



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Wiseman, Susan J. (2019) Labour's loves? Isabella Whitney, Leonard Wheatcroft and the love miscellany. *Textual Practice* 33 (8), pp. 1363-1387. ISSN 0950-236X.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/16233/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>
contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

or alternatively

Labour's Loves? Isabella Whitney, Leonard Wheatcroft and the Love Miscellany

ABSTRACT

This essay investigates the place of non-elite makers of miscellanies in print and manuscript. It analyses the parts of Richard Jones and Isabella Whitney in shaping *Copy of a Letter* (1567) and Leonard Wheatcroft's mid-seventeenth-century manuscript miscellany, 'Cum ye gallants' to ask how these miscellanists and poets used the material available to them to explore love. The essay argues for a reconsideration of the assumption that non-elite miscellanists had a socially aspirational relationship to the genre of the miscellany and suggests that they rather used cultural resources to enunciate the issues of their own world.

KEYWORDS Miscellanies, love lyric, status, non-elite, print, manuscript, Leonard Wheatcroft, Isabella Whitney, Tottell, *Heroides*, Ovid.

1 'marketed exclusivity'?

The fashion for writing and reading about love was an accepted and widely shared part of Anglophone culture by the late sixteenth century, so to understand its roles implies consideration of several social spheres. Starting from this assumption, what follows takes the miscellany as the locus classicus of the study of the love lyric in circulation and investigates how non-elite writers use discourses of love. It investigates two primary examples, the early printed *Copy of a Letter* (?1567, compiled by Isabella Whitney and

printed by Richard Jones) and Leonard Wheatcroft's mid- to late seventeenth-century manuscript miscellany, 'Cum ye gallants' and it sets them against some long-held assumptions about status underpinning scholarship on the miscellany. Wheatcroft was a rural, labouring man and Whitney seems to have been a working Londoner, probably in some kind of service though also with university connections. The essay asks what non-elite or unschooled practices of writing, copying and circulation disclose about the place of love discourse in sixteenth and seventeenth-century society and whether there are grounds for a reconsideration of the relationship between elite and non-elite lovers' discourse. Such a reconsideration of the dominance of courtly love as a mode of thought might, potentially, have implications for how we consider Renaissance love as a research field.

As Grant, Guy-Bray and McGowan all suggest in this volume, the lyric was central to the articulation of love and desire in the Renaissance and the miscellany a crucial mode of its transmission and circulation. At the same time as being a crucial, and flexible, form of textual transmission, and in part because of that, the miscellany here understood broadly as practices of making distinctly inflected in print and manuscript. These practices include a mixture of anthologisation, authorship, copying, accumulation and circulation (in manuscript and print) rather than a tightly defined genre. Broadly speaking, two approaches have been dominant in scholarship on the miscellany. The first approach starts from the elite poet and understands the printed miscellany as simultaneously transmitting and diluting a courtly or coterie manuscript phenomenon. Thus, concentrating substantially on the amatory lyrics of courtier poets, critics have explored the palpable losses of inwardness of the sonnet form in the move to print. As Meredith Anne Skura rightly notes, in Tottel's version of Wyatt, a reader cannot see at work Wyatt's 'ability to reconfigure existing material', but has only the content of an experience.¹ One logical conclusion of

such a formulation is not unreasonable that the reader-writer with access only to a miscellany is in receipt of an amatory verse attenuated to the point where print has evacuated the power of amorous discourse to the point where the words read are conventionalised counters, and this was explicitly H.A. Mason's view in 1959.² However, if we approach the same poets and poems from the point of view of readers, it is clear that very few had access to manuscript. By the early seventeenth century both elite and non-elite probably had access to most lyrics in print, so the distinction between the two modes might speak powerfully to modern readers, but less so to a seventeenth-century writer or reader.³

A second strand of argument on the miscellany focuses primarily on it as disseminating courtly practices. It continues to be an influential assumption that Tottel's miscellany and its followers 'marketed exclusivity' and 'functioned as conduct books ... because they demonstrated to more common audiences the poetic practices entertained by graceful courtly readers and writers'.⁴ By implication the reader of the miscellany is understood as wanting to acquire courtliness. This assumption that a reader of print miscellanies is addressing a lack in status by acquiring courtship through the love miscellany remains important despite the productive reconsideration of the anthology form (by scholars including Elizabeth Heale, Ian Moulton, Michelle O'Callaghan and Adam Smyth).⁵ While many miscellanists, like Tottel, do seem to have imagined that readers would seek to access courtliness through miscellanies, it is not clear at all that this was how readers and writers understood or used them. It does not seem clear that readers consistently experienced print as a lack nor does it seem evident that aspiration for social status (as opposed to cultural capital) was a particular draw for readers of miscellanies.

It may be that if we start with the non-elite readers and writers using the miscellany form we can see additional and different, if potentially patchy, evidence about what these readers did do with print and with the content of the poems. This essay takes non-elite writers as those who, though obviously potentially quite different from each other, had access to writing mediated neither by grammar school nor by elite tutoring. It uses the evidence offered by two non-elite reader-writers, Whitney and Wheatcroft, as a basis to reconsider the love miscellany from a distinct vantage point, and more closely test, and potentially qualify, assumptions about how non-elite subjects used the love miscellany.

II Love's work: making miscellanies

Come you galants looke and by:

Here is mirth and melody:

Here is epegrimes to learne:

And parose You will not scorne:

Here is lines on euery sort:

That will make your sweetheart sport:

If you please to cum and buy:

My name is mirth and melody:

So opens Leonard Wheatcroft's largest surviving manuscript book, one of several that he wrote and 'published' while also busy as a tailor, teacher gardener, parish clerk and alehouse-keeper in Civil War Derbyshire. This compendium uses running titles of 'Cum ye gallants, look and buy' and 'here is myrth and melody' to place the whole text in the mode

of a miscellany by grouping love and courtship material separately from elegies and epitaphs. 'Look and buy' indicates that something is for sale – a consumer of this mixture of narrative and verse will enjoy 'mirth and melody', acquire literary exemplars, borrow wit and pick up the skills to use lover's rhetoric. Thus, in a sizeable book, bound in a cover made from a reversed legal parchment, Wheatcroft shaped a section of elegies and epitaphs preceded by our subject here: two interconnected sections on love, the first of mixed poems and a second telling of his courtship in prose and poetry. Wheatcroft's use of the form of the love miscellany has not previously been discussed in detail. However, he tests it twice within the overall miscellany structure of 'Cum ye gallants'. These miscellany sections, particularly the second, blend material, textual, social, generic and autobiographical elements that invite investigation of non-elite love, what resources he might have had and his methods and possible literary and other purposes.

How we understand mid 1650s non-elite miscellanists such as Wheatcroft is perforce shaped by whether we consider them as unusual and exceptional or as participating in a longer-term practice of non-elite participation in miscellany-making. The characteristics of his anthology alert us to the potential for productive comparison with other texts, one of which is the much earlier anthology, *Copy of a Letter*, one of two miscellanies in which Isabella Whitney participated. While Whitney's later anthology, *A Sweet Nosegay*, parallels Wheatcroft's miscellanies in its evocation of friends and family as potential interlocutors and readers, *The Copy*, the earlier of the two, is a particularly useful comparator because of its evocation of a local world of love; its use of classical discourse and the inclusion of exchanges between women and men. Crucially, we see the makers of *The Copy* using cultural resources and imagining readers.

