

Joshua Eckhardt

## **Verse Miscellanies in Print and Manuscript: A Book Historiography**

Although printed poetry anthologies in English have been around at least since “Tottel’s Miscellany,” and their predecessors in manuscript much longer, scholars have only rather recently fashioned the tools necessary to determine the relationships between verse miscellanies in print and manuscript. In other words, the study of early modern verse miscellanies in *both* media, together, qualifies as a distinctly modern academic phenomenon. It was hardly possible before 1960. And the current moment will likely come to qualify as one its major phases of development, thanks in no small part to *Verse Miscellanies Online*.

This essay begins by briefly surveying the most important predecessors of *Verse Miscellanies Online*: the other big modern editions of the printed poetry anthologies featured on the site. Yet it focuses throughout on the manuscripts related to these printed books. For most of their existence, these manuscripts remained largely inaccessible to all but their owners and a few privileged scholars. But this has been changing especially over the last half-century or so, with editions and indices of manuscripts appearing and improving. These scholarly resources, and the particular manuscripts that they relate to the printed verse miscellanies, occupy the focal point of the essay. It proceeds chronologically through selected scholarly works on manuscripts. So it introduces the manuscripts in the order that scholars have made certain aspects of them available beyond manuscript reading rooms. This is the reason I call the essay “a book historiography”: it focuses not so directly on the usual subject matter of book history (the book) as on the written and published histories of the book – specifically, the editions, indices, and surveys of the verse miscellany in both print and manuscript. Considered together, these modern scholarly works and their early modern subjects demonstrate how much readers of *Verse Miscellanies Online* can now easily learn about manuscripts related to the printed miscellanies, and what scholars have yet to learn about them.

John Payne Collier effectively gave the name “miscellanies” to the printed books featured on this website when he reprinted most of them, in the 1860s, under the series title, *Seven English Poetical Miscellanies, Printed Between 1557 and 1602*. He began with *Songes and Sonettes*; others had reprinted the book throughout the 18th and 19th centuries without anticipating the title that Collier gave it: “Tottel’s Miscellany.” Just a couple years later, Edward Arber followed

suit, entitling his superior edition of the anthology *Tottel's Miscellany*.<sup>1</sup> The new name stuck. Collier's seven miscellanies match the seven titles that Michelle O'Callaghan has selected for this digital edition, with just a pair of exceptions: Collier omitted *A Handful of Pleasant Delights*, and featured instead *England's Parnassus* (1600), which does not appear here.

When Collier and Arber were reprinting miscellanies in the late 1860s, few people had much access to the manuscripts related to them. Many of the manuscripts remained in private libraries. Only a few of those in public collections had received contents lists in library catalogues. No one would start indexing the first lines of poems in manuscript for at least ten years. And no one would publish an edition of one of these manuscripts for nearly a century.

The British Museum and the Bodleian Library had improved this situation somewhat by the time that Hyder E. Rollins published his exquisite editions of the printed miscellanies in the 1920s and '30s. The manuscript catalogues of both institutions were well underway, although they offer little more than summaries of contents, which cannot convey much about a poem. More important, the British Museum's Department of Manuscripts had indexed, in 17 hand-written volumes, the first lines of all the English poems in manuscripts that it had acquired by 1894. So readers who reached the museum could cross-reference verse throughout all but its most recently added manuscripts. The Bodleian began work on its own first-line index in the midst of Rollins' series.<sup>2</sup> But the library at Oxford would not complete its project in Rollins' lifetime, or before Harvard University Press posthumously reissued his classic edition of *Tottel's Miscellany*.

The Rosenbach Company of Philadelphia began a first-line index as well in the 1930s, under the direction of Edwin Wolf II. Wolf's early employer, the legendary bookseller Abe Rosenbach, may have imported more (and more important) manuscript verse miscellanies into the United States than anyone else. Wolf indexed the first lines of manuscript verse that passed through the seller's inventory through the '30s and '40s. Uniquely, he alphabetized them not by the first, but by the last, word in the line, on the reasonable grounds that copyists would have varied such rhyming words less frequently than others. In

---

<sup>1</sup> John Payne Collier, ed., *Seven English Poetical Miscellanies, Printed Between 1557 and 1602* (London, 1867 [1866]). Edward Arber, ed., *Tottel's Miscellany. Songes and Sonnettes* (London, 1870), p. xv. Hyder Rollins, ed., *Tottel's Miscellany (1557-1587)*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 2.3, 2.37-61. See 'The Emergence of the English Miscellany,' Joshua Eckhardt and Daniel Starza Smith (eds.), *Miscellanies in Early Modern England* (proposed to Ashgate).

