

“the work of the passion is eternal and . . . certainly cannot be considered finished by the crucifixion” (194).

Providence College

**Sara J. van den Berg and W. Scott Howard, eds. *The Divorce Tracts of John Milton: Texts and Contexts*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne UP, 2010. xi + 513pp. ISBN 13: 978-0-8207-0440-1. \$75.00 (cloth).**

THOMAS FULTON

Sara J. van den Berg and W. Scott Howard have produced an elegant and accessible edition of Milton's divorce tracts. Unlike previous editions of the tracts, this collection is both lightweight and thorough, making it useful for undergraduate and graduate courses. It includes complete texts of the five different publications on divorce that Milton produced in 18 months: the two versions of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (the 1643 edition and the much expanded 1644 edition), *The Judgement of Martin Bucer* (1644), and *Tetrachordon* and *Colasterion*, published on the same day in 1645. It also contains selections from three contemporary pamphlets that represent the first major assault on Milton's views—William Prynne's *Twelve Considerable Serious Questions* (1644), Herbert Palmer's *Glasse of Gods Providence* (1644), and Daniel Featley's *Dippers Dipt* (1645)—and a complete text of the anonymous *Answer to a Book, Intituled, The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (1644), reproduced here for the first time in a modern edition.

In a lucid introduction, van den Berg and Howard position Milton's arguments for divorce in the context of its legal history in England and in relation to continental Protestantism. Supported by a short appendix entitled “A Legacy of Reform, 1643–1973,” they make the case for the enduring relevance of Milton's position: “Not until the Divorce Reform Act (1969–1973), would Parliament accept Milton's call for reform of marital law and legalize no-fault divorce on the ground of ‘irretrievable breakdown of the marital relationship’—or, to use Milton's words, ‘That indisposition, unfitness, or contrariety of mind, arising from a cause in nature unchangeable, hindring and ever likely to hinder the main benefits of conjugal society, which are solace and peace’ ” (1).

In addition to a “no-fault” justification of divorce, Milton also argued that England should follow other Protestant nations in allowing the right to remarry after divorce. Here, positioning Milton in the context of the Westminster Assembly's debates on marriage laws, van den Berg and Howard show that he “was the most vociferous advocate of divorce with the right to remarry, but he was not alone” (7). Milton's arguments are compared to those of contemporaries such as William Ames and continental reformers such as Theodore Beza—as well as, of course, Martin Bucer.

The editors also contextualize Milton's opponents, presenting a cogent demonstration of the interactions between politics, authorship, and the book trade. The book-length *Answer to a Book, Intituled, The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (November 14, 1644) was printed by G. M., whom van den Berg and Howard have

identified as George Miller, a printer who also produced Herbert Palmer's *Glasse of Gods Providence*, excerpted here, and, still more significantly, was "appointed by the Committee of Examinations in March 1642/43 to search for presses involved in publishing seditious pamphlets" (28). The connection sheds light on Milton's assertion in *Colesterion* that the printer was the author's "deputy" (28). Another deputy in this production was the licenser Joseph Caryl, who wrote a brief prefatory endorsement to *An Answer*, as the editors' informative preface to this tract points out (401).

The contextual documents, each prefaced with a short biographical summary, provide a vital sense of the nature of the debate in Milton's England. Prynne's *Twelve Considerable Serious Questions* is excerpted mainly for its censure of Milton's supposed support of "divorce at pleasure" and Prynne's hope that "Our grand Councill will speedily and carefully suppress" these views (395). Palmer's dour sermon to Parliament excerpted here condemns Milton's "wicked booke," "deserving to be burnt," and castigates members of Parliament for granting "a Toleration for all this" (399). The short passage from Featley's *Dippers Dipt* inveighs against "a Tractate of Divorce, in which the bonds of marriage are let loose to inordinate lust, and putting away wives for many other causes besides that which our Saviour onely approveth" (450). The full-length *Answer to a Book* will be of particular interest to students of Milton and of gender relations, as it spells out in detail an early modern position against divorce. Surprisingly, this anonymous author's rebuttal of Milton is not particularly vituperative or as crudely stated as the other pamphlets printed here. It approaches the question of divorce from not just a religious and exegetical angle, but also from the points of view of English legal history and simple common sense. "Who sees not how many thousands of lustfull and libidinous men would be parting from their Wives every week and marying others: and upon this, who should keep the children of these divorcers which sometimes they would leave in their Wives bellies?" (410). Against Milton's idea that a "contrariety of minde" should be grounds for divorce, the author suggests that "There is no such disposition in nature as is unchangeable, so teacheth Philosophy" (412).