The Copy seems to have been the product of several non-elite participants, but a key role was claimed by the miscellany-maker and marketer, Richard Jones. While this small anthology has two poems attributed to I.W and two poems using a male voice with initials, Richard Jones's name is even more prominent than the initials of three authors, as the 'printer', by whom the poems are 'ioyned', a term Michelle O'Callaghan suggests may indicate earlier publication of the Whitney material alone.⁶ Jones's name appears on the title page connecting I.W. and W.G's poems and again inside the text in full, twice, the last time in capitals.⁷ Jones tells the reader she or he will have 'bestowed your money well' on a 'fained' text, both 'false and also trewe':⁸

The matter of it selfe,
 is true as many know:
 And in the same, some fained tales,
 The Auctor doth bestow.⁹

Jones' emphasis on poems as 'fained' and 'false' but also 'trewe' addresses the applicability of story and trope to situation, inviting the reader to consider the power of a fictional situation to give truthful insights about the actual world. Fiction is presented as able to offer a modelling of point of view in love problems. As Richard Panofsky notes, like other miscellanists of the same period, in presenting the verse as both true and false, and foregrounding distinct voices, Jones exploits the power of the amatory lyric to carry narrative by juxtaposing voices and scenes within the volume.¹⁰ First publishing in 1564, Richard Jones's later career shows him at times apparently combining with authors in using paratexts to market books and so it may be here, for he is in harmony with Whitney's

contribution in inflecting the anthology towards a non-elite purchaser, buying to learn and model life in the non-aristocratic urban world.¹¹ It may be that their relationship is best understood as a collaboration in miscellany making.¹²

Isabella Whitney is the featured author of *Copy*. Her initials seem to be featured as a selling point on the title page and she contributes the first two poems.¹³ The first, 'To her unconstant Lover', complains that a betrothed has taken example 'by ENEAS first of all / who did poore Dido leaue'. The poem opens:

As close as you your wedi[n]g kept
yet know the trueth I here:
Which you (yer now) might me have told
what nede you nay to swere?

This lover, and therefore also the poem, is enmeshed in English courtship practice. At the same time, the poem interacts with the prominence of Dido's story in the Renaissance reception of the *Aeneid* as Whitney uses the *Heroides'* heroines to model a first-person plight. George Turberville had Englished the *Heroides* in 1567, and Whitney adds location to language in bringing that world to a local neighbourhood. The classics live in the streets and parlours readers might know.

While the poem shares with the *Heroides* a focus on the various feelings of the abandoned women, Whitney ends not with suicide but survival and defiance. To fully understand her purpose in writing, the unconstant lover is instructed to read the rest: 'The which you may perceiue, if that / you do peruse the rest' 'Her' situation is then implied as a model from which others can learn about love, and this is the topic of 'the rest' – Whitney's other contribution.¹⁴

Whitney's second poem, an 'admonition', didactically addresses a specific audience of 'yong Gentillwomen' and 'Maids being in Loue', warning them to 'Beware of false and painted talk / Beware of flattering tongues'. Perhaps drawing on some of the debates on women found in the *querelle des femmes* the poem's externalisation of some of the issues of self-management in love explored in the first person in 'To her unconstant Lover' is conveyed in some images that are both simple and complex. The poem opens with a metaphor:

Ye Virgins [that]from Cupid's tentes Doe beare away the spoyle
 Whose hartes as yet with raginge love
 Most painfully do boyle

What we are being told about the 'gentilwomen' and 'al other Mayds being in love' is quite enigmatic. The scene might describe the maids as thieves of Cupid's arms and also perhaps suggests a version of a story from Philostratus in which nymphs offered gifts to Venus as aids to success in love and so can remove the offerings when no longer in love. Of course, the maids are at present subject to 'raging' love, and cautious coolness is to be attained only in the future.¹⁵ Once again Whitney seems to use Latin authors. In doing so the poem takes the reader not to Rome but to a familiar world of socially situated courtship where a 'friend' would advise a maide to 'trye him well before' trusting (B6v), for 'like Leander there be fewe /therefore in time take heede' (B7v). Ultimately, the poem ends in the register of the quotidian, as she exemplifies her own escape as like that of a fish evading the hook. Like the start of 'to her unconstant', the second poem ends not with a classical heroine, nor the deer, but the world non-elite hunting. Whitney seems to use classical discourse (Heroides, *Aeneid*) to counter Petrarchan rhetoric. She provides a reader with classical examples to

use for themselves in interpreting and, potentially, in replying to it. Crucially, as suggested by Danielle Clarke's point that these situations are shaped as warnings rather than lamentations, the work of the reader which began to be imagined in the first poem, and on which Jones too comments, is even more strongly imagined in the second poem.¹⁶

Thus, in *The Copy*, Whitney's poems convey the classics to be used in encounters a reader might expect to have. Contrary to any assumption that the miscellany in itself carried values associated with the court, here there is no identifiable modelling on courtly manners; rather, after reading Whitney it seems clear that the advice to suspect a lover's vows is shared by custom, courts and conduct literature.¹⁷ The claim to cultural capital is made on the terrain of classical knowledge and learning (*Ovid, Aeneid*), the claim on the reader is made in the linking of these examples to situations the reader might have known or might experience in the future. These poems' use of classical knowledge to show the reader love in operation is obviously present in courtly poetry, but here it is differently combined and inflected to suggest a world of the middling sort and below rather than alongside other strands linking it to emphasis on courtly manners, social ambition, lineage or competition for patronage.¹⁸

In being a miscellanist and poet on the border between claimed gentility and service Whitney is like others. The miscellany's availability to users is evident from the complex case of one of the earliest and best known miscellanists, the schooled but non-elite George Gascoigne and from others such as Thomas Howell, who Elizabeth Heale thinks was probably a manservant. Howell used the ideas of love, if not, at first, the Petrarchan forms.¹⁹ Similarly, Whitney (as far as we know), was a non-elite, waged, worker who simultaneously claimed gentility. Both *Copy* and *A Sweet Nosegay* mix a troubled claim to gentility with a more often foregrounded difficulty in waged work and, above all, poverty.

We don't know much about Whitney's world at present, and in any case how directly we can link economic changes to the production of a subject, or a represented world, is questionable. However, if the miscellany was consistently popular among those of middle status and below, the world of service was changing, though how is not quite clear. The *Statute of Artificers* had legally fixed the status and definition of a servant in a way that, potentially at least, rendered gentility, family and service less ambiguously overlapping than before 1562/3. The effects and rationale of the statute are the subject of substantial debate in economic history, but the fixing or restricting of servants' wages certainly seems to have significantly shaped an economic and status identity, and Howell and Whitney must have been aware of it as they gestured towards their own extra-textual status.²⁰

As Roland Barthes suggests, love is learned from lovers' discourse.²¹ Obviously, in writing of love Whitney and Wheatcroft have read and use a lexicon of love they find in other texts where vocabularies of gallants, knights and classical lovers might be expected to inhibit their writing, but in practice such 'courtly' features are used as applicable to their situations. For example, for Wheatcroft, his readers are love's gallants. Thus, in *Copy* the subject at stake for Whitney, as for Jones her printer, is the subject to be moved – the purchaser and reader. As important as the *Heroides* in modelling a situation is its potential to be reimagined or used in the readers' worlds. In this regard, the reader finds the poems' speaker's desires are enmeshed with Dido's but also with reputation, gossip and a local world. Rather than any aping of distant social groups, *The Copy* addresses the concerns of readers by demonstrating the claiming and use of cultural capital. Whitney seeks to shape a voice experiencing suffering in love (just as she shapes a voice experiencing work in her 'Last Wyll' and *Sweet Nosegay*).²² The reader can learn from her experience that miscellanies act as amorous pedagogy and, for all that they are separated by just under a

century, the amorous materials of Wheatcroft and Whitney offer an emotionally inflected version of exemplarity and modelling. As Heale suggests of others, in *The Copy*, Whitney makes ‘narratives of social, economic, and cultural’ events.²³ Whether or not we can see these two writers as thinking through exemplarity in relation to Arthur Kinney’s persuasive argument that it was a key legacy of humanism in a wider culture is not clear, yet, certainly, in each case they use poetry to model an event on which there might be multiple perspectives. *The Copy of a Letter*, with its attention to example and selling ideas, looks outwards and anticipates a reader seeking models and, perhaps, examples against which to test love-situations. Set alongside Wheatcroft’s book, *The Copy* illustrates the miscellany’s longstanding availability to non-elite readers. The examples of both the miscellanies of Jones and Whitney and Wheatcroft also suggest that the genre facilitated the association and mixing of ideas and sources, loosely shaping them but doing so creatively and blending prosopopeia and exemplarity rather than, for example, within any terms of grammar-school or ‘learned’ forms of thought, might be key to the miscellany’s enduring marketability and the mode’s use by non-elite writers.

