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CHAPTER NINE

*Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* (1662),

*Ostensibly ‘By W. Shakespeare’, in Fact Partly by John Milton*

Lukas Erne

This chapter explores a mid-seventeenth-century printed poetic miscellany about which little has been written so far despite the fact that it has two claims to fame: it is attributed to William Shakespeare on the title page, and its contents are partly by John Milton.¹ As I go on to argue, the decision to attribute the miscellany, entitled *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t*, to Shakespeare may have had more to do with one stationer’s political allegiance than it did with how Shakespeare’s marketability was perceived at the time. In the first part of the essay I use the material with which one copy of *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* was originally bound in order to identify its date of publication and its publisher, before discussing the only extant complete copy of the book in which the miscellany appeared. The second part of the essay explores the attribution to Shakespeare by considering *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* in the context of his place in the book trade in the mid to late seventeenth century. The third part turns to the contents of the miscellany, especially the material by Milton.

*Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t*: A Poetic Miscellany Identified
Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t is an intriguing collection of poems that is absent from recent accounts of Shakespeare in print.2 The title page (see Figure 1) reads:

*Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t, / OR, / THE NEW ACCADEMY / OF /
COMPLEMENTS. / Odes, Epigrams, Songs, and Son- / nets, Poesies,
Presentations, / Congratulations, Ejaculations, / Rhapsodies, & c. /
With other various fancies. / Created partly for the delight, but /
chiefly for the use of all Ladies, / Gentlemen, and Strangers, who af /
fect to speak Elegantly, or write / Queintly / By W. Shakespeare.*

The collection, in duodecimo, contains thirty-five poems, none of which is by Shakespeare. The absence of an imprint means that Cupid’s Cabinet’s date of publication, printer, publisher and bookseller have until now remained a mystery.3 Indeed, so little has been known about this collection that scholars have almost entirely neglected it.4 What allows us to find out more about it is the material with which Cupid’s Cabinet Unlock’t was originally printed, as evidenced in the copy held at the Boston Public Library (call number G.176.62). Cupid’s Cabinet Unlock’t is the first text in a bound volume and takes up G8r to H12v, the copy being imperfect, with leaves I1-3 missing. After Cupid’s Cabinet Unlock’t there follows a fragment of a pamphlet whose running title is ‘The New Academy of Complements’. This pamphlet occupies K1r to N10v. Gary Taylor rightly concluded that the volume ‘lacks the entirety of sheet I, which must have contained the join between the two works’ (Taylor 1987, 136). After ‘The New Academy of Complements’ comes another fragment of a pamphlet whose running title is ‘The Art of Courtship’, but the signatures in this pamphlet break the sequence as the fragment begins on
C1r. A duodecimo pamphlet with the same title was published in 1662 (Wing D3A). Its title page, which conveys a fair impression of its contents, reads in part (see Figure 2):

The Art of / COURTSHIP / BY WHICH / Young Ladies, Gentle- / men and Forreigners may be fitted with / all Variety of Elegant Epistles, witty Dia- / logues, Eloquent expressions, Comple- / mental Ceremonies, Amorous An- / swers, and lofty Language, suita- / table [sic] to every occasion.

Above the imprint, a miscellany is mentioned that is appended to The Art of Courtship:

Whereunto are annexed, / Many new and pleasant Odes, Epigrams, / Songs, Sonnets, Posies, Presentations, Con- / gratulations, Ejaculations, and Rhapsodies. / With various and delightfull Fancies. These words are closely echoed on the title page of Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t:

Odes, Epigrams, Songs, and Son- / nets, Poesies, Presentations, / Congratulations, Ejaculations, / Rhapsodies, & c. / With other various fancies.

Comparison of The Art of Courtship as available on Early English Books Online (EEBO), which reproduces a copy at the Bodleian Library, with the equivalent portion of the pamphlet bound with the Boston copy of Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t shows the content to be the same. The Art of Courtship ends on G6v (G7v is blank), while Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t begins on G8v. What thus appears to have happened is that a past owner of the Boston copy disbound and then rebound the volume (perhaps losing the first two sheets of The New
Academy of Complements and Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t in the process), thereby inverting the order so as to make the title page mentioning Shakespeare come first.6

Taylor, in 1987, wrote that he had ‘been able to trace only two copies [of Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t], both defective’ (135). The Folger copy (call number C759a) lacks The Art of Courtship and The New Academy of Complements, and thus consists of Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t alone. It also lacks leaf G11. The Boston copy, as we have seen, inverts the volume’s three texts and lacks leaves I1-3. According to the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC), only a single copy of The Art of Courtship of 1662 is extant, now at the Bodleian, and EEBO leads one to believe that, disappointingly, the volume breaks off at G6v, after the end of The Art of Courtship, and thus right before the beginning of Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t. Consultation of the volume at the Bodleian (shelfmark Douce C.80[1]) shows, however, that EEBO is not to be trusted: this copy of the three-text volume is in fact complete. After The Art of Courtship (A1r-G6v) and two blank pages (G7r-v) comes Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t (the only full copy of the text of Cupid’s Cabinet Unlock’t now known to exist), which in turn is followed by The New Academy of Complements, which occupies I4r to M12v. The title reads: ‘THE NEW / ACCADEMY / OF / COMPLEMENTS’.7

The compiler of the material in The Art of Courtship is not identified, but it begins with an address ‘TO THE UNDERSTANDING READER’ (B1r-B2v), which is signed at the end by ‘B. D.’. Writing about himself in the third person, he states in the address that ‘some (that know him) will (perhaps) judge that
this work is too light for his sacred profession unto which he answers’ (B2r),
which suggests that ‘B. D.’ may have been a clergymen.

