

ANONYMOUS MILTON, OR, A MASKE MASKED

BY ANN BAYNES COIRO

Reacting against older bibliographic theories devoted to single authorship and a stable authorial text, theater historians have recently focused on the wide range of collaboration that theater necessitates, including collaborative authorship, revisions in performance, actors' memorial texts, and publishers' reinterpretation of drama as a print commodity.¹ There are few instances in early modern theater history where such rich detail survives about a play's progress from performance to print as survives for Milton's masque. Early modern drama's historians, however, have neglected this story because Milton is not regarded as a dramatist, and critics have transmogrified the masque into a Miltonic poem.² Milton's success in constructing himself as English literature's great, solitary author whose career, even its necessary interruptions, forms an overarching plan of vatic power has also obscured the involved history of the masque.³ Yet Milton's theatrical involvements at Cambridge, the masque's theatrical identity, and the masque's material existence as a printed book all tell a counterintuitive story—collaborative, theatrical, and historically and culturally embedded.

In the eighteenth century, *A Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle* was adapted for the professional stage, with the addition of lots of sexy temptation scenes and fun fairies. Retitled *Comus*, it was performed with brilliant success, becoming a staple of the theater for more than a hundred years. Oddly, this stagy title is the title we use to read the piece as a poem. Since, however, my concern here will be with its early history, I will use the title Milton used with close variations in the text's many manifestations during his lifetime, a title which itself insists on social connections and on performance.⁴

A Maske existed, first, as a script for an aristocratic family's celebration, the result of Milton's collaboration with Henry Lawes, court musician to Charles I. Lawes almost certainly got Milton the commission; he wrote the music for the masque's songs, rehearsed the Egerton children in their difficult roles, staged the piece at Ludlow Castle, making significant revisions under the exigencies of

performance, and, finally, performed a major role himself. Milton was asked to write a theatrical performance of a kind associated exclusively with the monarch and aristocracy and, by many, with their financial and sexual excesses. A poetic career rather than a life in the ministry or the law would have meant, in the early 1630s, being supported by patronage and writing within the constraints and obligations such a supported life entailed. By accepting the commission from the Egerton family he stood at the threshold of a life of literary service and artistic collaboration that seems to us now to be utterly inimical to our sense of Milton's career, but that then must have been the life he could see himself beginning.

The textual history of *A Maske* is dauntingly complex. Milton worked on the masque in the Trinity College MS, returning to edit it on numerous occasions; the result is a rich editorial puzzle of various inks and pen nibs that has prompted unresolvable but fascinating speculation about chronology and intention. But we also have a presentation manuscript to the Egerton family, known as the Bridgewater MS, that was apparently copied from the working script of the actual performance in 1634. We know, therefore, that 115 lines were cut for performance and that speeches were rearranged and reassigned. Theories about the motivations behind the cuts (and the author of them) have played important roles in, for example, the ongoing controversy about the effect of the Castlehaven scandal on the masque's conception.⁵ In 1645 *A Maske* is the final English piece in Milton's *Poems*, where he has restored it to the Trinity MS version, with the addition of the lady's speech on "the Sun-clad power of Chastity" and Comus's lines in response, which begin "She fables not."⁶ According to longstanding critical consensus, *A Maske* becomes a poem in the *Poems*, a keystone in the careful presentation of John Milton, Author.

There is one stage in this otherwise oft-told story that has received little attention—the anonymous publication of *A Maske* in 1637. Perhaps this anonymous edition has been neglected because it challenges, in a number of surprising ways, some of our fundamental conceptions about Milton.

* * * * *

The circulation of *A Maske* after its performance at Ludlow Castle is in many ways surprising. Lawes explains in his dedication of the 1637 edition to Lord Brackley, the performance's Elder Brother, that

the play was “so much desired, that the often copying of it hath tir’d my pen to give my severall friends satisfaction, and brought me to a necessitie of producing it to the publick view.”⁷ Since the publication keeps the author anonymous, Lawes assumes an even more prominent role as collaborator (imagine Inigo Jones publishing, associated with his name alone, one of the masques he worked on with Ben Jonson). Except for the Bridgewater MS, no other copies made or commissioned by Lawes are extant, and so we do not know whether Lawes was copying the performance script or the longer original. Whichever version Lawes was distributing, a scribal text was a quasi-private and privileged form of publication, especially one as beautifully executed as the Bridgewater MS. Manuscript miscellanies were also a common cultural practice in the 1630s, particularly among university men. Yet, except for the quintessentially college poems on Thomas Hobson, Milton had held himself distinctly apart from this inside conversation.⁸ That he allowed his first major work to be traded in this expensive, exclusive, and private market is a measure of how far into Lawes’s world he was willing to venture in the 1630s.

The musician not only orchestrated manuscript publication, but he also facilitated, as the socially prestigious front man, the coy author’s passage into print. Lawes asks Brackley to “receive this [Poem] as your owne, from the hands of him, who hath by many favours beene long oblig’d to your most honour’d Parents, and as in this repraesentation your attendant *Thyrsis*, so now in all reall expression / Your faithfull, and most / humble Servant, / H. LAVVES.” That art is a product of service to the nobility is strongly signaled at the beginning of this printed version of the masque, a gesture that would have surprised no reader of masques in 1637. In Lawes’s graceful introduction, the *Maske* becomes a nameless pastoral virgin, entrusted, as his sister had been, to the young lord: “Although not openly acknowledg’d by the Author, yet it is a legitimate off-spring, so lovely, and so much desired.”⁹ The sense of vulnerability, of almost sexual danger for the masque as it wanders the world unclaimed except as an aristocratic tribute, is striking. And the little book did have adventures in the world, at odds with our sense of Milton now, perhaps unsettling to its author’s sense of himself then.

A Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle was published in London for Humphrey Robinson to be sold at the sign of the “three Pidgeons” in St. Paul’s Churchyard. The 1637 edition is virtually identical to the version Humphrey Moseley would publish in 1645, that is, the version in the Trinity MS but also including the added speeches by

the Lady and Comus. It was not registered in the Stationers' Register. Fifteen copies are now known to exist, one of them the Bridgewater family's with manuscript corrections that may be in Milton's hand.¹⁰

Lawes's print version may have been meant for a slightly expanded but still bounded circle of family and social relations. Up to this point Milton had published just one brief lyric ("On Shakespeare"), also anonymously. The anonymous publication of *A Maske*, escorted out by a chaperon, is about as ambivalent a public appearance as one could imagine. Milton was clearly not yet ready to be a public writer.

