Postgraduate English
www.dur.ac.uk/postgraduate.english

Issue 26 March 2013

Editors: Avishek Parui & Michael Shallcross

'Firme and well fixt' Re-presentations of Robert Herrick's poetry in printed miscellanies

Callum Seddon
University of Oxford

‘Firme and well fixt’? Re-presentations of Robert Herrick’s poetry in printed miscellanies

Callum Seddon
University of Oxford

Postgraduate English, Issue 26, March 2013

Robert Herrick closes *Hesperides* (1648)[1] by erecting a monument in print. Although kingdoms fall, “*The pillar of Fame”* (335.2) boasts,

> This pillar never shal
> Decline or waste at all;
> But stand forever by his owne
> Firme and well fixt foundation.
> (11-14)

To be ‘firme and well fixt’ is to be stably rooted in one place, and as the last in the collection, arranged by the compositor to resemble a classical pillar, the poem performs this function by acting as the supporting foundation for every preceding verse. The plural pronouns of this poem, ‘at last *we* set’ (1) evoke an image of Herrick working side-by-side with the compositor, carefully surveying the production of his book and thus asserting control over it. As if in counterbalance to this suggestion of influence and monumentality, Herrick undercuts his boasts by calling upon the book’s potential for dislocation, and his own impotence in determining its afterlives, as it is free ‘wantonly to roame | From house to house, and never stay at home’ (“*To his Booke*”, 6.1: 3-4).

Thus, the fixity promised by print ironically imbues poetry with the potential energy for movement. Such mobility is the focus of this essay, which pursues a reading of Herrick’s textual afterlives as *Hesperides* wantonly roams from (printing)

[1] Robert Herrick, ‘Hesperides’, *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick* edited by L.C Martin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), pp. 1-337. All references to this volume in text by page number, and order of poem on the page.

house to (printing) house, its pages 'torne confusedly' ("*To his Booke*", 300.1: 2) and scattered throughout printed miscellanies. The textual variations, formal mutations and editorial alterations that ensue in the process, testify to the malleability of printed poetry. As a result, editorial and authorial categories used to assert control and stability over texts, are exploded by textual heterogeneity. In this movement, Herrick's monumental self-inscription is effaced through integrations into editions governed by principles of anonymity and variety. Far from 'firme and well fixt', the dynamic textual condition of these songs, sonnets and epigrams attest to their status as actively disrupted, rather than reverently, and passively read. Consequently, this essay prefers to complement 'author' with 'compiler' as a category of analysis.

By doing so, this essay challenges the 'firme and well fixt foundation' of *Hesperides* as a dominant focus of Herrick criticism.[2] A similar process is currently taking place in the preparation of a new edition of Herrick's works by Ruth Connolly and Tom Cain for Oxford University Press.[3] This new edition will dedicate a volume to tracking the variants, narrating the revisions and documenting the sources of Herrick's poetry as it circulated in manuscript before the publication of *Hesperides*.[4] This approach is in keeping with an established recognition of manuscript poetry as socially dialogic, and malleable; a process of its renewal and revitalization as it was composed and received in varying circumstances.[5] Whether a similar approach will be applied to editing Herrick's poetry as it was re-presented in print, is not clear. But

[2] See for example, John L. Kimmey, 'Order and Form in Herrick's *Hesperides*', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol 70, No. 2 (April, 1971), pp. 255-268; Ann Baynes Coiro, *Robert Herrick's* Hesperides *and the Epigram Book Tradition* (The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore and London, 1988).
[3] Tom Cain and Ruth Connolly (eds), *The Complete Poetry of Robert Herrick* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming, 2013).
[4] Ruth Connolly, 'Editing Intention in the Manuscript Poetry of Robert Herrick', *Studies in English Literature* (Winter 2012), pp. 69-74, p. 70.
[5] See Arthur Marotti, *Manuscript, Print and the Renaissance* Lyric (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995) and Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

critical accounts of such movements tend to be discussed in terms of a transition from malleability to fixity.[6] *Hesperides* supports this reading, reclaiming poetry from the vagaries of scribal publication and unauthorized printings, stabilizing and fixing them in an authorized collection. Because editors of Herrick are understandably concerned with establishing authorial, authoritative texts, the rich textual variants and adaptations of Herrick's poetry in printed miscellanies tend to be overlooked. Recent monographs by Adam Smyth and Barbara Benedict have shown the benefit of focusing on compilers and collections – unsettling the hegemony of author-centric approaches to the transmission of printed lyric poetry,[7] but the specific place of Herrick in such textual venues has not been considered. Because printed miscellanies are still a relatively recent object of critical focus, this is not surprising. But they offer an alternative lens through which to interpret his poetry, one in which his monumental project of self inscription appears to be on unstable ground. Certainly, they offer a corrective to Marotti's view that 'fruitful textual malleability was drastically reduced as print culture grew stronger and more authors…grew fussy about the form their texts took in print'.[8] Focusing on how Herrick's 'fussiness' registers in his authorial self-fashioning of *Hesperides,* this essay proceeds to examine how 'compiler functions' challenge this fantasy of control, both through the active disruption of poems' formal integrity, *and* through the expansion of their referential capacities through recollecting the poems in alternative contexts, with different co-texts.

[6] Marotti establishes a binary between manuscript poetry as malleable, and printed poetry as fixed. See Arthur Marotti, 'Malleable and Fixed Texts: Manuscript and Printed Miscellanies and the Transmission of Lyric Poetry in the English Renaissance', in W. Speed Hill ed., *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies* (New York: Binghamton University Press, 1993), pp. 159-174.

[7] Adam Smyth, *Profit and Delight: Printed Miscellanies in England, 1640-1682* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2004); Barbara Benedict, *Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Restoration and Eighteenth Century Literary Anthologies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

[8] Marotti, 'Malleable and Fixed Texts', p. 172.

