
Article:
Nevitt, M. (2025) John Dryden, Henry Herringman, and the dedication of restoration playbooks. Seventeenth Century. ISSN: 0268-117X

https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2025.2552294

The Seventeenth Century

Volume XL No. 4 July–August 2025

The Seventeenth Century

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

ISSN: 0268-117X (Print) 2050-4616 (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rsev20

John Dryden, Henry Herringman, and the dedication of Restoration playbooks

Marcus Nevitt

To cite this article: Marcus Nevitt (19 Sep 2025): John Dryden, Henry Herringman, and the dedication of Restoration playbooks, The Seventeenth Century, DOI: 10.1080/0268117X.2025.2552294

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2025.2552294

Published online: 19 Sep 2025.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY
https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2025.2552294

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

John Dryden, Henry Herringman, and the dedication of Restoration playbooks

Marcus Nevitt

The School of English, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

ABSTRACT

This article re-evaluates John Dryden's relationships with his stationers and demonstrates how Restoration book-trade practices could influence literary meaning. Modern scholarship celebrates Dryden's work with his later bookseller Jacob Tonson the Elder (1655–1736), centring Tonson as the dominant figure behind the marketing of literary culture in the long eighteenth century and the burnishing of Dryden's critical reputation in that period. One consequence of this emphasis, however, is that the significance of the poet laureate's work with his first stationer, Henry Herringman (1628–1704), has been occluded, underestimated, or disparaged. Focusing on the printed dedications to Dryden's new quarto playbooks, including the much-reviled dedication to *The State of Innocence* (1677), I offer quantitative and qualitative analysis to show that Dryden and Herringman modelled an influential format and practice for new playbook publication which Tonson imitated rather than ignored.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 30 July 2025
Accepted 21 August 2025

KEYWORDS
Print culture; John Dryden; Henry Herringman; Restoration; theatre

In 1692, and out of political favour, John Dryden republished an old poem which playfully re-imagined an epochal succession that had transformed the cultural landscape of late seventeenth-century London. That poem was *Mac Flecknoe* and the power-transfer it conjured with centred not on any member of the Stuart dynasty but on the current poet laureate, Thomas Shadwell, and his mock coronation in the mid 1670s as the dullest poet in the land. *Mac Flecknoe* had been in circulation, anonymously, in various manuscripts and two printed editions since 1676, but the 1692 republication was the first occasion on which Dryden acknowledged his authorship of the satire in print.[1] *Mac Flecnoe . . . By Mr Dryden* appeared as the first item in the second edition of *Miscellany Poems in Two Parts* published by the great entrepreneur-bookseller, Jacob Tonson the Elder (1655–1736).[2] Tonson was a careful reader of Dryden's satire, and echoed it in his own 1685 elegy for John Oldham; he would likely, then, have paid particular attention to *Mac Flecknoe*'s evocation of the difficulties of publishing printed drama in the mid 1670s, a time when he was still making his way in the book

CONTACT Marcus Nevitt m.nevitt@sheffield.ac.uk The School of English, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
[1]Hammond and Hopkins (eds.), *Dryden*, 123. All future references to poems in this edition will be cited parenthetically.
[2]*Miscellany Poems: in Two Parts.*

trade as an apprentice.[3] Shadwell was so unremittingly boring, Dryden contended, that his rise to cultural prominence was less triumphal entry than laughable disaster. Casting his eye around London, Dryden's speaker noticed how Shadwell's arrival had had some peculiar effects on the business of selling books in the capital:

> No Persian carpets spread th'imperial way,
> But scattered limbs of mangled poets lay:
> From dusty shops neglected authors come,
> Martyrs of pies, and relics of the bum.
> . . . loads of Shadwell almost choked the way.
> Bilked stationers for yeomen stood prepared,
> And Herringman was captain of the guard. (lines 98–105)

This association of Shadwell with bum relics and waste matter was accentuated in Tonson's printed versions of the poem, where his name was contracted, at once coyly and obscenely, to a scatological but hushing 'Sh___', both a foul evacuation and a demand for silence.[4] The logic of that contraction relates to the poem's contention that Shadwell should just stop writing; his unsold books were so numerous that they depleted the capital's literary oxygen, the adverbial poise of the observation that they '*almost* choked the way' suggesting that his cultural assault was insufficiently gripping and too much. It was London's booksellers, the poem maintains, who were the main collateral damage here; they emerged 'bilked' or unpaid by potential customers for all their labours in bringing Shadwell's works to an uninterested reading public. Even the most important literary stationer of the period before the emergence of Tonson, Henry Herringman (1628–1704), sometime exclusive publisher of both Shadwell and Dryden himself, was duped in the time and effort he devoted to Shadwell's works. According to *Mac Flecknoe*, Herringman was just the foremost member of a booksellers' regiment conducting, in his quarto editions of Shadwell's plays, the dreariest of wars against paper and enduring literary value.

While the fluctuations of Dryden's relationship with Shadwell – from respectful affinity as emerging dramatists through to intense hostility during the Exclusion Crisis and afterwards – have been the subject of extensive critical commentary, no one has probed what this satirical reference to Henry Herringman means for an understanding of Dryden's relationships with his seventeenth-century stationers, bilked or otherwise.[5] That story is worth knowing in more detail because it reveals how the omission of book-trade concerns from the analysis of texts produced by one of the period's most canonical writers has resulted in some durable and influential misreadings of Dryden as a poet-dramatist. Those misreadings have positioned him as, on the one hand, utterly in thrall to his patrons, willing to sacrifice any principle on the altar of aristocratic favour, and yet, at the other extreme, the most engaged verbal artist of his generation, unswervingly and purely political, even in his silences. The most enduring statement of the former position came from Samuel Johnson who in his *Lives of the Poets* (1779) objected to the

[3]Lynch, *Jacob Tonson*, p. 9. On Tonson's echo of *Mac Flecknoe* in the Oldham elegy see Hammond and Hopkins (eds.) *Dryden*, 128.

[4]The earliest manuscripts of the poem avoided such contractions, insisting upon and occasionally accentuating its proper nouns; Hammond, *Making of Restoration Poetry*, 51.

[5]On Dryden and Shadwell see Smith, 'Shadwell's Impact Upon Dryden'; Hume, 'Theory of Comedy in the Restoration'; Oden, *Dryden and Shadwell*; Combe, '"But Loads of S__ Almost Chok'd the Way"'.

dedication of Dryden's re-working of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, *The State of Innocence* (1677), to Mary of Modena, Duchess of York, as 'a strain of flattery which disgraces genius and which it is wonderful that any man that knew the meaning of his own words could use without self-detestation.'[6] The latter is best exemplified by a moment in James Winn's magnificent *John Dryden and His World* (1987) in which he explains the strange and uncharacteristic lack of a prefatory dedication to Dryden and Nathaniel Lee's *Oedipus* (1678):

> Although Dryden maintained his loyalty to James [Duke of York] during [the Exclusion Crisis] . . . he was circumspect about expressing it. Publication of *Oedipus* without dedication is evidence of this caution, since neither Dryden nor Lee had previously missed an opportunity to dedicate his work to some prominent person. In this case, however, they were probably afraid to choose a patron, lest he fall from power.[7]

This article corrects these two assessments by demonstrating that, in their reluctance to consider the influence of Dryden's stationers on his playbooks, they occlude those meanings of Restoration plays which originated in bookshop negotiations for the benefit of all of those engaged in the trade. Such arguments ignore, in other words, the ways in which the politics of Restoration drama – and their distinctive rhetoricization in printed dedications – were connected to the commercial interests of the book trade. In what follows, I demonstrate that Dryden's relationship with his first principal bookseller, Henry Herringman, was as transformative as those he enjoyed with his aristocratic patrons and which have preoccupied Dryden's readers for centuries. Moreover, the dedications to Dryden's plays, whether in their hyperbolic excess or riddling absence, need to be read in the context of Restoration quarto playbook-trade practices, which, as we will see, Dryden was instrumental in establishing.

Attention to Dryden and Herringman's work together is long overdue. The recent publication of the Dryden-Tonson correspondence has shown that despite their bad-tempered disagreements over payments and contractual terms in relation to Dryden's translations in the 1690s, the two men sustained a lifelong and important friendship despite considerable differences in age and politics.[8] No equivalent archive of correspondence survives, however, for Dryden and Herringman. The result of this is that Dryden's engagement with his first stationer has been disparaged – one assessment has Herringman as 'nothing more than an efficient tradesman satisfying the small demand for published plays in his own small way'[9] — or cast into the shadow of the later, justly celebrated collaborations with Tonson, such as their monumental *The Works of Virgil* (1697) published in folio with 100 engraved illustrations on a subscription basis. Tonson would surely have been alive to *Mac Flecknoe*'s unflattering portrait of Herringman in his editions of the *Miscellany Poems*, since the two stationers remained the biggest names in London's literary book trade until the end of the century. Even though Herringman migrated away from the publication of new plays in the late 1670s, he maintained a keen interest in publishing popular older playbooks in his list and was the driving force behind the fourth folio of Shakespeare's works in 1685, the same year that he was appointed Master of the Stationers' Company.[10] He continued as Tonson's chief rival in the publication of Dryden titles in the 1680s and 90s, bringing out

[6]Johnson, *Lives of the Poets*, 277.
[7]Winn, *John Dryden and His* World, 316.
[8]Bernard (ed.) with McTague, *Correspondence of John Dryden*, 76, 148, 151, 175–89.
[9]Geduld *Prince of Publishers*, 55.
[10]Connor, 'Henry Herringman, Richard Bentley and Shakespeare's Fourth Folio', 38–40.

older quarto editions for which he still retained rights until 1699, when he sold his remaining holdings to Tonson.[11] In 1694, Herringman even muscled in on Tonson's recent enterprise of selling bound-up copies of Dryden's play quartos, financing *Mr Dryden's Plays In Two Volumes* in a market which Tonson had been working exclusively since 1691 with his multi-volume quarto editions of *The Works of Mr John Dryden*.[12]

A sense of this continued professional rivalry is often lost in narratives which centre Tonson as the dominant figure behind the marketing of literary culture in the long eighteenth century and the burnishing of Dryden's critical reputation in that period.[13] Just as frequently forgotten is the fact that it was Herringman who did the groundwork for the late seventeenth-century trade in Dryden's quarto playbooks and that these were foundations which Tonson built upon rather than destroyed or ignored. This article will demonstrate that the marketing of dramatists' connections with their patrons in the printed dedications to quarto editions of their plays was an essential component of that work. Below I offer some quantitative and qualitative work on the patterns and purposes of Restoration playbook dedications and finish with close analysis of Dryden's *The State of Innocence*, placing its notorious dedication at the interpretive and commercial heart of the text. As we will see, throughout their careers together, Herringman and Dryden showed that a printed dedication could be much more than mere praise or panegyric and that discourse with an eminent, named patron could be an essential means of selling a one-shilling playbook to the reading public in a hyper-competitive print marketplace.

