Robert Herrick (1591–1674) and his *Hesperides* have long been admired for their lyricism. After a century of relative neglect between the poet’s death and the late eighteenth century, interest in Herrick was revived by John Nichols through the *Gentleman’s Magazine*. Poems like ‘To the Virgins, to make much of Time’, ‘Corinna’s going a Maying’, ‘Delight in Disorder’, ‘To Live Merrily, and to Trust to Good Verses’, ‘How Roses came Red’, and ‘How Violets came Blue’ made Herrick the darling of nineteenth-century anthologists; Algernon Charles Swinburne called him ‘the greatest song-writer – as surely as Shakespeare is the greatest dramatist – ever born of English race’.¹ The copy of *Hesperides* now in the Newberry Library (Chicago, Illinois) was once owned by a Mr William Combes of Henley, an amiable gentleman book collector who was said to carry *Hesperides* in his right-hand coat pocket and Izaak Walton’s *Complete Angler* in his left whenever ‘with tapering rod and trembling float, he enjoys his favourite diversion of angling on the banks of the Thames’.² But the genteel songster of this pastoral vignette was not the only image of the poet to surface during the nineteenth century: at least one Herrick poem, ‘To Daffodils’, was appropriated by Chartist writers, who identified him as a poet ‘for the People’.³

During the early twentieth century, Herrick continued to be frequently anthologized, but his association with lyric ease and country jollity did not help his reputation among critics who admired the ‘strong lines’ of Ben Jonson and John Donne. Ezra Pound owned and annotated a copy of his verses; other modernists read him, but often found him lacking. For F. R. Leavis he was ‘trivially charming’; for T. S. Eliot, he was the paradigmatic ‘minor poet’.⁴ In the late 1960s and early 1970s, however, a revival of sorts began, not because the ideal of rural merriment with which Herrick was so strongly associated had come back into fashion, but because critics had become more interested in reading *Hesperides* as a whole than in admiring its anthologized parts. Taken all together, *Hesperides* is a huge, sprawling...
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mass of 1,130 poems, not counting prefatory material – 1,402 poems if we include *His Noble Numbers*, the collection of ‘Pious Pieces’ published along with *Hesperides* in 1648 and integrally attached to the volume. Leafing through the 1648 edition itself, we receive a strong, immediate impression of extreme diversity in terms of the book’s typography and the length, shape, and subject-matter of individual poems. There is the expected abundance of verses on rural life and festivity, as announced in ‘The Argument of his Book’:

I sing of Brooks, of Blossomes, Birds, and Bowers:
Of April, May, of June, and July-Flowers.
I sing of May-poles, Hock-carts, Wassails, Wakes,
Of Bride-grooms, Brides, and of their Bridall-cakes.  

But crowding up against these poems are epigrams to various personages on a variety of subjects: some celebrate Herrick’s membership in the Tribe of Ben; some, like ‘Upon Shopter’, about a widow with rheumy eyes, are little gems of physical disgust; some are formal panegyrics to Charles I and members of the royal family. These poems are given visual prominence in the collection through ceremonial titles in block capitals nearly a centimetre high. Yet the royal panegyric is sometimes highly equivocal, alluding to defeats as well as victories in the English Civil War which was to bring Charles I’s reign to a violent end shortly after the publication of Herrick’s book. ‘To THE KING, To cure the Evil’ celebrates Charles I and the sacramental magic of his touch for curing scrofula and other unspecified ills: Charles is the ‘Tree of Life’, the healing waters of Bethesda, and its Angel combined in a single sacred personage (p. 61); ‘To THE KING, Upon his taking of Leicester’ celebrates a royal victory in the Civil War; but ‘To the King and Queene, upon their Unhappy Distances’ records the royal pair’s separation as a result of the exigencies of war. Alongside the poems of praise are very brief poems of advice on kingship, some of which undercut the seemingly adulatory royalism of the panegyrics. In ‘Examples, or like Prince, like People’, for instance, Herrick notes, ‘Examples lead us, and wee likely see, / Such as the Prince is, will his People be’ (p. 255) – scarcely a comforting message for a monarch whose subjects are in open rebellion. Other poems, like ‘The Bad Season makes the Poet Sad’, records the devastation that the war and pillaging were bringing to the populace and landscape celebrated in Herrick’s seemingly carefree poems of country life. Yet another category of poem interspersed among the *Hesperides* is Herrick’s many seduction poems and miscellaneous erotica addressed to various putative mistresses – especially Julia, but also Corinna, Perilla, Lucia, and others – or celebrating the poet’s own virile member, as in ‘The Vine’. Alongside
those poems, we encounter exquisite epitaphs for the deaths of flowers and children. Read as a whole, *Hesperides* is broader and stronger than the sum of its parts, but also more bewildering: where earlier readers and editors would have culled out the flowers from Herrick’s garden and left the rest, ignoring the politically topical poems and relegating the poems of physical disgust to appendices where they could fester unnoticed, more recent readers have become interested in searching out patterns of order within the collection’s wild abundance.

