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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In 1591 Thomas Newman published an unauthorized edition of Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* to which were attached "Sundry other rare Sonnets of divers Noblemen and Gentlemen." Along with the poems of Thomas Campion, and Fulke Greville, twenty-eight sonnets were presented by a previously unknown poet, Samuel Daniel. William Ringler points out in his edition of Sidney's poems that this single publication was quite probably the outstanding literary event of 1591. It is within this framework that Samuel Daniel takes his place upon the English literary scene. Edmund Spenser comments about that entrance when he says in "Colin Clout's Come Home Again":

```
. . . there is a new shepheard late up sprong,
The which doth all afore him far surpasse:
Appearing well in that well tuned song
Which late he sung unto a scornfull lasse. 1
11. 416-419.
```

Spenser's comments seem to reflect the high esteem in which Daniel was held from his initial publication to the end of the 1590's. But as Joan Rees points out in the introduction to her recent *Samuel Daniel: A Critical and Biographical Study,*

Samuel Daniel, the contemporary of Shakespeare and Jonson, protégé of the famous Countess of Pembroke, a man important and respected in his day, at the centre of the activity of the greatest age in English literature, is one whom, nevertheless,

---

critics, scholars and general readers have to a large extent neglected.\(^2\)

Unfortunately this statement of Rees is as true today as when it was first printed in 1964.

The reasons for this neglect by critics and scholars must be addressed before we move further. Rees states that one of the major barriers to Daniel's attaining the position of admiration he richly deserves is that Daniel's voice, unlike those of some of his more famous contemporaries, does not reverberate through the centuries. His tone is quieter than theirs and what he has to say does not immediately grip the imagination.\(^3\)

She further states:

"Not everyone is prepared to love a writer in order that he may be found worthy to be loved."\(^4\)

Her major reason, as can be seen in this last statement, is an excellent rephrasing of her attitude that not everyone is willing to "take things at Daniel's own speed without impatience at the lack of dramatic movement and exciting effects."\(^5\) She insists that to animate the most inaccessible work it takes only the will "to find the man in the poetry." Her method of finding the man in order to "clear the way to a fuller understanding" is through "telling as fully as possible the story of


\(^3\)Rees, p. xii.

\(^4\)Rees, p. xii.

\(^5\)Rees, p. xii.
Cecil Seronsy, however, feels that the reason Daniel does not hold a higher place in English literature rests squarely on the fact that up to the present there has been no detailed or full study of Daniel as innovator. Seronsy believes that Samuel Daniel contributed substantially to the literary achievements of the seventeenth century and that after his contributions to the sonnet, the complaint, verse epistle, and verse history are critically examined, Samuel Daniel's literary reputation will rest on firmer ground. Seronsy writes:

Modern scholars and critics, in their haste to dismiss him as prosaic and too much the poet of statement, have tended to ignore the fact that he was an innovator.

Seronsy then pursues Daniel's innovations and originality in the various genres which Daniel undertook. Seronsy, like Rees, seeks "to present an account of Daniel's life and work" and "to assess his mind and art."

While both Rees and Seronsy have committed themselves to presenting better understanding of Daniel, each has a slightly different vision of Daniel in mind. Both Rees and Seronsy feel that the poetry becomes more comprehensible as it is placed in a larger context. For Rees the larger context is Daniel's biography; for Seronsy, the larger context is Daniel's innovations in diction, imagery, and versification.

---

6Rees, p. xiii.


8Seronsy, p. 15.

9Seronsy, p. 5.
On one hand, Daniel can be viewed as a poet who spoke to an audience in a manner "all his own" and was admired for it; on the other hand, Daniel is condemned by that same manner's lack of vigor and inspiration. This is Daniel's stylistic paradox. To put matters as succinctly as possible, Serony's traditional approach through diction, imagery, and versification, when viewed against the limited background of the text itself, creates little more than a detailed description of Daniel's particular style. Yet Rees' more sensitive approach, gained through the admission of the presence of a speaker or voice, does not penetrate beyond the performance of that speaker and interprets the speaker's rhetorical positions in terms of Daniel's life. Through both of these approaches, valuable insights have been gained into Daniel's life and poetry, but both fall short of any confrontation with the vagaries of Daniel's chief asset, his manner of thinking in verse. It is in this rather large and poorly defined area of style that the general—and therefore, the weakest and most suspect—characterizations of Samuel Daniel's poetry are voiced. An example of these characterizations can be seen lurking behind statements which refer to Daniel's "sober style." Seronsy says that the consensus then has been that Daniel was "well languaged," though at times flat and prosy; that he had a grace and smoothness, but that he lacked vigor and daring. This appraisal of Daniel's style does, however backhandedly, indicate the area in which most of the problems involved in reading Daniel's

---

10Seronsy, p. 155.
poetry exist. Under the cover of this catch-all phrase, those qualities that distinguish the poetry of Daniel as his "own" also condemn it with critical appraisals such as "sober" and "well-languaged."

For example, Ben Jonson offered this statement regarding Daniel: "Samuel Daniel was a good honest man; had no children: but no poet." S. T. Coleridge's comments about Daniel would seem to reinforce the conclusions of Jonson when he remarks in the Biographia, "the sense shall be good and weighty, the language correct and dignified, and yet the style shall, notwithstanding all these merits, be justly blamable as prosaic, ..." The value of these comments is that both point to the essential paradox of Daniel's style. Both visualize in Daniel's speaker a worthy man, a moral man; and both evaluate his poetic style against a background largely created by that moral and "sober" style of his speaker. A restatement, however, of the paradoxical persona presented as his speaker does not really clarify any of the problems encountered in a study of Daniel. What remains is to examine Daniel's poetry against that literary background which suggests or offers to an author a set of rules or techniques in order that his readers and critics may discern more productively than previous efforts the energies expended as he adjusts the rhetorical position of his speaker to those rules or techniques. By a close examination of the


avenues taken by Daniel through these poetic adjustments, we may discern more of the poetic mind at work. No better set of rules or techniques can be offered than the various poetic traditions in which Daniel worked.

Even to the casual reader of Daniel's poetic works, it becomes obvious that Daniel made use of almost every poetic tradition available to him. This can be seen in those different traditions represented by such works as Delia, Rosamond, The Civil Warres and Musophilus, to mention but a few. While these poems in themselves provide a valuable clue to the method that should be employed in a study of Daniel's style and its development, they also introduce to his readers a series of choices in which it is all too easy to become confused. Once in this labyrinth of a poetic convention such as Petrarchanism, it is easy for the critic to choose the more concrete signals that this convention itself offers as a way out instead of choosing the ambiguous voice of the poetic speaker as a way into the poem. To state this again less abstractly, the reader instinctively grasps at the more concrete offerings of the convention itself; its imagery, conceits, themes, narrative progression, etc., instead of the more evasive, if dramatic, control of Daniel's poetic presence.

The purpose of this dissertation is to discover what part of Daniel's performance within selected poems contributed to his poetic development. The task, therefore, will be to examine Daniel's performance in two types of poems: the lyric and the complaint narrative; to note the interaction of imagery, diction and syntax as parts of that
rhetorical organization which Daniel deems appropriate to each type of poem; and to disclose how Daniel modified, refined, and enlarged each type of poem to embody the consistent frame of mind of his poetic speaker.

The unique aspect of this study is that it will demonstrate a development "in" maturity, not "toward" maturity. Rather than demonstrate the "growth" of a poet, I will describe the energy expended to "maintain" a poetic maturity in terms of interiority or the patterns of thought that are revealed as the poet's mind engages and participates in this inward life and intimacy, or those moments when we are allowed to witness or overhear the previously mentioned patterns of thought as they are conveyed through the voice of Daniel's speaker. Thus, my approach proceeds from concepts of rhetorical organization and style differing from those previously used.

These different concepts of rhetorical organization and style arise from my reading of recent philosophers, rhetoricians, stylisticians and linguists. What most of these theorists have in common is that their basic assumptions about language and its use differ radically from those theories widely accepted and used in the past. I have turned from these traditional or accepted theories most commonly held by critics of literature simply because these theories do not produce a deeper appreciation of Samuel Daniel. A reading of Daniel's critics, with the possible exception of S. T. Coleridge, provides a clear picture of these traditional or accepted approaches at work; it also presents a less
clear, but evident, picture of the "denotative or entitative" theories of meaning at work behind those critical approaches. In my approach I include and embrace the two major philosophic opponents of these "denotative and entitative" theories, Ludwig Wittgenstein and John L. Austin.

The question may be raised as to the relevance of these modern theories to the sixteenth-century poetry of Samuel Daniel. One answer is the obvious and self-evident fact that modern philosophers and thinkers are still seeking the truth of ancient philosophers, such as Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Kant, Hegel, ad infinitum. In their continuing search for the truth of these philosophers, contemporary philosophers do not limit themselves to any one formula, one pattern of thought, or one set of linguistic tools. They make use of a variety of approaches as they, like the philosophers who have preceded them, seek to make manifest the truth of the past. Samuel Daniel, it should be remembered at this point, was a philosopher as well as a poet as all of Daniel's major critics have recognized. Daniel thought, and thought deeply. A second answer to the question of "relevance" can be discovered if we consider the fact that Daniel, who was highly regarded by his contemporaries, is not so highly regarded by twentieth-century


14Among those critics who consider Daniel a poet-philosopher or philosopher-poet are Seronsy, especially in his "The Doctrine of Cyclical Recurrence and Some Related Ideas in the Works of Samuel Daniel," Rees, and Himelick.
readers. Whose judgment is more accurate—that of his sixteenth-century readers or that of his twentieth-century readers? If Daniel was a philosopher and thinker, as all claim, if he spoke to his own age about matters touching all of humanity, why then do twentieth-century readers not perceive or understand this "speaking to"? Is it possible that the fault is "ours" rather than Daniel's? Is it possible that this fault of our lies in our basic insistence on clinging to what we think is true about the Renaissance? If we cease to concentrate on Daniel as a "Renaissance man" and begin to consider him as a "thinking, feeling human being," perhaps we will find him more accessible. Because contemporary philosophers like Heidegger and Wittgenstein have given considerable attention to processes of thought, their work promises to be a useful tool in the investigation of Daniel's thought—thought which he himself believed would be accessible to men who came after him:

I know I shalbe read, among the rest
So long as men speake english, and so long
As verse and vertue shalbe in request
Or grace to honest industry belong:
And England since I vse thy present tongue
Thy forme of speech thou must be my defece
If to new eares, it seemes not well exprest
For though I hold not accent I hold sence.15

The major contribution of the dissenting philosophers I have mentioned is not that they have offered a new series of definitions to the philosophic study of language, but that both of these philosophers

have brought to the study of language new methods, or ways, of thinking about how words mean. The hallmark of these new methods is the negative way these methods attack the accepted theories. By this, I mean that much of the energy of Wittgenstein and Austin (and Heidegger) is spent in stripping away and negating definitions of language phenomena because they feel the definitions offered by the accepted theories are largely rhetorical or persuasive in origin. They seek therefore, methods which describe language phenomena while trying to avoid the traps of description by definition. For Wittgenstein and Austin meaning itself is rhetorical; as one points out what an entity is, one is persuading or convincing rather than describing. A much more detailed discussion of the above points can be found in Steinberg and Jacobovits' now standard edition of Semantics. 16

From these philosophers, Wittgenstein and Austin, I take terms which are shared by readers of philosophies of language: gesture, correct and correctness, public and private (exterior criteria and interior criteria). To these I have added negotiation, adjustment and modification to mean that which Wittgenstein describes as that activity required to bring these exterior and interior criteria into some sort of harmony or coincidence (a Click). These words are used throughout Ludwig Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations17 and Lectures and Conversations

16Caton, pp. 3-13.

Supporting these philosophic assumptions about the meaning of language are the philosophic works of Carl Jung, Martin Heidegger, Gaston Bachelard, Susanne Langer and M. Merleau-Ponty. From Heidegger and Bachelard, I take my definitions of language and poetry: language and poetry as synonymous. I believe as does Paul Campbell

... that language is most profitably viewed as a symbolic process that needs no reason for being other than itself and that is poetic in the broad sense of being an imaginative and pleasurable act and in the narrow sense of being a rhythmical and metaphorical one. We may turn from this poetic process to practical and instrumental language pursuits, of course, but that is not to say that the poetry has disappeared. Quite as communicative language acts are communicative in addition to being constitutive, practical language behaviors are practical in addition to being poetic. To argue otherwise is, once more, to make language an instrumental rather than a consummatory act, a practical rather than a poetic process, a signalling rather than a symbolic behavior.

Along with this basic definition and its implications, I take from Heidegger and Bachelard such concepts as thoughtfulness and wholeness as well as my many modifications of public and private as rhetorical organizing attitudes in Daniel's speaker.

More closely allied to the study of literature, I have further supported these general theories through the works of Paul Campbell,

---


Louis Martz, and Anthony LaBranche. But these theories and critical approaches may appear to be still abstract and difficult and I believe a more concrete example of the kind of critical thinking suggested by these men may be found in the following letter of S. T. Coleridge to Charles Lamb.

Tuesday, Feb. 10 [9], 1808. (10th or 9th.)

Dear Charles

I think more highly, far more, of the 'Civil Wars', than you seemed to do, on Monday night, Feb. 9th 1808--the Verse does not teize me; and all the while I am reading it, I cannot but fancy a plain England-loving English Country Gentleman with only some dozen Books in his whole Library, and at a time when a 'Mercury' or 'Intelligencer' was seen by him once in a month or two, making this his Newspaper & political Bible at the same time--& reading it so often as to store his Memory with it's aphorisms. Conceive a good man of that kind, diffident and passive, yet rather inclined to Jacobitism; seeing the reasons of the Revolutionary Party, yet by disposition and old principles leaning, in quiet nods and sighs at his own parlour fire, to the hereditary Right--(and of these characters there must have been many)--& then read this poem assuming in your heart his character--conceive how grave he would look, and what pleasure there would be, what unconscious, harmless, humble Self-conceit, self-compliment in his gravity; how wise he would feel himself--& yet after all, how forbearing, how much-calmed by that most calming reflection (when it is really the mind's own reflection) --aye! it was just so in Henry the 6th's Time--always the same passions at work.--20

In this letter Coleridge introduces a critical stance from which he feels Daniel's poetry is best read. Coleridge, unlike the critics who followed him, supplies from his own imagination that which he feels is necessary to read Daniel. When Coleridge says "I cannot but fancy . . . .," he has taken an enormous first step in reading Daniel. Coleridge has

supplied a gentleman, some dozen books, his reading material in the *Mercury* and *Intelligencer*, and Daniel's mind at work. He has created a character that he felt to be a logical outgrowth of his reading. He has linked the poetry with the picture of a character that for Coleridge was appropriate, and more importantly he has described an exactness, a correctness, matching the poetry of Daniel and Coleridge's own imagination.

Secondly, Coleridge focuses his attention upon the reader of his letter, Lamb, and urges him to "Conceive a good man..." Coleridge addresses Lamb in his, Lamb's, activity as reader. When this addressed activity is linked to the rhetorical qualities of "conceive," the end result would seem to insinuate the importance of some sort of prefatory activity needed to allow an increased dimensionality of Coleridge's character to become a speaker. His appeal is directed to Lamb's powers of conception--an appeal which gathers its rhetorical strength from the word "good." There would seem to be at work here some sort of dramatizing activity which operates much in the same way as when we hear the sentence "He's a good man" today. The appeal is to an area of mutual agreement upon the status of a "good" man.

Coleridge then furnishes his speaker with a dramatic presence viewed in terms of facial expression, nods, and sighs. Coleridge places his speaker in motion, (he nods) still wordless, yet in a posture of

---

21 The concept of the speaker is that self which is distinct from the author or reader and has its own life as it is presented in the literary work. It is the self which "speaks" the work.
speaking or thinking. Coleridge asks of Lamb "then read his poem
assuming, in your heart his character." Then Coleridge again asks Lamb
to "conceive how grave he would look, and what pleasure there would be,
what unconscious, harmless, humble Self-conceit, self-compliment in his
gravity; and how wise he would feel himself & yet after all, how for-
bearing; . . . ." Coleridge has deftly introduced to his reader, Lamb,
the interior, or stylistic qualities of "his" Daniel.

Lastly, Coleridge suggests a degree of control or guiding prin-
ciple behind that presence. In the phrase "the mind's own reflection"
Coleridge catches a glimpse of a Daniel that rewards and maintains his
reading of Daniel's poetry. He has gone beyond the "teizing" of Daniel's
verse to fulfil his expectations of meaning.

In other terms, Coleridge acknowledges the necessity of reading
Daniel's poetry within a particular framework or framing activity. That
activity presents qualities of a speaker seen in terms such as "gravity,"
"humble Self conceit," "wise," and "forbearing." Coleridge interprets
these characteristics of "his" Daniel against a background of a total
attitude or a wholeness which he sees as "the mind's own reflection. . . ."
The major significance of Coleridge's letter lies in its ability to
reflect Coleridge's awareness of the layered experience that Daniel's
poetry presents. Coleridge feels certain he is correct about the way
Daniel should be read. He has caught and recomunicated what Wittgen-
stein might call a private language situation, or what Kenneth Burke
refers to when he writes "Only those voices from without are effective
which can speak in the language of the voice within."\textsuperscript{22}

In the previous paragraphs I have attempted to outline the philosophic assumptions about language and rhetoric behind this dissertation. I would now like to place these assumptions alongside some recent ideas about the nature of style.

In the not so distant past, stylistics was concerned with what is termed the personality-style paradigm. Milic points out the weaknesses of this critical stance.

Much has been said about Buffon's famous aphorism, usually rendered as 'The style is the man.' It is usually interpreted to mean that the style of a work reflects the personality of its author. To be more precise--since reflects is a metaphor, both conventional and misleading--the specific linguistic forms of a text and their arrangement in some sense duplicate the traits of the author's personality, which is the aggregate of idiosyncrasies and peculiarities which differentiate him from other men. Ideally, if this hypothesis existed in a fully worked-out form, each trait of personality would be represented by a linguistic equivalent. Actually, the hypothesis is never realized except in impressionistic metaphors such as economical, flabby, muscular, pedantic, masculine, which seem vaguely appropriate to the description of both style and personality but actually say almost nothing about either.\textsuperscript{23}

I think it is clear to any reader of both this comment and Daniel's poetry that in Coleridge's depiction of Daniel's poetry that a personality style paradigm (the style is the man) is at work. The success and limitations of this type of critical procedure with a poet such as Daniel are echoed in the terms "sober," "serious," "grave," and "prosaic."


