12-2020

Samuel Daniel's Lyric Reception: The Role of Poet-Critics from Wordsworth to Winters

Caleb McGhee
East Tennessee State University

Samuel Daniel's Lyric Reception: The Role of Poet-Critics from Wordsworth to Winters

_____

A thesis

presented to

the faculty of the Department of Literature and Language

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts in English

_____

by

Caleb A. McGhee

December 2020

_____

Dr. Joshua Reid, Chair

Dr. Jesse Graves

Dr. Shawna Lichtenwalner

Keywords: Samuel Daniel, lyric poetry, Romanticism, Modernism, reception

ABSTRACT

Samuel Daniel's Lyric Reception: The Role of Poet-Critics from Wordsworth to Winters

by

Caleb A. McGhee

The Elizabethan poet Samuel Daniel was popular in his day, producing lyric, dramatic, and narrative poems. Contemporary anthologies, however, memorialize him primarily as a lyric poet, one that usually gets few entries. My thesis shows how Daniel had a minor reputation as a lyric poet by the 1960's, despite having high-profile admirers. These well-known poet-critics who engaged with his work are essential to analyzing his lyric reputation: owing to the Romantic emphasis on the lyric, I begin with William Wordsworth and Samuel Taylor Coleridge's reception of his lyrics in the 19th century. I then analyze the turn of the century poet A.E. Housman's glowing praise and end with the lukewarm reception of two 20th century Modernists, T.S. Eliot and Yvor Winters. I argue that, despite the enthusiasm of Coleridge and Housman, his lyrics failed to attract enough admirers, in part contributing to the current status of these poems.

DEDICATION

To everyone who helped me come to this point in my education and made this thesis possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not be possible without the generosity and support of ETSU's Languages and Literature Department. I greatly appreciate everything my thesis committee has done to help me write this thesis: the assistance, comments, and input from Dr. Reid, Dr. Lichtenwalner, and Dr. Graves have been invaluable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT 2
DEDICATION 4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 5
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION 7
Daniel and His Current Lyric Reputation 7
The Centrality of the 19th Century 9
Daniel's Lyrics and the Poet-Critics 10
CHAPTER 2. WORDSWORTH, DANIEL, AND THE SONNET: A QUESTION OF FORM AND THEME 12
Wordsworth's Poetics and the Sonnet 13
Wordsworth's Sonnets, Delia, and Style 15
Wordsworth's Thematic Goals and his Non-Reception of Delia 19
CHAPTER 3. LANGUAGE AND LOGIC: COLERIDGE AND DANIEL'S PHILOSOPHICAL LYRICS 22
Testing Coleridge's Principles on Daniel's Lyrics 24
Comparing Coleridge and Daniel's Philosophical Lyrics 26
CHAPTER 4. SAMUEL DANIEL IN SHROPSHIRE: A.E. HOUSMAN AND "ULYSSES AND THE SIREN" 32
Housman's Thematic Affinities with Daniel's Poem 37
CHAPTER 5. DANIEL'S LYRICS WITH THE MODERNISTS: T.S. ELIOT AND YVOR WINTERS 42
Eliot's Non-Reception of Daniel's Lyrics 43
Winters's Negative Reception 45
Wintersian Aesthetics Against Daniel 47
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION 52
Connecting the Dots with the Poet-Critics 52
Consequences of their Reception 53
WORKS CITED 57
VITA 61

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Daniel and His Current Lyric Reputation

The Elizabethan poet Samuel Daniel (1562-1619) was quite popular in his day, publishing work in almost all the genres: sonnets, closet dramas, masques, epic poems, short poems, and even literary criticism. Literary lore names him as one of England's early poet laureates: Daniel's article in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature* opens by referencing "the claim (though questionable) that he succeeded Edmund Spenser in the unofficial role of England's poet laureate" (106). This claim is "questionable" because the office did not yet exist; Jon Thomas Rowland dashes the legend of Daniel as poet laureate in *Faint Praise and Civil Leer*: *The "Decline" of the Eighteenth-Century Panegyric* (22). Nonetheless, the existence of such a legend testifies to the man's popularity. Francis Meres, writing in his *Palladis Tamia*, a 1598 treatise on vernacular writers, ranks Daniel with poets like Shakespeare, Spenser, and Marlowe; he gives a few Latin lines that say that their works will live forever, the old benediction of immortality. In a way, Meres's pronouncement is correct for Daniel: his works exist in the year 2020, just like those of his contemporaries. His poems appear in anthologies, and his name is familiar to scholars of Elizabethan literature. However, he receives much less attention. Daniel was a court poet of high prominence, and Meres writes that the English language "is mightily enriched and gorgeously inuested in rare ornaments and resplendent abiliments" through the man's verse, going so far as to compare him to Ovid, Lucan, and Latin lyric poets. Nonetheless, his current standing is not in line with Meres's extravagant praises.

Samuel Daniel has survived into the present as a minor lyric poet. We have the testimony of the anthologies. John Williams's 1963 *English Renaissance Poetry*: *A Collection of Shorter Poems* only contains a few of the *Sonnets to Delia* and some short poems. The 1991 *New Oxford*

Book of English Verse gives a selection from *The Civil Wars*, but his sonnets and some selections from *Musophilus* get much more space. The latest edition of *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, published in 2018, gives him only a measly three sonnets. This is not to say that contemporary scholars have totally forgotten his non-lyric output. There are specialized studies on these works: Paulina Kewes treats Daniel's closet drama *The Tragedy of Cleopatra* in "'A Fit Memorial for the Times to Come..': Admonition and Topical Application in Mary Sidney's *Antonius* and Samuel Daniel's *Cleopatra*," and John Pitcher treats one of Daniel's masques in "Samuel Daniel's Masque *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*: Texts and Payments." Nonetheless, we can wager that the average reader will first encounter Daniel as a lyric poet in an anthology; the choices of various editors to preserve and emphasize his lyrics to the exclusion of other works shows that we collectively emphasize the lyric as the main form of poetry.

The matter of anthologization reflects a real fact of interpreting literature: our interpretations are not always formed in a complete vacuum. The choice to anthologize certain works and leave out others is a subtle but implicit judgment about a writer and their work; editors argue quiet cases about literary value to their readers. The choices of editors are not the only external matters influencing the prospective reader. We often receive not only a text but also its history of interpretation, the various readings that have come down throughout the years. Interpreting the text becomes just as much a matter of interpreting the interpretations. To interpret the interpreters then tells us about both the text itself and those who have read and wrestled with it. Whatever his status as a "minor" poet and appeal to the protean, mysterious "general reader," Samuel Daniel has always had a readership among some of the most well-regarded poets in the English language. Looking at his lyric poems in light of his readers does

the dual task of reception study: it gives us a better understanding of Daniel's poems as well as the later poets who engage with them.

The Centrality of the 19th Century

The 19th century makes an excellent beginning for examining how major English-language poets have dealt with Daniel's lyrics. The century was a watershed moment for the kind of poetry we value, the lyric taking a newfound prominence. It is a commonplace to say that the lyric was the favored Romantic poetic form, but such a general statement neglects forms like narrative or epic poems and verse dramas, which every major Romantic tried their hand at: Wordsworth wrote *The Prelude* in addition to his well-known lyrics, and Coleridge produced a few verse dramas along with well-known narratives like *Christabel*. Nonetheless, we can say that by the beginning of the 19th century, poets and critics were paying much more attention to the lyric. M.H. Abrams documents the lyric's rise to prominence in *The Mirror and the Lamp*; citing a wide range of 18th century critics, as well-known as Samuel Johnson and as obscure as Sir William Jones, he shows how the lyric became "poetic norm" owing to its association with emotional expression (84-8).

Abrams is not the only authority to give a nuanced take on the lyric's greater prominence in 19th century literary culture. Stuart Curran, in his 1985 *Poetic Form and British Romanticism*, situates the form in the context of a culture that "was mad for poetry" (15). He acknowledges that the boundary between forms like the epic, dramatic, and lyric are porous, though he gives examples of narrative and dramatic poems having lyrical features, something we might connect with Abrams's notion of the lyric as the norm in the 19th century (5). Nonetheless, he cannot help but note "the explosion of lyrical forms" among the Romantics, testifying to the mode's intense importance for the era (215). Virginia Jackson, in her 2008 article "Who Reads Poetry?" criticizes 20th century criticism's "caricature" of Romantic lyricism (183). However, she cannot

help but mention “an idealization of the lyric” that comes because of Romanticism (182). The 19th century emphasis on the lyric changed our perception of poetry: brief poems with an emphasis on emotion became the norm.

Daniel’s Lyrics and the Poet-Critics

From the 19th century and to the early 20th century, poet-critics specializing in the lyric engaged with Daniel’s work: these major poets and literary theorists at times take notice of Daniel’s lyric poems and at times ignore them. Daniel’s sonnets and short poems get everything from praise, to criticism, to outright neglect. These five significant poet-critics are William Wordsworth (1770-1850), Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834), A.E. Housman (1859-1936), T.S. Eliot (1888-1965), and Yvor Winters (1900-1968). These poets have large bodies of lyrical work, and they have left us their views of their predecessors in the form of treatises, essays, lectures, and personal letters. Scholars of Elizabethan literature have long acknowledged that Wordsworth and Coleridge engaged with Daniel’s work in general, but none have focused on Daniel’s lyric work; moreover, there has been a distinct lack of attention to Housman’s, Eliot’s, and Winters’s reception of Daniel as a lyric poet. Though these critics died decades and sometimes centuries before modern anthologies made Daniel a minor lyric poet, their reception of his short works are essential to understanding his position today. Despite some occasional great praise for his lyric works, and despite their remarks on his non-lyrical work often applying to his lyrics, they generally give Daniel’s short poems little notice. If Daniel’s short poems are generally neglected by some of the major poet-critics of the language, we can understand why he has a comparatively slight position today.

Analyzing how these five poets received Daniel’s lyric poems, along with considering the possibility of influence, does the twofold task of reception criticism. We gain a better understanding of Samuel Daniel’s work while also gaining a better understanding of his

interpreters: each poet is a lens through which we see Daniel's work, and Daniel himself is a lens through which we see a particular poet. We see how two first-generation Romantics received his sonnets and verse epistles; Wordsworth's personal writings and sonnets give us an implied reception of *Delia*; Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria* and conversation poems give ample material for comparison with Daniel's verse epistles. Coming between the Romantics and Modernists, the melancholy formalist A.E. Housman gives Daniel's "Ulysses and the Siren" high praise in his lecture "The Name and Nature of Poetry," illuminating both Daniel's poem and his own work. The two greatly different modernists T.S. Eliot and Yvor Winters both analyze Daniel's poetry in their critical work; Eliot's non-reception of Daniel's lyric work and Winters's exclusive, negative remarks on these works illuminate their own poetic theories.

