

Paul Hammond. *The Making of Restoration Poetry*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2006. xxiii + 230 pp. + 12 illus. \$90.00. Review by MATTHEW SPENCER, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL.

Paul Hammond's new book gathers related essays (two new, others reprinted and revised) which, together, constitute an absorbing reference work that should be on the shelf of serious students of the period, not least since it elucidates areas in which we are probably unaware that our knowledge is deficient. Hammond shows us that the making of a Restoration poem involves complex social, cultural and political machinery, ignorance of which makes us liable to significant interpretive mistakes. The title's *making* is expansive, including not only what poets did, but also the many ways in which their poetry was constituted and reconstituted by publishers, copyists, editors, and readers. It raises important questions both critical and editorial, sometimes answering them confidently, other times showing that confidence is not warranted.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first part Hammond charts the cultural conditions which went into the making of a Restoration poem. The first three chapters address aspects of publication. Chapter One discusses the central role of print publishers, especially Herringman and his heir Tonson (Dryden's publishers), in the formation of poetic canons. In Chapter Two, Hammond explores the effects of censorship on poetic production, which naturally encouraged anonymity and indirection, even obscurity, but which also meant that texts, especially those circulating in manuscript, were open to alteration and editing during transmission. Censorship, ironically, enabled writers and texts to speak more powerfully, partly because of the way it precipitated complex modes of writing and reading. Chapter Three zeroes in on anonymity's uses and virtues. It is not merely an editorial or attribution problem, since it vitally participated in a culture of the communal voice, or of the voice of the "network," which could presumably serve social purposes of solidarity and identification. An anonymous pamphlet could seem to channel the voice of society at large, more like the public voice of consensus than that of one disgruntled individual. Taken together, these chapters warn us to be wary of our tendency to focus on or value only the version of the

poem that (we think) left an author's hands, as against the ones which have been edited and rewritten by readers and copyists; authorial and non-authorial versions are differently authentic.

Chapter Four discusses allusiveness in the period. Hammond points out some of the different kinds of allusion (to classical sources, contemporary sources, especially *Paradise Lost*, contemporary events and political rhetoric), giving a few examples of each. He discusses the way an allusion can turn out to oppose its source. He is most interesting when discussing the way an allusion can call into play not only a particular prior textual moment, but a whole ethos. So, he writes about Dryden calling up Horace: "How blessed is he' is more than just a translation of *Beatus ille*, for it sets in motion in the mind of the reader a string of assumptions derived from Horace's poem..." (86). Such oppositional allusion also happens in topical rhetoric, as in Dryden's use of Whig keywords like *patriot* and *liberty* in *Absalom and Achitophel*, implicitly redefining the terms in opposition to the Whig political agenda. In Hammond's account, the purposes of allusion are mainly political or tactical. What is missing here is some accounting for the pleasures of allusion: allusion as company or as community (in the vein of Christopher Ricks, whose *Allusion to the Poets* (2002) Hammond cites). Otherwise, Hammond compellingly makes clear how complex "intertextuality" can be.

Chapter Five pursues intertextuality into the field of classical translation. Among other examples, Hammond studies how Royalist writers, at home or in exile, used the translation of Latin poetry to make coded statements of their loyalty to the defeated cause. Marvell's "Horatian Ode," considered under the aspect of translation, generates uncomfortable questions through troubling inconsistencies: Charles is Caesar beheaded; but then, later in the poem, Cromwell too is Caesar, this time conquering foreigners; Marvell wants us to feel how precarious these acts of analogy are—and for that matter how precarious is any act of historical interpretation of the present. At the center of this chapter is a fascinating discussion of the most celebrated translation of the period, Dryden's *Aeneid*, and of what the practice of translation meant to its great practitioner. Why did Dryden turn so frequently to translation? Was it because he wanted to give to the English language the poems that meant the most to

him and spoke most for him? No. Or at least, not so simply that. Perhaps the primary motive was economic (especially after losing the Laureateship)? Hammond speculates fruitfully about this and many other motivations.

