English Studies in the 21st Century

English Studies in the 21st Century

Edited by

Zekiye Antakyalıoğlu,
Kyriaki Asiatidou,
Ela İpek Gündüz,
Enes Kavak
and Gamze Almacıoğlu

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

English Studies in the 21st Century

Edited by Zekiye Antakyalıoğlu, Kyriaki Asiatidou, Ela İpek Gündüz,
Enes Kavak and Gamze Almacıoğlu

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-4738-8
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-4738-4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

From April 24 to 26, 2019, the Department of Western Languages and Literatures at Gaziantep University in Gaziantep, Turkey hosted IDEA 2019, a conference entitled Studies in English. It was the 13th international conference of the English Language and Literature Research Association of Turkey (IDEA) which is affiliated with the European Society for the Study of English (ESSE). One valuable outcome of this conference is *English Studies in the 21st Century*, a book of twenty-three chapters adapted from presented papers that reflects the ideals of academic polyphony and diversity by highlighting the interdisciplinary character of the field of English Literature and Language. It accomplishes this by incorporating as its subjects various authors and works from almost all literary periods, and by giving voice to academics, both old and young, from different national, political, and religious backgrounds.

This book comprises the results of the most recent academic research dealing with a wide spectrum of subjects—politics, psychology, religion, philosophy, history, culture, aesthetics, and education—in relation to literary, cultural, and language studies. The criteria for selecting these chapters were the epistemological aim of the works, the recent character of the conducted research, the satisfactory degree of the qualitative and quantitative research conducted, the controversy specific authors and works have stirred within the academic community, as well as the influence of specific authors and works on the expression of the creative imagination of contemporary and/or future generations of authors. Because IDEA conferences take place in Turkey, special attention was also given to the learning needs of Turkish students, the relationship between teacher and student, and the application of teaching methods within the Turkish educational system.

The editors warmly thank all the contributors whose concerted efforts have led to the publication of *English Studies in the 21st Century*. This reference book is ideal for academics, graduate and undergraduate students in Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences, as well as literature enthusiasts outside the academic community. It is hoped that this continuous engagement in the process of learning will lead to the enrichment of their knowledge and thus to a broader understanding of contemporary research in English Studies.

Professor Zekiye ANTAKYALIOĞLU
On Behalf of the Editorial Board

CHAPTER ONE

THE PRESENCE OF THE *ZOHAR* IN MILTON'S *PARADISE LOST*: INTERTEXTUALITY AND ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN RHETORIC

KYRIAKI ASIATIDOU

Discussions on the mystical elements of the poetry of John Milton foreground the popularity of medieval and renaissance Jewish and Christian mysticisms in the seventeenth century as signs of the rise of religious zeal and its impact on the literature of that time. Particularly, scholarly attention has been given to the impact of the Kabbalistic work *Zohar*. A characteristic example is that of Denis Saurat who claims that Milton's religious thought was influenced by Jewish mysticism by connecting particular passages from *Paradise Lost* solely to passages from the *Zohar*.[1] Among the noteworthy scholars who have argued against Saurat's Jewish Kabbalistic approach to several passages of *Paradise Lost* stand Walter Clyde Curry, who interprets some of the alleged passages within the context of Hellenistic Neoplatonic philosophy,[2] and R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, who refutes Saurat's claim by interpreting some of the alleged passages within the context of Renaissance Christian mysticism/Christian Kabbalism.[3]

---

[1] Denis Saurat, "Milton and the 'Zohar'," *Studies in Philology* 19, no. 2 (1922): 136-151, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4171822.

[2] Walter Clyde Curry, "Milton's Chaos and Old Night," *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 46, no. 1 (1947): 38-52, https://www.jstor.org/stable/27712836. A commentary on Curry's Neoplatonic interpretation of several parts of *Paradise Lost* is not available in the present work. However, like Saurat, Curry fails to relate his interpretation to Milton's purpose of composing *Paradise Lost*.

[3] R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, "Milton and the Conjectura Cabbalistica," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 18, no. 1/2 (1955): 90-113,

Still, if interpretations solely emphasize the Jewish, pagan, or Christian mystical influences upon Milton the artist as distinct entities from the orthodox Christian tradition, they create the false impression that Milton has chosen a different spiritual path from mainstream Christianity; thus, Milton is transformed into a heretical man approaching the Christian faith idiosyncratically. Readings based on the various influences upon Milton the poet and the man may be many; however, they cannot be characterized by arbitrariness. To illustrate my claim by using Saurat's interpretation of *Paradise Lost*, I may assert that although scholars cannot miss traces of Jewish mysticism in *Paradise Lost*—a poem of a strong Christian character and, thus, of an inevitable intertextual nature because of the historical, cultural, and geographical conditions under which Christianity was formed—they cannot ignore this epic poem's specific purpose clearly uttered by Milton (the narrator) in the proem: "I may assert Eternal Providence,/And justify the ways of God to men (Book I, lines 25-26)."[4] I will attempt to demonstrate that Denis Saurat's exclusive Jewish interpretation of specific passages of *Paradise Lost* disrupts the overall meaning of the poem since Saurat fails to relate the provided interpretations of the specific passages to Milton's general purpose of composing *Paradise Lost*. My assertion is that a possible orthodox Christian mystical interpretation based on the teachings of the Patristic theologian Dionysius the Areopagite may better serve Milton's end. Before my refutation of Saurat's interpretation of particular excerpts from *Paradise Lost*, I briefly elaborate on the purpose of the composition of *Paradise Lost* on which my refutation of Saurat's interpretation will be built.

Paul Carus asserts that Christianity is a "branch of Gnosticism," acknowledging that Gnosticism—as a movement whose objective is man's salvation through the attainment of gnosis (knowledge)—existed before the founding of Christianity by Peter and Paul.[5] Carus traces the roots of Gnosticism to Oriental religions fostered in India—such as Brahmanism, Jainism, and Buddhism—with which Jews and Greeks became progressively familiar throughout the Hellenistic Period and the Roman Period.[6] He further notes that the Jewish Diaspora was responsible for the fusion of Indian and Greek beliefs and ideas into Judaism on Syrian soil,

---

http://www.jstor.org/stable/750289.