In addition to illuminating Daniel and these five later writers, we get a broader narrative about the reception of his lyric poems, one of general neglect despite some occasional intense interest. Wordsworth never deigns to mention the *Delia* sonnets and has no use for them in his own sonneteering project. Coleridge is enthusiastic about Daniel's verse epistles, but his comments about Daniel are generally broad, and his greatest praises point to no work in particular, though they do apply to his lyrics. A.E. Housman has some of the greatest praise, calling "Ulysses and the Siren" a work of perfection. T.S. Eliot, however, never mentions Daniel's lyrics, and Yvor Winters is not a huge fan of Daniel's short poems, not mentioning anything non-lyrical in the Elizabethan's oeuvre. Despite ending in 1968, the narrative of my study of these five critics makes Daniel's minor position today understandable: only a radical explosion of Danielism could have made him more than a minor lyric poet after this kind of reception, an explosion we have yet to see.

CHAPTER 2. WORDSWORTH, DANIEL, AND THE SONNET: A QUESTION OF FORM AND THEME

We are lucky to have a vast quantity of information about William Wordsworth's reading, which will help us evaluate his engagement with Daniel's verse. Scholars have long been aware of the connection between Wordsworth and Daniel by engaging with this evidence. In his 1959 essay "Daniel and Wordsworth," Cecil C. Seronsy makes a source-grounded comparison of Wordsworth's affinities with the earlier poet. Stephen Gill, in his 2004 essay "'Meditative Morality': Wordsworth and Samuel Daniel," also uses primary source evidence to consider Wordsworth's relationship with his predecessor. The most comprehensive source of pure evidence for Wordsworth's engagement with Daniel is Duncan Wu's two volume work, *Wordsworth's Reading*, covering a period between 1770 and 1815. He gives Daniel a scanty entry in the first volume, which covers the period between 1770 and 1799. Daniel has so short an entry here because the only evidence of Wordsworth's reading is a few lines of "Tintern Abbey" that echo lines from Daniel's *The Civil Wars*.

In his second volume, however, which covers the period of 1800 to 1815, Wu gives a much more evidence of Wordsworth's reading of Daniel; there is far more documentary evidence for this period. He had encountered *Musophilus* by 1801 and had encountered the verse epistle to the Countess of Cumberland by 1803 (68-9). We have little documentary evidence about Daniel's other texts, such as his sonnets or short poems, but the evidence shows that Wordsworth was knowledgeable of the Elizabethan's oeuvre. Wu gives good documentary evidence that proves Wordsworth had been reading Daniel's poetry since the first volume of *Lyrical Ballads* in 1798: Wordsworth had been reading him for the entirety of his poetic career.

Seronsy, Gill, and Wu all document Wordsworth's engagement with a few lyrics and Daniel's longer poems. We notice, though, that the *Sonnets to Delia*, poems which appear in the modern anthologies of Elizabethan literature, get no mention. It is surprising that a major sonneteer said nothing about Daniel's sonnets. We should not despair for lack of evidence: close reading of Wordsworth's own sonnets and critical writing gives us an implied reception of the *Sonnets to Delia*: Daniel's sonnets were incompatible with Wordsworth's own poetic values and goals for the sonnet, which easily explains why he did not find these verses worthy of mention or use despite valuing Daniel as a poet.

Wordsworth's Poetics and the Sonnet

Wordsworth was kind enough to give us his views about the sonnet, even naming some Elizabethan contemporaries of Daniel. His 1827 "Scorn Not the Sonnet" is a fine sonnet on the sonnet:

> Scorn not the Sonnet; Critic, you have frowned,
> Mindless of its just honours; with this key
> Shakespeare unlocked his heart; the melody
> Of this small lute gave ease to Petrarch's wound;
> A thousand times this pipe did Tasso sound;
> With it Camöens soothed an exile's grief;
> The Sonnet glittered a gay myrtle leaf
> Amid the cypress with which Dante crowned
> His visionary brow: a glow-worm lamp,
> It cheered mild Spenser, called from Faery-land
> To struggle through dark ways; and, when a damp
> Fell round the path of Milton, in his hand

> The Thing became a trumpet; whence he blew
> Soul-animating strains—alas, too few!

He is not deviating too far from what he had earlier expressed in the "Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads*." He echoes and applies of his best-known pronunciations on the origin of poetry:

> [Poetry] takes its origin from emotion recollected in tranquility: the emotion is contemplated till by a species of reaction the tranquility gradually disappears, and an emotion, kindred to that which was before the subject of contemplation, is gradually produced, and does itself actually exist in the mind. In this mood successful composition generally begins, and in a mood similar to this it is carried on; but the emotion, of whatever kind and in whatever degree, from various causes is qualified by various pleasures, so that in describing any passions whatsoever, which are voluntarily described, the mind will upon the whole be in a state of enjoyment. (611)

Granted, he does not speak of Sidney or Milton's tranquil demeanor at their writing desks as they begin their compositions, but the Wordsworth of 1827 is not too different from the Wordsworth of 1802 when it comes to sonnets and self-expression. In 1802, Wordsworth speaks of a poet's mind entering "a state of enjoyment" thanks to recollecting emotion when composing poems; in 1827, he speaks of Petrarch, Camões, Spenser, and Milton easing themselves by writing sonnets derived from the miseries of their misfortunes.

We see in "Scorn Not the Sonnet" that he was conversant with the tradition of the English sonnet, not merely Shakespeare but also Spenser and Milton. We have more evidence showing that he was conversant with the Elizabethan sonnet in particular; Wu conclusively proves that Wordsworth had read Sir Philip Sidney by 1787, borrowing a line from Sidney for an early poem

(127). Wordsworth knew the Elizabethan sonnet, and he had read Samuel Daniel; however, the *Sonnets to Delia* have no attestation. If we accept Duncan Wu's assertion that Wordsworth had first encountered Daniel in 1798, he certainly would have read Daniel's sonnets by 1827, the publication date of "Scorn Not the Sonnet." We can reasonably assume that Wordsworth read the *Sonnets to Delia*, but their lack of attestation is worth examining. Wordsworth does not seem to have found them worthy of mention or allusion: we must delve deeper into his theory and practice of the sonnet and compare some of his emblematic sonnets with those of Daniel.

Stylistic matters are extremely noticeable and make a good starting point for our comparison. The voice of a perceptive reader rings out. "By God," he declares, "Wordsworth seems to have written sonnets in the Petrarchan scheme, while Daniel seems to have worked in the English scheme, barring a few odd pieces in *Delia*. Could this be of any importance?" Wordsworth was no partisan for the Petrarchan. As "Scorn Not the Sonnet" shows, he greatly admired Shakespeare and Spenser, neither of whom employed Petrarchan sonnets; in the "Essay, Supplementary to the Preface (1815)," he writes glowingly of the Bard's sonnets, claiming "there is not a part of the writings of this Poet where is found in an equal compass a greater number of exquisite feelings felicitously expressed" (647). He could not have scorned the Surrey-style sonnet and also have referred to Shakespeare's sonnets as "felicitously expressed." There are, however, remarkable differences in Wordsworth and Daniel's descriptive techniques that show the vast gulf between them as sonnet-writers.

Wordsworth's Sonnets, Delia, and Style

Wordsworth's "Surprised by Joy" and Daniel's "Sonnet XXXI," from *Delia,* are good test cases for comparison, being representative of the styles of their respective authors. They share thematic commonalities as well, both being personal lamentations, in Daniel's case his lamentation for Delia's cruelty and in Wordsworth's his own lamentation for his lost daughter,

though they are not necessarily representative of their authors' thematic concerns. We see here two radically different stylistic approaches for expressing extreme emotion. Complex metaphors drive Daniel's sonnet:

> The star of my mishap imposed this pain
> To spend the April of my years in grief;
> Finding my fortune ever in the wane,
> With still fresh cares, supplied with no relief.
> Yet thee I blame not, though for thee 'tis done;
> But these weak wings presuming to aspire
> Which now are melted by thine eyes' bright sun
> That makes me fall from off my high desire;
> And in my fall I cry for help with speed,
> No pitying eye looks back upon my fears;
> No succour find I now when most I need:
> My heats must drown in th'ocean of my tears,
> Which still must bear the title of my wrong,
> Caused by those cruel beams that were so strong.

The sonnet is driven by a series of astrological/astronomical metaphors: the speaker first says that some evil star is behind his misery, using a seasonal spring metaphor for his youth, then using the lunar term "wane" to describe his decline. He compares himself to Icarus flying too close to the sun and falling to his doom, the sun in this case being Delia's eyes. He mixes the sun metaphor, however, when he describes the heat of his passion drowning in a teary ocean; he may be referencing the Greco-Roman cosmological myth of Helios drowning the sun in the sea at

night. We might take issue with conflating his love's eyes (something external to himself) with his fiery passion (something internal), but the metaphor is at least part of the theme. In the final couplet, he references back to the Icarus metaphor, "bearing the title of his wrong," perhaps an allusion to Icarus's infamy. In the last line, he mentions the "cruel beams" of her eyes, completing this pattern of metaphor (14).

The metaphor is the main thing to Daniel's sonnet, as a plain language paraphrase will show. Daniel is saying, essentially, that he has had unexpected misfortune in love that is causing his youth to be miserable, and things are getting worse with no help. He does not blame Delia, though she is the cause. He believes himself to have been unworthy of her. The foolishness of his enterprise made him a miserable laughingstock for having wooed so unapproachable a woman. These sentences are both accurate decodings of the patterns of metaphor as well as a complete misunderstanding of the point of the poem: without the astronomical metaphors, Daniel's sonnet is nothing. They are its chief interest and its chief justification. The metaphors and comparisons are the draw for this sonnet.

Wordsworth's sonnet, however, operates on the exact opposite principles. The method of expression is plainer, and it derives whatever power it possesses from its matter, not so much its method. Consider "Surprised by Joy" in full:

> Surprised by joy—impatient as the Wind
> I turned to share the transport—Oh! with whom
> But Thee, long buried in the silent Tomb,
> That spot which no vicissitude can find?
> Love, faithful love, recalled thee to my mind—
> But how could I forget thee?—Through what power,

Even for the least division of an hour,

Have I been so beguiled as to be blind

To my most grievous loss!—That thought's return

Was the worst pang that sorrow ever bore,

Save one, one only, when I stood forlorn,

Knowing my heart's best treasure was no more;

That neither present time, nor years unborn

Could to my sight that heavenly face restore.

We immediately notice that Wordsworth's sonnet is driven by no elaborate metaphorical scheme: there is no central, extravagant metaphor like in Daniel's sonnet, and there is a common, homely nature to Wordsworth's comparisons. He is "impatient as the Wind" to share joy with his dead daughter; his daughter is "his best treasure." It may surprise the reader to see me listing the latter as a metaphor worth noting, as calling a valued person a treasure is, while a metaphor, one of those metaphors fossilized into common speech. Indeed, most of Wordsworth's metaphors are the common personifications that unthinkingly come to mind when we talk. He speaks of a "power" by which he was "beguiled," causing him to forget his loss of his daughter (6-9). A power is not literally a beguiling force; power in this sense is abstract, something inhuman that is no crafty manipulator. He gives another hard to notice metaphor when he calls his pain "the worst pang that sorrow bore" (10). Sorrow is an abstract concept that cannot literally bear a pang. Wordsworth's metaphors are the colloquial personifications we reach for when trying to better put something into language, not anything like Daniel's elaborate Elizabethan comparisons.

