

University of Szeged
Faculty of Arts
Doctoral School of Literature and Culture

THESES OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Ágnes Bató

**“In emulation opposite to Heaven”:
Kinship and Image as Metaphors of
Imitation in *Paradise Lost***

Supervisors:

György Endre Szőnyi, professor

Larisa Zámbóné Kocic, associate professor

Szeged

2025

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| I. “Likening Spiritual to Corporeal Forms”: Theories of imitation in <i>Paradise Lost</i> | 7 |
| I.1. “Venial discourse unblam’d” - Literary Imitation and <i>Paradise Lost</i> | 9 |
| I.2. “Ambiguous words and jealousies” – Creation of meaning in <i>Paradise Lost</i> | 13 |
| II. Imitation as reproductive action | 22 |
| II.1. Imitation in Christian theology: <i>Imago dei</i> and <i>imitatio Christi</i> | 33 |
| II.2. Imitation as a psychosocial phenomenon: The <i>Laws of Imitation</i> of Gabriel Tarde | 34 |
| II.3. Imitation in Theological Anthropology: The Theory of René Girard | 40 |
| II.4. Mimetic Rivalry and the Divine – Criticism of Girard’s theory | 43 |
| II.5. The Laws of Imitation and the Patterns of Mimetic Desire in <i>Paradise Lost</i> | 50 |
| II.5.1. Imitation of the Superior – The mimetic hierarchy of creation | 53 |
| II.5.2. Imitation as contagion..... | 58 |
| II.5.3. The <i>vaniteux</i> and the false transcendence..... | 61 |
| II.5.4. The desire to be a model..... | 64 |
| III. “O Father” – The Kinship Metaphor in <i>Paradise Lost</i> | 67 |
| III.1. Kinship as cognitive metaphor | 70 |
| III.2. “Eternal Father” - Fatherhood in the Epic..... | 72 |
| III.3. “Filial Godhead” – Sonship in the Epic | 78 |
| III.4. Motherhood and brotherhood..... | 88 |
| IV. Image in <i>Paradise Lost</i> | 103 |
| IV.1. Theory of images..... | 105 |
| IV.2. Image as metaphor | 110 |
| IV.3. “Gods latest Image”: Images in <i>Paradise Lost</i> | 112 |
| IV.3.1. “Anointed universal King” - Kinship and Kingship..... | 113 |
| IV.7. 2. “His fair Inchanting Daughter” - Satan’s Perfect Image | 119 |
| IV. 7. 4. “His image multiply’d”: The Human Experience | 124 |
| V. “Adam’s Son” - Conclusion..... | 130 |
| Works Cited | 133 |

The Topic and Aims of the Dissertation

This dissertation is the product of an ambition to throw new light on imitation as a phenomenon in terms of the theology and the theodicy of John Milton's epic poem, *Paradise Lost* (1667). The crux of the “great argument” of the work is the issue of freedom and dignity of created beings in the hierarchy of the mimetically created of the universe of the work. The theological premise of the epic is that the mimetic condition dignifies, not oppresses creatures, while negative imitation or rivalry causes fall, not liberation.

As Michael Mack (2005) argues, Sir Philip Sidney in his *An Apology for Poetry* (1595) describes the work of the epic poet as the confluence of ontological and aesthetic mimesis, divine creativity imitated by human agency. As Liam Haydon (2016) and John Leonard (2020) claims, postlapsarian language in *Paradise Lost* exemplifies this ambition by pushing the boundaries of expression and involving the audience in the interpretative process, creating and re-creating meaning in order to approximate the ideal, divine meaning.

The history of the theory of imitation has been studied by Michael Motia in his *Imitations of Infinity* (2022) Jonathan Holmes and Adrian Streete (2005), who trace the concept through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance period respectively. René Girard (1976) started his theory of imitation by studying novels. Based on their research in this study first I revisit literary imitation and the way the theory of accommodation appears in *Paradise Lost*. I argue that the epic aims at revealing the meaning of two fundamental metaphors, kinship and image in order to convey divine truth, while the satanic discourse creates confusion and rivalry.

Rachel Trubowitz (2017), John Rogers (2019) and Stephen Fallon (2019) discuss the radical theology of *Paradise Lost* in relation to the mathematics of Sir Isaac Newton, and Miklós Péti (2014) studies the fragmented imagery of the epic. Trubowitz, Rogers and Fallon argue for the role of scientific discourse in the expression of the particular and often heretic Christian doctrines of Milton's work, Péti argues that the seemingly brittle imagery reflects the iconoclastic efforts of the poet, who intends to reform poetry. In addition, I explore the role of two biblical metaphors, kinship and image, and the way they

are dissected and recreated to express the radical theology of *Paradise Lost*. The radical meaning-making process can be traced throughout the epic in the metaphors kinship and “image”. Furthermore, I claim that according to the radical theology of *Paradise Lost*, the inherently contradicting conditions of similarity and difference, sameness and otherness, hierarchy and freedom coexist, creating the underlying paradox that constitutes the epistemological gap between God and his creatures. These contradictions are expressed through the kinship and “image” metaphors throughout the epic.

