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Abstract

Studying the mysterious character of Satan within the literary and artistic framework, is of a grabbing concern in a time when the world can no longer see but only the evil. The battle between the good and the evil took place since the early creation of this universe. This dissertation uses a Reader-response and reception study framework to discuss the character of Satan in Paradise Lost and the film of The Devil’s Advocates. The basic investigation of the study is determined exactly on how do readers react towards the character of Satan; make meaning from their interaction with the work of Paradise Lost and The Devil’s Advocate? And how does postmodernism encompasses all these as one aspect of its revolution on the absolute truth and the conventional. This research project is based on a review of relevant literature and most importantly film reviews that determine the audience’s responses. The findings underline that there are similarities and differences between the old and contemporary readings of Satan as the dominant character in literature and art. The main conclusion to be drawn from this work is that the contact of the reader with Satan reveals the work as an eventually aesthetic production with some hidden reasons that change the thought of the audience.

Key terms:

- Postmodern: as a literary and cultural movement
- Reader Response criticism: as an analytical tool.
- The role of the reader; and receptor in making the meaning.
- “Satan”': as a literary and artistic figure between the old and contemporary interpretation.
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I. Introduction:

When one starts researching the subjects that centered the focus of medieval writers either in literature, or art, and culture he will notice a figure that catches not only his attention, but also evokes his morals and values. The Medieval period holds a series of painting titles that portray a mysterious figure in reference to once religious, cultural, and literary memory as well. This figure was brought to us in various forms and images in which one would curiously want to reveal his world. This paper examines the character of ‘Satan’ and tries to revealing him through the approach of Reader-response theory.

The character of Satan was, at first, religiously painted, but later on, he takes a new personality when taken by dramatists and artists. John Milton’s *paradise lost* (1667) delivers a valuable depiction of Satan that one can ever see. When the persona of Satan had been located only in hell, now the reader traces his location in the shade of Milton’s Paradise Lost. Through it one can move by the image of struggled emotions between the good and the evil. This produces prediction in one’s mind who may take place as the winner? The good in which Satan is no more than a devilish creature, or, the protagonist: Satan.

Every culture around the world has tried to depict Satan in the way that suits it. This Satan which is theologically known as the spirit of evil that located in hell is now a subject of discussion in this paper. Reader-response theory provides the theoretical framework for my own discussion. Basing on a Reader-response theory perspective, I argue that the reader will take the important role in making meaning and interpreting such sensitive subjects. Because the Devil is portrayed through various works of literature and art, there is an existence of various representations that reveal him in
numerous ways. Hence, the variety in depictions leads to the variety of interpretations of readers and this can only be examined under the frame of Reader-response theory. By these principles I intended to assert that the reader is no longer set aside from the game, instead the reader is the “boss” who controls the value of the work.

Satan was introduced to be a dominant figure in the artistic works of the day. The depiction of Satan as a hero is renewed in literature and especially in film making. Now with the decrease or the absence of readership; the Devil has not lost his charm in the age of visual media. And the Devil is still the subject that catches the attentions of public. In this way my path surprisingly is oriented towards the correlation between the literature and film by taking one subject; one treated it with words and the other treated it via screens and stages. But what we see is that, Satan in today’s representations was almost freed from a theological context and driven by a complex wave of romantic and modernist interests.

Over this context, I have developed an interest in the relationship between literature and works of art; film. This topic of studying Satan as a hero through the modern age is of particular interest to me because I believe that the excessive use of Devil in literature and works of art stands for various reasons. One of the significant points is the dominance of movies on peoples’ lives. Because our culture today shifted from the one text- based to the one that is visual- based. People watch more movies than read books.

My dissertation therefore tends to explore the reception and the different readings of the incarnation of Satan as a hero through modern age. My study on such a context demonstrates clearly that there are various readings and interpretations of Satan as a model that needs exploration. Because once the author publishes his work,
the true owner of the work becomes the public; it is the reader who will appropriate the work for his own concerns.

The research’ aim is to examine the reasons behind the excessive use of Satan as a hero, directly or indirectly in the postmodern era. Also, since literature possesses an independent value and deeper understanding of reality; to what extent Paradise Lost can be read by a 21st century reader regarding this immense influence of this excessive use of Satan as a hero? I believe that such a study that relates literature to film with the process of rendering images and pictures will make us more critical viewers, and will create a critical ability which is translated through our cultural consciousness in our own world. And I assume that people in this era watch movies enough that this study will have relevance in their lives. Because the literature is considered as a partisan, the work is rooted to a way or another to local circumstances; and therefore the criticism is opened to the social and political debate.

*The literary work between reception and response* is the title of chapter one of this dissertation which is arranged purposefully so that the reader can go through the theoretical background of the current study. This part takes the reader through Postmodernism era by focusing on Reader-response criticism and reception theory, particularly its major concept “the Horizon of Expectation”. Further the reader will be shown the center of Reader-response theory’s of attention. What are the points of concern in this theory?

The second chapter, *The Character of Satan in Medieval and Contemporary Era*, tends to focus on the literary evolution of Satan by examining his depiction from the medieval period to John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. I provide a debatable discussion
and paying close attention to the representations of Satan in traditional works. I, then, moved to focus on the reception and the readings of Satan in Milton’s work.

Chapter three discusses Satan as a model in the 1997 film; The Devil’s Advocate. The movie which has some minor allusions to Milton's epic, such as the famous quotation "Better to reign in Hell, than to serve in Heaven". Also, the significant character that plays the role of Satan; Al Pacino; took the name of John Milton. This chapter tends to focus also on the reception and the readings of Satan about this film. As well as, it deduces the reasons that we are searching for, behind the excessive use of Satan as the hero in films. And I have tried to go through reasons to justify my thesis objectives.

My dissertation ends with a conclusion illustrating the main findings through this reading of paradise lost and The Devil’s Advocate.
1. The Literary Work between the Reception and Response:

This chapter deals with the Reader-response Theory as a critical and analytical approach. I have tried to go through the major points of attention concerning this approach. Trying to provide to the reader the theoretical frame work for this study; discussing its characteristics, its principles, its central pillars that highlight the discussion; moving around specific contributors that help me to examine what am looking for. Perceptibly, the reader would be the cornerstone of this section. Also the role he has within the interpretation of the literary work. Significantly, going through the concept of the reception theory; the Horizon of Expectations.
As there is bright and darkness, warmness and coldness, goodness and badness, there is God and Devil. Accordingly, while the belief in goodness leans towards God, the belief in evil leans towards Devil. Interestingly, one of the oldest and remarkable subjects in western literature and works of art is the Devil. Also, it is referred to as Satan. It is a firm character in literature, religion and culture. It has existed in a variety of types and forms in almost every culture around the world. Satan was constantly explored as a spirit of evil. Additionally, various scholars have investigated the term of Satan and agreed upon one description; that the Devil is not simply, the adversary of goodness and morality, also it is the pure spirit and symbol of evil. Most definitely, the “Devil” in different theologies specifically; Judaism, Christianity, and Islam; is known as the “supreme spirit of evil” (The Hutchinson Encyclopedia 311).

Significantly, the idea in the previous quotation is mainly about theological direction in defining Satan. Although Satan was treated as an imaginative creature in literature, Satan is linked firmly to religious belief. Satan as an embodiment or personification of evil has a deep established belief and understanding in western Christianity as “the ultimate antagonist”. The Devil therefore “in Christianity and other religions is the enemy of God” (Encarta dictionary). Particularly, Satan, Lucifer, Diablo, Serpent, Demon, Villain, and Prince of Darkness were names used to mean one thing, the ultimate spirit of evil. This spirit is in a persistent opposition to God. Additionally, one would distinguish between the beliefs of ‘Satan’ as a spirit of evil, enemy of God and ‘Satanism’ as the ultimate action of “worshiping the Devil instead of God” (The Hutchinson Encyclopedia 946).
Each culture has its own attitudes towards Devil, what is it, how it appears, and what are the forms it took. Each culture has formed ideas and perceptions of the Devil in minds of people. Devil and Evil are religious ideas that most of the world believe in their existence. Paul Caurus maintained that “progressive theologians has been developed much attention to the Devil which is an interesting personality and is a significance of an actual presence in fact (p 5). As it is mentioned in these previous lines, to speak about Satan as a religious, literary, or cultural character, it does not mean Satanism which is the act of worshiping Satan instead of God. In this regard Brother Nero, a Satanist writer, developed an open discussion in Satanism: A Beginner’s Guide to the Religious Worship of Satan and Demon, in which he strongly argued for his position as a worshiper of Satan. He is confidently proud of being a worshiper of Satan. And he clearly mentioned, in his opinion, that the act of worshiping Satan is the ultimate truth, he mentioned that “the beliefs of our philosophy are based on the beliefs that I hold to be the Truth and […] in my opinion […] the objective reality of the Universe” (7).

What concerns us in this area of discussion is neither the historical development of Devil nor the religious examination of the variety in Satan’s meanings in each religion. Instead we are clearly concerned with how this evasive term became part of literary personification. Correspondingly, Postmodernism emphasizes too much persuasion on various conceptions and matters such as interpretation, history, readings…etc. within this context, it is thought that Postmodernism was the birth place of such a term: Satan. Postmodernism devoted itself to the understanding of literature, art and its forms which are no longer seen as separated part from reality.

Accordingly, Satan became not only a religious character that represents fear and ignorance, instead is a firm cultural, artistic and literary character that needs a careful
examination. This careful examination of Satan as an excited character in literature and art is better scrutinized within the frame of Postmodernism.

Presumably, history, as concerned with the records of knowledge and analysis of past events; it is linked to the historical readings of Satan. Through the precedent definition of Satan we can introduce this term as a part of reality and existence; a reality that is recognized within the context of a historical fact, not as a myth distinguished within the context of historical fiction. History as a branch of analyzing facts; it provides a contribution to the readings of Satan and its various interpretations.

Evidently, Richard Evans intends to direct the reader toward the significance of distinguishing between “historical and myth, objective knowledge about the past…historical fact and fiction”. Perceptibly, postmodern literature is a part of social, cultural, and historical development. It is a means used to depict a given culture and life. And in order to depict a certain culture or society, there must be a clear image of its historical events and social development. Accordingly, to examine the character of Satan in western literature, we need basically to return back to the western history, religion, social and cultural development.

Many departures and arguers describe the term ‘Postmodernism’ as a mere continuation of modernist tradition. It is a “redemptive mission” of modernist arts but in a different way. Most of the time, Postmodernism was identified as a literary movement rather than a literary theory. Literary theories did not see an evasive term as the one of Postmodernism. Despite the various studies, analysis, and explanations elaborated from this term; there is an increase of vagueness in its meaning. The era of Postmodernism according to Ihab Hassan is characterized by impossibility of determination (Dr Raghib Nabil 542). That is to mean the impossibility of considering
Postmodernism a real and original theory because it is consisted of numerous contexts and a variety of works in a variety of fields. Raghib Nabil maintains that the critic Hebdeige Dick in his book *Hiding in the light: on images and things, 1988* claimed that Postmodernism revolt against all the conceptions and the precedent theories, and after this it started revolt against itself.

Subsequently, Raghib Nabil traces that Hebdeige Dick sees Postmodernism as a fabrication and opposition; imitating the traditional forms and mingling them in a new context (542). This is exactly, what is going on with this character of ‘Satan’. Contemporary artists and literary authors used to depict, this traditional and old mentioned character, in a new context and picture. Again Raghib Nabil focuses his attention on Ihab Hassan’s contribution that the term of Postmodernism, which is related firmly to deconstruction, extended to different places in the world in the seventeen’s of the twentieth through various studies.

Postmodernism regained many deconstructions’ ideas that had been lost before in France but in a new form. From a given side, postmodernism considered as an “artistic movement in western culture which is appeared in 1940”. The impression made from this statement oriented us towards insisting and confirming that Postmodernism, as a movement of art, is the exact frame of producing an evaluative study of Satan as a heroic character in literature and art. Because it helps the reader goes through the artistic vision to evaluate the character of Satan. And with the artistic insight the reader can merely interpret his depiction and representation.
Unmistakably, Postmodernism come from the Second World War status. France is considered as an alert of the decrease of most modern structure that the human thinking has assisted along centuries ago. France and the European countries were getting out of the Second World War with a bad economic, social and political status. This troubled situation caused a great inability of understanding and holding that catastrophic situation, and especially their realization of the significant role they may use to influence the general world opinion. This inability of thinking appeared as a characteristic during the advanced technological progress.

The recess of intellectual people and their theories, philosophies and perceptions of local and universal circumstances caused readers feel lost and waste. Therefore almost literary theories become absent from the intellectual and literary yard. The present troubles extended all around the world and shaped the instability of thinking and not having any based-working theory in the practical, social, literary activity. This discussion overwhelmingly referred to the impossibility of determination mentioned above.

As shortly mentioned, Postmodernism clearly used as a controversial term refer to “changes, development and tendencies which have taken place in literature, art, music, architecture, philosophy” (Cuddon 689). Rghib Nabil claimed that the tendencies and changed circumstances helped in a way or another in the appearance of Postmodernism. Additionally, followers of any theory are supposed to do their best to clarify their theory, and simplify it to the audience, whatever that theory is of complexity in order to become one part of the human intellectual heritage. Contrary to that, followers of Postmodernism’s writings are characterized by the vagueness and complexity of their theory. From this perspective, Raghib Nabil claims that this
instability in writing and clarifying is due to the troubled situations and events that had past.

