Introduction

Paradise Lost, by John Milton, and Order and Disorder, by Lucy Hutchinson, are early modern poetic retellings of the creation story, as recounted in the Book of Genesis. These retellings detail an account of the path humanity undertook to fall from the grace of God and the understanding of what must be done in order for humanity to once again enjoy a relationship with God. To understand what these narratives are saying about the likelihood and actuality of human salvation, it is necessary to discuss how these narratives present shame.¹

Shame, as relates to these works and this period, is relevant not only in relation to authors’ understandings of the role of shame in their particular theologies or formally, as it makes itself present in their poems, but actually forms a backdrop for the highly fraught political and cultural era in which Milton and Hutchinson lived. Paradise Lost, published in 1674, and Order and Disorder, published in 1679², were written relatively soon after

¹ According to the OED, shame is primarily defined as “1.a. The painful emotion arising from the consciousness of something dishonouring, ridiculous, or indecorous in one's own conduct or circumstances (or in those of others whose honour or disgrace one regards as one's own), or of being in a situation which offends one's sense of modesty or decency.” In this essay, shame will be considered as the emotional or visceral feeling of having failed to uphold the values of the society or community in question. Sometimes that shame will be physical and external, i.e. visible to the community, and other times, that shame will be internal, i.e. not discernable to the outside community and a function of an individual’s internal thought. “shame, n.”. OED Online. December 2016. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/177406?rskey=BMfJNe&result=1&isAdvanced=false (accessed March 08, 2017).

² Neither of these poems was first published in their current form. Paradise Lost, A Poem in Ten Books was published in 1667, and only the first five books of Order and Disorder were published in 1679, when they were erroneously attributed to Hutchinson’s brother, Sir Allen Apsley; the subsequent books were published posthumously.
the English Civil War in an intensely pressure-filled environment. Uncertainties of the period, including those regarding faith and divine right kingship, fostered a reassessment and reorganization of shame and the various roles shame might play in daily and literary life. While shaming did not affect the lives of Milton and Hutchinson in exactly the same ways, the way shame is divided in the narratives into what are essentially instances of good shaming and instances of bad shaming displays influence from their individual experiences and from the environment in which they were raised.

In his “Second Defense of the English People,” Milton discusses the shaming that he and the English people have undergone as a result of the regicide of King Charles I. Much of the criticism Milton received as a result of his support of the regicide was directed at his person and his blindness, including the suggestion that his blindness was a punishment from God for some immense wrongdoing he committed. In Milton’s writing, however, this shaming is not productive and is actually due to the assertion of “shameless and gratuitous falsehoods.” These assertions are “shameless” because they do not encourage action and are, in fact, evidence that his critics are not properly exercising their power to shame. Their power to shame should be directed at improvement of the community, a good shame; this bad shame is unproductive, the result of their spite against a man who is “not conscious, either in the more early or in the later periods of [his] life, of having committed any enormity which might deservedly have marked [him] out as a fit object for such a calamitous visitation” (825). Milton cannot do anything
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about his blindness, because his actions did not cause it; therefore, the shame being directed at him is a bad shame, a shameless shame, because it cannot motivate a course of action beneficial to the society. Similarly, the shame Satan experiences in book 6 of Paradise Lost, in which he lays “gnashing for anguish and despite and shame / to find himself not matchless,” is also unproductive: the shame affecting a damned individual who can never be properly humbled or taught to act rightly. In discussion of Milton’s Paradise Lost, this essay will not focus on this bad shame, but will rather focus on the good shame that motivates society toward the fulfilment of God’s wishes.

Similarly, Hutchinson was subjected to public shaming for her husband’s involvement, as a political Puritan, in the regicide of King Charles I. In her Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, she focuses on the role of divine providence in her husband’s life, noting that, in a military conflict, as Colonel Hutchinson was injured, left for dead, and subsequently ignored by passing enemy belligerents, it was “But by the good providence of God, that wound which the enemy intended to give him death gave him liberty.” Continuing to recognize the presence of God in daily life, Hutchinson addresses her husband’s involvement in the regicide, saying that he “addressed himself to God in prayer; desiring the Lord that, if through human frailty he were led into any error or false opinion in these great transactions, he would open his eyes and not suffer him to proceed” (235). “Finding no check” but rather experiencing a “confirmation in his conscience that it was his duty to act as he did,” Colonel Hutchinson “proceeded to sign the sentence against the King” (ibid). This sentence, which furthered the regicide effort,
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*Hutchinson, Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, ed. N. H. Keeble (London: Phoenix, 2000), 114. As this is one of Lucy Hutchinson’s writings, it will be referenced parenthetically in the text.*
was supported by the people, and Colonel Hutchinson and his compatriots felt that “they could not refuse it without giving up the people of God, whom they had led forth and engaged themselves unto by the oath of God” (ibid). According to Hutchinson, because he had acted “according to the dictates of the conscience which he had sought the Lord to guide,” “accordingly the Lord did signalize his favour afterwards to him” (ibid). In this description, Colonel Hutchinson, a faithful and loyal soldier, is among those chosen by God, those who are acting in accordance with the people’s wishes. Later, the people decide that those who signed the order for regicide were in the wrong, and Hutchinson notes that “strange it is how men who could afterwards pretend such reluctancy and abhorrence of those things that were done, should forget they were the effective answer of their petitions” (233). In this account, Colonel Hutchinson is being shamed unfairly, shamed by performing the actions he felt were his duty to God and to his people. Because he was an emissary of God, the people who are condemning him and shaming him are in the wrong; he is not. This improper application of shame is Hutchinson’s version of the bad shame discussed above in Milton’s narrative: this shame is not the divinely-brought shame by which humankind is constantly punished but must overcome, her version of good shame, but is rather due to the human tendency to be petty and fickle. In this essay, the discussion of *Order and Disorder* will focus on shame as it is properly exercised, as a divinely mandated condition of human existence, rather than shame as means by which humans mistreat one another.

Georgia Brown, commenting on the late Elizabethan period, in the wake of which Milton and Hutchinson would grow up, notes that contemporary critics accused literature
of being a “superficial pursuit that diverted readers and writers from serious employment
and Christian morality.”⁵ That criticism, however, did not stop writers from indulging in
the shameful creation of literature, as Brown notes that “Shame is not only produced by
late Elizabethan literature, it actually produces late Elizabethan literary culture.”⁶ Authors
of the period appear to have relished in the very impropriety of the work they were
creating and sought a way to make their writing as useful as possible. Brown says that, in
the 1590s, defense of literature diverted from its older humanist approach, in which
writers “argued that it held a kernel of political or moral truth,” because those defenses
“do not recognize advantages that are specific to literary discourse” or the importance of
“didactic and allegorical character” over the “literary or functional qualities” of the
writing.⁷ Rather than view literature only as a “vehicle for historical, political or religious
truth,” writers began instead to celebrate the “trivial and transgressive” nature of
literature “to uncover the paradoxical value of marginality, error, ornamentality and
excess.”⁸

As writers subverted the shame they were meant to experience in writing by
making their writing address particular kinds of shaming, they also embraced the
dualities that shame provided. In her example of The Faerie Queene, Brown notes that
shame, in this work, plays “varied, even contradictory, roles” in “social, political and
cultural self-definition”; in this way, shame can describe “proper, modest female
behavior,” but it can also have “negative associations, and can mean disgrace, guilt,

⁶ Ibid.
⁷ Ibid, 6.
⁸ Ibid.
humiliation, self-contempt, sexual violation and loss of chastity.”

This shame, defined by “Spenserian courtesy” and a set of “ethical, social and nationalistic ideals” of the period, “controls the interactions between individuals, and generates order.”

The mid-seventeenth century witnessed the widespread employment of shame as a means by which religious and political factions could promote conformity, stifle dissent, and persuade outsiders to join their cause. By the 1640s, shame was no longer being explored merely as a tension between opposing forces, as Brown suggests it had been in Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*; rather, it was being used to directly influence the behavior of others. Presbyterian works such as Thomas Edwards's *Gangraena*, an inflammatory list of the “Errors, Herefies, Blaphemies, and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries” of the period, which Edwards sent to Parliament in 1646, sought to rectify the behavior of the country from shameful beliefs and practices. Julie Fann, in her dissertation work on such writings, writes that Presbyterians of the 1630s and 40s “were attempting to amend religious and civil society” by disguising “institutional changes” as “reform.” She explains that, although the Presbyterian texts “employ dualistic commonplaces, such as true vs. false and good vs. evil, they also encourage the reader to interact with the text, a process that promotes interpretive variety.” While this “interpretive variability” may have been “anxiety producing” for the Presbyterians, “it
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9 Ibid.
10 Ibid, 7.
was an indispensable asset to their coercive campaigns,” which they used to gain followers in the Civil War period. This understanding of shame, in which the workings of shame from a Spenserian, dualistic perspective are exalted alongside a notion of personal interpretation, can lead to an understanding from which one can explore Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. By pairing of these techniques, Milton is able to explore the good and bad of shame while also engaging in personal interpretation; he is able, in *Paradise Lost*, to manipulate the source material such that the shame depicted in the Book of Genesis can be shaped to fulfil his own purposes.

*Paradise Lost* engages with shame in the story of creation as a means to explore the relationship between humans and God as one in which salvation is sought through the recognition of sins and the request for forgiveness. This understanding of the Genesis story diverges significantly from the source material found in Genesis, fictionalizing the relatively sparse account such that it creates a shame that is productive, influencing the free will that determines how and when characters in the narrative will act. In Milton’s *The Reason for Church Government*, the speaker says that “It was thought of old in philosophy that shame, or to call it better, the reverence of our elders, our brethren, and friends, was the greatest incitement of virtuous deeds and the greatest dissuasion from unworthy attempts that might be” (679). In this tract, written in 1642, Milton rejects the strategies of the religious groups, including the Presbyterians, that aim to control their congregations by “terror,” insisting that “whereas terror is thought such a great stickler in a commonwealth, honorable shame is far greater, and has more reason” (679). The shame
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14 Ibid, 19.
presented in *Paradise Lost* mimics the shame discussed in *The Reason for Church Government*, which asserts that shame, in order to be useful, must create “assemblies of the faithful” by making individuals accountable to their peers and their elders (680). This shame is, in *The Reason for Church Government*, paired with what Milton calls “esteem, ““a more ingenuous and noble degree of honest shame” “whereby men bear an inward reverence to their own persons” (ibid). When shame and esteem are accompanied by a reverence for God, the only way to keep from offending one’s self or one’s community is by upholding the will and teachings of God. The version of shame presented in *Paradise Lost*, in which physical shame and inward shame work together to foster contrition, suggests that, in a fallen world, shame and esteem must necessarily be cultivated in communities of faith to form a shame that functions as a guide to a relationship with God, not as a punishment that forever separates an individual from God.

*Order and Disorder*, on the other hand, uses its narrative to create an alternative to the shame presented in *Paradise Lost*; rather than providing an impetus for action in relation to free will, shame in *Order and Disorder* serves to mark how humans have fallen from the grace of God but have also been saved, in spite of their undeservedness. The shame in *Order and Disorder* exists in relation to predestination and influences human action as a trend across generations, rather than as an intimate force directly involved in decision making. Therefore, this shame is not as explicitly discussed as the shame in *Paradise Lost*, but is rather an overarching understanding from which human
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15 This tract appears to have been specifically addressing congregations, groups of like-minded individuals who choose to worship together. Its arguments, however, can be applied to larger communities, such as humanity as a whole, and to smaller communities, such as the family. Each individual can maintain membership in several communities, each of which can hold the individual accountable and has the power to influence what that individual sees as shameful.
action descends. Even when characters do not recognize they are being influenced by shame, shame is present and active. In *Order and Disorder*, shame appears to function as a punishment which separates humans from God, but it does not keep them from God in perpetuity; in spite of their separation, humans can still be saved. To act, however, in their fallen world, they must overcome the shame that limits their actions. Shame, in *Order and Disorder*, does not lead to salvation but instead operates as a punishment to hinder humanity’s progress; the prospect of overcoming shame and becoming more pleasing to and understanding of God is a motivational force throughout the narrative. Humankind, in *Order and Disorder*, acts to please God because it has been saved, not because it is seeking salvation.

In this essay, the relation of shame to the narratives of *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* will be discussed in three chapters: physical shame, internal shame, and the relation of shame to salvation.

The first chapter discusses how *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* present the physical manifestation of shame on a human body, the external shame. The attention given to physical shame, as present in these narratives, places an emphasis on the collective and allows the reader a place in the narrative. When the narratives witness the shame of a character by his or her blush, for example, so does the reader, without any narrative insight into that character’s psyche. Readers, therefore, are part of the community that witnesses to characters’ shame. Although *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* are presenting physical shame to achieve separate ends, the presentation of that
shame is comparable across the narratives, and it will be discussed, in this chapter, side-by-side.

The second chapter discusses how *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* represent the workings of shame within an individual: how the shame affects the internality of a character and how that internal understanding influences outside actions. It is here, in the exploration of this internal shame, where the two narratives primarily diverge. In *Paradise Lost*, the purpose of shame is to influence an individual’s actions by reaching into that individual’s thoughts and directing their actions in such a way that those actions better the individual’s relationship with God; in *Order and Disorder*, internal shame is of lesser importance, and the community, which is itself subject to the universal human shame, takes a place of prominence and subjects the internal will. Because these narratives employ internal shame to such different extents and for different reasons, it is not particularly useful to discuss the manifestations of internal shame in a side-by-side comparison, and each narrative will be discussed separately for most of the second chapter.

The third chapter discusses the relationship between shame and salvation as presented in *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder*. In *Paradise Lost*, this relationship centers on the ability of shame to incite a reaction: in this case, contrition. This contrition relies on the recognition of one’s wrongs through shame in order to seek forgiveness. In *Order and Disorder*, shame is omnipresent, and forgiveness is offered through God’s grace, rather than earned by human action; here, the proper use of free will and the
appropriate understanding of how to operate within a framework of shame is evidence of one’s salvation, rather than the means to salvation.
Chapter One: Approaches to External Shame

Both *Order and Disorder* and *Paradise Lost* are concerned with the defining and quantifying of shame, specifically as it relates to shame’s physicality. In each poem, characters are subjected to shaming within the narrative through various internal and external pressures; however, the two poems differ in their presentations of the nature of shame, especially in relation to shame’s origins. Although the narratives do not agree on the origins of shame, they present shame externally in similar manners. This similarity, however, does not extend to the characters’ responses to the shame or shaming they have experienced, and the poems provide different ideas about how individuals, once shamed, must proceed. *Order and Disorder* and *Paradise Lost* present different ideas regarding the defining and quantifying of shame; as a result of this difference, each of the poems also presents a different reasoning for, manifestation of, and response to what are, at times, the same incidents of shaming.

Much of the effort contained within *Order and Disorder* and *Paradise Lost* to define shame is directed towards explaining the physicality of shame. Physicalizing shame allows the reader insight into the inner functioning of the characters the narrative presents, even where the narrative does not explicitly describe the inner workings of the characters’ minds, but it also allows for the reader insight into what is considered shameful by the community; if the reader were relying entirely on an internal understanding of shame, characters who, due to the fallenness of humankind, possess abilities of deceit or the affliction of ignorance may not recognize their own shame. This refusal, either willing or unwilling, to recognize shame would restrict the reader from
learning about what the communities to which the characters in the narratives belong consider to be shameful.

