates that “Beelzebub is usually viewed [by critics] as politician or military second-in-command, or simply passed

---

3 1) Indeed as Lindenbaum explicates: “that Adam and Eve engaged in sexual relations while still in Eden before the Fall, a stand which was, if not totally original with Milton, at least a departure from almost all treatments of his scriptural material by Christian poet, theologians, and biblical commentators before him” (277). 2) See Stone 34 for the full quotations regarding Adam and Eve and sexuality.

4 Turner and Lehnoff, in “'Nor turned I weene': Paradise Lost and Pre-Lapsarian Sexuality,” also discuss to a much smaller degree the sexual and erotic responses Eve triggers in the arch-angel Raphael when he appears in Books 5-8. As a switch, critic Clay Daniel, in his article, “Milton’s Neo-Platonic Angel?” discusses Raphael’s sexuality in relation to Adam.
over without much comment” (301).\(^5\) Barbara K. Lewalski, Robert F. Wilson, and Michael Murrin have studied Beelzebub as either “politician or military second-in-command,” while Mark Crispin Miller has studied Beelzebub as “Satan’s instrument” (92).\(^6\) In their respective works, C.S. Lewis, Lehnhoff and Le Comte mention Beelzebub, but “without much comment,” (Barnard 301) while Turner and Lindenbaum ignore Beelzebub altogether.\(^7\) A few critics have made implicit remarks regarding an erotic Beelzebub and an erotic relationship between Beelzebub and Satan. William Empson, for example, coyly calls Beelzebub Satan’s “intimate” (39). Yet, with the exception of Jonathan Goldberg, who calls Satan and Beelzebub an “angelic couple”, perhaps the only one in Heaven (196),\(^8\) Empson, David Mikics, and Joad Raymond leave their comments on an erotic and sexual Beelzebub undeveloped.

This thesis contends that Milton portrays the pre-lapsarian Beelzebub and the pre-lapsarian Satan as sexually intimate. A developed and detailed exploration of an erotic and political consort relationship between Satan and Beelzebub allows for new questions to be asked about angelic gender and sex as depicted in *Paradise Lost*. Milton famously declares of angelic “spirits” that they, “when they please / Can either sex assume, or

---

\(^5\) Barnard also fashions Beelzebub as a demonic John the Baptist to Satan’s demonic Christ

\(^6\) As has Lewalski.

\(^7\) Lehnhof mention Beelzebub, but does not comment on him in his article, “Performing Masculinity in *Paradise Lost*.”

\(^8\) 1) Goldberg, however, in his book *The Seeds of Things*, (incorrectly) calls Milton’s Satan, Lucifer. When I explore in depth the erotic relationship between Satan and Beelzebub in chapter two and quote from Goldberg or in regard to Goldberg’s brief analysis of the relationship between the two, I will adhere to Goldberg’s use of Lucifer for Satan. 2) At his most explicit, Goldberg briefly suggests that perhaps the prelapsarian Satan and Beelzebub were sexually intimate, or at least had non-corporal sex (*The Seeds of Things* 196).
both” (1.423-24). In commenting on Milton’s description, Alastair Fowler, quoting Gregory W. Bredbeck, delineates further that spirits “can range freely” not only throughout the system of sex and gender, but ‘outside of it’” (463). James Grantham Turner notes: “there is clearly an undertone in the poem that points to the maleness of the good angels” (233). Therefore, Satan and Beelzebub have that capacity to “assume either sex or both” (Milton 1.424), and as pre-lapsarian angels, they possibly only “assume” the male form.

Milton’s angels, like his human Adam and Eve, have sex. As Milton’s archangel Raphael, explains to Adam regarding angelic sex:

Whatever pure thou in the body enjoys

(And pure thou wert created) we enjoy

In eminence, and obstacle find none

Of membrane, join, or limb, exclusive bars:

Easier than air with air, if spirits embrace,

Total they mist, union of pure with pure

Desiring: nor restrained conveyance need

As flesh to mix with flesh, or soul with soul (8.622-29).

Based on Raphael’s guide to angelic lovemaking, two questions must be asked and explored: does angelic lovemaking involve bodies, specifically the assumed male sex
(1.424)? Does angelic lovemaking involve penetration, specifically anal penetration? If so, it is not just that the sexual and erotic Beelzebub has been “written away” (Bredbeck, 262) by critics; it is that the potentially homoerotic or homosexual Beelzebub, and a homoerotic or homosexual relationship with Satan, has been “written away” (“Milton’s Ganymede: Negotiations of Homoerotic Tradition in Paradise Regained,”262). It is because of this potential (homo)erotic/sexual reading that it is when Beelzebub is present, *Paradise Lost*’s “intense and troubled eroticism” (Turner 231) is at its most explicit.

Studying the Satan and Beelzebub relationship as a consort relationship allows for several re-examinations of sexual and political themes. It brings into play a re-examination of sexual sodomy, political sodomy, the notion of beauty, and “situational” sexuality (Ross qtd. in Garber 30). These re-examinations provide not only new insights into the sexual dynamics between Beelzebub and Satan, but also between Satan and Eve (and by extension Adam). These re-examinations of the sexual and erotic Beelzebub and Satan prevent an either/or interpretation of Satan, in which he is

---

9 In his article “Milton’s Ganymede: Negotiations of Homoerotic Tradition in *Paradise Regained*”, which was later incorporated (mostly) into his book *Sodomy and Interpretation: Marlowe to Milton*, Gregory Bredbeck writes: Indeed, Lewis’s’ condemnation of Milton’s ‘poetically imprudence’ [that Milton was promoting the idea that the angels are homosexual because they are almost always referred to as he] succinctly displays two divergent ideas that still hinder Milton studies and have yet to be explored fully: the ease with which homoeroticism can be detected in Milton’s canon and the urgency with which it is written away” (262).

10 All uses of “situational” or situation are from Marjorie Garber, *Vice Versa: Bisexuality and the Eroticism of Everyday Life*, 30. In her list of the “taxonomies of bisexuality itself,” Garber includes “Married Bisexuality,” “Secondary Homosexuality” (more frequently called ‘situational bisexuality’-sex with same-sex partners in prisons or other single-sex institutions, in public parks or toilets, or for money).” Garber takes “Secondary Homosexuality”/ “situational bisexuality” as well as other items in her list from Michael W. Ross’s “A Taxonomy of Global Behavior” in Bisexuality and HIV/AIDS: A Global Perspective (531).
either hero or villain. Such either/or interpretations overly simplify his character, motivation, and potential for tragic evolution.

This thesis also allows for potential questions related to gender theorist Judith Butler’s concept of “performed” (2549) gender and imitation (2549-50) to be explored in new ways. Butler contends:

three contingent dimensions of significant corporality: anatomical sex, gender identity, and gender performance. If the anatomy of the performer is already distinct from the gender of the performer, and both of those are distinct from the gender of the performance, then the performance suggests a dissonance not only between sex and performance, but sex and gender and gender and performance...In imitating gender, drag implicitly reveals the imitative structure of gender itself---as well as its contingencies (2549-50).

Potential questions related to queer theorist Judith Halberstam’s argument against a society that requires that gender be “readable at a glance” (23) are brought into play by this thesis. It further allows for other questions and considerations of sexuality, to be explored such as opposite sex/opposite orientation eroticism, in which a female heterosexual finds male homosexuality erotic but does not wish to participate in sexual intercourse with a male homosexual.11

11) There are several additional forms of opposite sex/opposite orientation eroticism: a male heterosexual who finds female homosexuality erotic, a male homosexual who finds female heterosexuality erotic and a female homosexual who finds male heterosexuality erotic. However, in any or all of its forms what remains the same is that sexual intercourse with the opposite/opposite orientation individual does not occur. 2) Readers familiar with queer-focused critic Madhavi Menon’s article “Coriolanus and I” may notice a similarity between opposite sex/opposite orientation eroticism and Menon’s working and re-working of the term fag-hag. Menon describes the fag-hag as follows: “Revelling in an identity that has little to do with one’s own practices, and which depends instead on a desire emanating from someone else’s proclivities, the fag-hag does not seek sexual consummation from this relationship. If anything, it is precisely its non-consumption that provides the basis for the relationship. Fag-hagitude, in other words, depends on not forming a coherent identity; the lag between desire and self is the source of its delight” (160, underline added). That both opposite sex/opposite orientation eroticism and Menon’s require non-participation in sexual activity between the homosexual man and the woman is the only similarity. Opposite sex/opposite
This thesis attempts to contribute to the unfolding and breaking of what Jonathan Goldberg calls the “masculinity that is presumptively heterosexual” (Sodometries, 109), as well as the presumptive heterosexuality or heterosexual (and even homosexual) behaviors heterosexual-identified women are supposed to enact.

Turner writes: “If the masculine reader shares Milton’s adoration [for the erotic Eve] at this point [the Edenic visit between Raphael and Adam and Eve], then so do Raphael and Adam” (257). In his essay “Is the Rectum a Grave?” Leo Bersani writes of the slave who thinks he or she should be enslaved because they are enslaved (15). Bersani explicates:

a gay man doesn’t run the risk of loving his oppressor only in the ways in which blacks or Jews might more or less secretly collaborate with their oppressors---that is, as a consequence of the oppression, of that subtle corruption by which a slave can come to idolize power, to agree that he should be enslaved because he is enslaved, that he should be denied power because he doesn’t have any. (15).

As proposed by Bersani, the slave emulates or mimics the master. To continue in a similar pattern, the straight woman (claims) to find other women erotic because she is a woman. She has been told by the male heterosexual patriarchy that she is and women are erotic and are to be desired sexually. Where, then, is the place for the feminine reader who does not desire to adore or revel in the beauty or eroticism of the feminine but desires to desire the beauty of the masculine, of the masculine eroticizing the masculine, who wants and wants for “the appeal of male-male eroticism” (Bredbeck, “Milton’s Ganymede: Negotiations of Homoerotic Tradition in Paradise Regained,” 264), without orientation eroticism is a part of the heterosexual woman’s identity. Furthermore, while the heterosexual woman who experiences opposite sex/opposite orientation eroticism does find the male homosexual bond erotic, she does so without wanting to be a part of it. Menon’s fag-hag still seeks to make herself a part of the homosexual man’s relationship and/or identity.
losing her feminism or her egalitarian status in a post and pre-fallen society. The answer, or at least a partial answer, may be found through an exploration of the erotic and political consort relationship between Beelzebub and Satan.
Chapter 1: Where Damned Angels Dare To Tread

Christopher Marlowe’s Belzebub and Lucifer

Faustus: “And what are you that live with Lucifer?”

Mephostophilis: “Unhappy spirits that fell with Lucifer / Conspired against our God with Lucifer / And are forever damned with Lucifer” (1.3.69-72)

Before a discussion of Milton’s Beelzebub and Satan can be fully undertaken, it is pertinent to first examine Milton’s relative contemporary, Christopher Marlowe, and his play *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*. Within *Doctor Faustus*, we find not only an earlier representation of the erotic and political consort relationship between Beelzebub and Satan, here named Belzebub and Lucifer, but that the primary purpose of Marlowe’s Belzebub is to be Lucifer’s consort. *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* chronicles the exploits and damnation of the eponymous scientist who sells his soul to Lucifer, the fallen angel who was “most dearly loved of God” (1.3.65). As the story is primarily concerned with Faustus’s self-abandoned soul and ambiguously genuine repentance, as well as the serenely sly plans of the demonic Mephostophilis, an initial exploration of the characters of *Doctor Faustus* would most likely focus on them, either as a pair or standalone. In immersing ourselves in Faustus’s world we ask; will Faustus be doomed to damnation or will everything be erased in the last possible moment, how can one sell his soul, and given the opportunity or seemingly valid reason, would we sell our own soul without guilt, without horror? Reading Mephostopheles, we question: would we be so easily seduced and could we successfully seduce someone else? Mephostopheles may be
damned, but he does not admit regret for being one of the “unhappy spirits that fell with Lucifer (1.3.70). Lucifer and Belzebub, on the other hand, would probably be overlooked on an initial reading or performance.

Konstantin Stanislavski, father of method acting, coined the, now famous, slogan, “Remember: there are no small parts, only small actors” (“Naturalism and Stanislavski”). Although Christopher Marlowe would never hear or repeat this phrase, his fallen spirit, Belzebub, fulfills it. Commonly known within Marlowe studies, there are two versions of Doctor Faustus: the A text of 1604 and the expanded B text of 1616. Thomas Healy observes in his history and critique of Doctor Faustus that: “in 1616 John Wright, who had purchased the copyright, published a new edition [the B text] adding 676 lines to the earlier text [the 1604 A text], dropping 36, and making numerous minor changes” (179). If he was following the 1616 version the actor portraying Belzebub would have eight lines in total to memorize; Lucifer alone speaks when the pair appears in the A text. With such few lines delivered over the course of only two scenes, many audience members would, most likely, register the Belzebub character as important as the random individuals in the row ahead. These audience members, however, as well as initial readers, will have missed a crucial and provocative angle in understanding post-fallen angelic sexuality. Audiences, scholars, or general readers who simply dismiss Belzebub, who observe him as just another devil, one whose sole purpose is to taunt and torment the human Faustus, will have missed a key glimpse (albeit brief) into how Marlowe within and outside of the play “challeng[ed] conventional Christian perspectives on hell and heaven” (Healy 174). They will have missed the threads of male same-sex eroticism
among non-human entities, threads which are later revitalized, expanded, and repressed by John Milton in his epic poem *Paradise Lost.*

Lucifer introduces Belzebub as his “companion prince in hell” (2.1.91) in his round of introductions to Faustus after Faustus has agree to sell his soul to Mephostophilis, and hence to Lucifer. From this four-word title, it is clear that Belzebub is of a higher rank than Mephostophilis, the third fallen spirit in the room; earlier Mephostophilis had introduced himself to Faustus as a “servant to great Lucifer” (1.3.40). As a “servant to great Lucifer” Mephostophilis’s role, as he explicates to Faustus and readers, is to do “no more than he [Lucifer] commands” (1.3.42). And Mephostophilis’s most important, most substantial command and role is to ensure that Faustus permanently gives up his soul to Lucifer. Like his rank, Beelzebub’s role is more prosaic than Mephostophilis’s: Belzebub’s only substantial role and reason, in both the A and B texts, is to be Lucifer’s consort. Lucifer’s sentiment of a consort relationship is

---

12 In the Penguin edition of Marlowe’s *The Complete Plays,* in which *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* is included, Beelzebub is spelled Belzebub. In the Blackwell edition of *Doctor Faustus,* Belzebub is spelled Beelzebub. In the Viking Press edition of *Doctor Faustus,* Beelzebub is spelled Belzebub. Penguin includes the B version of the play. The Blackwell edition writes: “Only one extant copy of the A-text survives, that at the Bodleian Library, which serves as the copytext for that given here...the A-text with minor exceptions noted below, has been followed despite some questionable passages and placements of lines” (Kinney 201). The Viking Press edition does not state that it is following the A text, but the text it does provide is more similar to the text provided by Blackwell, than by Penguin. The Viking Press Belzebub does not speak just as the Blackwell Belzebub does not. Although this thesis focuses primarily on the Belzebub of Milton’s *Paradise Lost* for the duration of this chapter, I will keep to the spelling of Belzebub as I refer to the B text more often than the A text.

