

Gerard Manley
Hopkins and His
Poetics of Fancy

Gerard Manley Hopkins and His Poetics of Fancy

By

Kumiko Tanabe

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Gerard Manley Hopkins and His Poetics of Fancy

By Kumiko Tanabe

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2015 by Kumiko Tanabe

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-7728-X

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-7728-2

CONTENTS

List of Illustrations.....	vii
List of Abbreviations.....	ix
Acknowledgements.....	xi
Introduction.....	1
Chapter One.....	5
The Formation of Hopkins's Poetics of Fancy	
1.1. Introduction	
1.2. Coleridge's Definition of Fancy and Imagination	
1.3. Ruskin's Definition of Fancy and Imagination	
1.4. Hopkins's Introduction of Fancy into his Poetics	
1.4.1. Hopkins's Definition of Fancy and Imagination in 'Poetic Diction'	
1.4.2. Fancy as 'Diatonic Beauty': 'The Origin of Our Moral Ideas' and 'On the Origin of Beauty: A Platonic Dialogue'	
1.4.3. Hopkins's Quest for the Origin of Words as Christ and Fancy	
1.4.4. Toward 'the New Realism': 'The Probable Future of Metaphysics'	
1.5. Conclusion	
Chapter Two.....	35
'The Language of Inspiration' and 'Parnassian': The Two Kinds of Poetic Diction	
2.1. Hopkins's Definition of 'the Language of Inspiration' and 'Parnassian'	
2.2. Hopkins's Obsession with Beauty and Fancy: The Influence of the Parnassian Movement	
2.2.1. Introduction	
2.2.2. Hopkins's Obsession with Beauty: 'The Leaden Echo and the Golden Echo' and 'To what serves Mortal Beauty'	
2.2.3. 'The Flight of Fancy' as the Theme of the Parnassian School	

2.2.4. ‘The Flight of Fancy’ in ‘Il Mystico’	
2.2.5. The Imagination of the Poet in ‘A Vision of the Mermaids’	
2.2.6. Hopkins’s Departure from Wordsworth and Keats	
2.3. The Power of Fancy in the Disguised Heroines of Shakespeare	
2.3.1. Hopkins’s Interest in Shakespeare’s Fancy	
2.3.2. <i>The Merchant of Venice</i>	
2.3.3. <i>As You Like It</i>	
2.3.4. <i>Twelfth Night</i>	
2.3.5. Conclusion	
2.4. Between Truth and Untruth: Tennyson’s Fancy in ‘Lancelot and Elaine’	
2.5. Hopkins’s Experiments with ‘The Language of Inspiration’	
Produced by Fancy	
2.5.1. ‘Floris in Italy’	
2.5.2. ‘The Beginning of the End’	
Chapter Three.....	137
The Influence of Hopkins’s Conversion to Catholicism on his Poetics of Fancy	
3.1. Introduction	
3.2. Hopkins’s Conversion to Catholicism and his Belief in the Real Presence in the Eucharist	
3.3. Fancy in the Gothic Revival	
3.3.1. Fancy in Gothic Architecture: Coleridge, Ruskin and Hopkins	
3.3.2. Hopkins’s Sympathy for ‘Oddness’ in the Fancy of William Butterfield	
3.4. Hopkins’s Fancy and Inscape	
3.4.1. Fancy as Revealing Inscape in Nature	
3.4.2. Fancy as Revealing Inscape in Gothic Architecture	
3.4.3. Fancy, Inscape and the ‘Haecceitas’ of Duns Scotus	
3.4.4. Fancy, Inscape and ‘the Affective Will’	
3.4.5. Fancy, Inscape and Metalanguage	
3.5. Fancy in the Baroque: Hopkins’s Entrance into the Society of Jesus and Baroque Elements in his Poetry	
3.6. ‘Fancy, Come Faster’: The Abrupt Parallelism between Christ and Fancy in ‘The Wreck of the Deutschland’	
3.7. Fancy in Hopkins’s Sonnets Composed between 1877 and 1882	
Conclusion	217
Bibliography	219
Index	229

