Father, King, and God: John Milton's Prose Response to Monarchy

JOHN G. PETERS

> "He showed me that [the kite] was covered with manuscript. . . . I thought I saw some allusion to King Charles the First's head again."
> —Charles Dickens, *David Copperfield*

DURING THE RENAISSANCE in England, much discussion surrounded the proper role of the king. Supporters of the monarchy argued that the king was divinely appointed, carrying out the will of God and benevolently presiding over the citizens of the realm. In this role, the king came to represent order and security for the people. By the end of the Renaissance, particularly during the rule of Charles I, some began to question such assumptions about the role of the king, as Charles's opponents such as John Milton rejected the idea of the king as divinely appointed and argued instead that the king was a mere magistrate. In attempting to make this argument, Milton would have to overcome some of the most deeply entrenched ideas in the social psyche.

I

In 1581, John Stubbs published *The Gulph Wherein England Will Be Swallowed by the French Marriage*. This book greatly offended Elizabeth I, and she had both the author and the publisher, William Page, arrested. William Camden records the following events:

> Hereupon *Stubbs* and *Page* had their Right hands cut off with a Cleaver, driven through the Wrist by the force of a Mallet, upon a Scaffold in the Marketplace at *Westminster*. The Printer was pardoned. I remember (being there present) that when *Stubbs*, after his

> Right hand was cut off, put off his Hat with his Left, and said with a loud voice, *God save the Queen*; the Multitude standing about was deeply silent: either out of an Horrour at this new and unwonted kind of Punishment; or else out of Commiseration towards the man, as being of an honest and unblameable Repute; or else out of Hatred of the Marriage, which most men presaged would be the Overthrow of Religion. (Camden, 270)

Some time later, while still in prison, Stubbs explained his surprising action in a letter to the Queen and her Privy Counsel:

> If I should remember my dutiful suffering the punishment, in so much as in my bitterest extremity, and immediately after my hand cut off, even upon the place, the Lord gave me grace to speak these words from an unfeigned heart, "God save the Queen!" yet was all this no more then every man should do which maketh conscience to give none evil example to others of the left repining thought against God's sacred Magistrate, or due execution of justice. (Harington, 2: 208-9)

Although Camden and others present at the execution of the sentence believed the punishment to be barbaric, the idea and role of monarchy was so important to Stubbs that he responded with praise rather than with reproach. The significance of the monarchy to English culture remained strong throughout the Renaissance even down to Milton's time, and the origin of its significance lies in the relationship between father, king, and God.

For most human beings, the family is an individual's first experience with an organization and represents structure and protection for its members. Because the family experience makes an initial and lasting impact on an individual, this organization can become a model for other organizations as well. This phenomenon is particularly true of the monarchial organization during the Renaissance, especially since the monarchy was established by common consent. Leadership, loyalty, hierarchies, obedience, and kinship are all common elements of both the monarchy and the family. In fact, many people saw the king as a father figure. Richard F. Hardin argues, "Just as Adam and all succeeding fathers are sole rul-

ers of their families, so the father-king rules the collection of families known as the state" (180). As the father was a leader, protector, and director of the family's members and affairs, so also was the king leader, protector, and director of the kingdom's members and affairs. For many during Milton's time, such a role was important, and both Charles I's defenders and detractors recognized this popular view of monarchy. As Bruce Boehrer suggests, Charles's supporters "characterize the relation between subjects and sovereigns as a *family* relation, and they thus present crimes against sovereigns as *family* crimes" (100). Because English Renaissance society saw the governmental organization to be similar to the familial organization, it viewed crimes against monarchy as if they were crimes against family.

The position of the monarchy was further strengthened by a similar link with theology. Besides a similarity between the organizational structure of the Renaissance family and the Renaissance government, a similarity also exists between the structure of the family and the structure of theology. Hardin notes, "Monarchists took pleasure in associating the fatherly role of the king with the first person of the Trinity as well as the ordinary human father" (180). Christian theology posits a Father in heaven and children of God. This structure has much in common with the familial and governmental structures of that time. In the social consciousness, then, a link existed between father, king, and God—or more specifically between familial, monarchial, and divine order.

