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ABSTRACT In this essay, Marcy North examines a compilation oddity found in many early modern verse miscellanies—the poem entered twice into the same manuscript—and uses it to illuminate the practices of early modern verse collectors. Duplicated entries point to the kinds of source texts that verse collectors juggled, their reading and editorial practices, and their access to fashionable verse. The modest numbers of duplicates in many miscellanies and the cases in which accidental duplicates are cancelled suggest that most verse collectors were conscientious readers and editors, seeking new and better material and weeding out items they had already collected as they developed their miscellanies.
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DOCUMENTING THE FASHIONABLE and active exchange of lyric verse in early Stuart England are over two hundred hand-copied miscellanies compiled by university men, elite families, educated civil servants, and the occasional literary woman or tradesman.1 These miscellanies are, on the one hand, conventional products. They are shaped by collectors' shared source texts and cultural affinities and by the common experiences of verse collecting, especially at the universities and Inns of Court. On the other hand, they are unique material objects created for personal use and pleasure. They mirror their collectors' distinct social connections and literary preferences, and they prove a measure of their collectors' access to source texts, writing materials, time, and scribal labor. No two are exactly alike. Even the few miscellanies copied from known source manuscripts differ noticeably from their exemplars in

1. H. R. Woudhuysen estimates that about 230 miscellanies copied before 1640 are extant today; see Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558–1640 (Oxford, 1996), 157.
content, ordering, and material details such as handwriting and format. The practices of verse collection that make these fascinating manuscripts so alike and yet so distinct are brought to the fore by a compilation oddity found in close to a hundred extant miscellanies—the entry of the same poem twice, sometimes thrice, into a single manuscript. Redundant entries, whether they were copied accidentally or set down purposefully, help us reconstruct the paths by which poems reached collectors and the ways collectors managed the poems they received.

Because of their sheer number, Stuart verse miscellanies serve as central evidence in several important studies of post-print manuscript culture, the system of cultural exchange whose participants traded texts unavailable to the print audience through semi-private social networks. Books by Peter Beal, Mary Hobbs, Harold Love, Arthur Marotti, and H. R. Woudhuysen sketch out many of the practices of verse collectors and attest to the importance of verse miscellanies to book history generally, but they also acknowledge that evidentiary gaps make it difficult to generalize about verse miscellany production. Few collectors or copyists documented the process of compiling miscellanies, perhaps because they treasured the amateur status of their labors or considered verse collecting too well understood to merit comment. The anonymity of many collectors and copyists and the loss of verse miscellanies over time have made it difficult to establish direct connections among miscellanies that could clarify production choices. The smaller source texts that collectors used in trading verse—the folded sheets and unbound quires—have proven especially vulnerable to decay. External evidence tracing the paths poems took from author to collector is likewise scanty, and although personal letters and memoirs occasionally refer to poems enclosed with cor-

2. In books that have become essential references for manuscript scholars, Arthur Marotti documents the various types of miscellanies and their fashionable but varied contents in Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric (Ithaca, N.Y., 1993); and Mary Hobbs sketches out the university scribal networks from which many miscellanies emerged, arguing that collectors were likely copying from related extensive exempla, some of which may have been circulated by poets and their immediate circles, in Early Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts (Aldershot, U.K., 1992). Studies by Peter Beal, Harold Love, and H. R. Woudhuysen also provide an invaluable picture of the manuscript transmission and scribal practices that enabled verse exchange and miscellany compilation. See Beal, In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and Their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England (Oxford, 1998); Love, Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England (Oxford, 1993); and Woudhuysen, Sir Philip Sidney. Also helpful as both a reference and study of cultural practices is Beal’s Index of English Literary Manuscripts, vols. 1 and 2 (London, 1980, 1987) and the online revision of this finding aid, The Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts, 1450–1700, http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/. For other accounts of verse collection practices, see Joshua Eckhardt, Manuscript Verse Collectors and the Politics of Anti-Courtly Love Poetry (New York, 2009); and Scott Nixon’s articles on Thomas Carew, among them, “‘Aske me no more’ and the Manuscript Verse Miscellany,” English Literary Renaissance 29 (Winter 1999): 97–130.

3. Beal, In Praise of Scribes, 18–19; Love, Scribal Publication, 80. Marotti, in Manuscript, Print, notes a few of the unusual instances when manuscript miscellanies record their sources or the transmission path of a poem.

4. A few of these smaller units of transmission are preserved in composite manuscripts, where small items have been bound together after they have been copied. See Marotti, Manuscript, Print, 11–12; Woudhuysen, Sir Philip Sidney, 155–56.
respondence, epigrams exchanged verbally over dinner, or books loaned to or copied for friends, the information these sources provide is piecemeal.5

Since the external information about Stuart verse collection practices is so scattered and incomplete, evidence in the miscellanies themselves becomes indispensable. As Harold Love concedes, “the transmissional history of the poem can often be understood only through that of the miscellanies in which it is encountered.”6 Accepting this methodological challenge, the present study calls attention to a type of internal evidence used more often in textual analysis than in studies of verse collection—the poem copied twice into the same miscellany—and redefines it as evidence of the material and cultural processes of miscellany compilation.7 Redundant entries make visible a number of verse transmission patterns and compilation practices otherwise hidden from the modern researcher. They can, for instance, outline the scribal contributions of particular copyists and collaborators. They can mark when time has passed between one set of entries and the next. Duplicated poems also help to identify groups of poems that traveled together and, in fact, they provide some of the best internal evidence that compilers were working with multiple source texts and that these sources included many of the same fashionable poems in very different contexts and clusters. Doubled poems likewise serve as records of access and dissemination—proof that certain poems reached a collector more than once—and so they also offer the modern researcher a sense of how plentiful or dry various sources of poetry were for particular collectors. The presence of duplicates in miscellanies can even chart the organizational strategies of compilers as they acquire new materials.

Above all, duplicated entries call attention to the material and cultural challenges of verse collecting. They remind us that, although Stuart collectors can seem at first glance to have had access to very similar source materials, verse dissemination was hardly a smooth process. Some verse items were readily available and collectors might have found them in several source texts; other items might have proved rare and inaccessible. Time constraints might have prevented a collector from editing and organizing his source texts before having them copied, and a tired scribe might have


7. In “Amateur Compilers,” I introduced briefly the phenomenon of duplicated entries in miscellanies and the fact that collectors weeded out and occasionally struck through redundancies. I also discussed, somewhat separately, the treatment of fashionable verse in miscellany collection practices. In the earlier article, this evidence spoke to the divisions of labor in miscellany production. Here, the duplicates and fashionable clustering are explored in much more depth for what they tell us about verse circulation and the way that collectors manipulated their source texts.
ignored a collector’s instructions to avoid redundancies. This imperfect transmission and collection system often sets at odds the collector’s master plan and the reality of his or her time and resources. Duplicated entries register these conflicts. The receipt of the same poem in two or more source texts was a hurdle that almost all verse collectors faced. The modest number of duplicates in most miscellanies, the deletion of redundancies in others, and the inordinate number of duplicates in a few collections argue that most (though not all) compilers were surprisingly careful readers of their source texts. Collectors’ varying solutions to the problem of redundant acquisitions reveal that post-print manuscript culture had standardized certain collection practices, but that collectors did not always have the resources or inclination to follow the standard. Redundant entries thus efficiently map the intersection of a compiler’s access to source texts and his or her selection of items to copy, showing us how the supply of verse in its material particulars influenced the habits and tastes of collectors.

Although miscellany collectors occasionally entered an item twice to place it near related material or to record an interesting variant, they generally avoided doubling. Most extensive miscellanies contain just one or two duplicates, and many have none at all. In a sample of almost one hundred non-composite verse miscellanies for which I have reliable first line indices, each with fifty or more items and copied between 1620 and 1660, the statistics break down as follows: thirty-eight volumes contain no duplicates at all; thirty-seven have from one to three duplicates; six miscellanies contain from four to six duplicates; four have between seven and nine; one manuscript has ten doubled entries; and only four miscellanies have a dozen or more redundant entries. Although I have no doubt missed a few doubled poems with unusual variant first lines, these numbers tell us that collectors culled new poems from their source texts and left behind poems they already had. In several miscellanies, in fact, the work of avoiding duplicates is visible; redundancies have been left unfinished by remorseful copyists or crossed through by collectors making corrections. The inordinate doubling of poems in a few miscellanies points to a small set of collectors who entered source texts without comparing contents. Precisely because duplicates were something collectors avoided, they show us the raw material with which they worked and the labor that they devoted to the compilation process.

8. Woudhuysen, Sir Philip Sidney, especially 153–73; and Love, Scribal Publication, are particularly attuned to the various kinds of scribal labor behind post-print manuscript production. Love, looking at the mid- to late seventeenth century, tends to see the labor as more organized and professional than Woudhuysen.

