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I

Two texts printed by G. M. and published in London in 1644 fiercely attacked Milton's first edition of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, which had appeared on August 1, 1643. The first of these challenges—Herbert Palmer's *The glasse of Gods providence towards his faithfull ones. Held forth in a sermon preached to the two Houses of Parliament, at Margarets Westminster, Aug. 13. 1644*—was registered on November 7, 1644 (Shawcross, “Survey” 297). The second—*An Answer to a book, intituled, The doctrine and discipline of divorce, or, A plea for ladies and gentlewomen, and all other maried women against divorce*—was registered on October 31, 1644 and published on November 19 (Shawcross, “Survey” 297). *An Answer* holds distinction as the only tract produced during Milton's lifetime that offered a full-scale challenge to his arguments for divorce. Although other men (including William Prynne, Daniel Featley, and Thomas Edwards) assailed Milton’s position on divorce between 1644 and 1654 (Sirluck 103, 142; Parker, *Biography* 1: 259–89; Shawcross, “Survey” 296–301), Palmer’s sermon and the anonymous *Answer* are particularly important because they occasioned Milton's final divorce tracts, *Tetrachordon* and *Colasterion*, which were published on the same day (March 4, 1645). *Tetrachordon* replies directly to Palmer (among other detractors) “because,” Milton declares, “he hath oblig’d me to it”:

> I shall here briefly single one of them … [i.e. Herbert Palmer] … who I persuade me having scarce read the book, nor knowing him who writ it, or at least faining the latter, hath not forbore to scandalize him, unconferr’d with, unadmonisht, undealth with by any Pastorly or brotherly convincement, in the most open and invective manner, and at the most bitter opportunity that drift or set designe could have invented. (CPW 2: 579)

*Colasterion* takes a much harsher tone, castigating the “illiterat, and arrogant presumer” (CPW 2: 724) of *An Answer* with unremitting vituperation, and demolishing (point by point) his attack upon *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. Near the end of *Colasterion*, Milton reflects upon this unpleasant, yet necessary, “underwork”: “I have now don that, which for many causes I might have thought, could not likely have bin my fortune, to bee put to this under-work of scowring and unrubbishing the low and sordid ignorance of such a presumptuous lozel” (CPW 2: 756).

Milton scholars have not yet noted the fact that both *The glasse of Gods providence* and *An Answer* were printed by the same person, G. M., who has never been
certainly identified. Palmer’s sermon was “printed by G. M. for Th. Underhill at the Bible in Woodstreet” (2). An Answer was printed by G. M. “for William Lee at the Turks-Head in Fleetstreet, next to the Miter Taverne” (2), and was licensed by Joseph Caryl. In the case of these particular assaults against Milton’s argument in favor of divorce (a vinculo), naming the printer would be a first step toward gaining a more complete understanding of the context of pamphlet warfare in which the 1643 Doctrine and Discipline was written, challenged, and defended.

We believe that we have discovered sufficient evidence to identify G. M. as George Miller, a printer “dwelling in Black-Friers” ca. 1644 (Estwick i), who, as we have learned, had sustained business relationships between 1642 and 1646 with Herbert Palmer, William Lee, the author of An Answer, Joseph Caryl, and Giles Calvert (the preëminent radical publisher). George Miller also served as an agent in Parliament’s efforts to restrain the burgeoning print culture of the early 1640s. In one striking instance, Miller and Lee were both appointed by the Committee of Examinations in March 1642/43 to search for presses involved in publishing seditious pamphlets (Plomer 8). George Miller may also have been summoned (in August of 1644) to report to the Committee for Printing concerning the identity and whereabouts of authors, printers, and publishers of pamphlets on the subject of divorce (Sirluck 142; Lewalski 179, 598 n90). (This last observation, however, can not be proven with absolute certainty, as we will discuss below.)

Our primary aim in this essay is to present the evidence for identifying G. M. as George Miller. Careful investigation of the records of those associated with the printing and dissemination of a pamphlet can sometimes yield the identity of a heretofore anonymous author, printer, publisher, or bookseller. By examining Miller’s publishing record during the 1640s we will assess what some critics might protest as mere “guilt by association.” Nonetheless, we wish to argue, on the basis of that record—which includes incontrovertible material evidence (e.g. printers’ devices)—that Miller participated (as both G. M. and George Miller) in a coordinated attack against Milton by individuals as diversified in their views on Toleration as Palmer, Lee, the author of An Answer, Caryl, and Calvert.