The most obvious example of this physical shame is immediately after Eve and Adam eat the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge. Adam eating of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, in *Paradise Lost*, completes the fall of humankind, but does not cause it independently. In this narrative, Eve falls without Adam, through the influence of the disguised Satan, taking the form of a serpent, and “all [is] lost” for her before Adam even realizes she has fallen (9.784). Eve then takes the fruit to Adam so that Adam may join her in her newfound knowledge. Adam, however, does not fall with her in order to gain knowledge; rather, Adam knowingly falls so that he may die with her, for “with [her] / Certain [his] resolution is to Die (9.399). In *Paradise Lost*, the shame of Adam’s fall is felt by the whole Earth, but so is the shame of Eve’s fall. At Eve’s fall, the “Earth felt her wound,” and Nature “gave signs of woe” (9.782-83). At Adam’s fall, Earth “trembl’d from her entrails,” and Nature “gave a second groan” and “Wept at the completing of the mortal Sin / Original” (9.1000-1004). Earth’s shame at the fall of Adam and Eve is then reflected in their shame of their own physical forms, “The Parts of each from other, that seem most / To shame obnoxious and unseemliest seen” (9.1093-94). The response to the fall in *Order and Disorder* is extremely similar, although the action of falling is different.

In *Order and Disorder*, the fall does not happen to Eve until Adam also eats of the fruit and falls. This circumstance sets *Order and Disorder* apart from *Paradise Lost*, where Adam and Eve fall individually. In *Order and Disorder*, it is not until Eve
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16 Milton, *Paradise Lost*, in *John Milton Complete Poems and Major Prose*, ed. by Merritt Y. Hughes (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1957), 211-469, 9.784; all subsequent references to this work are from this edition and will be referenced by book and page number within the text.
“commends” the forbidden fruit to Adam and he “by her persuasion too offends” that “her inward torturing pains begin” (4.214-16). Indeed, neither Adam nor Eve realize that eating of the fruit will cause pain and punishment until after both have fallen. After Adam’s fall, “Sad Nature’s sighs gave the alarms” (5.1) and Adam hides from God, “afeared” and ashamed of his newly discovered and demonized nakedness (5.18). That physical shame is emphasized in this portion of the narrative of *Order and Disorder* and *Paradise Lost* is not surprising, as a cornerstone of Christian collective memory is that Adam and Eve were ashamed of their bodies after the fall, but it is worth noting that the type of physical shame described in the narratives immediately post-fall differs from the physical shame presented elsewhere Hutchinson and Milton’s poems.17

The physical shame shown in *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* immediately post-fall is a shame that first affects the mind and is then projected onto the body. The fall allows Adam and Eve to recognize their nakedness and then feel ashamed of it. However,  

17 Both *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* say that Earth and Nature lamented the fall of man. This lament demonstrates an ability on the part of physical, but not strictly alive, objects to mourn a loss or demonstrate discontent. In *Paradise Lost*, Adam is created of the “Dust of the ground” and is, therefore, parented by the Earth and a part of Earth’s physical body (7.525). Eve is formed of Adam’s rib, and as Adam is formed of the Earth, so is Eve (8.466). The physicality Adam and Eve share with the Earth is a characteristic that they do not share with their Creator; the initial disappointment comes from the Earth and from Nature because neither Earth nor Nature, not being divine, could have predicted the fall of man. Earth, however, is also home to the Garden of Eden, in which the Tree of Knowledge is contained. This tree and the garden within which it is contained are described as so wonderful that “The Earth now / Seem’d like to Heav’n, a seat where Gods might dwell, / Or wander with delight” (8.328-30). The same sentiment is echoed in *Order and Disorder*, where the garden is described as a place where “majesty and grace together meet” and where there sits the “throne of th’universal King” (1.197-99). Eden, in both poems, is presented as a location in which Heaven and Earth meet, where the boundary between the divine and the human is blurred, which is why it is from the garden that humankind has to be expelled after the fall, because they have lost the privilege of being so close to the Creator. However, that Eden, on Earth, contained both humankind, the agents of the fall, and the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, the means by which humankind falls. The narratives almost suggest that Earth, a non-living entity is at some fault for the fall, and has somewhat sinned. The Earth, however, is not capable of shame, as the Earth is non-living. Even if the Earth cannot be shamed for its potential sin, it can be punished: humankind goes on to enslave and rage war against the Earth, pitting humankind and the physical parents of man, Earth and Nature, against one another.
the nakedness of their bodies does not directly entail shame; rather, the knowledge gained from the fall, which tells that nakedness is somehow negative, signals that Adam and Eve should be ashamed of their bodies. In this case, the source of the shame is only partially known; elsewhere in *Paradise Lost*, before the fall, shame exhibits itself physically before the individual character is even capable of conceptualizing shame. In instances such as these, the shame that the characters experience cannot be in agreement with the shame that occurred immediately post-fall. Instead, this shame must first affect the body, then be known in the mind. For example, as early as book 4, well before the fall in the course of the narrative, Eve is characterized as “Dishevell’d,” wearing her hair in “wanton ringlets” (4.305).\(^{18}\) In this description, it is as if Eve is already being shamed, in this case for her perceived sexuality, before she is supposed to be capable of shameful behavior. The physicality of this shame suggests that disgrace is physically discernible, even when the individual being shamed is aware of neither the humiliation her behavior should bring nor the concept of shame at large. The reader can see that Eve’s behavior or person has been deemed shameful, even if she can not.\(^{19}\)

18 Wanton: 1.a. Of a person, a person's will, etc.: undisciplined, ungoverned; unmanageable, rebellious.; 3.a. Lustful; not chaste, sexually promiscuous; 4.a. Of a person: playful; unrestrained in merriment, jovial; inclined to joking; carefree. Also of behaviour. Obs. While 4.a. gives a positive definition of “wanton” that would have been, in Milton’s time, perfectly acceptable and would have lessened the association of Eve to shameful behavior, the pairing of “wanton” with “Dishevell’d,” which ascribes negative attributes to Eve, makes the analysis given here, of “wanton” as negatively reflecting on Eve, a reasonable one (4.305).


Dishevelled/disheveled: Of the hair: Unconfined by head-gear, hanging loose, flung about in disorder; unkempt.


19 It is important to recognize that fallen readers cannot help but to project falleness into situations of unfalleness; similarly, the fallen narrator cannot help but to project falleness into Eve’s supposed unfalleness. If the prelapsarian world is viewed as one in which shame does not exist because it has no
The presentation of shame in *Order and Disorder* seems to suggest that shame can contain an inherent physical manifestation. For example, the narrator describes the innocent love shared between man and wife before the fall as removed from the “lust” that would, in later sexual relationships, “dye the cheeks with shame” (3.501-2).\(^{20}\) In this description, shame is agentive and almost autonomous, itself coloring the cheeks of those committing shameful acts or having shameful thoughts; it is, however, not spurring any kind of action, as it does in *Paradise Lost*. Shame’s physical manifestation in this particular scene demonstrates again how shame may become obvious to those around the individual being shamed before that shame can be recognized by the individual for him- or herself.\(^{21}\) Shame, therefore, is not always a thought or an emotion, and physical shame reason to, rather than because it cannot yet be recognized, it is unexpected for Eve to have characteristics that the postlapsarian world would deem shameful, because they should not yet have existed. Although the shameful characteristics of Eve’s appearance are attributed to her by a fallen narrator, who would be incapable of recounting the story without evidence of fallenness, the narrator is ascribing shame to Eve before she should have been capable of experiencing, recognizing, or requiring it. Therefore, shame can be recognized by an outside party even if the individual being shamed does not recognize the shame. After the fall, the emphasis in Milton’s narrative is on communities of shame; these communities, through incidents of shaming, teach individuals in the community what the community thinks it shameful and what the community thinks is acceptable. To teach an individual, a community must be capable of recognizing that individual’s shortcomings; here, the reader is recognizing Eve’s shortcomings before she can recognize them in herself. This does not suggest that Eve is ignoring the shameful actions, but rather that her ignorance keeps her from recognizing and rectifying the ill in her behavior.

\(^{20}\) This scene is describing sinless love between man and wife. Between humans, this love must have happened before the fall, but this passage can also be interpreted as being a description of the love of Christ for his wife, the Church, which must necessarily take place, on Earth, after the fall. According to Norbrook’s commentary in *Order and Disorder*, “Adam’s love for Eve prefigures Christ’s love for the church, following a tradition of allegorical readings of the marital language in the Song of Songs (Canticles). Such readings were especially common amongst Dissenters,” in Lucy Hutchinson, *Order and Disorder*, ed. David Norbrook (Malden: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 2001), 47. This portion of the poem is a narrative grey area, where the narrator discusses behavior between a man and his bride, rather than specifically addressing either Adam and Eve or Christ and the Church. The reading presented above, however, suggests that the bodies being discussed in relation to the blush of lust are, in fact, physical bodies; Christ, at this point in the narrative of creation, had no physical body, so it is not unreasonable to interpret this portion of the narrative as speaking towards the marital relations of Adam and Eve, who both had physical bodies.

\(^{21}\) This particular scene is another where it becomes important to recognize that the narrator of *Order and Disorder*, like the narrator of *Paradise Lost*, is a fallen individual. In this case, the narrator is projecting onto Adam and Eve the shameful lust that the narrator knows they do not have and commenting on its absence as though its absence were exceptional, when the reader knows that its absence is to be expected in
is not always the manifestation of an emotion or thought on the human body. The shame described here is not a byproduct of the internalization of the understanding of shame, just as the shame attributed to Eve in the above scene from *Paradise Lost* is separated from her ability to perceive her behavior or existence as shameful. Both of the instances described above focus on the role of shame as it is present in the relationship between Adam and Eve before the fall. The passage from *Order and Disorder* predicts the existence of the shame that will be felt after the fall by denying its presence before the fall; *Paradise Lost*, on the other hand, ascribes shame to Eve before the fall even occurs. In each case, the physical attribute of the shame in question, whether recognized by the character on which it is presenting itself or not, makes the shame impossible for the reader to ignore. The characters being shamed have neither to recognize their shame nor accept their shame for that shame to make itself known. The reader, in this situation, becomes witness to the shame of the characters, part of their community of shame. *Order and Disorder* and *Paradise Lost* have different eventual requirements for salvation, but both narratives emphasize the importance of community in the understanding of shame; before the fall in each narrative, the only people capable of recognizing the shame that is or will be present in the narrative are the narrator and the reader. In this application of shame onto supposedly shameless characters, the narratives seem to be emphasizing that an important role of the community of shame is to recognize shame in another person when individuals do not recognize it for themselves. Because the community can then

a prelapsarian world. Its absence neither leaves a vacuum nor comments on the shamefulness of Adam and Eve’s relationship, because shame does not yet exist. Their relationship is not without shame because they are not ashamed of each other or of themselves; their relationship is without shame because they are incapable of understanding or recognizing shame in a prelapsarian existence.
teach those individuals about their shame, they can, in *Paradise Lost*, eventually be saved and, in *Order and Disorder*, begin to overcome that shame which is always present but must be bypassed in order to lead a fulfilling life.

One way both *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* represent shame as an undeniably physical process throughout their narratives is through ruminations on the act of blushing. For example, the narrative of *Paradise Lost* has Adam describe Eve as “blushing like the Morn” when he first led her “To the Nuptial Bower” (8.510-1). This suggestion of trepidation or anxiety on the part of Eve at her first sexual encounter with Adam, which occurs in the prelapsarian narrative, ascribes to Eve an emotion that causes her to blush. Be it an expression of her own lust, a sense of embarrassment at Adam’s lust, or an embellishment of Adam’s in assigning Eve excitement she did not actually display, the reader cannot know, as Eve is not being asked to tell her side of the story. If the reader is to assume that this is an instance of Eve being shamed, it is taking place in a story being told by Adam to God. This story occurs before the fall, so Adam should not be able to recognize that he is shaming Eve or discussing an instance in which she felt ashamed. However, when Adam recognizes Eve’s blush, he is ascribing to her an emotion or experience that causes her to blush, even if he cannot recognize or say what that emotion or experience might be. If lust were to exist in prelapsarian marital relationships, it would undermine the idea that the marriage between Adam and Eve was sinless prior to the fall; it is possible that Adam and Eve were experiencing lust, an emotion that may entail sin, for one another without recognizing it as sinful and,
therefore, as reason for shame.\textsuperscript{22} Eve’s blushing at Adam’s advances in \textit{Paradise Lost}, however, is exactly what is described as not happening in \textit{Order and Disorder}, suggesting that \textit{Paradise Lost} and \textit{Order and Disorder} might disagree regarding the terms by which Adam and Eve experienced marital love and sex before the fall; therefore, \textit{Paradise Lost} and \textit{Order and Disorder} might also disagree on the terms by which human relationships can be sinless.\textsuperscript{23}

The narrative of \textit{Order and Disorder} extends significantly farther into the Genesis story than does the narrative of \textit{Paradise Lost}, and although the narrative of \textit{Order and Disorder} refrains from accusing the relationship between Adam and Eve before the fall of being shameful, that is not to suggest that all of the relationships presented in \textit{Order and Disorder} are given similar license. After the fall, the purity of Adam and Eve’s relationship is “defiled,” and other postlapsarian relationships, those between the descendants of Adam and Eve, can never reach a level of sinlessness that approaches that

\textsuperscript{22} Lust: 3. spec. in Biblical and Theological use: Sensuous appetite or desire, considered as sinful or leading to sin.
\textsuperscript{23} While the OED cites “blush” as “4a. The reddening of the face caused by shame, modesty, or other emotion,” it also cites it as “5. transf. A rosy colour or glow, as that of the dawn; in wider sense, a flush of light or of colour.” Here, it is possible that Adam is describing Eve’s glowing nature, and presumably her pleasure, rather than her blush of embarrassment. Either way, when Adam describes the blush, the reader cannot know if he is accurately reporting her appearance or what he means when he describes her blush. It could be, as in the case of Hero in \textit{Much Ado About Nothing}, that Eve’s blush could be “the sign and simbance of her honour” just as much as it could be her “guiltiness” (4.1.31, 40). It could be argued that, in a prelapsarian world, the blush should be interpreted as a sign of her modesty or pleasure, but given that elsewhere it in the poem it is explored as a sign of shame, it does not seem unreasonable to explore it as such here.


of Adam and Eve’s prelapsarian marriage (4.259). The narrative of *Order and Disorder* includes, for example, the relationships between Lot and his daughters after they flee the ruined city of Sodom. In this narrative, the blushing motif is again utilized, in this case to describe the lifespan of the shame that befalls Lot’s daughters. The two daughters independently recognize their lust for their father, a desire that neither “The coldest springs” nor “the icy flood” could “quench” (13.305-6). This “hot lust” (13.304) leads to “modest shame” (13.309), which marks their faces with a “bashful red” (13.307). The sisters share their desires with one another, breaking down the “fence of shame” (13.344) that kept them from expressing their feelings and allowed the blush to “retire” from their cheeks (13.307). However, as when the narrator describes the kind of shame absent from Adam and Eve’s relationship before the fall, the shame marking the cheeks of Lot’s daughters is more than just physical blush, and it leaves a lasting stain, seen or unseen, on the skin of their cheeks, which are “sullied with their foul desire” even after the blush fades (13.308).