<sup>2</sup> "In 1932 it was settled, after consultation with members of the English faculty, that a card-index should be formed." Margaret Crum (ed.), *First-Line Index of English Poetry 1500-1800 in Manuscript of the Bodleian Library Oxford*, 2 vols (Oxford University Press, 1969), I.v.

1949, Wolf made the first recorded argument for the textual importance of “manuscript commonplace books” in a talk before the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, and then in a mimeographed transcript that a few dozen libraries collected.<sup>3</sup>

By the middle of the twentieth century, then, the best available resources on the manuscript verse miscellanies of Elizabethan and early Stuart England were – like their subject matter – rather scarce, hand-made objects: a more-or-less scribally published mimeograph from a learned society in Virginia, a card file at a Philadelphia rare book shop, a hand-written index at the British Museum. Few readers of Rollins’ first editions of the printed verse miscellanies could have determined their relationship to manuscripts in any detail.

But the posthumous revised edition of Rollins’ *Tottel* encountered a much better situation when it appeared in 1965. Rollins had edited six of Collier’s seven miscellanies (omitting *England’s Parnassus*), plus three more (*A Handful of Pleasant Delights*, *Brittons Bowre of Delights*, and *The Arbor of Amorous Devices*).<sup>4</sup> His editions vastly enhanced the quality of both the texts and the physical descriptions of the printed verse miscellanies, so much so that they continue to serve as models of type facsimile and bibliography. Yet, from the idiosyncratic perspective of this essay, Rollins’ editions also served to exacerbate the disparity between printed and manuscript verse miscellanies. Thanks to Rollins, editions of the printed ones had greatly improved, and increased in number; but only a relative few of their hand-written predecessors and counterparts had received so much as a place in a summary catalogue or first-line index.

Scholars had started to redress this imbalance by the time that the revised edition of Rollins’ *Tottel* appeared – Ruth Hughey foremost among them. Hughey was remarkable. She had contracted polio at age two in rural Arkansas, and had to use leg braces and crutches for the rest of her life. Before Columbia University accepted female students, she somehow started taking postgraduate classes there, earning full admittance after one term. For financial

---

<sup>3</sup> Edwin Wolf II, *First-line Index of Manuscripts handled by the Rosenbach Company*, Philadelphia [between 1930 and 1949], Unpublished card file, Rosenbach Museum & Library; “The Textual Importance of Manuscript Commonplace Books of 1620-1660: An Address Before the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, January 14, 1949,” (Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1949).

<sup>4</sup> *A Handful of Pleasant Delights* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924; revised ed. Dover, 1965); *A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions (1578)* (Harvard, 1926); *A Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576-1606)* (Harvard, 1927); *Tottel’s Miscellany (1557-1587)*, 2 vols (Harvard, 1928-1929; revised ed. 1965); *The Phoenix Nest 1593* (Harvard, 1931; revised ed., 1969); *A Poetical Rhapsody 1602-1621*, 2 vols (Harvard, 1931-32); *Brittons Bowre of Delights* (Harvard, 1933); *England’s Helicon 1600, 1614*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Harvard, 1935); *The Arbor of Amorous Devices 1597* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1936).

reasons, she had to discontinue her studies at Columbia, and resume them later at Cornell University, completing a doctoral dissertation on 16th-17th-century women's writing in 1932. The next year, she made her way from the British Museum to the private library of Arundel Castle, where she rediscovered the Arundel Harington manuscript.<sup>5</sup>