13 The definitions I consider for consort, as I apply it first to the Lucifer-Belzebub relationship and secondly in chapter 2 to the Miltonic Belzebub-Satan relationship is as follows (all definitions provided by the *Oxford English Dictionary* Online): “noun” 1a. A partner, companion, mate; a colleague in office or authority. Obs.,” and “3a. A partner in wedded or parental relations; a husband or wife, a spouse. Used in collocation with some titles, as queen-consort, the wife of a king; so king-consort, prince-consort (the latter the title of Prince Albert, husband of Queen Victoria).” As of now, the definitions I consider for consort, *v*erb are “1.2. “To be a consort or spouse to, to espouse; to have sexual commerce with. Obs.,” and “11.5c “To have intercourse with.”
neither altered nor added from text A to text B. Marlowe’s unchanging representation of Belzebub’s relationship to Lucifer has its beginnings in Marlowe’s earlier hypothesis of an erotic relationship between Saint John and Christ as well as his earlier play, the 1592 Edward II, whose King Edward and Gaveston serve as a dramatic parallel to Marlowe’s erotic theology.

Christopher Marlowe was arrested in 1593. According to critic Nicholas Davidson, Marlowe’s “religious opinions [i.e. atheism] became of interest only to the authorities only after his arrest” (141). What was striking, however, about Marlowe’s “religious opinions,” according to Davidson, was what was detailed in the poet Richard Baines’s ‘Note’ and playwright Thomas Kyd’s “evidence.”14 Baines related in his ‘Note’ that Marlowe held the persuasion: “That St John the Evangelist was bed-fellow to Christ and leaned always in his bosome, that he used him as the sinners of Sodomia” (qtd. in Davidson 141). Davidson explicates that “Kyd’s evidence seemed to corroborate this charge: ‘He wold report St. John to be our saviour Christes Alexis I cover it with reverence and trembling that is that Christ did love him with an extraordinary love’” (141) 15. Davidson observes that while many of Baines’s and Kyds’s charges against Marlowe are simply common “insults” (141) incorporated when accusing someone of

14 Richard Baines and the playwright, Thomas Kyd, were the men who brought many of the religious charges against Marlowe (Davidson 139).

15 In his classic queer-historical text, Homosexuality in Renaissance England, Alan Bray also discusses the probable theory that Marlowe held the opinion that Christ was in a sexual relationship with the disciple, and later saint, John. According to Bray’s research, Thomas Kyd after his arrest to prove himself less blasphemous than Marlowe, claimed that his fellow playwright “‘would report St. John to be our Saviour Christ’s Alexis. I cover it with reverence and trembling that it is that Christ did love him with an extraordinary love’” (64).
atheism, Marlowe’s claim that Saint John and Christ were “sodomites” (141) is such a “bizarre novelty” and “rarity... in other English records is an indication of its authenticity: Baines and Kyd could only have recorded such an unusual charge because they really had heard Marlowe talk in such terms about Christ and Saint John” (142), a “remarkably daring” (141) interpretation of New Testament history.16

If Marlowe did indeed suggest that “Christ and St John were sodomites” (Davidson 141) was this then an instance of homosexuality, homoeroticism, or sodomy as a “reduction of sexual desire” (Normand 194)? Baines and Kyd’s language is contradictory. Baines’s interpretation of Marlowe’s New Testament same-sex theology is one that is not poetic, not to be emulated, one that does not just indicate someone who is “likely to [not] have believed... in the doctrine of Trinity, the authority of scripture, or even the existence of the Christian God” (Davidson 142). Instead Baines’s language is indicative of a Marlowe whom when he did refer to the Scriptures, did so to justify same-sex sexual intimacy as sexual degradation.17 On the other hand, Kyd’s language for

16 Davidson argues:

“The suggestion that Christ and St John were sodomites, and the likening of their relationship to that of Alexis and Corydon, which is depicted in Virgil’s Eclogues as explicitly homosexual, is remarkably daring. Sodomy and homosexuality both appear in Marlowe’s writing; but there seems to be no precedent for such a startling assertion in any other English trail records, nor in the anti-atheist literature (141).

17 Furthermore, Baines’s language relies on the traditional interpretation of the Biblical story of Sodom; Sodom is destroyed by God because “the people of Sodom had tried to rape the angels” or because “the men of Sodom had tried to engage in homosexual intercourse with the angels” (93). According to John Boswell in his brilliant text, Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality these are two of the “four inferences one could make about the destruction of Sodom” just by reading the text by itself. The other two are: “the Sodomites were destroyed for the general wickedness which had prompted the Lord to send angels to the city to investigate in the first place” and “the city was destroyed for inhospitable treatment of visitors sent from the Lord” (93). Furthermore, Boswell explains: “None of the many Old Testament passages which refer to Sodom’s wickedness suggests any homosexual offenses, and the rise of homosexual associations can be traced to social trends and literature of a much later period. It is not likely
Marlowe’s erotic theology becomes almost spiritually-sanguine. Instead of crude “‘sinners,’” (Baines qtd. in Davidson 141) who abuse one another, here there is Christ who desires his apostle, with a love that is both “spiritual” and “fleshly” (Davidson 141). Christ and St John may still be sodomites, in that their relationship is one not consisting of a married man and a woman whose sexuality consists strictly of vaginal penetration by a penis, but they are not sodomites in that their sexual relationship offends God. There is “‘reverence,’” (Kyd qtd. in Davidson 141) and a quality of sacrament, in the Christ-Saint John erotic intimacy which Kyd acknowledges.

It is through Baines and Kyd’s renditions of Marlowe’s erotic theology that a parallel between the erotic relationship of Christ and Saint John and the jointly erotic, sexual, and political relationship between King Edward II and the “basely born” (2.1.405) Pierce of Gaveston in Marlowe’s 1592 play Edward II emerges. Baines’s use of the straight-forward phrase, “‘he used him as the sinners of Sodomia,’” (qtd. in Davidson 141) reflects someone who views male-male sexual encounters or erotic intimacy as the character of Younger Mortimer of Edward II does: brusque anal sex.\(^\text{18}\) It is the Younger Mortimer who allows for Edward’s execution by anal penetration with a spit (Davidson

---

\(\text{18}\) 1) Gaveston identifies himself as “Pierce of Gaveston” at 2.5.74. 2) The Younger Mortimer is Mortimer the elder’s (whose lines are given as Elder Mortimer) nephew. It is the Younger Mortimer who actively dislikes the relationship between Edward and Gaveston.
141). However, Kyd’s (or really Marlowe’s) hypothesis for the erotic Christ and Saint John relationship harkens back to, as Alan Bray observes, the “classical texts [i.e. Alexis and Corydon] which were easily available and yet contained a validation of homosexuality at odds with Renaissance prejudice, and Alexis only one of several such figures” (65). Bray’s recognition of the awareness Marlowe and his peers had of Alexis and Corydon brings in the reaction of Elder Mortimer, the uncle of Younger Mortimer, to Edward II’s sexual liaison(s) with Gaveston. Bray’s observation not only reflects Kyd’s claim of Marlowe’s hypothesis for Saint John and Christ but reflects as well the understanding Marlowe (and most likely) his peers had of historical and mythological male same-sex partnerships. The Elder Mortimer assuages the Younger Mortimer:

The mightiest kings have had their minions;

Great Alexander lov’d Hephaestion,

The conquering Hercules for Hylas wept,

And for Patroclus stern Achilles droop’d.

And not kings only, but the wisest men;

---

19 See also Goldberg, *Sodometries*, 63-66 for his discussion of Alexis and Corydon. The Greek myth of the lad Ganymede and the god Zeus was another one. See Bray (65-66) for a more detailed discussion of the use of Ganymede. See also Bredbeck, 264, 272-74. James Grantham Turner even makes mention of Ganymed in (a brief) connection to male homosexuality, in his text *One Flesh: paradisal marriage and sexual relations in the age of Milton*, (304-05). Turner writes that Milton wrote for his “proposed tragedy of Sodom, ‘every one with mistress, or Ganymed, glittering along the street or solacing on the banks of Jordan.’” It should be noted that the opening scene of Marlowe’s play, *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, is of Jupiter (or Zeus) “dandling Ganymede upon his knee” (45). See also Goldberg, *Sodometries*, 126-31, for his discussion of Ganymede in *Dido*. 
The Roman Tully lov'd Octavius,
Grave Socrates wild Alcibiades (2.1.393-99).

Within the Elder Mortimer's reaction, as Normand notes about this speech, "same-sex passions are transvalued here into a positive attribute" (190). The Elder Mortimer [is] trying to identify Edward and Gaveston's mutual passion as a familiar characteristic throughout history of certain political leaders and...[is] trying to subsume it within the familiar socio-political practices of court culture" (190). Edward and Gaveston may be sodomites, but history and mythology approve of the Elder Mortimer's beneficial defense of sexuality's homoerotic performance and dedication among males.

Normand proposes that in homoerotic desire we find "indefinition, ambiguity and metamorphosis [which] constitute sexual desire" whereas in sodomy we find "the ultimate reduction of sexual desire" (194). The Younger Mortimer and Richard Baines prefer to keep male-male sexual intimacy as diminishing-degrading sodomy and the Elder Mortimer and Thomas Kyd are willing to see male-male sexual intimacy as homoerotic as proven by the historical and mythological Greek and Latinate pairs they draw on. However, Normand also argues within the play that Marlowe depicts as well:

Edward's desire for Gaveston as exceeding the familiar and often reductive ways of representing homoeroticism, as an insistent claim for the value of his emotional and erotic desire. It is this claim that may make twentieth-century audiences and readers seem to see in the relationship represented between Edward and Gaveston the familiar form of twentieth-century homosexuality, with its essentialist assumption that homosexuality is always already present in the subject...Edward insists to the last in voicing a subjectivity that involves sexual desire as one of its irreducible constituents (193-94).
Edward’s “voicing...[of his] sexual desire” carries over and exceeds or transcends from “sexual desire” (194) to sexual orientation and role in the 1604 and 1616 relationship between Lucifer and Belzebub in The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus. There we will witness homosexuality having a definitive place in Hell because it has a definitive place in the Kingdom of Heaven (Bray 23) through the erotic intimacy of Christ and Saint John, an erotic intimacy, which had its beginnings in the Edward-Gaveston relationship. In the Lucifer-Belzebub relationship we will see not a “reduction of sexual desire” (Normand 194) through sodomy. Instead, through their consort relationship Belzebub and Lucifer will create a prioritization “of sexual desire” (194), demonstrating a (proto-)homosexual, not homoerotic or sodomic, bond.

Belzebub’s purpose and role in Doctor Faustus is to be Lucifer’s companion or consort. His role is revealed to Faustus, readers, and audiences in both the A and B texts through Lucifer’s joint introduction: “I am Lucifer, and this is my companion prince in hell” (2.1.91). Immediately readers perceive a sharp distinction has been made between the newly known Belzebub and the already familiar Mephostophilis, who is also present during Lucifer’s introductions. Unlike Belzebub, Mephostophilis is never referred to as

---

20 According to Bray’s historical-sexuality study, specifically on homosexuality in Renaissance England: “The Church had constructed its demonology in its own image, and although homosexuality might be the product of the Devil’s union with the witch, this product was unforeseen. Homosexuality had no place in the Kingdom of Hell because it had none in the Kingdom of Heaven” (23).

21 See footnote 1 for spelling of Belzebub.

22 Most quotes from Doctor Faustus are from the 1616 B text found in the Penguin edition of Marlowe’s Complete Plays. I quote from the A text at one location further on in this chapter. However, that the quote is from the A text will be indicated in my text.

Lucifer’s “companion” nor does he refer to himself as a “companion” of Lucifer. After arriving in Faustus’s study, in the A and B texts Mephostophilis introduces and titles himself as a “servant to great Lucifer” (1.3.40). Further on in his initial conversation with Faustus Mephostophilis’s notes that Lucifer is the “arch-regent and commander” of hell (1.3.63), whose commands Mephostophilis is required to “perform”; “no more” may Mephostophilis do (1.3.42). Mephostophilis’s sparse yet precise language for himself and Lucifer indicate that while he is important in terms of securing Faustus’s soul for Lucifer, Mephostophilis is also just a part of the masses of “unhappy spirits that fell with Lucifer” (1.3.70). Lucifer’s sentiment for Belzebub, on the other hand, automatically elevates Belezebub’s status. “Companion prince” (2.1.91) marks Belzebub as Lucifer’s equal, not his lackey, the role which the self-title of “servant” (1.3.40) designates for Mephostophilis.