Herrick would have been aware of the potential for a poem to change considerably as it moved from one textual situation to another. Circulating his poetry in manuscript throughout the 1620s involved a method of scribal publication whereby a poem was subtly altered from version to version, depending on the specific context of reception. The differences between "*R: HERRICKS* Farewell to Poesye" in MS. Rawlinson Poet. 160[9] and "*M^r^ ROBERT HERICKE HIS FAREWELL VNTO POETRIE*" in MS. Ashmole 38[10] are ostensibly unremarkable, such as the variant witnesses to the first couplet of:

> **E**uen as yow see twoe louers in a night
> hatch'd ore w*i*th moonshine fro*m* their stolne delight,[11]
>
> and
>
> **I** have beheld two louers in a night
> (Hatch't o're with Moone-shine, from their stolen delight)[12]

But such variations should not be considered 'interim drafts'[13] but significant differences, illustrating the dynamic history of composition and reception of a series of texts, rather than a single text.[14] Furthermore, within this mode of circulation, the attribution of authorship was unstable. The various hands of MS. Rawlinson Poet. 160 for instance, title some of Herrick's poetry possessively, such as "*R HERRICK* His charge vnto his wife",[15] but situate others anonymously, and within a more descriptive and occasional frame, such as "*Vpon a Cherrystone sent to the tip of the Lady Jemmonia Walgraues eare*"[16] Scribes could then, significantly influence the

[9] MS. Rawlinson Poet. 160, f. 46v.
[10] MS. Ashmole 38, p. 106.
[11] MS. Rawl. Poet. 160, f. 46v, ll. 1-2. Engrossing hand has been rendered bold; scribal contractions have been expanded, indicated by italics.
[12] MS. Ashmole 38, p. 106, ll.1-2.
[13] Connolly, *Intention*, 70.
[14] *ibid.*
[15] f. 47v.
[16] f. 28

shape and referential capacities of a poem through such practice, suggesting the instability of 'author' as a controlling, pervasive factor in circulation.

So too, could the attribution of poetry in print to Herrick *before* the publication of *Hesperides* be indeterminate. In a single year, four of Herrick's poems were attributed to alternative authors. "*Upon Mrs. Eliz. Wheeler*" (106.3) and "*The Primrose*" (208.1) were included in Thomas Carew's *Poems* (1640),[17] and "*Am I despis'd*" (63.1), and "*The Apparition*" (205.5) were printed with "*The Primrose*" in John Benson's *Poems: Written by Wil. Shake-speare. Gent.* (1640).[18] Framed in this way, the lively editorial license of John Benson and Thomas Walkley, significantly conditions the interpretation of the poems. "*Upon Eliz.Wheeler"*, for instance, is included as "A Song" in the miscellany, *The Academy of Complements* (1646)[19] and "The Enquiry" in Carew's *Poems* (p. 172). In both instances, the specificity of the poem's situation as it is later presented by Herrick in 1648 as "*Mrs. Eliz. Wheeler. under the name of the lost Shephardesse*" is cancelled, flattened into generalities. What Ruth Connolly has called the 'occasionality' of a poem, 'the generic register for poetry which is intimate, sociable, and reflective of the shared geographies, politics, and identities of both the poet and his audience,'[20] is lost, generalizing the verse's referential capacities. Consequently, the personal connection between Herrick and his cousin, Elizabeth Wheeler, is no longer the situation of the poem. Once scribally published, poetry could then, be appropriated in ways that obscured its origins, as it moved further away from its author.

[17] Thomas Carew, *Poems. Written by Thomas Carew, Esquire.* (London, 1640) All subsequent references to this volume in text.
[18] William Shakespeare, *Poems: Written by Wil. Shakespeare, Gent* (London, 1640) All subsequent references to this volume in text.
[19] 'Philomusus'., *The Academy of Complements* (London, 1646) All subsequent references to this volume as *AC46* in text.
[20] Connolly, 'Print, Miscellaneity and the Reader in Robert Herrick's *Hesperides*', in Allen, G., Griffin, C., O'Connell, M eds. *Readings on Audience and Textual Materiality* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2011), p. 25.

Read against this context of misattribution, *Hesperides* functions as a declaration of literary property. Lacking any inevitable legal connection to printed books,[21] an author function is fashioned through literary and bibliographic strategies. Herrick frames the book with possessive signifiers. At the book's beginning, a title-page and engraving of the author, calling to mind the marmoreal textual presence of the 'rare Arch-Poet JOHNSON' ("*Upon M.* Ben Johnson. *Epig.",* 150.1: 1) in his *Workes* (1616). And, at its close, an artifactual poem, "*The pillar of Fame",* which not only resembles a monument, but simultaneously, a majuscule 'I', as to reiterate just one more time *who* the subject of the book was. As Leah Marcus puts it, such strategies intensify into a 'hypercathexis of authorship'.[22] The very construction of the book, through a poetics of accumulation, gathers up the fragments of Herrick's personal history and experience, compounding them into poetical, autobiographical *sylva*.[23]

But this monumental self-construction through print is inextricably tied to self-destruction. As Marotti points out, this association between death and single-author volumes of poetry was cemented through the near contemporaneous posthumous publications of John Donne's *Poems* (1633) and George Herbert's *The Temple* (1633).[24] Herrick persistently iterates this association, declaring in an epigram, "*Posting to Printing*" (314.1), 'LET others to the Printing Presse run fast, | Since after death comes glory, *Ile not haste.*' And yet, ironically, this is precisely what *Hesperides* is; a premature, 'pre-posthumous publication'.[25] "*Poetry perpetuates the Poet"* (265.1) makes clear that this premature self-cancellation is a means of

[21] See Marjorie Swann, *Curiosities and Texts: The Culture of Collecting in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), p. 152.
[22] Leah Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance* (London: Routledge, 1996), p. 186.
[23] Swann, p. 150.
[24] Marotti, *Manuscript, Print and the English Renaissance Lyric*, p. 247.
[25] *ibid*, p. 258.

securing a legacy of fame; the poet 'might likewise die, | And utterly forgotten lye' (1-2), if it was not for the potency of 'eternal Poetry' to give 'repullulation' (3). So the hope of pre-posthumous publication is to guarantee that the death of the author is not a terminus, but the emergence of a pervasive and spectral textual afterlife, the poetry re-sprouting, as 'repullulation' suggests[26] 'unto the thirtieth thousand yeere, | When all now dead shall re-appeare' (5-6). Herrick's authorial presence as, to use Abraham Cowley's words, 'a Dead, or at least a *Dying Person*'[27] a constant prolepsis to the moment of death, can thus be read as a means to control his textual afterlives by prematurely anticipating them; a means of controlling the presentation, rather than leaving it to 'unworth[y] and 'avaric[ious] *Stationers*', making authorial monuments from 'a vast *heap* of Stones or Rubbish.'[28]