With Hughey's impeccable 1960 edition of the manuscript, readers finally had a printed version of a manuscript to equal Rollins' reprinted miscellanies. *The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry* holds its own against even the most extensive instalment in Rollins' series, the revised edition of *Tottel's Miscellany*. The two great works make a perfect pair. Standing side by side, they establish a rare balance between editions of a printed and a manuscript book. Each consists of two volumes, of similar heft. Each came from the editors' own university press: Harvard and Ohio State, where Rollins and Hughey, respectively, served as professors of English. More to the point, Hughey accomplished for her manuscript codex what Rollins had done for his printed books. Her codicology, in other words, met (and arguably exceeded) Rollins' rigorous standards for bibliography. She attended to the physical details of her source and, especially, to the relationships of its texts to copies of the same poems in other sources, in both manuscript and print. Hughey identified three other manuscripts and two early modern printed books especially relevant to the Arundel Harington manuscript, and showed in a chart which poems these rare books had in common. Of them, only *Tottel's Miscellany* and *The Arundel Harington Manuscript* had been edited and published. So Hughey pointed, throughout, to the numbers that Rollins had assigned to the 65 poems that the two miscellanies share.

In the over fifty years since Hughey's edition appeared, editors have gotten to only one of the other manuscripts that she identified: British Library MS Add. 17492 – known as the Devonshire manuscript (to which this essay will return). The other two manuscripts that she related to her source (British Library MSS Egerton 2711 and Add. 36529) would still reward editorial and other scholarly work.<sup>6</sup>

Together, *Tottel's Miscellany* and *The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry* have established an enduring, and thus far effectively inimitable, model for the study of verse miscellanies in both print and manuscript. Most

---

<sup>5</sup> Ruth Willard Hughey, "Cultural Interest of Women in England from 1524 to 1640 Indicated in the Writing of the Women, an electronic edition," 1932; Joni Laney and Mary Ruth Laney Reilly, "Family Reflections on Ruth W. Hughey, 1899-1980," Emory Women Writers Project. <[http://womenwriters.library.emory.edu/content.php?level=div&id=hughey\\_800&document=hughey](http://womenwriters.library.emory.edu/content.php?level=div&id=hughey_800&document=hughey)> 19 January 2013.

<sup>6</sup> Ruth Hughey, ed., *The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry*, 2 vols (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1960), 1:40-62, 70-73.

readers of even subsequent editions of *Songes and Sonettes* still need Hughey's unchallenged 1960 edition in order to learn much about its relationship to a manuscript. If readers of *Verse Miscellanies Online* want to see it alongside the Arundel Harington manuscript, they will likely resort to the PDF copies of Hughey's edition that the Ohio State University Libraries have generously and sensibly made available.<sup>7</sup>

Hughey was not the only scholar editing a manuscript related to the printed verse miscellanies in the 1950s. Matthias A. Shaabar was, at this time, sending graduate students from the University of Pennsylvania across town to what had become the Rosenbach Foundation Museum to edit some of its manuscript verse miscellanies. One of those Penn students, James Sanderson, worked on a manuscript that bears a relationship to some of the printed verse miscellanies featured on this site. As Sanderson acknowledges, Rosenbach MS 1083/15 includes a pair of poems that also appear in *Englands Helicon*: Marlowe's pastoral lyric beginning, "If thou wilt liue and by my loue", and the answer, "If that the world & loue weare young" (according to Sanderson's transcript of the manuscript).<sup>8</sup> It also has three poems in common with *A Poetical Rhapsody*: "Goe soule the bodies guest", attributed to Raleigh in this Rosenbach witness; "Are weomen faire? yea wondrous faire to see to", subscribed there to "P. Sydney"; and "The smallest trees haue toppes," which Sanderson ascribed to Sir Edward Dyer.<sup>9</sup>

Especially in regard to Sidney, Sanderson had benefited from the help of – and, in particular, a transcript from – William A. Ringler, Jr., who was then at Washington University in St. Louis.<sup>10</sup> In the midwest, far from relevant archives, Ringler had started providing his own graduate students with the reproductions of manuscripts that they would need to edit them. He did this at Wash. U. for Laurence Cummings.<sup>11</sup> As Cummings notes, Bodleian MS Rawl.

---

<sup>7</sup> Hughey, *Arundel Harington Manuscript*, 15 August 2007 <<http://hdl.handle.net/1811/28934>> 19 January 2013.

<sup>8</sup> *Englands Helicon*, sig. Aa1v-Aa2v; Rosenbach MS 1083/15, pp. 57-58; James Lee Sanderson, "An Edition of an Early Seventeenth-Century Manuscript Collection of Poems (Rosenbach MS. 186)" (University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D., 1960), pp. 288-301.