In this dissertation I have tried to avoid the traps of this limited stylistic approach. I have attempted to maintain a view which sees that real eloquence is more concerned with the ordering of one's thoughts than it is with a gift of words. In many ways I believe "style is concerned with thought, not only the manipulation of words."²⁴

As Himelick suggests of Daniel,

In the best and most typical Daniel there is not much 'sensuous apprehension.' For him, one gathers, the most interesting thing about thought was thought itself, not the way he felt when he had it. He did not differ from his contemporaries in his willingness to address the intellective powers of his readers, but he was probably less given to shadowing forth truths by 'feigning' examples. Sidney's amiable sophistry to the effect that the poet 'never lieth' because he 'nothing affirmeth' could scarcely have been used by Daniel. He did affirm.²⁵

What I believe Daniel affirmed is the power of mind to think, to search and find that which is "enough." I believe his poetic style reflects that mind as it thinks, searches and finds the truth of the mind--thought itself. When Musophilus says of poetry,

> Whenas (perhaps) the words thou scornest now May live, the speaking picture of the minde, The extract of the soule, ll. 177-9 . . . .²⁶

I believe we have encountered a poet who places his emphasis upon the expressiveness of his poetry rather than upon its expressions.

My purpose, therefore, is to present a better understanding of Samuel Daniel, the man and the poet, as he is seen in his style. I will

---

²⁴Milic, p. 79.


²⁶Himelick, p. 67.
examine selected significant poems with this view in mind: Delia and The Complaint of Rosamond. Because of the absence of a reliable and complete edition of Daniel's works, the following will be used:

Poems and A Defence of Ryme, Ed. A. C. Sprague, Phoenix Books (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965). This edition is a reprint of Harvard University Press edition of 1930 with the exception of some prefatory remarks by Sprague to this particular edition. I selected this edition because it is still in print. Included in this edition are To the Reader (1607), Delia, The Complaint of Rosamond, Musophilus, Epistles, A Defence of Ryme, Ulisses and the Syren. It is referred to throughout the dissertation as "Sprague."

In all quotations taken from the Sprague edition, v is printed instead of u, s for long ſ, w for vv, and j for i, where modern use requires it. Modernized punctuation has been allowed to stand in both Sprague and Himelick.
Samuel Daniel's Delia has long been considered to be among the best of the sonnet cycles written in English. Since its publication in early 1592, careful readers have maintained its greatness. It may well be "Daniel's most completely perfect achievement." On the one hand it offers its readers a glimpse of an author, thoughtful and reserved, an author who always seems to be in control or creates the illusion of control. On the other hand, Delia does not contain those energetic and passionate outbursts so reminiscent of Sidney's Astrophel and Stella. Except for a few of its sonnets which are often anthologized, the entire sonnet sequence is little regarded today. In contrast to the sonnets of Sidney, Shakespeare, and Spenser, Delia seems to lose itself in its own liquid quietness and sobriety. After witnessing the dramatic displays of a Sidney, few readers feel the need to wait for the echoes to fade, the audience to leave, in order to relish the provocative thoughtfulness of a quiet and emptied auditorium. Yet here, in these quiet surroundings, Daniel strides upon the stage with his own sober and submerged rhetoric. The purpose of this chapter is to gather some of our thoughts about the muted performance which Daniel presents in Delia and to place

these thoughts into a consideration of Daniel at work within the Petrarchan tradition. In this way I hope to uncover, first, those elements of Petrarchanism that Daniel felt to be essential to that tradition, and, second, those elements which Daniel was to refine, enlarge, and maintain throughout the remainder of his poetic career.

One of the most frequently overlooked and underestimated aspects of Daniel's total performance in Delia is suggested in his preface or dedication of the first authorized edition of 1592. Critics have sought out this preface in order to ascertain more facts about Daniel's life before 1592. In their investigations they have gleaned important biographical information while overlooking the preface's rhetorical information, an aspect that I believe will afford its reader a clearer understanding of the subsequent performance within the sonnets themselves. A Reading of that preface is now in order.²

To The Right Honourable the Ladie Mary, Countesse of Pembroke.

Right honorable, although I rather desired to keep in the private passions of my youth, from the multitude, as things uttered to my selfe, and consecrated to silence: yet seeing I was betraide by the indiscretion of a greedie Printer, and had some of my secrets bewaide to the world, uncorrected: doubting the like of the rest, I am forced to publish that which I neverment. But this wrong was not onely doone to mee, but to him whose unmatchable lines have indured the like

²Samuel Daniel, Poems and A Defence of Ryme, ed. by Arthur Colby Sprague, Phoenix Books (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 9. All references to Daniel's Delia and The Complaint of Rosamond are taken from this edition, and in the future it shall be referred to simply as Sprague, followed by the appropriate page number.
misfortune; Ignorance sparing not to commit sacrilege upon so holy Reliques. Yet Astrophel, flying with the wings of his own fame, a higher pitch then the gross-sighted can discerne, hath registred his owne name in the Annals of eternitie, and cannot be disgraced, howsoever disguised. And for my selfe, seeing I am thrust out into the worlde, and that my unboldned Muse, is forced to appeare so rawly in publique; I desire onely to bee graced by the countenance of your protection: whome the fortune of our time hath made the happie and judicall Patronesse of the Muses, (a glory hereditary to your house) to preserve them from those hidious Beastes, Oblivion, and Barbarisme. Whereby you doe not onely possesse the honour of the present, but also do bind posterity to an ever gratefull memorie of your vertues, wherein you must survive your selfe. And if my lines heereafter better laboured, shall purchase grace in the world, they must remaine the monuments of your honourable favour, and recorde the zealous duetie of mee, who am vowed to your honour in all observancy for ever,

Samuel Danyell.

In the larger movements of this preface, several observations may be pointed out. First, Daniel assumes the characteristic posture of the reluctant author. Second, Daniel links his own efforts with those of Sir Philip Sidney. Third, Daniel returns the focus to his own "unboldned Muse," and lastly, Daniel petitions for the protection and patronage of his addressee, Mary, Countesse of Pembroke. Significantly, Daniel has established a pattern in this preface which is to recur throughout his poetic career, but not quite as obviously as this pattern is reflected in the underlying rhetorical movements of the Delia sonnets and in the Complaint of Rosamond.

Although Daniel assumes what Seronsy calls a convention
among Elizabethan writers, the reluctance to publish, this fact need not be glossed over as quickly as Seronsy would indicate. For one thing, in Daniel's case there is probably more truth in it than just a conventional pose, and as Ringler points out in his edition of Sidney's poems, the pirated edition of Newman in 1591 was the literary highlight of that year.\(^3\) Daniel points out in this preface that his occasion to publish does indeed stem from that surreptitiously published edition of Newman's late in 1591. When we consider to whom the dedication is made, Mary Pembroke, and all the stir caused by the Newman edition, it is quite easy to see that Daniel's posture may in part stem from the efforts to suppress that same edition. The attempts of Sidney's friends to confiscate the edition were unsuccessful. The best that could be gotten from Newman was an agreement to re-publish Sidney's poems in a corrected version. It is noteworthy that Daniel echoes the terms of that agreement to re-publish in the word "uncorrected" in his dedication-preface.

At one level, then, the preface very much concerns itself with the idea of "correctness." The major difficulty for Daniel at this level was that he was addressing an audience that was extremely sensitive because the audience felt doubly "wronged." The Pembroke Circle felt they had been wronged in that the whole affair of Sir Philip Sidney and Penelope Rich had been made public, thus possibly damaging that great courtier's respected position. Secondly, the circle, largely

Mary Pembroke herself, felt "wronged" because of the manner in which these poems were made public, largely uncorrected. One cannot but link these two "uncorrected" aspects of the early Newman edition. Daniel seems to link the two in his phrase "holy Reliques." It would seem that such a phrase makes oblique reference to Sidney's life as well as his poetry.

At another level, Daniel finds himself in the role of the "corrector," a very awkward position indeed. After all, the pirated edition of Sidney's poem had also been an occasion for his own entrance onto the literary scene, an event which caused much consternation and worry for his friends and which proved to be his stepping stone to a literary career. He had to conduct himself carefully so as to avoid his occasion to publish being turned to his disadvantage. With these aspects in mind, we can clearly see reasons for the highly defensive position assumed by Daniel.

It is also understandable why Daniel links himself with Sidney in saying he was similarly wronged. From this rhetorical position, he can quite understandably seek to "correct" the wrong done to him. What remains, however, is that Daniel must in some way continue the tradition of Sidney on one hand and yet not surpass him on another. If Astrophel flies with wings of his own fame, "a higher pitch then the gross-sighted can discerne," then Daniel's pitch must seem lower and more "correct" to his position as spokesman for his Pembroke friends and patrons. It would appear highly indecorous if Daniel were to surpass Sidney at his own game. Daniel must indeed "rouze his feathers" as
Spenser suggests but do it in such a way that he will not overgo the wings of Astrophel. If what has been suggested approximates the delicate balance that Daniel was trying to maintain, one can only sense the sinking feeling with which Daniel read Spenser's leaden-footed praise.

And there is a new shepheard late up sprung,
The which doth all afore him far surpasse:
Appearing well in that well tuned song
Which late he sung unto a scornfull lasse.
Yet doth his trembling Muse but lowly flie,
As daring not too rashly mount on hight,
And doth her tender plumes as yet but trie
In loves soft laies and looser thoughts delight.
Then rouze thy feathers quickly Daniell,
And to what course thou please thy selfe advance:
But most, me seemes, thy accent will excell
In tragick plaints and passionate mischance.

It is most significant, however, that Spenser has captured and echoed what may be called the outstanding feature of Daniel's performance: the cautious attitude of the new shepherd. It is the judicious Daniel that speaks from the position of "wronged" person seeking some sort of justice or balance or correctness. Rees points out that the "probabilities point then to Daniel's association with the Pembroke family beginning in 1591-2 following the illicit publication of some of his sonnets alongside Sidney's."\(^4\) Rees also points up that these poems of Delia and Rosamond do not reflect a Daniel as "deeply immersed" in Wilton as does the later poem of Cleopatra.\(^5\) Given these circumstances,

\(^4\)Rees, p. 11.

\(^5\)Rees, p. 43.
it may be suggested that Daniel was placed in an extremely sensitive position during the time in which Delia and Rosamond appeared. Without becoming unduly dramatic, we might propose that during this period Daniel was on trial and that the best verdict that Daniel could envision was not to be found much better than Sidney or much worse. On one hand, he has been called upon to perform and his performance must be good enough to earn Pembroke patronage; on the other hand, his performance must not reduce in any way the performance of the Pembroke circle's sainted knight, Sidney. What I have been suggesting in the previous statements is that at one level, the historical or autobiographical, Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* was presented to Daniel as an immediate model. I have also suggested that this sonnet sequence also provided Daniel with a larger and more remote model, that of the Petrarchan tradition itself. But as LaBranche points out:

Actually, there seem to be at least two models to be followed in any imitation: the literary prototype and one's self (or one's image of that self). When we imitate in a creative manner, we bring our own presence as another center of existence from which the classic model is modified. This presence may be some notion of poetic balance or intellectual integrity (as in Daniel), or perhaps some strongly based moral position (as in Wyatt), or perhaps an anticipation of what the literary model or the universe is all about. This double imitation—of what the model is doing and of what one's self image is doing in the face of that model—depends upon a strong ability in the poet to project a dramatized or "literary" self-image, which may depend ultimately on his ideal or actual self-image.6

Although La Branche is primarily concerned with a continental model,

or literary prototype, DesPortes, it is quite conceivable that Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* also could qualify as part of that prototype. The "literary prototype" component of La Branche's theory may point to more layers of experience than he suggests. But the point to be made here is that while one part of the tradition prompts questions, another part may suggest answers. If what LaBranche says is accurate, and I believe it is, that Daniel did not choose DesPortes because he was "easy or watered down Petrarch" and that "Daniel recognizes that the French poet is 'pointing his finger' at the Italian, and he is inspired to prolong himself along the line of that activity,"\(^7\) then it is just as conceivable that Daniel was aware that Sidney also recognized these "finger pointing exercises." As Rudenstine points out, "Sidney certainly knew of the Pleiade experiments with verse and music."\(^8\) It should be noted that both DesPortes and Sidney assume the same Neo-Petrarchan stance very early in their verse: DesPortes' first book of amorous verse to Diane and Sidney's first sonnet in *Astrophel and Stella* both plead sincere speakers. The most obvious fact to be gleaned here is that Daniel must have seen the very large area of agreement in both Sidney's and DesPortes' Neo-Petrarchanism and that in some way he must have felt obliged to accommodate this style within his own. It must be admitted that Sidney's highly dramatic and forceful pleas, such as are contained in Sonnet #1 of *Astrophel and Stella*,

\(^7\)LaBranche, p. 326.

are much different from the moderate and sustained pleas of DesPortes. However, the importance of Sidney's appeals for sincerity cannot go unnoticed, especially by someone who would hope to be graced by Pembroke patronage. Sidney's often quoted "But truly many of such writings as come under the banner of irresistible love, if I were a mistress would never persuade me that they were in love; so coldly they apply fiery speeches, as men that had rather read lovers' writings..." must have been somewhere in Daniel's mind as he began the business of Delia (1592). Whereas this Neo-Petrarchan performance of Sidney's provoked more frustration for Daniel, another Neo-Petrarchan performance of DesPortes provided an answer or a "way out."

As we have seen, Sidney's Astrophel and Stella provided Daniel with a series of stylistic problems as well as a "way in" to both the tradition and the Pembroke Circle. It is now time to turn our attention to what Daniel sought as a "way out." LaBranche points out that in one respect the sequence is about the stylistic pains which accompany the growth toward a mature acceptance and celebration of the lady as a model of incarnate beauty and good. All of Daniel's sufferings relate to his effort to "get her into verse," to imitate in native terms the Petrarchan experience of supreme worship and supreme frustration,

I might add that what LaBranche has just described could also be extended to include Daniel's supreme worship of Sidney as his immediate forerunner, and the brother of his patroness, and Daniel's supreme frustration brought about by his attempt to develop his own style with-

---


10La Branche, p. 317.
in this "worshipping" posture. The point I wish to make here is that there are many levels on which the Petrarchan tradition did "present the image of the cares I prove."

The fact that Daniel wrote Delia in light of all these problems is a clear indication that he had found several ways to conduct himself in order to "carve his proper grief." For the most part, I believe Daniel made a series of stylistic choices that embodied that decorous conduct, "his proper grief." I would agree with LaBranche when he says that "this decorum does not depend on rules and forms already extant; rather it is the emotionally satisfying experience of finding one's own location by the light of other performances."\(^{11}\) I believe that DesPortes provides one of these performances. In general I believe as does LaBranche that DesPortes furnishes Daniel room for rhetorical maneuvering, through the parallelisms of his quatrains, and so inspires an "equivalent" rather than a close translation. More important, I believe again as does LaBranche that DesPortes represents to Daniel a speaker who maintains a delicate "balance between précieux compliment and personal involvement" and that this balance "strikes a response in Daniel's own search throughout Delia for a kind of neutral yet engaging amplification of the love-predicament."\(^{12}\) I also believe that Daniel saw in DesPortes a correct or decorous position much less dramatic than Sidney's which corresponded as a solution to many levels of Daniel's

\(^{11}\)LaBranche, pp. 323-4.

\(^{12}\)LaBranche, p. 319.
own poetic predicament. This, however, is but one component in a series of movements toward creating solutions to create and maintain what we are forced to call at this time, a rhetorical position which might be seen as decorous from many different perspectives.

II

On another level the rhetoric of Hermogenes can be seen to work upon Daniel in a similar fashion as did the rhetorical position exhibited in the poetic speaker of DesPortes in that it provided a set of rules and forms already extant, a set of rules which if followed could prompt comments like those of Rees and Lewis. Rees states that "Delia is not a dramatic sequence like Astrophel and Stella, and personal tensions, if there were any, seem to have dissolved away in melody and lucid imagery."13 Lewis says much the same when he says that Delia offers "no ideas, no psychology, and of course no story; it is simply a masterpiece of phrasing and melody."14

The points these critics make are valid if Daniel is expected to imitate the age-old formula of falling in love with a woman, being kept at a distance from that woman by some circumstance of fortune, being permitted a token of affection, perhaps a kiss, and then being forced to spend the remainder of his days lamenting his fate after the eventual parting. But the reader of Daniel's Delia is not called upon

13Rees, p. 13.

to witness these events or dramatic occurrences. There are simply no such events as these in Delia, and consequently there is no pattern or progression of events. More simply stated, there is no plot in Delia or causal links in Delia which reflect actual experience.\textsuperscript{15}

If there is to be a kind of progression in Delia, that progression does not betray the "passions of my youth" to which Daniel refers. Rees states that "although the poems derive at least some of their impulse from experience, their lyrical beauty does not invite analysis in terms of biography" and that "for the most part they reflect Bembo's words and Bembo's attitudes . . . fingo per aver rimare."\textsuperscript{16} It is in the light of these criticisms and many like them that Daniel's performance in Delia is insincere and seen to be no more than a mere exercise. But as we have suggested, "Delia is an exercise . . . in the most serious sense of the word."\textsuperscript{17} What we have been called upon to witness in

\textsuperscript{15}Many critics have sought the identity of Delia in the hopes of establishing more biographical information as well as explaining the "private passions" of the dedication-preface. Erskine boldly states, "Delia is almost certainly Sidney's sister--Mary, Countess of Pembroke, . . . was Daniel's patroness, and out of gratitude he wished to celebrate her in his art." [John Erskine, Elizabethan Lyric (New York: Gordian Press, 1967), pp. 134-5] Some attempts have been made to see Elizabeth Carey as Delia "on the Avon," but for the most part these attempts rely on even more circumstantial evidence than those that propose Mary, Countess of Pembroke, and must, therefore, remain highly tentative. Seronsy more strongly states, "Delia, however, is more shadowy [than Stella]; and her identification with the Countess of Pembroke or anyone else is tenuous, if not wholly unacceptable." [Seronsy, p. 25.]

