"Samuel Daniel's Delia"

Peter Reimann

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

McGill University of Montreal, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

27 March 1974

"Samuel Daniel's Delia"

Peter Reimann

Master of Arts

Department of English

ABSTRACT

Daniel was not, as is usually assumed, an orthodox Petrarchist. Nor does Delia lack dramatic and thematic unity, having as it does for its central theme the development of the artistic consciousness through the inspiration of love and the growing awareness of the nature of beauty and art. Daniel opposed the stylistic excesses of Petrarchism, striving to create a sonnetry wholly his own and truly English. The concepts of love and of the immortality of art in Delia are dependent upon Neo-Platonic thought, but are nevertheless original. The latter concept appears in Daniel's mature, philosophical writings.

Daniel n'est pas, comme on dit souvent, un Pétrarquiste bien pensant, et Delia ne manque pas d'unité dramatique et thématique. L'oeuvre a pour thème centrale l'évolution de la conscience artistique par l'amour et par la promtitude de la beauté. Daniel était opposé aux excès du style Pétrarquiste et a developpé une poésie amoureuse tellement à lui et vraiment anglaise. Les concepts de l'amour et de l'immortalité de l'art que Daniel présente dans les sonnets sont basés sur des idées néo-platoniennes, mais ils sont originaux. Nous les trouvons encore dans ses oeuvres philosophiques écrits bien après Delia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

After centuries of neglect Samuel Daniel is finally being accorded the attention and respect that he deserves. The past few years have seen three fine, book-length studies devoted to his life and work.[1] We at last have a reasonable biography--though certain phases of his career are still in dispute--and what amounts to a serious reevaluation of the significance of his achievement. A great deal, however, still remains to be done. Daniel produced works in almost every major Renaissance genre: love lyrics, songs, tragedies and pastoral comedies, a verse narrative, a historical epic, verse epistles and dialogues, an outstandingly incisive critical essay, and a prose history of England. The strength of his intellect and the excellence of his art were acknowledged by the finest minds of the age; the Countess of Pembroke, Fulke Greville, John Florio, and Camden were but a few of his close acquaintances. Poets ranging from the poorest, from Pseudo-Constable[2] to Shakespeare[3] himself imitated him. Daniel was, to quote C. S. Lewis, "the most interesting man of letters whom that century produced in England."[4] Obviously, it takes more than three biographical and critical studies, however fine, to guide us through the richness and diversity of his works.

Not least among the writings that have still to be carefully examined is the sonnet sequence, Delia. This, Daniel's loveliest work, ranks among the crucial sequences of the period. First published in part by the pirate printer Thomas Newman in 1591[5] alongside Astrophil and Stella, Delia is the first fruit of the new school of sonnetry that Sidney established. Its influence

is to be felt in almost all of the love sonnetry of the era; in fact, without this model the "sonnet craze" of the nineties would quite probably never have attained such impressive proportions. Daniel's early reputation, a very enviable one, was founded upon it, and if today he is at all remembered it is for the two or three regularly anthologized sonnets from Delia which not a few editors have judged the finest in the language.

Yet critics have ignored Daniel's sonnetry. Prejudiced by an antagonism towards Elizabethan love sonnet sequences that date back to the last century, they have systematically neglected, misunderstood, and undervalued Delia. Of the few critics who have felt obliged to deal with it, the majority confined their commentaries to misleading generalizations. A minute number, taking the opposite course, concentrated on biographical and source studies. Very seldom has anyone approached the work to discover the uniqueness of its artistry, even though the most cursory glance assures us that Delia contains poetry of unmatched excellence.

The biographical investigations, as one may expect from the dearth of historical reference in the sonnets, have yielded very little. It has been established within a reasonable margin of doubt that the original Delia was not, as tradition holds, Mary Herbert, Countess of Pembroke. But the true identity, or, for that matter, whether she actually ever existed—whether the lady of the sonnets is a portrait or a fiction—has not, and most probably never will be, established. The question is, however, not a crucial one. The work, as we shall see, is not autobiography but art; allusive, but definitely not historical. As the vast majority of Renaissance sonnet

sequences, it was meant to be appreciated as a fiction, a "made thing", and to impose a biographical pattern upon it is to destroy its aesthetic integrity. (For this reason we shall, though taking certain biographical elements into consideration, approach Delia as a work of art, referring to and treating the "I" of the sonnets not as Samuel Daniel, but "Delia's lover".)

While biographical investigations yielded little besides touch and go hypotheses, the source studies have been very fruitful, but neither sweet nor just. Until very lately critics were not concerned with analyzing how Daniel makes use of the models he adapts, but, without even a cursory regard for Elizabethan concepts of "imitation", simply itemized sources and influences and, citing this loaded evidence, branded Daniel as a servile imitator of the sonneteers of France and Italy. Fortunately, within the last few years opinion has turned about, and critics are finally examining the glaring differences between sonnets and their models. This shift in method is exemplified by the conflicting evaluations of two eminent scholars. Sidney Lee dismissed Delia as "a haphazard mosaic of French and Italian originals."[7] Patricia Thomson, who has looked at the sonnets as carefully as Lee ever did, states that "when Daniel does imitate a specific literary model, he can make a new poem of it."[8] Joan Rees[9] and Pierre Spriet[10] will agree with this succint statement.

The damage is, however, done. The examples of Sidney and his school[11] not only directed critical attention almost exlusively towards sources and influences, but, what is worse, falsely labelled Delia as a merely conventional effort, as an orthodox exercise in traditional Petrarchist sonnetry. Thus,

even critics appreciative of Delia finally maintain that it is devoid of serious intellectual value; that it is technically admirable, but lacking in substance. C. S. Lewis, for example, called the sequence "a masterpiece of phrasing and melody" and added that "it offers no ideas, no psychology, and of course no story."[12] Less kindly, Patrick Crutwell declared it "the quintessence of the Petrarchan, unenlivened by any doubt or originality."[13]

Quite recently, attempts have been made to answer these charges, which are characteristic of the modern attitude towards Delia. Joan Rees has shown that the sonnets are indeed valuable for their "notable psychological subtlety",[14] and C. F. Williamson[15] that they do form an organized whole which adumbrates a story. Williamson demonstrates that neither the attitudes of the lover towards Delia nor their relationship is static, but that as the sequence progresses the lover comes to realize that although he will never win Delia's love with his poetry, he is capable of granting her the immortality of his art, of assuring that her beauty is preserved against the workings of time in the very poems she scorned.

Williamson's short study can be truly called revolutionary. Above any others, it has revealed that Delia contains much more than meets the casual eye, that the work is a carefully planned and successfully finished organic whole with a distinct central theme, and not, as Lee had it, "a haphazard mosaic". However, Williamson's analysis is, as one expects of a ground-breaking study, not definitive. He ignores certain aspects of the lover's development and, as we shall see, actually misinterprets the conclusion of the sequence. Furthermore, while he suggests that Delia does offer ideas,

he adds that these are "veriest commonplace among the sonneteers",[16] thus effectively siding with Lewis. Even more importantly, he fails to answer the most serious charge brought against Daniel, that he is a mere Petrarchist.

This is, in part, what this essay will endeavour to do. It will also examine the central and secondary themes of the work to demonstrate that Delia is a testing ground for concepts Daniel later articulated in his apologia pro sua vita, the much applauded Musophilus: A General Defense of All Learning. Of course, because the sequence is not ratiocinative like Musophilus, but, like Astrophil and Stella, dramatizes rather than states its themes, we shall have to examine it carefully from beginning to end, observing modifications in the lover's attitudes towards Delia, himself, and his art, changes in tone, and the organic development of patterns of imagery.

The sequence is, as we shall see, divided into three major sections with a different type or combinations of types of sonnets characterizing each. At the start of the sequence, the lover is exclusively occupied with praising Delia's beauty and lamenting his own torment in an effort to win her love. Further on, the "praise and complaint" sonnets are replaced by the carpe diem and from then on it is eternizing sonnets that predominate. In these, instead of begging Delia to show mercy or urging her to "seize the day", the lover devotes himself to the preservation of her beauty and virtue against the depradations of time and mutability within the imperishable medium of poetry. By the very end of the sequence (Williamson fails to notice this), having thus attained though not possessed Delia's beauty, the lover finally decides

that as any attempt to win her is futile and as she doesn't care a bit about the immortality of art, he had better find a new source of inspiration and so make rewarding use of his new found powers.

It is in this way that Daniel presents his major theme, the growth of the artistic consciousness from its initial state of dependence upon beauty for inspiration to the brink of an artistic maturity where the ideal of beauty itself, and not the cruel smiles and frowns of a beautiful girl, provides the inspiration and to an extent even the subject of poetry. In short, he describes the transformation of a lover into a poet.

Following this theme's development, we shall pause at appropriate places to determine the philosophical background of the ideas that the sequence offers. Most time will be spent on the most important-- that of the immortality of art. Reference will be made to other works of Daniel's which forward this concept--mainly Musophilus--and the degree of Daniel's dependence on Neo-Platonic aesthetics for theoretical support will be gauged. This is an indispensible analysis, for, although Daniel's belief in the immortality of poetry lies at the basis of his philosophy of art, it has yet to be properly examined.

Part of an early chapter will be devoted to the analysis of the nature of the love described in Delia to clarify some of the reasoning behind the eternizing sonnets and to provide us with an opportunity to appreciate the intellectual independence with which the young Daniel approached a body of ideas as popular as Neo-Platonism was in the sixteenth century. In both these analyses, we shall refer to not the classic works of Neo-Platonism--Plotinus'

and Ficino's--but such as were more accessible and relevant to Daniel: Spenser's and Giordano Bruno's. Comparison of the Italian's philosophy of love with Daniel's is particularly interesting as it clearly demonstrates that our poet could take ideas from the most persuasive works without sacrificing his own views.

Thus, we shall see that Delia does offer ideas and that it has a much more finely defined "story" than critics have so far cared to admit, but there still remains the most serious criticism to consider--that the sequence is little more than an orthodox exercise in traditional forms. Therefore, to show that Daniel is not, to adapt a phrase, one of "Petrarch's apes", this essay begins with a comparison of Delia and her lover with the standard Petrarchist hero and heroine, and throughout attention will be drawn to the manner in which Daniel approaches the conventions and mannerisms of Petrarchist sonnetry. As we shall see, he not only excludes a great variety of conceits and types of sonnets from his sequence, but systematically avoids the stylistic excesses that make Petrarchism a pejorative term in our critical vocabulary.

The conclusion of the sequence, we shall find, actually hints at the abandonment of love poetry for higher themes and a sterner style. We shall therefore finally consider whether Daniel meant Delia's lover's final decision to mirror his own dissatisfaction with love poetry and refer to his critical writings to discover what he proposed as an alternative. In this way it will be possible to ascertain how he was dissatisfied with Petrarchism and thus better appreciate what he was trying to accomplish in Delia.

Unfortunately, this essay lacks the space for a serious examination of the shift in Daniel's style from the relatively ornate of the sonnets to the plain, ratiocination of Musophilus and the neo-classical verse epistles, but some comparison will be made and emphasis will be placed on the fact that as early as the composition of the sonnets Daniel insisted that English poets foster the essential genius of their own tongue, that instead of apeing the French and Italians, they develop a truly English literature.

Because Delia has been so neglected, a good part of this study is devoted to the discovery of the excellence of individual sonnets and the thematic and structural unity of the sequence as a whole. In this regard, I should apologize that limitations of space preclude extensive comparison of Delia with other sequences. However, at least a few sonnets will be examined beside ones by Drayton on similar themes and, whenever possible, the degree of the conventionality of Daniel's work will be noted. It has already been established what he took from the Petrarchist tradition; we shall see how he made use of this material, how he imposed the forms of his unique artistic personality upon it.

Finally, I must make clear that by the term "Petrarchist" I do not mean the manner and method of Petrarch, but that of the unquestioningly imitative sixteenth century poets who mishandled the traditional forms that he refined and shaped. I do not subscribe to the widespread opinion that Petrarchism had a stunting effect on the poetry of the English Renaissance. The greatest love poems of the age are, after all, love sonnets. Even if one considers Sidney's and Shakespeare's sequences anti-Petrarchist, he must admit that

they had their first nourishment from that tradition. What I do consider unworthy is the lack of critical self-awareness that undermines the method of the mere Petrarchist; the blind acceptance of conventions and mannerisms alien to the essential character of English poetry and the frenzied attempts to ape the southern European poetic temperament.

We shall see that Daniel did not fall victim to this common artistic malady.

NOTES

1

Joan Rees, Samuel Daniel (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1964). Hereafter referred to as Rees. C. C. Seronsy, Samuel Daniel (New York: Twayne, 1967). Pierre Spriet, Samuel Daniel, Etudes anglaises, 29 (Paris: Didier, 1968). Hereafter referred to as Spriet.

2

See Appendix III below.

3

Claes Schaar maintains against the bulk of critical opinion in his An Elizabethan Sonnet Problem, Lund Studies in English, 28 (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1960) that Shakespeare's sonnets influenced Daniel's. This "minority opinion" has become even less credible in the light of the new biographical materials A. L. Rowse presents in his Shakespeare the Man (London: Macmillan, 1973).

4

C. S. Lewis. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, excluding Drama, Oxford History of English Literature (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), p. 531. Hereafter referred to as Lewis.

5

In 1591, returning from a trip to Italy with Sir Edward Dymoke, Daniel found that Newman had pirated his sonnets and so published the first authorized edition of Delia containing fifty sonnets. Eight more editions were printed during his lifetime, all authorized. According to the common modern practice, I use the first edition of 1592, ed. A. C. Sprague, in Poems and "A Defence of Ryme" (1930; rpt. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), this edition being the only accessible and usable one. Reference will be made to one or two sonnets that Daniel added to later editions (all additions and corrections are recorded by Sprague, pp. 170-93), but the fifty sonnets of the first authorized edition are to be considered as the authentic form of the sequence. The sonnets that Daniel added are almost all perfunctory efforts produced to boost the sales of new editions and his corrections deprive the poems of their freshness and vitality. The first edition of 1592, written with the greatest imaginative force and lyric facility is by far the preferable one.

I cite added sonnets thusly: (1594, XXX; p. 183). The date refers to the edition, the Roman numeral to the number of the sonnet in that edition, and the page number to where it is reproduced in Sprague. In all quotations I retain original punctuation and spelling, modernizing only s's, u's, v's, and j's. I do not indent verses or reproduce ornamental capitals.

6
See Appendix I below.

7
Sidney Lee, The French Renaissance in England (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), p. 255.

8
Patricia Thomson, ed., Elizabethan Lyrical Poets, Routledge English Texts (London: Routledge, 1967), p. 14.

9
Rees, pp. 22-30.

10
Spriet, pp. 207-244.

11
See L. E. Kastner, "The Elizabethan Sonneteers and the French Poets," M.L.R., 3 (1908), 268-77; "The Italian Sources of Daniel's 'Delia'," M.L.R., 7 (1912), 153-56. C. Runtz-Rees, "Some Debts of Daniel to Du Bellay," M.L.N., 24 (1904), 134-37.

12
Lewis, p. 491.

13
Patrick Crutwell, The English Sonnet, British Council Writers and Their Work, 191 (London: Longmans, 1966), p. 14.

14
Rees, p. 33.

15
C. F. Williamson, "The Design of Samuel Daniel's 'Delia'," R.E.S., 19 (1968), 259 et passim. Hereafter referred to as Williamson.

16
Ibid., 260.

DELIA AND HER LOVER

As the appearance of the lady and the sufferings of the lover are among the most standardized elements of Petrarchist sonnetry, a good way of evaluating the originality of a poet's approach to the tradition is to see how his pair differ from the norm. Applying this test to Delia, we find that although both the lady and her lover are basically Petrarchist in conception, Daniel is anything but unquestioningly conventional. Not only does he outrightly reject highly characteristic elements of the tradition and treat those he retains in an individual manner, but he manages to make his pair more impressively life-like than the standard figures. As the sequence progresses, Delia appears in different postures against changing backgrounds and her lover develops emotionally and intellectually, turning from her abject slave into a self-confident poet for whom the eternization of beauty is more important than its possession, and the satisfaction of art more fulfilling than success in love.

1. The lover and Petrarchist despair.

It is not only the modern reader who is dissatisfied with the Petrarchist treatment of the effects of disappointed love. More than ten years before Delia Sidney had complained that fashionable love poets "bewray a want of inward tuch"[1], that their complaints lack depth and substance and too often are no more than mere exercises in a stale rhetoric.

Daniel came to a similar conclusion. Rejecting much of the elaborate ma-

chinery of the traditional complaint, he strives for the psychological veracity of that "inward tuch". True, he fails to create a persona as well rounded as that of Astrophil, but we do commiserate with Delia's lover. His emotions are impressively real. It is not the drone of the mere Petrarchist working his way through the standard antitheses of the "I burn-I freeze" sort and making the expected mythological comparisons that we hear in these sonnets, but the human voice of a man in great despair, a voice in which one may find the echoes of his own sadness.

The best complaint in Delia is the famous "Care Charmer Sleep" (XLV) (we shall examine it later on), but sonnets V and IX do not rank far behind. In these too Daniel uses conventional mythological conceits with unmatched subtlety and freshness and succeeds in both conveying and deftly analysing emotion.

> Whilst youth and error led my wandring minde,
> And set my thoughts in heedeles waies to range:
> All unawares a Goddesse chaste I finde,
> Diana-like, to worke my suddaine change.
> For her no sooner had my view bewrayde,
> But with disdaine to see me in that place:
> With fairest hand, the sweet unkindest maide,
> Castes water-cold disdaine upon my face.
> Which turn'd my sport into a Harts dispaire,
> Which still is chac'd, whilst I have any breath,
> By mine owne thoughts: set on me by my faire,
> My thoughts like houndes, pursue me to my death.
> Those that I fostred of mine owne accord,
> Are made by her to murther thus their Lord.
>
> (V)

Conspicuously absent from this description of the lover's infatuation is the witty account of the Cupid's darts' progress through the body. The Actaeon fable, on the other hand, is a popular enough Petrarchist motif but, Daniel

does not use it decoratively. Only the very basic facts of the story are retained, and these are compressed into images like "Castes water-cold disdaine upon my face" and "turn'd my sport into a Harts dispaire", the complexity of which is symbolic of the confusion of the lover's afflicted mind.[1]

Had Daniel followed the path of the orthodox Petrarchist, he would never have achieved such striking effects of condensation. Watson, for example, begins his poem on the same theme in the traditional manner:

> Diana and her nimphs in sylvane brooke,
> Did wash themselves in secret farre apart:
> But bold Actaeon dard on them to looke,
> For which faire Phoebe tournd him to a Hart.[2]

Watson sets the Ovidian scene and diffuses concentration through detail; Daniel mentions neither the pool or the entourage of nymphs, or even Delia's nakedness. Such detail would smudge the tense clarity of the poem and thus destroy it, for it is not a colourful variation on a traditional theme but a lens revealing, as Joan Rees puts it, "some region of inner experience."[3]

This inner realm has a morally symbolical topography, adumbrated by "heedeles" and highlighted through the suggestive force of the quasi-personifications "youth and error". The scene is set not for a fashionable Petrarchist masquerade, but a psychological morality. "My thoughts...Are made by her to murther thus their Lord" refers to more than a mere shift of the affections. Desire has committed regecide: reason has been overthrown and the order of the microcosm of the mind destroyed. The "suddaine change" is a fall from innocence, "sport", into the chaos of despair.

The consequences of the lover's transformation are elaborated by the echo of Sidney's "My sheepe are thoughts which I both guide and serve"[4] in "My thoughts like houndes, pursue me to my death" and the contrast between "Whilst youth and error led my wandring minde" and a line from the next sonnet, which describes Delia as a "modest maide" "Whose feete doe treade greene pathes of youth and love" (VI). The lover no longer provides for his thoughts like a good guardian--they devour him, and instead of being the carefull guide he finds himself the worried, breathless prey. What began as an innocent, though imprudent, excursion through the erotic imagination has turned into a feverish flight of the self from its own disintegration. Despair has plunged the lover into a nightmare so terrible that in contrast the very ground Delia walks on seems blessed: "pathes of youth and love".

Peter Ure has written that Daniel is not "concerned with the moments or the impacts of passion or the quickenings of thought in the mind."[5] This is generally true of Delia. Daniel does tend to "evaluate experience"[6] rather than epitomize it, but sonnet V exposes nerves.

Sonnet IX is almost relaxed in comparison. In V the lover's voice is broken by hysteria. "My thoughts like houndes, pursue me to my death" is a scream, and the couplet a gasp of consternation:

> Those that I fostred of mine owne accord,
> Are made by her to murther thus their Lord.

We see the lover panting this out in terror and dismay as his "houndes" drag him down. But sonnet IX, also a complaint, is liquid music:

If this be love, to drawe a weary breath,
Painte on flowdes, till the shore, crye to th'ayre:
With downward lookes, still reading on the earth;
The sad memorials of my loves despaire.
If this be love, to warre against my soule,
Lye downe to waile, rise up to sigh and grieve me:
The never-resting stone of care to roule,
Still to complaine my griefes, and none releive me.
If this be love, to cloath me with darke thoughts,
Haunting untroden pathes to waile apart;
My pleasures horror, Musique tragicke notes,
Teares in my eye, and sorrowe at my hart.
If this be love, to live a living death;
O then love I, and drawe this weary breath.°

This "definition of love" is, like the previous sonnet, controlled by a central mythological metaphor--the allusion to Sisyphus rolling the "never-resting stone of care". Like the Olympian curse, Delia's disdain has made her lover's life a hell of ineffectuality. Loving her and trying to win her mercy are as unescapable and impossible as struggling with Sisyphus' burden. Even music, a cure for melancholy, and a poet's sustenance, oppresses, for as in hell, what was once pleasurable is now the source of a double torment.

All this is quite conventional. The Petrarchist often describes his condition as infernal punishment, comparing himself to Sisyphus, Tantalus, or Ixion. Insomnia, weeping, inner conflict, longing for solitude, and despair are standard symptoms of love induced melancholy, and the oxymoron, "living death", is a hallmark of the traditional "definition of love". But the average Petrarchist effort is seldom this effective. The cloak of melancholy, for example, is easy enough to come by, but Delia's lover is draped in the dark stuff of his own thoughts:

If this be love, to cloath me with darke thoughts,

Haunting untroden pathes to waile apart.

Where another poet would elaborate the spectacle of tears eroding the earth like a second flood, Daniel gives us a brilliantly ambiguous phrase that comprehends the most exhaustive and explicit list of woes:

With downward lookes, still reading on the earth;
The sad memorials of my loves despaire.

Most impressively of all, Daniel imposes upon the wealth of detail that these sonnets contain a musical pattern that is itself metaphorical.

But no musician, I cannot say for certain that this poem was written to be sung, but it does seem to be as well adapted for part singing as sonnet XLVII, which Daniel's brother set to music.[7] The quadruple repetition of "If this be love" provides a burden and lines like "My pleasures horror, Musique tragicke notes" an opportunity for mimetic instrumentation. Counterpoint may emphasize the juxtaposition of metaphorical lines like "If this be love, to cloath me with darke thoughts" to more factual ones like "Teares in my eyes, and sorrow at my hart" and the coincidence of the opening and closing lines enhance the remarkable authority of the central metaphor. But even without musical arrangement it is plain that where the lover is Sisyphus his poem is the rock he struggles with: he cannot stop trying to win Delia's pity with complaining, and may pause only for a "weary breath" before resuming the cursed task of creating a poem that will move Delia's heart of stone to pity.

It is not only in these two sonnets that Daniel uses mythological allusions

with such intelligence and grace. Throughout the sequence his mythological conceits are always apt and truly metaphorical. The poems ring true. The conceits have precise meaning and in the best complaints we clearly hear, as A. B. Grosart had it, "the genuine 'cry' of a man's heart in suspensive anguish."[8]

Daniel was gifted with sharp psychological insight and a very sensitive ear for the rhythms of emotionally charged speech, and he knew exactly how to deal with the stock situations, postures, and rhetoric of the traditional complaint. In the two sonnets we have just looked at mechanics never outweigh purely dramatic values. Both controlling conceits are what the Elizabethans called "witty", but it is not the wit of the poems but the psychological states they discover that impress us. Unlike the mere Petrarchist, Daniel does not confuse analysis with ornament and because of this, even though the situations he elaborates and the basic means he employs are conventional, his complaints are emotionally moving as well as interesting. We find as much pleasure in the drama as in the technique, and we are all the more pleased when we remember that poetry this fresh is based on traditional material.

2. Delia and Petrarchist beauty.

Just as Daniel did not create a new type of sonnet hero, so he does not present us with a heroine radically different from the Petrarchist norm. Yet Delia, although she is actually called "a Laura" (XXXV), is in many ways quite unlike the average sonnet lady. To begin with, there are no Cupids

lurking in her eyes. Sidney himself approved of the Cupid conceit, but Daniel exiles the god of love and rids his sequence of the entire machinery of darts, brands, ambuscades, and naughty tickles that is so characteristic a feature of Petrarchist sonnetry. Similarly, he produces no blasons or baisirs, no mechanical catalogues of Delia's charms[9] or paeans to the miracle of her kiss. And, as if having a sonnet lady who is never surrounded by cohorts of deadly Cupids and never kissed were not distinction enough, Daniel systematically rejects the cluttered detail and unwarrented hyperboles that are basic to the Petrarchist descriptive method. Where the average sonneteer piles on epithet after exotic epithet until his lady fairly stoops under the load, Daniel observes the strictest economy, providing no more detail than is necessary to suggest, not depict, the fresh, transparent beauty he wants to celebrate.

Even more uniquely, Daniel refuses to produce the sensual descriptions that are a hallmark of Petrarchist sonnetry. Even when he bases a sonnet on a sexually explicit model, he maintains a degree of decorum rarely met in the love poetry of the era. We see this clearly in sonnet VI, which is based on a song from Robert Greene's Perimedes the Blacke-Smith. Greene's song runs:

> Faire is my love for Aprill in her face,
> Hir lovely brests September claimes his part,
> And lordly July in her eyes takes place,
> But colde December dwelleth in her heart.
> Blest be the months, that sets my thoughts on fire,
> Accurst that Month that hinders my desire.

Like Phoebus fire, so sparkles both her eies,
As ayre perfumde with Amber is her breath:
Like swelling waves her lovely teates do rise,
As earth hir heart, cold, dateth me to death.
Aye me poore man that on the earth do live,
When unking earth, death and dispaire.doth give.