[4] John Milton, "Paradise Lost," in *Paradise Lost: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds, and Sources Criticism*, 2nd ed., ed. Scott Elledge (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1993), 9.

[5] Paul Carus, "Gnosticism in Its Relation to Christianity," *The Monist* 8, no. 4 (1898): 502-503, http://www.jstor.org/stable/27897524.

[6] Ibid., 505-507.

and from there, various gnostic groups popularized their ideas in the multicultural societies of Alexandria and the cities of Asia Minor.[7] Gnosticism offered a "universal/supernational," "personal," and "spiritual" reading of the Jewish Scripture (the Old Testament), but Christianity succeeded in becoming more acceptable within the Hellenistic world because it transformed "abstract" gnostic views into "simple" and "concrete" ideas in the form of the Gospel.[8] Since the second century B.C., there were known Jewish gnostic communities, such as the Essenes with whom Jesus had connections, the Nazarenes/Nazarites/Ebionites, the Therapeutae, and the Zabians/Baptists among whom was St. John the Baptist. They generally embraced asceticism, poverty, intense contemplation and penance, fasting, praying, ablutions, baptism and special initiatory rituals, along with the rejection of oaths and bloody sacrifice. They also had their own set of secret doctrines of interpreting the Old Testament, and the millennium idea.[9] Particularly, the Nazarenes were the mystics/Gnostics associated with early Christians. The Jewish religious elite accused Paul of being a Nazarene and, in general, viewed all Christians as Nazarenes; similarly, early Christians did not find the epithet "Gnostic" a pejorative and early Church Fathers like Clement attached to this epithet a Christian meaning.[10] The contemporary Nazarenes/Ebionites of Origen were divided into those who acknowledged and those who did not acknowledge the "supernatural birth" and divine nature of Christ.[11] Later, many of the aforementioned Jewish gnostic practices, either comprised the core or were considered signs of the highest virtues within the orthodox Christian tradition. Furthermore, Carus notes that Apocryphal writings such as "the Book of Enoch, the Psalms of Solomon, and Leptogenesis […] are obvious symptoms of Gnosticism."[12] The Patristic theologians acknowledged Jewish mysticism—especially through their acceptance of the Apocrypha—as logos spermatikos. McGrath states that they accepted the authority of the Apocrypha/deutero-canonical writings, including them in the Septuagint, the Greek version of the Old Testament, with writings that were not originally in the Tanakh/the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament.[13]

---

[7] Ibid., 506-507.
[8] Ibid., 502-504.
[9] Ibid., 510-513, 526.
[10] Ibid., 502-503, 511.
[11] Ibid., 512.
[12] Ibid., 512.
[13] Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, 5th ed. (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 120-123.

Carus provides two noteworthy examples of the intellectual trading between early Jewish mysticism and Christianity which may be found in the Book of Enoch where the Messiah is mostly addressed as "the son of the woman," "the son of man," and once as "the son of God," who eternally existed before all creation.[14] Similarly, in the Christian tradition, "Son of Man" and "Son of God" address the dual nature of Christ, fully man and fully God respectively, as well as God's second hypostasis (the Son) that is consubstantial and coequal with the Father, the first hypostasis. Carus also justifies the appearance of a spiritual Messiah in the Book of Enoch by pointing out that the Book of Enoch was partially written after 79 AD, but he acknowledges Essenic influences rather than Christian ones.[15] Still, there are other Christian influences on Jewish mysticism. Examples like the bodily resurrection of the dead in the Book of Daniel and 2 Esdras and the association of the Messiah with God's son Jesus in 2 Esdras[16] remind us that, as they developed, Jewish mysticism and Christian mysticism have exchanged beliefs. The second example is related to the Babylonian idea of emanations that was embraced by various Gnostic groups.[17] In the Wisdom of Solomon viii. 3-4, Wisdom/Sophia—the emanation and bride of God—is "conversant with God."[18] In other words, the love relationship between God and Sophia is defined by the action of speech. Within the Christian tradition, wisdom, love, and speech are meanings of Logos, an epithet attached to Christ and the Holy Spirit, the second and the third hypostases of God. Therefore, while acknowledging the contribution of Jewish mysticism to the shaping of the orthodox Christian faith, Milton's mysticism may be interpreted within the boundaries of mainstream Christian mysticism rather than Jewish mysticism.

Milton's clear assertion of his poem's end—his fellowmen's realization of God's will for humanity, which is humanity's theosis (deification)—is directly related to the teachings of the first-century theologian Dionysius the Areopagite, the Bishop of Athens. Parker claims that Dionysius the Areopagite was a disciple of Paul and a major influence upon Pantaenus and Ammonius Saccus, the founders of the Alexandrian school, and he refutes the dominant view that attributes to Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, a Syrian monk of the late fifth and early sixth century, the Neoplatonic, panentheistic *On Divine Names*, *Mystic Theology*, *On the Heavenly Hierarchy*, and *On Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*. Rather, Parker

[14] Carus, "Gnosticism in Its Relation to Christianity," 516.
[15] Ibid., 517.
[16] Ibid., 518-519.
[17] Ibid., 509.
[18] Ibid., 514.

advocates that these works belong to the first century Dionysius the Areopagite, thus making panentheism the philosophical backbone of early Christianity before the shaping of the third-century Neoplatonic pagan philosopher Plotinus's panentheism. According to Parker, Plotinus came into contact with the Alexandrian school and, for eleven years, was a student of Ammonius-Saccus.[19] The theologians of the Alexandrian school, along with the theologians of the Antiochene school, were the major contributors to the formulation of the Trinity doctrine and the hypostatic union doctrine, the official position of the Church acknowledged by the council of Nicaea in 325 and the council of Chalcedon in 451.

