

But witchcraft trials continued in Germany and Jesuits continued to minister to suspected witches in prison. In Chapter 7, Sobiech shows how Spee's criticisms infiltrated the Society's opinions on witchcraft trials over the rest of the seventeenth and much of the eighteenth centuries, if not always in a smooth fashion; in Chapter 8, he reports how Spee became reconciled to the Society posthumously through attempts to give him official commemoration. Sobiech ends Chapter 7, however, with an extraordinary example of the text's continuing importance. In 1939, a new German translation of *Cautio Criminalis* by Joachim-Friedrich Ritter was published with blurb quoting a review in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* noting its contemporary significance. That contemporary significance was the criminal trial in Munich of Walter Hildmann for stating that "the state of today is less interested in justice than it is in power" (351–352).

The final part of Sobiech's book summarises significant elements of the preceding chapters and offers some suggestions for further research. That some of the summary could have gone in the relevant chapters is fundamentally an editorial issue rather than a criticism of the argument. The scholarship is impressive as is the use of the Society's *Annuae*, and there is much to learn about Friedrich Spee and Jesuit prison ministry that enriches our knowledge of witchcraft experience in early modern Germany. Sobiech has also opened up an area of scholarship that should be extended to the Jesuits' Upper German province and, in keeping with Sobiech's multidisciplinary approach, will reinvigorate the history of the Jesuits in their German provinces, the intellectual history of witchcraft in Germany and, potentially, the history of incarceration in the early modern period.

Thomas Festa and David Ainsworth, eds. *Locating Milton: Places and Perspectives*. Clemson, SC: Clemson University Press, 2021. x + 231 pp. + 8 illus. \$120. Review by JASON A. KERR, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY.

The essays in this book emerge (in expanded form) from the 2017 Conference on John Milton held in Birmingham, Alabama—the first time that the conference was held at a site other than its birthplace

in Murfreesboro, Tennessee. The collection continues a tradition of such volumes, with most of the earlier entries edited by conference founders Charles W. Durham and Kristin A. Pruitt. I understand that a similar volume drawing on the 2019 conference (also in Birmingham) is underway; it remains to be seen whether the 2022 conference in St. Louis will produce one.

As with most volumes of selected conference proceedings, the essays vary widely in content, and any attempt to marshal them around a single, central theme taxes the inventiveness of the volume editors. In this case, the subtitle, "Places and Perspectives," enables to editors to enlist the very diversity of the entries in the cause of challenging the image of an authoritative and unchanging Milton. The essays dealing in reception history prove especially fruitful to this end, especially Miklós Péti's essay on the reception of *Samson Agonistes* in socialist Hungary. Péti deftly pulls together reception histories in the American and British postwar left with the longer history of Hungarian Milton reception to show the complexities and contestations attendant on embracing Samson as a revolutionary hero. He also traces the dynamics of influence that crossed the Iron Curtain, as when a key early volume edited by Christopher Hill was translated into Hungarian, alongside Hungarian efforts to counter the pernicious effects of "bourgeois" critics like Douglas Bush and E. M. W. Tillyard. Péti rightly notes the incongruity of identifying the historical Milton as a socialist (he was no Gerrard Winstanley), and yet the popularity of *Samson Agonistes* among socialists and sympathizers (like William Carlos Williams) attests to the way that Milton's influence exceeds what can be established through what editor Thomas Festa calls "positivist epistemology and intentionalist interpretation" (7).

Essays by John Rumrich and Elizabeth Sauer both explore gaps between Milton's public self-presentation and documentary evidence from his life. Rumrich examines Milton's "night at the opera," referring to his attendance at *Chi soffre spera* in Rome on 27 February 1639 at the *palazzo* of Cardinal Barberini, who personally welcomed him. As Rumrich puts the question, "how did the thirty-year-old Milton come to spend Carnival at an opera in Rome among princes of a religion he considered false and mendacious?" (26). Rumrich proposes that the

answer has to do with point of tension that Milton leaves generally unacknowledged in his autobiographical passages—a tension between highly valued self-control and a profound personal susceptibility to music. The problem, in other words, is one of passion, a topic of noted ambivalence in Milton's oeuvre. Milton the man and Milton the author subtly diverge from each other, perhaps especially when Milton the author is writing about Milton the man.

Sauer's essay considers part of what she calls Milton's "bookscape," that is, the intellectual landscape mapped by the reading on evidence in his *Commonplace Book*. As an aside, Sauer relies on Ruth Mohl's edition of the *Commonplace Book* for the Yale Prose—as she had to in 2017—but in revising the essay has consulted William Poole's 2019 Oxford edition, alongside Poole's previously published scholarship on Milton's reading. Sauer pursues two inter-related theses: that being a "mental traveler in a bookscape" (49) made Milton a humanist and that "Milton often becomes someone else in his printed polemics" (54) than he appears to be in his *Commonplace Book*. To be a humanist meant reading promiscuously, and Milton's gathering of secular, pagan, and sacred sources under the same headings attests to this practice. But being a humanist also meant "digesting" what one read; so, although Milton manifestly read and made use of Machiavelli, he declined to name the influence in his published works. This example had me thinking about how, in *De Doctrina Christiana*, Milton declines to name Johannes Wolleb, the treatise's major interlocutor, generally preferring terms like "the Theologians" to more direct references. Again, Sauer's point is that self-fashioning can produce divergent results even in the same person.