In pompe sits Mercie seated in her face,
Love twixt her brests his trophees doth imprint.
Her eyes shines favour, courtesie, and grace:
But touch her heart, ah that is framd of flynt;
That fore my harvest in the Grasse beares graine,
The rocks will weare, washt with a winters raine.[10]

Daniel retains the basic antithetical patterns, a good deal of the imagery, and even a strand of the melody of this piece, but the beauty he celebrates is wholly different in conception.

Faire is my love, and cruell as sh'is faire;
Her brow shades frownes, although her eyes are sunny;
Her Smiles are lightning, though her pride dispaire;
And her disdaines are gall; her favours hunny.
A modest maide, deckt with a blush of honour,
Whose feete doe treade greene pathes of youth and love,
The wonder of all eyes that looke uppon her:
Sacred on earth, design'd a Saint above.
Chastitie and Beautie, which are deadly foes,
Live reconciled friends within her brow:
And had she pittie to conjoine with those,
Then who had heard the plaints I utter now.
O had she not beene faire, and thus unkinde,
My Muse had slept, and none had knowne my minde.
(VI)

It is not merely that Daniel omits mention of Delia's breast and generally describes her with less sensuous detail, but that the two girls exist in different realms of the imagination. The very earth that Delia walks on is idea-

lized: "pathes of youth and love". Yet she is not an impossibly distant ideal. Her blush, the brightness of her eyes, and the sweetness of her smiling lips are as delightfully human as may be desired. We seldom find such delicacy and grace in Petrarchist sonnetry.

Nor a beauty so interesting. Daniel, as I have said, suggests instead of describing, and subtlety of his method is an added delight. In the second quatrain of sonnet VI, for example, the juxtaposition of concrete and abstract values produces a scene verging on the allegorical:

> A modest maide, deckt with a blush of honour,
> Whose feete do treade greene pathes of youth and love,
> The wonder of all eyes that looke uppon her:
> Sacred on earth, design'd a Saint above.

"Feete" and "pathes" are tangible enough, but because they are "pathes of youth and love" Delia's stroll because a miniature allegory of the innocent pleasures of youth. Her beauty is ideal to the point of being symbolical, and thus the hyperbole of her praise is justified.

Daniel did not need a whole quatrain to produce such impressive effects. We find a single line subtle enough to contain an entire vignette: "Now whilst thy May hath fill'd thy lappe with flowers" (XXXII). The abstract "May" is juxtaposed to the concrete "lappe" in such a way as to suggest that Ver himself has met Delia and presented her with his sweetest blossoms to honour her beauty. Suggest, not depict: the poem does not describe this idyllic encounter, but prompts us, with the utmost delicacy and grace, to imagine it for ourselves. We are brought into the poetry to realize its vi-

sion, but, and this is why Daniel stands unique, where the Metaphysical conceit may require a considerable expense of intellectual energy, this is appreciable with perfect ease. The conceit is dynamic, but so subtle and delicate that we are scarcely aware of its complexity. It exists and delights us as effortlessly as a flower:

> But love whilst that thou maist be lov'd againe,
> Now whilst thy May hath fill'd thy lappe with flowers;
> Now whilst thy beautie beares without a staine;
> Now use thy Summer smiles ere winter lowres.
> (XXXII)

Had Daniel been any more explicit, he would have destroyed the magic of this lovely little allegory of Delia's intimacy with nature. This is, in fact, what happens in a poem by Herrick on the same theme:

> To gather Flowers Sappha went,
> And homeward she did bring,
> Within her Lawnie Continent,
> The treasure of the Spring.
>
> She smiling blusht, and blushing smil'd,
> And sweetly blushing thus,
> She lookt as she'd been got with child
> By young Favonius.[11]

Herrick fails because, for once, he labours the metaphor instead of letting it develop itself. Daniel stands back, refusing to smudge the delicacy of the vision with detail or explanation, and because of this his single line fills the imagination.

I do not wish to worry this one line to tatters, but I should point out that it constitutes the single instance in Delia that resembles a sexual

innuendo. But not because Daniel is any sort of prude; writers of that ilk cannot produce the charming descriptions he does. He wants to celebrate a "pure sweete beautie" (XXXI), and he succeeds. Few Elizabethan sonnet ladies are so sweetly lovely as Delia, and almost none so truly chaste.

Daniel never stoops to sensationalism to achieve effect. Although quite capable of writing in the Ovidian manner favoured by so many of his contemporaries,[12] he systematically avoids both sheer volume and overt sensuality. Even in a sonnet based on the Hero and Leander fable, all we saw of Delia are her "lovely eyes" and "fayrest hand":

> Faire and lovely maide, looke from the shore,
> See thy Leander striving in those waves:
> Poore soule fore-spent, whose force can do no more,
> Now send foorth hopes, for now calme pittie saves.
> And wafte him to thee with those lovely eyes,
> A happy convoy to a holy lande:
> Now shew thy powre, and where thy vertue lyes,
> To save thine owne, stretch out the fayrest hand.
>
> (XXXVIII)

The orthodox Petrarchist would both over-adorn and over-expose the lady; Daniel minimizes her sexuality, and because of this she is convincingly chaste. A poet may repeat time and time that his lady is ferociously virginal, but if he insists on describing her in the characteristic Petrarchist manner we shall hardly accept his assurances. Greene, for example, complains that his lady's heart is as cold as winter ground, but, with her breasts propped by a new conceit in each stanza, she is about as virginal as our own version of the Petrarchist heroine, the Hollywood blonde.

With Delia, there is no doubt. Chastity and beauty do "live reconciled

friends within her brow" (VI). Yet there is nothing cold about her beauty, and nothing lacking in the way Daniel describes it. Look:

> Ah sport sweet Mayde in season of these yeeres,
> And learne to gather flowers before they wither:
> And where the sweetest blossoms first appeares,
> Let love and youth conduct thy pleasures thither.
> (XLIII)

The delicacy, subtlety, and charm of these descriptions are unmatched in the literature.

3. Delia in 3-D.

So far we have been dealing somewhat in negatives, but this is unavoidable for a style as unobtrusive as Daniel's is best appreciated through contrast. The modern reader who is unfamiliar with the conventions and mannerisms of Petrarchist sonnetry will fail to fully understand Daniel's achievement if his divergence from the norm remains unemphasized. A simple matter like the absence of Cupid made the Elizabethan reader look twice at these sonnets; we have to be shown where to look to see how Daniel reacts against convention and fashion.

Daniel does do more than merely avoid certain characteristic excesses of the Petrarchist method. Delia may lack a fully developed personality, but she is more convincingly life-like than the standard sonnet heroine. As the sequence progresses, she appears in different postures against changing backgrounds, and the sum of these appearances gives an impression of roundness which many sonnet ladies lack.

The following sonnets are representative of these three aspects:

Behold what happe Pigmaleon had to frame,
And carve his proper griefe upon a stone:
My heavie fortune is much like the same,
I work on Flint, and that's the cause I mone.
For haples loe even with my owne desires,
I figured on the table of my harte,
The fayrest forme, the worldes eye admires,
And so did perish by my proper arte.
And still I toile, to chaunge the marble brest
Of her, whose sweetest grace I doe adore:
Yet cannot finde her breathe unto my reste,
Hard is her hart and woe is me therefore.
O happie he that joy'd his stone and arte,
Unhappy I to love a stony harte.
(XIII)

Here Delia is the traditional sonnet lady par excellence: an irresistible beauty with immovable affections, half angel, half man-destroying Sphynx; a thoroughbred Petrarchist "cruel-fair". But after sonnet XXIX we see another Delia:

But love whilst that thou maist be lov'd againe,
Now whilst thy May hath fill'd thy lappe with flowers,
Now whilst thy beautie beares without a staine;
Now use thy Summer smiles ere winter lowres.
And whilst thou spread'st unto the rysing sunne,
The fairest flowre that ever sawe the light:
Now joye thy time before thy sweete be dunne,
And Delia, thinke that morning must have night.
And that thy brightnes sets at length to west:
When thou wilt close up that which now thou showest:
And thinke the same becomes thy fading best,
Which then shall hide it most and cover lowest.
Men doe not weigh the stalke for that it was,
When once they finde her flowre, her glory passe.
(XXXII)

Marble has turned to flowers. Delia is no longer an omnipotent "cruel-fair", but a part of natural creation answerable to nature's laws. Two

sonnets later, however, her beauty is again ideal:

> When Winter snowes upon thy golden heares,
> And frost of age hath nipt thy flowers neere:
> When darke shall seeme thy day that never cleares,
> And all lyes withred that was held so deere.
> Then take this picture which I heere present thee,
> Limned with a Pensill not at all unworthy:
> Heere see the giftes that God and nature lent thee;
> Heere read thy selfe, and what I suffered for thee.
> This may remaine thy lasting monument,
> Which happily posteritie may cherish:
> These collours with thy fading are not spent;
> These may remaine, when thou and I shall perish.
> If they remaine, then thou shalt live thereby;
> They will remaine, and so thou canst not dye.
>
> (XXXIIII)

Here we see Delia's dismal future as an old woman lamenting the passing of her beauty, but this beauty has not really disappeared. "These collours with thy fading are not spent": it still exists, perfected, in poetry. Delia's beauty is no longer an obstacle to the lover's self-realization, as in sonnet XIII, or the victim of mutability, as in XXXII, but the imperishable essence of art. It has been eternized.

Thus, unlike the average sonnet lady, Delia has a history. We see her flourish and fade, and we know even the fate of her memory after death. This history is, to be sure, a very sketchy one, but the mere fact that it is supplied gives Delia a certain roundness and the sequence greater scope than is to be found in the standard Petrarchist effort.

One might, however, ask why Daniel did not make her even more life-like. It is, after all, only in appearance that Delia changes. Sonnet XXXIIII <u>forecasts</u> a painful emotional state. At the present fictional moment she is as

cruel to her lover as ever. Indeed, refusing him as disdainfully at the end of the sequence as at the beginning, she is, except for outward appearances, really quite static. The Complaint of Rosamond, Delia's companion piece, offers a much fuller portrait, and Daniel surely could have brought the same psychological insight to bear on his sonnet lady as he does on the heroine of his Mirror for Magistrates type of narrative.

Were Daniel an orthodox Petrarchist, the answer would be an obvious one. The sonnet lady is by definition perfect and needs realistic psychological analysis about as much as an ice castle mortar. Any attempt to minutely document her history or to probe the causes of her reluctance would destroy this fiction of perfection and leave the Petrarchist without his theme. Considering, however, that Daniel is artistically independent enough to dispense with so many basic Petrarchist conventions, there must be another explanation.

4. The lover and Delia.

As I have said earlier, the lover develops, changing from Delia's abject victim into a confident and competent artist for whom the preservation of beauty is more important than its possession in love. Delia is the frame of reference, the "control", against which his emotional and intellectual development is measured, and therefore she must remain consistantly disdainful of his suit throughout the sequence. For example, in sonnet XXIX[13] he realizes that her beauty is imperfect because her own vanity can mar it. Addressing her more bluntly than ever before, he tells her that self-admiration has changed her not into a mythical flower, but a Gorgon:

> And you are chaung'd, but not t'a Hiacint;
> I feare your eye hath turn'd your hart to flint.

She is still the "cruel-fair" who torments him with disdain, but in his eyes she has become less than perfect. This is why he addresses her so much more bluntly than before; he is no longer the absolute victim.

Once aware of the fact that Delia's beauty contains the seeds of its own destruction, the lover no longer regards her or reacts to her as to an absolute superior. She is as beautiful as ever, but he can now resist her attractions to the extent that he is able to lecture her on the nature and proper use of her beauty: "Now use thy Summer smiles ere winter lowres" (XXXII). Knowledge of the transitoriness of beauty leads him to the discovery of the eternizing powers of his art, and he is finally more concerned with the preservation than the possession of Delia's loveliness. In sonnet XLVI, for example, he no longer takes his disappointment and suffering into consideration:

> Though th'error of my youth they shall discover,
> Suffice they shew I liv'd and was thy lover.

"They", his poems, are no longer pleas for mercy, but the means of the preservation of the beauty that "made him speak that els was dombe" (XLVI). Though he still suffers, he no longer regards Delia primarily as the cause of his torment, but as the source of his inspiration, and his disappointment in love stands second to poetry and the conquest of time and mutability. At the very end of the sequence, however, he realizes that this state of affairs cannot continue and, refusing to sacrifice his great gift to the still thankless

"cruel-fair" bids farewell to love and love poetry.

Thus we see Delia in different postures against changing backgrounds because we look at her through her lover's eyes and he views her from different angles and in different lights according to the modifications in his attitudes towards her, his art, and his own self. He redefines her as he develops. When he envisions her as an omnipotent "cruel-fair" he sees no further than his disappointed desire and when he urges her to "seize the day", he is conscious of the fact that she is as susceptible to the ravages of time as he to her beauty and cruelty. When he declares that he will preserve her beauty against the workings of mutability, he sees past both Delia's and time's cruelty into the innermost nature of beauty and poetry.

In this scheme the three basic types of sonnets included in the sequence, "praise and complaint", carpe diem, and eternizing, become symbols of different ways of regarding and confronting the interrelationships of beauty, mutability, art, and eternity. Each type of sonnet is a lens trained on Delia, and by comparing variations in focus we see how the poetic visions become stronger and clearer as the poet is progressively more aware of the nature of his inspiration and his relationship with it.

This schematic exposition of the lover's emotional and intellectual development adds a new dimension to the sequence, which is further extended by the kind of internalization of experience we saw in sonnets V and IX and will encounter throughout Delia in lines like

> Once let the Ocean of my cares finde shore.
> (XXXVIII)
> Th'Ocean of my teares must drowne me burning.
> (XXVII)

Raysing my hopes on hills of high desire.
(XXVIII)

Of course, neither technique results in the creation of a fully rounded persona, but we do feel that we are in contact with the workings of the lover's mind, and consequently find his experience moving. Furthermore, although the lover is not a complete dramatic figure, he does react to circumstance in specific ways according to definite traits of character. We shall in this essay have ample opportunity to observe his stances in many situations as well as the modifications of his attitudes as he grows artistically, but we should note here the basic character traits that determine his reactions to Delia's cruelty and the consolations of his art, to fortune good and bad.

Basic to the lover's personality is an all-pervasive, self-effacing humility. In sonnet VII, for example, we find him lamenting the public discovery of his love for Delia:

O had she not been faire and thus unkinde,
Then had no finger pointed at my lightnes.

Such a reaction is, of course, as old as courtly love literature, but, unlike many sonnet lovers, Delia's is ashamed of his poetry as well as his infatuation:

The world had never knowne what I doe finde,
And Clowdes obscure had shaded still her brightnes.
Then had no Censors eye these lines survaide,
Nor graver browes have judg'd my Muse so vaine.
(VII)

The humility expressed in sonnet VII is to an extent a reflection of Daniel's own "irresolution and...selfe distrust",[14] but it serves a very important purpose in the sequence. By professing shame at the public discovery of his attempts to win Delia with his art and by bowing humbly to the censure of "graver browes", the lover can insist with more cogency than most that he sings to persuade Delia and ease his heart, not to win renown. An attack against his critics would imply that he really cares more for his literary reputation than he admits, and his protestations to the contrary would be insincere. We would simply not believe him when he insists:

> No Bayes I seeke to decke my mourning brow,
> O cleer-eyed Rector of the holie Hill:
> My humble accents crave the Olyve bow,
> Of her milde pittie and relenting will.
> These lines I use, t'unburthen my owne hart:
> My love affects no fame, nor steemes of art.
> (IIII)

Nor does he become boastful after sonnet XXIX, when he has discovered the eternizing powers of poetry:

> These are the Arkes the Tropheis I erect,
> That fortifie thy name against old age,
> And these thy sacred vertues must protect,
> Against the Darke and times consuming rage.
> Though th'error of my youth they shall discover,
> Suffice they shew I liv'd and was thy lover.
> (XLVI)

He does not deny his fear of time and mutability and, furthermore, concedes that he is unable to win Delia's pity, thus acknowledging his limitations as a poet. Although he is the position to, he refuses to crow about his

achievement. He serves Delia through his art, and is content to be remembered as nothing more than her ill-treated lover.

The great idealism expressed in sonnet XLVI is no less fundamental a part of the lover's personality than the unaffected humility. His intentions and actions are always noble and virtuous and his desire is truly "chaste" (XLIX) and high (XXVIII). He never daydreams of physical satisfaction, professes envy of the intimate items of Delia's apparel, or even thinks of her in erotic terms, though these are all favourite Petrarchist pastimes. In fact, he never even tries to kiss her. Thus not only are the baisir, the dream sonnet, and the jealousy sonnet absent from Delia, but we never once in the whole of the sequence hear the senses' cry of "give me some food".[15]

Several critics have noted the purity and nobility of the love described in Delia and correctly concluded that Daniel was influenced by the Neo-Platonic theories that had so marked an effect on Renaissance literature, but to date there has been no serious attempt made at determining what elements of the philosophy Daniel accepted.[16] We shall, in the first part of the next chapter, see what Daniel considered to be a noble passion and how he worked Neo-Platonic metaphors into the fabric of his sequence.

NOTES

1
Philip Sidney, Astrophil and Stella, in Poems, ed. W. A. Ringler, Jr. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), sonnet 15. All subsequent references to Sidney's poetical works are to this edition.

2
Thomas Watson, The Teares of Fancie, in Elizabethan Sonnets, ed. Sidney Lee (London: Constable, 1904), 1, sonnet XLIX.

3
Rees, p. 33.

4
Sidney, "Songs from Arcadia", p. 391.

5
Peter Ure, "Two Elizabethan Poets: Daniel and Ralegh," in The Age of Shakespeare, ed. Boris Ford, The Pelican Guide to English Literature, 2 (1956; rpt. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1962), p. 143.

6
Ibid.

7
John Daniel, Songs for the Lute, Viol and Voice (Kenston, England: Scholar's Press, 1970).

8
A. B. Grosart, ed., The Complete Works of Samuel Daniel (1885; rpt. New York: Russel, 1963), 1, p. xvii.

9
Sonnet XVIII, which lists the mythic origins of Delia's charms, is not a blason but an example of what K. K. Ruthven identifies as the "composite mistress" conceit in "The Composite Mistress," A.U.M.L.A., 26 (1966), 198-214.

10
Robert Greene, Perimedes the Black-Smith, in The Life and Works, ed. A. B. Grosart (1881-86; rpt. New York: Russel, 1964), 7, pp. 90-91. All subsequent references to Greene's works are to this edition.

11
Robert Herrick, Hesperides, in Poetical Works, ed. L. C. Martin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), pp. 250-51.

12

See Samuel Daniel, The Complaint of Rosamond, in Poems and "A Defence of Ryme", ed. cit., ll. 372-406 for a fine passage of Ovidian allegory. All subsequent references to Rosamond are to this edition.

13

Williamson contends (254) that sonnet XXX marks the turning point of the relationship. I shall show below in Chapter IV that XXIX is the pivotal sonnet.

14

Samuel Daniel, A Defence of Ryme, in Poems and "A Defence of Ryme", ed. cit., p. 156. All subsequent references to Defence are to this edition.

15

Sidney, Astrophil and Stella, sonnet 71.

16

Paul N. Segal merely includes Daniel in his list of Neo-Platonic sonneteers in "The Petrarchan Sonneteers and Neo-Platonic Love," S.P., 42 (1945), 179. Alfred H. Upham does no more than state that the love that Daniel describes is Neo-Platonic in his The French Influence in English Literature from the Accession of Elizabeth to the Restoration (New York: Columbia University Press, 1908), pp. 63-64. (Upham's study is referred to hereafter as Upham.)

LOVE AND SUFFERING

By the last decade of the century Neo-Platonism had become almost as fashionable as Petrarchism in England. Writers affected Neo-Platonic postures as enthusiastically as they aped Petrarchist mannerisms and for this reason it is sometimes difficult to gauge the sincerity of a poet's protestations of spiritual love. With Daniel there is no such problem. We can determine exactly to what degree he accepted the tenets of the philosophy and identify which of its exponents he was most influenced by.

We shall in this chapter have the opportunity to see also how Daniel works traditional Neo-Platonic metaphors into the fabric of the sequence and makes them serve a double duty. The sonnets we are now going to examine at once define the nature of the love felt for Delia and describe how cruelly she spurns it; they show how the lover loves and suffers.

1. Daniel's philosophy of love.

Daniel was never an orthodox Neo-Platonist, but he did believe deeply in the purity of true love and the excellence of the soul's struggle to surpass the limitations of mortality. We can appreciate the sincerity of his belief in a passage from Hymen's Triumph, a play written seven years after Daniel had abandoned the love lyric for more intellectual poetry of a sterner style. The passage is a rather long one, but worth quoting in full as it fairly expounds the whole of Daniel's philosophy of love and is, in addition, a fine piece of poetry.

Thirsis, still in love with Silvia, whom he thinks dead, answers his friend Palaemon, who well-meaningly thought to rouse him from melancholy langour by making sport of his despair:

> In love Palaemon? know you what you say?
> Doe you esteeme it light to be in love?
> How have I beene mistaken in the choice
> Of such a friend, as I held you to be,
> That seemes not, or else doth not understand
> The noblest portion of humanity,
> The worthiest peece of nature set in man?
> Ah know that when you mention love, you name
> A sacred mistery, a Deity,
> Not understood of creatures built of mudde,
> But of the purest and refined clay
> Whereto th'eternall fires their spirits convey.
> And for a woman, which you prize so low,
> Like men that doe forget whence they are men;
> Know her to be th'especiall creature, made
> By the Creator as the complement
> Of this great Architect the world; to hold
> The same together, which would otherwise
> Fall all asunder: and is natures chiefe
> Viceregent upon earth, supplies her state.
> And doe you hold it weaknesse then to love?
> And so excellent a miracle
> As is a woman! ah then let mee
> Still be so weake, still let me love and pine
> In contemplation of that cleane, cleare soule,
> That made mine see that nothing in the world
> Is so supreamely beautiful as it.
> Thinke not it was those colours white and red
> Laid but on flesh, that could affect me so.
> But something else, which thought holds under locks
> And hath no key of words to open it.
> They are the smallest peeces of the minde
> That passe this narrow organ of the voyce.
> The great remaine behinde in that vast orbe
> Of th'apprehension, and are never borne.[1]

True love cannot be understood by the sensuous, but only by those of high and noble spirit. Woman is the primate of creation and a miracle, and the woman that Thirsis loves is the type of all beauty. It is the beauty of the

soul that attracts love and through contemplation allows it to rise to "higher things", and the wonder of love and beauty are ineffable.

All this is said with none of intricacy or fanfare that characterize so much of Neo-Platonic literature. Daniel, and it is Daniel himself speaking in these lines, is thoroughly convinced of his argument and delivers it with the same unaffected self-assurance that makes Musophilus so appealing. The same is true of Delia. Daniel avoids the characteristic excesses of the Petrarchist tradition. We find no hyperbolic descriptions of Delia as the essential Idea of beauty and goodness and no pseudo-metaphysical accounts of the transcendence of mortality through divine love. Delia is, however beautiful and chaste, definitely no mystical entity, and her lover's quest, though noble and valiant, and in many ways actually philosophical, is not that of Neo-Platonists' for absolute enlightenment.

Considering whom among the Neo-Platonic philosophers of the era Daniel was influenced by, it is almost surprising that he was able to retain such a degree of authenticity. Had Daniel followed the genteel Castiglione, his ability to pick and chose ideas freely would be wholly unremarkable, for Castiglione's version of the philosophy is generalized and diluted. But it was Giordano Bruno's The Heroic Frenzies, a work infinitely more complex and compelling than The Courtier, whose influence is to be felt in Delia.

Daniel is much closer to Bruno's heroic intellectualism than Castiglione's milder brand of Neo-Platonism. He actually adopts a central metaphor of The Heroic Frenzies, that of flight, and celebrates the excellence of the heroically aspiring spirit in a manner not unlike Bruno's. He rejects, however,

both the mysticism and hermetic complexity of this astounding Italian.

We see what Daniel took from Bruno and what he rejects in a sonnet of his based on one from The Heroic Frenzies. This poem first appeared in the 1594 edition of Delia, but, unlike most of the sonnets added to later editions, it is anything but a prefunctionary effort produced to increase sales. Bruno's sonnet runs:

> Though you inflict upon me such tortures, even
> so I thank you and owe you much, Love, for you
> opened my breast with so generous a wound and so
> mastered my heart that it truly loves a divine
> and a living object,
> most beautiful image of God on earth. Let him
> who wills, think my fate cruel because it kills
> in hope and revives in desire.
> I am nourished by the high enterprise; and al-
> though the soul does not attain the end desired
> and is consumed with so much zeal,
> it is enough that it burns in so noble a fire;
> it is enough that I have been raised to the sky
> and delivered from the ignoble number.[2]

Daniel excludes the images of fire and the wounded heart, but retains the central metaphor of flight:

> And yet I cannot reprehend the flight,
> Or blame th'attempt presuming so the sore,
> The mounting venter for a high delight,
> Did make the honour of the fall the more.
> For who gets wealth that puts not from the shore?
> Daunger hath honour, great designes their fame,
> Glorie doth follow, courage goes before.
> And though th'event oft answers not the same,
> Suffise that high attempts have never shame.
> The Meane-observer, (whom base Safety keepes,)
> Lives without honour, dies without a name,
> And in eternall darkness ever sleepes.
> And therefore Delia, tis to me no blot,
> To have attempted, though attain'd thee not.
>
> (1594, XXX; p. 183)

Both lovers seek to soar to unattained heights, to transcend mediocrity. For Bruno, the object of this great effort of the soul is, as he himself says in his own commentary on the sonnet, "the highest intelligible aspect of the divinity...not the corporeal beauty which would obscure thoughts as it appears superficially to the sense."[3] Delia's lover is not seeking the ultimate sight of the divine intelligence, but he too aspires to immortality --that of honour, without which man "in eternall darkness ever sleepes." This "mounting venter" aims at something other and more than erotic satisfaction. The "high delight" is an epitome of fulfilment, a consummation of the self in the highest reality. He soars towards a greatness that is the motive and object of all heroism. Love is a triumphant surpassing of limitations, a quest so excellent that it transcends defeat.