Daniel's *Sonnets to Delia* could serve as no stylistic model for Wordsworth. These examples are by no means unrepresentative of the two's sonnets: any other selection from *Delia*

and any other Wordsworth sonnet would have the same stylistic divergences. Daniel employs an extravagant metaphorical vocabulary, packed with allusions and far-fetched comparisons, while Wordsworth prefers direct statement, using only homely personifications when he requires a metaphor. He could not have found much stylistic help in the *Sonnets to Delia*, nor could he have found models for his own sonnets. Wordsworth had no artistic use for the *Sonnets to Delia*, and that likely accounts, at least partially, for his lack of mention of them.

Wordsworth's Thematic Goals and his Non-Reception of Delia

Style is only part of a poem, and subject matter is relevant for understanding Wordsworth's (non) reception of *Delia*. Daniel's work is a standard Renaissance sonnet cycle: *Delia* is a first-person account of a man's abortive love for a woman, focusing on his internal states as well as the progress of his love. It is an intimate, drawn out discussion of a single individual's state in relation to another individual; that is not to say that there is no broader social context to Renaissance sonnets, and their allusions and conceits are of immense interest to scholars of the era's intellectual culture. However, they are first and foremost first-person narratives of romantic problems. Wordsworth, however, wrote few if any sonnets that are classifiable as love poems. He wrote a great deal of love poetry, but he did not employ the sonnet for such purposes. None of his best-known sonnets are love poems in any sense. Often they make political statements, such as "I grieved for Buonaparte" and "London, 1802," the former lamenting Napoleon Bonaparte's rule with pained incomprehension, the latter using Milton as an example of a great Englishman of a type all but nonexistent in 1802. There is the lament for extinct paganism in "The world is too much with us," and the impassioned description of London in "Composed Upon Westminster Bridge." Wordsworth even tried the sonnet cycle, his *Ecclesiastical Sonnets* narrating Britain's religious history and *The River Duddon* concerning, unsurprisingly, the River Duddon.

Wordsworth had a broad scope as a sonneteer, using the form for more purposes than descriptions of romance. Jerome Mazzaro, in his essay "Tapping God's Other Book: Wordsworth at Sonnets," describes how Wordsworth revived the sonnet at the beginning of the 19th century, John Milton's sonnets instigating his efforts in the form; Mazzaro goes so far as to say that Wordsworth wrote his sonnets by "choosing Milton as his model" (337-8). He notes formal and thematic similarities between Milton and Wordsworth, writing, "like those of his model, [Wordsworth's] sonnets appear to plunge immediately into their subjects, avoid feminine rhymes, indulge occasionally in inverted syntax, and be called forth by an actual event or strong emotion" (338). Mazzaro does argue that Wordsworth's sonnets are not always direct statements about the world, sometimes being descriptions of inner states, but he is merely qualifying himself to avoid making any overstatements (339). A sonnet like "Surprised by Joy" is a description of a speaker's grief for his daughter, but this is still a thematic broadening compared to the *Delia* sonnets, which are concerned with love. Milton's sonnets display a greater thematic variety than the Elizabethan sonneteers who wrote decades before him. Though Milton ends his first English-language sonnet with a claim that he serves the Muse and Love, only "Methought I saw my late espoused saint" is a clear love poem: Milton's sonnets have the same thematic range as Wordsworth's. We have the meditation on blindness in "When I consider how my light is spent," the religious imprecation of "On the Late Massacre in Piedmont," and the political poetry of "Cromwell, our chief of men, who through a cloud." Wordsworth found a model in Milton, whose poetry was of much more use for demonstrating the sonnet's potential than Daniel's *Delia* sequence.

My case is speculative, but we have convincing reasons for why Wordsworth never deigned to mention or echo Samuel Daniel's *Sonnets to Delia*, despite being well-acquainted

with the author's work for the entirety of his poetic career. These sonnets, despite being from an admired poet, were of little use for Wordsworth as a sonneteer: the Romantic shoots for direct speech with only common personifications in his metaphorical vocabulary, while Daniel employs extravagant conceits, metaphors, and allusions. He would have found the content and thematic concerns of Daniel's sequence far from useful as well; in his sonnets, Wordsworth transcends the amorous concerns of the Elizabethan sonneteers to explore new internal states as well as directly comment on social, historical, and intellectual matters.

CHAPTER 3. LANGUAGE AND LOGIC: COLERIDGE AND DANIEL'S PHILOSOPHICAL LYRICS

Wordsworth's engagement with Daniel's verse ought to get us thinking of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. After all, these two poet-critics were legendary friends and collaborators, and the biographer Sunil Kumar Sarker testifies their friendship's reputation in *S.T. Coleridge,* calling it a "deep bond of mutual love and affection" (433). Samuel Daniel was a poet they both valued, and Stephen Gill goes so far as to speculate in the aforementioned "'Meditative Morality': Wordsworth and Samuel Daniel" that "Wordsworth was recruited to Daniel by Coleridge sometime during 1797-8" (566). Gill is being speculative, and whether the author of "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" instructed the author of "My Heart Leaps Up" to pick up some musty *Collected Works* is lost to history. Nonetheless, Coleridge does link his friend to Daniel in his 1817 *Biographia Literaria*, where he claims, "Mr. Wordsworth strikingly resembles Samuel Daniel, one of the golden writers of our Elizabethan age" (406). He argues that Wordsworth and Daniel share a "freshness" of thought and clean, clear, powerful English.

Coleridge moves on from describing his friend's work to discussing Daniel's. His praises are extravagant, and he delivers a panegyric in prose:

> Samuel Daniel, whose diction bears no mark of time, no distinction of age which has been, and as long as our language shall last, will be so far the language of the to-day and for ever, as that it is more intelligible to us, than the transitory fashions of our own particular age. A similar praise is due to his sentiments. No frequency of perusal can deprive them of their freshness. For though they are brought into the full day-light of every reader's comprehension; yet are they drawn up from depths which few in any age are privileged to visit, into which few in any age have courage or inclination to descend. (406)

He argues that Daniel employs an ageless, lucid variety of English as good in 1817 as it was in the Elizabethan era. Moreover, he claims that this style will survive as long as English itself. In addition to praising Daniel for having a clear, supposedly timeless style, he makes much of the content of Daniel's poems, arguing that they have relevant "sentiments," which here seems to mean ideas. He views these insights as dark and difficult, something one would have to have "courage" to "descend" into. These extreme praises are a development on an earlier comment on Daniel's work, where he argues that it is fine poetry despite sharing much in common with prose, arguing that Daniel's verse epistles and his masque *Hymen's Triumph* contain "exquisite specimens" of a lucid, lovely style (359).

Apart from the judgments in *Biographia*, we have other evidence of Coleridge's reading of Daniel's work, along with some specific evaluations and reactions. Stephen Gill has done an excellent job of collating the various sources into a coherent narrative of Coleridge's encounters with Daniel's work in "Meditative Morality: Wordsworth and Samuel Daniel." Around New Year's of 1804, the despondent poet was comforted by the opening sonnet to *Musophilus*; from 1808-1809 he voraciously read *The Civil Wars*, pondering the long poem's political and ethical implications; in 1819, in an essay in his journal *The Friend*, he uses lines from the "Epistle to Lady Margaret, the Countess of Cumberland" as an epigraph (567-8). His marginalia provide information as well: the second volume of his *Marginalia*: *Camden to Hutton* documents his writing in a copy of Alexander Chalmer's *Life of Daniel*. He criticizes Chalmer's critical facilities and writes, "In Daniel's Sonnets there is scarcely one good line; while his *Hymen's Triumph*, of which Chalmers says not one word, exhibits a continued series of first-rate beauties in thought, passion, and imagery, and in language and metre is so faultless, that the style of that poem may without extravagance be declared to be imperishable English" (15). Written in 1815,

this praise of the style of *Hymen's Triumph* mimics his comments in *Biographia Literaria*. His comments regarding sonnets must mean the *Sonnets to Delia*; we might wonder, having considered Wordsworth's non-reception of them, if the two ever spoke of these poems and whether Wordsworth agreed that there is "scarcely one good line" in the sequence, despite having no use for these poems in his own sonneteering project.

Testing Coleridge's Principles on Daniel's Lyrics

Coleridge praises Daniel's work in general, yet he makes comparatively few comments on Daniel's lyrics. The most concrete reference is when he alludes to the verse epistles in *Biographia*, though he does not go into detail about these poems. Since these are the lyrics he gives the most attention to, they naturally deserve analysis. We can look at some of these verse epistles in light of the encomium in the *Biographia Literaria*. A close analysis shows Coleridge to be a perceptive critic of style who describes concrete features of the Elizabethan's lyrics. We can also compare a Coleridge lyric with a Daniel lyric: seeing Coleridge's similarities and departures will better illuminate his reception of his praised predecessor.

`The "Epistle to the Countess of Cumberland" is a fine piece for testing the principles in the *Biographia Literaria* on a lyric. It exemplifies the features of style and content that Coleridge praises. We see the accuracy of his claim that Daniel's "diction bears no mark of time, no distinction of age which has been, and as long as our language shall last, will be so far the language of the to-day and for ever." Coleridge is being hyperbolic, as one cannot determine whether a poet will be of value as long as the English language is spoken. Nonetheless, he rightly evaluates Daniel's syntax and lexicon. Few archaic or unusual words appear in this poem: there are the usual archaic pronouns and conjugations we see in Renaissance verse, but Daniel's lexicon and syntax is otherwise not too strange for a reader in the 21st century, let alone the 19th. Apart from the unfamiliar "weald" and "troublous," Daniel's word-choice is not shockingly

archaic, and he keeps close to normal English word order. Consider these following lines in the epistle:

> He looks upon the mightiest monarch's wars
> But only as on stately robberies;
> Where evermore the fortune that prevails
> Must be the right: the ill-succeeding mars
> The fairest and the best fac'd enterprise. (17-21)

We have "ill" for "bad" and "fair" for "beautiful," but otherwise Daniel draws from a familiar dictionary. We could probably show lines and stanzas to unfamiliar readers and convince them that they were written up to the twentieth century, a formal poet employing a bit of the expected high diction but otherwise using their contemporary idiom. Other than word choice, we can chalk up this comparative freshness of style to Daniel's metric skill. The iambic rhythm comes quite naturally to him, and he refrains from torturing, dislocating, or even gently bending English word order unless absolutely necessary. Hyperbole aside, Coleridge's evaluation of Daniel's language is reasonable and implicitly covers this lyric.

