first line of its text, its language, its genre, its author (when known), its addressee, its date, its handwriting, and notes about its scribe. Using this database, he can tell us 37% is in verse, 9% is private letters, and 7% is official letters; and 82% is in English. Would that Manchester University Press had included a digital form of this database as part of the edition, so that others could continue the analysis.

Redford’s transcriptions are accurate though not without error: his item 452 is a letter, probably from Wotton to Donne, whose first line is transcribed “Right Honorable Lord: It may seem strang to you that ...” but actually reads “Right. Ho: L: It may seeme strang to y’ Ho: that ...” (fol. 300v). (Evelyn Simpson also makes this same error in *A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne* [1948, 335].) Redford furthermore claims the *Donne Variorum* fails to cite a variant reading in line 17 of the Burley’s witness of Donne’s elegy “To his Mistress going to Bed,” when it clearly does: while the copy text’s “safely” is recorded in 22 witnesses, the rest of the 67 collated manuscripts read “softly” as designated in the textual apparatus by Σ, among whom is LR1 (the Burley Ms.). Still Redford’s edition of this fascinating manuscript is a welcome contribution to scholarship of the period.


While the travels of early modern British men and women beyond their nation’s shores have been addressed by a range of researchers in recent decades, the efforts of those who chose instead to examine their native lands have been less well documented. John Cramsie’s *British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain* is the most thorough effort yet to tackle this question. It is concerned with the knowledge that such travellers accumulated, and the ways in which they went about their research. In particular, it pursues an argument that these writers perceived Britain as “multicultural” (6), not just in the model of the “three kingdoms,” which has been dominant in recent seventeenth-century historiography, but also down to much more local levels. When these people travelled, they saw not sameness but “cultural
The book is structured into three parts, each of which is centred upon one key figure in the history of “the encounter with Britain.” In the first part this man is John Leland. This is the most logically organized of the book’s parts, with a chapter on Leland framed by a valuable opening chapter on the motivations behind travel at the outset of the early modern era, and later chapters on “Leland’s Scottish counterparts” (14) and the early efforts of chorographers, such as William Harrison, John Stow and William Lambarde, in the reign of Elizabeth. The material on Scotland, in particular, is fresh and engaging, demonstrating a parallel—and, in intriguing ways, interconnected—tradition of national description in this nation in the decades before the accession of James VI and I to the English throne.

The second section is centred on Fynes Moryson, a traveller most active in the early seventeenth century who has never had the level of attention that he warrants, and certainly not for his descriptions of Britain. Indeed his most valuable work on Britain was never published, apparently on account of a lack of interest from publishers. Other chapters in this section associate other writers, of roughly the same period, with what Cramsie defines as the same general project established by Moryson. Through this lens Cramsie approaches, among others, Thomas Churchyard, James Howell, William Brereton, and John Taylor. He even includes men, including Richard Carew and George Owen, whose descriptions stretched no further than the boundaries of their native counties. (While these county chorographers produced some of the most compelling descriptive writing of the period, they stretch Cramsie’s underlying concern with “travel” in ways he might have done more to examine.) Overall this proves to be an interesting yet in truth somewhat miscellaneous group. Cramsie tends to describe them as Moryson and his “stand-ins,” yet there is really very little sense in which they themselves appreciated their work in this way.

The third section is centred not so much on William Camden as on the long-term project of his Britannia, as it unfolded over more than one hundred years. Others have examined the development of this book from its first Latin edition in the 1580s through to the English translation of the “final” substantial folio edition of 1610. British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain is not greatly interested in
this process, though it is notably strong in its careful interpretation of Camden’s representation of a land being formed through the influence of multiple cultures and civilisations. Crucially, it attends to the development of the *Britannia*, effectively as a multi-authored text, at the latter end of the seventeenth century. A number of men were involved in this project, including the best known, Edmund Gibson, along with fascinating figures such as the Scot Timothy Pont and the Welshman Edward Lhuyd. The distinguishing feature of this process of revision was the effort to approach the research in a systematic way, most notably through the use of questionnaires, completed as the travellers entered any new settlement. The gathering of knowledge, and hence the ways of understanding places and their histories, had changed substantially since the time of Camden himself.