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. John Everett Millais, 'Cherry Ripe' (1879)
(Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge)
2. John Everett Millais, 'Bubbles' (1886) (V & A Museum, London)
3. John Everett Millais, 'My First Sermon' (1863)
(V & A Museum, London)
4. Pierre Puvis de Chavannes, 'La Fantasia' (1866)
(Ohara Museum of Art, Japan)
5. Gustave Moreau, 'Hesiod and the Muses' (1860)
(Musée Gustave Moreau, Paris)
6. Gustave Moreau, 'La Chimère' (1867) (Matsuo Collection, Japan)
7. Gustave Moreau, 'La Fantasia' (1879)
(Musée Gustave Moreau, Paris)
8. Gustave Moreau, 'L' Inspiration' (1893)
(The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago)
9. Edward Burne-Jones's 'Depth of the Sea' (The Fogg Art Museum,
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts)
10. Gustave Moreau, 'La sirène et le poète' (1895)
(Musée Sainte-Croix, Poitier, France)
11. Gerard Manley Hopkins, 'A Vision of the Mermaids' (1862)
(Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford)
12. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, 'Proserpine' (1874) (Tate Britain, London)
13. Walter Howell Deverell, '*Twelfth Night*, Act II, Scene IV' (1850)
(Forbes Magazine Collection, New York)
14. William Holman Hunt, 'Valentine Rescuing Sylvia from Proteus'
(1851) (Birmingham City Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham)
15. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, 'The Lady of Shalott' (1857)
(Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Boston)
16. Gian Lorenzo Bernini, 'The Ecstasy of St. Teresa' (1647-1652)
(Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome)
17. Stefano Maderno, 'The Statue of St. Cecilia' (1600)
(*Sta Cecilia in Trastevere, Rome*)

*All the photographs in 3.3. and 3.4. were taken by Kumiko Tanabe at All Saints' Margaret Street, London in July, 2008. The photographs in 3.7 were also taken by Kumiko Tanabe for the research under the theme of 'On Hopkins's Idea of Fancy' with the research grant from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research in 2013 and 2014.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- BL *Biographia Literaria*, ed. James Engell and W. Jackson Bate. 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983)
- CN *Coleridge's Notebooks: A Selection*, ed. Seamus Perry (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- CW *The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. Ed. W. G. T. Shedd. (Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., 1989)
- J *The Journals and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. Humphry House and completed by Graham Storey (London: Oxford University Press, 1959)
- LI *The Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins to Robert Bridges*, ed. with notes and Introduction by Claude Colleer Abbott (London: Oxford University Press, 1959)
- LII *The Correspondence of Gerard Manley Hopkins and Richard Watson Dixon*, ed. with notes and an Introduction by Claude Colleer Abbott (London: Oxford University Press, 1935, 2nd rev. impression 1955, repr. 1970)
- LIII *Further Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins, including his correspondence with Coventry Patmore*, ed. with notes and an Introduction by Claude Colleer Abbott (London: Oxford University Press, 1938; 2nd edn. rev. and enlarged, 1956)
- LNS *Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare and Other English Poets* (London: Chiswick Press, 1893)
- MP *Modern Painters*, 3 vols, ed. Ernest Rhys (London: Everyman's Library, 1907)
- PI *The Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, 4th ed. W. H. Gardner and N. H. MacKenzie (London: Oxford University Press, 1970)
- PII *Gerard Manley Hopkins: The Major Works*, ed. Catherine Phillips (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- PIII *The Poetical Works of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. N. H. MacKenzie, Oxford English Texts series (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990)