No sonnet in the 1592 edition of Delia is really as strong as this one, but others similarly describe love as a heroic effort and employ Bruno's metaphor of flight. In sonnet XXVII, for example, the lover compares himself to that archetype of the over-reaching spirit, Icarus:

> Yet her I blame not, though she might have blest mee,
> But my desires wings so high aspiring:
> Now melted with the sunne that hath possest mee,
> Downe doe I fall from off my high desiring;
> And in my fall doe cry for mercy speedy,
> No pittying eye looks backe uppon my mourning:
> No helpe I finde when now most favour neede I,
> Th'Ocean of my teares must drowne me burning,
> And this my death shall christen her anew,
> And give the cruell Faire her tytle dew.

The next sonnet continues the metaphor:

> Raysing my hopes on hills of high desire,
> Thinking to skale the heaven of her hart:
> My slender meanes presum'd too high a part;
> Her thunder of disdaine forst me retire.
> (XXVIII)

Here the lover compares himself to a rebellious Titan, but makes clear that his aspiration is in no way ignoble:

> Yet I protest my high aspyring will,
> Was not to dispossesse her of her right:
> Her soveraignty should have remayned still,
> I onely sought the bliss to have her sight.
> (XXVIII)

Like an orthodox Neo-Platonist, he seeks merely to contemplate Delia's beauty, not to possess it physically. I would not say that "the bliss to have her sight" is the vision of the form of the Beautiful and the Good, but, particularly in association with "the heaven of her hart", it is certainly comparable. Nor is Delia a specific rung in the Platonic ladder to enlightenment, but she is both physically and symbolically above her lover (until sonnet XXIX, when he discovers that she is as merely mortal as he) and he strives to rise to her level. Not only is she compared to luminous celestial bodies, but her very name, derived from the epithet Delian, associates her with the heavens.

"Delia" is, I should point out, a perfect anagram of "ideal", but considering how Daniel systematically rejects the standard Neo-Platonist jargon, this is probably no more than an interesting accident.[6] On the other hand, the choice of the name indicates some Neo-Platonic influence. Diana is the

virgin huntress as well as goddess of the moon--qualities which endear her to those who profess an intellectual love--and, furthermore, she appears in The Heroic Frenzies as the symbol of the "order of the secondary intelligences, who reflect the splendor of the first intelligence in order to communicate it to those who are deprived of its direct vision."[7] Of course, Daniel did not mean us to consider Delia as any mystical force, but, in the long run, she does lead her lover to a higher reality, that of art. In eternizing her he, or at least his poems, transcend the mortal condition of mutability and so she does provide access to a state of perfection.

2. My soules Idoll.

It is an exceptionally lovely name, and a cleverly chosen one, for it associates the sequence with Sidney's and Fulke Greville's: Caelica is the sky; Stella, a star; Delia, the moon. Furthermore, its innate symbolism helps to define the quality of the love felt for the girl. Enamoured of the moon, the lover wishes to rise to it; a lover of the virgin huntress, he is himself dedicated to chastity, something which many sonnet lovers boast, but few observe. Most important of all, he adores Delia as a goddess, and this allows Daniel to use religious metaphors with decorum. For example, in sonnet XLIX the lover compares his desire to the Vestal flame:

> My chaste desiers, the ever burning tapers,
> Inkindled by her eyes celestiall fiers.

In another sonnet he tells us of the futility of his supplications:

Teares, vowes, and prayers win the hardest hart:
Teares, vowes, and prayers have I spent in vaine;
.....
Yet though I cannot win her will with teares,
Though my soules Idoll scorneth all my vowes;
Though all my prayers be to so deafe eares:
No favour though the cruell faire allowes;
Yet will I weepe, vowe, pray to cruell Shee;
Flint, Frost, Disdaine, weares, melts, and yeelds we see.
(XI)

"Prayers" occurs four times and "pray" twice in this sonnet rapporté. The lover calls Delia his "soules Idoll" and, indeed, she behaves like the marble image of a virgin goddess, receiving the sacrifice of his despair with Olympian aloofness.

The next sonnet is also based on a metaphor of worship:

My spotless love hoovers with white wings,
About the temple of the proudest frame:
Where blaze those lights fayrest of earthly things,
Which cleere our clouded world with brightest flame.
M'ambitious thoughts confined to her face,
Affect no honour, but what she can give mee:
My hopes do rest in limits of her grace,
I weygh no comfort unlesse she releeve mee.
For she that can my hart imparadize,
Holdes in her fairest hand what deerest is:
My fortunes wheele, the circle of her eyes,
Whose rowling grace deigne once a turne of blis.
All my lives sweete consists in her alone,
So much I love the most unloving one.
(XII)

Delia's face is described as a temple--a favourite conceit of Neo-Platonic poets--and love aspires to reach it on "white wings" emblematic of its purity. Her eyes are the lover's "fortunes wheele", the beginning and end of his sad fate, and she could "imparadize" his heart, lift it to the height of

bliss that she occupies by virtue of the purity and excellence of her beauty. Like a true Neo-Platonist, he confines his "thoughts" to her face--he contemplates the noblest aspect of her beauty with his highest faculty.

Of course, by "imparadize" Daniel does not mean introduction into the Christian heaven but neither is he using the metaphor merely decoratively. Delia may not be a specific rung in the Platonic ladder, but the attainment of her love is a kind of salvation. We see this especially clearly in one of the finest sonnets of the sequence, a portion of which we have already glanced at:

> Faire and lovely maide, looke from the shore,
> See thy Leander striving in these waves:
> Poore soule fore-spent, whose force can do no more,
> Now send foorth hopes, for now calme pittie saves.
> And wafte him to thee with those lovely eyes,
> A happy convoy to a hole lande:
> Now shew thy powre, and where thy vertue lyes,
> To save thine owne, stretch out the fayrest hand.
> Stretch out the fairest hand a pledge of peace,
> That hand that dartes so right, and never misses:
> Ile not revenge olde wrongs, my wrath shall cease;
> For that which gave me woundes, Ile give it kisses.
> Once let the Ocean of my cares finde shore,
> That thou be pleas'd, and I may sigh no more.
>
> (XXXVIII)

The description of Sestos as "a holy lande" is not as outrightly Neo-Platonic as Chapman's description of Corynna's body as "those fields of peace, / Where soules are feasted with the soule of ease"[7] in Ovid's Banquet of Sense, but is does recall in tempestate securitas. And this is exactly what Delia's love represents.

Sonnet XXXVIII is an allegory of salvation. Delia is more of a vision

than a woman of flesh and blood. Her smiling eyes can wafte the "soule" to the safety of the "holy" shore with supernatural ease and her hand is not a physical entity by "a pledge of peace", a symbol. She is indeed his anchora spei. The allusion to "turning the other cheek" in "For that which gave me woundes, Ile give it kisses" reinforces this religious symbolism, and the internalization of the entire scene in the couplet ("the Ocean of my cares") raises the lover's struggle to an almost mystical, and certainly intensely symbolical, level. He may not be seeking to escape the sublunary sphere of imperfection, but the waves about to drown him are the turbulence of his own thoughts and the "holy lande" of Delia's love is definitely a spiritual condition.

Sonnet XXXVIII may lack metaphysical complexity, but it is not merely fashionably Neo-Platonic. Its symbolism is organic and profound and its vision convincingly intense. The single phrase "calme pittie" has enough wisdom in it to make up for the sonnet's lack of formal philosophy. I cannot say the same for all the others that we have just looked at, but neither can I dismiss them as superficial and merely fashionable. Throughout the sequence the purity and nobility of the lover's aspiration is wholly convincing, and Neo-Platonic symbolism is not just placed upon, but worked into the organic fabric of the work. Delia is above her lover--as a star, the sun, a towering temple, heaven, or, as in XXXVIII, Hero on the shore while he struggles in the waves. This metaphor of location emphasizes the aspiring nature of the lover's desire--he wants to rise to beauty and excellence, not fall into the base realm of sense. Thus, while Delia is not a means of access to the divinity,

she does represent a superior state of being, and even a superior reality. Certainly, the lover does attain the realm of the ideal when he eternizes her beauty, and, obviously, Delia is the means of access to it, though she is, in another sense, an impediment to self-realization. But this aspect of the relationship is also influenced by Neo-Platonic thought. Bruno's The Heroic Frenzies describes a series of disappointments and new efforts to achieve enlightenment. To use a colloquial metaphor (which Bruno would not disapprove of), the soul aspires, bangs its head, and bounces back again until it finally reaches the height of "intelligence" it aspires to. We see the same pattern in Delia: the lover desires her love, over-reaches and falls into despair, and finally attains her, though not completely, for although he can eternize her beauty he never enjoys her love.

Of course, Daniel does not adhere to the totality of Bruno's version of Neo-Platonism--but why should he? He simply did not believe that the flesh is absolutely corrupt or that through love the soul may attain the ecstatic enlightenment of true knowledge of the forms of the Beautiful and the Good as they exist in God. Nor did he wish to spin out an intricate metaphysic just to prove that he was as capable as the next poet of producing one. Daniel took just what he wanted from both the tenets of the philosophy and the rhetorical mannerisms of its exponents, and what he took he made his own. He believed that true love is a spiritual activity, a heroic aspiration to rise above the limitations of mortality and that the attempt to attain beauty, virtue, and excellence ennobles even in failure. He expresses these beliefs convincingly. Not merely the lack of sensual descriptive detail, but

the very purity of the language of the sonnets reflects the purity of the love felt for Delia. She is perfectly chaste, more a vision of innocent delight than a creature of corrupt flesh and blood, and her lover is as pure and noble as any Neo-Platonist may ask for.

3. Delia's tyranny.

Delia should consider herself fortunate to have so noble a lover, but, being a sonnet lady, she torments him to no end. However heroically he might strive to attain her, she ruthlessly casts him down and tramples on his love with absolute disdain. He is her abject slave, the victim of her every perverse whim. Her disdain of his love makes his life a hell of torment, and because she is irresistible, there is no escape--until he realizes that she is as much a victim of time and mutability as he of her torturing smiles and frowns. But until that time he suffers her tyranny.

To emphasize the unnaturalness of this relationship, before sonnet XXIX, the turning point of the sequence, Delia is systematically compared to tyrannical, masculine, mythological figures. In sonnet XXVIII, which we just glanced at, she is a thunder-wielding Jupiter to her lover's rebellious Titan:

> Raysing my hopes on hills of high desire,
> Thinking to skale the heaven of her hart;
> My slender meanes presum'd too high a part;
> Her thunder of disdaine forst me retire;
> And threw me downe to paine in all this fire,
> Where loe I languish in so heavie smart.

He aspired to the heaven of her love and she cast him down to the fires of hell.

In sonnet XV she is Jupiter again, this time to her lover's Prometheus:

> And if a brow with cares caracters painted,
> Bewraies my love, with broken words halfe spoken,
> To her that sits in my thoughts Temple sainted,
> And layes to view my Vultur-gnawne hart open.

In the sonnet following the lover compares himself to Hercules, but in no self-aggrandizing manner:

> But still the Hydra of my cares renuing,
> Revives new sorrowes of her fresh disdayning;
> Still must I goe the Summer windes pursuing:
> Finding no ende nor Period of my paynining.
> (XVI)

I would not go as far to say that Delia is Omphale to his Hercules, but special emphasis is placed on the fact that the relationship is an unnatural one. This Hydra is unconquerable; the lover cannot become a hero. Every one of his efforts to win Delia is futile and self-destructive. She is an obtacle to his self-realization and he can do nothing but bow to her perverse will, for, as he says:

> What bootes to lawes of succour to appeale mee?
> Ladies and tyrants, never lawes respecteth.
> (XXVI)

This state of affairs is, of course, a purely conventional. The Petrarchist lady is always domineering and her lover always passive, but Daniel does draw special attention to the unnaturalness of the relationship through systematic comparison of Delia to tyrannical, masculine mythological figures. Moreover, he introduces a not altogether conventional element into the lover's complaints.

The lover mourns the waste of his youth in hopeless love, lamenting that Delia's cruelty has turned the springtime of his years into a winter of despair:

> I sacrifize my youth, and blooming yeares,
> At her proud feete, and she respects not it:
> My flowre untimely's withered with my teares,
> And winter woes, for spring of youth unfit.
> (XXI)

Now sonneteers of the Plćiade were, as Frenchmen are wont to, rather attached to lamenting the passage of youth in bitterness, but Daniel gives a personal twist to this sort of complaint. Particular emphasis is placed on the fact that while the lover is wasting his youth, Delia is enjoying hers. He is withered with untimely sorrow; she:

> A modest maide, deckt with a blush of honour,
> Whose feete dóe treade greene pathes of youth and love.
> (VI)

This imbalance in their fortunes is so movingly presented that it leads one to think that Daniel is remembering a love affair of his own; certainly, it is with feeling that he compares the path the lover takes to Delia's:

> Whilst youth and error led my wandring minde,
> And set my thoughts in heedele waies to range:
> All unawares a Goddesse chaste I finde,
> Diana-like, to worke my suddaine change.
> (V)

Delia finds bliss; her lover torment. "Youth and love" lead her down pleasant paths to "where the sweetest blossoms first appeares" (XLIII), to the

locus amoenus; but instead of meeting her there, he is the prey of a murderous despair: "My thoughts like houndes, pursue me to my death" (V). Ver himself has filled her "lappe with flowers" (XXXII), but he must "goe the Summer windes pursuing" (XVI), wasting his youth in a hopeless passion.

Delia has her whole life before her; he, nothing but torment:

> Happie in sleepe, waking content to languish,
> Imbracing cloudes by night, in day time morne:
> All things I loath save her and mine owne anguish,
> Pleas'd in my hurt, inur'd to live forlorne.
> Nought do I crave, but love, death, of my Lady,
> Hoarce with crying mercy, mercy yet my merit;
> So many vowes and prayers ever made I,
> That now at length t'yeelde meere pittie were it.
>
> (XVI)

His love--his very life--is a mistake:

> Since the first looke that led me to this error,
> To this thoughts-maze, to my confusion tending:
> Still have I liv'd in griefe, in hope, in terror,
> The circle of my sorrowes never ending.
>
> (XVII)

Delia is no Ariadne to guide him through the labyrinth of despair; she exacts the tribue of his love like a Minatour:

> Yet cannot leave her love that holdes me hatefull,
> Her eyes exact it, though her hart disdaines mee.
> See what reward he hath that serves th'ungratefull,
> So true and loyall love no favours gaines mee.
>
> (XVII)

All he can do plead, and his pleas fall on deaf ears:

> Oft have I tolde her that my soule did love her,
> And that with teares, yet all this will not move her.
>
> (XVII)

Indeed, not only does she not respond to his pleas for mercy, but glories in them like a tyrant in his spoils. In sonnet X the lover prays to Venus (invoking her with the now famous epithet):

> O thou that rul'st the confines of the night,
> Laughter-loving Goddesse, wordly pleasures Queene,
> Intenerat that hart that sets so light,
> The truest love that ever yet was seene.
> And cause her leave to triumph on this wise,
> Uppon the prostrate spoyle of that poore harte:
> That serves a trophey to her conquering eyes,
> And must their glorie to the world imparte.
> Once let her know, sh'hath done enough to prove me;
> And let her pittie if she cannot love me.

His eloquent prayer proves futile, for in sonnet XIII Delia's heart is still as hard and cold as stone:

> And still I toile, to chaunge the marble brest
> Of her, whose sweetest grace I doe adore:
> Yet cannot finde her breathe unto my rest,
> Hard is her hart and woe is me therefore.

Delia is a marble Galatea who will not turn to flesh, and he the opposite of Pygmalion:

> Behold the happe <u>Pigmaleon</u> had to frame,
> And carve his proper griefe upon a stone:
> My heavie fortune is much like the same,
> I worke on Flint, and that's the cause I mone.
> .....
> O happie he that joy'd his stone and arte,
> Unhappy I to love a stony harte.
> (XIII)

Thus he has a double sorrow, for he fails as an artist as well as a lover. This is made clear as early as sonnet II:

Goe wailing verse, the infants of my love,
Minerva-like, brought foorth without a Mother:
Present the image of the cares I prove,
Witnes your Fathers griefe exceeds all other.
Sigh out a story of her cruell deedes,
With interrupted accents of dispayre:
A Monument that whosoever reedes,
May justly praise, and blame my loveles Faire.
Say her disdaine hath dryed up my blood,
And starved you, in succours still denying:
Presse to her eyes, importune me some good;
Waken her sleeping pittie with your crying.
Knock at that hard hart, beg till you have moov'd her;
And tell th'unkind, how deerely I have lov'd her.

The lover conceives poetry like a god, Jupiter, but he must send his verses begging for mercy like a father who sends his children to plead for their mother's return. He tells his poems to "presse to her eyes" for "pittie", which, through the punning force of "succours", is compared with milk. Then to wake her with crying, and when even that fails, to "knock at that hard hart", to clutch her breast like a baby when it wants milk. His poetry, conceived in god-like solitude, becomes as ineffectual and pathetic as an infant when confronting Delia. He is, in relation to her, the opposite of Jupiter: it is he who is abandoned and he who must wail.

Further on we find the lover in a wholly different position. When he eternizes Delia he is quite as successful as Pygmalion and by the very end of the sequence he is actually independent enough to stop singing her praises and turn to a more rewarding theme. But before the eternizing sonnets come the carpe diem, and they are worth looking at.

NOTES

1
Samuel Daniel, Hymen's Triumph, in The Life and Works, ed. cit., 3, ll. 1256-1290.

2
Giordano Bruno, The Heroic Frenzies, trans. Paul E. Memmo, Jr., University of North Carolina Studies in Romance Languages and Literature, 50 (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1964), pp. 113-14. All subsequent references to The Heroic Frenzies are to this translation and edition.

3
Ibid., p. 115.

4
See Appendix II below.

5
Bruno, p. 204.

6
In the 1591 version of sonnet XIII (p. 173) we read: "And still I toile, to chaunge the marble brest / Of her, whose sweete Idea I do adore." This was corrected to "whose sweetest grace I doe adore" in 1592.

7
George Chapman, Ovid's Banquet of Sense, in The Poems, ed. P. H. Bartlett (1941; rpt. New York: Russel, 1962), stanza 67. All subsequent references to Chapman's poetical works are to this edition.

SEIZE THE DAY

It is in Delia that we find the first full expression of the carpe diem theme in English sonnetry, yet, although these poems rank among the finest in the language, they have never been examined with care. We shall therefore subject the best of the carpe diem sonnets to close analysis and, of course, consider their role in the sequence as a whole, observing the changes in tone and developments in patterns of imagery that signal the modification on the lover's attitudes towards Delia, himself, and his art. Unfortunately, there is not enough space for extensive comparison of Daniel's treatment of the carpe diem with other Renaissance poets', but emphasis will be placed on how his method differs from the norm and the ethos of the sonnets will be discussed in the reference to the commentary of the one modern critic who has dealt with this aspect.

1. The lover's rebellion.

As I have pointed out, with the introduction of the carpe diem theme into the sequence we find the lover behaving quite differently. Before sonnet XXIX he was Delia's abject slave, the pathetic victim of her every perverse whim. Now, instead of pleading and whining for mercy he says:

> Beautie, sweet love, is like the morning dewe,
> Whose short refresh upon the tender greene,
> Cheeres for a time but tyll the Sunne doth shew,
> And straight tis gone as it had never beene.
> Soone doth it fade that makes the fairest florish,
> Short is the glory of the blushing Rose,
> The hew which thou so carefully doost nourish,

Yet which at length thou must be forc'd to lose.
(XLII)

He is lecturing Delia, telling her what she does not know with an air that verges on pedantry. He still loves her and still suffers from her disdain, but he has rebelled. Realizing that Delia is a mere mortal, as susceptible to the harshness of life as he to her cruel smiles and frowns, he regards her as an equal. He understands her beauty, understands it far better than she, and soon will be able to resist its deleterious influence. Aware of the nature of the force that captivated and torments him, he is no longer the absolute victim. He needed no longer beg and plead and suffer hopelessly.

When thou surcharg'd with burthen of thy yeeres,
Shalt bend thy wrinkles homeward to the earth:
When tyme hath made a pasport for thy feares,
Dated in age the Kalends of our death.
But ah no more, thys hath beene often tolde,
And women grieve to thinke they must be old.
(XLII)

He knows that Delia, the "cruel-fair", will herself grieve as bitterly as he does now. Understanding her beauty, seeing it in the wider context of the mortal condition, he is almost free of its spell. By the very end of the sequence he will be able to stop praising and complaining completely. He will be free enough to try to stop loving Delia.

This change in the lover's behaviour is neither sudden nor improbable. Daniel does not introduce the carpe diem directly after the "praise and complaint" section, but cleverly places a transitional poem at the crucial point, thus making the change in attitude dramatically plausible and the

reversal in the relationship causal. Instead of spontaneously realizing and declaring that Delia's beauty is imperfect and consequently resistible, the lover first looks at her objectively. He learns that she is less than perfect and that he need not suffer her perverse cruelty.

> O why dooth Delia credite so her glasse,
> Gazing her beautie deign'd her by the skyes:
> And dooth not rather looke on him (alas)
> Whose state best shewes the force of murthering eyes.
> The broken toppes of loftie trees declare,
> The fury of a mercy-wanting storme:
> And of what force your wounding graces are,
> Uppon my selfe you best may finde the forme.
> Then leave your glasse, and gaze your selfe on mee:
> That Mirrour shewes what powre is in your face:
> To viewe your forme too much, may daunger bee,
> Narcissus chaung'd t'a flowre in such a case.
> And you are chaung'd, but not t'a Hiacint;
> I feare your eye hath turn'd your hart to flint.
>
> (XXIX)

The lover has distanced himself enough from Delia to be able to see that her wilfull pride is as destructive to her as to himself. Tormenting him to please herself, she has become a monster of vanity—not Narcissus, but a Gorgon whose glance petrifies its own heart. In sonnet XVII the lover had complained:

> Yet cannot leave her love that holdes me hatefull,
> Her eyes exact it, though her hart disdaines mee.

Now he not only regards Delia's beauty objectively enough to perceive its imperfections, but is advising instead of imploring her. There is a hint of exasperation, perhaps even of disgust, in the couplet of XXIX; in any case,

this is the first time that Delia is being compared to anything repulsive. Furthermore, indicating his growing independence, for the first time in the sequence since sonnet II and the comparison of his inspiration with Jupiter's bearing of Minerva, the lover compares himself to a victorious mythological figure--Perseus, the Gorgon's conqueror.

> Then leave your glasse, and gaze your self on mee,
> That Mirrour shewes what powre is in your face.

His face is, to be sure, not nearly so effective a shield as Perseus', for it "shewes the force of murthering eyes", absorbs instead of deflecting the deadly rays, but the allusion signals a considerable modification in the relationship.

In sonnet V the lover lamented the "suddaine change" that Delia's beauty had worked on him. In sonnet XIII he complained that he could not, like Pygmalion, turn lifeless marble into living flesh, and in XXVII that his suit was as misfortunate as Icarus' reckless flight. In all three cases, and throughout the first section of the sequence, Delia was the irresistible cause of the lover's suffering and the immovable object of his pleas. Now she is herself subject to change, and tragically so, for it is not a mythic flower but a snake-coiffed Gorgon that her vanity turns her into.

The symbol of metamorphosis in sonnet XXIX prepares for the major theme of the carpe diem sonnets, that of mutability.

> I once may see when yeeres shall wrecke my wronge,
> When golden haires shall chaunge to silver wyer.
>
> (XXX)

Time, a natural process beyond Delia's authority, will affect a change as devastating as she worked on her lover. He is seeing her in the context of mortality: in his eyes, she has been humanized.

> Looke Delia how wee steeme the half-blowne Rose,
> The image of thy blush and Summers honor:
> Whilst in her tender greene she doth inclose
> That pure sweete beautie, Time bestowes uppon her.
> No sooner spreades her glorie in the ayre,
> But straight her ful-blowne pride is in declyning;
> She then is scorn'd that late adorn'd the fayre:
> So clowdes thy beautie, after fayrest shining.
> No Aprill can revive thy withred flowers,
> Whose blooming grace adornes thy glorie now:
> Swift speedy Time, feathred with flying howers,
> Dissolves the beautie of the fairest brow.
> O let not then such riches waste in vaine;
> But love whilst that thou maist be lov'd againe.
>
> (XXXI)

He no longer envisions her as a goddess-like "cruel-fair", but as a part of natural creation who must obey creation's laws. "No Aprill can revive thy withred flowers": mere flowers are more fortunate than she. They are born again each spring, as beautiful as ever, but she has only one April, one youth.

Delia is certainly no longer in the position she enjoyed when her lover complained:

> What bootes to lawes of succour to appeale mee?
> Ladies and tyrants, never lawes respecteth.
>
> (XXVI)

As Williamson points out, "Not Delia but Time is now the Tyrant, and whereas in XXI it was the poet's flower that untimely withred, it is now Delia's

flowers that fade to a 'winter-withred hue'."[1]

Unless Delia respects the laws of her creation, she will be in the same pitiful position that her lover complained of:

> I sacrifize my youth and blooming yeares,
> At her proud feete, and she respects not it:
> My flowre untimely's withred with my teares,
> And winter woes, for spring of youth unfit.
> (XXI)

If she continues in her proud disdain, she will find her youth a senseless sacrifice to a thankless tyrant--time.

Clearly, a reversal has occured in the relationship. The lover is still suffering, but he now knows that Delia's beauty is not perfect and consequently is bold enough to urge and warn her instead of begging and pleading. His tone of voice is stonger and more self-assured, though in no way cruel, and he actually regards Delia from a different perspective. Before sonnet XXIX he was always looking up at her; now, when she is no longer comparable to towering temples or the heavens but to flowers, he looks straight ahead to see her: they have become equals.

The fact that this reversal has occured is perfectly obvious from the way the lover speaks to Delia, but to make the point stick and to explain the subtleties of the transition, Daniel has recourse to yet another expedient.

2. The imagery of the carpe diem sonnets.

We turn again to the transitional sonnet, XXIX. Before this point, Delia was compared to marble and the light of heavenly bodies; now spring flowers.

The change in the dominating imagery occurs in XXIX:

> Narcissus chaung'd t'a flowre in such a case.
> And you are chaung'd, but not t'a Hiacint;
> I feare your eye hath turn'd your hart to flint.

