

EARLY MODERN LITERARY STUDIES



Milton's Image of the Tartar: 'Global Leviathan' vs. 'Global Commonwealth'

Mingjun Lu

University of Toronto

mingjun.lu@mail.utoronto.ca

The image of empire features prominently in Milton's epic poems. As is shown in Satan's offer of Parthia and Rome, the 'temptation of empire' is a major theme of *Paradise Regained*.¹ Similarly, in *Paradise Lost* a chief aim of Satan's venture to Eden is to '[Divide] Empire with Heav'n's King' (4.111).² Miltonic empire is a controversial image that has absorbed much critical energy. As Sharon Achinstein notes, most critics focus on identifying Milton's anti-or pro-empire tendencies, studying 'whether, and at what time, and in what ways, Milton opposed empire.'³ Robert Fallon denies Milton's endorsement of imperialism before the Restoration, but he concedes that 'the image of empire may well have suggested to the poet a paradigm for the political framework of his great epics.'⁴ Bruce McLeod maintains that England's absence and Rome's fleeting appearance in

This article has benefited abundantly from comments provided by Elizabeth D. Harvey, Mary Nyquist, and David Galbraith. My special thanks go to Elizabeth who first encouraged this project. I am also grateful to David Porter for his insightful input and to Esther de Bruijn for her helpful proofreading. This article was made possible through the generous support of a SSHRC Canadian Graduate Scholarship and the SSHRC William Taylor special award.

¹ Balachandra Rajan, 'The Imperial Temptation', in *Milton and the Imperial Vision*, ed. by Rajan and Elizabeth Sauer (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne UP, 1999), pp. 294-314. All quotes from Milton's poetry come from *John Milton, Complete Poems and Major Works*, ed. by Merritt Y. Hughes (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1957, reprint, 2003). All quotes from Milton's prose work are taken from *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. by Don M. Wolfe et. al., 8 vols. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1953-82), hereafter designated as 'YP' and cited parenthetically by volume and page number.

² Robert M. Fallon, *Divided Empire: Milton's Political Imagery* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State UP, 1995).

³ Sharon Achinstein, 'Imperial Dialectic: Milton and Conquered peoples', in *Milton and the Imperial Vision*, ed. by Rajan and Sauer, pp. 67-89 (p. 69).

⁴ Fallon, 'Cromwell, Milton, and the Western Design', in *Milton and the Imperial Vision*, ed. by Rajan and Sauer, pp. 133-54 (p. 153).

Adam's historical survey in book XI indicate that Milton locates the 'Lordly eye' in England and 'is (re)producing the space of empire from an imperial view point.'⁵ In contrast, David Quint holds that Milton's epic poem presents 'an indictment of European expansion and colonialism that includes his own countrymen.'⁶ Similarly, David Armitage argues that though Milton 'produce[d] an epic whose secondary narrative was of Satan's exploration and colonization of a new world,' the poet's 'continuing commitment to the political program of English humanism ensured that this would be a consciously anti-imperial epic.'⁷

A major problem with this scholarship is that critics tend to use the umbrella concept 'imperial' to describe Milton's image of empire. In fact, Milton differentiates between the empire as it is represented by Satan and Chaos and the spiritual empire registered in the rule of the Son or Jesus Christ. Whereas Satan and Chaos aspire to imperial expansion and conquest, the Son symbolizes a kind of spiritual and ethical rule. Since the two forms of sovereignty represented in Milton's epic poems aim at universal rather than regional or national governance, I use the framework of globalization/cosmopolitan theory to study Milton's conception of empire.⁸

Modern globalization theory contrasts 'empire' with 'cosmopolis.' According to the *OED*, *empire* means both 'imperial rule' and 'an extensive territory (esp. an aggregate of many separate states) under the sway of an emperor or supreme ruler.' Originating from the Roman *imperium*, the adjective 'imperial' denotes literally what pertains to an empire, and figuratively the supreme authority to rule and command subject territories. *Cosmopolis* comes from 'cosmopolite,' a word that indicates a 'citizen of the world' or 'one who

⁵ Bruce McLeod, 'The "Lordly eye": Milton and the Strategic Geography of Empire', in *Milton and the Imperial Vision*, ed. by Rajan and Sauer, pp. 48-66 (pp. 57, 63). For the imperial approach see also John Martin Evans, *Milton's Imperial Epic: Paradise Lost and the Discourse of Colonialism* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1996); Andrew Hadfield, 'The English and Other Peoples', in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. by Thomas N. Corns (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 174-90; and Willy Maley, *Nation, State, and Empire in English Renaissance Literature: Shakespeare to Milton* (New York: Palgrave, 2003).

⁶ David Quint, *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993), p. 265.

⁷ David Armitage, 'Literature and Empire', in *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, ed. by Roger Louis, vol. 1. *The Origins of Empire: British overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Canny and Elaine Low (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998), pp. 120-21; see also David Armitage, 'John Milton: Poet against Empire', in *Milton and Republicanism*, ed. by David Armitage and others (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995), pp. 206-26. For the anti-imperial approach also see J. P. Conlan, "'Paradise Lost': Milton's Anti-Imperial Epic', *Pacific Coast Philology*, 33.1(1998), 31-43.

⁸ For the globalization approach to Milton see Julie S. Peters, 'A "Bridge over Chaos": *De Jure Belli, Paradise Lost*, Terror, Sovereignty, Globalism, and the Modern Law of Nations', *Comparative Literature* 57.4 (2005), 273-93.

regards or treats the whole world as his country.’ Barry Gills argues that though both cosmopolis and empire express ‘an idea of human unity and community,’ they nevertheless ‘represent two antithetical conceptions and practices of world-consciousness and world order.’⁹ Whereas empire means ‘the naked pursuit of power and wealth,’ Gill says, cosmopolis signifies ‘our spiritual side and our quest for harmony, moral order, and community.’¹⁰ Fred Dallmayr also compares cosmopolis with empire, arguing that the ‘juncture of radical state autonomy and globalization’ ‘gives rise to two opposing tendencies’:

on the one hand, the ambitions of empire where globalization is subjected to global sovereignty (a global Leviathan); on the other side, a democratic cosmopolis (global commonwealth) achieved through the subordination of sovereignty to global interdependence.

Dallmayr defines ‘a global Leviathan’ as ‘the extension of political and military power beyond the scope of the metropolitan homeland, that is, the wielding of dominion over foreign territories inhabited by non-citizen populations.’ By comparison, ‘a global commonwealth’ is an institution that ‘embrac[es] different cultures and societies and [is] held together not by a central Leviathan but by lateral connections and bonds of cultural and political interdependence.’¹¹

But empire and cosmopolis are not ‘antithetical’ for those who seek to define empire in terms of cosmopolitanism, that is, as a juridical and ethical rather than imperial concept. Adam Watson maintains that ‘ethnic and civic loyalties increasingly found their place within an imperial political and cultural horizon.’¹² In their controversial work *Empire*, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri also claim that ‘the classical concept of empire united juridical categories and universal ethical values, making them work together as an organic whole.’¹³ In a globalized world, Hardt and Negri argue, ‘sovereignty has taken on a new form, composed of a series of national and supranational organisms united under a single logic of rule.’ The two authors give this ‘new global form of sovereignty’ the name of

⁹ Barry K. Gills, “‘Empire’ versus ‘Cosmopolis’: The Clash of Globalizations”, in *The Global Politics of Globalization: ‘Empire’ vs ‘Cosmopolis’*, ed. by Barry K. Gills (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), pp. 5-13 (p. 5)

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 9.

¹¹ Fred Dallmayr, ‘Empire or Cosmopolis? Civilization at the Crossroads’, in *The Global Politics of Globalization*, ed. by Gills, pp. 14-30 (pp. 15, 16, 26).

¹² Adam Watson, *The Evolution of International Society: A Comparative, Historical Analysis*, introd. Barry Buzan and Richard Little (London: Routledge, 2009), p. 102.

¹³ Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2000), p. 10.

‘empire,’ defining it as a ‘global concept under the direction of a single conductor, a unitary power that maintains the social peace and produces its ethical truths.’ The reason they choose ‘empire’ to designate the new authority in a global age is that, Hardt and Negri explain, though ‘every juridical system is in some way a crystallization of a specific set of values,’ empire ‘pushes the coincidence and universality of the ethical and juridical to the extreme.’¹⁴ Andrew Jones calls Hardt and Negri’s new governance structure ‘globalization-as-empire,’¹⁵ but I will call it a *cosmopolitan empire* on account of the emphasis they put on its social and ethical capacities, attributes that signal a ‘cosmopolitan will’ to embrace and ‘engage human diversity.’¹⁶ The two aspects of empire, that is, its imperial and cosmopolitan implications, are exemplified in the rule of Rome—the Roman Empire not only dominated but also showed considerable tolerance towards the cultural diversities it contained. In truth, as is argued by Amy Chua, in their rise to ‘global hegemony,’ almost all empires in history were noted for their remarkable ‘tolerance’ of various religions and nationals subsumed under the imperial rules.¹⁷

This essay adopts at once an anti-and pro-empire position. Drawing upon both the ‘imperial’ and ‘cosmopolitan’ definitions of empire in globalization theory, I argue that Milton conceives both a ‘global Leviathan’ and a ‘global commonwealth’ in his epic poems. According to Julie S. Peters:

From the Hill of Paradise Michael not only gives Adam a vision of the whole expanse of human history, with its lessons about *failed empire*, but also shows him the whole expanse of human geography—the great ‘Hemisphere of earth.../ Strecht out to the amplest reach’ (11.379-80), with its promise of *happy empire*.¹⁸

Whereas the ‘failed empire’ described by Peters reflects the ‘Global Leviathan,’ the ‘happy empire’ is manifested in the ‘global commonwealth’ symbolized in the Son’s rule. Specifically, while representing the ‘global Leviathan’ in the imperial ambitions of Satan, Chaos, and God, Milton imagines the ‘global commonwealth’ in the rule of Son. What Milton opposes is the ‘imperial’ empire, and what he champions is a ‘cosmopolitan’ empire. On the one hand, what is fought for between God, Satan, and Chaos is imperial hegemony

¹⁴ Hardt and Negri, *Empire*, pp. xi, xii, 10.

¹⁵ Andrew Jones, *Globalization: Key Thinkers* (Cambridge: Polity, 2010), p. 206.