Our patrons in the north: the patterns and decorum of Restoration playbook dedication

The Herringman-Dryden relationship very likely began with a shared preoccupation with paratexts. It was Shadwell who first alleged that Dryden's earliest years in London were spent working for Herringman as a jobbing writer of prefaces for various titles issued from his bookshop in the late 1650s and early 1660s.[14] Shadwell railed that, despite his frequent lofty claims to disinterested aesthetics, Dryden was nothing more than a mercenary scribbler who had honed his craft at Herringman's elbow. In *The Medal of John Bayes* (1682), published after his own working relationship with Herringman had ended, Shadwell questioned the loyalty and intimacy of both men:

> Your loyalty you [Dryden] learn'd in Cromwell's court
> . . .But he being dead who should the slave prefer[?]
> He turn'd a Journey-man t'a Bookseller*;*Mr Herringman, who kept him in his house for that purpose
> Writ Prefaces to Books for Meat and Drink,
> And as he paid, he would both write and think.[15]

As 'Journey-man', 'keeping', and 'paying' were all commonly eroticised terms in the period, this image of Dryden as Herringman's 'kept' journeyman, writing for bed and board and paying in other ways, equates the composition of paratexts-to-order with

[11]Miller, 'Henry Herringman, Restoration Bookseller-Publisher', 302, 305.
[12]Macdonald, *John Dryden*, 46–7.
[13]For studies centring Tonson see Lynch, *Jacob Tonson*; Gillespie, 'Early Years of the Dryden-Tonson Partnership'.
[14]For confirmations of Shadwell's assertion see Hammond, 'The Circulation of Dryden's Poetry', p. 384; Winn, *John Dryden*, 95; Osborn, *John Dryden*, 168–183.
[15]*The Medal of John Bayes*, 8–9.

sexual drudgery.[16] Shadwell's deprecation of Herringman here, suggesting that he is a successor to Cromwell in Dryden's affections, may also intimate at an awareness that Herringman was the stationer who first registered Dryden's controversial Cromwell elegy, 'The Heroique Stanzas', with the Stationers' Company.[17] If, though, we probe beneath the poem's lurid fascination with Dryden's sexual tastes – elsewhere it alleges that he is obsessed with buggery – these references indicate that some contemporaries recognised a close affinity between Herringman and Dryden in the business of selling books, and specifically using prefatory addresses to sell those books, even before the latter had become a professional dramatist. It was James M. Osborn who first tracked five Herringman prefaces from the late 1650s signed 'JD' and plausibly attributed them to the poet.[18] After the Restoration one of Dryden's very first original printed poems was also a paratext for a Herringman edition, the sole commendatory verse for Sir Robert Howard's *Poems* (1660) which extolled the virtue, shared by Howard and Dryden alike, of being able to 'write worthy things of worthy men'.[19] The unflattering picture of Herringman as Shadwell's bilked dupe in *Mac Flecknoe*, therefore, may represent the sharp, deprecatory humour of the satirist from which neither friend, foe, nor the poet themselves are safe, or it could reveal a real deterioration of once warm relations between the two men, even before they had ceased working together on new play quartos a few years later in 1678.[20]

Whatever the status of their relationship, Dryden's poem is clear that one of the reasons Herringman could not shift Shadwell's plays was that their author did not know how to dedicate a play correctly. Assuring Shadwell that he was tedious by temperament and nonsensical by instinct, Dryden advised him to stop straining for grandiloquence, especially in his play dedications, since he was already the embodiment of Sir Formal Trifle, the absurd, foppish pretender to eloquence in Shadwell's comedy *The Virtuoso* (1676):

> And when false flowers of rhetoric thou wouldst cull,
> Trust nature, do not labour to be dull;
> But write thy best, and top, and in each line
> Sir Formal's oratory will be thine
> Sir Formal, though unsought attends thy quill
> And does thy northern dedications fill. (lines 165–170)

The 'northern dedications' jibe refers to a breach of writerly etiquette that clearly nettled Dryden considerably since he returned to the phrase some years later, disparaging Shadwell as 'the northern Dedicator'.[21] Shadwell's northern dedications were the printed dedications of several of his play quartos to his patrons William and Margaret Cavendish, Duke and Duchess of Newcastle. The frequency of these northern dedications – five plays, all published by Herringman, beginning with *The Sullen Lovers* (1668) and ending with *The Virtuoso* (1676) – was unusual yet unimaginative, core attributes of Shadwell's

[16]The libertine Horner feigns impotence by declaiming 'I cannot be your Journey-man by night' in William Wycherley's *The Country Wife*, 67.
[17]Hammond and Hopkins (eds.), *Dryden*, 3.
[18]Osborn, *John Dryden*, 168–83.
[19]Howard, *Poems*, no sig.
[20]In addition to mocking Shadwell and Herringman, *Mac Flecknoe* ridicules Dryden's own hyperbole in the lines given to the emperor Maximin in *Tyrannick Love* (1670); Hammond and Hopkins (eds.), *Dryden*, 136.
[21]*The Vindication*, 25.

characterisation throughout *Mac Flecknoe*.[22] While a younger playwright like Nathaniel Lee worked with different booksellers and dedicated more than one play to the same patron over the course of his career, no one from Dryden's generation or the Herringman stable of dramatists had done so other than Shadwell.[23] The breach of decorum involved here was remarked upon by Edward Ravenscroft in *The Careless Lovers* (1673): 'No person of Quality, how remote soever can escape the Impertinences of Poets; for though they be Hundreds of miles off, they shall be pursu'd, and persecuted with Dedicatories o're and o're, *even by the same Authors*'.[24] Dryden and Herringman avoided such impertinences, and established, as we shall see, a successful model for editions of quarto plays, by ensuring that each of his sole-authored dramas were prefaced by an epistle to a different dedicatee.[25] This ensured novelty and was designed to prick readerly interest (as well as massage aristocratic egos) but it was also, primarily, fundamentally polite. Dryden and Herringman's dedicatory strategy refused to presume an over-familiarity between a dramatist and a single patron; it also marketed the author as sociable and deferential in aristocratic company rather than obsessive or anti-social. In neglecting to follow this model with Shadwell, *Mac Flecknoe* implies, Herringman practically guaranteed that loads of his playbooks would remain unsold, almost choking the way.

However, when Dryden was writing *Mac Flecknoe*, Shadwell's most recent northern dedication to *The Virtuoso* (1676) involved a more serious violation of dedicatory etiquette than desperate or unimaginative repetition. Shadwell informed the Duke of Newcastle of the success of his play – it was indeed one of the most popular of the 1676–7 season – but then proceeded to bring him into the orbit of an argument that Shadwell was having with another of Newcastle's patronised writers, Dryden himself, about the cultural standing of Ben Jonson in English literary culture and the significance of neoclassical rules for 'correct' English comedy. Shadwell excused his own theatrical style by reminding his patron of his poverty and the consequent demands on his time as well as his purse, implicitly comparing his difficulties with Dryden's unique privileges as Poet Laureate, Historiographer Royal, and pensioned writer for the King's Company:

> I had rather be Author of one Scene in [Jonson's] best Comedies, than of any Play this Age has produced. That there are a great many faults in the conduct of [my] Play, I am not ignorant. But I (having no Pension but from the Theatre, which is either unwilling, or unable, to reward a Man sufficiently, for so much pains as correct Comedies require) cannot allot my whole time to the writing of Plays, but am forced to mind some other business of

[22]The plays published by Herringman that Shadwell dedicated to William Cavendish were *The Sullen Lovers* (1668), *Empson Wells* (1672), *The Libertine* (1676), *The Virtuoso* (1676); *The Humorists* (1671) was dedicated to Margaret Cavendish.

[23]Lee's *Mithridates* (London: James Magnes,1678), *Lucius Junius Brutus* (London: Richard Tonson, 1681) and *The Princess of Cleve* (London: Abel Roper, 1689) were all dedicated to Charles Sackville, earl of Dorset.

[24]Ravenscroft, *The Careless Lovers*, sig A2r, emphasis added.

[25]This was a practice that Dryden did his best to adhere to throughout his career, even after he had fallen from favour and had to rebuild his public persona following the accession of William III and Mary II. Dryden's only duplicated play dedicatee came during this period when, working with Jacob Tonson, he dedicated *Cleomenes* (1692) to Laurence Hyde, first earl of Rochester, having already dedicated *The Duke of Guise* (1682) to him. Dryden excused this repetition revealing that he had wanted to dedicate *Cleomenes* to Lady Henrietta, Hyde's wife, but that she had declined, preferring to be 'Bountiful by stealth'; Dryden, *Cleomenes*, sig. A3r. There is a plaintive tone to Dryden's dedications in this late period since they stress that he has chosen dedicatees who have not abandoned him 'even in this Lowness of my Fortunes'; Dryden, *Love Triumphant*, sig. A3r.

> Advantage. (Had I as much Money, and as much time for it) I might perhaps write as Correct a Comedy as any of my Contemporaries.[26]

This is more than just a grumble born of professional rivalry. As praise slides into implied advice, the dedication strays into a heavy hint that Newcastle might redistribute aristocratic favours away from Dryden to a more deserving professional recipient like Shadwell himself. Given that the salary Dryden received from his royal appointments was frequently months or even years in arrears, Shadwell reminding their mutual patron about what he regarded as the inexplicable disparities in their income was both graceless and potentially damaging to Dryden's standing and livelihood.[27] This was yet further animus to ensure that Shadwell got *Mac Flecknoe* for his pains; small wonder, too, if Dryden was indeed irritated by Herringman's decision to allow this dedication to be printed, and brought the stationer within the poem's satiric reach.