Both Hardin and Boehrer present convincing arguments concerning the relationship between family, monarchy, and deity. However, I would argue that equally important are the psychological origins and effects of this phenomenon. In particular, why this phenomenon occurred and why it was so significant to the social consciousness become crucial issues in understanding why disrupting the link between father, king, and God (as Milton so often does) was so threatening to society.

The case of Charles I further complicates these relationships because not only did the English king hold an analogous position to that of father and God, but also many viewed the English monarchy as being divinely appointed. Furthermore, because of Henry VIII's break with the Roman Catholic Church, the English monarchy also became the literal head of the Church of England such that church and state merged. Consequently, as both head of the church and divine appointee, the English monarch's more specific ties to deity even further underscore the ties between king and God that exist through analogous structures. Many writings of the time bear out this attitude, and therefore their authors viewed the deposition and regicide of Charles I as a sacrilegious act. John Gauden, for example, wrote, "[I] exhibit to you, as the chief Consellours and Managers of *the present Designes* against the King, this my Loyal and Religious *Protestation against it*, and earnest obtestation of you; not to bring upon your souls, and the Kingdom, (as much as in you lies) *the blood of* His Majesty, *the Lords Anointed*" (7-8). William Prynne also wrote several tracts protesting the deposition and regicide of Charles I. In his *A Briefe Memento to the Present Unparliamentary Junto*, Prynne presents this same line of argument linking politics and religion:

> Remember, That no Protestant Kingdom or State, ever yet defiled their hands, or stained the purity and Honour of their Reformed Religion, with the deposition, or blood of any of their Kings or Princes, much lesse of a *Protestant King or Prince*. . . . And for a Reforming Protestant Parl. pretending the most of any to piety & Religion, to stain their profession or honour by the deposition, or defile their hands with the blood of a Protestant King, or for an army of Saints to do it, or they to please a Saint-seeming Army, and that against so many fore mentioned Oaths, Protestations, Declarations, Remonstrances, Solemn Leagues and Covenants one after another to the contrary, would be such an unparalleled scandal to the Protestant Religion & all professors of it. (12)

Among Prynne's other tracts opposing the deposition of Charles I is the following:

> And besides the Trust they [the army] hereby have assumed, they are under the obligation of a solemn Covenant sworn to Almighty God, That they will in their places and callings, with sincerity, reality and constancy, with their estates and lives, preserve the Rights and Priviledges of the Parliament, and the Liberties of the Kingdom; and defend the Kings person and Authority in the defense of the true Religion and Liberties of the Kingdom. (*Vindication*, 4-5)

Other similar writings include Prynne's *A Serious and Faithfull Representation of the Judgements of Ministers of the Gospel within the Province of London* and his *Breviate of the Prelates Intollerable Usurpations upon Kings Prerogative and Subjects Liberties*.

The most influential of the documents defending Charles I was *Eikon Basilike* (usually attributed at least in part to Charles I himself), which also takes up this line of reasoning:

> [Y]et hath he [God] graven such Characters of divine Authority, and sacred Power upon Kings, as none may without sin seek to blot them out. Nor shall their black veils be able to hide the shining of My face, while God gives Me a heart frequently & humbly to converse with him, from whom alone are all the traditions of true glory and majesty. (*Eikon Basilike*, 135-6)

Throughout the book, the author continually tries to yoke together religion and monarchy. The clearest depiction of this link appears in the frontispiece to *Eikon Basilike*. In this frontispiece (designed by William Marshall), the tie between king and God is readily apparent. Charles kneels in prayer and takes up a crown of thorns. While doing so, he puts off his earthly crown with a view toward a heavenly crown. He is also in the process of receiving divine inspiration. Along with the illustration's emphasis on Charles's position as divine appointee and holy man, the frontispiece further connects king and God by suggesting parallels between Charles and Christ (a similar comparison to that found in a number of other works defending the monarchy).