The publisher and bookseller of *The Art of Courtship* (along with *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* and *The New Academy of Complements*) is mentioned on that text’s title page: John Stafford. The Stationers’ Register records that Stafford had entered the text on 2 March 1656/7. Having taken his freedom of the Company on 28 September 1637, Stafford remained active as a publisher and bookseller until 1664, the presumed year of his death. By far the greatest part of his output was in religious literature: lives of divines (including Lancelot Andrewes), a life of Martin Luther, sermons (by William Fenner and Thomas Fuller among others), the psalms, Bible commentary, tracts of religious controversy, prayer books, and so on. But he also invested in a variety of other books, including two late editions (1648 and 1652) of Thomas Deloney’s collection of stories *The Gentle Craft* (first entered in the Stationers’ Register on October 19, 1597 and originally published before the turn of the century), five editions of *Triana*, a prose romance by Thomas Fuller (1654, 1655, 1658, 1660, 1664), and – generically closest to *The Art of Courtship* and *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* – *The academy of pleasure. Furnished with all kinds of complementall letters, discourses, and dialogues; with variety of new songs, sonets, and witty inventions* (London, 1656), in duodecimo. Stafford also co-published a work by Shakespeare – of which more in the next part of this essay.

‘By W. Shakespeare’: Shakespeare the Poet in the Book Trade, 1640-1700
The title-page ascription to ‘W. Shakespeare’ in a poetic miscellany in 1662 raises the question of how it got there. In the period from 1640 to 1700, few poetry books by Shakespeare reached print: the 1640 Poems, published by John Benson; one edition of The Rape of Lucrece in 1655, published by John Stafford and William Gilbertson; and one edition of Venus and Adonis, dated 1675 and published by ‘F. Coles, T. Vere, J. Wright, and J. Clark’. By comparison, the same period saw the publication of two folio editions of Shakespeare’s collected plays (1663/4 and 1685) and no fewer than sixteen Shakespeare playbooks in quarto (see Chapter Two, ‘Shakespeare for Sale, 1640-1740’ in this volume). Also, in the latter part of the seventeenth century, as Emma Depledge (2012) has shown, a historical moment can be singled out, namely the Exclusion Crisis, in which interest in Shakespeare’s drama is revived; no such moment can be identified for interest in Shakespeare’s poetry. In Shakespeare’s lifetime and the years immediately following it, Shakespeare’s poetry books had in fact had remarkable economic success: from 1593 to 1639, they received a massive total of twenty-eight editions, sixteen for Venus and Adonis, eight for The Rape of Lucrece, three for The Passionate Pilgrim and one for the Sonnets. During this period, Venus and Adonis was by far the most popular Shakespeare publication (indeed, it was the most popular poetry book of its period), and even The Rape of Lucrece was more successful in the book trade than all of Shakespeare’s plays except 1 Henry IV. In the period from 1640 to 1700, by contrast, no poetry book was among the most popular Shakespeare titles in the print market judging by the number of editions they received.
The authorial construction of Shakespeare as an endurably popular dramatist but a no-longer popular poet finds its bibliographic origins in the First Folio. Whereas quarto and octavo editions of Shakespeare’s plays and poems had appeared at a roughly similar pace up to 1623, the massive—and massively prestigious—collection of Shakespeare’s plays that enshrined him as a dramatic author precisely omitted the poems, thereby creating a stark imbalance from which our appreciation of Shakespeare suffers to this day. As Faith Acker notes in Chapter Eight of this collection, in 1640, Benson tried to do for the poems what the First and Second Folios had done for the plays, but his attempt was a spectacular failure. Benson’s relatively slight octavo, although its frontispiece and other paratexts consciously echoed the collection of plays, was no match for the stately folio, and it failed to include Shakespeare’s two narrative poems, *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*. The make-up of the 1640 *Poems*—with its rearranged and titled poems—has been read as Benson’s attempt to turn Shakespeare into a Cavalier poet, but judging by sales figures, the transformation did not please. Whereas the folio plays went through four editions in the course of the seventeenth century, the octavo poems received not a single reprint in the sixty years after their publication. As Patrick Cheney has pointed out, ‘Benson’s attempt to make Shakespeare a national poet-playwright is paradoxically instrumental in the un-making of this very author’. As a result, ‘in the emergent conversation about Shakespeare as the ‘national poet’, his poems lost their voice by the latter half of the seventeenth century, as readers, authors, and critics turn to the plays’ (2004, 3). In *The English Treasury of Wit and Language* (London, 1655), John Cotgrave draws all his
Shakespeare quotations from the plays. In Edward Phillips’s *Theatrum poetarum, or, A compleat collection of the poets* (London, 1675), Shakespeare is first and foremost ‘the Glory of the English Stage’, though ‘his *Venus and Adonis*, his *Rape of Lucrece* and other various Poems’ (ii1r) get a passing mention. And Charles Gildon, in his *Shakespeariana, or Select Moral Reflections, Topicks, Similies, and Descriptions from SHAKESPEAR* (London, 1718), quotes exclusively from the plays.

Additional evidence of the popularity of Shakespeare, the poet, in his own lifetime compared to his lack of popularity from 1640 to 1700 can be found in the practice of misattribution. In 1599, *The Passionate Pilgrim* attributes to ‘W. Shakespeare’ a collection of twenty poems of which no more than five are now believed to be by Shakespeare. In 1612, the third edition of this miscellany, still attributed to Shakespeare on the title page, includes even more non-Shakespearean poems. And in the same year, Shakespearean authorship may have been surreptitiously insinuated on the title page of *A Funerall Elegye in memory of the late Vertuous Maister William Peter*, ‘By W. S.’.15 In the period from 1640 to 1700, by contrast, there is no evidence of poetry books being misattributed to Shakespeare. The one possible exception is the frontispiece to John Cotgrave’s miscellany *Wits Interpreter* (London, 1655), reprinted in 1662 and 1671, in which Shakespeare’s name and portrait appear, and these only appear with those of nine other writers and are accorded no particular prominence.16 Insofar as the name and portrait constitute an unkept promise of the presence of Shakespeare poems in a miscellany, *Wits Interpreter* offers an intriguing parallel to *Cupids Cabinet*
Unlock’t. In the case of the latter, however, the ascription is to Shakespeare alone.