The Virtuoso dedication would have stung Dryden because it represented a breach of the dedicatory standards that he had established with Herringman since their earliest work together. Ever since *The Rival Ladies* (1664), Dryden's first play in print, a Herringman-Dryden quarto guaranteed that readers would receive a fulsome dedication, as much as prologue, epilogue and play text, as a core part of what they could expect for their shilling.[28] Thus Dryden's very first prefatory dedication thanked his patron and fellow dramatist Roger Boyle, first earl of Orrery, 'for the kindness your lordship has continually shown to all my writings' before opening out into a 3000-word canonical essay on poetics which, as well as reflecting on the standing of contemporary writers like William Davenant, John Denham, and Edmund Waller, offered a defence of artful rhyming in the theatre:

> that benefit which I consider most in [rhyme] ... is, that it bounds and circumscribes the fancy. For imagination in a poet is a faculty so wild and lawless, that, like an high-ranging spaniel, it must have clogs tied to it, lest it out-run the judgment. The great easiness of blank verse renders the poet too luxuriant; he is tempted to say many things, which might better be omitted, or at least shut up in fewer words.[29]

The more attentive of Herringman's customers would have spotted that, in addition to being a new tragicomedy by a pre-eminent talent, their copy of *The Rival Ladies* offered them a seat at a period-defining debate about the relationships between rhyme, the fancy, and the imagination which Dryden was entering into with his patron as well as the philosopher Thomas Hobbes (the spaniel simile used to describe the excitable movements of the imagination is lifted from *Leviathan*).[30] Such expansiveness reveals the intimate connection between Dryden's dedicatory work and his celebrated development of full-length critical essays used to preface later play quartos as well as volumes of translations such as *Ovid's Epistles* (1680) and *Fables, Ancient and Modern* (1700). Later generations of literary critics have read his pronouncements in the dedication to *The Rival Ladies* as Dryden administering the neoclassical last rites to metaphysical poetry, with its wild conceits and ungovernable lines; those picking up the quarto from

[26]Shadwell, *The Virtuoso*, sig. A2v.
[27]For the delays and non-payment of Dryden's official salary see Winn, *John Dryden*, 525–531. On Dryden's privileges see Payne, *Business of English Restoration Theatre*, 179–80.
[28]On Dryden's prefatory habits see Hume, *Dryden's Criticism*.
[29]Dryden, *The Rival Ladies*, sig. A4r-v.
[30]Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 10. On this dedication see John West, *Dryden and Enthusiasm*, 20–53.

Herringman's shop on the New Exchange in 1664 might also have thought, equally justifiably, that, when compared to other dramatists' playbooks, they were getting a lot for their shilling.

Herringman and Dryden were equally committed to this dedicatory strategy. However, Herringman was not the first stationer to use a dedication to preface a Restoration quarto playbook – the publishers of John Tatham's comedy *The Rump*, following an emerging pre-civil war book trade convention, utilised the form in 1660–1–nor was Dryden the first playwright whose work he marketed in this way.[31] But unlike the dedication to Herringman's quarto of Sir Samuel Tuke's comedy *The Adventure of the Five Hours* (1663), Dryden's dedications were always generically promiscuous, splicing together the familiar epistle with the literary critical essay, panegyric, and topical polemic. They were also ambitiously (or unforgivingly) long. Occasionally even exceeding the single quarto gathering usually marking the upper limit for a play's total paratextual matter, they were typically anywhere between two and three and a half thousand words, more than 10 times the length of Tuke's dedication of his play to the Duke of Norfolk.[32] Moreover, with the exception of those plays he collaborated on with members of the nobility — *The Indian Queen* (1665) with Sir Robert Howard, *Sir Martin Mar-All* (1668) with the Duke of Newcastle, and *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* (1670) with Sir William Davenant – all but two of Dryden's 13 sole-authored new plays published with Herringman carried a dedication. The absence on these two occasions is readily explained. With *The Wild Gallant* (1669), Dryden had already written a manuscript poem dedicating it to Lady Castlemaine when it was performed at court in 1663; when *Secret Love* (1668) appeared, Dryden explained that it needed no printed dedication because the king had 'grac'd it with the Title of His Play, and . . . after this glory which it has receiv'd from a Soveraign Prince, I could not send it to seek protection from any Subject. Be this Poem then sacred to him without the tedious form of a Dedication.'[33] Tedious form or not, this paratextual feature was something that Dryden and Herringman committed to together in 1664 and set a great deal of store by in the course of their work together over the next 14 years.

Crucially, however, this mode of repeated, extensive, and varied dedication was not a strategy that Herringman pursued with all writers in his list. The only comparable case, in terms of frequency if not variety and length, is Shadwell; 7 of the 8 new plays he published with Herringman carried a dedication.[34] Shadwell's northern dedications, which began appearing several years after Dryden began dedicating his plays, were always considerably shorter and less ambitious in scope than Dryden's; while working with Herringman in the 1670s, he clearly did not have the contacts book of a Poet Laureate to call upon a suitably varied list of eminent dedicatees.[35] Dryden and Shadwell were however, outliers amongst Herringman's stable of authors. 57%, or 26 out of 46, of the surviving new play quartos that

[31]Tatham, *The Rump*. Peter Blayney has shown that 31% of English playbooks carried dedications between 1583 and 1642; Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks', 395.
[32]Tuke's dedication is c. 250 words. Dryden's *Aureng-Zebe* ran to more than 3300 words and was too long for a single quarto gathering; John Dryden, *Aureng-Zebe*, sigs. A2r-av.
[33]Hammond (ed.) *The Poems of John Dryden. Volume I*, 80; Dryden, *Secret* Love, sig A2r.
[34]Shadwell's only undedicated play with Herringman is *The Royal Shepherdess* (1669), a re-writing of John Fountain's *The Rewards of Virtue* (1661).
[35]Dryden's dedication of *An Evening's Love* to the Duke of Newcastle at c.1500 words is significantly longer than any of Shadwell's to Cavendish; John Dryden, *An Evening's Love*, sigs. A2r-A3v.

Year	New Play Quartos	Dedications	% Dedicated
1663	11	3	27
1664	10	3	30
1665	2	0	0
1666	1	1	100
1667	6	2	33
1668	9	2	22
1669	5	1	20
1670	5	3	60
1671	15	8	53
1672	11	9	82
1673	15	7	47
1674	8	3	38
1675	14	8	57
1676	13	10	77
1677	26	14	54
1678	22	12	55
TOTAL	**173**	**86**	**50**

Figure 1. Total dedications to new quarto playbooks, 1663–1678.[36]

he issued between 1663 and 1678 carry any dedication at all (see Appendix A). As we can see from Figure 1, this pattern is slightly higher than the overall frequency of total playbook dedication for the period when Herringman was engaged in their production: 50% of all new play quartos.[37] However, given the frequency and variety of the dedications to Dryden's Herringman playbooks, 85% of sole-authored plays to 11 different dedicatees, these figures suggest that Dryden was at least as keen on the dedicatory habit as his bookseller; they also show that the prodigious and varied pattern of dedication Dryden and Herringman established in their work together was unique.

The unusual Dryden-Herringman dedicatory strategy was just one response to challenging trade practices and market conditions for the selling of playbooks. Unlike other publications in quarto format, new plays had to contend with the fact that they had, in a sense, already been published when they were performed. Booksellers had, therefore, to

[36]For an analysis of such data covering the entire Carolean period (1660–1685), see Nevitt, 'The Politics of Restoration Playbooks'.

[37]These figures are calculated from first edition quarto playbooks as listed in the ESTC alongside Wagonheim, *Annals of English Drama 975–1700*. The data excludes play manuscripts, pamphlet plays, closet drama, reprints, revised or collected editions. Stanley Archer first suggested that half of Restoration plays carried a dedication; he was, however, uninterested in booksellers and his headline figure conceals important year-on-year variations; Archer, 'The Epistle Dedicatory'. Robert D. Hume has demonstrated that 61% of printed plays were dedicated between 1660 and 1700 but his data includes compilations, collected editions, and non-quarto formats; Hume, *Paratext*, 12.

release a playbook onto the market as quickly as reasonably possible after the performance run, whose recency was advertised via the 'as it is acted' or 'as it was acted' locution on its titlepage; leave it too long and theatre-goers, a substantial portion of the target audience for a playbook, might have turned their attention elsewhere. In their work on the dating of Restoration play premieres, Judith Milhous and Robert Hume have shown just how difficult a time the period's booksellers had of it: in the 1660s the lag-time between play premiere and quarto publication was typically as long as a year; by the 1670s it could be 6 months, dropping to a minimum of approximately 3 months after 1675.[38] Dryden, however, as Milhous and Hume demonstrate, was something of a special case; 'habitually slow to publish', even successful 1670s' plays like *The Conquest of Granada* (1673) and *Marriage A La Mode* (1673) could take as long as 14 months to be available for purchase in Herringman's shop after their first performances.[39] Although some Dryden-Herringman plays were printed more quickly than this – *Aureng-Zebe* (1676) and *All for Love* (1678) both took less than 6 months – Shadwell was characteristically much quicker into print, taking just 2 months for *The Virtuoso* or 8 months for *The Libertine* in 1676.[40] With Dryden, therefore, this delay might be read as a deliberate strategy, related to Herringman's willingness to countenance a determination always to source fresh dedicatees and to supply their readers with ambitious and expansive prefatory addresses.

The purposes of Restoration playbook dedication

That roughly half of this period's play quartos carried no dedication at all, however, intimates that the decision to dedicate (or not) was far from straightforward. Thinking about play dedications primarily as a book-trade practice, a pragmatic or inventive aspect of the marketing of printed plays, ought to caution us against just reading them simply as privileged revelations of authorial intention, toadyish protestations of patronal devotion, or intimate confessions of creative principles. If they were primarily all or any of these things, it is striking that so many playwrights and booksellers, other than Dryden, Shadwell, and Herringman, avoided them so frequently or contributed them so intermittently. Booksellers had a number of factors to consider when deciding whether the inclusion of a dedication would enhance the chances of a good return on their expenses, including the initial outlay for copy, which, depending on the playwright, could be anywhere between £5 and £10 in the period that Herringman was still working on new plays.[41] If the play had flopped, and the bookseller had already paid for copy, a dedication to a member of the cognoscenti might help drive some sales. If a play had done well in the theatre, a dedication needed to be supplied relatively promptly to ensure it was still relatively fresh in the minds of the theatre-going public who might be among the book's most reliable buyers. The convention of securing permission from the dedicatee for a dedication could potentially be time-consuming, too, especially if the parties did not know each other. Stationers also had to judge whether the playwright was well-connected enough to persuade a sufficiently notable dedicatee to lend their name to the playbook's

[38]Milhous and Hume, 'Dating Play Premières', 374–405.
[39]Milhous and Hume, 'Dating Play Premières', 382–3, 385.
[40]Milhous and Hume, 'Dating Play Premières', 382–3.
[41]Milhous and Hume, *The Publication of Plays*, 165; Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, 'Playwrights' Remuneration in Eighteenth-Century London', 82.

preliminaries. This was an important consideration since, once written, dedications remained material properties of the book and were hardly ever retracted, even in later editions published after the deaths of all involved, or where changes in the political wind made earlier protestations of undying affection or loyalty embarrassing. Dryden suffered on this front when Herringman capitalised on the notoriety of the Duke of Monmouth, executed hero of the Exclusionist and Whig cause, by reprinting quartos of Dryden's 1670 tragedy *Tyrannick Love, or the Royal Martyr*, including its dedication to Monmouth as the Achilles and Rinaldo of the age, complete with the declamation that 'all men will joyn with me in the adoration I pay you'.[42] By 1677, the date of the third quarto, with the polarisation of the Crisis particularly intense, this statement seemed foolish or politically illiterate, especially coming from a committed Tory; by 1686 and the fourth quarto, with Monmouth dead and the Crisis over, it looked cruel and strange.