Figure 1
Frontispiece to *Eikon Basilike*

The common thread among these examples is that to attack the king (particularly in the manner proposed by many of Charles's opponents) is to attack religion, and such an attack upon religion was unacceptable. In addition to Charles's defenders' attempts to link king and God, they try to strengthen their position yet further by portraying Charles I as a devout Christian in such writings as E. R. Gentleman's *The Divine Penitential Meditations and Vowes of his Late Sacred Majestie at Holmby House, Faithfully Turned into Verse* and in the prayers that conclude each chapter of *Eikon Basilike*. Nor does this end with Charles's death; rather this conviction increases in vigor with the suggestion that Charles was a martyr in such publications as *The Life and Death of King Charles*

the Martyr, Parallel'd with Our Saviour in All His Sufferings; Perrinchief's *The Royal Martyr*; Thomas Wagstaffe's *Vindication of King Charles the Martyr*; Bishop of Downe, Henry Leslie's *The Martyrdom of King Charles, or His Conformity with Christ in His Sufferings*; Archbishop of Canterbury, William Juxon's *The Subjects of Sorrow: Lamentations upon the Death of Britaines Josiah*; and others as well.

As a result of this tie between family, monarchy, and divinity, what happens to one of these structures affects the others in a microcosmic/macrocosmic manner. Boehrer suggests, "To offend one of these figures of power is simultaneously to offend all three, and any gesture that might question their authority carries with itself the figurative overthrow of kingship, and paternal dignity, and heavenly order" (102). I would argue even further that not only does the question of the authority of one of "these figures of power" affect the others, but it affects the entire structure each represents and, more important, the psychological confidence society placed in such structures. The comfort and security afforded by a stable family, for instance, can also imply comfort and security on the social and divine levels as well. In contrast, instability in one of these organizations can imply instability in the others also, so that the execution of the king became not just regicide but also parricide and deicide in the social consciousness. In this way, lamenting the loss of the king is also lamenting the loss of security and confidence in family order and divine order, and even more significant than the secular chaos caused by the king's death is the spiritual chaos it can also imply. Furthermore, the literal regicide of Charles I metonymically implies a figurative parricide as well as a possible deicide by toppling analogous organizational structures such that the world of God is threatened with possible instability and destruction. In the single act of regicide, the foundation of stability that the primal family organization represents breaks up as does the protective social organization, metonymically imposing upon society the possibility that all other organizations resembling this model (even the divine organ-

ization) are also either tenuous or ephemeral. This brought home with power the question of one's place in the world and the disquieting implications associated with such disorder. Consequently, the longing for the reign of Charles I was a longing for a return to order, so the people could have faith again in a familiar, ordered system and thereby avert the possibility of a chaotic universe.

Given the immense psychological importance of the king then, Milton's defense of government without monarchy—especially his defense of regicide—had to confront the king's psychological role such that Milton's defense does not threaten the people's world view.

II

Milton considered the public perception of the goodness of the king's role as mistakenly valuing something that is valueless. Many saw the king as the good—a protector, leader, and divine intercessor. Throughout his political writings (and elsewhere as well) ranging from *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* through *Brief Notes upon a Late Sermon*, Milton seeks to refute this contention. To be sure, Milton's political views evolved significantly on several important points, such as his views on the nature of the common people and exactly what kind of government should succeed the monarchy. Nevertheless, I would argue that Milton remained constant in his views concerning the evils of absolute monarchy, the inherent freedom of human beings, and the necessity of some form of republican government (whether one elected by the people or a ruling oligarchy representing the people), and these are the primary issues I will deal with concerning Milton's view of monarchy.

In responding to monarchy, Milton accuses the public of preferring slavery to freedom, confusing public service with public protection, and confounding divine appointment with divine essence. In order for Milton to overcome the people's psychological attachment to the idea of the king, however, he

must also replace that attachment with something else. Milton must foster the nation's psychological comfort with a non-monarchial form of government, and, to do so, he consistently and systematically severs the cultural connections between father, king, and God.