The one contemporary account we have of the 1637 edition reveals, however, the price of anonymity. When Milton did claim authorship in 1645, he or the publisher Humphrey Moseley prefaced *A Maske* not only with Lawes's dedication to Lord Brackley, but also with a flattering letter Sir Henry Wotton had sent Milton in 1638. That Wotton's chatty personal letter about this-and-that, from a missed chance for dinner together to tips for European travel, should become a public document demonstrates the continuing importance of social connections and the public nature of handwritten communication. Wotton is writing a thank-you note for Milton's thank-you gift of a copy of the 1637 *Maske*. If Milton's gift was calculated to elicit praise that would advance his career, it succeeded. Wotton calls the masque "a dainty peece of entertainment. . . . Wherein I should much commend the Tragical part, if the Lyrical did not ravish me with a certain Dorique delicacy in your Songs and Odes, wherunto I must plainly confess to have seen yet nothing parallel in our Language: *Ipsa mollities*."¹¹

But then Wotton reveals a surprise—he had read the play already, although he had not known who the real author was: "For the work it self, I had view'd som good while before, with singular delight, having receiv'd it from our common Friend Mr. *R*. in the very close of the late *R*'s Poems, Printed at *Oxford*, wherunto it was added (as I now suppose) that the Accessory might help out the Principal, according to the Art of *Stationers*, and to leave the Reader *Con la bocca dolce*." The parenthetical "(as I now suppose)" at once flatters and leaves open the question of what Wotton thought before Milton "(how modestly soever)" confessed his authorship.¹²

Their common friend may be John Rouse, the librarian of the Bodleian to whom Milton would address an archly sophisticated, decidedly snobby Latin ode in 1647, or the publisher Humphrey Robinson himself.¹³ But the "late R" is almost certainly Thomas Randolph who had died in 1635 and whose *Poems with the Muses Looking-Glasse: and Amyntas* was published in Oxford by Leonard

Lichfield in 1638. The Randolph volume has separate title pages for the volume as a whole and then for each play. It has two separate paginations, one for the poems and one for both plays. It was common practice to bind volumes together for sale, and the Randolph volume, with its three separate title pages, already lent itself easily to the addition of another play.

It could have been, as Wotton kindly says, that adding *A Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle* would increase the sales of Randolph's work. But that was probably not the case since Randolph was highly regarded at the time, his young death seen as a great loss, and his work in steady demand from 1638 through the early years of the Restoration.¹⁴ Owen Feltham, who contributed one of the many memorial poems added to the front of Randolph's posthumous volume, predicts that "in the future it shall honour be, / That men shall read their names bound up with thee."¹⁵ It is much more likely that the bookseller (or their common friend, Mr. R.) bound Milton's masque with Randolph's poems and plays because it seemed so strikingly similar, and the two together made a nice package.

For many years among Milton scholars and editors, there has been quiet speculation about Randolph's influence on Milton.¹⁶ Such speculation can seem pedantic and discomfiting. Milton has come to assume a monumental position in literary history, his only English peers writers like Spenser or Shakespeare. Indeed, Milton himself seems invested in being understood as a member of this august canon. He later took pains to erase the marks of the collaborative prewar culture from his work; when *A Maske* is republished in the 1673 *Poems*, for example, both Lawes's and Wotton's letters are absent. In 1638, it must have been a shock to realize that instead of contemporary cultural sleuths clamoring to find the identity of the brilliant masque's author, readers—especially readers as literate and influential as Wotton—could assume it was another university wit, even a particular (and now dead) one. If we pursue this material connection, however, we can see Milton and his masque in a revealing transition, on its way to—but still far from—what Peter Lindenbaum has called a "Republican" "mode of producing literature."¹⁷ It also must make us hesitate to accept without qualification what is currently a critical axiom—that "[i]n *all* its stages but most emphatically in its final forms (1637/1645), Milton's *Masque Presented at Ludlow Castle* is a reformed masque," that is, a work critical of court culture and ambitious to offer a higher moral vision.¹⁸ To focus too tightly on the reformed nature of the masque risks a solely

retrospective understanding that can miss the ways it is embedded in and indebted to its cultural moment.

Randolph was a student at Trinity College, Cambridge while Milton was at Christ's College. He matriculated a year before Milton (in 1624), received his B.A. in 1628 and his M.A. in 1631. He seems to have taken a year off in 1630 to work as a professional playwright in London, an extremely unusual course of action for a College Fellow. Randolph was renowned in his time for his classical scholarship, particularly his command of Aristotle, and for his precocious poetic abilities. He, too, began his career with a Christmas poem, but *his* was written, according to John Aubrey, when he was nine.¹⁹ His poems are widely represented in contemporary manuscript culture, and Randolph was one of the many poets Lawes set to music.²⁰ There is no critical edition of Randolph, and his canon still remains unfixed (the first and last modern edition of his dramatic works is W. Carew Hazlitt's in 1875). His first play was written while he was still at Winchester School, to be performed by the boys there. He wrote at least five plays that were performed at Cambridge for (and by) his fellow students. As the regular playwright for the Salisbury Court theater (circa 1630) he wrote three plays that we know of and probably more. He was an acknowledged Son of Ben.²¹

Without question, Randolph was the most accomplished academic dramatist of the seventeenth century. Randolph's most recent editor, G. Thorn-Drury in 1929, argues that "notwithstanding his early death, the small amount of his work published before it and the limited sphere in which he passed most of his early manhood, he left behind him a reputation more considerable than that of any other writer of his period."²² G. E. Bentley found nearly a hundred allusions to him in the seventeenth century, in addition to scores of his poems in miscellanies. Nigel Smith, in his new edition of Marvell's poems, finds in Marvell's work a remarkable number of echoes and borrowings from Randolph.²³ Contemporaries ranked him with Shakespeare and Jonson.²⁴ The editor of Milton's sonnets, J. S. Smart, believes that the "timely-happy spirit" of Sonnet 7, written two or three years before *A Maske*, is Randolph.²⁵ Martin Butler has speculated that "[h]ad Randolph lived beyond thirty, through him the academic drama might have again significantly influenced the professional stage."²⁶ As a dramatist Randolph wrote dazzling syntheses, mixing together the influence of Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Jonson's humor plays; his work reads like a very funny seventeenth-century Reduced Renaissance Drama Company.

