

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 H. Anderson. *Light and Death: Figuration in Spenser, Kepler, Donne, Milton*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 2017. vii + 316 pages. \$65.00. Review by THOMAS P. ANDERSON, MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY.

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

Descartes. She argues that our own “modern framing” (83) separates “the concerns and methods of science and the imaginative arts and, more fundamentally, of things and words” (83). This tendency to view science as a narrative of progress that sheds the language of analogy and metaphor in its ever-more precise discovery pretends to “uproot without a trace” (83) the figurative language that had once been at the deep, psychological and imaginative core of scientific discourse and discovery. In the book’s fourth chapter “Connecting the Cultural Dots: Classical to Modern Traditions of Analogy,” Anderson offers a robust account of how scientific discourse redefines its own analogical practice to exclude other disciplines such as literature, philosophy, and religion. Focusing on the work of psychologists Dedre Gentner and Michael Jeziorski, Anderson shows how modern scientific frames altered the structure of analogy by stressing the structural content (79), a distinction that Anderson argues oversimplifies imaginative language, casting early modern analogy as “*mere* metaphor” (80).

The book’s fourth chapter is not only a trenchant critique of the transition in the way western culture accounted for the figure of analogy, but it also works diligently to present an alternative understanding of its function in scientific discourse. Anderson rehabilitates a classical understanding of analogy by exploring three essays in the history of science journal *Isis*. The articles by Katharine Park, Lorraine Daston, and Peter Galison all explore the force of the imaginative analogy in early modern science. This kind of deep engagement with historians and philosophers of science often gets relegated to the footnotes in literary analysis, but Anderson insists on its centrality to her argument for the “elusiveness of definitive difference between a rhetorical, psychological, and epistemological technique of analogy” within what we now tend to see as distinct systems of thought (90). Anderson’s work in the fourth chapter does not end, however, on contemporary scientific terrain; she turns back to Aristotle, and then Boethius, and then Aquinas to show that early modern scientists, even as they avoided transcendent metaphysics in their method and logic, do not “establish the absence of metaphor” from their practices (107).

The fourth chapter of *Light and Death* will unsettle some literary scholars (me) because of the demands it places on its audience (me). Yet, it is the book’s vital chapter, serving as the pivot between the

imaginative spaces occupied by darkness and light, death and life. Anderson locates her readers on more comfortable terrain in the book's other six chapters—a chapter on Spenser and Donne together, one on Spenser, one on Kepler, another on Donne, and two chapters on Milton. In the end, Anderson renders sensitive, surprising, and brilliant readings of the most canonical and widely-taught literature of the early modern period. These chapters gain in impact in their relation to the book's fourth chapter. Its demands on the reader are worth it.

Defining analogy as “*the* connector of the known to the unknown, the sensible to the subsensible and infinite” (5), Anderson organizes the first three chapters on Donne, Spenser and Milton on the perception of death—its “figuration” (3). In these chapters, Anderson unfolds the several ways death, as allegory or analogy, is represented in these poets' major works. In the final three chapters on Kepler, Donne and Milton, Anderson shifts from death and darkness to light. Anderson links Kepler's and Donne's analogical thinking through their use of the word “proportion.” As a word and concept key to Kepler's writings about optics and vision, Donne uses it over a dozen times in the *Anniversaries*, which for Anderson, signals his investment in “confident, constructive analogy” (12). According to Anderson, “the very physicality of death, captured in analogy, enables redemption” (12).

The book's final chapter, “Milton's Twilight Zone: Analogy, Light, and Darkness in *Paradise Lost*,” is at times breathtaking. Anderson's excellence as a close-reader is on full display in her analysis of the poem's many epic similes, which she claims are “fundamentally analogical” (186). The chapter explores the different effects of analogies from the poem's many characters, the poem's narrator, and Milton himself. In the end, Anderson argues that the force of analogy in Milton's epic resides in its form. She writes, “Form is what shapes, distinguishes, and actualizes a thing. Associated with essence in Milton's thinking, it is real” (216). Here, readers may hear the echo of Anderson's earlier work on the sacrament from *Translating Investments: Metaphor and the Dynamic of Cultural Change in Tudor-Stuart England* (2005). She insists on the force of an analogy that does not represent real presence but instead is an assertion of faith. Suggesting how the analogical in Milton connects the known to the unknown, Anderson writes, “Analogy connects cognition with rhetoric, God's creation with the poet's,

and both of these with darkness and light” (225). In what feels like a definitive account of the poem’s movement from the darkness of books one and two to light in book three and after, Anderson shows how this transition is also a movement into uncertain knowledge. In Anderson’s account of analogy, Milton’s movement from dark to light is as much about optics as symbolism. According to Anderson, the relational function of analogy in Milton, and in early modern scientific and literary discourse more broadly, “is neutral with respect to content, as the greater materiality of twilight, for example, is not, yet both serve in their own ways to mediate extremes and opposites” (214).

Like one of Milton’s famous epic similes, Anderson’s *Light and Death* is richer and more complex with every re-reading. The impact of either work—a Miltonic simile or Anderson’s book—inheres in content to be sure, but as Anderson shows her readers, impact is a product of form too, and scholars of early modern literature, history, religion or science will value the impact of the thoughtful, indeed formal, complexity of *Light and Death*.

Igor Djordjevic. *King John (Mis)Remembered: The Dunmow Chronicle, the Lord Admiral’s Men, and the Formation of Cultural Memory*. Farnham, Surrey, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015. xi + 204 pp. \$112.00. Review by DANIEL L. KEEGAN, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF SHARJAH (UAE).

Igor Djordjevic has produced a fascinating work of literary and cultural history, one centered around the sort of discovery that “any researcher in the early modern period dreams of, yet seldom finds” (6). In *King John (Mis)Remembered*, Djordjevic recalculates the trajectory of John’s posthumous reputation, especially as it intersects with a shadowy document called “the Dunmow Chronicle” and with the figure of Robin Hood (or, Djordjevic might have more accurately said, with that of Maid Marian). Djordjevic locates this intersection in the hothouse of theatrical and dramatic competition between the Lord Admiral’s and the Lord Chamberlain’s Men at the end of London’s sixteenth century. Djordjevic’s study will be essential reading for anyone interested in the historiographic, theatrical, literary, and