The egalitarian status which exists between Belzebub and Lucifer but not between Lucifer and Mephostophilis, becomes actively evident as the scene moves away from simple introductions. Lucifer’s introductions have been made at this time because Faustus is wavering in his decision to bind himself to Lucifer and has called on Christ for help (2.1.86-87). To convince Faustus that hell is where Faustus should want to descend to after his death, Lucifer and Belzebub show Faustus the Seven Deadly Sins. To do so, in an efficient and direct manner Lucifer issues the following order: “Go Mephostophilis,

---

24 Interestingly, the Blackwell edition describes Belzebub in the footnote for Scene III, line 60 as “chief prince of devils and servant to Lucifer” (Kinney 206). Faustus’s line is: “There is no chief but only Beelzebub.” I do not contend that Belzebub is a servant of Lucifer’s and explore this further on.

25 Faustus cries out: “Ah Christ my saviour, / Seek to save distressed Faustus’s soul.”
fetch them in" (2.1.111-12). Without a syllable, Mephostophilis follows suit. During the
Lucifer-Mephistophilis one-sided exchange or command Belzebub is still present. Yet,
Belzebub does not participate or assist Mephostophilis in the retrieval of the Seven
Deadly Sins. Lucifer does not command Belzebub for as Lucifer’s equal never is
Belzebub ordered. Instead, Belzebub commands Faustus, once before Lucifer’s command
to Mephostophilis\(^{26}\) and again after Mephostophilis has returned with the Sins. For his
second command, Belzebub orders: Now, Faustus, question them of their names and
dispositions” (2.1.113-14). And Faustus, as indicated by his reply “That shall I soon”
(2.1.115), obeys.

Faustus listens to Belzebub because he recognizes that Belzebub and
Lucifer are not easily separated, that they are, to use the terminology from the Greek
Plato’s erotic-philosophical text *The Symposium*, the other half (63) of each other’s
soul.\(^{27}\) Faustus first recognizes this when he calls upon the damned spirits (1.3.16-22), a
calling that will eventually lead to Mephostophilis’s appearance. As part of his chant,
Faustus states (and here I will use the English translation provided by J.B. Steane, as the
original is in Latin): “Prince of the east, Beelzebub, monarch of the fires below, and
Demogorgon, we appeal to you so that Mephostophilis may appear and rise” (273). In his

\(^{26}\) Belzebub commands Faustus to: “Sit down and thou shalt behold the seven deadly sins appear to thee in
their own proper shapes and likeness” (2.1.105-07).

\(^{27}\) In Plato’s *The Symposium*, during his tale of original joined beings, either two men, two women, or a
man and a woman, Aristophanes proposes: “Whenever the lover of boys—or any other person for that
matter---has the good fortune to encounter his own actual *other half*, affection and kinship and love
combined inspire in him an emotion which is quite overwhelming, and such a pair practically refuse ever to
be separated even for a moment....No one can suppose that it is mere physical enjoyment which causes the
one to take such intense delight in the company of the other. It is clear that the *soul* of each has some other
longing which it cannot express, but can only surmise and obscurely hint at” (63 my emphasis).
book-length analysis of the Satan figure, *The Biography of Satan*. Henry Ansgar Kelley notes that “in this scene [which I have just quoted from] Beelzebub is identical to Lucifer, according to Mephostophiles [and Faustus, I add] (269). That Belzebub and Lucifer are “identical,” or to borrow John Milton’s term are “one” (5.678)\(^{28}\) is re-recognized by Faustus in his initial conversation with Mephostophilis. To convince Mephostophilis that he understands what it means to sell his soul, he states:

So Faustus…holds this

principle:

There is no chief but only Belzebub,

To whom Faustus doth dedicate himself.

This word ‘damnation’ terrifies not me,

For I confound hell in elysium.

My ghost be with the old philosophers.

But leaving these vain trifles of men’\'s souls,

Tell me, what is that Lucifer, thy lord? (1.3.54-62).

\(^{28}\) In Milton’s epic poem *Paradise Lost* the prelapsarian Satan reminds the prelapsarian Beelzebub, his consort, that “both waking we were one” (5.678). In chapter 2 I explore in depth the erotic and political consort relationship between Satan and Beelzebub.
In Act 2 Scene 3 when “Beelzebub and Lucifer appear on stage as distinct characters” (269) as the critic Kelley notes, Belzebub of the B text (and to a lesser extent the B text Lucifer) picks up the threads of Faustus’s “identical” (269) language for himself and Lucifer as well as the language of the “other half” (Plato 63).

Belzebub’s lines, all of which are found in the 1616 B text, reinforce his status as Lucifer’s equal and erotic “companion” (2.3.91). Within the span of his eight lines, six of which occur in Act 2 Scene 1, his first scene, Belzebub uses the plural first person to account for himself and Lucifer three times. His first line to Faustus (and of the B text) in response to Faustus’s cry to Christ for soulful aid, “Ah Christ my saviour, / Speak to save distressed Faustus’ soul” (2.1.86-87) is: “We are come to tell thee thou dost injure us” (2.1.93). Belzebub’s first words indicate that Faustus’s wavering is both a political injustice and personal “injury” (2.1.93) to Belzebub and Lucifer because Belzebub as the “companion prince” (2.1.91) and Lucifer as the “arch-regent” (1.3.63) are the highest beings in the “Kingdom of Hell” (Bray 23). Furthermore, Belzebub linguistic inclusion of “we” and “us” automatically links Belzebub with Lucifer. If a soul which has willingly damned itself such as Faustus’s, a soul that is supposed to “enlarge his [Lucifer’s] kingdom” (1.5.40) but resists damnation harms or works against not only Lucifer, but harms and works in opposition against Belzebub. If Belzebub wanted to present himself as not equal to Lucifer, if he had wanted to demonstrate that it is Lucifer who holds supreme and absolute power in Hell, who is harmed most by Faustus’s brief yield to Christ, he would have either singled out Lucifer in his speech, by the use of the singular pronoun, or he would have confirmed straightway to Faustus as Mephostophilis did in
Act 1 Scene 3 when Faustus asks him “and what are you that live with Lucifer” (1.3.69) that while he is Lucifer’s “companion prince” he is also one of the “unhappy spirits that fell with Lucifer” (1.3.70). Instead Belzebub’s soft rebuke reinforces that he is not of the same status as Mephostophilis, but is the equal of Lucifer’s. And when he reinforces that Lucifer and he are equals, Belzebub also reinforces Faustus’s earlier recognition that Lucifer and he, if perhaps not “identical” as they are now presented as “separate entities” (Kelley 269), are inseparable.

This inseparability is further enhanced by the immediate back-and-forth dialogue Belzebub and Lucifer engage in. After Belzebub’s line regarding “injury” (2.1.93), Lucifer contributes his reprimand of Faustus with: “Thou call’st on Christ contrary to thy promise” (2.1.94). Immediately, Belzebub takes over Lucifer’s train of thought and adds to the rebuke, the proposal that Faustus “shouldst not think of God” (2.1.95). Following Belzebub’s echo and expansion of Lucifer’s rebuke, Lucifer echoes Belzebub previous language of inseparability; that is Lucifer also chooses to use “we” and “us” when referring to Belzebub and himself. To ensure that Faustus will follow orders and devote himself to the “arch-regent” (1.3.63), Lucifer tells Faustus: “Do so [abjure God and Christ] and we will gratify thee” (2.1.103). It is in Lucifer’s B text line that we find the origins for the language of inseparability that Belzebub and Lucifer use separately. Not only does Lucifer state “Do so this and we will gratify thee” (2.1.103) in the 1604 A text, but Lucifer also speaks all of Belzebub’s lines. Although the A text Belzebub is present—he must be for Lucifer to be able to state “and this is my companion prince in hell” (2.1.91), a title we know must not apply to Mephostophilis, for he has already identified
himself as a “servant” (1.3.40)—he is silent and passive when Faustus is reprimanded and commanded.29 Like the B text Belzebub, the A text Belzebub is never ordered by Lucifer (indeed the A text Lucifer only explicitly orders Faustus; it is Lucifer himself who calls in the Seven Deadly Sins (Scene 5.300))30 but unlike the B text Belzebub, the A text Belzebub does not issue any commands.31 The B text Belzebub, who issued commands to Faustus along with Lucifer demonstrated that his relationship with Lucifer was egalitarian and political and the B text Lucifer in his title of “companion prince” (2.1.91) for Belzebub demonstrated the relationship was egalitarian and erotic. The silent A text Belzebub and the “we” and “us” linguistically-inclined Lucifer, whom also calls Belzebub his “companion prince’ (2.1.91), demonstrates that the most important aspect of their consort relationship is its eroticism. A text Lucifer places front and center that it is Belzebub, not Mephostophiles, nor any other of the “unhappy spirits” (1.3.70) who is Lucifer’s erotic and soulful “other half” (Plato 63) as Lucifer is Belzebub’s. Although it might have been John Wright who dispersed Lucifer’s lines into a back-and-forth between Belzebub and him as well as who provided Belzebub with his two lines in Act 5 Scene 2,32 because Lucifer uses the first person plural in the A text as well as the title of

---

29 That Belzebub is silent occurs in both the Viking Press and Blackwell editions.

30 This is how it is presented in the A texty of the Blackwell edition. The Blackwell edition includes the stage direction “Calling offstage” (213) The Viking Press edition of the A text does not include Lucifer calling for the Seven Deadly Sins, but he does not order Mephostophilis to fetch them either. The Viking Press edition also lists the Seven Deadly Sins occurring in Scene VI.

31 This occurs in both the Viking Press and Blackwell editions.

32 Those lines would be “And here we’ll stay, / To mark him [Faustus] how he doth demean himself” (5.2.10-11). Belzebub says these lines to Lucifer and Mephostophilis. It should also be noted that in the A text version, this scene does not exist.
“companion prince” (2.1.91) for Belzebub in the A and B texts, because it is quite likely that Marlowe already held alternative ideas of New Testament sexuality, as witnessed in his erotic hypothesis of Christ and the apostle John, it is more probable that it was Marlowe (although one cannot help but acknowledge that it may have been Marlowe’s writing partner) who conceived of the Belzebub-Lucifer relationship as erotic, as intimate, as potentially sodomic.

If we accept that Belzebub and Lucifer have a consort relationship as opposed to the soldier/king or even master/slave relationship that Mephostophilis endures with Lucifer, as well that Belzebub and Lucifer are sodomites, even potentially sixteenth-century homosexuals, how then do we register their physical sex and/or gender and those respective contributions to their roles of consort and sodomite? Belzebub and Lucifer are not men, but they are presented as masculine. In his engaging study of sexuality (albeit a study that glosses over too lightly any non-heterosexual or hetero-erotic expression), in *Paradise Lost*, James Grantham Turner argues: “There is clearly an undertone in the poem that points to the maleness of the good angels” (291). Although, Marlowe does not depict Belzebub and Lucifer in their pre-fallen forms or embodiments, as fallen spirits he presents them as masculine and unlike Milton’s fallen and unfallen angels, as far as we can presume, without the ability to “either sex assume or both” (Milton 1.424). Belzebub’s sex and Lucifer’s sex is set as male.33 Belzebub’s sex is set as male through

---

33 Or as Karma DeGruy phrases her depiction of Satan, in her article “Desiring Angels: The Angelic Body in Paradise Lost,” there is the “fixedly sexed” body [of] Satan(119). According to deGruy, “the cosmos is troubled by the fixedly sexed bodies of Satan, Sin, and Death even before humanity takes the stage” (119). See bibliography for full bibliographic information
his title of “companion prince” (2.1.91). As witnessed by Mephostophilis’s speech to
Faustus regarding the looks of courtesans he will bring him, fallen spirits acknowledge a
binary gender system of male and female: “She whom thine eye shall like, thy heart shall
have, / Be she as chaste as was Penelope / As wise as Saba, or as beautiful / As was
bright Lucifer before his fall” (1.5.157-60 emphasis added). Thus, there is no reason to
suspect that Lucifer’s use of “prince” (2.1.91) is to indicate that Belzebub should be
observed physically as a female as the word prince could potentially refer to a female
ruler.

In his two B text scenes and his one A text scene, Belzebub retains his masculine
identity as does Lucifer. Furthermore, not only do we not witness the feminine and
feminine heteroeroticism (or even female homoeroticism) exhibited by the actual figures
of Belzebub and Lucifer, female eroticism is not present as an active or passive element
within the male-male sodomic relationship. In his analysis of Satan’s appraisals of the

34 It is intriguing to note how Mephostophilis emphasizes Lucifer’ prior angelic beauty whereas he does not
consider it as intensely a positive attribute or detail in the female figures he names to Faustus. In chapter
two I discuss in detail how beauty figures prominently in the pre and post-lapsarian consort relationship
between Satan and Beelzebub.

35 The *Oxford English Dictionary* includes as one of the definitions for “prince”: “b. applied to a female
sovereign Obs.” According to the *OED*, this definition was used as early as 1560 in the context of Queen
Elizabeth.