¹⁶ David Hollinger, *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism* (New York: Harper, 1995), p. 84.

¹⁷ Amy Chua, *How Hyperpowers Rise to Global Dominance – and Why They Fall* (New York: Doubleday, 2007), p. xxi.

¹⁸ Peters, ‘Bridge over Chaos’, p. 278, my italics.

or a 'global leviathan.' God is determined to defend his 'ancient' 'claim / of Deity or Empire' (5.723-24) against the 'rebellious crew' (4.952), and after the heavenly war he seeks to 'over Hell extend / His Empire' (2.325-26). Satan also targets 'Imperial Sov'ranty' (2.446). Not satisfied with 'build[ing]' a 'growing Empire' in Hell (2.315), Satan aspires to '[divide] Empire with Heav'n's King.' Chaos participates in the imperial rivalry by allying himself with Satan, accepting Satan's offer to help 'reduce' the created world to 'her original darkness' and 'once more / Erect the Standard there of *ancient Night*' (2.983-86). All these endeavors evince an imperial ambition for universal lordship, attempts that are deemed by Milton as 'Hatching vain Empires' (2.378).

One prototype for Milton's idea of a 'global Leviathan' is, I claim, the empire built by the Mongol Tartars. Milton associates both Satan and his crew and Chaos with the figure of the Tartar in *Paradise Lost*. Satan, when making his way to Eden, is likened to 'the roving *Tartar*' 'dislodging from a Region scarce of prey' (3.432-33). Book X speaks of the wandering of the fallen angels as the 'retir[ing]' of 'the *Tartar* from his Russian Foe' (10.431-33). The inassimilable chaos amidst God's creation is compared to 'The black tartareous cold Infernal dregs / Adverse to life' (7.238-39), and it is the gunpowder made of 'Tartarean Sulphur' (2.69) that enables the rebellious angels to achieve a decisive balance with the heavenly army and to premeditate further wars against God in the 'great consult' (1.798). Most critics link Milton's Tartars with Muslim Sultans in the Middle and Near East.¹⁹ Eric Song proves to be an exception in tracing the origin of Milton's Tartarian image to Tartary.²⁰ For Song, Milton 'deploy[s] the figure of the Tartar both to question the stability of political order based upon exclusion and conquest and to advance a critique of expansionist ambitions underwritten by any sense of national ascendancy.'²¹ I argue for the Tartarian source of Satan and Chaos as well, but whereas Song focuses on its significance to Milton's conception of national politics and culture, I study its relevance to his imagination of global governance. Milton's Tartars most powerfully evoke, I shall show, the whole Mongol empire founded by Genghis Khan (1162-1227) and his descendents, a world empire that encompassed within its vast boundaries not only the Middle and Near East but

¹⁹ See John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. by Alastair Fowler (London: Longman, 1998), p. 563 and Stevie Davies, *Images of Kingship in Paradise Lost: Milton's Politics and Christian Liberty* (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1983), pp. 51-88.

²⁰ Eric B. Song, 'Nation, Empire, and the Strange Fire of the Tartars in Milton's Poetry and Prose', *Milton Studies* 47 (2008), 119-44. For Milton's Tartars see also Michael Bryson, "'His Tyranny Who Begins": the Biblical Roots of Divine Kingship and Milton's Rejection of Heaven's King', *Milton Studies* 43 (2004), 111-44. 'Tartary' refers to the vast area under the Mongol rule; see Richard W. Cogley, "'The Most Vile and Barbarous Nation of all the World": Giles Fletcher the Elder's *The Tartars Or, Ten Tribes* (ca.1610)', *Renaissance Quarterly* 58.3 (2005), 781-814 (pp. 796-7).

²¹ Song, 'Strange Fire', p. 120.

also the Far East and part of Europe.²²

For early modern Europeans, the word ‘Tartar’ called to mind at once the Mongols and Manchus, two distinct yet interconnected nomadic tribes in the Eurasian steppe that not only overthrew two powerful Chinese dynasties but also built their own empires upon their ruin.²³ As the English chronicler Matthew Paris (1200-59) noted, ‘they [the Mongols] are called Tartars, from a river called Tartar, which runs through their mountains.’²⁴ The Mongols were known to western Europe through the far-ranging campaigns they launched against both the Muslims and Christians in 1218-60.²⁵ By conquering the Song Dynasty (960-1279) in China, Moscow and the regions around the Volga-Don Steppes, a large part of the Islamic world, and above all, a host of nations in Christendom, the Mongols established a world empire that stretched from the Pacific to the banks of Danube and from the Volga to the Ganges, the largest continuous land empire the world had ever seen. This vast empire is given the pride of place by Milton in the catalogue of the geographical regions Adam surveys in his overview of ‘all Earth’s Kingdoms and thir Glory’ (11.384) in book XI of *Paradise Lost*. Milton explicitly calls the two capital cities, ‘Cambalu, seat of Cathaian Can’ and ‘Paquin of Sinaean Kings,’ ‘seat / Of the mightiest Empire’ (11.386-90). Both ‘Cambalu’ and ‘Paquin’ mean present-day Beijing. ‘Cambalu’ was the capital city of the Yuan Empire (1271-1368) built by Genghis Khan’s grandson Kubilai Khan (1215-94), and it changed its name into ‘Paquin’ when it became the capital of the Ming Empire (1368-1644). After the Qing Dynasty (1644-1911) replaced Ming, Paquin continued to be the imperial seat. Further, as is shown in the various place names mentioned together with the Tartars, Milton reproduces not only the Mongol empire but also its western campaigns in his epic poem, a reproduction that, I shall show, echoes his discussion of the Mongol-Muscovia relation in *A Brief History of Muscovia* (1682).

The study of Milton’s image of empire in light of the Mongols’ world conquest provides new insight into the heavenly war and the global warfare triggered by Satan’s subversion of

²² For the Mongols see Donald Ostrowski, *Muscovy and the Mongols: Cross-Cultural Influences on the Steppe Frontier, 1304-1589* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002); Jack Weatherford, *Genghis Khan and the Making of the Modern World* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2004); and David Morgan, *The Mongols*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007).

²³ For western knowledge of the Mongols and Manchus see Cogley, ‘Fletcher the Elder’s *The Tartars*’, p. 797 and Edwin J. van Kley, ‘News from China: Seventeenth-Century European Notices of the Manchu Conquest’, *Journal of Modern History* 45.4 (1973), 561-82.

²⁴ *Matthew Paris’s English History from the Year 1235 to 1273*, trans. by J. A. Giles, 3 vols. (London: Henry G Bohn, reprint, 1852), vol.1, p. 314. All quotations from Paris are from vol.1.

²⁵ For the Mongols’ western expedition see James Chambers, *The Devil’s Horsemen: the Mongol Invasion of Europe* (Edison, N.J.: Castle Books, 2003).

Eden. If the heavenly war is fought within the territorial borders of Heaven, Satan's conquest of Paradise involves all major power centers, that is, Heaven, Hell, Chaos, and Earth in a global war. The 'global leviathan' Satan undertakes to forge definitely draws upon the formidable empires built by the Romans, Charlemagne, the Hapsburgs, the Spanish, and even the Ottoman Turks. But the Tartarian association of both Satan and Chaos also suggests the inspiration of the Mongol empire. The imperial model represented by the Mongols proves especially pertinent to study Milton's idea of 'global leviathan,' on three accounts. First, Miltonic Satan shares with the Mongol Khans the title of the 'Prince of Hell,' a heathen sovereign who dares to raise military standards against the Christian God and his regime. Satan is frequently called 'Prince of Hell' (2.313; 4.871; 10.621) in Milton's epic poem, and medieval Princes such as Emperor Frederick II (1194-1250) and King Louis IX of France (1214-70) explicitly accorded this title to the Mongol Khans. Whereas Milton's Satan attempts to challenge the supremacy of God, Guyuk Khan (1206-48), in his letter to Pope Innocent IV (1243-54) dated 1246, demands 'the great Pope, together with all the Princes' to 'come in person to serve us.'²⁶ Further, though worshipping some natural deity called God or the Eternal Sky, the Mongols were fundamentally atheists who showed a remarkable tolerance of the various religious groups under its rule, which distinguished them from the monotheistic Turks and Persians.²⁷ Similarly, Satan is called 'Th' Apostate' (6.100), and his rebellious army designated as a 'Godless' (6.811) and 'Atheist crew' (6.370). What the 'Godless' crew attempt to build is a '*heathenish* government' (YP7:424) like that of the Mongols.

Second, compared with the conquests of other empires like Rome and the Habsburgs, which were largely confined to the Mediterranean ring and the European continent, the Mongol empire aspired to global hegemony. The global enterprise of the Spanish empire might also be a source of the Satanic empire in *Paradise Lost*. But Mammon's proposal to dig 'Gems and Gold' in the 'Desert soil' of Hell (2.270-71), a proposal that recalls Spain's exploitation of American mines, is vetoed by the 'great consult' in Pandemonium. In effect, it is not a commercial but a political empire that is on the minds of Satan and Beelzebub, the 'Pillar of State' whose '*Atlantean* shoulders' are 'fit to bear / The weight of mightiest Monarchies' (300-06). Commissioned by Satan, Beelzebub imposes upon the 'infernal States' (2.387) the imperial plan to 'possess' (2.365) Eden so that 'this nether Empire'

²⁶ *The Mongol Mission: Narratives and Letters of the Franciscan Missionaries in Mongolia and China in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, ed. by Christopher Dawson (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955), p. 85.

²⁷ For the Mongols' religion see *The Travels of Marco Polo*, trans. by Ronald Latham (London: Penguin, 1958), pp. 160-61. For the Mongols' tolerance of various religions see *The Mongol Mission*, ed. by Dawson, p. 237.