I claim that apart from being the expression of what Motia (2022) calls ontological imitation, “image”, together with the kinship metaphor (sonship and fatherhood) evoke the complex dynamic of imitation as a psychological phenomenon. Moreover, “image” and kinship refract and generate meaning by activating a set of metaphorical connotations that come from the various contexts of the epic.

In order to understand the mimetic logic, I outline the background of imitation in the epic: what the image of God and the imitation of Christ mean in theology, and I rely on modern theories to explore the satanic reasoning. According to Satan, envy and jealousy inevitably emerge in the hierarchical order of Heaven. The *Laws of Imitation* (1962) by Gabriel Tarde provided a basis for the study of the society of angels and interpret the dynamics of contagion, identified by the angel Abdiel. The theories of René Girard describe the potential of rivalry growing out of similarity, and the concept of scandal accounts for Satan’s reaction to the exaltation of the Son, with whom he considered himself equal.

On the basis of these theories, I formulate my definition of the patterns of imitation: ontological and metaphysically directed imitation describes the mimetic relationship between the Creator and creatures, who are driven by an innate desire to imitate the model and thus enhance their resemblance. This type of imitation establishes hierarchy and dependence, but in this hierarchy the creature’s desire is directed towards the infinite and the inimitable, the divine; thusly it is an externally mediated desire in Girard’s terms. This means that the model is inaccessible to the imitating agents, so envy and jealousy have no place in the hierarchy. On the other hand, when desire is internally mediated, that is, the model is within the reach of the imitator, there is a naturally emerging hierarchy from the viewpoint of the imitating agent, who perceives the model as superior and at the same time resents them for the same reason. In this way, envy and

jealousy are born. The model and the imitating agent become mimetic doubles, which blurs the boundaries between them, and the imitating agent intends to replace the model.

The starting point of the mimetic conflict is the scandal, when the imitator becomes an imitator due to the recognition of a difference or a lack. These imitators are vain, or *vaniteux*, because they do not have the metaphysical desire to imitate an ideal or superior, they only start imitating when they are shown something desirable, be it an object or a position. Their mimetic conflict can spread, because the imitating agent tries to become a model itself, and draw followers. This contagion eventually generates violent conflict.

After identifying these patterns, I trace them in the epic. Imitation is the instrument of creation in the epic, hence creatures are “godlike”; however, the exaltation of the Son upsets the status quo in Heaven, and causes Satan to question the goodness of creation, claiming that envy and jealousy are inherent in the mimetic hierarchy. Satan in *Paradise Lost* argues that the goodness of creation causes envy (2.21-30). Applying René Girard’s terminology, I argue that Satan stumbles upon the Son’s exaltation, reinterpreting godlikeness, freedom and dignity, and spreading the contagion of his ideas within the society of angels. The Archangel questions the uniqueness of the Son and his position as the “image” (5.783-4). He ends up caught up in a mimetic rivalry with the Son, whom he claims is his equal, but by imitating him and the kingdom of Heaven he reinforces the superiority of the Godhead. Satan, moreover, seeks to gain “imitators”, followers to secure his superior status. His ideas are adopted in a way that resembles contagion, demonstrating the somnambulistic nature of imitation, while Abdiel demonstrates the power of conscious reason to resist suggestion.

Satan acts as a vain character, to use Girard’s terms, because his desire to imitate was born with the Son’s exaltation, when he compared himself with him. The fallen angels then created a false transcendence in two ways: firstly, by producing a narrative of a tyrannical Heaven and by becoming the false gods inhabiting Earth. Thus they “emulate” Heaven and pose as false models.

The desire to be a model means the paradoxical status of imitating a model and craving to be imitated. The aim of satanic imitation is to replace and remove the model, God, while the Son exemplifies the desire to represent God and become reunited with him in the process.

With the way imitation operates in mind, I analyze the key metaphors kinship and image and the structure they create in the epic. The work strategically compares ideal and fallen connotations of both metaphors in order to negotiate meaning.

As opposed to cognitive metaphor theory,¹ wherein meaning is anchored in human experience, *Paradise Lost* offers its own theological metaphorics, where the source of meaning is God.

I study the kinship metaphor to demonstrate the contrast between the fatherhood of the Father and Satan, and the sonship of the Son and Death: as opposed to mutual love and admiration between the members of the Godhead, there is rivalry and falsehood between Satan and Death. The apparent brotherhood of fallen angels seems to be democratic, but it is based on strict patriarchal hierarchy. The motherhood of Sin displays the mental and physical toll of fallen parenthood.