36 See Goldberg, *Sodometries*, for marriage arrangements as attempts to dispel sodomic behavior (17).
Goldberg writes: “to the alliances made through marriage…there are, there were, these other privileged ties
between men, not all of which were secured by the exchange of women or the normalizing function of
marriage. Even the colonial family therefore is an ideological structure, inserting women to secure political
relations between men, cloaking male-male sexual possibilities (those that accrue to men as they are
granted access to each other within a public sphere) with the thin veneer of family life as the sole domain of
sexual behavior. The regimes of modernity have only furthered these illusions, and homo-and
heterosexuality have been the means securing supposedly unbreachable differences.” See as well Katz, who
writes: “By the late nineteenth century the old true-love standard was giving way to a new different-sex
erotic ideal termed *normal* and *heterosexual*” (47). See also Katz 40, in which he writes: The ‘traditional
values’ of early colonial New England, its ordering of the sexes, their eroticism, and their reproduction,
pre-lapsarian Eve, Turner claims that Satan experiences a “thwarted love of Eve” (262) and must “attempt to find a tender, cool eroticism appropriate for Eve” (261). This portrayal or analysis of Satan’s post-fallen erotic nature, however allows Turner to ignore and erase Beelzebub entirely. In order for Satan to have such a critically strong sexual and erotic attraction to Eve, we have to displace, ignore, and erase any traces of sodomy, especially male-to-male sodomic relationships, male-to-male homosexuality and homoeroticism, in a word: Beelzebub. We must erase our knowledge of male-male eroticism for this heterocized male-male-female triangle of Adam, Satan, and Eve. The erotic and sexual relationship between Marlowe’s Belzebub and Lucifer, however does not exist within an erotic triangle that operates with same-sex and opposite-sex erotics. Lucifer’s dismissal of Eden effectively dismisses the potential for this type of triangle. It relegates to the background heteroeroticism, without necessarily erasing it for Lucifer does not make homoeroticism mandatory for he allows Faustus to be erotically entertained or enthralled by the female-marked Lust, the conjuration of Helen of Troy (during which as Healy proposes, Faustus takes on the female role and re-makes Helen into the masculine role (188)) as well as claiming to Faustus: “in hell is all manner of...
delight” (2.1.178). Furthermore, it dismisses the potential for a triangle to shape this erotic relationship. There is no other erotic source, not Eve, not Adam, nor Faustus or Mephostophilis (for as we have encountered, Mephostophilis classifies Mephostophilis as a servant\textsuperscript{40}) in the Lucifer-Belzebub relationship. They are a pair; they are in sixteenth-century fashion, perhaps even in the tradition of the seventeenth-century molly house culture, a sodomically married or consort pair of spirits.\textsuperscript{41}

Faustus sells his soul centuries after Adam and Eve’s expulsion from Eden. Thus, when we encounter Belzebub and Lucifer during their seduction of Faustus, we realize that Marlowe has allowed them to remain together as consorts after the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve. Marlowe’s Belzebub does not disappear nor does he simply serve as Satan’s hellish “instrument” (Lewalski 92) or general (Murrin 132). Furthermore, Marlowe does not acknowledge any role Belzebub had to perform in the temptation of Eve and Adam, which Milton will detail during the Council of Pandemonium in Book II of Paradise Lost. Lucifer too does not explicitly acknowledge the existence of Eve or Adam. Faustus states, somewhat in a hyperbolic manner that seeing the Seven Deadly Sins “will be as pleasant to me as Paradise was to Adam the first day of his creation”

\textsuperscript{39} One could even apply Susan Ackerman’s glossing of delight as it was used in Old Testament texts, such as the story of David and Jonathan (an influence of Satan and Beelzebub, which I explore further in chapter 2) to refer to sexual or erotic pleasure (176-77).

\textsuperscript{40} See \textit{Doctor Faustus} 1.3.40

\textsuperscript{41} For a description of molly house marriages, which involved (non-legal) marriages between men during the seventeenth-century, including their place in the history of same-sex eroticism and sexual roles during seventeenth-century England, see specifically Bray 86; however all of chapter four of \textit{Homosexuality in Renaissance England} is dedicated to molly houses and molly house culture. See also Goldberg, \textit{Sodomities}, 141, for his remarks on molly houses in his book.
(2.1.108-09). Lucifer responds to his sentiment with the following command: "Talk not of Paradise or Creation, but mark this show. / Talk of the devil and nothing else"

(2.1.110-11). Eve (and Adam) is inconsequential for Lucifer. Although Lucifer's response could indicate a denial of the past, that he will not acknowledge the "pride and insolence" (1.3.67) which (according to Mephostophilis's recollection) damned him, that he will not admit that while his temptation of Eve (and subsequently Adam) was successful, it also did not alleviate his own post-lapsarian torment, his response is not inherently vehement or a spark for rage (directed at Faustus, Belzebub or Mephostophilis). Instead, it retains almost a nonchalance. Instead of thundering at the mention of Eden, Lucifer dismisses Eden. The fall of Eve (and Adam) is not Lucifer's greatest triumph.

Similar to Milton's Satan and Beelzebub, Marlowe's Lucifer is presented as the "arch-regent" (1.3.63) of Hell. He is, like Milton's Satan, considered to be of high rank, post-lapsarian. Like Beelzebub, Belzebub is depicted as Lucifer's right-hand man (in a manner of speaking). Whether it is as the literalized silent partner of the A text or the dialog partner of the B text, Belzebub's presence evokes Milton's poetic claim that

42 Similar to Fowler's note, note 105 in Book I that Satan will not acknowledge that during the battle in Heaven, it was the Son's chariot, which shook the Heavens and not his (67). See also from C.S. Lewis's essay on Satan in Paradise Lost, but which is applicable here as well: "Satan lies about every subject he mentions in Paradise Lost. But I do not know whether or not we can distinguish his conscious lies from the blindness which he has almost willingly imposed on himself...There has never been any war between Satan and God, only between Satan and Michael; but it is possible he now believes his own propaganda" (199)

43 Or Paradise is Lucifer's greater pain because he saw what could have been, what he lost. I return to this argument in chapter two in my discussion of Satan watching Adam and Eve kiss, pre-lapsarian.

44 Mephostophilis notes that Lucifer was the "most dearly loved of God" (1.3.65). Milton's angelic Raphael claims to Adam and Eve that Satan was "the first / If not the first archangel, great in power, / In favor and pre-eminence..." (5.659-61).
Beelzebub, pre-lapsarian (and post) is “next himself [Satan] in power, and next in crime” (1.79) to Satan/Lucifer. Furthermore, Belzebub’s relation to Lucifer follows the pattern of kings and philosophers and their male bedmates, which Marlowe’s Elder Mortimer discusses in Edward II (and which has been discussed earlier in this chapter). The silent A text Belzebub is reminiscent of Hephaestion,45 of Hylas, of Patroklos in that there does not exist (as far as historians know) a History of Hephaestion by Curtius Rufus, or Plutarch. We do not re-tell the Twelve Labors of Hylas or evoke as tragic weakness our Patroklos heel. Hephaestion, Hylas, Patroklos. and Belzebub are secondary historical and mythic characters, neither heroes nor villains who could easily be written out of their histories and stories. Yet, we forget that it is Hephaestion who “installed Abdalonymus as king of Sidon...[and] bridged the Indus River” (Heckel 315), among other tasks.46 We forget that without Hylas, Hercules is a half-god brute who slaughters his wife and children (albeit while cursed), and without Patroklos, Achilles is a sulky soldier who would contribute to the loss of the Trojan War. More importantly, when we write out these other halves as Plato’s Aristophanes refers to the individuals of a split soul (63) including and especially, Belzebub, we contribute to writing out non-fixed heterosexual or hetero-erotic individuals.47 We contribute to a mandatory hetero-eroticism, or as

45 Indeed twenty-first century readers at least, cannot help but hear in Belzebub’s first line in the B text, after Lucifer has introduced him as his “companion-prince in hell” (2.1.91), “we are come to tell thee thou dost injure us (2.1.92 reverberations of Alexander the Great’s introduction of Hephaestion to Queen Mother Sisigambis of Persia, upon her false prostration to Hephaestion, believing he was king: “My lady, you made no mistake. This man is Alexander too” (Quintus Curtius Rufus 46).

46 See Waldemar Heckel, The History of Alexander, 315 for a complete list of the tasks of Hephaestion.

47 Paraphrased from popular and well-regarded sex and advice columnist Dan Savage’s quote from his June 2013 goodreads list, “Good Minds Suggest---Dan’s Savage’s Favorite LGBT Relationship Books” concerning Mary Renault’s historical fiction novel, The Persian Boy (which is about the relationship
Adrienne Rich would phrase it, a “compulsory heterosexuality,” which is precisely what Belzebub and Lucifer break as consorts and push for the threads of a (proto) or sixteenth-century, (potentially fixed) homosexuality. Unlike in the Satan-Beelzebub relationship, there is no female present either in the form of an Eve or within themselves. If we ignore Belzebub and the mythic and historical companions, including Saint John (a return to our Biblical sodomites), who come before him, we obscure myth, obscure history, obscure religion. We neglect and forget the “figure of the homosexual,” which as Alan Bray writes, is the “reflection” of “the atomized, pluralistic society, which gave rise to it” (114). Although we do not witness the exact role Belzebub performed before the fall, whether for benefit or ill, as we will in Paradise Lost, without him, Lucifer is simply between Alexander the Great and his Persian eunuch Bagoas): “Gay people have existed throughout human history, but our lives and our loves were written out of the story.” For an academic’s point of view on this same subject see also Gregory Bredbeck’s “Coda: The Essential Sodomite,” from his book Sodomy and Interpretation: Marlowe to Milton (235-39), specifically Bredbeck’s final sentence: “Therefore, if I have asked us to rethink ourselves through the terms of theory, I might now also ask us to reempower ourselves through the words of Quentin Crisp, for in an expanding universe, time is on the side of the outcast, and as our universe continues to expand ever more quickly, the ability to silence such outcasts will someday be lost” (239). See also Bredbeck 262 from “Milton’s Ganymede: Negotiations of Homoerotic Tradition in Paradise Regained” in which Bredbeck writes: “Indeed,[C.S.] Lewis’s condemnation of Milton’s ‘poetical imprudence’[that is allowing same-sex sexuality to be considered or to enter the mind of the reader when reading about Milton’s angelic beings] succinctly displays two divergent ideas that still hinder Milton studies and have yet to be explored fully: the ease with which homoeroticism can be detected in Milton’s canon and the urgency with which it is written away.”

48 See the excerpt from Adrienne Rich’s classic essay “Compulsory Heterosexuality and the Lesbian Experience” (1591-1609). The introduction to “Compulsory Heterosexuality” provided by the editors of The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism, Vincent B. Leitch, et al, succinctly sum-up Rich’s argument with the following: “Rich argues that heterosexuality is compulsory because only partners of the opposite sex are deemed appropriate, all same-sex desire must be denied or indulged in secret, and various kinds of same-sex bonding (including friendships) are viewed with suspicion. Compulsory heterosexuality functions to ensure that women are sexually accessible to men, with consent or choice on the women’s part neither legally nor practically taken into account. In sum, compulsory heterosexuality is an institution that punishes those who are not heterosexual and systematically ensures the power of men over women” (1589). For the purposes of my thesis I am most concerned and focused on the first quoted sentence.

49 For the term “sexual pluralism,” please see Gayle Rubin (2402) from her famous essay, “Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality” (2377-2402). This is included in The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism. See bibliography for complete bibliographic information.
a terrible figure,\textsuperscript{50} the ruler of Hell with masses who serve him, as Mephostophiles claims to do. We would only see him as the paragon of the Evil Angel, and not the fallen angel, who embodies the Evil Angel. In his continued companionship with Belzebub, Lucifer has not completely eradicated the Good. Within the Belzebub-Lucifer consort relationship, we see hell is not where sexual and erotic love are denied and lust without ecstasy enforced as in the hell Milton’s Satan and Beelzebub inhabit,\textsuperscript{51} but where sexual and erotic friendship, companionship thrives.\textsuperscript{52} In allowing Belzebub and Lucifer to be companions in hell, we see the potential for forgiveness and redemption, hand-in-hand themes, which of course, will be taken up by Milton in \textit{Paradise Lost} and \textit{Paradise Regained}.

\textsuperscript{50} Faustus’s line to Lucifer upon first seeing him is: “Oh what art thou that look’st so terribly?” (Marlowe 2.1.90).

\textsuperscript{51} In his tortured lament upon witnessing the prelapsarian Eve and Adam kiss, Satan claims: “while I to hell am thrust, / Where neither joy nor love but fierce desire, / Among our other torments not the least, / Still unfulfilled with pain of longing pines;” (4.508-11).

\textsuperscript{52} For a detailed account of the erotics or potential erotic expressions in male-male friendship, see Bray (59, 60, 69). See also Normand 179, specifically when he writes: “The signs of male friendship in the sixteenth century, as Alan Bray has shown, were intense and physical: ‘the embraces and the protestations of love, the common bed and the physical closeness, the physical and emotional intimacy’, and yet they were not taken to be signs of illicit sexual desire….Male friendship encompassed a breadth of behaviours that to twentieth-century eyes seem sexual (and are now proscribed); and yet were not then so interpreted.” See also Goldberg, \textit{The Seeds of Things}, 196. See Goldberg, \textit{Sodometries}, 118-121, 139. See also Katz 46-47 for “romantic friendships” between members of the same sex. See also Turner, \textit{One Flesh} 77-79, and 308 in which he writes that Adam and Eve “must relearn the arts of affectionate ‘conversation’ and erotic companionship.”
Chapter 2: One Sodomic Flesh: The Erotics and Politics of the Beelzebub and Satan Consort Relationship in John Milton’s Paradise Lost

...thus answered soon his [Satan] bold compeer [Beelzebub]

...Too well I see and rue the dire event,

That with sad overthrow and foul defeat

Hath lost us heaven...(1.127-36).

Beelzebub and Satan are the only two angels in Paradise Lost who are companions. This companionate relationship is revealed by their fellow angel, Raphael. During his four book visit with the pre-lapsarian Adam and Eve, the archangel Raphael recites the battle in Heaven and the events that led up to it. Satan’s pre-battle conversation with the unfallen Beelzebub (5.673-93) and his conversation with the other angels during the battle (6.418-43) are included in Raphael’s recollection. Raphael recounts that Satan awakes Beelzebub, his “bedmate” (Mikics 39), after Messiah’s promotion to head of the angelic body, with the following address:

Sleepst thou companion dear, what sleep can close

Thy eyelids? And rememberst what decrees

Of yesterday, so late hath passed the lips

Of heaven’s almighty? Thou to me thy thoughts

53 This would be Books five through eight.
Wast wont, I mine to thee was wont to impart;

Both waking we were one ;...(5.673-78)

It is thus that readers are introduced to the most explicit line that indicates a companion or consort relationship between Beelzebub and Satan: “Both waking we were one” (5.678). 54

During this same visit, Adam inquires of Raphael what an angelic sexual experience is like. Before he describes (somewhat ambiguously) 55 the mechanics of angelic sex, Raphael replies: “let it suffice thee that thou knowst / Us happy, and without love no happiness” (Milton 8.620-21, italics added). The archangel delineates: “if spirits embrace / Total they mix, union of pure with pure / Desiring” (8.626-28). Raphael switches to “spirits” and “they,” words that not only put distance between the sex act and himself, but also imply that angels do not bond themselves to one sex partner, but change from one to another (that “pure promiscuity” (283) that Raymond calls it). Satan and Beelzebub have a bond that is not replicated among the other angels: a consort relationship.