- S *The Sermons and Devotional Writings of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. with an Introduction by Christopher Devlin (London: Oxford University Press, 1959)
- SM *The Statesman's Manual*, in *Lay Sermons*, ed. R. J. White (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972)
- SV *The Stones of Venice*, 2 vols., ed. E. T. Cook & Alexander Wedderburn (London: George Allen, 1904)
- TT *Table Talk (The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, vol. 14)*, ed. Carl Woodring (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people whose support forms the foundation of this book which is based on my doctoral thesis with the same title. First of all, I would like to thank Professor David Vallins, my tutor at Hiroshima University and an authority on S. T. Coleridge, for reading it through, correcting the mistakes in my use of English and giving me precious comments especially about Coleridge which I totally depend on. I also owe a debt of gratitude to Fr. Peter Milward SJ, professor emeritus of Sophia University and one of the most prominent scholars of Hopkins not only in Japan but also overseas as well as one of the founders of Hopkins Society in Japan, who first read my doctoral thesis. I also thank Professor Joseph J. Feeney SJ for sending me a valuable article on Hopkins's idea of fancy written by Professor Robert Boyle, who first noticed the idea of fancy in his poetics, and had checked my article entitled 'Fancy, Come Faster: Hopkins's Poetics of Fancy as the Language of Inspiration', which appeared in *The Hopkins Quarterly* (Vol. XL, Nos. 1-2 WINTER-SPRING 2013). I really appreciate the kind assistance of Professor Cathy Phillips at University of Cambridge, an authority on G. M. Hopkins, who took care of me and gave me precious data concerning Hopkins's interest in paintings when I stayed at Downing College, University of Cambridge, as a visiting scholar in 2014. I also thank Professor Takashi Yoshinaka, Professor Akiyuki Jimura at Hiroshima University and Dr. Kazuyoshi Oishi at Tokyo University for checking my doctoral thesis. I must mention that my study on Hopkins's poetics of Fancy was accomplished with a research grant from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research in 2013 and 2014. I mostly used it for my research in UK with the conclusion of my study of Hopkins's fancy in my presentation at The Hopkins Conference in Denver in March, 2015.

I also thank Professor Toma Ogata, one of the founders of Hopkins Society in Japan, although he cannot read this book now because he passed away in September 2014. I first encountered Hopkins's poetry through his introduction in 1993, and he gave me the second edition of *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, edited by Robert Bridges (London: Humphrey Milford, 1933). Then I got the Master's degree from Osaka University with a thesis entitled 'Contrast and Unity in Hopkins's

Sonnets' in 1995. Since then, I have been occupied with Hopkins's idea of inscape, which connects opposite elements conspicuously in his metaphor. Around 2000, I found that Hopkins was influenced by Coleridge's definition of imagination and fancy, and that the concept of fancy is crucial to his poetics, which can be identified with his concept of inscape. In this regard, I thank Professor Kenji Tamura, whose book on Coleridge made me realize that the underlying concept in Hopkins's poetics is influenced by Coleridge's definition of fancy. I thank Professor Isamu Saito, who taught me the works of Chaucer, Langland, Malory and Spenser, giving me an idea of juxtaposed structures evident in medieval literature, which are comparable to Hopkins's idea of parallelism.

Lastly but not the least, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Mr. David Knight, the archivist at Stonyhurst College, who kindly gave me great assistance, Fr. Joseph Munitiz, SJ at Campion Hall, University of Oxford, Fr. James Channing-Pearce SJ, Fr. Brian McClorry SJ and Sr. Anne Morris at St Beuno's College, Mr. Henley Henley-Smith and Ms. Julia Hudson, the archivists at Highgate School, Fr. Adrian Howell SJ at St Francis Xavier Church in Liverpool, Mr. Daniel Joyce and Brother Joseph at Birmingham Oratory, Mr. Nigel Baldwin at All Saints Church in Selsley, and Dr George Mano who checked my English of an article which is a part of this book, as well as to many other people who encouraged me to work on this book.

March, 2015

Kumiko Tanabe

INTRODUCTION

This book deals with the poetics of fancy in the works of Gerard Manley Hopkins (1844-1889). Fancy is a term paired with imagination in the well-known Romantic poetics, and fancy has usually been given a secondary and degraded position under imagination. My aim in this book is to shed new light on fancy which is described positively in Hopkins's poetics and later becomes the essence of his idiosyncratic concept of 'inscape'.