I argue that the consistent use of “Son” and “Father” taps into the semiotic debate originating from Arius and his followers over status of the Son: the denomination does not mean to clarify the Son’s status, but together with the metaphor “image”, exploits the complexity of meaning to circumscribe the inexpressible and incomprehensible, relying on the issues of similarity and difference, dependence and autonomy, sameness and otherness, presence and absence particular to these metaphors.

I continue with the image metaphor in order to show its importance and embeddedness in the fabric of the text. Image is the connection between God, the Son and Adam and Eve. The divine meaning of the image is the biblical meaning of living breathing images, guaranteeing the dignity and liberty of man as the representation of God on Earth, while Eve and Adam experience the mutability, multiplicity and replaceability of images. With angelic guidance, they have to rediscover the meaning of God’s image in themselves in order to re-enter God’s family by the Son’s incarnation when he becomes Adam’s Son.

¹ Originally formulated by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980), the theory was further elaborated by Mark Turner (2000) and Zoltán Kövecses (2005).

The Structure and Methodology of the Dissertation

In this study I review diverse theories and concepts of imitation and mimesis in order to formulate the narrative patterns that constitute the phenomenon of imitation. I also apply cognitive metaphor theory to explore the possible connotations of the two fundamental metaphors of the epic, kinship and image. Then I carry out a close reading of the epic in order to identify the patterns of imitation at work in the epic and reveal the metaphorical structure made up of kinship and image within the work.

In the first section I introduce the concept of imitation in literary theory and its relevance to the research on *Paradise Lost*, with special attention to the theory of accommodation. They way the epic imitates and it is imitated is a well-researched but also fertile territory and cannot be avoided when discussing imitation.

Poetry as the imitation of divine creativity comes into play in the question of authorship studied by Marshall Grossman (1987), wherein authorship means freedom, autonomy and self-definition within the providential boundaries set by the supreme author, God. In the epic, Satan is also called an author, albeit by Sin; his imitation of the divine word and his commentary reflects an already fallen mindset. He uses rhetoric and narrative example to tempt the other angels and Eve, and by the transformative power of his words he turns them into his followers. Sin's birth is not only an allusion to mythology, but recalls the birth of the poetic idea, or as Philip Sidney (1595) calls it, the fore-conceit, in a negative way. Satan is not inspired by God or the Muses, but by Sin, who offers Satan the illusion of authorship, that is, authority and independence.

In the second section I explore the background of the concept of imitation across different discourses, such as literature and theology in order to lay the grounds of my research and discuss imitation as a phenomenon. Here I also present the theories of Gabriel Tarde (1962) and René Girard (1978, 2011) who described imitation as a sociological and anthropological phenomenon respectively. I also mention relevant criticism and Paul Richard Blum's essay (2012), which I find to be first attempt to approach *Paradise Lost* with a Girardian lens. I formulate my own concept of imitation and I conclude this section with the exploration of mimetic patterns such as imitation of the superior, scandal and the creation of the false transcendence in Milton's epic.

In the third section I turn to the theory of cognitive metaphors, which Mark Turner (2000) already utilized to describe the metaphorical inference patterns at work in *Paradise*

Lost concerning the father-daughter relationship between Satan and Sin. I expand the kinship metaphor to the study of the father-son relationship between God and the Son, and Satan and Death that stand in stark contrast, and the brotherhood of fallen angels and their dynamic. Moreover, I point out the patterns of imitation at work within these metaphors.

In the fourth section I apply cognitive metaphor theory to explore the concept of image as a metaphor and its possible connotations through the theory of images by W. J. T. Mitchell (1984, 2005). I describe where the metaphor image is at work in the epic, and what “image” implies in the different contexts, proving the operation of the patterns of imitation.

I conclude with arguing that sonship and image-ness are the core metaphors of the theology of the epic, with the Son becoming “Adams Son” (3.286), resetting identities and renewing the human condition. As Cathrine Osborne (1993) argues, concerning the refutation of Arian heresies, the ideal meaning of the kinship metaphor in theology is offered by the divine Father and Son, every other father and son is either a good or bad imitation of that. As Michael Lieb (2000) I also maintain that Arian tendencies in the epic are a matter of methodology, as they are a foray into the meaning-making process of poetry. The epic does not offer fixed meaning or theology, but a variety of meanings and interpretative strategies.

Results/ Contributions

The theology and the theodicy of the epic has been studied by several scholars, such as Dennis Danielson (1982), William B. Hunter, Jack H. Adamson, Constantinos A. Patrides (1971) just to name a few, in relation to contemporary Christian theology, heresies and Milton’s *A Treatise on Christian Doctrine* (1825), a Latin prose work attributed to Milton. Furthermore, as I have already mentioned, Rachel Trubowitz, John Rogers, Stephen Fallon and also Danielson (2014) studied the way science and mathematics served as a language to the poetic expression of the theology of *Paradise Lost*. In my dissertation, I explore the metaphorical articulation of the theodicy of the epic, and I argue for a providential metaphorical structure, where God provides and guarantees meaning.

