Estill, Laura. "Shakespearean Extracts, Manuscript Cataloguing, and the Misrepresentation of the Archive." *Rethinking Theatrical Documents in Shakespeare's England*. Ed. Tiffany Stern. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2020. 175–192. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350051379.ch-009>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 10:04 UTC.

Copyright © Tiffany Stern and contributors 2020. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

9

Shakespearean Extracts, Manuscript Cataloguing, and the Misrepresentation of the Archive

*Laura Estill**

As Leah Marcus has explored, scholars have often imagined what would come of finding more documents handwritten by Shakespeare.¹ This chapter suggests Shakespeare's canonical status colours not just how we value what manuscript evidence we find, but what we can find in the first place. This chapter highlights the worth of non-Shakespearean manuscripts and argues that we need to rethink the canon-focused biases inherent in our cataloguing and research practices in order to better apprehend early modern dramatic texts and their afterlives.

Early modern English plays were conglomerations of separate parts, as Tiffany Stern has shown: songs, prologues, plots, and other elements of plays were not always written by the playwright. Instead of imagining a playwright as someone who has wrought an entire text, Stern encourages us to

consider playwrights as play-patchers.² Rather than focusing on a dramatic text in its composition or during performance, however, this chapter instead focuses on afterlives: the pieces of plays that were removed from their original context after publication. These selections from plays, also called dramatic extracts, offer valuable evidence about early responses to plays, yet they are often overlooked or taken out of context by researchers. András Kiséry's chapter in this volume, for instance, draws on print and manuscript extracts to suggest that drama's 'representation of informal, improvisational conversation in social interaction' is why readers and playgoers copied selections from plays.³ This chapter demonstrates the need to reappraise how early modern plays and extracts were and are catalogued and made findable.

From all catalogued accounts of pre-1600 manuscripts, extracts from Shakespeare apparently outnumber those of other dramatists. This figure, however, is not because of Shakespeare's popularity in the Elizabethan period and is, furthermore, not necessarily accurate: it is because of later centuries' habits of Shakespeare-centric cataloguing and scholarship. A reception history focused on Shakespeare elides the bulk of the archive, and, as such, the majority of evidence about responses to early English drama. Roslyn L. Knutson and David McInnis posit a 'continuum of "lostness"' when it comes to lost plays;⁴ I suggest that 'unfindable' could be considered part of this continuum.

Library catalogues and canon

There are certainly manuscripts with selections by plays from Shakespeare and his contemporaries yet to be found: that is, catalogued, digitized, and discussed. The bulk of *known* early modern dramatic extracts, however, are known because they appear in libraries and archives that have been catalogued. Most major library catalogues such as those from the Bodleian Library at Oxford University were compiled by librarians and

archivists before digital workflows; they were manuscript or printed catalogues, designed to be consulted as codices or cards. Digital library catalogues that make manuscripts searchable are modelled on earlier catalogues: often, the content remains the same, even if the mode of access is different.

The pre-digital origins of library catalogues might not seem worth stating, however, it is precisely because these finding aids were created before easily searchable texts that they cemented our notions of the canon. Archivists who catalogued manuscripts could only identify those sources that were labelled with a title or author in the manuscript or that they could recall from memory. And in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, Shakespeare's plays were more recognizable, and therefore more likely to be catalogued, than those of lesser-known playwrights such as Lording Barry or George Wilkins. Library cataloguing, then, acts as a self-reinforcing cycle: known elements are catalogued, which makes them more readily findable, which makes them more known to scholars and cataloguers. When it comes to those selections from plays that early playgoers and readers copied, Shakespeare, specifically, is over-represented both in our catalogues and our scholarship.

Not only would Shakespeare's plays have been more easily identifiable to early cataloguers, his position at the centre of the nineteenth-century literary and theatrical canon means that selections from his works were thought worth identifying in even the shortest library catalogue descriptions, whereas those from lesser-known playwrights might not have been identifiable, or thought worth mentioning. Manuscript catalogue entries vary greatly in length, from one- to two-sentence descriptions to pages-long lists of complete manuscript contents. Particularly with shorter descriptions, it is only the most important writers who are named.