The book is rich in its information and enlightening in its attention to some lesser-known figures. But the structure is not without its problems. Fundamentally the reader is struck by just how disparate a group of people—who resist comparison as much as they appear to invite it—Cramsie gathers together. For instance, claiming Moryson as somehow definitive of a movement, complete with “stand-ins,” is never entirely convincing, whereas following the *Britannia* over more than a century has the effect of grouping together men in different times with different interests. Another effect of this method are the “why not?” questions that it invites. Most notably in this regard, his collection of significant authors is exclusively learned and male, and this focus causes the elision of parallel traditions of writing that were equally sensitive to cultural differences, despite maybe appearing more frivolous in their motivations. Celia Fiennes, one of the most engaging of seventeenth-century travel writers, warrants only one passing mention.

The book’s method is solidly based on description of material that will not be well known. Cramsie is uncomfortable with what he perceives as the “highly theorized” approaches of literary scholars, which seems unfortunate given the fact that his book’s argument has so much to offer them. Cramsie’s engagement with theories of cultural—and racial, another term which lurks fascinatingly at the margins of his research—identity is sketchy, largely confined to a survey in the introduction, and this leaves the conceptual development of his
argument somewhat limited. Moreover, it is not unrealistic to expect historians, in an age of interdisciplinarity, to engage with questions of form, genre and tone, all of which would have made a difference to this book. Cramsie has little to offer to ongoing debates about the politics of chorography, nor does he question how and why the idiosyncratic Moryson departs from that genre. Moryson’s failure to find an audience is curious given the wealth of information that his work contains, and begs questions about the ways in which his work was packaged and received. To take another example, Churchyard’s work is quite differently positioned in its tone—and hence in its imagined audience—by contrast with Camden’s; so how does this lend shape to the respective texts’ representations of the British nations and their many cultures? Taylor, who jokingly differentiated his populist and commercial project from that of the chorographers, also sits uneasily here, and Cramsie looks only at a very small selection of his work. *British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain* is a very long book. At one point Cramsie reflects that it rather got out of hand, the final section expanding exponentially from his initial intention. Research works like that sometimes, yet it seems to me that tough decisions about the book’s purpose were dodged along the way, by author and editors alike. As a description of relatively unknown material, the book works well enough, and some readers may appreciate the lengthy quotes and outlines of the contents and interests of relatively under-studied works. For Moryson, or for the late seventeenth-century effort to revise the *Britannia*, this book deserves to become the first port of call for researchers for many years to come. But this book is driven also by an important argument about early modern understandings of nationhood, and this is somewhat swamped by the sheer weight of evidence. I suspect that many of the people who should engage with this book’s arguments will not persevere with it, and that is unfortunate. It would have been more effective if it had been no more than half its eventual length.

Cramsie closes his book with a reflection on the politics of the national history syllabus in British schools. This is compelling and passionate, but feels misplaced at the end of such a doggedly scholarly book, otherwise speaking to an international audience for decades to come. It might have been better placed, reaching a wider and more
relevant audience, as an article in a relevant British educational journal. For the reader of *British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain*, however, it offers a final reminder of the strengths and weaknesses of Cramsie’s project. This is a copious and capacious study, packed with information and detail, and underpinned by a powerful and admirable commitment to the material and topic. Yet its length will stretch its readers, and as a result the book may not achieve the impact it deserves.


Judith Anderson’s *Light and Death: Figuration in Spenser, Kepler, Donne, Milton* is a wonderfully complex book. The author fills the book with complex close readings about analogy, metaphor and meaning in the poetry and prose from five of the most canonical early modern writers. Anderson explores complex early modern scientific discourse with rare depth and curiosity, and she shapes her audience’s reading experience with a complex structure to her own book, which seeks to replicate Anderson’s own process of the discovery that analogy is at the very core of both scientific and poetic discourse in the early modern period.

There is no ready and easy way to make sense of Anderson’s argument in *Light and Death*. The book concludes provocatively that “analogy arguably vies in importance with the introduction into Western culture of the mathematical sign zero” (226). By tracing its point of origin to early modernity, the link between poetic and scientific discourse posed by Anderson effectively denaturalizes the perceived dichotomy between science and the humanities. The book’s argument, therefore, has important implications across a university—and perhaps outside of a university as communities continue to establish values predicated on a two-culture mythology that pits scientific against humanistic inquiry.

At the core of Anderson’s argument is a reading of analogy or analogical thinking from Aristotle inherited by Bacon, Galileo, and