‘might rise / By policy’ (2.296-97). The ‘mightiest’ monarchy Satan and Beelzebub aspire to forge echoes the ‘mightiest’ empires towering in ‘Cambalu’ or ‘Paquin.’ The global sovereignty of the Mongols is expressly declared by Guyuk Khan in the same letter to the Pope: ‘from the rising of the sun to its setting, all the lands have been made subject to me. Who could do this contrary, to the command of God?’²⁸ Like Satan, the Mongol Khans made it a state policy to build a world empire through imperial conquests, an ambition trumpeted to the world not only through military expeditions but also royal decrees and seals. Genghis Khans made it a royal command to ‘bring all nations into subjection if possible’ so that ‘they alone shall rule the world’.²⁹ Guyuk Khan called himself ‘The strength of God, the Emperor of all men,’ impressing upon his royal seal the inscription that ‘God in heaven and Guyuc Chan on earth, the strength of God, the seal of the Emperor of all men.’³⁰

Last but most importantly, the figure of the Tartar allows Milton to represent not only imperial ‘over-reach’ (10.879) but also the limitations of this far-reaching endeavor. As ‘the Parent of many Nations,’ the Mongol empire disintegrated after reaching its zenith, a disintegration that gave rise to a host of new regions and nations in Eurasia.³¹ Genghis Khan’s eldest son Jochi came into possession of the Khanate of Kipchak or the Golden Horde in 1227, which was later inherited by Jochi’s own son Badu. Genghis Khan’s second son Chaghadai founded the Khanate in Transoxiana in central Asia in 1242. In Mongolia, headquarter of the Mongol rule, Ogodei and his son Guyuk ruled as Great Khans successively until 1251. The Mongol founder’s youngest son Tolui ruled as regent during 1227-29, and Tolui’s three sons carved the largest share of the empire between them. Tolui’s eldest son Mongke became the Great Khan in 1251, and Mongke’s brother Kubilai, after succeeding him in 1260, erected the Yuan Empire in 1271. Mongke’s other brother Hulegu built the Ilkhanate in Persia in 1258.³² However, though issuing from the same ancestor, the four Khanates involved themselves in endless wars and rivalries for territorial dominion. As Peter Jackson notes, the confederation between the Mamluks in Egypt and the Khanate of Kipchak against the Persian Ilkhanate around 1260 marks the ‘dissolution’

²⁸ *The Mongol Mission*, ed. by Dawson, p. 86.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 38, 39, 25.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

³¹ Martino Martini, *De Bello Tartarico Historia* (Antwerp, 1654). I quote from its English translation *The Conquest of the Great and Most Renowned Empire of China by the Invasion of the Tartars* (London, 1655). Martini calls the Tartars ‘the Parent of many nations’, p. 255.

³² For the scattering of Khanates from the Mongol political center see Polo, *Travels*, 152, 313 and *The Book of John Mandeville with Related Texts*, ed. and trans. by Iain M. Higgins (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2011), pp. 147-48.

of the Mongol Empire.³³ Likewise, though originating from ‘one Almighty’ (5.469) and ‘sons of one great Sire’ (6.95), ‘Angel[s] should with Angel[s] war’ (6.92) in heaven. The futility of the imperial rivalry between the great power centers in *Paradise Lost* recalls the collapsing of the Mongol empire.

The limitations of an imperial project suggested in the Tartarian association of Satan and Chaos, together with Jesus’s rejection of the Roman and Parthian empires in *Paradise Regained*, are intended by Milton to bear out the necessity of instituting a new sovereignty in the Son. This new authority, I claim, captures the idea of ‘global commonwealth’ described by Dallmayr. In *The Readie and Easie Way* (1660), Milton writes, ‘a free commonwealth’ is

Not only held by wisest men in all ages the noblest, the manliest, the equallest, the justest government, the most agreeable to all due libertie and proportioned equalitie, both human, civil, and Christian, most cherishing to virtue and true religion, but also (I may say it with greatest probabilitie) planely commended, or rather enjoined by our Saviour himself, to all Christians, not without remarkable disallowance, and the brand of *gentilism* upon kingship. (YP7:424)

What characterizes Milton’s ‘commonwealth’ is its ability to address ‘libertie,’ ‘equalitie,’ ‘virtue,’ and ‘true religion,’ ideas that speak evidently of its spiritual and ethical capacities. The national institutional form Milton envisaged in his political treatise was re-presented as the infrastructure of the Son’s universal rule in his epic poems. Since the Son intends to ‘guide nations in the way of truth / By saving doctrine’ (PR3.473-4), his rule aims at an ethical, spiritual, and juridical governance that goes beyond territorial borders. For Hardt and Negri, empire symbolizes not ‘a historical regime originating in conquest’ but ‘an order that effectively suspends history and thereby fixes the existing state of affairs for eternity.’ The global commonwealth Milton imagines in the Son’s rule is not a real historical institution either; instead, it is a ‘spirituall architecture’ (YP 2:555) that seeks to ‘define a project of international order,’³⁴ an order that can refocus the religious and ethical loyalties once harnessed within the framework of the nation state.

A globalization approach to Milton’s image of empire naturally challenges his alleged

³³ Peter Jackson, ‘The Dissolution of the Mongol Empire’, *Central Asiatic Journal* 22 (1978), 186-244; see also Peter Jackson, ‘The Crisis in the Holy Land in 1260’, *English Historical Review* 95 (1980), 481-513 and Morgan, *The Mongols*, p. 139.

³⁴ Hardt and Negri, *Empire*, p. 14.

nationalism.³⁵ A nationalist model refers both to claims of ‘national outlook’ and ‘methodological nationalism’ that presuppose that ‘the nation-state creates and controls the ‘container’ of society.’³⁶ In modern globalization theory the empire/cosmopolis conceptual paradigm is often proposed in opposition to the state system. David Held and Anthony McGrew raise doubts about the ‘descriptive, analytical and theoretical purchase’ of the nation-state, suggesting that ‘the roles and functions of states’ be ‘rearticulated, reconstituted and re-embedded at the intersection of regionalizing and globalizing networks and systems.’³⁷ Ulrich Beck uses the ideas of ‘cosmopolitanism’ to reconcile the conflict between the global and national models, on the grounds that in a globalized world ‘cultural ties, loyalties and identities have expanded beyond national borders and systems of control.’³⁸ For Herfried Munkler, ‘the failure of states, and especially their collapse, is more likely to prompt the intervention or creation of empires.’³⁹ The early modern state, as a political unity that replaced medieval feudal lord-vassal system and the Holy Roman Empire, was instituted as a legitimate form of organizing national life in the Westphalia conference (1648). But this state system, especially when ruled by monarchs, showed limitations in addressing religious and ethical issues that cut across national borders.⁴⁰

It is both the perception of the insufficiency of the monarchical system to articulate his liberal principles and the awareness of the limitations of imperial outreach, I argue, that compelled Milton to seek alternative world governance in a cosmopolitan empire.⁴¹ George Dunne holds that nationalism ‘consists in a narrow and arrogant assumption of the finality of national cultural forms. To these forms it attaches absolute value and is thus incapable of recognizing the values inherent in other cultures’⁴² After the Restoration, the ‘national cultural forms’ embodied by the English monarchy could no longer represent ‘absolute

³⁵ The nationalist approach to Milton is crystallized in *Early Modern Nationalism and Milton's England*, ed. by David Loewenstein and Paul Stevens (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 2008).

³⁶ Ulrich Beck, *The Cosmopolitan Vision*, trans. by Ciaran Cronin (Cambridge: Polity, 2006), p. 2.

³⁷ David Held and Anthony McGrew, *Globalization / Anti-Globalization: Beyond the Great Divide*, 2nd ed., (Cambridge: Polity, 2007), p. 211.

³⁸ Beck, *Cosmopolitan Vision*, p. 7.

³⁹ Herfried Munkler, *The Logic of World Domination from Ancient Rome to the United States*, trans. by Patrick Camiller (Cambridge: Polity, 2007), p. ix.

⁴⁰ On the limitations of nation states and the importance of the Westphalia settlement of 1648 see Peters, ‘Bride over Chaos’, p. 280; Stephen Krasner, ‘Compromising Westphalia’, *International Security* 20.3 (1995/96), 115-51; Martin van Creveld, *The Rise and Decline of the State* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1999); and Benno Teschke, *The Myth of 1648: Class, Geopolitics, and the Making of Modern International Relations* (London: Verso, 2003).

⁴¹ For Milton’s critique of Monarchy see his *Eikonoklastes* (1649) and *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1650).

⁴² George H. Dunne, *Generation of Giants: The Story Of The Jesuits In China In The Last Decades Of The Ming Dynasty* (Notre Dame, Ind.: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1962), p. 18.

value.’ Milton expressly states that ‘*Christ* apparently forbids his disciples to admit of any such *heathenish* government’ (YP7:424) as the monarchy to be restored in England. Put another way, after being yoked once again to monarchy, the English nationalism Milton vehemently championed in earlier years ceased to be a reference point to conceptualize ‘human, civil, and religious’ liberty (YP 3:215). The nationalist model cannot address the various forces that go beyond territorial control in *Paradise Lost* either. The imperial contenders cause a ‘universal ruin’ (6.797) exceeding the power of national sovereignty. God’s monarchial rule proves unable to prevent the revolt of the rebellious angels; nor can it contain the ‘tartareous’ residue amidst his creation. What Satan embarks on is a global and trans-territorial enterprise; and Chaos is ever ready to thrust the whole created world back into anarchy. In his attempt to build an ‘Empire tyrannous,’ Nimrod, the ‘mighty Hunter’ ‘Before the Lord’ (12.32-34), engenders linguistic diversities that cannot be articulated by a single national language. These globalizing tendencies have apparently gone beyond the jurisdiction of a territorial state and involved all in a global community. Thus it is but natural that the ‘saving doctrine’ proposed by the Son targets a global institution beyond the national state. The new authority Milton invests in the Son aims at a rule in which ‘All Nations’ can be entrusted (12.328-29).