As Henry Plomer and numerous scholars have since remarked, censorship was both capricious and severe during the period leading up to the Civil War; authors and printers accordingly “often contented themselves with placing their initials in the imprints” (Plomer 8). Title pages thus staged a paradoxical drama of typographic association wherein the use of initials both subverted and standardized the construction of anonymity, identity, and authority. Marcy L. North underscores the usefulness of print for those who sought anonymity:

What print did offer to anonymity was dissemination: it multiplied the number of texts available in which a reader might see the conventions of anonymity and the variations and patterns of naming …. Authors and book producers who sought to conceal names inevitably found themselves using the title page for both its liquidity and its standardization, whichever characteristic promised to work best for their purposes. (67)

Milton himself anonymously published the first version of The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce. The title page of the second edition (1644) represents the author only as J. M., although he did sign his full name in the letter to Parliament...
prefatory to his text (Sirluck 140–42). Such gestures on the page, of course, reveal Milton's wariness about licensing “well before he wrote Areopagitica” in November, 1644 (Shawcross, Self and World 31–32). Those concerns would soon be realized by increasing governmental scrutiny, as Milton was subsequently summoned, in December, to appear before the Committee for Printing and the Westminster Assembly (Parker, Biography 1: 262–66). However, while our research here touches upon the politics of licensing (Plant 17–58), censorship (Achinstein 1–22), and anonymity (North 56–116) within the larger context of print culture in seventeenth-century England (Bennett 1–66), a more thorough engagement with those topics vis-à-vis Milton’s entire career reaches beyond the scope of this essay.

II

According to the STC, the Thomason Tracts, and the EEB Tract Supplements, George Miller was a printer active in London from as early as 1625 (e.g. The fire of the sanctuarie newly vncouered by Cornelius Burges) until his death in 1646 (e.g. The last conflicts and death of Mr. Thomas Peacock by Robert Bolton). Miller was the son of a Northampton schoolmaster, and in 1604 began a seven-year apprenticeship with Richard Field, successor to Thomas Vautrollier, the renowned Huguenot printer. Field’s father, a resident of Stratford-upon-Avon, had been appointed to evaluate the property of John Shakespeare, father of William Shakespeare. Shakespeare had his own connection with Richard Field, who published Venus and Adonis and The Rape of Lucrece (Plomer 10). Field married Jaklyn (Jacqueline), Vautrollier’s widow, and took over his printing shop, said to be one of the best businesses in London (McKerrow, Dictionary 102). Field prospered, serving as Master of the Stationers’ Company in 1619 and 1622. One of Miller’s fellow apprentices was Richard Badger (like Field, a Stratford man). After Field died in 1624, Miller and Badger purchased his printing business. By 1630, Badger had left Miller and had his own print shop (Plomer 10). Miller continued the business, using the same printer’s device, the famous Anchora Spei (i.e., Anchor of Hope) preferred by Vautrollier and Field (McKerrow, Devices 171). Miller himself died shortly before October 8, 1646, when his will was probated. In it, Miller bequeathed his business to his son: “I give to my sonne Abraham the lease of my house in the Blackfriars with the letter and presses copies and all other utensils belonginge to the printinge house to enter all these immediately after my decease” (Plomer 128).

Miller had close ties to men of varying opinions. Published materials between 1642 and 1646 directly link G. M. [George Miller] to Herbert Palmer, William Lee, the author of An Answer, and Joseph Caryl, as well as to Giles Calvert. Between 1644 and 1645, G. M. printed “for Th. Underhill at the Bible in Woodstreet” (Palmer 2) three texts authored by Herbert Palmer: Memorials of godlinesse and Christianitie. Part I. Of making religion ones businesse (1644); The glasse of Gods providence (1644); and An endeavor of making the principles of religion, namely the Creed, the Ten commandments, the Lords prayer, and the Sacraments, plaine and easie (1645). Palmer, a Puritan divine and member of the Westminster Assembly, had preached often in Parliament. In The glasse of Gods providence, a sermon delivered on August 13, 1644—“a speciall and peculiar day of Humiliation” (1)—Palmer attacked “ungodly toleration pleaded for under pretence of liberty of conscience” (2) and singled-out Milton’s first divorce tract: “a wicked booke is abroad and uncensured,
though *deserving to be burnt*, whose *Author* hath been so *impudent* as to *set his Name*
to it, and *dedicate it to yourselves*” (Palmer 57; Sirluck 103; Lewalski 178–79). G. M.
printed Palmer’s sermon by order of the House of Commons (Palmer 1), which
suggests a larger role for Miller on behalf of governmental directives to supervise
and, when necessary, curb a vigorous print culture. As Plomer observes, until
1637 the Star Chamber had permitted only twenty printers; after that date, there
was a veritable explosion of printers, publishers, and pamphlets (12).