---

24 Here, the term “lifespan” has been chosen to describe the shame of Lot’s daughters because their shame appears to come for a short time and then go. It is, however, possible that shame, once felt, exists forever, regardless of the character’s ability to perceive it once it has been deemed unnecessary, as Lot’s daughters do after they learn that each has the same lustful desire for her father. The narrator seems to think that this shame will continue to mark them, an opinion supported by the eventual punishment of their descendants by the sons of Jacob, when it is said that “though the Lord spare sinners a long time / Yet judgement will at last meet every crime (14.357-8). Another possibility regarding the lifespan of shame is that shame exists inside the individual immediately upon imposition from the community, i.e. that shame does not exist until society teaches that certain actions are shameful, and that after that teaching is learned, the shame exists forever, whether or not it is felt, until the individual experiences the shameful action and then feels the shame it has been taught to experience. This does not, however, seem to be what *Order and Disorder* is suggesting; rather, *Order and Disorder* seems to be suggesting that the human condition of shame came with the fall, and that this shame can mark individuals through the physical manifestation of their community’s concept of shame, a concept that has been influenced by the universal shame. That shame cannot go away, because it is part of the human condition, but human beings may move past that shame in order to improve their lives.
The narrative of *Order and Disorder* is interested in assigning blame for events of shaming, as is the narrative of *Paradise Lost*. In *Order and Disorder*, when Lot produces sons Moab and Ammi with his own daughters, all of the blame is placed on his daughters, not on Lot, for it is said that Lot “unknowingly committed the offense” and is, therefore, not to blame (13.348). However, neither narrative suggests that ignorance categorically frees an individual from responsibility. In *Order and Disorder*, Eve is blamed for eating of the fruit and causing Adam to fall, but before she offered the fruit to Adam, she had no knowledge of fallenness, as they fall together in that narrative. Her ignorance does not free her from responsibility, and she is punished by death and childbirth. Similarly, after the fall, as told in *Paradise Lost*, Eve says that Adam could have fallen just as easily as she did, and that she was not to know that Satan could enter the garden and take the form of the serpent. Adam, however, continues to place the blame on Eve, suggesting to her that she was warned to beware “the lurking Enemy” and the death that accompanied him (9.1172). It can be argued, however, that Eve was not as well informed as Adam and that Adam failed to adequately express to Eve the danger of which he had been warned.\(^{25}\) This would suggest that Eve was, to some extent, ignorant of the ramifications of her actions. However, unlike Lot, whose shame is assigned to his daughters and their families, Eve is

\(^{25}\) In *Paradise Lost*, Adam has a relationship with the Creator and his emissaries that Eve has not been allowed. Adam tries to convince her that she can be made to fall, but Eve is convinced that Eden has not been constructed “so imperfect by the Maker wise, / As not secure” (9.337-38), Adam tells her that she was given free will, which will allow her to fall, and that Eden has not been created to keep her from making her own choices, not by the “imperfect or deficient” creation of God, but because her will must be tested to prove that she will make the choices God requires of her (9.344). At the end of this conversation, Eve leaves Adam, and it does not seem that she fully comprehends the enemy she has in Satan. Eve’s sex relegates her to a position of indirect contact with the Creator; Adam is supposed to communicate to her what he feels she must know, and her falling shortly after the conversation above suggests that he has not done that job well enough.
made responsible for the fall and shamed by her companion Adam, who fell separately, if not independently, from her.

While the narratives of *Order and Disorder* and *Paradise Lost* assign incidents of shaming to more female than male characters, and while issues of gender will be more fully explored in following chapters, it is worth noting that both male and female characters in both narratives are exposed to incidents of shaming. This numerical disparity between incidences of shaming of male and female characters suggests that there is a gendered dimension inherent to shame itself in the narratives. For example, one of the few cases of shaming of a male character in *Order and Disorder* is when Ham is derided by his brothers. Ham, one of Noah’s sons, “fears not to publish his [father’s] indecent shame” and publicly exposes Noah’s naked body while Noah is passed out drunk (9.191). Ham feels no remorse for his actions, but he and all of his descendants are punished for them. Ham and his progeny are punished, as Lot’s daughters’ descendants are punished, but in this case there are no female characters to blame. If there had been, as there were for Lot, Ham himself may not have received punishment to the same degree. The idea that the female characters act as scapegoat extends even into the narratives of Adam and Eve. In *Order and Disorder*, Eve places the blame for the fall on herself, saying that Adam was “by me betrayed” (5.435) and apparently forgetting that

---

26 This is one of the only instances of shaming in the narrative of *Order and Disorder* in which no female character is involved; because there is no female character, none can become the scapegoat for Ham’s crimes. His punishment, however, is very like the female punishments discussed elsewhere in the narrative, because he is the primary cause for the punishment and the punishment affects him as well as his progeny. His children, “equal to his brother’s born, / Excluded from the special blessing were” and instead “multiplied to sorrow and disgrace” (9.277-281). Where Lot’s daughters’ children are cursed and eventually triumphed over by Jacob’s descendants, the sons of Ham become “cursed Canaanites” to be ruled over by the “spreading European colonies” (10.6-7). Here, the narrator suggests that the sons of Ham were not given the mercy of total destruction that the descendants of Lot’s daughters were; instead, they are subjugated even in the period contemporary to the writing of *Order and Disorder*. 
Adam admits to God that Eve “Gave me the fatal fruit, and I did eat” (5.25). Nobody suggests that Eve forces him to eat the fruit, but even the narrator accuses Eve of scheming against Adam and God, saying that the Devil’s “lies could never have prevailed on Eve / But that she wished them truth” (5.43-44).

In assigning shame, *Order and Disorder* and *Paradise Lost* present narratives in which shame is applied to a collective and narratives in which shame is applied to an individual. Lot’s daughters feel ashamed of their lustful thoughts for their father as individuals but allow themselves to be free of that shame as a collective. Their punishment, however, is applied to and shames an entire collective: all of their descendants, for whom “judgment will at last meet every crime” (14.358). Even though the descendants of Lot’s daughters are not responsible for the daughters’ actions, they are punished. In *Paradise Lost*, the shame and punishment ascribed to Adam and Eve as a result of their eating of the Tree of Knowledge, death, is given to them as a collective, although they fall separately, and is also given to the collective of humankind, their descendants. This punishment, however, is delayed, and the “Pains only in Child-bearing were foretold” immediately (10.1051). This punishment is directed specifically to Eve, giving her a greater punishment than is given to Adam for what might be considered the same crime: disobeying God. The punishment ascribes shame to Eve’s individuality, but that same shame applies to the collective of womankind, the female descendants of Eve.

Although shame is applied to individuals and collectives in *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* for similar reasons, a different response to shame is prescribed in each of the poems. In *Paradise Lost*, the idea of the fortunate fall is explored, because the
fall allows humankind to access forgiveness through the Son, giving them eventual access to “A paradise within thee, happier far” than the Eden of their untested free will (12.587). *Order and Disorder*, on the other hand, suggests that creation would have been better off had humankind not fallen, that the “fetters, yokes and poisons” of the fall are “The obstacles of [their] felicity / The ruin of [their] souls’ most firm healths” (5.628-30).

Both *Order and Disorder* and *Paradise Lost*, however, do say that the redemption of humankind lies with procreation, “the dire curse of womankind” (*Order and Disorder* 5.128), because it will result in Christ, the “Promised Seed” that “shall all restore” (*Paradise Lost* 12.623).

That shame is represented physically in *Order and Disorder* and *Paradise Lost* is important because it suggests that shame cannot ever be fully hidden, and therefore that shame is necessarily communal. There can be, when shame is represented physically, no community that appears to be entirely shameless, because each will be able to see the shame of each, allowing the community to further shame individuals and force them to take responsibility for their instances of shaming. If there were a society in which shame were not represented physically, it may be possible to hide one’s shame. The figure of Satan in *Paradise Lost* is described as having taken the form of a serpent to disguise himself from Eve. Satan picks the serpent because he believes the serpent to be the “subtlest Beast of all the Field,” the “fittest Imp of fraud” (9.86-89). Satan has the ability to disguise that humans do not have; if the reader considers humans to be the model by which creation has improved the previously created angel, the removal of this ability to disguise could be due to the necessity, or at least benefit, of shame. Without shame, Satan
is convinced that he has acted rightly in disobeying God and venturing off to destroy humankind on his own, but with shame, the humans recognize that they must necessarily live in community with one another and that they have erred in disobeying God. Courtney O. Carlisle, in her dissertation on Milton’s “First Defense” and “Second Defense of the English People,” says that “Shame, in a very physical and intellectual way, makes us conscious of ourselves.”

This increased consciousness allows humanity to recognize that “We belong, in a sense, to the people that surround us... because of our interactions with them.” For Carlisle, this shame makes an individual a member of their community, but when an individuals are “shameless,” when they do not experience and apply shame appropriately, they are not members of that community, and cannot recognize their own shame. Because humans can recognize their inadequacies, and perhaps are forced to recognize their inadequacies by the physicality of the shame they experience as a result of the internalization of those inadequacies, they can improve upon their behavior, therefore becoming more pleasing to the Creator. Furthermore, the fallen angels, a group of which Satan is a part, experience no time pressure on their actions; they are not going to die, and therefore feel no need to behave as God has instructed them to behave, because they cannot be punished any more than they already have been.

Paradise Lost and Order and Disorder both employ physicality as a prominent characteristic in their defining of shame. This physicality makes the shame of characters unavoidable, allowing the reader and other characters access into the individual

---

28 Ibid.
29 Ibid.
consciences of characters even when their internality is not explored in the narrative. The physical manifestations of shame make it easier for shame to be forced on individual characters, as they make shame impossible to hide. Because shame is impossible to hide, its consequences cannot be avoided. Each of the poems, however, is interested in those consequences, specifically the consequences of childbirth, a punishment which offers redemption through the birth of a savior.

This is not to say, however, that each poem uses shame to the same ends, even if their employments of physical shame result in similar results. Shame in *Paradise Lost* is employed to result in action; the characters must feel shame to recognize that their actions have been against the will of God, and for that they must ask forgiveness, as it is by that process of asking for forgiveness that they can attempt to repair their relationship with the Creator. In *Order and Disorder*, shame exists all around the characters at all times and is a force that must be overcome in order to better the lot of humanity: to create a graceful order from a chaotic disorder. Ham commits a shameful action, but that shameful action is committed in a world which has already seen a multitude of sin and shame and is in response to another shameful situation: the drunkenness of his father, Noah. In *Order and Disorder*, shame is an omnipresent force reminding humankind that it has ruined its relationship with God, but in *Paradise Lost*, shame is a force by which humankind can try to repair its relationship with God.
Chapter Two: Approaches to Internal Shame

*Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* differ in their presentations of the nature of shame, especially as that presentation of shame relates to characterization. In their approaches to characterization, *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* focus on issues of the inner life, including the absence of an inner life. Given that inner lives are afforded to some characters and not to others, it becomes necessary to discuss the sex of the characters presented, as well as the roles their genders play in the application of shame in their various narratives. The narratives of *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* create characters with varying degrees of inner life, and therefore with varying understandings of the internality of shame; in these understandings, the poems present different ideas on how internalized an issue of shaming must be for that shame to be understood or displayed externally.

**Section One: Paradise Lost**

The narrative of *Paradise Lost* presents characters with rich internal lives; this is especially evident in the characters of Adam and Eve, whose internal lives are revealed in their long and detailed explanations of their own thoughts and rationalizations for their actions. Through these passages, which often seem to function as though they were dramatic soliloquies, Adam and Eve’s feelings regarding their creation, their

---

30 In this essay, *sex* and gender will be used synonymously to discuss the maleness and femaleness of characters and the relation of that characteristic to their shaming. This is not to ignore the semantic difference between sex as a physiological construct and gender as an expression of masculinity and femininity, but rather to suggest that neither author appears to pay great attention to the complexities of that difference as recognized in a 21st century context.

31 That is, the passages spoken by Adam and Eve, although they are addressed to other characters, are often so long and so revealing of internal thought that it is as though they were not addressing anyone else. 1.a. An instance of talking to or conversing with oneself, or of uttering one’s thoughts aloud without addressing any person.
relationship, and their fall, among other topics, are explored at length. This exploration of
their internal lives lends itself to the conclusion that Adam and Eve are crafted by the
narrative in such a way that they are believable facsimiles of living, breathing,
humankind. The internal lives of Adam and Eve as presented in the poem are described
as distinct, with one having no more effect on the other than seems typical of any other
close human relationship. Even before the fall, Adam and Eve have different accounts
of meeting one another. The differences in their accounts do not really seem to suggest
that either party is remembering incorrectly; rather, the differences seem to show that
Adam and Eve are not only capable of remembering events differently, as any two
humans would be, but that they are capable of independently making and acting on
decisions.

The meeting of Adam and Eve is described twice in the narrative of *Paradise Lost*. In Adam’s narrative, he asks the Creator for a companion, for he feels he can find
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32 If Adam and Eve are written such that they mimic humankind, with all the internal life that implies, that
does complicate the actuality of their unfallenness in the prelapsarian portion of the *Paradise Lost*
narrative. It would be difficult to parse the degree to which internal life is an inherent possession of
humanity, such that it would exist prior to the fall, and the degree to which internal life is a byproduct of
the fallenness of humanity. It is difficult to imagine that the characters of Adam and Eve could, without
presupposing a certain degree of internal life, be able to describe their thoughts and recount their
experiences as they frequently do in the narrative of *Paradise Lost*, so even if the possession of an
internality lends itself to having already fallen, not all of the internality, and therefore fallenness, exhibited
by Adam and Eve can be attributed to the narrator’s own fallenness.
33 i.e., Adam and Eve do not appear to be present in each other’s consciousnesses. They appear to
communicate their thoughts and feelings to each other much as humans conventionally do, both verbally
and non-verbally, but not within each other’s minds. That each of them has an individual conscience
implies that each has individual free will; this free will is described by Adam in book 9 as connected to
reason, so Adam and Eve also have their own reason (352). Interestingly, breakdowns in this method of
communication occur even before the fall, and Adam does not always understand Eve. For example, after
they both fall, Adam calls Eve’s choice to leave him and explore the garden on her own “that strange /
Desire of wand’ring” (9.1136-36). Adam cannot understand why Eve wants to be apart from him, even
before the fall, because he sees their separation as an invitation to the fall, and worries about her getting in
harm’s way when she is “sever’d from” him (9.252).
no “harmony or true delight” among the animals, who are not his equals (8.384). In this
desire for a companion, Adam separates himself from God, who, being “perfect” on his
own, needs no complement (8.415). Pleased with Adam’s evaluation of himself as in
need of another human, God creates Eve, “Manlike, but different sex, so lovely fair,”
from one of Adam’s ribs (8.469). Adam immediately feels attachment to this creature, a
creature who, although she has neither spoken to nor interacted with Adam, is not
“uninform’d / of nuptial Sanctity and marriage Rites” (8.486-87). Adam remembers Eve
turning to look at him after he says that marriage makes of man and woman “one Flesh,
one Heart, one Soul,” as though she were “divinely brought” to immediately become his
wife (8.499-500). This description of Eve sexualizes her from her introduction, defining
her only in relation to Adam. By the time he leads her, “blushing like the Morn” “To the
Nuptial Bow’r,” he has not even said her name, but has only described her “Innocence
and Virgin Modesty,” which was “pure of sinful thought” and neither “obvious” nor
“obtrusive” (8.501-11). Adam sees Eve as having been created for his use, at his
request, for the “God in him,” and for the ultimate goal of furthering his bloodline, but
without much of an internal life (4.299). However, by the time Adam tells his story of
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34 Eve is not shown here as being named by Adam, as he named the animals. Rather, Eve comes from the
Creator with her name, setting her apart from the animals. Although she is not as exalted as Adam, she is
raised above the animals, suggesting that Adam has not been promised the unfailing dominion over her that
he has been promised over the animals.