Armed with the conviction of being illuminated by the Divine ray of grace, Milton fulfils his duty, reminding his fellowmen of the Divine will of a deified humanity. Milton echoes Dionysius the Areopagite who reveals:

> For each of those who have been called into the Hierarchy, find their perfection in being carried to the Divine imitation in their own proper degree; and what is more Divine than all, in becoming a fellow-worker with God, as the Oracles say, and in shewing the Divine energy in himself manifested as far as possible. For it is an Hierarchical regulation that some are purified and that others purify; that some are enlightened and others enlighten; that some are perfected and others perfect; the Divine imitation will fit each one in this fashion.[20]

The striking similarity between Milton's purpose and Dionysius's explanation of orthodox Christian panentheism—which, in the relationship of God and man, brings to the fore the active response of man to the calling of divine grace through the practice of human will—provides readers with clues of the eschatological purpose of an amillennial character in *Paradise Lost*. *Paradise Lost* is an allegory which stresses that reality is mental and the degree of its perception by humanity depends on the latter's present mental state. As John of Ruysbroeck (1293-1381) eloquently states, "The second coming of Christ our Bridegroom takes place every day within good men; often and many times, with new graces and gifts, in all those who make themselves ready for it, each according to

---

[19] John Parker, "Dionysius the Areopagite and the Alexandrine School," in *Dionysius the Areopagite, Works (1897)*, trans. and comp. John Parker (London; Oxford: James Parker and Co, 1897), 132-135, https://www.ccel.org/ccel/dionysius/works.

[20] Dionysius the Areopagite, "On the Heavenly Hierarchy," in *Dionysius the Areopagite, Works (1897)*, trans. and comp. John Parker (London; Oxford: James Parker and Co, 1897), 149, https://www.ccel.org/ccel/dionysius/works.

his power."[21] Milton's reader must take immediate action to rise from the lower mental states of Ulro and Generation he/she experiences at present to the higher mental state of Beulah, in which one's soul gets prepared for its union with God in the Edenic state, which is the infinite and eternal highest mental state humanity may experience within the boundaries of physical reality at present. *Paradise Lost* refers to the different mental states which humanity as a whole, as well as the individual as a distinct soul, may experience. The narration's beginning, strongly connected as it is with the Christian hope—and Milton's hope—of the completion of the Divine Will of a restored and perfected humanity, alludes to the first and second coming of Christ and man's experiencing the highest mental state, the Edenic state.[22] The narration proceeds from the descriptions of the lowest mental state of Ulro that is personified by Satan in Hell, the low mental state of Generation that is personified by both Satan abandoning Hell and temporarily visiting Heaven and Adam being separated from Eve (the personification of his soul) to the high mental state of Beulah which is mirrored in the loving union of Adam and Eve both inside and outside the garden of Eden. This should be the context within which the identification and function of the various sources of Milton's artistic inspiration in *Paradise Lost* may be discussed, including the Kabbalistic work *Zohar*.[23]

Denis Saurat points out that Kabbalistic ideas have been known to Europe since the fifteenth century and have not been forgotten thanks to scholars such as Pico della Mirandola, Reuchlin, Agrippa, Cordovero, and

---

[21] John of Ruysbroeck, "The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage," in *John of Ruysbroeck: The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage, The Sparkling Stone, The Book of Supreme Truth*, trans. C. A. Wynschenk Dom and ed. Evelyn Underhill, 33, https://www.ccel.org/ccel/ruysbroeck/adornment.

[22] Milton refers to Christ's redeeming for humanity first coming as God's plan: "[…] Till one greater Man/Restore us, and regain the blissful seat" (Book I, lines 4-5). Humanity's status is elevated after the first coming of Christ, whose dual nature makes possible not only humanity's salvation but also humanity's perfection (Christlike/Godlike)—a continuous process that is taking place at present and will be completed in the future, during His second coming.

[23] Milton's purpose of spreading the news of man's capacity for deification is also evident in the felix culpa defining the end of *Paradise Lost*. Adam and Eve exit the garden of Eden in loving union, an allegory of man's being in union with his soul even after his fall. His union with his soul is the prerequisite toward the fulfilment of the Divine Promise (Logos) of Humanity's deification. The Divine Promise/Logos is manifested in Christ/Logos Who, through His incarnation, makes possible fallen man's redemption and theosis through the practice of man's free will. *Paradise Regained*, the sequel of *Paradise Lost*, illustrates, through Christ, man's partaking in the Divine (the Edenic state).

Loria and that European enthusiasm for Kabbalism was preserved during Milton's lifetime through the works of Joseph Voysin, Father Kircher, Robert Fludd, and the Cambridge Platonist Henry More.[24] He also comments that although Milton might not have believed in the sacredness of the *Zohar*, *Paradise Lost* includes three original ideas that are retrieved exclusively from the *Zohar*.[25] Saurat notices that in *Paradise Lost*, Book IX, lines 816-833, Eve expresses egoistic feelings of fear and jealousy after eating the forbidden fruit; she is uneasy with the thought of Adam having next to him another woman created by God. She decides to share the fruit with him because in comparison a lonely life or death due to exclusive access to knowledge is not worth living. Saurat notices that Milton's lines perfectly correspond to the following passage from the *Zohar*:

> The woman touched the tree. Then she saw the Angel of Death coming towards her, and thought: Perhaps I shall die and the Holy One, Blessed be He, will make another woman and give her to Adam. That must not happen. Let us live together or let us die together. And then she gave the fruit to her husband that he should eat it also. [26]

Indeed, the resemblance of the two passages—Book IX, lines 816-833 of *Paradise Lost* and the above excerpt from the *Zohar*—is striking, but Werblowsky differentiates between thirteenth-century Jewish Kabbalism, represented by the *Zohar*, and seventeenth-century Christian Kabbalism which attaches a Christian symbolic meaning to borrowed Jewish kabbalah elements. Most Christians of that time did not have direct contact with Jewish mysticism but copied material from their predecessors, such as Pico della Mirandola, Reuchlin, Riccius, and Knorr von Rosenroth.[27] Werblowsky brings the example of Henry More's statement, "'Christ is nothing but Moses unveiled'."[28] Unfortunately, Werblowsky's argument of the popularity of Christian—rather than Jewish—Kabbalism in Milton's time does not encourage readers to relate Christian Kabbalism to orthodox Christianity.