The most obvious unifying feature of the collection is that on nearly every page we are made emphatically aware that it belongs to Herrick, the poet, its author. We are accustomed to coming at the seventeenth century from the perspective of the late twentieth, in which an author’s possession of the work, his or her marking of it throughout with the stamp of authorial individuality, seems a self-evident feature of literary composition. That was by no means the case in Herrick’s own era. His verses circulated widely in manuscript and were sometimes attributed to him in manuscript miscellanies, but many of the poems that would later be incorporated into *Hesperides* made their publishing debut in anonymous anthologies, in which any sense of his authorship was lost. Herrick’s ‘father’ Ben Jonson had been one of the first English writers to behave more or less as we now expect authors to behave, planning an edition of his own collected *Works* (1616) and seeing it through the press, struggling to retain control over his writings after they left his hands. Herrick’s *Hesperides*, although a smaller production than Jonson’s, is also subtitled *Works* in the 1648 edition – *The Works both Humane & Divine of Robert Herrick Esq.* Unlike Jonson’s, Herrick’s *Works* features a frontispiece portrait presumably of the author himself, resplendent with curls and Roman nose. His bust is poised upon a classical-looking monument and surrounded by nymphs, garlands, and other accoutrements of the poet. The bust is in profile: the author appears to gaze beneficiently at his own facing title page, a demigod approving of his creation.

Within the volume, Herrick entitles numerous poems ‘His’, beginning with the very first, ‘The Argument of his Book’, and continuing through ‘To his Muse’, several poems ‘To his Book’, ‘When he would have his Verses Read’, ‘His Poetry his Pillar’, ‘To Music to becalm his Fever’, ‘Upon the Death of his Sparrow: An Elegy’, and so forth throughout the collection. Numerous poems from *Hesperides* are at least quasi-autobiographical, recording his discontents in Devonshire, where he held an ecclesiastical living until he was ousted by Puritan forces in 1647, and his joyous return to the London of his birth. These poems interfuse his creation with a sense of personal possession, the felt presence of his life. The ‘divine’ poems at the end are similarly marked by his ownership — they are *His Noble Numbers*: 
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or, His Pious Pieces, Wherein (amongst other things) he sings the Birth of his Christ: and sighes for his Saviours suffering on the Crosse. Even the volume’s errata list is marked, in a way that is uncommon for the first half of the seventeenth century, by the poet’s insistence on surveillance over the book and the image of him it communicates: he protests, in a rueful ditty prefacing the list of faults escaped, that he gave the printer ‘good Grain’; if that careless individual sowed ‘Tares’ throughout the volume, then they must be fastidiously sought out and eradicated (p. 4).

Another feature of authorship (as we understand the term) that can be observed through comparison of the first and second printed states of Hesperides is Herrick’s willingness, also fairly rare for the time, to fine tune his text even during the process of printing. In ‘To his maid Prew’, for example, the poet praises his servant for her steadfastness toward him in summer and winter alike. The last line of the cancelled version of the poem reads ‘Not one, but all the seasons of the yeare’, which he made more consistent with the rest of the poem in the new version, ‘Not two, but all the seasons of the yeare’ (p. 151). Similarly, in ‘To Deanbourn, a rude River in Devon, by which sometimes he lived’, he bids a cheerful farewell to the river and the uncivil inhabitants of its banks, but while at least one copy of the cancelled version terms them ‘rude as rudest Salvages’, the verdict is softened in the revision, ‘rude (almost) as rudest Salvages’ (p. 29). In Hesperides, we encounter not only authorship, but a hypercathexis of authorship: for all its squibs of frivolity and its interpolation of seemingly heterogeneous materials, Hesperides is unified by the poet’s pathbreaking insistence on its intimate relationship to himself.