The catalogue entry for Bodleian Rawlinson MS D. 952 offers an example of how Shakespearean extracts are often privileged over the other contents of a manuscript. The description runs:

A common-place book of sentences out of plays, under heads in alphabetical order.

On the first leaf is a list of twenty-four comedies and tragedies (by Davenant, Massinger, &c.) printed between 1607 and 1632, 'read of me', and of ten others (by Ben Jonson, &c.) up to the year 1633, described as 'comedyes not yet learned'.

The only Shakespearean play in the former list is *Pericles*.⁵

Although this manuscript contains only two Shakespearean extracts amidst pages of other dramatic content,⁶ the catalogue entry's final sentence singles out those few lines. Library catalogues announce what a cataloguer can determine about a manuscript; furthermore, they are often crafted around expectations of what will be most useful to scholars, which highlights certain elements and can give a biased or inaccurate description of a volume's contents.

When authors are listed, cataloguing practices have historically privileged Shakespeare over even those authors we think of as canonical. The British Library Catalogue entry for Additional MS 27406, an aggregation of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century texts, lists only five names: Simon Patrick, the Bishop of Chichester; Prudentius, the Roman poet; John Bence, a merchant; P[eter] Le Neve, the antiquarian; and Shakespeare.⁷ This manuscript, however, also includes poems by Ben Jonson, Thomas Dekker, Walter Raleigh, Francis Beaumont, and even four lines from Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*, none of which are mentioned in the catalogue entry. The manuscript includes a complete copy of Thomas Randolph's dramatic monologue, 'The Conceited Pedlar' (f. 121r–27v), that is similarly omitted from the description.⁸ BL Add MS 27406 is a composite volume, that is, a gathering of many different pages, 'in several hands and paper sizes': as the *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts* (CELM) explains, Le Neve gathered many of these pages together.⁹ As a composite volume, the different items are clearly differentiated for a reader or cataloguer handling the artifact: new handwriting

and new paper signals separate items. Yet the British Library Catalogue mentions only three items of the dozens gathered together here: the first item (ff. 1–18, Patrick's translation of Prudentius), the Shakespearean content (selections from *The Rape of Lucrece*, f. 74), and a letter from Bence to Le Neve, the person responsible for gathering this manuscript (f. 116). But Le Neve, and the others who compiled this manuscript by copying and gathering its contents (it was later bound in the nineteenth century), did not signal the Shakespearean extracts as more important than the others: they are buried mid-volume and not highlighted in any way in the manuscript itself. It is library cataloguing that has elevated Shakespeare to a level of prominence above other poets and playwrights of his day, such as Jonson, Dekker, Beaumont, Sidney, and Randolph.

Beyond the many short works in BL Add MS 27406, this composite volume also includes a 'separate' (a short manuscript intended to circulate alone) that contains the entire text of Thomas Randolph's *Conceited Pedlar*, titled and attributed 'Tho: Randolphs Pedlar' (ff. 121r–127v). Jill Levenson draws attention to 'Randolph's great popularity during his lifetime and for a generation after', which is confirmed by this full-text manuscript copy of this 'satirical monologue in verse and prose'¹⁰ – one of three full-text manuscripts known – and multiple early editions.¹¹ This handwritten copy gives information about the first performance, a piece of information absent from early modern print sources: 'All S^{ts}: 1627', that is, All Saints' Day (1 November 1627). As one of only three full-text manuscript copies of a work by a formerly lauded author, this copy has been a known scholarly commodity for decades, but it is still not in the manuscript's official library catalogue description. As is all too often the case, this manuscript's value to scholarship is not represented by its catalogue entry.