There are some moments where the editors' expertise could have benefited readers more had they detailed the sources of their knowledge. At one point, for example, van den Berg and Howard comment on social customs regarding divorce in England: "A few members of the aristocracy sought divorce *a vinculo* [that is, with the right to remarry] through private bills in Parliament; middle-class people who were unhappily married often separated without benefit of law; and lower-class husbands were known to sell their wives" (5–6). This valuable glimpse of social history is provided without reference to where a reader might look to discover the historical sources that testify to such private parliamentary bills or the practice of wife selling.

Perhaps the most important claim needing further support concerns the edition of the Bible that Milton used. In the note on the text, van den Berg and Howard state that because "Milton would have used the Geneva Bible," they have "chosen to cite *The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition*" (ix). This vital information is given without explanation of why a text printed more than eighty years before should be favored here. Readers may not know that this 1560 edition was extensively reprinted well into the seventeenth century (though other "Geneva" Bibles with different, more expansive notes were also produced), so that this earlier version—or a later reprint—might well have been used by Milton. A new "biblically annotated" edition of *Paradise Lost* by Matthew Stallard (Mercer UP, 2011) also uses the 1560 Geneva edition.

It remains unclear, however, why Milton would have preferred the Geneva Bible to the 1611 King James Version, a version that we know he owned—indeed, a 1612 quarto copy (British Library MS Add 32310) is one of only a handful of his books that have survived. The Bible Milton actually used deserves to be carefully determined, and given that Milton's divorce tracts are rich with biblical language and exegesis, it is possible to chart his usage accurately. In fact, Milton's citations suggest that the idea that he preferred the Geneva Bible should be reconsidered. Tracing the language of Milton's citations in the divorce tracts suggests that the KJV was the English Bible he used predominantly, if not exclusively. In the *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, for example, when he quotes Song of Solomon 8.6–7, “as the spouse of Christ thought, many waters cannot quench it, neither can the floods drown it” (48), he is alluding to the KJV, and not the Geneva, which has “Muche water can not quench love,” rather than “many waters cannot quench loue” in the KJV. Milton quotes from Ecclesiastes, “Thence says Solomon in Ecclesiastes live joyfully with the wife whom thou love” (50), and again here he is thinking of the KJV rather than the Geneva version, which has not “live joyfully with the wife,” but “Rejoyce with the wife.” When Milton quotes Paul as saying, in 2 Corinthians 6.17, “touch not the vnclean thing, and I will receiue you” (54), it is from that exact wording in the KJV, and not from the Geneva version: “touche none uncleane thing, & I will receive you.” A bit later, Milton weaves together two lines from 1 Corinthians 7.6 and 7.25: “I speake this by permission, not of commandment, I have no command of the Lord, yet I give my judgment.” This comes from the KJV wording: “I speake this by permission, and not of commandment. . . . I haue no commaundement of the Lord: yet I giue my iudgement.” Both the 1560 Geneva text, and the later Tomson-Junius text (which is also known as the Geneva Bible) have rather different wording: “I speake this by permission, not by commandment. . . . I have no commaundement of the Lord: but I give mine advise.” At one point in the second edition of the *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, Milton takes issue with the word “odious” in the KJV as if it were understood by his audience that this is the version he is using: “And this law the Spirit of Solomon, Proverbs 30.21, 23, testifies to be a good and necessary law, by granting it that *a hated woman* (for so the Hebrew word signifies, rather than odious, though it come all to one) *that a hated woman, when she is married . . .*” (153–54). The editors point out this quibble with the KJV in their note on the language of the first edition (458n78), but never clarify what role the Geneva translation would have here or elsewhere. The exact echoing of the KJV continues through the divorce tracts, and where Milton deviates, it seems that he is translating from the original languages or from a Latin study edition (the Junius–Tremellius edition with notes by Beza). It would have been useful for the editors to have cited Harris Francis Fletcher's erudite study, *The Use of the Bible in Milton's Prose* (Urbana, 1929), which makes a convincing case for the Authorized Version as Milton's English text.