Among the few critics who have mentioned Hopkins's fancy, John E. Keating questions the use of the term in stanza 28 of 'The Wreck of the Deutschland' because Hopkins later uses it with 'pejorative connotations' (Keating 94). Keating takes an example from Hopkins's letter of 1881 to Richard Watson Dixon and writes: 'Indeed, he himself accepts the pejorative connotations of the word, when...he criticizes a phrase in Browning's *Instans Tyrannus* as coming "of frigid fancy with no imagination"'. In 1972, Robert Boyle countered the argument of Keating, and explored Hopkins's use of the term 'Fancy' in 'The Beginning of the End' and 'The Wreck of the Deutschland'. It is natural for critics concerned with Hopkins's fancy to quote the term 'fancy' from these poems, and thus to interpret Hopkins's use of the term in ways that suggest agreement with the viewpoint taken by this book as well. However, I doubt Boyle's statement that Hopkins uses the term 'Fancy' in Wordsworth's sense though he does not mention what Wordsworth means by fancy, and nor did Wordsworth himself clearly define the term. Nevertheless, Wordsworth greatly values the act of contemplation, which Hopkins thinks necessary for fancy. As I will mention in Chapter 2, in the early stage of his career as a poet he was influenced by Wordsworth as well as by Keats to some degree, but departed from them in the formation of his poetics of fancy. Hopkins thinks that the parts of Wordsworth's poetic diction that come within the domain of fancy are not what he terms 'the language of inspiration' – that is, the highest kind of poetic diction – or the ideal embodiment of true fancy, but 'Parnassian' – a term by which he refers to a beautiful but lower, weary and practical kind of poetic diction without inspiration. Hopkins's criticism of Wordsworth's poetic diction can be observed in his essay 'Poetic Diction' as well as in his letter

of 1864 concerning Wordsworth's use of an 'intolerable deal of' Parnassian' (LIII 218). Hopkins criticizes Wordsworth's fancy as 'Parnassian', while Coleridge also regards it as 'recondite'. Furthermore, Hopkins changes his attitude toward fancy in his later years. This book will focus on Hopkins's poetics of fancy before and after his conversion to Catholicism in 1866. He develops his concept of fancy in 'The Wreck of the Deutschland' (1875) and his sonnets between 1877 and 1882. Although Hopkins does not neglect imagination, he sets fancy above it especially in the 1860s and 1870s.

The poetics of fancy has traditionally been subordinated to that of imagination, but Jeffrey C. Robinson in *Unfettering Poetry: The Fancy in British Romanticism* analyses 'the poetic faculty of the Fancy and its emanation in the poetry and poetics of the Romantic Period from, roughly, 1770 to 1840' (*Unfettering Poetry*, 1). His discussion of fancy associates it with the 'periphery' focused on in much recent literary criticism such as feminism or queer theory, in contrast to the central ideology of imagination. While Robinson does not comment on the idea of fancy in Coleridge in detail, much less in Ruskin and Hopkins, this book will independently highlight the development of their ideas in relation to Hopkins's concepts of inscape and contemplation. The elements of fancy in post-Romantic poetry should receive more critical attention, as they were the signs of counterattack against the respect for subjective imagination in the mainstream of Romantic ideology.

All the chapters in this book will examine various aspects of Hopkins's poetics of fancy as the basis of his concept of inscape. Chapter 1 will discuss the influence of Coleridge and Ruskin on Hopkins's poetics of fancy. Coleridge is known as the first literary critic who distinguished imagination from fancy, particularly in *Biographia Literaria*, while Ruskin also wrote many pages on the distinction between imagination and fancy in *Modern Painters*. Although Hopkins learned the theory of imagination and fancy from the works of these two literary critics, he stressed the importance of fancy and established his own poetics of fancy as producing the language of inspiration. This chapter also deals with some of the essays in which he formed his concept of fancy.