In the Introduction I present the key concept on which the theodicy of the epic is based, imitation, which is not only a term of literary theory. By describing the patterns of imitation, I aim at establishing the logic of imitation as a psychological, social and anthropological phenomenon, which patterns, I claim, are at work in the epic. In the second section I identify the patterns of imitating the superior, contagion and the desire to become a model, which account for the origin of Satan's envy, which was described by Arnold Williams (1968) and Stella P. Revard (1971) in comparison with pride.

From René Girard's theory I borrow the concept of the scandal, which describes Satan's experience and the starting point of his rivalry with the Son. To expand on Paul Richard Blum's reading, I argue that it is not only the Satan phenomenon, but the logic of mimetic rivalry must be applied to interpret the angelic rebellion and the social dynamics of Pandemonium. However, imitation in the epic is not inherently dangerous and rivalistic, as the Girardian herd mentality suggests, it is also the instrument of the elevation of mankind.

As the imagery of *Paradise Lost* has been studied by Roland Mushat Frye (1978), among many others, I turn to the metaphors of the work. By applying cognitive metaphor theory, I investigate the possible connotations kinship and image metaphors, but I claim that in the epic a theological metaphor theory is created, meaning that the source of meaning is God, and not human experience.

The diversity of meaning negotiated throughout the epic poem creates a metaphorical scaffolding as both kinship and image appear and reappear in the poem. The fatherhood of God is contrasted with the fatherhood of Satan, the obedience of the Son with the rivalry between Satan and Death. Louis Schwartz (2009) discusses the motherhood of Sin as the depiction of the experience of seventeenth century motherhood, while I explore family dynamics such as sibling rivalry, parental favoritism and the tradition of fraternities as phenomena informing the epic and describing the situation of the fallen angels.

In terms of image, I scrutinize the different contexts in which it appears. I analyze the human experience with reflective images and dreams, and the way it shapes Eve's perception of her own status as a human image: she is concerned by being a mere copy, expendable, replaceable, while Adam, just as Satan, struggles with the power of images, iconophilia as well as iconophobia. In other words, I shed a new light on the way the

principles of imitation operate and the function of the mimetic metaphors kinship and image.

In conclusion, I claim that imitation is the backdrop of the theology of *Paradise Lost* as the instrument of creation, but in order to understand the rebellion and the fall of the angels – and men – it is necessary to take into account the somnambulistic and rivalistic aspects of imitation.

Furthermore, I demonstrate that the kinship metaphor is key in the deliverance and exaltation of mankind, with the Son becoming both human and divine, Adam's Son, who in turn becomes a reformed father. The epic, then, provides a providential semiotics through the use of the metaphors kinship and image.

Works Cited

Primary sources

Douglas, John. 1751. *Milton Vindicated from the Charge of Plagiarism: Brought against Him by Mr. Lauder: And Mr. Lauder Himself Convicted of Several Forgeries and Gross Impositions on the Public: In a Letter Humbly Addressed to the Right Honorable the Earl of Bath*. London: Printed for A. Millar <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008701283>.

Eunomius. 1987. *The Extant Work - Eunomius*. Edited by Richard Paul Vaggione. New York: Clarendon Press.

Knachel, Philip A., ed. 1966. *EIKON BASILIKE The Portraiture of His Sacred Majesty in His Solitudes and Sufferings*. Itchaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Milton, John. 1825. *A Treatise on Christian Doctrine: Compiled from the Holy Scriptures Alone*. Edited by Charles Richard Sumner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1984. *The Prose Works of John Milton*. Edited by Rufus Wilmot Griswold. Philadelphia: John W. Moore.

———. 1932. *The Works Of John Milton*. Edited by Frank Allen Patterson, Allan Abbott, Henry Morgan Ayres, Donald Lemen Clark, John Erskine, William Haller, George Philip Krapp, and W. P. Trent. Vol. V. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. 2007. *Paradise Lost*. Edited by Barbara K. Lewalski. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Milton, J. (2018). *Visszanyert Paradicsom - Paradise Regained* (M. (ford.) Péti, Ed.). Jelenkor.

Sidney, Philip. 1951. *An Apology for Poetry*. Edited by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas Á Kempis. 1940. *The Imitation of Christ*. Edited by Aloysius Croft and Harold Bolton. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company.

Secondary sources

Banks, Theodore H. 1939. "The Meaning of 'Gods' in *Paradise Lost*." *Modern Language Notes* 54 (6): 450–54. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2910854>.