The King James Bible now at the British Library is often imagined as a “Family Bible” in the Milton household rather than as a reference book in the writer's study. But it seems not unlikely—and worth exploring further—that this heavily worn, marked, and annotated copy was the actual English Bible that Milton used while writing. More broadly, evidence in Milton's case challenges the reasonable but largely unsupported idea that advocates of continental Protestantism would have been uniformly biased against the KJV, and would have preferred the Genevan text for doctrinal reasons.

But here I have built a small mountain out of a molehill. This is a highly commendable edition of the divorce tracts, one that will do an especially fine job of introducing this complex and important body of texts.

Rutgers University

**Stella P. Revard. *Politics, Poetics, and the Pindaric Ode: 1450-1700*. Tempe, AZ and Turnhout, Belgium: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies and Brepols, 2009. xxvi + 359pp. ISBN 978-0-86698-399-0. \$59.00 (cloth).**

HOLLY M. SYPNIEWSKI

In *Politics, Poetics, and the Pindaric Ode: 1450-1700*, Stella Revard completes her exhaustive two-part study of the influence of Pindar's epinician poetry on Renaissance poetics. The first volume, *Pindar and the Renaissance Hymn-Ode* (ACMRS, Brepols, 2001), traced the Renaissance rediscovery of Pindar and the textual transmission of his odes. In this second book, Revard studies the development of the Pindaric ode for political and patronage poetry and charts how Pindar replaced Horace as the main model for Renaissance encomiasts.

Revard's title does not convey the breadth or the geographical range of her four-part analysis of Latin and vernacular Pindaric odes. Chapters 1 through 5 cover political odes. Chapters 6 and 7 discuss Pindar's influence on Renaissance funeral odes. Chapter 8 surveys familiar odes such as *epithalamia* and *genethliaca*, while Chapter 9 examines the city ode as a development of both familiar and political Pindarics. Revard's recursive argument follows the same ambit in each section: it begins with Pindar's Greek odes, moves to his Italian imitators, traces their influence in central Europe, and concludes with continental European Pindarists' influence on English poets. Critics of Milton will be particularly interested in Revard's detailed analysis of *Lycidas* in Chapter 6, her discussion of Milton's familiar Pindarics in Chapters 7 and 8, and the conclusion of Chapter 9 that places Satan's praise of Rome and Athens in the tradition of humanistic city odes.

Revard devotes more than half of the book to political odes. She begins with a well-informed discussion of Pindar's allusive and formulaic praise poetry that was first decoded by Elroy Bundy (*Studia Pindarica* [Berkeley, 1962]). Revard argues that Pindar replaced Horace as the exemplar for Italian Renaissance poets as they perceived a changing relationship between patron and poet. She documents this trend in Filefo's odes, Lampridio's Latin triads, Trissino's Italian canzone, and the vernacular poetry of Alamanni and Macrin in the French court. Revard concludes her discussion of the hundred-year Pindaric revival with the poetry of Minturno, Capiluppo, Tasso, and Amalteo.

In Chapter 2 Revard argues that Ronsard and his followers were the unacknowledged models for English Pindarists and chronicles how the Pindaric ode first reached England. She credits Alamanni and Macrin for passing the Pindaric mantle to Ronsard and his followers in France including Chiabrera, who reinvigorated the Italian Pindaric, and Melissus and Dousa, who debuted the Pindaric at Elizabeth's