But so too is this moment, when Herrick commands us to

> Behold this living stone,
> I reare for me,
> Ne'r to be thrown
> Downe, envious Time by thee[,]
> ("*His Poetrie his Pillar"*, 85.1:17-20)

a moment contemporaneous with its potential for destruction and disarray. The moment at which a book is published, and released into the world, is the moment at which it loses its perfected state of '*Candor* undefil'd' ("*To his Booke*", 6.1: 1), when Herrick must 'brake [brake] his bonds of love' (5) and submit the book to the vagaries of its future readers, who may not revere his monument. One reader of 8^{o} Malone 343, for instance, has defaced the book with the scrawl, '*Most Wretched Stuff,*' opposite the title-page, the very location where this monumental ambition is so ostentatiously declared. Consequently, while Herrick's self-fashioning suggests

[26] "repullulation, n", *OED* online. September 2012. Oxford University Press. 11 December 2012 [http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/163197?rskey=WUv7BT&result=7&isAdvanced=false].
[27] Abraham Cowley, 'Preface' to *Poems* (London, 1656), sig. A2r
[28] *ibid*, sig. A1r.

surveillance and authorial control, it also signals the moment at which his ability to determine the book's reception and use is diminished. This explains why Herrick is so persistent in his attempts to determine and control the reception of his text. "*When he would have his verses read*" (7.3) describes a convivial community of drinkers, 'when that men have both well drunke, and fed, | Let my Enchanments then be sung, or read' (4-5) as a fitting context. The fit readers of the book evoke the contexts of composition and reception that Herrick's poetry would have been originally circulated in whilst in London and Cambridge.[29] Indeed, as Connolly argues, the structural organization of *Hesperides*, its strategic 'delight in disorder,' in which genres, voice and counter-voice clash, suggests that Herrick alludes to the genre of verse miscellany – the repository of social textuality for these scribal communities – in the construction and arrangement of the book.[30] As such it implies that it is the communal *use* of the book, rather than print itself that guarantees Herrick's fame, suggested by Herrick it in the last *envoi* "*To his Booke*",

> It may chance good-luck will send
> Thee a kinsman, or a friend,
> That may harbour thee when I,
> With my fates neglected lye.
>
> ("*To his Booke*", 334.3: 1-8).

Herrick slips from the conditional, to the future tense, making the eventuality of his neglect, a certainty rather than a hypothesis. His lack of control over the destinations and future form of the text is thus made explicit. However much the genre and structure of the book may allude to the manuscript verse miscellany, there is a slippage between medium and content. These strategies reveal Herrick's attempt to

[29] See for example, Tom Cain and Ruth Connolly. *Lords of Wine and Oile: Community and Conviviality in the Poetry of Robert Herrick* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
[30] Connolly, 'New Approaches to the Work of Robert Herrick', *Literature Compass* 2009, (6), pp. 1177-1187, p. 1177.

construct an authorial fantasy; they reveal what they try to conceal, that Herrick's book is no longer received in this way.

Indeed, this slippage provokes further strategies through which Herrick attempts to control and stabilize the text in reception. Stephen Dobranski discusses this as a collaborative process between reader and author, in which the former is called upon to perfect the text in lieu of his own 'limited practical control' over the production of the book.[31] The poem, masquerading as editorial matter before the book proper begins, is a means of exerting such control:

> *For these Transgressions which thou here dost see,*
> *Condemne the Printer, Reader, and not me;*
> *Who gave him forth good Grain, though he mistook*
> *The seed; so sow'd these Tares throughout my Book.*
> (1-4)

We find here a recognition that print challenges the authority of an author, because the technologies required to bring a book into being deform the authorial, pure textual 'Good grain,' making them into 'transgressions.' A reader of 8^{o} Douce H 311 has indeed responded in this authorially sanctioned manner, responding to Herrick's instructions to 'wink at small faults, the greater, ne'erthelesse | Hide, and with them, their Fathers nakedness' ("*To the Generous Reader"*, 32.1: 3-4). Contrary to this encouragement to stabilize the text through participating in its completion, Herrick's book also sanctions its own fragmentation, through selection from its 'many poems.'[32] Herrick calls attention to this sanctioned selectivity in his address "*To Sir George Parrie, Doctor of the Civil Law*":

PERUSE my Measures thoroughly, and where

[31] Stephen Dobranski, *Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 59, p. 154.
[32] See Randall Ingram, 'Robert Herrick and the Makings of *Hesperides*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900,* Vol. 38, No. 1 (Winter, 1998), pp. 127-147.

> Your judgement finds a guilty poem, there
> Be you a judge, but not a judge severe.

But even here, the repeated imperatives, pedantic adverb and parenthetical plea for mercy, attempt to dictate the distribution of power in hierarchy of reader/Judge and author. Typographically, Herrick continues this fantasy of control by prompting the selection of specific units of verse through the italicized marking of *sententiae* and commonplaces, such as the final couplet from "*Upon Love*" (219.2): '*None pities him that's in the snare,* | *And warn'd before, wo'd not beware*' (11-12), or entire epigrams, '*TEARES quickly drie: griefes will in time decay:* | *A cleare will come after a cloudy day*' ("*Faire after foule*", 293.1)[33]. By doing so, he directs readerly attention, encouraging appropriation, in an attempt to forestall the death of his book, and prompt its afterlife through appropriation. As Ingram puts it, '[a]n author can create a monumental book, but only generations of readers, through their reiterations and appropriations will keep it alive.'[34]