I: Milton’s Representation of the Mongols’ Warfare and Sources for the Tartars

To understand the source for Milton’s knowledge of the Tartars, we need to know first how the west came to the knowledge of the Mongols.⁴³ It was Mongol warfare that disclosed the Far East to the medieval west, bringing it onto the center stage of global affairs. To achieve world dominion, the Mongols launched a three-pronged imperial project: to subdue the Song Empire in the south, the Islamic world in middle and southwest Asia, and Christian Europe in the West. In 1218 the Mongols, led by Genghis Khan himself, rode into the Khwarizmi Empire (1077-1231) and sacked its capital Samarquand [Samarkand]. Meanwhile, Genghis Khan dispatched his eldest son Jochi and his two generals Jebe and Subotei into Caucasus and the Kipchak Steppe in 1221. This special squad conquered in quick succession the Georgians, the Kipchak (also called Kuman Turks) residing on the Volga-Don Steppes, and the Russians on the Dnieper. In 1241, Ogodei Khan (1186-1241) started a second military movement. After destroying Moscow and Kiev, the Mongols,

⁴³ Morgan identifies four major ‘sources’ of the Mongols: *The Secret History of the Mongols* (c.1240); the Chinese Official *Yuanshi* or *History of the Yuan Dynasty* (1370); the Persian records; as well as European sources represented by Paris’s account. See Morgan, *The Mongols*, pp. 8-25.

commanded by Jochi's son Batu, marched further west, defeating the confederated armies of the Germans, Poles, and Hungarians and stationing their equestrians at, as Emperor Frederick II said, 'the door of Christendom.'⁴⁴ As is noted by the Armenia historian Hetoum or Hayton in his *La fleur des histoires de la terre d'Orient* (c.1307), while Batu scored victories in eastern Europe, his father Jochi 'conquered the kingdom of Turkestan and lesser Persia, extending his lordship to the Phison River.'⁴⁵ On the Far Eastern front in 1271, Kubilai Khan overthrew the Song dynasty and built the Yuan Empire. In the southwest in 1258, Hulegu subdued Bagdad, took Aleppo and Damascus, and built the Ilkhanate. Before the abrupt appearance of multitudes of Tartarian equestrians, the Far East, though mentioned by the ancients, was largely concealed from the west. For Paris, the Tartars 'came with the force of lightening into the territories of the Christians,' because 'never till this time [1241] has there been any mode of access to them [the Tartars]; nor have they themselves come forth, so as to allow any knowledge of their customs or persons to be gained through common intercourse with other men.'⁴⁶ In his *Purchas his Pilgrimage* (1617), Samuel Purchas also remarks that the 'armies' and 'Marchants' of the 'Carthaginians, Macedonians, and Romanes' had once 'discovered' the east, but that knowledge was 'drowne(d)' over by 'floods of barbarous people.' It is the 'terrible thunder-clap, with the lightening and noyse of their Armies' that declared, once again, the Far East to the West.⁴⁷

Most tellingly, the Mongols' western campaigns show up, though chiefly as place names, in *Paradise Lost*. In Book XI, under Michael's guidance, Adam perceives,

....the Seat
 Of mightiest Empire, from the destin'd Walls
 Of *Cambalu*, seat of *Cathaian Can*
 And *Samarchand* by *Oxus*, *Temir's* Throne,
 To *Paquin* of *Sinaean* Kings, and thence
 To *Agra* and *Lahor* of great *Mogul*
 Down to the golden *Chersonese*, or where
 The *Persian* in *Ecbatan* sat, or since

⁴⁴ Paris, p. 346.

⁴⁵ Hetoum or Hayton, *The Flower of Histories of the East*, Book 3, Chap. 20. <<http://rbedrosian.com/hetum3.htm>> [Accessed 21 May 2012]. *Phison* is one of the four rivers arising within the Garden of Eden mentioned in Genesis. The first century Jewish historian Flavius Josephus identified 'Pishon' with the 'Ganges' in Book I, chapter I, and section 3 of his *Antiquities of the Jews*.

⁴⁶ Paris, p. 313.

⁴⁷ Samuel Purchas, *Purchas His Pilgrimage*, 2 vols. (1617), vol.1. p. 463.

In *Hispanan*, or where the *Russian Ksar*
In *Mosco*, or the Sultan in *Bizance*,
Turkestan-born... (11.386-96)

Here, by virtue of a series of place names, Milton presents an outline of the world order shaped by the Mongol invasions. The Khwarizmi Empire, the first kingdom collapsed under the Mongols' attack, ruled over a large part of present Persia, Turkey, and India in the thirteenth century. So most of the capital seats enumerated in this passage, such as 'Samarchand,' 'Cambalu' and 'Paquin' (present Beijing), and 'Ecbatan,' were once subjugated under the Tartarian rule. 'Mosco' and the cities around it were the second to yield to the iron hooves of the Mongol equestrians. 'The roving Tartar' in Book III who are bent on the 'Indian streams' (3.436) might refer to Genghis Khan or his brave sons who, scaling the 'snowy ridge' of 'Imaus' (3.431), a mountain in the Himalayan range that reaches the Ganges, marched towards the Islamic world. In Book X, Milton writes,

As when the *Tartar* from his *Russian Foe*
By *Astracan* over the Snowy Plains
Retires, or *Bactrian* sophi from the horns
Of *Turkish* Crescent, leaves all waste beyond
The Realm of *Aladule*, in his retreat
To *Tauris* or *Casbeen*. (10.431-36)

'Sophi' meant Persian Shah for early modern Europe. The 'retreat' of the Persian king 'to Tauris or Casbeen' refers most likely to Shah Alā al-Dīn Muhammad II (1200-20) of the Khwarizmi Empire, who fled and died on an island in the Caspian Sea after the Mongols occupied Samarkand. After the death of his father, prince Jalāl al-Dīn set up his capital at Tabriz ('Tauris') in 1225. The 'waste' left by the royal fugitive represented in Milton's epic poem recalls thus the immense ruin and desolation inflicted by the Mongols.⁴⁸ The 'Russian Foe' and 'Astrakhan' or 'Astracan' where once resided 'Tartars of Mangat' (YP8:484-85) conjure the Mongols' conquest of Moscovia, a historical fact that finds a more detailed account in his *History of Moscovia*.⁴⁹ Here Milton relates that George, son of the Duke of Moscovia, 'was slain in battail by the *Tartar* Prince *Bathy* [Batu], who subdu'd *Muscovia* and made it a tributary' in 1237. 'This *Bathy*, say the *Russians*,' Milton writes, 'was the

⁴⁸ For Jalāl al-Dīn's fleeing from the Mongols see Peter Jackson, 'Jalāl al-Dīn, the Mongols, and the Khwarazmian Conquest of the Panjāb and Sind', *Iran* 28 (1990), 45-54.

⁴⁹ R. D. Bedford, 'Milton's Journeys North: A Brief History of Moscovia and *Paradise Lost*', *Renaissance Studies* 7.1 (1993), 71-85.

Father of *Tamerlan*, whom they call *Temirkutla*' (YP8:512-13). Batu was the grandson of Genghis Khan who inherited the Khanate of the Golden Horde. Tamerlane (1336-1405) was the tragic hero of Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great* (1587-88). Western historians tended to regard Genghis Khan as 'Tamerline or one of his successors,' an identification that, the Jesuit missionary Nicholas Trigault (1577-1628) says, 'seems to me with good reason.'⁵⁰ However, in his *De Bello Tartarico Historia* (1654), the Jesuit missionary Martino Martini (1614-61) discredited the legend that 'Tamberlain' had 'subdued' China.⁵¹ Martini is right. Tamerlane was neither Genghis Khan as Trigault thought nor his grandson Batu who subdued Moscovia, as Milton mentioned. Tamerlane came into power a century after Genghis Khan, though he himself claimed genealogy from the Mongol founder.⁵² Tamerlane did plan to make a conquest of China, but he died when marching his army there in 1405. Nevertheless, the popularity of the legend itself indicates the Renaissance tendency to misidentify Tamerlane with Genghis Khan or Kubilai Khan who actually conquered China. In just stating what the Russians 'say,' Milton showed a noncommittal attitude towards the Tamerlane legend. Apart from the Tartarian conquest of Moscovia, Milton also displayed knowledge of the Mongols' invasion of Europe when remarking that 'the Tartars wasted also *Polonia, Silesia, and Hungaria*, till Pope *Innocent the Fourth* obtain'd peace of them for 5 years' (YP8:512-13).

We can with certainty identify five major sources of Milton's Tartarian image: Paris's chronicle of English History; the *Of the Russe Commonwealth* (1591) of Giles Fletcher the Elder (c.1548-1611), the English ambassador to Moscow in 1588;⁵³ Purchas's travel collections; Martini's *Tartarico*; and the western literary tradition of representing the Mongol Tartars.⁵⁴ Milton not only knew about Paris but also considered him 'the best of our historians' (YP3:218). In a letter to Milton dated June 1656, Henry Oldenburg (1619-77), future secretary of the Royal Society, spoke of Martini's *Tartarico* and the Jesuit historian's 'promise' to publish his *Sinicae historiae decas prima* (1658) (YP 7:491), which suggests Milton's possible acquaintance with both works on Chinese history. Though dealing mainly with the Manchu Tartars and their war with the Ming Empire, Martini's *Tartarico* nevertheless draws attention to the historical connection between the two

⁵⁰ *China in the Sixteenth Century: The Journals of Matthew Ricci: 1583-1610*, ed. by Nicolas Trigault and trans. Louis J. Gallagher, S.J. (New York: Random, 1953), p. 42.

⁵¹ Martini, *Invasion of the Tartars*, p. 255.

⁵² For more on Tamerlane see Morgan, *The Mongols*, pp. 174-77.

⁵³ Giles Fletcher, the Elder, *Of the Russe Commonwealth* (London, 1591), in *The English Works of Giles Fletcher, the Elder*, ed. Lloyd E. Berry (Madison: The Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1964), pp. 169-306.

⁵⁴ On Milton's various sources for the Tartars see Robert R. Cawley, *Milton and the Literature of Travel* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1951), pp. 52-54.

branches of the Tartarian family, that is, the Mongols and the Manchus who dominated the Northern steppe in the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries respectively. Theodore Haak (1605-90) told Samuel Hartlib (1600-62), the famous educator to whom Milton dedicated his *Of Education* (1644), that ‘Milton is not only writing a Univ. History of Engl. But also an Epitome of all Purchas Volumes.’⁵⁵ The work mentioned here refers to Purchas’s *Hakluytus Posthumus* or *Purchas His Pilgrimes* (1625), an augmented compilation of Richard Hakluyt’s (1552-1616) posthumous travel collections. Milton himself confessed in his own notes that all of the material in his *History of Moscovia* came from Hakluyt and Purchas’s travel accounts.⁵⁶ Both Hakluyt and Purchas adapted in their works Fletcher’s *Russe Commonwealth*, which presents an elaborate account of the Mongol-Russian relations.⁵⁷

Most medieval narratives of the Tartars appeared in Purchas’s comprehensive travel compendium.⁵⁸ Marco Polo’s *Travels*, though focusing largely on the Yuan Empire, nevertheless gives ‘an unvarnished account of the usage and customs’ of ‘the genuine Tartars.’⁵⁹ The chief concern of John of Plano Carpini (1182-1252) and William of Rubruck (1210-c.1270), the two medieval Franciscan legates to the Mongol court, was the Mongol Empire before its conquest of the Han Chinese. A leading figure of the Franciscan order, Carpini was dispatched by Pope Innocent IV on an embassy to the Mongol court in 1245-47. Carpini’s *History of the Mongols which we Call Tartars* (1247) enjoyed great popularity in Europe, chiefly because it was incorporated into the Dominican friar Vincent of Beauvais’s (c.1190-1264) *Speculum Historiale*, the most widely disseminated part of his encyclopedic *Speculum Maius*. Rather than a diplomat like Carpini, Rubruck was sent by the King of France in 1253 as a missionary entrusted with the special mission to convert the Tartars. *The Journey of William Rubruck* (1253-55) is comparable to Polo’s *Travels* in both its geographical and anthropological breadth. After his return, Rubruck met in Paris the English philosopher and Franciscan friar Roger Bacon (c.1214-94), who took so great an interest in his Mongol account as to redact it into his famous *Opus Majus* (1267). It is largely through the enthusiasm excited by Bacon in England that Rubruck’s work was well

⁵⁵ *The Life Records of John Milton*, ed. by Milton French, 5 vols (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers UP, 1949-58), vol. 2, pp. 214-15.