In sum, then, *The Copy of a Letter* is a love miscellany interested in the relationships amongst subject, text and world, not in ‘courtly’ love behaviour or the acquisition of manners: love is part of the world of book and reader, and is a practice illuminated by other stories. Whitney’s poems do not address the questions of elite or non-elite posed by some critics; rather, they produce useful examples of feeling and experience.²⁴ If transport of Ovid to the everyday is a selling point in the reader being able to use the text actively, situation and example are central and status is significant in relation to them, but not in terms emulatory of the elite. The cultural precincts the poems work to join are learning (particularly classical knowledge, with its status as cultural capital) and situations that the

reader might have experienced. In terms of modern critical interest in inwardness and the lyric's autobiographical subject, while the use of complaint foregrounds the lover's experience, it does so in order that readers might empathise and correlate experiences with their own worlds. Thus, Meredith Skura's point regarding a loss of inwardness in not seeing an actual manuscript is helpful in pointing us to a larger and partially investigated area; the reading and writing resources of those who were literate, perhaps, like Whitney and Wheatcroft, highly literate and in some ways skilled writers, yet who were also informally educated.²⁵ Whitney's contribution to *The Copy* is synchronised with that of Jones in its concern to bring knowledge to the readers' world, where love might mean blending complaint and customs of courtship – and this mixture offers a clear point of contact with Leonard Wheatcroft's writing of love in a Derbyshire village.

III. Making Miscellanies: 'Cum ye gallants'

You that with teeth, did teare my true desire
 The rest you did burne with fire
 Which was the cause I would no longer stay
 It seems with you I am but as castaway
 O like burnt paper I must still remaine
 Though torne in peeces, I am alive againe

Thus Wheatcroft makes his words stand for himself 'like burnt paper', turning complaint to survivor invective - 'I must still remaine'. We cannot know exactly where and how Wheatcroft achieved his knowledge and considerable skill in amatory discourse.²⁶

However, because he employs miscellany-making expansively to shape and curate his work in relation to form, genre, readers and even other writers, we can investigate what his practices reveal and how he seems to mediate the idea of the anthology in relation to his world.

We know little of Wheatcroft's education. However, several pieces of evidence suggest Wheatcroft's reading and book-ownership including his Derbyshire context and the information yielded by his copying and references. Most generally, Wheatcroft's immediate locality, the area between Chesterfield and Wirksworth (both of which had grammar schools), offered increasing access to education and reading material from the Civil War period onwards. A Chesterfield bookseller's inventory of 1699, indexing many religious texts but also 'Creek's Lucretius 4s 6d', suggests a range of products were vendible in the area, and there were local collectors, such as William Boothby. Books were sold at Bakewell market, and family contacts may well have given Wheatcroft access to London bookselling.

²⁷ More specifically, Wheatcroft's book ownership is partially and patchily implied by an inventory of over three hundred books made by his son in the 1720s, though we can only speculate as to which of these were Leonard's. Second-hand purchasing may be suggested by Maureen Bell's finding that the inventoried books are titled by internal pages possibly implying that the books were worn and their title pages missing.²⁸ So, we have unusually rich sources of evidence about Wheatcroft's textual environment and even possible purchases, but much less about his practices of writing.

The text of 'Cum ye gallants' itself is suggestive in terms of reading and writing practices in relation to miscellanies and amatory lyric. It discloses Wheatcroft's extensive reading in anthologies from which we can trace his copying and adaptation of texts not listed in the inventory. The volume opens with such copying. Thus, as Cedric Brown and Adam Smyth

note, the third extant opening of the volume as it now exists sets out five poems from the anthology *Wit's Recreations* (1640).²⁹ Wheatcroft also seems to have had access to some volumes understood as by single authors, including Thomas Randolph, and amongst the poems of love appearing before the narrative of courtship is a poem that alerts us to some of Wheatcroft's repurposing strategies.

Wheatcroft copies one of Randolph's poems in the voice of a milkmaid:

Joy to the Bridgroom and the bride
 That lye by one anothers side
 No losse is gain but mayden heads
 Love quickly send the time may be
 When I shall deal my Roosmary
 I loug to simper at a feast,
 To dance, and kisse, and doe the rest.
 When I shall wed, and Bedded be
 O then the qualme comes over me,
 And tells the sweetnesse of a Theame
 That I ne're knew but in a dreame.

Thus, Randolph's poem fantasises a milkmaid's envious but restricted desire, concluding:

And you, deare Knight, whose every kisse
 Reapes the full crop of *Cupids* blisse,
 Now you have found, confesse and tell

That single sheets doe make up hell.

And then so charitable be

To get a man to pittie me.

The milkmaid's comic complaint ends with a generalised lubricious ambiguity in this request to the now married knight to find her a match. Wheatcroft uses the poem's unwillingly chaste desiring subject to adapt the poem's ending thus:

You Lords and Ladies know such nights

I pine away for such delights

Substituting a slightly less frank final statement of the milkmaid's desire, Wheatcroft clarifies her status within the firewall of chastity. 'Lords and Ladies' are imagined as sexually active in a way denied to the labouring subject, who chastely 'pines'. Wheatcroft's milkmaid longs for the license of Ladies and Lords while simultaneously recognising her (and his?) own status as a limit to sexual play. For all that the adaptation itself is small and simple, how we might read it is complex. Wheatcroft's choice of poem and adaptation foregrounds distinction of status rather than inhabiting an elite subject position.

If as readers we wonder at times how a non-elite rural subject might respond to pastoral or to the sexually inflected poems of rural labour by poets such as Randolph or the Duke of Newcastle, this is a response, though not an answer to that haunting critical question. Wheatcroft has chosen the poem, but how it speaks to him is uncertain and ambiguous. For example, whether his intervention must or might be a continuation of the voice of the milkmaid is ambiguous, whether his contemporary readers would have known the Randolph

is uncertain. It might be hard to say exactly how the voicing of this adapted poem in an overtly village-oriented love anthology reshapes how we think about speaking subject, reader and the author's relationship to rural labour and love, but we can notice that the anthologising of the poem leaves such questions unanswered.

'Cum ye gallants' includes both copied and authored material throughout. The love materials almost all claim dates of composition between 1652 and 1657, the year of Wheatcroft's marriage. In almost all cases it is a book into which fair copies are written, and for much of it Wheatcroft is attentive to format and filling the page, inserting epigrams and short poems into spaces and using ornament, as well as rules for emphasis and to define shifts of subject. The moment that introduces an explicitly authorial first person is signalled for the reader by an adaptation of the running title from 'Here is' to 'I am mirth and melody'. Prompted to notice a change, the reader looks down to find an original composition by Wheatcroft in the form of a love poem, 'Written at Ashover by mee: Leonard Wheatcrofte who was in Love with a fair and ammorous Creature'. This poem (though apparently not the volume's earliest composition) seems to imply that with its appearance the guiding author/narrator's poetic voice is brought to life by love. From this point he writes love lyrics and ballads which may have been about his own experiences. He develops prosopopeia ('Of a young maid who Loued a young man. And his friends were against it'), and he writes puzzle and acrostic poems apparently for himself, such as, 'To my dearest and well respected Lady...' 'her name in the close of the verse'. Significantly, in terms of indicating that he had an audience, he also wrote many proxy verses for others (such as an acrostic 'to Catrin Cantrill from GH').³⁰ The reader is directed to take note of the poet's voice shaping the anthology and in the poems, and often also prompted to imagine hearing Wheatcroft's voice. Within the pages of the anthology, once his voice is alive he is a

poet for himself, but also in the service of others, and their loves live in his acrostics and commemorations.