Given Shakespeare’s relative lack of popularity as a poet in the second half of the seventeenth century, why was Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t misattributed to him? The reason might reside with John Stafford, the volume’s publisher. Seven years earlier, Stafford, along with William Gilbertson, had published The Rape of Lucrece in an edition that calls Shakespeare ‘The incomparable Master of our English Poetry’ on the title page (see Figure ??).17

Among the books Stafford published are, significantly, several poetry books by John Quarles (see above, p. ???). As discussed in Adam Hooks’s contribution to the present volume, the 1655 edition of Shakespeare’s Lucrece appends Quarles’s The Banishment of Tarquin, or the Reward of Lust, and Stafford’s other publications suggest that his connection with Quarles may well have led to this joint publication. Not only is Shakespeare’s name present on the title page, but a frontispiece depicting Collatine and Lucrece stabbing herself, engraved by William Faithorne, includes a portrait of Shakespeare adapted from the Droeshout engraving in the First Folio but with the same oval shape as William Marshall’s engraving of Shakespeare in Benson’s 1640 Poems, which is also based on the Droeshout portrait (see above, p. ???). On the other hand, the 1655 edition of The Rape of Lucrece is the first to omit Shakespeare’s dedication to the Earl of Southampton and substitutes a dedication by Quarles to his friend Nehemiah Massey.18

Quarles more generally repurposed Shakespeare’s poem by having it printed next to his own, which focuses, as Adam Hooks puts it, ‘on Tarquin’s inner
struggle, rather than Lucrece’s’ (Hooks, ??); ‘In the 1655 Lucrece, then’, as Hooks continues, ‘a poem prefaced by a republican prose argument was appropriated by Quarles for a royalist programme’ (Hooks, ??).19

The 1655 Lucrece provides a suggestive context for the misattribution of Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t to Shakespeare in 1662. The two publications not only share a publisher, John Stafford, but also a political agenda, in that they both participate in the royalist reconfiguration of Shakespeare. The title to which Shakespeare’s name was attached must have evoked The King’s Cabinet Opened (London, 1645), in which the private papers of Charles I were published following his defeat at the battle of Naseby.20 As Taylor pointed out, ‘The allusion implies that a treasure-chest of Shakespeare’s poems has been found, comparable in importance to the chest of Charles I’s papers published in June 1645’ (1987, 136). As the King, so Shakespeare. More generally, Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t and The Art of Courtship with which it was printed conform to the generic ideology of mid-seventeenth-century printed miscellanies, which, as Adam Smyth has summed up, ‘celebrate Royalism, ... evoke the court and courtly love’ and constitute ‘an expression of pro-Crown ... sentiments’ (2004, 171).21 Considered in the context of Shakespeare’s reconfiguration as a cavalier poet in the 1640 Poems, and his enlistment in a royalist agenda in the 1655 Lucrece, the attribution of Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t to Shakespeare in 1662 thus continues the ideological transformation to which his earlier poetry books had already contributed.

John Milton and Others: The Poems of Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t
Given that the title page attribution to Shakespeare is entirely unfounded, it seems ironic that a text like *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t*, with its royalist resonance, contains five poems by a very prominent republican English poet without acknowledging him: Milton. The Milton poems in *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* are ‘Song. On May Morning’, the first ten lines of ‘L’Allegro’, a song from *Arcades* (‘O’re the smooth enameld green’), and two passages from *A Mask Presented at Ludlow-Castle (Comus)*, the Echo Song (‘Sweet echo, sweetest Nymph that liv’st unseene’) and a passage by the Attendant Spirit, starting ‘Listen and appear to us’. These poems have hitherto escaped the attention of Milton scholars. They add considerably to what is known about the early circulation of Milton’s minor poems. It has long been established that Milton’s Hobson poems, ‘On the University Carrier’, ‘Another on the Same’, and (if the attribution to Milton is correct) ‘Hobson’s Epitaph’, circulated widely. But, in general, there is little evidence of the early reception and dissemination of his minor poems. ‘Manuscript collections and printed miscellanies of the period have been ransacked by modern scholars’, as William Riley Parker put it, ‘but little or nothing has been found to suggest that the 1645 Poems were known to many poetry-readers’ (1940, 23-24). And John Shawcross concurred that ‘Aside from William Sancroft’s manuscript transcriptions of two poems, Joshua Poole’s use of the volume in compiling *The English Parnassus* in 1657, and Richard [i.e. Robert] Baron’s imitations, we have no evidence of contemporary awareness of the minor poems’ (1979, vol. 1, 8). Apart from the Hobson poems, very little material included in the 1645 *Poems* is known to have been printed elsewhere before the second edition in 1673. Milton’s Shakespeare poem appeared in the
Second Folio of Shakespeare’s *Works* (1632) and in his *Poems* (1640); *Comus* in a separate printing in 1637; ‘Lycidas’ in *Justa Edovardo King naufrago* (1638); ‘Epitaphium Damonis’ in a private, limited printing in 1640; and Sonnet 13, ‘To Mr H. Lawes, on his Airs’, in William and Henry Lawes’s *Choice Psalms Put Into Musick for Three Voices* (1648). To these should now be added the Milton material in *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t*.

The five poems in *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* all depart to some extent from their earlier printings. Two of them do so in minor ways. In ‘Song. On May Morning’, simply titled ‘May Morning’ in the miscellany, the last line gains a word, ‘And singing welcome thee, and wish thee long’. Milton’s ten-line poem begins with four pentameters, followed by four tetrameters, and ends with a pentameter and a tetrameter. The version in *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* ends instead with two pentameters. The change might be the result of a deliberate reworking, perhaps for a musical setting, as happened to George Herbert’s poems when, in 1681-2, they were adapted for singing to Psalm tunes. The version of the second song in *Arcades*, beginning ‘O’re the smooth enameld green’, also changes only one word, in line 8, where ‘I will bring you where she sits’, in the 1645 *Poems* (D4v) becomes ‘Ile bring you where Clarissa sits’. A marginal note explains that Clarissa is ‘A feigned name given by the Author to his Mistresse’ (G10v), where ‘the Author’, we may assume, stands not for Milton but for the adapter.

The three other poems differ more substantially from the earlier printed texts. In what follows, I therefore reproduce the variant forms to enable comparison. The poem corresponding to the opening ten lines of
'L’Allegro’, titled ‘A Charm, To expell Melancholy’, is the third poem in *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t*. It reads as follows (G9v-G10r):

Hence loathed Melancholy
Of *Cerberus*, and blackest midnight born
‘Mongst horrid shapes, and shriecks, and sights unholy,
In the Stygian Cave forlorn
Finde out some uncouth cell,
Where the night Raven sings
And brooding darknesse spreads his jealous wings
There, (ragged as thy locks)
Under those Ebon shades, and low brow’d Rocks
In dark Cimmerian shades for ever dwell.