British Literary Manuscripts Online (BLMO) includes a facsimile of BL Add MS 27406, including Randolph's *Conceited Pedlar*. As with all of their metadata, BLMO replicates library catalogues, rather than writing new, detailed descriptions. Similarly, BLMO's facsimiles, including BL Add

MS 27406, have all been created by digitizing existing microfilm collections – its core is drawn from the ‘Britain’s Literary Heritage’ microfilms by Harvester.¹² In this case, however, the cataloguing metadata is even less substantial than that provided in the British Library’s Online ‘Manuscripts and Archives’ catalogue: *BLMO* simply includes the description of BL Add MS 27406–27408 as a group of three manuscripts, ‘POETICAL pieces: the collections of Oliver and Peter Le Neve and Thomas Martin, of Palgrave, comprising religious, political, lyrical, and other compositions’.¹³ *BLMO* users wanting to find dramatic or literary works, even by Shakespeare, who do not miraculously stumble upon the search term ‘poetical’ or ‘lyrical’, will find no results: instead, they will need to turn to the bibliographic resources beyond library catalogues that underpin archival research on early modern drama.

The catalogues that describe manuscripts have been written (and, at times, re-written) over centuries: it can be difficult to trace who wrote each individual entry. Each library has been catalogued to different standards, and sometimes the descriptions vary widely between collections within a given library. For instance, a catalogue description of a manuscript in the British Library’s Harleian Collection can run to a dozen pages, whereas a description of a manuscript in the British Library’s Additional Collection is often just a few sentences long. The guides for how to catalogue manuscripts are long and detailed;¹⁴ even these, however, make assumptions about the material being catalogued and suggest that literary manuscripts be catalogued at the item level. Cataloguing ‘literary’ manuscripts as one object assumes that one manuscript contains a single or few identifiable literary work(s), which, in the case of a composite volume or miscellany, is not accurate. Further scholarship in this area will necessitate collaboration between archivists and scholars not only to improve catalogue entries (a monumental task itself) but also to write the history of the catalogues that have been and continue to be created.

Beyond the library catalogue

Scholars interested in studying early modern dramatic texts can supplement library catalogues and search across archives by turning to more specialized bibliographic resources. As Gregory A. Pass notes, 'As an undifferentiated group of materials, manuscripts rest uneasily or not at all in the library catalog. Manuscript descriptions reside more often in finding aids that stand apart from the main library catalog'.¹⁵ First-line indices were one of the earliest resources that materialized to fill the needs of literary researchers for whom traditional manuscript cataloguing was inadequate.

The earliest first-line index was the British Museum's unpublished 'First-line index to English (and some French and Latin) poetry', which was compiled in the 1880s and continues to be expanded on.¹⁶ Published, and later, online first-line indices emerged in the twentieth century, with important contributions indexing major archives such as those by Margaret Crum (Bodleian Library) and Peter Seng (Houghton Library, Harvard)¹⁷ as well as indices on particular topics, such as Steven W. May and William Ringler's *Elizabeth Verse* and Harold Love's index of 'English Clandestine Satire 1660–1702'.¹⁸ These sources, and more, were consolidated, put online, and made searchable in the Folger Shakespeare Library's *Union First-Line Index of English Verse* (firstlines.folger.edu). First-line indices were and are an important part of democratizing the archive so that the contents of manuscripts are accurately represented without a bias towards canonical authors.

First-line indices, however, are by their nature restricted to poetry, which means that of the wealth of early modern manuscript miscellanies they cover, only the poems are listed. As a result, songs and speeches from plays only fall within the purview of a first-line index when they are written in verse. The other contents of manuscript miscellanies can be difficult to categorize and catalogue – such as prose letters, recipes ('receipts'), pen trials, and so on – to the point where our very

name for these manuscripts, miscellanies, is derived from their heterogeneity and miscellaneity. When dramatic extracts appear in these volumes, particularly when they are not signalled by title or author, they are often overlooked by cataloguers.