If the volume is Herrick’s in terms of composition, however, it also belongs to Prince Charles (the future Charles II), to whom it is dedicated, and who has authored it in a more metaphoric sense. One of the ways in which recent critics have rescued Hesperides from the modernist charge of triviality is by foregrounding the political and cultural agenda that runs through the collection. The dedicatory epistle to Prince Charles links the ‘little stars’ of Hesperides to the prince’s great ‘Light’ — not only the mythical gardens of Hesperus, but also the planet Hesperus with which Prince Charles had been associated since his birth, when it suddenly and miraculously appeared in the midday sky. The volume belongs to the prince in the sense that he has inspired it as ‘my Works Creator, and alone / The Flame of it, and the Expansion’ (p. 3). Similarly, ‘To THE KING’ and ‘To THE QUEEN’ invite Charles I and Henrietta Maria to repose in Herrick’s garden as their own. The royal family’s metaphoric light is shed typographically throughout the 1648 volume. The large block capitals used as ceremonial markings for the titles of poems to the royals (and only for those
titles) also appear as the decorative enlarged initial letter of every single poem in the collection, so that, if read in the 1648 edition, *Hesperides*’ myriad verses, its ‘little stars’, are typographically linked with a greater source in Hesperus, the prince, and other members of the royal family, at least for those portions of the collection in the immediate vicinity of the large block titles themselves. The effect is lost in modern reprints, but quite striking in the 1648 volume.

If we read Herrick’s book within the strongly pro-Stuart framework that the dedication and ceremonial poems seem to construct, then many features of *Hesperides* that may on the surface seem little more than a delight in trivia suddenly carry a distinct ideological agenda. In the decades before the Civil War, the Stuart kings were strongly committed to protecting traditional English holiday pastimes from local Puritan and judicial attempts to suppress them. Through the *Book of Sports* issued by James I in 1618 and reissued by Charles I in 1633, the crown sought to encourage the old customs as a bulwark of the established church and the established social order. It specified:

> And as for Our good peoples lawfull Recreation, Our pleasure likewise is, That after the end of Diuine Seruice, Our good people be not disturbed, letted, or discouraged from any lawfull Recreation; Such as dauncing, either men or women, Archery for men, leaping, vaulting, or any other such harmelesse Recreation, nor from hauing of May-Games, Whitson Ales, and Morris-dances, and the setting vp of Maypoles and other sports therewith vsed, so as the same be had in due and conuenient time, without impediment or neglect of diuine Seruice.6

Throughout the 1620s and 1630s, there were localized skirmishes between advocates of the old pastimes and those who wanted them suppressed. Even the Anglican clergy became involved, with some ‘merry’ priests going out of their way to encourage May games and kindred sports among their parishioners. Read in the context of the controversy over the *Book of Sports*, Herrick’s *Hesperides*, with its repeated invitation to the delights of ‘Maypoles, Hock-carts, Wassails, Wakes’ as enumerated in ‘The Argument of his Book’, can easily be read as a contribution to the Stuart cause. Indeed, ‘Corinna’s going a Maying’, can be interpreted as making direct reference to the *Book of Sports*. Herrick urges Corinna not to stay abed, but to follow the troop of village merrymakers into the countryside to gather the traditional flowers and boughs of whitethorn:

> Come, we’ll abroad; and let’s obay The Proclamation made for May: And sin no more, as we have done, by staying; But my Corinna, come, let’s goe a Maying. (p. 68)
The lines set two moral systems at odds: for Puritan controversialists of the period, May Day rituals were ‘sin’. But if Corinna refuses to participate, she will sin more powerfully against the royal *Book of Sports*, the ‘Proclamation made for May’, and against the Stuart advocacy of traditional pastimes. As the poem progresses it widens out to form an ever more inclusive landscape of festivity and rural harmony. The sexual licence strongly associated with the holiday is not glossed over, but assimilated into marriage: while Corinna drowses at home, young couples have ‘wept, and woo’d, and plighted Troth, / And chose their Priest’ (p. 69). The final stanza of the poem, with its argument of *carpe diem* in the face of death and decay, may appear abruptly to extinguish the celebratory tone of the earlier stanzas, but it echoes not only folk carols for the maying season, but even the Anglican liturgy for May Day, the feast of Philip and James the Less.⁷ 