In Milton’s *Poems* (1645) the corresponding passage reads (B7r):

Hence loathed Melancholy
   Of *Cerberus*, and blackest midnight born,
In *Stygian* Cave forlorn
   ’Mongst horrid shapes, and shreiks, and sights unholy,
Find out som uncouth cell,
   Wher brooding darknes spreads his jealous wings,
And the night Raven sings;
   There under *Ebon* shades, and low-brow’d Rocks,
As ragged as thy Locks,
   In dark *Cimmerian* desert ever dwell.

The order of lines 3 and 4, 6 and 7, and 8 and 9 is inverted, with some minor variations. This changes the poem’s rhyme scheme and metrical pattern. In both versions, a quatrain (envelope-rhymed in 1645, cross-rhymed in 1662) is followed by a sestet rhyming cddeec). In the 1645 *Poems*, the trimeters and pentameters alternate regularly, whereas in the later miscellany, they occur more irregularly, pentameters in lines 2, 7, 9, and 10, trimeters in the other lines. What is particularly suspicious in the later version is the final line, where ‘shades’ is repeated from line 9. ‘Cimmerian shades’ is of course more common than ‘Cimmerian desert’. Spenser, for instance, has ‘I carried am into waste wildernesse, / Waste wildernes, amongst Cymerian shades’.30

Even in the absence of other evidence, the principle of *lectio difficilior potior*
would suggest that ‘Cimmerian desert’ is the original reading. The passage in
*Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* may well reflect non-authorial tinkering, perhaps
combined with misremembering, of the 1645 version.

The two remaining ‘Milton poems’ in *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t*
correspond to passages in *Comus*. In the miscellany, the first one reads

(G11\(r-v\));\(^{31}\)

Listen, and appear to us,
In name of great Oceanus,
By Tethys grave majestick pace,
And earth-shaking Neptunes mace.
By the Caarpathian wisards hook,
And hoary Nereus wrink’led look,
By Lucotheas lovely hands,
And her Son that rules the strands,
By old sooth-saying Glaucus spell,
By Scaly Tritons winding shell,
By Thetis tinsel-slipper’d feet,
And the Songs of Syrens sweet,
By fair Ligeas golden comb
By dead Parthenopes dear Tomb,
By all the Nymph’s that nightly dance
Upon thy stream, with wily glance:
Rise, rise, and heave thy Rosie-head
From thy coral-pav’n bed.

In the corresponding passage in the 1645 *Poems* (H1\(r-v\)), the Attendant Spirit
says:\(^{32}\)

Listen and appear to us
In name of great Oceanus,
By the earth-shaking Neptun’s mace
And Tethys grave majestick pace,
By hoarie Nereus wrincled look,
And the Carpathian wisards hook,
By scaly Tritons winding shell,
And old sooth-saying Glaucus spell,
By Leucothea’s lovely hands,
And her son that rules the strands,
By Thetis tinsel-slipper’d feet,
And the Songs of Sirens sweet,
By dead Parthenope’s dear tomb,
And faire Ligea’s golden comb,
Wherewith she sits on diamond rocks
Sleeking her soft alluring locks,
By all the Nymphs that nightly dance
Upon thy streams with wily glance,
Rise, rise, and heave thy rosie head
From thy coral-pav’n bed,
And bridle in thy headlong wave,
Till thou our summons answer’d have.

Listen and save.

A major source of differences is again the order of lines, combined with

minor verbal variation, such as ‘By’ (1662: ll. 9, 13) for ‘And’ (1645: ll. 8, 14),
or ‘stream’ (1662: l. 16) for ‘streams’ (1645: l. 18). The order of lines 3 and 4,
5 and 6, 7-8 and 9-10, and 13 and 14 is inverted. The version in Cupids
Cabinet Unlock further omits lines 15-16 and 21-3 in the Poems. Just as the
opening of ‘L’Allegro’ in the Poems regularly alternates trimeter and
pentameter, a regularity the version in the miscellany discards, so here the
regular alternation of ‘By’ and ‘And’ at the beginning of lines is eliminated.

We may suspect that the same non-authorial adapter was behind both
poems.

The other passage from Comus in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t is the Echo
Song. In Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t, it is titled ‘The Search. An Ode.’ and reads
(H3v):

1.
Echo, sweetest Nymph, that liv’est unseen,
   Within thy airie cell,
By slow Meanders margent green,
   And in the violet imbroider’d vale,
Where the Love-lorn Nightingale,
Nightly to thee her ravishment doth tell.

2.
Canst thou not tell me of a gentle paire
   That likest thy Narcissus are,
Oh, if thou have
Hid them in some flowry cave,
Tell me but where,
Sweet Queen of parly, daughter of the sphair.
So may'st thou be translated to the skies,
And give resound to heavenly harmonies.

Here is the equivalent passage in Milton’s 1645 Poems (F3r-v):33

Song.

Sweet Echo, sweetest Nymph that liv’st unseen
Within thy airy shell
   By slow Meander’s margent green,
And in the violet-imbroider’d vale
   Where the love-lorn Nightingale
Nightly to thee her sad Song mourneth well.

Canst thou not tell me of a gentle Pair
That likest thy Narcissus are?
   O if thou have
Hid them in som flowry Cave,
Tell me but where
Sweet Queen of Parly, Daughter of the Sphear,
So maist thou be translated to the skies,
And give resounding grace to all Heav’ns Harmonies.