⁵⁶ Milton drew chiefly on Hakluyt’s *Principal Navigations* (1598), vol. 1, pp. 221-514 and Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumus* or *Purchas His Pilgrimes* (1625), vol. 3, pp. 413-567.

⁵⁷ Fletcher’s account of the Tartars in *The Russe Common Wealth* appears in Chap. 19; see *Works*, ed. by Berry, pp. 246-58. For Milton and Fletcher see Lloyd E. Berry, ‘Giles Fletcher, the Elder, and Milton’s *A Brief History of Moscovia*’, *The Review of English Studies* 11.42 (1960), 150-56.

⁵⁸ Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumus*, vols. 11, 12.

⁵⁹ Polo, *Travels*, pp. 102, 101.

preserved and transmitted.⁶⁰

The literary prototypes of Milton's image of the Tartars came from Geoffrey Chaucer's 'The Squire's Tale' and Ludovico Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (1516). Chaucer's tale tells the story of Cambuskan, a Tartarian King who is celebrating a royal birthday with princess Canace and the two princes Algarsyf and Cambalus. During the feast, a knight rides in, holding four gifts from the king of Arabia and India—a brass steed, a magic mirror, a ring that can make its bearer understand birds' language, and a sword that can cure any wound it inflicts. The knight gives the ring and mirror to Canace. The magical ring enables the Tartarian princess to learn the story of a falcon betrayed by her lover. At this juncture, the narrator declares that he will tell the adventures of Cambuskan, Cambalus, and Algarsif. So ends the poem.⁶¹ Both Edmund Spenser and Milton famously expressed the wish to complete Chaucer's unfinished tale. While Spenser continued the story in Book Four of his *Faerie Queene*, Milton engaged it in both his prose work and poems. In 'Il Penseroso' Milton evokes the 'sad Virgin' (103) whose power could 'call up him that left half told,'

The story of *Cambuscan* bold,
Of *Camball*, and of *Algarsife*,
And who had *Canace* to wife,
That owned the virtuous Ring and Glass,
And of the wondrous Horse of Brass,
On which the *Tartar* King did ride. (109-15)

In addition to Chaucer's tale, Milton's image of the Tartars also draws upon Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*. Tartary is one of the eastern countries visited by Orlando, who falls deeply in love with Angelica, a native of Cathay. In *Paradise Regained*, Milton, referring to Ariosto, relates how Angelica's lover 'Agrican,' king of Tartary, 'with all his Northern powers / Besieg'd Albraca,' the fortress of 'Gallaphrone,' Angelica's father and king of Cathay (PR3.338-42).

II: Satan, Chaos, and the Tartars: Global Imperialists

Herfried Munkler differentiates between 'empire' and 'imperial' projects in terms of

⁶⁰ I am indebted to Dawson's *The Mongol Mission* for these bibliographical sources.

⁶¹ Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Canterbury Tales* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998).

‘center’ and ‘periphery.’ Whereas imperialism ‘fixes its gaze on the goals of a few players in the center’ and ‘downplay[]s’ the periphery, Munkler argues, ‘theories of empire’ ‘keep center and periphery equally in view.’⁶² Milton draws attention both to the center and the periphery in his representation of empire, but he puts special emphasis on the subordinate powers embodied by Satan and Chaos. The Satanic empire features as a subversive power in both of Milton’s epic poems. Though references to the ‘misrule / of *Chaos*’ (7.271-72) are sporadic in *Paradise Lost*, when gathered together, they allow us to see a picture of ‘subaltern’ rebellion no less powerful than that represented by Satan.⁶³

Paradise Lost stages two Satanic ‘revolt[s]’ (6.262): the heavenly war and the sabotage of Eden. These two rebellions operate on different terrains. The war in heaven, though of a global dimension, is a civil strife or ‘Intestine War’ (6.259). Satan’s revolt, a peripheral rebellion against the center, or a subaltern insurgence against an oppressive overlord, is condemned by God as ‘Treason’ (3.207) ‘Against the high Supremacy of Heav’n’ (3.205). In fact, Satan is only one of the many heavenly princes who are, though endowed with certain authority, subordinate to God who ‘reigns / Monarch in Heav’n’ (1.637-38). The monarchy of heaven comprises a number of princely rules, with the power center located in God and the Son and the periphery delegated to ‘Scepter’d angels,’ as the speaker says,

In Heav’n by many a Tow’red structure high,
Where Scepter’d Angels held thir residence,
And sat as Princes, whom the supreme King
Exalted to such power, and gave to rule,
Each in his Hierarchy, the Orders bright. (1.733-37)

In such a strictly hierarchical regime, Satan, like other heavenly ‘Princes,’ governs a designated number of angels with a ‘Royal seat’ (5.756) on ‘The Mountain of the Congregation’ (5.766) in the ‘The Quarters of the North’ (5.689). It is only after the fall that the rebellious angels, once ‘Throne and Imperial Powers, off-spring of heav’n,’ ‘chang[ed] style’ and were ‘call’d / Princes of hell’ (2.310-13). But for Satan, such ‘magnific Titles’ as ‘Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, and Powers’ are ‘merely titular’ (5.772-74). Whatever the power with which he is invested, he is a subordinate who has to pay ‘Knee-tribute’ (5.782) not only to God but also to the newly ‘anointed’ Son (5. 605). Gabriel

⁶² Munkler, *World Domination*, p. 27.

⁶³ For the elite-subaltern theory see Ania Loomba, *Colonialism / Postcolonialism*, 2nd ed. (London, Routledge, 2005), p. 166.

sharply points out Satan's 'servile[]' status: 'who more than thou / Once fawned, and cringed, and servilely adored / Heaven's awful monarch?' (4.958-59) But Satan insists that 'those Imperial Titles' 'assert / Our being ordain'd to govern, not to serve' (5.801-02). Thus it is both an acute sense of 'injur'd merit' (1.98) and the resolve to 'move' 'the great Hierarchical Standard' (5.701) in heaven that initiate the subaltern revolt.

The civil war in Heaven is but a prelude to the global war waged between Hell, Earth, Chaos, and Heaven. Satan 'Stand[ing] on the brink of Hell' and 'Pondering his Voyage' (2.918-19) into Chaos resembles Julius Caesar overlooking the banks of the Rubicon in 49 BC. This is an 'imperial moment' for both Caesar and Satan: a step backward meant to be an absolute sovereign of a peripheral state like Hell or Gaul; a step forward presaged a war of empire that might lead to universal dominance.⁶⁴ Whereas Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon ended the Republic and ushered in the era of Roman Empire, Satan's plunging into Chaos disturbed the balance of power intended by God in creating the new world, and directly triggered global warfare. Both imperial adventurers threw the former regime into anarchy, which made it imperative to establish a new form of sovereign power.⁶⁵ Though lacking the grandeur of the heavenly war, Satan's subversion of Eden, a mere colony that 'lie[s] expos'd / The utmost border of his [God's] Kingdom' (2.360-61), is a global project that involves almost all major power centers in a war of empire: Eden the object of competition, Hell the initiator, Chaos that agrees to form an alliance and facilitate Satan's passage and is therefore complicit in the Satanic imperial project, God the chief rival, and Sin and Death who are in 'League' (4.375) with Satan. Simply put, the global war is waged between the God-Son alliance and the Satan-Chaos-Sin/death confederation. Both the divine and hellish monarchs put their expansionist plans into practice. God creates 'another World' (2.347) as 'Th' addition of his Empire' (7.555) and undertakes to 'over Hell extend / His empire.' The Satanic crew not only 'sit in darkness here / Hatching vain Empires' (2.377-78) but also seek to bring that 'hatching' to fruition through Satan's expedition. By comparison, Chaos and Sin and Death participate in the war of empire by reaping profits from the rivalry of the chief contenders. Chaos urges Satan, 'go and speed / Havoc and

⁶⁴ For Armitage, 'The imperial moment of the English republic extends from the peace settlement which concluded the first Anglo-Dutch War in 1654 to the second Protectoral Parliament of 1656, and it comprehends Cromwell's Western Design, the beginnings of the Anglo-Spanish War, the growing opposition to Protectoral rule culminating in the exclusion of members from the 1656 parliament, and the publication of Harrington's *Oceana*.' Armitage, 'The Cromwellian Protectorate and the Language of Empire', *The Historical Journal* 35.3 (1992), 531-55 (p. 533). I argue that Milton reproduces this 'imperial moment' in Satan's plunging into Chaos.

⁶⁵ For the imperial moment of Caesar, see Arthur M. Eckstein, 'Rome and the Hellenistic World: Masculinity and Militarism, Monarchy and Republic', in *Enduring Empire: Ancient Lessons for Global Politics*, ed. by David E. Tabachnick and Toivo Koivukoski (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 2009), pp.114-26.

spoil and ruin are my gain' (2.1009). Sin and Death not only share the 'Trophies' (10.355) Satan gained from the downfall of mankind but also are 'Create[d] / Plenipotent on Earth' (10.404) by Satan.