Where author and bookseller decided that a dedication was feasible and warranted, they were designed to enhance a reader's sense that they were part of an esteemed interpretive community alongside the stated addressee of the dedication. For instance, Dryden's comedy, *The Assignation, Or Love in a Nunnery* (1673) seemingly flopped with its first audiences whom he thought implacably hostile to its Roman Catholic associations. In order to bolster sales of the quarto, Dryden dedicated it to Sir Charles Sedley, a celebrated patron of poets and dramatists, a playwright himself, and one of the most eminent wits and theatre habitués of the day. Dryden contrasted the reception of his play amongst prejudiced spectators with the critical discernment of a coterie of well-connected litterateurs who might read or had even heard Dryden himself read it. The shilling that a reader paid for the quarto effectively bought them two hours of leisure as well as imagined admission into this charmed circle. Dryden told Sedley that his play had:

> succeeded ill in the representation, against the opinion of many the best Judges of our Age, to whom you know I read it e're it was presented publickly . . . I have had formerly so much success, that the miscarriage of this Play was onely my giving fortune her revenge: I ow'd it her; and she was indulgent that she exacted not the paiment long before . . .Think, if you please, that this Dedication is onely an occasion I have taken to do my self the greatest honour imaginable with Posterity; that is, to be recorded in the number of those Men whom you have favour'd with your Friendship and esteem. For, I am well assur'd, that . . . it will gain me the greatest part of my reputation with after-Ages, when they shall find me valuing my self on your kindness to me.[43]

Even if the play had only enjoyed a short run in the theatre, this dedication assured readers that the quarto they had in their hands was not a piece of ephemera, a pie martyr or bum relic, but something worth collecting over a much longer timeframe. While the reference to Dryden's unusually adverse encounter with the goddess Fortune is knowingly self-aggrandising, the eye that he casts on 'Posterity' and the role he thinks a printed dedication will play in cementing his 'reputation with after-Ages' says as much about the importance he and Herringman ascribed to printed dedications in the longevity and saleability of their playbooks as it does about deferential attitudes to aristocratic taste.

Dedications were unusually important, then, for Dryden and Herringman's work together and became central to their vision of playbook marketing because of two related

[42]Dryden, *Tyrannick Love*, sig.A3v.
[43]Dryden, *The Assignation*, sigs. A2r-A2v.

factors, one temperamental and the other directly related to the nature of the trade in quarto editions of new Restoration plays. Firstly, Dryden, as a poet working successfully in the theatre, affected to yearn for a readership and currency with 'after-Ages' more keenly than the evanescent applause of theatre audiences; as he admitted in the dedication to *The Spanish Fryar*: 'as 'tis my Interest to please my audience, 'tis my Ambition to be read'.[44] That ambition can be seen very clearly in the unperformable printed dedications to his dramas, even if continued performance remained more lucrative for a playwright than the publication and reissuing of playbooks, since most dramatists received just a tenth of the money for selling copy to a bookseller that they got from their third-night box-office takings from the playhouse. (In Dryden's case, that disparity would have been even greater since his 1668 contract with the King's Company, retaining him as their house dramatist, entitled him to a larger share of company profits than the standard third-night takings.)[45] Secondly, along with many of their contemporaries, Dryden and Herringman recognised that anonymised play readers were actually a much tougher audience to keep onside than the period's notoriously demanding, flighty, or unruly playgoers. Thus for every paratextual lament about absent, inattentive, or jeering punters in the auditorium, there are countless more references to the need for a quarto playbook to have the 'protection' conferred by a dedicatee in order to ensure a favourable critical reception amongst its print readership. When George Etherege dedicated *The Man of Mode* (1676) to the Duchess of York, he claimed to be nervous about how the quarto, published by Herringman, would be greeted by its purchasers. He thanked the Duchess for allowing him to use her name, asserting that 'your protection will be . . . fortunate to it in the Printing; for all are so ambitious of making their Court to You, that none can be severe to what you are pleas'd to favour'.[46] Dryden offered *The Indian Emperour* (1667) to the Duchess of Monmouth worried about its 'being now more publickly expos'd in Print' and therefore 'humbly recommend[ing] it to your Graces Protection'.[47] John Crowne revealed exactly what patronal protection meant for playwrights and their stationers in the dedication of his adaptation of Shakespeare's *I Henry VI* to Sir Charles Sedley: 'I use your Name to guide . . . this Play through the Press, as I did *Shakespear's* to support it on the Stage . . . To hinder this Rush light from being blown out, is the reason why I place your Name before it. I have a mind the Play shou'd be read, and every one will read it, if they think you like it.'[48]

Dryden and his peers, in other words, used patrons' names to help their stationers compete for readers' attention with rival publishers of various book types and genres in the Restoration print marketplace. An earlier Herringman edition, Edward Howard's tragedy *The Usurper* (1668), did not require a dedication because of the aristocratic identity of its author, but its preface reminded readers of the additional difficulties that playwrights faced when venturing from the stage into print and swapping an audience for a readership:

[44]Dryden, *The Spanish Fryar*, sig. A3v. Until the maturation of his relationship with Jacob Tonson, it was impossible for Dryden to sustain himself and his family through poetry alone; Hammond, 'The Circulation of Dryden's Poetry', 384.
[45]Hume and Milhous estimated that playwrights typically received £5–10 for copy, as opposed to £50 for third-night author benefit; *The Publication of* Plays, 166. For Dryden's contract with the King's Company see Osborn, *John Dryden*, 184–191.
[46]Etherege, *The Man of Mode*, sig. A2v.
[47]Dryden, *The Indian Emperour*, sig. A2r.
[48]Crowne, *Henry the Sixth*, sig. A2v.

> Since the Impression of Plays, is so much the Practice of the Age, that few or none have been Acted, which fail to be display'd in Print; where they seem to put on the greater formality of Authors, while perhaps thus appearing, divested of the life of Action, which gave no small varnish to their figures, they suffer a more severe Correction from the Reader . . . And indeed I think it some impudence to hazard the Reader's being less Gentle than Spectators; the Press being in some manner the Stages Tyring-House, where all Ornaments are thrown off, save native design and Language.[49]

Stripped of the varnish of embodiment and performance, Restoration playbooks acquired, in Howard's assessment, the vulnerability of a performer backstage, eagerly anticipating the luxuries of privacy but prey instead to the intense, excessive attentions of admirers and critics alike. Dryden avoided this metaphor but, several years after he had finished working with Herringman, made a similar observation in his dedication to *The Spanish Fryar* (1681), reflecting on the trials faced by those who tried to make a living selling Restoration plays:

> I have often heard the Stationer sighing in his shop, and wishing for those hands to take off his melancholy bargain which clapp'd its Performance on the Stage. In a Play-house every thing contributes to impose upon the Iudgment; the Lights, the Scenes, the Habits, and, above all, the Grace of Action . . . But these false Beauties of the Stage are no more lasting than a Rainbow; when the Actor ceases to shine upon them . . . they vanish in a twinkling.[50]

As there is some truth in Dryden's assertion that the leisure of reading left critical faculties less distracted than they were during the live multi-media spectaculars offered in playhouses, his contention that playbooks 'often' proved a 'melancholy bargain' for Restoration booksellers deserves scrutiny.

The synchronic snapshots provided by Figures 2 and 3 reveal that Restoration playbook selling was indeed a difficult business in a busy marketplace and the prefatory dedication might well, therefore, have been used to ameliorate the situation for all involved. The data here is derived from the ESTC and the Term Catalogues and compares the presence of dedications in new playbooks to the frequency of such paratexts in other new quartos, using the descriptive book categories that Restoration stationers themselves used to advertise their wares to potential customers.[51] As James Raven has shown, Term Catalogue data is best regarded as broadly indicative rather than an exact expression of total press output in any given year; it is restricted here to new quarto publications since playbooks were issued in that format – folios, by contrast, as prestige publications, carried honorific dedications much more frequently – and to two sample years.[52] 1677, as Figure 1 revealed, was the highpoint for new Restoration playbook production during the period that Herringman was involved in the trade; by 1681, the year that Dryden reflected on the 'melancholy bargain' of playbook publication in his dedication to *The Spanish Fryar*, Herringman had ceased producing new playbooks, leaving those who remained to deal with the effects of plummeting theatre audiences when the Exclusion Crisis was at its height.[53]

[49]Howard, *The Usurper*, sig. A2r-v.
[50]Dryden, *Spanish Fryar*, sig. A2v.
[51]Arber, *The Term Catalogues*. In The Term Catalogues plays and poems are frequently combined into a single category; they have been separated in the data below. The statistics here are for new books only and exclude the very sizeable number of 'Books Reprinted'.
[52]Raven, *The Business of* Books, 110.
[53]On falling audiences during the Exclusion Crisis see Nevitt, 'The Politics of Restoration Playbook Dedications', 8; Depledge, 'Playbills, Prologues, and Playbooks', 309–10.

Book Category	New Quartos	Dedicated	Undedicated	% Dedicated
Divinity	48	14	34	29
History	4	2	2	50
Law	10	0	10	0
Libri Latini	12	7	5	58
Livre Francois	1	0	1	0
Mathematicks	2	0	2	0
Miscellanies	156	13	143	8
Musick	2	1	1	50
Physick	2	1	1	50
Plays	26	14	12	54
Poems	5	3	2	60
Totals	**268**	**55**	**213**	**20**

Figure 2. Dedication of new quartos by book category in the term catalogues, 1677.

Book Category	New Quartos	Dedicated	Undedicated	% Dedicated
Divinity	140	62	78	44
History	9	1	8	11
Law	5	0	5	0
Libri Latini	24	7	17	29
Mathematics	2	1	1	50
Miscellanies	228	22	206	10
Physick	3	0	3	0
Plays	11	9	2	82
Poems	10	2	8	20
Totals	**432**	**104**	**328**	**24**

Figure 3. Dedication of new quartos by book category in the term catalogues, 1681.

Even at their peak in 1677, when they were the third most published category of new quarto book, Restoration playbooks represented less than 10% (26 out of 268) of the market. Their production was overshadowed by the volume of quarto works of divinity (which included sermons) and miscellanies, a capacious category comprising editions of astronomy, linguistics, philosophy, translations, travel writing, and, crucially, controversial pamphlets. Fifty-four percent of the new playbooks printed in 1677 carried dedications, a figure significantly higher than both the overall year average of 24% as well as the figure for the most popular works of divinity (29%) and miscellanies (8%). If the presence of controversial pamphlets in the latter category, frequently anonymous or pseudonymous and thus never carrying a dedication, partially explains that low figure, it seems as if booksellers of the most popular categories of quarto books – unlike the producers of

playbooks – were not especially troubled by the presence or absence of dedications in their printed wares.