There is a bit of subjectivity in Coleridge's praise of the "freshness" of Daniel's ideas and sensibility, novelty varying from person to person, but it has a great deal of truth when applied to this verse epistle. Daniel's metaphors add some nuance to the rather unexceptional content of the "Epistle to the Countess of Cumberland," a poem which on its surface seems to be nothing more than the standard denunciations of the value of earthly station and attainment. Daniel describes the mundane world as a place "where honour, power, renown / Are only gay afflications, golden toil" (12-3). There is something both aesthetically pleasing and intellectually fresh about the phrase "golden toil" describing honor, power, and renown. There is tension and near-

contradiction between the adjective and the noun, "golden" having the expected connotations of grandeur and greatness, with "toil" having the opposite connotations of lowness and drudgery. The paradoxical nature of this utterance is what gives it whatever "freshness" it has. It is not a condemnation of honour, power, and renown, yet it is by no means a praise of these things; they are "golden" and great, yet they are also miserable "toil" to maintain. It may very well be this sort of paradoxical thinking that appealed to Coleridge. Consider, for instance, Daniel's epithet for self-serving language, calling it "the smoke of wit" (32). Daniel is being paradoxical here because he is writing a fairly witty poem; indeed, he denounces self-serving wit in a concise couplet, writing, "That the all-guiding Providence doth yet / All disappoint and mocks the smoke of wit" (31-2). He mocks wit with a witty rhyme; this paradoxical intellect he displays here is as fresh as Coleridge claims. Paradoxes do not go stale easily.

Comparing Coleridge and Daniel's Philosophical Lyrics

In addition to being an attentive reader of Daniel's verse epistles, Coleridge wrote philosophical lyrics that have much in common with these works. Daniel's "Epistle to Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton" and Coleridge's "The Lime-Tree Bower My Prison" are great test cases, both being longer lyrics of consolation. Daniel attempts to console the Earl by arguing that his sufferings are the natural consequence of attempting notable deeds, that they prove one's character, and that they help one gain knowledge. "The Lime-Tree Bower My Prison" is also consolatory. While Coleridge complains about his injury preventing him from going on a pleasant rural ramble with his friends, he devotes many lines to addressing Charles Lamb. The "evil and pain / And strange calamity" Coleridge refers to Lamb suffering is that well-known piece of literary lore, Lamb's sister committing matricide due to mental illness and living her life in her brother's care (31-2). We have extra-textual evidence pointing to this poem being one of intended consolation. As William Christie writes in *Samuel Taylor Coleridge*: *A*

Literary Life, Coleridge "had been writing long letters of comfort and consolation" to Lamb before the countryside meeting that occasioned "The Lime-Tree Bower My Prison" (79). We can easily see this poem as a continuation of these letters.

The poems share similarities of style as well as purpose. Coleridge's poem is in blank verse while Daniel's is iambic pentameter in ottava rima, but both share the lexical features Coleridge praises. We see no unusual latinisms or odd terms yanked from the musty storage rooms of the English language. Coleridge cannot help himself from an occasional "thou" or "perchance," but he keeps a natural tone, starting his poem with a vernacular, "Well, they are gone, and here must I remain" (1). Daniel keeps a similar tone, telling Wriothesley, "The world had never taken so full note / Of what thou art, hadst thou not been undone" (9-10). Both avoid uncommon word order unless necessary to fit the meter, and their tone is that of conceivable conversation.

These are stylistically similar poems with the same purpose, but they try to achieve their goals through radically different means. Daniel makes a direct exposition of the causes for consolation, while Coleridge's method is far more subtle. Daniel makes no references to Wriothesley's circumstance of misfortune, and there are no friendly endearments. Instead, Daniel makes a rigorous case. The first four lines show the tone of the entire poem:

> He who hath never warred with misery,
> Nor ever tugged with Fortune and Distress,
> Hath had no occasion nor no field to try
> The strength and forces of his worthiness. (1-4)

His language is plain but conceptual, and the poem reads like a succession of aphorisms in rhyme. The non-specific "he" in the very first line gives it the tone of a moral maxim delivered

in conversation, a tone which remains throughout the epistle. For instance, he declares, “Not to be unhappy is unhappiness, / And misery not to have known misery” (25-6). He asserts, “It is not but the tempest that doth show / The seaman’s cunning; but the field that tries / The captain’s courage” (41-3). These are the moral sentences Elizabethans are so fond of. Daniel’s epistle is a philosophical essay in verse that builds up to the final couplet, when he concludes, “Only the best composed and worthiest hearts / God sets to act the hard’st and constant’st parts” (55-6).

Coleridge is just as much a thinker as Daniel, though he is less abstract. His mode in “The Lime-Tree Bower My Prison” is more descriptive than expository. He begins the poem by lamenting his inability to join his friends, and he devotes many lines to describing the natural scenery surrounding him. Many of his lines are rich in visual detail. He describes a dell with such detail that he seems overwhelmed by vision:

> The roaring dell, o’erwooded, narrow, deep,
> And only speckled by the mid-day sun,
> Where its slim trunk the ash from rock to rock
> Flings arching like a branch;—that branchless ash,
> Unsunned and damp. (10-4).

This is a far cry from Daniel’s aphorisms and argumentation. Indeed, the consolatory aspect of the poem only comes to prominence about halfway through. Seeing his friends, he notices Lamb among them and notes that Charles has “pined / And hungered after Nature, many a year, / In the great City pent,” before alluding to his sister’s troubles (28-30). Coleridge introduces the cause for consolation by acknowledging Lamb and his troubles, but he seems to digress on the sunset for a few lines. He finally gives a cause for consolation, arguing that the natural beauty he has

been so concretely describing is evidence of a divine presence. He rhetorically advises Lamb to interpret this beauty philosophically:

> Gaze till all doth seem
> Less gross than bodily; and of such hues
> As veil the Almighty Spirit, when he yet makes
> Spirits perceive his presence. (40-3)

His consolation is a bit vaguer than Daniel's: hues veiling the Almighty Spirit is more open to interpretation than claims that adversity is a sign of worthiness. Nonetheless, we have an explanation for the natural imagery, which appears digressive but is in fact central to the consolation Coleridge offers.

Coleridge expands his consolation in the final lines, describing more of this significant natural imagery in concrete terms, before deciding, "Henceforth I shall know / That Nature never deserts the wise and pure" (59-60). Nature, in Coleridge's vision, will overwhelm sufferers with comforting "Love and Beauty" (63-4). He calls Lamb "my gentle-hearted Charles" and again remarks on the scenery (68). He concludes the poem by concluding that the scenery was intended "For thee, my gentle-hearted Charles, to whom / No sound is dissonant which tells of Life" (75-6). There is ambiguity in these final lines about whether Lamb is already being comforted by the natural scenery, rendering the consolation superfluous, or is merely receptive to consolation through nature without really having taken comfort. We should incline to the latter interpretation as, in the earlier quoted lines, he tells Lamb to "gaze" in the imperative mood, an unnecessary command if Lamb needed no advice. We should note that Coleridge's consolation is an attempted one; Lamb the real -world man may have not taken any consolation from Coleridge's arguments, any more than Wriothesly may not have been comforted by Daniel's sentences of

soothing. Our concern here is how Coleridge and Daniel themselves went about consolation as poetic thinkers: their suffering friends are far beyond our critical concern.

These two consolatory poems show how Daniel and Coleridge differ as poetic thinkers. In Daniel's verse epistle, he gives direct and aphoristic consolation through an ottava rima essay. Coleridge, however, takes a far more indirect route, devoting many lines to descriptive passages that demonstrate, or at least try to demonstrate, the claims within the expository lines about natural beauty leading to the divine. Despite their lexical similarities, Daniel and Coleridge differ in how they express their sentiments, Daniel making direct statements and Coleridge choosing indirect, less apparent exposition. Daniel and Coleridge are thinking in two distinct ways. Apart from some historical examples in the third stanza, Daniel gives merely a succession of rhyming moral sentences. He is using the assertive logic of the aphorism, which is too compact to hold its unwieldy proof. Coleridge, however, attempts to give proof for his assertions through his descriptive passages. It may be that Coleridge's proof is inferior to Daniel's assertions, but we see in these poems the self-sufficiency of the maxim contrasted with a proof-minded poetic speaker. Coleridge is merely displaying a different mode of thinking here, not arguing for one, and he may very well have found a "freshness" in Daniel's verse aphorisms. Indeed, the vehemence of his arguments for greatness being one with defeat and suffering are somewhat disturbing and counterintuitive. When Coleridge claims Daniel's ideas are "drawn up from depths" and originate somewhere from "which few in any age have courage or inclination to descend," he may have had such arguments in mind.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge's critical principles fit Daniel's lyrics and contain an implicit reception. Everything he praises in Daniel's poetry exists in his lyrical works: the verse epistles are fine cases that show Coleridge to be a perceptive critic, albeit given to a bit of hyperbole

about timelessness and the newness of his insights. The Elizabethan's style and substance both appealed to him. While we lack the documentation to prove Daniel an influence, he is certainly a valued poet whose linguistic and thematic concerns are like Coleridge's. Although the two use different methods of consolation in "The Lime-Tree Bower My Prison" and "Epistle to Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton," both pieces attempt to use the intellect to provide comfort, and their styles employ a natural syntax and lexicon. These two lyric poets are united in their deployment of language and learning. Coleridge's positive reception of Daniel's verse epistles, and their many affinities with those of a major Romantic poet-critic, is a high point in his lyric reception.

CHAPTER 4. SAMUEL DANIEL IN SHROPSHIRE: A.E. HOUSMAN AND "ULYSSES AND THE SIREN"

Though his remarks on English-language literature are few, A.E. Housman is one of the notable poet-critics in the canon. His most thorough and comprehensive critical piece is his 1933 lecture, "The Name and Nature of Poetry," where he expounds his theories on the purpose and identity of poetry, evaluating every era of English verse from Chaucer to the Victorians. Its dating should not make us think of Housman as a Modernist: his main claim to fame, *A Shropshire Lad*, was published in 1896, and he died only a few years after giving this talk. In this lecture, the turn of the century poet expounds upon his theories of verse, advancing an emotive view that eschews a cerebral view of poetry. He declares, "Poetry indeed seems to me more physical than intellectual," and he describes his test for valuable verse: if a line gives him goosebumps while shaving, it is good (193). The charm and value of this lecture is that it is a reticent major poet giving his thoughts on poetry after a lifetime of reading and composing verse.

This poet-critic gives Samuel Daniel some high praise in "The Name and Nature of Poetry." After his opening remarks, he poses the problem of identifying poetry. He gives the first stanza of Samuel Daniel's lyric "Ulysses and the Siren" and gives it some high praise:

> Indeed a promising young poetaster could not do better than lay up that stanza in his memory, not necessarily as a pattern to set before him, but as a touchstone to keep at his side. Diction and movement alike, it is perfect. It is made out of the most ordinary words, yet it is pure from the least alloy of prose; and however much nearer heaven the art of poetry may have mounted, it has never flown on a surer or a lighter wing. (171)

Housman then simply declares, "It is perfect, I say" (171). These sentences are pregnant with meaning: Housman believes that its beauty is argument enough to call it poetry; he then argues

that this stanza is worthy of imitation for younger poets as an example of linguistic excellence. Like Coleridge, he finds Daniel's poetic use of a common lexicon worth praising. Housman sees Daniel using prosaic words to create something totally unlike common writing: it embodies the verbal magic he defines poetry by.