Chapter 2 will focus on the concept of fancy in Hopkins's predecessors, William Shakespeare and Alfred Lord Tennyson, who influenced him along with Coleridge and Ruskin, leading him to write the play *Floris in Italy* and the sonnet series 'The Beginning of the End' in order to experiment with the language of inspiration as an expression of

fancy. This chapter also deals with the aspects of nineteenth-century aestheticism which influenced his concept of fancy, and includes discussions of his early poems 'Il Mystico' and 'A Vision of the Mermaids'. Both of these poems were written in 1862 before Hopkins had fully developed his concept of fancy, though he had been influenced by the aestheticism of the Parnassian Movement. The term 'vision' is related to Romantic imagination in contrast with 'sight' or objective perception which is connected with Hopkins's idea of fancy. 'A Vision of the Mermaids' reflects the influence of Walter Pater as his tutor at Oxford University, but the latter part of the poem expresses a reaction against this influence because the ideal of 'flux' in Pater's thoughts is similar to Coleridge's imagination. This chapter also refers to Hopkins's departure from the fancy or poetic diction of Wordsworth and Keats.

Chapter 3 will treat Hopkins's conversion to Catholicism and Catholic art. He was deeply attracted to the concept of fancy just before his conversion to Catholicism. Hopkins was influenced by the religious and aesthetic tendencies at the time of his conversion, such as the Gothic Revival, the Oxford Movement and medievalism. This chapter will deal with his concept of inscape which is based on his idea of fancy, and with the influence of the two styles of Catholic art, gothic and baroque, on his poetics. After his conversion to Catholicism and seven years of poetic silence, Hopkins wrote 'The Wreck of the Deutschland' and the sonnets between 1877 and 1882, where he successfully connected fancy with his concept of inscape as Christ incarnate.

CHAPTER ONE

THE FORMATION OF HOPKINS'S POETICS OF FANCY

1.1. Introduction

This chapter will focus on Hopkins's definitions of fancy and imagination, which were influenced by but also diverged from those of Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834) and John Ruskin (1819-1900), and then consider the formation of his poetics of fancy in the 1860s through his essays, journals and letters. Hopkins elaborated his poetics of fancy in 'Poetic Diction' and other essays of the 1860s through his consideration of the origin of beauty and words, and of Christ and the Incarnation in the Real Presence of the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar. He converted from the Anglican Church to the Roman Catholic Church in 1866 against his parents' objection. What made him determine on conversion seems to be relevant to his resolution to create 'the poetry of inspiration' through what he termed 'fancy'. Hopkins's poetics of fancy is not only concerned with his creation of a new poetry but also with his belief in the Incarnation.

1.2. Coleridge's Definition of Fancy and Imagination

We find a lot of similarities between Hopkins's poetics and Coleridge's, which represents a dominant trend in Romanticism. Both poets are at the same time critics and philosophers, much influenced by Platonism. Hopkins studied the classics at Oxford University and was an ardent admirer of Plato and Heraclitus, whom Coleridge often used in his works. Both Hopkins and Coleridge rejected materialism but accepted idealism. Such a philosophical ideal seems to give similarity to their poetics. Hopkins's journals also include descriptions of nature similar to those of Coleridge. Coleridge, Ruskin and Hopkins describe nature in detail, and their depictions of nature originate in their religious view of it as God's creation. Some influence from Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria* can be observed in Hopkins's journals and letters, though the expressions

in his poetical works differ from those of Coleridge and other Romantic poets. While the high Romanticism of Coleridge holds subjectivity or the individual's creative vision in high esteem, Hopkins avoids clinging to this and values fancy or objectivity more than imagination, though he inherits Romanticism to some degree by using the terms fancy and imagination. The key difference between the poetics of Hopkins and Coleridge lies in their treatment of fancy.