Readers are encouraged then, as one of Herrick's most frequently anthologized poems puts it, to 'pluck [the poems] one by one | To make parts of an union' ("*Upon Eliz. Wheeler*", 106.3: 14-15). But the nature of these pickings has not been discussed by critics. The next intuitive step to the process of destabilizing the 'firme and well fixt foundation' of *Hesperides* is to question how these authorial and editorial functions interact. Herrick's own fear, voiced in *Hesperides*, is that in the hands of others, his book will be mistreated.[35] Certainly, as the book and its poems move between printing houses, and the hands of compilers, its integrity – both at the level of collection, and individual poems – is confounded. Herrick's assertion of

[33] See G.K Hunter, 'The Marking of Sententiae in Elizabethan Printed Plays, Poems and Romances', *The Library*, Vol. 6 (Issue 3-4, 1951). pp. 171-188.
[34] Ingram, p. 133.
[35] See for example, '*Another* (poem 'to his Booke')', 6.3, in which Herrick imagines his book as potential toilet paper.

literary property is also disrupted, when his poems are re-presented as the literary property of others. Henry Bold, a poet, and the compiler of *Wit a Sporting in a Pleasant Grove of New Fancies*[36] presents a miscellaneous collection of Herrick's poetry, along with the first fifty pages of Thomas Beedome's *Poems Divine and Humane* (1641) as his own, poorly composed, with frequent errors, and the formal collapse of poems in order to cram more poetry into the book. Bold even deletes Herrick's presence from a self-inscriptive poem, "*To Robbin Red-brest*" (19.2), replacing 'Robin Herrick' with 'William Redley' (*WS*57, p. 68).These instances alone challenge Herrick's monumental self-construction; readers, compilers and other poets clearly thought little of iconoclastically breaking his '*Pyramides*' ("*His Poetry his Pillar*", 85.1: 24) into smaller parts, and making them their own.

But the editorial practice of miscellany compilers is not merely iconoclasm; shifting from 'author' to 'compiler' as a category of analysis illuminates the ways in which these early editors of Herrick participated with his book, in ways beyond those cautiously sanctioned by the author. A significant collection in this regard is *Recreation for Ingenious head-peeces*,[37] a series of miscellanies that collected Herrick's poetry from 1645 to 1663. The 1645 edition featured two long poems that had previously circulated in manuscript, "*His fare-well to Sack*" (45.1) and "*A Description of a Woman"*(404.1). The publication of *Hesperides* in 1648 sees this number significantly expanded, from two, to seventy-five poems by Herrick, most of which are the terse, occasional epigrams that the nineteenth century editor, Alfred Pollard tried to suppress.[38] In 1663, ten poems were added to this seventy-five, a large

[36] 'H[enry].B[old]', *Wit a Sporting in a Pleasant Grove of New Fancies* (London, 1657). All subsequent references to this volume in text as *WS*57.
[37] James Smith/John Mennes [?], *Recreation for Ingenious Head-Peeces* (London, 1646, 1650, 1663). All subsequent references in text as *WR* and year of edition, for example, *WR*46).
[38] Alfred Pollard ed. *Hesperides & Noble Numbers* (London, 1898). Pollard confined the epigrams to an appendix.

number of which are amatory songs and sonnets rather than biting, invective verse. Containing by 1663 eighty-five poems by Herrick, alongside verse by Henry Bold, Thomas Jordan, William Strode, John Grange and Thomas Carew, these miscellanies constitute the largest collection of Herrick's printed poems *not* authorized, making them a significant case study through which to consider his collection and remediation.

The discordant generic and thematic dynamics of *Hesperides* are harmonized through the recollection of the book. The arrangement of poems as generically and topically diverse as "*To his Muse*" (214.1) a poem to Prince Charles II, "*The bad season makes the poet sad*" (214.2), a melancholic sonnet, "*To Vulcan*" (214.3), a witty epigram, and "*Like Pattern, like People"* (214.4), a moral proverb, exhibit principles of collection, and a reading experience 'full of incongruities' ("*No loathesomenesse in love"*, 11.1: 8). But by dividing the selections from *Hesperides* into a tripartite generic hierarchy, epigrams, epitaphs, and 'fancies and fantasticks' the incongruities are flattened into an art more 'precise in every part' ("*Delight in Disorder*", 28.1: 15), a collection arranged by similarities rather than difference and discord.

This generic re-distribution, showing in particular, a preference for Herrick the witty epigrammatist, occurs at the level of individual poems. In *Hesperides*, "*The showre of Blossomes*" (283.3) is a lyric that formally, confronts the sonnet tradition:

LOVE in a showre of Blossomes came
Down, and halfe drown'd me with the same:
The Blooms that fell were white and red;
But with such sweets commingled,
As whether (this) I cannot tell
My sigh was pleas'd more, or my smell:
But true it was, as I rowl'd there,
Without a thought of hurt, or feare;
Love turn'd himself into a Bee,

> And with his Javelin wounded me:
> From which mishap this use I make,
> *Where most sweets are, there lyes a Snake.*
> *Kisses and Favours are sweet things;*
> *But Those have thorns, and These have stings.*

Topically, this poem dramatizes an experience of swift modulation, as Love metamorphoses into a Bee, and the speaker's pleasure collapses into pain. And generically too, it is 'commingled,' and it exhibits modulation and fluidity as the speaker moves from the particularities of the experience, to the universalizing, gnomic statement in lines twelve to fourteen. Although the poem exhibits an integrated narrative structure, which presses linearly towards its epigrammatic closure, the form is simultaneously perforated. The italicization of these lines, marking them as potential *sententiae* prompts an awareness of this, something that the compiler was seemingly aware of in his re-presentation of the sonnet in his miscellany as:

> 653. *Sharpe Sauce.*
> Kisses and favours are sweet things
> But those have thornes and these have stings.
> (sig. K4r).

This selection has not followed the typographical instructions directly, by truncating the three line epigrammatic closure even further into a terse, self-contained couplet of verse. In this movement of two lines from *Hesperides* into *Recreation for Ingenious head-peeces*, the situation of the epigram's original form are obscured, making it a general statement of bitterness, rather than the surprising turn, and closure to a sonnet. So too, is the authorial presence of Herrick cancelled; the numerical labeling imposes uniformity on the poem, encouraging comparisons with its immediately contemporaneous co-texts.