In March 1642/43, Parliament authorized the Committee of Examinations
“to appoint searchers for presses employed in printing scandalous and lying pam-
phlets” (Plomer 13). The searchers, prominent members of the Stationers’ Com-
pany, included George Miller and William Lee, the publisher (in 1644) of *An
Answer*. Miller and Lee might have been selected once more—this time in late
August 1644—to find suspect authors and printing businesses, and thereby could
have played additional parts in the assaults against Milton’s first divorce tract. In
response to a petition (the text of which has been lost) from the Stationers’ Com-
pany to the House of Commons on August 24, 1644, the House referred the
appeal, on August 26, to its own Committee for Printing with directions for the
preparation of an ordinance “diligently to inquire out the Authors, Printers and
Publishers of the Pamphlet[s] against the Immortality of the Soul [i.e. Richard
Overton’s *Mans mortallitie* (1643)], and concerning Divorce” (Sirluck 142; Lewalski
179, 598 n90). If the printer (i.e. G. M.) of both Palmer’s *The glasse of Gods provi-
dence* and the anonymously authored *An Answer* was indeed George Miller, then—
given Miller’s affiliation with Palmer, Lee, Caryl, Calvert and perhaps others hos-
tile towards Milton’s argument for divorce—he might have been one of the
searchers chosen to “inquire out” John Milton, who had anonymously authored
the first edition of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*.

From his shop at “the Turks-Head in Fleetstreet, next to the Miter Taverne”
(*An Answer* 2), G. M. printed two texts for William Lee: *The trve Protestant sovldier*
by François Monginot (1642); and *An Answer* (1644). However, it cannot be
shown definitively that the William Lee who served Parliament as a searcher
(March 1642/43) and the William Lee who published *An Answer* were the same
man. Three men named William Lee (or Ley) completed apprenticeships and took
up their freedom between 1601 and 1637 (Plomer 115). Any of these men could
have been the William Lee who was appointed with George Miller to discover
printing businesses that were disseminating scandalous materials. Plomer records
bookshops of William Lee (or Ley) at Paul’s Chain, 1640–46; at Fleet Street, signe
of the Golden Buck, 1621–52; at Turk’s Head in Fleet Street, 1627–65; and in
Lombard Street, 1623–65. In 1659, William Lee of Lombard Street was Master of
the Stationers’ Company (Plomer 115).

The person whose identity is certain and who provides the most important
key to G. M.’s identity is Joseph Caryl, licenser of *An Answer*. Caryl (1602–73) was
an Independent minister and preacher at Lincoln’s Inn from 1643 through 1647.
He wrote a massive commentary on the Book of Job—*An exposition with practical
observations upon the three first chapters of the book of Iob* (1643) printed by G[eorge]miller—and frequently preached sermons to members of the Long Parliament,
the Rump Parliament, and the Protectorate. His fast sermons to Parliament often
contained brief, ingenious pleas for Toleration. He served as a Representative of
London at the Westminster Assembly, and was appointed a licenser for religious
works on January 14, 1643, “a task he performed assiduously” (Greaves 1: 128).
His commendation for the licensing of *An Answer* provides one example of his zeal:

To preserve the strength of the Mariage-bond and the Honour of that estate, against those sad breaches and dangerous abuses of it, which common discon[st]ents (on this side Adultery) are likely to make in un-staied minds and men given to change, by taking in or grounding themselves upon the opinion answered, and with good reason confuted in this Treatise, I have approved the printing and publishing of it. (Parker, *Contemporary* 170; Lewalski 179)

To take such a stand was not unusual; licensers were seldom neutral. For example, James Cranford, one of the other licensers in divinity, not only authorized Thomas Edwards’ *Gangraena* (1645), but also wrote a lavish preface for it (Johns 236). Licensers, moreover, could not ride roughshod over booksellers, printers, writers, and readers, but had to maintain an alliance with all of them in order to ensure the success of their offices (Johns 240).