Housman lauds "Ulysses and the Siren" for purely formal reasons, and his conception of form tends toward sound: metaphor and simile, those techniques that straddle form and content, get short-shrift from Housman. He makes a general comment on the poems from the first half of the 17th century, nearly two decades of which Samuel Daniel saw before his 1619 death. He names no names other than giving two lines of Richard Crashaw's "The Weeper" as an example; he argues that the far-flung similes and metaphors of the metaphysical poets are not poetry and are even "intellectually frivolous" (173-4). He baldly calls simile and metaphor "things inessential to poetry," though he does not deny that they might yield some pleasure (173). He is purely focused on sound: to give an example, he cites a selection from the *Book of Common Prayer* and the Bible both expressing the same theological sentiment about redemption, yet Housman prefers the *Book of Common Prayer*'s for some occult sonic reason (187). Donna Richardson evaluates Housman's attitude in "The Name and Nature of Poetry" in her article "The Can of Ail: A.E. Housman's Moral Ironies." She writes, "His prose criticizes many of the modernist philosophical assumptions and corresponding uses of language, especially tropes adapted from metaphysical wit, that evolved symbiotically with the practice of close reading" (267). She elaborates in a footnote, calling his emotion-centered view of poetry "infamous" (283). Nonetheless, Richardson sees some nuance and writes "given the tongue-in-cheek tone of much of the essay, Housman's purpose appears mainly to be to correct a modernist imbalance of emphasis on intellect over emotion in the poetry" (283). Housman makes no mention of

modernism in his lecture, but if we equate "modernism" with a meaning-based approach to poetry centered on non-emotive close reading, Housman is certainly offering an alternative.

Though Housman praises Daniel's poem extravagantly, he only quotes a stanza and gives a few long sentences of analysis; while we might want Housman to go more in-depth, his focus is on poetry in general, not a drawn-out discussion of a single Elizabethan poem. None of the poets he quotes get more than a paragraph or two of cursory analysis. Despite the brevity of his comments, Housman furnishes us with enough poetic principles in "The Name and Nature of Poetry" to examine "Ulysses and the Siren" in light of his work and theories. There is something tantalizing about his assertion that a "promising young poetaster" could learn from Daniel's poem. After all, Housman is writing about poetry in general and is not advising would-be writers, and while there is no extant evidence proving Daniel influenced Housman, his mention of Daniel as a poetic model ought to get us thinking of reception and influence. We can look at "Ulysses and the Siren" through Housman's stated formal principles, comparing it also with some choice examples from the later poet's own work. We can also go beyond Housman's stated principles and find thematic links between Daniel's poem and some of Housman's verse.

Housman's Formal Affinities with "Ulysses and the Siren"

While Housman does not actually scan "Ulysses and the Siren" and give a syllable by syllable reading, we can read the poem in light of his praise of its "diction and movement." Housman does disclaim a hyper-technical focus on versification for his lecture, claiming the subject has "dryness" and "might not be easy for listeners to follow" (170). Nonetheless, praising diction and movement implies technical analysis, and a footnote at the very beginning is loaded with one-sentence observations about meter, rhythm, alliteration and pauses in verse (170). We can certainly connect his praise of Daniel's diction with Coleridge's assertion that it "bears no

mark of time, no distinction of age which has been, and as long as our language shall last, will be so far the language of the to-day and for ever." Housman says that Daniel employs "only the most ordinary words" in "Ulysses and the Siren," and these common words are certainly the most long-lasting. It is quite striking that Daniel's poem is made up, for the most part, of one-syllable or two-syllable words, those short ones that easily come to hand in conversation; his polysyllabics are by no means uncommon or high-register words, if we bar the name "Ulysses." When Daniel uses a polysyllabic here, it is always something like "delicious," "manliness," "tediousness," and "opinion." He does not use, say, "delectable," "virility," "monotony," or "supposition." It is surprising that Daniel maintains such metric regularity with the lexicon; his verse has the occasional variations from an unyielding iambic rhythm, but he generally maintains regularity and only diverges for justifiable sonic reasons. Consider the second half of the first stanza that Housman so approvingly quotes:

> Here may we sit and view their toil
> That travail in the deep,
> And joy the day in mirth the while,
> And spend the night in sleep. (4-8)

Lines 4 and 5 are a bit irregular; the first foot of line 4 is a trochee, an inverted iamb, and line 5 is two anapests instead of three iambs, but the next two lines are regular and iambic. The variations in 4 and 5 slow down our reading and make it seem as if the Siren is varying her pace of speech, slowing down a bit before returning to regular iambic speed. Daniel's ability to play with iambic regularity must have been part of what gives "Ulysses and the Siren" the "movement" that Housman so greatly praises.

From a purely formal perspective, “Ulysses and the Siren” shares a great deal in common with Housman’s verse. Daniel’s poem is in ballad meter, with alternating lines of eight and six syllables; the rhythm is iambic, and each stanza has an ABAB rhyme scheme. Tom Burns Haber, in his 1942 essay “The Influence of the Ballads in Housman’s Poetry,” notes that Housman both cited ballads as an influence and composed many poems in ballad meter. Haber gives us some fine literary statistics:

> Even a casual survey of the forms of Housman's poems reveals that he preferred the ballad stanza. Actually, forty percent of the poems of *A Shropshire Lad* are written in this pattern. If we add twelve more poems that have their lines two and four in iambic tetrameter, we find that fifty-eight percent of the poems in Housman's first volume fall into the abab quatrain. Of his 178 published poems, no more than 47 (26 percent) escape the restriction of the quatrain pattern. (118)

Now, not all of Housman’s poems perfectly fit the ballad pattern like “Ulysses and the Siren,” though we may note that “1887,” “On moonlit heath and lonesome bank,” and “Oh when I was in love with you” from *A Shropshire Lad* do. He often plays with the ballad’s form, inverting the meter to trochaic and adding or subtracting final syllables to his lines, but his poetry is firmly in the ballad tradition. Haber quotes Housman’s oft-repeated declaration about his influences, the poet declaring, “Its [my poetry’s] chief sources of which I am aware are Shakespeare's songs, the Scottish Border Ballads, and Heine” (118). Indeed, we might wonder whether Housman praises “Ulysses and the Siren” because it was a possible influence: he admits to being influenced by works in the ballad tradition, and his assertion that Daniel’s poem is of value to “a promising young poetaster” is tantalizing. While we cannot draw any concrete conclusions, Housman’s

fondness of the ballad and admitted influences ought to at least explain, in part, his fondness for Daniel's poem.

Another formal reason for Housman's affinity with "Ulysses and the Siren" may be that it is a dialogue. Daniel's poem consists of a back and forth exchange between Ulysses, presumably tied to the mast by his stop-eared rowers, and a melodious siren on the rocks. The two debate on whether he should jump ship in a long philosophical argument. Housman was himself quite fond of dialogue-style poems in which two speakers converse. Benjamin F. Fisher notes this stylistic tendency in Housman's poems in his essay "The Critical Reception of *A Shropshire Lad*." Speaking of Housman's early reception in the 1890's, Fisher attempts to situate Housman with his contemporaries, calling him part of a "renaissance in the dialogue form" (30). Fisher speaks of the poet as having a "penchant for the dialogue," giving his poems a "dramatic texture" (30). Indeed, this feature of Housman's poems stands out to a casual reader. Certainly, many of the verses in *A Shropshire Lad* are addresses to someone with no answer, but several are. We have the well-known example of "Is my team ploughing," an exchange between a dead man and a friend that ends on the last-stanza twist that the friend has taken the dead man's sweetheart. The even more famous "Terence, this is stupid stuff" is a dialogue between the speaker and a critic of his pessimistic poetry. There are other examples, such as the fanciful dialogue between the speaker and some posies in "Oh see how thick the goldcup flowers" and the ghostly conversation in "The True Lover." Even in his later work, Housman occasionally employed the dialogue form, like "Atys," unpublished in his lifetime, shows. We have yet another formal affinity between Housman's work and "Ulysses and the Siren."

Housman's Thematic Affinities with Daniel's Poem

We do not, however, have to focus solely on formal affinities between Daniel's poem and those of Housman; though Housman speaks slightingly of content in "The Name and Nature of

Poetry," there is no reason we have to be bound by his statements. Housman does not entirely get rid of meaning. He asks the rhetorical question, "Is there such a thing as pure unmingled poetry, poetry independent of meaning" (187)? He does not, however, come to a satisfactory answer, only asserting that poetry "usually has" a meaning that "it may be inadvisable to draw out" (187). He makes this assertion after delivering a popular claim about verse, "Poetry is not the thing said but a way of saying it" (187). He does not have a definitive answer for the old debate between form and content, though his remarks on Shakespeare do hint at his position. He praises the Bard as a poet, but argues that there is more to appreciate than merely poetry in his work, claiming "Shakespeare is rich in thought, and his meaning has power of itself to move us, even if the poetry were not there" (189). So, for Housman, a work of poetry can have meaning, and this meaning can be extremely valuable, but the meaning has nothing to do with the piece's status and quality as a poem. By comparing the thematic affinities between Housman's poems and Daniel's "Ulysses and the Siren," we will merely break from Housman's ideas by examining the "unpoetic" aspects of these works.

"Ulysses and the Siren" has more than sonic interest, as two recent interpreters have hinted at. Though their focus is on Homeric reception throughout the ages, not doing close readings of Samuel Daniel, they give context to the poem's debate between idleness and activity. Edith Hall, in *The Return of Ulysses*: *A Cultural History of Homer's* Odyssey, writes that "for the Renaissance poet Samuel Daniel, [Ulysses] epitomized the man of action seeking fame upon the high seas, and scorning sensual pleasures" (109). She quotes both the Siren and Ulysses, with the Ithacan replying that courage in warfare is better than lazy idleness. Nonetheless, she only gives the poem half a paragraph. Jeffrey Miller, in "What the Siren Sang: A Law and Literature Answer," also gives Daniel's poem a brief paragraph, with quotes from the poem itself taking up

most of the space. He declares that the poem has "a Hegelian, or even Marxist, ring today," and that it is "a duet between sailor and temptress, a dialectic pitting the glories of labor on the high seas against the bourgeois torpor of eternally cavorting with sea-dwelling nymphomaniacs" (383). Miller's focus is more legal than literary, so we can forgive him for some of his shortcomings, but he really should provide us with more evidence for a Marxian reading of "Ulysses and the Siren." Two sentences and some uninterpreted quotes are by no means enough to connect this poem to the Marxist tradition. Nonetheless, he is quite right to see that the action vs. inaction debate within the poem is not purely abstract, just as Hall does.