Figuratively speaking, the global warfare engineered by Satan necessarily infringes upon the integrity of territorial states. Satan's cosmic journey to Eden unfolds a continual transgressing of territorial borders. After issuing from 'Th' infernal doors' (2:881), the prince of Hell delves into the 'hoary deep' (2:891) of Chaos. Emerging from the realm of Chaos, Satan steps onto 'the lower stair / That Scal'd by steps of Gold to Heaven Gate' (3.540-41). At Satan's 'bold entrance on this place [Eden],' Gabriel rebukes him for having 'broke[n] the bounds prescrib'd / To thy transgressions, and disturb'd the charge / Of others' (4.877-82). All these images—'doors,' 'stair,' 'Gate,' 'entrance,' and 'bounds'—mark the frontiers of territorial states. The fact that sovereign borders are repeatedly 'transgress[ed]' (4.880) and 'violate[d]' (4.883) by an adventurer bent on 'havoc and 'ruin' indicates at once their vulnerability and the imperial nature of Satan's enterprise.

Whether in the civil war in heaven or the global war featured in Satan's sabotage of Eden, what is at stake is divine 'Omnipotence' (5.722), that is, God's spiritual and temporal sovereignty. God explicitly states that what is endangered by the Satanic rebellion is his 'omnipotence' as is registered in his 'ancient' 'claim / of deity or Empire' (5.723-24). In attempting to divide empire with God, Satan seeks precisely to challenge God's spiritual and imperial hegemony. In the 'great consult,' Satan justifies his expedition into Eden with claims of 'public reasons just, / Honor and Empire with revenge enlarg'd' (4.389-90). Here Satan unambiguously pronounces an imperial project: 'Public reasons,' 'just / Honor,' and above all, the imperative to build an 'Empire,' these three necessities 'compel[]'(4.391) him to wreak 'revenge' upon the newly created man. Satan's ambition to usurp God's authority is explicitly pointed out by the heavenly chorus. In rebelling against God, the Chorus says, Satan has sought to 'impair' the 'Mighty King' of Heaven, 'bound / Thy empire,' and 'diminish' his 'worshippers' (7.608-13). Though failing in this imperial attempt, Satan has nevertheless succeeded in 'draw[ing] after him the third part of Heav'n's Host' (5.710).

The Satanic rule represents an 'equal' royalty to the divine throne, or as God puts it, his 'foe' 'intends to erect his Throne / Equal to ours' (5.725-26). The deistic and imperial primacy he asserts by '[ancient] claim' (5.723), God realizes, is 'now' (5.721) grievously challenged by an 'equal' 'Throne.' Satan's ambition to establish an 'equal' sovereignty is mentioned a number of times in *Paradise Lost*. The Satanic crew 'Towards him bend / With

awful reverence prone; and as a God / Extol him equal to the highest in Heav'n' (2.477-79). Gabriel perceives Satan's 'hope / To dispossess' 'Heav'n's awful Monarch' and 'reign' by himself (4.959-60). Equality proves the central point of contention between Satan and the loyal Abdiel. Satan justifies his rebellion on the grounds of the 'unjust[ness]' for 'equal[s]' to 'Reign' 'over equals' (5.819-20). Even if 'to grant it thee unjust, / That equal over equals Monarch Reign,' Abdiel retorts, Satan is not so 'great and glorious' as he 'count[s]' himself (5.831-33). Despite this scathing taunt, Satan and his crew are resolved to prove by 'our own right hand' 'Who is our equal' (5.864-66). In fact, God himself admits that his 'armed saints' (6.47) commanded by Michael and Gabriel are 'Equal in number to that Godless crew / Rebellious' (6.49-50). God's repetitive use of the royal first-person possessive pronoun 'our' evinces a broad awareness of the danger posed to 'our high place, our sanctuary, our hill' (5.732).

Satan's imperial 'over-reach' to be 'equal' to God resonates with the global ambition of the Tartars. Satan's Tartarian association allows Milton to represent both the radical nature of the subaltern insurgence and the damage caused by the imperial contention. Pointedly identified as God's 'foe,' Miltonic Satan was 'mighty Paramount' and 'seem'd / Alone th' Antagonist of Heav'n' (2.508-09). What the Satanic crew aspires is to 'prevail / Against God and *Messiah*' (6.795-96). Likewise, in claiming to fight for God's cause and raising military standards against Christendom, the Mongols proved a formidable enemy of the Christian God as well. In his *History of the Mongols*, Carpini observes that the Mongols 'raised the standards of proceeding against the Church of God and the Roman Empire, and against all Christian kingdoms and nations of the West.'⁶⁶ Paris remarked that the Tartars inflicted an 'injury' at once 'to Christ, to the Catholic Church, and all Christendom.'⁶⁷ For Emperor Frederick, the Tartars intended to 'subdu[e] the whole of the West,' 'ruining and uprooting the faith and name of Christ.'⁶⁸ The Emperor's fear was not ungrounded. In the royal emissary delivered by Rubruck to the King of France, the Tartarian monarch declares openly, 'This is the decree of the eternal God. In heaven there is but one eternal God, on earth there is but one Lord Chingis Chan, the son of God.'⁶⁹ The Mongol Khan's arrogation of the name of 'the Son of God' and his equalization of God's 'decree' with his own edict directly challenged the omnipotence of the Christian God. Most remarkably, the self-styled God in the east demanded 'the great Pope, together with all the Princes' to 'come in person

⁶⁶ Dawson, ed., pp. 43-44.

⁶⁷ Paris, p. 473.

⁶⁸ Paris, p. 346.

⁶⁹ Dawson, ed., p. 202.

to serve us.’ Thus unlike the ‘puny’ Indian king,⁷⁰ the ‘great Commander’ of Hell (1.358) recalls strongly the Mongol Khans in his imperial outreach and boldness to wage wars against God’s regime. Like the Tartarian Khans who erected the ‘mightiest Empire,’ Miltonic Satan is ‘Fit to decide the Empire of great Heav’n’ (6.303).

For the medieval west, the Mongol Khans belonged to ‘the race of Satan’ residing in ‘Tartarus’ or ‘Hell,’ sharing with Satan the title of the ‘Prince of Hell.’ Milton’s Satan declares that he ‘glor[ies] in the name’ of ‘the Race / Of *Satan*,’ because the title means ‘Antagonist of Heav’n’s Almighty King’ (10.385-87). God commands Michael to ‘drive’ the rebellious angels ‘into their place of punishment, the Gulf / of *Tartarus*, which ready opens wide / His fiery *Chaos* to receive thir fall’ (6.52-55). ‘Tartarus,’ a cognate of ‘Tartary,’ was the Greek and Roman term for the ‘underworld’ or ‘Hell.’ In Book Six of his *Aeneid*, Virgil uses ‘*Tartarei*’ (295) to signify the underworld punishment for evil doers. In his ‘The Tartars or Ten Tribes’ (c.1610), Fletcher remarks that ‘Tartaros’ means ‘the place of the damned souls, and Hell it self, in resemblance, as may be thought, of like disorder and confusion of both the places.’⁷¹ To maintain order in heaven, the satanic race must be ‘scourage[d]...back to Hell’ (4.914). In like manner, to preserve the peace of Christendom, the Tartars must be ‘thrust’ back into Tartarus, that is, Tartary. Medieval observers explicitly associated the Mongol Khans with the race residing in Tartarus or Hell. For Paris, the Mongols ‘are well called Tartars, as it were inhabitants of Tartarus,’⁷² and he calls them ‘an immense horde of that *detestable race of Satan*’ who ‘rushed forth, like demons loosed from Tartarus.’⁷³ The King of France also observed that ‘if these people, whom we call Tartars, should come upon us, either we will thrust them back into the regions of Tartarus, whence they emanated, or else they shall send all of us to heaven.’⁷⁴ In his letter to the English King Henry III (1207-72), Emperor Frederick writes, the Tartars ‘who have burst forth from the abodes of Tartarus, may find their pride humbled, after experiencing the strength of the West, and be thrust back to their own Tartarus.’⁷⁵

As powerful enemies of God, both the Mongols and the Satanic crew in *Paradise Lost* caused great damage and panic in Christendom, which renders it urgent for the Christians to fight back. Satan’s two revolts have reduced much of the created world to chaos and

⁷⁰ Banerjee, ‘Milton’s India’, p. 154.

⁷¹ Fletcher, ‘That the Tartars are the Ten Tribes, who were Carried Captives, and Transplanted by the Assyrians’ (c.1610), in *Works*, ed. by Berry, pp. 318-31, 321.

⁷² Paris, p. 312.

⁷³ Paris, p. 312, my italics.

⁷⁴ Paris, p. 341.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 346.

subjected the New World to the ‘misrule’ (10.628) of Sin and Death. Likewise, the global ambition of the Mongols threw the whole of Christendom into anarchy. Whereas Satan ‘drew after him the third part of Heav’n’s Host’ into Hell, the Mongols succeeded in subduing a host of Christian nations. By 1241, Paris relates, the Tartars had ‘visited the northern provinces of the Christians’ and ‘reduced to a desert the countries of Friesland, Gothland, Poland, Bohemia, and both divisions of Hungary, slaying or putting to flight princes, prelates, citizens, and rustics.’ In inflicting ‘dreadful devastation and destruction,’ these ‘barbarous’ people had ‘struck great fear and terror into all Christendom.’⁷⁶ In a letter to all western princes, Emperor Frederick warns that by 1243 ‘six Christian kingdoms have already been destroyed, and the same fate hangs over the others,’ and now the Tartars are physically stationed at ‘the door of Christendom,’ ‘purposing to enter the boundaries of Germany.’⁷⁷ Since Satan seeks to ‘try / In battle, what our Power is, or our right’ (5.728), God says to the Son:

Let us advise, and to this hazard draw
 With speed what force is left, and all imploy
 In our defense, lest unawares we lose
 This our high place, our Sanctuary, our Hill (5.729-32)

God’s call for confederation against the ‘atheist crew’ evokes Frederick’s urge to form a ‘potent European empire’ against the Mongol invasions. In the same letter to the King of England, Frederick remarks that it is ‘Satan himself’ who ‘has dragged them [the Mongols] hither to die, before the victorious eagles of the potent European empire.’⁷⁸ Similarly, Carpini observed that ‘if Christians wish to save themselves, their country and Christendom, then ought kings, princes, barons, and rulers of countries to assemble together and by common consent send men to fight against the Tartars.’⁷⁹ By appealing to an imaginary confederation, both the Emperor and the pontifical legate meant to mobilize western nations to battle against the Satanic forces bursting forth from the Far East.

