binical writings that shaped the milieu in which Milton and his contemporaries worked out their relationship to Christianity and to the ancient and contemporary Hebraic traditions. The results are enlightening and truly rewarding.


This helpful resource offers a compilation of (by Isitt’s count) the 2425 names and 237 similes found in Paradise Lost. Although the book is primarily a reference guide, it does have a clearly stated polemical goal: to use the compiled names to demonstrate that Milton’s epic is, to quote Maurice Kelley in This Great Argument, “an Arian document” (xv). Isitt’s book contains 32 chapters divided into three major parts, whose titles I quote: Part I) a “Complete Catalogue of Names in Book Order,” giving one chapter for each book of the epic; Part II) a list of “Names by Character with Added Names from Other Works by Milton”—this section includes chapters listing names of the Father, the Son, Satan, Rebel Angels, Good Angels, and Adam and Eve; Part III) a list of “Epic and Simple Similes in Book Order.” Names are listed in order of their appearance, including listings for the name itself, the subject named, the speaker of the name, and the one to whom the name is spoken. Below is a sample entry:

PL 3.139-40

in him all his Father shon
Substantially express’d
Named: Son
Speaker: Milton’s Epic Voice
Spoken to: Reader (51)

Many of the individual chapters are prefaced with concise but valuable general commentary on the nature of the names discussed in that chapter, and much of this commentary highlights
what Isitt argues is the Arian nature of *Paradise Lost*. Isitt does indeed make a number of persuasive observations for his position, particularly in his prefaces to chapters on *PL* Books 3, 5, and 6, as well as his individual chapters on the names for the Father and the Son. It is not clear, however, which specific points are derived from other sources and which are Isitt’s own. In his acknowledgements, Isitt states his indebtedness to Kelley’s *This Great Argument* and Michael Bauman’s *Milton’s Arianism*, as well as the opposing view championed in William B. Hunter’s “Milton’s Arianism Reconsidered,” but none of these works nor any other secondary sources are cited in his chapter introductions. Similarly, an essay that appears at the beginning of Part II, “Names and Milton’s Arian Deity,” contains informative brief discussions of Milton’s theology in relation to the ancient and Reformation church creeds and also concisely outlines the modern debate over Milton’s Arianism. But even this essay offers only minimal interaction with relevant secondary material. I will admit that I hesitate to offer such criticism, for Isitt should be commended for giving us more than a bare reference guide. Still, more citations and a bibliography of material germane to the Miltonic Arian debate would have been a welcome addition to Isitt’s text.

The introduction outlines the book’s structural format. Isitt defines “names” as “all proper names and epithets, as well as closely packaged paragraphs of description that develop character” (xv-xvi). Clearly differentiating his study from a concordance, Isitt notes that he does not list every appearance of a proper name, but that he does “list attributive names if they are repeated by different speakers” (xvi). He breaks down the names of *Paradise Lost* into three basic categories—adjectival names, substantival names, and clausal names—and he also outlines the major categories of name sources in the epic. In addition, each individual chapter’s introductory material provides a statistical breakdown of the frequency both of characters named and the speakers of these names. Part I also highlights which names are metonyms and which are synecdoches, although, inexplicably, Part II does not do so. Part III
is prefaced by an informative “Overview of Epic and Simple Similes in Paradise Lost.”

Isitt’s method for determining the “named” character in cases where Milton’s deity is simply called “God” and/or the “Father” or “Son” is not specifically delineated (as occurs in Books 4, 7, and 8) reveals his interpretive slant concerning the epic’s alleged Arianism. In such cases, Isitt chooses to assign “attributive names of the highest order [such as ‘omniscient’ ‘author,’ and ‘Maker Omnipotent’] to the Father” (129). His explanation for this decision is that whenever the Father and the Son are depicted together, most significantly in Book 3, “Milton has been entirely consistent in naming the Father by these [absolute] qualities and by synonyms for them, while at the same time withholding them from the Son” (206). Consequently, Isitt affirms, “in the troublesome passages of the epic where it is difficult to know which of the two Milton speaks, we should take as our guide the clear indicators of Book 3 . . . in our determinations of who is being named, vague passages should give way to clear” (206). Although Isitt’s methodology is clearly explained and consistently applied, his interpretive decision here is arguably an overly-convenient simplification of a complex problem. It would have been appropriate in these uncertain cases to assign the “named” in a way that specifically signaled that Isitt’s assignments of attributive names are indeed his interpretation; using, for example, “Named: (Father)” instead of “Named: Father” for such entries would have allowed Isitt to affirm his interpretation while more overtly acknowledging the text’s ambiguity.

All this being said, Isitt’s book is indeed a valuable resource, not only for scholars debating the Arian nature of Milton’s epic, but for any reader desiring to investigate the implications of Milton’s names for the epic’s various characters. The fact that Part II also contains names of profiled characters that appear in Paradise Regained, Samson Agonistes, and the Nativity Ode will make fruitful character analysis all the more accessible. This book also will aid classroom teaching on a number of levels and should prove a beneficial tool for student essays on Paradise Lost.