Blurring Milton's place on the political spectrum is Clay Greene's essay about the anonymous 1714 poem *Praeexistence*. Greene begins on familiar historicist ground: noting the backdrop of the War of Spanish Succession and its role in forming the identities of England's Whig and Tory political parties while also making a case that the poem and its printer sit firmly on the Whig side. In this context, he reads the poem as correcting Milton's basically voluntarist (and therefore potentially tyrannical) God with a more rationalist one—an argument that leads him, again on familiar historicist ground,

to consider the poem's relationship to the Cambridge Platonists, those exponents of rational religion and the poem's eponymous doctrine of the soul's pre-existence. This historicist road results in an unexpected U-turn, however, as *Praeexistence* revises Henry More in ways that leave God finally inscrutable to disobedient humanity. At this point, the poem turns out to map uneasily onto the emerging distinction between early eighteenth-century "Miltons": the classicist Tory Milton and the republican-Dissenting Whig Milton. The possibility presents itself that *Praeexistence* is not a Whig poem at all, but a Tory satire of Whig values—perhaps. But the larger point is that it appeared in a moment when Milton's reception in England was heterogeneous in ways not reducible to the neat historicist categories the essay had begun by invoking.

One essay in the volume takes "place" very literally: Jameela Lares's "Milton for Mississippi." Rather than conceptually unsettle Milton's "place," as the essays described so far do, Lares documents a public Milton project that she undertook as the Charles W. Moorman Distinguished Professor of the Humanities at the University of Southern Mississippi. Her essay has a conceptual dimension, about which more in a moment, but largely it aims simply to describe her efforts and to report on their relative success, hoping to provide fodder for future public work on Milton by others. The conceptual aspects of place emerge obliquely, as Lares describes the various communities she is able to engage. Beyond English departments, where is Milton's "place"? Public radio stations, it turns out, and botanical museums, and various places on the internet, and more. Behind the essay's surface pragmatism, with its welcome plenitude of detail, lies a set of larger questions involving the place of the humanities not in America or the world more broadly, but in Hattiesburg, Mississippi. In a way, the pragmatism and detail offer a more hopeful response than more abstract ruminations on such questions often do.

Speaking of abstraction, at the heart of the volume are three essays on "Milton's Mathematical Models" by Matthew Dolloff, Christopher Koester, and D. Geoffrey Emerson. Dolloff and Koester cover similar conceptual territory, situating Milton amidst contemporary developments in the mathematics of infinity (or "indivisibles") by the likes of Torricelli and Wallis. Dolloff's essay centers Torricelli's

figure of “Gabriel’s Trumpet,” which has a finite volume and an infinite surface area, showing that the finite and the infinite can be in proportion to each other. At issue is the infinitude and intelligibility of Milton’s God. Dolloff distinguishes usefully between “negative” conceptions that can define infinity only as “not finite,” thinkable as potentiality rather than actuality, and “positive” conceptions that attend to actual infinities manifesting as extension, say, of a certain imagined “bridge of wondrous length” in *Paradise Lost* (2.1028). Ultimately, Milton engages both modes of thinking about infinity, showing clear debts to Aristotle while also hinting at awareness of the contemporary debates. Koester, working with similar materials (“Gabriel’s Horn” makes an appearance) argues for the influence of mathematical debates on Milton’s account of the Fall, holding that Adam chooses geometric oneness (love and connection) over arithmetic oneness (which depends on a sense of difference and distance between discrete entities). Between the two essays, the volume offers a good primer on seventeenth-century debates about the mathematics of infinity, with notes pointing interested readers to opportunities for deeper engagement.

Emerson’s essay operates in adjacent territory—the names of Galileo and Kepler connect all three essays—but to different ends. Rather than Milton’s engagement with mathematics, Emerson is interested in the ways that scientific writings use poetic tropes and narrative as means for inviting readers to think counterintuitively about cosmology. These literary modes thus serve as a point of continuity between overtly scientific texts and *Paradise Lost*: all traffic in simulation and kinds of scientific modeling. But whereas the scientific texts invoke multiple perspectives in service of stable models, Milton fixes perspectives less reliably (using the figure of Satan, for instance). The dizzying effects that result, argues Emerson, invite readers not only to participate in scientific modeling, but to think metacognitively about it. Milton models modeling.

As collections of essays drawn from a conference go, then, this volume is relatively coherent. Together, the essays invite readers (in the spirit of Emerson’s contribution) to think about the perspectives that produce the various models of Milton that populate our teaching and research—and then to consider not only alternative perspectives

but our very reliance on perspective in the first place. On that note, one might notice some perspectives not on evidence here, such as the emphasis on premodern race that has energized early modern studies in recent years. Even so, the volume puts forward a model that, far from precluding such work, opens space for the kinds of perspectival shifts that attend it. Beyond what the individual essays have to offer, the collection's conceptual framework is a welcome contribution to Milton studies.

Laura Gowing. *Ingenious Trade: Women and Work in Seventeenth-Century London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022. x + 275 pp. \$39.99. Review by JOSEPH P. WARD, UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY.

With this important new book, Laura Gowing compellingly expands our understanding of women's contributions to the preindustrial economy by demonstrating their ability to engage in formally recognized work outside the home. Largely focusing on the needle trades during the seventeenth century, she draws on a wide variety of archival, printed, and digital sources to demonstrate conclusively that women were highly capable of engaging independently in the economic life of the metropolis. Although she attends primarily to the experience of women, Gowing also sheds new light on daily life in London in ways that make this book essential reading for anyone interested in the society and culture of the early modern metropolis.

Gowing begins with a richly detailed chapter that reveals the prominent place of women in the manufacturing and distribution of high quality, fashionable clothing in shops located in the Royal Exchange. Working as both seamstresses and shopkeepers, women appear in archival records in several recognized economic roles, including as apprentices, shopkeepers, and tenants of shop stalls in their own right. Along the way, Gowing painstakingly reconstructs the social and economic connections among a subset of several dozen women, highlighting the ways in which kinship, apprenticeship, neighborhood, and executorship established and maintained durable networks of commercially active women.