Hopkins has some connections with Coleridge not only because he was influenced by the poetics of Coleridge himself but also because Coleridge's grandchild, Ernest Hartley Coleridge (1846-1920), was one of his best friends at Highgate School. In a note of 1864, Hopkins mentions the name of John Duke Coleridge (1820-1894): 'Butterfield had restored Ottery St. Mary church for John Duke Coleridge, and painted his drawing-room, whom he knows' (J 59). William Butterfield (1814-1900) was an architect of the Gothic Revival, and his original and unusual patterns and style attracted Hopkins.¹ The church of St. Mary was restored between 1849 and 1850, through the influence of Sir John Taylor Coleridge (nephew of Samuel Taylor Coleridge), and his eldest son, John Duke, was 'certainly responsible for the choice of his life-long friend, Butterfield' (J 329-30).²

*

Before considering Coleridge's definition of fancy, which he distinguishes from imagination, we should take heed of Longinus's definitions of '*phantasia*' and '*imaginatio*', which influenced Coleridge's definitions of 'imagination' and 'fancy'. Coleridge's discussions of imagination and fancy possibly originate in Longinus's argument in *On the Sublime*. He uses the term *phantasia* to mean 'visualization':

¹ Catherine Phillips in *Gerard Manley Hopkins and the Victorian Visual World* mentions that Hopkins's 'favourite architect was William Butterfield, partly because he responded to the colour schemes used, but also because of the sensitivity to the religious significance of each part of the church evident in Butterfield's designs' (ix-x). Hopkins's interest in Butterfield's architecture will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

² Sir John Taylor Coleridge was Justice of the Queen's Bench and John Duke was later Lord Chief Justice and 1st Baron Coleridge. John Duke 'extolled Butterfield's work (carried out against the active opposition of the governors of the church) in a paper on the restoration read to the Exeter Diocesan Architectural Society Sept. 1851 (*Transactions*, iv. 189-217)' (J 330).

Weight, grandeur, and urgency in writing are very largely produced...by the use of 'visualization' (*phantasia*). ...For the term *phantasia* is applied...to an idea which enters the mind from any source and engenders speech, but the word has now come to be used...of passages where, inspired by strong emotion, you seem to see what you describe and bring it vividly before the eyes of your audience. The *phantasia* means that the object of the poetical form of it is to enthrall, and that of the prose form to present things vividly, though both...aim at the emotional and the excited.

(Longinus 215-17)

This statement describes *phantasia* as being related to the mental vision 'inspired by strong emotion' (passion) when one has a feeling of the sublime, which creates poetic diction.

Coleridge divides *phantasia* into two different conceptions in *Biographia Literaria*:

...fancy and imagination were two distinct and widely different faculties, instead of being...two names with one meaning.... It is not, I own, easy to conceive a more apposite translation of the Greek *Phantasia*, than the Latin *Imaginatio*.... The first and most important point to be proved is, that two conceptions perfectly distinct are confused under one and the same word....

(BL I 82-84)

Coleridge describes the confusion of the terms *phantasia* and *imaginatio* in English translation, which makes the distinction between fancy and imagination unclear (BL I 99). He defines *phantasia* that 'is employed...to express the mental power of comprehension or the active function of the mind' as imagination, and 'imaginatio for the receptivity...of impressions, or for the passive perception' as fancy, and distinguishes imagination into two types, 'primary' and 'secondary':

The primary IMAGINATION I hold to be the living power and prime Agent of all human Perception, and a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM. The secondary I consider as an echo of the former co-existing with the conscious will, yet still as identical with the primary in the *kind* of its agency... It dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to re-create; ...it struggles to idealize and to unify. It is essentially *vital*, even as all objects (as objects) are essentially fixed and dead.