This picture is largely replicated at the height of the Exclusion Crisis in 1681 when the overall volume of quarto book production had increased significantly, up 62% (432 new titles) on 1677 levels. Given the intensity of religious and political polarisation of the Crisis, it is unsurprising that the production of works of divinity in that format increased most markedly (up almost 300% to 140 titles) and that the number of miscellanies, including controversial pamphlet literature, had also increased by 68% to 228 titles. While the percentage of these works carrying a dedication was also up on 1677 levels (Divinity up to 44% and Miscellanies up to 10%) and the year average of dedicated works increased slightly from 20% to 24%, such numbers are vastly outstripped by those for playbooks. Dramatists frequently lamented the difficulty in making a living from the theatre in this year, remarking that playhouses had come to resemble 'forsaken barns', with punters lured away from theatrical entertainment because of the political crisis enveloping the capital; in the second half of the 1680–1 season, King's Company receipts were so low that the players even stopped performing for a short period, considering it not worth their time.[54] This parlous situation had a clear impact on the business of selling playbooks as that share of the market in new quartos dropped to just 2.5% (or 11 out of 432 titles). At the same time, the vast majority of those books (81%) carried a dedication, significantly higher than the year percentage average and the frequency of dedication in any other category, suggesting that the habit of dedication was directly related to the adverse conditions stationers and playwrights faced in this sector of the book trade. Booksellers and dramatists might, in other words, have used the dedications to new printed drama as an additional means of selling playbooks, especially when the market was flat.

Because of the tough market conditions for playbooks, some dramatists claimed they were being reluctantly led into supplying dedications by their stationers. Abraham Bailey could not find a dedicatee for *The Spiteful Sisters* (1677) so wrote an 'Epistle to the Reader' instead, confessing that he would have omitted the paratext entirely were it not for 'the importunity of the Stationer (who was unwilling to have a blank page but that the Buyer might have enough for his money)'.[55] In a more celebrated episode, the bookseller Richard Bentley was desperate for Thomas Otway to burnish the manuscript of *The Soldier's Fortune* (1681) with some paratextual matter. When Otway failed to find a suitable dedicatee or write a preface in time, he dedicated the quarto to the bookseller himself:

Mr. *Bentley*,

> I Have often (during this Plays being in the Press) been importun'd for a Preface; which you, I suppose, would have speak something in Vindication of the Comedy: Now to please you, Mr. *Bentley*, … be pleas'd to accept of [this] … as a Dedication to your self, and next as a Preface to the Book … Wherefore … make the best of it you can; praise it to your Customers: Sell ten thousand of them if possible, and then you will compleat the wishes of Your Friend and Servant, *THO. OTWAY*.[56]

[54]Crowne, *Henry the Sixth*, sig. A2r; Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, 267.
[55]Bailey, *The Spightful Sisters*, no sig.
[56]Otway, *The Souldiers Fortune*, sigs. A2r-A3r.

As comically self-referential as Otway's dedication was, the instruction that Bentley praise it to his customers surely drew upon some knowledge of Restoration bookshop sales practices, whereby the details of a playwright's dedication could be used to promote new works to customers.[57] Elkanah Settle was explicit that stationers were directly asking playwrights for dedications, complaining in the dedication to *The Empress of Morocco* (1673) that even plays damned by theatre audiences were still required to carry them:

> The Bookseller . . . whispers the Poet, and tells him, Sir, Your Play had misfortune, and all that — but if you'd but write a Dedication, or Preface — The Poet takes the hint, picks out a person of Honour, tells him he has a great deal of Wit, . . . Disputes the nature of Verse, Answers a Cavil or two, Quibbles upon the Court, Huffs the Critiques, and the work's don. 'Tis not to be imagin'd how far a sheet of this goes to make a Bookseller Rich, and a Poet Famous.[58]

Given that the publication of Settle's play prompted Dryden to enter a vituperative print controversy with its author, this bad-tempered dig about rich booksellers and famous poets is most likely a reference to the Dryden and Herringman collaboration, complaining that it was their creative partnership that was driving the contemporary dedicatory habit.[59]

Disgracing genius, or, selling playbooks without self-detestation: Dryden's *The State of Innocence* (1677)

The Dryden-Herringman collaboration resulted in what has frequently been regarded as the creative nadir of Dryden's career: the quarto publication of *The State of Innocence* (1677), his operatic adaptation of John Milton's *Paradise Lost*, complete with its fulsome dedication to Mary of Modena, Duchess of York (1658–1718). A critical tradition since Samuel Johnson's barb that it 'disgraces genius' has derided Dryden's opera, dubbing it a 'vulgarisation' of Milton's epic, a 'literary husk', 'strangely degraded', 'artistically grotesque' or '*Paradise Lost* thrown in a blender'.[60] Even the staunchest defenders of Dryden's opera concede that its dedication is 'most extreme' even by the standards of Renaissance panegyric.[61] However, from the vantage point of the Restoration playbook trade we have attained up to this point, the quarto edition of *The State of Innocence* would be much better regarded as the zenith of the Dryden-Herringman collaboration, since it offers one of the most complete syntheses of paratext and play text of any Restoration playbook.

The synthesis was signalled from the work's title page. The full title runs: *The State of Innocence*, | *AND* | *FALL of MAN*: | *AN* | *OPERA*. | *Written in Heroique Verse*, | *And Dedicated to Her Royal Highness*, | *THE DUTCHESS*. | *By John Dryden, Servant to His Majesty*. Such advertising of a dedication on the title page of a Restoration quarto playbook, as opposed to an alternative paratext like a prefatory critical essay, was

[57]On stationers' in-shop sales techniques see Loveman, *Samuel Pepys and His Books*, 178–82.
[58]Settle, *The Empress of Morocco*, sig. A2v.
[59]MacDonald, *Dryden*, p. 206.
[60]Ferry, *Milton and the Miltonic Dryden*, 21; Roston, *Biblical Drama*, 178; Raymond, *Milton's Angels*, 333. For an overview of the scholarship on Dryden's opera see Gabel, *Paradise Reframed*, 8–15.
[61]James Winn, *'When Beauty Fires the Blood'*, 412.

unprecedented and not widely imitated. [62] It was, however, a feature retained in all subsequent seventeenth-century printings of Dryden's opera, the rights to which Herringman retained until he eventually sold them to Jacob Tonson and Thomas Bennet, who in their 1703 quarto dropped the dedication detail from the title-page.[63] If this intimates at the centrality the dedication held for both Dryden and Herringman alike in this playbook's marketing, we need to recognise, too, that they had longer than usual to think about its presentation and contents. Even though Dryden had probably written his opera for the opening of the new Drury Lane Theatre in March 1674 (and Herringman's registration of copy with the Stationers Company on 17 April makes this likely), the nature of Milton's contract with his bookseller Samuel Simmons, which restricted republication of work of the 'same tenor or subject' as *Paradise Lost*, meant that it did not appear in print for another three years.[64] During that lag period, the opera had an astonishing life in contemporary manuscript culture; since it remained unperformed having not been finally chosen for the Drury Lane opening, Dryden claimed that 'many hundred copies [were] ... dispers'd abroad without my knowledge or consent'.[65] When the quarto eventually appeared, therefore, it had to contend with the fact that no theatre audience had actually seen it, but many had already encountered complete versions and variants of it via scribal circulation, a unique set of pressures for the marketing of a Dryden playbook. This led Dryden and his stationer to emphasise its status as a print commodity, accentuating features that scribal readers and copyists had been unable to encounter, but playbook buyers familiar with Dryden and Herringman's ways might reasonably have expected. Thus, while manuscript copies of the opera contained no preliminaries, readers of the quarto got, in addition to Dryden's libretto: Dryden's 1800-word dedication to the Duchess of York; a commendatory poem by one of the rising stars of the King's theatre company, Nathaniel Lee (1649–92); and the poet laureate's literary critical essay on hyperbole and genre decorum, 'The Authors Apology for Heroique Poetry: and Poetique License', which contained Dryden's assessment of the contemporary English literary scene.[66] This offering, as well as the sheer audacity of Dryden's decision to adapt a work by one of the most renowned literary figures of the age, caused, as is well known, *The State of Innocence* to sell very handsomely, far outstripping the steady sales of the early quarto and octavo editions of Milton's original poem.[67] *The State of Innocence* also proved to be the most successful playbook that Herringman ever produced, which perhaps explains why he only sold the rights to Tonson and Bennet in the year before his death. Nine editions of it appeared between 1677 and 1695 in a stable text, the first quarto being the only substantive printing with subsequent editions, including a piracy, exhibiting only minor variations in spelling and punctuation.[68]

If Herringman and Dryden carefully deliberated the structure of that quarto, the latter was sensitive to the impact the first printing would have amongst his contemporaries. His

[62]The only other surviving play quartos imitating this strategy were Cooke's *Love's Triumph*, and Edward Eccleston's *Noah's Flood*) which, by its 1714 edition advertised itself as a sequel to Dryden's *State of Innocence*. For a fuller discussion of Dryden's title-page and the early printings of *Paradise Lost* see Gabel *Paradise Reframed*, 85–117.
[63]Dryden, *The State of Innocence*.
[64]Winn, *John Dryden*, p. 262; Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 320–1. All future references will be to this edition unless specified.
[65]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 86; Hamilton, 'The Manuscripts of Dryden's *State of Innocence*': 237–46.
[66]For one preliminary-free manuscript of the opera see Bodleian, MS Rawl. C. 146, ff. 103 r-22 r.
[67]On the early sales of *Paradise Lost* see Poole, *Milton and the Making of Paradise*, 157.
[68]Hamilton, 'The Early Editions of Dryden's *The State of Innocence*', 163–166; Macdonald, *John Dryden*, 115–117.

prefatory 'Apology for Heroique Poetry' is profoundly circumspect, defending the work's hyperbole (and hyperbole itself as a rhetorical mode) from detractors who had read the opera in manuscript. '*Catachreses* and *Hyperboles*', he contended, are 'not to be avoided, but … but us'd judiciously, and plac'd in Poetry as heightenings and shadows are in Painting, to make the Figure bolder, and cause it to stand off to sight'.[69] He was especially touchy about the ridicule attached to an early description of decadent angels 'dissolv'd in Hallelujahs' - one wag reportedly snorted that that they had heard of anchovies 'dissolv'd in sauce' but never of emulsified seraphim – and justified the outlandish turn of the metaphor by comparing it to Virgil's evocation of the vulnerability of Troy 'buried in sleep and wine' ('somno vinoque sepultam') in Book II of the *Aeneid*.[70] He defended, too, Nathaniel Lee's commendatory poem for the quarto asking that it 'be esteem'd the effect of his love to me, than of his deliberate and sober judgment. His Genius is to make beautiful what he pleases'.[71] However, Dryden never once apologised for the book's dedication to the Roman Catholic Mary of Modena, no matter how much later critics have loathed it or deemed it an astonishing provocation due to the febrile atmosphere and anti-Catholic hostility of the Popish Plot.[72] Rather, he emphasised its centrality to the decision to produce a printed edition at all:

> In the first place … my chiefest Motive, was the Ambition which I acknowledg'd in the [dedicatory] Epistle. I was desirous to lay at the feet of so Beautiful and Excellent a Princess, a Work which I confess was unworthy her, but which I hope she will have the goodness to forgive. I was also induc'd to it in my own defence: many hundred Copies of it being dispers'd abroad without my knowledge or consent: so that every one gathering new faults, it became at length a Libel against me.[73]

Scholars have carefully attended to the second of Dryden's stated reasons for having his unperformed opera printed: a quarto would provide author-approved textual stability denied by widespread scribal publication.[74] But few have taken seriously the primary reason for the existence of the edition proffered here by Dryden himself: that he wanted to dedicate his opera to Mary of Modena in print from the outset, and that the dedication is at the heart of his edition rather than an excessive distraction from its principal creative business.[75]

This urge to centre the Duchess in his opera may be Dryden's attempt to show her and her new husband that, despite the widespread public hostility to their recent match (Parliament tried to block it in October 1673 and orchestrated the first Pope-burning procession through the capital that November), not everybody regarded the arrival of a teenage Italian heiress as an opportunity for violent anti-Catholicism.[76] Whether or not, as some critics have suggested, *The State of Innocence* was first conceived of as a wedding entertainment for the couple, Mary of Modena's fondness for music as well as her avid consumption of theatre and spectacle were surely significant drivers of Dryden's decision

[69]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 91.
[70]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*. 95, 351.
[71]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 86.
[72]On the dedication as a provocation see Zwicker, 'John Dryden Meets, Rhymes, and Says Farewell', 185.
[73]Dryden, *State of Innocence*, 86.
[74]von Maltzahn, 'Dryden's Milton and the Theatre of Imagination', 32–56.
[75]James Winn has read the dedication in relation to the quarto playbook as a whole, but even he finds 'the notorious excess of the dedication difficult to explain'; Winn, *'When Beauty Fires the Blood'*, 411.
[76]Winn, *John Dryden*, 253. On the Pope-burning processions see Johnson, *Rehearsing the Revolution*, 64–83

to dedicate the opera to her.[77] In addition to her contributions to musical culture at court, bringing a consort of Italian musicians to play at her chapel, Robert Hooke saw her shortly after her marriage at a performance of Settle's *The Empress of Morrocco* in December 1673; she repeatedly went to Bartholomew Fair in 1675 and became patron to the dramatist George Etherege in that same year.[78] Dryden's dedication to her, then, is just the first of *The State of Innocence's* many efforts to re-orient Milton's original poem away from Puritan aesthetics and ethics and towards the dominant tastes of the Stuart court, whose appeal, as poet laureate and pensioned writer for the King's Company, it was Dryden's happy duty to promulgate. Even though he hymned *Paradise Lost* as 'one of the greatest, most noble, and most sublime Poems, which either Age or Nation has produc'd' and situated the epic as the glorious culmination of a tradition running from Homer, through Virgil, Ariosto, and Tasso, he had no qualms about entirely reimagining the poem's foundational loyalties.[79] If the replacement of Milton's blank verse with heroic couplets is the most notorious of these changes, it sits alongside a commitment to unmoralised spectacle, a decision to present Eve as less ethically complex, as well as an audaciously witty conscription of core dissenter and republican concepts into the service of the system of aristocratic patronage. Thus Dryden's dedication informed Mary of Modena that her beauty obsessed and enraptured everyone she met; as a result she had 'subverted . . .. even our Fundamental Laws; and Reign[ed] absolute over the hearts of a stubborn and Freeborn people tenacious almost to madness of their Liberty', neutralising the egalitarian clarion calls of interregnum and Restoration radical politics by recoding them as the language of court intrigue.[80] The dedication repurposed *Paradise Lost*'s creative allegiances, too. Whereas Milton left it to his readers to find the breadcrumbs back to Ariosto and Tasso through his poem's imitations of baroque rhetoric or its revision of the goals and expectations of romance heroism, Dryden explicitly used the patronage networks surrounding his dedicatee's family to connect his version of *Paradise Lost* back to those two earlier authors.[81] By asserting that his adaptation belonged to and was inspired by the Duchess, he claimed creative kinship with these giants of Italian Renaissance literary culture whose achievements, he contended, were the result of enlightened and generous patron–client relations. Dryden acknowledged that there was precedent for his dedicatory act – Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (1516) and Tasso's *Gerusalem Liberata* (1581) both signalled their debts to the Este dynasty, Mary of Modena's forbears – and was willing to 'yield without envy, to the Nation of Poets, the Family of *Este* to which *Ariosto* and *Tasso* have ow'd their Patronage; and to which the World has ow'd their Poems'.[82]

To strengthen this connection, Dryden quoted a quatrain from *Orlando Furioso* in the Italian to his 18-year-old dedicatee. The passage centred on the dazzling effects of the Duchess's beauty on the sight of those she encountered, likening it to an episode from canto 2 of Ariosto's poem where the magical shield of the sorcerer Atlantes temporarily blinded all who saw it (the aptness of the extravagant comparison is grounded in the fact

[77]McDonald, *John Dryden*, 115.
[78]Winn, *When Beauty Fires the* Blood, 208; Robinson and Adams (eds.), *The Diary of Robert Hooke*, 73; Van Lennep et al. (eds.), *The London Stage 1660–1800*, 235 Etherege, *Man of Mode*, sig. A2^{r}.
[79]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, p. 86.
[80]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 83.
[81]On *Paradise Lost*'s creative allegiances see Quint, *Epic and Empire*; Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 483.
[82]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 81.

that Atlantes is a protector of Ruggiero, a protagonist positioned in Book I as the founder of the Duchess's Este lineage).[83] Just as, in Sir John Harrington's translation of the same lines, the shield cast 'such light [as] was never seene with mortall eye' and made 'to ground . . . lookers-on decline',[84] Dryden imagines the Duchess as endlessly gazed-upon, but stunning and disabling everybody around her:

> You are never seen but You are blest: and I am sure You bless all those who see You. We think not the Day is long enough when we behold You: And You are so much the business of our Soules, that while You are in sight, we can neither look not think on any else. There are no Eyes for other Beauties: *You only are present . . . your Person is a Paradice*, and your Soul a Cherubin within to guard it. *If the excellence of the outside invite the Beholders, the Majesty of your Mind deters them from too bold approaches*.[85]

Samuel Johnson, as we have seen, thought it impossible to write such words without 'self-detestation'; but Dryden, as Johnson did not acknowledge, very carefully tailored his dedication to the contents of the playbook it prefaced. The paradisal, singular, and solitary beauty of the Duchess is envisaged as a Restoration emanation of that of Dryden's Eve, with the exception that the former, unlike her Biblical predecessor, is protected by the qualities of her mind from the temptations occasioned by calamitous and over-bold approaches.

If the Duchess is a new and improved Eve, Dryden's old one experiences some of the trials of her seventeenth-century descendent. Eve's emergence into consciousness is presented as an awareness of being looked at. Even before she sees her own reflection in an Eden that resembles an aristocratic estate – she catches herself in a fountain rather than Milton's smooth lake – her very first speech reveals a sense of herself as a spectacle at the top of a species hierarchy. Whereas Milton's heroine begins speaking in *Paradise Lost* with an uncomfortable awareness of her subjection under divine patriarchy ('O thou [Adam] for whom/And from whom I was formd'), when Dryden's Eve first opens her mouth she reveals only that she is insufferably superior. She instinctively understands that she is peerless, born to domineer, and proudly knows, without having lived long at all, that she is envied and worth the attention:

> Like myself, I see nothing: from each Tree
> The feather'd kind peep down, to look on me;
> And Beasts, with up-cast eyes, forsake their shade,
> And gaze, as if I were to be obeyed.
> Sure I am somewhat which they wish to be,
> And cannot: I myself am proud of me.[86]

As Dryden's dedication makes abundantly clear, Mary of Modena, though still young herself, suffers from none of these vices. Her soul guards her person so attentively that her very existence expands the ethical possibilities of womanhood, or, as Dryden tells her directly, 'Moral perfections are rais'd higher by you in the softer Sex'.[87]

This gap between Dryden's Eve and his dedicatee is emphasised by his depiction of the former's experience of socialisation in Eden. From the moment she encounters Adam

[83]Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, 1.4. 3–4.
[84]Harrington *Orlando Furioso*, 13.
[85]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 82, 83, 84 (emphasis added).
[86]Milton, *Paradise Lost*, 4.459; Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 2.3.10–15.
[87]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 84

through to her temptation by Lucifer, Eve's being-in-the-world is figured as her exposure to hyperbolic panegyric. When Adam first meets her, he sounds as if he has been taking cues from Dryden's dedication to the Duchess:

> O Virgin, Heav'n begot, and born of Man,
> Thou fairest of thy great Creator's Works . . .
> Nature, in triumph, after thee is led.
> Angels, with pleasure, view thy matchless Grace,
> And love their Maker's Image in thy Face.[88]

Eve's vanity and susceptibility to such rhetoric is what makes her the agent of the Fall in Dryden's imagination; it is also, precisely, what distinguishes her from the playbook's dedicatee.[89] In contrast to the Duchess's 'Moral perfections', as soon as she becomes conscious, Eve is 'pleas'd' by such adulation since it validates her estimation of her self-worth. She tells Adam that his oratory means that 'next myself, [I] admire and love thee best' and, unlike *Paradise Lost*, progresses around Eden like a coquettish Restoration mistress who already understands the rules of courtship and desire.[90] She responds to Adam's grandiloquent overtures by telling him 'you long should beg, I long deny' and, innately jealous before the Fall, intuitively senses the probability of rakish infidelity in paradise: 'some other [woman] may be made;/And her new Beauty may thy [Adam's] heart invade'.[91] Whereas Mary of Modena deterred the 'too bold approaches' of her admirers, Dryden's Eve has no defence against Lucifer's flattery when she encounters him:

> Hail, Sovereign of this Orb! form'd to possess
> The world, and with one look, all nature bless.
> Nature is thine; thou, Empress, dost bestow
> On fruits, to blossom; and on flowers to blow.
> They happy, yet insensible to boast
> Their bliss: more happy they who know thee most.[92]

In the equivalent moment in *Paradise Lost*, Milton's narrator calls such Satanic smooth talk 'glozing', or deceptively manipulative praise.[93] Dryden thought that it sounded just like dedicatory rhetoric. When he offered the first quarto of *Tyrannick Love* to the Duke of Monmouth in 1670, having, several years previously, already dedicated *The Indian Emperor* to Anna Scott, the Duchess of Monmouth, he admitted that he was in danger of seeming like 'the Serpent who first presented the fruit of my Poetry to the wife, and so gained the opportunity to seduce the Husband'.[94] While he swerved this comparison in the preliminaries for *The State of Innocence*, by so carefully counterposing the imagined characters of Eve and Mary of Modena throughout the text of the quarto, he demonstrated that dedications could be much more than paratextual adornment, and that they could transform the ways in which dramatic character might be read. Dryden's Duchess

[88]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 2.3.28–35.
[89]Elsewhere, Dryden describes Eve as one of the 'two Devils' that Adam had to resist in Eden; *Absalom and Achitophel, A Poem*, sig. A2v.
[90]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 2.3. 45.
[91]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 2.3. 55, 68–9.
[92]Dearing, *Works of John Dryden*, 4.2.36–43.
[93]Milton, *Paradise Lost*, 9.549: 'So gloz'd the Tempter, and his Proem tun'd'.
[94]Dryden, *Tyrannick Love*, sig. A3^{r}.

of York is every bit as rhetorically constructed as his Eve; she is, however, an improvement on her Old Testament forbear since her 'Majesty of . . . Mind' enables her to resist the temptation to regard grandiloquence as truth and, instead, to recognise praise, even dedicatory praise, as rhetoric.