In *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates, A Defense of the People of England, The Ready and Easy Way to a Free Commonwealth,* and elsewhere, Milton attacks the bond between father and king. In his first *Defense*, for instance, Milton argues, "Fathers and kings are very different things: Our fathers begot us, but our kings did not, and it is we, rather, who created the king. It is nature which gave the people fathers, and the people who gave themselves a king; the people therefore do not exist for the king, but the king for the people" (*Complete Prose*, 4,1: 327). In order to fully break the bond between king and father, though, Milton must show that the king is neither protector, nor lord, nor kin. In showing the king is not a protector, Milton focuses on Charles's actions that present him as a tyrant rather than a protector. In fact, Milton describes Charles I as a tyrant throughout his writings. As a tyrant, the king then becomes an enemy of the people and a significant danger to their well being, not a father figure who protects their interests. In *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, Milton stresses that it is not right that "so many thousand Christians destroyed, should lie unaccounted for, polluting with their slaughtered carcasses all the Land over, and crying for vengeance against the living that should have righted them" (*Complete Prose*, 3: 214). Similarly, in *The Ready and Easy Way*, Milton accuses of the king of bringing "upon our lives destruction" (*Complete Prose*, 7: 410). In this way, Milton underscores incidents that highlight the malevolent rather than benevolent nature of Charles's reign and portray Charles as a destroyer—not a protector.

In addition to portraying Charles as a destroyer rather than a protector, Milton wants to argue that the king is not a lord to whom obedience is required, as it would be to a father. From this perspective, the king is not a leader but rather a

helper—a public servant in the literal sense of the term. For Milton, this fact is clearly one of the most important reasons for rejecting kingship. He expends much energy in both *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* and in *The Ready and Easy Way* arguing this point. In *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates,* Milton writes,

> Not to be their Lords and Masters (though afterward those names in some places were given voluntarily to such as had been Authors of inestimable good to the people) but, to be their Deputies and Commissioners, to execute, by virtue of their entrusted power, that justice which else every man by the bond of nature and of Covenant must have executed for himself, and for one another. And to him that shall consider well why among free Persons, one man by civil right should bear authority and jurisdiction over another, no other end or reason can be imaginable. (*Complete Prose*, 3: 199; see also 3, 204)

Milton wants to emphasize here that all human beings should be free and that kings and magistrates should be servants rather than lords. Otherwise, under a monarchial government, the people are merely slaves (*cf. Complete Prose*, 3: 412; 7: 462). Milton suggests that Charles "neither can perform what he undertakes, and yet for undertaking it, though royally paid, will not be their servant, but their lord" (*Complete Prose*, 7: 427). Similarly, Milton continually argues that human beings have a God-given right to be free and that rulers are not leaders but functionaries: "No man who knows ought, can be so stupid to deny that all men naturally were borne free, being the image and resemblance of God himself, and were by privilege above all the creatures, born to command and not to obey" (*Complete Prose*, 3: 198-99). As a result, "the King must not be at such a distance from the people, in judging what is better and what worse" (*Complete Prose*, 3: 403), and "if the King may deny to pass what the Parliament hath chosen to be a Law, then doth the King make himself Superiour to his whole Kingdom" (*Complete Prose*, 3: 415). Kings then are simply public servants, and their role is to facilitate social interaction and to help maintain social order—not to rule over the people as a father would his chil-

dren. (From Milton's point of view, this transformation of king from lord to servant also effectually eliminates the king's ability to function as a father-like protector.)