\textsuperscript{16}Rees, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{17}LaBranche, p. 317.
Delia is not the progression of a speaker from one dramatic state to another but rather the progression of a speaker within one, constant and recurring, internal state which may be best realized in the modulated and controlled decorum he sought as a "model." In this sense much of the energia, which we normally associate with the speaker in the poetry of Sidney or Wyatt, is internal in that Daniel does not begin his sequence at one point and end at another; rather he ends at much the same point as he begins. For him the tension is not to become other, but rather to maintain over and through a series of sonnets that which he has already become. Daniel's speaker does not present a dramatic progression from one state of mind to another, nor does he present the process by which that speaker has arrived at his final position. Rather, Daniel presents a speaker who reflects an active engagement with the past and points to that same speaker's need to present the questions, "What does it mean to have been in these states of mind?" "What was I thinking about?"

As I stated a few paragraphs earlier, I believe that Hermogenes' rhetorical theory provided Daniel with a program of sorts in which many more problematic levels could be encountered and controlled than could be through a more traditional rhetorical theory. As I suggested earlier in the case of Sidney, honesty, sincerity, or truth became a major idea in his rhetorical performances. Patterson provides a clue to how both Daniel and Sidney could have worked within a major rhetorical schema: Hermogenes' Concerning Ideas, one of the three major parts of his Art of Rhetoric. The heart of Patterson's book is that in Hermo-
genes, Renaissance critics found a system which had at its base an "implicit Platonism and the implication of this for the development of Renaissance aesthetic[s]." Along with this overall Platonic theory, the poets of this period were offered more specific instructions for the writing of their poems than any previous commentary, including those of Cicero, Quintilian, and Demetrius, current in the earlier half of the sixteenth century. Hermogenes offered Seven Ideas (or styles) as well as subdivisions of these: Clarity, Grandeur (subdivided into Magnificence, Asperity, Vehemence, Vigor, Splendor, and Circumlocution), Beauty, Speed, Ethos (with four subdivisions), Verity, and Gravity or Decorum.

What I shall seek to prove in the following discussion is that because Sidney's style was basically a combination of Verity and Beauty, a style very high in Hermogenes' rating system, Daniel chose a lower stylistic level, Ethos; and that Daniel's critics have themselves pointed out this style in their usage of terms contained in the subdivision of Ethos: Simplicity, Sweetness, Subtlety, and Modesty.

If it is true, and it seems so, that one of Daniel's chief concerns in writing Delia was to determine that pitch at which he sought to fly, then before determining that pitch he had to locate the level of his most immediate predecessor, Sidney. Patterson comments upon this pitch when she states:

---


19 Patterson, p. 45.
In other words, both Sidney and Shakespeare repeatedly express, within a highly artificial framework, either a desire to reject artifice in favor of sincerity (Sidney), or the inability to acquire stylistic polish (Shakespeare) which happily coincides with a belief that nakedness is more truthful. In Sidney's sequence, most of the relevant sonnets come at the beginning, and thus might be expected to define the tone of the whole . . . . In addition, both poets play ostentatiously with the word "true" when trying to define the honest style. It seems more than probable that both poets had learned directly or indirectly of the Idea of Verity as a style, had perceived its relevance to the formal courtship of the sonnet, and made its presence known in their sequences not only by the appropriate devices, but also by hammering on the word "true." 20

All this suggests "that Sidney's attitude is Verity alone." 21

It seems more than probable that Daniel recognized this primary stylistic attitude as well. To imitate this same Idea of Verity could only place Daniel in too close a proximity to Sidney's style. Furthermore, for him to imitate the same major Idea of Verity as Sidney had done could not help but bring him into conflict with the balanced, middle position, exemplified by DesPortes. Again I propose that by lowering his rhetorical pitch one level from Sidney's, Daniel found a style which would be acceptable to both his own image of himself and that of another Petrarchist, DesPortes. The problem I am trying to work out here is complicated, however, because as I write about these choices that I believe Daniel made, we are apt to view them in some chronological or logical series when in reality they could have occured simultaneously or concurrently. It is highly probable that Daniel considered DesPortes in the light of the Idea of Ethos, 20Patterson, pp. 135-6. 21Patterson, p. 136.
accepting or rejecting his mannerisms little by little until these mannerisms merged with the entire fabric of Daniel's mind.

The suggestion that Daniel selected the Idea of Ethos can be established further by listing the chorus of critics who have identified by name the three subdivisions Hermogenes presents as parts of the Idea of Ethos: Simplicity, Sweetness, Subtlety. For example, William Drummond of Hawthornden thought Daniel was "for sweetness in rhyming second to none." Drayton called him "the sweet Musaeus of these times" and "Sweete honydropping Daniel" who melts his heart in "sugred sonneting." Southey captures the likeness of Daniel when he says:

Daniel frequently wrote below his subject and his strength, but always in a strain of tender feeling and in a language as easy and natural as it is pure. For his diction alone he would deserve to be studied by all students or lovers of poetry, even if his works did not abound with passages of singular beauty. Thoughtful, graceful, right mind and gentlehearted, there is no poet in our language of whom it may be affirmed with more certainty, from his writings, that he was an amiable and wise and good man.

Southey says again that Daniel was "One of the sweetest and tenderest of English poets." Yvor Winters says:

Like Sidney, he aims primarily at grace and expression; his tone is less exuberant than that of Sidney; his style is more consis-

---


23"Memorial Introduction," pp. xii-xiii.


tently pure; his inspiration is less rich.26 Seronsy asserts that the consensus has been that Daniel was "well languaged," graceful and smooth, employing a vocabulary that is "deceptively simple."27 Rees states that "the 1592 Delia ends with a lyric, graceful, honeysweet and melodious" tone.28 Sprague says that the sonnets "offer instead purity of diction, tranquil but by no means drowsy rhythms, and the perfection of single lines."29 At this point I believe I have made my case for critics seeing in Daniel a sweetness and a simplicity (purity of diction).

It should be noted at this point that Daniel has been called a constant revisor. And although our discussion deals primarily with his first publication, Delia and Rosamond of early 1592, Daniel nevertheless took pains to revise the sonnets printed in the pirated edition of 1591. These sonnets underwent many changes in diction, versification, and imagery, and in some cases whole quatrains were rewritten. Another of Daniel's revisions was the rearrangement of the order of the sonnets as they appeared in 1591. Also whole sonnets were rejected and were never printed again. I have prepared the following list that shows to what extent Daniel relocated the older sonnets within the new sequence.

---


29 Sprague, p. xvi.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman Numeral</th>
<th>Arabic Numeral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>XVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>XIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman Numeral</th>
<th>Arabic Numeral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXXI</td>
<td>XLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXII</td>
<td>XLII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIII</td>
<td>XLIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV</td>
<td>XLIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXV</td>
<td>XLV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVI</td>
<td>XLVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVII</td>
<td>XLVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVIII</td>
<td>XLVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIX</td>
<td>XLIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the old sonnets appear in the first thirty sonnets but largely rearranged. We may surmise that in what is referred to as typically Daniel's style, much of his energy went into the creation of some sort of framing activity. The older sonnets have been surrounded by the sonnets he added. Williamson sees in this arrangement "that Daniel has developed the commonplaces to produce a highly wrought and subtly textured whole." He further suggests that Daniel first establishes "the theme of unhappy love, and then weaves about it new and contrasting motifs, each one enriching the harmony and tone colour." Williamson concludes his article by saying that "Daniel's variations on

---


31 Williamson, p. 260.
a well-known theme and his 'formal ordering' of the sonnets as a whole represent what is probably the high water mark of deliberate artistry in the whole range of the Elizabethan sonnet sequences. On one level then the entire sequence can be termed a subtle ordering of ideas.

Seronsy states in his dissertation that:

An examination of the sonnets most heavily altered in the course of successive revisions shows certain tendencies at work: a concern for more precise diction and word economy, an effort to improve syntax, a sharpening of metaphor. Sometimes precision and consistency are attained at the expense of force and vividness. The emotion towards Delia becomes less charged, and the tone of the poet is pitched at a more moderate level. Accompanying these changes is a general deletion of rhetorical devices—a transformation that occasionally results in loss of vigor. The revisions likewise show repeated adjustments for metrical smoothness and the elimination of feminine rhymes. Style is occasionally heightened by varying the tense of verbs, or by adding irony and paradox.

It should be pointed out that when Seronsy says "successive revisions" he refers to all the editions of Delia up to 1601. But when we examine the chart of revisions Seronsy includes, we find that the bulk of these revisions occurs in the first edition of 1592. Seronsy also adds that in the 1592 edition there is a definite elimination of the "extravagance and hyperbole of the earlier edition [Newman edition, 1591], it has less vigor and movement, the diction is less concrete,

32Williamson, p. 260.


and the imagery is far more vague. Seronsy sees these changes as characteristic of Daniel's later style. What I think can be shown from Seronsy's comments is that Daniel was employing specific means to accomplish his end: Simplicity, Sweetness, Subtlety, and Modesty. More significant, perhaps, is that Daniel seems to have much more in mind when he says the word "correction" than just spelling and punctuation.

I would now like to turn to the sonnets themselves in order to reinforce the previous statements. I would like to group them into three groups for the sake of discussion. The first group consists of those sonnets with clearly identifiable sources in the Petrarchan tradition, Petrarch and DesPortes, and which also reflect the pattern of revision explained by Seronsy (see page 33). For that purpose, I have selected from that group sonnet XV. The second group consists of those sonnets which I believe reflect the poet's mind at work within the tradition. By that I mean those sonnets which imitate the particular kind of thought process which Daniel saw at the heart of the tradition. And lastly, the third group consists of those sonnets bound together by rather subtle links of metaphor. From this last group I have selected sonnets I, II, III, and IV.

Pierre Spriet in his lengthy study of Daniel finds that except for a few instances "l'atmosphère du recueil de Daniel est très différente de celle des sonnets de Pétrarque: la nature en particulier

est absente des vers du poète anglais, peu préoccupé d'associer l'univers à sa passion, sauf dans la mesure où ce monde se compose d'hommes qui seront témoins de sa gloire."36 Spriet is led to this conclusion because the basis of his search, like that of critics before him, is rooted in the process of finding translations of Petrarch's sonnets more than in detecting exactly what Daniel was imitating in Petrarch. Given Spriet's criterion of "l'atmosphère," a reader is quite likely to agree that Daniel owed more to DesPortes than to Petrarch.

An example of this problem of sources can be seen in comparing Petrarch's CCXXIV, DesPortes' Diane VIII and Daniel's Delia XV.

Petrarch, CCXXIV

S'una fede amorosa, un cor non finto,
Un languir dolce, un desiar cortese;
S'oneste voglie in gentil foco accese,
Un lungo error in cieco laberinto;
Se ne la fronte ogni penser depinto.
Od in voci interrotte a pena intese,
Or da paura or da vergogna offese;
S'un pallor di viola e d'amor tinto;
S'aver altrui piu caro che se stesso;
Se sospirare e lagrimar mai sempre.
Pascendosi di duol, d'ira e d'affanno;
S'ander da lunge et agghiacciar da presso
Son le cagion ch'amando i' mi distempe:
Vestro, donna, 'l peccato, e mio fice 'l danno.

DesPortes, Diane VIII

Si la foy plus certaine en une ame non feinte,
Un desir temeraire, un doux langusement,
Une erreur volontaire, et sentir vivement,
Avec peur d'en guarir, une profonde atteinte;
Si voir une pensee au front toute peinte
Une voix empeschee, un morn e estonnement,
De honte ou de frayeur naissans soudainement,
Une pasle couleuer, de lies et d'amour teinte;
Bref, si se mespriser pour une autre adour,
Si verser mille pleurs, si toujours soupirer,
Faisant de sa douleur nourriture et breuvage;
Si, loin estre de flamme, et de pres tout transi,
Sont cause que je meurs par defaut de mercy,
L'offense en est sur vous, et sur moy le dommage.

Delia XIV (Newman edition)

If that a true heart and faith unfained,
If a sweet languish with a chast desire,
If hunger-starven thoughts so long retained,
Fed but with smoake, and cherisht but with fire.
And if a brow with cares caracters painted,
Bewraies my love, with broken words half spoken,
To her which sits in my thoughts Temple sainted
And layes to view my Vultur-gnawne hart open.
If I have wept the day, and sighted the night
Whilst thrice the Sun approached this northern bound:
If such a faith hath ever wrought a right,
And well deserv'd, and yet no favour found:
Let this suffice, the world yet may see;
The fault is hers, though mine the most hurt bee.

Delia (1592) XV

If that a loyall hart and faith unfained,
If a sweet languish with a chaste desire:
If hunger-starven thoughts so long retayned,
Fed but with smoake, and cherisht but with fire.
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.
If I have doone due homage to her eyes,
And had my sighes styll tending on her name:
If on her love my life and honour lyes;
And she th'unkindest maide still scornes the same.
Let this suffice, the world yet may see;
The fault is hers, though mine the hurt must bee.
A cursory examination of Petrarch's sonnet CCXXIV reveals its status as a very definite source for DesPortes. For Daniel, however, the case is a little less certain. Richard Adamany admits the difficulty of determining which source Daniel used but suggests that Daniel's "choice of diction in two phrases, and because his original last half of the first quatrains may have been suggested by the corresponding lines of Petrarch, that Petrarch is the source rather than DesPortes." On the other hand, Pierre Spriet sees that "Le sonnet 15 de Daniel semble en dépendance de DesPortes plus que Pétarque." His argument is based upon the images of hunger, the state of love that DesPortes compares to the confusion and disarray, provoked by the "erreur volontaire." In his study of this sonnet, Adamany rests his case largely on diction; Spriet asserts DesPortes to be the unquestioned source because of image and tone.

A close study of this sonnet will provide, I believe, further indications of Daniel at work with the convention. It is fairly obvious that at the beginning of this sonnet, Daniel had a choice to make concerning the catalogue of the symptoms of love so characteristic of "Petrarchismo." Initially, Daniel accepts those elements of "Petrarchismo" in the first quatrains with its "sweet languish," "chast desire," "Fed but with smoake, and cherisht but with fire."

In line five, however, Daniel departs from both Petrarch and


38Spriet, p. 228.
DesPortes to enlarge upon the ideas prompted by "hunger-starven" and "chast desire... cherisht but with fire" by his injection of the larger and more universal images of Diana and Prometheus. This imagery and diction provoke a remembrance of Sonnet V with its submerged Acteon myth. Seronsy sees that "Daniel is most effective in his use of the submerged mythological allusion in which, with little explicit reference, the myth is ingeniously applied to the poet's own situation--as in the Acteon myth in the fifth sonnet." Daniel begins the quatrain with the repetition of "if" and in doing so follows Petrarch and DesPortes; however, with Daniel the imagery is not used structurally in linking the "ifs" of the first quatrain only, but rather enlarges the concern of an "if" through a subtle shift in topic away from his "brow with caracters painted" to the caracters painted on his brow: Prometheus and Diana and Acteon. In doing so, Daniel would seem to open Petrarch's "laberinto" allowing the larger world of myth to work quietly upon the mind of the reader.

The major difference, however, in these sonnets of Petrarch, DesPortes, and Daniel lies in the usage of one word. Petrarch uses the word "peccato" in his closing line much in the sense of fault, whereas DesPortes uses the word "offense." It is Daniel's choice to use the word "fault" in much the same sense as Petrarch. DesPortes' "offense" is a much stronger indictment of his Diana than is Petrarch's or Daniel's of Laura and Delia. As Adamany points out: "I do not wish to labor this point but it is through the use of this word, ["peccato"]

39Seronsy, p. 27.
the phrase 'chaste desire' and the echoes of Petrarch in Daniel's second half of his first quatrain that I can conclude that Daniel imitated Petrarch directly rather than Desportes."\textsuperscript{40} Although I do not agree wholeheartedly with Adamany's conclusion that Daniel used Petrarch as his only source, the point he makes about Daniel's choosing the word "fault" to lessen the emotional intent of DesPortes "offense" is accurate. Joan Rees points out from her characteristically balanced position that "The poem has come to Desportes from Petrarch, so that Daniel had two possible models, though he appears to have had DesPortes immediately in mind."\textsuperscript{41} It would seem that both Adamany and Rees have overlooked Wyatt's XII where he concludes his sonnet with "Yours is the fault and myn the great annoy." Furthermore, when Rees says of Daniel's XV, "Daniel tightens the structure by the three times repeated 'if' and writes completely new lines 3 and 4 which introduce verbs more naturally and more vigorously than the French,"\textsuperscript{42} she is in error. Her error lies not in her perception of the relationship between Daniel and Desportes, for Daniel's poem is structurally tighter than DesPortes'; but rather in her failure to see the reflection of Petrarch's structure in Daniel's sonnet. Both Petrarch's and Daniel's sonnets are significantly structured around repetitions of the word if. We therefore conclude that Daniel was not tightening up DesPortes' structure but imitating Petrarch's. One must only recall Petrarch's

\textsuperscript{40}Adamany, p. 56.
\textsuperscript{41}Rees, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{42}Rees, p. 25.
sonnet to see the stamp the "if's" have made. The real divergence of Daniel from Petrarch, Wyatt, and DesPortes is his reference to the lady in terms of the third person. The "vestio" of Petrarch, l. 14, the "yours" of Wyatt, the "Vous", l. 14, of DesPortes have become the "hers" of Daniel. Rees is on the right track when she concludes that:

The DesPortes sonnet continues with its list of 'symptoms' to the end of the poem, but Daniel's sonnet introduces a new motif in line 7, the idea of the lady herself. He has, in fact, two sequences of 'if' clauses, the first culminating in ll. 7-8. The third quatrain develops a second series which centre on the lady and which prepare for the couplet and the conclusion. These modifications make the structure of the poem firmer, and the introduction of the lady at the earlier point and with greater distinctiveness than in the DesPortes sonnet very much heightens the drama in Daniel's version.43

If Rees means that Daniel's tension arises somehow from his use of "I" and "her," she is correct. But in what way does the third person usage in this poem exemplify Daniel's style? Is it a characteristic of Daniel to objectify the "you" of Petrarch, Wyatt, and DesPortes? I believe if we backtrack slightly to compare Daniel's first version of this sonnet in the Newman edition of 1591 with the 1592 version used by Rees in her comparison, several distinctions involving Daniel's style will become apparent.

First of all, Daniel leaves the octave basically untouched. He does exchange the word "true" in line 1 for "Loyall" but this exchange must be admitted as minimal and slight. The bulk of Daniel's energy is spent in ll. 9 through 12. He completely eliminates:

43Rees, p. 25.
If I have wept the day, and sighted the night
Whilst thrice the Sun approached this northern bound:
If such a faith hath ever wrought aright,
And well deserv'd, and yet no favour found:

and substitutes:

If I have doone due homage to her eyes,
And had my sighes styll tending on her name:
If on her love my life and honour lyes;
And she th'unkindest maide still scornes the same.