In addition, sonnet XXIX is the first to introduce nature as an important agency in the lover's universe. Of course, sonnet XXI spoke of "winter woes, for spring of youth unfit", but only in order to show that Delia had usurped nature and that the passing of the lover's youth in bitterness was unnatural. The destructive forces in XXIX are natural, not the lightning of Delia's eyes but the "Fury of a mercy-wanting storme". Her beauty is "deign'd her by the skyes", it is derived from a source of greater authority than hers, an authority to which she herself must yield. If the furious winds can so easily break the tops of "loftie trees" think what they could do to a mere flower that blooms for no more than a few days in the early spring. Sonnet XXX develops this theme of mutability with "Then fade those flowres which deckt her pride so long", and in XXXI it is completed in brilliant "No Aprill can revive thy withred flowers", which, with the greatest delicacy and grace, evoces the entire pattern of the seasonal cycle and locates Delia within the Chain of Being.

The cosmologically oriented Elizabethan certainly appreciated sonnet XXIX as a turning point, and I believe that we too should consider it, and not, as Williamson suggests,[2] XXX, as the crux of the sequence. It is, after all, here that the lover first addresses Delia boldly and that he begins to see himself in a new light. The tops of the "loftie trees" that he compares

himself to may be "broken", but they were towering and the trunks still stand. Previously, he lamented a precipitous down-fall; now he has attained some stature, and from here on he will no longer regard Delia as an absolute superior. The metaphor of location describing the relationship is beginning to be reversed.

And the purport of the light imagery also. Before XXIX Delia's eyes were compared to the blinding sun (II), piercing crystal darts (XIII), the lover's evil star (XXVI), and the flash of Olympian thunder (XXVIII). In sonnet XXIX they are still "murthering", but no less so to Delia than her lover, for they have turned her heart to "flint". Sonnet XXX describes the actual fading of their forces:

> I once may see when yeeres shall wrecke my wronge,
> .....
> And those bright rayes, that kindle all this fyer
> shall faile in force, their working not so stronge.

In sonnet XXXII, Delia's eyes, the epitome of her beauty, are outshined by a greater source of light, that of the natural sun:

> But love whilst that thou maist be lov'd againe,
> Now whilst thy May hath fill'd thy lappe with flowers;
> Now whilst thy beautie beares without a staine;
> Now use thy Summer smiles ere winter lowres.
> And whilst thou spread'st unto the rysing sunne,
> The fairest flowre that ever sawe the light:
> Now joye thy time before thy sweete be dunne,
> And Delia, thinke thy morning must have night.
> And that thy brightnes sets at lenght to west:
> When thou wilt close up that which now thou showest:
> And thinke the same becomes thy fading best,
> Which then shall hide it most, and cover lowest.
> Ken doe not weigh the stalke for that it was,
> When once they finde her flowre, her glory passe.

In sonnet XII Delia's eyes were her lover's "fortunes wheel", his destiny. Now Delia is as dependent on the "rowling grace" (XII) of the sun as her lover on her smiles and frowns. While it is strong and bright she is "the fairest flowre that ever sawe the light", but once it "sets at length to west" and "winter lowres" at her, she will fade and crumple like a frost-striken bloom.

Such is, of course, the standard message of the carpe diem address, but few match this one. Behind the lovely imagery stands the wisdom of experience. Sonnet XXXII is a history of beauty from its apex to its nadir so full and so intricate that one scarcely understands how it is a mere fourteen line long.

The second line in the first quatrain is, as we seen, itself suggestive enough to constitute an allegorical vignette. "Now whilst thy May hath fill'd thy lappe with flowers": wandering through a vernal wood, Delia has met the May and her apron is full of the blossoms he gave her to honour her loveliness. The couplet presents an entirely different situation.

> Men doe not weigh the stalke for that it was.
> When once they finde her flowre, her glory passe.

"Men" suggests a crowded location and "weigh" commercial activity: Delia will be constrained to bring her beauty to market (not an uncommon Elizabethan practice), but instead of a whole apron-full of flowers, all she will have to offer is a single, crown-less stalk, which none will bother to even look at, much less love and honour for "that it was".

The next sonnet develops this miniature to its logical conclusion more naturalistically:

> When men shall finde thy flowre, thy glory passe,
> And thou with carefull brow sitting alone:
> Received hast this message from thy glasse,
> That tells thee trueth, and saies that all is gone.
>
> (XXXIII)

In the first quatrain of sonnet XXXII Delia was free to wander carelessly, shunning all company for the intimacy of the May. Now she is again alone, but it is the solitude of loneliness, not pastoral bliss. "Men", whom she shunned, now reject her and all she has left to converse with is the mirror that "tells" her "all is gone".

If we look at sonnet XXXII again, we see how its least features elaborates the unavoidability and tragic swiftness of the passing of beauty. In the first quatrain "May" and "Summer" define the span of Delia's youthfull loveliness as a single season. By the second quatrain, it seems as short as a single day: "And Delia, thinke thy morning must have night." The third quatrain introduces a geographical metaphor, and the temporal is seen in terms of the spatial, as in Marvell's "To His Coy Mistress". When Delia's brightness "sets at length to west" she will "close up" all the loveliness she now shows, fold up the apron that held the sweetest flowers of the spring and in doing so cover her whole life, her whole world, with darkness.

The single line "Now use thy Summer smiles ere winter lowres" is also suggestive enough to present another miniature allegory of the transitoriness of mortal beauty. Delia's smiles, like her apron-full of flowers, are hers

only for a season, but winter's frown is always its own. Smile as she may when her beauty has faded, winter's angry frown will beat her down like a single, slender stalk. The juxtaposition of the verb "lowres" to the weaker noun "smiles" emphasizes this imbalance: the very grammar of the poem is a part of its argument.

With so formidable a model in his control, Daniel had no need for the gruesome explicitness favoured by many of his contemporaries. Indeed, specific and satirical detail would destroy these poems, for their greatest strength is subtlety and delicacy. Take the couplet of XXXII as an example. We could name a good many Elizabethan poets who would prefer to see it changed to something like

> Men weigh, then drop the stalke 'spite that it was,
> When once they finde her flowre, her glory passe.

Had Daniel given the couplet such a twist, it would have changed the sonnet's vision from tragic to satirical. We may, of course, think of a crown-less stem rotting in a market-place gutter, but we do it on our own time and outside the authority of the poem.

Daniel counted on this. He expects the reader to fill in the details and so never raises the death's head or makes off-coloured jokes about worms. His poems are none the weaker for this; in fact, they may be read along with the very greatest of the Renaissance, never mind the sixteenth century, with perfect satisfaction.

3. The ethos of the carpe diem sonnets

The eroticism that characterizes the Renaissance carpe diem is also absent from these sonnets, but this is not a weakness either. Anxiety for the passing of beauty replaces sexual urgency and tenderness nervous enthusiasm. Delia is pathetically, not excitingly beautiful, and her lover responds to her reluctance not with feverish impatience, but a tender, elegiac sorrow that is perfectly in keeping with his basic character.

J. B. Broadbent overlooks this aspect of Daniel's carpe diem sonnets. According to him, Daniel

> treats the carpe diem as an erotic ritual....Set in an Elizabethan garden, these sonnets are in the Renaissance mode of courtly love--sumptuous, but lacking in either metaphysic or passion. They rustle with cruelly amusing whispers ("And Delia, think thy morning must have night") and glances (Thou wilt close up that which now thou show'st), threats of penetration and detumescence ("Straight her wide-blown pomp comes to decline"). But they are addressed to no-one in particular--the posturing of literary sex.[3]

The emphasis in "And Delia, thinke thy morning must have night" (XXXII) is on "thinke", not "must", and this makes it a heart-felt plea rather than a "cruelly amusing whisper". The antithesis is brilliant, but being a part of the organic whole of the sonnet, which contrasts age to youth to demonstrate that Delia is a part of natural creation and must obey its laws, it is anything but glib, punitive wit. As for "wide blowne pomp comes to decline" (1601 version of "ful-blowne pride is in declyning" XXXI), "blowne" means blossomed, not swelled, and there is no hint whatsoever, much less "threats" of "penetration". "Decline" indicates wilting, not puncture, and the whole purpose of the sonnet is to demonstrate that this

wilting is a perfectly natural process.

For Daniel the transitoriness of beauty was a philosophical fact, not an excuse for frenzied celebration. Nor can his concern with mutability be considered a neurosis. He may lament the impermanence of mortal works more often than most, but he always faces up to the problem squarely. He believed as deeply in the immortality of the written word as he feared for the transitory nature of the things he eternized; more in fact, for his belief was strong enough to prevail. It is his faith in the immortality of his art that moved him to develop a style so pure and clear that after more than three hundred years virtually everything he wrote can be read without the aid of a glossary. If one insists that he bore a psychological wound, he must also acknowledge that he had a stout bow, and drew it well.

As for the sonnets being a necrophilic "erotic ritual", if any one of them is read outside the sequence they impress the reader as being remarkably tender, and anything but frivolously perverse. Whatever impression of oddness may arise from the fact that Delia is the most beautiful when metaphorically nearest death is instantly dispelled by the promises of the eternity of art that come right after the carpe diem. Indeed, there is more and greater love in these sonnets than in any other in the sequence, and if Daniel is to be blamed for loving things that fade quickly, he is in good company.

Furthermore, there is still sonnet XLIII to consider:

> Ah sport sweet Layde in season of these yeeres,
> And learne to gather flowers before they wither:
> And where the sweetest blossoms first appeares,
> Let love and youth conduct thy pleasures thither.

This is, if anything, an affirmation of life virtually at the expense of art. Throughout the sequence, Delia's lover's heroic struggles have a life and not death loving motivation, particularly in the eternizing sonnets: "Thou canst not dye whilst any zeale abounde / In feeling harts" (XXXV). As a matter of fact, the lover's idealism is so great thatthere is not the slightest hint of greed about his motives. He never says "enjoy your youth with me", and never tries to persuade Delia of the pleasures of cooperation. With a few minor changes these sonnets might be addressed to a girl urging her to marry someone else.

Broadbent finds this a fault also: "They are addressed to no-one in particular--the posturing of literary sex." He has failed to notice that the love felt for Delia is pure, more spiritual than physical. There is nothing to "posture". Indeed, the lover is now closer to Delia than ever before:

> When Winter snowes upon thy golden heares,
> And frost of age hath nipt thy flowers neere:
> When darke shall seeme thy day that never cleares,
> And all lyes withred that was held so deere.
> (XXXIIII)

He is looking at the world as she will in her old age--actually through her eyes. This is a considerably more sympathetic attitude than we encounter in the vast majority of Petrarchist works.

The carpe diem sonnets are not punitive wit. To think so is to misinterpret the sequence, to fail to observe the quite evident changes in the lover's attitudes towards Delia.

4. From revenge to pity.

It would be most unlike Daniel to make his lover wallow in self-satisfaction at the knowledge of Delia's imperfection. The most cursory glance at this part of the sequence assures that he did not, that whatever feeling of triumph the lover first expresses in his discovery of Delia's mortality is quickly replaced by sympathetic emotions. For example, the opening line of the first sonnet in this section warns Delia that "I once may see when yeeres shall wrecke my wronge" (XXX). This is vengeful, but the last quatrain of XXX ends with:

> Goe you my verse, goe tell her what she was;
> For what she was she best shall finde in you.

Age will treat Delia harshly, but not her lover's poem, though she mocked his love.

Similarly, in sonnet XXXII the lover tells Delia that

> Thou maist repent, that thou hast scorn'd my teares,
> When Winter snowes uppon thy golden heares.

The second couplet of the following sonnet, however, shows the lover acting quite differently:

> Then take this picture which I heere present thee,
> Limned with a Pensill not at all unworthy:
> Heere see the giftes that God and nature lent thee;
> Heere read thy selfe, and what I suffred for thee.
>
> (XXXIIII)

Each time that the lover warns Delia that time will avenge his wrong he immediately adds that he will be there to stand by her, at least through his poetry. Furthermore, in sonnet XLII he actually repents having frightened her:

> I must not grieve my Love, whose eyes would reede,
> Lines of delight, whereon her youth might smyle:
> Flowers have a tyme before they come to seede,
> And she is young and now must sport the while.

This second thought constitutes a veritable retraction of the memento mori. He no longer says "Looke Delia how wee steeme the half-blowne Rose" (XXXI): consider how you will fade and wither, but,

> Ah sport sweet Mayde in season of these yeeres,
> And learne to gather flowers before they wither,
> (XLIII).

even though her "sport" is his despair.

In a similar position, the lover of Drayton's Idea makes capital use of the opportunity to punish his lady for her cruelty:

> There's nothing grieves me but that Age should haste,
> That in my dayes I may not see thee old,
> That where those two cleare sparkling Eyes are plac'd,
> Onely two Loope-holes, then I might behold.
> That lovely, arched, yvorie, pollish'd Brow,
> Defac'd with Wrinkles, that I might but see;
> Like grizzled Mosse upon some aged Tree;
> Thy Cheeke, now flush with Roses, sunke, and leane,
> Thy lips, with age, as any Wafer thinne,
> Thy Pearly Teeth out of thy Head so cleane,
> That when thou feed'st, thy Nose shall touch thy Chinne:
> These lines that now thou scorn'st, which should delight thee,
> Then would I make thee read, but to despight thee.

Instead of thus pickling his spleen for future use, Delia's lover mourns, and his sorrow comprehends all beauty that is doomed to fade.

The lover has no need to crow because he has realized that he and Delia share a common fate, that, indeed, he is more fortunate than she in that he understands the nature of beauty and is able to defend it against the ravages of time. Delia is no more ready to love him than before and she still scorns his art, but, with true greatness of spirit, he brings it to her service nevertheless:

> These are the Arkes the Tropheis I erect,
> To fortifie thy name against old age,
> And these thy sacred vertues must protect,
> Against the Darke and times consuming rage.
>
> (XLVI)

The lover is struggling with time, not Delia. The basic conflict of the sequence has been displaced—not completely, for Delia is still cruel and he still suffers, but enough to redefine his role. The lover is no longer Delia's victim but her champion, and a stout one, for "times consuming rage" is as dangerous as any dragon's maw.

The redefinition of the lover's role and situation is logically preceeded by the redefinition of the nature of Delia's beauty, his greatest influence. Before sonnet XXXIX it is as irresistible as a goddess's; after, it is no less excellent, but different, as far as the lover is concerned, in kind and effect.

> Then take this picture which I heere present thee,
> Limned with a Pensill not at all unworthy:
> Heere see the giftes that God and nature lent thee.
>
> (XXXIII)

He has realized that Delia's beauty is not absolutely her own, that it is a gift of "God and nature" left to her only for a span, and that, like all gifts, it must be properly used lest the givers' displeasure be incurred. Because he has become aware of this, he is able to resist her attraction to a considerable degree and, furthermore, begins to see himself in a new light--not as her cringing victim, but her protector. It is through the discovery of the transitoriness of her beauty that he discovers the eternizing powers of his art and his own potentials as a poet.

By thus preparing the way for the eternizing sonnets, the carpe diem sonnets have a transitional function. This is why the two sorts are mingled rather than set apart. The lover's assurances of the immortality of art must come fast on his advice to "seize the day" lest the transitoriness of Delia's beauty strike us as absolute. One is the logical conclusion of the other: Delia's beauty is transitory; it must be eternized. A separation into two distinct sections would destroy the equation, obscuring the significance of the lover's new attitude towards Delia and the change in their relationship. It would also deprive us of the pleasure of being able to read sonnets XXXI to XXXV, which are linked by the repetition of first and last lines, as the musically fluid development of single idea.

NOTES

1
Williamson, 254.

2
Ibid.

3
J. B. Broadbent, Poetic Love (London: Chatto, 1964), pp. 153-54.

4
Michael Drayton, Idea, 1619, in Works, eds. J. W. Hebel, K. Tillotson, and B. H. Newdigate (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961), II, sonnet 8. All subsequent references to Drayton's works are to this edition.

ETERNITY

We now come to the eternizing sonnets, the crowning achievement of Daniel's lyric poetry. As before, we shall examine modulations in tone and developments in the patterns of imagery to determine how far the lover has progressed towards artistic independence. But, as the concept of the immortality of art stands central in Daniel's aesthetic, most time will be spent on defining what he actually means by eternization. This is an indispensable study for Daniel's work is scarcely comprehensible without understanding of this concept and appreciation of the depth of his belief in his own capacity to preserve the transitory in poetry. We shall therefore try to look at as many expressions as possible of this belief in works other than Delia and examine his dependence on Neo-Platonic aesthetics for theoretical support. Thus we shall have a glimpse at the development of this concept in his writings and, in addition, the opportunity to appreciate the intellectual independence with which the young Daniel approached a body of thought as well established as Neo-Platonism was in the sixteenth century.

1. The tone and imagery of the eterning sonnets.

We have seen that Daniel was more troubled than most by the fact of mutability and how he projected this concern unto the persona of the sonnets. Delia's lover mourns the passing of beauty, warning her to "seize the day" before age steals the sweetness of her youth. We noticed that in the carpe diem sonnets the lover was no longer as abject and pathetic as in the "praise

and complaint" section. He was beginning to think for himself, to regard Delia objectively and act accordingly. In the eternizing sonnets we find yet another posture and hear a different voice. Before XXIX the lover pleaded plaintively, not seldom hysterically. In the carpe diem he spoke with greater assurance. He had realized that Delia was not all so powerful but, like him, susceptible to all the misfortunes of human existence. But it is only in the eternizing sonnets, when he is fully certain of the values of his art, perfectly assured that he can preserve mortal beauty in the imperishable medium of poetry, that he speaks with complete and convincing confidence:

> This may remaine thy lasting monument,
> Which happily posteritie may cherish:
> These collours with thy fading are not spent;
> These may remaine, when thou and I shall perish.
> If they remaine, then thou shalt live thereby;
> They will remaine, and so thou canst not dye.
> (XXXIIII)

The sense of certainty and fulfilment is unmistakable. "Thou shalt not dye": it could not be said more simply. The lover has no need for elaborate rhetoric; he is perfectly convinced of his own abilities and need not protest effusively. We feel his confidence in the very ring of the sonnets.

So much is evident, but it was still necessary for Daniel to work the imagery of these sonnets into the over-all patterns of the sequence, for although the tone is convincing enough, he has to specify the extent of the lover's development and explain its significance. To accomplish this, Daniel does not, as in the carpe diem sonnets, introduce new images, but redefines

ones already established within the sequence. We find again images of stone, flames, eyes and symbols of cold and darkness and heat and light, but the context, and consequently the purport, are new.

For example, before sonnet XXIX Delia was marmoreal in her reluctance. Like all sonnet ladies, she had a "marble brest" (XIII), a heart of stone against which the lover was ever cracking his spellbound head:

> Still must I whet my younge desires abated,
> Uppon the Flint of such a hart rebelling.
> (XVII)

Now, having eternized her, preserved the essence of her beauty in poetry, he exclaims:

> How many live, the glory of whose name,
> Shall rest in yce, when thine is grand in Marble.
> (XXXVI)

As C. F. Williamson points out, "the durability of marble, which in XIII represented Delia's stony heart, has now become a measure of the power of verse."[1]

Symbols of fire and consumption also acquire a new meaning. In sonnet XXVII the lover complained "Th'Ocean of my teares must drown me burning", and in XXVIII:

> Her thunder of disdaine forst me retire;
> And threw mee downe to paine in all this fire.

As Williamson again observes: "Fire...now has the power to immortalize the lady."[2] We see this in sonnet XXX:

> Your firie heate, lets not her glorie passe,
> But Phenix-like shall make her live anew.

The energy of the poet's verse will replace the heat and light of the sun when it "sets at length to west" (XXXII) and make her beauty shine again. Similarly, before sonnet XXIX the lover lamented that Delia triumphed in his despair:

> And cause her leave to triumph in this wise,
> Uppon the prostrate spoyle of that poore harte.
> (X)

She accepted his complaints like a conqueror the trophies of his victory; now she will be utterly dependent upon his art for a "lasting monument" (XXXIIII) of her loveliness, and he will erect trophies instead of being trampled on like one:

> These are the Arkes the Tropheis I erect
> To fortifie thy name against old age..
> (XLVI)

The lover has become a poet. Realizing that Delia is wholly dependent upon his art, he is infinitely more self-assured than at the opening of the sequence, and not only in regard to her. In sonnet III he asked that only those whose eyes love had blinded read his poems:

> But untouch'd harts, with unaffected eye,
> Approch not to behold so great distresse:
> Cleer-sighted you, soone note what is awry,
> Whilst blinded ones mine errours never gesse.

He lamented the public discover of his poetry, bowing before the censure of

his critics:

> Then had no Censors eye these lines survaide,
> Nor graver browes have judg'd my Muse so vaine.
> (VII)

Now he proclaims:

> Let others sing of Knights and Palladines,
> In aged accents, and untimely words:
> Paint shadowes in iraginary lines,
> Which well the reach of their high wits records;
> But I must sing of thee and those faire eyes,
> Autentique shall my verse in time to come,
> When yet th'unborne shall say, loe where she lyes,
> Whose beautie made him speake that els was dombe.
> These are the Arkes the Tropheis I erect,
> That fortifie they name against old age,
> And these they sacred vertues must protect,
> Against the Darke and times consuming rage.
> Though th'error of my youth they shall discover,
> Suffice they shew I liv'd and was thy lover.
> (XLVI)

He is no longer ashamed of his theme, or the "error" of his love. In sonnet XVII he had complained that he was trapped in a "thoughts-maze" of conflicting impulses. Now he rises above the labyrinth of error to erect the "Arkes and Tropheis" that will stand witness to the excellence of Delia's beauty and the power of his own art for all eternity.

The lover has found new meanings in the metaphors he used before sonnet XXIX. Fire and marble no longer represent Delia's cruel reluctance but the power and might of his poetry, the poetry she so lightly spurned. He is not merely reacting to his "cruel-fair" differently, but has actually found a new use for his art, and consequently a new identity. No longer constrained to

sing Delia's praises, he does so of his accord, and much more successfully, for while his art never moved Delia's heart of stone to pity, it now preserves her beauty in poetry as durable as marble.

The lover's situation has certainly improved, yet, quite surprisingly he is neither complacent nor boastful. For all the assurance it proclaims, sonnet XLVI retains the humility that characterizes the sonnets preceeding XXIX. "Whose beautie made him speake that els was dombe": Delia is given her fair share of glory, and at the lover's expense at that;

> Though th'error of my youth they shall discover,
> Suffice they show I liv'd and was thy lover.
> (XLVI)

He admits that he has failed to win Delia's love, that his poetry failed to do what it was first supposed to. Content to be merely remembered as Delia's unfortunate lover, he is almost apologetic.

Elizabethan sonneteers produced a good amount of eternizing sonnets, but very few attained such a degree of self-effacing altruism. Drayton, for example, whom Daniel influenced greatly, writes a paean to his own pride:

> How many paltry, foolish painted things,
> That now in Coaches trouble ev'ry Street,
> Shall be forgotten, whom no Poet sings,
> Ere they be well wrap'd in their winding Sheet?
> Where I do theee Eternitie shall give,
> When nothing else remayneth of these dayes,
> And Queenes hereafter shall be glad to live
> Upon the Almes of thy superfluous praise;
> Virgins and Matrons reading these my Rimes,
> Shall be so much delighted with thy story,
> That they shall grieve, they liv'd not in these Times,
> To have seene thee, their Sexes onely glory:

So shalt thou flye above the vulgar Throng,
Still to survive in my immortal Song.[3]

Drayton begins well and his second quatrain is unequalled, but by the end of the sonnet his superb egotism is deflated into pettiness. The possesives in "my Rimes" and "my immortal Song" are greedy and the movement of the verse is too easy. Worst of all, by the couplet and "vulgar Throng", it is no longer time but the much less formidable fashion that is being Hectored. Drayton vitiates his own argument by minimizing the opposition.

Daniel's sonnets, on the other hand, frankly acknowledge a deep fear of mutability:

Delia these eyes that so admireth thine,
Have seene those walls the which ambition reared,
To check the world, how they intombd have lyen
Within themselves; and on them ploughes have eared.
(XXXVII)

Far from being boastful, they show the lover in a position subordinate to his beloved:

But I may ad one feather to thy fame,
To helpe her flight throughout the fairest Ile:
And if my penne could more enlarge thy name,
Then shouldst thou live in an immortal stile.
But though that Laura better limned bee,
Suffice, thou shalt be lov'd as well as shee.
(XXXV)

He grants that Petrarch is the greater poet, and claims to be able to do no more than "ad one feather" to Delia's "fame". The lover wishes to "enlarge" her name, not make it, and is satisfied merely to "helpe her flight through-

out the fairest Ile". Note also how, unlike in Drayton's sonnet, it is the third and second, and not the first person possessives that take emphases.

In this Daniel much closer to Shakespeare than Drayton, or any other Elizabethan sonneteer with the possible exception of Spenser, whose love of beauty raises him to heights of altruism where equally idealistic poets--, Chapman, for example--never arrive. Yet many Elizabethan had more poetry than Daniel, and more formal philosophy as well. Why is his statement so emotionally pure? To find the answer we must look at beyond Delia.

2. Daniel and eternity.

The immortality of art is as constantly recurring a theme in Daniel's writings as the impermanence of mortal works. This was his answer to mutability, to his own fear of uncontrollable change and decay--he would eternize what he loved and honoured. His belief in this potential of poetry is the basis of his philosophy of art--indeed, of his philosophy of life. Yet critics have neglected this most important theme of his writings. We have no satisfactory explanation of his concept of eternization nor any examination of the philosophical bases of the belief.

To understand what Daniel meant by the immortality of art--and we have to know this to understand Daniel--we must look at expressions of this belief in works other than Delia, where he is more explicit. This will enable us to approach the sonnets with a fuller understanding of Daniel's philosophy of art and, no less importantly, allow us to read some excellent poetry.