Unlike Satan who ventures out to another world to compete with God for global hegemony, the ‘Throne / Of *Chaos*’ (2.959-60), the personification of the anarchical forces that threaten the created world, appears a sedentary monarchy wanting in imperial initiatives. In truth, Milton’s *Chaos* is a powerful monarch with a tangible territory bordering Heaven and

⁷⁶ Ibid., pp. 339, 313. For the nations and regions conquered by the Mongols also see Dawson, ed., pp. 29-32.

⁷⁷ Paris, pp. 473, 346.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 347.

⁷⁹ Dawson, ed., pp. 45-46.

Hell and a resolute polity to contend with God for dominion. That Chaos resides on the very 'Frontiers' of his realm (2.998) shows his constant alert to territorial sovereignty. So rather than a mere 'abortive gulf' (2.441), the Chaotic realm features a political entity with a determined purpose to compete with God for 'havoc and spoil and ruin.'⁸⁰

The subversive strategy Chaos adopts also registers in its Tartarian association. In Book VII, Raphael gives a vivid account of how the Son created the world through 'the spirit of God' (7.235). As is signified by such instrumental images as 'voice' (7.221), 'the fervid Wheels,' 'the golden Compasses' (7.224-25), and the 'brooding wings' (7.235), creation is simultaneously a commanding and circumscribing process. All these instruments are adopted by the Son with a definite purpose, that is, to bring under yoke and force to birth the intractable chaos. Most of chaos gets tamed, but there remain some 'black tartareous cold Infernal dregs' that refuse to be warmed to life, whatever device is employed. The lower case 'tartar' denotes 'dregs,' and it first appeared in *Arderne's Surgery* (c1425): 'First I made hym ane emplastre of tartare of ale, i.[e]. dreggez.' (*Online OED*) These resistant 'tartareous' 'dregs' amidst God's creation constitute a fertile site of contention in Milton studies. John Rogers refers to these dregs as physical 'tartar,' 'the inassimilable elements purged from the system in the process of digestion,' which 'introduce(s) into the otherwise monistic world of the poem a residual race of dualism.'⁸¹ For Eric Song, 'Despite God's attempt to purge the 'tartareous' dregs from Creation, chaotic elements persist to disrupt an ostensibly monist world by revealing its primordial fissures.'⁸² I argue that Milton's 'tartareous' 'dregs' encode Chaos's remarkable subversive strategy, a tactic adopted by the periphery to contend with the divine center for hegemony and territorial control.

Politically speaking, God's 'monistic' economy is erected at the exclusion of the anarchical (Chaos), the non-conformist (rebellion angels), and the incestuous (Sin) 'other.' Like the Satanic revolt, Chaos's disruption of such an excluding polity symbolizes the rebellion of the periphery. Paris called the Tartars an 'inhuman and brutal, outlawed, barbarous, and untamable people' who are fit 'to be called monsters than men' or wild 'beasts' 'thirsting after and drinking blood.'⁸³ Emperor Frederick thought 'this race of people' 'wild,

⁸⁰ For a 'hostile' chaos see Regina Schwartz, 'Milton's Hostile Chaos: "... And the Sea Was No More"', *English Literary History* 52.2 (1985), 337-74.

⁸¹ John Rogers, *The Matter of Revolution: Science, Poetry, and Politics in the Age of Milton* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1996), pp. 133, 134.

⁸² Song, 'Strange Fire', p. 119.

⁸³ Paris, p. 312.

outlawed, and ignorant of the laws of humanity.’⁸⁴ For Fletcher, the Tatars had ‘the most vile and barbarous Nation of all the world.’⁸⁵ In refusing to take on the forms imposed by the creator and sticking to their chaotic state, the tartareous sediments in Milton’s epic poem show the very inhuman or ‘untamable’ stubbornness characteristic of the Tartars. Moreover, just as the Tartars were pushing into the heartland of Christendom, Chaos, by condensing itself into some seemingly insignificant deposit amidst creation, manages to lodge his resistance at the very heart of the divine economy. By rejecting being tamed to life by ‘the spirit of God,’ Chaos asserts its powerful existence and irreducible part in the creation of the world.

Milton’s resistant tartareous dregs elicit in particular the degenerated state of the ten tribes of Israel, the exiled Jews who disappeared after the Babylonian captivity. The upper case ‘Tartar’ means ‘residue or remainder,’ especially the ‘residue’ of the ten tribes of Israel. Fletcher remarks that ‘*Tartar* in the *Syrian* Tongue signifies *Remnants* or *Remainders*,’ and ‘the Tartars are the Ten Tribes, who were Carried Captives, and Transplanted by the Assyrians.’⁸⁶ Similarly, the English antiquary Edward Brerewood (c.1565-1613) noted that ‘It is alleaged that the word Tatari, or Totari...signifieth in the Syriaque and Hebrew tongues, a Residue or Remainder such as these Tartars are

supposed to bee of the Ten Tribes.’⁸⁷ The association between the Tartars and the ten tribes was no mere conjecture—the Jews themselves practically made that connection when learning about the great havoc wrought by the Tartars upon Christendom. According to Paris, the Tartars’ invasion uncovered ‘the enormous wickedness’ or ‘hidden treachery and extraordinary deceit of the Jews.’ While panic gripped Christendom, Paris says, the Jews looked at the victorious Mongols as ‘a portion of their race’ or ‘brethren of the tribes of Israel’ who came to ‘bring the whole world to subjection to them and to us.’ Some Jews even went to the lengths of gathering ‘all the swords, daggers, and armour’ and ‘assembl[ing] on a general summons in a secret place’ to discuss how to welcome the Mongols ‘with valuable gifts, and receive them with the highest honour.’⁸⁸ Paris’s chronicle of the Jews’ enthusiasm for the Tartars had most likely been on Milton’s mind when he represented the ten lost tribes in *Paradise Regained*. One of the reasons Jesus gives for

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 344.

⁸⁵ Berry ed., p. 321.

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 322.

⁸⁷ Edward Brerewood, *Enquiries Touching the Diversity of Languages, and Religions through the Chief Parts of the Worlde* (London, 1614), pp. xiii, 94.

⁸⁸ Paris, pp. 357-58.

refusing to deliver his fellowmen echoes Paris's disparaging remarks about the ten tribes. For Paris, what makes the lost Jews most detestable is their apostate ways of 'follow[ing] strange gods and unknown customs,' which 'perverted' them to 'an evil way of thinking,' 'confused' 'their heart and language,' and 'changed' their life 'to that of the cruel and irrational wild beast.'⁸⁹ Similarly, Jesus' critique of the lost tribes also harps on their deviation from the Christian God. That he declines to 'deliver[]' his 'brethren, those ten Tribes' (PR3.374), Jesus says, is because they have become enemies of God with their 'heathenish crimes' (PR3.419). The worshipping of 'all the Idolatries of Heathen round' (PR3.418) have rendered them 'distinguishable scarce / From Gentiles' (PR3.424-25). Since these 'captive Tribes' 'wrought their own captivity' (PR3.414-15), the Savior argues, they are not worthy to be redeemed.

In addition to engineering his own rebellion, Chaos also agrees to ally himself with Satan and is therefore complicit in Satan's imperial project. On the one hand, he obeys the divine behest to provide the 'dark materials' of chaos for the creation of 'more Worlds' (2.916). But on the other hand, he offers the same 'materials' for Satan to fabricate weapons to fight against God. To get a passport to Eden, Satan promises to assist Chaos to win back 'all usurpation' by 'reduc(ing)' them to their 'original darkness' and reasserting the chaotic 'sway' and 'Standard' (2.983-85). Chaos's endorsement of Satan's plan signifies the joining of hands of the rebellious pair in their revolt against God. Apart from this diplomatic pact, their confederation is also registered in the 'Tartarean sulphur' amidst Chaos. During the heavenly war, the Satanic crew turns the tide by resorting to 'engines' and 'Balls / Of missive ruin' (6.518-19). These destructive weapons were made from the gunpowder or 'Sulphurous and Nitrous Foam' dug from the earth (6.512, 516). Moreover, in the 'great consult,' Moloch proposes 'open War' (2.51), suggesting 'O'er Heav'n's high Tow'rs to force restless way' (2.62) by, once again, fabricating weapons out of 'Tartarean sulphur' (2.69). This powerful agent, Moloch remarks, will 'mix[]' and explode 'his [God's] throne itself' into 'strange fire' (2.68-69). Thus the 'Tartarean sulphur' nourished by Chaos provides powerful resources for the rebellion angels to meditate another war against Heaven and thereby negotiate terms of peace with God.

III: The Threat of Chaos and the 'global commonwealth' Embodied in the Son's Rule

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 314.

Fear of Chaos is a chief motivation behind the establishment of empire.

Toivo Koivukoski holds that ‘imperial compulsions’ are ‘moved by a terror of civilizational collapse—a state of being that paradoxically produces a profound level of anxiety regarding potential future threats, while providing a commonsense basis for social cohesion within such large organizations as are empires.’⁹⁰ Likewise, Munkler maintains that empires ‘see themselves as creators and guarantors of an order that ultimately depends on them and that they must defend against the outbreak of chaos, which they regard as a constant threat.’⁹¹

The Tartarian association of Satanic and Chaotic empires in *Paradise Lost* suggests precisely a ‘terror of civilizational collapse.’ Paris records that the Tartars succeeded in ‘laying waste the country, committing great slaughter, and striking inexpressible terror and alarm into every one.’⁹² For Emperor Frederick, the Mongols who caused ‘a universal desolation of kingdoms’ meant ‘the general ruin of the whole world, especially of Christendom.’⁹³ The ‘constant threat’ of chaos is a chief motif of Milton’s epic poems. An anarchical world graphically figures in the ‘wilderness’ in *Paradise Regained*, the background against which the drama of competition for global ‘lord[ship]’ (PR4.167) between Satan and the Son plays out. Likewise, the ‘vast immeasurable Abyss’ that lies ‘Outrageous as a Sea, dark, wasteful, wild’ (7.211-12) forms a predominant backdrop of the world represented in *Paradise Lost*. To make things worse, Satan and Chaos’s imperial ambitions threaten to thrust the created world back to its uncreated chaotic state. After disrupting the ‘the great Hierarchical Standard’ in heaven, Satan reduces Eden to the ‘misrule’ of Sin and Death. Not satisfied with ruling over the ‘Eternal Anarchy’ (2.896), Chaos, together with ‘Night,’ the ‘Consort of his Reign’ (2.963), aspires to ‘gain’ ‘Havoc and spoil and ruin’ from Satan’s imperial adventure. Chaos’s chief complaint to Satan is his competition with God for territorial control. Bordering on the edge of Heaven, undermined by ‘Hell’ from beneath, and infiltrated by the newly created world, Chaos complains to Satan, his realm is constantly ‘encroached on still through our intestine broils’ (2.1001), impinged upon by the already created worlds, and above all, tyrannically usurped by God. Chaos and Night obviously do not take things lying down. ‘The womb / of unoriginal *Night* and *Chaos* wild’ (10.476-77) is ever ready to ‘swallow[] up’ created beings (2.149), ‘threaten[ing]’ the ‘utter loss of being’ with its ‘abortive gulf’ (2.440-41).