Belousek, Darrin Snyder. 2017. "Violence and Vengeance, Mimesis and Murder, Conflict and Cross: A Critical-Constructive Engagement with René Girard." *Brethren Life & Thought* 62 (1): 60–74.

Bennett, Joan S. 1989. *Reviving Liberty - Radical Christian Humanism in Milton's Great Poems*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bernard, Richard. 1834. *The Isle of Man*. London: Thomas Tegg and Son.

Bevan Zlatar, Antoinina. 2007. “‘The Image of Their Glorious Maker’: Looking at Representation and Similitude in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*.” In *What Is an Image in Medieval and Early Modern England?*, edited by Antoinina Bevan Zlatar and Olga Timofeeva, 241–65. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.

Blum, Paul Richard. 2012. “Satan and the Human Condition: John Milton Read in Terms of René Girard.” In *Milton Through the Centuries*, edited by Gábor Itzés and Miklós Péti. Budapest: Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary / L’Harmattan Publishing.

Broadbent, John. 1972. *Paradise Lost: Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chaise-Brun, Vanessa. 2019. “‘The King Is Dead, Long Live the King!’, *Eikon Basiliike*, a Modern Book.” *Monarchy and Modernity since 1500*, 1–12.

Charles, Robert Henry. 1913. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Clark, Stuart. 2007. *Vanities of the Eye. Vision in Early Modern European Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clawson, Mary Ann. 1980. “Early Modern Fraternalism and the Patriarchal Family.” *Feminist Studies* 6 (2): 368–91. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3177750>.

Clay, Daniel. 1998. “‘Eikonoklastes’ and the Miltonic King.” *South Central Review* 15 (2): 34–48. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3190327>.

Cefalu, Paul. 2016. “Incarnational ‘Apophatic’: Rethinking Divine Accommodation in John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*.” *Studies in Philology* 113 (1): 198–228. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43921883>.

Cockayne, Joshua. 2017. “The Imitation Game: Becoming Imitators of Christ.” *Religious Studies* 53 (1): 3–24. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26160018>.

Cope, Jackson I. 2020. *The Metaphoric Structure of Paradise Lost*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Danielson, Dennis D. 1982. *Milton’s Good God: A Study in Literary Theodicy*. Cambridge University Press.

Destrée, Pierre, and Radcliffe G. Edmonds. 2017. “Introduction: The Power—and the Problems—of Plato’s Images.” In *Plato and the Power of Images*, 1–10. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004345010_002.

Duran, Angelica. 2010. “‘Join Thy Voice’: Oral Readings of *Paradise Lost*.” *Milton Quarterly* 44 (4): 254–72. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24461760>.

Duran, Angelica, Islam Issa, and Jonathan R Olson, eds. 2017. *Milton in Translation*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198754824.001.0001>.

Durham, Charles W. 2005. “Suffering for Truth’s Sake’: The Conflict Between Abdiel and Satan in *Paradise Lost*.” *CEA Critic* 68 (1/2): 60–66. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44377616>.

Edmonds, Radcliffe G. 2017. “Putting Him on a Pedestal: (Re)Collection and the Use of Images in Plato’s *Phaedrus*.” In *Plato and the Power of Images*, 66–87. BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004345010_006.

Erskine, John. 1917. “The Theme of Death in *Paradise Lost*.” *PMLA* 32 (4): 573–82. <https://doi.org/10.2307/456939>.

Evelyn-White, Hugh. G. 1914. *Hesiod. Theogony. The Homeric Hymns and Homerica with an English Translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fabiny, Tibor. 2016. *Az Eljövendő Árnyékai. A Figurális-Tipológiai Olvasás*. Budapest: L’Harmattan Kiadó.

Fallon, Stephen M. 2019. “John Milton, Isaac Newton, and the Life of Matter.” In *Milton and the New Scientific Age*, edited by Catherine Martin, 211–37. New York: Routledge.

Ferrer-Ventosa, Roger. 2024. “Images as a Hint to the Other World: The Use of Images as Mediators in Medieval and Early Modern Societies.” *Arts* 13 (3): 93–116. <https://doi.org/10.3390/arts13030093>.

Forsyth, Neil. 2003. *The Satanic Epic*. Princeton University Press.

Freud, Sigmund. 2004. *Totem and Taboo*. Taylor & Francis.

Fried, Daniel. 2003. “Milton and Empiricist Semiotics”. *Milton Quarterly*, 37(3), 117–138.

Frye, Northrop. 1982. *The Great Code - The Bible and Literature*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company.

Frye, Roland Mushat. 1978. *Milton’s Imagery and the Visual Arts*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Gaffney, James. 1983. *Sin Reconsidered*. New York: Paulist Press.