Conclusion

Dryden and Herringman, as we have seen, certainly regarded such rhetoric as seductive and a useful way to sell playbooks. It is likely, therefore, that the sideswipes from *Mac Flecknoe* with which we began were offered out of a satirist's resentment for the way that the 1676 edition of Shadwell's *The Virtuoso*, decrying Dryden's income and pre-eminence in print to a patron, debased the dedicatory arts that Dryden and his first stationer had inaugurated. In their hands, as *The State of Innocence* shows, the playbook dedication became anything but a formal trifle. If, from Dryden's perspective, Herringman had shown poor judgment in allowing Shadwell's northern dedications to be printed, he was nonetheless, as I have argued, the first stationer to appreciate the full potential that printed dedications offered for playbooks, and always gave Dryden the latitude to explore their paratextual possibilities, even if that meant more pages to print and potentially delayed a play's appearance on the bookseller's shelves. After *The State of Innocence*, Dryden and Herringman produced just one more new play quarto together, *All for Love, or the World Well Lost* (1678), with a lengthy preface on tragedy and vernacular translation, and a 2300-word, stridently Tory dedication to another intensely controversial public figure, Thomas Osborne, first earl of Danby (1631–1712). In that year Herringman moved into wholesale bookselling, presumably finding it more lucrative, gradually turning over his retail business in new plays to Francis Saunders and Joseph Knight.[95] This meant that Dryden had to find himself a new bookseller. Eventually, that stationer, the ambitious, entrepreneurial Jacob Tonson, still in his early 20s, found him; he paid Dryden an astonishing £20 – approximately four times the going rate – for the copy of *Troilus and Cressida* (1679), which included the text of Dryden's rewrite of Shakespeare's play, an epochal essay on 'The Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy', as well as 2000 words of dedication to another eminent politician close to the king, Robert Spencer, second earl of Sunderland (1641–1702).[96] Dryden and Tonson were clearly publishing this playbook according to expectations and practices that the former had modelled with Herringman; they never once deviated from this format with the quarto playbooks they produced together for the rest of Dryden's career.

Between *All for Love* and *Troilus and Cressida*, however, there appeared a bibliographic anomaly, the first quarto edition of Dryden's and Nathaniel Lee's hit adaptation of Sophocles' *Oedipus*, which was prefaced by an uncharacteristically brief essay on translation and carried no dedication at all.[97] We saw at the outset how James Winn read this paratextual absence as politically profound, as evidence that Dryden was avoiding dedication altogether in order to navigate the hurricane conditions of the Exclusion Crisis, 'afraid to choose a patron . . . lest he fall from power'. Given all we

[95]Wheatley, 'Dryden's Publishers', 25; Miller, 'Henry Herringman', 296–301.
[96]Lynch, Tonson, 16; Milhous and Hume, *Publication of* Plays, 166; Dryden, *Troilus and Cressida*.
[97]Dryden and Lee, *Oedipus: A Tragedy*.

now know about Dryden's dedicatory habits, his relationships with his booksellers, and the ways in which the material conditions of playbook production might contribute to literary meaning, this is extremely improbable. Much more likely is that the quarto appeared in its unusual, relatively abbreviated format because its stationers, Richard Bentley and Mary Magnes, wanted it to appear quickly to capitalise upon the adaptation's 10-day run in the theatre and were willing to sacrifice a dedication, and the delays that such paratexts might occasion, to facilitate that.[98] They had recent experience of such a delay with Dryden's *The Kind Keeper*, staged by the Duke's Company in March 1678 but not printed, with its dedication to John Vaughan, third earl of Carbery (1639–1713), until over 18 months later with Dryden still complaining that the publication process was hurried and slapdash: 'it was printed in my absence from the Town, this summer, much against my expectation, otherwise I had over-lookd the Press'.[99] Dryden switched stationers again after this interlude, settling with Tonson and changing forever the nature of literary publishing in English. It was not just Tonson's substantial payment for *Troilus and Cressida* that lured the laureate to work with him, however; it was also Tonson's willingness to imitate the dedicatory habits and playbook design that Dryden and Henry Herringman had forged together.

Acknowledgements

I am extremely grateful to the following people for reading earlier versions of this article and making it better than it might otherwise have been: Frances Babbage, Maureen Bell, Tom Lockwood, Sam Nevitt, Emma Rhatigan, Tom Rutter, Cathy Shrank as well as the editor and the anonymous reviewer for *The Seventeenth Century*.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Bodleian Library, Oxford: MS Rawl. C. 146.

Printed Works

Absalom and Achitophel, a Poem (London: J.T. 1681).
Arber, Edward. *The Term Catalogues, 1668-1709*. 3 vols. London: privately printed, 1903-1906.
Archer, Stanley L. 'The Epistle Dedicatory in Restoration Drama', *Restoration and eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 10.1 (1971): 8–13.
Ariosto, Lodovico. *Orlando Furioso, Part I*. Translated by Barbara Reynolds. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975.
Bailey, Abraham. *The Spightful Sister: A New Comedy*. London: Thomas Dring, 1667.

[98]Van Lennep, *London Stage*, 273.
[99]Dryden, *The Kind Keeper*, sig. A4r.

Bernard, Stephen (ed.) with John McTague. *The Correspondence of John Dryden*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2022.
Blayney, Peter. 'The Publication of Playbooks'. In *A New History of Early English Drama*, edited by John D. Cox, and David Scott Kastan, 383–422. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
Combe, Kirk. '"But Loads of S__ Almost Chok'd the Way": Shadwell, Dryden, Rochester, and the Summer of 1676.' *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 37.2 (1995):127–164.
Connor Francis X. 'Henry Herringman, Richard Bentley and Shakespeare's Fourth Folio'. In *Canonising Shakespeare: Stationers and the Book Trade 1640–1740*, edited by Emma Depledge and Peter Kirwan, 38–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
Cooke, Edward. *Love's Triumph, or, the Royal Union: A Tragedy . . . Dedicated to Her Highness the Princess of Orange*. London: Thomas James, 1678.
Crowne, John. *Henry the Sixth, the First Part*. London: R. Bentley and M. Magnes, 1681.
Dearing, Vinton A. *The Works of John Dryden: Volume XII*. Berkeley CA and London: University of California Press, 1994.
Depledge, Emma Lesley. 'Playbills, Prologues, and Playbooks: Selling Shakespeare Adaptations, 1678-82', *Philological Quarterly* 91 (2012): 305–330.
Dryden, John. *The Rival Ladies, a Tragi-Comedy*. London: Henry Herringman, 1664.
Dryden, John. *The Indian Emperour, or, the Conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards*. London: Henry Herringman, 1667.
Dryden, John. *Secret Love, or, the Maiden Queen*. London: Henry Herringman, 1668.
Dryden, John. *Tyrannick Love, or, the Royal Martyr*. London: Henry Herringman, 1670.
Dryden, John. *An Evening's Love, or the Mock Astrologer*. London: Henry Herringman, 1671.
Dryden, John. *The Assignation, or Love in a Nunnery*. London: Henry Herringman, 1673.
Dryden, John. *Aureng-Zebe, A Tragedy*. London: Henry Herringman, 1676.
Dryden, John. *Troilus and Cressida, or Truth Found Too Late*. London: Jacob Tonson and Abel Swall, 1679.
Dryden, John. *The Kind Keeper or Mr Limberham*. London: Richard Bentley and Mary Magnes, 1680.
Dryden, John. *The Spanish Fryar*. London: Richard Tonson and Jacob Tonson, 1681.
Dryden, John. *Cleomenes, the Spartan Hero: A Tragedy*. London: Jacob Tonson, 1692.
Dryden, John. *Love Triumphant, or, Nature Will Prevail*. London: Jacob Tonson, 1694.
Dryden, John. *The State of Innocence, and Fall of Man: An Opera. Written in Heroick Verse. By Mr Dryden*. London: J. Tonson and T. Bennet, 1703.
Dryden, John and Lee, Nathaniel. *Oedipus: A Tragedy*. London: Richard Bentley and Mary Magnes, 1679.
Eccleston, Edward. *Noah's Flood, an Opera. Dedicated to Her Grace the Duchess of Monmouth*. London: B. Tooke, 1679.
Etherege, George. *The Man of Mode, or Sir Fopling Flutter*. London: Henry Herringman, 1676.
Ferry, Anne. *Milton and the Miltonic Dryden*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1968.
Gabel, Tobia. *Paradise Reframed: Milton, Dryden, and the Politics of Literary Adaptation*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2016.
Geduld, H.M. *Prince of Publishers: A Study of the Work and Career of Jacob Tonson*. Bloomington, IN and London: Indiana University Press, 1969.
Gillespie, Stuart. 'The Early Years of the Dryden-Tonson Partnership.' *Restoration* 12.1 (1988): 10–19.
Hamilton, Marion H. 'The Early Editions of Dryden's *The State of Innocence*.' *Studies in Bibliography* 5 (1952/1953): 163–166.
Hamilton, Marion H. 'The Manuscripts of Dryden's *State of Innocence* and the Relation of the Harvard MS to the First Quarto.' *Studies in Bibliography* 6 (1954): 237–46
Hammond, Paul, ed. *The Poems of John Dryden. Volume I:1649–1681*. London: Longman, 1995.
Hammond, Paul. *The Making of Restoration Poetry*. Cambridge: D.S Brewer, 2006.
Hammond, Paul. 'The Circulation of Dryden's Poetry'. *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 86.4 (1992): 379–409.

