from Sidney without much attempt to adapt them to dramatic form, other than putting them into direct speech. The result is that conversations which are suitable in a discursive narrative fail when confined to the more tense dramatic medium.

In presenting a diplomatic transcript, as Mr. Cutts is doing, one must exercise the greatest care, and we must be in no doubt about what the transcript means. Unfortunately there is no set convention rigorously followed in diplomatic transcripts, no statement of exactly what is to be understood by square, pointed, or half brackets and so forth. The best one can do is state each time what one means by these conventions, as C. J. Sisson did in his Malone Society edition of *Believe as you List*, which is still one of the touchstones of the art.

Mr. Cutts' text does not contain any statement of conventions, and the result is confusing. What, for example, is meant by square brackets? If we follow Sisson, they mean a deletion. But in this text there are several cases where the material within the square brackets has been scored through. Surely, then, these are deletions in the original, but what, then, is the meaning of brackets without scoring? Another symbol used in the transcript is a half-bracket. Are we to take this as meaning the same thing as Sisson's pointed bracket: a mutilation? Had these points been explained, the reader would be in a much better position to understand the text.

This volume has been presented in typescript. There is nothing wrong with this, except that many of the symbols have been added in ink. These include the brackets (together with the scoring), the "es" ligature, the crossed "p," the tilde, and the caret. Surely it would have been possible to have obtained the typewriter keys necessary for most of these signs; the errata list, in fact, was typed on a machine which did have square brackets. This strikes me as simply sloppy attention to detail, and attention to detail is one thing necessary in transcripts of this kind.

We are not told in the introduction to the text very much about the manuscript, and it is necessary to turn to Greg's *Dramatic Documents* to learn the probable date of the manuscript. Greg suggests a date in the 1630s, and it would be interesting to know if Mr. Cutts' research confirms this dating or narrows it down in any way. I received the general impression from reading the introduction that Mr. Cutts considered it to be earlier.

As the manuscript is not readily available, it is not possible at this remove to check the accuracy of the transcript. However, Greg did transcribe many of the stage directions, and there are disquieting differences between his transcripts and Cutts'. Many of the differences are relatively minor matters of form, if one can allow for minor matters in a transcript. For example, Greg's transcript shows the contractions "wch" and "wth" with the last two letters raised. There are differences in the transcribing of final "e" and some spelling differences. Greg gives one direction as "with two shepherdes" (unexpanded by Greg) while Cutts gives "wth two shephards." Two directions show substantive changes (albeit minor ones), with Cutts reading "hoops from within" and "His drum sounding" while Greg gives "a hoope" coming from within, and "The Drū". While these may seem quibbles, we must be as certain as we can be of the accuracy of the text, and perhaps Mr. Cutts should have explained his divergence from Sir Walter in these readings.

W. CRAIG FERGUSON, *Queen's University*

Dale B. J. Randall. *Jonson's Gypsies Unmasked*. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1975. Pp. xiii, 200. \$9.50.

On August 3rd, 1621, at his mansion at Burley-on-the-Hill that resplendent royal favourite, George Villiers, Marquess of Buckingham (soon to be a duke), entertained King James I with a masque, *The Gypsies Metamorphos'd*. Especially commissioned for the occasion, this masque by Ben Jonson was very much a coterie piece. Buckingham and various of his male relatives and friends appeared disguised as gypsies, read the fortunes of six of Buckingham's female relatives and those of the King and Prince Charles. James, in the loneliness of his final years, had become so closely involved with Buckingham's family as to be practically a member of it. Obviously he thoroughly enjoyed the family fun (plus no doubt the elaborate flattery which hailed him as "James the Just" and culminated in elaborate blessings upon his five senses). Moreover the rough, rather scatological humour about the gypsies meeting with the devil in a Derbyshire cavern known as "The Devil's Arse" was just the sort of thing that James relished. And it was heart-warming to have the beloved Buckingham, playing the part of the Gypsy Captain, speaking some seventy-five lines nearly all buttering up the sovereign who had raised him from obscurity to greatness.

Report had it that King James was so delighted with the piece that he intended to knight Ben Jonson. Two days later James was treated to a repeat performance at Belvoir, the home of Buckingham's father-in-law, the Earl of Rutland. Word of the King's fondness for the piece reached the grandees who had not been with James at Burley or Belvoir. The next month, apparently with the Earl of Arundel footing the bill, a third performance was put on at Windsor. Jonson substantially modified his piece for the Windsor production. It ceased to be a piece of Villiers family fun. The fortunes that the gypsies told were no longer those of Buckingham's womenfolk but those of great court dignitaries, among them the Lord Chamberlain, the Lord Keeper, and the Lord Treasurer. At Windsor, as at Burley and Belvoir, the piece concluded with the "gypsies" being metamorphosed—appearing in their own persons as knights and lords to commence the evening's dancing.

Since the three versions, the Burley, the Belvoir and the Windsor, have reached us in a composite text which merges all three, it has been a pretty bibliographical problem to sort them out, but this was done in 1952 in a magisterial study by the late Sir Walter Greg. The textual puzzle once attended to, we might have expected *The Gypsies Metamorphos'd* to rate a few pages in studies of Jonson or of the Jacobean masque, but not much more. Instead we now have an entire book devoted to it, one in which Dale B. J. Randall, Professor of English at Duke University and Chairman of the Southeastern Institute of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, claims to have made a notable discovery, "an interpretive plum that has lain hidden and plump for three and a half centuries." The plum is that Jonson's masque is really an attack upon Buckingham and his upstart relatives, warning King James that these gypsies are really something rotten in the state of England. According to Randall, beneath the surface jollity lies "massive and deadly satire." Now this is a most interesting proposition. One wonders if Randall is really onto something, as Miss De Luna was when, so convincingly, she demonstrated to us the topical significance of Jonson's *Catiline*. One turns eagerly to the evidence with which Randall will prove his case.

Alas, the case goes unproven. Too much is made of the lines in which Buckingham's termagant mother is told "Two of your sons are Gypsies: / You shall our Queene be," and