Still, having some knowledge of Christian mysticism in general and Patristic theology in particular, a reader may discern in this passage of the *Zohar* how significant it is for man to be in union with his soul to taste

---

[24] Saurat, "Milton and the 'Zohar'," 136.
[25] Ibid., 137.
[26] Ibid., 138.
[27] Werblowsky, "Milton and the Conjectura Cabbalistica," 91-92.
[28] Ibid., 92-93.

true life. The use of the word "husband" connotes marriage. In the fourth century, the Antiochene school used marriage imagery to speak about the hypostatic union of Christ (the dual nature of Christ). The same imagery was also used by the Antiochene school to talk about the union of Christ (the husband) with the Ecclesia/the Church (the wife).[29] The imagery of the union of a husband and wife is also preserved by Western Christian mystics to talk about the perfect state of the man who is in touch with his soul (his feminine part). Both the teachings of the Patristic tradition formed by the Alexandrian and Antiochene schools and those of Western Christian mysticism echo the teachings of Dionysius the Areopagite who advises, "We must then contemplate things Divine, after this Union, not after ourselves, but by our whole selves, standing out of our whole selves, and becoming wholly of God."[30] In the marriage (erotic relationship) of God and the believer, the latter unites with the divine through his soul/feminine side where Christ/Logos—man's essence—resides. The human soul's depiction as a female in the Eastern Patristic Christian discourse may be related to the "psyche," the Greek word for the soul that is a feminine noun. In *Metamorphoses*, the second-century Platonist Lucius Apuleius depicts Psyche as the wife of Eros and claims her

[29] Eastern Patristic theological discourse is analogical; God is sexless and genderless since He is beyond being and cannot be perceived by the human mind. Dionysius the Areopagite acknowledges the limitations of Symbolic theology, pointing out that God is the "Nameless" because "It previously embraced in Itself all things existing, absolutely and without limit" [Dionysius the Areopagite, "On Divine Names," in *Dionysius the Areopagite, Works (1897)*, trans. and comp. John Parker (London; Oxford: James Parker, 1897), 16, https://www.ccel.org/ccel/dionysius/works]. However, Dionysius also highlights the need of creation to celebrate the Creator in a respectful way through the use of "numerous beneficent Names of the uncalled and unnamed Deity" (Ibid., 17). Maybe the best evidence that Eastern Patristic theology uses analogical language is the use of God's name Logos. Although logos is primarily a masculine noun, its multiple meanings are expressed by both masculine and feminine nouns, including aitia/cause (feminine noun) connoting nous/mind (masculine noun) and sophia/wisdom (feminine noun), logos/speech (masculine noun), and diathiki/covenant (feminine noun) connoting charis/grace (feminine noun), agape/love (feminine noun), and Eros/love (masculine noun). Eastern Patristic theology, as well as Western Christian mysticism, celebrates both the masculine and feminine attributes of Christ. Christ as Logos (masculine noun) is the true life/zoe (feminine noun); He is the essence/ousia (feminine noun) and the divine will/energia (feminine noun). The Fathers portray the human soul as the female partner of Christ because to really exist, the human soul must submit to the will of God, that is, the essence of all creations.

[30] Dionysius the Areopagite, "On Divine Names," 55.

attaining immortality by Zeus; Apuleius's allegorical narration delivers the human soul's yearning for divine love.[31] The union of Psyche and Eros may be a source of inspiration for the Eastern Patristic theologians, who, speaking the Greek language and addressing a mainly Greek-speaking audience, deliver the Christian message of humanity's theosis in Christ through familiar imageries. Similarities may be drawn between Zeus and God the Father, Who makes the human soul immortal through His grace Logos/Christ; only through her union with Christ, the human soul may become immortal. Christ/Logos is the divine will to which the believer must submit, that is, God's will and the believer's will must be one. According to the Patristic Christian teachings, the relationship of the human soul and Christ is not a power relationship but a love relationship. Explaining the Eastern Patristic dogma of man's theosis, the seventh-century theologian and mystic Maximus the Confessor states that "each nature has its own real manifestation, possesses its own existence proper to itself, its own 'will,' even though the two are united in the person of the Word and the human will is subject in all things to the divine will."[32] In the Eastern Patristic discourse, will—free from any meaning attached to it by modern individualistic philosophy—means "energy," "the manifestation of *real existence*."[33]

Therefore, one's detachment from his soul results in his emotional and intellectual fragmentation because he distances himself from God/Christ. The fragmentation of the ideal Self results from the domination of ego/natural selfhood that leads man to spiritual death/nonexistence. In both passages—Book IX, lines 816-833 from *Paradise Lost* and its counterpart in the *Zohar*—a controlling Eve who contemplates on whether she should eat the fruit by herself or together with Adam is the female will, the personification of man's domination by his selfhood and therefore, a man alienated from the divine, the true life. In his ideal state, the man is harmoniously united with his soul (man's feminine part). The fragmentation of man—that is, his detachment from his soul—and his alienation from God and his divine state (ideal Self) caused by the domination of selfhood is, as has already been shown, the primary concern of Christian mysticism, as well as Milton's major concern.

Milton foreshadows the need for this union through the expression of Adam's preference for a shared life. Adam complains to God/Christ about

---

[31] Michael Grant and John Hazel, eds., *Who's Who in Classical Mythology* (NY: Routledge, 2006), 287-289.
[32] John Meyendorff, *St Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality*, trans. Adele Fiske (NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974), 41.
[33] Ibid., 41.

his loneliness although God has endowed him with all knowledge and has appointed him the master of all the subjects of "the garden of bliss" and all the earth:[34]

> I found not what methought I wanted still;
> […]
> And all this good to man, for whose well-being
> So amply, and with hands so liberal
> Thou hast provided all things: but with me
> I see not who partakes. In solitude
> What happiness, who can enjoy alone,
> Or all enjoying, what contentment find?
> […]
> […] of fellowship I speak
> Such as I seek, fit to participate
> All rational delight, wherein the brute
> Cannot be human consort; (Book VIII, lines 355, 361-366, 389-392)[35]

Adam yearns for a union, feeling that earthly possession and knowledge are not enough to satisfy him. Adam confesses that reason is enjoyed when he is in communion with his female consort. Milton uses the term "rational delight" in a playful, erotic way, encouraging his readers to associate it with "reason"—which, in Greek, is logos—to think of logos's multiple meanings, including speech, cause/creativity/productivity, and love, and finally to identify logos with the divine reason residing in man's soul, Christ, whose activation—according to the Patristic theologians and medieval Christian mystics—is the mental faculty man should employ to connect with God. Therefore, the union of Adam (man) and Eve (his psyche) corresponds to the marriage of God and man; Adam's yearning for a consort/his soul (psyche)/feminine side personifies his yearning to become Godlike/Christlike. The positive response of God to Adam's yearning for union validates the truth of his desire; a man who is in union with his soul is on the path to perfection.