In his revision Daniel returns to a Petrarchan idea with his choice of "homage to her eyes," "My sighes," "life and honour," "unkindest maide still scornes," while avoiding a Petrarchan translation. The interception of this traditional diction surrounding a lady does cause the reader gently to shift his focus from an image of the speaker's weeping and sighing for three days to a more succinct and less personal "eyes," "name," "honour" and "unkindest maide," etc. This refocusing does, however, permit the much more forceful and finer-toned ending supplied by the couplet. It is to be noted also that Daniel does keep the structural support of the recurring "if" clauses.

What may be indicated by these examples is that for Daniel imitation was the "series of minute adjustments of one's external stylistic movements to some inner, imitative decorum--the sense of decorum which arises from an active inspection of the ways in which a classic model creates its effects and the contemporary ways which suggest themselves to the imitator."44

Very early in my reading of Daniel's Delia I felt that certain words seemed to betray a particular frame of mind. One of these words

44LaBranche, pp. 327-8.
was the personal pronoun "I." In *Delia*, Daniel uses this pronoun 120 times in 110 lines. My initial impression was that this was an inordinate number of times in comparison to other sonneteers such as Sidney or Wyatt. It was not clear whether Daniel actually used this personal pronoun more than either Sidney or Wyatt, or whether Daniel's usage of this pronoun called more attention to itself. It now seems that the above questions can be answered affirmatively. The first conclusion to be drawn is that in *Delia* Daniel places his speaker in a rather egocentric world: an indication on Daniel's part that his speaker is anxious to report the slightest change in each internal event as it occurs. Approximately half the time, Daniel's speaker seems to be involved in a performative gesture. In such lines as "Here I unclasp the book of my charg'd soule," the major emphasis is placed upon who the speaker is, and what he has performed, or will perform. The rest of the time Daniel's "I's" seem to be involved in situations calling attention to their own time, place, or manner of being; e.g., "I spent in vaine," where the underlined terms refer to manner. It is also worth noting that the speaker nowhere links his non-conventional "I" with a "non-conventional" term, time, or circumstance. By this, I mean, that for the most part he is seen in what would be termed a conventional pose: wailing, moaning, loving, vowing, languishing, losing, weeping, etc. An example of Daniel's "I" being linked to the

45 By this I mean that the gesture "indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action--it is not normally thought of as just saying something," J. L. Austin, *How To Do Things With Words* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 6-7.
conventional pose can be seen in Sonnet XI.

Teares, vowes, and prayers win the hardest hart:
Teares, vowes, and prayers have I spent in vaine;
Teares, cannot soften flint, nor vowes convart,
Prayers prevaine not with a quaint disdaine.

I lose my teares, where I have lost my love,
I vowe my faith, where faith is not regarded,
I pray in vaine, as merciles to move:
So rare a faith ought better be rewarded.

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 yields we see.

In lines 5-7, Daniel's "I" participates in the crying, vowing, and praying which had been presented in "impersonal" terms in the first four lines. The total impact of the sonnet seems to indicate a passive speaker who knows that he can take no action more decisive than that of lamenting and languishing. The passive speaker remains outside the convention although making several gestures of being in the work. This outsidedness of the "I" is its natural place although countless gestures are made to enter into the framework. The ambiguous nature of the "I" of the speaker contributes to what some call a lack of definition or character, or lack of sincerity in the speaker's performance.

This sonnet does, for all its logical progression, provide a privileged entrance to an interior world which lacks a sense of concreteness about it. Daniel's first line is direct and to the point, "Teares, vowes, and prayers win the hardest hart." With such a direct statement we feel we are going to be given reasons why this statement is true. On the contrary, Daniel's next lines are a series of logical contradictions. Daniel presents what we feel to be true, but what we
know to be "illogical." Daniel has surrounded himself with the "concrete" occurrences of the inner man; his "teares," his "vowes," his "prayers." The "I" in this sonnet surrounds itself with these concrete items. It seems that Daniel's speaker is demonstrating the need for something concrete to speak about. He links his "I" with these events caused by interior phenomena; yet for all his "logical" and desired linking, he admits the ultimate failure. Daniel repeats and alters the position of "Teares," "prayers," "vowes" as if to add more reality than for a typical Petrarchan imitator. The first quatrain uses these words "tears, Prayers, vowes" as nouns, things "spent in vaine." In the second quatrain, however, the center is shifted from these "concrete" tools of sonnet convention to verbs. The center or emphatic beginning word of each of the first three lines of the second quatrain is the "I." Now Daniel is combining the rather weak and abstract "I" of the first quatrain with the more concrete nouns of the first quatrain to establish a seemingly more concrete "I," an "I" which does "weep," "pray," "vowe." He links all these with "Faith."

The point here is to demonstrate the movements of the "I" in this sonnet. These movements seem to be going toward something or someplace; we feel the speaker is moving toward something, but these movements for all their directness, seen in a "logicality" and a "linking," moderate in words such as "yet," "though." These three overt manifestations (tears, vows, prayers) of interior states reflect the mind of a man who is not satisfied, one who wants or desires that which is absent. The place never materializes; we don't "see" anything.
Despite the logical forefront of this sonnet seen in terms of its development, it provides a privileged entrance into an interior world which seems to beg for concreteness. In this sonnet Daniel surrounds his poetic speaker, the "have I spent in vaine," with those particular concrete expressions of the needs of an interior voice, such as, "teares," "vowes," and "prayers." Through repeating these words in lines 1, 2, and 3, he begs more insistently for their reality.

Sonnet XVI (#19 in Newman edition) provides us with another example:

Happie in sleepe, waking content to languish,
Imbracing cloudes by night, in day time morn:
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,
Hoarse 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.
But still the Hydra of my cares renowning,
Revives new sorrowes of her fresh disdayning;
Still must I goe the Summer windes pursuing:
Finding no ende nor Period or my payning.
Waile all my life, my griefes do touch so neerely,
And thus I live, because I love her deerely.

In the first two lines of the first quatrains, Daniel's speaker begins without concrete "things." He uses words which represent states of mind. His speaker speaks from absence. The "I" is not present except to tell us his paradox. In the next two lines he tells us he "loath[s]" all except "her and mine owne anguish." He progresses in line four to "Pleas'd in my hurt," "inur'd to live forlorne." He continues the gestures of a negative catalogue, a desire for something which is lacking, then retreats again with "but love, death, or my Lady" as he "thinks" over the first quatrains; he is becoming more cautious. He is
busy "reconstructing" his position again. He is even confident enough at this point, or feels confident enough, to interject the highly rhetorical "Hoarce with crying mercy, mercy yet my merit." He feels he has put enough together to "get away" with this device. Just when he is standing confidently upon his last clever display and starts to puff up his poetic chest with "So many vows and prayers ever made I," he seems to feel the false fulness and exhales "That now at length t'yeelde, meere pittie were it." Daniel's speaker echoes this false fulness with false rhyme--forced rhyme to get himself out of the existential trouble he is in. That "puffiness" of himself has again revealed the real problem of himself which is that "many headedness," "the Hydra of my cares renewing," we all get about ourselves, the real problem of consciousness. The figure of the Hydra presents to us his readers the refraction of the poet's viewpoint from many angles as he shifts from prayers to vows, from pain to the acceptance of pain. In the first two quatrains, he has again renewed the topic of his cares. He has revived "new sorrowes." He is back to the place from which he began, back among the clouds that would be embracing, back to being pursued by "Summer windes" at his back, the pushing force of lyricism. There is no "ende" nor "Period." He concludes that he will "Waile all my life, my griefes do touch so neerely." The speaker has felt the "closeness" of getting "something" "someplace." He has approximated, "imitated," "been in the proximity of something." He concludes, "And thus I live, because I love her deerely." Again the speaker sounds the dour note of an almost awful rhyme. The last phrase echoes a cliché of
existence. He has returned to a position of "reasonableness," a
"because," a reason—as good as any. He returns to the conventional
source of his motive, "I love her deerely." This sonnet of Daniel's
again demonstrates the circuitousness of thought: it ends much as it
had begun.

Donald Davie makes a similar observation about Daniel's thought
pattern when he comments upon another of Daniel's sonnets, "Care-
charmer Sleep":

It is well established that a great deal of Elizabethan thought
was of this kind, perceiving correspondences on different 'levels'.
This thing on one level corresponds to that thing on another, level
above level, microcosm inside macrocosm, sphere outside sphere. It
often seems there is no movement in 'the Elizabethan world-picture';
or what movement there is, is movement that cancels itself out,
like the dance in which the dancer ends where he started, or the
circular motion of the sphere which returns upon itself. It was an
age that appreciated Spenser's ingenious and radical dislocation of
narrative order in The Faerie Queen. The timeless and motionless
painted emblem, or the dance in which time and motion abrogate them-
selves, seem to be better media than language for expressing some
characteristically Elizabethan attitudes.46

The last group of sonnets to be discussed are those which seem
to be bound or linked together. What I propose to demonstrate is
Daniel's extremely subtle use of metaphor. I have chosen the first
four sonnets of the 1592 Delia to illustrate my point.

46 Donald Davie, Articulate Energy (London: Routledge and Kegan
Sonnet I

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 book of my charg'd soule,
Where I have cast th'accounts of all my care:
Heere have I summ'd my sighs, heere I enroule
How they were spent for thee; Looke what they are.
Looke on the deere expences of my youth,
And see how just I reckon with thyne eyes:
Examine well thy beautie with my trueth,
And crosse my cares ere greater summes arise.
Read it sweet maid, though it be doone but slightly;
Who can shew all his love, doth love but lightly.

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,
Witness your Fathers griefe exceedes all other.
Sigh out a story of her cruell deeds,
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.
Sonnet III

If so it hap this of-spring of my care,  
These fatall Antheames, sad and mornefull Songes:  
Come to their view, who like afflicted are;  
Let them yet sigh their owne, and none my wrongs.  
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.  
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.  
That she hath doone, the motive of my paine;  
Who whilst I love, doth kill me with disdaine.

Sonnet IV

These plaintive verse, the Posts of my desire,  
Which haste for succour to her slowe regarde:  
Beare not report of any slender fire,  
Forging a griefe to winne a fames rewarde.  
Nor are my passions limn'd for outward hewe,  
For that no col lours can depaynt my sorrov1es:  
Delia her selfe, and all the world may viewe  
Best in my face, how cares hath til'd deepe forrowes.  
No Bayes I seeke to deck my mourning brow,  
O cleer-eyde 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 owne hart;  
My love affects no fame, nor steemes of art.

At first glance it is easily discernible that all of these
sonnets have something to do with writing and reading poetry. In sonnet
I, Daniel's speaker addresses a Venus-type figure in terms normally
associated with accounting and in the background we get a rather ironic
gesture towards balancing the books. In II, we see the poetic speaker
addressing his efforts themselves and he sees each sonnet as an infant,
he being the father of them all. We also witness a reference to Minerva,
the goddess of artifice. In III, he addresses his readers and asks that we treat his "of-spring" thoughtfully. In IV, our speaker is not addressing anyone by name and seems to allow us to overhear his thoughts about his verse reflecting the "forging" process they represent. All of them, on one level, deal with the writing of poetry itself.

On another level, perhaps more abstract, they all deal with the idea of generation. In I, the poetic speaker mentions a river which is generating an ocean; the river in turn is being generated by "charg'd" steams. In II, our speaker presents his verse as infants being generated by him, their father. This verse is called upon to "move" his love. In III the speaker refers again to his "of-spring." In IV, the speaker sees himself "forging" a grief which is internal and cannot be made visible.

Daniel has bound these sonnets together in yet another way. In all four sonnets Daniel ends the first line with the same type of prepositional phrase: of thy beautie, of my love, of my care, of my desire. In fact there may be a pun intended in the word "of-spring." Each of these phrases is part, an integral part, of a metaphor. The name most often given to this kind of metaphor is the "genitive metaphor." 47

Christine Brooke-Rose describes this particular kind of meta-

phor as "the most complex type of all, for the noun metaphor is linked sometimes to its proper term, [the noun] and sometimes to a third term which gives the provenance of the metaphoric term." It is most complex because unlike other metaphors this particular type of metaphoric structure does not link itself necessarily to a proper term but rather to a third term which can be seen illustrated by the following: "A = the B of C." In Daniel's line "Goe wailing verse the infants of my love," we have two components of this structure in that infants (wailing verse) is the "B" element and my love is the "C" element. "This [Genitive] link tells us that the metaphoric term belongs to, or comes from or out of, or is to be found in, or is attributed to, some person or thing or abstraction." In some cases we are forced to guess or intuit the missing term; in other cases where the relationship between "B and C" is not strong or clear enough for us to intuit or guess, the poet supplies us with the term by using a form of the verb to be, or the vocative and so forth. "The Genitive metaphor can thus combine two metaphoric relationships in the same word: on the one hand to the proper terms stated or unstated, and on the other, to the third term with which the metaphor is linked." Our concern in Daniel is with this second kind of relationship and with its extreme complexity and ambiguity.

48 Brooke-Rose, p. 198.
49 Brooke-Rose, p. 204.
50 Brooke-Rose, p. 204.
This particular metaphor exhibits a relationship between nouns which is primarily a verbal one where the preposition used stands for "a verbal idea which can also be expressed verbally, and the non-metaphoric noun is indirectly changed into something else by the metaphoric noun, just as the verb metaphor changes a noun into something else:"51 for example, in "Goe wailing verse the infants of my love," "infants" replaces the concept of crying children, off-spring, progeny, and "love" becomes a mother. This indirect change escapes the possible ridiculousness of the statement "Love is the mother of these crying children." Yet it should be noticed in these relationships described above, the metaphoric element is still a noun. In some way or at some level "Love can cause tears" and is not metaphoric. The metaphoric level of the above example is between the idea of love and wailing children and can do quite well without having a verb at all: "the infants of my love."

Another way of presenting this indirect linking of nouns in Daniel has been observed elsewhere. Donald Davie says in his *Articulate Energy* roughly the same thing when he compares Sidney's "Come, Sleep! O sleep, the certain knot of peace," and Daniel's "Care-charmer Sleep, son of the sable Night, Brother to death ....". Davie says that what is going on in Daniel's poem "is different from anything in Sidney's poem," and:

Sleep, Night, and Death are not particulars of one stunning abstraction. Nor, on the other hand, is Sleep going to do any-

51Brooke-Rose, p. 205.
thing to Night or to Death, as Sidney's sleep was going to knot peace and bait wit, until prevented by having its verbs wrenched from it one by one. There is no conceivable verb that could convey the relation of Sleep to Night, or of Sleep to Death. Yet these relationships are being established by the copulas understood and the metaphor (not a very lively one) of family kinship. The relationship established is a correspondence, not an equivalence. Night is the sleep of the world; death is the sleep of the soul. Articulation is effected, but no force is expended, for none is needed.52

The use of this kind of metaphor by Daniel is widespread throughout Delia. I believe we can see that, in contrast to Sidney's forceful use of syntax and metaphor, Daniel is using a metaphoric structure that does not depend on force but on seeing "corresponding levels" of thought.53 This kind of metaphor demands thought on the part of Daniel's readers to make these correspondences. It also indicates yet another method of maintaining the "modest" voice of his speaker, a voice which could be maintained by including this type of metaphor and its echoing syntax within a larger system of rhetoric represented by Ethos in Hermogenes' rhetoric.

The previous discussion has pointed out the major problems which any attempt to deal with Daniel at work within the Petrarchan tradition must encounter. The fact that we know so little about that area of Daniel's life which immediately preceded his entrance into a literary career complicates from the outset any statements usually made about a poet's growth. I have been bold enough to suggest that

52Davie, p. 46.

53See Donald Davie as cited on page 50.
Daniel began his career in extremely demanding circumstances, the problem of poetic appearance in Newman, the search for a patron, which could only be overcome by demonstrating and maintaining a poetic speaker who met these demands and turned them into a performance of control and cool deliberation. Daniel could not afford the luxury of an immature performance on any level. With this in mind, we are able to understand more completely a poet who seems to embody those virtues most normally associated with "older and wiser" within his speaking voice. In this way Daniel really began in the middle of things and sought to pursue the way out suggested by this middle. In many ways what is lacking in Daniel's Delia is everything we can most easily address ourselves to. We cannot hold up to everyone's view what we ourselves have discovered to be half buried. It seems that Daniel's performance is much like the presence in the room which whenever it is sought retreats leaving only an emptiness. We sense in Daniel's Delia a correctness, not a comfortableness.

We can view the fact that Daniel constantly revised Delia in the light that Daniel was never really very comfortable with Delia. It is as if the furniture that was given to him to start housekeeping is constantly being shuffled about, repainted, refinished. Daniel always seems to have in the back of his mind the idea of some day replacing those pieces entirely which are no longer needed and/or which are no longer comfortable, do not fit in with a present idea of decor. Daniel seems always in search of what will suffice. When Daniel's poetic speaker says in Sonnet L,
This is my state, and Delias hart is such;
I say no more, I feare I saide too much.

we gather a conclusion not based on a beginning, a middle, and an end,
but on "enough," or having said all he has to say. His speaker
leaves us on one hand with an ending which is determined not by any
sense we his hearers have but rather with his pointing to the end as
just that, an end. On the other hand, we sense a performer who is
full but not satisfied, a speaker who calls forth a feeling of having
done but only to be undone. What we have witnessed is the mind of a
speaker in the act of finding what will suffice, only to be left with
his not having found it. As Louis Martz says of Donne, "Such is the
interior quest--to find what will suffice...".54 I find appropriate
also the conclusion of a poem of Wallace Stevens entitled "Man and
Bottle" with which Martz begins his inquiry.