Anonymity, and an effacing of the situational and occasional specificity of texts as they occur in *Hesperides* is persistent practice in the miscellany. "*Cherry-pit"* (19.1), for example, is shifted from the first, to third-person, removing the traces of Herrick and Julia in the first line, '*JULIA* and I did lately sit' (1), to 'Nicholas and Nell did lately sit' (*WR*63. sig.f.Cc4v:1). A similar process of depersonalization occurs in "*Upon himselfe"* (97.3), in *Hesperides*, a self-reflective lyric, but in *Recreation for Ingenious Head-Peeces*, a poem 'On an old batchelour.' (*WR*63 sig. f.Dd1). Such expansion of the particular into the general is part of the miscellany's invitation to its readers for selection and application. The paratextual conceit of the collection is one of dining: 'this little book is like a furnish't feast; | And hath a dish, I hope, to please each guest' ("*Ad Lectorem*", sig. A2r). The dining metaphor not only suggests consumption, but extraction. 'The new [collection] was fram'd to humour some mens tast, | Which if they like not, they may *carve* the last' ("*The Stationer to the Reader*", sig. A3v). The transfer of poetic materials from Herrick's book elicits further transfer by the reader. A collection of such choice cuts exists in MS Eng. Poet. d. 152, some of the leaves of which consist of a reader's transcriptions from *Recreation for Ingenious Head-Peeces*, including "Sharpe Sauce".[39]

The adaptation of poetry in order to prompt selection is more insistent in conduct-manual miscellanies, such as *The Academy of Complements*, *The Marrow of Complements* and *The New Help to Discourse.*[40] Like *Recreation for Ingenious head-peeces*, this genre of miscellany tends to generalize the headings of poems, universalizing their particularities and advertising their potential to be used by readers. Thus, Philomusus, the pseudonymous compiler of *The Marrow of*

[39] MS. Eng. Poet. d 152, f.106v
[40] 'Philomusus' ed. *The Marrow of Complements* (London, 1654). William Winstanley, ed. *The New Help to Discourse* (London, 1684). All subsequent references to these volumes in text as *MC*54 and *HD*84 respectively.

Complements presents the onomastically specific "To Oenone" (168.3) as simply "A SONG" (*MC*54, p.159). In the hands of Philomusus, these poems become general examples of eloquence, the knowledge of which he is evangelical in communicating to the reader, and which 'adornes our Discourse, gives a grace and life to our actions, opens us the gates and doors to the best company, and puts us in such esteem as well-born spirits ought to strive to' (sig. A4r). Furthermore, the re-presentation of poetry is fashioned as a redistribution of materials, from an elite, to an aspirational culture: 'Let me tell thee that thou has a Cabinet, wherein the richest Jewels of our Language are lockt up' (sig. A4v). In order to unlock the social potential of verse, it is re-presented alongside other forms of discourse: model letters, examples of complements, or dialogue. William Winstanley's *The New Help to Discourse*, for example interpolates poetry between series of trivial questions and answers, in order to clearly designate a social application. Herrick's poem "*Anger*" (260.4) is presented thus:

> Q. *Which is the best way to overcome wrongs?*
> A. By neglecting them, according to the Poet,
> *Wrongs if neglected, vanish in Short time,*
> *But heard with anger, we confess the crime*.
> (p. 67).

Framed in this way, Herrick's authorial presence is effaced, and subsumed under the generalized authoritative category of 'The Poet'. The trans-historical principles of collection group verse by Herrick alongside extracts from Chaucer, Buchanan and Drayton. Poetry is re-presented for its social application and potential source of knowledge. William Winstanley thus approached poetry with much more of a concern for its destinations in application, rather than a reverence for its origins, and thought little of disrupting the text to encourage a particular use by the reader.

These instances of editorial disruption show that Herrick's printed monument was fractured and reconstituted in radically different ways to its original presentation,

and moreover, that it was the uses to which a text could but put – the potential destinations of a text – rather than its authorial origins that interested the compilers of these miscellanies. Recognizing this challenges critical narratives that construct scribal publication as a malleable mode of circulation, and print as relatively fixed. Arthur Marotti argues that 'despite the sloppy editorial practices, compositional inconsistencies, and proof reading that characterized the print industry, texts were bound to be stabilized as objects within the literary institutions embodied in print culture'[41] But the textual variations between "*The Showre of blossomes"*, the way in which Herrick's verse is presented in *Hesperides* to how it is presented in *The New Help to Discourse* poses not only a challenge to this critical binary, but also to editorial principles in general. Herrick's, poetry – along with all the other texts contained in these printed miscellanies – was available in these varying states, *in addition* to the ways in which they confound and disrupt the presentational stability of critical editions.

But to witness the malleability of lyric poetry in print is not just to note the variability of specific texts in isolation. Variance in re-presentation can be pursued then, through both textual and co-textual analysis. To facilitate specificity of study, the final component of my argument will address the presentation and re-presentations of "*To the Virgins, that make much of time*", the most widely anthologized of Herrick's poetry[42]. An examination of the *Union First Line Index of English Poetry*[43] attests to the prodigious number of textual witnesses to this poem. In

[41] Marotti, 'Malleable and Fixed Texts', p. 172.
[42] This calculation has been arrived at by counting the instances of poems cited in printed miscellanies included by L.C Martin in his textual notes, in conjunction with the *Union First Line Index of English Poetry*. 'To the Virgins' has a total of eleven re-presentations in printed miscellanies/song-books, but this essay consciously excludes the song-books, the examination of which would extend beyond the scope of its focus.
[43] [http://firstlines.folger.edu accessed Dec 4 2012] Adam Smyth's *Online Index of Printed Miscellanies* [http://cobweb.buinesscollaborator.com/pub/English.cgi/0/5383492] has also been

total, twenty-seven records are counted, seventeen of which are printed, and ten, manuscript sources.[44] In print, the poem is included in *The Academy of Complements, Wit a Sporting in a Pleasant Grove of New Fancies, The Second Part of Merry Drollery, Witts Recreations* (1663 edition), *Windsor Drollery*,[45] *The New Help to Discourse* and *The Loyal Garland.*[46] Additionally, the poem is parodied in "Keep to the Churches", a satirical poem included in *Poems on Affairs of State, the second part.*[47] It enjoyed then, a transmission extending across a broad chronological period, and a wide range of miscellany genres: conduct manuals, drolleries, and politically partisan collections.[48]