Trinity College was the perfect place for Randolph's talents to flourish, for it had a longstanding commitment to college theatricals. The other Cambridge colleges, except for Queens, had let dramatic performances fade, often prompted by antitheatrical criticism. But Trinity College was alive with theater, and the spectacular center of that theatrical life during Milton's years at Cambridge was Randolph.²⁷

Milton never mentions Randolph, at least directly, but he must have known him or, at the very least, his various Cambridge productions. We now know that Milton's "Prolusion VI" and "At a Vacation Exercise" were actually parts of a longer entertainment that Milton wrote and for which he acted the comic master of ceremonies in the summer of 1628. Something like a hazing, this ceremony, known as a "salting," inducted freshman into the ranks of the upperclassmen, involved plenty of alcohol, and demanded sophomoric humor at its grossest, archest, and most punning. If, when the inductees were called upon to perform, their wit wasn't "salty" enough, they were made to drink salted beer; otherwise, they were rewarded with undoctored beer. A tradition of long-standing, saltings could get out of hand and be banned by the University authorities.²⁸ In the years before Milton's matriculation, the tradition seems to have been in abeyance for some time, but it was hilariously and brilliantly revived in 1627, the year before Milton got to try his hand.

It was Randolph who wrote and hosted the salting in 1627, and Milton seems to have picked up his cues from Randolph's production. The master of salting ceremonies was conventionally known as the Father and the freshman inductees were always the Sons. Part of the humor of the occasion was the conceit of the Sons' family resemblance: they might be beasts or body parts or anything that provided a pretext for clever puns and clowning around. Randolph made his Sons the dishes of a banquet, with a preliminary riff on what he won't call them, including books, metals, or body parts. Milton decides to be Ens, or Absolute Being, and therefore to call his Sons the predicaments of Aristotle (Substance, Quantity, Quality, Relation, Place, Time, Posture, State, Action, and Passivity), but he spends a long time explaining why he won't call them banquet dishes, milking the idea for a lot of jokes before turning from it. Both his *occupatio*, which loops back to Randolph's salting of the year before, and his clever use of Aristotle underscore Milton's sense of rivalry with Randolph, the charmingly funny Aristotle scholar. There are certainly differences between Randolph's and Milton's saltings: Milton's is, for example, much less personal and much more oratorical, but the most

striking difference is how much more insulting and obscene Milton's performance is. Milton's "Father" figure is clearly very pleased to have been asked to lead this rowdy, clever ritual, especially since, as he self-mockingly points out, he was the "Lady" of Christ's Church.²⁹ He seems eager to switch gender roles for the evening and get down to raucous play.

It is temptingly simple to label Milton a great revolutionary, a Puritan, or a towering author figure and then become complicit with him in smoothing over things that complicate and humanize his history. After all, Milton retrospectively crafts his own persona carefully, which is probably one reason *A Maske* has not been considered dramatic. A decade after taking his M.A., for example, Milton speaks directly about Cambridge theatricals in the *Apology for Smectymnuus*. Defending himself against the charge that he haunts "Play-Houses, or the Bordelli," Milton deftly sidesteps the question of whether he attended professional theater in London.³⁰ Instead he focuses on his career at Cambridge, since his accomplishments and excellent reputation there are the basis of his self-defense.³¹ At Cambridge, he admits, he did indeed attend plays. He describes sarcastically a kind of show particularly offensive to him: "when in the Colleges so many of the young Divines, and those in next aptitude to Divinity have bin seene so oft upon the Stage writhing and unboning their Clergie limmes to al the antick and dishonest gestures of Trinculo's, Buffons, and Bawds; prostituting the shame of that ministry which either they had, or were nigh having, to the eyes of Courtiers and Court-Ladies, with their Groomes and *Madamoisellaes*." He conjures a vivid picture of himself in the audience as well: "There while they acted, and overacted, among other young scholars, I was a spectator; they thought themselves gallant men, and I thought them fools, they made sport, and I laught, they mispronounc't and I mislik't, and to make up the *atticisme*, they were out, and I hist."³² Milton here enjoys his own elegant prose style but the scene he conjures is full of guilty pleasure. After all, Milton was a completely engaged "spectator": he "laught," he "mislik't," he "hist." There is no hint here that he himself participated in theatrical shows (or that at least two of the five-member Smectymnuus consortium had been in the audience watching him).³³ Read carefully, the self-defense rests on a crucial distinction: the offending "young Divines" prostituted themselves for the eyes of the court, not to entertain each other.

Perhaps Milton is thinking of a particular and notorious Cambridge play, performed before the court and celebrated for its

ridiculous badness. In 1632, Milton's last year there, Charles and Henrietta Maria visited Cambridge. The University therefore needed to prepare theatrical performances, the time-honored offering to visiting monarchs. But this visit occasioned a classic academic imbroglio. Both Queens College and Trinity College had plays to put on, and there was a nasty debate between the College heads and the two student bodies about which would go first. The playwrights were each celebrated college writers. Trinity had Randolph, of course, with a new play, *The Jealous Lovers*. Queens had a play by Peter Hausted, called *The Rival Friends*. Hausted was several years older than Randolph and Milton but had stayed at Cambridge after taking his M.A. in 1627. He had acted in college theatricals and had previously written a well-received Latin play. Dr. Butts, the Vice-Chancellor of the University, interceded in the conflict and chose Hausted's play to go first.³⁴

It was a disaster. The King and Queen disliked it, and the play was, in Hausted's injured words, "Cryed downe by Boyes, Faction, envie, and confident ignorance."³⁵ Randolph's *Jealous Lovers*, on the other hand, was a spectacular success. Sad evidence of how important these rivalries and performances could be is the suicide of Dr. Butts after the Chancellor of Cambridge "is said to have told him that the King and himself had more confidence in his discretion than they found cause, in that he found such a comedy fitting, &c."³⁶