9. To establish my sample, I started with the manuscripts listed in the Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts (CELM) that contain at least one of three broadly circulated poems: William Strode’s “I saw fair Chloris walk alone,” Sir Walter Ralegh’s “What is this life, a play of passion,” and William Browne’s “Underneath this sable hearse.” To locate all of the duplicates in this initial set of miscellanies, I used the finding aids listed below, various library catalogues, and my own research and examination of manuscripts. I excluded manuscripts that were composite volumes, single-author anthologies, and most song books with repeated parts. See the Union First-Line Index of English Verse, http://firstlines.folger.edu/; Beal, Index and CELM; Margaret Crum, First-Line Index of English Poetry, 1500–1800, in Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1969); Early Stuart Libels: An Edition of Poetry from Manuscript Sources, ed. Alastair Bellany and Andrew McRae, Early Modern Literary Studies Text Series 1 (2005), http://purl.oclc.org/emls/texts/libels/.
My evidence is taken primarily from manuscript miscellanies housed at the Bodleian, Cambridge University, Edinburgh University, Folger Shakespeare, Huntington, and British Libraries, and I utilize first-line indices I have assembled along with other bibliographic and archival aids. I open my discussion by asking what kinds of poems tended to be copied twice. Highly fashionable, broadly circulating poems were often duplicated, of course, but so were poems that were brief, easily excerpted, or especially malleable. Aside from a relatively small subset of poems that were duplicated multiple times, most redundancies were the result of one-time editorial oversights, and consequently the duplications in one manuscript will be very different from those in another. In my second section, I examine collectors’ editorial practices, looking broadly at a number of miscellanies and closely at a few to reconstruct the process by which collectors acquired source texts with overlapping content and weeded out duplicates. Those moments when editing failed are the focus of my next section, where in close analyses of three manuscripts, I detail how the accidents of duplication laid bare the shape of source texts and the constraints under which collectors worked. In the final section of this article, I turn to duplicates that have been intentionally entered into manuscripts. The desire to incorporate an improved text, relocate an item, or link related variants posed a serious material challenge for collectors, especially when source texts were acquired separately. The practices and patterns I uncover demonstrate that although miscellany compilation can seem on the surface to be a somewhat casual activity, collectors often performed their labors with a keen sense of what they had already entered and what they would like to add. Given the vagaries of manuscript transmission, which made certain poems widely accessible and others hard to acquire, and given the challenges of sequential copying, which made rearranging items difficult, collectors had to organize and edit with flexibility. The methods that collectors adopted for dealing with redundant acquisitions show them navigating more or less successfully between the cultural trends that made collecting so socially rewarding and the labor that actually produced miscellanies.

Characterizing the Poems that Reached Compilers Twice

It is no surprise that fashionable, broadly disseminated poems account for a large number of the duplicates in miscellanies. “Poetry and the business of collecting poems were fashionable in themselves,” H. R. Woudhuysen explains, and “once a poet’s verse began to circulate in manuscript it tended to continue to do so: supply, however

10. I rely most often on Beal’s Index and CELM, the Folger’s Union First-Line Index, and Crum’s First-Line Index.

11. Generally, I consider “fashionable” poems those extant today in thirty or more miscellanies, using Beal’s CELM as my primary measure. About eight dozen poems fall into this category. A subset of two dozen exceptionally fashionable poems appear in fifty or more miscellanies. For poems that have not been indexed in CELM, I have compared their numbers in other indices to the numbers for poems indexed in CELM. I exclude from the fashionable category a few items copied outside of the usual networks—in state papers, for instance—or items that circulated primarily after 1650. I rarely use Donne poems as examples, although his fashionability is indisputable, since the many single-author anthologies of Donne’s work distort the degree to which particular Donne poems circulated among miscellany collectors.
limited, created demand.”¹² Poems with broad appeal appear to have reached collectors not only more than once but also in varied material formats. A popular libel on the Duke of Buckingham, for instance, was copied in a bifolium and in a folded letter sometime in the 1630s before the compiler of British Library (BL), Add. MS 27408 bound the items together in a larger composite volume (fols. 146r–47r, 148r).¹³ Single poems on individual sheets, like these two, probably brought collectors a number of redundancies. Collectors might also have borrowed small booklets or miscellanies with overlapping materials or even gained access to the same source text twice. What is surprising, given how accessible some poems were in early manuscript networks, is that most individual fashionable poems are found doubled in only a few miscellanies. Even those poems that appear today in fifty or more extant manuscripts, such as William Strode’s “I’ll tell you whence the rose grew red,” may only be duplicated in one or two. There are exceptions to this rule, but they are rare. Only a dozen of the most fashionable poems, those extant today in over seventy Stuart miscellanies, produced more than one or two duplications. Thomas Carew’s “When this fly liv’d, she us’d to play” (the “Amorous Fly”), for example, appears twice in four manuscripts, Sir Henry Wotton’s “You meaner beauties of the night,” in five, and Sir Walter Ralegh’s ubiquitous “Even such is time that takes in trust,” in half a dozen manuscripts. Those rare and highly fashionable poems duplicated in several miscellanies make evident the more general connection between fashionable verse and duplication, confirming that the broad circulation of certain poems is what most often created the opportunity for redundant acquisitions. The great majority of duplicated poems, even those duplicated in just one manuscript, belong to the set of fashionable, collectible, and sought-after verse that makes Stuart miscellanies seem so akin to one another.

Because all but the most fashionable dozen poems were duplicated just once or twice, individual miscellanies differ greatly when it comes to which sought-after poems their copyists have doubled, and often the redundancies found in any one miscellany are unique to that miscellany. This does not mean that duplication was rare or insignificant; over 150 different poems are duplicated in my sample set. Rather, this pattern of unique redundancies presumes that either the source materials to which individual collectors gained access varied greatly from one collector to the next or that their handling of similar materials varied even more. The truth may lie somewhere in between. The broad dissemination of fashionable poetry clearly created opportunities for duplication by bringing poems to collectors multiple times and in a variety of source texts, but careful editing on the part of collectors, who kept close track of their acquisitions, reduced the duplications to impressively few. Even though the poems duplicated tend to belong to a widely shared set of fashionable Stuart verse, this set was plentiful and varied enough to guarantee that no two collectors would receive exactly the same redundancies and, at the point of copying items, no two collectors would overlook exactly the same duplicates.

¹³. “And art returned again with all the faults,” Beal, CELM, MrJ34 and MrJ34.5.
Fashionability is not the only reason why certain poems were more likely than others to be duplicated. The brevity of many sought-after poems also encouraged their inclusion in packets, letters, and bifolia and likewise made them easier to overlook during compilation editing. Very long poems, no matter how fashionable, were not copied twice as often as shorter works. Many duplicated poems also had a thematic or tonal flexibility that made them easy to include in different groupings and thus brought them to collectors in more than one cluster of related verse. An eight-line antifeminist epigram comparing women’s love to a game of backgammon is typical of what may have circulated broadly and thus reached a collector twice—it is salacious, clever, and critical of women, though its setting is courtly and leisured:

Loue is a game at Tables where the dye  
Of Maids affection doth by fancy fly  
yf once wee take them faulty in a blot  
‘Tis ten to one yf that wee enter not  
But being a gamester you may boldly venture  
And yf you see the point lye open enter  
mark them well, else by false-playing [then]  
Do what you can they will be bearing men

(Huntington Library, MS HM 116, p. 77)

In HM 116, where the backgammon poem appears twice, it is clustered first in a section of short, witty epigrams and mock epitaphs, where the tone of the poems is consistently farcical (p. 49). The second version has been entered in a slightly more miscellaneous section of the manuscript, where it is followed by a punning, risqué riddle very much in a similar vein. The riddle, attributed to Sir Walter Ralegh, compares the parts of a hard-to-draw bow, including the “notch,” to the poem’s addressee, Lady Bendbow (p. 77). At the end of the poem, however, Lady Bendbow is said to laugh at Ralegh’s double meanings, turning what could have been taken as a misogynist attack into a congenial and courtly provocation. Also in the vicinity of the second backgammon poem are religious pieces, elegies, and more-thoughtful verse, such as Richard Corbett’s advice poem to his son, “What shall I leave thee, none can tell,” and the contemplative “Farewell, ye gilded follies, pleasing trouble,” attributed here to John Donne. In this setting, the tone of the backgammon poem seems somewhat more courtly and perhaps even admonitory. It is not that the context has changed dramatically from one version to the next—there are plenty of mocking epigrams throughout the miscellany—but the versatile tone of the poem appears to have made it a suitable addition to two different source texts that reached the Huntington collector, each with a slightly different focus and emphasis.