35 Adam’s description of Eve as “pure of sinful thought,” given that it takes place before the fall, is odd
(8.506). Before the fall, Eve should necessarily be sinless, just as Adam should. It is almost as if, even
before the fall, the association of women and sin, or sexuality and sin, is already known, regardless of its
actuality. For this to be true, it would suggest some strange premonition of Adam’s that women and
sexuality will eventually equate to sin; such a premonition would make Adam more like his Creator, and
less like his companion. Technically, Adam should not know of the existence of sin; presumably
knowledge of the existence of sin should appear only after the two have eaten of the Tree of Knowledge.
meeting Eve, Eve has already provided her story of meeting Adam, and they do not correspond.

While Eve also tells Adam that she was created “for” and “from” Adam, “flesh of [his] flesh,” she also demonstrates that she was satisfied with her own company before she was led by God to go find Adam (4.440-41). When she first sees Adam, she finds him less attractive than herself, “less winning soft, less amiably mild” than her reflection, and therefore, less interesting than herself (4.479). This self-characterization could suggest that Eve is obsessed with her outward appearances and sacrifices the internal understanding of herself for this obsession. However, her assessment is more complex.

36 The story of Eve and her reflection has clear parallels with the story of Narcissus, who was so vain that he lost his life seeking his own reflection, as in "Narcissus," in Dictionary Plus Classical Studies, Oxford University Press, 23 March 2017, http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780191831065.001.0001/acref-9780191831065-e-258. If the reader assumes that Eve is a significantly more complicated character than the character of Narcissus, which seems advisable, then the comparison between Eve and Narcissus seems, rather than being unflattering of Eve, actually quite subversive. We are to understand that Eve is beautiful, but it is not necessarily her beauty that attracts her to her reflection; it is her contentment with herself. Upon command from her Creator, she leaves what she understands to be herself and becomes Adam’s companion, doing what God has required of her rather than seeking to further her own desires. This presentation is contrasted by her experience of the fall, when she does not do as God requires of her rather than seeking to further her own desires. The parallels between these stories suggest that Eve, having already made a self-sacrificing decision to serve God, would know to continue making what she understood to be self-sacrificing decisions to serve God and would not have eaten of the Tree of Knowledge. It is possible here that the decision to become Adam’s companion was not really her own decision. Adam, in his discussion of free will in book 9, says that “God left free the Will, for what obeys / Reason is free” (351-52). However, it could be that, although Eve is in possession of free will, she is unaware of that free will and has never used it, so she feels no choice but to follow Adam. In her own description of the event, Eve says, “what could I do, / But follow straight, invisibly thus led?” (4:475-76), suggesting that she did not decide to follow Adam but that she rather felt no choice but to follow Adam. Adam tells her she was created with free will, but she has no experience exercising that free will until she interacts with the serpent and subsequently falls, at which point the narrative shames her for making the wrong decision. Without having experience of exercising her free will in any significant way, Eve must choose to either save or destroy humankind without the help of God or Adam, those who have helped her previously. The suggestion that Eve needed protection from her own decision making is unnerving, as it suggests that she is not capable of being an independent human being, but it is worth noting that, at this point, Adam is similarly incapable of independent decision making. The difference indicated here is that Adam has help making his decisions, either from direct intervention from God or through the intervention of angels. With their help, Adam exercises his free will. Eve, created for the “God in” Adam and deprived of celestial contact after her initial introduction to Adam, is supposed to have help from Adam to make her decisions (4.299). She leaves him, and in doing so separates herself from any support in her decision making. The difference represented here between Eve and Adam is that,
than that analysis allows, and it is important to recognize that all Eve knows of herself is her outward appearance and her relationship to her creator. Before she meets Adam, the Creator speaks directly to Eve; after she meets Adam, the Creator speaks to Eve through God, as Adam was created for “for God only,” and she was created for Adam (4.299). Eve does not need relationship with Adam to feel complete, and she does not have the visceral longing for him that he has for her. In her reflection, Eve sees herself, and is told by her creator that that reflection is “thyself,” not “a reflection of thyself” (4.468).

Because she is satisfied by her own existence, the vision she sees of herself is enough to satisfy her. She must be convinced to seek Adam by the Creator, because she is happy without Adam. After she meets Adam, however, Eve is no longer directly spoken to by God, and she must relate to her creator through Adam’s consciousness, which she does not share directly. That Eve must be with Adam to have a relationship with God might suggest that she would be uncomfortable to be without Adam, but she seems to leave his company regularly throughout *Paradise Lost*. Eve, lulled into a sense of security in her own decision making and comfortable on her own, falls when she has been separated from Adam.37

---

37 At this point in the narrative, Eve’s contact with the Creator is completely dependent on Adam. When she leaves Adam, she is incapable of contacting her God. The voluntary departure from access to her Creator can be seen as an instance of shaming on Eve, as leaving Adam can be seen as a voluntary departure from God. That the fall of man is inevitable is discussed by the Father and Son in book 3, in which the Creator says that the fall of man will be “his own” fault, as man was created “Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall,” and when the occasion of the fall appears, the Creator does not intervene (96-99). That the might of the Creator is absolute is never in question, but the Creator requires that humankind was “form’d...free, and free they must remain” (3.124). Therefore, the Creator does not intervene in the fall, as that would be intervention in an area where humankind is intended to exercise free will. That the Creator does intervene in Eve’s initial contact with Adam, then, becomes interesting, because it leaves the reader with the
Adam and Eve are treated differently by God, even before the fall; the difference in their treatment may be related to later differences in how they are shamed. At Eve’s creation, the Creator speaks directly to her, but she can only identify it as “a voice,” not knowing who her Creator is (4.467). Eve’s understanding of the voice contrasts with Adam’s, as Adam knows that the voice he hears is the voice of God as soon as he hears it, just as he knows the names of the animals as soon as he sees them (8.272-73).

Regardless of her ignorance of the identity of the possessor of the voice, she believes the voice without questioning, and it informs her:

What thou seest  
What there thou seest fair Creature is thyself,  
With thee it came and goes: but follow me,  
And I will bring thee where no shadow stays  
Thy coming, and thy soft imbracees, hee  
Whose image thou art, him thou shalt enjoy  
Inseparably thine, to him shalt bear  
Multitudes like thyself, and thence be call’d  
Mother of human Race  
(4.467-75)

impression that Eve, as a woman, was never in full control of her own free will or given full license with which to practice that free will until she is made to fall. She loses the training wheels of divine intervention at precisely the wrong moment and is made to fall via ignorant exercise of that free will. In this way, the bulk of the shame applied as a result of the fall can be applied to Eve and, by extension, the rest of womankind, but it can only be applied in this way because she had her support system, her support system in God, not in Adam, removed without her knowledge or understanding. Eve, of course, seems quite intelligent and capable of caring for herself throughout her prelapsarian relationship with Adam. This capability, however, does not negate the fact that the standards for her behavior have changed without her knowledge. Whereas, at her birth, she was given assistance and not shamed, at the fall she is left alone and is subsequently shamed. In a way, this lack of help from the Creator draws parallels between Eve and Christ, as she is abandoned by God just as the Jesus of Matthew’s gospel is at his crucifixion, when he cries “My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?” (Matthew 27:46). This parallel, in itself, is subversive of gender norms, as parallels are typically drawn, as in Hutchinson’s narrative, between Adam and Christ, not between Eve and Christ.

For the purposes of this analysis, biblical passages, unless otherwise noted, will be quoted from the 1599 version of the Geneva Bible. The Geneva Bible, one of several year’s versions, was of use by Puritans and other religious dissidents of this period; it is, therefore, not unreasonable to assume that Milton and Hutchinson would have had access to this biblical text.
It is possible that Adam may have heard the voice of the Creator speaking to Eve at this point in the narrative, but it seems unlikely; although he was, in all likelihood, close enough to have heard the voice, he does not mention it or any other knowledge of God’s speaking to her in his recollection. However, it seems unlikely that he heard the Creator’s voice speaking to Eve. He does not think to credit a third party with Eve’s return to him; instead, he remembers that his praise of her and the Creator attracted Eve to him. His recollection is as follows:

This turn hath made amends; thou hast fulfill’d
Thy words, Creator, bounteous and benign,
Giver of all things fair, but fairest this
Of all thy gifts, nor envious. I now see
Bone of my Bone, Flesh of my Flesh, my Self
Before me: Woman is her Name, of Man
Extracted; for this cause he shall forgo
Father and Mother, and to his Wife adhere;
And they shall be one Flesh, one Heart, one Soul.
(8.491-99)

This praise of the Creator and of Eve, as one of his creations, is not what Eve hears; rather, at the same time, before she turns to Adam, she listens to the Creator himself. Presumably, if Adam notes that “She heard me thus,” it can be assumed that he was speaking aloud, but Eve says that she has heard different words: words she has heard from the Creator. Not only has Eve heard words from the Creator that Adam has not heard, but she has also ignored Adam, and does not remember his speaking at all. Adam can hear the Creator, but apparently did not here, suggesting that the Creator was speaking, inside Eve’s mind, a message specifically meant for her. The Creator tells Eve that she will become a mother, “Mother of human Race,” and create “multitudes” like herself (4.474-75), but Adam tells her that she will become his wife, and that they “shall
be one Flesh, one Heart, one Soul” (8.499). The Creator, in the difference in treatment of
Adam and Eve, not only speaks to them separately, but actually promises them different
life trajectores. As related as the trajectories of marriage and childbearing may be for
Adam and Eve, they are still not promised the same outcomes. Adam is promised
marriage, a happy union with his perfect companion. Eve is promised children, the ability
to produce more beings like herself, whom she adores. In punishment for their fall, and as
an instance of shaming, Adam is forced to remain in a marriage that is not perfectly
harmonious. Eve, as his wife, is similarly forced to stay in this corrupted marriage, but is
given the additional punishment of painful childbearing. The Creator treats Adam and
Eve differently before the fall, and these differences contribute to their later treatment, in
which the two are not shamed equally.

Eve, from the beginning, is far more interested in herself than in being with
Adam; she was promised the ability to create more like herself, and she seems to have
found this prospect appealing. She and Adam, do not, however, have children before the
fall. Her promised children appear after the fall, through the specifically female
punishment of the childbirth. Adam’s promise to Eve at her birth, which she either does
not recall or did not hear, that he and Eve will be as one being, is never accomplished, but
he was never in the place of authority to make that promise come to fruition. In Paradise
Lost, the Creator gave Adam and Eve their own consciousnesses, their own free will, and
their own minds; Adam’s suggestion that he and Eve will even be one could, in fact, be
read as evidence of Adam challenging the will of God that they be created separately: an
act for which he should, but cannot, be shamed. By creating them as separate beings with
separate thoughts, the figure of the Creator is able to treat Adam and Eve differently. As sex is supposed to be the only characteristic distinguishing Adam from Eve, all of the differences in their treatment from the Creator, including their relationships with the Creator and the access to information that they are given as a result of those relationships, must be due solely to their being different sexes. Through the internal lives of Adam and Eve, as made known to the reader through recollections of their meeting, the Creator of *Paradise Lost* treats Adam and Eve differently on the basis of their sexes.

In the prelapsarian world, it is only this sex that separates Adam and Eve, but it is used to treat them differently, and thus to shame them differently. Because sex is supposedly the only characteristic separating Adam and Eve, the differences in their shaming, as well as the differences in their individual consciousnesses, must be a result of their being different sexes; therefore, the differences of shaming and internality are gendered.\(^{38}\) Much of Eve’s shame comes from her being labelled as inappropriately sexual, “wanton,” as discussed in the previous chapter (4.305), but much of Adam’s shame comes from not being able to control Eve.\(^{39}\) He, as her husband, is supposed to

---

\(^{38}\) If there were more men and women present, it would be silly to say that all the differences between individual characters presented can be due to their being different sexes; some of the differences would, in all likelihood, be due to personality or general character, rather than only due to sex. The narrative supports that Adam and Eve were created such that their only difference was in their sex; Eve is created “Manlike, but different sex, so lovely fair,” from one of Adam’s ribs (8.469). Because the only objective difference between Adam and Eve is sex, all other differences must necessarily be related to their being different sexes. For example, if Eve is presented as female and also, hypothetically, tall, the tallness of Eve must be associated with her being female. This seems like an oversimplification; after all, could it not be possible that Eve was female and also just happened to be tall? This explanation, of course, is logical. However, in terms of *Paradise Lost*, this explanation is also refuted. That Eve is sexualized, then, is a direct result of her being female, regardless of the fact that, to the modern reader, it is equally as likely that men and women can be sexualized within a narrative. That there are only two characters allegedly separated only by their sex necessarily entails that all of their other differences are a result of their sex.

\(^{39}\) It could be suggested that a power imbalance is the root of the shaming of both Adam and Eve. If Adam’s shame comes from his inability to control Eve, that is clearly a result of his lack of power over her and her actions. If Eve’s shame comes from her sexuality, however, that sexuality could still be connected to her power. If her sexuality is indicative of some level of control she has over Adam, then it makes sense that
stay with her, and because he allows himself to be separated from her, she falls. Adam cannot imagine life without Eve, telling her “to lose thee were to lose myself,” so he intentionally falls (9.959). The fall leaves Adam “Shorn of his strength,” and turns him against Eve (9.1062), but the fall leaves Eve newly dependent on Adam, who no longer allows his wife to “Let her Will rule,” for “if left to herself...She first his weak indulgence will accuse” (9.1184-86). Adam accuses Eve’s internality, her “Will,” of being dangerous (9.1184); this will is what made her fall, and is therefore central to her shaming.

Individual thought is what gets Eve in trouble, and it is through the workings of his individual thought that Adam nearly rejects Eve. Both Adam and Eve demonstrate the ability to think individually. This individual thought gives them the ability to internalize the shaming they receive from their external environment; having compiled evidence about what their community believes to be shameful from that external input, Adam and she would be shamed over that sexuality. As Adam’s wife, Eve is not intended to be out from under his thumb, but as his sexual partner, she necessarily has some degree of intimacy with him. This intimacy, in the relationship between Adam and Eve, is manifested in Adam’s devotion to Eve and his unconditional desire to be with her. Adam loses some power over Eve by being so committed to her, especially when he knowingly falls in order that she not be removed from him. Her sexuality gives her control over Adam: not absolute control, but more control than the narrator sees as fitting for a wife to have over her husband. This level of control is seen as inappropriate, and because it was achieved through her sexuality, which Adam clearly desires; that sexuality is also seen as inappropriate and a cause for shaming, even before Adam and Eve fall.

This description of Adam as “Shorn of his strength” draws parallels between this narrative and the story of Samson as explored in Milton’s Samson Agonistes (9.1062). To a certain extent, both Paradise Lost and Samson Agonistes are stories of a man who is shamed and punished for the lack of control he has over his wife. In Samson Agonistes, the chorus says that “God’s universal Law / Gave to the man despotic power / Over his female in due awe “ (1053-55), but in neither of the stories does that really seem to be the case. Adam’s power does not come from his “despotic power” over Eve, but his downfall is credited to his inability to protect or control her (Samson Agonistes 1053). Similarly, Samson’s misfortunes are blamed on his relationship with Dalila, “His lot unfortunate in nuptial choice” (1743). This “choice” leaves him “powerless” and subject to “captivity and loss of eyes,” just as Adam’s choice to fall leaves him powerless over death and subject to loss of relationship with his God (1743-44). The separations from God that both Adam and Samson experience, however, do not last forever, and this resumption of relationship is addressed by the chorus of Samson Agonistes, which describes God as one who often “seems to hide his face, / But unexpectedly returns” (1749-50). Both of these narratives demonstrate that God, the Creator, shows deep care for his creation and forgives humanity of its shame, allowing it back into relationship with him, even if that relationship ends in death.
Eve can then use their fallen internalized understandings to apply shame for themselves. It is with this understanding that Adam and Eve can evaluate the shame of their personal and internal failures, as well as the shame they experience from their community.