Hausted was about to become a tactlessly censorious Laudian minister. On Sunday, 2 November 1634, for example, he would be arrested right from the pulpit of Great St. Mary's in Cambridge after preaching a sermon that was probably indiscreet in its attacks on Calvinists, judging by other sermons he preached that argued for "reverence, alacrity, purity and order in God's service, for adoration in Churches, and bowing at the Blessed name, for the surplis and other Ceremonyes."³⁷ In 1632 Hausted not only wrote *The Rival Friends* for the royal visit but acted in it, unlimbing himself before "the eyes of Courtiers and Court-Ladies, with their Groomes and Madamoisellaes." When he published *The Rival Friends* a few months after its performance in an attempt to vindicate himself, Hausted had prominently placed a long Latin poem in enthusiastic praise of himself and his talent from another about-to-be minister, *Lycidas's* Edward King. In spite of King's labored Latin poem in praise of the abused playwright, Milton would certainly have despised Hausted, if only because he was a wretched writer. The scathing outburst in *Apology for Smectymnuus* can easily be applied to Hausted's play and his performance.

But what of the other play performed before the King and Queen? Randolph's *Jealous Lovers* has got bawds and Trinculos aplenty, elements which perhaps account for its success. But it also has a masque within the play flattering a useless heir and his whore, which seems an uncomfortably close satire of the kind of court masques Charles and Henrietta Maria loved. In the midst of dissolute, even psychotic behavior, there is one perfectly lovely character who is lured unsuspecting into a whorehouse full of debauched men who plan to rape her. She cries out:

Diana,
And whatsoever goddess else protects
Untouch'd virginity, shield me with your powers.
To what a wilderness have my wandering steps
Betray'd me! . . .
What strange fancies
My maiden fears present me!

(R, 1:128–29)

When Milton's Lady implores Echo, it almost seems to be Randolph's outrageously successful play that answers back.

In 1638 it made sense to someone to bind Milton and Randolph together. In 1949 James Holly Hanford pointed out defensively that there was indeed a connection between *A Maske* and *The Muses Looking-Glasse*; Milton was repudiating the libertine philosophy of Randolph's entertainment.³⁸ But *The Muses Looking-Glasse* is not in the least libertine. It does mock bourgeois Puritans for being superstitiously afraid of the theater, but its point is a Sidnean defense of the power of visual and verbal art. Two amusingly obtuse Puritans, Mistress Featherdew, a haberdasher of small wares, and Bird, a feather merchant, sit on stage in a huff for almost the entire five-act play, dead set against the horrors of playacting. Roscius, a player, convinces them to let him try to prove their assumptions wrong. He brings on a series of paired characters who portray the extremes of a series of virtues. Courtesy, for example, is represented by a very funny routine between Colax, the servile flatterer, and Dyscolus, a peevish and irritable man. Liberality is represented by a dialogue between a niggardly usurer and a profuse prodigal; meekness is represented by Orgylus, who is angry and easily injured, and Aorgus, who is so absurdly patient, so impervious to insult that Orgylus finally beats and kicks him offstage. At the close of each scene the pairs go off to look in Roscius's looking glass. In the end, every extreme

character is changed by the looking glass of theater into a perfectly moderate embodiment of its virtue. Even the two Puritans realize they have been censorious and vow to go to plays for their own good instruction. Randolph's *The Muses Looking-Glasse* is episodic, repetitive, and static. By the standards of early modern professional theater it needs work.³⁹ But as a university "Entertainment" (its original title), it was a success: a series of often brilliant sketches—academic disputations played out as humor routines.

Besides the Puritan onstage audience and Roscius, the player, the one character constantly present in *The Muses Looking-Glasse* is Colax, the flatterer. His praise for each extreme is disconcertingly convincing. Colax's praise of "Acolastus, a voluptuous epicure, that out of an immoderate and untamed desire seeks after all pleasures promiscuously, without respect of honest or lawful" (*R*, 1:204) is, in particular, also disconcertingly similar to some of the great arguments of Milton's *Comus*. Colax praises the bestial glutton and libertine:

Nature has been bountiful
To provide pleasures, and shall we be niggards
At plenteous boards? He's a discourteous guest
That will observe a diet at a feast.

.....

When she bestow'd
So powerful faces, such commanding beauties,
On many glorious nymphs, was it to say:
Be chaste and continent? Not to enjoy
All pleasures and at full, were to make Nature
Guilty of that she ne'er was guilty of—
A vanity in her works.

(*R*, 1:208–9)

Also evocative of Milton's *Maske* is Colax's praise of "an over-curious lady, too neat in her attire":

. . . so great a beauty
Must have her ornaments. Nature adorns
The peacock's tail with stars; 'tis she . . .
.....
Spangled the heavens with all those glorious lights;
She spotted th' ermine's skin, and arm'd the fish
In silver mail. But man she sent forth naked,
Not that he should remain so, but that he,
Endued with reason, should adorn himself
With every one of these. The silkworm is

Only man's spinster, else we might suspect
That she esteem'd the painted butterfly
Above her masterpiece.

(R, 1:241)

Wotton's little Randolph book, with its bound-in mystery masque, unintentionally amplifies the conceit of the Muses' Looking-Glass.

Whether or not Randolph's Aristotelian humor play is a source for Milton's *Maske*, it does demonstrate the academic environment out of which Milton's early work grows. The paired characters, the disputations, the indulgence and worry over alcohol and sex are at least as characteristic of Oxbridge conventions as they are of the court. The similarities also underscore how easy it would be for a reader to mistake Milton for Randolph. The literary profession is devoted to establishing authorial canons and to determining authorship right down to lines. But the world in which Milton first wrote was characterized by manuscript circulation or by miscellany collections. Works could circulate anonymously or be stripped of attribution during copying. In this world Thomas Randolph was at least as well known and as highly regarded as John Milton. The trauma of *Lycidas* is all the more palpable when we think of Milton's first public achievement bound to a dead man's work.