As the poem moves through these different collections, its formal integrity remains relatively stable, in comparison to the willful generic dislocations and disruptions we saw in John Mennes's and James Smith's treatment of "*The Showre of blossomes*". The nature of the textual variants would largely seem to confirm Marotti's view of 'sloppy editorial practice.' The printing of the poem as "A Song" in *The Second Part of Merry Drollery*[49] for instance, suggests that the compositor's eye slipped, exchanging the original places of stanzas two and three in *Hesperides*. The poem also exhibits a generic fluidity in both manuscript and print. In MS Harley 3991, the poem is headed 'Lose no time', in MS Harley 6918 "A Sonnet", and in Folger V.a. 308, "Sonnets 115". Such generic instability remains in the poem's

consulted, but the data collected by Smyth is partial for Herrick, since it only indexes the contents of the first editions of miscellanies, not their frequent augmentations.

[44] The Manuscript witnesses are: MS Harley 3991 (f. 145v), MS Harley 6918 (f. 25), MS Folger V.A. 308 (f.37), MS Eng 540, MS Don c.57 (f. 72v), MS Mus. Sch. E. 451 (p.335), MS Rawl. Poet. 65 (f.30), as well as three manuscript versions of an appropriation of Herrick's poem for political purposes.

[45] 'A person of quality' ed. *Windsor Drollery*… (London, 1671). Subsequent references to this volume in text as *WD*71.

[46] 'S.N', *The Loyal Garland*… (London, 1673) Subsequent references to this volume in text as *LG*73.

[47] Anon. *Poems on Affairs of State…the second part* (London, 1697), pp. 169-170. Subsequent references to this volume in text as *AS*97.

[48] The first quatrain is also included in an Almanac, John Phillips, *Montelion,* (London,*1662*), sig. B5v under the prognostications for June.

[49] 'W.N', *The Second part of Merry drollery* (London, 1661), sigs. B6r-B6v. All subsequent references to this volume in text as *MD61*.

printed forms. Removing Herrick's descriptive title, *The Academy of Complements* (1646, 1650) presents it as "A song", and *The Loyal Garland*, "*Good Advice*" and categorizes it as a sonnet.

While the poem remains relatively stable in terms of form throughout these remediations, it would be misleading to view its printing in *Hesperides* as a curtailment of movement. Rather, the life of this song or sonnet extends as its referential capabilities are expanded and contracted depending on the values of its textual arena of collection. Neil Fraistat's critical vocabulary of 'contexture' and 'contextural poetics' is useful here: 'the book – with all of its informing contexts – is the meeting ground of the poet and reader, the "situation" in which its constituent texts occur. As such, the book is constantly conditioning the reader's responses, activating various sets of what semioticians call "interpretative codes".'[50] We should be alert then, to the ways in which the situation of the poem as it occurs in *Hesperides*, shifts as it is recollected elsewhere.

Presented in *Hesperides*, the poem occurs in a book with explicitly royalist credentials, loudly declared by a large crown on the title-page, and a dedicatory poem addressed "TO THE MOST ILLVSTRIOVS, AND Most Hopefull PRINCE, CHARLES, Princes of *Wales*." Although "*To the Virgins"*" is by no means a poem that explicitly speaks to this discourse of royalism, it is important to recognize how the referential capacities of this poem are framed by its co-texts. Its celebration of an immersion in the present, and its encouragement to festivity and dalliance, is certainly informed and critiqued by the sonnet "*The bad season makes the Poet sad"* (214.2):

> DULL to my selfe, and almost dead to these
> My many fresh and fragrant Mistresses:

[50] Neil Fraistat 'Introduction' Neil Fraistat ed., *Poems in their Place: the Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections* (University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill and London, 1986). Pp. 3-18, p.3.

> Lost to all Musick now; since every thing
> Puts on the semblance here of sorrowing.
> Sick is the Land to'th'heart; and doth endure
> More dangerous faintings by her desp'rate cure.
> But if that golden Age wo'd come again,
> And *Charles* here Rule, as he before did Raign;
> If smooth and unperplext the Seasons were,
> As when the *Sweet Maria* lived here:
> I sho'd delight to have my Curles halfe drown'd
> In *Tyrian Dewes,* and Head with Roses crown'd.
> And once more yet (ere I am laid out dead)
> *Knock at a Starre with my exalted Head.*

The world of amorous delight to which the virgins are encouraged finds a counter-voice in this sonnet, which makes such behaviour seem inappropriate, and 'almost' impossible in a nation without the beneficent rule of Charles and Maria. Indeed, the question of when such activities will be possible is left open, through the repetition of conditional phrases, making the argument that Stuart monarchic rule is a necessary precursor for delight. Read in this context, an encouragement to Herrick's 'many fresh and fragrant mistresses' to 'use your time; | And while ye may goe marry' (13-14) takes on an elegiac significance; the delight that Herrick suggests is accessible through seizing the moment, is not attainable in a land 'sick to'th'heart'.

The sonnet's prolepsis to the moment of restoration, a moment in which delight will also be restored, is precisely the moment that drolleries – and Herrick's poetry collected in them – celebrate. *The Second Part of Merry Drollery* the 1663 *Recreation for Ingenious Head-Peeces* and *Windsor Drollery* each present the poem in a context of unproblematic mirth, wit and joviality. A poem in *Windsor Drollery*, Abraham Cowley's "Fill up the bowl with rosy wine" ("Song 23", p. 14) revels in precisely the moment that Herrick skeptically looks forward to in "*the bad season*": 'Fill up the Bowl with Rosie wine, | Round our Temples Roses twine' (1-2), and persistently displays delight in inebriation and festivity. "Song 48. *The Politick Drinker*" (p. 32). suggests that such activity is an escape from the political:

> Now lest you should prate of matters of State,
> Or anything else that might hurt us,
> Rather let us drink off our Cups to the brink,
> And then we shall speak to the purpose.
> (5-8)

But this very escape, accessed *through* drunkenness is itself a declaration of political values. As Smyth observes, 'to appreciate miscellanies we need to detect politics through association, connotation, implication – to note actions or modes which, although superficially "nonpolitical" in fact indicate allegiances or tendencies.'[51] This very celebration of mirth, functions in a manner similar to Herrick's own celebration of it in poems such as "*The Welcome to Sack*". If 'speaking to the purpose' can be carried out by indulging in revelry, it is possible to read "*To the Virgins*", as it appears in *Windsor Drollery* and *The Second Part of Merry Drollery* as a form of this. The poem thus functions, in these contexts, with these co-texts as celebration rather than lament.