Section Two: *Order and Disorder*

In contrast to the characters presented in *Paradise Lost*, the characters of *Order and Disorder* are, with very few exceptions, given almost no evidence of internal life. The above analysis of *Paradise Lost*, therefore, by which shame is processed through the internality of an individual character’s psyche, is unsuitable for analyzing the way shame is experienced by characters in *Order and Disorder*. To understand how these characters are shamed without as much evidence of internality, it is important to explore possible reasons that they are not afforded the internality of the characters of *Paradise Lost*. By and large, the characters presented in the narrative of *Order and Disorder* are unidimensional and reactionary, responding immediately to outward stimulus without evidence of internal thought or processing. These characters, unlike those of *Paradise Lost*, do not behave as though they were meant to be faithful representations of real people.41 The lack of attention paid to individual characterization of figures presented in the poem has many possible reasons, including the propensity for authors of this period to allegorize, the form of *Order and Disorder* as it is distinct from that of *Paradise Lost*, the amount of information available to Hutchinson from the source material, and a

41 This is not to say that Hutchinson is incapable of creating well developed characters. It would, in fact, be erroneous to suggest that her abilities did not stretch themselves to character development. Her other works demonstrate fastidious attention to the detail and the intricacies of human character. This ability is especially notable in *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, where she pays careful attention to the representation of her husband’s character and, as a result, presents a complex picture of her own character. This attention to her own character shows that she does not, as one may believe from reading only *Order and Disorder*, suggest that women, in their entirety, are undeserving of any character development.
fascination with predestination. These characters do not have the internality of those in Paradise Lost, so the shame by which they are affected occurs at the level of a universal: it is a condition of human existence, not an intimate motivational force.

One possible reason that the characters presented in *Order and Disorder* show little evidence of characterization, and therefore little evidence of internal thought, is that they are being incorporated into a typological understanding of the Genesis story. Norbrook, in his contextualization of *Order and Disorder*, says that “Christians always had a strong investment in pushing away from a wholly literal reading of the Old Testament, since they wished to superimpose on that narrative a systematic foreshadowing of the story of Jesus: the historical events were also types of the future”⁴² Reading the Genesis story to foreshadow the coming of Christ could entail that the individual characteristics of the historical figures are somewhat deemphasized in exchange for their representation of what is to come. Norbrook, however, also says that this allegorization “for Hutchinson could only be pushed so far”: she is committed to reading “certain key events typologically,” but for other events, “she tries to follow the literal sense closely.”⁴³ Hutchinson tries to maintain the humanity of her characters, but she is not interested in fabricating for them an internal life that they do not have in the source material, because she is wants to uphold the integrity of the Genesis story: “Hutchinson was writing at a time when the meaning and even the divine authority of Genesis could by no means be taken for granted; defending her own version of the text

---

⁴³ Ibid, xxiv.
was part of a political as well as a religious struggle." The historical reality of the Genesis story was being threatened, but is maintained in the poem. If she were to completely allegorize, it would be to deny the historical actuality of the events in the narrative, but to ignore allegorization would be to suggest that the Old Testament narratives were not speaking to the coming of Christ; since Christ is included in the narrative of *Order and Disorder*, the narrative clearly allegorizes to a certain extent. The tension between maintaining the historical credibility of the Genesis story and reading Christ into the narrative could be a major contributing factor to Hutchinson’s dissatisfaction at other poets’ functionalizations of biblical narratives; she, perhaps, may not have thought other poets were achieving the appropriate balance.

Form, as explored in *Order and Disorder*, emphasizes the voice of the narrator over the voice of the individual characters. In contrast to *Paradise Lost*, a more dramatic retelling, where the characters of Adam, Eve, Satan, and the Creator drive much of the plot, the progression of *Order and Disorder* relies almost completely on the voice of the narrator. This emphasis changes the tone of the entire poem; rather than having the poem be a character-driven, action-packed tale of damnation, temptation, and eventual redemption, *Order and Disorder* is more discreetly rebellious, hiding its controversy behind the facade of faithfulness to the Bible and criticism of other poems, which fail to disguise their subversive rhetoric behind appropriately demure verse. An example of this subtly subversive pattern is in *Order and Disorder*’s treatment of female characters. *Order and Disorder* is notable for the attention it pays to issues of gender, but this

---

44 Ibid.
attention to gender does not always result in an understanding that is sympathetic to female characters.\textsuperscript{45} For example, the narrative recognizes the power that women have, especially the power women have over men, asking, “What power like that of subtle women when / They exercise their skill to manage men, / Their weak force recompensed with wily arts! / While men rule kingdoms, women rule their hearts” (18.219-222). Through the case of Rebecca, the narrative here shows that women are powerful and exercise significant political influence, but that they are not supportive of one another and are prone to the shaming of one another, as when the narrator notes that Rebecca wanted Jacob to marry a woman of her people, rather than of the Hittite people, because the Hittite wives of Esau “add to the affliction of her life” (18.218). Even without suggesting that women are in a place to support one another, rather than engage in antagonistic relationships with one another, the narrative is subverting norms by paying significant attention to the power of women, engaging in issues of gender without taking what could now be seen as a feminist stance.

The source material from which \textit{Order and Disorder} claims to be based in its entirety is the Book of Genesis. The narrative voice is extremely wary of any

\textsuperscript{45} The relationship between issues of gender and sympathy to female characters found in \textit{Order and Disorder} is mirrored in Hutchinson’s \textit{Memoirs of The Life of Colonel Hutchinson}. In that text, Hutchinson, as the narrator, seems to suggest that she is an agentive and active female character, as when she kicks her husband out of the house, disallows him from surrendering to the authorities upon backlash from the regicide, and writes “a letter in his name to the Speaker” (281). Her actions, which keep her husband from imprisonment, show that she is obviously an agentive and authoritative figure. However, it is also clear that the narrator considers women to be of naturally lesser value than men. This consideration is demonstrated when the narrator, discussing the talents of a specific woman, describes them as “extraordinary qualities, which are therefore more glorious because more rare in the female sex” (35) and calls males “man’s nobler sex” (12). It seems as though Hutchinson considers herself to be remarkable among women, one who “outstripped [her] brothers at school” and is “convinced that the knowledge of God was the most excellent study” (14-15). This self-characterization presents Hutchinson as a figure who is exists in between the worlds of male and female; remarkable among women for her education and talent, she is limited by her female sex while being allowed into the male world of theology and critical study.
fictionalization of biblical text, and appears to be scandalized, or at least disappointed, in other poets’ attempts to sully the message of the biblical text through overzealous creativity. This is obvious several times throughout the poem; one significant passage that demonstrates the narrator’s dissatisfaction with other poets’ treatment of the biblical narrative is as follows:

Treating of which, let’s waive Platonic dreams
Of worlds made in Idea, fitter themes
For poets’ fancies than the reverent view
Of contemplation, fixed on what is true
And only certain, kept upon record
In the Creator’s own revealèd Word,
Which, when it taught us how our world was made,
Wrapped up th’invisible in mystic shade.

(1.174-80)

This passage suggests that the “revealèd Word” of the Bible is unsuitable for the “fancies” of poets’ imaginations (1.179, 1.175). It seems as though the narrative voice, in this passage, is uncomfortable with poets trying to unwrap the mysticism of the biblical narrative, which the narrator understands as the divinely revealed word of God (1.178-80). The narrative that follows, logically, is simply a poeticized and slightly

---

46 It is worth noting here that the narrative voice of Order and Disorder is much more pervasive than that of Paradise Lost. Because the characters of Order and Disorder as so significantly less developed than those of Paradise Lost, the characters do not tell the story as filtered through their individual consciousnesses, and the narrative voice possesses the onus of the story telling.

47 It is unclear how much interaction Hutchinson would have had with Milton’s Paradise Lost. Norbrook, in his contextualization of Order and Disorder, suggests in David Norbrook, “Order and Disorder: The Poem and its Contexts,” in Order and Disorder, ed. David Norbrook (Malden: Blackwell, 2011), xiv that it is “fascinating to set these two poems in dialogue,” and given that the second edition of Paradise Lost was published in 1674 and the first edition of Order and Disorder was not published until 1679, it is entirely possible that Hutchinson read Paradise Lost before completing Order and Disorder. If that were the case, it is possible that, in Hutchinson’s criticism of poets’ mishandling of biblical information, she is directing her commentary at Milton. It is, of course, possible that other poets are being accused, as well. One such author is Mary Sidney Herbert, who was not an immediate contemporary of Hutchinson but whose Psalm translations incorporate significant creativity. An example of this is her poetic translation of “Psalm 52,” as found in Mary Sidney Herbert, “Psalm 52,” in The Norton Anthology of English Literature, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York: Norton, 2012), 1103-4).
expanded version of the biblical source material. For example, the following is the account of the naming of the animals, as described in the Geneva Bible: “So the Lord God formed of the earth every beast of the field, and every fowl of the heaven, and brought them unto the man to see how he would call them: for howsoever the man named the living creature, so was the name thereof” (Genesis 2:19). This event is similarly described in *Order and Disorder*, when it is said

The noble creature sat, as on his throne,
When God brought every fowl and every brute
That he might names unto their natures suit,
Whose comprehensive understanding knew
How to distinguish them at their first view

(3.212-16)

Both of these accounts include a process by which Adam, under the instruction of God and using some innate wisdom, named all the animals that God had created. This passage can be compared to the description of the same event in *Paradise Lost*, in which Adam is speaking to the angel Raphael, describing his own creation, and says, “But who I was, or where, or from what cause, / Knew not; to speak I tri’d, and forthwith spake, / My Tongue obey’d and readily could name / Whate’er I say” (8.270-73). This passage contains a recollection, a recollection which is itself contained within a recollection to the angel Raphael about how Adam, without instruction from God, was able to name each object, including animals, he beheld in his environment; neither the recollection, the conversation with Raphael, nor the lack of direct contact with God are included in the source material and are, therefore, additions of the poet’s own devising. This is the kind of fictionalization the narrator of *Order and Disorder* claims to be avoiding, but it is just this fictionalization that gives the character of Adam the internality that allows him to
process his events of shaming within the narrative of *Paradise Lost*. Without this internality, alternative processes by which characters in *Order and Disorder* understand shame must be considered.\(^{48}\)

There are many instances in *Order and Disorder* in which the character’s internality is subordinate to his or her external environment. The first six cantos of this poem are devoted to the treatment of Adam and Eve as they relate to the creation and the fall, but neither Adam nor Eve display significant interior thought.\(^{49}\) It would, therefore, be inappropriate to suggest that the characters of Adam and Eve, as presented through the narrative of *Order and Disorder*, are being shamed through internal processing of their thoughts, because the reader is not able to see their internal processing or evidence of that processing, but the reader is able to see that Adam and Eve are being shamed.\(^{50}\) Adam and Eve, in *Order and Disorder*, are given free will, but this free will is not given the

\(^{48}\) It is interesting to consider that, when the narrator is criticizing other poets for fictionalizing their accounts of biblical narratives, the narrator is simultaneously fictionalizing for his- or herself and incorporating additional shame, the shaming of those poets, into the narrative. There is not only shaming going on in the poem between characters in the poem or between characters in the narrative and the narrator, but also shaming taking place between the narrator and entities that exist entirely outside of the narrative. In this almost petty demonization of other poets within a work of poetry, the narrator is demonstrating his or her own fallenness, even as he or she claims to be superior to the other equally fallen poets. This shame, however, does not seem to be a good shame by the standards set for either poet. This is not a good shame by Milton’s standards because it is not productive; no amount of vilification can revoke the publication of the works which the narrator believes to be inappropriate. It is not a good shame for Hutchinson, either, as it is more the product of human folly than of divine understanding. Because it is a bad shame, it is even more evidence of the narrator’s fallenness.

\(^{49}\) Here is another instance when it would be extremely helpful to have more information about the amount of contact Hutchinson had with Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. If she were vilifying him directly for his fictionalizing the story of the fall in relation to Adam and Eve, she would be highly unlikely to treat them as he does, explaining the complete lack of personality that these two characters demonstrate in *Order and Disorder*.

\(^{50}\) Courtney Carlisle says that “Shame, because it is contagious and easily transmittable, breaks down the space that exists between bodies and selves” and is “intrinsically associated with identity” (67). That shame is an identity-forming concept can perhaps explain why Adam and Eve, in *Order and Disorder*, fail to demonstrate significant individual character or identity before the fall: they do not understand shame and, therefore, they cannot use it to mold their identity. Adam and Eve of *Paradise Lost*, on the other hand, always seem to possess individuality, but, as discussed above, they also possess a suspicious amount of knowledge of shame before the fall.
same way it is given in *Paradise Lost*. In *Order and Disorder*, Eve does not fall until after Adam has also fallen, even though she eats of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge before he does. Eve “The pleasure to her husband she commends,” and Adam “by her persuasion too offends,” but neither are shown demonstrating much thought regarding their disobedience (4.216-17). Because Eve does not fall before Adam eats, she is not convincing him to eat of the fruit from a place of knowledge; “Before her inward torturing pangs begin,” which does not happen until after Adam falls, she appears to think there have been no repercussions for eating the fruit (4.215). When they are punished, Adam and Eve are confused, and “with confusion on each other stare” (4.226). It is not convincing that Adam and Eve were afforded the benefit of internality; if they had been, Eve may have been able to resist the serpent, and Adam may have been able to resist Eve. Instead, they are left punished, “Wishing they had been pure and ignorant still,” but it is unclear if their susceptibility to fall was due to their ignorance of the repercussions of their actions or, in fact, due to their lack of ability to think critically about the information they did have, that they were not allowed to eat of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, and determine from that information that they would be punished upon eating (4.267). They are shamed, therefore, for a decision that they were unable to carefully consider before acting upon.

As the narrative of *Order and Disorder* progresses, certain characters demonstrate that they have more internality than the characters of Adam and Eve, but the role of the internality of these characters is still subordinate to the role of these characters’ environments. For example, when Lot’s daughters are shown contemplating the seduction
of their father, it is said that “Awhile they were restrained with modest shame, / Not knowing their thoughts and lusts were both the same” (13.309-310). That Lot’s daughters have thoughts is evidence of their having some measure of internality; this internality is debatably more than any offered to either Adam or Eve earlier in the narrative. Regardless of whatever internality they may possess, however, the physical representation of their shame, the “bashful red” of their cheeks, takes center stage. After the elder sister tells her younger sister of her sexual desires for her father, the description of their fading discomfort is described as the breaking of the “fence of shame” (13.306, 13.344). That their lust is shared in community and is made to be a part of the environment is more important than the internal processing of that lust, which is deemed shameful. When the lust is made communal, there is no longer any need for that emotion to be processed internally; it is as though the lust has become separated from the individuals themselves and surrendered to the outside environment.