That Wheatcroft was writing explicitly for an audience in 'Cum ye gallants' is signalled in the texts and in the paratextual material indicating that the book is clearly understood as 'published'. Moreover, like Whitney's poems in *The Copy of a Letter*, the love poetry Wheatcroft wrote addressed courtship practices in his own world rather than being part of an individualised project of aspiration to acquire manners. Some evidence suggests that he might have sold poems and written to order, not simply for friends. In writing for his world, Wheatcroft took what he needed to make his own experience available as a model in love.

We know that Wheatcroft reflected on skill in writing as well as love because he makes it part of his subject. In the midst of a mixed anthology the voice of the miscellanist appears. It takes over and directs us to review love and our experience of reading:

Well, gentle reader, you see how I have extolled not only one part but every part of woman, and why I did so was because I loved every part; but finding non as yet to seal an impression upon, I could not withhold my muses till they had uttered what love was; and finding it to be both a friend, a fire, a heaven, a hell, how can I do any less than express all I know of it?

Thus, part way through his miscellany's largest section, on love, Wheatcroft begins again with a second 'book' promising to anthologise one love. Wheatcroft's address to the reader establishes an authorial persona aware of an audience, uses the apparatus of post-Renaissance poetic address (evoking the muses), and inhabits a loosely Petrarchan

discourse (fire, heaven and hell). The density of love-tropes suggests a light-hearted inflection even as the imperative to 'express all I know' might prompt the reader to recall the speaker in Sir Philip Sidney's first sonnet in *Astrophil*, who must 'look in his heart' and write.

In the courtship section mixed lyrics, puzzle poems and acrostics give way to a different combining of prose and poetry to tell the story of Wheatcroft's desire to 'seal an impression' on one. This involves both a rethinking of the boundaries and possibilities of the love miscellany, and a complex set of integrations and mediations between the form and the world it is to express, and the world that is understood as its first audience. Promising that his 'pilgrimage' is exemplary and useful, he writes that for our 'further recreation I will declare what fortune I had in my pilgrimage towards this towne called Woman'. In his and Elizabeth Hawley's story are 'contained many Love Lessons written in Perrowes able to winn the hart of the Coyest daphan [Daphne?] in the World,' with miscellany-style 'Elegies, Epitaphs, and The Like'. In an elaborately decorated poem he explains that he has saved the best for last, as when 'some curious work=man doth Import / His Chiefest Cunning and his best of art /To that peece which, he meanes shall be his last', and so the earlier writing 'had sum power, but these more strongly moue / And do enforce young maides to fall in Loue.' We are to know that 'These lessons heard of Loue, though last cum forth', are his best.

One aspect of Wheatcroft's skilful mediation of his world and the miscellany genre is in his evocation of romance quest, both serious and comic. Thus, the author's failure to secure Woman is in part because his courting has been beset by obstacles:

First, I having mustered and called up my forces many a time, I could never advance towards her for lack of something or other. Sometimes I wanted horse to ride to her, and sometimes arms to embrace her, and sometimes men to speak for me, and – to conclude - most of all moneys for advancement. (p. 36)

The reader is alerted to a relationship to romance writing, yet, at the same time Wheatcroft's quest difficulties belong in a provincial village – he is poor, lacks family to woo on his behalf and is not only Cupid's soldier, but Cromwell's. If at this point romance is comic it returns later in a more serious mode.

That Wheatcroft's second anthology is, then, very much his own story invites us to return to the question of authoring and copying. When, at last, his beloved accepts his suit, she writes describing him as 'so prevelant that it is impregnable for anyone either foreign or domestic (though never so reverend) to cause me to change'. Like any provident love correspondent, Wheatcroft visits her to check that 'her lines and her love did both in one union agree'. That he finds her true impels him to heartfelt poetry: he 'could noways withhold my tongue and pen from warbling forth these ensuing lines'(p. 51). The eight lines that ensue describe a mistress' 'perfections rare' (l. 1) , 'Like tapers on an altar shine her eyes, /Her breath is the perfume of sacrifice,/And whererso'er my fancy would begin / Still her perfection lets religion in'(p.52). Wheatcroft here warbles another poem from Randolph (appearing in *The Muses Looking Glass* (1638) and *Parnassus Biceps* (1656)). So, at the height of delight Wheatcroft models a situation for a reader by appropriating a poem. This action suggests that for Wheatcroft, what is at stake is the reader's experience. In using a poem he prioritises not authorship alone but how any poem crystallises and

evokes the experience of within the narrative moment. The choice of poems is determined by the miscellany's emotional ups and downs and texts match moment, mood and momentum.

Love poems using religious discourses clearly appealed to Wheatcroft, notwithstanding the external sign of him working as a parish clerk during the Protectorate. His use of love's fire as tapers on an altar seems not to be an accident because soon after we find another poem mixing religion and love. Later, as the courtship reaches a crisis, he tells us to look 'in the first book' (having earlier referred the reader to the 'second' book – so the one we are reading appears to be the third that he has made, or divided, of this kind) to find a poem 'which showed me that true love was a precious pleasure'.³¹ This poem, 'The Price of Love', again has a religious inflection; true love is 'Foe to faithless vows perfidious / True love is a knot religious'. We find Wheatcroft rededicating and recycling (could we even say re-anthologising?) a piece that would have been available in a slightly different version in *Cupids master-piece* (1656), exists in a different version in *Wit's Academy* (1677), and was available exactly as we find it in Wheatcroft's book of love in an anthology published two years earlier, Sir John Mennes' *Recreation for ingenious head-peeeces* (1654). In reading to find love poetry it seems Wheatcroft went his own way; while Joseph Frank estimates that most printed lyric anthologies between 1641 and 1660 were 'political', Wheatcroft's is a love miscellany.³² The anthologies Wheatcroft draws on seem to include potentially those from the 1650s, but he selects to fit his own circumstances. He builds the variety of love poems at his readers' disposal and advises his world in love.

As important as Wheatcroft's agency in the use of literary resources is the way his text uses and reconfigures the dimensions of his world already understood as symbolic, or partly so. This world of festival games, wakes and Mayings did itself have some literary

representation, not only in the writings of Robert Herrick but in the anthologies we know Wheatcroft used. Thus, assuming Wheatcroft did know Randolph's *Poems with the Muses looking-glasse* (1638), he will have seen the poem directly after 'the Milkmaid's Epithalamium' called 'An Eglogue on the noble Assemblies revived on Cotswold Hills, by M. Robert Dover' which celebrates Robert Dover's Cotswold Olympics. Thought to have been an adaptation of village Whitsun games, this explicitly rural event provides an illuminating comparator for 'Cum ye gallants', and perhaps particularly for the narrative's final marriage games, and ribbon races. The Cotswold 'Olympick' games were celebrated in their own anthology, *Annala Dubrensis* (1636).³³ As the publication of Jonson's epigram on the games indicates, they were a politically saturated multi-media event:

But I can tell thee Dover, how thy Games
 Renew the Glories of our blessed leames;
 How they doe keepe alive his memori;
 With the Glad Countrey, and Posteritie

Although disrupted by the Civil War, the symbolic games were remembered in 1651 and at some point in the Restoration were revived.³⁴ Wheatcroft may well have known of the Cotswold games, but here their significance is as a contrast to his integration of form and place versus Dover's heavily Stuart inflection, and specific loyalty to James I. The volume joins local worthies with visitor poets explicitly enlisted to praise the joyously dutiful exercises of 'Ladds of the Hills, and Lasses of the Vale', as 'Rustick Swains' compete for yellow favours, presided over by Robert Dover inhabiting James I's hat, ruff and his feather; rural life is in the service of a Stuart agenda.³⁵

The obedient and ludic qualities of the Cotswold games were condensed in Dover's dress, which was reproduced in woodcuts alongside contributions from both locals and poets attending with the intention of generating circulated and printed textual records. The markedly ideological use of these sports and performances makes clear that contemporaries saw 'custom' as meaningful, even potentially symbolic – and in this case deployed in national ideology.