(BL I 304)

Though Hopkins's poetics is partly influenced by Coleridge's definition of the primary imagination as the repetition of God's creation and as unity in art, the essential difference between their views is that Hopkins respects

objects that are ‘fixed’ and does not regard them as ‘dead’. Coleridge sets imagination and the human subject above fancy and the object:

Fancy, on the contrary, has no other counters to play with, but fixities and definites. The Fancy is indeed no other than a mode of Memory emancipated from the order of time and space; and blended with, and modified by that empirical phenomenon of the will, which we express by the word CHOICE. (BL I 305)

Coleridge’s *Table Talk* further mentions the qualities of fancy and imagination:

The Fancy brings together images which have no connection natural or moral, but are yoked together by the poet by means of some accidental coincidence... The imagination modifies images, and gives unity to variety; it sees all things in one.... (TT 423)

Coleridge also refers to ‘the *passive fancy* and *mechanical memory*’:

In association then consists the whole mechanism of their production of impressions, in the Aristotelian Psychology. It is the universal law of the *passive fancy* and *mechanical memory*; that which supplies to other faculties their objects, to all thought the elements of its materials. (BL I 103-104)

In *The Self-Conscious Imagination*, Kathleen Coburn picks up several passages from Coleridge’s notebooks which reveal that imagination is related to reason, the self-conscious self, and subjectivity:

Thursday Night, X. 9 Sept 1830

It is a painful, a mortifying, but even therefore a necessary business, to make strict inquisition into the amiable tendencies of the comparatively best-natured Individuals, as soon as they are loose from the leading-strings of the Universal Reason.... Thus, take the yearning to be beloved, the craving for sympathy, in persons of active & constitutional Sensibility...— and then watch the day-dreams, that have perhaps been scared & frowned or scoffed away by the awaking Conscience & the re-dawning tricky imaginations, by which the creaturely Will *subjectively* realizes for itself the sense of being beloved.... It is therefore Selfishness: that is, the Self is not only the starting-point *from*, but the Goal, *to*—which the Soul is working during such moments—and consequently it is a Circuit of Ascent to a Zenith completing itself by a descent to the Nadir— [N 46 f 21]

(*The Self-Conscious Imagination*, 13)

Coburn comments that 'Coleridge was well aware of the dangers of self-concentration', and 'because he saw what he called "self-centering resolve" in Southey, and "self-vorticity" in Wordsworth, he believed in "genuine self-research", to quote the first number of *The Friend*' (*The Self-Conscious Imagination*, 14-15). Though their syntax is somewhat ambiguous, these notes by Coleridge seem also to reveal an unusual use of the word 'imagination' to refer to something relatively misleading, and similar to 'day-dreams', whereby the individual may be distracted from the dictates of 'Universal Reason' (in Coleridge, an organ of divine illumination), even though 'imagination', as an aspect of the mind, is more often linked by Coleridge with Reason, rather than contrasted with it. 'Secondary' imagination, for Coleridge, indeed, is a source of the profoundest insights, whereby the intuitions of Reason are expressed in literature and philosophy, while 'primary' imagination underlies and shapes all our perceptions of a seemingly objective world. His use of the word 'imagination' in this passage is therefore unusual, but reveals his concern about avoiding the forms of egotism or selfishness he found in some of his contemporaries. For Coleridge, the concept of imagination as such involves no idea of selfishness, though he places great emphasis on the importance of the individual, revelatory insights which the individual achieves and expresses through imagination. Hopkins, in contrast, finds such insights not to depend on the individual's imagination, but rather on a passive immersion of the self in the forms of the perceptual world, through which 'fancy' can reveal the presence of Christ in the world through transubstantiation.

1.3. Ruskin's Definition of Fancy and Imagination

John Ruskin also influenced the formation of Hopkins's poetics of fancy as well as Victorian arts in general including the Gothic Revival and medievalism. Hopkins's journals show the influence of the Gothic Revival, in connection with Ruskin and the Pre-Raphaelites. He expresses his interest in medievalism and left a lot of notes in the 1860s on the architects of the Gothic Revival, especially on Butterfield and the restorations of Catholic churches. Hopkins's aesthetic concern is naturally directed to Ruskin, who champions medievalism, the restitution of Gothic architecture and the importance of the details in works of art. Although Hopkins does not completely agree with Ruskin and comments that 'Ruskin often goes astray' (LIII 204), he is certainly intrigued by Ruskin's theories, as he mentions *Modern Painters* as one of the books to be read in his journal written in 1865 (J 56).