Subsequently, Postmodernists do not pretend a new literary work; instead they use old forms of literature, genres, art and other means to contextualize their meaning in a new and different cultural and literary context. Noticeably, this crystallizes our endeavor in this whole discussion. Old forms in literature and art that depict ‘Satan’ in seventeenth period were significantly renewed in a new context of literature and culture of modern age. That is to mean using traditional form of depicting ‘Satan’ and placing it in new form and look. This new embraced technique is for the sake of showing up distinction between past and traditional forms of personification, and present and contemporary ones. Particularly, this emplacement of an existing literary work or artistic work in a new context with new creative techniques is for further modification of that work. We are going to see this modification later in our discussion.

Evidently, Margart Drabble (2000) has mentioned that postmodernism asserts itself with the cultural influence of television and popular culture. This statement is noteworthy in that it supports the idea that postmodernism is linked to the development of advanced technologies; media such as television, film, computers which in fact not only accelerate communication among people in the world but also manipulation of people’s vision of the world. Prominently, technology in postmodernism grabs the rapidity that is incurable on any theory which leads to new artistic forms and unfinished scattering. Media and more specifically TV have the dominant role in influencing and impressing the public opinion.
Consequently, technology became an alternative to consciousness or as an extension to it. This great extension of consciousness through this technological achievement clearly becomes the cornerstone of spiritual knowledge. The character of ‘Satan’ for instance had been depicted with traditional forms in the past. And since Postmodernism places the old forms in new context, ‘Satan’ took a new form or look when it is presented in television. Greg Miller and Micheal Real clearly describe the previous discussion in *Postmodernism and communication technologies* that technological progress is “a central feature of the Postmodern landscape” and he enforces the role of technology by saying “we create technologies then they create us”

Perceptibly, art becomes nearer to the public and presented in a performing show. Moreover the rapid development of technology within highly advanced societies lend a hand to closely connect Postmodern culture to include films, TV programs and other that have become on-screen all over the world. Art become nearer to the public in the sense of the ability that TV or films has to present actual rather than fictional images of the factual world. Mainly, this allusion encapsulates the current study of new depiction of ‘Satan’ with new forms and techniques. This is directly or indirectly led to the worshiping of that culture without investigating the value of that fact.

In particular, placing the character of Satan in a new receptacle/container gives the impression and expectation of new work with new endeavor. If the reader takes a quick look at this expression, he will notice that this allusion means a variety of things. Literary work is no longer seen a literary production, instead is seen as a cultural production used to express only national, regional, ethnic identities and differences. This leans us to say that the aesthetic and artistic value of interpreting a literary work was replaced and suppressed by ideological and political value. So the ideological and
political dimension took their position within the aesthetic and artistic expression of
the literary work. These suggestions touch the heart of our current study.

Another perspective of postmodern literature is the emphasis on relativism or
the belief in changeable standards. This idea deduce to the suspicion of understanding
and explaining the world through reason or rational response to reality. Instead, there
is a spontaneous reflection of the truth which is not integrated. If truth is limited only
to reason this means that there is objectivity in knowledge. And the Postmodern mind
refuses the idea or the belief that “knowledge is objective” (“Automatically”). Clearly
mentioned that objectivity and reason is not the only path that determine truth. Instead
there are other ways to do so. Emotions for instance can determine the truth and
society as well.

We can link the objectivity in knowledge to what we have previously
mentioned as “historical objectivity”. Because many historians maintained that there is
nothing to be called as historical objectivity which is no more than a myth invented by
superior class in a society “in order to suppress alternative version of the past that
express the aspirations of oppressed minorities” (Evans).

In light of these words, we understand that there is no historical objectivity in
the worlds of fiction and poetry because “authors can write more or less what they like
in order to achieve a satisfying aesthetic effect”. This is directly or not assumes that
Postmodernism refuses the fixed and stable principles to the literary, artistic creation.
Evidently, there are no fixed standards in reading the character ‘Satan’ in literature and
art, because the circumstances are not the same and are in a constant change.
Conclusively, although the troubles and changeable conditions of postmodernism, and
the division it led to between intellectuals, philosophers, authors, critics, and artists,
between allied and opposed views; no one can deny that it has been succeed to turn the intellectual, cultural, artistic, literary, and social ground by creating conflicts, confusions that swallow those deeply rooted principles and traditions. It is right that Postmodernism creates something of confusion, but these characteristics of troubles, dispersion, and perplexity urged the human thinking to discover new horizons had never been reached before. It is not important therefore the affluent of Postmodernism’s principles and values because the human thinking have the power enough to correct and realize the right from the false.

Postmodernism as a contemporary movement, it embarks numerous literary and non literary approaches. The literary and critical approaches that are basically related to the present study are Reader-response criticism, and reception theory. These literary approaches connected much more to the audience and readers who is, in fact, the jury of all produced works in many fields. Art becomes nearer to the public and its reactions and responses to the work.

In the beginnings of the eighties, the audience, the readers, reception, response, and interpretation became the center point of American and European contemporary criticism. And the studies in this context directed the critical theory towards a new direction that consists of various literary periods, readings and rereading of non-literary arts, and different fields of knowledge. The biographical approach among various literary periods centered its critical focus on the “author”. And then the criticism goes from this frame to center again in an area of emphasis that is directed only to the “text” for a given period of time, such as structuralism and deconstruction approaches. Particularly, between the “author” and his “text” there was a clear neglect of another partner in this game: it is the “reader”. Obviously, there is no
need to talk about the slight references that took the reader in small consideration in shade of the whole and big perceptions, and structure granted to the “author” and “text”. Indeed if the audience of readers had been oppressed and persecuted for a long period, it is time to regain its significance, and returning to its respects and regard back to the critical yard and take it as partner in its part in literary criticism. We do not want to refer that criticism is oppressive or unjust and astray, and it is empty of vitality with the absence of the reader, however we want to assert that the literary criticism gushes out of vitality with the presence of the reader.

When the discussion about Reader-response theory arose, the attention would be directly oriented towards various sets of texts and various discussions contributed upon those texts. Reader-response criticism is a vast and open area, and needs the full time to go through its major contributions and contributors as well. Specifically, we are concerned to the apparent characteristics that crystallize this theory, trying to trace its major principles that nearly help us or contribute to our current study. Who are the shining pillars of this theory? What do they focus on? And to what extent this provides a clear persuasion of our study that clearly correlated to ‘Satan’ a literary and artistic character? And how can Reader-response criticism give explanation for our choice as a critical approach to read ‘Satan’?

The variety of critical theories concludes to the variety in methods of interpretation. Each critical theory has its own way of interpreting a text. Reader-response criticism as a critical theory and analytical tool linked initially to Louise Rosenblatt, Norman Holland, Wolfgang Iser, Stanley Fish and Hans Robert Jauss. Most definitely, Patricia Harkins goes in “The Reception of Reader Response Theory” to point out that Reader response theory is “what happens when human beings engage in a process” called “reading”. Perceptibly, the theory of Reader-response is all about
the reaction of the reader to the text. It is based on the view that the meaning of the
text is determined when the reader encounters the literary text or a given work during
the process of reading. As Patricia mentioned that the result of this theory is when
human beings encounter a given literary text in a conscious way as it is strongly
argued by Izer in his famous work *The Act of Reading* (Harkins 411).

The emphasis on the reader took place only after the period of semiotic and
structuralism in which the study was centered on the text itself and exclude the author
and contexture. Their emphasis was on the text and considering it as a sequence of
closed internal structure, and a whole world of linguistic signs and optic imageries.
Clearly then, to say the text took much more significance through semiotic
perspective, than the role of the reader. The importance of the reader in the process of
reading, criticism and interpretation was made also by Roland Barthes, Todorov, and
Umberto Eco.

In the light of speaking about Tzvetan Todorov, let’s see together what Susan
Rubine mentioned that in the article of Todorov which is entitled “Reading as
Construction”, the process of reading is discussed within the frame of literary studies
with two opposing views. The first is related to reader and their social, historical,
individual and communal difference. And the second view is related to the image of
the reader as a character in a given text. The standing point of Tzvetan Todorov is that
the process of reading is a construction process. Because he clearly reported that a
given text makes us build an entire imaginable world and there is a specific part of the
text that determines the construction we created when we read, and there is specific
way to create that construction (T. Todorov, reading as construction, [translated by
Susan Sulaiman] 88).
After these contributions came the various theories of reading in the era of postmodernism (1960-1980) returning the emphasis to the reader. Clearly the role of the reader appeared in light of postmodernism. The reader then became an effective element in the process of interpretation, analysis, comprehension… etc. also this pushes us to allude to some other writers such as Derrida, Julia Christiva, Micheal Riffatere who have looked to the reader and his value and significance of understanding and interpreting the text (Dr. Djamil Hamdawi). The careful consideration of the reader came as a reaction to the disregard of external contexture and focusing only on the text.

Reader-response theory deals with the fear of how the literary work is going to be interpreted if it is dropped on hands of people who are unfamiliar of interpreting it. In the context of giving trivial interest to the reader in the process of reading, Fowler, Robert states that “someone to hear the story or, in the case of literature, someone to read it was obvious to mention” (qtd. In schoes; Kellog 4). Enforcing that the readership is necessarily required if only one reader. Because the author cannot write something or speaks to himself, the author “cannot have himself as an audience” (Fowler 9).

Clearly mentioned, there were a neglect of the reader and his role in the process of reading. We absolutely agree that the reader is of vital importance to determine the meaning of the text. And at the same time we cannot ignore the value of the text and its influence on the reader’s mind. The text also can have special effects on the reader’s response, because one special text has all the power to do so. Let’s take an example; if the author writes a text which is meant to be devilish, the reader knows that is devilish, but the author can use in his text a language of suspense and impact that can strongly make the reader fear and has a great response. Significantly, the
text’s importance and value is the same of the reader. The importance here is shared between the text and the reader. Cyril Connolly has noted in this context that:

A great writer creates a world of his own and his readers are proud to live in it. A lesser writer may entice them in for a moment, but soon he will watch them filing out (Encarta: Enemies of Promise).

From the angle and perspective of reader response theory the literary text has no existence and meaning until it is completed by the process of reading and understanding which is done by “reader”. Raman Selden clearly notes that the “viewer’s knowledge” and his “ability to complete” the meaning is placed in a vital significance for the success of interpretation. In this context, the reader or the recipient is perceptibly an active representative in creating the meaning. The meaning according to Reader-response criticism is related to the reader. And “he must act upon the textual material in order to produce the meaning” (p 46). The production of the meaning of a given work should be based on the original work itself. And the reader here is not free for creating a meaning from his own mind; he has to limit himself to the textual material.

Specifically, the idea most defined within the framework of Reader-response criticism, that the reader fills the “blank” left in the text through his interpretation is traced in Selden Raman’s argument: “Wolfgang Iser argues that literary texts always contain ‘blanks’ which only the reader can fill” (p 47). This perspective that the reader fills the gaps of the text is introduced by Iser and will be later discussed in details. Additionally the work of Umberto Eco’s The Role of the Reader 1979 traces a clear argument of the openness of the text and the significance of the reader in the
construction of the meaning. The same work illustrates that not all texts are ‘open’ because other texts are ‘closed’ ones and such texts does not request the reader’s association but instead encode his reaction (Cuddon).

In general the discussion examines the role of the reader in composing the meaning of the text. As observed the relevant role of the reader, impose on us to provide a clear demarcation of who is the reader? And since the reader is the cornerstone of text’s meaning, what is his nature? Vladimir Nabokov said: “A good reader has imagination, memory, dictionary, and some artistic sense” (Encarta: Reading). The work published by the author needs not a hypocrite reader, but instead an actual reader who uses and brings to the process of reading his imagination, his literary and artistic sense, and with no doubt his memories.

The emphasis of Reader-response criticism clearly oriented towards the role of the reader or the audience of a literary work. And Reader-response criticism as a critical approach is the first to speak about the importance of the reader or audience in a literary work. This point has been recognized with Plato and Aristotle. The latter centered the audience’s response to figure out the significance of poetry that “must inspire… emotions of fear and pity in the audience” (Habib 708). The classical writers have shown that the implication of the audiences’ expectations is of vital importance to the value of understanding literature.

Many questions impose themselves within the context of the significance of the reader in this theory. The purpose of literary criticism and analysis is all about searching for the meaning. Since Reader-response criticism bases its emphasis on the reader, does all reader’s interpretations correct and valid? This significant role of the reader does not mean all reader’s interpretations are correct. Because the interpretation
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must based on the text, and had evidence within it. In the “Fish’s argument for the Relativity of interpretive Truth”, Robert Stecker mentions that there are interrelated problems about the interpretation of literature; “correctness of interpretations”, “standard of acceptability”, “number of acceptable interpretations”, and “writer’s intention”. This proves that there is an impact between the text and the reader.

If all interpretations are not all correct, so where can the true meaning be found? The true meaning of literary work; play, poem, or a story can be found in tie with the “author”, the “text”, and the “reader”. Mainly, if we want to analyze these three elements we can say particularly the text initiated with its author. When the author writes down his work, he knows what he means, because the text is created according to his own ideas that are based upon his experiences, his own personality, also upon sending a certain message.

Since the author knows what he writes, does the true meaning exist in his mind? Moreover, the author leaves his work/text for readers to complete the meaning through their exploration of the interpretation. Here we need to look for the meaning of the text itself. What does the text provide to the reader for the interpretation? It provides provocation, indications and signs, author’s ideas, language and style.

Through this does the true meaning of the text exists in the text? Are there several meanings or just one meaning? Now, when the reader encounters the text, the meaning differs from one reader to another. Each reader calls out his own culture experience, gender, values, personality, and language to the text. What all readers share in common is the question of meaning; what does this text; poem, story mean? The meaning therefore is established by each individual reader. And the validity of the
interpretation is related to the reader’s ability of bringing proof and indication from the
text to support his/her view.