In order to loosen the ties between father and king, in addition to portraying the king as a destroyer rather than a protector and as a servant rather than a lord, Milton must also show that the relationship between the king and his people is not one of kinship. Portraying the king as destroyer and servant aid in denying his kinship to the people. In particular, by showing the king to be selfish and harmful to the people, Milton supports the proposition that he is other than kin, since kinship implies mutual caring and loyalty, along with obligations to protect one another. Similarly, by viewing the king as a servant rather than a lord, Milton implies that the king cannot fulfill the role of an elder kin—either that of father or of some other elder kin. Milton most effectively denies the king's kinship, however, by arguing that the king is foreign to the social group. In *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, for instance, by suggesting that Charles I was charged "with the spilling of more innocent blood by far, then ever *Nero*" (*Complete Prose*, 3: 193), Milton does more than merely argue that Charles is a tyrant; Milton also aligns him with a reputedly mad pagan emperor—one noted as well for his persecution of Christians. This association implies that his likeness to the social group is analogous to that of a pagan to a Christian English society. In addition, Milton refers to *Eikon Basilike* containing prayers copied from Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* and accuses Charles of "borrowing to a Christian use Prayers offered to a Heathen God" (*Complete Prose*, 3: 362). In so arguing, Milton employs an important strategy: by transforming the king into a heathen or a pagan, Charles becomes the Other—in short, not kin. This Otherness also allows the social group to deal with the king differently than it would with one of its own kind. In other words, they do not have to treat him with the same deference they would kin or even another member of society.

In order to sever the more difficult tie between king and God, Milton must attack several arguments: the king as devout Christian, the king as divine appointee, and the king as divine intercessor. In rejecting the king as Christian, Milton rejects both kingship in general as Christian and King Charles specifically as Christian. In *The Ready and Easy Way*, for example, Milton cites biblical sources as evidence that kingship is a "heathenish government" (*Complete Prose*, 7: 424). Similarly, Milton endeavors elsewhere to show that Charles is not a Christian ruler. Much of *Eikon Basilike*, for instance, portrays the king as a devout Christian (as do many other writings supporting the king). The king's devoutness is in part irrelevant to whether he is divinely appointed, but the implication is that devout people exhibit their relationship to God. Consequently, since the king is said to be divinely appointed, if he is devout, then his piety would re-affirm his divine appointment. Conversely, when Milton argues that the king is a pagan (*e.g. Complete Prose*, 3: 404) or a Papist (*e.g. Complete Prose*, 7: 460) or simply a religious hypocrite (*e.g.* 3: 367), he tries to show that the king cannot be divinely appointed because God would not invest His will in a pagan, Papist, or hypocrite. For this reason, much of *Eikonoklastes*, for example, portrays the king as either a pagan, Papist, or hypocrite.

Milton also employs a kind of metaphorical trial by combat or trial by ordeal to show that the king is not divinely appointed: "What need then more disputing? He [Charles I] appealed to Gods Tribunal, and behold God hath judged, and done to him in the sight of all men according to the verdict of his own mouth" (*Complete Prose*, 3: 381). Milton suggests here that Charles's fate is like a medieval trial by combat, in which it was assumed that the winner was the one God chose because God would not allow the wrong outcome to result. In this case, the same kind of reasoning exists in Milton's assuming that if God had not wanted Charles I deposed and executed, then it would not have happened. This reasoning is certainly far from irrefutable, but its importance lies rather

in Milton's attempting to justify severing the tie between king and God and in his asserting that the divine appointment of kings can be reversed. Once Milton can establish a precedent for reversing the divine appointment of kings, then the way is open to depose Charles I if sufficient justification can be had.