Perhaps the most important finding aid for literary manuscripts is Peter Beal's monumental *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts (CELM)*, which arose to meet the needs of scholars that were not being fulfilled by library catalogues and first-line indices.¹⁹ *CELM* expanded on the information available in library catalogues and first-line indices by describing manuscript contents beyond poetry. Although *CELM* has broadened our understanding of the literary canon (particularly by increasing its coverage of women writers from the early printed volumes), it is still predicated on the author. So far, the online instantiation of *CELM* has attempted to cover only one anonymous work, *Leicester's Commonwealth*. That means that dramatic materials by lesser-known or unknown authors are not included in *CELM* – even when they appear alongside dramatic material by canonical authors.²⁰

For instance, BL MS Egerton 1994 contains fourteen full-text plays and a masque, but *CELM* lists only five of its dramatic works: *The Elder Brother* by Beaumont and Fletcher; three plays by Thomas Heywood; and *Loves Changelings Change*, adapted from Sidney's *The Old Arcadia*. *CELM*'s focus on canon neglects more than half of the manuscript, which includes handwritten and sometimes unique copies of important plays such as the anonymous *Thomas of Woodstock*, *Edmund Ironside*, and *Nero*. This manuscript is so well-known it even has its own *Wikipedia* page, which currently does a better job of listing its dramatic contents than *CELM* (though even the *Wikipedia* entry does not, at present, mention the selections from Sidney).²¹ The British Library catalogue entry for Egerton 1994 lists the dramatic contents, but not always in a way that is easily searchable by scholars: for instance, it lists *Thomas of Woodstock* as 'King Richard the Second; a

tragedy'.²² And while, indeed, this play has been published as *Richard II, Part 1* (and sometimes attributed to Shakespeare), most scholars know it by the title *Thomas of Woodstock*, which is not to be found in the catalogue entry. Similarly, the ascription of *The Lady Mother* to Henry Glapthorne 'has never seriously been challenged',²³ yet Glapthorne's name is omitted from the library catalogue page for BL MS Egerton 1994, the only known manuscript copy of this work. Catalogue entries for manuscript plays are especially important for works by lesser-known playwrights that are not included in *CELM*, such as Glapthorne's *The Lady Mother* or Walter Monfort's *The Launching of the Mary* (also in BL MS Egerton 1994), because the unpublished nature of their work means it is also beyond the scope of print-focused databases to which scholars turn every day, such as the *Database of Early English Playbooks* (DEEP) and the *English Short-Title Catalogue* (ESTC).²⁴

Although we can imagine a happy time where *CELM* is expanded to include all literary works, even by anonymous authors, realistically, the project has to be bounded so that it can have in-depth coverage. It would take years (the work of digitizing and broadening *CELM* to its current state spanned from 2005–2013²⁵) and much funding to develop this project further: and it can be a challenge to convince funding agencies that we need expansion to help us research authors who are ignored in BL MS Egerton 1994 like Glapthorne or Robert Daborne.²⁶ Matteo Pangallo's work-in-progress, a *Database of English Manuscript Drama* (DEManD), will offer a searchable database of full-text manuscript plays.²⁷ Similarly, the online edition of Martin Wiggins's *British Drama 1533–1642: A Catalogue*, to be undertaken by Catherine Richardson and Mark Merry, will be an invaluable resource.²⁸ The *British Drama* print volumes mention many, but not all, known dramatic extracts. The *Lost Plays Database*, discussed by Knutson and McInnis in this volume, is a welcome addition to these resources, as it provides all known evidence about plays for which we no longer have complete texts.²⁹ There is much work to be done for bibliographers, cataloguers, archivists,

and other researchers to expand our understanding of early modern textual and dramatic culture.

Overlooked evidence of play-reading

Even when a manuscript or author makes it into a particular bibliographic resource or catalogue, dramatic extracts, and particularly non-Shakespearean dramatic extracts, can still be ignored. For instance, two songs from plays by Thomas Otway that appear in BL Add. MS 27406 are missing from all the bibliographical resources in which scholars would expect to find them (see Figure 9.1). Despite Otway's being an author included in *CELM*, the songs are omitted from Beal's database; similarly, they are not found in the short British Library catalogue description discussed earlier. The Folger *First Line Index* lists the poems' first and last lines, and even the appended date listed in the manuscript (1714), but does not note that these songs appeared in Otway's plays.