"Ulysses and the Siren" contains an argument against warfare and the military feats. The poem's dialogue is drawing to a close; Ulysses and his chimeric interlocutor are approaching an impasse in their dialogue. After advocating a vague life of "pleasure" and "disport," she declares that life with the sirens is peaceful and free from militaristic miseries:

> No widows wail for our delights;
> Our sports are without blood;
> The world we see by warlike wights
> Receives more hurt than good. (60-3)

In short, there are none of the gory agonies of warfare. Ulysses gives a predictable answer, claiming that war is necessary to cleanse the world of accumulating flaws and that certain fellows have a knack for it; he quotes that old saw, "For oft we see a wicked peace / To be well changed for war" (64-71). This is the end of their argument, and the next two stanzas show the siren giving up and declaring that she will come to Ulysses in some way. Nonetheless, she never admits intellectual defeat and only says, "Well, well, Ulysses, then I see / I shall not have thee here, / And there I will come to thee" (65-8). She speaks of "winning" and "being won" in the

poem's concluding lines, but she seems to only come with Ulysses because she wants to be with him; she never actually says that his reasons defeat hers. The argument is never resolved. She says, "I must be won that cannot win," and it is telling that it is people being won here, not debates (71). The implicit horror at warfare still stands.

Housman's poetry has as much horror at the ways of "warlike wights" as Daniel's. *A Shropshire Lad* is rich in subtle disgust at the death and brutality of warfare. The collection's opening poem, "1887," is a bitter reflection on the old British anthem, "God save the Queen." The speaker laments the war-dead, closing the poem with this bitter stanza:

> Oh, God will save her, fear you not:
> Be you the men you've been,
> Get you the sons your fathers got,
> And God will save the Queen. (29-32)

The addressees are advised to beget sons as their fathers did to die in warfare for the British government. If soldiers appear in *A Shropshire Lad*, they are associated with death through warfare. When the speaker of "On the idle hill of summer" spots some military men walking by on the road, he calls them "Dear to friends and food for powder, / Soldiers marching, all to die" (7-8). There is the speaker's counsel to a young soldier in "The Day of Battle," the poem concluding with the advice, "Stand and fight and see your slain, / And take the bullet in your brain" (15-6). Housman quotes only the first stanza of "Ulysses and the Siren," yet the siren's agonized description of warfare must have appealed to the writer of such gruesome and pained lines.

We can easily understand A.E. Housman's affection for "Ulysses and the Siren." The principles by which he praises it in "The Name and Nature of Poetry" hold up; Housman

accurately takes stock of Daniel's prosody and lexicon. Going beyond Housman's written statements on "Ulysses and the Siren," we can see many affinities between it and Housman's own poems. The ballad is a favorite form for Housman, and he often employs a dialogue style in his work: we cannot dismiss the possibility of Daniel as an influence. Moreover, there are thematic affinities which stand even though Housman would claim to find them irrelevant for poetry: the siren's distaste for warfare echoes the frequent imagery of the horror of war in Housman's verse. We should not be surprised, then, that Housman gives the poem such praise in his main work of literary criticism. All in all, we can see continuity between Housman and Coleridge: his praise for Daniel's language echoes the remarks in *Biographia Literaria*, and they are arguably stronger in terms of Daniel's lyric reception. After all, Coleridge's exorbitant praise for Daniel is a general evaluation of his writings, at most praising the verse epistles as a collective body of lyric poems, while Housman applies such extravagant praise to a single work. Of these five poet-critics, Daniel's lyric reception is the high mark; Housman was Daniel's greatest advocate as a lyric poet in "The Name and Nature of Poetry."

CHAPTER 5. DANIEL'S LYRICS WITH THE MODERNISTS: T.S. ELIOT AND YVOR WINTERS

So far, Daniel's lyrics have gotten a decent reception: Wordsworth has no use for his sonnets, but Coleridge praises his verse epistles and shares affinities with them in his own verse, and Housman gives "Ulysses and the Siren" glowing praise. Nonetheless, our two Modernist poet-critics represent a decline in his lyric reputation. T.S. Eliot never mentions Daniel's lyric poems, while Yvor Winters exclusively, and negatively, writes of them. These two were both major tastemakers in their lifetimes, Eliot obviously the greater, Winters having the most influence on his now-neglected disciples like J.V. Cunningham, Helen Pinkerton, and other students of his at Stanford. Eliot, on the other hand, was vital for the New Critics who set the tone for the academic study of literature in the middle of the 20th century. That neither of these two advanced his lyric reputation is ominous: these Modernist poet-critics represent a decline in his lyric reputation. Getting Winters's opprobrium is not necessarily a critical kiss of death, as he insults even the writers he loves. However, Eliot's cold shoulder is more troublesome: one of the most influential critics of the early 20th century, a central figure in the renewed interest in Metaphysical Poets and Renaissance drama, gives no attention to him as a lyric poet.

Both Eliot and Winters thoroughly explicate their critical principles: there is hardly any guesswork in evaluating their evaluations. T.S. Eliot looks at Samuel Daniel's non-lyric, dramatic work in his work on Elizabethan drama, and he also takes notice of the "Defense of Rhyme." The key to understanding why Daniel's lyrics got short shrift is contained in his earlier essays where he treats poetic form. It is even easier to interpret Winters's reception, as his essays and books lay out systematic evaluations of every anglophone poet from Sir Thomas Wyatt to the 1960's; his own formalist poems share thematic affinities with Daniel's lyrics yet are far-

removed from then. Eliot neglects his lyric work, having a negative, implied reception, while Yvor Winters briefly and harshly disposes of his lyrics.

Eliot's Non-Reception of Daniel's Lyrics

Eliot mentions Daniel in two essays on Elizabethan literature as well as a letter. For instance, in the 1927 essay "Seneca in Elizabethan Translation," Eliot devotes a few pages to Daniel's *Tragedy of Cleopatra* (39-42). In his 1933 essay "Apology for the Countess of Pembroke," he displays a deep awareness of Daniel's poetic treatise, the *Defense of Rhyme*. He dubs Daniel a member of "the classicising school" and dismisses the technical questions of versification that Elizabethans showed such concern for, declaring, "No prosodic system can teach anyone to write good English verse" (38). Outside of criticism, we can point to a letter from April of 1926 to a friend named Bonamy Dubrée, to whom he had lent a volume of Daniel's poetry. Eliot knew Daniel, yet he seems to have paid no attention to his sonnets, verse epistles, and lyric poems.

He certainly thinks well of Daniel as a non-lyrical poet. The pages in "Seneca in Elizabethan Translation" are the longest treatment Daniel gets in Eliot, and he says only good things about his poetic ability. He declares Daniel's *Tragedy of Cleopatra* and *Philotas* "the best, the best sustained, the most poetic and the most lyrical" of Elizabethan Seneca-influenced closet dramas, containing "lovely passages" and being "readable" (41). He calls the *Tragedy of Cleopatra* a work "in good taste," and he finally says that Daniel is a "good poet" (42-3). He makes the same praise of Daniel's language that Coleridge makes in the *Biographia* and that Housman makes in his lecture: Eliot writes, "The language of Daniel is pure and restrained; the vocabulary choice, the expression clear; there is nothing far fetched, conceited, or perverse" (42). This is not a far cry from Coleridge's assertion that Daniel's diction "bears no mark of time" and is easily intelligible, and that the Elizabethans sentiments have "freshness." While Eliot's essay

was published some six years before Housman's essay, both poet-critics call the language "pure." Eliot was no anti-Daniel partisan, and he held common views on Daniel's style.

Eliot's own comments on lyric poetry hint at why he gave Daniel's lyric work no attention. In his 1917 essay "Reflections on *Vers Libre*," he makes remarks concerning form that seem to exclude Daniel's lyric work as a poetic model. Not a partisan for either free verse or regular verse, he declares, "The most interesting verse which has yet been written in our language has been done either by taking a very simple form, like the iambic pentameter, and constantly withdrawing from it, or taking no form at all, and constantly approximating to a very simple one" (513). Evasion of form that still hints at regular forms appeals to Eliot as poetic models, and thus he valorizes the irregular blank verse of Renaissance dramatists like John Webster and Thomas Middleton while criticizing the regular versification of a dramatist like Cyril Tourneur (514). He argues that irregular, occasional rhyme might still have a place in modern verse, "applied with greater effect where it is most needed" in a poem (516). He claims, though, that "formal rhymed verse will certainly not lose its place," and argues that a satirist could revive the heroic couplet, though he has no confidence in the sonnet (516). The regular meter and rhyme schemes of Daniel's epistles and lyric poems are out as models, and the lack of confidence in the sonnet excludes the *Sonnets to Delia*. Indeed, Eliot displays little confidence in the sonnet in his published work. For instance, in the 1917 "Ezra Pound: His Music and His Poetry," Eliot paraphrases Pound to say that the sonnet is an excellent form for certain things, but that it is rare for "any poet to find himself in possession of just the block of stuff which can perfectly be modelled into the sonnet" (630). He hints that he views the sonnet as a stiff form in which the content is truncated, crunched, and malformed by the sonnet's structure. These essays

give us a good idea for why he never mentions Daniel's lyrical work when mentioning the author in the sixteen years that follow the publication of these early essays.

Winters's Negative Reception

Yvor Winters was a far more systematic poet-critic than Eliot, so there will be far fewer informed guesses about his reception of Daniel's lyric poems. Indeed, Winters seems to have left us with at least a lucid sentence about how he views every poet from the 16th century to the early 20th century; if he does not give his reasons for his reception right there, we can easily uncover his reasoning from other published remarks. He left us a thin volume of poetry along with a number of volumes of prose criticism, focusing on the English lyric while also mentioning Romance language verse, dramatic verse, and English-language prose fiction. He displays an especial fondness for Renaissance literature, and he does not leave Samuel Daniel out when evaluating the poets of the era.

He does not, however, give Daniel much space. His clearest comment is in his last work of criticism, the 1968 *Forms of Discovery*: *Critical and Historical Essays on the Forms of the Short Poem in English* released shortly before his death. In this hefty book, he analyzes almost five-hundred years of verse, favoring abstract formal lyrics that "rationally evaluate experience," to use a phrase he often employs when describing the goal of poetry. When covering Renaissance poets, he makes sure to mention Samuel Daniel, giving him a few short sentences:

> Of Samuel Daniel little need be said. His best poem is the sonnet beginning *Beauty, sweet love*; his best poems are all available in the standard anthology and are well known. Like Sidney, he aims primarily at grace of expression; his tone is less exuberant than that of Sidney; his style is more consistently pure; he has less talent. His tone is one of consistent melancholy. (36)

Winters is displaying his characteristic harshness here. According to Winters, "little need be said" of Daniel, who "has less talent" than the better-known Sir Philip Sidney. He makes sure to praise Daniel by calling him "pure" in style, just like Eliot and Housman, but he treats him like a writer not worth mentioning. He does not even attack the anthologists, an un-Wintersian move suggesting that he finds the matter unworthy of too much bile. We might note that these sentences are copied word for word from Winters's 1939 essay, "The 16th Century Lyric in England," the landmark essay where he identifies the Petrarchan and plain styles in 16th century verse. Winters very likely did not give Daniel another thought over the twenty-nine years separating the essay from the book.