The poem lashes more fiercely than the wind,
As the mind, to find what will suffice, destroys
Romantic tenements of rose and ice.55

Although not as dramatic as is Donne's speaker, Daniel's speaker is
nevertheless upon a sombre stage and

... on that stage
And like an insatiable actor, slowly and
With meditation, speak words that in the ear,
In the delicatest ear of the mind, repeat,
Exactly, that which it wants to hear...56

---


56Stevens, p. 240.
Throughout this chapter on *Delia*, I have been concerned with linking Daniel's initial plea for correctness to various levels of Daniel's style. I have suggested that Daniel searched for and found a rhetorical theory in which he could accomplish both public and private goals. I have also indicated through an examination of some of his sonnets that this overriding concern for decorum is echoed in his revisions, his sonnet structures and in his choice of metaphor. With these indications in mind, I shall now turn my attention to *Delia's* companion piece *The Complaint of Rosamond*. 
CHAPTER III

THE COMPLAINT OF ROSAMOND:
"SWEET SILENT RETHORIQUE"

In our discussion of Delia, I mentioned that the preface to this, Daniel's first serious publication, was significant in that it offered Daniel's more thoughtful readers a glimpse of a particular pattern of thought which can be seen reflected in both Delia and The Complaint of Rosamond. I have suggested also that this particular pattern indicates a much more elaborate and thoughtful rhetorical organization than has previously been investigated. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that The Complaint of Rosamond, published together with the Delia sonnets, forms an integral part of the complete poetic performance offered by this volume. I propose that The Complaint of Rosamond is a companion piece in the true sense of the word, and that when the two poetic performances are seen as a whole, they offer a completeness totally ignored by modern criticism. In pursuit of this goal, I hope to gather some thoughts about the performance which Daniel presents in Rosamond and to place these thoughts into a consideration of Daniel at work with a tradition chiefly concerned with myth, legend and history. With this in mind, I hope to isolate those elements which Daniel felt to be intrinsic to those ideas suggested by the complaint, and to show how Daniel modi-
fied these elements as they are adopted by his poetic speaker.

But before we can proceed, it is necessary to review the historical surroundings out of which Daniel's poetic effort in Rosamond arose.

Two sources lay before Daniel which provided him with his "heroine." The first of these is in the history supplied to him from the various chronicles: the Polychronicon, Giraldus Cambrensis' De Principes Instructione, Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi, and The French Chronicle. While supplying Daniel with a real event, these chronicles also supplied him with a legendary tradition. Heltzel points out in his Fair Rosamond that there is "no real evidence to support the traditional beliefs either that Queen Eleanor's jealousy led to an act of vengeful reprisal or that her imprisonment was in punishment of any act of violence against her rival."¹ A statement can be made, however, that the core of the Henry and Rosamond story is comprised of these basic elements: a) Rosamond was Rosamond Clifford, daughter of Walter de Clifford, b) she was the mistress of Henry after his marriage to Eleanor and possibly before, c) Rosamond was not poisoned, d) after Henry's public announcement that Rosamond was his mistress, she died and was buried at Godstow.² When we consider how detailed the story became as it was handed down from century to century, these are indeed


²Heltzel, p. 5.
meager historical facts. We find no labyrinth, no poison, no jealousy, no grange, no casket, no pandering matron which do appear in Daniel's version. Heltzel makes the point that "The simple materials with which Daniel constructs his plot are obviously derived from chronicle accounts, both early and late." Daniel could, therefore, be aware of the heavy elaboration that these simple materials of the Rosamond legend had undergone.

The most immediate source for Daniel was The French Chronicle of London, which provided him with the details and events following Rosamond's death. The most important of these events is the description of Henry's coming upon the body of Rosamond and his subsequent outbursts of amazement, grief, and vengeance, and his promise to eternalize the memory of Rosamond. When we view the history and legend as received by Daniel we can identify those elements which he rejected and those which he accepted and elaborated upon. The most important elements that Daniel accepted were: the casket; the queen's jealousy and guilt; the labyrinth in which Henry secluded Rosamond; and Henry's emotional, eloquent speech after Rosamond's death. Daniel rejected the ideas that Eleanor had sadistically tortured Rosamond and that Rosamond was Henry's mistress before his marriage to Eleanor.

To these elements Daniel contributes three new embellishments. The first of these is the matron, who persuades Rosamond to accept

---

3 Heltzel, p. 18.
4 Heltzel, p. 18.
the king's advances. The second is the use of the emblems of Io and
Jove on the casket instead of the various animals described by Higden. 5
The third is the solitary grange in which Rosamond is secluded before
she is taken to the labyrinth. Later in our discussion we will return
to these additions of character, emblem and setting and see their
importance to the total fabric of Rosamond, but for the present we must
continue our review of the historical background of Rosamond.

The framework into which Daniel places the above history,
legend and myth is a curious merging of two medieval forms: the mirror
and the complaint. The most obvious source available to Daniel was
Thomas Churchyard's "Shore's Wife" (1563). All of Daniel's major
critics have commented about this source at length. Seronsy believes
that the "Induction" and "Shore's Wife" of the 1563 edition of The
Mirror for Magistrates had the most influence upon Rosamond. A
second contributing factor which Seronsy comments on is the "popular
appetite for history and moral example" 6 which was very pronounced in
the early 1590's. A third source was Sackville's "Induction," which
according to Seronsy, "made a more subtle contribution to Daniel's
poem" 7; for in order to minimize the "abhorred wickedness" of the
complainant and engage our sympathy,

5These animals are described as giants fighting, beasts
surprised or startled, birds flying, and fish swimming. (See Heltzel,
p. 9).

6Cecil Seronsy, Samuel Daniel, Twayne English Authors Series

7Seronsy, p. 37.
... the poet must himself get within the framework and, in a sense, join the action of the poem. For this participation Daniel had the example of the "Induction" in which the illusion is achieved not by asking the reader to imagine or to suppose or to accept the relation as from a dream, but by placing the poet himself as narrator within the framework.8

Both Sackville and Daniel reduce the elements of the "literalness and probability" by dispensing with lines like "Think that you see him standing," "Imagine that you see him."9

But Seronsy balances these attributes of Rosamond by stating that the moralizing becomes too obvious at times and the narrative lacks action, and that the conflict within Rosamond is rectified all too easily. In conclusion Seronsy sees Daniel's presentation of a soul in conflict as important in developing conceptions of Elizabethan tragedy and that this extremely well-told tale exerted extensive influence over a great many other complaints in the 1590's.10

While Rees agrees with much of Seronsy's treatment of the relationship between Churchyard and Daniel, she sees even more similarities. In both works the woman becomes a king's mistress, has a tragic end, and concludes her tale with a moral of "fall not to folli so." In Rees' opinion, the similar patterns in the two works reflect an even more striking similarity: both Churchyard and Daniel treat their heroines sympathetically. But there are differences. While Churchyard's narrative confuses personal and political emphasis, Daniel concentrates

8Seronsy, p. 37.
9Seronsy, p. 37.
10Seronsy, p. 37.
on the personal aspect and completely ignores the political. Rees also feels that Daniel's *Rosamond* is more subtle than anything previously attempted in this vein, and that it shows a considerable lyric warmth centered in Daniel's use of apostrophe instead of Churchyard's series of exempla. Rees concludes her treatment of *Rosamond* by echoing the sentiments of Hebel, Tillotson and Newdigate that "Daniel is the first to appreciate fully the psychological possibilities of the Mirror form."12

Pierre Spriet says of these psychological possibilities:

La Complaint of Rosamond est donc bien différente d'une <<tragédie>> du *Mirror for Magistrates*. C'est moins le récit de la chute d'une femme punie par le destin et par sa propre faiblesse que l'analyse des sentiments qui agitent son âme. L'histoire s'interiorise: Daniel montre bien que Rosamond n'est pas victime d'un hasard aveugle mais qu'elle est l'instrument de son malheur. L'histoire y perd en pittoresque mais elle gagne en profondeur psychologique et en vérité humaine. Rosamond n'est plus seulement un exemple propre à faire réfléchir les âmes faible tentées de la suivre, c'est avant tout une femme bien vivante et qui souffre: Malgré ses fautes, elle conserve la sympathie de l'auteur et de ses lecteurs. La peinture d'une âme affligée importe davantage que la leçon morale.13

In his statement about Rosamond, Spriet makes several delicate points.

He thinks that the poem is very different from its counterparts in the


12This comment by Rees is taken from *The Works of Michael Drayton* (Oxford 1931-41), 23.

Mirror. Most significantly he sees Rosamond as having to do more with the mind. In his phrase "L'histoire s'interiorise" he captures an element which others have also seen in Rosamond. Maurice Evans says:

Its importance lies in the fact that it exploits history for other than historical purposes; the fact that it deals with historical characters is only incidental, for it is primarily a love story told in appropriately conceited language; and in crossing the historical 'Complaint' with the traditional lament of forsaken woman, Daniel created what was virtually a new "kind" of poetry.¹⁴

This statement reflects what many recent critics consider to be Daniel's major contribution to the literature of the early 1590's. Time and time again, critics have pointed to Shakespeare, Drayton and Chute as proof of Rosamond's catalytic action. No doubt much, if not all, of Evans' statement is true; but lurking behind these well-meaning gestures of enthusiasm lies the danger that while pointing back to Daniel as a source, they may neglect to delineate what Daniel himself pointed back to. An example can be seen in Seronsy:

The Complaint of Rosamond proved to be more influential than the Delia sonnets. Although less commonly known today than formerly, despite frequent inclusion in anthologies, it still has a strong interest for its historical and artistic origins and for the precise way by which it fused a variety of literary conventions and gave shape and temper to the work of other poets immediately following Daniel, who brings tragic conflict for the first time into union with the Renaissance erotic narrative and medieval "complaint."¹⁵

With respect to Seronsy's statement, it should be noted that a reader can too quickly pass over the term "medieval 'complaint.'" The use of


¹⁵Seronsy, pp. 34-5.
that term betrays an attitude which sees the "medieval" element as an entity in itself. It would seem much more realistic, given Daniel's awareness of history, to see Daniel looking back at the "medieval" traditions and looking for what was "classical." In this way Daniel could examine the tradition to find what was really "medieval" as opposed to what was "classical." In other words, I believe that Daniel saw the medieval tradition as layered experiences having many classic elements embedded within it.

It is quite possible that Daniel thought that the lament and complaint forms of medieval literature were indebted to classical rhetorical theory. Richmond says that a "good indication of rhetorical theory about laments may be found in the two treatises, Cicero's *De Inventione* and the *Auctor ad Herennium*, which shared a position of influence and availability in the Middle Ages."\(^{16}\) She also says that, for the most part, laments (and complaints) follow an order suggested by Cicero's *Ad Herennium*:

1) External Circumstances: Descent . . . Education . . .

2) Next we must pass to the Physical Advantages: . . . impressiveness and beauty . . . exceptional strength and agility . . . continual good health . . .

3) Then we shall return to External Circumstances and consider his virtues and defects of Character evinced with respect to

---

these: (wealth, power, fame, friendship, private feuds, etc.)[17] Richmond concludes her treatment of style in the Middle Ages by saying that there were "Theories and manuals of composition" which "provide ample evidence that laments for the dead constitute a genre which was recognized and about which general rules existed."[18] The importance of these rules, however, should not be overweighed. The major characteristic of their employment was that of a signal topic. Also, it is important to note that these rules have been seen as a vehicle which allow for an individual writer's style to present itself. The lament was the starting point from which many of the medieval romances developed.[19] When Richmond looks back over the history of the lament she finds that the most successful were those "in which elements of style are indeed memorably present, but so neatly poised that they serve to clarify and enrich an idea, to add vitality to a dramatic scene."[20]

Along with these ideas about the characteristic rhetoric in the medieval lament and complaint is that body of topics which is seen to be central to this same tradition. For these ideas, I again refer to Richmond.

Some ideas, such as grief and praise, are almost always present; others, such as Fortune, appear less frequently. The most charac-

[17]Richmond, p. 86. Richmond is referring to a section of the Ad Herennium found on page 175 of the Loeb edition.
[18]Richmond, p. 100.
teristic method is to select about three ideas which are inter-related and combine them to produce a lament which is fairly well unified. . . . In the longer laments there is a marked tendency to explore the possibilities of a significant moral question. . . . Emphasis is placed on personal reaction . . . there are references to broader concerns about the future of the public weal. . . . When he [the speaker] not only reacts emotionally but also thinks about some of the implications of the death. His intellectual exploration of these implications gives an insight into human reactions . . . for even in conventional medieval narrative there is individuality in the responses which various characters make to death. Often characters really become individuals only when they are confronted with a problem like death. Then their ideas materialize, and as they speak laments for the dead they become not narrative frames but human persons trying to understand and cope with a difficulty. The result is usually increased elegance and vigor of language in a dramatic sense which exploits the subtleties of personality, situation, and intellectual awareness.21

Daniel recognized in the medieval poems of lament and complaint these two concerns of rhetoric and theme. When these concerns are placed within the mind of Daniel with its interest in history and philosophy, it is possible to witness Daniel, the historian, viewing the traditions of the medieval past in such a way as to see what events most concerned his predecessors. It is also possible to see Daniel, the philosopher, chiefly concerned, not with what kind of events they were, but what it was about these events that made it possible for them to be known.22

The medieval traditions of lament and complaint gave Daniel a threefold heritage. First, they afforded Daniel a known centrality or

21 Richmond, p. 81

a common link to the ancients because they contained and demonstrated a use of classical rhetoric. Second, they provided Daniel with a kind of poetry that invited a personal and individual response. Third, they demonstrated, most visibly, a system of knowledge—a way of perceiving, knowing, and understanding. This Daniel can be seen as integrating classical ideas and rhetoric with what the Middle Ages had contributed in knowledge and sensitivity.23

So far, we have traced the history of Rosamond and one major element which contributed to its novelty. It is now time to turn our attention to what critics have seen as the "Ovidian" or "erotic" element. The fact that this element has been ignored by Seronsy and Rees would seem to reflect a notion that whatever is Ovidian about Rosamond has been watered down to a point defying description. Smith on the other hand finds at least two of what he considers Ovidian elements in the speeches of the matron and the pictures on the casket.24 Smith does not remark, however, when naming the matron and the casket, that these two elements are two of the three additions that Daniel made to the Rosamond legend. It is quite possible that Daniel's third addition, the "Solitary Grange," is also Ovidian in the sense that it


presents anew the isolation so dominant in the tale itself. In this case Daniel has merely changed the concept of isolation in the myth into a more concrete and believable form in the Grange. The three additions made to the Rosamond legend point toward the Italian method of handling Ovidian myth.

Smith is able to link this Ovidian tradition with another important aspect of *The Complaint of Rosamond*:

Daniel saw in the Woman's complaint, exemplified by Churchyard's poem, an opportunity to temper the grim atmosphere of the fall of princes with pathos, description of physical beauty, and even some Italianate mythological decoration.

Perhaps there is an area in which the idea of a female speaker and the Ovidian tradition of ornate, sweet rhetoric overlap. It is this area of overlapping that I would now like to investigate. The first question which springs to mind is why did Daniel choose a female speaker?

Daniel had not only the precedent of Jane Shore but also the medieval tradition of complaint from which to draw. One aspect of this tradition made women a topic of scorn. When we omit the complaints which were written against certain professions, women are by far the

25The facts that the cloud is a hiding force and its position is a major element in the Io myth are reflected in Drayton's *Barons Warres* (1603) in his description of Mortimer's Tower.

26It is quite possible that this Italian method of handling Ovidian myth may have been unified for Daniel in the work of Giordano Bruni, especially *De gli eroici furori* (London: 1585).

27Smith, p. 105.
most prominent group attacked. Over and over we find women connected to myths echoing the fall from paradise. On the other hand, there were many attempts to praise women. But the most significant aspect of this tradition was that much of what was said about women was presented as paradox. An example of this use of paradox can be seen in Amicitia inimica; ineffugabilis poena; necessarium malum; naturalis temptatio; desidercibilis calamitas; domesticum periculum; delectabile detrimentum; etc. However, there was a strong tendency in the last half of the sixteenth century to review women's position. Much of the energy expended on this review was directed toward a reconciliation of the two terms present in such paradoxical statements as necessarium malum. Daniel was very much involved in these attempts and, as Shackford points out, much of his "interest in feminine points of view and feminine personality is a continuous element in his poetry."30

But beyond the fact that the female speaker offered a new point of view, the complaint allowed Daniel to concentrate his efforts upon unifying the diverse elements of a private world. Daniel did not have to worry about including political elements within his framework. He was left to concentrate upon ideas suggested by a "shame that


29Peter, p. 87.

never sleepes."

Along with this private world came a new interior world in which Daniel was free to roam. This liberty is felt immediately in the manner in which he begins his poem,

Out from the horror of infernall deepes,
My poore afflicted ghost comes heere to plaine it:  
Attended with my shame that never sleepes,
The spot wherewith my kinde, and youth did staine it:  
My body found a grave where to containe it,  
A sheete could hide my face, but not my sin,  
For Fame finds never tombe t'inclose it in. 11. 1-7.

Daniel has used no prefacing comments to locate himself or his reader. He uses no excuses or qualifications. Rosamond appears. Supposedly we are faced as is Daniel by the soul of a woman, long dead and in need of justice. Daniel has called upon something in himself, some unified force which he might be able to maintain at a particular emotional level throughout the entire poem. But what part of his being could possibly be used to speak as a woman?

As we have seen in Delia, Daniel had presented a male speaker who was very concerned about maintaining control. We have further suggested that the presence of Daniel behind that speaker was also concerned with control and balance. It may be Daniel's sense of balance and control which prompts a response from the other side, in fact a presence from the "other world" that appears in feminine dress. After Rosamond's initial plea, Daniel's muse, another feminine entity, Calliope, presses Daniel's speaker to take up the task.
Thus saide: forthwith mov'd with a tender care
And pittie, which my selfe could never finde:
What she desir'd, my Muse deygn'd to declare,
And therefore will'd her boldly tell her minde:
And I more willing tooke this charge assignd,
Because her griefes were worthy to be knowne,
And telling hers, might hap forget mine owne.

In so doing Daniel is calling upon another voice which he felt needed to be sounded, a part of his being not explored in Delia.

Another interesting aspect of Daniel's choice of Rosamond is revealed in the fact that she, like Jane Shore before her, comes from the middle class. When this observation is coupled with the less than aristocratic class of Delia's speaker and Daniel's own middle-class background, a much larger sense of decorum is seen maintained. The choice of Rosamond de Clifford does not force Daniel to present a different rhetorical pitch in order to mirror an aristocratic background. A decorum of style can therefore be maintained on all levels. I am suggesting that Daniel's speaker is aware of his middle-class background and speaks for other persons of the middle class.