In this discussion of interpretation and meaning, Robert Crossman in “does
reader’s make meaning” opened the door to speak about how reader’s interpretations
make meaning? Interpretation in itself needs some few rules to be applied during the
process of interpretation. First, the reader should not add anything to the text. For
instance, if the reader is a woman and women generally want stories to end happily
and dislike the sad closing stages. Here the woman’s interpretation should not be in
proportion to her own feelings. Because this woman’s addition will be considered as a
distort to the true text.

Although readers want a happy conclusion, they cannot add something which
is not existed in the text. Secondly the reader in his interpretation needs not to ignore
segments from the text. For example, if the reader detests a given character within the
text, in which the character is described for his best deed, the reader cannot ignore the
positive side of that character because he just detest him. Milton’s Satan for instance,
is a character within a poem that is described in a positive way, however he is a
devilish character in reality, the reader here cannot pay no attention to the positive
description of Satan for only the sake of his hate towards him. The reader’s duty is to
acknowledge the truth of text even he did not like it. Thirdly, the reader has an
important role, but this does not mean to change parts of that reading text. Here the
reader has to do well with the understanding of the text in order to provide a valid
interpretation. Indeed as it is mentioned in “Reader-response criticism: National
Endowment for the Arts” we cannot modify “the setting, the way a story’s plot
unfolds, or redefine its characters” (17). We need to imagine here the text speaking
and saying: please do not make me appear something I am not.
Reader response criticism helps us as readers to make a sense of a given text, and wake up the spirit of reading and thinking and experiencing our readings’ power. Returning back to our prominent discussion, Reader-response criticism defends our position that ‘Satan’ as a literary and artistic character is better scrutinized within it.

As suggested, there is a closure correlation between Reader-response theory and the beliefs of the response towards new depiction of ‘Satan’. This is because Reader-response criticism permits to the reader to carry onward all what he has from personal and cultural background to evaluate a given literary work. When the reader encounters with a text that place ‘Satan’ in a prominent and valued position, as Milton did in Paradise Lost, he/she will calls all his cultural, religious, and social backgrounds in judging this spirit of evil. And of course reacting in a given way and each reaction differs from one reader to another. Subsequently, it highlights the importance of religious, social, and cultural values and how it touches and influences the reader’s response to a work of fiction. Moreover, Reader-response criticism is familiar with the different visions of the same work. Because it is certain that, either reading or making meaning of two individuals will vary. That is to mean that this theory, instead of ignoring the different interpretations and visions of a literary work, it tries to discover that difference.

Along these lines Reader-response theory is the appropriate tool to our study because it explores those variations in reading and making meaning as an alternative to ignore it. Above all, it coincides with a mixture of critical approaches such as gender criticism; in the sense of discovering how the same text raises different suppositions when it is read by men and women. One would ask what happen to the works after their authors had finished with them. Here it is clear that the authority of the works moves directly to work’s receptors. The difference and variety of readings
deal to the various interpretations of ‘Satan’. Theologians for instance have a standpoint towards ‘Satan’ full of disregard and hate which is completely differs from the one of Satanists who worship Satan and defend it.

Some of the very significant theorists in Reader-response theory include Louise Rosenblatt, Norman Holland, Hans Robert Jauss, Wolfgang Iser, and Stanley Fish. Reader-response theory originates with Louise Rosenblatt in 1938, with her publication *Literature as exploration*. Rosenblatt’s interest oriented towards the description of processes that reader’s need to engage and compose their own view. Additionally, Rosenblatt relates Reader-response theory to what she called “events”. Richard L. W. Clarke points out:

> The reader brings to the work personality, traits, and memories of past events, present needs and preoccupations, a particular mood of the moment, and a particular physical condition. These and many other elements […] determine his response to the peculiar contribution of the text (2).

The following article “*the significance of Louise Rosenblatt on the field of teaching Literature*” provides an appealing explanation about the two opposing modes in experiencing text; the “efferent” and the “aesthetic”. The former is about what is used as a motivation to the reader to acknowledge him/her. The reader here is merely in position in which he/she needs to understand what the text is about. Whereas the latter is about what the reader has lived and experienced to engage aesthetically with the text. In other words each individual reader calls his own subjectivity to interpret the meaning of the text.
Significantly, the reader is of vital importance within this contribution, as it is clearly mentioned through the analysis of Rosenblatt. And what seems amazing about the Reader-response theory is to free the reader from the authority of the author. The reader would no longer fears about the hidden meaning of the text that the author may or may not have been thinking about. Reader-response criticism seem to be as a term related to various works of different critics who base their contributions upon key terms; reader, reading process, and response in order to investigate what was behind those terms. Reader response critics argue that the literary text has no meaning outside the mind of the reader and its realization to the work.

Numerous attitudes were contributed to the understanding of Reader-response theory. Particularly, the focus is upon the reader, and the role reader plays in determining the meaning of a literary text and the status of the reader during the process of interpretation. What Reader response critics positioned on the reader’s significance was in a total disagreement and obstruction to the past critical approaches in which they focus upon the text and it vital impact on the reader’s response. Louise Rosenblatt, Stanley Fish, Wolfgang Iser as reader response critics actually differ in their critical study of texts of literature. In spite of this, they were in agreement about the objections and reservations of what William Wimsatt and Monroe C. Beardsley in their influential essay in 1949 called “Affective Fallacy” and “Intentional Fallacy”. It is about the objective interpretation and criticism. The former is about what the text is and what its effects are. While the latter is on the subject of the dissimilarity that is should be between the text and its origin. They considered it as obstacles because they see as other formalist critics argue that the effects of the text on the reader are unimportant to the study of the text. Because the text here is no more a dependent literary object, but instead is the reader’s subjective response to the text.
While 1970s and 1980s Reader-response criticism predisposed by psychological and psychoanalytical trend in the sense of significance. The emphasis here shifted from the tie between the text and reader, oriented towards “self-knowledge and observation” including the work of Jane Tompkin: Reader-response Criticism: From Formalism to Poststructuralism 1980. Deneau Daniel has noted that Tompkins’ collected essays in the precedent work includes several theoretical orientations, “Although the essays focus on the reader and the reading process, they represent a variety of theoretical orientations: New criticism, Structuralism, Phenomenology, Psychoanalysis… etc”. The point upon which the essayists here agree is their opposition to the idea that the meaning completely related to the literary text. The crucial aim as Daniel has noted is to “specify meaning” (Deneau).

Louise Rosenblatt is also best recognized for her work entitled The Reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work, (1978). In it, she asserts that the process of reading literature includes a “transaction” between the reader and the text. Readers according to her did not share the same meaning of a written work or “poem” because each individual reader brings individual backgrounds, acquaintance, beliefs into the act of reading. That is why each “transaction” between the reader and the text is a unique experience in itself: “the meaning happens during the transaction between the reader and the signs in the page” (“Automatically”).

Subsequently, Reader-response criticism influenced by specific trends; such as Psychology and Psychoanalysis. Norman Holland held a position in this area in which he embarks upon a psychological criticism by considering interpretation a role of reader’s identity. Clearly claims that readers present a notable dissimilarity. Additionally to that, the moment the truth of a text have pleased the ego defenses of
the reader, the reader then immediately forecast his response of fear or desire and aspiration onto it. In this regard Holland identifies what he calls ‘DEFT’ that is to mean “Defense, Expectation, Fantasy, Transformation” in this way “the text frees the reader to experience his … significance”

Additionally, Norman Holland advocates the same psychological orientation. From a psychological perspective, he enforced the influence of the personality, and how the personal history has an impact on the literary interpretation (Susan 42). Susan also maintained that the method of Holland consist of three steps. Start with describing the text objectively such as written or spelled words. Then, provide a psychological description of its objective response. And, identify the points of similarity between the text which is understood objectively and the personal experience of the text. According to Holland, any literary text however it was stylized or striped from its style, it includes in the depth unconscious illusion. Susan reports that Holland in his work *The Dynamics of Literary Response* has presented theoretical method to the process when readers move from the unconscious illusion to the conscious level of interpretation (44).

One of the leading aspects of Reader-response theory is covered in what is acknowledged as reception theory, debated by Hans Robert Jauss in correlation with what he labels Horizon of Expectations. Many critical approaches tended to center their emphasis on the idea that the author is the owner of the text and he is the only one who can decide the meaning of that text once it was written. And by this perspective the reader has little significance which is no more than a consumer of the meaning. Reader-response then comes with the contradictory vision. That is the reader is not the consumer but the producer of the meaning of the text. By this, the “reader” placed in a vital position within the literary criticism. Within this context, the reader is
the responsible for constructing norms, and expects what he/she derive or understand from the work. The reader’s expectation depends on the reader’s anticipation, memory, perceptions, psychology, and experiences . . . etc. All these have effects on the result which is the interpretation of the meaning understood. Significantly, the interpretation of the meaning depends on the subjectivity of the reader.

In the light of this critic, various discussions are made on his concept “horizon of expectations”. It is a criteria used by the reader to judge a given literary text whatever the period is. The horizon of expectation changes every time. It helps the reader to constitute the meaning and judge the work. Hans Robert Jauss’s concept “designates the shared set of assumptions” that is available to any “generation of readers”. Jauss provide an empirical contribution studying the role of this term, Horizon of Expectation, in literature. Because the privilege of this criterion is that, the work or poetry of a given age is valued and interpreted by contemporary generation or readers. Particularly, the interpretations and perspectives of that period are not necessarily the definitive meaning and value of the work. In other words, the meaning is not fixed, because the readers with the shifts of horizon of expectation will change over time. Prominently, Robert Jauss provide evidence that:

A literary work is not an object which stands by itself and which offers the same face to each reader in each period (Selden 53).

The meaning of a given literary work is reinterpreted in the light of that environment, on that reader’s knowledge and experience. Additionally, the initial receptors of the work measure it aesthetically to what is called in this context “aesthetic distance”. Jefferson and Robey (1982), comments that “Aesthetic distance
… has a radical effect on their readers”. Thus, the first aesthetic interpretation paves the way towards the contemporary reader’s interpretation (Cuddon 387).

Another noticeable critic under this umbrella of Reader-response criticism is Stanley Fish. This American critic advanced a “reader-oriented theory” called “Affective Stylistic” that has to do with the various progress and variation of reader’s response relative to the “words or sentences” as they following each other in time (Cuddon 726). Fish argues on the point that the text is created through reader’s strategy of interpretation. More specifically, there is no the text, he added, apart from what readers and interpretive community produce. It is claimed that there are two kinds of understanding Fish’s contribution. One is phenomenological approach to reading which illustrates Fish’s early work. The phenomenological approach is devoted on what happens in the mind of the reader during the process in the mind of the reader during the process of reading. This concern is indicated in his essays entitled Is There A Text in This Class? In this regard we have presented the developing process between reader’s responses in connection to text, mentioned above. Most definitely, Fish refuses and eliminates the intention of the author in making meaning and places this in the hands of receptors of the work. Therefore, his theory is called “Affective Stylistic” or “reception aesthetics”. From this direction Fish alleges that reality and fact are created by the interpretive community. Accordingly, the reader is the producer of meaning, or the reading community. It is clearly pointing out:

The reader’s activities are at the center of attention, where they are regarded not as leading to meaning but as having meaning. […] meaning does not exist “out there” somewhere. It exists, rather, within the reader (qtd in Ottem 1999).
As a sequence, the authorial intent is not the controlling tenet in interpretation. And why the controlling principle is in the reader or community, because he believes that society is the constructor of reality. The knowledge, he think, is accustomed to society. And all the possible information that the individual knows is his community or social interpretation in which he lives. Fish said that “the facts emerge only in the context of some point of view” (Fish 338).

Perceptibly, the Reader-response theory is best outlined by Stanley Fish and Wolfgang Iser. The latter is located with the category that supports the interaction between text and reader. Iser in his famous work *The Art of Reading* put into effect the fact of making meaning as “dialectic” process between reader and text (Susan). Wolfgang Iser in his theory of reading process emphasizes on the interaction between the text and the reader. This context was oriented towards many coins according to Iser. First of all, the literary work consists of two main poles; the artistic and the aesthetic pole. Also the realization of the work occurs only when that work is read. Thirdly, the imagination of the reader is important because it creates his active participation. The text, therefore, have to set aside a specific scope to the reader’s participation; or the text would be unexpressed and inactive.

Additionally, the meaning of the literary work is developed each time we read it. Furthermore, the work of Iser did not focus on the reader only in making meaning, but he also involves the author participation by influencing the reader’s imagination. As well as the literary text perform two segments, he suggests that the first portion of the text is said to be written in order to offer acquaintance. Whereas the second portion of the text is said to be unwritten, for this sake the reader has the opportunity to realize elements in the text. Also, visualize those elements which are done by the reader’s
imagination and forms only, a shape of meaning not the true meaning (Suleiman 129-130).

Accordingly, if the actual position of the work is situate between the text and the reader, its realization would perceptibly be a result of the interaction between the two. Thus the focus on the authors’ techniques, or the psychology of the reader would slightly reveal the process of reading. Because according to Iser, if one missed the view of this relation, he won’t see the actual work (Suleiman 130). This is clearly investigated in the following lines:

We cannot identify the literary work with either the text or the realization of the text; it must lies ‘halfway between the two’, and in fact it comes into being only through the convergence of text and reader (Habib 724).