It is no coincidence that some of the characteristics that encouraged the broad dissemination of poems—brevity, thematic and tonal flexibility, and textual malleability—also made poems vulnerable to duplication. The relationship between circulation and duplication for many poems may be associative rather than causal. In the case of Sir Henry Wotton’s song praising a woman’s beauty, “You meaner beauties of the night,” the textual malleability of the poem explains both its collectibility and its duplication. Wotton’s brief, elegant comparison of “meaner beauties” such as stars and songbirds to the more majestic moon and Philomel proved adaptable enough to serve as praise for three different royal women, although it was most often directed at King James’s unfortunate daughter, Elizabeth, queen of Bohemia. The poem also sported different first lines and extra stanzas in certain miscellanies and songbooks.15 It is no wonder, then, that a single copyist in Folger Library, MS V.a. 170 entered “You meaner beauties of the night” in praise of Queen Anne on page 44 and in praise of Elizabeth, queen of Bohemia, on page 100, where the poem begins “You glorious trifles of the east”:

```
On Queen Anne by Sr H. Wooton
You meaner beauties of the Night,
That poorly satisfy our Eyes
More by your number, then your light,
Like common people of the skies:
What are you, when the Moone shall rise?
(Folger MS V.a. 170, pp. 43–44, ll. 1–5)
```

```
Vpon the La: Elizabeth / By Sr H. Wootton
You glorious trifles of the East,
Whose estimation Fancies rayse,
Pearls, rubies, saphyres; and the rest
Of precious Gemme: what is your prayse,
When once the diamond shews his rayes?
(Folger MS V.a. 170, p. 100, ll. 1–5)
```

It is poems like Wotton’s—poems that are decidedly well crafted but that utilize relatively uncomplicated conceits, imitable structures, and economic phrasing—that are most often copied into manuscripts twice. Variant lines and extra stanzas are a consequence of broad dissemination and reuse, and once in play, they encourage even wider distribution and render a poem more vulnerable to duplication. In Harvard University, MS English 686, where Wotton’s poem is again duplicated, it is dedicated to the “Spanish Lady” on folio 9v and sits among poems and libels on the unpopular mar-

15. There are five-stanza and six-stanza versions along with versions set to music that have a variant first line; Beal, Index, WoH 62–133.5. “Moon” in line five of the Folger V.a. 170 version is a variant of the more common “sun.”
riage negotiation between Charles I and the Spanish infanta. On folio 84, the poem more conventionally makes Elizabeth, queen of Bohemia, its subject. Although the first line is the same in both Harvard versions, the numbers of stanzas differ. As one of the exceptional poems found duplicated in several miscellanies, Wotton’s song probably reached many collectors in more than one source text. Its brevity and thematic flexibility gave those exchanging verse multiple reasons to add this poem to a letter or packet, and its variant first lines and dedicatees probably encouraged at least a few copyists to assume that they had two different poems and so to enter the poem a second time.

If a poem’s tendency to travel from collector to collector in a variety of groupings made it vulnerable to duplication, then analyzing those groups—at least the vestiges of those groups visible in extant miscellanies—may tell us more about the compilation practices that lead to duplication. In Stuart miscellanies, fashionable poems are often copied in clusters of equally fashionable verse, that is, in groups of poems unified not by author or theme but rather by sheer collectibility. Fashionable clusters appear to be formed when source providers and collectors, in successive acts of transmission and compilation, select their favorites from a larger group. The clustering can originate at some distance from the miscellany collector or in the collector’s own compilation. Fashionable clusters naturally tend to share materials, since those compiling them were seeking and selecting the best-known poems in circulation. As the context for so many duplicated poems, clusters demonstrate how a collector’s familiarity with a poem could be an editorial liability; those poems he or she had heard about or seen numerous times may have been some of the hardest redundancies to catch. As well as bringing two copies of poems to collectors with regularity, clusters of fashionable verse may also have dissuaded collectors from tampering with the rich mix of material or removing items that might not have been so fashionably framed elsewhere in the miscellany. Examples of doubled poems in clusters are numerous. The first version of the backgammon poem in Huntington HM 116 and the first of the Wotton elegies in Folger MS V.a. 170 both appear in distinct groupings of fashionable verse.

In Richard Jackson’s miscellany (Edinburgh University Library, MS H-P Coll. 401), the second versions of three duplicated poems appear right next to each other.

---


17. For more examples of the way fashionable poems are clustered or dispersed in miscellanies, see North, “Amateur Compilers,” 96–108.

18. For a similar process, see Love’s discussion of the “rolling archive,” *Scribal Publication*, 346–47.

19. In the same HM 116 stint with the backgammon poem, one finds the epitaph for Mr. Prick (p. 48), “Chide not thy sprouting lip” (pp. 46–47), and “Why slights thou her whom I approve?” (pp. 43–44), all three of which appear in over thirty Stuart miscellanies. Immediately following the Wotton poem in Folger V.a. 170, one finds Raleigh’s “What is our life? a play of passion” (p. 44), two fashionable Strode poems, “Be silent you still music of the spheres” and “I’ll tell you whence the rose did first grow red” (pp. 45–46), the popular exchange between Henry Reynolds’s fair boy and Henry King’s black maid (pp. 46–47), and Strode’s “I saw fair Chloris” (p. 48).
beginning on folio 110 in an obvious cluster: William Strode’s “I saw fair Chloris walk alone,” Thomas Carew’s “Amorous Fly,” and Carew’s “Go thou gentle whispering wind” (“A Prayer to the Wind”). Since the first copy of Carew’s “Amorous Fly” appears on folio 106 of the Jackson miscellany, just a few leaves before the second, one may guess that Richard Jackson switched source texts at some point between the two copies of the “Amorous Fly.” Indeed, the ink color and the quality of the hand change at least twice between the Carew duplicates. A distinct scribal stint running from folio 110 through folio 112 contains the three duplicated fashionable poems and probably denotes a single source text, perhaps a folded sheet enclosed in a letter.20 For whatever reason, Jackson did not strike out the items he had already copied. There are many short and clearly demarcated stints in his miscellany, and it seems to have been his habit to copy whole source texts as he received them rather than setting them aside for more careful organization and editing. Limited leisure time, source texts that had to be returned, scarce scribal labor, or a fear of losing track of poems on loose sheets might have influenced his practice. In the specific case of the three duplicates, he might have wanted to preserve an especially bountiful cluster of poems that reached him in a single source. Or, he might simply have preferred to edit items after copying them rather than before. Jackson corrected or revised many items in his miscellany, including Francis Quarles’s “Like to the damask rose you see,” which he entered twice in a row, immediately reformatting and recopying it (fols. 53–54v). The redundant poems in Jackson’s miscellany help us reimagine the process by which he compiled his miscellany, the shape and contents of his source manuscripts, and the ways that he manipulated these texts. In the absence of the actual source manuscripts, Jackson’s redundant entries offer some of the best evidence available that he was entering multiple exempla over time, making little effort to exclude duplicates before entry but taking time to edit and revise items later. The poems that Jackson duplicated also typify in several ways the poems that most frequently reached collectors twice. All four are exceptionally well-traveled, with clever yet imitable conceits, precise but simple imagery, and themes that are adaptable. The fact that three of them probably reached Jackson in the same source text gives us a sense of the overlapping clusters of fashionable materials with which most collectors worked in assembling their miscellanies.

Tracing the Supply and the Editing of Duplicates

We know what kinds of poems reached miscellany collectors more than once and what characteristics made certain poems vulnerable to duplication, but can we determine exactly how many times a poem like Wotton’s “Meaner Beauties” or Carew’s “Amorous Fly” might have reached a particular miscellany collector? What makes answering this question difficult is the fact that most collectors weeded out redundancies in their source texts before they entered items into their miscellanies. Many instances of duplication in miscellanies do not reflect collectors’ raw materials but rather the occasional

20. A few poems at the bottom of the leaves may be later insertions, but the three duplicated poems are clearly part of the original stint.
oversights of collectors and copyists who were otherwise diligently avoiding redundant acquisitions. Fortunately, by observing the scarcity of duplicates in certain substantial miscellanies, by analyzing the striking out of duplicates by collectors, and by comparing edited miscellanies to less-edited and composite verse manuscripts, one gets a sense of both the supply of redundancies encountered by collectors and their customary efforts to avoid them, whether successful or not.

Avoiding duplicates was not necessarily a simple task, but, remarkably, most collectors who took pains to search for and weed out redundancies succeeded, in the broad sense at least. The distribution of duplicates in the Stuart miscellanies that I tallied earlier indicates that up to 70 percent of Stuart miscellanies were edited. This figure is borne out by the modest numbers of duplicates in some of the most substantial miscellanies extant, miscellanies with hundreds of items by the most collectible poets in Stuart England. Folger MS V.a. 97, a small but dense manuscript with about 230 items, has only one clear duplicate, Carew’s “Amorous Fly” on pages 65 and 86. Bodleian Library (Bod.), MS Donations d. 58, BL MS Harley 6917, and Yale University, MS Osborn b.356 all have over 200 items and no obvious duplicates. Folger MS V.a. 345 has over five hundred poems, including many of the most fashionable, but only four obvious duplicates. Although somewhat slighter than these miscellanies, BL MS Egerton 2421 and Sir Henry Chomley’s manuscript, Harvard MS English 703, contain no duplicates, even though they have been copied by several hands. The Chomley and Egerton manuscripts offer evidence that collectors could supervise a project and edit out unwanted items even when more than one copyist was involved.