In his courtship section we see Wheatcroft using customary events very differently. The same symbolic language that allowed Dover to politicise rural games meant that customary celebrations based on the Church year sometimes became the focus of protest, too. They did function as a dynamically symbolic, or just meaningful, vocabulary and we can see such custom as popular, in the sense of common thought shared between status groups. While many poems mark emotional pauses, in the courtship narrative Wheatcroft uses customary occasions to propel narrative and events. For example, immediately after Wheatcroft drafts in Randolph to articulate his love's religious flame, he tells the following story:

One day I obtained leave of her father and mother that we should go to a wakes about 3 or 4 miles distant . . . where we met many of both our friends and acquaintance...And at night coming home together, there were no small discourse of love betwixt us, neither any scarcity of loving salutations. The next day I met with one or 2 of her old sweethearts, and to the alehouse we went, and merry we were, and lovingly we drunk. So, in process of time I got them to sleep; then were it time for me to leave off that exercise and depart.

So coming to her father's house again, I stayed all night again with my dear and chief delight, using unto her many sweet expressions of my love. (p. 52-3)

The next day Elizabeth accompanies him along his route from Winster towards Ashover, and 'like two loving souls we sat down where many passengers came by', until time forced them to part. That this night indeed marked a courtship stage is indicated by the fact that on his return he begins to draw up indentures for their marriage and 'divided' the land, taking away 'my child's part' (p. 53). The events are locally and customarily symbolic, and would have been known to be so by local readers. Wakes, strongly surviving in Derbyshire, were reworkings of pre-Reformation celebration of a church's saint.³⁶ For all that some aspects of courtship overlap between, for example Thomas Wyatt's evocation of the court and Wheatcroft, in evoking a world of parish and custom (such as wakes and what appears to be a local custom of quenching fraternal rivalry in ale) Wheatcroft calls up the world of village love we find in legal, not aristocratic, courts. Shared symbolism means that Wheatcroft's juxtaposition of poetry and custom need not be understood as mixing wholly distinct spheres. That Diana O'Hara and others find such occasions cited in the court testimony on broken courtships supports an understanding that such occasions had significance in themselves; the attendance at the church wake, the sanctioned erotic encounter, the indentures are all steps filled with personal and social meaning. Wheatcroft uses custom as symbolic and dynamically meaningful alongside literary texts. Moreover, the style and mode of his text recognises the potential of settlement, the legal or quasi-legal dimension of proceedings, to generate absolute decisions.

As Hudson reminds us in this volume, love and law are never far apart.³⁷ In the narrative of courtship a crisis is marked when dowry negotiations break down. Although Elizabeth's father had assented that the marriage be 'accomplished', in conference 'her friends' were unable to agree on 'feoffment and portion' and there was no clear path to agreement. Wheatcroft decides not to forsake her, 'though her father seemed very willing it should be so' (p. 54). We don't at present have the Wheatcrofts' marriage settlement, but a surviving 1663 marriage settlement of a Wingerworth yeoman, George Holland, and the Yorkshire farmer's daughter, Mary Elam, indicates something of the difficulty and detail involved. George's father gives property worth a 'yearly value of twenty pounds', a 'dwelling house' and some land while, alarmingly unevenly, Elam's father's fortune seemed to be entirely in land and so the settlement includes minute detail attempting to future-proof her side of the bargain so that even if her father dies intestate his executors are bound to ensure that Mary will have a 'proportionable' share.³⁸ Parents are key to the negotiation – in life and death. That Leonard Wheatcroft's father was dead meant that presumably he had to negotiate on his own behalf, had no-one to speak for him, but did have his own resources, could make his own 'indentures'. Certainly, there is a crisis and, perhaps, no-one to step in to negotiate with Elizabeth's father; so, even though he was mature, Wheatcroft's circumstances were a little unusual.

Unlike the vocabulary derived from amatory discourse, such as that of siege and battle, legal discourse is one of several which make bridges between Wheatcroft's own world and any anticipated lyric lexicon of the miscellany. Thus, romance is also carefully grounded in a world familiar to Wheatcroft and potentially his reader, as romance obstacles are fused with quotidian, but serious, hindrances. Wheatcroft, like the courtship litigants discussed by Diana O'Hara, describes the conduct of courtship: proxy wooers or 'friends'; the traversing

of distances, and, crucially, arranging the capital with which to set up a marriage usually, in English practice, paid by both sides of the family in a 'match'. So, if the narrator is fluent in the discourse of love, he is also concerned to stitch it to the everyday; not only do the obstacles recur in relation to Elizabeth Hawley (the One), but Wheatcroft even incorporates a detail which is only clarified later; when he was courting he actually was a soldier, often himself called to muster. From the start, genre and circumstance are brought to bear on each other in ways both similar to and unlike texts produced by higher status authors.

In representing the encounters with Elizabeth poetry is deployed to lead both away from and towards the everyday. Thus, Wheatcroft notes uncertainty about what to write to his lady and while maintaining an epistolary exchange describes an interlude of melancholy isolation, inaugurated by splicing in another song from earlier in the book - a song of his own composition, 'A sorrowful lover's song, by me, Leon.' (p. 56). At the same time, he gives us a second poem, apparently also of his composition, which combines love and domesticity - 'A house I have and furniture / And all to pleasure thee, my dear, / And I have lands for thee to view / Is worth five hundred pound a year'. The poetry, here, links feeling to circumstance, settlement and marriage negotiation; the poem enumerates the offer of a substantial yeoman (if true, Wheatcroft's claim to land worth £500 made him a good prospect as a marriage partner; local yeoman death inventories of the 1680s and 90s range from totals of £3108 to only £27 11 4d).³⁹ Such a poem, though clearly addressing specific circumstances, had precedents in poems elucidating the duties of spouses - such as Sir John Harington's poems or translations in the person of wife and husband.⁴⁰ Here Wheatcroft's poetic voice unites love discourse with local marriage custom.

Wheatcroft's foregrounding of his own poetry is set against a complex use of a prose romance mode to express melancholy:

Thus, wandering alone from my Love, from place to place, at last I espied a fair and handsome damsel following of me as I were alone. "Father", said she, "what ail you, to look so heavily?"