Joseph Caryl’s work as licenser, preacher, and author first led us to identify G. M. as George Miller. Milton suspected Caryl of being not only the licenser but also the author of *An Answer*, if only by way of revision (Parker, *Biography* 1: 279–80). William Parker (*Contemporary* 51) even proposed that the same individual who had written the anonymous *The transproser rehears’d* (1673), which attacks Andrew Marvell, had also penned the anonymous *Answer*. Parker later changed his view, however, and the tract’s anonymity unchallenged (*Biography* 1: 276–82). G. M. printed five works that were authored by Joseph Caryl and published for Giles Calvert: *Davids prayer for Solomon* (1643); *The saints thankfull acclamation at Christs resumption of his great power and the initials of his kingdome* (1644); *Heaven and earth embracing; or, God and man approaching* (1646); *Ioy out-joyed: or, joy in overcoming evil spirits and evil men, overcome by better joy* (1646); and *Englands plus ultra* (1646). Four of these texts were licensed to be sold by Giles Calvert “at the signe of the Black-spread-Eagle at the west end of Pauls” (Caryl 1). Caryl also authored *The arraign-ment of unbelief* (1645), which was printed by G. Miller for Calvert at the same location. Calvert was one of the two “most eminent Quaker publishers” in London between 1635 and 1681 (Mack 190). Maureen Bell argues that his sympathies, “insofar as they can be deduced at all from his publishing, lay with radicalism” (8). Calvert’s shop at the Black-spread-Eagle was the favorite gathering place of Ranters and other radical sectarians. In the 1640s, Calvert published and sold works by: John Saltmarsh (a republican); William Dell (a university man and Ranter adherent); Hugh Peters and John Cook (later executed as regicides); Isaac Penington the younger; the Leveller William Walwyn; Gerrard Winstanley; Jakob Boehme; and Hendrik Niclaes, founder of the Family of Love (Bell 8–9; Hill 96–97; Norbrook 67).

These texts authored by Joseph Caryl and published and sold by Giles Calvert identify the printer by the initials G. M. and also as G. Miller. We have also discovered one record in *EEBO* that positively establishes “George Miller” as the printer of another tract licensed by Joseph Caryl: *Christ’s submission to His Fathers will. Set forth in a sermon preached at Thrapston in Northampton-shire* (1644) by Nicholas Estwick, “Imprimatur Joseph Caryl … printed by George Miller dwelling in Black-Friers” (1). Our claim also rests upon further evidence from records that
positively identify G. M. as George Miller. EEBO lists 248 citations (between 1620 and 1686) for works “printed by G. M.” Although the same printer’s license may have been used by Abraham Miller after his father’s death, at least one dozen of these entries name G. M. as “G. M[iller],” including the following two texts: The rule of faith; or, An exposition of the Apostles Creed by Nicholas Byfield (1620); and The whole book of Psalms: collected into English meter by Thomas Sternhold, John Hopkins, and others (1660). Furthermore, a keyword search of EEBO for “printed by George Miller” yields 128 citations between 1625 and 1646, including at least one text published in 1626 that identifies “G. M.” as “George Miller”: The dignitie of chivalrie by William Gouge “Printed by G[eorge] M[iller] for Ralph Mab” (1). A second listing in EEBO for this same work by Gouge explicitly credits “George Miller” as the printer: “The dignitie of chivalrie by Gouge, William, 1578-1653. London: Printed by George Miller, 1626” (1). One anomalous record lists “G. M.” as the printer for a bookseller by the name of “George Miller”: The Kings chronicle in two sections (1643) by Ezekias Woodward. This is the only citation, in our findings, that names George Miller as a bookseller.

We have also discovered, through EEBO, material evidence that directly links G. M. and George Miller to the printing of the anonymous An Answer as well as to publications by Palmer and by Caryl for Calvert. As previously discussed, Miller inherited from Vautrollier and Field the Anchora Spei printer’s device. McKerrow observes six versions of this particular device (#164, 170, 192, 195, 210, and 233), all of which were transferred from Vautrollier to Field, then to Miller and Badger in 1624. When Miller and Badger dissolved their partnership in 1630, “all these devices passed to Miller alone” (Devices 171). After 1630, the Anchor of Hope, which Miller seems to have used somewhat sparingly in the 1640s, would thus signify publications from his business alone. For example, in 1644—the year in which An Answer was published—George Miller printed sixteen works, at least two of which bear, on their title pages, the distinctive Anchor of Hope: A commentarie of Master Doctor Martin Luther upon the epistle of S. Paul to the Galathians by Martin Luther; and the Estwick text (noted above) that was licensed by Caryl, Christ’s submission to His Fathers will.