The sin of Lot’s daughters results in the creation of two vast nations, fathered by their sons Moab and Ammi. The two sons, born of incest, sin, and shame, are described

---

51 The naming of Lot’s daughters as “Lot’s daughters,” rather than by their given names, is not here an editorial choice. In the narrative, these characters are not given names, but they are burdened with immense responsibility. The sons they conceive through their incestuous relationship with their father, Moab and Ammi, grow up to father “two prosperous spreading nations,” but these nations are later conquered by the sons of Jacob as punishment for the sin of their incestuous births (13.355). It is difficult to suggest that the discrepancy in the treatment of the male and female characters in this narrative is not, in some way, leading to the disproportionate shaming on the female, rather than the male, participants. While it seems most reasonable not to blame Moab and Ammi for the sins of their parents, their progeny are forced to accept punishment for Lot’s and Lot’s daughters’ actions; in this punishment, much of the punishment is forced upon further generations of women who are made to bear the children of incest which they, possibly unknowingly, bring into the world only to be shamed. If the narrator is trying not to embellish the biblical source material, the narrator is incapable of providing Lot’s daughters with names, as they are not given names in the source material (Genesis 19:30-38). These nameless characters are left with the bulk of the responsibility for their sin with their father, while Lot himself is largely excused from the incestuous relationship with his daughters and said to have “Unknowingly committed the offence” (13.348). In this way, the responsibility, and therefore the shame, is given more to the female than the male characters in the story.
as the “fruit oft-times denied to chaste love” (13.350). This description serves to further shame both the sons and their mothers; it is as if the crime of their births is not only an affront because it is the result of incest, but also because their mothers were given children when other more deserving women were not. This suggestion further increases the crime of the sons, and even though the sons were not agentive in the act of incest, they, along with their progeny, are punished. This punishment, however, becomes part of God’s plan for Jacob; the kingdoms of Moab and Ammi are only prosperous “Till Jacob’s sons their kingdom overthrew” (13.356). The narrator says that “though the Lord spare sinners a long time / Yet judgement will at last meet every crime” (13.357-58). That the overthrow of these nations was foreknown, and that it was for the greater glory of Jacob, whom God chooses to be “his servant,” once again emphasizes the importance of predestination to the narrative of *Order and Disorder* (20.145).

Predestination is related to shame in the relationship between Rebecca and Jacob because Rebecca justifies her preference for Jacob over Esau by asserting that he is more chosen than his brother. It is said of Rebecca that “but Rebecca’s mind / more strongly to her second son inclined. / Confirmed with powerful reason, she professed / And justified her loving Jacob best” (17.539-420. This “powerful reason” seems to be her conviction that Jacob is the more divinely favored of her twin sons, a conviction that was inspired in her by an angel of God sent to her before the birth of her sons, saying (17.541):

The younger’s happier destiny shall prevail.  
He shall his elder brother subjugate,  
Courage and strength in vain opposing fate:  
Fate whose irrevocable laws decree  
The endest must the younger’s servant be.  

(17.136-140)
Rebecca justifies her loving Jacob more than Esau because Jacob is in better favor with God than Esau, but it is not entirely clear that this preference is, in its entirety, divinely inspired. It may be that, before the sons are born, her preference is decided for her by the angel’s message. It may also be, however, that Esau’s behavior, described as his “rash and disobedient fault,” is what causes Rebecca to love Jacob more than she loves him (18.533). It may even be that Rebecca believes Jacob is chosen and sees his behavior as evidence of his salvation. Rebecca, exercising preference for her favorite child over the favorite child of her husband, helps Jacob steal Esau’s birthright, the blessing of Jehovah as delivered by Isaac (18.57-68). After this deception, Rebecca helps Jacob “make a politic retreat,” again showing her preference for him and ignoring the shame that their actions should be causing (18.211). Rebecca’s rejection of shame is particularly interesting, as it is not the result of her lack of recognition that her actions and Jacob’s have been shameful; rather, her rejection of shame is the result of her deciding that her favored son’s place of leadership in is more important than any shame she might experience. If Rebecca believes that Jacob’s destined leadership over the Jewish people is more important than the shame associated with the actions required, or at least utilized, to get him to that place of leadership, then the shame is, in effect, set aside for larger purposes. This capability suggests that the shame of the community, the one which should be keeping Rebecca from plotting against her son and husband, even though she is convinced that Jacob is chosen by God above Esau, could be set aside properly or improperly.
When shame is properly overcome, it is akin to the overcoming of self-consciousness, and it allows for human progress and the furthering of God’s plan. Not all overcoming of the limits of shame, however, is properly directed, and this improper divergence from the rules of shaming can lead to the application of shame for unproductive reasons. This improperly directed shame seems to be like that Milton and Hutchinson believed themselves to have experienced for their respective blindness and involvement in the regicide: an ill-directed and misguided bad shame.
Chapter Three: Shame and Contrition

Following discussion of the external representations of shame and of the internal processing of shame in Paradise Lost and Order and Disorder, it becomes important to understand the greater applications of shame in the arguments of both poems. The importance of shame, to both narratives, is directly tied to the poems’ understandings of ideas of contrition, forgiveness, and salvation. Despite their somewhat shared religious contexts, Paradise Lost and Order and Disorder do not describe, in their narratives, the same processes by which salvation through Christ occurs. In Paradise Lost, internal representations of shame become extremely important, as the prescribed way to salvation is through a truly contrite spirit, one in which the sins of the individual have been subject to external shaming, internal understanding of the reasons for that external shaming, genuine desire of forgiveness, and an appeal to God through Christ. In Order and Disorder, the path to salvation is noticeably less clear, for while it seems that the narrative says that salvation is to be sought through Christ, that option does not seem to be equally available to everyone. This narrative disagreement between the two poems relates to the understandings of predestination and free will as explored in the poems, as well as the role of communities of shame. The narrative understanding in Paradise Lost of salvation as a personal process of contrition through the internalization of external stimulus necessitates free will and the presence of a community of shame, which interacts with the underlying theme of predestination; the narrative of Order and Disorder, on the other hand, places such an emphasis on predestination that the roles of contrition and free will can be seen as evidence of salvation, rather than ingredients of salvation.
Both *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* are interested in what is required in order to seek forgiveness from God for having committed sins. However, though *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* both approach the topic of forgiveness through the context of repentance, the poems do not demonstrate equal representations of the relationship between shame and forgiveness. The treatment of shame in relation to forgiveness is important for each narrative, as the understanding of that treatment is related to the understanding of each poem’s relationship to predestination and the exercise of free will. As discussed in previous chapters, *Paradise Lost* places a great emphasis on agentive shame, while *Order and Disorder* understands shame only as a backdrop, the world wherein humankind, as those who have fallen, live after Adam and Eve’s sin. The authors of each poem come from extremely similar faith backgrounds and use the same source material for their works, but each comes to an entirely different conclusion regarding the relationship of shame to sin and, therefore, to forgiveness. As this difference is achieved through variations in narrative style and manipulation of the same source text, it is worth discussing.

In the following passage, the narrative of *Paradise Lost* has Adam, speaking to Eve, discuss the best possible course of action for humankind after the fall:

```
What better can we do, than to the place
Repairing where he judg’d us, prostrate fall
Before him reverent, and there confess
Humbly our faults, and pardon beg, with tears
Watering the ground, and with our sighs the Air
Frequenting, sent from hearts contrite, in sign
Of sorrow unfeign’d, and humiliation meek.
Undoubtedly he will relent and turn
From his displeasure; in whose look serene,
What else but favor, grace, and mercy shone?
```
This passage suggests that genuine reverence to God, which necessitates honest and self-deprecating confession, is the best course of action for mankind after the fall. If Adam and Eve can achieve this kind of confession, appealing to God for forgiveness with “hearts contrite,” then God will “relent and turn / From his displeasure,” forgiving them for their mistakes and showing them the same “favor, grace, and mercy” shown to them after the fall, when God did not immediately kill Adam and Eve, even though death was their promised punishment (10.1096).^52

In the narrative of *Paradise Lost*, to achieve forgiveness, Adam and Eve must approach God with contrition, humility, sorrow, and humiliation. To achieve this approach, Adam and Eve must engage in internal processing of their actions, which have been deemed shameful through processes of external shaming, in order to feel remorse for their actions; only through this remorse is forgiveness attainable. Upon Adam and Eve’s first asking for forgiveness, it is not immediately clear what relationship that forgiveness has with ultimate salvation. However, shortly after Adam explains to Eve how they must ask for forgiveness, the Son appeals to the Father on behalf of humankind. Before promising to save mankind, the Son asks permission to bring the prayers of man, 

---

^52 The only reason Adam is able to tell Eve how they must approach the Creator with contrition to receive forgiveness is that Eve has first approached Adam in a state of contrition to ask his forgiveness. After the fall, Adam engages in the shaming of Eve, blaming her “wand’ring vanity” (10.875) for their fall and calling her a “bad Woman” (10.837). Eve, in response, calms Adam, approaching him with “Soft words to his fierce passion” (10.865). This calming, however, does not soothe his anger, and it is not until Eve goes to Adam, even after he has turned away from her, with “tresses all disorder’d” and “at his feet / Fell humble,” seeking “His peace” and forgiveness that Adam can overcome his anger (10.910-13). Seeing her “at his feet submissive in distress” (10.942), he is able to forgive her, and “with peaceful words uprais[e] her” (10.946). Understanding that Eve has rectified her relationship with him by this process of contrition, Adam then suggests the application of her method of asking forgiveness to their relationship with the Creator.
the “first fruits” of the “implanted Grace in Man,” “sown with contrition in his heart,” to the Father, whom he asks to “bend thine ear / To supplication” to what the Son will interpret for the Father on behalf of humankind (11.22-31). Humankind, having lost their direct contact with the Creator in the fall, can only reach God through the Son, who interprets man’s unsophisticated prayers into the language of the divine. The Son, however, does not only ask to deliver man’s prayers to God, but also to save mankind, as follows:

let mee
Interpret for him, mee his Advcoate
And propitiation, all his works on mee
Good or not good ingraft, my Merit those
Shall perfet, and for these my Death shall pay
Accept me, and in mee from these receive
The smell of peace toward Mankind, let him live
Before thee reconcil’d, at least his days
Number’d, though sad, till Death, his doom (which I
To mitigate thus plead, not to reverse)
To better life shall yield him, where with mee
All my redeem’d may dwell in joy and bliss,
Made one with me as I with thee am one.
(11.32-44)

In this passage, the Son asserts that it is not only his desire to interpret the prayers of humankind to God, but also to “perfet” their flaws with his “Merit” (11.33-36). The Son, as presented in Paradise Lost, is perfect enough to encompass all of humankind, no matter their deeds, under the umbrella of his perfection and acceptance from God, thus allowing Adam and Eve to seek salvation through him. In Paradise Lost, salvation can

53 The tension that arises, then, is that anyone who simply prays to the Son should be saved. In Milton’s Christian Doctrine, the speaker describes a “general” election, in which the “privilege [of salvation] belongs to all who heartily believe and continue in their belief” (919). In this theology, which argues that “salvation and eternal life” are offered “equally to all, under the condition of obedience in the Old Testament, and of faith in the New,” it is the firm and true belief in the Son that is a prerequisite for salvation, not predestination. This belief has to be genuine, however, and a prayer made as an obligation,
be sought after the fall as follows. Adam and Eve sin in eating the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, after which they are met with external shaming by God. This external shaming is recognized internally and results in Adam and Eve externally projecting further shame upon themselves in recognition of the shamefulness of their actions. This internal shame leads Adam and Eve to seek forgiveness from God through prayer, after which these prayers are filtered through the Son, who interprets them for the Father. The Son, interpreting the prayers of Adam and Eve, recognizes that Adam and Eve are seeking forgiveness for sins which they have committed, even though they are not worthy of being forgiven. Because they are not worthy of being forgiven and, therefore, of having their punishment of death taken away, they cannot be given eternal life on Earth, but because they have sought the forgiveness of God, they can be saved after their death and allowed to be with the Father, as the Son already is.

While *Paradise Lost* provides a distinct path by which Adam and Eve can go from sinfulness to salvation, *Order and Disorder* provides an understanding that Adam and Eve are already recipients of God’s grace, regardless of their behavior. After Adam and Eve fall, together, they are shown discussing what their futures will be like. Eve, distraught, cannot understand why they have not already been killed as punishment for their disobedience, asking “Is there a pleasure yet that life can show, / Doth not each moment multiply our woe?” (5.407-8). Adam, evidently in possession of greater knowledge of the divine than Eve, assures her that they cannot know when death will

with no true belief behind it, is not satisfactory for forgiveness through the Son or for salvation through faith.
claim them; “God’s sovereign will and power are absolute,” and God will take them
evertheless he chooses (5.446). Adam says that he and Eve “must not question why” God
makes the decisions that he does, but that they must rather see all of God’s actions as
“wise and just and good” and accept them when they make themselves known (448-50).

Although Adam tells Eve they are not to assume that they know the thoughts or
plans of God, he also tells her that they have been saved by God. He tells her that, instead
of having “At once...plunged us in the lowest Hell,” God has “by his mercy” decided that
he and Eve may “have reprieve” (5.462-63). This mercy, shown by God to Adam and
Eve in not immediately killing them after the fall, gives them time to live knowing they
are destined to die. Adam tells Eve that they “yet are showed how we in death may live, /
If we improve our short-indulged space / To understand, prize, and accept his grace”
(5.464-66). The time given to Adam and Eve to live on Earth after their fall is not, in
Order and Disorder, given such that they may spend their time being repentant in order
to be saved; rather, they have been shown mercy in not being killed immediately after the
fall, and they are supposed to spend the time they are given “improv[ing]” the lives they
have been given (5.465). This improvement, as described by Adam, consists of
“understand[ing], priz[ing], and accept[ing]” God’s grace: the grace that has shown them
mercy in life and will show them mercy in death. In Order and Disorder, Adam and Eve
do not pray to God to ask for forgiveness; they pray to God to thank him for the mercy
they have already been afforded, which has saved them, even though they have been
disobedient. Adam and Eve “join in mutual fervent prayer” to thank God for their
eventual salvation through Eve’s “seed” (5.594-98), but they do not pray to ask for
forgiveness as the Adam and Eve of *Paradise Lost* do, because they know they are already saved.

In *Order and Disorder*, Adam and Eve do not question their fate, as they do in *Paradise Lost*: a logical action, since they know they will be saved. Instead, Adam asserts his complete confidence in what he calls “certain truths” (5.675). Among these truths is his assertion about the role of Providence in his and Eve’s lives, and it is as follows:

```
Whatever doth to mortal men befall
Not casual is, like shafts at random shot,
But Providence distributes every lot,
In which th’obedient and the meek rejoice,
Above their own preferring God’s wise choice
```

(5.676-80)

This passage shows Adam telling Eve that nothing that happens to mortals, of which there are currently only two, happens without being part of God’s plan, named here as Providence. Providence instead “distributes every lot,” not “random[ly]” or “casual[ly],” but through the design of the divine (5.677-68). Just as Adam and Eve, in *Order and Disorder*, are given time in life to understand that they have been saved by God’s mercy, so have they been given time to understand that every human action has been foreknown and foredesigned. Given that this understanding leads to the realization that even the fall was foreknown, this portion of *Order and Disorder* introduces ideas of predestination.

