

Peter Redford, ed. *The Burley Manuscript*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017. xiii + 447 pp. £90.00. Review by DONALD R. DICKSON, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

In the 1879 report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, Alfred J. Horwood brought to the attention of the scholarly world the existence of a seventeenth-century manuscript miscellany in the possession of the Finch family at Burley-on-the-Hill, noting that it contained “copies of letters seemingly by and to Sir Henry Wotton.” Logan Pearsall Smith then made considerable use of it for his edition of *The Life and Letters of Henry Wotton* (Oxford, 1907) at which time a transcript of the Donne-Wotton portions was made. Herbert J. C. Grierson drew upon the manuscript for his edition of *The Poems of John Donne* (Oxford, 1912), having discovered in it the previously unknown verse letter to Wotton, “H: W: in Hiber: belligeranti.” When an extensive fire broke out at Burley-on-the-Hill in 1908 that destroyed most of the archives and library, this transcript was thought to be the only witness of the Burley Ms. until 1960 when I. A. Shapiro discovered the manuscript in the National Register of Archives where it had been moved for safekeeping before the fire. Now that Peter Redford has edited this important manuscript, those interested in Donne, Wotton, Spenser, and other poets of the seventeenth century will be able to assess its significance more readily.

The Burley Ms. contains 373 folios (61 of which are blank) with writing on both recto and verso. All told there are 616 items in this manuscript miscellany that includes poems, letters, semiofficial reports, and other kinds of writing, most in English. The volume was assembled from previously copied booklets that were acquired, expanded, and eventually bound together by Sir William Parkhurst (1581-1667), who had been secretary to Sir Henry Wotton in Venice and later Warden of the Mint. Redford conveniently gathers all that is now known of Parkhurst into a brief chapter on his life (as yet there is no *ODNB* article for him). About half of the manuscript is in Parkhurst’s hand; the rest, in various sixteenth- and seventeenth-century scribal hands, notably a hand called “D1” by Grierson and Pearsall Smith that copied most of the Donne materials. While Redford lists all 616 items with an *incipit* and notes about the scribal hand that produced the item,

he only transcribes the private letters and the verse in English. *The Burley Manuscript* is thus more useful to students of literature than of history. His transcriptions retain the original spelling but expand contractions, normalize i/j and u/v, so the text is reader friendly (though not diplomatic).

One of Redford's most interesting contributions is his theory of interception to explain how the "45 or so private letters" were copied into the Burley. Noting that the bulk of the Donne-Wotton correspondence (most in the hand of the D1 scribe) is from 1598-1601 when both men were employed as secretaries to Sir Thomas Egerton and the Earl of Essex, Redford argues that these letters were copies of copies made as part of a domestic surveillance effort most likely ordered by the Secretary of State, Sir Robert Cecil. This is a plausible explanation for why these early letters (which lack dates and subscriptions) were copied. It seems also clear that other letters that can be dated from the time of Wotton's first Venetian embassy (1604-1610) must have been copies of letters received in Venice. The emphasis on surveillance intercepts in Redford's account also takes care of a point of courtesy. In Donne's letter to Sir Henry Goodere that begins "S^r. Only in obedience" and transmits a copy of his *Paradoxes*, Donne asks "on the religion of your friendship that no copy shall be taken"; the presence of a copy of the *Paradoxes* in the Burley Ms, it had been assumed, meant that the addressee had forsworn himself by making such a copy. Redford's theory of interception explains how a copy could have been made surreptitiously without consent. Equally interesting, though more difficult to prove, is his assertion that "memorised, rather than copied, texts may form at least part of the whole manuscript" (44). Redford considers textual variants in a number of poems that are potentially the result of faulty memory. These are plausible but readers will have to decide for themselves. In my view, these variants are not the sort that we see in comparisons to, for example, the Q1 text of *Hamlet* that seems almost certainly a pirated text based on memorial reconstruction.

The texts of the poems and letters presented in *The Burley Manuscript* make it possible to study the Burley as a manuscript miscellany. To assist in his own analysis of the manuscript, Redford constructed a database in which each item was indexed giving its precise location (often there are multiple items on a folio), title (where possible), the

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^e 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.

John Cramsie. *British Travellers and the Encounter with Britain*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2015. x + 552 pp. + 26 illus. \$80.00. Review by ANDREW McRAE, UNIVERSITY OF EXETER.

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