The first of these two documents, A commentarie of Master Doctor Martin Luther, also proved central to our research. This work (printed by “George Miller”) not only carries the Anchora Spei, but also bears the exact tail-piece device—an elaborate fleur-de-lis crest within a larger ornament—that appears on the final page of An Answer (printed by “G. M.”). This same tail-piece also appears in Joseph Caryl’s Davids prayer for Solomon (1643) printed by “G. M.” for Giles Calvert.

There is further material evidence from the pamphlets. The ornament set immediately above the beginning of the text of An Answer—a fleur-de-lis flanked respectively by alternating crowned and uncrowned thistles and roses—serves an identical placement and purpose in at least three key publications: Palmer’s The glasse of Gods providence (1644) printed by “G. M.”; Caryl’s Heaven and earth embracing (1646) printed by “G. M.” for Calvert; and Estwick’s Christ’s submission to His Fathers will (1644), which bears the Anchor of Hope on the title page and provides the following record of the text’s licensing and printing, “Imprimatur Joseph Caryl … printed by George Miller dwelling in Black-Friers” (1).

There have been other attempts to identify G. M. In the original STC II, Wing provisionally named the printer of An Answer as “G[eorge] M[iller],” but
that reference has been omitted from EEBO. Moreover, neither the STC nor EEBO identifies George Miller as the G. M. who printed Palmer’s *The glasse of Gods providence*. John Shawcross names “G[eorge] M[oule]” as the printer of *An Answer* (“Survey” 297). Since there are no listings in EEBO for a George Moule, however, we can neither confirm nor deny his existence as a printer. David Masson (4: 246–47) and William Parker (*Biography* 2: 975–76) mention “G[regory] Moule” as one of two booksellers who marketed the 1650 edition of Milton’s *Eikonoklastes*. The title page of that tract reads, in part: “Eikonoklestes in answer to a book intitl’d Eikon basilike the portrature His Sacred Majesty in his solitudes and sufferings … Printed by T.N. and … to be sold by Tho. Brewster and G. Moule” (1). Gregory Moule was a bookseller in London at Three Bibles in the Poultry, under St. Mildred’s Church, during the years 1649–51. With his partner, Thomas Brewster, he published theological, political, and miscellaneous literature (Plomer 133). A search in EEBO for “G. Moule” yields seven entries, all for a bookseller in association with Thomas Brewster; these records range from 1649 (e.g. *A brief discourse about baptisme* by Thomas Moore, Sr.) to 1654 (e.g. *The faithful counsellor, or, The marrow of the law in English* by William Sheppard). A keyword search for “Gregory Moule” likewise yields entries for a bookseller in association with Thomas Brewster during the years 1649–51. It seems unlikely that Milton would engage, for the sale (in 1650) of *Eikonokletes*, the same individual who had (in 1644) printed two challenges against the first edition of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. Still, circumstances change, and Thomas Brewster, along with Giles Calvert and Henry Hills, was official printer to the Council of State from the accession of Cromwell until the end of 1653 (Plomer 32). Although Gregory Moule remains a candidate to be the G. M. who printed Palmer’s *The glasse of Gods providence* and the anonymously authored *An Answer*, that likelihood is diminished by the fact that there are no entries in EEBO for Moule prior to 1649, and no entries for Gregory Moule as a printer.

III

We have tried to maintain a skeptical distance from our findings, given the difficulty of determining with absolute certainty relationships between and among authors, licensers, publishers, printers, and booksellers in the seventeenth century. However, the pattern of evidence that we have presented here suggests strongly (if not conclusively) that George Miller was the G. M. who printed both *The glasse of Gods providence* and *An Answer*.