The first song, 'Princes that rule, & Empires Sway', appeared in Otway's *Alcibiades* (first published in 1675). It is followed by 'How blest he appears' from Otway's *Friendship in Fashion* (first published in 1672). Martin probably copied these selections from the one-volume *Works of Mr Thomas Otway* (1692), where *Alcibiades* and *Friendship in Fashion* are the first and second plays, respectively. It is not an overstatement to say that had these songs been published in a Shakespeare play, they would have been discussed by scholars at length. Songs from plays by Otway, however, provide no less insight into the reception of drama and early textual cultures.

Linking a manuscript copy of song to a play can help scholars better understand 'documents of performance', as Stern puts it: that is, researchers can find and analyse songs that have been incorporated into a play by a playwright/play-patcher. Similarly, identifying a song *from* a play can help us understand a work's reception history and how it was read and understood. Yet these two songs from Otway's plays are

FIGURE 9.1 'Songs from Otway's Plays', BL Add MS 27406, f. 114 v. © The British Library Board.

not findable by scholars. And because they are extracts from a Restoration play copied in the early eighteenth century, it seems likely that they will remain under-catalogued (when mentioned at all) in bibliographic resources for the foreseeable future, even though they appear in a volume where Shakespearean extracts are well-documented.

The need to be able to find and identify extracts from Otway's plays will be readily apparent to scholars of Restoration theatre. This should be, however, also important to scholars who work on English theatre from before the closure of the theatres in 1642, and, indeed, even for those who work on non-dramatic early modern literatures. Harold Love's convincing argument on this point (with its reference to D. F. McKenzie) is worth quoting at length:

Within a broad sociology of the scribal text, the identification of scribal communities and the analysis of their intellectual affiliations, political allegiances, and relationships to patronage networks is one of the most rewarding tasks facing manuscript studies. The first goal of such inquiries should be to explain how certain works rather than others should have been brought together between a given pair of covers over a given span of time. For a few celebrated collections this question has been answered, but most continue to be treated merely as quarries for editions of individual writers with no attention given to accompanying parliamentary speeches, medical remedies, antiquarian documents, or prophecies, whose patterns of circulation are often just as intricate and culturally revealing.³⁰

As Love points out, it is important to think about entire manuscripts as evidence of reception: each manuscript can be considered as evidence of a text's 'sociology'. McKenzie notes that 'we must . . . consider carefully the expressive functions of the text's modes of transmission, and account for its reception by an audience or readership'.³¹ The questions we ask of manuscripts shape our understanding of an entire textual

culture: changing our focus from authors to copyists and readers can be a powerful corrective.

Finding and identifying dramatic extracts today

Without improved cataloguing or indexing, it will be impossible to make quantitative claims about the reception history of early modern drama. Scholarly claims about a play or playwright's relative popularity based on manuscript extracts must begin with many caveats: the high loss rate for unbound volumes; the large number of manuscripts not-yet-catalogued; and, as this chapter has demonstrated, the over-representation of Shakespeare in catalogues, bibliographies, and scholarship.

The full-text transcription of manuscripts offers one potential way to break the cycle of canon-centred cataloguing and scholarship. The Folger Shakespeare Library's *Early Modern Manuscripts Online* (EMMO, in beta) holds great promise in this regard:³² if the Folger transcribes all of its early modern manuscripts, new dramatic extracts will surely turn up. Paired with an algorithm that can find similarities in other digitized text (such that developed by *Commonplace Cultures*³³), full-text manuscript transcriptions can allow us to see what plays early readers were actually reading, even if they are now largely forgotten.

The expense of manuscript transcription and digital project design and maintenance, however, means that for the foreseeable future many dramatic extracts will remain uncatalogued. My own *DEx: A Database of Dramatic Extracts* is a still-growing site that fills this gap somewhat by indexing extracts from plays performed and published before 1642 that are found in manuscripts written before 1700.³⁴ *DEx* allows users to search across archives and includes material that is outside the author-bound purview of *CELM* or the poetry-based scope of the Folger's *First Line Index*. While *DEx*, which

is still being updated, can lead researchers to new evidence about the reception of early modern plays, it too is limited by scope: users interested in thinking about a manuscript as a complete unit will still have to turn elsewhere for codicological information and non-dramatic contents.³⁵ *DEx*, then, is just one tool available to researchers of early modern drama and the archive; and like all other catalogues and bibliographic resources, *DEx* encourages particular research questions. There are many dramatic extracts still to be catalogued in *DEx*. Similarly, there are also dramatic extracts that are simply beyond the scope of the project, like Otway's Restoration songs in Figure 9.1 as well as numerous selections that survive in manuscripts from the eighteenth century and beyond.