Predestination has an important, although complicated, role in discerning similarities and differences between *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder*. While each narrative relies on a framework of predestination for the overall functioning of its plot, each narrative also seeks to either affirm or counter the presence and importance of predestination. The actuality of predestination in each narrative leads to the narratives
having different reactions to the events they both narrate, such as the response to the fall of Adam and Eve. In *Order and Disorder*, Adam tells Eve that they have been spared as a show of God’s mercy and that they must pray in praise of that mercy and of God’s grace, but in *Paradise Lost*, Adam tells Eve that the way to achieve forgiveness from God is through prayer asking for that forgiveness. While these two narratives may not seem to be suggesting drastically different courses of action, they are, in fact, presenting two completely different methods of approaching the divine, and their approaches may be emblematic of the approaches of each poems’ author. In *Order and Disorder*, the mystery of the divine is emphasized, and neither Adam nor Eve presumes to have the ability to speak for God; therefore, Hutchinson does not claim to have the ability or the right to speak for the divine. Her Adam and Eve’s goal in prayer is to “understand, prize, and accept” the grace of God and to recognize that their salvation was predestined, not to determine why they were given that grace or forgiveness (5.466). The suggestion in *Paradise Lost*, however, that Adam and Eve must follow a specific course of action to achieve forgiveness seems to suggest that Adam has been capable of predicting what behavior is necessary for God to forgive them.\(^{54}\) In the emphasis on predestination found in *Order and Disorder*, Hutchinson seems to be avoiding the suggestion that she, as a human narrator, or Adam and Eve, as human facsimiles, are capable of speaking for God or presuming to know God’s thoughts. While Adam of *Paradise Lost* does not necessarily claim to speak for God in his understanding of what must be done for he and

\(^{54}\) If Adam claims to know what he and Eve must do to seek forgiveness from God, it could have been predetermined that he have that information capable of saving them. On the other hand, his decision to presume knowledge of the divine might be yet another example of his fallenness. That it works may be due to the Son’s intervention on behalf of man, not necessarily to do with man’s actions.
Eve to seek forgiveness, the entire narrative of *Paradise Lost* consists of Milton, through his narrator, claiming the ability to speak for God and provide reasoning for God’s actions.\(^5^5\)

This complication regarding the immediate post-fall narratives is simply one of the many examples in the narratives where *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* assume or describe different versions of predestination. These versions of predestination present several complicated issues, including the duality of agency and omnipotence, the concept of free will, the idea of the fortunate fall, and the necessity of Christ’s death and resurrection. While the narratives of *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* each contribute to the discussion of these issues, other texts by Hutchinson and Milton also contain discussion of these issues in relation to the greater theme of shame and will also be included in the analysis.

One of the major questions facing a predestination theology is in relation to agency. Operating under the assumption of divine omnipotence, it is logical to understand how the suggestion that God, in God’s omnipotence, should have predicted the fall or been able to protect God’s creation from the fall. In these poems, and in the biblical narrative, God gives humankind an option, and in choosing to eat of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, humankind is choosing to disobey God and to fall. However, if God knew that humankind would fall and chose not to do anything about it, there is some

---

\(^5^5\) Hutchinson, provided she had read Milton’s narrative, could have been answering him directly in her narrative of *Order and Disorder*, putting special emphasis on the impropriety of assuming to know the will and thoughts of God, which Milton does in *Paradise Lost*’s narration of how to achieve salvation, as well as in the fabricated dialogue between God and other characters in the poem. It is also possible that Hutchinson, in *Order and Disorder*, was simply responding to other authors or theologians who claimed to be able to know, to whatever extent, the reasoning behind God’s actions.
suggestion that humankind, after all, may not be at fault for its actions. If God chose not
to save humankind from the fall, should God not be the party ultimately responsible for
the fall, the party being shamed?

The narrative of *Paradise Lost* has a direct answer for this particular question, and
it is that, although the all-powerful God could have kept Satan from humanity,
humankind is still responsible for the fall, because the fall is caused by the free will of
humankind.56 Before the fall, Adam and Eve are in the garden discussing the possibility
of their separating so as to more efficiently keep their garden under control. Speaking,
presumably, from the knowledge that he has through his personal relationship with the
Creator, the relationship Eve is not allowed, Adam tells Eve that he does not want her
separated from him, “lest harm / Befall thee sever’d from me” (9.250-51). He reminds
her that Satan, the “malicious Foe” (9.253) against whom they have been warned, wants
them to make a mistake and fall from the favor of God, and while Adam says that Satan
would be “Hopeless to circumvent us join’d, where each / To other speedy aid might lend
at need,” he feels that Eve is likely to get them into trouble if she goes off on her own
(9.259-60). It would excite Satan if Eve were to remove herself from Adam, but if she
were to stay by his side, she would be safe, and neither of them would fall, for “The
Wife, where danger or dishonor lurks, / Safest and seemliest by her Husband stays”

---

56 This assertion is supported in Milton’s Christian Doctrine, where the speaker says that for an individual
“to be gifted with free will” entails that the “his fall might depend upon his own volition” (914). It would
be, according to the speaker, a mistake to “erroneously conclude that the decree of God is the cause of his
foreknowledge,” i.e. that God must have decided to make humankind fall just because God knew
humankind would fall (ibid). Interestingly, the speaker of this tract justifies this opinion by comparing God
to a human: “shall we say that this foresight or foreknowledge on the part of God imposed on them the
necessity of acting in any definite way? No more than if the future event had been foreseen by any human
being. For what any human being has foreseen as certain to happen, will not less certainly happen than
what God himself has predicted” (915). Foreknowledge, in Milton’s works, only implies that God knew
humans would fall, not that anything God did anything that made humans fall.
Here, the narrative seems to be suggesting that Eve’s behavior in leaving Adam, or in even wanting to leave Adam, is provoking Satan into acting against humankind. Once again, although she has not fallen, Eve is being shamed.  

This shaming leads into a conversation regarding the free will of humankind. Eve does not believe that she and Adam are in danger while they stay in the garden, because she does not understand how Satan would be able to threaten them while they are under God’s protection. She even seems to think that Adam is offending God by suggesting that they are in danger from Satan, saying, “Let us not then suspect our happy State / Left so imperfect by the Maker wise,” and she shames him for insulting their Creator (9.337-38). Adam, however, asserts that he was not offending God, saying, “his creating hand / Nothing imperfect or deficient left” (9.344-45). Adam seems to think that humankind, under the umbrella of a creation of God, is perfect, but its perfection is dynamic, rather than static. Humankind’s perfection requires constant upkeep through the maintenance of the interactions between Reason and the Will, for

Against his will he can receive no harm.  
But God left free the Will, for what obeys Reason, is free, and Reason he made right,  
But bid her well beware, and still erect,  
Lest by some fair appearing good surpris’d

57 Here, however, Eve seems to recognize that she’s being treated unfairly, as it is reasonable for her to think that she should not be shamed for something she has not done, especially in a prelapsarian world, where shame should not necessarily exist, just as it is reasonable for her to think that she should be safe from Satan in Eden, a walled garden patrolled by angel guards. She does not understand why Adam seems to think she will fail, answering him “But that thou shouldst my firmness therefore doubt / To God or thee, because we have a foe / May tempt it, I expected not to here” (9.279-81). Instead of accepting his assertion, that without him she will fall, she instead accuses him of fault, saying that Satan’s real hold over mankind is his control of Adam’s thoughts, Adam’s feeling that Eve’s “Faith and Love / Can by his [Satan’s] fraud be shak’n or seduc’t” (9.286-87). In this instance, Adam and Eve are shaming one another, but as this takes place in the prelapsarian world, they should not be experiencing shame at all. Here, it becomes unconvincing that eating the fruit is what causes the fall in its entirety; rather, it is as though Adam and Eve are slipping into fallenness by degrees, slowly turning against one another and only being pushed over the edge when they eat the fruit.
She dictate false, and misinform the Will
To do what God expressly hath forbid.
(9.350-56)

God gave humankind a free will, leaving them “Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall” (3.99). Although free will should have allowed them to stay sinless in the garden, Eve and Adam both choose to fall. Subsequently, Adam and Eve can also choose to ask for forgiveness. The narrative of *Paradise Lost* gives the characters of Adam and Eve a significant amount of agency, even where there is some suggestion, as there is with Eve, that she may not know how to use her own agency or fully understand the effects of her decisions.

In the understanding of free will explored in *Paradise Lost*, it is possible to see how the narrative deemphasizes, or even delegitimizes, the role of and belief in predestination. In *Paradise Lost*, as God is watching over Adam and Eve in the garden, God sees that Satan has escaped from Hell and is going to the garden to tempt humankind. Omniscient, God sees that this temptation will be successful and knows that humankind will fall, but resists the blame, saying:

They therefore as to right belong’d,
So were created, nor can justly accuse
Thir maker, or thir making, or thir Fate;
As if Predestination over-ruled
Thir will, dispos’d by absolute Decree
Or high foreknowledge; they themselves decreed
Thir own revolt, not I
(3.111-17)

Humankind’s fall is the fault of humankind, and it was not predestined, although it was foreknown, because humankind was created with Reason to withstand temptation of Satan; however, humankind did not engineer its own fall. The Creator says to the Son
“Man falls deceiv’d / By th’ other first: Man therefore shall find grace, / The other none” (3.131-32). Humanity, therefore, is allowed to be saved, because the humans were enticed by Satan, while Satan and the rest of the fallen angels were enticed only by their own power.

The Creator, while watching the fall of humankind with the Son, discusses the consequences of the fall, including the actualities of salvation. The Creator says that those who are saved will be saved by “grace in me,” “not will in him” (3.174) and that, although some people will be “chosen of peculiar grace / Elect above the rest” (3.183-84), only those who “neglect and scorn” the call of God will be excluded from God’s mercies (3.199-203). The understanding of the Son, as presented in Paradise Lost, is that he is agreeing to save Adam and Eve after they ask for forgiveness, regardless of the fact that he has not yet come to Earth as Jesus and been persecuted, crucified, and resurrected. The Son, in Paradise Lost, must sacrifice his life to save humankind, because before he sacrifices himself, he is not equal to the Father and exists in time. The Father, on the other hand, “beholds” “past, present, future” from “his prospect high” (3.77-78). The Son cannot save before his death, so it is necessary for him to descend to Earth and be killed. After he does, he will “sit incarnate” and “shalt Reign /

---

58 In Milton’s Christian Doctrine, the speaker equates the term “elect” with the term “believer,” saying “whence I conclude that believers are the same as the elect, and that the terms are used indiscriminately” (921). In this context, it is strange that the narration of Paradise Lost suggests that some are “Elect above the rest,” which might suggest that some are elect and some are more elect (3.184). However, it seems to be that Paradise Lost is actually saying that some are elect, and that the qualification of being elect puts those individuals “above the rest” (ibid). This suggestion is supported in Christian Doctrine, for the speaker says that, when Matthew 20:16 says that “many be called, but few chosen,” the speaker is not saying that only some believers are chosen; the speaker, rather, is saying that “they which believe are few” (921). Being “Elect above the rest” for Paradise Lost seems to suggest that there are few believers among the nonbelievers, not that some of the believers will not be elect (3.184). Those who “neglect and scorn” will not be elect, and there will be many of them, but they will not be saved (3.199).
Both God and Man, Son both of God and Man, / Anointed universal King” as equal to the Creator (3.313-317). This narrative, in which the Creator calls for someone “just th’ unjust to save,” seems to suggest that the death of the Son as a human is necessary, not only to save those who already believe in him, but to spread the news of his existence in order that more may believe in him and be saved (3.215). This interpretation is supported by Michael’s last conversation with Adam, where he tells Adam that the Son will come to Earth and “Proclaim life to all who shall believe / In his redemption” (12.407-408). By asking forgiveness, Adam and Eve are showing they have internalized their own shame and are contrite, but by dying for all of humanity, the Son is showing that he, not himself shameful, is willing to adopt and take responsibility for the shame of humanity. This gives agency to the whole of the human race, suggesting that each person is capable of finding salvation in the Son. Because anyone is capable of seeking salvation through Christ in the narrative of Paradise Lost, those who choose not to do so are afforded an additional action, or inaction, for which they can be shamed: the rejection of Jesus.

The narrative of Order and Disorder seems to suggest a much more rigid understanding of predestination and election than does the narrative of Paradise Lost. Although this narrative does not take the liberty of creating conversations between God and Christ, as Paradise Lost does between the Creator and the Son, its understanding of the role of Christ in human salvation comes from the narrative voice, which is pervasive and authoritative in the text.

The narrative understanding of the role of Christ, as presented in Order and Disorder, also contributes the the narrative’s understanding of free will and its
connections to predestination. While *Order and Disorder* does not provide an in-depth discussion of free will, as *Paradise Lost* does, it presupposes the existence of free will; this presupposition is especially evident in the discussions Adam and Eve have regarding their attitude towards life after the fall. In the narrative of *Order and Disorder*, the fall was predestined and foreknown, and there is significant indication that some of this distinction comes from humankind being inherently more dangerous than the other creatures; while humanity is armed with “Fancy and Invention” (3.66), “Majesty and Grace” (3.69), it is also given “false spies both at the ears and eyes,” which “conspire with strangers for the soul’s surprise / And let all life-perturbing passions in” (3.83-84).

This description could be, and probably is, indicative of the fallenness of the narrator and the narrator’s knowledge of the forthcoming fall, but it also implies that, at some level, humanity was created such that it would find the fall, and shameful actions, in general, irresistible.

This assertion, however, seems to be countered by the narrator’s description of humanity elsewhere in *Order and Disorder*. Where the narrator is describing God resting on the seventh day of creation, it notes that God was “Full satisfied in their perfection” (3.547). While it is possible that the narrator is here referring to the perfection of humankind, which had not yet been defiled by its fall, it is also possible that the narrator is referring to the perfection of a different kind of being: the soul. The larger section from which this quotation is pulled is as follows:

```
He ceased not from his own celestial joy,
Which doth himself perpetually employ
In contemplation of himself and those
Most excellent works wherein himself he shows;
He only ceased from making lower things,
```
By which, as steps, the mounting soul he brings
To th’upmost height, and, having finished these,
Himself did his own productions please,
Full satisfied in their perfection
(3.539-47)

This passage seems to suggest that God, after the creation of the first two humans,
stopped creating “lower things” and focused on bringing creation “To th’upmost height”
(3.543-45). Operating within a predestined framework, it seems as though this could be
when God, resting after the creation of the physical world, created the souls destined for
salvation, those that would be higher than any of the creation currently in existence and
would later be distributed to the elect until the end of time. This supposition, however,
might entail that Adam and Eve, having already been created, were without these souls
and, therefore, not destined for salvation, directly countering the assertion after the fall
that Adam and Eve “shall be out of bondage led,” presumably into salvation, by Christ
(5.208). While this allows the reader to believe that Adam and Eve are bound for
salvation through Christ, perhaps they could not be recipients of God’s mercy but through
Christ. These elected souls, however, seem to be considered of a higher nature, with
generally better character and greater value than the unelect. These souls are not excused
from the worship of God through Christ, as the narrative encourages worship when it
says, “So, when on us the seventh day’s light doth shine, / Should we ourselves to God’s
assemblies join,” but the souls of the elect may influence their physical bodies in such a
way that their actions are not reprehensible to God (3.588-89). Interestingly, however, if
Adam and Eve are not saved through their being elect, they are still promised mercy and
salvation; if they, through good behavior, are offered salvation, perhaps others who are
not elect and are still appropriately devout may also be saved. However, as this narrative advocates for prayer in praise of mercy shown, as opposed to prayer in want of forgiveness, it is unclear how this salvation might be achieved without direct access to God, as Adam had in *Order and Disorder*.

Adam and Eve, in *Order and Disorder*, succumb to their innate ungodliness and fall from the grace of God. Part of their punishment as a result of the fall is to propagate the human species on Earth, a punishment that disproportionately affects Eve, as she will be the one who experiences pain as a result of childbirth. This act will ultimately be redemptive, as it is through her progeny that Jesus Christ, the savior of humanity, will eventually be born. This act, however, is also what will subject her and all of her female offspring to male domination, for “from her womb / Her father, brother, husband shall come. / Subjection to the husband’s rule enjoined” (5.227-29). Women, in effect, will produce their own masters. This Eve, unlike the notoriously independent Eve of *Paradise Lost*, has put up little vocal resistance to her husband Adam thus far in the narrative, and it is suggested that not only will she be unable to execute such resistance in the future, but that it would be ill-advised, as such resistance could distance woman from man and result in the the delay of Christ’s arrival on Earth. Here, where the narrative of *Order and Disorder* is presenting resistance to patriarchal rule as a shameful act, one that endangers humanity, it is possible that Hutchinson is again providing a direct contrast to Milton’s narrative, one in which his narrative’s Eve is punished after the fall by the increasingly patriarchal nature of her life.
This particular punishment is relevant to the question of agency in the narrative, especially as it relates to the reasoning behind characters’ actions. Female subjection, as presented in *Order and Disorder*, does not seem to suggest that women are less likely than men to be destined for salvation. Salvation, since it is predestined and does not seem to be earned by actions, does not require agency on the part of the individual being saved. Since God, in *Order and Disorder*, already knows who will be saved and has created certain individuals for the very purpose of being saved, actions individuals undertake when they believe they are saved come to take on a different meaning than if they were taken in a state of unknown salvation. For example, Adam and Eve pray to “understand, prize, and accept [God’s] grace” in *Order and Disorder* because they know they have been saved (5.476), but in *Paradise Lost*, where Adam and Eve do not know they are saved and are, in fact, not yet saved, they must learn to ask for forgiveness; in both cases, Adam and Eve respond to the fall with prayer, but they respond in the same way for different reasons.