She enigmatically suggests they "sit down by this fair fountain and drink to her health and your good proceeding" They talk, and, 'for four days I did not return again to my habitation; but at last I returned home again and with[al] saddled my Gillbard with resolution to see her.' (p. 61). As Catrin Griffiths notes, like earlier Arcadian romances, seventeenth century romance represented the world from the point of view of the inner desires and passions of its characters and opened up what Aemelia Zurcher calls an 'allegorical middle space' allowing exploration of time, ethics, passion and the subject disciplined and in excess.⁴¹ The aristocrat Robert Boyle, one of a family of romance readers, wrote a tellingly overlaid account of the vain thinking of the romance mode as 'impossible, vnlkely or useless suppositions <hypotheses> commonly called Raving which is nothing but a Play or a Romance personated <acted> in the Braine/Imagination'.⁴² In this episode, Wheatcroft's deployment of romance suggests a reader-user's familiarity with romance conventions which facilitate a semi-fantastic, mode of thought. Although it is not clear whether the 'fountain' is one of the many springs of the karst Derbyshire landscape or possibly, an alehouse, the enigmatic and marvellous quality of this episode clearly signals a casting of the event within the magnifying horizons of romance mode.

The use of prose in a love miscellany was a familiar generic possibility. An early example, though of a very different mode of narrative, is the narrative of Master F.J. in George Gascoigne's *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowers* (1573). Wheatcroft's uses of the romance mode as

an intermittent inflection of style to either lighten or darken atmosphere is specific to the second section of his miscellany. It is a central mode in the second of the two miscellanies he attempts and functions to both heighten the mood of the love story and to embed it in the local world of his courtship. Wheatcroft convenes the modes of romance, love letter and jesting narrative within his world, reframing them within genres with purchase on an immediate world. The lyric miscellany is a generically enabling starting point for this combinatory practice.

The evidence of the second miscellany suggests, then, that Wheatcroft uses 'custom' and romance as he wants and needs them to shape his writing in ways which are crafted and logical but not necessarily as we would expect a writer with tertiary or even grammar-school training. The practice of mixing, though familiar from practices of miscellany-making, in this example at times goes so far as to be considered a significant adaptation of the form.

At the heart of Wheatcroft's exemplary project in the second love miscellany, and giving it a narrative coherence, is an adventure in literary curation or collaboration which he feels requires the best of all his rhetorical and literary resources. We are given the courtship letters from both Wheatcroft and Elizabeth Hawley from 1656-7. Of course, these are copied by Wheatcroft and may have been adapted, but they are presented and read fairly convincingly as Hawley's distinct epistolary voice. Her literary persona is strongly present within the text as distinct from Wheatcroft's and, overall, he presents her as a maid wisely sceptical of love's rhetoric. Her voice is present in letters, but also in reports – as when he tells us that she asks "'where have you been that you have learned all these fine compliments?'" (p.61) Thus, their exchange of letters demonstrates the power of Leonard's love persona as dynamic, even virtuosic, in action and shows it pitted against her worthy testing and questioning the language of love.

Love begins, of course, in a garden. Having heard from ‘one of her relations’ that Elizabeth was ‘very fortunate, beside beautiful lovely’ and that she would be at ‘a famous arbour which at that time held 28 people’, Wheatcroft attends the gathering and approaches her. However, after they have ‘parled’ they cannot ‘agree’ so, using the siege language of war and of Civil War romance, ‘[w]e parted and she returned to her castle again; from which hold she sent me a challenge, and withal hang her flag of defiance against me’ (p. 41). Where, ‘like a courageous commander’, she continues to ‘resist’ his siege and ‘cannon-like letters against the main tower of her heart’ (p. 42).

For all that Elizabeth Hawley is in part called into being by Wheatcroft’s rhetoric, what we read offers a very distinct literary and epistolary persona such that it seems very likely that the claimed copying of her texts is indeed what we have. Hawley’s responses both register and deflect high-flown lover’s rhetoric while suggesting a focus on questions of honesty and love that overlap with rather than mirror Wheatcroft’s concerns. Thus, according to the *Narrative*, on 22 August 1656 he sent the following, signing himself ‘Leonardus Wheatcroft’:

O my dearest Love,

How long must I wait at the pool of your Bethseda (all besmeared with sorrow) ere I hear that sweet echo from you, “I am yours”? O ‘tis a wonder that all my letters miscarry, but a greater wonder to me that you will not let me hear from you ere now. . . . And so I rest and remain till I hear from you, yours, nay, your very servant’s servant to command.

Once again Wheatcroft puts the language of religion in the service of love.⁴³ Here he uses John 5:2-3, and the descent of an angel, at a certain time, to the pool of Bethseda. So, as in

the romance episode, the referent is unclear. It seems possible that this may recall actual meetings at a local pool (perhaps the now diminished but still energetic Shothouse Spring). Certainly, it casts into Biblical romance her desired reply as so restorative as to miraculously revivify her interlocutor. It is this letter which sparks an answer - 'her loving answer' - which he transcribed:

Friend,

For so I like to call you, omitting all new compliments, I commend the choicest of my affections unto you, and return the thanks due to your expectations in all your letters, whether serious or feigned, for as I find you so shall I be. But one thing seemeth strange to me, that your friends should have power to cross your pretended love.

Therefore will I defer my further thoughts till I see you again, assuring you that true love were never set on price, nor constant friend sold to the worth. I shall cease at this time to trouble you any further in expectation of your presence, and rest till death,

Your respective friend,

Eliz: Hawley

Hawley explicitly addresses the nature and claim of Wheatcroft's prose. Lowering the heat by changing the register, she relocates him in a network of social and economic relations as her 'friend'.⁴⁴ Hawley tests Wheatcroft's worth in love. Although she appears to be less at home than Wheatcroft in the literary language of love, her letter is rhetorically and generically astute in using this external circumstance within the conventions of chivalric

romance to put Wheatcroft's love to the test, and further discursive awareness is present in her enforcing friendship as coding their relationship. Eventually the letters trace a trajectory from silence to consent and he becomes 'my peculiar treasure'.⁴⁵ As this description suggests, a central part of their courtship involves her careful withholding not of desire, but of commitment and, later, chastity, sealed up 'in the closet of my heart, to attend upon our nuptial feast' (p. 48).

While the textual effects of Elizabeth Hawley's subjectivity are controlled by Wheatcroft, a specific subject is suggested by both the letters and in their reported exchanges. While Hawley probably did not know that her letters might be anthologised as she wrote, it is very likely that she read them in Wheatcroft's miscellany. As a curated writer she is a complex rhetorical subject shaping an equal yet distinct part of an epistolary pair, so that in this second miscellany we read two writers of love, as in *The Copy*. Again, as in *The Copy* these are used to ground a reading in location, place and time. Yet if the quest and evasion they evoke is very much that which a Derbyshire reader might experience, it shares love's motives, not decorum, with Wyatt's world. Given the focus on one story – of Elizabeth and Leonard – and its use of prose, this second section undoubtedly begs the question of genre, though the focus on the reader is maintained throughout. The framing of the Harley and Wheatcroft narrative as part of a miscellany, and as part of the world of the reader, is recalled in a closing poem on the wedding which frames and bookends the story. That Wheatcroft is addressing his world in terms of reading pleasure, use of compliments in prose and poetry, but also within the legal framework is made clear by a brief poem which acts as an addendum to this literary and loving adventure – and returns us to the world of the text and reader as one in which love, economics and law mingle to shape experience. It is also positioned in the large book as the end of 'love' – what follows is to be very

different. The importance of legal material is marked in the transition – immediately after the courtship narrative we find ‘Verses on the Marriages made by ye Justices, my selfe for one May 20 1657’ with the note set with line breaks:

I put these verses in this Booke
 Because the so nere concern marriage
 Moreover the are not unfit foor this place.
 Because the next thing I did, I married with my mistress, with Olivers
 law⁴⁶

Obviously, it was in everyone’s interests to acknowledge Protectorate marriages, but Wheatcroft’s addendum addresses the question of the law and seems likely to respond to later questioning of the legality of the marriage – a possibility which could have rendered both the narrative and his whole life a scandal. Justice Spatman (or Spateman) who married him was clearly active as a Derbyshire justice at moments of theological and political heat and it seems likely that the Restoration threatened such figures. This final gesture shows Wheatcroft once again writing for an audience. He is fully engaged in miscellany-making and the way his literary texts expressed the emotional world in which the law, poetry, storytelling and custom all worked – but not always in harmony, and themselves, presumably, changing - to make love meaningful.