It is also possible that Daniel selected the subject because he perceived, in the way the Rosamond story was passed on from generation to generation, a general sympathy for Rosamond in his fellow Englishmen. The basis for this sympathy may have been revealed to Daniel by the nature of the elements that were added from time to time. As we judge the nature of these additions, the figure of Rosamond is progressively seen more sympathetically as she becomes more and more the victim of circumstance. If Daniel did indeed see in
Rosamond a character who elicited a sympathetic response, it is possible that he anticipated a warm and receptive audience eager for poetic justice to be done.31

II

At first glance, the poems of Delia and Rosamond do not appear to be at all similar. In Delia the effect created is one of control. This control asserts itself over and over again in the individual sonnets as they strike a single note and focus with slight variations on one single emotional phenomenon. Delia points out no moral lesson to be learned. In Rosamond, however, one senses a pattern which points to something. The narrative leads from a beginning through a middle to an end. It purports to justify a life; to see similarities in things; it begs for meaning as does the icon of Io on Rosamond's casket. In Delia, the reader is called upon to witness the idealization of a male speaker; in Rosamond the idealization begs the readers to listen and react and in this reaction to be led out of themselves.

More important, however, than these apparent differences in Delia and Rosamond are the ways in which Delia and Rosamond do

31Moreover, his selection of a female speaker in Rosamond may have been in keeping with the Renaissance attitude which held that women were the social counterparts to men. This idea can be seen in the following sources. Paul Oscar Kristeller, Renaissance Thought II: Papers on Humanism and the Arts, Harper Torchbooks (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 51ff. See also, Jacob Burkhardt, The Civilization of Renaissance Italy, Harper Torchbooks (New York: Harper and Row, 1958), pp. 389ff.
resemble one another. By confronting the similarities, we may better appreciate Daniel's poetic style as he sought to link and unite these idealized contraries into the wholeness of the poem.

There are within these two works many indications of linking. The most obvious example of linking is adumbrated in Delia. Daniel joins Sonnet IX to X, Sonnet XXXI to XXXII, Sonnet XXXIII to XXXIII by making the last line of the first, the first line of the next sonnet. Rees sees that Daniel "has a trick of echoing the last line of one sonnet in the opening lines of the next, giving the effect of picking up, after a pause, a continuing line of song." Daniel used an even subtler method of linking opposites than Ree's "echoes." A brief look at these sonnets will bear this subtlety out:

Sonnet XXXIII.

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:
Then what my faith hath beene thy selfe shalt see,
And that thou wast unkinde thou maiest repent.
Thou maist repent, that thou hast scorn'd my teares,
When Winter snowes uppon thy golden heares.

---

32Rees, p. 30.
Sonnet XXXIII.

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 all unworthy:  
Heere see the giftes that God and nature lent thee;  
Heere read thy selfe, and what I suffred 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.

In sonnet XXXIII, Daniel paints a picture of Delia seeing herself in her mirror, verifying the fact that "all is gone." The poetic speaker then describes the "heate remayning" and the "miracle in mee / That fire can burne, when all the matter's spent." He concludes this sonnet with the whiteness of snow upon Delia's golden hairs. In sonnet XXXIII, he repeats this same phrase; he turns the fire of the previous sonnet to snow and frost and asks Delia to take "this picture which I heere present thee; / Limned with a Pensill." He asks Delia to read the mirror of herself because "These collours with thy fading are not spent." In one sonnet, he paints a picture of positives, the heat, the sight of Delia seeing herself and the snow upon her hair. In the following sonnet, a negative is offered in that in sonnet XXXIII we see white on gold; in sonnet XXXIII we see gold, or whatever colors are produced by a "Pensill," on white. Daniel's revision of 1601 makes more visual sense when he changes the words "golden" to "sable." Daniel has reversed the image much the same way that photo-
graphy does; i.e., the negative of a print is identical to the print except for the fact that the white becomes the black and the black becomes the white. It is also quite possible that Daniel is alluding to the reversed image that words give of themselves as they appear on the printing block. This image is re-inforced by the poetic speaker's last statements about "These collours" which because they are "dye" (ink) will not "die."

With these highly sophisticated techniques of linked contraries at work within the fabric of Delia, it is logical to assume that Daniel could have enlarged these techniques to encompass the scope of both seemingly contrary positions of his poetic speakers in Delia and Rosamond. In Delia, the poetic speaker continually refers to his own "Hoarce" voice, "harsh" style; he is always "wailing," "moaning," "lamenting," "complaining," "languishing." He questions: "Why should I more molest the world with cryes?" This attitude would seem to be contrasted in Rosamond's attitude:

Looke how a Comet at the first appearing,
Drawes all mens eyes with wonder to behold it:
Or as the saddest tale at suddaine hearing,
Makes silent listning unto him that told it:
So did my speech when rubies did unfold it;
So did the blasing of my blush appeare,
T'amaze the world, that holds such sights so deere.

Ah beauty Syren, fayre enchanting good,
Sweet silent rethorique of perswading eyes;
Dombe eloquence, whose powre doth move the blood,
More then the words or wisedome of the wise:
Still harmonie, whose diapason lyes
Within a brow, the key which passions move,
To ravish sence, and play a world in love.
11. 113-126.
Although this passage refers to "Sweet silent rethorique" as a force which moves the passions, it is sadly appropriate that this topic is included in a highly rhetorical passage introduced by a medieval convention of exclamation typical of the lament and complaint: "Ah." These examples would seem to point to an apparent contradiction in attitudes the speakers hold toward their individual performances.

As Smith points out, however, "they are both [Delia and Rosamond] laments, and since the poet's success in softening a mistress' heart depends upon a woman's grace, he should be sensitive to the complaint of a beautiful woman." Also when we view Delia as an ultimate judge whose sigh of pity may lighten the burden of Rosamond, the sigh justifies both poet and speaker simultaneously (see 11. 43-9.) These observations would seem to indicate that the entire edition may be aimed at a feminine taste.

What Smith senses to be the end of the sonnet sequence and complaint may in some way be a product of a combination of other similarities rather than the one line of direction towards this end of the "feminine taste." What I propose to offer in the following pages is an examination of certain similarities between Delia and The Complaint of Rosamond.

One obvious fact is that Delia and Rosamond are approximately

---

33Richmond, pp. 83ff.
34Smith, p. 106.
35Smith, p. 106.
the same length. Delia plus the Ode at its closing add up to 724 lines; The Complaint of Rosamond contains 742 lines. If we subtract the sixteen lines of the male speaker in Rosamond, we have 726 lines of Rosamond's actual complaint. In this sense The Complaint of Rosamond physically mirrors the Delia sequence.

Another obvious link which suggests the possibility of similarity can be found in the way Rosamond refers to Delia and the just completed performance of its speaker:

Delia may happe to deygne to read our story,
And offer up her sigh among the rest,
Whose merit would suffice for both our glorie,
Whereby thou might'st be grac'd, and I be blest,
That indulgence would profit me the best;
Such powre she hath by whom thy youth is lead,
To joy the living and to blesse the dead.

11. 43-49.

and again,

But heere an end, I may no longer stay thee,
I must returne t'attend at Stigian flood:
Yet ere I goe, thys one word more I pray thee,
Tell Delia now her sigh may doe me good,
And will her note the frailtie of our blood.
And if I passe unto those happy banks,
Then she must have her praise, thy pen her thanks.

11. 729-735.

Delia is thus mentioned at the start of the poem and at its close.

Rees makes a further point:

Delia is remembered also, rather unexpectedly, in the body of the poem when Rosamond is reflecting on the cruelty of shutting beauty away from the admiration of the world.

---

36Rees, p. 34.
The lines Rees refers to seem curious when one remembers the recurrent idea of isolation which is stated throughout the poem.

Witnes the fayrest streetes that Thames doth visit,
The wondrous concourse of the glittering Faire:
For what rare women deckt with Beautie is it,
That thither covets not to make repaire.
The solitary Country may not stay her,
Heere is the center of all beauties best,
Excepting Delia, left to adorne the West.

Thus far several ways have been suggested through which Daniel links Delia to Rosamond. For the most part, they have been on the rather obvious level of direct address, or reference to Delia, the physical length of the poems, and a unity of purpose as seen in Smith's comments about a "feminine taste." The remainder of this discussion will be given over to similarities in rhetoric and imagery (particularly as it suggests Ovidian myth) and the poetic traditions of Petrarchanism and medieval complaint as seen in Delia and Rosamond.

Seronsy detects a marked relationship in these works:

The Delia framework gives to the narrative of Rosamond an additional charge of personal feeling which never becomes obtrusive. By keeping within the confines of his single narrative, and by his judicious use of details available from his sources, Daniel achieves a unity that is lacking in some of the poems modeled after Rosamond. Not heavily freighted with incident, the poem has an air of repose and charm.37

While it is true that Rosamond is dependent upon the Delia framework, it has been suggested in the previous chapter that Delia itself is dependent upon a framework embodied in the preface. As the speaker in

---

37Seronsy, p. 41,
Delia carefully guards his performance, so the speaker in Rosamond is guarded by the previous performance. It may be that Daniel is careful to enwrap the appearance of the "soulful" speaker of Rosamond within the self-conscious frame of past experience. A closer look at the beginnings of the works reveals several striking resemblances.

It is curious that Daniel says,

I desire onely to bee graced by . . . judicall Patronesse of the Muses, . . . to preserve them [the sonnets] from those hidious Beastes, Oblivion, and Barbarisme. Whereby you doe not onely possessse the honour of the present, but also do bind posterity to an ever gratefull memorie of your virtues, wherein you must survive your selfe. And if my lines heereafter better laboured, shall purchase grace in the world, they must remaine the monuments of your honourable favour, and recorde the zealous dutie of mee, . . .

This finds a juxtaposition in the following lines:

So shall I never passe; for how should I
Procure this sacrifice amongst the living?
Time hath long since worne out the memorie,
Both of my life, and lives unjust depriving:
Sorrow for me is dead for aye reviving.
Rosamond hath little left her but her name,
And that disgrac'd, for time hath wrong'd the same.

No Muse suggests the pittie of my case,
Each penne dooth overpasse my just complaint,
Whilst others are preferd, though farre more base:
Shores wife is grac'd, and passes for a Saint;
Her Legend justifies her foule attaint;
Her well-told tale did such compassion finde,
That she is pass'd, and I am left behinde.

Which seene with griefe, my myserable ghost,
(Whilome invested in so faire a vaile,
Which whilst it liv'd, was honoured of the most,
And being dead, gives matter to bewaile)
Comes to sollicit thee, since others faile,
To take this taske, and in thy wofull Song
To forme my case, and register my wrong.
Although I knowe thy just lamenting Muse,
Toylde in th' affliction of thine owne distresse,
In others cares hath little time to use,
And therefore maist esteeme of mine the lesse:
Yet as thy hopes attend happie redresse,
Thy joyes depending on a womans grace,
So move thy minde a wofull womans case.

Delia may happe to deygne to read our story,
And offer up her sigh among the rest,
Whose merit would suffice for both our glorie,
Whereby thou might'st be grac'd, and I be blest,
That indulgence would profit me the best;
Such powre she hath by whom thy youth is lead,
To joy the living and to blesse the dead.

So I through beautie made the wofull' st wight,
By beautie might have comfort after death:
That dying fayrest, by the fayrest might
Finde life above on earth, and rest beneath:
She that can blesse us with one happy breath,
Give comfort to thy Muse to doe her best.
That thereby thou maist joy, and I might rest.

Both speakers appeal to a judicial quality seen in both the
Countess and Delia. Both speakers refer to Oblivion. Daniel says
"Beastes of Oblivion;" Rosamond says she has "little left but her
name" since "Time hath long since wore out the memorie, / Both of my
life, and lives unjust depriving." As Daniel seeks to preserve his
sonnets, so Rosamond seeks to preserve her life and death, her tale,
from oblivion and forgetfulness. Daniel refers to the grace he seeks;
Rosamond refers to the grace which may bless both herself and the
writer of Rosamond.

Beyond these similarities lies the larger similarity they
project in their appeals for "correction." We have already seen how
this concept of correctness is at work in Delia; it is the initial
rhetorical position seen in that work. Likewise we see in Rosamond's entrance a plea for correctness, which is now, however, referred to as Justice. Rosamond feels that she deserves a better fate, a rest from her suffering. Both speakers, Rosamond and Daniel (Daniel in two roles— that of the preface writer and that of the speaker in the sonnets), have in mind a corrected vision of experience, a re-ordering that will accomplish a peace of mind and spirit. They both see a sufficiency of effort or something that will suffice. Rosamond, like the speaker before her in the sonnets, make reference to the act of writing whereby something may be saved from "oblivion." Both plead for a re-organization of experience and feeling into a form which will merit a salvation of sorts, a form brought to life through a thoughtful speaker. It would seem that both speakers are concerned with that interior voice that pleads for a re-adjustment of itself. Both speakers must find a voice, a voice which will approximate those things "utter'd to my selfe" and in so doing "forme my case, and register my wrong." Rosamond's distress is in a certain way the same as that of the writer of the preface. As Smith observes, "She is in distress rather because of her obscurity, both when alive and kept secretly in the labyrinithine castle by her royal lover, and now after death, forgotten and unpitied." In this way, the speaker of Rosamond is imitating the speaker of Delia. She has seen a rhetorical

---
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position and approximates it to her own stance. Rosamond has perceived a resemblance of things "Ideal" to "Real." By doing so, Rosamond displays a perceptiveness and thoughtfulness long before the casket episode.

This idea of preservation from the "wrongs" of obscurity is again sounded near the poem's conclusion when Rosamond says:

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.  

11. 722-728.

Rosamond herself seems to have connected Petrarchan themes first sounded in Delia with those of the complaint. Smith again catches the flavor:

In general tone the Mirror poems had something in common with Petrarchan sonnets, which often resolved themselves into small and systematic complaints on the subject of love. The assumed speaker and listener relationship in the ghost-complaint may well have had something to do with the transformation and exploitation of this relationship in the sonnet cycles. At any rate, the pioneer in the new kind of complaint poem, Samuel Daniel, draws a connection between his sonnets to Delia and his Complaint of Rosamond.39

Joan Rees makes an acute point when she says that there are many passages reminiscent of Delia in Rosamond. She comments on a passage which she believes is full of Petrarchan sentiment, but which is mouthed

39Smith, p. 103.
by "the sinful monster [the matron] suborned to corrupt Rosamond's morals." 40

Thou must not thinke thy flowre can alwayes flourish,
And that thy beautie will be still admired:
But that those rayes which all these flames doe nourish,
Canceld with Time, will have their date expyred,
And men will scorne what now is so desired:
Our frailtyes doome is written in the flowers,
Which florish now and fade ere many howers.

ll. 239-245.

The point I believe Daniel is making is consistent with his ambivalence of attitude. He demonstrates how the carpe diem theme of Petrarchanism can be put to shameful uses by shameful people. This possibly might indicate a feeling on Daniel's part that rhetoric itself was neutral; only when placed within character did it assume a moral quality. 41

In discussing the poetic speaker in Delia, we dealt with Daniel once removed. Daniel worked through a voice. In Rosamond, it would appear Daniel has removed himself even farther. He presents a "lost soul" who speaks through the poetic speaker in Delia. Rees understands that they are the same speaker, but this really tells us little. 42 The question that should be phrased is what is Daniel

40Rees, p. 38.

41Zocca points out in his Elizabethan Narrative Poetry, p. 70, that Daniel seems to have made a serious attempt at linking Delia to Rosamond. He concludes, however, that the linkage is tenuous because of the "familiar ghost convention." While Zocca sees the spirit of a Renaissance Sonneteer at work in Lodge's complaint, The Tragical Complaint of Elstred, he is unable to see this stylistic quality in Daniel.

42Rees, p. 34.
trying to demonstrate in having the same speaker offer us two separate and different worlds of thought? This total attitude is referred to as his "style," but that style belongs to one poetic speaker, whom we feel to be both eloquent and thoughtful. Initially, that speaker offered his "world of ideas" seen in Petrarchan terms. That same speaker then offers another "world of ideas" that would seem to speak back in The Complaint of Rosamond. In the combined poems of Delia and Rosamond we are faced with a duality of sorts, yet the disquieting encounter of duality is soothed by the ever-reassuring voice of the poetic speaker. In these two poems, we hear everywhere a human, thoughtful and highly responsive voice guiding us through a series of discoveries toward the inner depths of the "soul."

The directed energy of Rosamond is inward, moving carefully on an inward journey that seeks that place beneath the conscious, the reverie of repose beneath Daniel's stylistic experiment. Whereas Daniel has his poetic speaker experiment with the Petrarchan tradition in Delia and its idealizations of love, pure, distant and aloof, in Rosamond the love is "Attended with my shame that never sleepes, / The spot wherewith my kinde, and youth did stain it."

The fact that Daniel "brings tragic conflict for the first time into union with Renaissance erotic narrative and medieval 'com-

43Gaston Bachelard observes this same phenomenon as it occurs as a motif in literature in his The Poetics of Reverie, pp. 57-95. See also, Erich Auerbach, Dante: Poet of the Secular World, pp. 24ff.
plaint"44 should not be overlooked. The appeal of the impure love entices as do "passions of my youth." Both awaken reactions in an audience and in so doing create an eagerness for more facts. In Delia the poetic speaker presents this audience with the discovery of how to adjust or adapt a series of parts, the sonnets, into a total attitude which was perceived to emerge recurrently throughout Delia. In Rosamond, the audience is presented with a total attitude of the speaker and is called upon to witness the adjustment of parts, plot, character, theme, as they are adjusted from the vantage of this total attitude.

I believe one way of reinforcing this statement is through an examination of one of the most interesting aspects of Daniel's poetry: the manner in which he submerges and underlays classical myth, symbol, and imagery in the totality of his work. When Seronsy addresses himself to this concern he notes that whenever Daniel uses classical myth, it is closely integrated with the total design of his work, and not mere "excrescence." Daniel's allusions to classical mythology are few and where they occur they are usually well assimilated into the fabric of the poem, as in the Actaeon myth in the "fifth sonnet or the casket episode in Rosamond."45 When this submerged imagery is placed within the light of what Rees sees as a "psychological subtlety," a larger perspective may be gained. An

44Seronsy, p. 35.
45Seronsy, p. 168.
example of this larger perspective can be seen in Wells's treatment of what he terms the "Sunken Image." Wells feels that there is a large group of images which does not convey a definite picture yet powerfully affects the imagination.46 In this area of "sunken imagery," Wells says, "Among his fellow poets Daniel ranks here the highest. Though Daniel is by no means severe he is seldom bold."47 Wells sees that this type of imagery is of special interest because of the way it "invigorates, elevates and ennobles the language" and because it is especially appropriate to the poetry of Samuel Daniel and William Wordsworth.48

With these thoughts in mind about "submerged" or "sunken" imagery, it is possible to enlarge this idea to include both symbol and myth and to show how all three work together to produce a new awareness of the poetic technique used in Rosamond. The casket scene in The Complaint of Rosamond provides us with an opportunity to view all three elements working quietly to present us with a powerful and intricate key which may unlock this new awareness of Daniel's style.