Finally, Milton succinctly places his most important argument against the link between king and God in the mouth of Christ in *Paradise Regained* when Christ rejects Satan's offer of all the worldly kingdoms in exchange for worshiping Satan: "It is written / The first of all Commandments, Thou shalt worship / The Lord thy God, and onely him shalt serve" (*Poetical Works*, 4: 175-77; *cf.* Matthew 4: 10). Christ responds not merely to Satan's demand for worship; He also rejects worldly kingdoms in favor of otherworldly kingdoms. In other words, He rejects the secular in favor of the sacred. Furthermore, Christ's reply also implies that worldly kingdoms are Satan's domain: since Satan has the power to give these kingdoms away, they must be under his control. In fact, Satan himself says, "All these which in a moment thou beholdest, / The Kingdoms of the World to thee I give; / For given to me, I give to whom I please" (*Poetical Works*, 4: 162-64; *cf.* Matthew 4: 9). Hence, for Milton, accepting worldly kingdoms means rejecting spiritual kingdoms. Milton takes up this same line of argument in his prose writings and expands his point further by linking the possessing of worldly kingdoms to the worshiping of the ungodly. Florence Sandler refers to Milton "confronting singly the worshippers of Baal and denouncing the bewildered majority" (161). Milton consistently pursues such a campaign in *Eikonoklastes*. He refers to Charles's defenders as his "Deifying friends" (*Complete Prose*, 3: 364), remarking that they "are ready to fall flat and give adoration to the Image and Memory of this Man" (3: 344). Similarly, in *Brief Notes upon a Late Sermon*, Milton argues that Matthew Griffith (author of *The Fear of God and the King*) "degrades God to a Cherub, and raises your King to be his collateral in place" (*Complete Prose*, 7: 472-73). Nor does

Milton's accusation of king worship seem exaggerated. Hardin remarks that "the Caroline monarchy itself, with all its pomp and ceremony. . . verged on becoming a religious cult" (21), and David Loewenstein argues that Milton "undermines the portrait of the Christlike martyr who has suffered terrible afflictions at the hands of his enemies by depicting the King not only as a rageful tyrant worse than his biblical paradigms, but as a mythical and theatrical figure elaborately fabricated by his ideological defenders" (182). No less does Milton accuse Charles himself of aspiring to deity: "He who *desires* from men as much obedience and subjection, as we may all pay to God, desires not less then to be a God" (*Complete Prose*, 3: 532-33; see also 3: 567). Milton even goes so far as to associate Charles with Lucifer, who usurped "over spiritual things . . . beyond his sphere" (*Complete Prose*, 3: 502). Ultimately, Milton argues that a king should not hold a position analogous to that of God and that to view the king as do Charles's defenders is to worship him, and to worship him is thus to be guilty of idolatry (*cf. Complete Prose*, 3: 343, 367).

This accusation of idolatry is a crucial component against yoking together king and God because in this injunction Milton seeks both to replace the need for the king and to correct the social perception of the good, and so even more important than identifying Charles and his defenders with king worship is Milton's attempt to replace king worship with God worship. To do so, Milton tries to transfer the attachment to king away from the king and place it solely on God. Milton refers to Christ as "our true and rightful and only to be expected King, only worthy as he is our only Saviour, the Messiah, the Christ, the only heir of his eternal father, the only by him anointed and ordained since the work of our redemption finished, Universal Lord of all mankind" (*Complete Prose*, 7: 445; see also 7: 476). Consequently, what Milton offers is a society that recognizes the valuable as God's gift of human freedom and the valueless as slavery to a mere equal (the king). More significant, though, in showing the king to be merely mortal, no more divine than any other mortal, Milton can offer undi-

vided worship of God to replace worship of king, as Milton suggests, "[W]e could not serve two contrary masters, God and the king" (*Complete Prose*, 7: 411). Even more emphatically, Milton argues that linking God and king "is contrary to the plaine teaching of Christ, that *No man can serve two Masters*, but, if he hold to the one, he must reject and forsake the other. If God then and earthly Kings be for the most part not several only, but opposite Masters, it will as oft happen, that they who will serve their King must forsake their God" (*Complete Prose*, 3: 581; *cf.* Matthew 6: 24). From Milton's perspective, then, in worshiping the king, the people not only worship a man, they worship a man *instead* of God.