Shifting the poem's referential capacities by re-presenting it in this way is carried out in subtly different ways in *The Loyal Garland,* a miscellany compiled by 'S.N, A Lover of Mirth', and published with "*To the Virgins*" included as "*Good Advice*" in 1673, 1680 and 1686. While *The Second Part of Merry Drollery* and *Windsor Drollery* present the texts with implicit politics, *The Loyal Garland* focuses in 1673, on what Herrick would call 'the bad season', by collecting 'choice Songs and Sonnets of our late unhappy Revolutions'. Its title-page declares its political values by using similar paratextual signifiers and visual language to Herrick's book: a crown tops a garland, also decorated with an image of Charles II, and surrounding biblical epigraphs: 'Fear God, Honor the King 1 Pet. 2.17. My Son, fear thou the LORD, and the King: and meddle not with them that are given to change, *Prov*. 24.21.1'. Unlike the drolleries, this miscellany presents more immediately topical poetry, declaring in a

[51] Smyth, *Profit and Delight*. p. 136.

poem early in the collection: 'You Loyalists all now rejoice and be glad, | The day is our own, there's no need to be sad' (*LG*86 "The Loyalists Incouragement", sig. A5r: 1-2 '). It thus presents a voice of celebration, countering the 'sadness' of Herrick in 'the bad season', and enabling a poem with 'To the Virgins's' sentiment, to appear celebratory, rather than elegiac. Although Herrick appears in the collection anonymously, his presence fashions a monument to a community of like-minded voices: a collaborative monument to Loyalist writers of the 'late unhappy revolutions.' But even between different editions of the same miscellany, the implications of re-presentation can differ considerably. What is a celebratory praise of Loyalism to Charles I, made to function as a celebration of the Restoration in the early 1670s, is obviously made more problematic and fraught by the time it appears two years before another 'Revolution', at a time of further monarchic crisis.

The form of the poem does not change, but referentially, this lyric is not resistant to what Herrick calls in *"The Argument of his Booke"* (5.1), '*Time's trans-shifting*' (9). Rather, its situation must be approached trans-historically, and take into account not only textual, but presentational differences. To approach 'To the Virgins, that make much of time' as it occurs in the context of *Hesperides*, but to obscure how it was reinterpreted through its re-presentation by compilers of printed miscellanies, is to obscure its accretive referential capacities; how, in the hands of different compilers, it could be made to function in different ways from its initial situation of reception. To use a final illustration that aptly demonstrates *both* kinds of textual malleability discussed by this essay, "SONG. To the Tune of, *Gather your Rose-Buds, &*c", occurs in *Poems on Affairs of State. The Second Part* (pp. 169-170): The poem recalls the memory of the poem's original form, by alluding to its familiar musical setting, but also through its arguments of a persuasion to marriage, its floral imagery and thematic

concerns with temporality. Through appropriation, the poem's argument is also adapted to suit an anti-Catholic agenda, in the first stanza, urging its reader to 'Keep to the Church, while yet you may, | Now sects are still a growing' (1-2). In *Hesperides*, change, in the form of marriage was offered as a preferable alternative to 'tarry[ing]', but in this poem, the converse is argued: change, in the form of religious conversion will lead to an endless condition of religious changeability:

> Then be not Wedded to the New,
> But in the old way tarry,
> For having once but left the New,
> You may forever vary.
> (13-16)

The poem's intertextual connections with 'To the Virgins', suggest familiarity with its 'original' state, whilst simultaneously exhibiting a willingness to disrupt and alter this. As such, its final line, 'you may forever vary', uncannily describes the potential for an endlessly open textual condition of printed lyric poems.

Bibliography

Printed sources

Anon. *Poems on Affairs of State, the second part.* (London, 1697). Bodleian Library, Oxford. 8^{o} Harding 344.

B[old], H[enry], *Wit a Sporting in a Pleasant Grove of New Fancies* (London, 1657). Accessed on EEBO. Wing/B3476-127-11.

Carew, Thomas, *Poems Written by Thomas Carew, Esquire* (London,1640) Accessed on EEBO. STC/1060:12

Herrick, Robert, 'Hesperides' in *Herrick's Poetical Works* L.C Martin ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 1-337.

_____ *Hesperides*: *or, the Works both humane and divine of Robert Herrick esquire* (London, 1648). Bodleian Library, Oxford. 8^{o} Douce H 311.

_____ *Hesperides*: *or, the Works both humane and divine of Robert Herrick esquire* (London, 1648). Bodleian Library, Oxford. 8^{o} Malone 343.

Mennes, John and James Smith, *Recreation for Ingenious head-peeces* (London, 1650) Accessed on EEBO. Wing/ M1713-284-02

_____ *Recreation for Ingenious head-peeces…* (London, 1663) Accessed on EEBO. Wing/M1715-608-05.

Person of quality, *Windsor Drollery, An Exact Collection of the Newest Songs, Poems, and Catches Now in use Both in City and Countrey* (London, 1671). Accessed on EEBO. STC/2203:12

Philomusus, *The Academy of Complements… the Seventh Edition* (London, 1646). Accessed on EEBO. Wing/ G1401B-1832.

_____ *The Marrow of Complements* (London, 1654). Accessed on EEBO. Wing/M719-195-E-1350.

Shakespeare, William, *Poems: Written by Wil. Shakespeare, Gent.* (London, 1640). Accessed on EEBO. STC/22344-1156-05.