Also, Habib solidifies the previous idea that the text has “unwritten implications or ‘gaps’ which allows the reader to present his own creativity and activity (ibid). So the production of the text is created by reader’s response during the process of reading. This point also solidifies the idea of reader’s imagination with the text represent what Iser calls “virtual dimension” (725). Particularly, since the text is defined according to Iser from one part as unwritten and includes gaps; the reader here tries to look for reliability and stability with the text. According to Iser, said Habib, is produced by reader’s imagination and production in other words the stability of the text is the result of the encounter between the written text and historical experience, consciousness of the reader’s mind (725).

Noticeably, Reader-response theory focuses on how the reader receives the text, and reader’s experience. One would notice that the act of reading a given piece of
work is considered as a dialogue between the reader and the text creating in a way or another meaningful conversation. The reader is no longer underestimated as a passive but rather an active receptor. By considering the reader as a receptor, the act of reception and interpretation will differ from one receptor to another, from Muslim to Christian to Buddhist, from the cultivated to the layman…etc. and if we ask here why there are different insights, we can merely say that each reader/receptor relate or link a given text/work to personal experiences, cultural beliefs and backgrounds. This is prominently what critics of Reader-response theory focus on; what do the reader/receptor brings with him during the process of reading/reception to that text/work/film. For that reason the receptor’s cultural expectations ultimately shape his/her experience of reception which clearly would have an impact on him.

Principally, within the context that determines the reader who makes meaning, some would comment. The owner of the work is the author; the author is definitively the only one who can put the tenets/standards of understanding his work. We merely reply that the author is the owner of his work until he publishes it. After publication, the owner is the one who receive it is the audience. Mainly, the authority, of the literary work, moves from the author’s hand to the reader. The reader is the receptor and the only interpreter of text’s meanings “the reader as creator of textual meanings occupies the central position” (Thompson 1993). The response of the reader/receptor during the process of reception/reading is based on the past experiences of the reader/receptor. Each receptor with his experiences creates a distinctive interpretation of the text’s meaning. This interpretation goes beyond the boundaries of the author to the reader and receptor once his/her work was published.
The impression from the above discussion makes the mind oriented towards “reception theory”. Reception theory came with the emphasis on different contexts of the text. Therefore the reception of the text is ultimately related to the receptor, the process of reception, and limiting the meaning of the text and interpreting it. The importance of the receptor had no effect in the past. And the question of who is the receptor, how the reader receives the work; have not existed. Thus one would find strange the results that may come out with when the reader and his identity is the center of the critical process.

One of the prominent insights of reception theory is the horizon of expectation. The receptor receives the text/work/film before a given horizon of expectation. The significance of the literary work related to the way the receptor accept and understand that literary work. The nature of the receptor decides the kind of the interpretation of a given work. There is a clear relation between the Reader-response theory and reception theory. The former focus on how the reader has the significant role in reading a given literary work. Whereas the latter centered on how that reader receives that literary text. The way of reading differs from one reader to another. Also, the reception of a given literary work or work of art varies from one receptor to another. Each receptor has his reading/reception, understanding, and interpretation.

The various personal experiences serve as an argument for the variety responses and interpretations of the same work. Hence each receptor’s experience ultimately would change the preliminary meaning of the work. Reader’s experiences and expectations change with time. As time pass, each reader’s generation would have its own expectations and interpretation.
The reception theory is best defined with Hans Robert Jauss who is related with “reception aesthetics” rather than general response of individuals. According to him, the impression of literary works creates the aesthetic response of the audience. Considerably, with the “aesthetic distance”, Jauss designates the distance in responses between the “contemporary view of a work of art at the time of its first publication and the present-day” (Cuddon 733). Jauss linked his reception theory to the concept of horizon of expectation that is the receptor stand on this horizon to rebuild his expectations. And therefore, we can judge the literary works and the extent of its aesthetics on the basis of that horizon which is recovered by the works.
To conclude in this chapter, it seems clear that the Reader-response theory and the reception theory as it is mentioned in this chapter which is entitled *The Literary Work between Reception and Response* provide the exact frame work to my study in which I have tried to go through the principles and standards of this theory to discuss the literary character Satan. And to mention how it is appeared and received by the readers of various generations. Also I have tried to clarify and justify my subject with the use of the postmodern look and characteristics. And I clearly deduce that the literary work under discussion is clearly treated in this theoretical area. In which the postmodern era opened the door to the modernization and advances technologies. And the reader –response approach determines the value of the reader and his importance to make meaning of the literary and artistic work.
2. Satan as a Heroic Character and Subject of Reception in Paradise Lost:

This section is mainly focus on the literary evolution of the figure of Satan in the medieval period. If the reader takes a quick look at it he will notice that this part is divided into small segments, each of which has a different purpose. How this character is traced and appeared through the medieval period eye. Also trying to mention the difference between the heroes of Milton’s Paradise Lost and the early heroic characters that may influence the image presented by Milton. And we have tried to justify our use of Reader-response theory for the analysis of this character of Satan. Particularly, how the audience of readers receive the figure of Satan through the work of Milton Paradise Lost and the early medieval works. Mainly, the basis of readers’ reception is their horizons of expectations that differ from one generation to another.
One of the prominent figures in literature and art is ‘Satan’. This mysterious figure is mentioned in various works starting from the sixth century period till present. His names can be noticed in folklore and fantasy descends throughout generations and stretched from one place to the next. This character has dominated the literary and artistic inspirations in the medieval era. The medieval era transports us a mysterious character in which many critics used to chose dealing with this devilish figure aesthetically rather than theologically.

That is to mean, the portrayal of ‘Satan’ with a given image or perspective is for reasons of work of art rather than religion or culture. In “The Real Devil in Biblical Exploration” J. R. Russel is mentioned that his idea about the personification of ‘Satan’ in Middle Ages that the Christian concept of the Devil was “influenced by folklore elements, Mediterranean cultures” and other religions (Duncan Heaster). At the same time, as the medieval character of Satan advocates the spirit of evil and Devilish feelings; he earns new qualities when he is maintained as a heroic literary figure. In other words there is an incarnation of the Devil as a hero. The word incarnate means to put something in a picture that was not previously in that form.

The Devil was used to portray as “an old man” or “muscular man with human hands but clawed feet and a tail” (J. B. Russel 130-131). Rarely, the Devil was depicted as a female. The Medieval Historian Jeffrey Burton Russell suggested that the intention from the given representation of the Devil was “to frighten sinners with threats of … hell”. This contexture reminds us of the ‘Affective Fallacy’, in which the poem or the artistic work arise emotional effects produced by the reader. The old traditional artists portray Satan in ugly forms, by which they provide an ugly physical and emotional depiction. Subsequently, this character places horror and hate in
peoples’ hearts which is all done by the author’s creation and representation and to what extent the aesthetic production plays on people’s morals and responses. The audience when they encounter such a character in such a description they absolutely react against it. And instead of loving him, they will hate him. This proves the aesthetic effect of the work on the reader.

Who is this character of Satan? Let us reveal the character of Satan through the medieval eye. Let us close our eyes and try to picture out what Satan might look like. We absolutely see a man in red underwear with horns on his head, and holding a pitchfork. In the middle Ages the devil played vital roles in art and folklore, always seen as an evil, irresponsible “animal-human” with “a tail and horns”. In most European literature or works of art, Satan appeared ugly, a creature that had different animal body parts. Another development of Satan during the middle Ages can be found in the wish of churches to make Pagan gods appear evil.

Various early portrayals of Satan show him as black, purple, or dark blue. The most primitive representations of Satan show him as naked and black. The blackness of Satan was used in distinction of the whiteness, and hence devoutness, of the Angels. The blackness also represents evil. Principally, the article of “The Medieval Origins of Satan in Literature and Art” portrays the Devil’s blackness is connected with Egyptian and Nubian gods (Kelly Wyman).

The fifth century traces the establishment of Christianity in Nubia, and early Egyptian Christians immigrates in the seventh century be in charge of efficient damage of long-established Egyptian and Nubian sculptures. Anubis was an Egyptian god and a standard type used for the “weighing of souls,” In many pieces of artistic
works and statutes in this period, the Devil is portrayed having Egyptian clothes. In this regard, Satan was portrayed in such a picture for the reason to put forward that Pagan gods were devils. To all intents and purposes, this way of depicting the Devil as black was a technique for the Church to show the sinfulness and immorality of the Nubian divinity. Additionally, the idea of making the Devil appears as naked and black is for maintaining that classical Pagan gods were naked and black (Ibid).

Consequently, our readers would directly understand that the work of literature and art is created and produced always for a given reason and most of the time to send a specific message to the audience of readers. This message is differs from one author to another and depends on those existing circumstances.

This brief description shows that Satan is one of the most horrifying figures in all of literature and art and every culture has a sign of him. Mainly, we do mention that the idea of representing Devil in literature and art had existed long time periods, and in different images and colors. By this we are mentioning the diversity in representation and then the diversity of receptions. Literary speaking, J. B. Russel said that “literature drew more specifically than representational art upon theology, popular religion, and folklore” (133). This is mainly what motivates the author to produce his piece of art or literature. His work is principally raised from theology’s disputes or perceptions.

As should be clear by now, the picture of a heroic Satan of John Milton’s Paradise Lost influenced by the initial representations of the medieval period. There is a clear difference from Miltonic Satan and those heroic epics of Iliad, and Beowulf. However, Milton's poem investigates an extra spiritual heroism. Predominantly, let us
examine the element of a hero. A hero is defined as “the principal male character in a literary or dramatic work” (“Hero”) and he is belongs to a courageous brave person “who commits an act of remarkable bravery” and shows a great courage or strength of character”. We already knew the hero as the one who faces enemies that try to beat him in his journey, gathers followers and partners along his journey. A hero is big-hearted to his supporters but brutal to adversaries; is a man of achievement; agree to take encounters and sometimes provokes troubles. A hero is always a descendent into darkness. Identically, the epic hero illuminates qualities, achieve deeds, and embodies certain principles that are appreciated by the general public from which the epic initiates. Likewise, the epic hero usually symbolizes cultural and religious attitudes of the community. And the epic hero is a superhuman in that he is clever, powerful, and courageous than regular humans. An epic hero also carries out unexpected missions that nearly everyone gets difficult (Encyclopedia Hero).

Let us take the example of Beowulf’s hero which is seen through the expression of his encounter with Grendel, Grendel’s mother, and the dragon. The poem investigates his heroism in his power. Beowulf is a great fighter, illustrated principally by his accomplishments of power and bravery. He also exemplified the comportments and morals embracing loyalty and pride. His overcome of Grendel and Grendel’s mother confirms his character for heroism and institutes him entirely as a hero. This is from one hand, from the other hand there also specific characteristics that determine the Greek epic hero. The Greek hero has an exceptional power, honorable nativity, and is an astonishing soldier that has a high level in fighting using sword. Achilles as the epic hero of the Iliad has most of qualities of an enormous combatant. He is frankly recognized as the most excellent of the Greek soldiers.
Achilles gets hold of permanence in the Greek World since his achievements as a fighter. He scarifies his life to achieve his brilliant position and his name will therefore be remembered after his death. So then, Heroes, through their own efforts, create success and glory that stays alive in the remembrance of their offspring.

Notably, the heroic Satan in *Paradise Lost* is influenced by the medieval depiction in the work of *Beowulf* and *Iliad*. As we have mentioned previously the characteristics of a hero applies on a courageous human, powerful, and enormous combatant. But the unimaginable thing is to find the Devil as the hero of a given work instead of human. Satan appears almost heroic rather than of being a matter of disregard and hate as a spirit of evil. Peoples were used to love the hero because of his good deeds. Obviously, the reader would react lovely towards this heroic character. Which is difficult to understand is to place the Devil in the position of a hero, to place the spirit of evil in a position that receives all the love and admire from the audience. The reader therefore feels obligated and require a full understand of this castaway angel and thus not fully detest him. Milton’s impersonal description of Satan with a heroic style actually could produce a profound emotional response in the reader.

The important thing to be discussed here is how Satan can be described as an epic hero. While this question has occupied literary critics and scholars for generations, this subject produce again debate for it produces reactions that take place from intimately held religious or moral values, on the one hand, and a liability to severe literary explanation, on the other. In *Paradise Lost*, Milton plays with the tension that the character of Satan provokes emotions on the reader in which the reader took the possibility to consider Satan really as a hero. In this regard, Nicole
Smith maintained that “there are moments when the reader can identify with Satan’s desires and his disappointments”. The same contexture assumed by “‘Paradise Lost’ by Milton: Satan, Heroism, and classical Definitions of the Epic Hero” that that Milton in his production of this masterpiece of Paradise Lost familiarizes God as furious and displaced, which make Satan still more appealing and heroic.

Some readers consider Satan to be the hero, or protagonist, of the story, because he struggles to overcome his own doubts and weaknesses and accomplishes his goal of corrupting humankind. This goal, however, is evil, and Adam and Eve are the moral heroes at the end of the story, as they help to begin humankind’s slow process of redemption and salvation. Satan is far from being the story’s object of admiration, as most heroes are. Nor does it make sense for readers to celebrate or emulate him, as they might with a true hero. Yet there are many compelling qualities to his character that make him intriguing to readers.

One source of Satan’s fascination for us is that he is an extremely complex and subtle character. It would be difficult, perhaps impossible, for Milton to make perfect, infallible characters such as God the Father, God the Son, and the angels as interesting to read about as the flawed characters, such as Satan, Adam, and Eve. Satan, moreover, strikes a grand and majestic figure, apparently unafraid of being damned eternally, and uncrowned by such terrifying figures as Chaos or Death. Many readers have argued that Milton deliberately makes Satan seem heroic and appealing early in the poem to draw us into sympathizing with him against our will, so that we may see how seductive evil is and learn to be more vigilant in resisting its appeal.
Milton devotes much of the poem’s early books to developing Satan’s character. Satan’s greatest fault is his pride. He engenders himself as an innocent victim, unnoticed for an important encouragement. But his talent to think so selfishly in Heaven, where all angels are equal and loved and happy, is surprising. His confidence in thinking that he could ever overthrow God displays incredible vanity and pride. We may feel to some extent sympathetic to him or even categorize with him. But Satan continues to devote himself to evil. Every speech he gives is deceitful and every story he tells is a lie.