We ought not, however, make too much of Winters's harshness. He could not help but make the occasional sharp remark, and he seems to have enjoyed harsh invective for its own sake. Despite his clear love of Renaissance poets like Gascoigne, Googe, Raleigh, and Greville, he goes so far as to insult the era. In his essay "English Literature in the Sixteenth Century," found in his 1957 collection *The Function of Criticism*, he trashes English Renaissance drama and prose, using such terms as "primitive" and "clumsy" to characterize these writings and declaring them inferior to their continental contemporaries (191-2). Even when dealing with writers he likes, he is bitter. In the essay "Emily Dickinson and the Limits of Judgment," found in his 1947 omnibus *In Defense of Reason,* he says of Dickinson, "probably no poet of comparable reputation has been guilty of so much unpardonable writing" and makes a number of rough remarks (283). Despite the scabrousness of the essay's opening, he concludes the piece by saying that Dickinson "is surpassed by no writer that this country has produced" except for Herman Melville, and that "she is one of the greatest lyric poets of all time" (299). He was

addicted to asperity, and we ought to take that into account when considering his remarks on Samuel Daniel's lyric poems.

Wintersian Aesthetics Against Daniel

Nonetheless, Winters lays out plenty of reasons for why he would not find Daniel's poems up to snuff. He considers Daniel a Petrarchan as opposed to a plain style poet; the dichotomy between these two styles is central to Winters's work on Renaissance poetry, and his identifying them may very well be his best contribution to the study of the era's poetry. Winters does not propose a systematic definition of Petrarchanism in one place, but he sketches out the features of this school over the three parts of "The Sixteenth Century Lyric in England." In the first part he says that the poetry is driven "the pleasures of rhetoric for its own sake" (262). In the second part, he links the sonnet to the school, declaring most Elizabethan sonneteers Petrarchans, given to "decorative" imagery that advances less substance than style (327-8). In the third part, he links Elizabethan songs with Petrarchanism, having their "ornament and elaborate meter" (38). In the second part of this study he names the poets he associates with Petrarchanism: Sidney, Spenser, Daniel, Drayton, and Greville, with Shakespeare occasionally exhibiting Petrarchan qualities (326). Winters prefers what he calls the plain style, which he explicates in the first part of his study: this school includes Sir Thomas Wyatt, George Gascoigne, Barnabe Googe, and Sir Walter Raleigh. He gives a thorough definition:

> The characteristics of the typical poem of the school are these: a theme usually broad, simple, and obvious, even tending toward the proverbial, but usually a theme of some importance, humanly speaking; a feeling restrained to the minimum required by the subject; a rhetoric restrained to a similar minimum, the poet being interested in his rhetoric as a means of stating his matter as economically as possible, and not, as are the Petrarchans, in the pleasures of

> rhetoric for its own sake. There is also in the school a strong tendency towards aphoristic statement, many of the best poems being composed wholly of aphorisms. (262)

He does not totally discount Petrarchan poetry and often praises works by poets he groups in this school. Though he harshly criticizes Petrarchan poets, he says in the final part of his study that "in spite of their limitations and errors, they enriched the sensuous texture of the language" (51). It is surprising that the plain style school he values has much in common with Coleridge and Housman's praise of Daniel's "pure diction," how he uses a lexicon derived from common speech in his verse. It may be that Winters takes issue with Daniel's content, not finding it aphoristic enough or having a logical enough structure. Still, the verse epistles contain aphoristic argumentation as seen when looking at Coleridge's reception. It may be that Winters would find the style too flashy, despite approving of the content. As it is, he can only give approval to a single Daniel sonnet. He values Daniel's school of poetry less for its intrinsic merit and more for what it led to: he argues that Petrarchan writers allowed more sensual detail into English poetry.

Winters clearly does not put much value in Daniel's lyric poems and values his school of verse more for historical importance than intrinsic merit. The features Winters identifies with Petrarchanism are present in Daniel's verse, most evidently in the *Sonnets to Delia*. There is rhetoric for rhetoric's sake throughout this sequence. At times it produces excellent results, such as in "Care-charmer sleep, son of the sabled night," where Daniel's search for more novel metaphors yields the excellent phrase, "the shipwreck of my ill-adventured youth" (6). Sometimes the search yields metaphors that are simultaneously novel and hackneyed; in "Then do I love and draw this weary breath," the speaker describes Delia, "within whose brow / I written find the sentence of my death / In unkind letters written she cares not how" (2-4). The

syntax is convoluted, the rhyme is heavy, and the belief that her disfavor will kill him is foolish, but the metaphor accurately shows how a subjective state of mind colors concrete sensual perceptions. We might even admit that there is something letter-like in the patterns of hair on the human eyebrow. Of course, there are more than a few sonnets where the mannered style and overblown metaphors send them crashing like Icarus. The opening quatrain of his first sonnet is destroyed by vague and overblown metaphors:

> These plaintive verse, the posts of my desire,
> Which haste for succour to her slow regard,
> Bear not report of any slender fire,
> Forging a grief to win a fame's reward.

As excellent as the phrase "slender fire" is, these lines are ruined by their piling-on of metaphors. The verses are plaintive, i.e. personified as having the same grief as the unloved speaker. However, they are also posts, letter-carriers who are conveying knowledge of the speaker's affection to his beloved. Why would a letter-carrier be plaintive when he has no interest in the matter? Why would he "haste for succour"? It is the speaker who wants relief, not the messenger. Moreover, the sentence structure is ambiguous in the last two lines: the "fire" which is not slender must be the speaker's love, yet the "forging" in the fourth line seems to be done not by the "fire" but by the "plaintive verses." We are uncertain even if the "forging" is that of a blacksmith or one who writes falsehoods under another's name. Daniel has been carried away by rhetoric here.

Winters's established principles show both why he values "Beauty, sweet love." This sonnet, the forty-seventh in *Delia,* shares much in common with the plain style Winters prefers. We can call its theme "broad, simple, and obvious, even tending toward the proverbial, but

usually a theme of some importance, humanly speaking." It concerns the fleetingness of youthful beauty, effectively saying that it does not last, disappearing with age and finally death; this theme is indeed simple, obvious, and proverbial, yet also important enough that it requires remembering. The feeling is relatively restrained, with the speaker only giving out a single "but ah!" in the penultimate line, every other sentence consisting of declarative, aphoristic statements (13). The first quatrain shows its restrained, declarative style:

> Beauty, sweet love, is like the morning dew,
> Whose short refresh upon the tender green
> Cheers for a time but till the sun doth show,
> And straight 'tis gone as it had never been. (1-4)

There are no far-fetched metaphors or similes, and "is" type statements dominate. This sonnet is meditative and subdued compared to other pieces in the *Delia* sequence.

Winters's overall low estimation of Daniel's work should make any possibility of influence moot. He wrote many sonnets and, except for "The Prince," he never wrote the Surrey-type English sonnet, preferring variations on the Italianate type or, in the case of "Sonnet to the Moon," seven couplets in the fashion of Henry King's sonnets. Nonetheless, we might note that "Beauty, sweet love" concerns the inevitability of death, and this is a favorite theme in Winters's verse. Daniel's final quatrain ends with the speaker declaring, "In beauty's lease expired appears / The date of age, the kalends of our death" (11-2). Winters's sonnet "The Realization," for instance, is a beautifully-blunt meditation on death with a lovely opening going, "Death. Nothing is simpler. One is dead. / The set face now will fade out" (1-2). There are also the fine lines in his lyric "To the Holy Spirit," where the speaker addresses a vague God:

> But thou art mind alone,

And I, alas, am bound

Pure mind to flesh and bone,

And flesh and bone to ground. (24-7)

Mortality haunted Winters, and his affinity for Daniel's poem is easily explicable. It is merely an affinity, however, and not an influence: Winters is the sort of man who would have told us if he had learned anything from Daniel's sonnet.

These two Modernist poet-critics did not give Daniel's lyric poems a good reception; Eliot repeats the standard praises of Daniel's non-dramatic verse, but he does not mention Daniel's lyric poems at all. Winters, on the other hand, only mentions Daniel's lyric poems but hardly praises them, his evaluation negative overall. Neither were influenced by Daniel's work, nor did they present him as a valuable model for lyric poetry. These two poet-critics were great tastemakers in their era, Eliot obviously the more influential, and Eliot's snubbing and Winters's damning both have a role to play in Daniel's status as a minor lyric poet: he remains in memory, and the anthologies keep him, but he gets little more. Coleridge and Housman may have appreciated his lyric poems greatly, but we must remember that a reputation has to continue: neither Eliot nor Winters continued his reputation, and it took a downward turn with both.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION

Connecting the Dots with the Poet-Critics

We have covered roughly a century and a half, looking at figures from knee-stockinged Wordsworth in England to tubercular Winters in California; all readers of Samuel Daniel's verse, they received his lyric work according to their own poetic goals and prejudices. Wordsworth, though an avid enthusiast of Daniel's work, could make no use of the *Sonnets to Delia* for his own sonneteering, preferring less stylistic extravagance; thematically, he sought to broaden the subject matter of the sonnet, not using it merely for love poetry like Daniel and many of his Elizabethan contemporaries. Coleridge, meanwhile, lays out clear principles for appreciating Daniel's language and ideas in the *Biographia Literaria* and singles out the verse epistles for praise; looking at these lyrics in light of Coleridge's ideas shows the Romantic poet-critic to be an astute interpreter, even if his praise can be a bit extravagant. Daniel's diction and ideas have much in common with Coleridge's own poetry, "The Lime-Tree Bower My Prison" resembling Daniel's verse epistles, the main difference between the two being that Coleridge is more descriptive and Daniel more declarative, Daniel philosophizing directly while Coleridge does so more subtly.

After Wordsworth and Coleridge, 20th century poet-critics continued to engage Daniel's oeuvre, often making incisive remarks about his lyric poems. A.E. Housman, whose poetic heyday was at the turn of the century, gives Daniel's "Ulysses and the Siren" high praise in his 1933 lecture "The Name and Nature of Poetry." He accurately assesses Daniel's language though, like Coleridge, is a bit hyperbolic. Daniel's poem shares much in common with Housman's, as the later poet frequently employs ballad-type structures and poetic dialogues; moreover, the implicit criticism of military deeds in Daniel's poem certainly resembles Housman's frequent lamentations of death and destruction from warfare. Finally, the two

Modernist poet-critics T.S. Eliot and Yvor Winters have contrasting attitudes toward Daniel: Eliot gives his non-lyric work great praise but has left us with no comments on his lyric poems. Winters, on the other hand, exclusively mentions Daniel's lyric work but gives him an overall negative reception, having a poor opinion of Daniel's Petrarchan school of verse. Both poet-critics echo their predecessors in praising Daniel's "pure" language, yet they have little in common with him; Eliot's experimental verse and Winters's cerebral formal poems share nothing with Daniel's poems, though Winters likely appreciated Daniel's awareness of death in the sonnet "Beauty, sweet love."

