too great significance is attached to the declaration that these are "the Kings Gypsies." Actually the latter phrase carries overtones of comedy mixed with obsequiousness. It was a standard gambit to play oneself down in the process of building up the royal ego. One recalls how Buckingham signed his letters to the King "Your Majesty's most humble slave and dog."

Powerful arguments negate Randall's thesis. The first is that nobody who saw the masque seems to have viewed it as an anti-Buckingham satire. Indeed, if Jonson had contrived that spectators should so construe it, he would most infallibly have ruined himself. Randall frets over the obtuseness of the King in not getting the alleged satiric message, but reflects that the King was old and his mental powers were failing. He might also have wondered how scholars of the calibre of Herford and Simpson, Greg, and Orgel, working over the masque in detail, have all similarly failed to detect the satire. One ends up feeling that Randall has put himself into Jonson's category of "inuading interpreters" that "professe to haue a key for the decyphering of euery thing."

Since Randall's key hypothesis will not supply material for a book he fleshes it out with a lot of information, much of it tangential but not uninteresting, about such varied matters as Prince Charles as a masquer, antiquarian lore about "The Devil's Arse," the history of gypsies in England and Scotland, Dr. Lambe, and the power and character of Buckingham who, in a telling phrase, is described as "every inch a King's creature."

Once one puts out of mind the unfortunate central thesis, one can find a fair bit that is good to say about Randall and his book. He writes very well indeed, with wit and polish, and with complete command over his materials. He knows his period exhaustively. One feels that he is a scholar from whom we may, one day, get a major book. *Jonson's Gypsies Unmasked* is far from being one. What would have made an interesting minor speculative article has been inflated into a book.

G. P. V. AKRIGG, *University of British Columbia*

John Milton. *A Maske: The Earlier Versions*. Ed. S. E. Sprott. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973. Pp. 230. \$25.

In this volume, Professor Sprott has supplied fresh transcripts of the three earliest available versions of Milton's masque, arranged for ease of comparison, together with a considerable textual introduction and two appendices. Although, as this editor quickly admits, it is the basically similar printed editions of 1645 and 1673 that form the proper basis for modern editions (p. 3), the significant variations among the earlier forms of the work make them worth examining and comparing.

The first version, that of the Trinity College manuscript of Milton's minor poems, is of greatest interest and importance, since (except for a very few revisions) it is in Milton's own hand. Sprott takes issue with Diekhoff and Shawcross on the dating of this version and suggests that in its first stages it constituted the "earliest complete text of the work" (p. 5); he also considers that it "was not long, if ever, intended as a fair copy but served Milton early and late as a working copy for private reference" (p. 4). After describing the manuscript and what is known of its origin, Sprott in his introduction outlines four stages (and more than a dozen sub-stages) of its revision. This minor miracle he accomplishes by

comparing handwriting, ink, condition of pen, and detailed differences from the other versions—and by being admittedly willing to conjecture when unmistakable evidence is lacking. My own look at this manuscript in Cambridge generally supported Sprott's findings, although I cannot agree on a few points, such as that the ink of pasted leaf (b) is "clearly different" from that of (a) (p. 9).

With regard to the second version of the poem, the Bridgewater manuscript, Sprott proposes that, though not in Milton's (nor likely in Lawes') hand, it "probably indicates the form and contents of Milton's first fair copy" (p. 23). Sprott also tabulates the major variants and omissions in this manuscript, and examines the relationship between it and the two song manuscripts, transcripts of which (without the music) are given in an appendix.

The third early version, the 1637 edition, has Milton's authority, Sprott claims, in that he "had prepared the copy text, and indeed probably wrote it" (p. 31). Partly because this version cannot be simply derived from either of the other two, Sprott supports the claim of Shawcross for the existence of a third manuscript, not now extant. This began, Sprott believes, as a fair copy of the already somewhat revised Trinity manuscript, was revised by Lawes for the actual performance (and in this state served as a basis for the Bridgewater manuscript), and was then revised again by Milton and used as a copy for the 1637 edition. In an appendix, Sprott ventures a re-creation of the first form of this manuscript.

There can be few complaints about the book. One may feel that the point of the sentence beginning "It is not clear . . ." (p. 23) is too far from clear, and one may have trouble finding one's way to the end of the first sentence on page 8, but generally Sprott's style in dealing with a rather complex subject is readable. The only misprint I have found is the printing of 392 instead of 390 (a reference to a line number) on page 33. The edition has obviously been prepared and executed with great care.

One may regret a delay of about seven years between the completion and the publication of Sprott's work. On page 33, brief notice is taken of the Trinity manuscript restoration in 1969 and of later transcripts and facsimiles. Especially noteworthy among these is the Scolar Press facsimile of the entire Trinity College manuscript, which is sold in Britain for only £1 in the paper-covered sewn-bound edition, less than one-tenth the cost of Sprott's obviously different book. The price of the latter does seem high; one is thankful that subsidies have kept it from being even higher.

There can be no doubt that this book constitutes a valuable addition to Milton studies, and sheds light both on the masque and on how Milton worked. Most editions and facsimiles of these early versions are now out of print, and Sprott's book not only makes the texts available, but presents them for the first time together, on facing pages, in a form eminently suitable for detailed comparison.

DANIEL W. DOERKSEN, *University of New Brunswick*

Donald F. Bouchard. *Milton a structural reading*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1974. Pp. 180. \$11.75.

In his introduction Professor Bouchard declares his book "is divided into three sections: the first section deals with a selected group of works before *Paradise Lost* [*Comus*, *Lycidas*