Milton highlights the threat of chaos to bring out the necessity of instituting a new

⁹⁰ Toivo Koivukoski, ‘Imperial Compulsions,’ in Tabachnick and Koivukoski, eds., *Enduring Empire*, pp. 96-113 (p. 98).

⁹¹ Munkler, *World Domination*, p. viii.

⁹² Paris, p. 313.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 341, 344.

sovereignty that can forestall the ‘civilizational collapse’ or ‘universal ruin’ (6.797) threatened by the Satanic revolt. In globalization theory, empire is often regarded as an antidote to chaos. Hardt and Negri assert that ‘in Empire there is peace, in Empire there is the guarantee of justice for all peoples.’⁹⁴ For Munkler, ‘fear of Chaos, and the self-appointed role of defender of order against disorder, good against evil, through which the empire sees and legitimizes itself, are corollaries of the imperial mission, which also represents a fundamental justification for world empire.’⁹⁵ Milton’s God proclaims the Son’s rule at once to preempt ‘the outbreak of chaos’ and erect a new ‘order.’ What the Son assumes is precisely the ‘role of defender of order against disorder, good against evil,’ a role that ‘legitimizes’ the ‘world empire’ he promotes. The Son’s power manifests itself most when the world tends to subject to the ‘misrule’ of Chaos. It is at the critical moment when ‘all Heav’n / Had gone to wrack, with ruin overspread’ (6.669-70) that God delegates the Son to ‘[avenge] Upon his enemies’ (6.676-77) during the heavenly war. It is to ‘repair / That detriment’ (7.152-53) caused by the fallen angels that God commissions the Son to ‘create / Another World’ (7.154-55). To remedy the havoc wrought by Sin and Death, the Son takes on the role of the ‘restorer of Mankind’ (10.646).

The figure of the Son provides an ideal platform for Milton to imagine a new form of sovereignty that can not only arrest the threat of chaos but also address the limitations of territorial polities, whose rivalry for hegemony proves a major source of widespread chaos. The Son aims at governance beyond national borders. In *Paradise Regained*, Jesus rebukes Satan that ‘God hath justly giv’n the Nations up / To thy Delusions; justly, since they fell / Idolatrous’ (PR1.442-44). For the two disciples Andrew and Simon, it is because ‘the kings of th’Earth...oppress / Thy chosen’ that God thinks it ‘time’ to ‘Send thy Messiah forth’ (PR 2.42-45). So the new sovereignty the Son intends to erect is, rather than a kingly rule, a global governance that can ‘guide Nations in the way of truth’ (PR2.473). Even Satan admits that the Son is ‘the head of Nations,’ ‘Their King, their leader, and Supreme on Earth’ (PR1.98-99). In *Paradise Lost*, God expressly proclaims that the Son is ‘Anointed universal King’ and ‘Head Supreme,’ and he will subsume all ‘Thrones, Princedoms, Powers, Dominions’ ‘In Heaven, or Earth, or under Earth in Hell’ (3.317-22) to his own rule.⁹⁶ In effect, God institutes the Son’s governance with a view to replacing the kingly rule; as God himself puts it, ‘Then thou thy regal Sceptre shalt lay by, / For regal Sceptre then no more shall need, / God shall be All in All’ (3.339-41). The ‘regal Sceptre’ is the

⁹⁴ Hardt and Negri, *Empire*, p. 10.

⁹⁵ Munkler, *World Domination*, p. viii.

⁹⁶ For the Son’s ‘universal godhead and universal sovereignty’ see Stephen M. Buhler, ‘Kingly States: The Politics in *Paradise Lost*’, *Milton Studies* 28 (1992), 49-68.

archetypal symbol of monarchical rule. Thus the rule of the Son ‘in whom shall trust / All nations’ (12.328-29) intends at once to overcome the limitations of national rule and to govern nations ‘in the way of truth.’ By ‘all nations’ Milton means not only ‘the sons of *Abraham’s* loins’ but also ‘the Sons / Of *Abraham’s* Faith wherever through the world’ (12.447-49). Thus Milton defines nations, rather than as territorial entities, in terms of ‘faith’—nations will participate in a global commonwealth as ‘the Sons / Of *Abraham’s* Faith.’

In seeking to govern nations by spiritual faith or truth and to achieve a ‘New Heav’n and Earth, wherein the just shall dwell’ (3.335), the Son’s universal sovereignty recalls both Hardt and Negri’s ‘empire’ and Dallmayr’s ‘global commonwealth.’ For Hardt and Negri, empire is directed by ‘a unitary power that maintains the social peace and produces its ethical truths,’ and Dallmayr’s global cosmopolis ‘embrace[s] different cultures and societies and [is] held together...by lateral connections and bonds of cultural and political interdependence.’ On the one hand, Satan unwittingly articulates the cosmopolitan nature of the Son’s rule when he remarks that the Son resembles his Father who regards it a ‘glory’ to receive[] / Promiscuous from all Nations, Jew, or Greek / Or Barbarous, nor exception hath declar’d; / From us his foes pronounc’t glory he exacts’ (PR3.117-20). In embracing ‘promiscuous[ly]’ all nations and peoples and even the hostile forces, the universal authority represented by the Son means to refocus the various loyalties and identities once governed by the nation state toward a new institutional form. On the other hand, the fundamental constitution of the Son’s ‘everlasting Kingdom’ (PR3.199), that is, the ‘better Cov’nant’ (12.302), bears out the top priority the Savior accords to ethical and spiritual truths. God turns evil to good in creating man to fill the ‘vacant room’ left by the rebellious angels; likewise, when Michael tries to distill ethical and political lessons from the sinful history initiated by the fall, divine ‘wisdom’ once again ‘ordain’d / Good out of evil’ (7.187-90). These lessons are epitomized in the new Covenant:

So Law appears imperfect, and but giv’n
With purpose to resign them in full time
Up to a better Cov’nant, disciplin’d
From shadowy Types to Truth, from Flesh to Spirit,
From imposition of strict Laws, to free
Acceptance of large Grace, from servile fear
To filial, words of Law to works of Faith. (12.300-06)

Typology is used in this passage to signify, among others, two different modes of governance. The new covenant Adam and his offspring are to contract with the Son not only replaces the Mosaic 'law' but also derives from and fulfills the old covenant God made with Abraham. The 'shadowy Types' in the Old Testament become 'truth,' the 'Flesh' turns into 'Spirit,' the 'imposition of strict laws' is replaced by 'acceptance of large Grace,' 'servile fear' by 'filial' love, and 'words of law' by 'works of Faith.' Two different governance structures are evidently juxtaposed and contrasted here. Whereas shadowy types, flesh, strict laws, and servile fear characterize the kingly rule, truth, spirit, filial love, and faith speak of the ethos informing the new governance, an alternative form of sovereignty that symbolizes, as Gills puts it, 'our spiritual side and our quest for harmony, moral order, and community.' For Milton, the new one is a 'better cov'nant.'

The global cosmopolis promoted by the Son is far from a mere spiritual empire united by the bonds of 'Abraham's Faith' and the new covenant; it is a political commonwealth with its own 'Tribunal' (3.326) to 'judge,' '[arraign],' and 'Sentence' (3.330-33) as well. Robert Fallon holds that 'New Heav'n and Earth shall to the Ages rise' (10.647), heralding the end of politics itself, once God's Creation will have achieved a state of existence that need no longer be defined in terms of the governing and the governed.'⁹⁷ In fact, the rule of the Son does not indicate 'the end of politics itself,' nor does the Son merely '[prefer] a metaphorical, inward rule over liberal political might' as Eric Song claims.⁹⁸ Rather, as Linda Gregerson argues, 'the 'inner man' in question is not merely the self, a kingdom of one, but the soul of Nations.'⁹⁹ By 'the soul of Nations,' most likely Gregerson means the welfare, whether political or spiritual, of nation states. Thus though propounded as a spiritual principle, the Son's 'saving doctrine' has a political mission to regulate not only a private man, a nation or a 'selected nation,' but also a community of 'nations.' In *Paradise Regained*, Satan, consistent in his uncanny perception, penetrates the very political nature of the Son's governance. 'Should Kings and Nations from thy mouth consult, / Thy Counsel would be as the Oracle' (PR3.12-13), and 'wert thou sought to deeds / That might require th' array of war,' Satan says to the Son, 'thy skill / Of conduct would be such, that all the world / Could not sustain thy Prowess, or subsist / In battle' (PR3.16-19). The Son concedes to Satan's view. A peaceful doctrine will be propagated with 'winning words' to 'conquer willing hearts' (PR1.222), the Son soliloquizes, but 'the stubborn' can 'only' be 'sudue[d]' (PR1.226) with 'the array of war.' Moreover, the Son intends to institute an

⁹⁷ Fallon, *Divided Empire*, p. 107

⁹⁸ Song, 'Strange Fire', p. 136.

⁹⁹ Linda Gregerson, 'Colonials Write the Nation: Spenser, Milton, and England on the Margins', in *Milton and the Imperial Vision*, ed. by Rajan and Sauer, pp. 169-90 (p. 186).

'everlasting kingdom' that 'shall to pieces dash / All Monarchies' (PR4.149-51), an institution that apparently presupposes armed violence. But the Son does not endorse imperial empires that 'once just' and 'conquer'd well' but later 'govern ill the Nations under yoke' (PR4.133-35). What he prefers is an institutional form that not only conquers but also governs well, that is, a 'global commonwealth' guided by a 'saving doctrine.'