Musophilus, Daniel's apologia pro sua vita, contains a particularly im-

pressive statement:

> For these lines are the vaines, the Arteries,
> And undecaying life-strings of those harts
> That still shall pant, and still shall exercise
> The motion spirit and nature both imparts,
> And shall, with those alive so sympathize
> As nourisht with their powers injoy their parts.[4]

This is what Daniel held his verses to be. This belief was the justification of his life and work, his greatest source of inspiration:

> And, if I may attaine, but to redeeme
> My name from dissolution and the grave,
> I shall have done enough, and better deeme
> T'have liv'd to be, then to have dyde to have.
> Short-breath'd mortalitie would yet extende
> That spanne of life so farre forth as it may,
> And rob her fate, seeke to beguile her and
> Of some few lingring daies of after staie,
> That all this little All, might not descend
> Into the darke a universall pray.
> And give our labors yet this poore delight,
> That when our daies doe end and they are not done;
> And though we die we shall not perish quite,
> But live two lives where other have but one.[5]

We notice that this language does not ring with the same emotion as that of the sonnets and, of course, that here Daniel presents his concept more logically, one might even say drily, though the total effect is quite as moving. For this reason we cannot apply Raymond Himelick's interpretation of the faith professed in Musophilus to Delia: "there is little specifically Christian in this poem, and nothing mystical. When he speaks of immortality he expresses only the intransigent faith of the Renaissance humanist in the power of literature to outlast sluttish time."[6] This may be

true of Musophilus, but not of Delia, or other poems for that matter. The-tys' Festivall, a masque written in 1610, when Daniel's imagination was supposed to have been even drier than in 1599, the year Musophilus was published, contains a song strongly reminiscent of the eternizing sonnets:

> Are they shadowes that we see?
> And can shadowes pleasures give?
> Pleasures only shadowes bee
> Cast by bodies we conceive,
> And are made the thinges we deeme,
> In those figures which they seeme.
> But these pleasures vanish fast,
> Which by shadowes are expresst:
> Pleasures are not, if they last,
> In their passing, is their best.
> Glory is most bright and gay
> In a flash, and so away.
> Feed apace then greedy eyes
> On the wonder you behold.
> Take it sodaine as it flies
> Though you take it not to hold:
> When your eyes have done their part,
> Thought must length it in the heart.[7]

The definition of sensually appreciable beauty as "shadowes" and the concept of the beholder preserving transitory beauty within himself are Neo-Platonic. A note of Epicureanism is introduced by "Take it sudden as it flies" (carpe fugacem), but it is by no means a dominant one. Eyes, not arms, embrace these "shadowes", and only for a fleeting instant: then "Thought must length it in the heart".

In Musophilus, Daniel can set forth his philosophy of the immortality of art in a straightforward manner because it is the eternizing of glorious deeds and not beauty that he is considering. In "Are They Shadowes?" and

in Delia he must be more imaginative and emotional, even somewhat mystical, for beauty trembling on the edge of oblivion cannot be approached with the same stoic equanimity as "Th'acts of worthy men".[8]

Such is also the case in Rosamond. The shade of the unfortunate lady appears to the poet and asks him to record her history because

> my soule is nowe denied,
> Her transport to the sweet Elisean rest,
> The joyfull blisse for ghosts repurified,
> The ever springing Gardens of the blest,
> Caron denies me waftage with the rest.
> And sayes my soule can never passe the River,
> Till Lovers sighes on earth shall it deliver.[9]

The poet's verse not only preserves Rosamond's memory in the hearts and minds of men, but, in the words of a Delia sonnet, "Dooth her unto eternitie assommon" (XXXVII).

There is a similar application of the Orpheus fable in Spenser's The Ruines of Time. Spenser says of the Muses:

> The seven fold yron gates of grislie Hell,
> And horrid house of sad Proserpina,
> They able are with power of mightie spell
> To breake, and thence the soules to bring awaie
> Out of dread darkenesse, to eternal day;
> And them immortal make, which alse would die
> In foule forgetfulnesse, and nameless lie.[10]

The Ruines of Time is a kind of "dream vision", part elegy and part Neo-Platonic apology for poetry. Published in 1591, Daniel had time to read it before completing Rosamond and the majority of the eternizing sonnets in Delia, and considering that it was dedicated to the Countess of Pembroke

and was in part an elegy for Sidney, he must have read it very carefully. Certainly, there are similarities among it and both Rosamond and Delia. As the title indicates, Spenser literally laments the passing of beauty and glory, taking the ruins of Verlane as his central metaphor. We have seen that sonnet XXXVII speaks of "those walles which ambition reared"; Rosamond also contains an elegiac passage describing the shambles of the unfortunate lady's tomb.

More important yet, Delia echoes a passage of Spenser's proclaiming the immortality of poetry. Addressing Sidney's widow, Spenser assures her that

> Thy Lord shall never die, the whiles this verse
> Shall live, and surely it shall live for ever:
> For ever it shall live, and shall rehearse
> His worthy praise, and vertues dying never.[11]

Delia's lover assures her that

> If they remaine, then thou shalt live thereby;
> They will remaine, and so thou canst not die.
> (XXXIIII)

> Thou canst not dye whilst any abounde
> In feeling harts. (XXXV)

We have a clue here, slender enough, but the best we have to follow. But then it is almost a matter of course that Daniel should have depended upon Neo-Platonic aesthetics. As I have said before, Musophilus can be stoical because it deals with honour and virtue; Delia treats the interrelationships of love, beauty, virtue, mutability, art, and eternity: Neo-Platonism was the only organized philosophy that provided guidelines for the

treatment of these themes. Daniel simply had to depend upon it, just as he was constrained to base his work on the conventions of the Petrarchist tradition. But, just as with Petrarchism, he did not accept the whole of the Neo-Platonic aesthetic. He chose with care, accepting only those concepts he found reasonable. For this reason an analysis of the eternizing sonnets is particularly valuable as it allows us to see how the young Daniel approached a philosophy as fashionable as Neo-Platonism was in the late sixteenth century.

3. Daniel and Neo-Platonic aesthetics.

One of the obvious indications of the eternizing sonnets dependence on Neo-Platonic theories is their consistent use of light imagery. The carpe diem sonnets warn that Delia's "brightnes sets at length to west" (XXXII) and the eternizing proclaim that their "firie heate lets not her glorie passe, / But Phenix-like shall make her live anew" (XXX). We find a similar scheme in Spenser's "An Hymne in Honour of Beautie":

> For that same goodly new of white and red,
> With which the cheekes are sprinckled, shal decay,
> .....
> That golden wyre, those sparckling stars so bright
> Shal turne to dust, and loose their goodly light.
>
> But that faire lampe, from whose celestiall ray
> That light proceedes, which kindleth lovers fire,
> Shall never be extinguisht nor decay,
> But when the vitall spirits doe expyre,
> Unto her native planet shall retyre,
> For it is heavenly borne and can not die,
> Being a parcell of the purest skie.[12]

The similarities between this passage and sonnet XXX's

> I once may see when yeeres shall wrecke my wronge,
> When golden haires shall chaunge to silver wyer:

may be coincidental, but sonnet XXIX clearly describes Delia's beauty as being "deign'd her by the skyes", and sonnet XXXIIII makes the Neo-Platonic distinction between the flesh and the beauty that it is allowed to bear for a span: "Heere see the giftes that God and nature lent thee".

Talking of the distinction between essential and bodily beauty, in The Courtier Castiglione advises the true lover to "frame beauty within in his imagination, and so make it friendly loving to his soule, and there enjoy it, and have it with him day and night, in every time and place, without mistrust ever to lose it: keeping always fast in minde, that the body is a most diverse thinge from beautie, and that not onely not encreaseth, but diminisheth the perfection of it."[13] Delia's lover never claims that beauty is defiled in corporeal manifestation, but he does make the all-important distinction between essence and incarnation and, furthermore, takes Castiglione's advice about preserving it within the imagination.

> When men shall finde thy flowre, thy glory passe,
> And thou with carefull brow sitting alone:
> Received hast this message from thy glasse,
> That tells thee trueth, and saies that all is gone.
> Fresh shalt thou see in mee the woundes thou madest,
> Though spent thy flame, in mee the heate remayning:
> I that have lov'd thee thus before thou fadest,
> My faith shall waxe, when thou art in thy wayning.
> The world shall finde this miracle in mee,
> That fire can burne, when all the matter's spent.

Beauty is preserved within "sundred of all matter": it burns without fuel, and not only "day and night", but for the rest of the lover's life.

More important than all this is the fact that Daniel posits love as the means of access to art. It is through seeking Delia's love that the lover attains poetry and eternity. Such is also the case in Chapman's Ovid's Banquet of Sense. Now, of course, this is a declaration that poets have made in every age, but Chapman does not merely announce that love has inspired poetry. He carefully anatomizes the process, using the Platonic metaphor of the ladder for his basic scheme. The young Ovid apprehends Corynna's beauty with each of his five senses in turn, thus attaining the vision of the Beautiful and the Good, and the knowledge and ability to "write the art of love".[14]

We see a similar pattern in Delia. Before sonnet XXIX the lover is the lady's cringing victim. In the carpe diem sonnets he acquires the ability to distinguish between beauty as it is manifest in the body and beauty as a discreet essence: he is beginning to understand it. In the eternizing sonnets he responds not to Delia, but her beauty and virtue--to an ideal (though not an Idea) and not its corporeal manifestation. He thus progresses from earthly love to love through art, from love within the confines of space and time to a love that transcends time.

The perfection of nature through art is a concept central to the Neo-Platonic aesthetic. Spenser maintains that Astrophill not only "doth give / To short livde beautie age to live", but "beautie reard above her height"[15] as well. As we have seen, he claims also that the Muses imparadize those whom

the poets sing. Bruno is of the same opinion:

> Who would know of Achilles, Ulysses, and so many other Greek and Trojan captains, who would guard the memory of so many great warriors, men of wisdom, and heroes of this world, if they had not been raised to the stars and deified by the sacrifice of poets and other illustrious seers, a sacrifice which raises to the sky the celebrant, the victim, and the divine hero, canonized by the hand and vow of a legitimate and worthy priest?[16]

Daniel does not, of course, go as far as to make Delia's lover a priest of art, much less include him in a metaphorical Trinity, but the lover does in a way imparadize Delia's beauty, though he may not deify her.

In sonnet VI Delia enjoys a youth of paradisical bliss:

> A modest maide, deckt with a blush of honour,
> Whose feete doe treade greene pathes of youth and love.

The carpe diem sonnets declare that time will rob her of this:

> Men doe not weigh the stalke for that it was,
> When once they finde her flowre, her glory passe.
> (XXXII)

The eternizing sonnets free beauty from time's tyranny and the laws of mortality:

> These collours with thy fading are not spent;
> These may remaine, when thou and I shall perish.
> (XXXIIII)

Poetry recreates beauty, perfecting it by changing its way of being. Once eternized, it exists in accordance with laws wholly different from those of

natural creation.

> Thou maist in after ages live esteem'd
> Unburied in these lines reserv'd in purenes.
> (XXXVI)

It is intangible and imperishable. Purer and higher than before, it exists in an ideal condition according to the nature of ideas.

> When men shall finde thy flowre, thy glory passe,
> And thou with carefull brow sitting alone:
> Received hast this message from thy glasse,
> That tells thee trueth, and saies that all is gone.
> (XXXIII)

> Then take this picture which I heere present thee,
> .....
> Heere see the giftes that God and nature lent thee.
> .....
> If they remaine, then thou shalt live thereby;
> They will remaine, and so thou canst not dye.
> (XXXIIII)

Poetry, "this picture", replaces the mirror that "tells the trueth" because it contains a greater one. The mirror functions within time; art reflects from an a-temporal dimension, relocating beauty outside of the condition of mutability within a sphere of greater truth. "Thou canst not dye": art does not mirror superfluities, but preserves the essence in an imperishable medium. Thus, while Delia is not deified by her poet, he does raise her beauty to a higher level of reality.

Similarly, while the lover does not, like Bruno, deify himself, he has entered the world of ideas through his art. He has vanquished mutability, "times consuming rage" (XLVI), and the best part of him is also "reserv'd

in purenes" (XXXVI).

This progression from love to art, from the earthly to the ideal is, however, not identical but analogous to the Neo-Platonic scheme. Daniel does not claim to have access to the sphere of the forms of the Beautiful and the Good; indeed, he makes no specific mention of the orthodox distinction between sublunary illusion and ideal reality. Nor does he even suggest that he is capable of wafting people to heaven on the heat of his praise, or at all consider himself a priest of art with mystical powers. He does, on the other hand, believe that poetry that not merely preserves memory but perfects what the poet eternizes, relocating mortal beauty within an ideal realm of being. Like Bruno, he maintains that art is a valient and noble undertaking which raises the poet above the limitations of mortality. He believes that existance within and through art is higher and better than the mundane, and that the poet is the possessor and to an extent even the inventor of truth.

Daniel's concept of the nature and function of poetry is, like his concept of true love, seriously influenced by Neo-Platonic though, but ultimately his own. He uses Neo-Platonic aesthetics as guidelines and the traditional imagery of Neo-Platonic writings as raw material to construct an aesthetic he can believe in and use.

Some might say that, though original enough, his ideas lack sophistication, that he fails to give us a formal metaphysic. This is quite true, but inconsequential. Daniel may not provide us with an elaborate system, but the ideas which he does offer are eminently reasonable. It is, after all, easier to grant that art preserves its subject perfected within an imperishable medium

than that the artist wafts his hero to heaven on the smoke of a heretical sacrifice. As a matter of fact, Daniel's theories are similar to those of some modern aesthetic philosophers. Just consider Roger Fry's distinction between "the actual life...and the imaginative life",[17] between the psychological state attuned to biological survival and that receptive to aesthetic stimuli. Perfected in poetry, Delia is beyond the touch of change and decay. She exists in an ideal condition according to the nature of things ideal and her lover responds to her as to a work of art. He no longer suffers from her disdain; it is not important while he conceives of her as "reserv'd in purenes" (XXXVI). The realm of art is different in kind from the mundane.

Of course, I am not saying that there are connections between Daniel's and Fry's aesthetics, but merely pointing out that our poet had a clearly developed idea of how poetry works and that his concepts were reasonable--acceptable even to us to the extent that we may use them as the bases for relevant aesthetic argument centuries after his death.

As for the excellence of these sonnets, there is no need for my praise. The greatest of English poets thought well enough of them to make them models for his own. Shakespeare found in these sonnets not only images and metaphors, but a passion and a spirit that he could commune with. Though a greater poet, and a man of wider experience and deeper feeling, he once stood in awe of the calm assurance, the nobility and wisdom of Daniel's faith. That we should ignore them is our own loss.

NOTES

1 Williamson, 256.

2 Ibid., 254.

3 Michael Drayton, Idea, sonnet 6.

4 Samuel Daniel, Musophilus, in Poems and "A Defence of Ryme", ed. cit., ll. 184-89. All subsequent references to Musophilus are to this edition.

5 Ibid., ll. 29-42.

6 Raymond Himelick, ed., Samuel Daniel's "Musophilus" (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Studies, 1965), p. 31.

7 Samuel Daniel, Thetys' Festivall, in The Complete Works, ed. cit., 3, p. 31.

8 Musophilus, l. 982.

9 Rosamond, ll. 8-14.

10 Edmund Spenser, The Ruines of Time, in Poems, eds. J. C. Smith & E. de Selincourt (1912; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1960), ll. 372-78. All subsequent references to Spenser's works are to this edition.

11 Ibid., ll. 260-64.

12 "An Hymn in Honour of Beautie", ll. 92-105.

13 Balsassare Castiglione, The Book of the Courtier, trans. Thomas Hoby, in Three Renaissance Classics (New York: Scribner's, 1953), p. 689.

[14] Ovid's Banquet of Sense, stanza 113.

[15] "An Elegie, or Friends Passion, for his Astrophill", ll. 149-50, 162.

[16] Bruno, p. 189.

[17] Roger Fry, An Essay in Aesthetics, in Vision and Design (1920; rpt. Harmondswoth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1961), p. 24.

FAREWELL TO LOVE

We have followed the sequence from the "praise and complaint" sonnets through to the eternizing and found that the lover is increasingly less susceptible to the destructive influences of infatuation and more confident in his own powers as a poet. A problem, however, arises when we remember that there are complaints after sonnet XXIX, the turning point of the sequence. In spite of his newly gained self-confidence, the lover is still plagued by despair; indeed, some of the sonnets after XXIX speak of a blacker sorrow than ever suffered before.

To see through this apparent inconsistency, to understand why the lover still suffers from Delia's disdain, we must now examine the remainder of the sequence. In doing so, we shall look at C. F. Williamson's analysis of the conclusion and refer to the closing sonnets of several prominent sixteenth century sequences which Daniel seems to have had in mind when he wrote his own.

1. The two voices.

We find after sonnet XXIX not only more lamentation, but the bitterest poem of the whole sequence, the celebrated "Care Charmer Sleep".

> Care-charmer sleepe, sonne of the Sable night,
> Brother to death, in silent darknes borne:
> Relieve my languish, and restore the light,
> With darke forgetting of my cares returne.
> And let the day be time enough to morne,
> The shipwrack of my ill-adventred youth:
> Let waking eyes suffice to wayle theyr scorne,
> Without the torment of the nights untruth.

Cease dreames, th'ymagery of our day desires,
To modell foorth the passions of the morrow:
Never let the rysing Sunne approve you lyers,
To adde more griefe to aggravat my sorrow.
Still let me sleepe, imbracing clowdes in vaine;
And never wake, to feele the dayes disdayne.
(XLV)

Even though the lover has discovered eternity in his art and is much more confident of his powers and less susceptible to Delia's charms than ever before, this poem speaks of a sorrow darker than any we have seen. In sonnet XVI, before he had discovered the eternizing powers of poetry, the lover had lamented:

Happie, in sleepe, waking content to languish,
Imbracing cloudes by night, in day time morne:
All things I loath save her and mine owne anguish,
Pleas'd in my hurt, inur'd to live forlorne.
Nought doe I crave, but love, death, or my Lady,
Hoarce with crying mercy, mercy yet my merit;
So many vowes and prayers ever made I,
That now at length t'yeelde, meere pittie were it.

Then he had a choice between love and death, now love is impossible, and death as sweet as sleep. He complained of "Imbracing cloudes by night", of being fooled like Ixion. "Still let me sleepe, imbracing clowdes in vaine": now he prays for delusion. In sonnet XVI he insisted on trying to win Delia's heart with "vowes and prayers"; in sonnet XLV he wants to be able to stop lamenting:

And let the day be time enough to morne,
The shipwrack of my ill-adventred youth:
Let waking eyes suffice to wayle theyr scorne.

It is too painful to cry for mercy.

But the next sonnet speaks heroically of the conquest of time and death:

> These are the Arkes the Tropheis I erect,
> That fortifie thy name against old age,
> And these thy sacred vertues must protect,
> Against the Darke and times consuming rage.
> (XLVI)

Whereas XLV asked for silence and darkness, this celebrates poetry, and maintains that poetry is truth:

> But I must sing of thee and those faire eyes,
> Autentique shall my verse in time to come.
> (XLVI)

Daniel is too clever to let these two poems stand side by side without a reason, or for that matter to include complaints in this final section indiscriminately. We cannot dismiss the presence of these as the outcome of negligence. There is an explanation. In sonnet XLV it is the lover who is speaking; in XLVI, the poet. The poet can say easily enough:

> Though th'error of my youth they shall discover,
> Suffice they shew I liv'd and was thy lover.
> (XLVI)

He has found truth and eternity in poetry. The lover has lost everything. Thus, the persona of the poet-lover is split neatly down the hyphen. As artist he attains beauty, but as lover he fails to, for Delia will never return his love.

C. F. Williamson, though he brings many previously unnoticed features of the sequence to light, fails to heed these two voices, and the significance of the dichotomy. According to him, a "perfect interdependence"[1] exists between Delia and her lover: she inspires him and he eternizes her; without him she is forgotten, without infatuation the lover has no poems and no art.

He goes on to say that "what matters is not that the poet's love is unhappy, but that if should prove artistically fruitfull, and so provide a common memorial for the poet and his lady."[2]

I would say that it does matter. By juxtaposing the lover's failure to the poet's success Daniel is indicating the limitations of art. It is only in the proper realm of poetry that the poet-lover's efforts prove successfull; within the love affair and outside of the realm of the ideal they are anything but that.

Williamson maintains in addition that the conclusion of Delia is merely a concession to tradition, arguing that

> a sonnet sequence could not properly end on a note of triumph. The epilogue of Astrophil and Stella was, according to Nashe despair, and, perhaps aiming at the decorum of the dying fall, Spenser concluded the Amoretti by deploring estrangement and absence. So in the two concluding sonnets of Delia, Daniel returns to his point of departure, his constancy, his humility, his despair, and Delia's disdainful beauty...But this muted ending cannot undo what has gone before, and the argument developed in and after sonnet XXX remains irrefutable: the lady played the tyrant to her lover, but Time will treat her in the same way; Time is ruthless, Delia need not be; beauty is powerless, but not so the poet; the lady needs the poet to immortalize her, just as the poet needs the lady to inspire and so to immortalize himself; and ultimately the nature of the relationship, whether of joy or frustation, is less important that the poetry to which it gives rise.[3]

I must disagree with this observation of Williamson's as well. The last two sonnets are integral parts of the sequence. They recapitulate the themes

and bring definitive focus on the developments of the sequence, capping it off quite like the couplet of an English sonnet. They conclude Delia, and are certainly not mere bows to the tradition of the dying fall.

2. From poet to lover.

In the penultimate sonnet of Delia we find almost all the major symbols we have encountered: eyes, light, darkness, sacrifice, death, and, most important of all, those of song and flight, which are compressed into an avian metaphor.

> Unhappy pen and ill accepted papers,
> That intimate in vaine my chaste desiers,
> My chaste desiers, the ever burning tapers,
> Inkindled by her eyes celestiall fiers.
> Celestiall fiers and unrespecting powers,
> That deigne not view the glory of your might,
> In humble lines the worke of carefull howers,
> The sacrifice I offer to her sight.
> But sith she scornes her own, this rests for me,
> Ile mone by selfe, and hide the wrong I have:
> And so content me that her frownes should be
> To my' infant stile the cradle, and the grave.
> What though my selfe no honor get thereby,
> Each byrd sings t'herself, and so will I.
>
> (XLIX)

To understand the sequence, to determine the kind and degree of independence the lover finally attains, we must trace the pattern of metaphors of flight which concludes in the line "Each byrd sings t'herself, and so will I". In sonnet III the lover complained that the blaze of Delia's eyes had blinded his, and asked that only those similarly suffering from love read his verse:

You blinded soules whom youth and errours lead,
You outcast Eglets, dazled with your sunne:
Ah you, and none but you my sorrowes read,
You best can judge the wrongs that she hath dunne.

Sonnet XIIII also contains an avian metaphor:

Those amber locks, are those same nets my deere,
Wherewith my libertie thou didst surprize:
Love was the flame, that fired me so neere,
The darte transpearsing, were those Christall eyes.

The conventional conceit compares Delia's hair to a birding web and lover's heart to the trapped bird. Again, Delia's beauty is impeding the lover, and depriving him of his will to be free: "So much I please to perish in my wo" (XIIII); he delights in his martyrdom.

In sonnet XXVI, which describes the lover's heart flying into Delia's bosom like a sparrow seeking refuge, we detect a sign of rebellion.

Whilst by her eyes pursu'd, my poore hart flew it,
Into the sacred bosom of my deerest:
She there in that sweete sanctuary slew it,
Where it presum'd his safetie to be neerest.
My priviledge of faith could not protect it,
That was with blood and three years witnes signed:
In all which time she never could suspect it,
For well she sawe my love, and how I pined.
And yet no comfort would her brow reveale mee,
No lightning looke, which falling hopes erecteth:
What bootes to lawes of succour to appeale mee?
ladies and tyrants, never lawes respecteth.
Then there I dye, where hop'd I to have liven;
And by that hand, which better might have given.

The reference to privilege of clergy and ecclesiastical sanctuary, to an authority other than that of the beauty which oppresses the lover, indicates that

he has begun to regard Delia objectively. She is not the sole source of authority; indeed, a "tyrant" who usurps the church's right, she wields a power not absolutely her own. To be sure, the lover is still passive, but he has contemplated an "appeale" to the true law. Calling Delia a "tyrant", so odious a word in the Elizabethan political vocabulary, indicates that within himself he is not the absolute victim. His case is hopeless, but he has protested, and doubted.

In sonnet XXX the coup d'état is accomplished:

> I once may see when yeeres shall wrecke my wronge,
> When golden haires shall chaunge to silver wyre:
> .....
> Goe you my verse, goe tell her what she was;
> For what she was she best shall finde in you.
> Your firie heate lets not her glorie passe,
> But Phenix-like shall make her live anew.

The lover has an upper hand. Delia is wholly dependent on his ability to preserve her beauty against the ravages of time. He is no longer like a sun-blinded eaglet (III), a night bird caught in a web (XIIII), or Icarus with his wings melted by the fire of her eyes (XXVII), but master of the words whose fragrance and heat will, like the Phoenix' nest, enable her to enjoy a miraculous rebirth.

He is, however, still dependent upon her. It is because of Delia that he writes, and because of her beauty that his art has value. She set the "firie heat" of his heart a-blazing, and it is still for her that it burns. Similarly, in sonnet XXXV the lover proclaims:

But I may ad one feather to thy fame,
To helpe her flight throughout the fairest Ile:
And if my penne could more enlarge thy name,
Then shouldst thou live in an immortal stile.

It is not his but Delia's fame that flies throughout England. However much the lover has risen in his own self-esteem, he is still Delia's servant. His art is subservient to her beauty. "Goe you my verse, goe tell her what she was" (XXX) is prouder than "Goe wailing verse, the infants of my love" (II), but the poetry is still attending Delia. She is still the goal and impulse of its flight.

In sonnet XLIX such is no longer the case:

But sith she scornes her owne, this rests with me,
Ile mone my selfe, and hide the wrong I have:
.....
What though my selfe no honor get thereby,
Each byrd sings t'herselfe, and so will I.

The lover will no longer plead with Delia, or even praise her. "Each byrd sings t'herself, and so will I": he will retire and make poetry for himself alone--sadly, but not in despair, for he is, though still sorrowfull, more free than ever before.

My joyes abortive, perisht at their byrth,
My cares long liv'de, and will not dye without mee.
(L)

As lover he still suffers, but as poet he finds liberty:

And so content me that her frownes should be
To my' infant stile the cradle, and the grave.
(XLIX)

It was Delia's smiles and frowns that compelled him to write:

> Yet cannot leave her love that holds me hatefull,
> Her eyes exact it, though her hart disdaines mee.
> (XVII)

They cradled his verse, nurtured it--now they are its grave. But it is the "infant stile" that her unkindness kills. The lover's mature style, the "immortall stile" (XXXV) he has discovered in the eternizing sonnets, rises above the "grave" of Delia's frowns just as it rose above time and death.