In a comparative study of *Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder*, it is possible to see that each narrative operates to either refute or support the concept of predestination through an understanding of free will and its relationship to shame: in *Paradise Lost*, free will allows humankind to fall, while in *Order and Disorder*, free will allows humankind to properly praise God and is evidence of salvation, for it is supposed that saved individuals naturally act in accordance with the wishes of God. In both narratives, the role of Christ in relation to salvation is explored, revealing that, in *Paradise Lost*, the Son directly intervenes to save humanity from the wrath of the Creator, while in *Order and
Disorder, where the elect are already saved, Christ must live and die to provide redemption to the unelect, as they will give birth to him and can only seek salvation through worship of God through him. In addition to the understandings of free will and the role of Christ in relation to predestination as explored in each narrative, Paradise Lost and Order and Disorder also explore the idea of the fortunate fall. The idea of a fortunate fall would suggest that humanity is actually better off after its fall than it was before its fall, but it is not immediately clear if either narrative supports this understanding.

In Paradise Lost, that the fall led to changed opportunities for humanity is clear. Before the fall, Adam and Eve live lives of unequal access to God, one in which Eve has access to a foolish and naive version of the deity through Adam and Adam has direct contact with the divine himself; after the fall, neither Adam nor Eve have direct access to their Creator, only access to God through the Son, and this debasement actually serves to make husband and wife more equal. Before the fall, Adam and Eve have been charged with populating the Earth, but have been unable to do so for reasons they do not understand; after the fall, Eve is charged with the punishment of childbearing, but she and Adam are finally gifted with children. While both of these consequences can be manipulated such that they might seem positive, neither seems particularly supportive of the idea of the fortunate fall. Paradise Lost, as a whole, however, does seem to support the idea of the fortunate fall, and this support comes primarily from Paradise Lost’s presentation of events of shaming before and after the fall.

As has been discussed above, the narrative of Paradise Lost appears to ascribe shame to Adam and Eve before they have fallen, when they are supposed to be incapable
of performing actions that have cause to bring them shame. Nonetheless, they are shamed before the fall, and they appear to be engaging in actions which should bring them shame, even if they do not realize the sinfulness of their actions. After the fall, they are aware of what constitutes shame and are able to atone for their sins. Therefore, they can ask for forgiveness for their sins as they could not have done before the fall, because before the fall, they did not realize their actions were shameful and required forgiveness. The knowledge of evil gained from their eating of the Tree of Knowledge has shown them that they were not truly unfallen before they ate of the tree, because, before the fall, they had not been tested.

Milton discusses the concept of untested goodness in his prose tract *Areopagitica*, which discusses, among other topics, the censorship of books. A passage of *Areopagitica* relevant to the discussion of the fortunate fall is as follows:

> It was from out the rind of one apple tasted, that the knowledge of good and evil, as two twins cleaving together, leaped forth into the world. And perhaps this is that doom which Adam fell into of knowing good and evil, that is to say, of knowing good by evil. As therefore the state of man is, what wisdom can there be to choose, what continence to forbear without the knowledge of evil? He that can apprehend and consider vice with all her baits and seeming pleasures, and yet abstain, and yet distinguish, and yet prefer that which is truly better, he is the true warfaring Christian.

> I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathe[d], that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat. Assuredly we bring not innocence into the world, we bring impurity much rather: that which purifies us is trial, and trial is by what is contrary. That virtue therefore which is but a youngling in the contemplation of evil, and knows not the utmost that vice promises to her followers, and rejects it, is but a blank virtue, not a pure; her whiteness is but an excremental whiteness.

This passage describes the fall as an escape from the trap of “blank virtue,” for after the fall, humanity had been tested, and humanity had failed, but this failure allowed humanity to

---

to recognize its sins and ask for forgiveness of them (ibid). If humanity had not been allowed to fall, it would have continued living in a state of ignorance, one in which it was committing acts of sinfulness and shamefulness completely, without realizing the wrong in its actions. The fall allows for the bifurcation of humanity, because it allows for the separation of humanity into those that know of evil and have abstained and those who know of evil and have indulged. Without the fall, it would not have been possible to parse the “true warfaring Christian” from the infidel or the liar, and in *Areopagitica*, that seems to make the fall worth it (ibid).

For *Order and Disorder*, it is decidedly less clear how fortunate the reader is supposed to understand the fall to be, because there is no alternative to the fall presented. The fall, in *Order and Disorder*, is predestined and completely foreknown; before humanity had even been created, God “made for signs” the stars in the sky (2.166), foreshadowing a fallen world where humankind has to cultivate the Earth for food, raise animals for slaughter, engage in dangerous trade, and outlast “Droughts, inundations, famines, plagues and wars” (2.181). Adam and Eve are not like the fallen angels, who brought on their own damnation “by the apostasy of their will,” but are much less agentive, and had little choice in the matter of falling (4.67). This is not to say, however, that Adam and Eve did not lose greatly in the fall. Adam and Eve have significantly more peaceful lives before the fall, but they never would have been able to maintain the lives they had. The best way the fall can be read as fortunate in *Order and Disorder* is to read it in terms of Christ. Had humanity not fallen, it is still possible that the population of the Earth would have increased in some way, whether that be by Adam and Eve’s
propagation or through creation direct from the divine, as Adam and Eve experienced. If the souls of the elect are created after Adam and Eve are created, perhaps Adam and Eve are not naturally saved and must be saved by Christ, although, if they had not fallen, they would not have been damned either; they simply would have lived forever. If the population of the Earth increases, some of those people may have elect souls, while others are unelect, with no way to seek salvation. The fall allows for the birth, death, and resurrection of Christ, because Christ, fathered by God but born of human pain, killed of human vengeance, and raised of divine power, could not have been born to sacrifice himself for humanity if humanity had not already condemned itself. Because humanity falls, Christ can come, through the mercy of God, to save those who are unelect.

If the fall can be considered fortunate, at least to some degree, for both Paradise Lost and Order and Disorder, the shaming the characters experience must be mitigated by the benefits they receive as a result of that shaming. In each poem, shame is presented as a powerful force, capable of altering one’s relationship with God; however, each poem has a different understanding of the power of shame. In Paradise Lost, this power is best explored in communities of shame, while in Order and Disorder, this power is best explored through the moments of hope offered in the narrative.

If there is shaming before and after the fall in Paradise Lost, as there seems to be, especially with the character of Eve, then the fall gives humankind the opportunity to recognize and atone for its sins. To recognize his or her sins, an individual must acquire from external stimulus information detailing what its community finds to be shameful. From his or her community, an individual can observe what is shameful and what is
acceptable, either through their own experiences of shaming or of witnessing the shaming of others. Upon recognition of their societies’ particular values, individuals can internalize what has been communicated to them, either directly or indirectly, thus making themselves microcosmic authorities of the particular value system of their society. This internalized notion of shame can then be projected inward and outward such that it functions internally and collectively. Inwardly, individuals who have internalized the value systems of their communities are capable of recognizing what in themselves is shameful. Outwardly, those same individuals are able to engage in acts of shaming of others, furthering the particular notion of shame in which their communities partake.

At first glance, the perpetuation of a system of judgement that allows and even encourages what is essentially ritualized shaming of individuals by those individuals’ peers or members of those individuals’ communities seems to be only negative. However, it does not seem as though this type of behavior is supposed to be seen, in totality, with such negativity. Rather, this type of community is designed such that it brings the individuals within that community closer to God. On a larger scale, this system is rife with complication, as it simplistically denies that shaming might be disproportionately aimed towards community members for arbitrary reasons, like race, gender, sex, or sexuality, that authority figures who perpetuate the system of shaming might be spiteful or vindictive, rather than God-fearing and ultimately benevolent, and that all members of the community will be given equal access to the systems that allow for conformity with the prescribed norms of behavior.\footnote{Nor is it clear that that is not as the narrative of \textit{Paradise Lost} intends for it to be. That some exclusivity is built into the system is logical, given Milton’s general aura of mental superiority and the religious structure of Puritanism, which necessarily entails a deeply hierarchical organizational structure.} In the context of \textit{Paradise Lost}, however, the only
hope provided for humanity is that they will be able to seek forgiveness for their inevitable sin and probable ignominy through the Son. Without this forgiveness, individuals must necessarily be in a state of utter degradation and damnation, and if the only way individuals will know to ask for forgiveness is through this system of shaming, then the negative ramifications of the employment of the system might be worth it.

While this kind of collective shaming, shaming within a community, is present somewhat in *Order and Disorder*, it certainly does not play the same role that it does in *Paradise Lost*. As previously discussed, the role of shame itself is less pronounced in *Order and Disorder* than in *Paradise Lost*, but it does still make note of communities of shame. While *Order and Disorder* notes that a community’s values influence the behaviors that an individual in that community will find shameful, its narrative also shows characters who overcome that system of values, possibly to their detriment, and act based on individual desire or sensibility, rather than the community’s values. This is especially evident in the example of Lot’s daughters, who were “restrained with modest shame” from their lustful desire of their father (13.309). The collective shame that they have experienced from their community has taught them that incest is a shameful activity, and that they should feel shame for desiring it. This collective shame has been internalized and has resulted in their shaming of themselves for their internal thoughts, but they allow their collective desire to overcome their shame. Before each sister knows that the other also has lustful feelings for their father, those feelings are acceptable; after they each know the other’s desire, “The fence of shame” is removed and neither feels inhibited from “their wicked plot” (13.344). The narrator recognizes that these actions are
shameful, and says that the children of Lot’s daughters are later punished, when “Jacob’s sons their kingdom overthrew,” but there is no mention of their being contrite or asking for forgiveness for their actions; in this case, it seems as though the actions of Lot’s daughters are evidence that they are unregenerate and may be damned. This damnation, however, is part of what leads the sons of Jacob, as God’s chosen people, to success, implying that it was planned, foreknown, and predestined.

Disheartening as the presented analysis of the episode of Lot’s daughters may be, it is an example of one of the few explicit mentions of shame in the narrative. *Order and Disorder* tends to focus not on specific instances of shaming but on what the general state of humanity, as a population of inherently shamed and fallen individuals, can do to redeem itself. For *Order and Disorder*, this redemption seems to be found in the bearing and raising of children. The redemptive quality of procreation is referenced in the following passage:

But we shall trample on the serpent’s head.
Our scattered atoms shall again condense\(^6\),
And be again inspired with living sense;
Captivity shall then a captive be,
Death shall be swallowed up in victory,

\(^6\) Before Hutchinson wrote *Order and Disorder*, she engaged in translation work of Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura*. She later regretted her translation, telling Arthur, Earle of Anglesey that she did it out of “youthfull curiositie” and not to “propagate any of the wicked pernitious doctrines in it” (7). Evidence of her discomfort with the material is clear even in her translation itself, which omits large portions from the source material. This omission is especially noticeable where the source material is speaking towards what Hutchinson may have viewed as sexual licentiousness. For example, when the poem says, “And youths who first attaine their manly age / The images of beauty into lusts engage,” the Latin source material contains more than 100 subsequent lines before Hutchinson resumes her translation (4.1084-85). Though she later regretted her decision to translate the philosophical work, evidence of its influence in her personal thinking is discernable in her later works. This influence is notable here and in relation to the beliefs of childbirth espoused in *Order and Disorder*, especially as relating to the lines “for nature makes new creatures rise / From those which were dissolvd, & all that liue / Their beings out of others deaths receiue” (1.269-71). The understanding incorporated here from *De Rerum Natura* into the Christian context of *Order and Disorder* suggests that childbirth, a punishment originally intended to address the shame of humankind, is a regeneration, symbolizing the renewal of humanity’s relationship with God through the birth of Christ.
And God shall man to Paradise restore,  
Where foul tempter shall seduce no more.  
(5.252-58)  

This passage seems to connect the eventual defeat of Satan with the process of procreation, a mercy hidden within the specifically female punishment of childbearing. The mercy promised in this passage seems to suggest that the suffering of ordinary women will lead to salvation through the eventual suffering of one highly unusual man, Jesus, who is born as a human to bring other humans to the divine. Even regular, non-divine, children seem to bring man ever closer to God, because, although they are occasionally involved in sinful or shameful actions, they are part of what humanity can do to “improve [its] short-indulged space” of life (5.465). For example, although the birth of Jacob and Esau increases enmity between Rebecca and Isaac, it came from love, a love described by the narrator as one which “if it come powerfully, it leaves no room / For any other cares” (16.268-69); this love that leads to children, this idealized marital bliss, unachieved by Adam and Eve but neared by their descendants, is one which overcomes the shame and desolation of the fall and ultimately gives humanity hope.

---

62 This passage contains a near-verbatim transcription of a portion of 1 Corinthians 15:54, which states, “Death is swallowed up in victory.”
Conclusion

*Paradise Lost* and *Order and Disorder* engage in the retelling of the Genesis story in such a way that their narratives provide two different explanations for the fall of humanity. In *Paradise Lost*, the fall is understood to have been avoidable but ultimately survivable, because it results in the coming of the Son, who sacrifices himself to save humanity from damnation. In *Order and Disorder*, the fall of humanity is predestined and completely unavoidable, and those who are chosen by God will be saved from ultimate destruction. In addition to presenting different ideas about the origins of the fall, each of these narratives also presents different ideas about the role of shame in a postlapsarian world. For the narrative of *Paradise Lost*, shame is what leads humankind to recognize its own misdeeds and approach the divine with a contrite heart to ask for forgiveness. For the narrative of *Order and Disorder*, on the other hand, shame is a universal condition of the postlapsarian world which simultaneously limits and challenges humanity to live, aware of its forthcoming death, in order to please and praise God.

While these narratives take different interpretive approaches to the same source material, some of their conclusions are identical, even if they are not expressed in exactly the same ways. One of these conclusions is that humanity is unique, separated from God and the other divine beings, but also from the other Earthly creations. Humankind alone has been challenged, has failed, and has been given the opportunity to be forgiven; no other creatures are given such rights. In neither narrative is the fall excused, but each narrative is concerned with making the status quo of human existence one in which
humanity is not paralyzed by its failure but is instead motivated by its opportunities, either to achieve salvation or to praise and seek to understand the divine.

In spite of what may seem like a disheartening subject matter, these narratives are ultimately concerned with bringing humanity closer to God: improving the relationship that was damaged in the fall and praising the sacrifice of Christ. While the creation of these narratives may have also been motivated by political or social factors, they are, at their core, demonstrations of creative, artistic, and masterful exegesis of the Genesis story, and though they are worth studying for their literary merit alone, these narratives must also be viewed as explorations of personal theologies that were used to support those who espoused them in times of criticism, upheaval, danger, and challenge.
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