<sup>9</sup> *A Poetical Rhapsody*, pp. 15-17, 194, 160; Rosenbach MS 1083/15, pp. 32-34, 59, 137; Sanderson, pp. 155-65, 307-13, 687-92. "Are women fair?" also appears in Rosenbach MS 1082/16, p. 15; David Coleman Redding, "Robert Bishop's Commonplace Book: An Edition of a Seventeenth-Century Miscellany" (University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D., 1960), pp. 42-45.

<sup>10</sup> Sanderson, p. 309 ("I am indebted to Professor William Ringler of Washington University for providing me with a transcript of the Sloane text").

<sup>11</sup> Laurence Anthony Cummings, "John Finet's Miscellany" (Washington University, Ph.D., 1960), pp. iv ("Professor William Ringler urged me to take up the task of editing this manuscript, provided me with indices of several poetry manuscripts, advised me on procedures and presentations, and checked many details against the codex in the Bodleian Library when his own research was pressing; this edition would never have been started without his

poet. 85 shares eight texts with *The Phoenix Nest*,<sup>12</sup> seven with *Englands Helicon*,<sup>13</sup> and one with *A Poetical Rhapsody*.<sup>14</sup>

After moving upstate to the University of Chicago, Ringler did the same for Steven W. May.<sup>15</sup> As May showed, Cambridge University Library MS Dd. 5.75. shares three texts with *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*,<sup>16</sup> three with *England's Helicon*,<sup>17</sup> three with *The Phoenix Nest*,<sup>18</sup> and two with *A Poetical Rhapsody*.<sup>19</sup> May also included an abbreviated apparatus that is particularly valuable, from this essay's perspective, because it lists copies of each poem in both print and

encouragement and scholarship"), 5 n.2 ("I have never seen the manuscript itself, or, for that matter, any of the manuscripts or early prints that I discuss. I have worked entirely from microfilm, photostats, photographs, printed reprints, and editors' collations").

<sup>12</sup> *The Phoenix Nest*, p.70-71 ("A secret murder hath been done of late,"), 72 ("Calling to mind mine eye long went about"), 73-74 ("Would I were chang'd into that golden shower,"), 74-75 ("Those eyes that holds the hand of every heart,"), 75-76 ("As rare to hear, as seldom to be seen,"), 79-80 ("The gentle season of the year,"), 88-90 ("Divide my times, and rate my wretched hours,"), 92-93 ("Short is my rest, whose toil is overlong,"); Bodleian MS Rawl. poet. 85, ff. 104v, 108v, 46r, 24v, 7v, 17v-18r, 40-41, 50v; Cummings, pp. 74-42 (item cxxxi), 706-11 (cxxxiii), 453-57 (lxviii), 272-76 (xliii), 133-35 (xi), 202-5 (xxxiii), 354-59 (lvii), 435-38 (lxxv).

<sup>13</sup> *Englands Helicon*, sig. B1r-B2r ("Only joy, now here you are,"), D3r-Dvr ("In the merry month of May,"), G4r-H1r ("Fair in a morn, (oh fairest morn)"), T2r-T3v ("In a grove most rich of shade,"), Z3r-Z4r ("In peascod time, when hound to horn,"), Bb2r ("Prometheus, when first from heaven high,"), Bb2v ("A satyr once did run away for dread,"); Bodleian MS Rawl. poet. 85, ff. 42r-v, 3r, 1v, 34v-36v, 51r-53r, 8r, 8v; Cummings, pp. 369-74 (lx), 95-102 (iv), 83-91 (ii), 322-32 (xlix), 442-52 (lxxvii), 142-44 (xiii), 145-48 (xiv).

<sup>14</sup> *A Poetical Rhapsody*, pp. 41-47 ("Perin, [arreed] what new mischance betide."); Bodleian MS Rawl. poet. 85, ff. 93v-98r; Cummings, pp. 660-74 (cxviii).

<sup>15</sup> Steven W. May, "Henry Stanford's Anthology: An Edition of Cambridge University Library Manuscript Dd.5.75" (University of Chicago, Ph.D., 1968), p. xxx n. 1 ("The information used in the description of Dd.5.75 was supplied to me by Professor William A. Ringler, Jr., after his first-hand study of the manuscript at Cambridge University Library").