Finally, the lover is symbolically above Delia. Before sonnet XXIX she always towered over him and his attempts to win her love always ended in precipitous failure. In the carpe diem they were on a level, she herself a creature passive beneath the absolute authority of the sun, whose motions symbolized the passage of time. Now it is he who stands superior and self-sufficient. The best part of him has risen above Delia's tyranny like a song bird above a cemetary plot. He has poetically come of age.

3. Farewell to love.

C. F. Williamson, as we have seen, maintains that these final sonnets are concessions to the tradition of the dying fall, that their sorrowfulness has no place here and so they should not be regarded as integral parts of the sequence. But they are in a position so prominent that disregard spoils our appreciation of the whole. Certainly Daniel, after so carefully constructing patterns of imagery, after modulating changes in tone with such precision,

would not have tacked sonnets XLIX and L onto the conclusion of Delia without artistic justification. We have to look at them more carefully than Williamson did.

We find, first of all, that though not actually triumphant, the ending is much more affirmative than Williamson admits. Instead of apeing Sidney's despairing conclusion, Daniel actually meant us to contrast Delia's lover's fortune with Astrophil's. Both sequences end on sonnets containing metaphors of flight--indeed; the final sonnets of du Bellay's l'Olive and Spenser's Amoretti also contain avian metaphors, and the Elizabethan reader referred to these.

The closing sonnet of Astrophil and Stella runs:

> When sorrow (using my owne fier's might)
> Melts downe his lead into my boyling brest,
> Through that darke fornace to my nart opprest,
> There shines a joy from thee my only light;
> But soone as thought of thee breeds my delight,
> And my yong soule flutters to thee his nest,
> Most rude dispaire my daily unbidden guest,
> Clips streight my wings, streight wraps me in his night,
> And makes me then bow downe my head, and say,
> Ah what does Phoebus' gold that wretch availe,
> Whom iron doores do keepe from use of day?
> So strangely (alas) thy works in me prevaile,
> That in my woes for thee thou art my joy,
> And in my joyes for thee my only annoy.[4]

Astrophil's ending is despair. His soul is trapped like a wingless bird in the prison of his hopeless love, and poetry, "Phoebus' gold" stands him to no avail. Stella is his "only light", and her absence his darkness. Delia's lover may not have found perfect happiness, but he is no longer constrained

to sing to her alone. As artist he escapes the prison of despair. His song may not be triumphant, but it is not that of a slave to love.

Du Bellay's l'Olive also ends with a sonnet containing a metaphor of flight:

> De quel Soleil, de quel divin flambeau
> Vint ton ardeur? lequel des plus haulx Dieux
> Pour te combler du parfaict de son mieulx,
> Du Vandomois te fist l'astre nouveau?
> Quel cigne encor' des cignes le plus beau
> Te prêta l'aele? de quel vent jusqu'aux cieulx
> Te balança le vol audacieux,
> Sans que la mer te fust large tombeau?
> De quel rocher vint l'eternelle source,
> De quel torrent vint la superbe course,
> De quele fleur vint le miel de tes vers?
> Montre le moy, qui te prise et honnore,
> Pour mieulx haulser la Plante que j'adore,
> Jusq'à l'egal des lauriers tousjours verds.[5]

Paying tribute to Ronsard, du Bellay asks to be taught how to fly higher than Icarus without plunging into the "vast tomb" of the sea that he might raise Olive to the supreme heights of poetry, where laurals never fade. Delia's lover seeks the opposite: "Ile mone my selfe, and hide the wrong I have" (XLIX). In sonnet XLVI he had insisted that

> Though th'error of my youth they shall discover,
> Suffice they shew I liv'd and was thy lover.

Now he wants to hide his wrongs, keep his error secret, and cease praising Delia.

The Amoretti ends with a sonnet containing an avian metaphor as well:

Lyke as the Culver on the bared bough,
Sits mourning for the absence of her mate:
and in her songs sends many a wishfull vow,
for his returns that seemes to linger late.
So I alone now left disconsolate,
mourne to my selfe the absence of my love:
and wandring here and there all desolare,
seek with my playnts to match that mournful dove:
Ne joy of ought that under heaven doth hove,
can comfort me, but her owne joyous sight:
whose sweet aspect both God and man can move,
in her unspotted pleasaunes to delight.
Dark is my day, whyles her fayre light I mis,
and dead my life that wants such lively bliss.[6]

It is impossible to say whether Daniel saw this sonnet before 1592, but he certainly knew Sidney's and du Bellay's and expected his readers to make the comparison, at the very least with Astrophil and Stella. The implications are quite clear. Astrophil despairs as both lover and poet; Delia's poet-lover despairs as lover, but as poet he has found liberty. In eternizing he has attained her beauty, and self-realization as well.

This is my state, and Delias hart is such;
I say no more, I feare I saide too much.
(L)

Delia's "hart is such" that neither praise nor complaint, nor the warnings of the carpe diem sonnets, nor the promise of eternity can win it. The lover still suffers from her cruelty and moans "cast downe from myrth, / Pensive alone" (L), but the poet has found an end to his "payning" (XVI). "I say no more"; before he had complained that

The starre of my mishappe impos'd this payning,
To spend the Aprill of my yeeres in wayling,
(XXVII)

but now he can sing when he chooses to, for he sings to himself.

In fact, he is beginning to think of an audience other than Delia. "What though my selfe no honor get thereby" (XLIX), he philosophizes. In sonnet IIII he had declared that

> No Bayes I seeke to deck my mourning brow,
> O cleer-eyed Rector of the holie Hill:
> My humble accents crave the Olyve bow,
> Of her milde pittie and relenting will.
> These lines I use, t'unburthen mine own hart;
> My love affects no fame, nor steems of art.

Delia will never relent, and realizing that pleading and complaining are futile, he starts to think about himself and the honour his verse might bring him.

He is no longer dissatisfied with his art. In sonnet XIX he described his poetry as an "untun'd moane"; in the eternizing sonnets he is justly proud of it. In sonnet XLVII he declared that "Hoarce sounds the voyce that prayseth not her name": in sonnet XLIX he is "content" to sing to and of himself. Delia's authority has waned to the extent that her lover can write without her inspiration.

Sonnets XLIX and L are integral parts of the sequence. Far from bowing to the tradition of the dying fall, Daniel actually departs from it. We have seen the differences between Delia, the Amoretti, and Astrophil and Stella and examined the development of the avian metaphor and changes in tone in these concluding sonnets. There can be no doubt that the ending of Delia is a farewell to love.

Williamson, though he examines the sequence carefully, fails to notice this. We cannot therefore accept his analysis, suggestive as it may be, as anywhere near definitive. Indeed, it is surprising that after having made so close a study of the Daniel's corrections and additions, he failed to notice the significance of the change of the couplet of sonnet L from

> What shall I doo but sigh and waile the while
> My martyrdome exceeds the highest stile
> (1591, XXV)

to

> This is my state, and Delias hart is such;
> I say no more, I feare I saide too muoh.

This makes all the difference: not more useless pleading, but a time silence; not continuation of an impossible situation, but finality.

How is it possible that Daniel meant to leave the lover in the situation which Williamson describes. Surely, it is anything but reasonable--and Daniel was the most reasonable of men--that the lover should be content to eternize a girl who continues to torment him, whose heart is still, and always will be "such" that he "no honor get thereby", not even a kiss once in a while. We cannot overlook the fact that the lover has already attained Delia's beauty through art, that his poetry raised her to an ideal realm where she is wholly his. How long could the relationship which Williamson describes continue? It is inconveivable that Daniel wanted us to believe that the lover will persevere in a hopeless, stupid effort to win Delia's

heart ad infinitum. He has, after all, declared "I say no more" (L).

Of course, the lover has not as of yet wholly gotten over his infatuation, but this is perfectly reasonable. The heart continues to smart a good while after the last goodbye; the sorrow and regret of the concluding sonnets are psychologically exact. Furthermore, we must remember that Daniel has described the inconsistancies between the ideal and the mundane. Mortal beauty decays; beauty eternized prevails even over the ravages of time: the lover is still suffering from the pangs of an unrequited passion; the poet, who deals in things ideal, is free to turn away, to "say no more" about Delia and his love.

The lover has been brought to the brink of independence--the brink bacause he is still partially the victim of Delia's mortal beauty. But, and this of the greatest importance, it is not the ideal of beauty that torments him, but Delia's mortal perversity, the flirtatious smiles and killing frowns that the winter of her old age will overshadow with a frown of its own.

4. Farewell to love poetry.

The lover is almost free, but he still lacks a thing perhaps even more important than freedom itself--inspiration. Daniel settles this problem in Rosamond, Delia's companion piece, which refers to both the lady and the sonnets dedicated to her.[7] In Rosamond Daniel offers us a new kind of poetry. The unfortunate heroine is a historical personage; the work is based on facts. However artistically elaborated, Rosamond is historical, and thus anticipated Daniel's epic of the Wars of the Roses and his prose history of

England, the final important work of his career.

Being so self-conscious an artist, Daniel understood the significance of this progression from love lyrics to history in verse. It is adumbrated in Delia and Rosamond. The persona of the poet-lover begins by writing of the beauty of his lady and the torments of love. Realizing that he can eternize beauty in his poems, he decides that as Delia will never relent and acknowledge his devotion, he might as well cease celebrating her beauty and lamenting his misfortune. Finally, in Rosamond, he finds a new theme and a new manner, and a new source of inspiration as well. He finds new matter to eternize—Rosamond's doleful fate and later, in The Civil Wars, the acts of worthy men.

Delia dramatizes the development of the artistic personality from its initial state of dependence upon love for inspiration to the brink of a maturity where epic themes are subjects for the poet's pen; it shows how love of mortal beauty leads to love of ideal beauty and truth through and within art. It is thus, though not auto-biographical, deeply self-allusive, and this explains the tone of the conclusion. Daniel literally feared that he had said "too much" (L). The most modest and self-critical of men, he was not about to proclaim that he had come artistically of age, that, just as Virgil abandoned the pastoral for higher themes and a nobler style, he was about to leave love sonnetry to write a historical epic. Daniel hints at this development, whispers it for those close to him to hear and understand.

There is no reason why we, who can see how Daniel's art developed by merely glancing at a chronology of his works, should fail to do so. It is not even

necessary to refer to Daniel's career to see what happens to Delia's lover, and why these things must happen. He can eternize beauty; why suffer from her perverse cruelty: he no longer needs the inspiration of her smile; why not turn away? Why not sing of "Knights and Palladines" (XLVI)? His love for Delia was "th'error of his youth" (XLVI); her frowns are the "grave" of his "infant stile" (XLIX). His youth has passed in sorrow and it is time for a mature style, and a new poetic life, to arise from the grave of the old.

Delia is not completely forgotten. The lover is still hurt and quite likely will continue to love her, as one continues to love a girl whom he has lost forever—sadly, in the poetic realms of memory. But he has found that he is a true poet and that he need not rely on Delia alone for inspiration. Her "beautie made him speake that els was dombe" (XLVI); she gave him a voice and compelled, "extorted" (L), him to use it. Now, independent, he can "say no more" (L). He can be silent or sing of what and to whom he wishes. The heroine of Rosamond is someone other than Delia, and that poem is written for the whole world to read.

His love and wonder at his new found powers made him declare in a final outburst of selfless adulation that Delia alone was all his inspiration (XLVII). In the final tally of the two concluding sonnets, he finds that such a course is wholly "vaine" (XLIX), that "Delias hart is such" that he must "say no more" (L). Here again we appreciate the wisdom that pervades the sequence. After the nadir of hopelessness of "Care Charmer Sleepe" (XLV) comes the majestic certainty of sonnet XLVI:

These are the Arkes the Tropheis I erect,
That fortifie thy name against old age,
And these thy sacred vertues must protect,
Against the Darke and times consuming rage.

Exhileration follows:

Her touch doth cause the warble of the sound,
Which I heere yeeld in lamentable wise,
A wailing deskant on the sweetest ground,
Whose due reports give honor to her eyes.
.....
O happie ground that makes the musique such,
And blessed hand that gives so sweete a tuch.
(XLVII)

None other fame myne unambitious Muse,
Affected ever but t'eternize thee:
All other honours doe my hopes refuse,
Which meaner priz'd and momentarie bee.
(XLVIII)

The pattern of emotions is perfect; that final, blinding charge of self-delusive hope before the recapitulation of the true facts, and then the sigh of relief, migled with incredulity at one's own ability to break free:

Loe heere the impost of a faith unfaining,
That love hath paide, and her disdaine extorted:
Beholde the message of my just complayning,
That shewes the world how much my griefe imported.
.....
This is my state, and Delias hart is such;
I say no more, I feare I saide too much.
(L)

The sonnet signals the end of the matter, not its extension. We cannot mistake this. Examine the dramatic structure of the sequence and the patterns of its imagery, refer to Daniel's own career or consult archetypes of the birth of the artistic consciousness; the totality of the evidence,

not to speak of mere common sense, shows that the ending of Delia is a farewell to love.

NOTES

1 Williamson, 259.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., 259-60.

4 Astrophil and Stella, sonnet 108.

5 Amoretti, sonnet LXXXIX.

6 Joachim du Bellay, l'Olive, in Poésies françaises et latines (Paris: Garnier, 1918), 1, sonnet CXV.

7 Rosamond, ll. 36-49, 732-35.

THE ENGLISH MUSE

I pointed out in the introduction to this essay that Daniel is considered by many to be no more than an orthodox Petrarchist. We shall now see just what his attitudes towards the Petrarchist tradition really were. Examining critical opinions forwarded in his mature writings and taking into consideration the absence of basic elements of the tradition from Delia and the quality of the verse itself, we shall find that Daniel aimed at a compromise between the best the love poetry of the continent and that native to his country--what has been variously called "plain" and" Drab"--had to offer. It is not a defeatist's comprimise. Daniel was eclectic, ready to learn everywhere, but he never abandoned his own critical beliefs and high standards. More ardently than any other writer of his age he believed that the genius of English excelled all others, and that it was the duty of the English poet to bring his literature to the peak of its potential. This faith pervades Delia. In these sonnets we find not orthodox exercizes in traditional forms but an English poetic genius consciously imposed upon the raw material of the imported conventions; not "the quintessence of the Petrarchan, unenlivened by any doubt or originality"[1], but the quintessentially English lyric poetry of a writer who was one of the farest-seeing critics of the age.

1. The English Muse.

Daniel stopped paying serious attention to love poetry in 1592. After the publication of the first authorized edition of Delia he produced no more love

lyrics except for the occasional sonnet and songs for his plays. Furthermore, the works written after 1592--Cleopatra, The Civil Wars, Musophilus--are all much more philosophical in content and plainer in style than Delia and Rosamond. Indeed, at a careless first reading one might fail to recognize the early and the later writings as the works of one poet.

Clearly, Daniel was dissatisfied with love sonnetry and the style appropriate to it. The sequence itself hints at disappointment. Just as the lover stops singing Delia's praises, so Daniel stopped producing love sonnets. In making the conclusion of Delia a farewell to love poetry as well as farewell to love, Daniel was telling the public about his literary plans--he would write no more love poems.

Why not? What disappointed him? Delia had gained him an enviable reputation, the approval of the finest poets of the era as well as the enthusiastic interest of the reading public and, being so sensitive a critic, he could himself appreciate the merits of the work, yet he abandoned a kind of poetry that could have brought him even greater success than the relatively difficult writings of his mature period.

If we can discover what Daniel found lacking in Delia, what he thought he had failed to accomplish, we shall be able to tell what he wanted to do with love sonnetry. Unfortunately, he never spoke of Petrarchism specifically in his critical writings, but very often he did touch upon associated matters, the problem of foreign literary influence and the importance of maintaining and developing the national integrity of English literature. In Musophilus for example, he asks:

> Or should we carelesse come behind the rest
> In powre of wordes, that go before in worth,
> When as our accents equall to the best
> Is able greater wonders to bring forth:
> When all that ever hotter spirits exprest
> Comes bottered by the patience of the North?[2]

Daniel was so firmly convinced of the necessity to develop a literature quintessentially English that, although an early neo-classicist himself,[3] in his defence of the "native ornaments"[4] of English poetry he goes so far as to reject the authority of the ancients:

> Me thinkes we should not so soone yeeld our consents captive to the authoritie of Antiquitie, unlesse we saw more reason: all our understandings are not be be built by the square of Greece and Italie [Rome]. We are children of nature as well as they, we are not so placed out of the way of judgement that the same Sunne of Discretion shineth uppon us, wee have our portion of the same vertues as well as the same vices.[5]

There is no need for me to emphasize that these views are close to those of writers like Sidney and Fulke Greville, who opposed the tyranny of foreign literary influences and sought to produce a poetry essentially English. Just compare a passage from Daniel's A Defence of Ryme treating excessive ornamentation with one from Sidney's The Defence of Poesy:

> so is it that hony-flowing Matrone Eloquence apparrelled, or rather disguised, in a Courtisanlike painted affectation. One time with so farre fet words, that may seeme maonsters, but must be straungers to anie poore Englishman: an other time with coursing of a letter, as if they were bound to follow the method of a Dictionary: an other time with figures and flowers, extreemlie winter-starved.[6]

> Eloquence and gay wordes are not the Substance of wit,

> but the garnish of a nice time, the ornaments that but decke the house of state, and imitatur publicos mores: Hunger is as well satisfied with meat served in pewter as silver. Discretion is the best measure, the rightest foote in what habit soever it runne.[7]

Both criticise what was a major weakness of Elizabethan poetics, the unquestioning acceptance of the ornateness of continental poetry, which is often inimicable to English verse. In practice Daniel carried this belief much further than Sidney ever did; the poetry of his mature period is as plain and straightforward as that of the writer's of the "Drab" period.

Now we begin to see what Daniel found wanting in his own love poems. He had failed to resist the influence of the sonneteers of France and Italy stoutly enough. Delia is still too ornamental, too like the frivolously decorative sequences of the French and Italians. Moreover, the stuff the work is made of is not English. The rhetoric and conceits are Petrarchist, imported. Nor are the sonnets intellectual enough. "The function of Poem," Daniel maintains in Musophilus, is "to discourse."[8] "I versifie the troth, not Poetize,"[9] he tells us in The Civil Wars. Delia does neither sufficiently. It is neither history nor philosophy. By 1592 Daniel knew where his future as a poet lay—in historical and ratiocinative verse. Love sonnetry did not give him the opportunity to perfect these gifts. So he left it. Just as Delia's lover ceases to sing of love and suffering, he stopped writing love lyrics. They were no longer rewarding or challenging enough.

But Delia is well on the way towards Daniel's ideal of poetry. He did not suddenly become dissatisfied with sonnetry and realize that his future lay in

historical and moral verse. The development from the style of the sonnets to that of Musophilus and the verse epistles is no "suddaine change" (V). Daniel was convinced that English poets must resist foreign influences and strive to create a literature uniquely their own when he wrote the sonnets.

He tells of his faith in the potentials and values of English poetry in Rosamond, Delia's companion piece, which was written at the same time as the eternizing sonnets:

> Then when confusion in her course shall bring,
> Sad desolation on the times to come:
> When myrth-lesse Thames shall have no Swan to sing,
> All Musique silent, and the Muses dombe.
> And yet even then it must be known to some,
> That once they florisht, though not cherisht so,
> And Thames had Swannes as well as ever Po.[10]

Two years later, in his dedication of Cleopatra to the Countess of Pembroke, he spoke of the matter more specifically:

> O that the Ocean did not bound our stile
> Within thiese strict and narrow limites so:
> But that the melodie of our sweete Ile,
> Might now be heard to Tyber, Arne, and Po:
> That they might know how far Thames doth out-go
> The Musicke of declined Italy:
> And listning to our Songs another while,
> Might learne of thee, their notes to purifie.
>
> O why may not some after-comming hand
> Unlocke these limites, open our confines,
> And breake asunder this imprisoning band,
> T'inlarge our spirits, and publish our designes;
> Planting our Roses on the Apenines?
> And teach to Rheyne, to Loyre, and Rhodanus
> Our accents, and the wonders of our Iand,
> That they might all admire and honour us.
>
> Whereby great Sidney and our Spencer might,

With those Po-singers being equalled,
Enchaunt the world with such a sweet delight,
That their eternall Songs (for ever read)
May shew what great Elizaes raigne hath peace
Hath now beene made to her, and by her might,
Whereby her glorious fame shall never cease.[11]

Here he tells us what he wants accomplished. The literature of Italy is effete. England must raise her voice, her very own voice, and show Europe what it is worth.

This is the foundation of Daniel's critical beliefs. Throughout his life he insisted that the literature of his native land was equal in potential to the best and had to be developed with its national integrity maintained. He was of this opinion when he began to write sonnets at Wilton with Sidney's manuscript at hand and Lady Mary ready to explain her brother's critical views to him.

Daniel did not ape the French and Italians, but sought to impose upon the raw material of the imported tradition the unique forms of his own artistic personality, which he knew to be essentially English. We find in his sonnets not unquestioning acceptance of Petrarchist conventions and mannerisms, but a compromise between these and English emotion, spirit, and imagination; the stuff of Petrarchism given shape and form by the "patience of the North."[12]

2. Daniel and Petrarchism.

That Daniel did not accept Petrarchism without qualification but approached it critically, carefully chosing what elements he thought compatible with his own, the English Muse before moulding this stuff into poetry uniquely his own

is quite evident. Although, unlike Sidney, he never outrightly criticise or parodies elements he disapproved of, we can easily determine what he thought objectionable, for what he disapproved of he systematically excludes from the sequence.

Consider the major aesthetic weaknesses of Englich Petrarchism and see if they are to be found in Delia: overly elaborate descriptions that not seldom verge on the pornographic, excessively hyperbolic complaints, stale antitheses of the "I burn-I freeze" sort, superfluous mythological allusions, the overly complex conceit, and outlandish diction and syntax.

The language of Delia is as pure as water. We find no inkhorn terms, no awkward neologisms, and no affected archaisms. Each one of the sonnets can be read and understood without the aid of a glossary. Syntax is natural. Although in his mature works Daniel does more regularly reproduce the rhythms of spoken speech, it is very seldom that we find construction awkward in the sonnets, and when syntax is slightly unusual, it is so to accomodate the music of the verse. Indeed, this combination of maximum naturalness of syntax with verbal melody is one of Delia's most appealing qualities.

Just as Daniel rejected the outlandish diction and queer syntax favoured by the less original sonneteers, just so he refused to have a sonnet lady as excessively and erotically described as the standard one is. He tells us almost nothing about Delia's appearance, yet she lives in our imagination. Instead of piling on epithet after exotic epithet, he suggests her beauty, adumbrates it, one might say, with unequalled delicacy and grace. What another poet needs a whole sonnet to describe, he realizes in two suggestive lines:

And where the sweetest blossoms first appeares,
Let love and youth conduct they pleasures thither.
(XLIII)

The Elizabethan noticed these differences between Delia and traditional sequences and appreciated the implications. That the sequence contains no blasons, baisirs, or Cupid anecdotes, that the girl is described with a minimum of detail yet achieves imaginative vitality we too observe, but because we are not so well acquainted with the elements of the tradition, we have to be helped to see what Daniel was trying to do with Petrarchism. Let us, therefore, examine a sonnet with reference to the conventions and mannerisms of Petrarchist sonnetry. "Care Charmer Sleep" is, I admit, one of Daniel's finest, but it is characteristic of his manner and method:

Care-charmer sleepe. Sonne of the Sable night,
Brother to death, in silent darknes borne:
Relieve my languish, and restore the light,
With darke forgetting of my cares returne.
And let the day be time enough to morne,
The shipwrack of my ill-adventured youth:
Let waking eyes suffice to wayle theyr scorne,
Without the torment of the nights untruth.
Cease dreames, th'ymagery of our day desires,
To modell foorth the passions of the morrow:
Never let the rysing Sunne approve you lyers,
To adde more griefe to aggravat my sorrow.
Still let me sleepe, imbracing clowdes in vaine;
And never wake, to feele the dayes disdayne.
(XLV)

To start with, the mythological allusions are absolutely metaphorical, parts of the poem, not decoration to display familiarity with the classics. "Imbracing clowds in vaine": the whole fable of Ixion, of ambitious and for-

bidden longing and tyrannical punishment is here, compressed into a single clause. The opening invocation is perfect; full but not overly detailed, formal but charged with precise and powerful emotion.

And, of course, Daniel gives us a phrase that vibrates with the very genius of the language: "Care-charmer Sleepe". So too with "Laughter-loving Goddesse" (X) and "the nights pale Queen" (XL). They are perfect epithets, precise and graceful enough to bring honour to a Greek, but in poetic essence unmistakeably English. Nor are they mere tours de force; each is an organic part of its poem. So throughout the sequence mythological allusions and conceits are always truly metaphorical, whether expanded into a whole sonnet, as in V, which is based on the Actaeon fable, or concentrated into a single line like "Now whilst thy May hath fill'd thy lappe with flowers" (XXXII), which, reminiscent of Proserpine in the vale of Enna filling her apron with lilies and violets, evokes the primal loss of eternal spring and the perfection of innocent loveliness.

Daniel dealt as intelligently and imaginatively with another Petrarchist figure of classical lineage, the antithesis:

> Relieve my languish, and restore the light,
> With darke forgetting of my cares returne.
> (XLV)

It is simply said, but nothing could be more moving. Instead of merely listing "contraries", Daniel explores the conflicts of the inner self.

> Happie in sleepe, waking content to languish,
> Imbracing cloudes by night, in day time morne:
> All things I loath save her and mine owne anguishe,

Pleas'd in my hurt, inur'd to live forlorne.
(XVI)

These are conventional antitheses describing the standard "contraries" of love sickness, but they have force and meaning.

The hyperboles are no less successfull. "And never wake, to feele the dayes disdayne" (XLV) is clearly a rhetorical exaggeration, but notice how natural the language is, and how moving the passion.

Still must I goe the Summer windes pursuing:
Finding no ende nor Period of my payning.
(XVI)

Exaggeration again, but the art does not outweigh emotion or sense. Of course, some sonnets are overdone, but for the vastly greater part Daniel communicates emotion with precision and force. He avoids the Petrarchist pitfall: hyperbole is not used for its own sake in Delia. Emotion is convincing enough to justify the exaggeration and the hyperbole expresses and defines emotion instead of being a rhetorical tour de force.

The same is true of the conceits. Daniel never contructs one just to flout technique. His conceits are organic parts of the poem, incisive and meaningful in the specific context.