Satan’s steady deprivation is dramatized by the series of dissimilar shapes he assumes. His ability to rationale and dispute also deteriorates. In Book I, he persuades the devils to agree to his plan. He is a picture of continual rational activity without the capacity to think ethically. Once a powerful angel, he has become blinded to God’s grace, forever unable to reconcile his past with his eternal penalty.

What seems to the reader is that the personification of Satan as a persona of control in Paradise Lost is not a heroism depiction. Because the reality his leadership is extended to a given to the exercising power he mentioned. The deep supremacy also is shown in the quality of being an adversary to God and Man. The picture of portraying Satan took two sides of perceptions. The trouble with readers and other critics is treating Satan negatively, but the case here is the treatment of Satan positively.
Milton provides his Satan with heroic persona and since he is such an active and notorious character in the work, critics have been at variance whether or not Satan is a hero of fallen angels, all the time since the work was available. Both sides have suitable point of view to maintain their sight. Satan certainly has many heroic traits, but they are fixed in immorality and sin and his heroic individuality decline quickly as the scheme develops.

What stimulates the debate about the Heroism of Satan in *Paradise Lost* for numerous readers is the long-established representation of a hero as a good person encounters problems and overcome them effectively. However this character of Satan challenges all the figurative image of the hero. Even, many critics tend to say that “Milton made Satan too human” (Britannica Student Library "Milton, John"). Milton’s portrayal of Satan, as criticism occupied, presented God in a way that makes readers fear him instead of religiously seeing him. Smith Nicole reports that Aristotle argued for the complexity of Heroes as “good, appealing people who make mistakes” also “heroes are human”.

Critics at the underneath of Satan’s heroic position center their consideration on the heroic traits that Satan obviously does keeps. Anti-Satanists pressure the actuality that Satan’s discourses are self-important as an alternative of heroic and that revolting in opposition to God can on no account be heroic. This is one of the readings that that audience may make. This asserts the difference of mind thinking and interpretation. Because if this interpretation suits the Anti-Satanists, it will not suit Satanists who devotes Satanism movements.
Paradise Lost gives the impression for attracting dialogue between the reader and the character of Satan. This raises the idea of how reader makes meaning from such a description. How the readers can relate the work to an acceptable interpretation and understand the author’s intention. For the reader of Paradise Lost who can speculate the point for what makes Satan a hero is that his uncompleted object in the end. Because to see Milton attempting to emphasize evil in Satan is something, and placing Satan in superior position than Milton's God is something else.

What Milton brings to his epic and especially the characterization of Satan is embodiment of this figure with the Romantic’s look. This is in the sixteenth century in which the Romantic authors and painters were captivated with Satan in a picture of sympathy and power. They developed Satan into an ideological representation with a large variety of functions: expressing disobedient or strange political, moral. The reader’s insights of Satan are distorted by the era in which the epic is comprehended. Milton may not have proposed his Satan to be the hero of the work; his heroic type is certainly disputed in many compliments. However, readers in the Romantic period were predisposed by the period they lived in, their horizon of expectation is characterized by the era they experience its facts and conditions. However, this horizon has another insight with the contemporary readers. This we will see in the next chapter of this paper.
The political and the religious values of Milton that are depicted in his work is being clarified with the fallen angel in which he uses as a symbol to present his rebel against the government at that time. The myth of Satan started to lose the important position it had before. The Bible does not contain many references to the devil and his fallen angels, nor the War in Heaven. These things opened up the opportunity to walk away from the medieval idea of the devil as pure evil and highlight the idea that there are reasons in making the author manipulate his reader the way he wants.

The romantic period made Satan into an inspiring form, who could be a hero in spite of the fact that he was the devil. The opinions that hold up the argue of the Anti-Satanists that Satan is not the hero of Paradise Lost give the impression reasonably persuasive, but why is it probable that so many readers have observed and still observe Satan as the hero of the work?

Although Milton sticks to structural principles of the epic namely dividing the text into twelve books and narrative principles by opening the narrative in the center of the action; critics have debated over which character Milton proposed to be the epic hero. Others pointed out that Satan is the hero, whereas others contended to say that Adam is the hero of Milton’s epic. In this way, John T. Shawcross points in “An Early View of Satan as Hero of Paradise Lost” out that “Milton answers the poet's remarks, saying, "The Devil really was my Hero".
Most prominently, upon recognizing this perception of Milton’s Satan, the reader has cause to question the objectivity, and therefore the validity of the overall depiction. Why Satan has dominated the mind's eye of scholars and therefore the audience of the reader? It is said that Milton used the Christian beliefs to write down his work. Significantly, a contemporary reading of *Paradise Lost* may look for detach the plot from its connected ideological morals, for the sake of permitting a reading of Satan as the hero. Also, a twenty-first century cultural reading of Satan as a hero will lay emphasis on the deficiency of faith and commitment to religion. Incidentally, Ferdinand de Saussure asserted that the meaning of a given word existed only through its connection to other opposite words. To obtain a meaning of ‘good’ is firstly to look for an adversarial notion of ‘evil’. So then, the existence of Satan to exemplify ‘evil’ is used for the reason to make the appearance of the ‘good’.

Without the undesirable personification of Satan, there is no origin of ‘good’ for God to occupy. Accordingly, this may stand as an argument to say that Milton attempts to use Satan as a negative focus situation from which to place God at an opposing last part. And this paves the way to suggest that Satan is not a hero instead is still a devilish persona in the work of Milton. Mainly, the title of ‘good’ which is attributed to confirm the ‘evil’ as it is mentioned above, allows the reader to consider Satan as really a devilish character.

However, this is not clear in reader’s perceptions about the Miltonic personification of Satan. The reader can clearly see Satan displacing from his original persona of a Devil to a fictional image produced by Milton of heroic persona capturing the reader’s attention. Thus, all over the ages there have been
several exemplifications of the heroic personified in characters which have dominated the mind's eye of readers for centuries.

The topic of Satan as a model stretched through thousands of years, as we have seen, even before the publication of *Paradise Lost* had taken place. The what is not been a disagreement between two, *Paradise Lost* is a master piece of literature, because till now it raises questions and debates between so many scholars, literary, religious, and historical as well. To read *Paradise Lost* by placing its major character in that place of strength, admire, and sympathy; Satan is not mean to provoke reader’s attention only but also their feelings concerning this devilish character.

Generally, when the work consists of beliefs against the people’s theology, will absolutely gain no attraction, no readership, no respond and varied interpretations. Contradictory to that, Satan as an epic hero in *Paradise lost* gain more than one respond, and interpretation. Historically speaking, we are discussing a character that never appears in such a portrayal. Satan as already known in works of art and literature contains a horrible description and representation.

Briefly, the reader would question again the reason behind personifying Satan in the contexture and picture of a hero. Here we are shedding light on the significance of the Reader- response theory and its major standards. If we spoke about the Affective fallacy, we are focusing the attention on the effect that the author may use to play on the reader’s imagination and understanding. Another direction is belongs to the American Critic Stanley Fish, and one of the most
prominent Reader-response contributors, has put in his work “surprised by Sin: the reader in Paradise Lost” the following:

The subject of John Milton’s master piece is in fact the reader, who is forced to undergo spiritual self-examination when led by Milton down the path taken by Adam, eve, and Satan. (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2009).

And since we are connecting to Reader-response criticism we do not associated to the biographical approach or any other approach. Let us go a little bit back to what do we have said about the objectives of the current study. We do mention that we are concerning to the reasons behind the excessive use of Satan in literature and art. And later on we have concluded to the idea that the personification of such a character based upon the circumstances of that time of writing. And there is no single representation of Satan, instead there are various ones and each depiction contains its own reasons. But if we tried to examine the conditions that make Milton wrote this piece of work; there should at least a slight reference to Milton’s statutes at that time to produce Paradise Lost, and therefore one would directly notice that the debate here is opened to religious, cultural, and even political perspectives.

All through history there has been an assortment of exemplifications of Satan in literature, performing him as a cultural invention. In the medieval depictions, Satan was proposed to be frightening as “monstrous composite of human and animal”. He is something Russell mentions to as the “grotesque” that is an ugly creature (209). these depictions have roots in the Christian Bible where Satan is referred to as “a great Red Dragon, with seven heads and ten horns, and seven diadems on his heads” (ibid).
Though, as Russell perceives the representations of Satan, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, began to alter towards a humanoid picture (64). How does Milton’s work influence the readership of his period?

The character of Satan is depicted according to the imagination of the writer. And the imagination is absolutely inspired by the local circumstances surrounding him. The literary work cannot be created from nothing, even the imagination cannot be inspired only from imitation or something influenced the writer to produce it. The historical, social, theological, political, and psychological factors and circumstances lend a hand to create the image of Satan in a particular way.

However, our standing analysis is based on the approach of Reader-response and the image of reception not the biographical, nor the historical approaches. This undoubtedly influenced the readership in numerous ways and each reader interprets it through his own horizon of expectation. We can find a set of readers during the era of publication of John Milton having various and diverse readings of this *Paradise Lost* and of that Satan who is prominently placed in a position like God to Milton.

In view of that, we are orienting towards the reception of *Paradise Lost*. Let us discover what most critics say about Satan and *Paradise Lost*. Paradise lost is still being recognized as the supreme and strange achievement for what it provokes the critical thinking and debate. And its reputation is in an extraordinary fluctuation since its appearance and publication. Interestingly; it is said that the historical conditions affected Milton in which he was inspired by the medieval representations of Satan. The medieval Satan as we already mentioned before colored by darkness and appeared in a specific figure that make readers hate him and see him as an adversary.
That is used to mean that *Paradise Lost* can be seen through various lenses; in which its depiction of Satan was not the initial view. Instead there have been numerous portrayals before Milton to depict Satan either in works of literature or in arts. In spite of this, Milton was the first to portray Satan as a hero. This is exactly what drew attentions on critics and readers’ eyes. In this regard critics mentions that Milton’s *Paradise Lost* and the way of using characters to play their roles is really unique but it is no more than a historical view and stimulation of the medieval period’s inventions.

Appreciating and accepting that Milton was sightless when he produced his story, and to a large extent the verse stretched to his mind in a nightmare, let one to question if his analysis of the battle in “Heaven and Hell” was no more than a mirror image of the conflict between his “conscious and subconscious” psyche. These analogues demonstrate narration right through the tale when the goal of Satan is to demolish human kind whereas the goal of God is to keep human kind alive. The idea is set in the correspondence between unintentional shadows and attentive brightness. This can be traced in the “comic book pages of Superman's "Bizarro World," where bad is good” (Joseph Aaron Friedman).

Critics uphold that Milton has spoiled the story because he has made Satan, the most devilish creature, more attractive than God. This is a point that may in a way direct he reader that the psychology of Milton is unstable in which he may blame his God for making him blind. Milton’s unstable psychology made him introduce Satan as a bad character, but at the same time the reader feels sympathy, power, and majesty in Satan’s speeches. This is another point that asserts the deviation of interpretation of readers.
Paradise Lost is also taken into account as theological contribution necessitating an aspect of interpretation. Paradise Lost describes a difficult clash between the good and the evil which has been the vital subject in most of our debate. In this milieu, Satan is unfamiliar with the difference between the created and the Creator and what his place according to God is (Morgan A. Matos 72).

Satan, reject to distinguish the truth of God’s control over him, believed that by obtaining strength in numbers he would grow to be stronger than God. In the following selection Satan’s internal monologue is discovered as he acknowledges the tenderness and hostility he has felt, illuminating a facet of sympathy and uncertainty:

O thou that with surpassing Glory crown’d,
Look’st from thy sole Dominion like the God
Of this new World; at whose sight all the Stars
Hide their diminish’d heads; to thee I call,
But with no friendly voice, and add thy name
O Sun, to tell thee how I hate thy beams
That brings to my remembrance from what state
I fell, how glorious once above thy Sphere;
Till Pride and worse Ambition threw me down
Warring in Heav’n against Heav’n’s matchless King:

Ah wherefore! he deserv’d no such return
From me, whom he created what I was
In that bright eminence, and with his good
Upbraided none; nor was his service hard.
What could be less then to afford him praise,
The easiest recompense, and pay him thanks (Milton 40).

Milton embraces the Manichaeism belief of evil which means an early “belief system based on the separation of matter and spirit of good and evil” as an autonomous power which can be observed in the improvement of Satan’s character through the tale. This in one angle asserts that Milton’s intention is not depicting Satan as a Hero because he
believed in it; instead the ideological stress and hate towards the conditions he lived
oppressed him to do so.

Evidently, the previous discussion attract the reader to say that Milton
succeeded to establish an image of confusion in the reader’s mind for how can he/she
logically, explain the evil of Satan. No matter what one understands of his own
religious vision, he would read the issue Satan, and God in a way that conversed to
Milton’s description. Consequently, one would say no matter how Satan is depicted
because at the end the work is a poem and a work of art therefore there is no precise
reading in the sense of how it might make one experience the meaning. This was
Milton's mental picture, and one can scrutinize it as unbelievable vision, or blind
silliness, even here, the dispute continues. Neil Forsyth said that:

The reader has, or believes himself to have, an inner self like Satan’s, and
experiences the split self as Satan does. God may be right, but it is Satan
with whom we sympathize (246).