What, then, does the evidence examined here tell us about the love miscellany, its relationship to social hierarchy and our critical assumptions about ‘love’ as a research field? Whitney’s and Wheacroft’s two miscellanies suggest that we can extend our understanding

of the love miscellany as offering a version of a specific world from the court to that of the non-elite, including the middling sort and those below that social range. As we know, the anthologies associated with 'courtly' producers that Whitney and Wheatcroft may have read, included poems on not trusting in love, or the experience of desire.⁴⁷ As we see, too, Wheatcroft uses courtly modes – he addresses 'gallants', uses the Lords and Ladies of Randolph's poem and locates himself as a lover besieging a castle. Neither poet ignores the features of love poetry. Rather, they strongly re-orient them to address, and be dense with detail from, their world and to articulate non-elite relationships.⁴⁸

Overall, if these anthologies are to some extent representative of engagement in miscellany-making, it suggests that we can reconsider critical assumptions about the interplay between social status and love discourse and miscellanies; reconsider any assumptions that non-elite writers and miscellany-makers were isolated or writing solely autobiographically, develop thinking on the porous and receptive quality of the form and, perhaps, reconsider the evidence given in other manuscript and print miscellanies.

In terms of critical assumptions, we can change our critical agenda from thinking that readers and writers understood the miscellany as exclusive to a more sustainable understanding of non-university trained readers and writers as taking material to their own world and using the miscellany form to put into circulation social love-practice. While critics from Tottel to Wall may be accurate in seeing the miscellany as a textual site disclosive of relationships of social hierarchy, as Steven W. May has reminded us, the actual courtier poets were of a limited number and many others existed – the later Elizabethan anthologies included many contributions not penned by the high elite.⁴⁹ Thus, taking the question of status and the miscellany from the vantage point of non-elite users suggests a rather different picture of what is disclosed and what that suggests non-elite miscellanists wanted

from those texts. If *The Copy* and 'Cum ye gallants' can stand as a sample it seems that what non-elite miscellanists saw in the form was not manners but flexibility of form that allowed them to address concerns in their world. Whitney and Wheatcroft use the genre to imagine a world inhabited by readers and reader-purchasers and very clearly engage with the flexibility of the miscellany to expand the way it builds a rhetoric of love. While few direct challenges have been mounted to the view that miscellanies involved social aspiration, it is not a helpful background assumption and is contradicted by evidence; we cannot take Tottel and the critics that follow him as reporting on the evidence. We do not find courtship passed down, or courtly manners desired, as much critical writing on the anthology presumes. We certainly find anthologies being used by non-elite makers in ways that are, in distinct terms, as innovative as the writers and publishers we accept, and even teach, as anthologists. We can speculate that, for an unschooled reader, one without grammar school taxonomies, the form's very capaciousness and flexibility might make it available.

While, as Heale suggests, miscellanists such as Whitney, Howell, Jones and Wheatcroft produce non-elite autobiographical subject positions, they also use the anthology form and copy, adapt and author poems within to imagine a reader. Whitney and Wheatcroft represent and address worlds similar to but not copied from other socially fluid yet bounded worlds of love – such as that evoked by Wyatt in his shadowy, inhabited world of court, custom and transgression. The multiple subject positions and points of view articulated in miscellanies also challenge any assumption that non-elite writers write solely autobiographically. The expectation that the writer of lower status does not play, masquerade or inhabit personae is substantially undermined by even a brief reading of 'Cum ye gallants' and *The Copy* deliberately plays out points of view set against one another.

In terms of critical assumptions about non-elite participation in writing and publishing in both manuscript and print, the love anthologies discussed here suggest that the frequency with which non-elite writing is assumed to be only autobiographical is an index not necessarily of the nature of the generically diverse texts but of critical assumptions about non-elite voices. While it has been asserted that early modern notebooks are 'the primitive form of a practice which would, by the nineteenth century, produce the narrativised autobiography and the concept of the individualist self', the evidence suggests much more strongly that writers used notebooks but also forms that they encountered in reading to shape material to their own purposes – and in these cases to shape a genre which tells not only the self's love story but, at least for Wheatcroft, his reader's.⁵⁰ The evidence explored here demonstrates non-elite compiler-writers seeking to articulate the world, not only a 'self'.

As Adam Smyth suggests of other non-elite texts, these love miscellanies invite an understanding attuned to occasion and an 'historically sensitive' sense of form.⁵¹ The love-miscellany is a flexible and available genre – permissive rather than strict in its demands. Intention and form can be less discernible or mainstream in non-elite writing, recognition of this allows quite substantial literary skills, writing processes and literacy to come into focus. The Latin rituals of the grammar school and university definitely produce both knowledge and forms distinct from and in many ways superior to informal training, but as the work of Keith Thomas and Roger Chartier implies, it is also the case that vernacular reading can build a relatively large, if eclectic, range of reference.⁵² Moreover, by the late sixteenth century access to books and education was also in part a matter of physical and familial location – if literacy was available at all, logically the skills on offer from an educated teacher to an able student might extend, informally, far beyond the basics which so deeply concern the

literature on literacy, to be as Chartier puts it, 'dynamic and inventive'.⁵³ As Keith Thomas reminds us, readers acquired literacy for purposes of necessity and elective use; as well as doing business and writing letters they employed many kinds of writing including chronicling, writing poetry, making notes, religious analysis, generating news or composing love letters and tokens. Such vernacular literacy might, and did, generate texts that are opaque in genre and intention in comparison to elite texts, or might produce a text both 'miscellaneous and complex', or both outwardly directed to readers while being also formally enigmatic.⁵⁴ *The Copy* and 'Cum ye gallants' nowhere suggest that for the author or contemporaries the material 'showed . . . familiarity with the practices of more elite circles', or, indeed, was intended to do so.⁵⁵ Moreover, that these texts do not evoke the specific subject positions of labouring status poets as in the terms on which Stephen Duck, Mary Leapor, Mary Collier were invited into publication suggests a more mixed and available world to which the non-elite miscellanist speaks through the miscellany in this period.⁵⁶

The mixed, expansive and worldly nature of these anthologies shows that, at least for the long moment, to write town or village love for a town or village world was neither, necessarily, to ape other manners nor to claim a place marked out within the limited zone allowed the labouring voice. The love miscellanies of these non-elite writers invite us to reconsider how we research status in texts of love in this long moment of cultural mixture.

The author is grateful to Linda Grant and Judith Hudson for reading this essay several times and to the generous and precise reader for *Textual Practice*. Remaining barbarisms are the author's.

¹ Meredith Anne Skura, *Tudor Autobiography: Listening for Inwardness* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 35-48; p. 48; p. 35.

² H.A. Mason, *Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1959) p. 255-6.

³ On poet's use of Tottel see Anne Ferry, *The Inward Language* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 1-6 and passim., and on Wyatt specifically p. 257 n.4.

⁴ Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 97. Cited in e.g. Kathleen Forni, *Chaucerian Apocrypha* (2005) p. 4; William A. Sessions, *Henry Howard* p. 274. Cf. Heale, 'Self-representation', p. 61.

⁵ Elizabeth Heale, 'Self-representation in verse miscellanies', in Helen Dragstra, Sheila Ottway and Helen Wilcox eds., *Betraying Ourselves: Forms of Self-Representation in Early Modern Texts* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2008), p. 59-75; Michelle O'Callaghan, 'Collecting Verse: "significant shape" and the paper-book in the early seventeenth century' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 2017 (80/2), 309-324; Adam Smyth, *Profit and Delight* (Wayne State University Press, 2014).