And let the day be time enough to morne,
The shipwrack of my ill-adventured youth.
(XLV)

This is the most familiar of Petrarchist conceits, used by virtually every English sonneteer from Wyatt down, but the way it appears in Daniel's poem

is anything but stale. His touch is masterly. One single line gives a history of despair. We know very well that the metaphor is an old one, but he uses it so poignantly that we simply do not care. The traditional conceit has become new and unique in his hand.

Of course, in some sonnets, XXIIII for instance, which has Delia's eyes, hand, and voice besieging the fortress of the lover's heart, the conceit is laboured and unsatisfying, but such a case is the exception. Daniel almost always constructs his conceits with economy and subtlety, aiming not to astound with technique but awe with emotion. It is not the mere "wit" of the conceit that he is primarily interested in, but the poem, the organization of emotion and vision; that the conceit is a vital part of.

Daniel avoided the major weaknesses of Petrarchist sonnetry and created a love poetry all his own. The raw materials, the situations, postures, and rhetoric, are traditional, but the poetry is unique. We cannot mistake the character of Daniel's Muse. Delicacy, subtlety, and grace and a gentle melancholy and quiet joy--these qualities and emotions are Daniel's, and they are essentially English.

His critically aware contemporaries would realize this. Let us too look at the work through Elizabethan eyes. There are no blasons, baisirs, or Cupid anecdotes, strange words and queer syntax, gaudy and pornographic descriptions, superfluous mythological allusions, stale antitheses, unjustified hyperboles, or overly complex conceits. It is clear that the systematic avoidance of elements and characteristic stylistic excesses is tantamount to outright criticism or parody. Nor is it any less plainly understandable that

when Daniel preferred suggestiveness to elaborate and detailed description, made the lover speak simply and movingly, produced conceits of subtle implications with the utmost artistic economy, and wrote in a language of exemplary purity, that when he exercised measure and delicacy and wrote from the wisdom of experience he was not apeing but exploiting Petrarchism.

3. The patience of the North.

Daniel knew perfectly well that he himself was, in Theodore Spenser's words, "the typical English poet [whose] style can be felt as the ground swell of English poetry."[13] It is not unconsciously that he drew his poetry from the purest depths of the language and made his verse move to rhythms that are archetypally English.

> Let other sing of Knights and Palladines,
> In aged accents, and untimely words.
> (XLVI)

He tells us himself that he would have none of Spenserian archaisms or inkhorns terms or awkward neologisms.

> Thou maist in after ages live esteem'd,
> Unburied in these line reserv'd in purenes.
> (XXXVI)

"Purenes": he gives us the very adjective to describe the language of the sonnets.

Deliberately, with the care and patience that distinguish both his thinking and style, Daniel developed a sonnetry that was as English as possible. Of

course, he failed to achieve his ideal of poetry--that is why he abandoned the love lyric--but Delia is well on the way. How could it be otherwise? He was already working on The Civil Wars in 1592. The style of this epic is that of his mature period. The gap between the relatively ornate poetry of Delia and the plain, ratiocinative of Musophilus and the verse epistles is not nearly as wide as most critics would have it; indeed, it is a gap almost bridged. Delia is the beginning, but it leads right to the other side. Daniel tells us this himself. The sequence moves from "praise and complaint" to eternizing, from the "infant stile" (XLIX) to the mature, just as he went from love poetry to the mature, philosophical works.

Consider the qualities of his mature writings. They are, primarily, discursive. Musophilus is a debate. The Civil Wars contains as much ethics as history. Delia also offers ideas. We have analyzed its themes, observed that Daniel develops an aesthetic, considers the dichotomy of the ideal and the mundane, and ponders the nature, function, and efficacy of art. He even moralizes:

> Delia these eyes that so admireth thine,
> Have seene those walles the which ambition reared,
> To checke the world, how they intombed lyen
> Within themselves; and on them ploughes have eared.
> Yet for all that no barbarous hand attaynde,
> The spoyle of fame deserv'd by vertuous men:
> Whose glorious actions luckely had gainde,
> Th'eternall Annals of a happie pen.
> (XXXVII)

This is the central theme of Musophilus--mortal works decay, but the things of the mind and heart, art and knowledge, prevail. The philosophical debate

between Philocosmos and Musophilus, the lover of the world and the lover of the Muses, is in Delia in embryo.

With history, it is another story. Daniel was incapable of bringing a historical theme into the sequence. Delia is, indeed, almost devoid of facts. We are told almost nothing about the lady and her lover, of how they live and what outside of disdaining love and suffering they actually do. Daniel could not say of Delia "I versifie the troth, not Poetize."[14] He simply does not deal with facts in the sonnets. But there is "trueth" (I) in Delia. The will to truth, the impulse to question, explain, and teach that informs the mature writings is to be felt in the sequence. After all, in examining the development of the artistic consciousness Daniel is subjecting himself to objective analysis. The story of the lover's attainment of artistic independence is the story of his own maturation. When he shows that art is effective only within definite limitations, that the lover cannot win Delia's pity however moving and powerful his verse may be, Daniel is honestly acknowledging the inadequacies of his own art.

This will to truth is appreciable in the analyses of the lover's despairing condition as well. Where the average Petrarchist gives us mere elaborations of standard conceits, Daniel opens up the mind and heart. In a sonnet like V we enter the lover's mind and feel the texture of hysteria. The insight into the workings of the mind that distinguishes the verse epistles and the plays is operating in the sonnets. Daniel was already measuring the capacities of the personality to withstand external and internal pressures, probing to so how the mind and heart works and what makes men stand or fall.

The sequence is, after all, a story of faith. The lover prevails because he believes in poetry and his own ability to vanquish "times consuming rage" (XLVI). Just as in Musophilus, Daniel is making a declaration of faith.

I am not saying that Delia is a philosophical work, but it does have philosophy. The sonnets are contemplative, they ponder the transitoriness of mortal beauty and the power of art to perfect and preserve. Daniel is thinking in Delia, not merely producing moving phrases and lovely images. It is for this that we cannot consider the shift in his style to the plainer and ratiocinative of the mature writings as a "suddaine change" (V). Daniel had a definite programme when he set out to write the sequence. In Delia as well as in The Civil Wars, Musophilus, and the verse epistles he was trying to produce a poetry as English as possible, a poetry that would be an adequate vehicle for English thought and acceptable to the English Muse.

Just consider the most obvious feature of the sonnets. Their form is English--not the original Petrarchan, not that of Sidney's hybrid, but Surrey's, the three cross-rhymed quatrains capped with an epigrammatic couplet. It was Daniel who perfected this form, making it ready for Shakespeare to use with absolute mastery.

But this is only a minor matter. What connects Daniel with Wyatt and Surrey and sets him apart from sonneteers like Soothern and Watson and places him in the main stream of the development that led from Tottel's to Sidney to Shakespeare is that he made sonnetry a mode of personal expression. Wyatt and Surrey had taken the stuff of Petrarchism and made of it poetry that not only had a personal voice, but manifested a personal comprehension of the

world and man's life. Soothern and Watson imitated the French and Italians in the modern sense of the word, they copied. English sonnetry was in danger of succumbing to this fallacy; Watson had greater influence on his fellow poets than most modern critics realize. Sidney put a stop to this with Astrophil and Stella, which reintroduces the truly contemplative mode of Wyatt's and Surrey's poems. Daniel perpetuated this kind of sonnetry. Delia proved again that sonnets could speak with a personal voice and be meaningful.

There is no need for me to pause on the significance of this achievement. Just think of the difference between Drayton's Ideas Mirrour (1594) and his Idea (1616). The first contains, for the most part, exercises in traditional forms and themes. In the later work we find a personal understanding of life, a distinct reaction to the order and workings of the universe. Now Drayton was as fine a poet as Daniel, but never so critically aware. Before the publication of Astrophil and Stella in 1591, indeed, before going to Italy in late 1590, Daniel had decided to produce sonnets that would be contemplative, that would speak about things that mattered and not merely complain and praise in a hundred different ways. He purposefully created a kind of poetry that would ring with his personal voice and manifest his conception of the order of the universe.

Daniel never aped the French and Italians, but sought to show that English poet could beat them at their own game. Like Sidney, he took the raw material of Petrarchism and shaped it to his own conception of an ideal English lyric poetry. Where his contemporaries struggled for the yet more impressive effect, tried to be more of an astounding Petrarchist than the next man, Daniel culti-

vated restraint and ease. Working carefully and patiently, he made of the elements of the tradition a poetry uniquely his own, and uniquely English. We feel this in its unobtrusivenesss, in its measure and delicacy and the melancholy and quiet joy that come from the English heart, and see it perfectly clearly in the fact that the sonnets in Delia are, like Wyatt's, Surrey's, Sidney's, Shakespeare's, and Spenser's, truly contemplative.

Some might say that Daniel was responding to an instinctive preference for discursive verse and merely acknowledged and worked within his limitations, but think of what this means. The major fallacy of English Petrarchism, the flaw at the very centre of the poetry, is unreasonable ambition. They tried to achieve the heights of passion and spirit that come naturally to the southern temperament, they aped what the "hotter spirtits"[15] could express with ease and grace and like unthinking mimics, parodied what they tried to emulate. Daniel was certainly conscious of his limitations, and he was perfectly aware of what this critical self-awareness meant. He consciously, carefully and patiently imposed the forms of his own artistic personality upon the stuff of Petrarchism. He made of the stock situations, postures, and rhetoric of the traditional poetry sonnets whose restraint, subtlety, and thoughtfulness identifies them as purely English.

Who can deny that he worked consciously, with a definite goal in mind? Of how many writers can we say that they are their own best critics? It is not necessary to look any farther than the sonnets to find descriptions of the quality of Daniel's lyric poetry: "fatall antheames, sad and mornefull songes" (III), "sorrowing sighes" (XXXIIII), "A wailing deskant on the

sweetest ground" (XLVII), "mournefull warble" (XXXVI), "lines of delight" (XLIII), "purenes" (XXXVI). (I do not think I exaggerate when I add to this list "immortal stile" XXXV .)

A poet who can describe his own verse so well knows exactly what kind of verse he is writing. Daniel cannot be accused of blindly imitating the poets of the continent. He sought a compromise, an honest and honourable one, never sacrificing the values that lie at the basis of all his poetry. In Delia he steered a middle course between the excesses of Petrarchism on one hand and the excessive reaction against the tradition on the other. This is why he never parodies—he considered one extreme as destructive as the other.

Thus critics who look for direct criticism and parody are in error. A poet does not have to shout to make his opposition to conventions known. Daniel did not have mock Petrarchism. He controlled it, achieving a balance between the stuff of the tradition and his English artistic sensibility. This is undeniable. We see it in the systematic exclusion of elements he disapproved of, in his perpetuation of the contemplative mode of Wyatt and Surrey, the masterly exploitation of stock situations, postures, and rhetoric, and feel it in the very texture of the verse, in the purity of its diction, the ease of its syntax, and the archetypally English movement of its rhythms. Daniel himself tells us that he wanted to prove to Europe that "Thames had Swannes as well as ever Po."[16] All his life he sought to create a poetry that would place England above France and Italy. Delia was his first offering. It is here that he first tried to show how

all that ever hotter spirits exprest
Comes bettered by the patience of the North.[18]

NOTES

1 Patrick Crutwell, op. cit.

2 Musophilus, ll. 957-68.

3 Cleopatra, The Complete Works, 3, is a perfect Neo-Senecan tragedy.

4 A Defence of Ryme, p. 153.

5 Ibid., p. 139.

6 Philip Sidney, The Defence of Poesie, in Prose Works, ed. Albert Feuillerat (1912; rpt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 3, p. 42.

7 Defence, p. 145.

8 Musophilus, l. 999.

9 Samuel Daniel, The Civil Wars, ed. L. Michel (New Haven: Conn.: Yale University Press, 1958), I, 6.

10 Rosamond, ll. 722-28.

11 Cleopatra, "Dedication", ll. 73-96.

12 Musophilus, loc. cit.

13 Theodore Spenser, Two Classic Elizabethans: Samuel Daniel and Sir John Davies, in Selected Essays, ed. A. C. Purvis (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press), p. 108.

14 The Civil Wars, loc. cit.

15
Musophilus, loc. cit.

CONCLUSION

Daniel was in many ways his own best critic, but in one instance we need not take his opinion as fact. He was disappointed enough with love sonnetry to abandon the genre and the style for works much more intellectual in content and plainer in form. Yet his sonnet sequence is still his loveliest and perhaps most perfect work. It is also one of the finest of the period and no man should be dissatisfied with ranking just behind Sidney, Spenser, and Shakespeare.

The excellences of Daniel's love poetry have made themselves evident even in this short study. What other minor sonnet sequence offers such diversity? Where the average Petrarchist is content with the eternal "praise and complaint", Daniel gives us his carpe diem and eternizing sonnets, the first full expressions of these themes in English sonnetry. His work is a perfectly organized whole. It tells a story and contains situations and characters that change and develop. The average Petrarchist heroine is perfectly beautiful and absolutely unresponsive and the hero consequently loves and suffers forever; in Delia the relationship changes radically. The lady and her lover develop externally and internally. We see Delia age and fade through her lover's eyes and we see how he responds to his own consciousness of her mortality. The different kinds of sonnets--"praise and complaint", carpe diem, eternizing--are lenses trained on Delia and the forms of beauty she symbolizes: by observing modifications in focus we see how the poetic vision functions and develops. Each type of sonnet and the progression from

one to another exemplify and analyze ways of regarding and responding to beauty, virtue, mutability, mortality, art, and eternity. Daniel offers us ideas. In Delia he is working out the problems of his own artistic development.

To be sure, some sonnets would have been better excluded, but the majority are successfull and indispensable to the organic structure of the sequence, and the best are the finest in the language. No one else could have written "Care Charmer Sleep". Only Daniel could charge the carpe diem with such gentle pathos and speak of the immortality of art with such measured majesty. Where he excells he is unsurpassed. No other poet produced descriptions of such subtlety and charm. Unobtrusively, with the ease that betrays perfect control, he draws scenes so delicately suggestive that they tremble on the verge of allegory without assuming static form.

The complaints are no less successfull. The matter is Petrarchist but the poetry itself transcends convention. We do not care if this has been said before because when we read it we know that this is how it was always meant to be said. Some might prefer greater passion, and savage cynicism, but they disregard the depth and range Daniel was capable of. The sorrow is not of one kind: the lover laments not only his own plight but the passing of beauty as well, and he finds as much joy in poetry as in beauty. The emotions Daniel presents are not great and wild, but they are varied and, most important of all, true. We believe the lover, delight and lament with him freely. We also think with him, and this is more than can be said for the majority of Petrarchist sequences.

Yet Delia is neglected. Though a work of great influence, the first and loveliest of a poet who ranks among the finest of his age, it is regularly disregarded, misunderstood, and undervalued. Critics call Daniel a mere Petrarchist; he strove all his life to create a poetry free of foreign influences, a poetry "mere English". A critic of deep sensitivity and astounding foresight, he brought the totality of his knowledge and taste to bear upon the tradition. From the chaos of English Petrarchism he shaped a work of unique beauty and unmatched grace. His sonnetry is all his own. No one can mistake his style and no one but be awed by the purity and subtlety of his imagination.

Daniel wrote some of the most beautiful lyric poetry of his age. Among giants of men, artists whom none have matched, he ranked with the best. We neglect him at our own loss.

Appendix I: The Identity of Delia and the Date, Place, and Circumstances of the Composition of the Sonnets.

We have very little internal evidence to help us identify the original Delia. Daniel tells us that she lives beside the river Avon (XLVIII), but not which particular one. Her youth, her beauty, and her fair hair (changed to "sable" in the 1601 version of XXXIIII--evidently Daniel did not care about such details) are qualities she shares with the vast majority of sonnet ladies. She has really no distinguishing physical features, no special personality, or peculiar circumstances in her life. Unlike Sidney and Henry Constable, Daniel never puns on her name or writes sonnets around her armorial bearings. In effect, he tells us so little about her that it is impossible to say whether there was a real Delia in Daniel's life, whether the lady of the sonnets is a portrait or a fiction.[1]

Nor would this knowledge further our appreciation of the work, which, as we have seen, is plainly understandable without reference to Daniel's career. It would, however, help us to know when and where the sonnets were composed, for if Daniel began to write poetry seriously at Wilton, under the patronage of Mary Herbert, Countess of Pembroke, we could be certain that at the formative stage of his career he was not only acquainted with Astrophil and Stella, but was also familiar with Sidney's literary programme. If we can prove that Daniel was connected with the Pembroke household before 1591, the year his and Sidney's sonnets were pirated by Thomas Newman, we shall be certain that his conviction in the need to resist foreign literary influences and develop

the essential qualities of English verse lies behind Delia as well as the later writings.

The prose dedication of the first (1592) edition of the sequence and the dedicatory sonnet of that of 1594 (Sprague, p. 170-71) gratefully acknowledge Lady Mary's patronage and inspiration, but they are so vague as to fail to answer the nagging question, was Lady Mary Delia? Tradition has it that she indeed was the woman for whom Daniel wrote the sonnets, but Joan Rees rejects this theory. According to her, Delia was "a local girl"[2] of Daniel's native Somerset and the "crisis"[3] of the affair occurred in 1590-91, before Daniel travelled to Italy with Sir Edward Dymoke, to whom he had dedicated his translation of Paulo Giovo's treaties on imprese in 1585. In addition, Rees maintains that Daniel became one of the "Wilton Circle" after the surreptitious printing of Delia and consequently Lady Mary "did not produce the seminal ideas for the poems" and extended her patronage "only to the finished work",[4] the first complete and authorized edition of 1592, which is dedicated to her.

Pierre Spriet, on the other hand, accepts the traditional viewpoint, maintaining that Daniel began to compose sonnets at Wilton before 1591; specifically, between 1584 and 1588,[5] after leaving Oxford (without a degree) and settling in Lincolnshire for a short while. This is much more reasonable than Rees's theory, but Spriet fails to present positive proof. Fortunately, we can point to new evidence which establishes that Daniel was connected with Lady Mary before 1591.

At the back of the posthumous 1623 edition of Daniel's poetical works appears an elegeic poem entitled "To the Angell Spirit of the most excellent,

Sr. Phillip Sidney". According to W. A. Ringler, Jr.,[6] this is not by Daniel but a copy of one of Lady Mary's which the editor, Daniel's brother, John, found among his papers and erroneously printed as his. Certainly the poem is a rough draft of Lady Mary's dedicatory elegy of Sidney's and her metric translations of the Psalms, but we find echoes of it in Daniel's sonnets, and thus cannot dismiss it, as Rees does,[7] as insignificant. The connection indicates that Daniel was on close enough terms with Lady Mary to possess a copy--a rough draft at that--of a poem which she evidently wrote in sorrow.

Sonnet I of Delia is based on parts of the elegy:

> And that my thoughts (like smalles streames that flow,
> Pay to their sea, their tributary fee)
> .....
> O when from this accompt, this cast-up somme,
> This reckning made the audit of my woe.[8]
>
> Unto the boundles Ocean of thy beautie
> Runs this poore river, charg'd with streames of zeale:
> Returning thee the tribute of my dutie,
> Which heere my love, my youth, my playnts reveale.
> Heere I unclaspe the booke of my charg'd soule,
> Where I have cast th'accounts of all my care:
> Heere have I summ'd my sighes, heere I enroule
> Howe they were spent on thee; Looke what they are.
> (I)

Now sonnet I was not printed by Newman, but it is certain that Daniel saw the elegy before leaving for Italy in late 1590. The last two lines of the rough draft of Lady Mary's poem are echoed in a sonnet printed by Newman:

> I can do no more deare soule, I take my leave,
> My sorrow strives to mount the highest sphere.[9]
>
> What shall I doo but sigh and waile, the while

My martyrdome exceedes the highest stile. *

(This is the 1591 version of the couplet of sonnet L.)

We can now safely agree with Spriet that Daniel came to Wilton well before 1591, but the question of Delia's identity still remains unsolved. Was she Lady Mary? I think not. Lady Mary was a mother when Daniel came to Wilton, and a great noble and Puritan to boot--scarcely the sort of woman a man as shy and unsure as Daniel makes love to. It is quite impossible that he, knowing the depth of her philosophy and scope of her learning, would have dared to suspect her of wanting to read nothing but "Lines of delight, whereon her youth might smyle" (XLIII). Without a doubt they valued a deep friendship, but love was impossible there, particularly a publicized one. Lady Mary would never have allowed Daniel to dedicate the sequence to her if it contained one single hint of a love affair. She was his patron and to an extent his mentor, but never his lover.

As for Rees's "local girl", I do not doubt that there was a Delia in Daniel's youth; it is, after all, normal for an artistic young man to plunge into hopeless love, and in that age it was quite normal for such young men to preserve their tears in sonnets. The real Delia--if there was one-- might well have been a girl living by the Wiltshire Avon, but the sonnets were written at Wilton.

This is what is important. We shall probably never establish Delia's identity (unless more becomes known of Daniel's badly documented youth), but we know where and how the sonnets were written. At Wilton Daniel had ready ac-

cess to Astrophil and Stella, the treasure of the age. Who knows whether Sidney had not annotated some of the sonnets? Many other works, Spenser's and Thomas Watson's for example, are provided with commentaries. Surrey annotated his copy of Castiglione's The Courtier and Giordano Bruno, whom Sidney, Greville, and Florio, and possibly even Daniel entertained in London, went so far as to develop his commentaries on his own sonnets into a philosophical treastise in The Heroic Frenzies. But even if Sidney had not done this, Astrophil and Stella could show Daniel how to exploit the conventions and mannerisms of Petrarchist sonnetry, and Lady Mary, who was as familiar with her brother's critical convictions as anyone, stood by to give the young Daniel good advice. Wilton was his "beste Schoole",[10] it was here that he first learned to write truly English poetry, to refuse to ape the French and Italians and strive to blend the poetic traditions of the continent and those native to England in love sonnetry that bore the stamp of his unique artistic personality.

NOTES

1
According to Sidney Lee Delia is "a shadow of a shadow—a mere embodiment of what Petrarch wrote of Laura, and Ronsard of Marie." Elizabethan Sonnets, 1, p. lix.

2
Rees, p. 14.

3
Ibid., p. 20.

4
Ibid., p. 43.

5
Spriet, p. 59.

6
W. A. Ringler, Jr., ed., The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney, ed. cit., p. 551.

7
Rees, p. 12, n. 31.

8
Samuel Daniel, "To the Angell Spirit of the most excellent, Sr. Phillip Sidney," in The Complete Works, ed. cit., 1, ll. 48-49, 59-60.

9
Ibid., ll. 76-77.

10
A Defence of Ryme, p. 129.

Appendix II: The Source of the Title and Sonnet VI of "Delia".

Scholars have long supposed that Daniel took the title of his sonnet sequence from either a Roman or a sixteenth century French source. It is, in fact, an English work, Robert Greene's Perimedes the Blacke-Smith (1588), that provided Daniel with the name Delia.

In 1898 Joseph Guggenheim suggested that Daniel named his lady after the Delia of Tibullus's Elegies.[1] According to Guggenheim, further connections exist between the two works. For example:

> Quam cito purpureos deperdit terra colores,
> Quam cito formosas populas alba comas!
> .....
> Forma non ullam fata dedere moram.[2]

supposedly[3] provided the pattern for Daniel's

> Soone doth it fade that makes the fairest florish,
> Short is the glory of the blushing Rose,
> The hew which thou so carefully doost nourish,
> Yet which at length thou must be forc'd to lose.
> (XLII)

It is a rose, not a poplar and the general colouring of the blooming earth, that Daniel's poem speaks of, and it makes no direct reference to "fate". There is nothing to suggest that Daniel had Tibullus's elegy in mind, much less that he deliberately imitated it.

In another instance Guggenheim seems to have actually misread Tibullus. He insists that[4]

Vincula, quae maneant semper, dum tarda senectus
Inducat rugas inficiatque comas[5]

was the basis for

When thou surcharg'd with burthen of thy yeeres,
Shalt bend thy wrinkles homeward to the earth.
(XLII)

"Vincula" are the bonds of matrimony, not the fetters of age; the first two verses of the quatrain read:

Vota cadunt, utinam strepitantibus advolet alis
Flavaque coniugio vincula portet amor.[6]

The two poems deal with completely opposed matters.

Daniel probably knew Tibullus's Elegics, but, except for the name, the two works have nothing in common. And the chances of Daniel deliberately taking the name from this source are virtually nil. The chastest of poets, he definitely would not have wanted his sequence to be in any way associated with a work as notorious for its eroticism as Tibullus's was in the Renaissance.

In 1903 Max Maiberger, dismissed Guggenheim's suggestion, offering an alternate which Alfred H. Upham[7] and Sidney Lee[8] approved, but Janet Scott[9] correctly rejected. According to Maiberger,[10] Delia is based on the title of Maurice Scève's Neo-Platonic sequence of dizaines, Délie, object de plus haulte vertu (1544). This work is at least chronologically closer to Delia than the Roman, but, again, there is nothing to indicate that Daniel was at all influenced by Scève. Whatever vague thematic similarities exist between

the two sequences are such as one expects to find in Petrarchist love poetry. Furthermore, it is impossible that Daniel could have meant Delia to be an anagram for ideal, as Délie is. As we have seen, he was anything but an orthodox Neo-Platonist, and eschewed puns and word plays of all sorts methodically. Nor would he, who so firmly insisted on the national integrity of English literature, willingly associate his work with a French one on its very title page.