The other Randolph play with which *A Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle* was bound is *Amyntas, or The Impossible Dowry*, a "Pastorall," the title page claims proudly, "Acted before the King & Queene at Whitehall" (R, 1:268). *Amyntas* is a dizzying hash of pastoral tragicomedy with no character development, no motivation, and no discernable point except sexual titillation. The main plot is the lovers' plight from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ratcheted up several degrees of kinkiness. Milton's *Maske* certainly reflects the influence of Shakespeare's comedy as well, although in glancing and complicated ways. But *Amyntas*, like *The Muses Looking-Glasse*, continually strikes other notes oddly evocative of Milton: it relies on moly as a crucial plot device, it places the myth of Ceres and Persephone at the center of its fiction, and its titillating crisis is a threatened rape and a nasty act of violence (by one of the two young lovers upon the lady who hopelessly adores him). The play is finally resolved by a clever Echo song and concludes with a character "epilogizing" (R, 1:371). The similarities between Milton's pastoral masque and Randolph's pastoral tragicomedy are, again, strong enough to be startling.

Beyond plot, on the level of language there are other uncanny echoes of Randolph in Milton. The delightful line describing *L'Allegro's*

Euphrosyne as “a daughter fair, / So buxom, blithe, and debonair” is remarkably close to a line from Randolph’s *Aristippus*, a play in defense of drinking rather than studying all the time: “A bowl of wine is wondrous good cheer, / To make one blithe, buxom, and debonair” (*R*, 1:21).⁴⁰ Comus sounds like Randolph’s Jonson figure, Tityrus, telling his protege Damon (clearly Randolph): “we, whose souls are made of purer fire, / Have other aims” (*R*, 2:609).⁴¹ The remorseful lover in *Amyntas* “bewail[s] / The funeral of my virtue, that lies buried / Here in this living tomb, this moving sepulchre” (*R*, 1:350), a less wrenching version of Samson’s cry “To live a life half dead, a living death, / And buried; but O yet more miserable! / Myself my sepulcher, a moving Grave, / Buried.”⁴² What are we to make of this shared vocabulary of potted mythology, pastoral conventions, moral assumptions, and even words and phrases? Milton is a seventeenth-century writer who went to Cambridge in the 1620s and early 1630s, who had literary aspirations in a culture where the avenues for such ambitions were changing and confused, who struggled, like his contemporaries, with the restrictions and grace notes of the humanist and scholastic training he had received. Milton is probably borrowing from and tweaking his gifted contemporary, a perfectly normal procedure in a culture that prized answer poems, imitations, and one-upping conventions. Reconstructing a reading of Milton’s *Maske* in the volume that Wotton first read it in is at once a deflating and an exhilarating experience.

In the volume Wotton was given, *A Maske* follows a Jonsonian academic disputation of Aristotelian pairs that makes gentle fun of Puritans and a charmingly kitschy debasement of pastoral into what one *Amyntas* character quaintly and repeatedly calls “mellisonant tingle-tangle.”⁴³ Wotton probably thought Randolph wrote all three. Milton wrote his masque to be a critique of and moral improvement on the genre, as much criticism has shown. But Milton also wrote it to be an entertaining piece of theater that would please his patrons and outdo his contemporaries. After all, in 1638 Milton’s masque passed comfortably in unreformed company. Wotton—man of letters, ambassador to Venice, member of Parliament, provost of Eton—understood the masque he read in 1630s terms: a very good piece of tragical-lyrical invention, a “dainty peece of entertainment,” the kind of mixed theater very popular in the years before the theaters were closed. Milton’s masque is much more finished, much more ambitious and serious, than Randolph’s intelligent but unpolished and unstructured work, but in 1634 and in 1637 (and, in some ways, even

in 1645) Milton's *A Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle* is still the work of an idealistic and ambitious young dramatist, not of a revolutionary prophet with his singing robes around him.

The story of the commission, composition, and first publication of *A Maske* arcs through the most private years of Milton's life. *Lycidas*, published directly on the heels of the masque's anonymous publication, brilliantly enacts the intense anxiety and sense of being without direction that Milton must have felt in the 1630s. Other men of his age and training were pursuing careers, and some accomplished men his age were already dead. In many ways *Lycidas* is a final farewell to Cambridge and to the literary pursuits he could have imagined while there. *Lycidas*, signed J. M., uses the death of Edward King to articulate a transition from secular poetry and from any career in religious bureaucracy into a life devoted to a higher purpose. The exact direction of that life is unclear, as is any sense of final resolution or safe comfort, but one thing *Lycidas* is certainly doing is edging its author into a public, print role. It should not be surprising that even here, in the astonishing accomplishment of *Lycidas*, other Cambridge echoes linger, transmuted.

Milton had written about King before, in his version of a Cambridge salting. Oratorical display and obscene humor drop away when Milton's character turns to English, a move marked by his direct address to his "native language."⁴⁴ Besides being a movingly tender description of English as his baby language, this speech is Milton's first public exploration of his poetic career; he asks the English language to dress him in

Not those new fangled toys, and trimming slight
Which takes our late fantastics with delight,
But cull those richest Robes, and gay'st attire
Which deepest spirits, and choicest Wits desire:
I have some naked thoughts that rove about
And loudly knock to have their passage out.⁴⁵

The *Ens* character speaking here sounds like the Milton we know now. He imagines writing poetry that will transport the mind, "soar / Above the wheeling poles," view classical heaven and its deities, sing of the beginning of things, and, finally, culminate in an epic poem.⁴⁶ It is significant and funny that Milton performs himself, or the self he

imagines becoming, as the Aristotelian Absolute Being. But because this is a performance, the show must go on; the rest of the surviving English lines introduce two of Father Milton's Sons, the Aristotelian Predicaments: Substance and Relation. George Rivers gets a brief, wittily Draytonian introduction as Relation, but the first Son is introduced at length. Substance was almost certainly played by Edward King.⁴⁷ Heavy with clever puns, Ens's lines for Substance are warm and flattering. They are, nevertheless, shocking to read. Milton uses a fairy tale conceit—fairies sang and danced about his bed when the charmed boy was born. But blessings bring curses:

Yet there is something that doth force my fear,
For once it was my dismal hap to hear
A *Sibyl* old, bow-bent with crooked age,
That far events full wisely could presage,
And in time's long and dark Prospective Glass
Foresaw what future days should bring to pass!
"Your Son," said she, "(nor can you it prevent)
Shall subject be to many an Accident."⁴⁸

Unlike his other youthful work, Milton did not publish "At a Vacation Exercise" until 1673. Perhaps so soon after the *Apology for Smectymnuss*, he did not want to admit to participating in college entertainments, even one full of intellectual puns on philosophical concepts. Or perhaps the uncanny predictive quality of his joking play was prophetic in ways that were too haunting to admit into the same volume with *Lycidas*. Language is powerful, and performing words is a serious business, even when they are funny. A pun can double back.