Gallagher, Philip J. 1979. “*Paradise Lost* and the Greek Theogony.” *English Literary Renaissance* 9 (1): 121–48. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43446941>.

George, Arapura G. 1974. *Milton and the Nature of Man; a Descriptive Study of Paradise Lost in Terms of the Concept of Man As the Image of God*. Asia Publishing House.

Girard, René. 1965. *Deceit, Desire and the Novel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 1976. *Deceit, Desire and the Novel: Self and Other in Literary Structure*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 2001. *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning*. New York: Orbis Books.

Girard, René, Jean-Michel Oughourlian, and Guy Lefort. 1978. *Things Hidden Since The Foundation of the World*. Stanford, California: Stranford University Press.

Grossman, Marshall, and Biancamaria Fontana. 1987. *Authors to Themselves: Milton and the Revelation of History*. Cambridge University Press.

Gully, Anthony L. 1981. “John Milton’s ‘Unholy Trinity’: Satan, Sin and Death.” *Phoebus 3: A Journal of Art History* 3:19–36.

Harrap, David Alexander. 2016. “The Phenomena of Prayer: The Reception of the *Imitatio Christi* in England (1438-c.1600).” London: Queen Mary University of London.

Haydon, Liam D. 2016. “Post-Lapsarian Language in *Paradise Lost*.” *Renaissance Studies* 30 (2): 174–91. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26618846>.

Heim, S. Mark. 2006. *Saved From Sacrifice; A Theology Of The Cross* . Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, William B. Publishing Co.

Herman, Peter C. 2003. “*Paradise Lost*, the Miltonic ‘Or,’ and the Poetics of Incertitude.” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 43 (1): 181–211.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4625063>.

Herrando, Carolina, and Efthymios Constantinides. 2021. “Emotional Contagion: A Brief Overview and Future Directions.” *Frontiers in Psychology* 12.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.712606>.

Hoekema, Anthony A. 1986. *Created in God’s Image*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Holmes, Jonathan, and Adrian Streete, eds. 2005. *Refiguring Mimesis. Representation in Early Modern Literature* . Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Hunter, William B. 1971. “ Milton’s Arianism Reconsidered.” In *Bright Essence: Studies in Milton’s Theology*, 2951. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Hunter, William B., Constantinos A. Patrides, and Jack H. Adamson. 1971. *Bright Essence; Studies in Milton’s Theology*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Ide, Richard S. 1984. “On the Begetting of the Son in *Paradise Lost*.” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 24 (1): 141–55. <https://doi.org/10.2307/450354>.

Idel, Moshe. 2007. *Ben: Sonship and Jewish Mysticism*. London: Continuum.

Ittzés, Gábor. 2016. “Thus God the Heaven Created, Thus the Earth’: The Biblical Creation Story in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*.” In *The King James Bible (1611–2011) : Prehistory and Afterlife*, edited by Tibor Fabiny and Sára Tóth. Budapest: Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem, L’Harmattan Kiadó.

Jensen, Michael. 2021. “Imitating Paul, Imitating Christ: How Does Imitation Work as a Moral Concept?” *Churchman* 124 (1).

Johnson, Mark. 2007. *The Meaning of the Body: Aesthetics of Human Understanding*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kilgour, Maggie. 2005. “‘Thy Perfect Image Viewing’: Poetic Creation and Ovid’s Narcissus in *Paradise Lost*.” *Studies in Philology* 102 (3): 307–39.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4174823>.

Kocic-Zambo, Larisa. 2012. “‘To Turn One Idea into More Shapes than Proteus’: The Copious Use of Words in Erasmus and Milton.” *Early Modern Culture Online* 3 (1): 39–64.

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2005. *A Metafora*. Budapest: Typotex.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1980. “The Metaphorical Structure of the Human Conceptual System.” *Cognitive Science* 4 (2): 195–208.
https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog0402_4.

Landy, Joshua. 2012. “Deceit, Desire, and the Literature Professor: Why Girardians Exist.” *Republics of Letters*, no. 1.

LeBon, Gustave. 1909. *The Crowd - A Study of the Popular Mind*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
———. 2002. *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, Inc.

Lewis, Charlton T. 1890. *An Elementary Latin Dictionary*. New York: American Book Company.

Leonard, John. 2020. “‘Or’ in *Paradise Lost*: The Poetics of Incertitude Reconsidered.” *The Review of English Studies* 71 (302): 896–920. <https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgaa018>.

Lieb, Michael. 2000. “Milton and ‘Arianism.’” *Religion & Literature* 32 (2): 197–220.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40059873>.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. 1937. “Milton and the Paradox of the Fortunate Fall.” *ELH* 4 (3): 161–79.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2871531>.

Mack, Michael. 2005. *Sidney’s Poetics - Imitating Creation*. Washington D.C. : The Catholic University of America Press.