In the final chapter of Part One, “The King’s Two Bodies,” Hammond shows how all of the contextual elements he has been exploring can converge in a single poetic problem: how to represent the king at a time when the normal ways of doing so are no longer viable. Charles’s vaunted promiscuity, and the earlier execution of his father, constituted almost insurmountable challenges to the traditional view of the royal body. Printers, editors, scribes, censors, complex allusive strategies all play their manifold parts in the ways the poetry of the period attempted to solve (or exploit) this problem.

In Part Two, Hammond gives us four fascinating case studies: the circulation of Dryden’s poetry (essential reading for any serious student of Dryden), Dryden’s choice of Flecknoe as poetical father of Shadwell in *Mac Flecknoe*, a famous textual crux in the manuscripts of Marvell’s “To His Coy Mistress,” and a history of modern critical editions of Rochester (to remind us how elusive the editorial questions are, Hammond points out that the table of contents in Harold Love’s great edition can do no better than cite “Poems *Probably* by Rochester”). Each of these in their individual ways illustrates the complex machinery of the world of Restoration poetry.

One disappointment of the book is in the invisibility of Milton. Hammond says that he was “not a significant part of ‘Restoration poetry’ as it was perceived by writers, readers, and booksellers” until the “end of this period” (xxiii). But Dryden is alluding to him as early as 1676, and Hammond does not explain why it became possible for Herringman to publish *Paradise Lost* in 1688 whereas “political caution” (6) had prevented this from happening earlier. There is also, I think, an important missing context: seventeenth-century debates about style and the English language itself. Which English words are suitable and which not? Kenneth Haynes, in *English Literature and Ancient Languages* (2003), reminds us, for example, of how Dryden “complained that Holyday’s translation of Juvenal was crowded with ‘ill sounding Monosyllables, of which our Barbarous Language affords him a wild plenty’” (68). Different relations to English could be “low”

or “high,” could evoke the character of the classic or of the modern, and this seems especially relevant to the period that produced both Milton and Rochester. Still, even with these omissions, Hammond’s book is a fine work of scholarship on Dryden, Marvell, Rochester and their contexts.

Wyman H. Herendeen. *William Camden. A Life in Context*. Woodbridge and Rochester: Boydell, 2007. xiii + 536pp. \$115.00. Review by JONATHAN WRIGHT, HARTLEPOOL, UNITED KINGDOM.

William Camden (1551-1623) will always be best remembered as the author of two extraordinarily important works: the *Britannia*, his genre-straddling study of the history, geography and cultural roots of Britain; and the *Annals of Elizabeth*, his painstaking, year-by-year account of the Virgin Queen’s reign. Wyman Herendeen certainly doesn’t want us to forget these achievements (indeed, an analysis of *Britannia* represents one of the most valuable parts of Herendeen’s book) but he would like us to remember that Camden’s life was about much more than the creation of a brace of scholarly masterpieces.

Camden, Herendeen laments, is often pushed to the margins. He usually serves as little more than “a gloss to narratives other than his own” (59). Camden was not a flamboyant person and he lived in an “understated and self-effacing” (14) fashion but, as a schoolmaster, a member of the College of Arms, and as a much-respected figure in the European republic of letters, his contribution was much greater than that of a dusty antiquarian. His role as under master (from 1575) and headmaster (from 1593) at Westminster School is perhaps the most neglected of all his non-literary accomplishments. It is easy to think of Camden reluctantly carrying out his daily pedagogical tasks while itching to get back to his study or to embark upon one of his historical fact-gathering tours around the country. This, Herendeen insists, is likely to be an inaccurate portrayal. Camden was a committed teacher who played a part in the education of many future luminaries, Robert Cotton and Ben Jonson included. Herendeen does a superb job of exploring the world of Elizabethan education which not only serves to put Camden in context but also reminds us that,