A reader can distinguish a similarity between the awareness of Satan and his or
her own, allowing a compassionate sight and thus the opinion that he may be a hero.

Morgan A. Matos in his thesis “The Satanic Phenomenon: Medieval
Representation of Satan” includes a helpful examination of the scholar Greg
Cavenaugh. The latter uses Bakhtin’s philosophy in understanding the audience’s
theatrical experience of the medieval period. He clarified that there are diverse
categories of probable attitudes that several medieval viewers possibly will carry to
that work. He expected that even if the audience undoubtedly exhibits an enormous
control of explanatory self-determination, the cultural and social circumstances direct the variation of perceptions of the experience (71).

Clearly, the previous assessment seems to convince the reader that a diversity of ways of thinking were for the most part definitely symbolized among spectators, principally set the presence of other religious, social, and political conversation. This is mainly applied to the medieval idea of Satan. Satan as a recurring theme in literary and artistic representation has been found as a controversial picture in which the importance and the authentic sense of his presence would have diverged from one mind to another. Furthermore, it is apparent that one, who confronts with Milton’s work, has to be clever to examine it with what he owns from literal aware as well as a figurative understanding.
Paradise Lost is so widespread in which it raises debates that one could easily expend long time to investigate the secret facts of the invented world created by Milton to discover a large number of congruencies all over “history, postmodern society, and beyond”. The character of Satan of Milton has been the issue of question for centuries till now and it is in continuity. The portrayal in such a way permits to not reject his bravery, power, and owning qualities of a leader, although these characters are wasted because of his arrogance and egoism.

What Milton did in his piece of working, he had tried to shape the Christian vision of Satan and how the devil is understood in Christian theology. However, his work still becomes a piece that is influenced by the ancient traditional representations of Satan either in mythology, folklore, art, literature and drama. Because absolutely each works either literary or artistic depict its evolving culture, religion, policy. Trying by that to render to the audience the climate of their time in each area and figuring to people how that writer himself experiences that conditions and how he was trying to send his experience to his people sharing with him dialogue, experience, thinking and world vision about the discussed theme. Apart from of one’s principle in how Satan should be depicted, Satan unquestionably appears as a historical concept and theological as well.

Concerning the reactions of the reader, as it is mentioned, differs from one reader to another, from one culture to another, from one religion to another. Take for example, Muslim’s insight about the depiction of this character in works of art and literature. He will absolutely call what he has from religious background, his faith towards the Devil; and therefore directly deny the imagination of such a work because
this imagination may lean him and orient him towards spiritual understanding and he may deviate from the right path. Because when he encounters the text at the first time he will hate the writer because his beliefs proposed an obligation to react in such a way and considering either the writer or his work a deviation from the religion of Islam.

Contradictory to that, an atheist reader would possess an ultimate different response and interpretation. According to his beliefs there is no God and there is nothing to be called Devil. And therefore the reaction produced, during the process of reading, has no effect in his mind and interpretation of such a work would be a just imagination of the author inspired from nothing and has no existence in reality, thus there is no need to hate or love the character depicted in the work.

And the previous view may go in parallel with what Tzvetan Todorov already maintained that that the process of reading is a construction process. By this he clearly mention that a given text makes us build an entire imaginable world and there is a specific part of the text that determines the construction we created when we read, and there is specific way to create that construction.

From an artistic point of view, the work consisted of no more than an aesthetic construction and taste. In which the author and the reader taste the work from the sense of invention and the cleverness in imagination. And critics in this area may present their fear of how the literary work is going to be interpreted if it is dropped on hands of people who are unfamiliar of the act of interpretation. Let us remember what Cyril Connolly said that the “great writer creates a world of his own” and this exactly what the reader face with Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. 
George Sampson has put it this way:

[…] A detailed criticism of Milton’s greatest poem is not possible here. A few general remarks may be offered. Some readers, including those who should have known better, have troubled themselves variously about the subject, the hero and theology of the poem. A poem does not become unreadable when its theology is no longer accepted […]. Those who maintain that Satan the rebel is the real hero fail to understand that the adversary of god and Man must be presented in majesty and magnitude if he to be worthy of his place in the story (308).

In this regard the interpretation that is given to the character of Satan is opened to numerous views and perceptions. And till now, no one can provide the exact interpretation why Milton portrays Satan as a hero and why he puts the characters as such a way. The readers of the Miltonic era received the portrayal of Satan according to what they believe and as we have seen the Romantic authors pave the way for readers to see an enormous Satan, powerful and evoke sympathy.
As a final point, religion, beliefs, past knowledge strongly influence the interpretation of the reader. In this regard each individual’s interpretation differs from one reader to another. By this the reader fills the “blank” left in the text through his interpretation. And the Reader-response criticism, as the current analytical approach, permits to the reader to carry onward all what he has from personal and cultural background to evaluate a given literary work. Milton’s depiction of Satan in *Paradise Lost* does not reduce him from the heroic picture. The reader is eager to throw out and eliminate the traditional model that decides the standards of the epic hero. Because when the reader of *Paradise Lost* can hold the impression of a hero on the whole as a good person who has either a mistake or a difficult experience that is not easy to make your mind up, the conception of a hero is accepted to develop to a large extent. Incidentally Satan is eventually a heroic figure in *Paradise Lost* because he is capable to accept the power of impossible tenderness. Also highlights the importance of religious, social, and cultural values and how it touches and influences the reader’s response to a work of fiction. Additionally, each reader with his own horizon of expectation helps the reader to constitute the meaning and judge the work. Here, each reader is the owner of the meaning and its validity because it is his own interpretation which is based on his own knowledge, beliefs and values each reader is the master of the valid meaning, because briefly we cannot say this reader’s interpretation is good and the other reader’s is false. The meaning of a given literary work is reinterpreted in the light of that environment, on that reader’s knowledge and experience. The initial receptors of the work measure it aesthetically to what is called “aesthetic distance”. That is to mean the first aesthetic interpretation paves the way towards the contemporary reader’s interpretation. And this is what we are going to see in the next part of this paper.
3. **The Heroic Satan in the Film of The Devil’s Advocate:**

As should be clear by now, there are various correlations about the character of Satan and its development in the works of literature and arts. This chapter will mainly introduce a simple typical study in which we have tried to link between the postmodern principles, the approach of Reader-response theory, the image of reception and the current theme under discussion. Principally, I started with a general overview about the film; trying by this to provide to the reader what do the plot of this film turn around? Who are the major actors? And where does the complexity of the plot appear? Also I have tried to clarify the relation between the film and the epic of John Milton; what do their share in common and how each work highlights his heroic character Satan. By these points we prepare the reader to a clear examination of the Devil which is the center of this study. And most prominently in this area of research, specify the audience horizons of expectations.
The character of Satan in artistic and literary contexture was already took place within the previous sections of this paper. And I have agreed upon the representation of Satan in works of art and literature had taken place within the first periods before the appearance of Paradise Lost of John Milton. The previous discussion provide to the reader of my paper to understand and be in line with the medieval depiction of this mysterious character; Satan. As should be clear to my reader by now, is his understanding about the Satan’s depiction in the medieval period and the image of this character that has been already painted in the minds. This is for the reason to smoothly pave the way towards another orientation of this discussion.

As a starting point of this discussion’s part let us remember how Satan was traditionally painted in the works of literature and art. Because most of this part focuses on the relationship between the ancient readings of Satan and the contemporary readings as the analysis of literary works moved to the postmodern era. For this reason, it is appropriate to distinguish between the traditional depictions and the contemporary ones to make the reader notice how the changes occurred between the two.

The Devil had taken place in literature and art as “an old man”, “animal-human” with “a tail and horns”. Furthermore, Satan appeared ugly, as a creature that had different animal body parts. The most primal representations of Satan show him as naked and black. In many pieces of artistic works and statutes of the Egyptian and Nubian sculptures the Devil is portrayed having Egyptian clothes. Particularly, Satan has existed as the ultimate adversary to goodness and morality. This is the general image of the initial portrayals of the Devil in literature, until the coming of Paradise Lost in which Satan is strictly seen as the epic’s protagonist. And then with the
increase of “Enlightenment rationalism” critics found that such subject is inappropriate and rejected this unsuitable choice of themes as center of the literary and artistic works.

What seems surprising is the returning of this Satan in the ground, not only literary and artistic but, even the media; films. The contemporary centuries provided the groundwork for a second look of Satan by figuring the evil spirit in Miltonic terms as a problematic character who takes the role of a hero and stood in opposition to God. After Satan being as a hero in the Milton era, the same character returns to take a new look, new image and appearing in a new figure to the audience.

The reader by now would move directly to follow how the postmodern view encapsulates the current discussion of the paper. We have clearly introduced that we are concerned with how this evasive term; Satan became part of literary personification. The personification of Satan in literature and art depends on the circumstances that affect the creative mind at the time. Because the inspiration of the author is colored by what that author possess from background; religious, cultural, social, and political.

Each occurring events contribute to shape the mind, beliefs, and values of the author and therefore shape the product itself. If for example the author is theologically influenced; this with no doubt would be personified in his work. Hence the personification in literature starts from a basis, a real and existed basis not from nothing.

Postmodernism also encapsulate this study because it is concerned with the interpretations and the readings of the audience. And this helps to contribute much more to the study because the presence of the reader in determining the meaning and interpretation of the given work give a valuable analysis an understanding. In the
previous time critics considered literature and art as a part of the unconscious action in which the author or the artist is imagining and thinking no more. But in fact it is not. The literature is a part from reality. And the reader should understand that. Satan personified in literature not from nothing but it is a fact and reality that evolves an ultimate interpretation. The mysterious character of Satan was established in minds of people as a religious evil spirit. This evil spirit evokes fear and ignorance of conducting towards him, in the past.

However today, he is no more call up fear or confusion of conduction. Instead he is a firm cultural, artistic, and literary character that arouses controversies and debates. Such as; why Satan is no more evoking audience? Why he becomes artistic and literary accepted although he is the enemy of the humankind? Questions like these arouse many times as we trying to go through this character. That is why Postmodernism is suggested to be the birth of this character. Not the birth of the idea but the birth of a total new personification. Incidentally, postmodern literature and art is a part of social, cultural, and historical development. It is a means used to depict a given culture and life.

What seems much more interested through postmodern vision is that Postmodernists do not pretend a new literary work; instead they use old forms of literature, genres, art and other means to contextualize their meaning in a new and different cultural and literary context. Old forms in literature and art that depict ‘Satan’ in seventeenth period were significantly renewed in a new context of literature and culture of modern age. That is to mean using traditional form of depicting ‘Satan’ and placing it in new form and look. This new embraced technique is for the sake of showing up distinction between past and traditional forms of personification, and present and contemporary ones. One here would ask why the contemporary authors
would do that. Since the topic and the work is from the past what can they do to make it new? What are those techniques that may modify the work?

Satan was already known as Satan, what the difference would be in the context of postmodern view. The difference is mentioned in the sense when we say postmodernism stressed the cultural influence of television and popular culture. The reader here would directly orient his thinking to the progress of the technology, television and films. Outstandingly, technology in postmodernism attracts the speediness that is untreatable on any theory which leads to a continuing development of new artistic forms and an ongoing spreading. Media and more specifically TV have the dominant role in influencing and impressing the public opinion. And most of the time technology is seen more than a dominant power but instead it takes the place of the consciousness of people.

There is more than one critical approach related to the point of linking the work of art to the work of literature. The psychological approach for instance deals strongly to the importance of the author and his major contribution to the understanding of the work. This approach according to its pillars shed the light on the author’s psychological life and how this life with its conscious and unconscious traits helps to understand what do the author means from his work. But here we are linking to the Reader-response/ reception approach in which the emphasis is centered on the role that the viewer plays within the process of reading, and interpreting.

The relationship between the literature and film is embodied in specific standards; the methodological standard and the interpretive one. How do books and films differ in the act of depicting the image to the audience? There is an old debate concerning the relationship between literature and film and effects produced by each. Here we are not concerned to bring the history of this debate; instead we are
concerned to touch the idea that in the last decade of the 19th century there is a creative exchange between literature and film.

What one would notice is that films and literature is sharing the employment of the structures and devices used in narration. Literature written in form of words on pages of the book and the film uses instead of words images not written but portrayed on the screen as the principle device to tell the tale. The literary work has its own method to present characters and events. And films present actors on the stage to perform the story.

Critics, according to Akech Obat Masira, have argued that films have the power with the imagistic and visual presentation; whereas the strength of literature is “linguistic”. The film is presented including techniques, light, actions and signs. The best thing that one can imagine is to visualize words, to make words appear on the screen as images. Literature sometimes not always presents the feelings in a form of poem and words, whereas the film introduces the feelings in the form visual images and sounds.

Many theoretical schools have been used to analyze the films over various approaches; Aesthetic theory, historical . . . etc. These approaches share one common element which is the location of meaning. The meaning has always been associated to the director or the work itself. Clearly, the viewer has been missed or neglected in the process of making meaning. Therefore we wish to introduce the viewer as part of making meaning by the interaction created between him and the work published either a literary work or an artistic one. This operation is clearly recognized through the Reader-response theory which provides the theoretical structure for the study at hand.
It is not an easy task to define the viewer’s perspective towards that film, because what a given viewer brings during the act of watching for instance differs from one viewer to another. But the most noticeable is the interaction between the viewer and the film.