Maltz, Harold P. 1988. “*Paradise Lost*, Genesis and Job: A Reconstruction Of Authorial Choices.” *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, no. 71, 23–34.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41801782>.

Marcuse, Michael J. 1978. "The Pre-Publication History of William Lauder's 'Essay on Milton's Use and Imitation of the Moderns in His *Paradise Lost*.'" *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 72 (1): 37–57. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24302216>.

Marsden, Paul. 1998. "Memetics and Social Contagion: Two Sides of the Same Coin?" *Journal of Memetics* 2 (January):171–85.

Maurer, Joshua, and Amy Peeler. 2022. "Sonship in the Bible." In *St Andrews Encyclopaedia of Theology*, edited by Brendan N. et. al. Wolfe.

Mayo, Peter. 1984. "Milton: Of the Devil's Party?" *Hyphen* 4 (3): 121–26.

Mazzola, Elizabeth. 2003. *Favorite Sons*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-09158-1>.

McLaren, John. 1980. "John Milton - the Poet as God." *Critical Review (Melbourne)*.

Middleton, J. Richard. 1994. "The Liberating Image? Interpreting the Imago Dei in Context." *Christian Scholars Review* 24 (1): 8–25.

Middleton, Richard J. 2005. *The Liberating Image - The Imago Dei In Genesis 1*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Brazos Press.

Miner, Earl, William Moeck, and Steven Jablonski. 2004. *Paradise Lost, 1668-1968; Three Centuries of Commentary*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.

Mitchell, W J T. 1996. "What Do Pictures 'Really' Want?" *October* 77:71–82. <https://doi.org/10.2307/778960>.

Mitchell, W. J. Thomas. 1984. "What Is an Image?" *New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation* 15 (3): 503–37.

———. 2008. *A Képek Politikája*. Szeged: JATEPress Kiadó.

Mitchell, W. J. Thomas. 2005. *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Motia, Michael. 2022. *Imitations of Infinity. Gregory of Nyssa and the Transformation of Mimesis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Murase, Amadeo. 2020. "The Homunculus and the Paracelsian *Liber de Imaginibus*." *Ambix* 67 (1): 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00026980.2020.1720359>.

New, Emily. 2010. "Family, Favouritism and Sibling Rivalry in Early Modern England." Master's Thesis, Warwick: University of Warwick.

Newmann, William R. 2004. *Promethean Ambitions: Alchemy and the Quest to Perfect Nature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Osborne, Catherine. 1993. "Literal Or Metaphorical? Some Issues Of Language In The Arian Controversy." In *Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, edited by Lionel R. Wickham and Caroline P. Bammel, 148–70. Leiden: BRILL.

Péti, M. (2014). A heap of broken images or, why Milton is an iconoclast? *Classical Receptions Journal*, 6(2), 270–293. <https://doi.org/10.1093/crj/clt016>

Revard, Stella P. 1973. "Satan's Envy of the Kingship of the Son of God: A Reconsideration of *Paradise Lost*, Book 5, and Its Theological Background." *Modern Philology* 70 (3): 190–98. <https://doi.org/10.1086/390409>.

Revard, Stella Purce. 1967. "The Dramatic Function of the Son in *Paradise Los*: A Commentary on Milton's 'Trinitarianism.'" *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 66 (1): 45–58. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27705262>.

Ricks, Christopher. 1963. *Milton's Grand Style*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rogers, John. 1998. *The Matter of Revolution. Science, Poetry, and Politics in the Age of Milton*. Cornell University Press.

———. 2019. "Newton's Arian Epistemology and the Cosmogony of *Paradise Lost*." *ELH* 86 (1): 77–106. <https://doi.org/10.1353/elh.2019.0003>.

Schwartz, Louis. 2009. *Milton and Maternal Mortality*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511581175>.

Scobie, A., and A. J. W. Taylor. 1975. "Perversions Ancient and Modern: I. Agalmatophilia, the Statue Syndrome." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 11 (1): 49–54. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6696\(197501\)11:1<49::AID-JHBS2300110112>3.0.CO;2-6](https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6696(197501)11:1<49::AID-JHBS2300110112>3.0.CO;2-6).

Soskice, Janet Martin. 1985. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Steadman, John M. 1958. "Milton and St. Basil: The Genesis of Sin and Death." *Modern Language Notes* 73:83. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:169375065>.

———. 1967. *Milton And The Renaissance Hero*. London: Clarendon Press.

Stein, Arnold. 1996. "Imagining Death: The Ways of Milton." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 30 (2): 77. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3333193>.

Sternberg, Meir. 1987. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Stone, Lawrence. 1979. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*. New York: Harper & Row.

Szőnyi, György Endre. 1998. "Exaltatio" és hatalom. Keresztény Mágia és okkult szimbolizmus egy angol mágus műveiben. Szeged: JATEPress

Tarde, Gabriel. 1962. *The Laws of Imitation*. Edited by Elsie Clews Parsons.