Other poems of *Hesperides* similarly commemorate threatened holiday pastimes: a group of Candlemas poems (pp. 285, 304); numerous ‘ceremonies’ and ‘carols’ for Christmas, some specified for performance before the king; ‘The Maypole’, several poems offered as New Year’s gifts, ‘Twelfth night, or King and Queen’, ‘The Wake’, and ‘The Wassail’. ‘The Hock-cart, or Harvest Home’ is particularly noteworthy for its linking of the harvest festival to the preservation of a feudal or immediately post-feudal agrarianism. Herrick’s subtitle dedicates the poem ‘To the Right Honourable, Mildmay, Earl of Westmorland’, but the verses themselves are addressed partly to the lord and partly to his labourers, the ‘Sons of Summer, by whose toile, / We are the Lords of Wine and Oile’ (p. 101). In this poem, as frequently in *Hesperides*, the observance of a traditional custom has almost magical efficacy in preserving a traditional pattern of mutual obligations: the Earl of Westmoreland feeds the labourers, and they in turn, sustain him through their ‘toile’. The poem is remarkably frank about the costs of this support: although today they feast on mutton, veal, bacon, and ‘Fat Beefe’, on the morrow they will be expected to return to their labours: ‘this pleasure is like raine, / Not sent ye for to drowne your paine, / But for to make it spring againe’ (p. 102). By laying bare the ‘paine’ upon which the system is built, ‘The Hock-cart’ demystifies the reciprocity between lord and labourers even while arguing for its continuance. Herrick’s poems of holiday festivity, appearing as they do amidst a highly varied body of verse that laments the faltering royal cause and even makes indirect reference to royal defeats,⁸ take on a strongly elegiac quality – more a lament for a Stuart ‘Merry England’ past than a defence of festival as a bulwark of traditional order in the volume’s strife-torn present. Even as Herrick asserts the value of Stuart ceremony, he records its passing, along with every other human institution, as a result of ‘Times trans-shifting’ (p. 5).
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To assert such a political impetus behind the whole of *Hesperides*, however, is to miss much of the strange heterogeneity of the collection. Critics who have argued strongly for the royalist and conservative Anglican nature of Herrick’s book have generally based themselves on a strongly dualistic and agonistic model of seventeenth-century history, by which the ideological conflict between the established church and its Puritan opponents in the early decades of the century is seen as both prelude and cause of the English Civil War. More recently, revisionist historians have argued for a less rigidly polarized configuration of the political and ecclesiastical allegiances of the period. Their work has enabled recent critics like Ann Baynes Coiro to see nuances and complexities in Herrick’s system of allegiances that qualify the characterization of *Hesperides* as a document in Stuart panegyric. Coiro prefers to think of *Hesperides* in terms of the epigram-book tradition, a tradition that, beginning at least as far back as Martial, offers a caustic mix of political and personal approbation and criticism. Like Martial, whose poems were dedicated to the Emperor Domitian but played dangerous and interesting games with critique of the tyrant, and like several earlier English epigrammatists, among them Ben Jonson, Herrick’s royalism is part of a complex dynamic of praise and blame of the monarch and of other figures, public and private. As Coiro and others have pointed out, at least a few of the personages praised in *Hesperides* were opponents of the royal cause, rather than adherents: Herrick’s epigram ‘To his Kinsman, Sir Tho. Soame’ praises a prominent Londoner (Herrick’s first cousin) with numerous Puritan and Parliamentary connections; another epigram, ‘To the most accomplished Gentleman Master Michael Oulsworth’, commemorates a ‘Brave Man’ who sat on both the Short and Long Parliaments (p. 329).  

Some recent critics have carried the hunt for political dissidence in Herrick too far: one article centres on ‘A Carol presented to Dr Williams Bishop of Lincoln as a New Year’s gift’ as the centrepiece for an argument about ‘resistance literature’ in *Hesperides*, unfortunately failing to note that the poem was excluded by the poet from *Hesperides*, and was not, in fact, published at all until modern editions. Nevertheless, despite the pro-Caroline frame of the collection, Herrick’s verses construct a varied gallery of luminaries that cut across the broad ideological divisions of the pre-war period. Although *Hesperides* belongs to Prince Charles, its dedicatee and metaphoric creator, it also belongs to the poet Herrick himself, his kin, friends, and neighbours, and the two systems of ownership are not always in accord.