As a result of Milton's numerous arguments, rather than a microcosmic/macrocosmic relationship between father, king, and God, Milton proposes a world view that identifies each as separate entities, each with his own purpose, such that father is earthly protector, king is earthly servant, and God is sole object of worship. In this view, the deposition and death of Charles I does not impact the realms of the domestic or the divine because it is unrelated; furthermore, society's psychological need for an ordered, knowable universe is then transferred away from the existence of the king and fully onto the existence of God, and Milton thus avoids cutting the moorings attaching society to its dominant view of the world.

Some commentators have noted Milton's complaints with the notion of the king as father figure and with what Milton saw as king worship. However, I have argued that it is crucial not only to identify these complaints but also to see the way Milton *systematically* cuts the connections that society had established between father, king, and God and, most important, to see how Milton tries to replace the people's psychological need for the king (as father figure and divine intercessor) with something more valuable and more appropriate (undivided worship of God) in order to avoid the strongly negative psychological effects on society should the monarchy be removed, and it is to these ends that he wrote.

In the end, Milton foresaw a world in which human beings remain free, as he argued God had intended them to be, and a world in which religious worship was not divided between king and God. The world Milton awaited, however, was yet some time off and ultimately could not be ushered in through regicide. That Milton was unsuccessful in persuading the English people away from the idea that father, king, and God are linked does not prove that his arguments were wholly faulty but merely that the people's psychological need could not be quickly, easily, or rationally replaced with something else—so strongly was the relationship between father, king, and God embedded in the social consciousness. Only the gradual eroding of monarchial power over many generations—without regicide—has also allowed an analogous gradual eroding of ties between father, king, and God to leave present-day England without the kind of monarchy that existed during the Renaissance; the sudden disruption of the social order and world view through the deposition and regicide of Charles I apparently was too much for that society to tolerate. And so the king was eventually restored, for without the restoration of monarchial order, the people have would wandered spiritually and lost confidence in their place in the universe. Milton at times invoked Euripides in support of his anti-monarchial views (*Complete Prose*, 3: 205, 589; 4,1: 440, 455, 460), and perhaps Euripides anticipates Milton's own conclusions when his chorus in *Elektra* remarks, "It is no small thing to kill a king" (l. 760).

WORKS CITED

Boehrer, Bruce. "Elementary Structures of Kingship: Milton, Regicide, and the Family." *Milton Studies*, 23 (1987), 97-117.

Camden,William. *The Historie of the Most Renowned & Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England*. 4th ed. London: R. Bentley, 1688.

Eikon Basilike: The Pourtraicture of His Sacred Majestie in His Solitudes and Sufferings. n.p.: n.p., 1648.

Gauden, John. *The Religious & Loyal Protestation of John Gauden Dr. in Divinity; Against the Present Declared Purposes and Proceedings of the Army and Others; About the Trying and destroying our Soveraign Lord the King.* London: Richard Royston, 1648.

Hardin, Richard F. *Civil Idolatry*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992.

Harington, John. *Nugæ Antiquæ: Being a Miscellaneous Collection of Original Papers.* 3 vols. London: W. Frederick, 1775. 2, 208-9.

Loewenstein, David. "Milton and the Poetics of Defense." In *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose.* Eds. David Loewenstein and James Grantham Turner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 171-92.

Milton, John. *Complete Prose Works of John Milton.* Ed. Don M. Wolfe, et al. 8 vols. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1953-1982.

——. *The Poetical Works of John Milton.* Ed. Helen Darbishire. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.

Prynne, William. *A Briefe Memento to the Present Unparliamentary Junto Touching Their Present Intentions and Proceedings to Depose and Execute, Charles Steward, Their Lawfull King.* London: n.p., 1648.

——. *A Vindication of the Imprisoned and Secluded Members of the House of Commons from the Aspersions Cast upon Them, and the Majority of the House.* London: Michael Spark, 1649.

Sandler, Florence. "Icon & Iconoclast." In *Achievements of the Left Hand: Essays on the Prose of John Milton.* Eds. Michael Lieb and John T. Shawcross. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1974. 160-84.

Copyright of Midwest Quarterly is the property of Midwest Quarterly and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.