One may suspect that the limited numbers of duplicates in miscellanies reflect the scarcity of sources in elite manuscript networks and that collectors were eager to record almost all of the items to which they gained access. For those with very limited access to manuscript networks, demand might indeed have exceeded supply. For most collectors, however, the slim numbers of duplicates were the consequence of their active reading, selecting, and editing. Their care in editing is made manifest in several manuscripts in which redundancies have been discovered and crossed out. In Folger MS V.a. 262, a mid-seventeenth-century manuscript with connections to the Inns of Court, a second copy of William Strode’s “Keep on your mask, and hide your eye” has been crossed out by the copyist who entered both versions.21 In Bod. MS English Poetry e.14, several duplicated items have been identified and struck through, among them Ben Jonson’s “Execration on Vulcan.” The first few lines of Jonson’s poem were added and then crossed out on folio 78 reversed, probably because the very same copyist had already entered the “Execration” on 22v. The full version of Jonson’s witty complaint about the loss of his books in a 1623 fire is quite long, which may explain why the collector was intent on not copying it again.22 There are numerous other Stuart

21. The first copy appears on p. 76; the second, on p. 124. The ink used to cross out the second version is identical to the ink used to copy the poem.

manuscripts in which second copies of poems have been struck out. The practice, it turns out, was quite common. One even finds a redundant prose anecdote crossed through in Lambeth Palace Library, MS 2086, a collection of anecdotes, witticisms, and verse compiled by William Rawley between 1620 and 1640 (fols. 38r, 39r).

However usual it was for collectors to strike out duplicates, the practice compels us to ask what they achieved in the process. If the item was noticeably corrupt or incomplete, then the striking out might have prevented readers from misinterpreting or recopying a faulty text. Cancels that recorded a collector’s choice of one variant over another might have advertised the access and taste of the collector. In instances when the duplicates are similar textually, however, the marking out is more baffling, for the collector did not regain the space on the leaf or the time it took to copy an item, nor was the miscellany any more legible for the editing. The practice of striking through these “true” duplicates may document the collectors’ desire to draft an ideal exemplar, not necessarily with the intention of making a fair copy, and certainly not with the intention of printing the collection, but rather in anticipation of future use. Collectors expected to use their miscellanies for their own pleasure and advancement and to share their miscellanies with other collectors, who might themselves have wanted to avoid redundancies. Some deletions may even be in the hands of careful readers planning their own copy projects. The value of verse miscellanies for collectors and readers lay not in their material appearance or organization, but in the access to sought-after poems that they simultaneously flaunted and provided. Miscellanies touted the collector’s literary connections and acquisition successes, offered him or her continued use of the acquired treasures, and provided subsequent readers with a select gathering of collectible verse. However messy the results, deleting duplicates served to maintain and improve the access to and usefulness of the poems in the miscellany by identifying what was superfluous.

It is fair to assume that if these collectors went to the trouble of deleting redundancies already copied into miscellanies, many more collectors and copyists edited out potential duplicates before the copying began. The paucity of duplicates in the majority of verse miscellanies points to collectors who were intently involved in the details of manuscript production, and who either performed these editorial tasks themselves or asked their copyists to perform them. This characterization is substantiated by several miscellanies in which the collectors have done much of their own copying. For instance, BL Add. MS 58215, compiled and copied primarily by Thomas Manne, and Bod. MS Donations d. 58, a formal miscellany compiled by John Hopkinson, contain very few duplicates and almost none that are accidental. Collector-copyists had the advantage of familiarity with their miscellanies, and they were able to combine differ-

23. See, for example, Folger V.a.322, fols. 14 and 85. I discuss deletions in Bod. MS Ashmole 47, Bod. MS Malone 19, and BL MS Sloan 1792 in “Amateur Compilers,” 93–95. Beal, in CELM, notes several other deletions of second copies, among them those in Bod. MS Tanner 465, fols. 38 and 65v and Edinburgh University Library, LA III 468, fols. 4 and 63r.

24. My information about the owner/copyists of these manuscripts is taken primarily from Beal’s descriptions in CELM.
ent aspects of the compilation labors—perhaps reading, selecting items, and copying in the same sitting. Collectors’ intimate knowledge of their miscellany contents should not be underestimated; it explains not only the absence of duplicates but also many other seemingly accidental practices such as the clustering of fashionable verse and the haphazard attribution of items. Although owner-copied miscellanies are not always the neatest of manuscripts, they are important gauges of how a collector’s editorial labors prior to copying shaped the content of many Stuart miscellanies.

Our picture of the careful, editorial collector who received multiple copies of many poems but weeded them out successfully is given greater definition by the opposite kind of collector, the one who entered source texts with little-to-no selection and editing. The miscellanies of less-editorial collectors often have many duplicated entries, which may reflect how much overlapping material collectors encountered. Bod. MS English Poetry c. 50, whose two main scribes alternated in copying several large source texts, has close to a dozen redundancies. Bod. MS Ashmole 38, copied primarily by its owner, Nicholas Burghe, has over a dozen. Christ Church College, Oxford, MS 328 contains almost ten duplicated poems, and Harvard MS English 686, a manuscript copied over time and containing both Oxford and Inns of Court materials, has at least a dozen duplicates. The prevalent duplication of poems in some Stuart miscellanies has been used to argue that those projects involved the wholesale copying of large manuscript sources, often by a hired copyist who completed the project quickly and efficiently. Bod. MS English Poetry c. 50 certainly falls into this category; its redundancies are all cases in which one scribe entered an item already recorded by another scribe. However, the Harvard manuscript, which was copied over a period of time, and the Ashmole manuscript, which was copied primarily by its owner, offers proof that indiscriminate copying was also occasionally performed by collectors themselves. The fact that miscellanies with many redundant entries are somewhat unusual reminds us that the rote copying of source texts was not the primary means of producing verse miscellanies. The majority of miscellany collectors managed to pare down the dozen redundancies they likely received to a bare one or two.

Composite manuscripts, in which smaller gatherings and sheets that once circulated separately are bound together, offer another contrast to the edited miscellany. Although composite manuscripts do not necessarily have more duplicates than edited collections, they sometimes preserve multiple copies of the same poem, each in the form in which it reached collectors. This is certainly the case for BL Add. MS 27408, cited earlier in this article, which has two copies of a Buckingham libel in different material formats. It is in a composite manuscript that an example of the rarely seen

25. Eckhardt, in *Manuscript Verse Collectors*, 210, argues that much of Burghe’s miscellany was a single project and not strictly composite, as other scholars have suggested.
28. For details about the division of labor in the production of Bod. MS English Poetry c. 50, see North, “Amateur Compilers,” 104–8.
triplicate appears, in this case of the most duplicated poem in circulation during the period. Bod. MS Rawlinson Poetry 26, a collection of political, bawdy, and fashionable verse from the first half of the seventeenth century, contains three separate versions of Ralegh's “Even such is time,” a poem often associated with Ralegh's 1618 execution and claimed in many miscellanies to be his final verse. The first version, which appears on a separate sheet and precedes the pagination of the manuscript, is “signed” by the mid-seventeenth-century owner of the manuscript, John Cooke, who was likely more interested in appropriating the contemplative moral of the poem for himself than connecting it to Ralegh's history. The second version appears in a four-leaf mix of light poems and political libels at the beginning of the manuscript and is titled, “Sr Walter Raleigh's epitaph on his owne death—Novemb: 1618.”

Euen such is tyme, which takes in trust
Our youth, our ioyes, and all wee haue.
And payes vs but with age & dust.
Within the darke & silent graue:
When wee haue wandred all our wayes
Shufts vp the story of our dayes.
And from which death & graue, & dust
The Lord will rayse mee vp I trust.

(Fol. 2)

A libel on the Essex rebellion conspirators and two poems on John Hoskyns's 1614 arrest for speaking out in Parliament mark this section as politically focused. The third version of “Even such is time” is copied on folio 69v between two other poems documenting Ralegh's 1618 execution. Although there are light poems earlier in the four-leaf gathering that holds this third version of the poem, the juxtaposition of Ralegh poems on facing leaves (fols. 69v–70) lends “Even such as time” more weight here. The three different source texts that brought Ralegh's poem to the Rawlinson collector show us the kinds of materials another collector might have chosen to select from. Not only would such a collector need to choose just one of the texts (a task made easy in this case because the three are similar textually), he or she would also have to choose whether to preserve the clusters of poems with which the Ralegh poem traveled. If the duplicates were eliminated, at least one of the clusters would be short the Ralegh poem and perhaps be the less coherent for its absence. The editorial tasks that this composite manuscript lets us imagine were quite extensive and could potentially involve the shuffling of many sources and their contents. This example helps us understand how a duplicated poem could slip by a compiler, but it also points to the incredi-

30. I base this argument on Beal, *Index, RaW* 21, since I have not been able to view the first version of this poem.
31. "Essex prays, Southampton plays," fol. 2; "Hoskins the lawyer is merrily sad," fol. 2; "Son Benjamin, whilst thou art young," fol. 2v.
ble organizational skill and editorial tenacity that belonged to the average amateur collector whose miscellany was relatively free of duplicates.