It has been seen that Rosamond is a much more unified work than some critics have suggested. Ira Clark states that critics have been unaware of its unity because they have "overlooked the meaning

47Wells, p. 77.
48Wells, p. 227.
of the celebrated casket.\textsuperscript{49} The critics have overlooked the casket because they "have assumed it [the casket] to be primarily a redaction of the history of Rosamond Clifford, Henry II's mistress."\textsuperscript{50} Clark's approach to Rosamond is interesting in that it is accurate as far as it goes. He understands that the casket is a metaphor of Rosamond, the speaker, but insists that

\begin{quote}
... the picture on the casket, is a retelling of the myth of Io in terms of English history in order to inculcate the moral that the sin of lustful prostitution, particularly when adulterous, results in self-metamorphosis into a beast.\textsuperscript{51}
\end{quote}

This idea of Clark's portrays a dangerous, if not alarming, perversion of both myth and symbol. It would be interesting to see what Clark does with the rest of the Io story.\textsuperscript{52} Given what we feel is a thoughtful, humane, and understanding voice, it does not appear likely that this same voice would engage in obvious "moralizing." The purpose of Rosamond on one level is to forgive and not forget.

Clark is correct, though, about the heart of the complaint being Rosamond's perception about the casket. Rosamond says of Io and Jove:

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{49}Ira Clark, "Samuel Daniel's 'Complaint of Rosamond'," Renaissance Quarterly, XXIII (1970), 152.
\textsuperscript{50}Clark, p. 152.
\textsuperscript{51}Clark, p. 152.
\textsuperscript{52}There is much of Ovid's tale of Io which is ignored by Clark. Clark has seen the middle of the Io story as its end which, of course, it is not. Io is eventually redeemed and becomes Isis and rules the underworld with Osiris. See also, Joseph Campbell, The Mask of God: Primitive Mythology, pp. 424ff.
\end{center}
These presidents presented to my view,
Wherein the presage of my fall was showne:
Might have fore-warn'd me well what would ensue,
And others harmes have made me shunne mine owne;
But fate is not prevented though fore-knowne.
For that must hap decreed by heavenly powers,
Who worke our fall, yet make the fault still ours.

11. 407-413.

The main point of this speech by Rosamond is that she admits the powerlessness of resemblances. She says it does not do any good to have only that "fore-knowne" quality of seeming similarities. Rosamond would seem to have cast off those allegorical feelings of a moralizing nature.

If we backtrack to the submerged reference to Atalanta, we may see how she cast these resemblances off. Rosamond says:

Thus stood I ballanc'd equallie precize,
Till my fraile flesh did weigh me downe to sinne:
Till world and pleasure made me partialize,
And glittering pompe my vanitie did winne; 
When to excuse my fault my lusts beginne,
And impious thoughts alledg'd this wanton clause,
That though I sinn'd, my sinne had honest cause.

So well the golden balles cast downe before me,
Could entertaine my course, hinder my way:
Whereat my rechlesse youth stooping to store me,
Lost me the gole, the glory, and the day.
Pleasure had set my wel-skoold thoughts to play,
And bade me use the vertue of mine eyes,
For sweetly it fits the fayre to wantonise.

11. 351-364.

The point Rosamond makes is that the balance she sought to maintain "did weigh me downe to sinne" because of her flesh, her body. Then did "impious thoughts" offer her a rationalization that her "sinne had honest cause." In the very next line she refers to Atalanta with
"golden balles cast downe before me." Her use of this reference reflects her rationalization that she had "honest cause." She is seeing herself as Atalanta at this moment. She has picked up those golden balls as we pick up the wind and water-rounded stones on the shore. She is carefully rolling them in her hand. She is deriving the same pleasure we would derive. The gesture Rosamond makes is the gesture of warm well-being, a well-being which comes from the pleasure she derives from her "self-awareness" in the Atalanta myth, a well-rounded, much turned over idea. With this old idea she is aware and comfortable with herself. She is engaged in play. The rhythm of this entire stanza is playful as is seen in lines such as "Lost me the gole, the glory and the day." The polished quality suggests the mutually supporting rhythms at work. Rosamond is not only self-aware at this point but also self-confident.

Thus wrought to sinne, soone was I traind from court,  
To a solitary Grange there to attend  
The time the King should thether make resort,  
Where he loves long-desired work should end.  
Thether he daily messages doth send,  
With costly jewels orators of love:  
Which (ah too well men know) doe women move.  
11. 365-371.

Rosamond displays self-confidence with such a phrase as "Thus wrought to sinne." How lightly she dismisses everything that went before. She immerses herself in the comfort of the king's "daily messages," "costly jewels." She voices the almost humorous interjection of "(ah too well men know)." The confidence she holds in such an interjection is quickly re-inforced. One of the king's presents has a
message. As Rosamond elaborates upon the casket, her confidence undergoes a slow, very quiet change. It is as if one of those polished stones she so quickly picked up has a sharp point, which she then begins to explore. She explodes that jaggedness into her being as she turns it ever so deftly waiting for the exact place where its significance will arise. As she continues to the stanza we had previously discussed, "These presidents," she wanders through those worlds of similarities. They offer little pleasure now. How relatively quickly Daniel has Rosamond run through the comfortable similarities and paradoxes of the Petrarchan world of "fire in water, heate in teares"--all miracles of the articulate lover. Then, and only then, does Daniel have Rosamond say: "This having viewed and therewith something moved." Rosamond is now experiencing the other side of the world of resemblances--the painful side. The polished stone with a jagged point is all jagged point--a stone chipped and tormented. The round "golden balles" have turned to figures "within other squares." The sharpness of the pained resemblance is "kept with jealous eyes." Now when we read the "perception scene" we see that Rosamond is about to leave the world of similarities and move on towards a truer perception of existence.

For Rosamond the emblems have lost their power. As vividly as these classical myths represent reality, they do not resemble it. The sufficiency of meaning on the casket has been surpassed. The roundness of her well-being has become the square of un-well-being.
The deformed figure of Io "has turn'd to a Heiffer" in order to represent Io. As Merleau-Ponty points out:

The etching gives us sufficient indices, unequivocal means for forming an idea of the thing represented that does not come from the icon itself; rather, it arises in us as it is 'occasioned.' The magic of intentional species--the old idea of effective resemblance as suggested by mirrors and paintings--loses its final argument if the entire potency of a painting is that of a text to be read, a text totally free of promissucity between the seeing and the seen.53

Rosamond says:

I sawe the sinne wherein my foote was entring,
I sawe how that dishonour did attend it,
I sawe the shame whereon my flesh was ventring,
Yet had I not the powre for to defend it;
So weake is sence when error hath condemn'd it:
We see what's good, and thereto we consent us;
But yet we choose the worst, and soone repent us.

Rosamond says that even though she has seen, she is still powerless. She has perceived, but perception is no defense. Rosamond joins with us, her readers, when she says "We see what's good, and thereto consent us; / But yet we choose the worst, and soone repent us." Rosamond increases the dimensionality of the poem when she includes us, her listeners. She further increases the dimensionality of myth when she offers:

And now I come to tell the worst of ilnes,
Now drawes the date of mine affliction neere:
Now when the darke had wrapt up all in stillnes
And dreadfull blacke, had dispossess'd the cleere:

Com'd was the night, mother of sleepe and feare,
Who with her sable mantle friendly covers,
The sweet-stolne sports, of joyful meeting Lovers.
11. 428-434.

I believe the situation is this: Rosamond is trying to convey the idea that the "sweet-stoln sport," Love, sex or whatever is a temporary stay against that "dreadfull blacke... mother of sleepe and feare." I think this passage has a larger significance than its local application to night. Rosamond herself is enlarging the idea of night. The imagery of Rosamond is no longer flat and framed in squares. It is now three-dimensional. The dark has enwrapped all in silence, a silence which is absent yet really present in its totality. Rosamond presents for us the silence and negation which surrounds maternally, mantling in friendly dimensions, the "sweet-stolne sports, of joyful meeting Lovers." How lyrically Rosamond has joined those expressions of duality we feel about ourselves. How different from "Care-charmer sleepe, sonne of the Sable night."

What we have witnessed is Daniel's ability to submerge his myth and imagery in order to present a much more abstract and conceptual account of thought processes at work. How Rosamond thinks is how she is. How she gets at perception is of importance, not necessarily what she perceives. The truth she offers is thought, her mind at work seen in the most intimate of terms. What Daniel has done through his poetic speaker is to resemble a mind thinking. As Merleau-Ponty says, "Resemblance is the result of perception, not its main-
spring."\textsuperscript{54} Through Rosamond Daniel presents an invitation to the unconscious level of a "dumb rhetoric." This rhetoric moves us as those silent emblems of thought move Rosamond to an occasion which permits her to feel she has temporarily reconciled the opposites of Death and Life, Male and Female, Sound and Silence.

I might add that I do not believe Rosamond sees herself in the icon; she sees only a "dummy," an outsidedness which she has every reason to believe can be seen by everyone else, too. The image she sees in the mirror of the icon is an effect of the "mechanics of things."\textsuperscript{55} If she recognizes herself in the image, if she thinks it resembles herself, it is her thought that presents the connection. The icon is not she; its power is limited by her own thought. The icon is for Daniel only an occasion of "dumb rhetoric," the way things can speak to ears that are eyes.

Ah beauty Syren, fayre enchanting good,  
Sweet silent rethorique of persuading eyes:  
Dombe eloquence, whose powre doth move the blood,  
More then the words, or wisdome of the wise:  
Still harmonie, whose diapason lyes  
Within a brow, the key which passions move;  
To ravish sence, and play a world in love.  

11. 120-126.

Rosemond Tuve suggests that this passage demonstrates an understanding that the "element that was seen as rhetorical in poetry was this conscious penetration into men's faculties with such power that they

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{54}Merleau-Ponty, p. 265.
\item \textsuperscript{55}Merleau-Ponty, p. 264.
\end{itemize}
could not choose but be moved."\textsuperscript{56} She also points out that the last image in this passage is "a 'metaphysical conceit' from an unjustly neglected 'conventional' and 'prosaic' poet."\textsuperscript{57} However, while Tuve is able to integrate many of Wells's ideas within her treatment of imagery, she fails to incorporate the "sunken image" so often found in Daniel's poetry.

Within this area of "dumb eloquence" and the Io myth Daniel presents a larger and subtler world. When we look back to the opening of the poem and Rosamond's initial plea for a voice, it appears that Rosamond presents a plea similar to Io's; moreover the pattern of Rosamond's tale is similar to Ovid's. In Ovid's tale, Jove falls in love with Io, secludes her from Juno's sight and in an attempt to save her from Juno's wrath, once Jove realizes her suspicions, turns her into a heifer. Argos, who had fifty pairs of eyes, is sent by Juno to guard her. After Mercury slays Argos, Juno sends insects to drive Io throughout the world. Ovid then goes into a long description of Io's real torment: her inability to speak. Inachus, Io's father, discovers that the heifer is Io because she is able to write the letters of her name with her hoof, I O. Inachus's plea to Jove and Jove's plea to Juno finally persuade Juno to return her to her former state. Ovid details the transformation back to human form:


\textsuperscript{57}Tuve, p. 419.
... Fugiunt e corpore saetae, 
cornu descrescunt, fit lumnis artior orbis, 
contrahit rictus, redeuntumerique manesque, 
ungulaque in quinos d'lapsa absumitur ungues. 
De bove nil superset, formae nisi candor, in illa. 
Officio pedum nympha contenta duorum 
erigitur; metuitque loqui, ne more juvencae 
mugiat, et timide verba intermissa retemptat. 
Metamorphoses 11. 739-746. 58

The accent Ovid places is "verba intermissa retemptat" or "she tries again her lost speech." The myth itself is said to correspond to the emergence of the female ego or as Ong sees it, reflected in Neumann's The Origins and History of Consciousness, "the freeing of the captive (liberation of the ego from the endogamous kinship, libido and emergence of the higher femininity, with woman now as person, anima-sister, related positively to ego consciousness)." 59

The Io myth organizes and unifies the various elements of Daniel's Rosamond: the female speaker, the use of isolation, the casket, the labyrinth and lastly the moment when Rosamond views her own dead face and reports Henry's eloquent and moving lines.

58Charles William Dunmore, ed. Selections from Ovid (New York: David McKay Co., 1963), p. 29. I offer my translation: the bristles of her body left, the horns withdrew, the large eyes became smaller, the jaws narrowed, the shoulders returned, again she had hands, and toes and fingers, nothing remained of the cow but its shining whiteness. She stands upon her own two feet; a return to the nymph. She still fears her voice to be a bellowing and with timidity gains intermittently her words again. Another translation is available in Ovid, Metamorphoses, trans. by Rolfe Humphries (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1955).

Judge those whom chaunce deprives of sweetest treasure,
What tis to lose a thing we hold so deare:
The best delight, wherein our soule takes pleasure,
The sweet of life, that penetrates so neare.
What passions feeles that hart, inforc'd to beare
The deepe impression of so strange a sight?
Tongue, pen, nor art, can never shew aright.

Amaz'd he standes, nor voyce nor body steares,
Words had no passage, teares no issue found:
For sorrow shut up words, wrath kept in teares,
Confus'd affects each other doe confounde:
Oppress'd with griefe his passions had no bounde:
Striving to tell his woes, wordes would not come;
For light cares speake, when mightie griefes are dombe.

At length extremitie breaks out a way,
Through which th'imprisoned voice with teares
Wayles out a sound that sorrowes doe bewray:
With armes a crosse and eyes to heaven bended,
Vauporing out sighes that to the skyes ascended.
Sighes, the poore ease calamitie affords,
Which serve for speech when sorrow wanteth words.

0 heavens (quoth he) why doe myne eyes behold,
The hatefull rayes of this unhappy sonne?
Why have I light to see my sinnes controld,
With blood of mine owne shame thus vildly donne?
How can my sight endure to looke thereon?
Why doth not blacke eternall darknes hide,
That from myne eyes my hart cannot abide?

What saw my life, wherein my soule might joy?
What had my dayes, whom troubles still afflicted?
But onely this, to counterpoize annoy,
This joy, this hope, which death hath interdicted:
This sweete, whose losse hath all distresse inflicted.
This that did season all my sowre of life,
Vext still at home with broyles, abroade in strife.
Vext stiyl at home with broyles, abrode in strife,
Dissentin in my blood, jarres in my bed:
Distrust at boord, suspecting still my life,
Spending the night in horror, dayes in dred;
Such life hath tyrants, and thys lyfe I led.
These myseries goe mask'd in glittering showes,
Which wisemen see, the vulgar little knowes.

Thus as these passions doe him over-whelme,
He drawes him neere my bodie to behold it:
And as the Vine maried unto the Elme
With strict imbraces, so doth he infold it;
And as he in hys carefull armes doth hold it,
Viewing the face that even death commendes,
On senselesse lips, millions of kysses spends.

Pittifull mouth (quoth he) that living gavest
The sweetest comfort that my soule could wish:
0 be it lawfull now, that dead thou havest,
Thys sorrowing farewell of a dying kisse.
And you fayre eyes, containers of my blisse,
Motives of love, borne to be matched never:
Entomb'd in your sweet circles sleepe for ever.

Ah how me thinks I see death dallying seekes,
To entertaine it selfe in loves sweet place:
Decayes Roses of discoloured cheekes,
Doe yet retaine deere notes of former grace:
And ougly death sits faire within her face;
Sweet remnants resting of vermilion red,
That death it selfe, doubts whether she be dead.

Wonder of beautie, oh receive these plaints,
The obsequies, the last that I shall make thee:
For loe my soule that now already faints,
(That lov'd thee lyving, dead will not forsake thee,)
Hastens her speedy course to over-take thee.
Ile meete my death, and free my selfe thereby,
For ah what can he doe that cannot die?
Yet ere I die, thus much my soule doth vow,
Revenge shall sweeten death with ease of minde:
And I will cause posterity shall know,
How faire thou wert above all women kind.
And after ages monuments shall find,
Shewing thy beauties title not thy name,
Rose of the world that sweetned so the same.

11. 617-693.

In presenting Rosamond's corpse and Henry's reaction, Daniel locates that aspect of perception that is seen in Hamlet as "That which would be spoke to."

Daniel ends Rosamond as he had ended Delia:

But ah the worlde hath heard too much of those,
My youth such errors must no more disclose.
Ile hide the rest, and greeve for what hath beene,
Who made me knowne, must make me live unsee ne.

Daniel's speaker makes the same statement as he had in Delia.

"I say no more, I feare I saide too much."

The performances of Daniel's speaker have been very similar to each other and yet different. A sense of continuity is created in both works through each speaker's choice of a rhetoric, sweet, subtle, simple, and modest. When we recall the passages already cited in this discussion, especially lines 239-245 on page 90, we may agree that a Petrarchan diction is heard to echo throughout Rosamond. The physical length of Rosamond mirrors that of Delia. Daniel's choice of classical myth, as seen in Ovid's tale of Io, finds a male counterpart in the Actaeon myth in sonnet V. We have noted that the preface includes both poems. Daniel's rhetorical performances seem to suggest that the "Rhetorical clearly occupies an intermediary stage between
the unconscious and conscious. In this edition of Delia and The Complaint of Rosamond (1592a), Daniel has presented both sides of the stylistic coin—imposed order and discovered order. In Delia his speaker is able to impose on a fragmented body of materials of thought an order which approximates his own unique vision of the world: in Rosamond this same speaker is called upon to voice a discovery of an inevitable order (fate, chance, etc.) in much the same way that the carpenter is said to discover within the wood with which he works with the slumbering forms. In the total performance, Daniel appears

60 Ong, pp. 11ff.


A cabinetmaker's apprentice, someone who is learning to build cabinets and the like, will serve as an example. His learning is not mere practice, to gain facility in the use of tools. Nor does he merely gather knowledge about the customary forms of the things he is to build. If he is to become a true cabinetmaker, he makes himself answer and respond above all to the different kinds of wood and to the shapes slumbering within wood—to wood as it enters into man's dwelling with all the hidden riches of its nature. In fact, this relatedness to wood is what maintains the whole craft. Without that relatedness, the craft will never be anything but empty busywork, any occupation with it will be determined exclusively by business concerns. Every handicraft, all human dealings are constantly in that danger. The writing of poetry is no more exempt from it than is thinking.

to have reconciled these two opposites within the humane, thoughtful, intelligent and sympathetic voice of his poetic speaker.