Consequences of their Reception

Of these five poet-critics, Yvor Winters is the only one that could reasonably be called obscure and non-canonical. Wordsworth, Coleridge, Housman, and Eliot are all well-known to readers and scholars of poetry, and they do not seem to be disappearing from the canon any time soon; even querulous Winters has lived on vicariously through the better-known poets and scholars who studied under him, like Thom Gunn, Donald Hall, Donald Justice, and Gerald Graff. Wordsworth and Coleridge's enthusiasm would probably be enough to keep Daniel's memory going, the two being the most important early Romantic poets; the praise from Housman and Eliot is also greatly significant. And, of course, Winters displays his usual harshness when evaluating Daniel, but even then, he calls his language "pure." The comments of all these writers give him the reputation of a "poet's poet." This is high praise for a writer, but in terms of reputation this is quite different from being a reader's poet or a scholar's poet. It is a mark of obscurity; readers and scholars are plenteous, but canonical poets are few. Daniel's audience is small but has included some of the most well-known English poets.

His lyric poems found favor with Coleridge and Housman, and even Eliot and Winters praise his language. Nonetheless, though so many of these poet-critics praise him, their remarks

on Daniel are few, and he is by no means their favored poet. That Wordsworth and Coleridge give Shakespeare and Milton more importance is not shocking, given that these writers are cornerstones of the English canon; Housman gives him about as much space as any other poet he mentions in "The Name and Nature of Poetry." Nonetheless, Eliot's seeming snub of Daniel's lyric works is significant; one of the most important tastemakers of the 20th century, whose critical pronouncements are at least partially responsible for the 20th century renewal of interest in Renaissance drama and the Metaphysical Poets, gave Daniel's lyrics no attention. Eliot and Winters, two important Modernist tastemakers, respectively ignored and dismissed Daniel's lyric poems, and this in part has contributed to the obscurity that his work now has. T.S. Eliot ignoring the *Sonnets to Delia* is not the sole reason, say, that Daniel gets only three sonnets in the 2018 *Norton Anthology*, but it is part of the process by which his current reputation came about; we should not ignore the role of such poet-critics in the formation of the canon of Elizabethan literature.

Despite finding favor with Coleridge and Housman, Daniel's lyric poems found no one to carry on their appreciation: Eliot and Winters's neglect set the stage for Daniel's present-day obscurity. A writer must continue to find favor with successive generations of readers, writers, and scholars to retain a canonical status. With Eliot and Winters, a link went missing: while Daniel has not totally disappeared, he remains a minor lyric poet. Obviously, the literary landscape has changed; Wordsworth and Coleridge made their pronouncements in an age in which independent men of letters set the tone for taste; Housman and Eliot made their remarks at the cusp of English-language literature becoming an academic discipline. Winters, teaching at Stanford up to the 1960's, was most involved with the academic milieu that is now our main source for evaluating and preserving works of literature. This study, then, has been a sort of

prehistory of Daniel's modern reputation as a lyric poet. By the time the 1960's came around, his position as a lyric poet was marginal enough that only an explosion of Danielism could have given him a better position. Coleridge and Housman made fine advocates, but Daniel would have needed more enthusiasts and to have gotten the favor of the Modernists to have more prominence as a lyric poet. The role of poet-critics up to the 1960's is clear in explaining the reputation of his short poems, such that only a sea-shift in poetic thinking could have gotten them more scholarly attention and more inclusions in the anthologies. Another student of literature may very well examine the literary scene of the past fifty years, particularly the reception of Elizabethan poetry, to look at the place of Samuel Daniel's lyric poems in the second decade of the 21st century.

This study of Daniel's lyric reception is not merely an analysis of his past readers: it is an attempt, however small, at reviving and continuing his reputation as a lyric poet and giving this often underlooked writer more attention. If Coleridge and Housman praised him so enthusiastically, we ought to take notice of his lyrics: though comments about the "purity of Daniel's language" get reflexively repeated, they are grounded in reality and point to his admirable lexicon and syntax, that clean and natural music we see in his best short poems. Winters's theories of Petrarchanism in the late 16th century also give us new grounds for appreciating these works. Daniel was part of a wave of lyric poets adding to the machinery and techniques of English verse, expanding the language's descriptive vocabulary and developing the English-language sonnet, a new and innovative form at its time. We do not have to appreciate Petrarchan poetry solely for its historical importance like Winters, however: the great beauties in Daniel's sonnets and verse epistles are due, in part, to this experimentation with new forms and techniques. The humanistic wit we see in the verse epistles and the best images and metaphors in the *Sonnets to Delia* are the results of a writer using language and learning to produce valuable

new poetry. We have Samuel Daniel the clear thinker and writer of "pure" English, and we also have Samuel Daniel the poetic innovator, the experimenter in advanced descriptive techniques. His "Ulysses and the Siren," his verse epistles, and his best sonnets from *Delia* are masterpieces of the Elizabethan lyric that have gotten the attention of some of our language's finest poet-critics: we can only hope for a resurgence of Danielism to give these works a higher place in the canon of Elizabethan poetry.

WORKS CITED

Abrams, M.H. *The Mirror and the Lamp*: *Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*. Oxford UP, 1971.

The Book of Elizabethan Verse, edited by William Stanley Braithwaite, Herbert B. Turner & Co., 1907. *Bartleby.com*.

Christie, William. *Samuel Taylor Coleridge*: *A Literary Life*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *The Major Works, Including* Biographia Literaria, edited by H.J. Jackson, Oxford UP, 2000.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*: *The Friend*. Edited by W.G.T. Shedd, Vol. II, Harper and Brothers, 1884.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Marginalia*: *Camden to Hutton*. Vol. II, Princeton UP, 1984.

Curran, Stewart. *Poetic Form and British Romanticism*. Oxford UP, 1989.

Daniel, Samuel. *Delia*. Edited by Mark Tuley, Crescent Moon Publishing, 2013.

Eliot, T.S. *Collected Poems 1909-1962*. Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1991.

Eliot, T.S. *The Complete Prose of T.S. Eliot*: *Apprentice Years, 1915-1918*. Vol. 1, Faber, 2014.

Eliot, T.S. *Essays on Elizabethan Drama*. Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1956.

Eliot, T.S. *Letters of T.S. Eliot, Volume 3*: *1926-1927*. Vol. 3, Yale UP, 2012.

Eliot, T.S. *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*. Faber, 1947.

Fisher, Benjamin F. "The Critical Reception of *A Shropshire Lad*." *A.E. Housman*: *A Reassessment*. Edited by Alan W. Holden and J. Roy Birch, St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Gill, Stephen. "'Meditative Morality': Wordsworth and Samuel Daniel." *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 55, no. 221, 2004, pp. 565–582.

Greenblatt, Stephen, editor. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 10th ed., B, W.W. Norton and Co, 2018.

Haber, Tom Burns. “The Influence of the Ballads in Housman's Poetry.” *Studies in Philology*, vol. 39, no. 1, 1942, pp. 118–129.

Hall, Edith. *The Return of Ulysses*: *A Cultural History of Homer’s Odyssey*. I.B. Tauris & Co., 2008.

Housman, A.E. *The Collected Poems of A.E. Housman*. Henry Holt and Company, 1965.

Housman, A.E. *Selected Prose*. Cambridge UP, 2011.

Jackson, Virginia. “Who Reads Poetry?” *PMLA*, vol. 123, no. 1, 2008, pp. 181–187.

Jones, Emrys, compiler. *The New Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse*. Oxford UP, 1991.

Kastan, David Scott, editor. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature*. Vol. 1, Oxford UP, 2006.

Kewes, Paulina. “‘A Fit Memorial for the Times to Come..’: Admonition and Topical Application in Mary Sidney’s *Antonius* and Samuel Daniel’s *Cleopatra*.” *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 63, no. 259, 2012, pp. 243–264.

Mazzaro, Jerome. “Tapping God’s Other Book: Wordsworth at Sonnets.” *Studies in Romanticism*, vol. 33, no. 3, Fall 1994, pp. 337-54.

Meres, Francis. “From *Palladis Tamia*, 1598.” *Elizabethan Critical Essays*. Edited by G. Gregory Smith, 1904. *Bartleby.com*.

Miller, Jeffrey. “What the Sirens Sang: A Law-and-Literature Answer.” *Law and Literature*, vol. 24, no. 3, 2012, pp. 380-392.

Milton, John. *The Complete English Poems*. Edited by Gordon Campbell, Everyman’s Library, 1990.

Pitcher, John. “Samuel Daniel's Masque *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*: Texts and Payments.” *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England*, vol. 26, 2013, pp. 17–42.

Richardson, Donna. “The Can of Ail: A. E. Housman’s Moral Irony.” *Victorian Poetry*, vol. 48, no. 2, Summer 2010, pp. 267–285.

Rowland, John Thomas. *Faint Praise and Civil Leer*: *The “Decline” of Eighteenth-Century Panegyric*. Associated University Presses, 1994.

Sarker, Sunil Kumar. *A Companion to William Wordsworth*. Vol. 2, Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, 2003.

Sarker, Sunil Kumar. *S.T. Coleridge*. Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, 2001.

Seronsy, Cecil C. “Daniel and Wordsworth.” *Studies in Philology*, vol. 56, no. 2, 1959, pp. 187–213.

Sukic, Christine. “‘Things Uttered to My Selfe and Consecrated to Silence:’ Samuel Daniel’s Silent Rhetoric.” *Cahiers Charles V*, no. 43, 2007.

Williams, John, compiler. *English Renaissance Poetry*: *A Collection of Shorter Poems*. New York Review of Books, 2016.

Winters, Yvor. “The 16th Century Lyric in England: A Critical and Historical Reinterpretation: Part I.” *Poetry*, vol. 53, no. 5, 1939, pp. 258-272. *JSTOR*.

Winters, Yvor. “The 16th Century Lyric in England: A Critical and Historical Reinterpretation: Part II.” *Poetry*, vol. 53, no. 6, 1939, pp. 320-335. *JSTOR*.

Winters, Yvor. “The 16th Century Lyric in England: A Critical and Historical Reinterpretation: Part III.” *Poetry*, vol. 54, no. 1, 1939, pp. 35-51. *JSTOR*.

Winters, Yvor. *The Function of Criticism*: *Problems and Exercises*. Swallow Press, 1957.

Winters, Yvor. *In Defense of Reason*. Swallow Press, 1947.

Winters, Yvor. *The Poetry of Yvor Winters*. Swallow Press, 1978.

Wordsworth, William. *The Major Works*. Edited by Stephen Gill, Oxford UP.

Wu, Duncan. *Wordsworth's Reading*. 2 vols., Cambridge UP, 1995.

VITA

CALEB A. MCGHEE

Education:	M.A. English, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee, 2020
	B.A. English, *summa cum laude,* University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 2018
	Associate of Arts, General Concentration, Roane State Community College, Harriman, Tennessee, 2016
	Public Schools, Roane County, Tennessee
Professional Experience:	Research Assistant, East Tennessee State University, College of Arts and Sciences, 2019-2020
Publications:	"Portraits After the Camera," fiction, *Fluland.com* (defunct), 2017