The second exclusive element of the *Zohar* in Milton's *Paradise Lost* that Saurat points out is the marital relationship of Satan with his daughter Sin. This relationship is inspired by the well-established father-daughter form of incest present in Kabbalistic tales, including the *Zohar* in which "God himself has sexual intercourse with the Matrona, or Shekhina, his daughter."[36] Within a Christian context, the portrayal of man's soul as a

---

[34] See *Paradise Lost*, Book VIII, lines 299, 319, 338-348.
[35] Milton, "Paradise Lost," 189-190.
[36] Saurat, "Milton and the 'Zohar'," 139.

"daughter" symbolizes his becoming his ideal Self and the portrayal of man's soul as a "bride" symbolizes man's membership to the Divine body.[37] That the outcome of Satan and Sin's union is monstrous symbolizes the falsehood experienced by a man when he is dominated by his ego/natural reason since he has distanced himself from both his true Self and God.

Saurat traces a third common feature between Milton's *Paradise Lost* and the *Zohar* that is related to the role of chaos, quoting from Book II, line 911: "[Chaos is] The womb of Nature and perhaps her grave."[38] According to Saurat, the *Zohar* speaks of many worlds that were created and destroyed by God. Saurat thinks that through the mentioning of Chaos and its destroyed worlds, Milton warns about the possibility of our world's destruction if we do not serve our purpose. Saurat also claims that Milton wants to stress God's free will to act creatively the way He wants.[39] However, within a Christian context, because the omnipotence of Divine Will is unquestionable, theological discourse focuses on man's free will. The notion of God's will to destroy creations may indeed shock Milton's Christian audience whose God, far from being a vindictive God, is seen essentially as a loving Creator. Divine creativity closely related to God's love for his creations is the divine attribute emphasized above all in the relationship of God and man upon which Patristic theologians dwell. The fourth-century Athanasius of Alexandria, who made a major contribution to the shaping of the Christological and Soteriological doctrines officially accepted by the early Christian Church, explains the response of God to fallen humanity:

> […] What then was God, being Good, to do? Was He to let corruption and death have their way with them? In that case, what was the use of having made them in the beginning? Surely it would have been better never to have been created at all than, having been created, to be neglected and perish; and, besides that, such indifference to the ruin of His own work before His very eyes would argue not goodness in God but limitation, and that far more than if He had never created man at all. It was impossible, therefore, that God should leave man to be carried off by corruption, because it would be unfitting and unworthy of Himself (2:6).[40]

---

[37] Like Milton, William Blake does something similar in *Jerusalem*, where at the beginning, Jerusalem/man's emanation/soul appears as his alienated wife and, later in the poem, she becomes his daughter given to Christ as His bride.
[38] Saurat, "Milton and the 'Zohar'," 140.
[39] Ibid., 141.
[40] Athanasius of Alexandria, *On the Incarnation of the Word* (https://www.ccel.org/ccel/athanasius/incarnation/html).

The meaning of Saurat's chosen line from Book II must not contradict any other passage in *Paradise Lost*, including the following lines from Book VII, in which the angelic choir praises God by uttering: "[…] but to create/ Is greater than created to destroy./ Who can impair thee, mighty king, or bound/ Thy empire? […]/ […] his evil/ Thou usest, and from thence creat'st more good" (Lines 606-609, 615-616).[41] If a reader places these two passages of *Paradise Lost* side by side, he/she receives a complete orthodox Christian message. Saurat's choice of the specific line from Book II of *Paradise Lost* echoes Milton's eschatological concerns, but these are of a Christian nature. An orthodox Christian understanding of Saurat's chosen line from Book II may be traced to Dionysius the Areopagite's words, "All things are from Him, and to Him."[42] John of Ruysbroeck echoes the Patristic theologian when he states:

> The time which is fitting for this coming is the hour of death, and the Last Judgment of all men. When God created the soul out of nothing and united it with the body, He set a fixed day and a fixed hour known only to Him, when it should have to give up temporal things and to appear in His presence.[43]

In Patristic theology, the obscurity and darkness of "Chaos" have the negative connotations of confusion and perplexion only when addressing man's fallen mental state (Ulro/Generation), viz., when man willingly detaches himself from God, being permeated by ego/self-love. In contrast, when "Chaos" refers to God, it becomes part of the diction used in apophatic theology (negative theology) and relates to His unrevealed, unknown, and ineffable side and our agnosia[44] of Him. Dionysius the Areopagite advocates, "the most Divine Knowledge of Almighty God, which is known, through not knowing (agnosia) during the union above the mind."[45] He further claims that negative diction is more proper when we address the divine because "It [God] is above every essence and life,"[46] and he notes, "Not even one of the things existing is altogether deprived of participation in the beautiful, since, […] all things are very beautiful."[47] In other words, everything that the super-essential God has created is good,

---

[41] Milton, "Paradise Lost," 179.
[42] Dionysius the Areopagite, "On the Heavenly Hierarchy," 141.
[43] John of Ruysbroeck, "The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage," 35.
[44] To unite with God, we must surrender our knowledge of Him.
[45] Dionysius the Areopagite, "On Divine Names," 57.
[46] Dionysius the Areopagite, "On the Heavenly Hierarchy," 145.
[47] Ibid., 145.

including evil. Milton embraces Dionysius the Areopagite's view when, in Book VII, the angels differentiate between the essence of God (the Creator) and Satan (the created) and confirm the goodness of the destructive Satan, thus indirectly also acknowledging that all creatures of God are of divine essence—that is, whether good or evil, all turn to be good. Dionysius the Areopagite explains that all creations of God are known by Him before their existence because they are of His essence, the cause of the existence of all:

> 'He, knowing all things, before their birth.' For, not as learning existing things from existing things, does the Divine Mind know, but from Itself, and in Itself, as Cause, it pre-holds and pre-comprehends the notion and knowledge, and essence of all things.[48]

The popularity of mysticism in Milton's times is not inimical to orthodox Christianity. In contrast, it fosters the harmonious union of orthodox Christianity's advocacy of the potential theosis of humanity beyond the latter's salvation and the seventeenth-century intellectual spirit's nurturing of the upcoming age of reason by foregrounding the potential of the use of human intellect for the satisfactory apprehension of the truth. Mysticism is an integral and inseparable part of the orthodox Christian tradition, ensuring the survival of orthodox Christian tradition throughout the centuries, even after the physical fragmentation of the initially unified Christian Church. William Philip Downes observes that "as the state cannot live without the idealist, so the church would die without the mystic. It is the mystic that always saves the church."[49] Although some readers may not wish to read *Paradise Lost* as an example of a zealous Christian using his worldly calling for the spiritual revitalization of his Christian fellowmen, they cannot ignore Milton's identity as an enthusiastic mystic, and a mystic is primarily a humanist, one who aspires to humanity's ideal state. Downes remarks, "'All mystics speak the same language and come from the same country'."[50] Interpretations of *Paradise Lost* that acknowledge the intertextual nature of orthodox Christian mysticism not only endow the poem with vivacity and color and make the poem's reading an exciting adventure but also, and above all, contribute to the strengthening of a unified humanity's yearning for the fulfillment of man's potential deification.

---

[48] Dionysius the Areopagite, "On Divine Names," 56.
[49] William Philip Downes, "Mysticism," *The Biblical World* 54, no. 6 (1920): 619, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3136208.
[50] Ibid., 620.

References

Athanasius, Alexandria of. *On the Incarnation of the Word*. https://www.ccel.org/ccel/athanasius/incarnation/html.

Carus, Paul. "Gnosticism in Its Relation to Christianity." *The Monist* 8, no. 4 (1898): 502-546. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27897524.

Curry, Walter Clyde. "Milton's Chaos and Old Night." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 46, no.1 (1947): 38-52. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27712836.

Dionysius, Areopagite the. "On the Heavenly Hierarchy." In *Dionysius the Areopagite, Works (1897)*, translated and compiled by John Parker, 140-178. London; Oxford: James Parker and Co, 1897. https://www.ccel.org/ccel/dionysius/works.

Dionysius, Areopagite the. "On Divine Names." In *Dionysius the Areopagite, Works (1897)*, translated and compiled by John Parker, 12-77. London; Oxford: James Parker and Co, 1897. https://www.ccel.org/ccel/dionysius/works.

Downes, William Philip. "Mysticism." *The Biblical World* 54, no. 6 (1920): 619-624. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3136208.

Grant, Michael and John Hazel, eds. *Who's Who in Classical Mythology*. NY: Routledge, 2006.

John, of Ruysbroeck. "The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage." In *John of Ruysbroeck: The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage, The Sparkling Stone, The Book of Supreme Truth*, translated by C. A. Wynschenk Dom and edited by Evelyn Underhill, 21-164. https://www.ccel.org/ccel/ruysbroeck/adornment.

McGrath, Alister E. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*. 5th ed. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Meyendorff, John. *St Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality*, translated by Adele Fiske. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974.

Milton, John. "Paradise Lost." In *Paradise Lost: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds, and Sources Criticism*. 2nd ed. Edited by Scott Elledge, 6-301. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1993.

Parker, John. "Dionysius the Areopagite and the Alexandrine School." In *Dionysius the Areopagite, Works (1897)*, translated and compiled by John Parker, 132-139. London; Oxford: James Parker and Co, 1897. https://www.ccel.org/ccel/dionysius/works.

Saurat, Denis. "Milton and the 'Zohar'." *Studies in Philology* 19, no. 2 (1922): 136-151. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4171822.

Werblowsky, Zwi R. J. "Milton and the Conjectura Cabbalistica." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 18, no. 1/2 (1955): 90-113. http://www.jstor.org/stable/750289.

CHAPTER TWO

A STUDY ON LORD BYRON'S *CAIN: A MYSTERY* AND FEDERICO GARCIA LORCA'S *BLOOD WEDDING*

ONUR EKLER

Sublime moments occur when one is overwhelmed by the sudden, immediate realization of the fact that one's essence is of the chaosmic energy, released out of the perpetual fight between one's opposing forces in one's mind and body. This formless, raw energy, which constitutes the paradoxical basis of a human being, is the driving force behind one's creative and destructive acts. In this study, Byron's *Cain: A Mystery* and Lorca's *Blood Wedding* are mainly discussed as two noteworthy examples that corroborate the argument about how chaosmic energy is trapped and repressed in the social settings that see the boundless energy of the Self as a potential threat to the system. This study also focuses on the struggle of Cain and Leonardo each of whom is a "terrible beauty" that strives to let the trapped energy flow freely into the fissured chamber of the existing society. Though not necessarily a comparative one, this study aims to trace the dis-organization of the body in social and religious levels by drawing parallelism in the playwrights' perception of chaosmic energy of the Self.

There have been different interpretations made by various scholars on chaosmic energy. Some perceive it as the true nature of the Self; others regard it as a potential danger that has to be eradicated for the goodness of community. Artaud compares the chaosmic energy to "a body without organs,"[1] a term borrowed later by Deleuze and Guattari. For Artaud, it is the body outside the castrating law that has life and energy. He justifies this point with these lines:

---

[1] Antonin Artaud, *Selected Writings*, trans. Susan Sontag (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 571.

> There is nothing more useless than an organ.
> When you will have made him a body without organs,
> then you will have delivered him from all his automatic reactions
> and restored him to his true freedom.[2]

Deleuze and Guattari borrow the term "BWO" and define it as free-flowing, unrestrained energy, which is always in the process of becoming. It functions in a way to de-stratify, de-personalize, and to dis-organize the body by setting it free from any form of an organism.