The version in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t omits the opening word, ‘Sweet’, and substitutes ‘cell’ for ‘shell’ in line 2, ‘her ravishment doth tell’ for ‘her sad Song mourneth well’ in line 6, and, in the final line, ‘And give resound to heavenly harmonies’ for ‘And give resounding grace to all Heav’ns Harmonies’. The last of these changes eliminates the poem’s unique hexameter, so that the poem ends with two iambic pentameters. (The only substantive change in the miscellany’s version of ‘On May Morning’, as noted above, had the same effect.) In the second line, ‘thy airie cell’ is a plausible alternative for ‘thy airy shell’. The ‘shell’ is the vault of the sky, as Milton’s modern editors explain. They refer to Charles Stephanus’s Dictionarium
Historicum, Geographicum, Poeticum for the idea of Echo as a heavenly nymph. But ‘heavenly cell’ was occasionally adopted as a reading in eighteenth and nineteenth-century editions of Comus, for instance by Sir Walter Scott in his edition of Modern British Drama (1811, vol. 5, 2). In 1871, Henry R. Huckin objected to the emendation: ‘some read “airy cell,” which could perhaps be easier. But it is a rule which cannot be too soon learned, that when there are various readings, the easiest is usually the wrong one’ (1871, 56). The reading in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t thus anticipated the emendation in Scott’s edition, and the impulse of lectio facilior that perhaps accounts for the emendation of ‘shell’ to ‘cell’ may explain why the adapter made the same change (or changed ‘Cimmerian desert’ to ‘Cymerian shades’, as seen above). Something similar may explain why the version in the miscellany reads ‘her ravishment doth tell’ instead of ‘her sad Song mourneth well’. The Nightingale’s ‘sad Song’ is Philomela’s lament over her ravishment by Tereus, so the version in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t renders explicit what in Milton’s 1645 Poems is only implicit. What several of the poems in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t thus share is that they explain or render more straightforward the poetry as it appears in the authorised collection of 1645. In other words, the ‘Milton poems’ in the miscellany are unlikely to constitute authorial versions and more likely to reflect conscious adaptation, perhaps along with some misremembering or miscopying.

Two of the ‘Milton poems’ in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t also appear in a later ‘Cupid’ miscellany, The compleat courtier: Or, Cupid’s Academy (London, 1683), by ‘J. Shurly’ (i.e., John Shirley). In both cases the indebtedness to
Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t or to a version close to it seems clear since the versions in the two miscellanies are significantly closer to each other than either is to the 1645 Poems. The first one reads (D8’):

The Invocation.

Echo sweet Nymph, that livest unseen
Within thy Airy Cell,
By slow Meander’s Margent Green,
    And in each fair inamell’d vail,
Where sweet Harmonious Philomel,
Nightly to thee her ravishments does tell.

2.

Canst thou not tell me of a gentle pair,
That bright as thy Narcissus are:
    Oh if you have
Hid them in some flowry Cave,
    Tell me but where,
Sweet Queen of Parly, Daughter of the Sphear;
So mayst thou be translated to the Skies,
    And give resound to Heavenly Harmonies.

The final line is the same as in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t and significantly different from that in the 1645 Poems. As in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t, the opening word ‘Sweet’ (l. 1) is omitted, and the poem has ‘Cell’ instead of ‘shell’ (l. 2) and ‘her ravishments [Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t: ‘ravishment’] does tell’ instead of ‘her sad Song mourneth well’ (l. 6). Yet the version in The compleat courtier also occasionally differs where Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t and the 1645 Poems agree: it has ‘sweet’ instead of ‘sweetest’ (l. 1), ‘livest’ instead of ‘liv’st’ (l. 1), ‘each fair inamell’d vail’ for ‘the violet imbroider’d vale’ (l. 4), ‘sweet Harmonious Philomel’ for ‘the Love-lorn Nightingale’ (l. 5), ‘bright as’ for ‘likest’ (l. 8), and ‘you’ for ‘thou’ (l. 9). What this suggests is that the poem in The compleat courtier is an adaption of the earlier adaptation in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t.
Here is the second ‘Milton poem’ in *The compleat courtier* (B10v):

*The Melancholy Lovers Complaint.*

Hence loathed Melancholy,
   Of *Cerberus* and blackest midnight born,
'Mongst horrid shapes and shrieks and sights unholy,
   In *Stygian* Caves forlorn,
Find out some dismal Cell
   Where the Night-Raven sings,
And brooding darkness spreads his jealous wings:
   There (ragged as thy Locks)
Under those gloomy shades, and low-brow’d Rocks,
In sad *Cimmerian* darkness ever dwell.

The versions in *The compleat courtier* and *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* agree in lines 3-4 and 6-9, where they substantially depart from that in the 1645 *Poems*. But *The compleat courtier* several times disagrees with *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* where *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* and the 1645 *Poems* agree: see ‘dismal’ for ‘uncouth’ (l. 5), ‘gloomy’ for ‘Ebon’ (l. 9), and ‘sad’ for ‘dark’ (l. 10). It is also worth noting that the version in *The compleat courtier* eliminates the repetition of ‘shades’ in *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* by substituting the word ‘darkness’ in the last line (where 1645 has ‘desert’).

Again, it seems clear that the material in *The compleat courtier* derives from *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* and not directly from Milton. The close relationship between the two miscellanies is confirmed by other poems that occur in both: see my notes to poems 9, 17, and 24 in the Appendix.37