Carsten Strathausen maintained that Kittler argued for the idea that “Media are real,” he asserts, “they are always already beyond aesthetics” (3). To be precise, when cinema envisages “real” pictures on the screen, this performs what literature cannot send through words. Thus it tries to invoke these fictional images in the mind of the reader. Film has the ability to give away “real” rather than merely “imagined” pictures of the material world. Literature according to Herbert Read expects the coming of film. He said “If you ask me to give you the most distinctive quality of good writing, I would give it to you in this one word: VISUAL. Reduce the art of writing to its fundamentals and you come to this single aim: to convey images by means of words” (5).

However one would wonder about what makes film play on the tension of the audience mind. Carsten in this regard added that “New media art forces critics to refocus their attention on the physiological mechanisms that determine our affective response to art” (10). The media critic Mark Hansen referred to by Carsten that the “body-in-code,” that is to mean “a body submitted”, formed, and realized only by “techniques” (Ibid).

Most definitely, there was an emphasis on the theme of Satan a heroic character, which according to many critics of the day continued its path from the past times to the present times but in a new fashion with a new tool, in which it helps the designer to catch the audience’s attention. And what seem brilliant in our days with this satanic representation are the media and more specifically television. TV prevail
misconception and misrepresentation of that devilish character in a heroic image. One would say what is the problem about that? We are in an elaborative century that needs depth imagination of the world, and such incarnation within the borders of theater and cinema would not hurt public’s vision but rather it will pave the way towards openness and success.

Contradictory view to that, and the problem from all this is the way of depiction and the excessive use of such a theme. In which the receptor begin to take those depictions and incarnations as a realistic portrayal of the truth and reality. This is what one would notice and paid his attention. Because the work of art, although its conditions of creation and production, should not be received as a total fact, because it is just a work inspired from imagination.

The receptor here should be eclectic in his response to the artistic work. He should not base his reception on what is called escapism; which means escape reality to imagination. The viewer and receptor of the work should not be separated from the responsibility of what they select and believe.

The concentration in the relation between media, film and literature was dedicated to plot and narrative dissimilarities between the book and the version of the film. This, according to Carsten is termed by Eric Rentschler (1968) as “fidelity analysis”. Also we can speak about the traits that were being lost for the transition from literature to film. Some authors center their attention on this point but it gives the impression that there is no emphasis upon what is being “gained”.

Numerous studies devoted their focus on demonstrating the control of film upon literary texts. They outline the significance of film for a particular author, period, and text. According to Carsten film is always far from the aesthetics. Film has the ability to present “real” rather than “imagined” pictures of material world. Ronald
Perrier notes that “the study of literature casts light on the meanings in the film, and the study of the film can illuminate the world of the literature” (From Film to Fiction).

Now the reader will be shown how the theme of Satan as the model and the hero is going to be a matter of concern in the film of *The Devil’s Advocate*. In the 1960s and 1970’s new literary criticism techniques appeared by engaging past texts in fruitful dialogue with the present by examining different interpretations of literature through history.

The reflection of Satan as a mutual figure was also represented in the 1997 film *The Devil’s Advocate*. The film’s story is turning around an ambitious and highly talented young lawyer, Keanu Reeves, played by Keven Lomax; recruited to join an elite New York law firm by John Milton, played by Al Pacino, who turns out to be Satan. Pacino’s character creates disorder on the souls and moral reliability of the firm’s followers, also on the lives and lawful dealings of all who come in contact with his law firm.

The process of watching movie or reading a book is the same, whereas the realization varied from one person to another. The realization is subjective. And since there is no one correct production of meaning; each viewer will see the depiction of this Satan from his own angle and vision. Satan who is portrayed in a humanoid picture is played in this film by Al Pacino who took the name of John Milton. The Artistic career of Al Pacino proves his excellent credibility on the stage. He has ability in his personality that makes the viewer enjoy watching him. What is most important is how it is perfect to choose Al Pacino for the role of Satan. Enormously, to say “Satan” is portrayed in film is enough in itself to evoke the emotions of the audience, how if the Devil is played with Al Pacino! It is really amazing. And if one notices there is a credible relation over here. What is seems clear is more than an artistic and
aesthetic production. It is simply something called the manipulation of the viewer’s thinking via an excellent actor who represents “The Devil”. This step is in itself a reason to control people’s minds. This can be interpreted through reader response’s eye in which the author used gaps to involve the reader’s imagination and experience.

Al Pacino who played John Milton is for an interesting knowledge to the viewer. John Milton who is best known for his ‘heroic Satan’ is the principle character in a film which is Satan.

Kevin Lomax a protection lawyer in Gainesville, Florida, has, on no account, misplaced a case. He stands for a schoolteacher alongside an accusation of child sexual abuse. Throughout the trial, Kevin recognizes that his client is at fault. Though, throughout an unsympathetic interrogation, Kevin obliterates the reliability of the injured party, Barbara, and secures another innocent judgment.

As he has fun, Kevin is came close to by a delegate of the New York law firm Milton. After Kevin's panel of judges set free an innocent decision, John Milton, Al Pacino recommends him a great payment and a glamorous residence on the assumption that he link up the organization. Regardless of cautions from his Evangelical Christian mother, Kevin agrees to take the job and shifts in the company of his wife Mary Ann to Manhattan.

Kevin first defends a wizard, Phillipe Moyez played by Delroy Lindo, who officially surrenders an animal. He argues that his client is confined under Freedom of Religion, engaging the case. Kevin spends all the time at his work, setting aside his wife Mary Ann alone which made her feel lonely. Kevin's mother visits for a short time and tells her son she needs to take Mary Ann backside to Gainesville after bearing in mind her mental state; nevertheless, Kevin rejects to let her take his wife.
Kevin after that defends Alexander Cullen played by Craig T. Nelson, who is alleged of killing his wife, his child and a young woman. This incident requires much more time, additionally sorting him out from Mary Ann. He begins having imagininations about colleague Christabella Andreoli played by Connie Nielsen, at the same time as Mary Ann exhibits signs of psychiatric disorder. Mary Ann claims, while trying on clothing with the wives of the extra associates at the firm, are demons after she sees their faces become demonic. She also claims that someone has stolen her ovaries and can no longer get pregnant after having a dream where a baby plays with her ovaries and her dress becomes covered in blood. Milton suggests that Kevin quit from the examination, however Kevin rejects.

Eddie Barzoon played by Jeffrey Jones, the firm's running lawyer, is persuaded that Kevin is challenging for his job after finding his name in the company papers as a colleague. While preparing Cullen's mistress Melissa Black Laura Harrington to testify about Cullen's alibi, Kevin realizes she is lying and tells Milton he believes Cullen is guilty. Milton offers to back Kevin regardless. Kevin decides to proceed with her testimony and wins an acquittal. After the trial, Kevin finds Mary Ann in a nearby church, naked and covered with cuts. She tells her husband that Milton raped and mutilated her, but Kevin saw Milton in court with him at the time of the alleged attack; he believes that Mary Ann injured herself, and has her committed.

Kevin is approached by U.S. Attorney Mitch Weaver played the role Vyto Ruginis, with knowledge of the law firm's illegal activities. Although Kevin tries walking away, he stops when Weaver tells him that Gettys was found with a dead girl in his car trunk. Following Kevin, Weaver walks into the street and is run over by a car. Alice and Pam Garrety who played by Debra Monk, Kevin's case manager at the firm, visit Mary Ann. Alone with Mary Ann, Pam appears as a demon through a
mirror. Mary Ann attacks Pam with the mirror and locks herself in the room. As Kevin tries to break down the door, Mary Ann takes a piece of broken glass from the mirror and cuts her throat with it, killing herself.

Before he can mourn, Alice reveals that Milton is Kevin's father. Kevin leaves the hospital to confront Milton, who merrily admits to raping Mary Ann. Kevin fires a pistol into Milton's chest, but the bullets have no effect. Kevin realizes that Milton is not only his father, but also Satan himself. Kevin blames Milton for everything that happened, but Milton explains that he merely "set the stage" and that Kevin could have left at any time. Kevin realizes that he always wanted to win, no matter the cost, and left Mary Ann behind. Milton explains that he wants Kevin and Christabella, who is Kevin's half-sister, to conceive a child: the Antichrist. He offers Kevin anything that he wants. However, when he asks about love and Milton dismisses it as "overrated", Kevin rejects his satanic heritage, cites free will and shoots himself in the head, ruining Milton's plan.

Kevin wakes up during the vacation of the Getty’s trial. After kissing Mary Ann, Kevin announces that he can no longer represent his client, despite the threat of being disbarred. The reporter who told Kevin at the beginning of the film that a guilty verdict was all but inevitable follows Kevin and Mary Ann, pleading for an interview and promising to make Kevin a star. After some prodding from Mary Ann, Kevin reluctantly agrees. After Kevin and Mary Ann leave, the reporter shape shifts into a grinning Milton. Breaking the fourth wall, he says, "Vanity — definitely my favorite sin."

Taylor Hackford, *The Devil's Advocate’s* director has actually a cool, ironic, and attention grabber in it: those lawyers are in actual fact functioning for the devil, like we all anticipated in any case. Watching it is very controlling: the story seems to
be going nowhere until a final scene sums it all up, and it all seems great. Normally, I'd try to be cynical and say this is what "brings it down, causing it to be less than what should be there," or something like that. But then again, I've been known to go against the norm.

The Devil that we already know is shown as the adversary of God who fights to attract people to sins. The current film of *The Devil’s Advocate* presents a Satan that is depicted through his level of power over humanity. Satan in this film has been represented as human, the fact that proves this character took the same shape and appearance all over the literary and artistic heritage. From another side this film represents a new thing that never appears in the past. Because in the past films were concerned to discuss the character God and not Satan in film (The Journal of Religion and Film). When Marry Ann becomes detached from Kevin and start seeing images of people as demons; the viewer here begin to suspect that Milton is not a human but instead a super human spirit.

The satanic power of John Milton also clarified when Kevin drawn to the sexy lawyer Christabelle. The viewer may ask also why Marry Ann instead of her husband was being haunted. Also we ae as audience may strongly ask why Kevin who is depicted as a lawyer, was being shown a defendant of criminals instead of representing the justice in the court.

The ending is what makes everything worth. Towards the end, Kevin and Milton have an oversize confrontation in Milton’s office, which we have seen excerpts that explain everything and even have a number of sudden twists. This trend is the best in movies, when the audience found that the ending is the thing that makes everything important.
To fully understand "The Devil's Advocate," one desires to understand this is not art: it is a public’s pleaser. It's the kind of film that tempts you throughout it, with lots of cool individual scenes and great cinematic moments which seem disjointed from everything else until the grand finale blows you away, and leaves you giddy afterwards. I'd love to say that I'm one of those critics who can "see through the film and was the only one who booed afterwards for it being manipulative," but the film was able to snatch me up into it, and by the ending, with the Rolling Stones' "Paint It Black" playing over the end credits, I was leaving with a big fat smile on my face. The ending makes all the apparent flaws of this film seem like they were good.

The first scene where we see John Milton really is more than just a man is where he is in the church scene and his dips his finger in the holy water causing it to boil. This boiling water scene is also likened to Keven's life, which now he finally realizes is out of control and he has reached his metaphorical boiling point (Carol Roach).

*The Devil's Advocate* is a typically valuable mix of supernatural adventures and character examination. Milton’s epic Paradise Lost, met with a cool reception when it was first published in 1667 and still has a cool reception in the contemporary centuries. If we ask readers of the 20th century about the strange description of Satan in literature they absolutely would name Milton’s Paradise Lost. For almost 330 centuries now, the epic has been recognized as a masterpiece of style and description. The paradise lost was especially well received when it was published. And it still has a special reception by the contemporary readers. And Milton still has a reputation as one of the surprising writers concerning the character of Satan. Milton had come to universal attention in 1667 for his epic Paradise Lost. This epic had a generational appeal.
The film has clear allusions to the John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. Mainly, through the name of the principle character Satan; John Milton. The director of the movie seems having the same suspense found in the epic *Paradise Lost* in which the reader was encountering a piece of work that enables the devilish character and placing him in powerful position and status. The viewer feels through *The Devil’s Advocate* the power of the spirit of evil over humanity. Most of the time, the viewer does not feels upset when he observes himself leaning towards this Satan. And this is absolutely contradicted with the one’s values and religious beliefs and commitments.

The director Taylor Hackford said in "Jumping into the Fire", By Jack Mathews: "I was interested in a devil that was sardonic, fascinating, charming, sexy and seductive, but not necessarily all-powerful. This devil operates on the power of temptation. He just puts temptation in front of them, and lets them choose". Also he added that he wanted to illustrate that each individual makes his own choices in life because the Devil is no more than an impulse inside of us to select what we know is ethically wrong, “we ourselves are responsible”, he said. As he mentioned also, the core of the western values that became in touch with the progress of the culture of the twentieth. He said that he wanted to observe a character who has been satisfied all his life for being a success, so he has never stepped back to say that winning may not always be the best thing (Hollywood Online). And “instead of showing him as something with horns and a tail”, he chose “to show him as he once was, before his ego corrupted him”.

When Kevin Lomax told Milton that "Better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven", is that it? Milton answered him the following:
Why not? I'm here on the ground with my nose in it since the whole thing began. I've nurtured every sensation man's been inspired to have. I cared about what he wanted and I never judged him. Why? Because I never rejected him. In spite of all his imperfections, I'm a fan of man! I'm a humanist. Maybe the last humanist (Devil’s Advocate).

The viewer can clearly see here how these words gives impression about the Satan’s self-confidence and power to control people.