While some manuscripts will undoubtedly continue to be valued because of their Shakespeare content, improved cataloguing and finding aids will allow scholars to move beyond author-centric and, specifically, Shakespeare-centric questions. Where we have previously only been able to conjecture about early readers or point to selective manuscripts as evidence, we are on the cusp of being able to search and analyse more comprehensive and quantifiable evidence of the early reception of plays. The chapters in this collection are a testament to the varied and rich kinds of conclusions we can draw from archival evidence – increased findability of this evidence, including dramatic extracts, can only lead to improved research and further compelling interpretations. When we seek and document only Shakespearean extracts, however, we misrepresent the wealth of material evidence on readership, reception, and literary and dramatic culture that the archive has to offer.

Notes

- * I would like to thank Tamara Atkin, Beatrice Montedoro, Kailin Wright, and Tiffany Stern for their thoughtful feedback on this chapter.

- 1 For more on this (misplaced) scholarly longing for Shakespeare's manuscripts, see Leah Marcus, 'The Veil of Manuscript', *Renaissance Drama*, 30 (1999–2001), 115–131.
- 2 Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- 3 András Kiséry, '“Flowers for English Speaking”: Play Extracts and Conversation', in this volume (169).
- 4 Roslyn L. Knutson and David McInnis, 'Lost Documents, Absent Documents, Forged Documents', in this volume (241).
- 5 [William Macray], *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae Partis Quittae Fasciculus Quartus* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1898), 216.
- 6 For more on the contents of this manuscript, see Beatrice Montedoro, 'Comedies and Tragedies “read of me” and “not yet learned”: Dramatic Extracting in a Newly Re-discovered Manuscript', in *Early British Drama in Manuscript*, ed. Laura Estill and Tamara Atkin (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2019).
- 7 http://searcharchives.bl.uk/IAMS_VU2:IAMS040-002030841 [accessed 15 July 2018].
- 8 Scholars have, however, long known of its presence. See, for instance, Bernard M. Wagner, 'Thomas Randolph's *The Conceited Pedlar*', *Times Literary Supplement* (9 April 1931), 288.
- 9 Beal, *CELM*, <http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/repositories/british-library-additional-25000.html> [accessed 10 July 2018].
- 10 Jill L. Levenson, 'Thomas Randolph (June 1605–March 1635)' in *Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*, ed. Fredson Bowers, *Dictionary of Literary Biography* 58 (Detroit: Gale, 1987), 232.
- 11 For a bibliography of early editions, see *CELM* and the *Database of Early English Playbooks*, deep.sas.upenn.edu [accessed 10 July 2018].
- 12 *BLMO*, homepage [paywalled resource, accessed 15 July 2018] and 'source microfilm collections'. For more on the challenges and affordances of *BLMO*, see Laura Estill and Andie Silva, 'Storing and Accessing Knowledge: Digital Tools for the Study of