What is puzzling about both composite miscellanies and miscellanies with extensive duplications is that the triplication of poems was very rare. Given how ubiquitous poems such as Ralegh’s “Even such as time” must have been, and given that it was possible for a collector to acquire two versions of over a dozen poems, it seems logical that collectors would encounter three, four, or even more copies of the most fashionable poems in the course of their collecting. The fact that most miscellanies have relatively few duplicates and hardly any triplicates argues that the weeding out of unwanted items from source texts was a regular and standardized part of the miscellany production process. In several of the miscellanies with a great number of duplicates, such as Bod. MS English Poetry c. 50, the copyists appear to have been working with longer source texts that were already relatively free of duplicates, though they entered them without any further editing. Indeed, none of the several scribes in this manuscript duplicates a poem he has entered himself. If the editing out of redundancies was indeed standardized practice, and if many longer exampas to which collectors had access were already carefully edited, this would explain why duplicates are far more common than triplicates. The frequent reading and use of miscellanies also made a third copy of a poem much harder to overlook than a second. Even owners who initially relied on hired scribes or who entered sources themselves without editing would probably catch later redundancies, perhaps because, after a period of use, they were more familiar with the contents of their miscellany, had noticed the earlier duplicates, and had taken a greater interest in filling out and shaping the remainder of their miscellany.

Although collectors’ attentive reading and editorial efficiency help explain the limited numbers of duplicates and the dearth of triplicates in most miscellanies, it is important to remember that over 150 different redundant poems escaped their attention in my sample set alone. This variety is significant. It seems unlikely that 150 different duplicates would be the outcome if collectors were borrowing the same or related long exempla for their miscellany projects. The variety of duplicates offers proof instead that collectors were mostly working with different raw materials, sources that were similar enough to create the duplicates in the first place but distinct enough to ensure that few poems were duplicated more than once. The sheer variety of duplicated poems may also indicate that collectors were trading and sharing not extensive, bound source texts but shorter sources that could be shuffled and rearranged.32 Notably, the variety of duplicated titles is not a sign of lax editing but, rather, further proof that the weeding out of duplicates had been standardized. If editing had been uncommon, one would see the same poems duplicated over and over again. We have no way of recreating exactly what sources were available to any one collector, but the patterns of duplication imply that collectors considered it conventional to read

---

32. Here, I am to some extent challenging the model established by Hobbs, who imagined that collectors had access to and shared more substantial source texts. See Early Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts, 64.
their sources attentively for both new acquisitions and redundancies. The variety of source texts that reached collectors and the challenges this transmission method posed led to more systematized strategies for compilation. The personal investment and editorial attention of miscellany collectors prove to be defining features of Stuart verse-collection practices. The nonchalant collector commissioning scribes to enter sources wholesale and the disengaged copyist entering sources mechanically are the exceptions.

When Editing Fails: Case Studies
Despite their usually careful reading and editing, collectors and their copyists did miss the occasional duplicate. Looking at three miscellanies more closely here, I consider what conditions and processes might have created the opportunity for duplication. Just as certain poems were more likely to reach a collector twice or to be duplicated because of variant first lines, certain compilation practices also tended to lead to greater accidental duplication. If collectors and their copyists were working with multiple loose leaves or with very extensive bound sources, redundancies might have slipped by them. If collectors added to their miscellanies over time with frequent interruptions between entries (as Richard Jackson seems to have done) or if their organizational or editorial strategies were especially complicated, these factors, too, could result in duplicated poems. Thus, while the editing of source texts seems to have been a standard practice among verse collectors, the complexities of poem acquisition, organization, and entry could work against the editorial intentions of both careful and nonchalant collectors. Throughout this article, I have emphasized that it is the mistakes and failures in verse collection that can help modern scholars imagine and define the successes and common practices, especially when the successes are unrevealing of the strategies and labor to which they owe their existence. Looking at how and why three particular copyists accidentally recorded redundancies gives us a more detailed picture of their compilation strategies and limitations. Since I only know the collector's identity in my third case, where the collector is also one of the copyists, I discuss the copyists in the following paragraphs as if they are editorial agents in the compilation process. For many Stuart miscellanies, copyists were friends, family members, literate retainers, or the collectors themselves, all of whom could perform editorial tasks as well as scribal labors.

Bod. MS Ashmole 47 shows us a copyist who struck out one partial duplicate but missed two others in completing an ambitious project, a project whose length may have compromised the collector's editorial intentions. Ashmole 47 is a miscellany compiled in the 1630s and '40s and copied in a single italic hand from folio 8v through 130. The hand here is legible but somewhat irregular; the copyist gets sloppy at the end of long stints, and his lines often overrun the width of the leaves, forcing him to insert words between the lines.33 Ashmole 47 contains some of the most fashionable poems

33. Elias Ashmole owned and contributed to this miscellany at some point in the 1640s. John R. Elliott Jr. and Joshua Eckhardt come to different conclusions about Ashmole's contributions as a
in circulation in Stuart manuscript networks, many of which appear in concentrated groups in the middle of the miscellany. The three duplicates make their way into the miscellany through the fashionable clusters, though the copyist’s inconsistent performance may explain why they were overlooked. On folio 46v, the Ashmole copyist caught himself as he began a second copy of Henry King’s “Misery of Man,” for he crossed through a first line that reads, somewhat ironically given the mistake, “I’ll busied man why shouldst thou take such care?” The apparent reason for the deletion is that the copyist was striking out a poem that he had already entered on folio 38. A few leaves later, however, in one of the sloppiest and most hurried sections of the miscellany, the same copyist accidentally added second versions of two William Strode poems, thereby demonstrating that a scribe can be selective and attentive in one instance (perhaps with the intention of avoiding duplicates throughout the miscellany) but then miss redundancies later in the compilation process.34

The two duplicated Strode poems—“I’ll tell you whence the rose grew red” and an elegy on Sir Thomas Pelham, “Merely for death to grieve and mourn”—were entered first in a grouping of fashionable items between folios 35 and 41 of the miscellany, where the copyist had also placed “A Prayer to the Wind” and the “Amorous Fly,” two of Carew’s most broadly circulated poems. The first copy of “Misery of Man” also appears in this cluster, and the pen work suggests that this whole section was probably copied in a single sitting. The second versions of the two Strode poems were copied as part of a similarly fashionable cluster between folios 51v and 54v, where Ralegh’s “On Man’s Life” and “Tichbourne’s Elegy” are just two of several sought-after items nearby. Although the two clusters share only the two duplicates, each contains an extraordinary percentage of well-traveled verse. Almost half of the entries in each cluster appear in forty or more extant miscellanies today. In a volume with over 250 items, this sort of concentration of fashionable verse is unlikely to be coincidental, especially when large sections of the rest of the manuscript contain far fewer well-traveled items. These impressive groupings most likely trace the outline of the small booklets or folded sheets that carried poems to the Ashmole copyist. We can be pretty certain that the copyist was working with more than one source text when he entered the two fashionable clusters, because both sets of duplicates have just enough variants to point to different sources, though not enough to suggest that the second poems were copied for the purposes of variety or improvement. The “rose” poems illustrate this degree of difference:

copyist of fols. 8–130. Elliott believes that Ashmole’s entries follow those of the main scribe; see “Mr. Moore’s Revels: A ‘Lost’ Oxford Masque,” Renaissance Quarterly 37 (Fall 1984): 414. Eckhardt believes that Ashmole is responsible for most of the copying; see Manuscript Verse Collectors, 218. Like Elliott, Beal, CELM, attributes only the latter part of the miscellany to Ashmole.

34. There is a stricken false start to “All you that women love and like” on fol. 101v and a full copy on fol. 104. I do not discuss this as a duplicate here, because the recopying of the poem marks the correction of an error that the copyist caught very quickly, but it is further evidence of the copyist’s editorial agency.
The two versions differ in their occasional tetrameter lines, in the order of certain words, and in minor verbs and pronouns, but they both preserve the details of the poem’s origin myth, whereby the mistress’s blush gives the rose its color and her hand gives the lily its paleness. Although “dight” properly means “furnish” or “clothe” in line 3, its homophonic connection to “indite” resonates in manuscript, where the copyist’s manual application of black ink to white paper complements the contrasting colors and the creative agency described in the poem. The aptness of the conceit’s framing in manuscript may have even encouraged its broad circulation. The two versions of the Pelham elegy have about the same level of variants as the “rose” poem, though different headings and first lines (none of which identify Pelham as the poems’ subject) would have made this duplicate harder to catch. As with the “rose” poems, the Pelham elegies almost certainly derive from separate source texts. In fact, it seems likely that the first versions of the “rose” and “Pelham” poems reached the copyist in the same impressive source text, and the second copies of both in a second treasured exemplar.

Along with the two source texts that contained these duplicates, the Ashmole copyist likely had other materials on his desk when he began his project, perhaps more than he could deal with efficiently. He stopped to sharpen or switch the pen mid-poem on several occasions, which is often indication that a scribe is involved in a longer project. The loose organization of the manuscript, the rushed handwriting in parts, and the poor layout of lines on the page offer more evidence that the copyist was working quickly rather than trying to produce a careful show piece. He may have copied his manuscript in more than one sitting, but based on the relatively consistent ink color, the central section of the miscellany from folio 17 to 103v was probably conceived of as a single copy project. The fortunate collector of this miscellany appears to have gained access to several source texts at the same time—or he was inclined to put off copying until the acquisitions piled up. The result was that when the Ashmole copyist reached the middle of his project, perhaps at the end of a long sitting, he missed the Strode redundancies even though he was probably avoiding redundancies in principle. The duplicates in Ashmole 47 document the copyist’s difficulties when facing an abundance of collectible poems in multiple sources. If a scarcity of good poems was a problem for some collectors, successful acquisition proved a hurdle for
others, especially in a manuscript culture where amateur collectors were often doing their own copying.