Most important of all, we can point to a work chronologically closer to Delia than even Délie, and much more accessible, which provided Daniel with the name in its full form. There can be no doubt that he took the title of his sequence from Greene's story, naming his lady after Perimedes' wife; sonnet VI of Delia is based on Greene's "Faire is My Love", which runs:

> Faire is my love for Aprill in her face,
> Hir lovely brests September claimes his part,
> And lordly July in her eyes takes place,
> But colde December dwelleth in her heart:
> Blest be the months, that sets my thoughts on fire,
> Accurst that Month that hindreth my desire.
>
> Like Phoebus fire, so sparkles both her eies,
> As ayre perfumde with Amber is her breath:
> Like swelling waves her lovely teates do rise,
> As earth his heart, cold, dateth me to death.
> Aye me poore man that on the earth do live,
> When unkind earth, death and dispaire doth give.
>
> In pompe sits Mercie seated in hir face,
> Love twixt her brests his trophees dooth imprint.
> Her eyes shines favour, courtesie, and grace:
> But touch her heart, ah that is framd of flynt;
> That fore my harvest in the Grasse beares graine,
> The rocke will weare, washt with a winters raine.[11]

Daniel turned this into:

Faire is my love, and cruell as sh'is faire;
Her brow shades frownes, although her eyes are sunny;
Her Smiles are lightning, though her pride dispaire;
And her disdaines are gall; her favours hunny.
A modest maide, deckt with a blush of honour,
Whose feete doe treade greene pathes of youth and love,
The wonder of all eyes that looke uppon her:
Sacred on earth, design'd a Saint above.
Chastitie and Beautie, which were deadly foes,
Live reconciled friends within her brow:
And had she pittie to conjoine with those,
Then who had heard the plaints I utter now.
O had she not beene faire, and thus unkinde,
My Muse had slept, and none had knowne my minde.
(VI)

A verse from another of Greene's poems provided the pattern for "A modest maide, deckt with a blush of honour": "A bonny lasse quaint in her Country tire",[12] and the antithesis of "And her disdaines are gall; her favours hunny" was probably suggested by a prose passage treating the nature of playing cards, which reads: "which in the mouth taste like hony, but in the maw more bitter than Gall".[13] The honey-gall antithesis is, however, such a common one in Elizabethan poetry that I cannot insist on a definite connection here.

As for further connections between these two works, all we can say is that the association of Daniel's Delia with Greene's is ironical. The latter is quite the antipodes of our "cruel-fair"--a cheerfull middle-aged housewife who occasionally helps her sagacious husband at the forge. It is also possible that Daniel assumed that his more knowledgeable readers would recognize the source of his sonnet VI and appreciate the wit of the phrase "greene pathes of youth and love".

Unfortunately, as sonnet VI does not appear in Newman's pirate edition of

1591, we cannot rely on this connection for a dating of the composition of the sonnets. Daniel may have read or reread Perimedes late in 1591 and used the song for a model for a new sonnet to add to the authorized edition of 1592.

Interestingly enough, a poem from The Passionate Pigrim, attributed to Shakespeare, is also based on Greene's "Faire is My Love":

> Fair is my love, but not so fair as fickle;
> Mild as a dove, but neither true nor trusty;
> Brighter than glass, and yet, as glass is, brittle;
> Softer than wax, and yet, as iron, rusty:
> A lily pale, with damask dye to grace her,
> None fairer, nor none falser to deface her.
>
> Her lips to mine, how often hath she joined,
> Between each kiss her oaths of true love swearing!
> How many tales to please me hath she coined,
> Dreading my love, the loss thereof still fearing!
> Yet in the midst of all her pure protestings,
> Her faith, her oaths, her tears, and all were jestings.
>
> She burn'd with love, as straw with fire flameth;
> She burn'd out love, as soon as straw ourburneth;
> She framed the love, and yet she foil'd the framing;
> She bade love last, and yet she fell a-turning.
> Was this a lover, or a lecher whether?
> Bad in the best, though excellent in neither.[14]

We notice that "A lily pale, with damask dye to grace her" has the cadence of "A modest maide, deckt with a blush of honour", and that both verses deal with a thing not mentioned in Greene's poem--the girl's blush. That the author of the poem in The Passionate Pilgrim took the pattern for this line from Greene's "A bonny lasse quaint in her Country tire" just as Daniel did is too much of a coincidence. Clearly, he had Daniel's adaptation of Greene's poem on his tongue when he set about to imitate that one.

With this in mind, I am given to think that perhaps the two derivative poems were composed in a friendly literary duel. The anonymous one is certainly written in the spirit of play, and the telling phrase in Daniel's, "greene pathes of youth and love", has more sportive wit than we usually find in his writings. Of course, there is no way to establish that the poems were written under such conditions, but it is inviting to think of Daniel and Shakespeare, who may have written the other, engaging in such a contest. Certainly, they would have found each other sympathetic, being equally so gentle of spirit. In any case, we know that Daniel took the name of his sonnet lady from Greene and used a poem of his as a model as well, and that the third poet imitated both Greene and Daniel.

NOTES.

1
Joseph Guggenheim, Quellenstudien zu Samuel Daniels Sonettcyklus "Delia", Friedrich-Wilhelms Univ. doct. diss. (Berlin: Ebering, 1898), p. 58.

2
Albius Tibullus, Aliorumque Carminum Libri Tres, ed. F. W. Lenz (Leiden: Brill, 1959), I, 4, ll. 29-30.

3
Guggenheim, p. 60.

4
Ibid.

5
Tibullus, II, 1, ll. 19-20

6
Ibid., ll. 17-18

7
Alfred H. Upham, The French Influence in English Literature from the Accession of Elizabeth to the Restoration (New York: Columbia University Press, 1908), p. 63.

8
Sidney Lee, ed., Elizabethan Sonnets (London: Constable, 1904), 1, p. liv, n. 2.

9
Janet Scott, "Names of the Heroines in Elizabethan Sonnet-Sequences," R.E.S., 2 (1926), 160.

10
Max Maiberger, Studien uber den Einfluss Frankreichs auf die Elisabethanische Literatur, Ludwig-Maximilians Univ. doct. diss. (Frankfurt: Knauer, 1903), pp. 26-27.

11
Robert Greene, Perimedes the Blacke-Smith, pp. 90-91.

12
Ibid., p. 92.

[13] Ibid., p. 43.

[14] William Shakespeare, The Passionate Pilgrim, in The Complete Works, ed. Hardin Craig (1951; rpt. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, 1961), number VII.

Appendix III: "Delia" and the Sonnets of Pseudo-Constable in the Second (1594) Edition of Henry Constable's "Diana".

In 1594 Henry Constable's Diana appeared in a second edition augmented, as the title page annouces, "with divers Quatorzains of honorable and learned personages."[1] Eight of these forty-nine added sonnets are by Sidney. The author of the remaining forty-one, Pseudo-Constable, will probably never be identified, but we can determine when he wrote and whom among Elizabethan sonneteers he sought to emulate. A fair number of his sonnets echo ones from Delia, one a passage from The Complaint of Rosamond, and a group of them are, like some in Delia, linked by the repetition of closing and opening lines of adjacent sonnets.

Sonnets II of the sixth decade and III of the eighth decade of Diana are based on entire sonnets from Delia:

> To live in hell, and heaven to behold,
> to welcome life, and die a living death,
> to sweat with heate, and yet be freezing cold,
> to graspe at starres, and lye the earth beneath;
> To tread a Maze that never shall haue end,
> to burne in sighes and starve in daily teares,
> to clime a hill, and never to discend,
> Gyants to kill, and quake at childish feares;
> To pyne for foode, and watch Thesperian tree,
> to thirst for drinke, and Nectar still to draw,
> to live accurst, whom men hold blest to be,
> and weepe those wrongs which never creature saw,
> If this be loue, if loue in these be founded,
> My hart is loue, for these in it are grounded.
>
> (Diana, 6th, II; p. 203)

> If this be love, to drawe a weary breath,

Painte on flowdes, till the shore, crye to th'ayre:
With downward lookes, still reading on the earth;
The sad memorials of my loves despaire.
If this be loue, to warre against my soule,
Lye downe to waile, rise vp to sigh and grieve me:
The neuer-resting stone of care to roule,
Still to complaine my greifes, and none releive me.
If this be loue, to cloath me with darke thoughts,
Haunting untroden pathes to waile apart;
My pleasures horror, lusique tragicke notes,
Teares in my eyes, and sorrowe at my hart.
If this be loue, to live a living death;
O then love I, and drawe this weary breath.

(IX)

My teares are true, though others be divine,
and sing of warres, and Troys new-rising frame,
meeting Heroick feete in every line,
that treat high measures on the Scene of Fame.
And I though disaccustoming my Muse,
to sing but low songs in an humble vaine,
may one day raise my stile as other use,
and turne Elizon to a higher straine.
When reintombing from oblivious ages
in better stanzas her surviving wonder,
I may oppos'd against the monster-rages
that part desert, and excellence a sunder:.
That shee (though coy) may yet survive to see
Her beauties wonder lyves againe in mee.

(Diana, 8th, III; p. 217)

Let others sing of Knights and Palladines,
In aged accents, and untimely words:
Paint shadowes in imaginary lines,
Which well the reach of their high wits records;
But I must sing to thee and those faire eyes,
Autentique shall my verse in time to come,
When yet th'unborne shall say, loe where she lyes,
Whose beautie made him speake that els was dombe.
These are the Arkes the Tropheis I erect,
That fortifie thy name against old age,
And these thy sacred vertues must protect,
Against the Darke and times consuming rage.
Though th'error of my youth they shall discover,
Suffice they shew I liv'd and was thy lover.

(Delia, XLVI)

Sonnet V of the seventh decade echoes quatrains and a single line taken from three of Daniel's:

> Bad shee not beene so excellently faire,
> my Muse had never mourn'd in lines of woe,
> but I did too too inestimable wey her,
> and that's the cause I now lament me so.
> Yet not for her contempt doe I complaine mee,
> (complaints may ease the minde, but that is all,)
> therefore though shee too constantly disdaine mee
> I can but sigh and greeve, and so I shall:
> Yet greeve I not, because I must greeve euer,
> and yet (alas) waste teares away in vaine,
> I am resolued, truely to persever,
> though shee persisteth in her olde disdaine.
> But that which grieves mee most, is that I see,
> Those which most faire, the most unkindest bee.
>
> (Diana, 7th, V; p. 212)

> O had she not beene faire and thus unkinde,
> Then had no finger pointed at my lightness:
> The world had neuer knowne what I doe finde,
> And Clowdes obscure had shaded still her brightnes.
>
> (Delia, VII, ll. 1-4)

> Yet her I blame not, though she might haue blest mee,
> But my desires wings so high aspiring:
> Now melted with the sunne that hath possest mee,
> Downe doe I fall from off my high desiring;
>
> (Delia, XXVII, ll. 5-8)

> I worke on Flint, and that's the cause I mone.
>
> (Delia, XIII, l.4)

The opening of sonnet VI of the seventh decade echoes a quatrain of XXVII of Delia and the couplet of sonnet V of the fourth decade the couplet of XXI of Delia:

> Thus long impos'd to everlasting plaining,

(divinely constant to the worthiest Fayre)
and mooved by eternally disdayning,
aye to persever in unkind despayre:
(Diana, 7th, VI, ll. 1-4; p. 212)

The starre of my mishappe impos'd this payning,
To spend the Aprill of my yeers in wayling,
That neuer found my fortune but in wayning,
With still fresh cares my present woes assayling.
(Delia, XXVII, ll. 1-4)

Doubtfull delay is worse than any fever,
Or helpe me soone, or caste me off for ever.
(Diana, 4th, V, ll. 13-14; p. 195).

Thus she returnes my hopes so fruitlesse ever,
Once let her love indeede, or eye me never.
(Delia, XXI, ll. 13-14)

Sonnet IIII of the seventh decade echoes both a stanza from The Complaint of Rosamond and a quatrain of X of Delia:

When tedious much, and ouer-wearie long,
cruell disdaine, reflecting from her brow,
hath beene the cause that I endur's such wrong,
and rest thus discontent, and wearie now.
Yet when posteritie in time to come,
shall find th'vncanceld tenor of her vow,
and her disdaine be then confest of some,
how much unkind, and long I find it now.
O yet euen then, (though then will be too late
to comfort mee, dead many a day ere then)
they shall confesse I did not force her hart,
and tyme shall make it knowne to other men,
That nere had her disdaine made mee dispaire,
Had she not beene so excellently faire.
(Diana, 7th, 4; p. 210)

Then when confusion in her course shall bring,
Sad desolation on the times to come:
When myrth-lesse Thames shall haue no Swan to sing,
All Musique silent, and the Muses dombe.

And yet euen then it must be known to some,
That once they florisht, though not cherisht so,
And Thames had Swannes as well as euer Po.
(Rosamond, ll. 722-28)

O then I love, and drawe this weary breath,
For her the cruell faire, within whose brow
I written finde the sentence of my death,
In unkinde letters; wrought she cares not how.
(Delia, X, ll. 1-4)

Sonnets X of the seventh decade and I and II of the eighth echo lines from XLV, II and XVI of Delia:

to agravate the cause of my complayning.
(Diana, 7th, X, l.6; p. 215)

To adde more griefe to aggravate my sorrow.
(Delia, XLV, l. 12)

Say that shee doth requite you with disdaine.
(Diana, 8th, I, l. 5; p. 215)

Say her disdaine hath dryed vp my blood.
(Delia, II, l. 9)

Give Period to my matter of complaining.
(Diana, 8th, II, l.1; p. 216)

Finding no ende nor Period of my payning.
(Delia, XVI, l. 12)

Sonnet II of the sixth decade is based on the central conceit of XIII of Delia:

A Carver, hauing lou's too-long in vaine,
hewed out the portrature of Venus sonne
in Marble rocke, vpon the which did raine
small drizling drops, that from a fount did runne,
Imagining, the drops would eyther weare
his furie out, or quench his living flame.
But when hee saw it bootlesse did appeare,
hee swore the water did augment the same.

So, I that seeke in verse to carve thee out,
hoping thy beauty will my flame alay,
viewing my verse and Poems all throughout,
find my will, rather to my loue obey.
That, with the Caruer, I my worke doe blame,
Finding it still th'augmentor of my flame.

(Diana, 6th, III; p. 204)

Behold what happe Pigmaleon had to frame,
And carue his proper grief vpon a stone:
My heauie fortune is much like the same,
I worke on Flint, and that's the cause I mone.
For haples loe even with mine owne desires,
I figured on the table of my harte,
The fayrest forme, the worldes eye admires,
And so did perish by my proper arte.
And still I toile, to chaunge the marble brest
Of her, whose sweetest grace I doe adore:
Yet cannot finde her breathe vnto my rest,
Hard is her hart and woe is me therefore.
O happie he that joy'd his stone and arte,
Unhappy I to loue a stony harte.

(Delia, XIII)

In addition to thus imitating Daniel, the author of the anonymous sonnets links VI-XI of the fifth decade by repetition of closing and opening lines, as Daniel does XXXI-XXXV in his sequence. He also couples IV-V, VI-VII, VIII-IX of the seventh decade, X of the seventh and I of the eight decades, and II-III of the eight in a similar manner in imitation of IX-X and XXIIII-XXV of Delia. Furthermore, many of the anonymous sonnets are, unlike those of Constable himself, in the Shakespearean form and contain hendecasyllabic lines. These characteristics also connect them with Delia.

The fact that this sonneteer sought to emulate Daniel does not at all help us to identify him, but we can be certain that he wrote after 1592, the year The Complaint of Rosamond and the first complete and authorized edition of Delia appeared. Furthermore, we see how much more highly Daniel's sonnetry

was regarded in his days than in ours. Elizabethan love poets, particularly the less gifted ones, tended to use continental models. That this one depended upon Delia witnesses the work's prominance and popularity.

NOTES

1 Henry Constable, The Poems, ed. Joan Grundy (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1960), p. 107. All following references to Diana are to this edition. For convenient location I provide page references.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Works of Samuel Daniel.

The Civil Wars. Ed. L. Michel. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1958.

The Complete Works, in Verse and Prose. Ed. A. B. Grosart. 5 vols. 1885; rpt. New York: Russel, 1963.

Delia: With The Complaint of Rosamond, 1592. Menston, England: Scholar's Press, 1964.

Musophilus. Ed. Raymond Himelick. West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Studies, 1965.

Poems and "A Defence of Ryme". Ed. A. C. Sprague. 1930; rpt. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

II. Concordance and bibliographies.

Donow, H. S. A Concordance of the Sonnet Sequences of Daniel, Drayton, Shakespeare, Sidney, and Spenser. London: Fetter, 1969.

Guffey, G. P. Samuel Daniel. Elizabethan Bibliographies Supplements. London: Nether Press, 1967.

Sellers, H. "A Bibliography of the Works of Samuel Daniel; 1585-1623, with an Appendix of Daniel's Letters." O.B.B.S.P.P., 2, pt. 1 (1930), 29-54.

Tannenbaum. S. A. Samuel Daniel: A Concise Bibliography. Elizabethan Bibliographies. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennicut Press, 1943.

III. Literary background.

Bruno, Giordano. The Heroic Frenzies. Trans. P. E. Memmo. University of North Carolina Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures, 50. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1964.

Burton, Robert. The Anatomy of Melancholy. Ed. A. R. Shilleto. 3 vols. London: Bell, 1904.

Castiglione, Baldassare. The Book of the Courtier. Trans. Thomas Hoby. In Three Renaissance Classics. New York: Scribners, 1953.

Chapman, George. The Poems. Ed. P. B. Bartlett. 1941; rpt. New York: Russel, 1962.

Constable, Henry. The Poems. Ed. J. Grundy. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1960.

Daniel, John. Songs for the Lute, Viol and Voice. Ménston, England: Scholar's Press, 1970.

Desportes, Phillipe. Oeuvres. Paris: Delahays, 1858.

Drayton, Michael. Works. Ed. J. W. Hebel, K. Tillotson, and B. H. Newdigate. 5 vols. Oxford: Blackwell, 1961.

Du Bellay, Joachim. Poésie françaises et latines. 2 vols. Paris: Garnier, 1918.

Firenzuola, Agnolo. Of the Beauty of Women. Trans. Clara Bell. London: Osgood, 1892.

A Gorgeous Gallary of Gallant Inventions. Ed. H. E. Rollins. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Greville, Fulke, Lord Brooke. Poems and Dramas. 2 vols. Ed. G. Bullough. Edinburgh: Oliver, 1939.

Lee, Sidney, ed. Elizabethan Sonnets. 2 vols. London: Constable, 1904.

The Paradice of Dainty Devices. Ed. H. E. Rollins. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Petrarca, Francesco. Songs and Sonnets. Trans. A. M. Armi. New York: Pantheon, 1946.

Puttenham, George. The Arte of English Poesie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.

Shakespeare, William. The Complete Works. Ed. H. Craig. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, 1961.

Sidney, Philip. Poems. Ed. W. A. Ringler, Jr. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

.....Prose Works. Ed. A. Feuillerat. 4 vols. 1912; rpt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Smith, G. G., ed. Elizabethan Critical Essays. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1904.

Soowthern, John. Pandora. The Facsimile Text Society, 43. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Spenser, Edmund. The Poetical Works. Eds. J. C. Smith and E. de Selincourt. 1912; rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Tottel's Miscellany. Ed. H. E. Rollins. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Watson, Thomas. The Hekatompathia, or Passionate Centurie of Love. Manchester: Simms, 1864.

IV. Studies devoted to Samuel Daniel's life and work.

1. Books and essays.

Rees, Joan. Samuel Daniel: A Critical and Biographical Study. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1964.

Schaar, Claes. An Elizabethan Sonnet Problem: Shakespeare's "Sonnets", Daniel's "Delia", and their Literary Background. Lund Studies in English, 28. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1960.

Seronsy, C. C. Samuel Daniel. New York: Twayne, 1967.

Spenser, Theodore. "Two Classical Elizabethans: Samuel Daniel and Sir John Davies". In Selected Essays. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1966.

Spriet, Pierre. Samuel Daniel: Sa vie--son Oeuvre. Etudes anglaises, 29. Paris: Didier, 1968.

Ure, Peter. "Two Elizabethan Poets: Daniel and Raleigh." In The Age of Shakespeare. Ed. B. Ford. The Pelican Guide to English Literature, 2. 1956; rpt. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1962.

2. Dissertations.

Adamany, R. G. "Daniel's Debt to Foreign Literatures and 'Delia' Edited." University of Wisconsin doct. diss., 1963.

Brady, George K. Samuel Daniel: A Critical Study. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Abstracts of Theses, 1923.

Josef Guggenheim. Quellenstudien zu Samuel Daniels Sonnettencyklus "Delia". Berlin: Ebering, 1898.

3. Articles.

Fleay, E. G. "On the Career of Samuel Daniel." Anglia, 11 (1889), 619-30.

Goldman, L. "Samuel Daniel's 'Delia' and the Emblem Tradition." J.E.G.P., 67 (1968), 49-63.

Hoepner, T. C. "Daniel's 'Delia', Sonnet XL." Explicator, 10 (1952), 38.

Kastner, L. E. "Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the French Poets." M.L.R., 3 (1908), 268-77.

..... "The Italian Sources of Daniel's 'Delia'." M.L.R., 7 (1912). 153-56.

Miller, E. "Samuel Daniel's Revisions in 'Delia'." J.E.G.P., 53 (1954), 58-68.

Ruutz-Rees, C. "Some Debts of Samuel Daniel to du Bellay." M.L.N., 24 (1919), 26-27.

Schaar, Claes. "A Textual Problem in Daniel's 'Delia'." E.S., 40 (1959), 382-85.

Seronsy, C. C. "The Doctrine of Cyclical Recurrences and Some Related Ideas in the Works of Samuel Daniel." S.P., 54 (1954), 387-407.

..... "Well-Languaged Daniel: A Reconsideration." M.L.R., 53 (1957), 481-97.

Thomson, Patricia. "Sonnet 15 of Daniel's 'Delia': A Petrarchan Imitation." C.L., 8 (1965), 151-57.

Williamson, C. F. "The Design of Samuel Daniel's 'Delia'." R.E.S., 19 (1968), 251-60.

V. Studies devoted to the love poetry of the period and related topics.

1. Books and essays.

Atkins, J. W. H. English Literary Criticism: The Renascence. London: Methuen, 1947.

Babb, Lawrence. The English Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1590-1642. East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State College Press, 1951.

Broadbent, J. B. Poetic Love. London: Chatto, 1964.

Borghesi, P. Petrarch and his Influence on English Literature. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1906.

Bullen, A. H. Elizabethans. London: Chapman, 1924.

Buxton, John. Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance. London: Macmillan, 1954.

Crosland, W. H. The English Sonnet. London: Seeker, 1917.

Crutwell, Patrick. The English Sonnet. British Council Writers and their Works, 191. London: Longmans, 1966.

Erskine, J. The Elizabethan Lyric. New York: Macmillan, 1903.

Einstein, Lewis. The Italian Renaissance in England: Studies. New York: Columbia University Press, 1913.

Evans, Maurice. English Poetry in the Sixteenth Century. London: Hutchinson's, 1955.

Fuller, John. The Sonnet. The Critical Idiom, 26. London: Methuen, 1972.

Harrison, J. S. Platonism in the English Poetry of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. New York: Columbia University Press, 1911.

Inglis, F. The Elizabethan Poets. London: Evans, 1969.

John, L. C. The Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences: Studies in Conventional Conceits. 1938; rpt. New York: Russel, 1964.

Lee, Sidney. The French Renaissance in England: An Account of the Literary Relations of England and France in the Sixteenth Century. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Leishman, J. B. Themes and Variations in Shakespeare's Sonnets. London: Hutchinson, 1961.

Lever, Charles. The Elizabethan Love Sonnets. London: Methuen, 1956.

Lewis, C. S. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, excluding Drama. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

Miller, E. H. The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England: A Study of Non-Dramatic Literature. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Nelson, John. Renaissance Theory of Love: The Context of Giordano Bruno's "Eroici furori". New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Pearson, Lu Emily. Elizabethan Love Conventions. 1933; rpt. New York: Barnes, 1966.

Paterson, D. L. The English Lyric from Wyatt to Donne: A History of the Plain and Eloquent Styles. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Pieri, Mario. Pétrarque et Ronsard, ou, de l'Influence de Pétrarque sur la Pléiade française. Marseille: Lafitte, 1896.

Praz, Mario, The Flaming Heart. New York: Doubleday, 1958.

Prince, F. T. "The Sonnet from Wyatt to Shakespeare." In Elizabethan Poetry. Eds. J. R. Brown and B. Harris. Stratford-upon Avon Studies, 2. London: Arnold, 1960.

Rees, D. G. "Italian and Italianate Poetry." In Elizabethan Poetry. As above.

Richmond, H. M. The School of Love: The Evolution of the Stuart Love Lyric. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1964.

Ruthven, K. K. The Conceit. The Critical Idiom, 4. London: Methuen, 1969.

Salomon, Louis B. The Devil Take Her: A Study of the Rebellious Lover in English Poetry. 1931; rpt. New York: Barnes, 1961.

Schaar, Claes. Elizabethan Sonnet Themes and the Dating of Shakespeare's "Sonnets". Lund Studies in English, 32. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1962.

Scott, J. G. Les Sonnets élisabéthains. Paris: Champion, 1929.

Sells, A. L. The Italian Influence in English Poetry. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1955.

Sheavyn, Phoebe A. B. The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967.

Spingarn, J. G. A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance. 1889; rpt. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Tuve, Rosemond. Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery: Renaissance Poetic and Twentieth-Century Critics. 1947; rpt. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Upham, A. H. The French Influence on English Literature from the Accession of Elizabeth to the Restoration. New York: Columbia University Press, 1908.

White, H. O. Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935.

2. Articles.

Bullock, W. L. "The Genesis of the English Sonnet Form." P.M.L.A., 38 (1923), 729-44.

Lea, K. M. "Conceits." M.L.R., 20 (1925), 395-407.

Mathews, G. M. "Sex and the Sonnet." E.C., 2 (1952), 119-37.

Ogle, J. M. "The Classical Origin and Tradition of Literary Conceits." A.J.P., 24 (1913), 125-53.

Ruthven, K. K. "The Composite Mistress." A.U.M.L.A., 26 (1960), 198-214.

Scott, J. G. "The Names of the Heroines of Elizabethan Sonnet-Sequences." R.E.S., 2 (1926), 159-62.

Siegal, Paul. "The Petrarchism Sonneteers and Neo-Platonic Love." S.P., 42 (1945), 164-82.

Southall, Raymond. "Love Poetry in the Sixteenth Century." E.C., 22 (1972), 362-80.

Winters, Yvor. "The 16th Century Lyric in England: A Critical and Historical Reinterpretation." Poetry, 53 (1939), 258-62, 320-25; 54 (1939), 35-51.

ABBREVIATIONS

A.J.P.....American Journal of Poetics.

A.U.M.L.A.....(Publication of the) Australian Universities Modern Languages Association.

C.L.....Comparative Literature.

E.C.....Essays in Criticism.

E.S.....English Studies.

J.E.G.P.....Journal of English and Germanic Philology.

M.L.N.....Modern Language Notes.

M.L.R.....Modern Language Review.

O.B.S.P.P.....Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings and Papers.

P.M.L.A.....Publication of the Modern Language Association of America.

R.E.S.....Review of English Studies.

S.P.....Studies in Philology.