The fact that G. M. printed both attacks on Milton remains open to interpretation. Elizabeth Eisenstein (1979) claimed that printers in seventeenth-century England endorsed the ideas contained within the works they produced; Robert Darnton (1982), on the contrary, reached the conclusion that printers were neutral businessmen. G. M., the printer of both hostile tracts on Milton’s *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, may have been indifferent to the content of the works, simply providing a commercial service; or G. M. might have felt ambivalent about ascribing his complete identity to these challenges against Milton’s first argument for divorce. Or, like Giles Calvert, G. M. may have printed these assaults because of his own involvement in public debates about marital and divorce laws (Friest 87). Calvert was clearly a niche publisher closely affiliated with the radical authors he promoted. George Miller had a much larger and more diverse business, so the
case is more tenuous for his direct involvement with criticism against Milton’s argument for reform.

However, because both The glasse of Gods providence and An Answer were printed by the same man, G. M., it is possible to speculate that there was a coordinated attack upon Milton by individuals who had different reasons for opposing the first edition of The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce. As Stephen Dobranski has shown, writing and publishing were often “collaborative processes” (26). Between 1644 and 1645 Thomas Underhill used George Miller to print three sermons by Herbert Palmer, a Presbyterian who rejected Toleration; but Miller also worked extensively with Calvert, publisher of the most radical writers in London. Although these radicals, such as John Saltmarsh and Henry Burton, might have agreed (at least in principle) with Milton’s call for domestic liberty—including a desacramentalized and private concept of marriage—many, like the Quakers, advocated “hostility toward all ungodly sects [together with] a strictly literalist reading of Scripture” (Howard 190–91). They might well have rejected Milton’s contention in The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce that Christ “meant not to be taken word for word” (CPW 2: 283). In Tetrachordon, Milton asks his critics to follow the rule of Charity (CPW 2: 584–85) and to accept his capacious (even metaphorical) reinterpretation of key passages from Genesis, Deuteronomy, Matthew, and 1 Corinthians. Throughout Colasterion, he mocks literal-minded readers, who might include the less educated among Independents, Quakers, and radical sectarians.

Milton’s idealized view of political pamphlet warfare is perhaps best expressed in Areopagitica (November 1644), when he celebrates London as a “City of refuge, the mansion house of liberty,” where writers of all sorts are “musing, searching, revolving new notions and idea’s wherewith to present, as with their homage and their fealty the approaching Reformation: others as fast reading, trying all things, assenting to the force of reason and convincement” (CPW 2: 553–54). Between 1640 and 1642, in fact, the publication of books and pamphlets in England increased ninety-fold (Hill 95). David Cressy determined that, by 1640, thirty percent of the total male population in south-east England and ten percent of the female population could write (Literacy and the Social Order, Tables 6.1–6.5). According to her studies of different social groups in East Anglia and of the Protestation Returns of 1642, Margaret Spufford estimated that “there was at the very least a reading public of 30 percent of men in the second half of the seventeenth century” (45). Those observations have recently been reviewed by Keith Thomas (1986), Margaret Ferguson (1988), and Eve Sanders (1998), who maintain that levels of reading-literacy were markedly higher than those of signature-literacy. The revolution in print culture was not exclusively for the literate, however, as Christopher Hill notes: pamphlets and newsbooks “were read aloud in alehouses, in marketplaces, and in the Army” (95). Within this vigorous atmosphere that would seem to embrace the “industry of free reasoning” (2 Works 3: 368) praised so highly by the first edition of The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, Milton may have been deeply surprised, disappointed, and angered to find himself swiftly assailed from all sides in 1644—from radical dissenters as well as from Independents and Presbyterians—for advocating domestic liberty and the reform of marital and divorce laws in accordance with a capacious belief in “the defenders of Charity” (2 Works 3: 377).
NOTES

1 This essay emerges from collaborative research and writing preparatory to a casebook under contract and forthcoming from Duquesne University Press, *John Milton's Divorce Tracts: Texts and Contexts*, by Sara J. van den Berg (Saint Louis University) and W. Scott Howard (University of Denver). The volume will collect and introduce Milton’s complete writings on divorce and significant published responses to his arguments between 1644 and 1969. The authors wish to thank Elizabeth Freebairn (Newberry Library), Peggy Keeran and Michael Levine-Clark (Penrose Library, University of Denver) for their assistance with archival materials. Sara van den Berg acknowledges with thanks the support of a Summer Stipend from the National Endowment for the Humanities, and Scott Howard acknowledges with gratitude a grant from the Faculty Research Fund, University of Denver.
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