In St. John's College, Cambridge, MS S.32, one finds another example of redundancies that both mark the collector's oversight and trace the shape of his source texts. In this case, however, the copyist appears to have entered one poem twice using the same source text and duplicated another poem in order to preserve a collection of song lyrics. The St. John's manuscript is a sizeable collection of fashionable poetry, political verse, and songs. Two poems attributed in the manuscript to Carew, “A Lover's Passion” and the “Amorous Fly,” have been copied twice by the manuscript's main scribe, who entered nearly all of the manuscript items and divided his labor into six or more stints that are marked by changes in writing style. “A Lover’s Passion” begins “Is She Not Wondrous Fair?” and revisits the Petrarchan paradox of a woman too heavenly to be dishonored with an earthly kiss. The copyist has included “A Lover’s Passion” as part of two distinct stints running from folios 8r to 12v and from 27r to 44v. Both of these sections of the manuscript share a noticeable amount of material with the first part of BL MS Harley 6931. Folios 9v–11r (items 22–27) in the St. John's manuscript contain five poems found in the first five leaves of the Harley manuscript. Folios 36r–44v (items 83–100) of the St. John's manuscript contain ten poems found in the first nineteen leaves of the Harley manuscript. Although Stuart manuscripts of fashionable verse, such as these, can seem more closely related than they actually were, the profusion of overlapping poems in the St. John's and Harley manuscripts points to the possibility that the St. John's copyist took a single source text related to the Harley manuscript and split it into two stints, entering the two groups into the St. John's manuscript several leaves apart. The handwriting analysis provided by Cambridge University’s Scriptorium, which has digitized the miscellany, finds the copyist using a similar style of handwriting with these two groups, again supporting the possibility that these separate stints are linked. The two versions of “A Lover’s Passion” in the St. John's manuscript are quite similar textually, and aside from one word in the heading, they have almost no substantive variants. The most likely explanation for this duplicate is that “A Lover’s Passion” was entered once and then somehow reshuffled into the pile again when the copyist began to enter the second group of poems from his source. The second “Lover's Passion” appears near the very end of the second, longer stint, at a point when the copyist was perhaps tired, more hurried, and less focused on weeding out duplicates. This explanation assumes that the copyist was working with at least some loose sheets that could be reorganized at will.

The second Carew poem duplicated in St. John's MS S.32 is much more likely to have been copied from two different sources, since the texts of the “Amorous Fly” vary somewhat in their vocabulary:

35. The St. John's stint that includes this second cluster has a change in pen quality between fol. 32v and fol. 33r.
Vppon A flye drown'ld in a ladies eye
When this flie liu'd shee vs'd to plaie
In the sunshine of the daie
Tyll coming neere my Celia's sight
Shee felt a straunge and vnknowne light
Soe full of glory that yt made
The middaie seeme a gloriouse shade
Then this amorous fly became
My rivall, and did courte my flame
From head to bosome shee did skipp
And on her brests her necke her lippe
Suckt all the incence & the spice
And grewe the bird of Paradise
At length into her eye shee flewe,
Where scorcht with flame and drencht with dewe
Like Phaeton from the sunnes sphare
Shee fell and with her dropt a teare
Of which a pearle was straight compos'd
Wherein her ashes yse inclos'd
Soe shee receav'd from Celia's eye
Funerall fyre, tombe, Obsequie
(St. John's MS S.32, fol. 10r–v)

Sonnett.
When this Flye liu'd shee us'd to play
In the sunshine all the daye;
Tyll coming neere my Celia's sight,
Shee found a new & vnkowne light,
Soe full of glory as yt made
The noone daie sun a gloomeing shade.
Then this amorous fly became
My Ryvall, & did court my flame.
Shee did from hand to bosome skipp,
& from her breast, her Cheeke, her lyppes,
Suckt all the Incense, Myrrhe, & spice
And grewe a bird of Paradise.
Att last into her eye shee flewe,
There scorcht in flame, & drencht in dewe,
Lyke Phaeton from the sunnes sphare
Shee fell, and with her dropt a teare:
Of which a pearle was straight compos'd;
Where in her ashes yse inclos'd.
Thus shee receav'd from Celia's eye
Funerall, flame, tombe, Obsequie
(St. John's MS S.32, fol. 50r)

None of the variants in these two versions of the "Amorous Fly" alters the poem's well-known extended conceit, in which the poet's winged rival enjoys intimacy with the mistress only to meet his destruction in her eye and his burial in her tear. Since the memorable conceit likely drove this poem's fashionability, the conceit's stability was a material as well as an aesthetic factor in the poem's dissemination. This stability is evident in other witnesses to the poem, where the variants tend to involve the parts of the body that the fly touches and the spices it sucks, while the actions in the poem remain exactly the same.\(^{37}\) It is unlikely, therefore, that confusing variants led to the duplication of this particular poem.

\(^{37}\) See, for instance, the duplicates in Folger V.a. 97, fols. 65 and 86; Bod. MS English Poetry c. 50, fol. 72; Harvard MS English 703, fol. 22v.
The St. John's manuscript introduces another possible reason for the Carew redundancy. The second version of the “Amorous Fly” is included in a series of song lyrics, all of which are titled “Sonnett.” This series runs from folio 46r to 53v and is further distinguished by a change in the quality of the hand and by dark lines between entries. All these features suggest that the songs were copied in a single stint. Except for the “Amorous Fly,” no other poems in this section of the manuscript overlap with other content in the St. John’s manuscript or with the content of BL MS Harley 6931. Two-thirds of these lyrics, however, can also be found spread throughout John Wilson’s songbook, Bod. MS Music b. 1, and it is likely that a similar songbook was the exemplar for the St. John’s copyist. Upon acquiring this set of song lyrics, this copyist may have assumed that he had a new and original source text that did not need to be checked against his previous entries. He may also have wanted to keep these lyrics together for future use as a discrete collection within the collection. Thus, this redundancy may be an example of the purposeful neglect exercised by copyists creating a comprehensive generic or authorial subset within a larger miscellany. A lack of editing is thus sometimes an act of carelessness and sometimes its own strategy. The duplicated poems in St. John’s MS S.32 capture both of these editorial practices in the same miscellany.

When it came to copying long sources in a focused amount of time, copyists sometimes ignored duplicates in order to finish their tasks more expediently. This effort-saving measure likely explains the Carew duplicate in St. John’s MS S.32, but the measure is especially evident in such manuscripts as Bod. MS English Poetry c. 50, where the two central copyists enlisted for the large project did not compare their work. Even in manuscripts maintained closely by the collector, however, the demands of a long source text could compromise the collector’s editorial strategy. Daniel Leare’s very extensive miscellany, BL Add. MS 30982, has earned attention because of its remarkable collection of fashionable Stuart verse and because the William Strode poems in the reverse portion of the manuscript are closely related textually to the poems in Strode’s autograph manuscript, Corpus Christi College, Oxford (CCC), MS 325. Mary Hobbs, who has documented the social connections between Leare and Strode and the textual similarities of the poems their manuscripts share, argues that Leare was using the Corpus Christi manuscript to fill out the second half of his miscellany. A comparison of the two manuscripts uncovers several interesting editorial patterns in the Leare miscellany. The Strode sequence entered into Leare’s miscellany is part of a larger group of poems copied upside down starting from the back of the volume. Within this portion of the manuscript, the uninterrupted series of Strode poems runs from folio 133v reversed to 118 reversed and seems to have been the last major addition to the manuscript, postdating the forward part of the miscellany and also folios 164–133 reversed. Leare is the copyist for much of his miscellany, but just before the reversed Strode sequence, he handed the pen to another copyist, entering the heading for a poem on folio 134 but not the poem itself. Although the change in hand may

explain some of the decisions and mistakes in the entry of poems from Strode's Corpus Christi manuscript, Leare's copyist was not entering items by rote. Whether Leare's or his own, the copyist had a clear editorial strategy when it came to dealing with the prized loan from William Strode.

The reversed Strode sequence in Add. MS 30982 closely follows the order of poems in Strode's Corpus Christi manuscript between folios 60v and 100. The copyist did not, however, add every poem he found in the Corpus Christi manuscript. He appears to have intentionally left behind close to twenty-five poems. Not coincidentally, these are items that Leare had already entered into his miscellany on previous leaves. For example, on folio 133 reversed, the copyist entered Strode's satirical “Preferment is like a game of bowls” but then skipped two similarly humorous poems in the Corpus Christi manuscript that had been previously added to other sections of Add. MS 30982: an argument that a woman's foot is a measure of her beauty and a very popular couplet on a butcher marrying a tanner's daughter. After these omissions, he continued to add the next six poems from the Strode manuscript. This same pattern is evident throughout the reversed Strode sequence. In using Strode's Corpus Christi manuscript, Leare's copyist managed to eliminate over twenty-five potential redundancies by skipping over previously acquired poems, and he missed only three poems that he should have edited out.