Although the Devil is portrayed devilish and all around the film, Milton enforcing the idea of evil, the viewer still admire this character via the persona of Al Pacino. In the final scene, Satan seems want to acknowledge Kevin Lomax about God, he said:

Let me give you a little inside information about God. God likes to watch. He's a prankster. Think about it. He gives man INSTINCTS! He gives you this extraordinary gift, and then what does He do, I swear for His own amusement, his own private, cosmic gag reel, He sets the rules in opposition. It's the goof of all time. Look but don't touch. Touch, but don't taste! Taste, don't swallow. Ahaha! And when you're jumpin' from one foot to the next, what is he doing? He's laughin' His sick, fuckin' ass off. He's a tight-ass! He's a sadist! He's an absentee landlord. Worship THAT? NEVER!

Although the film is produced by the western culture who has nothing to do with my religion Islam, but I really loved the way AL Pacino represent the Devil. This is driving me in opposition to my religion, and to my belief. Satan is Satan, in the sense of his evil, but the way of depiction and the powerful presence of the actor made me want to see more and live a long experience through this film. And this is the point
exactly, the power of film that placed on peoples’ lives and thinking. May be if we encounter such a character in a novel or a given literary work he can do anything. Because if we dislike him we can merely close the book and forget about it. But to encounter this character in a film with sounds and curious images, to see Satan seems to be real making us never stopping our feelings wanting to see more.

Personally, I cannot stop myself watching the movie for the sake of seeing how this Satan speaks, walks, laughs, how he tempt people to do bad things although they have their free will to avoid doing this. It is really amazing!! He showed to them the wrong and the right path, and at the same time he blames them for their choice because he had done nothing over their will. To watch Satan like this an especially in film make me never forget the situation; never forget the characters who –were fighting to not deviating from their right path-.

Before to speak about the impact that media and Television has on people, I hoped to go a little bit backwards and remembering together the issue of the reader and the viewer. The viewer as a receptor receives his work before a horizon of expectation, what does this mean? It means that when the viewer or the reader encounters the work he is reaction before a specific horizon and specific expectations. The viewers of this film of *The Devil’s Advocate*, which portrayed Satan as strong and powerful character, when the human feels himself weak in front of this character and at the same time the viewer pleased in a way or another.

The cultural, ideological, and social beliefs that determine one’s identity cannot be vanished during the process of interpretations. Once the encounter built between the viewer and the film the viewer directly and unconsciously calls back his
knowledge package. This package is the driver of the viewer’s mind and understanding.

Peoples today draw much more attention to the depiction of film’s characters rather than a novel’s ones. Here we can introduce a slight and clear difference between the depiction of the character of Satan in the medieval age in Milton’s epic and its depiction as a model character portrayed in stage of a film.

In the interpretation of the film presented to the viewer Livindstone Sonia contributed an evaluative study in which she treated the social psychology of the television viewer. And how Television has a great role in everyday life; by this media has enormous effects on its audience. In this way the viewer may totally absorbed within this television and cannot observe himself what he is doing.

In this regard the interpretation of the viewer is based on his knowledge. What he brings from backgrounds determine the meaning and the interpretation and the sense of the film. His beliefs also are within his knowledge. Also Livindstone tried to link between the active viewer and the effect that TV plays on him. The active viewer is who possess various possibilities in the act of interpretation and tried intelligently to link what the film consist of his social conditions and conclude that the film is the mirror of those conditions. In this way he reacts positively and deeply merged with the film’s plot and actions (49).

The communication built during the process of interaction between the viewer and the film creates the ultimate thinking of the viewer. In this case the consciousness of the viewer became what affects him during the process of reception. Subsequently, The devil is developed with the progress of civilization because he is what men make him. In the past the idea of devilish works appears strange to people, but today, who
actually keeps fighting against the evil are the strangest. Today people are in line with the devilish works, absorbing their depiction, supporting them and acting within their personalities and traits.

Today there is a widespread tendency to control people’s minds through TV and fictional films. In which the reality and truth is hidden by what we can say magical techniques that catches the public’s attention without directing the attention towards the truth behind the performance of that film’s stage.

The films’ methods of portrayal are totally different from that of a novel in which pictures and sounds helped to improve the suspense of rendering messages. Talking about methods to be used is important but not as great significant as the reason behind this strange use of a character seemed from early and long period as a pure evil and against good. So! What happened to this character? And why there is such a depiction? Is it a matter of aesthetic creation and production or is it a matter that needs a careful discussion and clearly opened to political and ideological debate?

The representation and incarnation of Satan as a hero needs a closer examination. A misconception reinforced through the media misrepresentation. From this idea we can deduce clearly that the inaccurate perceptions/description and beliefs incarnated in films were based on specific reasons. It is really irrational to base our beliefs and perspective on the imaginations of films their reality is no more than a fiction. The antipathy towards Satan embodied in arts of sixteenth century. Facts about this sensual issue should be preserved and fiction through away from the audience perspectives.

This film of The Devil’s Advocate seems to some people a piece of work that controls the mind. This film shows us exactly how the Devil can control our mind and
our behavior if we let. Even the actors are excellent which make the movie very interesting. And at the same time give the viewer how to win the Devil’s arguments. Describe in an extraordinary way the battle between good and evil.

The idea to be enforced now is oriented towards the impression that those who makes the work of arts or even literary ones play on the viewer’s tension. How is this? They stress the power of the figure indirectly that would undoubtedly manipulate his thinking before he tries reacting. The viewer is active with his knowledge and values and memory and all what determine the interpretation; but at the same time he cannot use them because the power of the work is more than what he believes and think. For example, the film of Twilight also presents the devilish characters as the models and heroes, the fact that make the viewer instead of neglecting the evil and its opponents; he go positively and really loves the characters. What do this mean? It means that however the viewer obtain his own interesting and culture, values and beliefs; he seemed a weak substance in front of the impact of the work.

Now, what are the reasons behind this case; of having the evil as good and the good seems invaluable? If we open the door to the debate here we cannot stop of linking facts to fiction. But the ultimate reason to control the mind of the viewer is started from the simplest points; the impact of film as an aesthetic tool to show tales. We have developed previously a discussion about the effects of film in the sense of having sounds, images, light . . . etc. All these set on the top as a tool to strongly convey the picture rather than the literary book when the reader feels boring with the imagination. Films give the viewer the opportunity to live the situation, feel the character’s statutes. Also another interesting point that can be included in this context is that: when the designer of the film distinguishes between the use of black images and light ones, he is doing so with hidden reason. That is to mean, the viewer may
never notice why the film is presenting the images of such a film of Devil using blackness. Because in many movies Satan is represented in as black man depicted him as a black creature. “black” defined by *Webster’s New World Dictionary* as “dirty, evil, wicked” and “white” as “pure, innocent,” making us wonder how color can have such an effect in influencing the viewer’s response and even if the color seem nothing great, it acquire moral qualities. Whereas portraying Satan using light gives the direct impression that the director of the work wants to influence the viewer’s insight by making him reacting positively.

This in short is one reason and is only about the color. But what can one say if the matter is related to the modern technology and progression in making movies, using new techniques and new strategies? The result is so expensive. The previous discussion also, I have tried to mention that there are some concepts of Satan that came from the popular culture. In this way it is said in “Satan in the Modern World”:

Satan has been reduced to a profitable, humorous caricature, a symbol or image used as jewelry, displayed on clothing, used for decoration and costumes on Halloween, engraved on bodies as tattoos, and praised in certain music styles marketed to “wanna-be” rebellious youth (15).

This shows that the Devil is not only produced by those who want so, bu also the audience; people participating in making this thing “loving Satan” be part of their lives. This is what I call evil persuasions. Persuading the audience using Satan in a form of good, an angel for instance, but the actions contain bad and evil inside. This can be most depicted in comics and childish films to make children love the character. Therefore, children start absorbing it as reality not a just description or fiction. In this
way the danger of media and technology appeared in light clearly and highlights with no doubt the hidden reasons behind. So different groups within modern societies have “created Satan to meet their needs”

The obvious question arouses itself: What happened to humanity’s primitive worries of Satan and the forces of evil? This can be answered by mentioning to the visual arts media of the modern world that offered a debate for the discovery of evil and human violence in rational cinematic depictions that traditional literature and the arts could not convey as effectively. This can be illustrated with the following:

Scholars […] observed that, although depictions of Satan and the forces of evil decreased among popular culture and literature from the 1700s to the early 1900s, the beginnings of the cinema industry had an indirect but noticeable effect on the modern rediscovery of the Prince of Darkness (17).

Significantly, there were ideological movements that go in parallel with the media. This fact had a great influence on the public’s opinion in an indirect way. The postmodern era as it is defined by the European thinking, was not a social, political concept, nor it is a historical one and to all the traditional culture. Because modernization is not the scientific and technological revolution, instead it is the combine of this revolution into the show of social and personal life. Obviously, one would say for instance, I like this book because I like the author and his persona. The same thing here the horror of the film may reflects the badness of the filmmakers and vise versa the goodness in depiction represents the goodness of the filmmaker. Some critics thought from the beginning of modern revolution or modernization, film
making was susceptible to evil and manipulation because of the power of visual images to encourage and seduce human beings into given behaviors while shaping individual opinions with the influential control of the visual representation. Movies create symbols to influence the emotions of viewers and concepts of misery in the same way that immense works of literature can shift our souls and influence our emotions and visions.

Most of the time, Satan is imagined and established by our popular culture and how these appearances not merely form our sights about evil but also how we have come to define goodness and the Divine. The imagination that fueled filmmakers is that the reality can imitate fiction. The reception as we have said differs from one to another, from one religion to another, from one culture to another. If we placed Satan among Satanists, what do expect the result will be? According to them, Satan is not a creature to be feared or admonished but rather an archetype to be respected, honored, and accepted; are those who seek to be Satan’s followers and supporters.

When the world is relating to civilization and Globalization, this would take with this also the progression of literatures and arts into consideration. Literature and arts cope with each modifications and development of the day. The modernization is related to modernize the mind’s standards.

A one reason behind the excessive use of such representations is correlated to the intellectual policy of those dangerous ideological movements who play on the tension of the audience by dumping them via the media in which they centered on different problems; one of them is Satanism. Such subjects occupy the minds of people to not look to their real problems (Shakir Nabulssi 100). This is the problem of mind control can be seen over two perspectives; one is the psychological side and the other is the technological techniques.
Nicholas West, points out “mind control has been in place for a very long time with the goal to turn the human race into non-thinking automatons”. Media can influence people through images about the devil through in which they can bring something human, kind and acceptable about the devil. And the viewer can observe inside the global image something adventured. The film lets the whole image as it is to say yes we talk about the devil as you know –evil spirit- but there is something delicious to be as a devil inside a whole image of wrong doing. Nicolas added in this regard:

For as long as man has pursued power over the masses, mind control has been orchestrated by those who study human behavior in order to bend large populations to the will of a small "elite" group.

This means that there were only “elite” powers that practice the control of minds through a study of the masse’s behavior. This mainly asserts the political reasons behind controlling the viewer’s mind through the depiction of the Devil for the sake of practicing what do powerful groups want from the audience in indirect way. Personally, this seems to me thorough the angle of divide and then conquers. This happens to the masses today through this media and films. The hidden power direct the filmmakers to produce and make films that touch the sensual vein of the audience to find it easy reach their goals.
Conclusively, the character of Satan in this chapter has taken the wide area of depiction in films. The film of *The Devil’s Advocate* is considered and excellent master’s art. This chapter is already entitled as *The Heroic Satan in the Film of The Devil’s Advocate*. The film is really a masterfully product that took the viewer step by step to see if the attempt of Satan to make humans being sinful or not. The viewer would ultimately enjoy this master of depicting a dark figure oddly existed in the minds of people using light images and sound which with no effort capture their attentions. We have seen together how the character of Satan took place within the contemporary period and how audience draw their knowledge upon interpreting it. But this cannot make us ignore the fact of figuring such a creature in a way that evokes one’s morals, values, and ideology. This is, as mentioned, one of the numerous techniques that control the audience’s mind in a way that please the controlling power.
II. Conclusion

Last but not least, it has been discusses how the character of Satan is becoming a prominent figure in literature and art. One of the main reasons given for this depiction is the aesthetic production of the authors and filmmakers. Some of the other causes mentioned are the excessive use of the Devil in films, the odd reactions of the audience, and the controlling films that are in a continuity of such a depiction in the contemporary period. The challenge is to make a link between the medieval readings, receptions, and responses concerning the heroic depiction of an evil creature. The current study explores the reception and the different readings of the incarnation of Satan as a hero from the medieval to the modern age. This study demonstrates the variety in readings and interpretations of Satan as a model.

This research examined the reasons behind the excessive use of Satan as a hero, directly or indirectly in the postmodern era. Also, this paper showed that literature possesses an independent value and deeper understanding of reality. Extending the examination to the readings of a 21st century reader of Paradise Lost regarding the massive manipulate of the excessive use of Satan as a hero. This research also highlights the relation between literature and film in this Modern Age stressing that the films possess a process of rendering images and pictures which creating in our minds the ability of being critical viewers, and able to give our own vision about matters that concerns our culture, our religion, and our own knowledge. And this can only be done and realized via the consciousness of relevant matters surrounding our universe. The fact that assume this developed era produces people who watch movies more than read books argues for the impact of films, media and
TV in people’s lives. Therefore the criticism is opened to the social and political debate when the fact is clearly examined and discussed.

This research project cannot have a limit study, readings and interpretations because as it is based on the readings, reception, and the meaning production, it is also based on the concept of the Horizon of Expectations that is related to each generation’s attitudes about their works, conditions. Thus each generation will produce its own vision, interpretation, has its own standards of reacting, receiving and making meaning.

This clearly make us freeing this project from any limited reading and comprehension and emancipate it to the next generation’s experiences, knowledge, values and circumstances which left the results in an open conclusion.
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