Of the poets who were put to contribution in *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t*, Milton is the most noteworthy, but I have identified a few more (details are provided in the Appendix). Five poems are adapted from Richard Brathwait’s collection of satires and epigrams, *A strappado for the Diuell* (London, 1615), and one each are from Thomas Bastard, *Chrestoleros. Seuen*
bookes of epigrames (London, 1598), David Murray’s sonnet collection Caelia, appended to his narrative poem, The Tragicall Death of Sophonisba (London, 1611), Thomas Bushell’s The severall speeches and songs, at the presentment of Mr Bushells rock to the Queenes most excellent Majesty (London, 1636), Sir John Suckling’s tragedy The Discontented Colonel (London 1642, reprinted 1646), and George Wither’s Amygdala Britannica, almonds for parrets (London, 1647). Two anonymous poems had appeared in a number of earlier publications, including popular miscellanies like Wits Interpreter, The English Parnassus (London, 1655) and Wit and Drollery (London, 1656). Overall, the selection of poems included in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t is eclectic, their origins spreading over at least a half century and their genres being as varied as the title page suggests: ‘Odes, Epigrams, Songs, and Sonnets, Poesies, Presentations, Congratulations, Ejaculations, Rhapsodies, & c.’ What may have recommended the poems for inclusion is their perceived ‘use’, to quote again from the title page, to ‘all Ladies, Gentlemen, and Strangers, who affect to speak Elegantly, or write Queintly’. That the poems in the miscellany are designed for use in various social contexts is repeatedly made clear: a sonnet is for ‘Inviting to some pleasant walk’ (G8?) and a series of poems is for ‘PRESENTATIONS / Of Gifts, / Or Love tokens’ (H6v), namely ‘a pair of Gloves’, ‘a pair of Knives’, ‘a pair of Bracelets’, and ‘a Muffe’ (H6v-H8v). Towards the end of the miscellany appear nine ‘POESIES for RINGS’ (H12r) and after the last poem a series of formulas for ‘finishing … Epistles’ (I2r). It may rightly be asked if Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t is Milton or posies of a ring. The answer is that it is both. But it is not ‘By W. Shakespeare’.This chapter has established the publication context and the
contents of a poetic miscellany, entitled Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t, that appeared in 1662 and is said on the title page to be by ‘W. Shakespeare’. Considered in the context of the relative lack of popularity of Shakespeare’s poetry in the book trade from the middle to the end of the seventeenth century, the miscellany’s authorial attribution is intriguing. Why is a collection of poems with no Shakespeare in it assigned to him at a time when poetry that is genuinely his, like the Sonnets or Venus and Adonis, had not been printed for more than two decades? The answer, I have suggested, may be related to the book’s publisher, John Stafford, who had published Shakespeare’s Rape of Lucrece seven years earlier in an edition that, like Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t, participated in the royalist reconfiguration of Shakespeare.

Appendix

The Poems in Cupids Cabinet’s Unlock’t: A List of First Lines and Notes

This appendix consists of a list of the first lines of the poems in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t in the order of their appearance, followed by notes about their occurrence, as far as traced, in the seventeenth (or, in one case, late-sixteenth) century.

(1) Come away blest Soules, no more
(2) A Wonderfull scarcity will shortly ensue
(3) Hence loathed Melancholly
(4) Come let the state stay, and drink away,
(5) Cariola had a spot upon her face,
(6) As with fresh meat, mixture of Salt is meet,
(7) O’re the smooth enameld green,
(8) Wise is that fool, that hath his Coffers full,
(9) Tears I do shed, yet are they shed in vain,
(10) Listen, and appear to us,
(11) Faustus is sick of seven, which deadly be,
(12) I can no longer (sweet) forbear
(13) Shall I impeach my self, and say,
(14) Now purgd by bless’d, and holy fire
(15) What th’antick Bards fabled of old,
(16) Come then (my dearest, let’s combine)
(17) Since ’tis my fate to be thy slave,
(18) Didst thou not once, Lucinda, vow,
(19) Echo, sweetest Nymph, that liv’st unseen,
(20) Ulysses, having scap’d the Ocean stood,
(21) Pox take you Mistresse, Ile be gone,
(22) Now the bright morning starre, dayes harbinger,
(23) Sweetest, thy name to me doth promise much,
(24) How happy are these skins, that licence have
(25) These (dearest Mistresse) like your beauty are,
(26) Had it been possible, in power of Art,
(27) The deeper (Mistresse) that your Love is set,
(28) This is no ERMINS skin, though I
(29) Blessed be this paire
(30) Sillius hath brought from strange, and forreigne Lands,
(31) Adieu sweet Delia, for I must depart,
(32) A Man there was, who liv'd a merry life,
(33) When Autumn disroabed the woods of their leaves,
(34) When men and women blushlesse grow
(35) Crowned be thou Queen of love

Between the penultimate and the last poem appear nine ‘POESIES for RINGS’ (H12r) and after the last poem a series of formulas for ‘finishing … Epistles’ (I2r).

(1) A version of this poem was prepared for the Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell, on the occasion of a ceremonial entertainment prepared by the City of London and printed in The Weekly Intelligencer of the Commonwealth, number 204, 7-14 February ‘1653’ (i.e., 1654), pp. 159-60 (Thomason 112:E.729[9]). No author is named. John Tatham is sometimes referred to as the ‘city poet’ of this period and is known to have composed a number of city pageants, so it is possible that he wrote the poem.

(3) See ‘L’Allegro’, lines 1-10, in John Milton, Poems (1645), B7r (cf. above, p. ???).

(4) A near-identical version of this poem appears in Sir John Suckling, The Discontented Colonel (London 1642), C4v, reprinted as Brennavalt (London, 1646), where the poem appears on B2v-B3v.

(7) See ‘II. Song’ from Arcades, in Milton, Poems, D4r-v (cf. above, p. ???).
(8) This epigram appears in Richard Brathwaite, *A strappado for the Diuell* (London, 1615), F2v. It was also printed in a miscellany, compiled by Samuel Pick, called *Festum voluptatis, or the banquet of pleasure* (London, 1639), G2v-G3r.

(9) A different version of this elegy is ‘Upon the premature death of ... Sir Richard Musgrave’ in Richard Brathwaite, *A strappado for the Diuell* (London, 1615), R1v-R2r. A version closer to the one in *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t*, with the title ‘Repentance too late, or the Ladie[]s laments for her Lover, kill’d by her Disdain’, was printed in *The compleat courtier: Or, Cupid’s Academy* (London, 1683), B10v. It appears on the same page as the opening ten lines of ‘L’Allegro’ (see above, p. ???), strengthening the likelihood that *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* was used in the preparation of the material for *The compleat courtier*.

(10) See the Attendant Spirit’s song in *A maske presented at Ludlow Castle*, i.e., John Milton’s *Comus* (London, 1637), E3v and *Poems* (London, 1645), H1r-v (cf. above, p. ???).


(17) This poem is attributed to ‘K. D.’ (H2v), which may suggest Sir Kenelm Digby (1603-65) (see Taylor 1987, 136). A different version appears in the
miscellany *The Loyal Garland* (London, 1673), D8r-v. This is ‘the fourth Edition’, according to the title page, the first three being lost. The wording on the title page, ‘*Containing Choice Songs and Sonnets of our late unhappy Revolutions*’, suggests that the volume’s contents goes back to the time before 1660. The poem’s title is ‘A Lovers Request’; lines 5 to 8 in *Cupid’s Cabinet Unlock’t* have no equivalent in *The Loyal Garland*. A version close to that in *Cupid’s Cabinet Unlock’t*, with the title ‘A Letter to a coy Mistress’, is printed in *The compleat courtier: Or, Cupid’s Academy* (London, 1683), C7v. The poem also appears in a late-seventeenth-century manuscript verse miscellany (Bodleian MS Rawl. poet. 65, f. 24; Crum S0632).