Within the Beelzebub-Satan companion or consort relationship, the opportunity to explore sexuality and eroticism in Paradise Lost becomes apparent. Yet, critics interested

54 It should be noted that this is spoken “in secret” (5.672). However, as Fowler notes about the line: “But overheard, and so known to Raphael. No need to speculate, with Gilbert (1947) 63, about omniscient narration in a putative original version. In any case Raphael (or M[ilton]) might follow the historical convention of invented speeches” (325). However, the contention of this thesis is that Satan’s speech to Beelzebub is not “invented.”

55 See Lehnhof, “Nor turned I weene: Paradise Lost and PreLapsarian Sexuality,” 82 on Raphael ambiguously describing “angel sexuality.”
in questions of sexuality and eroticism in *Paradise Lost* have tended to focus on Adam and Eve.\(^5^6\) In their individual respective works, James Grantham Tuner, Peter Lindenbaum, and Edward Le Comte explore in great detail, the “erotic companionship” (Turner, 308) between Adam and Eve. Turner proposes in his fascinating text *One Flesh: Paradisal Marriage and Sexual Relations in the Age of Milton* that: “*Paradise Lost* represents the climax of Milton’s lifelong struggle to create a vision of Eros based on his reading of Genesis” (232). Turner further suggests that while within his divorce tracts:

Milton could not incorporate sexuality into the ideal without tension, violence, and open disgust. His reconstruction of the love of Adam and Eve may thus be seen as an imaginary reversal of the incompatibility and hatred depicted in the earlier prose, an attempt to ‘revisit safe’ the realm of light in which Eros can see again (232).

The majority, then, of Turner’s erotic analysis of *Paradise Lost*, including the “sexual worship” which Turner argues is “installed in ‘holiest place’”—Adam and Eve’s marriage/sex-bower—(237) is focused on the first man and the first woman. Arguing that Adam is the “most important human character in the poem” (299), Lindenbaum spends a great deal of his article, “Lovemaking in Milton’s Paradise,” analyzing Adam’s specific sexuality from a heterosexual or heteroerotic standpoint. Lindenbaum’s argument is therefore concerned with “what amounts to an instance of Milton’s personal emphasis [“enthusiastic outbursts” when Adam and Eve engage in sex] in the poem, then encourages the reader as well as Adam to view sexual love as the “sum” of prelapsarian bliss” (277). In his book *Milton and Sex*, Le Comte theorizes that Milton:

\(^{56}\)At times Raphael has been the focus of critics’ inquiries of sexuality and eroticism in *Paradise Lost*. For example, James Grantham Turner briefly explores Raphael’s erotic nature in relation to Eve in his book *One Flesh* and Clay Daniels has explored eroticism in relation to Adam and Raphael in his article “Milton’s Neo-Platonic Angel?” See bibliography for complete bibliographic information for both.
wishes to unite marriage and romantic love, putting sex in its proper place. Eve must be extremely attractive but Adam must not be the slave to her charm, or charms. Her beauty must be felt without becoming an idol to be worshiped. But sex in its proper place, the marriage bed, is given full due, in disagreement with those church fathers who declined to believe there was copulation before the fall (91).

Nor are Turner, Lindenbaum, and Le Comte the only three critics who discuss erotics in relation to Adam and/or Eve. James W. Stone, Kent R. Lehnoff, and Clay Daniels have contributed to this specific discussion in their respective works as well.

When Satan does enter the picture of sexuality, his erotic nature tends to be critically discussed with regard to Eve. In her article, “On Authorship, Sexuality, and the Psychology of Privation in Milton’s Paradise Lost,” Katherine O. Ascheson argues that Satan’s (eventual) temptation of Eve is both “both sexual and authorial…” (906). While James Grantham Turner may predominantly analyze the erotics between Adam and Eve, he too considers an erotic relation between Satan and Eve. Turner takes the position that when the fallen Satan first spots the pre-fallen Eve kissing Adam in Eden in their prelapsarian state, he is “boiling over with sexual jealousy and ‘fierce desire’” (258). According to Turner, Satan “joins a series of characters in Milton’s poetry who are ravished at a distance by the ideal woman…Satan feels the redemptive power…of the whole female ‘spirit of love and amorous delight’” (261). Lindenbaum, in the same article quoted from earlier, proposes that when Satan watches Adam and Eve kiss, Satan “considers an embrace between Adam and Eve as Paradise in itself…[and that it is] Satan

57 Or Sin, but to a lesser degree. Edward Le Comte discusses Satan’s erotic nature in relation to Sin, his daughter-paramour in his book Milton and Sex as does Kent Lehnoff in his article, “Performing Masculinity in Paradise Lost,” in which he even calls Sin, Satan’s “lover” (68).
who is jealous of it [the Adam-Eve relationship]” (283). Edward Le Comte, James W. Stone, and Alastair Fowler have also noted Satan’s jealousy for Eve and of Adam.

While the potential for the exploration of sexuality and eroticism within the poem is present in the Beelzebub/Satan relationship, Satan’s sexuality and erotic nature has instead been analyzed in regard to Eve (or Sin, his daughter) and Beelzebub’s sexuality and erotic nature, with a few exceptions, has been critically obscured or forgotten. As Nancy K. Barnard has contended: “Beelzebub is usually viewed as politician or military second-in-command, or simply passed over without much comment” (301). Indeed, past criticism of the fallen angel has tended to focus on a political, business-like, or martial Beelzebub. Barbara K. Lewalski, for example, has interpreted Beelzebub as “a highly intelligent and imaginative minister of state” who is an “instrument of his prince [Satan]” (92). Michael Murrin has named Beelzebub a general along with Satan (132). If a political or military reading is not given for Beelzebub, then Beelzebub is indeed “passed over without comment” (Barnard 301). Kent R. Lehnhoff, in his article regarding how masculinity is performed in *Paradise Lost*, includes Beelzebub in a list of “characters we tend to think of in masculine terms” (65) within the poem, but makes no specific mention of how then Beelzebub should be read. Peter Lindembaum, in his article on Edenic lovemaking, makes no mention of Beelzebub at all. And Turner, who devotes almost 58 Mikics calls Beelzebub, Satan’s “bedmate” (39) but does not delve into too much detail regarding the Beelzebub-Satan relationship. Jonathan Goldberg refers to Beelzebub and Satan (or Lucifer as Goldberg, incorrectly for a *Paradise Lost* study, calls Satan) as the “angelic couple” (196). Goldberg briefly explores the sexual behavior of Satan and Beelzebub, stating that perhaps the prelapsarian Satan and Beelzebub were sexually intimate, or at least had non-corporal sex (196). In his 1965 critical classic *Milton’s God*, William Empson coyly calls Beelzebub’s Satan’s “intimate” (39). This designation, however, is left undeveloped. Joad Raymond too, in his book, *Milton’s Angels: The Early-Modern Imagination*, coyly refers to Beelzebub as Satan’s “companion” (291).
eighty pages to an analysis of the erotics within *Paradise Lost*, including the erotic behavior and responses of Eve, Adam, the archangel Raphael, and Satan, does not once mention Beelzebub.

This chapter seeks then to recover the importance of Beelzebub with regard to understanding the matters of sexuality and eroticism in *Paradise Lost* and with regard to Satan in particular. While past criticism has been too one-sided, too much in favor of only a political or business-like relationship between Satan and Beelzebub, this chapter also seeks to recover the Satan and Beelzebub relationship as simultaneously emotional, political, and erotic. In recovering the importance of Beelzebub, this will also alluringly cast new light on Satan’s painfully striking responses to seeing the pre-lapsarian Eve. As the consort of Satan, Beelzebub humanizes and creates sympathy for Satan. In the archangel Raphael’s retelling of the battle of Heaven, readers witness the fall of Beelzebub, a fall that is more tragic because he chooses to damn himself for love, like Adam did for Eve.

Beelzebub is the first character Milton names in *Paradise Lost*. Before readers have even learned the name Satan,59 Milton states that the one whom the “infernal serpent” (1.34) “soon discerns, and weltering by side” (1.78) in Hell is: “One next himself in power, and next in crime, / Long after known in Palestine, and named / Beelzebub…” (1.79-81). Readers immediately understand, from his introduction and his

---

59 Satan is first called by Milton the “infernal serpent” (1.34) and the “arch-enemy” (1.81) before Milton names him Satan (1.82).
proximity to Satan, that Beelzebub is not some random angel to be quickly glossed over. (196). Satan laments:

If thou beest he; but oh how fallen! how changed

From him, who in the happy realms of light

Clothed with transcendent brightness didst outshine

Myriads though bright: if he whom mutual league,

United thoughts and counsels, equal hope

And hazard in the glorious enterprise,

Joined with me once, now misery hath joined

In equal ruin… (1.84-91).

Satan’s first speech, especially his sentiment “if he whom mutual league / United thought and counsels, equal hope / And hazard…” (1. 87-89), secure Milton’s introduction that Beelzebub is “next himself [Satan] in power and next in crime” (1.79). Included in his (albeit brief) analysis of Beelzebub and Satan, whom he calls Lucifer, Jonathan Goldberg argues: “Often the differences between angels are marked as degrees and kinds of beauty, which eroticize them” (196). Satan introduces Beelzebub as the one “who in the happy realms of light / Clothed with transcendent brightness didst outshine / Myriads though bright” (1.85-87). Here, Satan claims that Beelzebub’s beauty surpassed that of the other angels. Satan’s introduction, similar to Lucifer’s introduction of
Belzebub as his “companion-prince in hell” (2.1.91) in Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*, automatically elevates Beelzebub above any other angel, fallen or not.

Unlike the narrator’s quick, harsh language focused on “power,” “crime” (1.79) and the damned Beelzebub of future Palestine (1.80), Satan’s introductory language is intimate, soft, almost woefully reminiscent, and focused on the pre-fallen, Heavenly Beelzebub. Satan’s tale of two beings who were “joined” (1.88) and “united” (1.90) brings to mind Plato’s erotically philosophical text *The Symposium*. *The Symposium* revolves around a dinner-and-wine conversation among a group of male friends, including the philosopher Socrates, regarding erotics, love, and how they should be expressed. It is during the speech of Aristophanes that readers are given the famous story of the original joined beings, either two men, two women, or a man and a woman, who were eventually split in half by the god of all gods, Zeus. During his tale, Aristophanes proposes:

> Whenever the lover of boys—or any other person for that matter—has the good fortune to encounter his own actual other half, affection and kinship and love combined inspire in him an emotion which is quite overwhelming, and such a pair practically refuse ever to be separated even for a moment....No one can suppose that it is mere physical enjoyment which causes the one to take such intense delight in the company of the other. It is clear that the soul of each has some other longing which it cannot express, but can only surmise and obscurely hint at (63 my emphasis).

In his work *One Flesh*, James Turner notes that “Milton himself was clearly influenced by the Platonic account of love...In *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*...he invents his own myths of Eros and his own method of equating Genesis with *The Symposium*” (70). Once Turner turns his attention almost exclusively to *Paradise Lost*, he writes: “As a truly comprehensive epic it must be a theology, an
encyclopaedia, and a history, but it is also an erotology, a Symposium…” (132).

Aristophanes’s emotionally-erotic language, the language of the “other half” (63) in combination with Milton’s “erotology” (Turner 132), thus has its beginning in Paradise Lost in the first speech of the poem between Satan and Beelzebub. From the beginning, readers understand that it is Beelzebub whose place is at Satan’s side. Where Satan falls, Beelzebub falls with him.

Indeed as Jonathan Goldberg writes: “The Beelzebub that we see as the poem opens ‘next’ to Satan (1.79), is likely to be where he was when he and Lucifer were in heaven and joined as bedfellows” (The Seeds of Things, 196). In bed, Satan wonders to his consort:

Sleepst thou companion dear, what sleep can close

Thy eyelids? And rememberst what decree

Of yesterday, so late hath passed the lips

Of heaven’s almighty? Thou to me thy thoughts

Was wont, I mine to thee was wont to impart;

Both waking we were one; how then can now

Thy sleep dissent? New laws thou seest imposed; (673-79)

Here in this speech, the most explicit line regarding Satan’s erotic and sexual consort relationship with Beelzebub is given: “Both waking we were one” (5.678).
As Joad Raymond succinctly explicates in the book *Milton’s Angels and the Early Modern Imagination*:

sexual intercourse is intrinsically good. Angels interpenetrate ‘union of pure with pure / Desiring’ (8.627-8); they feel desire, and what they desire is union with another pure being...angelic lovemaking [is]...also proof that all rational beings with the exception of God, experience community and desire as a principle of their being (282-83).

In Satan’s line “Both waking we were one” (5.678) that “union” (Raymond 282) of the “other half” (Plato 63) is present. It is at this moment that Satan is portrayed as a more sensitive and hence more complicated figure. Gone or not yet developed is the Satan who will later declare: “Better to reign in hell, than serve in heaven” (1.263). Here pride and ambition are not the “principle of” Satan’s “being” (Raymond 283), but love.

Love is more present in this second awakening of Book 5 than in the first awakening of Book 5 between Adam and Eve, which it parallels. In Eden, pre-fallen Adam coaxes his wife, pre-fallen Eve, to cease sleeping with the following lines:

...Awake
My fairest, my espoused, my latest found
Heaven’s last best gift, my ever new delight.
Awake, the morning shines, and the fresh field
Calls us (5,17-21).
Although they have had only one night together, Adam still employs the possessive “my” in describing how Eve relates to him. Unlike Adam’s wake-up speech to Eve, Satan’s to Beelzebub avoids explicit one-sided possession. While Satan does refer to Beelzebub as “companion dear” (5.673), he does not include the words ‘my’ or ‘you are mine.’ Nor does Satan ever refer to Beelzebub as “best image of myself” (5.95), as Adam calls Eve. According to James W. Stone, this is Adam “at once implying her [Eve’s] superlativeness and inferiority” (36). Neither Satan nor Beelzebub uses any kind of language that implies that he feels the other is inferior. In this speech, Beelzebub retains autonomy, for although Satan is speaking to him, he is not using Beelzebub to parrot his ideas about harming Man for him, as he will in Book 2, after they fall from heaven.