⁶ Michelle O'Callaghan, "' My Printer must haue somewhat to his share": Isabella Whitney, Richard Jones, and crafting books' in 'Early Modern Women's Writing and Transmission' ed. Pail Salzman *women's Writing* 26/1 (2019), pp. 15-34.

⁷ I.W. appears at A2r, A5v, A8v; W.G. at A9r, B4v; R.W at B5r, B(3)v and the printer A1v; Richard Jones B9 v; B(3)v. As the sig. numbers imply, R.W.'s addition may be an effect of binding.

⁸ See Wall, *Imprint*, p. 98.

⁹ *Copy*, A1v.

¹⁰ Richard J. Panofsky, 'Introduction' in Panofsky ed., Hugh Plat, *The Floures of Philosophie (1572) and A Sweet Nosegay (1573) and The Copy of a Letter (1573)* (, p. xiii.

¹¹ H. Bennett, *English Books and Readers 1558 to 1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), p. 24; 53

¹² See also the evidence given in O'Callaghan, "'My Printer'" passim.,

¹³ See Wall, *Imprint*, p. 94, 97-8.

¹⁴ George Turbeuile, *The Heroycall Epistles* (London, 1567).

¹⁵ See Virginia Cox, *Lytic Poetry by Women of the Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013), p. 88.

¹⁶ Danielle Clarke ed., *Isabella Whitney, Mary Sidney and Aemilia Lanyer* (London: Penguin, 2000), p. 295.

¹⁷ See Diana O'Hara, *Courtship and Constraint* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 200) and Laura Gowing, *Common Bodies* (Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 2000).

¹⁸ Compare the implied courtly virtues attributed to a woman in eg John Harington, 'In all respectes' (II A 29) or 'Amanza myne' (II A 19) in Ruth Hughey ed., *John Harington of Stepney* (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1971), p. 122, p. 11-111. See also Nona Fienberg, *Elizabeth, Her Poets and the Creation of the Courtly Manner* (New York & London: Garland, 1988), p. 1-19.

¹⁹ George Gascoigne, *A Hudreth Sundrie Flowers* ed. and introduced G.W. Pigman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).

²⁰ See e.g., Susan Foot, *The Effect of the Elizabethan Statute of Artificers on Wages in England* (Exeter: Exter Research Group, 1980). See also Ann Rosalind Jones, 'Apostrophes to

Cities: Urban Rhetorics in Isabella Whitney and Moderata Fonte', Susan D. Amussen and Adele Seeff, *Attending to Early Modern Women* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998), pp. 155-175.

²¹ Roland Barthes, *A Lover's Discourse* (1977; trans. Richard Hill, 1979).

²² 'Wyll and Testament', *A Sweet Nosegay* (London, 1573), Ciir-Cviiiiv; Copy, A2r.

²³ Heale, *Verse*, p. 19.

²⁴ E.g. Wall, *Imprint*, p. 97.

²⁵ Skura, *Tudor Autobiography*, pp. 35-48.

²⁶ 'Cum ye gallants', F39r.

²⁷ Wiseman, 'The Maid of Haddon: event, text and women in Derbyshire literate culture', forthcoming *Women's Writing*; Peter Beal, "'My Books are the Great Joy of my Life": Sir William Boothby, Seventeenth-century Bibliophile', *The Book Collector*, 46 (1997), 350-78.

²⁸ Maureen Bell, *A Catalogue of the Library of Titus Wheatcroft of Ashover*, ed. Maureen Bell (Derbyshire Record Society vol XXXV (2008)).

²⁹ *Wit's Recreations* (London, 1640), See pp. 165, 166, 189, 190, 131; Smyth, *Profit*, p. 54; Cedric Brown 'The Two Pilgrimages' p. 129 and n.p. 135 n. 10.

³⁰ DRO 5433, F22r; F39r; F20r; F51v; F108v.

³¹ *The Courtship Narrative of Leonard Wheatcroft* ed., George Parfitt & Ralph Houlbrooke (Reading: Whiteknights Press, 1986), e.g. p. 55

³² Joseph Frank, *Hobbled Pegasus* (Albuquerque: New Mexico Press, c.1968), p. 5, p. 7.

³³ If he was reading up to date anthologies, Wheatcroft may have seen many of the poets again in two strongly royalist anthologies published in the 1650s, *Musarum Deliciae* (1655) and *Wit Restor'd* (1658), Timothy Raylor, 'Introduction' *Musarum Deliciae* (1655) and *Wit*

Restor'd (1658) Scholars Facsimilies 402 (Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles, 1985), p. 7. See also Raylor, *Cavliers, Clubs, and Literary Culture* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994).

³⁴ Clement Barksdale *Nimphas Libethris* (1651) and in the edition of *A Joviall Crew* (1652) as an alternative to Bath cited in Francis Burns, *Heigh For Cotswold!* (Chipping Camden: Robert Dover's Games Society, 2000), p. 14.

³⁵ Francis Burns, *Robert Dover's Cotswold Olimpick Games* (Chipping Camden: Robert Dover's Games Society, 2004), p. vi.

³⁶ John Brand, *Observations on Popular Antiquities* (Newcastle upon Tyne/London: J. Johnson, 1777), p. 299.

³⁷ Judith Hudson, *****

³⁸ DRO D 37 M/T 725.

³⁹ DRO D2855/3/1 H-P.

⁴⁰ Hughey, *John Harington* (II A 16, II A 17), p. 106-108.

⁴¹ Catrin Griffiths, 'Renovating Romance in Interregnum England', submitted for the degree of PhD, Birkbeck, 2018; Amelia A. Zurcher, *Seventeenth-Century English Romance* (Palgrave: Basingstoke, 2007), p. 184.

⁴² Robert Boyle, 'The Doctrine of Thinking', in *The Early Essays and Ethics* ed John T. Harwood (Southern Illinois University Press, 1991), p. 185-201; p. 192. Interleaving retained. I am grateful to Cat Griffiths for this reference.

⁴³ *Narrative*, p. 45 and n.1.

⁴⁴ *Narrative* p. 45-6.

⁴⁵ See *Narrative*, p. 51.

⁴⁶ 'Cum Ye Gallants' p. 78; see p. 78-9.

⁴⁷ See e.g. Wyatt's 'The lover taught' and Surrey's 'A warning to the lover' in Richard Tottel, *Songes and Sonnettes* ed. Paul A. Marquis (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2007), p. 45, p. 20. I am grateful to Steven W. May for pointing out this example.

⁴⁸ I am grateful to Steven May for the articulation of this point.

⁴⁹ Steven W. May, *The Elizabethan Courtier Poets* (Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1991)

⁵⁰ Michael Masuch, *Origins of the Individualist Self* (Cambridge: Polity, 1997), p. 71.

⁵¹ Adam Smyth, *Autobiography in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 1; see also p. 209, 215-216.

⁵² Keith Thomas, 'The meaning of literacy in early modern England' in Thomas ed., *The Written Word* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 97-131.

⁵³ David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); Roger Chartier, 'Crossing borders in early modern Europe', *Book History* 8 (2005), pp. 37-50. See also Margaret W. Ferguson and Mihoko Suzuki, 'Women's literacies and social hierarchy in early modern England' *Literature Compass* 12/11 (2015), pp. 575-590.

⁵⁴ Christopher Dyer, 'Foreword' *The Chronicles of John Cannon Excise Officer and Writing Master* ed. John Money (Records of Social and Economic History ns 44) (Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2009), p. v.

⁵⁵ Wall, p. 298.

⁵⁶ Stephen Duck, *A Poem (the Thresher's Labour)* (London, 1730); Mary Collier, *The Woman's Labour* (London, 1739).