<sup>16</sup> *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*, sig. Iii<sup>r</sup>-Iii<sup>v</sup> ("With painted speech I list not prove, my cunning for to try,"), Iii<sup>v</sup> ("How can the tree, but waste and wither away,"), Iiv<sup>r</sup> ("In choice of friends what hap had I to choose one of siren's kind,"); CUL MS Dd.5.75, ff. 44v, 44r, 44r; May, "Henry Stanford's Anthology," pp. 157 (item 223), 155 (221), 153-54 (219), 238, 341-44.

<sup>17</sup> *England's Helicon*, sig. B3v-B4r ("Ring out your bells, let mourning shows be spread,"), C1r-v ("Go my flock, go get ye hence"), G4r-H1r ("Fair in a morn, (oh fairest morn)"); CUL MS Dd.5.75, ff. 27r, 47r-v, 38v; May, "Henry Stanford's Anthology," pp. 79 (item 106), 168-70 (237), 128-29 (201), 269-76, 327-29.

<sup>18</sup> *The Phoenix Nest*, pp. 71-72 ("Her face, Her tongue, Her wit,"), 72 ("Calling to mind mine eye long went about"), 79-80 ("The gentle season of the year,"); CUL MS Dd.5.75, ff. 36r, 27r, 40v; May, "Henry Stanford's Anthology," pp. 117-18 (item 193), 81 (109), 136-37 (208), 278-81, 319-21, 337-38.

<sup>19</sup> *A Poetical Rhapsody*, pp. 47-51 ("Come gentle herdman, sit by me,"), 189-90 ("Her face, her tongue, her wit, so fair, so sweet, so sharp,"); CUL MD Dd.5.75, ff. 39v-40r, 36r; May, "Henry Stanford's Anthology," 132-34 (item 205), 117-18 (193), 278-81, 316-18, 319-21, 333-36.

manuscript. In this apparatus and in his notes, May showed that the “poetic novelty” that begins with a variation on the phrase “Her face, her tongue, her wit” appears not only in *The Phoenix Nest, A Poetical Rhapsody*, and the CUL manuscript, but also in four British Library manuscripts (Add. 15227, Add. 22118, Egerton 3165 (Sir Arthur Gorges’ manuscript), Harl. 7392(2)), a Bodleian manuscript (Rawl. poet. 117), and a couple more printed books (*Brittons Bowre of Delights* (1594; STC 3634) and William Barley’s *A New Booke of Tabliture* (1596; STC 1433)). Better still, May discussed the evidence for Henry Stanford’s sources for the group of poems that contains this text.<sup>20</sup>

A few years later, also for a Chicago dissertation, Katherine Gottschalk edited another manuscript miscellany with important links to these printed miscellanies: British Library MS Harl. 6910.<sup>21</sup> Not far away at the University of Notre Dame in Indiana, William Senior edited the same manuscript for his dissertation.<sup>22</sup> Harleian MS 6910 has two texts in common with *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*,<sup>23</sup> four with *The Phoenix Nest*,<sup>24</sup> four with *England’s Helicon*,<sup>25</sup> and seven with *A Poetical Rhapsody*.<sup>26</sup>

These dissertation editions typically include introductory comments relating their sources, and other manuscripts, to the printed miscellanies. They feature careful claims regarding their compilers’ possible sources. And they may now be more useful than ever, because they are more accessible than ever, in PDF copies derived from microfilm and available to subscribers of the

---

<sup>20</sup> May, “Henry Stanford’s Anthology,” 220-23 (sigla), 224-29 (abbreviated apparatus), 316-21.

<sup>21</sup> Katherine Kiblinger Gottschalk, “British Museum Manuscript Harley 6910, An Edition” (University of Chicago, Ph.D., 1974).

<sup>22</sup> William A. Senior, “An Edition of the Elizabethan Poetical Miscellany, Harley MS 6910” (University of Notre Dame, Ph.D., 1982).

<sup>23</sup> *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*, sig. Giv<sup>r</sup> (“If thou delight, in quietness of life,”), liii<sup>v</sup> (“How can the tree, but waste and wither away,”); British Library MS Harl. 6910, ff. 139<sup>r</sup>, 168<sup>v</sup>; Gottschalk, pp. 110 (item 101), 163 (178), 315-16, 454-58.