The responses given to the wake-up speeches differ as well. Eve, “embracing” (5.27) Adam with “startled eyes” (5.26-7), starts to tell him her dream (5.28-94). She says, “O sole in whom my thoughts find all respose, / My glory, my perfection, glad I see / thy face…” (5.28-30) as her morning greeting. Although Eve’s words too use possession---“my glory, my perfection” (emphasis added)---there is an overtone of submissive praise, expressing less how Eve can raise Adam up and more how Adam can raise Eve up. That unequal partnership still stands. Beelzebub, however, does not respond to Satan’s endearments. As the soon-to-be-fallen angels eventually all gather (5.775-76),

---

60 Idea of possession and language with Adam and Eve compared to Satan and Beelzebub inspired by page 248 of Gregory Sanborn’s article (albeit on *Moby-Dick*), “Whence Come You, Queequeg?” See bibliography for full bibliographic information.

61 Fowler 151, ftn 839-44
it can be implied that Beelzebub simply follows his “bedmate”['s] (Mikics, 39) order, without argument or agreement. While this could indicate that Beelzebub is silenced by Satan, it could also indicate Beelzebub’s free will. Lehnhof writes: “only when forcibly detained does Eve finally fulfill her companionate role” ("'Nor turned I weene': Paradise Lost and PreLapsarian Sexuality,” 68). Unlike Eve, Beelzebub freely chooses to stay with Satan, his partner. After Satan has confided his plans to Beelzebub, Raphael recites:

So spake the false archangel, and infused

Bad influence into the unwary breast

Of his associate; he together calls,

Or several one by one, the regent powers,

Under him regent, tells, as he was taught (5.694-98).

While this could be seen as manipulation on Satan’s part, it is more likely evidence of loyalty and free will. Beelzebub takes his essence and his life into his own hands.

In his article on marriage and Adam and Eve, David Mikics takes the position that:

…a narcissistic mirroring was never what Adam wanted: from her beginning, he pursued Eve as an other self, but one necessarily different from him…this difference…renders Adam and Eve alien to the companionate space of intimacy, the

---

62 This is a reference to when Eve has been “fleeing from his [Adam’s] side when led to him” (68).
childlike communion, that Satan says he shared with Beelzebub, that seemingly innate, angelic imaginary… (42)

Satan and Beelzebub’s relationship resonates more with James W. Stone’s interpretation of Adam and Eve’s, when Stone proposes, “unlike God the creator, the creature, although a unity, needs a supplement to his oneness, an other self to complete or perfect his lack…” (34). Mikics, however, uses the word “share” (42) to describe the relationship between Satan and Beelzebub, which ties into Stone’s point about Adam and Eve. The Satan of Paradise Regained may provoke Jesus to “fall down, / And worship me as thy superior lord” (Milton 4.166-67) in regard to giving Jesus kingdoms, but Satan does not use such language in his confidence to Beelzebub about gaining Heaven. Satan may wish for Beelzebub to follow him, but he does not use their bed as a source for ownership and manipulation. Alastair Fowler notes that before Satan speaks to his “companion dear” (5.673), Beelzebub is referred to as Satan’s “next subordinate” (5.671) because “Beelzebub is still innocent and his pre-lapsarian name unknown” (325). When Satan first speaks to Beelzebub in bed, Fowler does not mention if Satan is still innocent. Raphael explicitly terms Satan the “false archangel” (5.694). He is also, however, in his unfallen bed, an “innocent” consort.

It may be that this bedroom scene is what prompted past critics to construct implicit readings regarding the sexuality and eroticism surrounding Beelzebub. We understand Joad Raymond dubbing Beelzebub Satan’s “companion” (291), David Mikics

---

63 Fowler also notes that Beelzebub’s name is not given because Milton wrote Book 5 before Book II, at least according to William Empson (325).

64 “innocent” (Fowler 325)
referring to Beelzebub as Satan’s “bedmate” (39), and Jonathan Goldberg’s asserting that Beelzebub and Satan are the “undoubtedly one angelic couple in the poem” (*The Seeds of Things*, 196). Goldberg delves into the sexual nature of the Beelzebub-Satan relationship. He claims that Beelzebub and Satan’s “bedfellow” scene, indicates a “form of same-sex intimacy [that] is utterly unremarkable as a phenomenon of early modern life” (*The Seeds of Things*, 196). Goldberg argues that this “sharing of thoughts that translates into sharing a bed” is a “mirror scene of mutuality and oneness” that may be “the angelic sex Raphael describes to Adam”; that is, “complete oneness of bodily interpenetration” (*The Seeds of Things*, 196).

Goldberg’s reasoning is logical. Satan’s line, “Both waking we were one,” (5.678) foreshadows Raphael’s Book 8 explanation of angelic sex. During Raphael’s sojourn in Eden, Adam, who since his creation has had sexual intercourse with Eve, asks the archangel what angelic sexual experience is like. The blushing Raphael provides the following answer:

> ...Let it suffice thee that thou knowst

> Us happy, and without love no happiness.

> Whatever pure thou in the body enjoyst

> (And pure thou wert created) we enjoy

> In eminence, and obstacle find none

> Of membrane, joint, or limb, exclusive bars:
Easier than air with air, if spirits embrace,

Total they mix, union of pure with pure

Desiring; nor restrained conveyance need

As flesh to mix with flesh, or soul with soul (8.620-29).

Kent R. Lehnhof observes that, in his lesson on angelic sexuality, Raphael asserts that “angels are indivisible, unfragmented, all-of-one-piece. There can be no specification beyond ‘total’ because ‘total’ is all there is” (“Nor turned I weene: Paradise Lost and PreLapsarian Sexuality." 81). This angelic totality has been seen in Book I when the now-fallen Satan and Beelzebub are introduced. Milton writes that while lying in the Lake of Fire, Satan “soon discerns, and weltering by his side / One next himself in power, and next in crime” (1.78-79). Although Satan’s first line, “If thou beest he; but oh how fallen! how changed” (1.84) reflects his anguish and shock at how drastically Beelzebub’s appearance has changed from its heavenly “ transcendent brightness” (1.86), Satan recognizes that Beelzebub and he are still “total,” (8.627) still united as they were before in Heaven.65 Beelzebub is still, as Goldberg observes, at Satan’s side as he was when the two were in their Book 5 heavenly bed (196). Goldberg writes that after Beelzebub and Satan fall from Heaven, “the union of Satan and his partner is broken by the divine decree, which appears not to trouble Beelzebub until Satan reminds him of their lost unanimity” (196). Beelzebub appears untroubled (The Seeds of Things,196)

65 As Satan himself remembers: “if he whom mutual league / United thoughts and counsels, equal hope / And hazard in the glorious enterprise...” (1.87-89).
because for Beelzebub, his totality with Satan, his “union” (Raymond 282) is intrinsic.

Beelzebub realizes that while they may have “lost” heaven (1.136), Satan and he need not be divided.

According to Goldberg to read sexual activity between Satan and Beelzebub at this moment in bed as anything but “complete oneness of bodily interpenetration” (or that the “sharing of thoughts that translates into sharing a bed”) is “wrong” (The Seeds of Things, 196). In his striking text Milton’s Angels and the Early Modern Imagination Joad Raymond proposes the following conclusion regarding Milton and angelic bodies:

This is Milton’s position: angels are substantial and material, but, unlike humans, their matter is highly spiritual and therefore they are not corporeal….Matter and spirit exist on a continuous scale, from the incorporeal to the merely corporeal. This scale permits movements, and beings can ascend and descend it through continuing obedience to God, refining the very corporeality of their being (286).

However, based on Raymond’s declaration it is arguable that just like angels can convert human food to angelic food, they could convert human sexuality to angelic sexuality. They are not rigidly restricted to angelic sex. Love-making between angels could, then, involve physical or human bodies. Raymond proposes: “The penetrability of angels was a commonplace: though they could act with assumed bodies and upon material bodies ‘with external violence’ according to Jan Amos Comenius, they themselves ‘can be hindered or stayed by no body’ ”(282). The crucial word here in Raymond’s argument is “can” (282), because can implies choice and ability. The angels can choose to perform sexually with one another with a body. This means it could be possible that if both angels assume material bodies or at least a flesh-based form, penetration during intercourse could occur.
As the hetero-partial critic James Grantham Turner notes: “there is clearly an undertone in the poem that points to the maleness of the good angels” (233) and as Milton himself writes:

For spirits when they please

Can either sex assume, or both; so soft

And uncompounded is their essence pure,

Not tied or manacled with joint or limb,

Not founded on the brittle strength of bones,

Like cumbrous flesh” (1.423-28).

Thus, the material forms assumed may be male or female, but they could also possibly be only male. Like his Marlovian counterpart, Belzebub, the Miltonic Beelzebub is a fixed male. Satan first refers to Beelzebub’s gender in his first line of the poem (and first speech): “If thou beest he...” (1.84). As Satan’s continues to recount pre-fallen features of Beelzebub, he states, almost awestruck: “…how changed / From him, who in the happy realms of light / Clothed with transcendent brightness....” (1.84-86 emphasis added). Throughout his Book I dialog with Beelzebub, not once does Satan refer to Beelzebub as she. Nor does the narrator, or Milton in Book II. When Beelzebub first appears in Book II, in the Council of Pandemonium, Milton writes: “Which when Beelzebub perceived... /...with grave / Aspect he rose, and in his rising seemed, / A
pillar a state” (2.299-301). Beelzebub pleads his devilish counsel to seduce Man and not once does Milton alter his gender from he to she or claim that he is “both” (1.424).

Therefore, penetration during angelic sex, especially between Beelzebub and Satan, would not just be vaginal penetration, but also, if not only, anal penetration. Angelic bodies have the potential to participate in physical shapes, for as Raymond explicates, angels possess “proper shapes” (290), as well as “bodies [that] emanate from spirit, and the shape that a spiritual being has is not only a manifestation of its identity: it is the potential it has to turn corporeal…” (291) We can then reasonably propose that sodomy, specifically sodomy as “male penetration…[during and as well as] male-male sexual intercourse,” which as Gregory Bredbeck notes was how sodomy was regarded in the seventeenth-century, as well as Goldbergian sodomy which is “a sexual act, [or] anything that threatens alliance—any sexual act, that is, that does not promote the aim of married procreative sex (anal intercourse, fellatio, masturbation, bestiality…)--- or accusations of their performance---…. [are] at the very least, disturbers of the social order that alliance----marriage arrangements---maintained” (19) exists as a potential angelic sexual behavior. Thus, Beelzebub and Satan are sodomites in the physically specific seventeenth-century vernacular, two male (albeit non-human) entities who participate in anal penetration by a penis.

Goldberg argues the relationship, and particularly Satan’s endearment for Beelzebub of “companion dear” (5.673) switches from the “normative same-sex intimacy” to “sodomy” as soon as Satan’s bedroom speech is dubbed “‘bad influence’”
(The Seeds of Things, 196). However, Beelzebub and Satan do not just acknowledge the “hair’s breadth” which “separates” sodomy and “normative same-sex intimacy” (196). Instead, Satan and Beelzebub rumple the “hair’s breadth” (196). As Goldberg reminds us, “there is no sense of correct ‘position’ in angelic sex acts” (The Seeds of Things, 195). Therefore, Beelzebub and Satan in their pre-fallen consort relationship embody simultaneously “normative same-sex intimacy” and “sodomy” (196). It is not “unremarkable” (196) as Goldberg claims “that Satan has a bedfellow” (196) in his pre-lapsarian life (and later a hell-fellow post-lapsarian). It is remarkable that Satan and Beelzebub, as pre-and post-lapsarian consorts, as bedfellows, at least in Heaven, “share a normative form of friendship and intimacy” (196), which includes anal penetration, not as sodomy, but as “normative” (196) sexual intimacy, as God-approved seventeenth-century homosexuality.

If we accept that Beelzebub and Satan are the only two angels who routinely sleep together (euphemistically and non-euphemistically), Satan and Beelzebub may also have broken “sanctioned sexual behavior” (Thomas 452) of Heaven, which is “pure promiscuity” (Raymond 283). Furthermore, Beelzebub and Satan may have yearned for “earthly” (Daniel 186) sacraments, for we know in Heaven they can “neither marry nor are given in marriage” (Mark 12:25 qtd. in Fowler 464). Fowler even suggests that Satan has an “envy of conjugal love” (250) (though Fowler’s suggestion suggests more of an “envy of [heterosexual] conjugal love” (250)). Thus, from there it becomes questionable if perhaps Beelzebub and Satan desired more choices in their relationship. Beelzebub (and, to an extent, Satan) may be damned because not only has he fought against God, he
has chosen Satan over God, love over obedience to God. Beelzebub, like Adam, is willing to fall because of his devotion to his partner. Yet, unlike Adam, Beelzebub does not eventually experience God’s mercy, and suffers for his love, not as an angel, not transformed into a human, but as a damned devil. Yet as both an unfallen angel and as a damned devil, the bond of the “other half” (Plato 63) is present between Satan and Beelzebub. Upon seeing the fallen Beelzebub for the first time in his physically mutated form, the fallen Satan woefully reminisces:

If he whom mutual league,

United thoughts and counsels, equal hope

And hazard in the glorious enterprise,

Joined with me once, now misery hath joined

In equal ruin;...(1.87-91)

II: Politics of Erotics

“And Saul said to him, Whose son art thou, thou young man? And David answered, I am the son of thy servant Jesse the Bethlehemite” (1 Samuel 17:58)
“And it came to pass, when he had made an end of speaking unto Saul, that the soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul” (1 Samuel 18:1).66

Susan Ackerman proposes that when we examine the David-Jonathan relationship, “first, we can note that the conjunction of the terms love (ahbel ahaba) and convent (berit) in 1 Sam 20:16-17 clearly point to there being a political dimension to David and Jonathan’s relationship. However, according to most commentators, David and Jonathan’s political relationship...is...coupled with ‘deep affection’” (183). Like their Canaanite ancestors, the Miltonic Beelzebub and Satan consort relationship includes political calculations, which may contribute to the eventual dissolution of an active relationship. It must always be remembered that Beelzebub is nowhere to be seen or heard in Paradise Regained, although homoerotic energy continues to envelope Satan.