(19) See the song in *A maske presented at Ludlow Castle*, i.e., Milton’s *Comus* (London, 1637), C1r and *Poems* (London, 1645), F3r-v (cf. above, p. ???).

(21) Versions of this poem can be found in *Wit and Drollery* (London, 1656), G3v-G4v, *The Second part of Merry drollery* (London, 1661), I3v-I4r, *Merry drollery, complete* (London, 1670), T8v-V1v, and *The loyal garland* (London, 1673), E1r-v. For manuscript versions, see BL MS Harley 3991, f. 41v; Folger
MS, V.a.169.2, f. 38; Bodl. MS. Rawl. poet. 65, fol. 24; and Bodl. MS. Mus. C. 3, fol. 21, with music.

(22) See ‘On a May Morning’ in John Milton, *Poems* (1645), B5v-B6r (cf. above, p. ??).

(23) This verse letter is ascribed to ‘R. H.’ (H6v). A different version – in (usually headless) iambic tetrameter, whereas that in *Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t* is in iambic pentameter – is in Richard Brathwait, *A strappado for the Divell* (London, 1615), F7v-G1v.

(24) A similar version appears in *The compleat courtier: Or, Cupid’s Academy* (London, 1683), B2v.

(29) A longer version of this poem is printed in Thomas Bushell, *The severall speeches and songs, at the presentment of Mr Bushells rock to the Queenes most excellent Majesty* (London, 1636), A4v-B1r.

(31) A similar version appears as Sonnet 13 in David Murray, *Caelia, Containing certaine Sonets*, appended to Murray’s narrative poem, *The Tragical Death of Sophonisba* (London, 1611), E3r.


(34) An almost identical version of this poem is printed in George Wither, *Amygdala Britannica, almonds for parrets* (London, 1647), A6v.

Notes

1 I would like to thank Antoinina Bevan Zlatar, Megan Palmer Browne, Emma Depledge, Neil Forsyth, Indira Ghose, Beatrice Montedoro, Jason Moschella, William Poole and Michael Suarez, S.J. for their help in the writing of this article.

2 It is not mentioned, for instance, in Murphy 2003, nor in Erne 2013.

3 The English Short Title Catalogue dates the volume ‘1650?'; the Union First Line Index of English Verse has ‘pre-1700'.

4 For the few occasions on which the volume was mentioned in past scholarship, see Taylor 1987, 135-6.

5 Taylor pointed out that a pamphlet of the same title that appeared in 1686 and was reprinted in the following years has nothing to do with the fragment of the same title bound up with Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t in the Boston copy (1987, 136), but he was unaware of the duodecimo pamphlet with the same title that was published in 1662. The Boston copy in fact belongs to a later edition of The Art of Courtship, with some additional material at the end of the volume, which can be conjecturally dated 1671/2. See Erne (forthcoming, ??).

6 See Jeffrey Todd Knight (2013, esp. Ch.2), who has studied the related phenomenon of how ‘in modern archives’, early modern Sammelbände ‘were disassembled, their texts rebound separately, eliminating the evidence of previous users in favor of a Shakespearean text that looks modern’ (16).

7 The New Academy of Complements contains a whole series of adaptations of poems by John Donne (see Erne forthcoming, ??).
‘Entred for his copie under the hand of Master THRALE warden a booke called The art of courtship, together with a tragi-comedy called, Luponio, or the cittie senatour’ (Eyre 1913, vol. 2, 117). I can find no evidence of the tragi-comedy having been printed.


Murphy refers to ‘two editions’ of Venus and Adonis dated 1675 (2003, 308), but the second is a variant issue, with a slightly different title page, not a separate edition. See also Rollins 1938, 379.

To these Shakespeare playbooks, we may add The Birth of Merlin, published by Francis Kirkman in 1662 with an authorship attribution to ‘William Shakespear, and William Rowley’, the same year, incidentally, as Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t. Note that another 1662 publication with a similarly oblique Shakespearean presence is Kirkman’s collection of drolls, The Wits, which features ‘The Grave-makers’ (F4r-F7r), a droll based on the graveyard scene in Hamlet, another droll, The Bouncing Knight, or the Robers Rob’d (C1r-C7r), based on 1 Henry IV, and a frontispiece with representations of Falstaff and the Hostess from 1 Henry IV. Two years later, Thomas Jordan included in A royal arbor of loyal poesie (Wing J1059) ballads based on The Merchant of Venice, The Winter’s Tale, and Much Ado about Nothing. It is noticeable that Shakespeare’s name is absent from both The Wits and The Royal Arbour, although material based on his plays is included.

See Erne and Badcoe 2014.


See Baker 1998.

For Wits Interpreter, see Marotti 1993, esp. 73-4.

For the copyright transfer of Lucrece to Stafford and Gilbertson, see above, ??? [CROSS-REFERENCE TO HOOKS, TYPESCRIPT, P. 14]..

The 1675 edition of Venus and Adonis, by contrast, does nothing to update the paratext of Shakespeare’s narrative poem and reproduces the original dedication to the Earl of Southampton.

For the prose argument in Lucrece and the poem’s politics, see Belsey 2001, esp. 320-2, and Patterson 1993, 300-5.