S.N, *The Loyal Garland, Containing choice Songs and Sonnets of our late unhappy Revolutions…the fourth Editon, with Additions Printed by T. Johnson* (London, 1673). Accessed on EEBO. Wing/M79B-643-15.

___ *The Loyal Garland or a Choice Collection of Songs highly in Request, and much esteemed in the past and present Times…Printed by J.R for T. Passenger* (London, 1685). Accessed on EEBO. Wing/M79D-1781-24.

Winstanley, William, *The New Help to Discourse...Printed by H.C and sold by P. Parker* (London, 1684). Accessed on EEBO. Wing/W3071-1244-22.

W.N, *The Second Part of Merry Drollery…Printed by J.W for P.H* (London, 1661). Accessed on EEBO. Wing/s2295-1158-02.

Manuscript sources

MS. Ashmole 38 (Bodleian Library, Oxford).

MS. Eng. Poet. d. 152 (Bodleian Library, Oxford).

MS. Rawlinson Poet. 160 (Bodleian Library, Oxford).

Reference works

Beal, Peter, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, Vol. 2, 1625-1700 (London: Mansell, 1993).

Case, Arthur E., *A Bibliography of English Poetical Miscellanies, 1521-1750* (Oxford: Printed for the Bibliographical Society at the University Press, 1935).

Union First Line Index of English Verse [http://firstlines.folger.edu/]

Smyth, Adam, *An Online Index of Poetry in Printed Miscellanies, 1640-1682* [http://cobweb.businesscollaborator.com/pub/english.cgi/0/5383492].

Secondary Sources

Alpers, Paul. 'Renaissance Lyrics and their Situations', *New Literary History*, Vol. 38, No.2, (Spring 2007) pp. 309-331.

Beal, Peter, 'Notions in Garrison: The Seventeenth-Century Commonplace Book', *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies* (New York: Binghamton University Press, 1993), pp. 131-147.

Benedict, Barbara, *Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Restoration and Eighteenth Century Literary Anthologies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

Coiro, Anne Baynes, *Robert Herrick's* Hesperides *and the Epigram Book Tradition* (The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore and London, 1988).

_____ 'Herrick's *Hesperides:* The Name and the Frame', *English Literary History*, Vol. 52, No. 2 (Summer, 1985), pp. 311-336.

Connolly, Ruth and Tom Cain eds., *'Lords of Wine and Oile': Community and*

Conviviality in the Poetry of Robert Herrick. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Connolly, Ruth, 'Editing Intention in the Manuscript Poetry of Robert Herrick,' *Studies in English Literature* (Winter 2012), pp. 69-74.

_____ 'Print, Miscellaneity and the Reader in Robert Herrick's *Hesperides*', in Allen, G., Griffin, C., O'Connell, M (eds.), *Readings on Audience and Textual Materiality* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2011), pp. 23-37.

_____ 'New Approaches to the Work of Robert Herrick', *Literature Compass,* 2009, (6) pp. 1177-1187.

_____ 'Herrick's Communities of Manuscript and Print', in Connolly and Cain (eds.), pp. 1-24.

Corns, John (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry,* Donne to Marvell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Creaser, John, 'Time's Trans-shifting': Chronology and the Misshaping of Herrick', in *English Literary Renaissance,* Volume 39 (February, 2009), Issue 1, pp. 163-196.

Dobranski, Stephen, *Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Ezell, Margaret J. M. *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Fraistat, Neil (ed.), *Poems in Their Place: The Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections,* (University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill and London, 1986).

Helgerson, Richard, *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992).

Hobbs, Mary, *Early Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992).

Hunter, G.K, 'The Marking of Sententiae in Elizabethan Printed Plays, Poems and Romances', *The Library,* Vol. 6 (Issue 3-4, 1951), pp. 171-188.

Ingram, Randall, 'Robert Herrick and the Makings of *Hesperides*', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900,* Vol. 38, No. 1 (Winter, 1998), pp. 127-147.

Johnson, Barbara, *Persons and Things* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008).

Kimmey, John L., 'Order and Form in Herrick's *Hesperides*', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology,* Vol 70, No. 2 (April, 1971), pp. 255-268.

Love, Harold, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

Marcus, Leah,'Robert Herrick', in John Corns (ed.), pp. 171-183.

_____'Conviviality Interrupted, or Herrick and Postmodernism', in Conolly and Cain (eds.), pp. 65-82.

_____ *Unediting the Renaissance*: *Shakespeare, Marlowe and Milton* (London: Routledge, 1996).

_____ *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

Marotti, Arthur F, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995).

_____ 'Malleable and Fixed Texts: Manuscript and Printed Miscellanies and the Transmission of Lyric Poetry in the English Renaissance, in W.Speed Hill (ed.), pp. 159-174.

Maus, Katharine E., 'Why read Herrick?' in Connolly and Corns (eds.), pp. 25-38.

McGann, Jerome, *The Textual Condition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

Nebeker, Eric, 'Broadside Ballads, Miscellanies, and the Lyric in Print,' *English Literary History*, Vol. 76 (2009), pp. 989-1013.

Pomeroy, Elizabeth W., *The Elizabethan Miscellanies, their Development and Conventions* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1973).

Pugh, Syrithe, *Herrick, Fanshawe and the Politics of Intertextuality: Classical Literature and Seventeenth-Century Royalism* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.

_____ 'Supping with Ghosts: Imitation and Immortality in Herrick', in Connolly and Cains (eds)., pp. 220-249.

Smith, Nigel. *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1994.

Smyth, Adam, *Profit and Delight: Printed Miscellanies in England, 1640-1682* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2004).

_____ 'Such a general itching after book-learning': Popular Readers of 'the most eiminent Wits', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 33, Medieval and Early Modern Miscellanies and Anthologies (2003), pp. 262-272.

Spiller, Michael, *The Development of the Sonnet: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 1992).

Speed-Hill, W (ed.), *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts Medieval and Renaissance*

Texts and Studies (New York: Binghamton University Press, 1993).

Swann, Marjorie, *Curiosities and Texts: The Culture of Collecting in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).

_____ *Aspects of Herrick's Lyricism* (Unpublished thesis (D.Phil), Oxford University, Faculty of English Language and Literature, 1990).