Above all, readers have responded to the playfulness and eroticism of Herrick’s poetry – yet another feature of the collection that coexists uneasily with the praise of the royal family. Like several other poets of the pre-war
LEAH S. MARCUS

and Civil War period who are often grouped together as ‘the Cavaliers’, Herrick declares his independence of the chaste Platonic love promoted in the court of King Charles and Queen Henrietta Maria through numerous poems of sexual liberty that revel in amatory solipsism. Some readers have found Herrick’s sexuality curiously, even disturbingly, infantile: rather than celebrating sexual consummation, as Thomas Carew, for example, does in ‘The Rapture’, Herrick focusses on his mistresses’ feet (‘The Night-Piece, to Julia’), or their nipples and the ‘Via Lactea’ between them (‘Upon Julia’s Breasts’, p. 96), or the flowers, dainties, and little ceremonies with which they surround themselves and him. ‘Julia’s Petticoat’ displaces onto her glittering garment the heaving, panting ‘transgression’ of a willing mistress (p. 66). ‘Delight in Disorder’ is modelled upon Jonson’s ‘Still to Be Neat’, but kindles that poem’s moral distrust of overprecision in dress into a kinetic vision of female sartorial ‘wantonnesse’: lawn thrown into ‘fine distraction’, ‘erring Lace’, ‘Ribbands’ that ‘flow confusedly’, ‘carelesse’ shoe-strings, and, above all, the ‘tempestuous petticote’ (p. 28). However we interpret the sexuality of these poems of bewitching ‘wilde civility’, they create a charge of playful and highly personalized eroticism that surges seemingly unchecked through the garden of Hesperides, although it wanes somewhat in the volume’s second half.

By interpreting the 1,130 poems of Hesperides as an epigram book and dividing it into hypothetical centuries of poems (like Martial’s), Coiro has created a rough system of classification that allows us to recognize striking differences between disparate parts of the collection. In such a large body of verses, the immediate context of a given group of lyrics may play a determining role in the reader’s perception of them. In Hesperides, Coiro suggests, we can identify a pattern of increasing alienation from the ideals of early centuries as the collection winds on, with the late centuries, like a ‘masque turned upside down’, expressing a spirit of ‘mockery, disorder, and warning’ quite alien from the charming ‘Merry England’ materials and the sexual titillation of the first half of the volume. That is not to say that there are no evocations of war and dissolution early on: among the first hundred poems of the volume are ‘All things decay and die’, ‘To THE KING, upon his comming with his Army into the West’, and ‘To the King and Queen, upon their Unhappy Distances’. Nevertheless, Coiro may be right that reading through Hesperides seriatem rather than browsing here and there, we receive an impression of increasing fragmentation and dejection, with sententious poems gradually replacing the more joyous ceremonial verses of earlier parts of the collection. As the idealized image of the monarchy and the myth of Merry England are gradually hedged about by poems that undercut them, their lustre is inevitably darkened.
Such, at least, is the impression of *Hesperides* we are likely to receive if we leave out the last 270 or so poems, those comprising *Noble Numbers*. In modern editions of Herrick, the editors regularly take care to separate Herrick’s ‘Pious Pieces’ from *Hesperides* proper: in L. C. Martin’s edition, there is a page and a half of white space between the end of *Hesperides* proper and the beginning of *Noble Numbers*; in J. Max Patrick’s edition, still more strikingly, almost two leaves intervene, with the second bearing a half title of the kind one would expect at the beginning of a separate work. Modern editors have worked to distance *Noble Numbers* from *Hesperides* in large part because they find the ‘Pious Pieces’ a woeful falling off from the aesthetic standards of Herrick’s secular verse. As some editors have speculated, *Noble Numbers* may at one point have been intended by the poet as a separate publication, but if we peruse the 1648 *Hesperides*, the two parts of the collection appear inextricably linked. The title page for the *Hesperides* announces that it is to include ‘The Works Both Humane & Divine’ of its author, so that the name *Hesperides* encompasses both; ‘The Argument of his Book’ ends, ‘I write of Hell; I sing (and ever shall) / Of Heaven and hope to have it after all’ (p. 5), placing the divine subjects at the end of his introductory poem, just as *Noble Numbers* appears at the end of the volume. *Noble Numbers* is given a separate title page in the 1648 edition, but one lacking the full publication information offered on the title page for the volume as a whole in the four copies I have consulted. Moreover, its numbering begins with sig. Aa, not sig. A, as we would expect if it were being offered as a separate work. The list of errata at the beginning of *Hesperides* includes faults escaped from *Noble Numbers*. Beyond that, the last two pages of *Hesperides* proper feature a number of poems that mark the closing of the first part of the collection, but also advise the reader that the voyage is far from over – more verses are to come. At the bottom of page 297 (CC71r), a poem entitled ‘The End of his Work’ appears to be moving toward closure, but its text promises that the closure is temporary, not final: ‘Part of the worke remaines; one part is past: And here my ship rides having anchor cast.’ If we turn the leaf, we encounter the last poems of *Hesperides* proper on the left and, without any blank space whatsoever, the title page of *Noble Numbers* on the right. The poet may have reached a *terminus* and set anchor temporarily, but he is poised to re-embark, to offer the other ‘part of the worke’.