The King’s Cabinet Opened created a massive scandal and prompted various responses in print, for instance, Some observations upon occasion of the publishing their Majesties letters (London, 1645), A letter, in which the arguments of the Annotator, and three other speeches upon their Majestie’s letters published at London, are examined and answered (Oxford, 1645), Martin Lluelyn, A satyr, occasioned by the author’s survey of a scandalous pamphlet intituled, The King’s cabanet [sic] opened (Oxford, 1645), and Edward Symmons, A vindicacion of King Charles: or, A loyal subjects dury. Manifested in vindicating his soveraigne from those aspersions cast upon him by certain persons in a scandalous libel, entituled, The Kings cabinet opened (London, 1648). See Maddison 1966, 2-9; Potter 1989, 57-64; and Hirst 2003, 211-29. In the years after 1645, titles with opened, discovered or unlocked cabinets were popular. See, for instance, The Scots cabinett opened (London, 1648), Satans stratagemes, or The devils cabinet-councel discovered (London, 1648), The ladies cabinet enlarged and opened (London, 1654), The Queens closet opened (London, 1656), The grand cabinet-counsels unlocked (London, 1656), Nature’s cabinet unlock’d (London, 1657), Rare verities. The
cabinet of Venus unlocked (London, 1658), The Calvinist’s cabinet unlock’d (London, 1659), The queens cabinet newly opened (London, 1662), and Caliope’s cabinet opened (London, 1665).

21 For the mid-seventeenth-century popularity of miscellanies of which Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t is an example, see Smyth 2004. Note that Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t is not among Smyth’s list of forty-one printed miscellanies from 1640 to 1682 (2004, 4), and his study shows no awareness of it. Yet Smyth’s description of the mid-seventeenth-century printed miscellanies as generically hybrid, sharing characteristics with ‘song books, conduct manuals, commonplace books, manuscript verse collections, ballads, and educational tracts’ (2004, 1), conforms well to Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t.


23 The first ten lines of ‘L’Allegro’ form a self-contained passage, about the banishment of Melancholy, corresponding to the first ten lines of ‘Il Penseroso’, about the banishment of ‘vain deluding joyes’ (see Woodhouse and Bush 1972, 270).

24 They are not recorded, for instance, in Shawcross 1984, and 1990, nor are they mentioned in Lewalski and Haan 2012. Note that A Catalogue of the Shakespeare Exhibition Held in the Bodleian Library to Commemorate the Death of Shakespeare includes Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t (1916, item 88, 52-53) and states that ‘there are several [extracts] from Milton’, without providing any details. Oddly, the entry also claims that Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t contains ‘one extract from Shakespeare’ (1916, 53), which is untrue, and does not provide the exact publication date, even though it appears on
the title page of *The Art of Courtship*. I am grateful to William Poole for drawing my attention to this catalogue entry.

25 Versions of ‘Another on the same’ and ‘Hobson’s Epitaph’ are included in a *Banquet of Jests* (1640, F11r-F12v; 1657, D9v-D10v), a miscellany of witty poetry and prose. Versions of ‘On the University Carrier’, ‘Another on the same’, and ‘Hobson’s Epitaph’ also appear in another popular miscellany, *Wit Restor’d* (1658, G2r-G3v). These versions have recently been edited in ‘Appendix D: Other Hobson Poems’ of Lewalski and Haan (2012, 582-6).

Early manuscripts of the Hobson poems have also been preserved; see the Milton entry in the *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts 1450–1700*, [http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/authors/miltonjohn.html](http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/authors/miltonjohn.html). For the question of the authorship of ‘Hobson’s Epitaph’, see Parker 1936; Evans 1943; and Shawcross 1967. Note that Peter Beal, in his introduction to Milton in the *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts 1450–1700*, is sceptical about Milton’s authorship of the poem ([http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/introductions/MiltonJohn.html](http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/introductions/MiltonJohn.html)).

26 Sancroft transcribed Psalm 136 and the Nativity Ode (see Campbell and Corns 2008, 187). For the mention of ‘*Miltons Poems*’ in *The English Parnassus* (Wing P2814), see D5v. For Baron, see Parker 1940, 23.


28 Peter Beal, ‘George Herbert’, in *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts 1450–1700*, [http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/introductions/HerbertGeorge.html](http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/introductions/HerbertGeorge.html). That ‘Song. On May Morning’ may have been set to music is suggested by the title page of Milton’s 1645 *Poems* which states: ‘The SONGS were set in
Musick / by Mr. Henry Lawes Gentleman of / the Kings Chappel, and one / of His Majesties / Private Musick’.

29 A draft of Arcades survives in the Trinity Manuscript. The only substantive difference in the second song between the manuscript and the 1645 Poems is that the printed text has ‘you’ (l. 8), whereas the manuscript reads ‘yee’. The reading in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t here agrees with the printed Poems.


31 Before the beginning of the poem, the following note is printed: ‘The ancients allotted every River its peculiar Diety [sic.], the fancy whereof so far transported the Author, that to one of those (supposed) powers, he thus adventured’ (G11r).

32 Note that in Comus (1637, E3v) and the Trinity Manuscript, the text is substantively the same (although in the latter, ll. 3-8 and 17-18 are marginal additions, and ll. 13-16 are crossed out). In the Bridgewater Manuscript, the passage is preceded by the stage direction, ‘The verse to singe or not’, and the twenty lines are parcelled out to the two brothers and the Attendant Spirit. The only substantive difference in the dialogue text to the printed version is ‘of nightly daunce’ instead of ‘that nightly dance’ (l. 17). See also Diekhoff 1968.

33 The text in Comus (1637, C1r) is substantively the same. In the Bridgewater and Trinity Manuscripts, the final line begins (with non-substantive spelling variants) ‘And hould a Counterpointe’. The passage corresponds to one of the five extant songs Henry Lawes wrote for Comus. The text in Lawes’s autograph song book (BL Add MS 53723, ff. 37-9)
likewise reads ‘And hold A Counterpoint’ (see Lewalski and Haan 2012, 587-98, esp. 591). For Lawes’s connections to Milton, see also Spink 2000, and Walls 1996.

34 See, for instance, Carey 1968,188, and Revard 2009, 95.

35 The reading has also found its way into a recent edition (Raffel 1999, 85). Note that the Trinity Manuscript ‘has in the margin cell (as an alternative, without cancelling shell …)’ (Woodhouse and Bush 1972, 891).

36 Like the ones in Cupids Cabinet Unlock’t, these poems are unacknowledged in Milton scholarship, such as Shawcross 1984.

37 Note that two poems in The Art of Courtship also reappear in The compleat courtier: see The Art of Courtship, F10r and G1v-G2r, and The compleat courtier, D6r and B2v-B3r.
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