King had died in 1637, Randolph in 1635. Even more than King, Randolph must have haunted Milton's memory, on many levels. Each was a specter of what Milton might have been: a minister or a learned, acclaimed, and generally frivolous poet and dramatist. *Lycidas* is explicitly about King and is placed at the end of the memorial volume *Iusta Eduardo King*, but it is visited as well by that other Cambridge volume of loving memory, Randolph's posthumous *Poems*.

Among the finest poems in Randolph's collection is "An Eclogue occasioned by Two Doctors disputing upon Predestination," a poem which, like *Lycidas*, uses pastoral poetry to criticize Anglican church politics, and particularly the current state of training for the ministry at Cambridge. It opens with a bitter debate between two shepherds

about why one lamb should wither while the other flourishes: “Were they not both ean’d by the selfsame ewe?” (*R*, 2:602). But Thyrsis interrupts angrily: “Fie, shepherds, fie! while you these strifes begin, / Here creeps the wolf, and there the fox gets in. / To your vain piping on so deep a reed / The lambkins listen, but forget to feed” (*R*, 2:603). Thyrsis argues, instead, that they should be singing of divine love and then tells the story of Christ’s birth and crucifixion. The poem ends:

Now love is dead. O no, he never dies;
Three days he sleeps, and then again doth rise
(Like fair Aurora from the Eastern bay),
And with his beams drives all our clouds away.
This pipe unto our flocks, this sonnet get—
But O, I see the sun ready to set.
Good night to all, for the great night is come;
Flocks, to your folds, and shepherds, hie you home:
To-morrow morning, when we all have slept,
Pan’s cornet’s blown, and the great sheep-shear’s kept.
(*R*, 2:605)

Milton’s *Lycidas* is haunted by death, bodily dismemberment and loss, and secondariness. With Abraham Cowley, Randolph was considered the prodigy of his generation, but Randolph died before his talent fully bloomed. There would be no tomorrow for him; in *Lycidas*, as in *A Maske*, he became a genius inhabiting the shores of Milton’s great talent.

In 1638, Randolph threatened to erase Milton; he almost turned him into a court wit, a lightweight playwright, a dead Cambridge prodigy. Lawes is Milton’s collaborator in 1634 and again in 1637. Randolph is Milton’s collaborator, too, a collaboration forged by a collaborative world where Milton borrowed, the bookseller bound, and the reading public did not discriminate. Milton needed to break away from his literary culture in order to become the great and singular English writer he was beginning to understand he could be. Literary historians never know what to do with Milton. He gets included awkwardly in the Renaissance and never fits comfortably in the Restoration, the period of his great works. As *A Maske* moved from performance to anonymous print and then to fully authorized print publication, it broke away from an imitative, conventional, and collaborative past to something quite new: an autobiography told in a collected volume of his own work. Randolph was dead, King was dead. Milton would live and be known. *A Maske Presented at Ludlow*

Castle was becoming, through the course of its material existence, a drama of authorship.

Rutgers University

NOTES

¹ See, for example, Douglas A. Brooks, *From Playhouse to Printing House in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000); Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997); Julie Stone Peters, *Theatre of the Book: Print and Stage 1480–1880* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000); and Paul Yachnin, *Stage-Wrights: Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton, and the Making of Theatrical Value* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1997).

² The dismissal of Milton's *A Maske* as a drama began with Samuel Johnson and has had a long critical history since. See the useful summary of critical opinions in A. S. P. Woodhouse and Douglas Bush, editors of *A Variorum Commentary on the Poems of John Milton. Vol. Two: The Minor English Poems* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1972–), part 3, 785–852. In recent years, there has been much interest in the masque itself as a genre, but, while Milton's masque has been studied extensively, it has been seen as critical of the genre, so "reformed" as hardly to be dramatic at all. In his monumental study *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage: Plays and Playwrights*, 7 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941–1968), Gerald Eades Bentley succinctly stated the opinion of most drama scholars: "John Milton presents an awkward problem in a study of the Jacobean and Caroline stage. Certainly he was no dramatist; in the history of the theatre he has a very minor place. . . . [T]he measure of interest here is theatrical significance, not literary genius. Milton's towering figure must be given pygmy treatment" (4:911–12).

³ As Leah Marcus has recently pointed out, "the poet's voice is so seemingly authoritative and individualized—so *authentic*—that those of us who read and teach him can easily assume he had full control over his materials, as though they were written in stone like the two tablets of the law." Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (London: Routledge, 1996), 179. Marcus's important discussion of Milton and textual variations ("John Milton's Voice," 177–227) touches only glancingly on *A Maske*. Stephen B. Dobranski has also argued persuasively for Milton's collaboration with booksellers and publishers throughout his career, including the 1645 *Poems*; see his *Milton, Authorship, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999), esp. 1–13, 62–81. In "Dating Milton," Jonathan Goldberg argues that "chance, contingency, and revision" must be admitted into an understanding of Milton's development (in *Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century English Poetry*, ed. Elizabeth D. Harvey and Katharine Eisaman Maus [Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1990], 200).

⁴ These variations are: 1) *A Maske* (Trinity MS); 2) *A Maske Represented before the right ho^{ble} the Earle of Bridgewater Lord president of Wales and the right ho^{ble}: the Conntesse of Bridgewater. / At Ludlow Castle the 29th of September 1634* (the Bridgewater MS); 3) *A MASKE PRESENTED AT Ludlow Castle, 1634: On Michaelmasse night, before the RIGHT HONORABLE, IOHN Earle of Bridgewater, Vicount BRACKLY, Lord Praesident of WALES, And one of His MAIESTIES most honorable Privie Counsell* (1637 edition); 4) *A MASKE . . . PRESENTED AT LUDLOW-Castle, 1634. Before The Earl*

of BRIDGEWATER Then President of WALES (1645 edition); 5) the 1673 edition of *Poems* dispenses with Henry Lawes's and Sir Henry Wotton's prefatory letters and dispenses with a separate title page. The masque is simply printed after *Lycidas* with the title A MASK Presented at LUDLOW-CASTLE, 1634 &c.