For all of Leare's and his copyists' efforts to bring in the new and leave out the redundancies, Add. MS 30982 still has more than the usual number of duplicates, especially for a miscellany with such an involved collector. In addition to the redundancies that the copyist introduced when he took items from Strode's Corpus Christi manuscript, there are nine additional doubled poems in other parts of the miscellany. Leare's erratic handwriting indicates that he was often hurried, but it may have been Leare's close ties to Strode and his ready access to Strode's verse that most complicated his editorial endeavors. As Strode's cousin and possibly his pupil at Christ Church College, Leare probably acquired Strode's work in numerous source texts over the course of compiling Add. MS 30982, and he may have gained access to the Corpus Christi manuscript more than once. Of the twelve doubled poems in Leare's miscellany, eight are commonly attributed to Strode. Six are in Strode's Corpus Christi manuscript, another is attributed to “W. S.” in Leare's miscellany, and an eighth, “Fair valentine, since once your welcome hand,” is attributed to Strode in many other contemporary miscellanies. Leare's miscellany has a remarkable variety of fashionable verse by authors other than Strode, and if Leare's editorial problems were simply careless.

39. The poems left behind are “If Hercules tall stature might be guessed,” and “A fitter match hath never been,” both found on fol. 71 of CCC MS 325. In Additional MS 30982, “Hercules” appears on fol. 15 and the “fitter match” couplet is found both on fol. 7 and 164 rev. Because of the reversal, all three entries were copied before the Strode sequence.
40. “O sing a new song,” fols. 5 and 133v; “Like as the hand which hath been used to play,” fols. 10 and 128v; “Whatever in Philoclea the fair,” fols. 18v and 125.
42. I base this assertion on the information in first line indices and also on The Poetical Works of William Strode, ed. Bertram Dobell (London, 1907).
lessness, one might expect some of these other authors to be represented among his duplicates. However, the only redundancies that are definitely not Strode poems are Ralegh’s “Even such is time” (fols. 21v, 148v), a brief epitaph that Leare attributes to R[ichard] C[orbett] (fols. 28, 57), “Tichbourne’s Elegy” (fols. 24r, 160), and Carew’s “Know Celia since thou art so proud” (fols. 65v, 79v); the later versions of the last two poems are shorter variants. Leare’s tendency to enter duplicates, therefore, seems related specifically to his access to Strode source texts.

The variants among the duplicated Strode poems not only confirm that Leare worked with the Corpus Christi manuscript more than once, they also verify that Leare had access to other sources of Strode poetry as well. Those Strode poems copied earlier in the miscellany and then recopied within the reversed Strode sequence are very close textually. The duplicates of “Whatever in Philoclea the fair,” “O sing a new song to the Lord,” and “Like as the hand which hath been us’d to play” have almost no variants. This pattern suggests that Leare used texts provided by Strode for some very early entries as well as for his reversed Strode sequence. In cases where Leare entered two copies of the same Strode poem outside of his reversed Strode sequence, the variants are more prevalent. The second copy of “Return my joys and hither bring” (fol. 161v), for instance, is two lines longer than the copy on folio 24 and contains other substantive variants as well. These examples suggest strongly that Leare gained access to less-authoritative Strode material in between the times that he was able to borrow Strode’s own manuscript.

Leare’s close ties to Strode guaranteed him access to much of Strode’s work and to his autograph manuscript, but this access did not necessarily lead to better editing practices. When Leare borrowed the Corpus Christi manuscript late in his compilation project, he appears to have been rushed to copy its contents. This may explain why he enlisted a copyist to help out. Although Leare’s intention seems to have been to gather only poems he did not have already from the Strode exemplar, the redundancies argue that he or his copyist was editing from memory as the copying progressed rather than comparing the manuscripts carefully. Along with the missed redundancies, the copyist also passed over a few poems that Leare had not copied earlier. He did not copy one of Strode’s most collectible titles, “On a Blistered Lip,” perhaps because its familiarity led him to believe that he already possessed the poem. For the most part, Leare achieved what he set out to do, and his miscellany is a remarkable collection of fashionable verse and an important witness to the collectibility of Strode’s poetry. For modern scholars, it also serves as an example of how a collector’s close and plentiful access to one author’s texts could prove an impediment, especially when it came to sorting out new and previous acquisitions. All three of my examples of imperfect editing remind us that slips and oversights in miscellanies often uncover the processes of compilation, ranging from the receipt of materials to after-the-fact readerly interventions. The

43. “O sing a new song,” fols. 5 and 133v; “Like as the hand which hath been used to play,” fols. 10 and 128v; “Whatever in Philoclea the fair,” 18v and 125.
44. “Chide not thy sprouting lip, nor kill” appears on fol. 77 of CCC MS 325 amid several other poems that Leare did copy.
irony is that those collectors and copyists who made the revealing mistakes were, at the same time, documenting the care and attention that they could and often did pay to the various aspects of verse miscellany production.

**Purposeful Duplication**

Although the accidental duplication of poems offers evidence that miscellany compilers frequently juggled multiple source texts as they undertook ambitious copy projects, intentional duplication points even more explicitly to the collector’s reliance on and strategic manipulation of distinct exempla. The purposeful recopying of a poem often signals that a collector has gained access to what he or she believes is a better version of a poem, a more complete text, or an interesting variant. Accordingly, second entries are a measure of success—of expanded access and opportunity for the collector. However, intentional duplicates also expose the awkwardness of incorporating new material into an existing miscellany—the messiness of replacing an inferior copy with a better one, the difficulty of linking separately acquired variants for comparison, and the compromises of space and labor required to reposition or reorganize poems. It is important to see the compromises in miscellany compilation as an integral and expected part of the compilation process rather than as scribal errors. The hurdles introduced by new source texts in fact encouraged compilers to anticipate and standardize much after-the-fact editing and reorganizing.

Judging from the large majority of miscellanies, collectors thought it was important to incorporate new or fuller variants of poems even if there was no simple way to organize such duplicates. A bawdy epitaph on the death of Mr. Prick, who was a “privy member” of Christ Church College, has variant first lines in many Stuart miscellanies depending on the month in which he was believed to have died. In Bod. MS Malone 19, the copyist must have acquired new information about the correct month of his death, for he crossed through the version beginning “The three and twentieth of November” on page 55 and entered the poem again, beginning with “The three and twentieth of December,” on page 56. This isn’t a case of a scribal error caught and corrected in the process of double checking a source text. Rather, the collector has seen and compared two versions of the epitaph and judiciously selected one. However trivial Prick’s date of death may seem, the deletion marks a moment of expanded access to texts and information. The same may be said for a Thomas Campion air that appears twice in BL Add. MS 10309, a 1630s miscellany copied by a single scribe and possibly owned by a Margaret Bellasys. The second version (fol. 94v), which appears barely ten folios after the first (fols. 85v–86r), is a significant rewriting of “Could my heart more tongues employ.” The tetrameter lines of the first version are expanded to pentameters, metaphors are filled out, and the speaker is allowed more expressive suffering than the tetrameters can convey. Although Add. MS 10309 has very few doubled poems, it is known for its interesting rewritings and variants of fashionable verse. Its collector, whether Bellasys or someone else, appears to have included the second copy of the

---

Campion air precisely because it was different enough from the first to offer a new perspective and a new potential use, either as a lyric to a different musical score or as a complaint with a different emotional register. With both Malone 19 and Add. MS 10309, the collectors had no neat or easy way to replace an incorrect poem or juxtapose two related variants, but the desire to record these second versions outweighed any material disadvantages.

In a few cases, duplicates that have been entered purposely bear some reference to the other copy, making explicit the collectors’ strategies and compromises. A short version of a libelous epitaph on Penelope Rich on page 9 of Folger MS V.a. 345 has a note beside it in the copyist’s hand, “see more p. 28,” that directs a reader to a longer version and to two other epitaphs on Rich. The main copyist (probably the collector) did not want his readers to overlook the more complete epitaph and the related material that he later acquired. His note was meant to compensate for the disadvantages of sequential copying, providing a kind of road map for the reader, but it also demonstrates how he expertly navigated his own miscellany and made use of connected contents several leaves apart. In Rosenbach Library, MS 1083/17, one finds another note acknowledging a duplicate. A second copy of Thomas Carew’s “He that loves a rosy cheek” is headed “A Songe, write befor. page 18.”46 The heading could have been added as a kind of correction to the manuscript after the duplication was discovered, but it is just as likely that the note registered both the copyist’s awareness of the previous version and his reemployment of Carew’s poem in a new setting. The first version is in a cluster of Carew poems and the second in a miscellaneous grouping of love poems, several written from the point of view of the discouraged lover. Such notes are rare, but when they are present, they attest to the fact that collectors and readers expected to cross-reference items and to make connections outside of the sequential organization of the miscellany.

Perhaps the most common reason for copying a second version of a poem was that the first one was somehow imperfect. In Cambridge University Library, MS Additional 8470, the copyist crossed through one incomplete version of Carew’s “On His Mistress’s Sickness” (fols. 11v–12) and included another several folios later (fol. 17–17v). This is one of only two poems that appear duplicated in this miscellany, and in both cases, the first version is imperfect.47 The central collector of Bod. MS Rawlinson Poetry 117 was a printer who entered items into the miscellany over a very long period of time.48 The manuscript has an unusual number of duplicates, perhaps because time passed between entries or because the printer was seeking the best versions of manuscript materials. Like the copyist of Bod. MS Malone 19, this collector used second versions to correct problems with the first. In a case where three copies of a popular epitaph for Prince Henry, “Reader, wonder think it none,” have been entered in a reversed and inverted section of the manuscript, a four-line version has...