Trubowitz, Rachel. 2017. "Reading Milton and Newton in the Radical Reformation: Poetry, Mathematics, and Religion." *ELH* 84 (1): 33–62. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26173887>.

Turner, Mark. 2000. *Death Is the Mother of Beauty: Mind, Metaphor, Criticism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tussay, Ákos. 2021. "Plague Discourse, Quarantine and Plague Control in Early Modern England: 1578–1625." *Hungarian Journal of Legal Studies* 61 (1): 113–32. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2052.2020.00001>.

Walsham, Alexandra. 2017. "The Art of Iconoclasm and the Afterlife of the English Reformation." In *What Is an Image in Medieval and Early Modern England?*, edited by Antoinina Bevan Zlatar and Olga Timofeeva, 34:81–115. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag GmbH.

Wickenheiser, Robert J. 1978. "Milton's 'Pattern of A Christian Hero:' The Son in *Paradise Lost*." *Milton Quarterly* 12 (1): 1–9. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24462750>.

Williams, Arnold. 1968. "The Motivation of Satan's Rebellion in *Paradise Lost*." In . <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:192150591>.

Wyschogrod, Edith. 1990. *Saints and Postmodernism: Revisioning Moral Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zámbóné, Kocic Larisa. 2012. "Protean Vicissitude and Milton's *Paradise Lost* ." Doctoral Thesis, Szeged: University of Szeged.

Publications Pertaining to the Topic of Dissertation

"Unimmortal Men and the Body of Death: The Somatic Experience of Death in Milton's *Paradise Lost*" In: Anna, Budziak; Katarzyna, Lisowska; Jarosław, Woźniak (eds.) *Literature, Performance, and Somaesthetics : Studies in Agency and Embodiment* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing (2017) 299 p. pp. 267-282

Review of Rachel Trubowitz's "Reading Milton and Newton in the Radical Reformation: Poetry, Mathematics, and Religion." *JLS* 11.1 (2018): 122-123

"The Experience of Death—A Cognitive Approach". In: Matuska, Ágnes; Kocic-Zámbó, Larisa (szerk.) *Essays on the Medieval Period and the Renaissance : Things Old and New* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing (2019) 184 p. pp. 147-160.

“Satanic L/Imitations. “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God (Phil. 2:6)” In: Tournu, Christophe; Hale, John K.; Forsyth, Neil (eds.) *Milton in Strasbourg*. Bruxelles, Belgium : Peter Lang Verlag (2022) 548 p. pp. 263-277.

„Visszanyerjük-e a Paradicsomot? Péti Miklós Milton-fordításáról”. In: *Credo Evangélikus Műhely* Budapest: 2023 29:1. 150p.

“Vetélkedik bölcs kormályzatban még a Mennel is” - Dogma és dráma az Elveszett paradicsomban. In: Benyik, György (ed.) *A fordítástól a parafrázsig - Von der Übersetzung bis zur Paraphrase*. Szeged, Magyarország : Szegedi Nemzetközi Biblikus Konferencia Alapítvány (2024) 442 p. pp. 353-364.

Conference Presentations Pertaining to the Topic of Dissertation

2014- Performance studies – Literary studies – Somaesthetics. *Unimmortal Men and the Body of Death*. University of Wroclaw, Poland 18-20 December

2015 - Religion and Spirituality in the Literature and Arts. *Cosmology in Milton’s Paradise Lost*. University of Bucharest, Romania 1-4 June

Conference of the Hungarian Society for the study of English, Debrecen (HUSSE12). *The Experience of Death – a Cognitive Approach* 29-31 January

2017 - British Society for Literature and Science - Winter Symposium. *Mirror mirror in the brain, or how did the looking glass end up in the premotor cortex*. London, UK 4-5 November

ESSE Doctoral Symposium. *Imitation and Mimetic Desire in Paradise Lost*. 2017, Thessaloniki, Greece. 30-31 August

Disbelief Conference, EMERG. *Full of the Devil or Full of Death?* ELTE, Budapest, Hungary. 25-27 May

Conference of the Hungarian Society for the study of English (HUSSE13). *Mirror, mirror in the book. Mirror as a cognitive metaphor*. Eger, Hungary 26-28 January

2019- 12th International Milton Symposium, *Satanic L/Imitations*. Strasbourg, University of Strasbourg, France 17-21 June

2023 – 13th International Milton Symposium. *O Father: The Kinship Metaphor and its Implications in Milton's Paradise Lost*. University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, 10-14 July

2025 - Conference of the Hungarian Society for the study of English (HUSSE17). “*his image multipli'd*” – *The Theology of Image in Paradise Lost*. University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary, 30 January-2 February