⁵ Barbara Breasted first argued for the importance of the Castlehaven scandal to the conception of Milton's masque in "Comus and the Castlehaven Scandal," *Milton Studies* 3 (1971): 201–24. John Creaser argues the opposite case in "Milton's *Comus*: The Irrelevance of the Castlehaven Scandal," *N&Q* 31 (1984): 307–17. See also Cedric C. Brown, *John Milton's Aristocratic Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985), 20–23, 175–78; and Marcus, "The Milieu of Milton's *Comus*: Judicial Reform at Ludlow and the Problem of Sexual Assault," *Criticism* 25 (1983): 293–327.

⁶ Milton, *A Maske*, in *Complete Poems and Major Prose*, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (New York: Odyssey, 1957), 779–806.

⁷ Milton, *A Maske: The Earlier Versions*, ed. S. E. Sprott (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1973), 39, 41. Besides the autograph draft of the masque in the Trinity MS, the only complete manuscript extant is the presentation copy to the Earl of Bridgewater. For many years there was speculation that the Bridgewater MS was in Lawes's hand, but there are a number of extant examples of Lawes's hand, and the beautifully modulated hand of the presentation MS is not his. The Bridgewater manuscript is, rather, in the hand of a scribe. See Sprott, 15, 37; Peter Beal, *English Literary Manuscripts*, 4 vols. (London: Mansell; New York: Bowker, 1980–1997), vol. 2 (1625–1700), part 2, 86.

⁸ The Thomas Hobson poems are a natural coin of exchange since there was a flurry of them written after the Cambridge carrier's death. See Beal and Mary Hobbs, *Early Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts* (Aldershot, Eng.: Scholar Press, 1992), who have also found Milton's elegy on the Marchioness of Winchester and "On Time" in miscellany collections. Harold Love's *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993), provides a rich cultural history of scribal practices.

⁹ Lawes, introduction to Milton's *A Maske: The Earlier Versions*, 39.

¹⁰ See Milton, *Complete Shorter Poems*, ed. John Carey (London: Longman, 1971), 169; and Beal, vol. 2, part 2, 103. Carey believes that the publisher of the 1637 volume, unnamed on the title page, is probably John Raworth, whose widow Ruth published the 1645 *Poems*. Some of the print copies were probably distributed by Milton himself to friends and important social connections (like Wotton).

¹¹ Milton, *John Milton's Complete Poetical Works Reproduced in Photographic Facsimile*, ed. Harris Francis Fletcher, 4 vols. (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1943–1948), 1:191.

¹² Milton, *Complete Poetical Works*, 1:191.

¹³ Mr. R. could also be Thomas Randolph's brother Robert, who gathered the posthumous volume together.

¹⁴ STC and Wing list the following editions for Randolph: *Aristippus* (three in 1630, then 1631, 1635, and a 1635 Dublin edition); *Cornelianum Dolium* (1638); *The Jealous Lovers* (1632, 1634, 1640, 1646, 1652, 1662); and *Poems with The Muses Looking-Glasse* (1638, 1640 [2 eds.], 1643, 1652 [2 eds.], 1664, 1668 [2 eds.]). Aphra Behn revised *The Jealous Lovers* in 1682; only her epilogue is extant (Bentley, 5:985). Randolph's *Drinking Academy* remained in manuscript until S. A. Tannenbaum and Hyder E. Rollin's 1930 edition. Randolph's *Hey for Honesty*, an adaptation of

Aristophanes' *Plutus*, was published in 1651 but is not listed in Wing under Randolph. On the other hand, the STC's attribution of the Latin comedy *Cornelianum Dolium* to Randolph is probably wrong.

¹⁵ Owen Feltham, "On his beloved friend the Author, and his ingenious Poems," in *Poetical and Dramatic Works of Thomas Randolph*, ed. W. Carew Hazlitt, 2 vols. (London: Reeves and Turner, 1875), 2:509. Hereafter abbreviated *R* and cited by volume and page number.

¹⁶ See the Milton *Variorum*, vol. 2, part 3, 773–75; and Brown, 63–64, 94–95. Throughout this argument, connections between Randolph and Milton already made by scholars will be noted; otherwise, the speculations are my own. The only sustained analyses of Randolph's work are: Karl Kottas, *Thomas Randolph: Sein Leben und Seine Werke* (Wien and Leipzig: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1909), and G. C. Moore Smith, "Thomas Randolph," Warton Lecture on English Poetry, *Proceedings of the British Academy 1927* (London: Published for the British Academy by Humphrey Milford, Oxford Univ. Press, n.d.), 79–121.

¹⁷ Peter Lindenbaum, "John Milton and the Republican Mode of Literary Production," *YES* 21 (1991): 123. See Marshall Grossman, "The Fruits of One's Labor in Miltonic Practice and Marxian Theory," *ELH* 59 (1992): 77–105, for a subtle and brilliant reading of Milton's worries about authorship and its products.

¹⁸ Barbara Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 76, my emphasis. Lewalski here summarizes a generation of critical argument. Among other important arguments based on the idea of the masque as reformed are: Brown, *John Milton's Aristocratic Entertainments*; Lewalski, "Milton's *Comus* and the Politics of Masquing," in *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, ed. David Bevington and Peter Holbrook (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998), 296–320; Maryann Cale McGuire, *Milton's Puritan Masque* (Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1983); and David Norbrook, "The Reformation of the Masque," in *The Court Masque*, ed. David Lindley (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1984), 94–110.

¹⁹ Sidney Lee, "Thomas Randolph," vol. 16 of the *DNB*, 723–25. Milton wrote his "Nativity Ode" soon after his twenty-first birthday.

²⁰ Ian Spink, *Henry Lawes: Cavalier Songwriter* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000), 102. Lawes included his Randolph setting in his 1653 volume of *Ayres and Dialogues*, which he dedicated to Alice Egerton and one of her sisters.

²¹ For John Aubrey's amusing account of how Randolph charmed Ben Jonson, see the *DNB* entry on Randolph.

²² See G. Thorn-Drury's introduction to *The Poems of Thomas Randolph*, ed. Thorn-Drury (London: Frederick Etchells & Hugh Macdonald, 1929), viii.

²³ Andrew Marvell, *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Nigel Smith (London: Pearson Longman, 2003).