Nancy K. Barnard correctly asserts that: “Beelzebub is usually viewed as politician or military second-in-command...” (301). However, not once in Paradise Lost is it explicitly stated by either the narrator, Raphael, Satan, or Beelzebub himself that he participated in actual military combat during the battle in Heaven. Raphael states, in his recollection of the battle and pre-fallen Satan to Adam and Eve:

...the might of Gabriel fought,

And with fierce ensigns pierced the deep array

66 All Biblical quotations from the Holy Bible: Authorized King James Version. See bibliography for complete bibliographic information.
Of Moloch furious king, who him defied...

...On each wing Uriel and Raphael his vaunting foe,

Though huge, and in a rock of diamond armed,

Vanquished Adramelec and Asmadai

Two potent thrones... (6.355-66).

Furthermore, while Beelzebub specifically reminds Satan after their fall that it was Satan who led the “embattled seraphim to war” (1.129), Satan makes no mention of a battling Beelzebub.

Barnard notes that “without Beelzebub the angelic rebellion might have assumed a different shape” (302). Although Barnard seeks to justify that Beelzebub is John the Baptist to Satan’s demonic Christ, and this thesis seeks to contend that Beelzebub is consort to the arch-fiend Satan and the pre-lapsarian Satan, our (albeit unknown to Barnard) mutual hypothesis is pertinent. Robert F. Wilson “sees Beelzebub as evidence that Satan, even this early in the epic, has been able to corrupt a subordinate into doing his dirty work” (qtd. in Barnard 301). Wilson’s comment refers to Beelzebub’s contribution to the Book 2 debate in Pandemonium among the fallen angels; however, it is also applicable to Barnard’s point that Beelzebub’s role amassing the other pre-fallen angels is crucial to Satan’s rebellion.

When Beelzebub argues for the plan to infiltrate Mankind, Beelzebub retains autonomy. Milton writes:
Thus Beelzebub

Pleased his devilish counsel, first devised

By Satan, and in part proposed: for whence

But from the author of all ill could spring

So deep a malice… (2.378-82).

On the surface this appears to be a recognition of Beelzebub solely as Satan’s microphone. Satan’s use of Beelzebub to speak his plan to the council of the fallen angels is a means to exert his power. However, Satan needs Beelzebub to speak for him, needs Beelzebub for the actions of his pre-lapsarian life and the beginnings of his post-lapsarian life. Before they fall, Satan has Beelzebub tell the other angels his plans of rebellion (Milton 5.685-704). Why wouldn’t Satan complete that task himself—-he is, after all, possibly God’s “first archangel” (Milton 5.660) as well as “the ‘equal’ to Michael” (Fowler 324)? For those very reasons, Satan may have been hindered from gathering the other angels. The other angels may have been too awed by him, too frightened of him; he is the “superior voice” (5.705). Or he may not simply have even been as charismatic as Beelzebub. Later (time-line wise, the scene occurs four books earlier in the poem), in the council in hell, Beelzebub’s countenance is described as “and princely counsel in his face yet shone / Majestic though in ruin” (Milton 2.304-5). Beelzebub is further and more importantly described as

Sage he stood
With Atlantean shoulders fit to bear
The weight of mightiest monarchies; his look
Drew audience and attention still as night
Or summer’s noontide air (2.305-09).

Their comrades, post-fall and pre-fall, respond to Beelzebub. They listen to him, perhaps because he is Satan’s consort, and perhaps because although he is “next in himself [Satan] power, and next in crime” (Milton 1.79), after he is damned, it is not indicated that Beelzebub is that powerful before he falls. The other angels can relate more to Beelzebub; the other angels follow Satan because Beelzebub follows Satan.

Barbara K. Lewalski hypothesizes in her brief analysis of Beelzebub: “Beelzebub takes on the roles of Odysseus and Nestor in recalling the rebels to their war commitment. But unlike the Greek heroes, who think and act for themselves, Beelzebub is simply a front man for his leader, manipulating the council so as to make Satan’s plan prevail” (86-87). Lewalski, however, overlooks that even though Beelzebub listens to Satan, he also makes the choice to act, to call to the other soon-to-be-fallen angels as well as to call out to the now-fallen angels. Beelzebub could have easily chosen not to do so. Secondly, Lewalski overlooks the power and charisma that must be in inherent within Beelzebub in order for his manipulation (87) or seduction to succeed.67

---

67 Perhaps one could even argue that Satan’s temptation or seduction of Eve is an emulation of Beelzebub’s seduction of the other soon-to-be fallen angels. Satan successfully tempts Eve, one person. Beelzebub seduces multitudes.
Satan perhaps recognizes this. During the battle he employs the consort language while motivating the soon-to-be-fallen angels during the battle in Heaven. To re-inspire the troops, Satan cajoles:

O now in danger tried, now known in arms

Not to be overpowered, companions dear,

Found worthy not of liberty alone,

Too mean pretence, but what we more affect

Honour, dominion, glory, and renown (6.418-22, emphasis added)

By using the same language that he uses when Beelzebub and he are alone together, he subtly compliments Beelzebub, for he recognizes that Beelzebub is a vital “instrument” (Lewalski 92).

Milton writes that this Pandemonium speech Beelzebub gives is “…first devised / By Satan, and in part proposed:” (2.379-80). That “in part proposed” (2.380) is vital to the understanding of the Satan-Beelzebub relationship. If Satan and Beelzebub are “one” (5.678), it is not too implausible to read that line as “in part proposed” (2.380) by Beelzebub. Like a true human partnership, Satan and Beelzebub need each other and recognize each other’s strengths. Mark Crispin Miller is inaccurate when he says that Beelzebub “parodies Satan’s resolve by striking to emulate it” (65).68 Satan and

---

68 Barnard explains that Miller says this about Beelzebub in Book 1 (310).
Beelzebub do not parody (Miller 65) each other; they work with each other. Satan may be ambitious, but Beelzebub is ambitious and charismatic. Beelzebub is inherently respectable, while Satan must earn his respect from others, damned or not.

In his brief analysis of the Satan and Beelzebub relationship, Jonathan Goldberg concludes that Satan’s pre-lapsarian endearment for Beelzebub, “companion dear,” (5.673) and by extension the relationship, only turns sodomie when Satan’s “imparting [of his plan/advice] becomes ‘bad influence’” (The Seeds of Things 196). Further on in his discussion of Satan’s erotic interactions with other pre- and post-fallen angelic associates, specifically with the cherub Zephon, Goldberg proposes: “indeed, it appears that had this lowly Zephon, been Satan’s ‘mate’ in heaven, something like sodomy would have been the name for the untowardness of a coupling of figures so disparate, a coupling akin to what happened when angelic lust flares for human women” (The Seeds of Things, 197-98).

In Book 1 Satan explicitly calls Beelzebub a “cherub” (1.157). Readers understand that Beelzebub is a member of the “second angelic order, excelling in knowledge” (Fowler 70). Satan’s rank, however, is more ambiguously named. Beelzebub reminds him that he led “the embattled seraphim to war” (1.129), but does not explicitly name him a seraph. Milton, however describes that the pre-lapsarian Satan was “of the first / If not the first archangel” (5.659-60). And Joad Raymond observes that “Satan scornfully mistitles Gabriel a ‘Proud limitary cherub’, a logical insult only to a seraph…”

69 Beelzebub is almost like a “smooth-talker,” as Ross Leasure calls Belial (75).
(262) Therefore, if Satan is not a cherub, but is indeed a seraph as Milton and Raymond suggest, and Beelzebub is a cherub, which readers are explicitly told in the second conversation between Satan and Beelzebub,\textsuperscript{70} it would stand to reason that the Beelzebub-Satan relationship, especially as a consort relationship, is, in the Goldbergian sense, sodomie from its genesis.

Satan’s first lines are about Beelzebub and within them he obliquely outlines as to why as a cherub he considered Beelzebub a fit “mate” (4.828) unlike the cherub Zephon. Satan laments with rueful awe:

If thou beest he; but oh how fallen! how changed

From him, who in the happy realms of light

Clothed with transcendent brightness didst outshine

Myriads though bright… (1.84-87)

Satan, here, reveals that the unfallen Beelzebub was to Satan a superior cherubic being, at least in terms of physical appearance.\textsuperscript{71} The unfallen Beelzebub was more than

\textsuperscript{70} And which Fowler’s annotations confirm (170).

\textsuperscript{71} Compare briefly C.S. Lewis’s claims of Satan’s beliefs of superiority but here in relation to the Son (and by extent God): “A being superior to himself in kind, by whom he himself had been created—a being far above him in the natural hierarchy—had been preferred to him in honour by an authority whose right to do so was not disputable, and in a fashion which, as Abdiel points out, constituted a compliment to the angels rather than a slight” (198)
standard-cherubic beautiful, more beautiful perhaps than even the unfallen Satan in Satan’s eyes.72

In recognizing Beelzebub’s cherubic status and beauty, Satan sets the reader up for his own cherubic disguise to Uriel, a seraph, in order to achieve access to Eden. There Satan seduces Uriel with his beautiful cherubic charms and looks.73 With Uriel, Satan perverts the seraph-cherub relationship. The sodomy has become shameful because it is used as and for seduction, not love, because the cherub is only a cherub in appearance, not personality or role. Beelzebub’s former cherubic beauty corresponds to Goldberg’s following argument regarding angelic physical glory: “Often the differences between angels are marked as degrees and kinds of beauty, which eroticize them....To this figure [Uriel whom Satan needs to seduce to gain access to Eden], Satan accommodates himself in the form that would seem to correspond erotically [to Uriel’s own beauty]” (The Seeds of Things, 196-97). Between Uriel as a seraph responding erotically to Satan, an (albeit disguised) cherub, and the revelation from Satan that Beelzebub was a cherub, and not a seraph as the unfallen Satan was, it is arguable that “cross” (Goldberg 198) -ranks relationships between cherubs and seraphs are not sodomic as long as love or “oneness” (196) is involved, as long as God is involved.

Thus, Satan sets up Raphael’s account of Beelzebub and Satan’s Heavenly pillow-talk in Book V. Neither Raphael nor the narrator explicitly state that this relationship is

72 Mark Crispin Miller disputes this argument, commenting that when Satan speaks of “lost angelic beauty” he is “probably thinking of himself” (75). See bibliography for complete bibliographic information.

not approved by God or the other angels because one is a cherub, the other a seraph. This differs from their Old Testament Hebraic influences, David and Jonathan, in which David is intensely disapproved of by Saul, King of Judea, because “of the political scandal of a royal son [Jonathan] betraying father and kingdom for the sake of a stranger, but also the effrontery of this homosexual love” (Silvia Schroer and Thomas Staubli qtd. in Ackerman 187). With their difference in rank the Miltonic pre-fallen, more so than the fallen, Beelzebub and Satan, and by extent the Marlovian fixidly-fallen Belzebub and Lucifer, do not just acknowledge the “hair’s breadth” which “separates” sodomy and “normative same-sex intimacy” (Goldberg, *The Seeds of Things*, 196); they rumple the “hair’s breadth” (196), acknowledging that as the angels “can either sex assume or both” (1.424) they can also embody simultaneously “normative same-sex intimacy” (*The Seeds of Things*, 196) and sodomy, that there can be at times nothing separating the two states, that the two states exist, just as Beelzebub and Satan do, as “one” (5.678).

Like Zephon, whom Satan (and Goldberg) points out would not have been worthy of the status of being Satan’s “‘mate’” (*The Seeds of Things*, 197), Beelzebub should not have been considered a proper “‘mate’” (197) either for Satan. Nor should Satan have been considered a proper “‘mate’” (197) for Beelzebub because Beelzebub is a cherub. It should be that within their relationship because of their ranks that Satan, “a seraph, whose natures were particularly suited to Love” (Turner 270) has descended the “ladder of love” (Lewalski 215), whereas Beelzebub, a cherub whose specialty is knowledge (Fowler 70) perhaps has climbed it too quickly, similar to the fallen Eve and Adam who “think they
are deliberately re-enacting their love on a higher plane, but we can see it only as a
travesty (Turner 303).

However, Satan and Beelzebub continue to exist in “mirror scene[s] of mutuality
and oneness” (Goldberg, *The Seeds of Things*, 196). It is the latter idea of “oneness”
(196), the united being that finds its roots and influences in the Platonic figure that was
originally either two males, two females, or one of each, that we find Beelzebub and
Satan inverting, not perverting, the perceived heavenly status quo as it pertains to erotic-
sexual bonds. It is this completed place of “oneness” (196) that cements the Beelzebub-
Satan relationship, allows it to be “normative”-sodomic, regardless of their ranks.74 It is
not just that Zephon is a cherub that made him the wrong partner for Satan or because he
was the “lowest of your throng” (4.831) as the fallen Satan taunts, nor the most beautiful
of cherubs as Satan hints Beelzebub may have been, outshining the others, but it is
because Zephon was not Satan’s “other half” (Plato 63) nor was Satan, Zephon’s, but
Beelzebub’s.

III: All About Eve?