46. Beal, CELM, notes for CwT 167.
47. Donne’s “Bracelet” begins on fol. 5 with line 68, and the copyist enters the whole poem again, starting on fol. 7.
48. For a description of this manuscript, see Sasha Roberts, Reading Shakespeare’s Poems in Early Modern England (New York, 2003), 90.
been crossed through (fol. 269 rev.), another version has several lines added in the margin (fol. 268v rev.), and a third version is complete (fol. 183v rev.). The Rawlinson copyist likewise entered two versions of a poem that combines Carew’s “Cruel Mistress” and his “Murdering Beauty.”49 The copies of this combined poem appear about ten folios apart, also in the reversed half of the miscellany. In entering the first version on folio 172 reversed, the copyist ran into some older notes at the bottom of the leaf and had to finish the Carew verse in the margin. With the later entry on folio 163 reversed, he carefully centered the poem on the leaf. The variants indicate that the copyist was using the first version as his source for the second, flipping the leaves of the volume as he copied, though he had to add a few corrections in the end to better align the two poems.50 Almost as if he were preparing a fair copy for print, the collector of Rawlinson Poetry 117 recopied his imperfect poems; in the first case, because he acquired a longer version, and in the second, because he wanted the entire poem situated neatly on one leaf.

Sometimes the point of a duplicate is not to record a better version of the poem but rather to record a better ordering of items. Folger MS V.a. 96 contains two versions of a pair of poems that are often copied together in miscellanies: a poem chiding a woman for her inconstancy, “Whither are all her false oaths blown,” and a female-voiced response, “Go, perjur’d man,” attributed today to Robert Herrick. Herrick’s “Curse,” as the response is known, appears in over sixty seventeenth-century manuscripts and twice in three, making it one of the most frequently copied poems in Stuart manuscript circles. Its companion poem was also well known. In the Folger manuscript, both versions of the “Curse” and its companion poem are entered by the same copyist. The first time they appear, on folios 44 and 45v, they are separated by a ballad on a mad lover. Judging from the way that Herrick’s “Curse” is squeezed onto a half page below this ballad, the copyist may have inserted it later than other items in the section, perhaps because he recognized its connections to the first poem after he had already organized his source items and begun his copying. When the Folger copyist entered duplicates of these related poems on folios 72–72v, he set them together, adding a heading to Herrick’s “Curse” that links the two poems explicitly:

Whether are all her false oathes blowne?
Or in what Region doe they Liue?
I’m sure noe place where Faith is knowne
Dare any harbour to them giue
My wither’d hart which Loue did burne
shall venter one sigh with the wynde
O may it neuer home returne
Till one of her false oathes it fynde!

49. The “Cruel Mistress” begins “We read of kings and gods that kindly took”; “Murdering Beauty” begins “I’ll gaze no more on her bewitching face.”

50. For instance “angry” in line 5 is copied as “anger” in the later entry, and “But such as to his Image would not bow” in line 14 becomes “But such as would not to his Image bowe.”
There lett them wrestle in the sky
Till they both one lightning proue
And falling may they peirce her eye
That was thus periur'd in her Loue.

The answer
Goe periur'd Man, and if thou ere returne
To viewe the small Remainder in my vrne;
 scoffe
When thou shalt laugh at my Religious Dust,
And aske, wher's now the Colour, forme, and trust
In perhaps with
Of womans beauty and hands too rude
hands teare
Rifle the flowers which the virgins strewed,
Knowe, I haue pray'd to pitty, that some wynde
May blowe my ashes vpp and strike thee blynde.

Mr Ro: Herrick./

(Folger MS V.a. 96, fol. 72–72v)

In repositioning these poems, the Folger copyist juxtaposed the male and female perspectives on betrayal, allowing the two voices to echo each other, both in the repetition of the word “perjur'd” and in the image of the wind or sigh instigating an act of revenge that the speakers cannot perform physically. The speakers both employ hyperbole to depict the injustice done to them, and this technique is most noticeable when the poems are adjacent. The personified heart and false oaths in the initial poem, and the pitiable voice from beyond the grave in Herrick’s response that bewails her lover’s continuing abuse, each seems a desperate attempt to win over a shared audience.

The Folger collector may also have been inspired to recopy the poems because of the variants he found in a new source. The texts of the first set and the second set differ substantially. Interestingly, the corrections made to the second copy of “Go periur’d man” on folio 72–72v appear to have come from a third version of Herrick’s poem that the collector had on hand, one in which the speaker fears the lover will “scoffe” at her ashes and “teare” the flowers at her tomb. In this one case of purposeful duplication, we have evidence that the collector gained access to at least three different versions of Herrick’s verse, but that he could only make use of his finds by adding “The Curse” a second time and then by revising and correcting that version. Sequential collecting and copying made it especially difficult for collectors to reorganize materials, so the Folger collector’s “ideal” placement of these poems was recorded in the insertions, corrections, deletions, and duplications.

When copyists did not work in a strictly sequential fashion, duplicates might have been relied on to solve very different organizational problems. A complicated
series of small errors led the copyist of Folger MS V.a. 345 to miscalculate the space needed to enter two poems on the physician James Vaux. After writing out the elegy for Vaux, “Great Aesculape not studied in the art,” the copyist ran into material previously entered into the miscellany and did not have room to finish the related epitaph, “When first I heard thy fame then I began.” He was forced to cross through the initial lines on page 304 and re-enter the epitaph on page 314, at the end of the manuscript. The ink of both versions of the epitaph is similar, and interestingly, their placement on the page is identical; both begin at the bottom of the recto with the fourth line touching the bottom ruling. It is likely that immediately after the false attempt to enter the epitaph, the copyist re-entered it. What this odd placement of duplicates reveals is that, although the elegy-epitaph pair probably traveled to the collector in a single source text, his previous entry of several poems out of sequence forced him to separate the related poems. The collector clearly had some vague sense of how he wanted his miscellany organized. Unfortunately, his earlier efforts to organize multiple source texts seem to have worked against his later efforts to do the same.

For early verse-miscellany collectors, the verse that counted as redundant in a set of duplicates was not necessarily the second one. When duplicates were overlooked and entered accidentally, the second version was certainly more likely to be identified as the mistake. But when collectors re-entered improved versions of texts, for whatever reason, the first poem often became the redundancy. Entering a better version of a poem, however, involved much more than replacing the old one with a new copy, even in cases where the first version was struck through. In sequentially copied manuscripts especially, adding an improved version of a poem almost always involved setting it in a new location and among different poems. The context for the second copy may be very different from the first. Sometimes the new setting was the objective, as in the case of the Folger MS V.a. 96 collector who duplicated Herrick’s “Curse” and its companion poem to bring them together. In other instances, however, entering an improved second copy of a poem resulted in awkward contextual adjustments, as the separation of the Vaux elegy and epitaph in Folger MS V.a. 345 illustrates. Given the fact that many collectors acquired and copied materials over time, compilation strategies had to be flexible. Collectors might have discovered an ideal organization for their manuscript after some essential items had already been copied, or they might have acquired halves of an acknowledged verse exchange separately and wanted to pair them together. The printer who compiled Bod. MS Rawlinson Poetry 117 seems to have been perfectly willing to put up with the resulting mess in order to take advantage of better texts and better formats. In this regard, he seems to represent a good number of miscellany collectors, who privileged expanded content over material aesthetics. It is possible that some collectors did eventually make fair copies of their miscellanies, but we have little evidence that this practice was common. Many collectors treasured and built on their first efforts, regardless of the difficulties of revising and reordering items.

The image of the typical collector that emerges from the quirks and mistakes in the miscellanies themselves is of an involved and conscientious editor, but one who
was slightly more practiced at reading and enjoying poems than at producing manuscripts. This collector knew his or her own miscellany intimately and read critically the multiple source texts that reached him or her. This collector was also invested in the future use of the miscellany and anticipated employing it as a conversation piece, as an exemplar for other collectors, or as a personal library of poems. Although a particularly determined collector might have gathered all of his sources together, hired a scribe to copy loose sheets, and bound his volume after it was complete, many collectors adopted a more piecemeal approach, working with a bound volume or stitched booklet and adding items over time. No matter how conscientious such collectors were, their ideal miscellany was something only sketched out in material form. They prized their volumes more for content than for show, and to improve and broaden their entries, they were willing to squeeze poems into margins and scratch through imperfect copies. What makes duplicates such a rich source of information about verse collecting is that they pinpoint the challenges of this sort of collecting, those moments when verse dissemination practices and compilation processes defeated the individual intentions of collectors and, conversely, those moments when collectors imposed their wills upon the jumble of materials at hand. Above all, duplicates establish that the difficulties of verse transmission and miscellany compilation are as much a key to understanding Stuart manuscript culture as the successes.
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