Hammond, Paul and Hopkins, David (eds.). *Dryden: Selected Poems*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd, 2007.
Harrington, John. *Orlando Furioso in English Heroical Verse, by Sr Iohn Harington of Bathe, Knight*. London: Richard Field, 1591.
Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan, or, the Matter, Forme, and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil*. London: Andrew Crooke, 1651.
Hotson, Leslie. *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1928.
Howard, Edward. *The Usurper, a Tragedy*. London: Henry Herringman, 1668.
Howard, Robert. *Poems*. London: Henry Herringman, 1660.
Hume, Robert D. *Dryden's Criticism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1970.
Hume, Robert D. 'Theory of Comedy in the Restoration.' *Modern Philology* 70.4 (1973): 302–318.
Hume, Robert D. *Paratext Printed with New English Plays, 1660-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.
Johnson, Odai. *Rehearsing the Revolution: Radical Performance, Radical Politics in the English Restoration*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2000.
Johnson, Samuel. *The Lives of the Poets; and a Criticism on Their Works: Volume I*. Dublin: William Wilson, 1781.
Lee, Nathaniel. *Mithridates, King of Pontus, a Tragedy*. London: James Magnes, 1678.
Lee, Nathaniel. *Lucius Junius Brutus, Father of His Country, a Tragedy*. London: Richard Tonson, 1681.
Lee, Nathaniel. *The Princess of Cleve*. London: Abel Roper, 1689.
Loveman, Kate. *Samuel Pepys and His Books: Reading, Newsgathering, and Sociability, 1660–1703*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
Lynch, Katherine M. *Jacob Tonson: Kit-Kat Publisher*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1971.
Macdonald, Hugh. *John Dryden: A Bibliography of Early Editions and of Drydeniana*. London: Dawsons, 1966.
The Medal of John Bayes: A Satyr Against Folly and Knavery. London: Richard Janeway, 1682.
Milhous, Judith and Hume, Robert D. 'Dating Play Premières from Publication Data, 1660–1700.' *Harvard Library Bulletin* 22.4 (1974): 374–405.
Milhous, Judith and Hume, Robert D. 'Playwrights' Remuneration in Eighteenth-Century London'. *Harvard Library Bulletin* 10 (1999): 3–90.
Miller, C. William. 'Henry Herringman, Restoration Bookseller-Publisher.' *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 42.4 (1948): 292–30.
Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*, edited by Alastair Fowler. 2nd ed. Harlow: Longman, 1997.
Miscellany Poems: In Two Parts. Containing New Translations Out of Virgil, Lucretius, Horace, Ovid, Theocritus, and Other Authours. With Several Original Poems. By the Most Eminent Hands. Published by Mr. Dryden. London: Jacob Tonson, 1692.
Nevitt, Marcus. 'The Politics of Restoration Playbooks.' *The History of European Ideas* (2025). doi: 10.1080/01916599.2025.2528402
Norbrook, David. *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric, Politics, 1627–1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
Oden, Richard L. *Dryden and Shadwell: The Literary Controversy and Mackflecnoe, 1668–1678*. Delmar, NY: Scholar Facsimiles and Reprints, 1977.
Osborn, James M. *John Dryden: Some Biographical Facts and Problems*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.
Otway, Thomas. *The Souldiers Fortune, a Comedy*. London: R. Bentley and R. Magnes, 1681.
Poole, William. *Milton and the Making of Paradise Lost*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2017.
Robinson Henry W. and Adams, Walter (eds.), *The Diary of Robert Hooke, M.A. M.D. F.R.S. 1672–1680*. London: Wykeham Publications Ltd, 1968.
Payne, Deborah C. *The Business of English Restoration Theatre, 1660–1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2024.

Quint, David. *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
Raven, James. *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade, 1450–1850*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007.
Ravenscroft, Edward. *The Careless Lovers, a Comedy*. London: William Cademan, 1673.
Raymond, William. *Milton's Angels: The Early Modern Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
Roston, Murray. *Biblical Drama in England: From the Middle Ages to the Present Day*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
Settle, Elkanah. *The Empress of Morocco*. London: William Cademan, 1673.
Shadwell, Thomas. *The Virtuoso, a Comedy*. London: Henry Herringman, 1676.
Smith, Jack R. 'Shadwell's Impact Upon Dryden.' *Review of English Studies* 20 (1944): 29–44.
Tatham, John. *The Rump*. London: R. Bloome, 1661.
Van Lennep, William et al. (eds.). *The London Stage 1660-1800*, *Part I*, *1660-1700*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.
The Vindication, or, the Parallel of the French Holy-League and the English League and Covenant. London: Jacob Tonson, 1683.
von Maltzahn, Nicholas. 'Dryden's Milton and the Theatre of Imagination.' In *John Dryden: Tercentenary Essays* edited by Paul Hammond and David Hopkins, 32–56. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
West, John. *Dryden and Enthusiasm: Literature, Religion, and Politics in Restoration England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
Wheatley, Henry B. 'Dryden's Publishers.' *The Library*, Issue 1 (1909): 17–38.
Winn, James Anderson. *John Dryden and His World*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987.
Winn, James Anderson. *'When Beauty Fires the Blood': Love and the Arts in the Age of Dryden*. Ann Arbour: University of Michigan Press, 1997.
Wycherley, William *The Country Wife*. London: Thomas Dring, 1675.
Wagonheim, Sylvia Stoler. *Annals of English Drama 975–1700: An Analytical Record of All Plays, Extant or Lost, Chronologically Arranged and Indexed by Authors, Titles, Dramatic Companies &c*. Third edition. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.
Zwicker, Steven N. 'John Dryden Meets, Rhymes, and Says Farewell to John Milton: A Restoration Drama in Three Acts'. In *Milton in the Long Restoration* edited by Blair Hoxby and Ann Baynes, 181–190. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Appendix A

Henry Herringman's New Quarto Playbooks[100]

Date of 1st Quarto	Playwright(s)	Title	Printer	ESTC No.	Dedicatee
1663	Samuel Tuke,	*The Adventures of Five Hours*	William Wilson	R23158	Henry Howard, 6th Duke of Norfolk
1663	Abraham Cowley	*Cutter of Coleman-Street*	William Wilson	R21561	none
1663	Thomas Porter	*The Villain*	__	R12291	none
1664	George Etherege	*The Comical Revenge*	__	R21296	Charles Sackville, Lord Buckhurst
1664	Charles Sedley et al.	*Pompey the Great*	William Wilson	R2242	none
1664	Thomas Porter	*The Carnival*	__	R9392	none
1664	John Dryden	*The Rival Ladies*	William Wilson	R72	Roger Boyle, 1st Earl of Orrery
1667	John Dryden	*The Indian Emperour, or, The Conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards*	John Macock	R404	Anna Scott, Duchess of Monmouth
1667	John Weston	*The Amazon Queen*	__	R30187	none
1668	Thomas St. Serfe	*Tarugo's Wiles, or, The Coffee-House*	__	R27882	George Gordon, Marquesse of Huntly
1668	Charles Sedley	*The Mulberry-Garden*	__	R8813	none
1668	Edward Howard	*The Usurper*	__	R11923	none
1668	George Etherege	*She Would if She Could*	John Macock	R1834	none
1668	John Dryden	*Secret-Love, or, The Maiden-Queen*	__	R120	none
1668	Robert Howard	*The Great Favourite, or, The Duke of Lerma*	__	R15573	none
1668	William Cavendish and John Dryden	*Sr. Martin Mar-all, or, The Feign'd Innocence,*	__	R4440	none
1668	Thomas Shadwell	*The Sullen Lovers, or, The Impertinents*	__	R13843	William Cavendish, 1st Duke of Newcastle
1669	John Dryden	*The Wild Gallant*	Thomas Newcomb	R31381	none
1669	Thomas Shadwell	*The Royal Shepherdess*	__	R11510	none

(*Continued*)

[100]This data is derived from the ESTC and Wagonheim, *Annals of English Drama 975–1700* __ indicates that the printer is not named on the quarto title-page and is not cited by the EST.

(Continued).

Date of 1st Quarto	Playwright(s)	Title	Printer	ESTC No.	Dedicatee
1669	William Davenant	*The Man's the Master*	—	R6415	none
1670	John Dryden	*Tyrannick Love, or, The Royal Martyr*	—	R4038	James Scott, 1st Duke of Monmouth
1670	John Dryden and William Davenant	*The Tempest, or, The Enchanted Island*	John Macock	R17310	none
1671	William Joyner	*The Roman Empress*	Thomas Newcomb	R695	Charles Sedley
1671	Thomas Shadwell	*The Humorists*	—	R21339	Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle
1671	Edward Howard	*The Womens Conquest*	John Macock	R2298	none
1671	John Caryll	*Sir Salomon, or, The Cautious Coxcomb*	Thomas Newcomb	R11614	none
1671	John Dryden	*An Evening's Love, or, The Mock-Astrologer*	Thomas Newcomb	R20110	William Cavendish, 1st Duke of Newcastle
1672	William Wycherley	*Love in a Wood, or, St. James's Park*	John Macock	R7945	Duchess of Cleveland
1672	John Dryden	*The Conquest of Granada by the Spaniards in two parts*	Thomas Newcomb	R1594	James, Duke of York
1673	John Dryden	*The Assignation, or, Love in a Nunnery*	Thomas Newcomb	R19769	Charles Sedley
1673	William Davenant	*The Siege of Rhodes, Parts I and II*	—	R2178	Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of Clarendon
1673	John Dryden	*Marriage a-la Mode*	Thomas Newcomb	R3349	John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of Rochester
1673	John Dryden	*Amboyna*	Thomas Newcomb	R22616	Thomas Clifford, 1st Baron Clifford of Chudleigh.
1673	William Wycherley	*The Gentleman Dancing-Master*	John Macock	R12858	none
1673	Thomas Shadwell	*Epsom-Wells*	John Macock	R18685	William Cavendish, 1st Duke of Newcastle
1675	Thomas Shadwell	*Psyche*	Thomas Newcomb	R22616	James Scott, 1st Duke of Monmouth
1675	Francis Fane	*Love in the Dark, or, The Man of Business*	Thomas Newcomb	R16385	John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of Rochester
1676	George Etherege	*The Man of Mode, or, Sr. Fopling Flutter*	John Macock	R38861	Maria Beatrice of Modena, 2nd Duchess of York

(*Continued*)

(Continued).

Date of 1st Quarto	Playwright(s)	Title	Printer	ESTC No.	Dedicatee
1676	John Dryden	*Aureng-Zebe*	Thomas Newcomb	R19798	John Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave
1676	Thomas Shadwell	*The Libertine*	Thomas Newcomb	R21917	William Cavendish, 1st Duke of Newcastle
1676	Thomas Shadwell	*The Virtuoso*	Thomas Newcomb	R13418	William Cavendish, 1st Duke of Newcastle
1677	John Dryden	*The State of Innocence, and Fall of Man*	Thomas Newcomb	R4242	Maria Beatrice of Modena, Duchess of York
1677	William Cavendish	*The Triumphant Widow, or, The Medley of Humours*	John Macock	R8043	none
1677	William Cavendish	*The Humorous Lovers*	John Macock	R8990	none
1678	Thomas Shadwell	*The History of Timon of Athens, the Man-Hater*	John Macock	R18723	George Villiers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham
1678	John Dryden	*All for Love, or, The World Well Lost*	Thomas Newcomb	R15963	Thomas Osborne, 1st Earl of Danby