Moreover, within this reconciliation of stylistic opposites is a suggestion of another sort of reconciliation: that of the Platonic and Aristotelian principles of mimesis. In Delia the direction is toward the Ideal as suggested not only by the anagram but also by the manner in which the speaker displays the idea and essence of Petrarchism; in Rosamond, the speaker is invoked to "forme" and "register," to select and present, incidents that imitate an action—that "form" being the presiding principle which determines both the internal elements and the adjustment of the speaker's voice to an appropriate tone and pitch. Daniel has accomplished the Horation aim of the poet who combines "the useful and the pleasing," thus both "instructing and delighting the reader."63

Finally, a poem of Wallace Stevens, "Final Soliloquy of the Interior Paramour," sums up what I believe Daniel finds as a sufficient performance in Rosamond:


63 Horace, Art of Poetry in Criticism: the Major Texts ed. by Walter Jackson Bate (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1952), p. 56. I would also suggest that Daniel had seen Sir Philip Sidney's Apologie for Poetry in manuscript form. This would further re-inforce the unification of the Platonic, Aristotelian and Horatian theories of mimesis.
Here, now, we forget each other and ourselves.
We feel the obscurity of an order, a whole,
A knowledge, that which arranged the rendezvous.

Within its vital boundary, in the mind.
We say God and the imagination are one . . .
How high that highest candle lights the dark.

Out of this same light, out of the central mind,
We make a dwelling in the evening air,
In which being there together is enough.

---

CHAPTER IV

"A SPEAKING PICTURE OF THE MIND"

Throughout the previous discussions of Delia and Rosamond, the major concern has been the performances of Daniel's poetic speaker. These performances have appeared to be eloquent, honest, and persuasive. This persuasiveness, however, seems to derive its power from a method or technique other than that which is normally associated with oratory. It has been suggested that behind these eloquent and honest performances lies a kind of poetry that not only puts forth in words or statements what is overtly or covertly intended to be communicated, but also brings Daniel's thinking process into the open—in Coleridge's words, "the mind's own reflections." Joan Rees sees this persistent and pervasive presence of mind to lie on the reverse side of Daniel's virtues. She clarifies this reverse side when she states, "Sometimes he allowed the thinking process to absorb him to the exclusion of all else..." 1 This process of thought, whatever else it defects, is not oratorical in tone or even remotely connected to oratory, but rather is rhetorical, rhetorical in the sense that it is persuasive as it becomes and happens to be

truth for the poet and thinker, Daniel.²

What is implied in the phrase "as it becomes and happens to be truth for the poet"? Certainly it is essential to reflect, for a moment, upon the particular notion of truth which is here in question. Because this idea of truth as "unconcealedness" differs from the conventional idea of truth as "correctness of proposition" and because an understanding of this difference is central to my concluding remarks, I will trace in some detail Heidegger's argument as it relates to thinking and language.

Heidegger begins his remarks on language in the following fashion:

We would reflect on language itself, and on language only. Language itself is -- language and nothing else besides. Language itself is language. The understanding that is schooled in logic, thinking of everything in terms of calculation and hence usually overbearing, calls this proposition an empty tautology. Merely to say the identical thing twice -- language is language -- how is that supposed to get us anywhere? But we do not want to get anywhere. We would like only, for once, to get to just where we are already.³

The point that Heidegger makes in this paragraph is that we should think about language as that which it is, not as that which it is.


³Heidegger, p. 190.
not; i.e., logic. To begin to think about language, we should strip away the "overbearing" aspect of logic and "calculation." Heidegger then asks, "In what way does language occur as language"? He answers his own question, "Language speaks." ⁴

Heidegger continues:

To reflect on language thus demands that we enter into the speaking of language in order to take up our stay with language, i.e., within its speaking, not within our own. Only in this way do we arrive at the region within which it may happen -- or also fail to happen -- that language will call to us from there and grant us its nature. We leave the speaking to language. We do not wish to ground language in something else that is not language itself, nor do we wish to explain other things by means of language. ⁵

Heidegger's point here is that if we make language that which it is not; i.e., reason, we may spend our time trying to discover what reason is by using language. We have returned to language merely to say what reason is and with our glance aimed at reason, we fall into an "abyss." We must return to a statement which allows us to "hover over the abyss as long as we endure what it says"; i.e., "Language is language." ⁶

Heidegger continues this line of thinking with these words:

Language is -- language, speech. Language speaks. If we let ourselves fall into the abyss denoted by this sentence, we do not go tumbling into emptiness. We fall upward, to a height. Its loftiness opens up a depth. The two span a realm in which we would like to become at home, so as to find a residence, a

---

⁴Heidegger, p. 190.

⁵Heidegger, pp. 190-191.

⁶Heidegger, p. 191.
dwelling place for the life of man.\textsuperscript{7}

To reflect on language means -- to reach the speaking of language in such a way that this speaking takes place as that which grants an abode for the being of mortals.

Heidegger reminds us that the current view declares that speech is the activation of the organs for sounding and hearing. There are three characteristics of language that Heidegger feels are taken for granted: "First and foremost, speaking is expression. The idea of speech as an utterance . . . already presupposes the idea of something internal that utters or externalizes itself. . . . Secondly, speech is regarded as an activity of man. . . . Finally, human expression is always presentation and representation of the real and the unreal."\textsuperscript{9} Heidegger attacks the concept of speech as "human performance" by alluding to the "opening of the Prologue of the Gospel of St. John, in the beginning the Word was with God." Heidegger feels that this Gospel is not only an attempt to free the question of origin of language from the "fetters of a rational-logical explanation but also to set aside the limits of a merely logical description of language."\textsuperscript{10} Finally, Heidegger concludes this section of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{7}Heidegger, pp. 191-192.
\item \textsuperscript{8}Heidegger, p. 192.
\item \textsuperscript{9}Heidegger, p. 192.
\item \textsuperscript{10}Heidegger, pp. 192-193.
\end{itemize}
his argument by summarizing that "no one would dare to declare incorrect, let alone reject as useless, the identification of language as audible utterance of inner emotions, as human activity, as a representation by image and by concept."

The last perception which Heidegger offers is, I believe, of particular importance with respect to Daniel's poetry. "The opposite of what is purely spoken, the opposite of the poem, is not prose. Pure prose is never 'prosaic.' It is as poetic and hence as rare as poetry." Heidegger offers these three final points before closing his argument:

Man speaks only as he responds to language.
Language speaks.
Its speaking speaks for us in what has been spoken.

In this way Heidegger presents his view that "Truth, as the clearing and concealing of what is, happens in being composed, as a poet composes a poem," and that "Poetry is the saying of the unconcealedness of what is."

In Daniel I believe we have found a poet who "allowed the thinking process to absorb him to the exclusion of all else. . ." and gave voice to this thinking. As he did so, he revealed that which

---

16Rees, p. 172.
was very much a part of him, a thinking, searching mind.

Through this rather long excursus I hope I have revealed what may be called the atmosphere of thinking which surrounds Daniel's particular style, his recurring choices in organization, imagery, syntax, diction. I have sought to demonstrate that Daniel's poetry presents habits of the mind through certain rhetorical signals, a mind given in this case to a multi-layered sense of decorum. By this, I mean a sense of decorum which operates simultaneously at several levels, or in Heidegger's terms, a state of mind which is capable of reflecting a thought process which responds and recalls—a mind which has gone beyond representing or explaining and has assumed a position which co-responds, "which appealed to in the world's being by the world's being, answers within itself to that appeal." This multi-layered sense of decorum differs from the conventional Renaissance meaning of "decorum" in that this multi-layered decorum has more to do with the mind's activity to find what is proper to its activity than the conventional Renaissance meaning of decorum which has more to do with a proper action or mode of conduct. I have sought to demonstrate this rather difficult and abstract, multi-layered sense of decorum by calling our attention to the events surrounding the publication of the 1592 edition of Delia.

In Delia we observed the performance of a speaker who reflects

what I believe to be the more outward operation of this multi-
layered decorum. This outward operation emerges specifically
through Daniel's preface to this 1592 edition of Delia and the
relationship which this preface presents to his predecessor, Sidney,
and through the ambivalence which surrounded Newman's pirated 1591
edition of Astrophel and Stella. It is Daniel's speaker who breaks
that silence, the silence implied by the author's lack of opportunity
to speak as himself in the pirated edition, and calls attention to
himself as he emerges, in his preface, to speak. "... I rather
desired to keep in the private passions of my youth, from the
multitude, as things uttered to my selfe, and consecrated to
silence . . . ."18 We may better understand the dimensions of this
emergence when we couple Daniel's reluctance to speak sensed in the
"thrust out into the worlde . . . forced to appeare rawly in publique"19
with Joan Rees' judgment that

The consideration of Daniel's hesitations and uncertainties
may lead us a long way into his characteristic attitudes. He
was, above all, a man incapable of a single view: he saw his
subjects from many angles. Sometimes this leads to weakness,
a deflated poetry very depressing to the imagination. On the
other hand it can issue in a rich reflectiveness.20

What Rees calls "hesitation" may well be a part of Daniel's actual
manner of responding to "the call." Like Heidegger's poet (thinker),

18Samuel Daniel, Poems and A Defence of Ryme, ed. by Arthur
Colby Sprague, Phoenix Books (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,

19Sprague, p. 9.

20Rees, p. 173.
Daniel's speaker also appears to be responding to some call. This call can be heard in the way Daniel addresses himself to what he feels is an injustice: "But this wrong was not onely doone to mee, but to him whose unmatchable lines have indured the like misfortune." An injustice has been committed, and it pleads for redress. It is profitable if we recall at this time Heidegger's comments about the thought process which responds and recalls.

I have suggested that the preface to Delia, like some of Daniel's later prefaces, is more than a mere "convention." I do not mean that at one level it is not a "conventional" plea for patronage and understanding, but rather that along with this "conventional" level there exists another level at which can be heard an "authentic" voice, or as Heidegger terms it, that which is "spoken purely." When we become able to recognize these qualities in Daniel's preface, we may see the preface become vital, and in some sense share in that which may be described as "poetic." In this way the preface not only follows the established rules for prefaces of the English Renaissance, but it also opens to us, its readers, a thinking process. The thinking process reveals itself as it recalls the past—for Daniel the illicit publication of Newman's editions, Petrarch and his imitators, and most likely the unauthorized citation of others as well.

21 Sprague, p. 9


23 These would include the preface to Philotas, the dedicatory sonnet to Musophilus, "To the Reader" (1607).
notably Sir Philip Sidney—and commits itself at a very real level to open itself to that which it would become: "I am forced to publish that which I never ment." 24 In other words Daniel sees a similarity between the performances of his predecessors and his own performance, yet simultaneously he also sees how his performance is destined to contain his own personal working out of "conventional" ideas, themes, conceits, in a unique search for the Ideal (Delia). As C. S. Lewis points out, Daniel "actually thinks in verse; thinks deeply, arduously." 25 It is this seriousness of thought that I believe is present in his preface and throughout Delia. Each sonnet, therefore, becomes a serious re-expression (a re-expression since these ideas had been expressed before) of Petrarchan commonplaces as they became known (or unconcealed) to his poetic speaker. In other words, Daniel's speaker reflects not only what he feels to be the truth of a particular Petrarchan idea, but also his own thought process as he arrives at his own poetic truth as it emerges from the occasion of a particular Petrarchan idea. In this manner Daniel's sonnets present the acts of speaking and thinking as they are united in his speaker's confrontation of the convention.

The importance of Delia to Daniel's development is that within the performance of his poetic speaker Daniel is able to accomplish both the public goal of patronage and public praise and the private

24 Sprague, p. 9.

goal of poetic truth. The fact that Daniel did win continued patronage and public praise re-inforced his vision of the Ideal speaker who could maintain both public and private postures. In this way the anagramatic title, Delia, becomes even more suitable in that as it presents the name of a "private passion" made public, it also contains within this public level a private value which through the individual reader's re-arrangement becomes Ideal.

In Rosamond, Daniel brings another kind of historical situation into being. In selecting Rosamond, he reflects, according to Rees, the "Elizabethan interests in pageantry, in poetry, and in patriotism." To this selection of character and event, he applies an outward covering of historical elements which may be described as causal and narrative. At this historical level, Daniel's speaker presents the causes for Rosamond's fall and, in so doing tells her story. Daniel's speaker hopes that through presenting her story he may persuade his listeners to remember, to criticize, and perhaps to forgive Rosamond. But this also proved to be an exercise in deepening self-reflection on the part of Daniel's own speaker. Rees remarks: "The Pembroke influence matured him as a poet and roused him to exert his intellect more fully in his poetry, and in so doing and in causing him to dig more deeply into himself, it brought into prominence ideas only partly realized before." According to Rees,

26Rees, p. 175.
27Rees, p. 175.
Daniel realized that:

Behind great names and great shows are thinking and feeling human beings and behind kings and nobles are the common people, their fortunes bound up with the lives and conduct of the great; behind poetry is life with its moral problems, its difficulty and complexity; behind patriotism is the truth of history— to glorify one's native land may not be a simple project but one must come to think of universal human nature, not of an age or a dynasty. The more elements in a situation he perceives the greater a truly great poet becomes: a man with a more fragile talent may find himself sorely tried by the many-sidedness of truth. 28

I believe that this realization operates throughout Daniel's description of Rosamond's fall at the level of the Platonic and the phenomenological. By Platonic I mean that there is a great emphasis placed on Rosamond's soul and her spiritual torment. (This emphasis upon the immortality of the soul along with the timelessness of her state of torment suggest what Paul Oskar Kristeller identifies as "typical Platonist doctrines." 29) I believe. Daniel also presents a phenomenological analysis of experience in that Rosamond is presented to us as she perceives and judges events as they occur before both her and us.

The two works, Delia and Rosamond, can be seen as complementary parts of a larger and more significant rhetorical organization. Daniel couples these two works and allows them to mirror each other; and in this activity juxtaposes two speaking worlds, one which strives for originality and openness in a traditional poetic form, the sonnet,

28 Rees, p. 175.

the other which strives to present traditional ideas and values in an original poetic form, the complaint, which had seen only limited service elsewhere. In this respect Delia can be said to delight; Rosamond to teach.

Isocrates stated long ago that "While we call eloquent those who are able to speak before a crowd, we regard as sage those who most skillfully debate their problem in their own minds." It is this quality of the skillful debate within one's own mind that we see so often appear in Daniel's poetry. It is also quite possible that what has been described as Daniel's "prosaic" quality is in reality the presence of this voice which speaks to, converses with, and listens to itself. I have maintained that such devices as "submerged imagery," "unusual syntax," "submerged metaphor," or "genitive metaphor," "ironic word play" have a cumulative effect. All point to a level of continuity and meaning below the rhetorical surface of the work itself.

The idea of one self talking to another self within the world of the poem does provide a general overall context in which we may better observe Daniel's poetic performances; for example, the verse epistles, Musophilus, and sections of the Civil Wars. Most

---


of Daniel's rhetorical traits point to a welcoming of a thought process as the basic activity of his poetry. To those readers who demand a distinct and clear-cut speaker, his poems may seem muted and removed. When Rees suggests in her conclusion that Daniel's works "reflect, no doubt, an amiable modesty, but is there not also in Daniel a fundamental insecurity, a hesitation, a failure of confidence at the crucial point," I believe she is suggesting that Daniel's poems point to types of performances which preoccupy themselves more with the continuation of a discourse within themselves than they do to an outside occasion. In a way, they speak for themselves, or to themselves, much as we sing in the shower or answer yesterday's insult in front of today's mirror. We, his thoughtful readers, are allowed to witness Daniel's showers and shaves. In many instances the lack of what we may call "dramatic" has prompted his critics to point out these interior performances in terms largely negative.

In order to avoid these traps of "negative" description, it is important that we permit ourselves to see Daniel's poetry as a poetic representation over oratorical persuasion. By this I mean that many of Daniel's rhetorical figures become meaningful only in the context of the larger gestures of a thinking presence of the poem in which these figures appear. An example of this can be seen in the confused syntax in the Chaucer section of Musophilus, (11. 147-182) which stresses ironically the confusion of the speaker's present age.

32 Rees, p. 172.
Another example may be seen in the imagery of the first four sonnets of \textit{Delia}. Not only does the genitive metaphor in these sonnets of \textit{Delia} support the presence of a subdued and moderate speaker, but it is able also to support an overall plan which called for a submersion of Petrarchan imagery from explicit statements to implied comparisons.

The major concern of this study has been to suggest that a rather demanding imaginative effort is needed to pursue and describe a style which Daniel was set on presenting. Daniel settled upon a style which adjusts and re-adjusts itself in a particularly distant yet engaged tone and which is far from the misleading description of "prosaic." At many levels of Daniel's imitative process we are called upon to witness the adjustments of his poetic speaker in a most thoughtful and sympathetic manner. Many of these positions are localized for us in terms which suggest a re-balancing, a re-correcting, a re-searching for a position that may once have been held.

We may be better directed to search out the "thinking" presence that appears in all of Daniel's best poetry rather than condemning this same poetry because it lacks a power traditionally ascribed to Renaissance poetry. In recalling Rosamond one senses that Daniel's best poetry has something to do with the voice's being an extension of the mind as well as a rhetorical verbalization of it. The dual activity of the extension of this active center within us, on the one hand, and of the dramatic excitement inherent in its portrayal and verbalization, on the other, is a continuing action in all of Daniel's
poetry. I believe that Daniel shaped his style at both the intuitive and the conscious levels in order to reflect that activity.

At the technical level, this same need to shape a style motivates the self-praising and self-blaming type of imitation we have been investigating, and the adoption of conventional rhetorical strategies, such as those embodied in the arguments of Delia, with the ultimate purpose of making them private, personal, and "directly expressive." The respect Daniel shows toward correctness is directed equally toward an inner "calm of mind," and his desire to imitate that balance as exactly as his knowledge of it permitted. All these factors contribute to our feeling that Daniel is often concerned with responding to an interior call rather than with poetic effect or even poetic expression. As readers, we may be reluctant to address ourselves to that area from which Daniel's speaker is presented because of its indefiniteness or because of those qualities which Heidegger ascribes to his concept of "dif-ference," and so we assume the easy posture of pointing to the poet standing apart from his creation. Daniel's concern with authenticity and correctness was an intensely personal trait, no doubt, but in its adoption of sober and muted tones, it offered Daniel an opportunity of establishing in poetry a vision of "thought" itself--"a speaking picture of the mind."
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