This sort of energy may be liberating, but—as Bertalanffy observes in his *General System Theory*—the modern world is inclined to see it as a potential threat for its functioning system.[3] The system attempts to control every sphere of life lest any kind of individual acts should be threatening. Bertalanffy argues that the Self with such unpredictable energy may harm the system. Therefore, it must be canalized, engineered through the functioning understanding of the capitalist system. To his system theory, the Self is self-regulating machinery like computers. It has to be "mechanized, conformist, controlled and standardized."[4] Similarly, Sorokin, another social theorist, compares the Self to a cogwheel in the system that can easily be controlled by the dominating forces in the society.[5] Kennedy defines the fact of having to act in such predetermined roles, controlled by the society as "the protean Self"[6] The romantic Self, whose essence is formless, chaosmic energy, is considered an inappropriate entity for this functioning system. Thus, social systems have designed their structures in such a way to rehabilitate the rebellious individual. Such systems also consider that the flexible notions of the Self that celebrate multiplicity pose a huge threat to the big machine. Therefore, it is the system that tries to familiarize the individual with the possibilities of a protean mode of the Self and existence. Because of this notion, the individuals are canalized into predetermined spaces and roles by the totalizing institutions of the society.

To Artaud, yielding to such a controlling mechanism is one's suicide: "If I commit suicide, it will not be to destroy myself but to put myself

---

[2] Ibid., 571.
[3] Ludwig von Bertalanffy, *General System Theory* (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1973), 13.
[4] Ibid., 13.
[5] P. A Sorokin, *Sociological Theories of Today* (New York/London: Harper& Row, 1966), 558.
[6] Alan Kennedy, *The Protean Self: Dramatic Action in Contemporary Fiction* (London: Macmillan International Higher Education, 1974), 4-6.

back together again […] I free myself from the conditioned reflexes of my organs."[7] Likewise, Deleuze and Guattari see this functioning system as an enemy to BWO.[8] They argue that one can't apprehend the multiplicities within BWO unless the recoiling organization over the body is dissolved:

> "The BWO howls: They have made me an organism! They have wrongfully folded me! They have stolen my body! The judgement of God […] makes it an organism, a signification, a subject."[9]

The individual reciprocally sees the protean mode of the Self that is controlled by the system as a threat to his uniqueness. With its ideological apparatuses, the functioning systems canalize the people into the predetermined spheres and turn them to the willing prisoners in the blocks of civilization that is built upon some hegemonic and hierarchal orders. Ironically, over time, the people unconsciously become the volunteer army of the rehabilitation institutes of these functioning systems. Also, their willingness to act in the predetermined roles in the society unconsciously interrupts the dynamic relation between the de-structuring and re-structuring functions of the mind, which in turn suffices to subdue the unbridled energy of the individual in the social world. Thus, the free-flowing desire of the individual becomes one of the discontents that have to be repressed for the sake of the seemingly symmetrical order of the systems.

However, one weakness characterizing such rigid systems with the ossified principles is their fragility. The self-liberating energy leaks into any possible cracks of these rigid systems, gradually worn-off in time. However, the ones who have such higher consciousness are usually stigmatized by the existing societies as distorted and deformed figures. Their transgressions cause them to be ostracized, castrated, and emasculated by the guardians of the system. They become monsters, the grotesque in their contemporary societies as well as the sublime figures to future generations. The Greek term to characterize their ambiguous situation is "deinos,"[10] which means both repellent and admirable. They are, to use

---

[7] Antonin Artaud, *Artaud Anthology* (City Lights Books, 1965), 56.
[8] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Bloomsbury Publishing, 1988), 176.
[9] Ibid., 176.
[10] Bernard M. W. Knox, *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* (London: University of California Press, 1964), 23.

Yeats's words, a "terrible beauty"[11] that might disorganize the body. In this context, both Byron's Cain and Lorca's Leonardo are a "terrible beauty" aware of the unrestrained energy, repressed by the existing hegemonic order. Their rebellious acts enable them to find out the formless energy beyond the received forms and norms of the existing society.

The irony in the struggle between the individual and the functioning system lies in the realization that mankind creates the functioning system, which would eventually imprison oneself. As Popper argues in *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, men who call themselves the social engineers have designed the system in a way so as not to give any space for individualistic acts. Popper calls Plato one of the earliest social engineers. He labels him as an enemy to open society because of Plato's attack on the uncontrollable acts of the individuals in the following lines:

> The greatest principle of all is that nobody, whether male, or female should be without a leader. Nor should the mind of anybody be habituated to letting him do anything at all on his own initiative; neither out of zeal, nor even playfully […] In a word, he should teach his soul, by long habit, never to dream of acting independently, and to become utterly incapable of it.[12]

The perpetual war between the defenders and the enemies of the open society is not a new phenomenon. It dates back to the earliest times in the history of mankind since this ongoing fight arises as to the reflection of the internal warring forces within man's mind. For these warring forces, Nietzsche coins two terms in *The Birth of Tragedy*, the etymological origins of which are two Greek deities, Apollo and Dionysus. Nietzsche defines them as two opposing forces in perpetual antagonism in art, man, and life. The Apollonian is the symbolical reflection of illusion, individuation, form, and restraint. On the contrary, the Dionysian is the primordial formless state. Nietzsche claims that both forces are in ceaseless conflict with each other.[13] This paradoxical relation as Popper argues is the source of life. However, the problem in the functioning systems is that the Apollonian force prevails over the Dionysian force since the Self-ordained Dionysian force is not desired in the machine-like structures. One can observe this mechanic network in the eighteenth century, also called the

---

[11] William Butler Yeats, *Easter, 1916 and Other Poems* (Mineola: Dover Publications, Inc, 1997).

[12] Karl R. Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies* Vol.1 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), 16.

[13] Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, trans. Douglas Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 10-16.

Enlightenment period. The mechanic aesthetic of the rationalists hated the boundless energy of the Renaissance man, so they were on the quest for a complete, precise, and symmetrical vision of things.[14] The annihilation of the individual acts in the functional systems that have dominated Europe since the Enlightenment has led to the fierce philosophical and artistic rebellions in the following centuries.