<sup>24</sup> *The Phoenix Nest*, pp. 69-70 (“Like to a hermit poor in place obscure”), 72 (“Calling to mind mine eye long went about”), 75-76 (“As rare to hear, as seldom to be seen,” 92-93 (“Short is my rest, whose toil is overlong,”); British Library MS Harl. 6910, ff. 139<sup>v</sup>, 142<sup>v</sup>, 173<sup>r</sup>, 148<sup>r-v</sup>; Gottschalk, pp. 112 (item 105), 121-22 (115), 207 (216), and 175 (188).

<sup>25</sup> *England’s Helicon*, sig. G4<sup>r</sup>-H1<sup>r</sup> (“Fair in a morn, (oh fairest morn)”), H1<sup>v</sup>-H2<sup>r</sup> (“My flocks feed not, my ewes breed not”), T2<sup>r</sup>-T3<sup>v</sup> (“In a grove most rich of shade,”), Bb2<sup>r</sup> (“Prometheus, when first from heaven high,”); British Library MS Harl. 6910, ff. 140<sup>r</sup>, 156<sup>r</sup>, 171<sup>r</sup>, 154<sup>v</sup>; Gottschalk, pp. 112-13 (item 106), 133-34 (147), 202-6 (214), 193-94 (204).

<sup>26</sup> *A Poetical Rhapsody*, pp. 15-17 (“Go soul the body’s guest”), 113-14 (“Love is a sour delight, a sugared grief,”), 138-39 (“Disdain that so doth fill me,”), 148-49 (“Break heavy heart, and rid me of this pain,”), 157 (“The bull by nature hath his horns,”), 158 (“Of late, what time the bear turned round”); British Library MS Harl. 6910, ff. 141<sup>v</sup>-42<sup>r</sup>, 170<sup>v</sup>-71<sup>r</sup>, 154<sup>r</sup>, 153<sup>r-v</sup>, 169<sup>r</sup>, 145<sup>v</sup>-46<sup>r</sup>; Gottschalk, pp. 118-21 (item 113), 201-2 (212), 192 (202), 190-91 (199), 195 (206), 167-68 (183).

ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. Before ProQuest digitized them, however, most copies of these dissertations remained in the libraries of the degree-granting institutions; on reels from University Microfilms; and in the personal libraries of the few scholars who ordered individual printings. Only one of them was published as a book: May's edition, printed by Garland twenty years after its completion.<sup>27</sup> By this time, Edward Doughtie had published his edition of Bodleian MS Rawl. poet. 148. This manuscript has three texts in common with *England's Helicon*<sup>28</sup> and one with *A Poetical Rhapsody*.<sup>29</sup> Finally, in late '80s, students and scholars had a couple published, bound editions of manuscripts to stand next to Hughey's.

By this time, other projects (beyond editions of individual manuscripts) were also making it much more possible to study the relationships between verse miscellanies in manuscript and print. In 1965, the British Museum distributed microfilm copies of its 19th-century first-line index to some research libraries. In 1969, Margaret Crum completed and published the (comparatively much more up-to-date) first-line index of manuscript poems that the Bodleian Library had begun in the 1930s. She included references to printed works. So one could quickly see, for instance, that Marlowe's "Come live with me and be my love" appears not only in the Bodleian manuscript that Doughtie would edit, but also in *England's Helicon*.<sup>30</sup>

In 1980, Peter Beal's multi-volume *Index of English Literary Manuscripts* began to appear. Unlike the indices from the British Museum and Bodleian, Beal's is a union index, listing all known manuscript copies, anywhere, of all texts by certain canonical literary authors. Beal also included notes regarding the printed history of these texts. To stick with the most recent example above, users of his *Index* could see that Marlowe's lyric appeared not only in *England's Helicon* and Bodleian MS Rawl. poet. 148, but also in *The Passionate Pilgrim* (1599) and several other manuscripts.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Steven W. May, *Henry Stanford's Anthology: An Edition of Cambridge University Library Manuscript Dd. 5.75* (New York; Garland, 1988).

<sup>28</sup> *England's Helicon*, sig. I4r-K1r ("Phil. Coridon, arise my Coridon,"), Aa1v-Aa2r ("Come live with me, and be my love"), Aa2r-v ("If all the world and love were young"); Bodleian MS Rawl. poet. 148, ff. 88v-90r, 96v-97r; Edward Doughtie, ed. *Liber Lilliati, Elizabeth Verse and Song (Bodleian MS Rawlinson Poetry 148)* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1985), pp. 99-100, 108-10.