If we take *Noble Numbers* to be an integral part of the whole of *Hesperides* rather than a completely separate work, we are forced to rethink the pattern of gradual decline and disillusionment that appears to be traced in the first 1,130 poems. In *Noble Numbers*, the king and court shine once more in a series of poems announced as having been sung in the royal presence at Whitehall: ‘To God: An Anthem, sung in the Chapel at Whitehall,
before the King’, ‘The Star-Song: A Carol to the King; sung at Whitehall’, and several others. Appearing as they do after the apparent demise of order in the secular part of *Hesperides*, these poems serve to constitute almost a ‘real presence’ of the monarch and courtly ceremony amidst the devastation of war. Most of the poems of *Noble Numbers* are much simpler than their counterparts among the secular lyrics, and several, like ‘To his Saviour, a Child: A Present, by a Child’ and ‘Graces for Children’, are explicitly designed for children. Indeed, in *Noble Numbers*, the poet himself assumes the persona of a dutiful child of the church: the poems announced as ‘His’ are strikingly similar in tone and language to the poems expressly for children. Herrick appears to have shared at least some of these poems with his parishioners at Dean Prior: a visitor to the village in 1809 found that several of his *Noble Numbers* were still being used as prayers by local people.\(^{12}\) Perhaps the Chartists were not far wrong in identifying Herrick as a poet ‘For the People’. Despite the obvious elitism of many features of *Hesperides*, he was capable of writing in a popular vein: *Noble Numbers*, with its markedly humbler and more uniform lyrics than earlier parts of the collection, can be regarded as a retreat into simplicity and a resuscitated Anglican community amidst the uncertainties of war – as the poet’s final resort against the ravages of ‘Times trans-shifting’.

Arguably, what recent readers have responded to most warmly in *Hesperides* is its ‘Delight in Disorder’ – a phrase that describes the pleasant disarray of secular lyrics as a whole as well as the poem bearing the name. But the poet creates a clear line of demarcation between the playful eroticism of the first part of the volume and the more constricted piety of the second through the couplet that immediately precedes the ‘Pious Pieces’: ‘To his Book’s end this last line he’d have plac’t, / Jocund his Muse was; but his Life was chasf’ (p. 335). After this Ovidian palinode, *Noble Numbers* offers simplicity and bedrock sincerity – a pared-down verse in stark contrast with the curious and pleasant vagaries of the secular part of the book. *Hesperides* considered as a whole is bounded by a fanfare of royal allegiance at its beginning and a retreat to communal Anglican piety at its end, but in between it offers a seductively sweet, strangely tumultuous exploration of love, war, friendship, festivity, and loss.

NOTES


180


6 The King's Maiesties Declaration to His Subjects, concerning lawfull Sports to be vsed (London, 1618), pp. 6–7.


10 Janie Caves McCauley, 'On the "Childhood of the Yeare": Herrick's Hesperides New Year's Poems', in Coiro (ed.), Robert Herrick, pp. 72–96. Since Williams died in 1649, it is unlikely that Herrick wrote the poem after the completion of Hesperides, which leaves us with the strong probability that he deliberately omitted it.
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