- Early Modern Drama', in *Shakespeare's Language in Digital Media*, ed. Janelle Jenstad, Mark Kaethler, and Jennifer Roberts-Smith (London and New York: Routledge, 2018), 131–143.
- 13 This description first appeared, without differentiating the three manuscripts, in the 1877 *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years MDCCCLIV–MDCCCLXXV*, 2 vols (London, 1877), 2: 316.
 - 14 Important guides include *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)* (Chicago: Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries, 2016) and Kathleen D. Roe, *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005).
 - 15 Gregory A. Pass, *Descriptive Cataloguing of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts* (Chicago: Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries, 2003), xi.
 - 16 James Woolley, 'Finding English Verse: First-Line Indexes and Searchable Electronic Texts', *Bibliographical Society of America* (2013), bibsocamer.org/BibSite/Woolley/index.pdf, 1 [accessed 21 August 2018].
 - 17 Margaret Crum, *First-Line Index of English Poetry, 1500–1800, in Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library, Oxford*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969); Peter J. Seng, *English-Language Manuscript Verse in the Houghton Library: First-Line Index*, 1987, hollisarchives.lib.harvard.edu/repositories/24/resources/6760 [accessed 21 August 2018].
 - 18 Steven W. May and William A. Ringler, Jr., *Elizabethan Poetry: A Bibliography and First-Line Index of English Verse, 1559–1603* (London and New York: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004); Harold Love, 'First-Line Index to Selected Anthologies of Clandestine Satire', in *English Clandestine Satire, 1660–1702* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), which used to be online at Monash University and can now be accessed through the Wayback Machine.
 - 19 CELM began in print as the *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, which originally appeared in 4 volumes (9 parts) (London and New York: Mansell, 1980–1993).

- 20 For more on the importance of turning to anonymous works, see Arthur Marotti, 'The Verse Nobody Knows: Rare or Unique Poems in Early Modern Manuscripts', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 80, no. 2 (2017), 201–221. See also Marcy North on how pivotal anonymity was to early modern literary culture in *The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).
- 21 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_Library,_MS_Egerton_1994 [accessed 17 August 2018].
- 22 http://searcharchives.bl.uk/IAMS_VU2:IAMS032-001982918 [accessed 17 August 2018].
- 23 Julie Sanders, 'Glapthorne, Henry', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004): doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/10796 [accessed 17 August 2018]. See also Charles L. Squier, 'Henry Glapthorne (July 1610–1643?)', *Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*, ed. Fredson Bowers, *Dictionary of Literary Biography* 58 (Detroit: Gale, 1987), 107–114.
- 24 Alan B. Farmer and Zachary Lesser, *DEEP* (University of Pennsylvania), deep.sas.upenn.edu; *ESTC* (British Library), estc.bl.uk.
- 25 Beal, *CELM*, 'About'.
- 26 Jamie 'Skye' Bianco explains that 'digital humanities is directly linked to the institutional funding that privileges canonical literary and historiographic objects and narratives'. See Bianco, 'This Digital Humanities Which Is Not One' in *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, ed. Matthew K. Gold (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012): dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/debates/text/9 [accessed 19 December 2018]. For more on the canon-replicating tendencies of digital projects, specifically with regards to Shakespeare, see Estill, 'Digital Humanities' Shakespeare Problem', *Humanities* 8, no. 1 (2019), article 45, doi.org/10.3390/h8010045 [accessed 25 March 2019].
- 27 I would like to thank Pangallo for sharing his *DEManD* prospectus.
- 28 Martin Wiggins, *British Drama 1533–1642: A Catalogue*, vol. 1: 1533–1566 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), viii.
- 29 Knutson and McInnis, 'Lost Documents, Absent Documents, Forged Documents', throughout.

- 30 Love, 'The Work in Transmission and its Recovery', *Shakespeare Studies*, 32 (2004), 73–80; 74.
- 31 D.F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 45.
- 32 Heather Wolfe, Principal Investigator, *Early Modern Manuscripts Online*, Folger Shakespeare Library, emmo.folger.edu [accessed 20 March 2019] See also Wolfe, curator, *Shakespeare Documented* (Folger Shakespeare Library), shakespearedocumented.org [accessed 20 March 2019], which documents selected Shakespearean dramatic extracts.
- 33 Robert Morissey and Min Chen, Primary Investigators, *Commonplace Cultures: Digging Into 18th-Century Literary Culture* (University of Chicago and University of Oxford), commonplacecultures.org/ [accessed 20 March 2019].
- 34 Estill and Montedoro, eds., *DEx: A Database of Dramatic Extracts*, Iter: Gateway to the Middle Ages and Renaissance, dex.itercommunity.org (in beta) [accessed 20 March 2019].
- 35 *DEx* links to library catalogue entries and facsimiles when available online, while also pointing to *CELM*, the Folger's *First Line Index*, and other relevant digital resources.