The primary artistic mode of reaction is romantic irony. Schlegel introduces the Self-evolving system in his famous fragments. To Schlegel, the romantic irony is a way of thinking about the world that embraces change and process.[15] Schlegel ontologically sees the world as chaotic.[16] However, this chaos has an eternal flux of forms, always flowing into new ones and new creations. Schlegel sees the impotency in the rational image that is symmetrically reflected in the flat mirror. He replaces the flat mirror with a convex mirror since he realizes the abundant fertile land of the chaotic universe. The romantic ironist attempts to see the beauty in the teeming chaosmic energy and not the light of reason. The clear image becomes diffused and distorted. The crack in the "camera obscura"—the mind of the artist—causes distorted images of situations and characters and chaotic scenery. The Romantics' introduction of distorted figures and chaotic situations were harsh reactions against the controlling mechanisms. Their focus is on the romantic ironic Self that celebrates the chaosmic energy spreading out of the tension between the opposing forces. With this notion, the drastic change in taste and beauty made the grotesque figures both repellent and admirable at the same time even though the guardians of the system called them demonic. As Schock notes, the romantic hero displays several distinguishing attributes of this so-called demonic tradition and, in many ways, can be considered a rebel. This figure is an unconventional hero, dangerous, and destructive but attractive because he is greater than life.[17]

Byron himself—like his mouthpiece Cain—is a sort of deinos that is a sum of paradoxes. In Bloom's description, Byron is the embodiment of opposing forces. Byron "incarnated countless contradictions of thought

---

[14] M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and The Lamp* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953), 17-20.

[15] Friedrich von Schlegel, *Dialogue on Poetry and Literary Aphorisms* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1968), 54.

[16] Anne K. Mellor, *English Romantic Irony* (Harvard University Press, 1980), 7.

[17] Peter A. Schock, *Romantic Satanism: Myth and the Historical Moment in Blake, Shelley and Byron* (Springer, 2003), 143-160.

and feeling. He bewildered and fascinated his contemporaries."[18] Though he was a nobleman who was supposedly in the Tories' side in the parliament, most critics labelled him as "a poet on the Left."[19] The inspirational source of his poetry is his revolutionary side, that is, his enthusiasm to redeem the individual from any sort of oppression, restraint, and authority. Dowden similarly notes that Byron glorifies all revolters against the social order. He also adds that "His mockery was a dissolvent of accepted conventions and traditional manners and morals."[20] In his works, Byron portrays his protagonists with some common attributes, which would label him as the originator of the Byronic hero. This romantic hero/heroine fights against the tyrannical order and has a distaste for the socially imposed roles. S/he is an outsider, a wanderer, and an exile. S/he is inclined to act transgressively. S/he suffers from gigantic passions and tends to be self-destructive. Overall, the Byronic hero gives the utmost value to the autonomous individual above others. In his influential study on Byron and Goethe, Mazzini defines the Byronic hero as the unbridled Self that manifests himself "in all its pride of power, freedom and desire […] the world around him neither rules nor tempers him. The Byronic Self aspires to rule it."[21] Manfred, arguably one of the best Byronic heroes, depicts the autonomous individual in these fascinating lines:

> The mind, which is immortal, makes itself
> Requital for its good and evil thoughts—
> Is its own origin of ill, and end—
> And its own place and time, its innate sense
> […]
> Born from the knowledge of its own desert.[22]

As the lines above imply, Manfred fully bears the responsibility of his actions free from all external/spiritual powers that would supposedly reign over his will. His Self-referential dramatic speech over the individual consciousness is the reverberating theme that echoes through Byron's oeuvre.

---

[18] Harold Bloom, ed., *George Gordon, Lord Byron* (New York: Infobase Publishing, 2009), X.
[19] Ibid., Xiii.
[20] İbid., 113.
[21] Guisseppe Mazzini, "On Byron and Liberty" in *Lord Byron: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Andrew Rutherford (Routledge, 2013), 331.
[22] George Gordon Byron Lord, *Manfred, A Dramatic Poem* (London: John Murray, 1817), 74.

The eponymous protagonist, Cain, like Manfred, features the Byronic hero as the measure of one's existence in Byron's closet play *Cain: A Mystery*, published in 1822. It attracted some controversial reviews upon its publication. Thomas Moore comments on the play in one of his letters to Byron: "Cain is wonderful—terrible—never to be forgotten."[23] Eckermann delivers Goethe's praise of the play with these words: "How the inadequate dogmas of the church work upon a free mind like Byron's, and how by such a piece he struggles to get rid of a doctrine which has been forced upon him."[24] Still, some reviewers fiercely attacked Byron's play. An anonymous reviewer sees the play as "an heinous offence against the society."[25] William Blake calls Byron's play blasphemous since he regards it as an attack against the justice of God.[26] To Franklin, these fierce attacks made the play censored and labeled Byron a representative of the so-called Satanic school.[27]

Byron's de-familiarization of the biblical story is his deliberate intention to voice out the annihilating forces of the arborescent system that suppresses one's free-flowing energy. Self-redemption from the imposed roles is inevitable despite the challenging path. Byron's understanding of freedom here is quite similar to Schelling's account of freedom in his *Ages of the World*. To Schelling, the path to freedom passes through one's awareness of the terror and evil hidden in one's dark chamber.[28] That is, the consciousness of the disease[29] in one's mind through one's rupture from one's unconscious roles in society leads one to one's highest potentiality to achieve freedom.

The dis-eased Cain's awareness of the disease in his community lines Byron with Schelling in terms of the concept of freedom. One can easily notice that all the characters surrounding Cain act in the predetermined roles. The camera is so fixed and limited that all the characters but for Cain are canalized through the fixed paths.

---

[23] Thomas Moore, *The Letters of Thomas Moore*, ed. Wilfred Sellers Dowden (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), **quoted in** Andrew Rutherford, *Lord Byron: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge, 2013), 214.

[24] Johann Peter Eckermann, *Conversations with Goethe* (North Carolina: Lulu Press, Inc, 2016), **quoted in** Harold Bloom, ed., *George Gordon, Lord Byron* (New York: Infobase Publishing, 2009), 275.

[25] Ibid., 265.

[26] Ibid., 266.

[27] Caroline Franklin, *Byron* (London, Routledge, 2006), 23.

[28] Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, *The Ages of the World* (Columbia University Press, 1942), 175.

[29] Schellling equates evil and terror with disease in his book.