<sup>29</sup> *A Poetical Rhapsody*, p. 160 (The lowest trees have tops, the ant her gall"); Bodleian MS Rawl. poet. 148, f. 106r-v; Doughtie, pp. 122-23.

<sup>30</sup> Margaret Crum, ed., *First-Line Index of English Poetry 1500-1800 in Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library Oxford*, 2 vols (Oxford University Press, 1969), 1:167 (item C530).

<sup>31</sup> Peter Beal, ed., *Index of English Literary Manuscripts, Volume I: 1450-1625*, 2 parts (London: Mansell, 1980), 1:2, MrC 10-19.



Another influential – but usually unacknowledged – 1980s contribution to the study of manuscripts is Harvester Microform’s series of “British Literary Manuscripts” from the British Library, Bodleian, Cambridge University Library, National Library of Scotland, and Folger Shakespeare Library.<sup>32</sup> With access to these reels, students and scholars could read black and white facsimiles of complete manuscripts – including, for instance, the Bodleian manuscripts that Cummings and Doughtie had edited. So they could see (however dimly) images of the original texts that editors had transcribed and cataloguers had indexed. They could scrutinize the experts’ transcripts (or, more likely, use them to read the script). They could see variations in scripts. And they could follow sequences of texts much more easily than they could in an index.

They could also compare texts of microfilmed manuscripts with those in the Rollins editions of the printed miscellanies; or possibly with the University Microfilms facsimiles of “Early English Books”; or, soon, with the digitized copies of these that ProQuest has published (to paying subscribers) as “Early English Books Online.” Gale Cengage has recently done the same thing with *some* of its microfilms of manuscripts, digitizing and publishing them (again to paying subscribers) as “British Literary Manuscripts Online.” Like EEBO, this new manuscript resource is limited by the rather low quality of the images that it has acquired from 1980s microfilm. Unlike EEBO, though, it includes no transcripts. Further limiting its value, this online resource omits the manuscripts from the Bodleian and Cambridge University Library. So, in order to check an image of a Bodleian manuscript against the editions by Cummings, May, or Doughtie, one still needs to resort to the rather rare microfilms.

In the 1990s, scholars began to feature manuscript verse miscellanies in major monographs. In the first of these, and the only one devoted entirely to miscellanies, Mary Hobbs (who had also edited a manuscript for her dissertation, in the 1970s) included a chapter on the manuscript origins of the verse miscellany in England, concluding with their Elizabethan printed successors.<sup>33</sup> Arthur Marotti also proceeded from manuscript verse miscellanies to printed books, including the anthologies featured on this site, in the late chapters of his monograph.<sup>34</sup> Henry Woudhuysen dealt with manuscript verse miscellanies in two important sections of his book, including in the latter comments on the Sidney poems in printed miscellanies and other books.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> “British Literary Manuscripts” (Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Microform, 1984-1988).

<sup>33</sup> Mary Hobbs, *Early Seventeenth-Century Miscellany Manuscripts* (Aldershot: Scolar, 1992), 13-24.

<sup>34</sup> Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 212-47.

<sup>35</sup> H.R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 153-73, 242-98, esp. 286-92.

In the twenty-first century, Paul Marquis' edition of the more popular, yet largely ignored, second quarto of Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes* contains a useful introduction to its relationship to manuscript sources – not only those that Hughey related to the Arundel Harington manuscript, but several others as well.<sup>36</sup> Also in the twenty-first century, scholars finally produced an edition of the Devonshire manuscript: an online, collaboratively produced, and therefore “social” edition, published via Wikibooks. Among its most obvious virtues, this edition combines a complete transcript (as do twentieth-century editions) with a complete black-and-white photographic facsimile (as do microfilms). Even more important, it is free to anyone who can access a computer and a decent internet connection for a while. Virtually all of the 19th- and 20th-century publications that this essay has surveyed have required users or their home institutions to pay for a copy or for access. To its great credit, some of the most important (and therefore likely most influential) twenty-first-century, digital scholarship on early modern English manuscripts is free, at least to internet users.