²⁴ Bentley, 5:968; and see the dedicatory poems to the 1638 *Poems* which praise and lament the loss of Randolph and frequently describe him as having been Jonson's heir presumptive (Randolph, *Poetical and Dramatic Works*, 2:497–518).

²⁵ See *Variorum*, part 2, 370–71, on the "timely-happy spirit." James Holly Hanford seems to have a strong antipathy to the idea that Milton could have been influenced by Randolph in any positive way. He rejects the idea that Randolph could be Milton's "timely-happy spirit." Such an idea "is patently absurd, for there is nothing in the work of Randolph or any contemporary poet that Milton could have envied." If Milton had any particular person in mind Hanford thinks it must be

someone of the stature of Lucan or Sidney. Hanford, *John Milton, Englishman* (New York: Crown, 1949), 63.

²⁶ Martin Butler, "Private and Occasional Drama," in *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, ed. A. R. Braunmuller and Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990), 152.

²⁷ See Frederick S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (1914; reprint, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), and, for the seventeenth century, G. C. Moore Smith, *College Plays Performed at the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1923). Jonas Barish, in *The Antitheatrical Prejudice*, outlines the shift in early modern antitheatrical treatises from an earlier tolerance for academic performances to increasing intolerance for any form of performance, even for educational purposes, during the second and third decades of the seventeenth century (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1981), 82–83.

²⁸ Indeed, the 1628 salting was itself in danger of cancellation when its chosen host, a popular student leader, got sent home for causing trouble in town. Milton was a last-minute choice, perhaps chosen in part because of a reputation for seriousness and reliability. I am indebted to John K. Hale, "Milton Plays the Fool: The Christ's College Salting, 1628," *Classical and Modern Literature* 20 (2000): 51–70; and Roslyn Richek, "Thomas Randolph's *Salting* (1627), Its text, and John Milton's Sixth Proclusion as Another Salting," *ELR* 12 (1982): 103–31. Under Puritan influence, even Trinity College would completely ban saltings in 1646 because of the "unsufferable Abuses" they occasioned. See John Twigg, *The University of Cambridge and the English Revolution 1625–1688* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press; Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Library, 1990), 132–33.

²⁹ Milton, *Complete Prose Works*, ed. Don M. Wolfe and others, 8 vols. (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1953–1982), 1:283.

³⁰ Milton, *A Modest Confutation of a Slanderous and Scurrilous Libell, Entituled, Animadversions* (1642), A3v.

³¹ His attacker, whom he imagines as a "lozel Bachelour of Art," has given him the opportunity "to acknowledge publickly with all gratefull minde, that more then ordinary favour and respect which I found above any of my equals at the hands of those curteous and learned men, the Fellowes of that Colledge wherein I spent some yeares." Milton, *Complete Prose Works*, 1:920, 884.

³² Milton, *Complete Prose Works*, 1:887.

³³ Smectymnuus is an acronym for the five Presbyterian ministers who collaborated on the answer to Joseph Hall's *Humble Remonstrance*: Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstowe. Young and Spurstowe were in attendance at the 1628 salting. See Dobranski, 72.

³⁴ On Peter Hausted, see Bentley, 2:532–37; and Laurens J. Mills, *Peter Hausted: Playwright, Poet, and Preacher*, Humanities Series 12 (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Publications, 1944), and Mills's edition of *The Rival Friends*, Humanities Series 23 (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Publications, 1951).

³⁵ These words on the title page of the 1632 edition of *The Rival Friends: A Comedy* become virtually a subtitle (London: Printed by Aug. Matthews for Humphrey Robinson, at the Sign of the Three Pigeons, in Paul's Churchyard, 1632). The 1637 edition of Milton's *Maske* is also published by Robinson.

³⁶ "Relation of the manner of the death of Dr. Butts," a letter in the State Paper Office quoted by David Masson, *The Life of John Milton* (1877–1896), 6 vols. (New York: Peter Smith, 1946), 1:256.

³⁷ He was arrested on the last day of Richard Love's term as Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge and released the next day by the new Vice-Chancellor, William Beale, a Laudian. See Twigg, 31–32; and Bentley, 2:533.

³⁸ "It is, I think, no fanciful idea that Milton's *Comus* was written as a more or less official reply to the libertine philosophy of his fellow student, Thomas Randolph." Hanford, 63.

³⁹ See Barish's discussion of *Muses Looking-Glasse* in "Three Caroline 'Defenses' of the Stage," in *Comedy from Shakespeare to Sheridan: Change and Continuity in the English and European Dramatic Tradition*, ed. Braunmuller and J. C. Bulman (Newark: Univ. of Delaware, 1986), 198–212, esp. 202–5.

⁴⁰ Milton, *L'Allegro*, in *Complete Poems*, 23–24. J. B. Leishman noted this echo in "*L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* in their Relation to Seventeenth-Century Poetry," *Essays & Studies*, n.s. 4 (1951): 30. "It does not seem absolutely necessary to assume that either [Randolph] must have been borrowing from Milton or Milton from him. If one of them was borrowing, it is rather more likely to have been Milton, who, as his manner was, had entered the phrase in his notebook; but it seems possible that each of them, quite independently, was, as it were, telescoping two time-hallowed and traditional phrases."

⁴¹ See Milton, *A Maske*, in *Complete Poems*, 111.

⁴² Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, in *Complete Poems*, 100–3. The Milton *Variorum* notes the similarity between the lines from *A Maske* and Randolph's "Eclogue to Master Jonson" (2:875). The connection between *Amyntas* and *Samson Agonistes* is mine; see also the Elder Brother's conclusion: "he that hides a dark soul, and foul thoughts / Benighted walks under the midday sun; / Himself is his own dungeon" (*A Maske*, 383–85).

⁴³ Randolph, *Poetical and Dramatic Works*, 1:329, 356, 363, 365.

⁴⁴ Milton, "At a Vacation Exercise," in *Complete Poems*, 1.

⁴⁵ Milton, "At a Vacation Exercise," 19–24.

⁴⁶ Milton, "At a Vacation Exercise," 33–34.

⁴⁷ See Richek, 131; and Lewalski, *Life*, 556 n. 55.

⁴⁸ Milton, "At a Vacation Exercise," 67–74.