Previous criticism of Satan’s sexuality has tended to associate it with Eve.
Acheson argues that “the temptation of Eve by Satan is both sexual and authorial…”
(906). While Turner may pre-dominantly analyze the erotics between Adam and Eve, he
too considers an erotic relation between Satan and Eve. Turner takes the position that
when the fallen Satan first spots the pre-fallen Eve kissing Adam in Eden in their pre-

74 “Normative” (Goldberg, *The Seeds of Things*, 196)
lapsarian state, he is “boiling over with sexual jealousy and ‘fierce desire’” (258). According to Turner, Satan “joins a series of characters in Milton’s poetry who are ravished at a distance by the ideal woman…Satan feels the redemptive power…of the whole female ‘spirit of love and amorous delight’” (261). Lindenbaum proposes that when Satan watches Adam and Eve kiss, Satan “considers an embrace between Adam and Eve as Paradise in itself…[and that it is] Satan who is jealous of it [the Adam-Eve relationship]” (283). Stone observes that “Satan envies Adam his paradisiacal happiness with Eve; the lack of what Adam has, a copartner, excites Satan’s envy when he first overlooks Paradise as a deprived voyeur” (36). Alastair Fowler annotates that “instructed by Raphael, Adam later infers Satan’s envy of conjugal love” (250). Fowler’s wording implies that Satan is envious of the “conjugal love” between Adam and Eve, which corroborates the above critical points on Satanic jealousy.

It is easy to point out where in the poem these critics may have drawn their conclusions from. The fallen Satan spies on the pre-lapsarian Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden in Book 4, five books before he enacts (successfully) his temptation of Eve. During this earlier scene, Satan watches Adam and Eve kiss, Satan wails:

Sight hateful, sight tormenting! Thus these two

Imparadises in one another’s arms

The happier Eden, shall enjoy their fill

Of bliss on bliss, while I to hell am thrust,
Where neither joy nor love, but fierce desire,

Among our other torments not the least

Still unfulfilled with pain of longing pines (4.505-11)

James Stone (as well as the other critics) is partially right; Satan does “envy” (36) Adam for the happiness he is able to share with Eve. But that “envy” does not exist because Satan doesn’t have a “copartner” (36) or because he only has heterosexual attraction to/for Eve, which would almost place a “compulsive” heterosexual spin on Satan’s sexuality,⁷⁵ if he has one that can be defined, or classify him and his attraction in the poem as “heteronormative” (Thomas 446). As Catherine Thomas comments on Milton’s A Mask, “the drama itself allows for a much more fluid consideration desire and sexuality” (446), so too does this scene from Paradise Lost. Here, the parallel to or reflection of Eve is not that she is a consort (Fowler 422),⁷⁶ but that she has the capability of having a sanctioned and sustained relationship.

Goldberg hypothesizes that unfallen angels create a hierarchy based on beauty and the eroticization of it (196-97). If we adopt Goldberg’s premise, Satan should have

⁷⁵ See the excerpt from Adrienne Rich’s classic essay “Compulsory Heterosexuality and the Lesbian Experience” (1591-1609). The introduction to “Compulsory Heterosexuality” provided by the editors of The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism succinctly sum-up Rich’s argument with the following: “Rich argues that heterosexuality is compulsory because only partners of the opposite sex are deemed appropriate, all same-sex desire must be denied or indulged in secret, and various kinds of same-sex bonding (including friendships) are viewed with suspicion. Compulsory heterosexuality functions to ensure that women are sexually accessible to men, with consent or choice on the women’s part neither legally nor practically taken into account. In sum, compulsory heterosexuality is an institution that punishes those who are not heterosexual and systematically ensures the power of men over women” (Leitch, et al 1589). For the purposes of my thesis I am most concerned and focused on the first quoted sentence.

⁷⁶ As Alastair Fowler reflects in his footnote to lines 529-30 of Book V, “Eve is first a consort, only secondly for race” (422).
eroticized and, perhaps additionally, idealized, Belial’s beauty. Belial’s beauty was, according to the narrator, the paragon of “fair” (2.110) angelic appearances. Yet, from Satan’s perspective, Beelzebub was the most beautiful of the pre-lapsarian angelic beings; in his introduction he states that the pre-fallen Beelzebub “didst outshine / Myriads though bright” (1.86-87). Satan never once comments on Belial’s beauty, nor does Satan demonstrate any sort of attraction to Belial. It may be as Gregory Bredbeck glosses in his critique of homoeroticism in *Paradise Regained*, because Satan berates Belial for having a “limited notion of sexual temptation” (“Milton’s Ganymede: Negotiations of Homoerotic Tradition in Paradise Regained,” 264) for Belial only suggests sexually tempting Christ with women, not women and men as Satan will suggest. Bredback observes that “Satan knows that the temptation of woman is insufficient to make him [Christ] unprofitable, for as Satan notes, ‘Beauty stands / in th’ admiration of weak minds’ ” (*Sodomy and Interpretation*, 224). Although Satan’s rebuke may appear as a denigration of beauty, as a quality that is not to be valued, Satan’s reply may not be a rebuke against beauty, but a rebuke against a “limited notion of” (264) beauty, a rebuke against a pre-determined beauty, in which the male automatically responds the aesthetics and erotics of the beauty of the opposite-sex and the opposite sex alone. However, in choosing to consort with Beelzebub and to be enamored of Beelzebub’s beauty, which he, not the narrator, focuses on, Satan does not adhere to the sexuality the situation calls for.\(^7\) While it is acceptable for Satan, a seraph, to lust for

---

\(^7\) All uses of “situational” or situation are from Marjorie Garber, *Vice Versa: Bisexuality and the Eroticism of Everyday Life*, 30. In her list of the “taxonomies of bisexuality itself,” Garber includes “ ‘Married Bisexuality,’ ‘Secondary Homosexuality’ (more frequently called ‘situational bisexuality’—sex with same-sex partners in prisons or other single-sex institutions, in public parks or toilets, or for money)....” Garber
Beelzebub, a cherub, as Goldberg tells us the archangel Uriel erotically falls for Satan in cherubic costume (197), it is not acceptable for Satan to set Beelzebub’s beauty higher than Belial’s, who as the superior beauty in Heaven, in this situation, should have been the pre-fallen Satan’s appropriate erotic target.

With Eve, Satan enters into a “situational” (Ross qtd. in Garber 30) heterosexuality. Although Eve is part of the “loveliest pair / That ever since in love’s embraces met / ....the fairest of her daughters Eve” (Milton 4.321-24), whose “beauty is close to an ideal (Flannagan qtd. in Fowler 496) of feminine beauty, she is also the only human female present. The pre-lapsarain Satan had to choose to find the pre-lapsarian Beelzebub more beautiful than whom his “situational” angelic sexuality was supposed to find the most beautiful, and thus, most erotic. If Satan is to participate in hetero-erotic experiences, it must be with Eve, for he has no other choice. And since he has no other choice, it is not quite a true attraction, for while his attraction to Beelzebub was a part of his “situational” angelic sexuality, it also broke the situation, while his “situational” heterosexuality parallels more of the classic situational homosexuality, in which homosexual behavior occurs in the “single-sex” environment (Garber 30). Satan may not choose his hetero-eroticism, and while it is arguable that it would be appropriate for Satan to direct his hetero-eroticism towards Eve if there were other human women present, to argue that Satan is fiercely jealous of Adam because he fiercely (Milton qtd.

takes “Secondary Homosexuality”/ “situational bisexuality” as well as other items in her list from Michael W. Ross’s “ A Taxonomy of Global Behavior” in Bisexuality and HIV/AIDS: A Global Perspective (531).

78 See footnote 65
in Turner 258) desires Eve, is borderline ridiculous. Satan does not choose Eve; for Satan to experience hetero-erotic attraction after his fall, with a non-angelic being fallen or unfallen, Eve is the only option available. Satan thus experiences heteroerotic attraction from a homoerotic source: Beelzebub.

To argue that Satan has a "fierce" (Milton qtd. in Turner 248) desire for Eve and "fierce" (248) jealousy of Adam is to slap on a "compulsive" heterosexual reading and reasoning of Satan's sexuality.79 If critics such as C.S. Lewis denied the unfallen angels homosexual or homoerotic behaviors and attractions in Heaven, (Bredback, "Milton's Ganymede: Negotiations of Homoerotic Tradition in Paradise Regained," 262) then arguments such as Turner's, deny the fallen angels. The "compulsive"80 heterosexual reading of Satan and by extent Beelzebub does not even place the homosexual in limbo; it turns him (or her) to unsanctified dust. It is during his interactions with Eve (and by extent his non-interactions with Adam) that Satan finally realizes the true meaning of damnation: loss and separation. Satan crying out "Sight hateful / sight tormenting!" (4.505) is not Satan expressing jealousy for Eve, or even just for sexual intercourse,

79 See the excerpt from Adrienne Rich's classic essay "Compulsory Heterosexuality and the Lesbian Experience" (1591-1609). The introduction to "Compulsory Heterosexuality" provided by the editors of The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism succinctly sum-up Rich's argument with the following: "Rich argues that heterosexuality is compulsory because only partners of the opposite sex are deemed appropriate, all same-sex desire must be denied or indulged in secret, and various kinds of same-sex bonding (including friendships) are viewed with suspicion. Compulsory heterosexuality functions to ensure that women are sexually accessible to men, with consent or choice on the women's part neither legally nor practically taken into account. In sum, compulsory heterosexuality is an institution that punishes those who are not heterosexual and systematically ensures the power of men over women" (Leitch et al 1589). For the purposes of my thesis I am most concerned and focused on the first quoted sentence.

80 See footnote 67
which fallen angels are denied. It is Satan grieving. If Barnard says that Beelzebub “disappears” (310) from *Paradise Lost* after Book 2 it is because he has to for Satan to understand what he has done. The farther Satan walks from Beelzebub, the farther he walks from God.

Beelzebub graces the stage in *Paradise Lost* only a handful of times. Yet, his appearances mark a more sensitive, and hence more complicated, side of Satan as well as more sides to himself. If other fallen angels are described in sexual matters, such as “Michael Lieb discuss[ing] Belial in terms of sodomy,” (Stone 40), we may not at first wish to place Beelzebub in a sexual context because that would mean we would have to view Satan in that more sensitive light, perhaps even in a more positive framework. Beelzebub is not only Satan’s “bold compeer” (1.127), the “one next himself in power, and next in crime” (1.79). He is Satan’s consort, a status that is recognized by the other angels as it is during Raphael’s retelling that we hear the consort language (5.673, 6.419). Most importantly, while Beelzebub may be prideful like Satan, he is sympathetic because he chooses to damn himself for love. Satan is not sympathetic because he is a “heroic figure” (Thomas 459) or because he attempted to fight against God. Satan is sympathetic because he loved and eventually chose “glory” (Milton 3.148) and pride and placed that “glory” (3.148) and pride as superior to love. In the intimate Satan-Beelzebub relationship, a parallel or reflection of the Adam-Eve relationship, we see paradise lost; sorrow, empathy, the beginnings of humanity gained.

---

81 As Satan explains in his lament which beings “Sight hateful sight tormenting!”: “…while I to hell am thrust, /Where neither joy nor love, but fierce desire, /Among our other torments not the least, /Still unfulfilled with pain of longing pines” (4.508-11).
Conclusion: Return of Beelzebub, the “Bold” Consort (1.127)

This thesis has contended that Beelzebub is the erotic and political consort of Satan in John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. To fully understand this consort relationship, chapter one examined Christopher Marlowe’s earlier play, *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*. Christopher Marlowe was a relative contemporary of Milton’s, and Milton may have been familiar with Marlowe’s play. In *Doctor Faustus*, Marlowe includes the characters, Lucifer and Belzebub. Belzebub is introduced as Lucifer’s “companion prince in hell” (2.1.91). This thesis contended that Belzebub’s primary purpose is to be Lucifer’s consort. Chapter two was partitioned into three sections. The first section examined how the Beelzebub-Satan consort relationship is erotic and sexual. Specific language between Satan and Beelzebub, such as Satan’s most erotic line in *Paradise Lost*, “Both waking we were one” (5.678), was examined. Section one incorporated Plato’s *The Symposium*, its concept of the “other half” (63) of an individual’s soul and its place within the Satan-Beelzebub erotic consort relationship. Section one examined how sodomy and anal penetration reshape not only how readers understand Satan and Beelzebub’s relationship, but also how readers understand angelic gender and sexual intercourse in *Paradise Lost*. Section one concluded that Beelzebub and Satan engaged in anal penetration and that this was “normative”- sodomic sexual behavior. Section one also concluded that the Beelzebub-Saan relationship is homoerotic/homosexual. Section two examined the political aspect of the Satan and Beelzebub consort relationship. Section two examined the place and purpose of political sodomy within the relationship. Section two incorporated the Old Testament erotic-
political story of David Jonathan and explicited how it is a predecessor to the Beelzebub-Satan relationship. Section two explained that Satan and Beelzebub commit “cross”-rank sodomy\(^\text{82}\) because Beelzebub is a cherub, and it can be concluded that Satan is a seraph. Section three incorporated Eve. Section three contended that Satan is not jealous of Eve or Adam because he desires the other. Section three contended that Satan’s painfully striking responses to the pre-lapsarian Eve are moments of Satan grieving. Satan realizes that he has not just lost his “unanimity” (Goldberg, *The Seeds of Things*, 196) with Beelzebub, but that he has lost Beelzebub.

Several questions remain going forward. If Beelzebub is the erotic and political consort of Satan, what is the significance of his disappearance in *Paradise Regained*? How does the consort Beelzebub reshape our ideas and biases of gender performances and expressions of sexuality, including marriage? How does the erotic Beelzebub challenge our notions of female heterosexuality, male homosexuality, and their opposites? How does the erotic Beelzebub reshape our understanding of love, forgiveness, and humility in *Paradise Lost*, secular and religious texts, including the *Bible*, and ourselves? The newly fallen Beelzebub laments, “...Too well I see and rue the dire event, / That.../ Hath lost us heaven (1.134-36). We ask in response to the erotic fallen and pre-lapsarian Beelzebub: Will we find redemption? If we do, do we accept it or do we stay “lost?” Is to damn oneself to be seduced or is it to love? As he is for most of the poem, Beelzebub is silent, but ready to speak.

---
\(^{82}\) For “cross” see Goldberg, *The Seeds of Things*, 196
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