First-line indices have been vastly improving in the twenty-first century. Several have appeared for individual repositories, but (for Elizabethan sources) they have been eclipsed by William Ringler and Steven May's union index of first lines of verse produced in *both* manuscript *and print* during Elizabeth I's reign.<sup>37</sup> The Folger Shakespeare Library's free, online “Union First-Line Index of English Verse” includes the first lines of manuscripts from the Ringler and May bibliography. It also has the first lines of verse in: manuscripts from the British Library (including all those acquired by 2009), the Bodleian, the Rosenbach, the Huntington, the Beinecke at Yale, the Brotherton Collection at Leeds, the Houghton at Harvard, and of course the Folger; manuscripts that contain the works of John Wilmot, earl of Rochester; *and* the printed books in the short title catalogues of both Pollard and Wing.<sup>38</sup> The Folger first-line index is likely to expand; and, again, it is free to online computer (or “tablet” or “smartphone”) users.

---

<sup>36</sup> Paul A. Marquis, ed., *Richard Tottel's Songes and Sonettes: The Elizabethan Version* (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies / Renaissance English Text Society, 2007), pp. xxvi-xxxiv. In addition to the Arundel Harington, Devonshire, and Egerton manuscripts, Marquis identifies Beinecke MS Osborn music 13 (Braye lute book); Bodleian MSS Ash. 48, Rawl. poet. 85; British Library MSS Add. 15225, Add. 23971, Add. 28635, Add. 30513, Add. 36529, Add. 60577, Cotton Titus 48, Hargrave 205, Harl. 78, Royal 7.C.ix, Sloane 1896, ; National Archives, Kew MS Sloane 159, Sloane 1207, SP 1/246; and Trinity College Dublin MS 160 (D.2.7; Blage MS).

<sup>37</sup> Steven W. May and William A. Ringler, Jr., eds., *Elizabethan Poetry: A Bibliography and First-Line Index of English Verse, 1559-1603* (London: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004).

<sup>38</sup> Carolyn W. Nelson, ed., “Union First-Line Index of English Verse,” Folger Shakespeare Library <<http://firstlines.folger.edu/>> 19 January 2013.

Peter Beal's greatly expanded, online *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts* is free too. It features far more authors than does the original *Index*. Because it's online, it is also (or easily can be) organized not only by author but also by manuscript. So users will (soon) be able to see all of the works by a large number of authors in any given manuscript – again, without paywalls or costly subscriptions.<sup>39</sup>

These free, online resources – the social edition of the Devonshire manuscript, the Folger first-line index, and *CELM* – offer much of interest to any users of *Verse Miscellanies Online* who want to determine the relationships of its printed sources to manuscripts. *Verse Miscellanies Online* is free too. Even better for those interested in both printed and manuscript verse miscellanies, this website identifies the other copies of each poem. By clicking on the blue plus sign (+) next to the heading of a poem, a user of the site can see a reference to other known copies of the poem in both manuscript and print. These references can direct enterprising readers to manuscripts that would reward new research.

Users of the site who take advantage of these notes will likely recognize several of the manuscripts mentioned above. But they will also see citations to manuscripts that this essay has not yet mentioned, because they have not yet been edited or much discussed in earlier editions of the printed verse miscellanies. That is, readers will notice the Arundel Harington manuscript and the two unedited manuscripts that Hughey related to both it and Tottel's miscellany back in 1960: British Library MSS Add. 36529 and Egerton 2711. But they will also see, for example in *A Paradise of Dainty Devices*, several notes featuring Bodleian MS Douce e.16 and Folger MS V.a.149. For more than one miscellany, they will notice British Library MS Harl, 7392(2) (which Jessica Edmondson is editing for a dissertation under Steven May's direction). They will also find manuscripts that no one (to my knowledge) has started editing (like British Library MSS Add. 34064, Egerton 3165, Harl. 2127, Bodleian MS e.Museo 37, Folger MS H.b.1) and others whose first lines have not even been indexed (such as the Ottery Papers at the National Library of Wales in Aberystwyth).

While the verse miscellanies of early modern England may seem like an old subject with a long, venerable academic tradition, the ability to study them in both print and manuscript is a rather modern and even recent development, facilitated by resources that are still emerging and improving.

---

<sup>39</sup> Peter Beal, ed., *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts 1450-1700* <<http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/>> 19 January 2013.