*

In volume II of *Modern Painters*, Ruskin attaches more significance to fancy than Coleridge does but still defends imagination over it: imagination is ‘the source of all that is great in the poetic arts’ and fancy is ‘merely decorative and entertaining’; however, they ‘have so much in common as to render strict definition of either difficult’ (MP II 152). For Ruskin, fancy responds to the outside of objects and sees them as parts, while imagination responds to the inside and grasps the whole (MP II 179). He adds a detailed explication of fancy in contrast to imagination:

...the imagination being at the heart of things...is still, quiet, and brooding...; but the fancy staying at the outside of things...bounding merrily from point to point...but necessarily always settling...on a point only, never embracing the whole. And from these single points she can strike analogies and catch resemblances, which, so far as the point she looks at is concerned, are true, but would be false, if she could see through to the other side. This, however, she cares not to do; the point of contact is enough for her, and even if there be a gap left between the two things and they do not quite touch, she will spring from one to the other like an electric spark, and be seen brightest in her leaping. (MP II 182-3)

Ruskin here describes fancy’s restlessness and its ambiguity which can be both true and false. Fancy’s characteristic of uniting two things which ‘do not quite touch’ is compatible with Coleridge’s definition of fancy as that which ‘brings together images which have no connection’.

Ruskin focuses on contemplation or *theoria* (a Greek word meaning ‘gaze’), which he connects with imagination. Though Ruskin admits the merit of contemplation detached from fancy, the third function of fancy, which he describes as ‘the highest’, is closely related to contemplation and evokes its nature as defined by Coleridge:

The third function of Fancy already spoken of as subordinate to this of the Imagination, is the highest of which she is capable; like the Imagination, she beholds in the things submitted to her treatment things different from actual; but the suggestions...are not in their nature essential in the object contemplated; and the images resulting...may...change the current of contemplative feeling: for...we saw her dwelling upon external features.... (MP II 209)

This notion of fancy is similar to Coleridge’s definition of fancy that ‘brings together images which have no connection’. For Ruskin, the ‘regardant or contemplative action of Fancy is...different from...that

mere...likeness-catching operation' and it 'loses sight of actuality' and 'passes gradually from mere vivid sight of reality, and witty suggestion of likeness, to...what is unreal' (MP II 209-10).

1.4. Hopkins's Introduction of Fancy into his Poetics

1.4.1. Hopkins's Definition of Fancy and Imagination in 'Poetic Diction'

In his undergraduate essay, 'Poetic Diction' (1865), Hopkins mentions Coleridge's view on poetic diction and the ideas of imagination and fancy in order to refute Wordsworth's opinion 'that poetic diction scarcely differed...from that of prose' (J 84). Hopkins apparently raises an objection to Wordsworth's claim in *Lyrical Ballads* that the 'most interesting parts of the best poems will be found to be strictly the language of prose when prose is well written' (*Lyrical Ballads*, 252).³ Instead, Hopkins seems to approve of Coleridge's view of poetic diction: 'If the best prose and the best poetry use the same language—(Coleridge defined poetry as the best thoughts in the best words)—why not use unfettered prose of the two? Because...of the beauty of verse' (J 84). However, Coleridge actually defines prose and poetry as 'prose = words in their best order;—poetry = the best words in the best order' (TT 56). Hopkins develops his own poetics from his misreading of Coleridge's view of poetic diction: '...metre, rhythm, rhyme, and all the structure which is called verse both necessitate and engender a difference in diction and in thought...' (J 84). Except for the emphasis on the 'difference in diction and in thought' of verse from prose, the statement resembles Coleridge's argument in *Biographia Literaria* on the artificial arrangement of poetry as different from the nature of prose (BL II 11).

Hopkins, however, underlines the necessity of structure and parallelism for the beauty of verse and places this at the centre of his poetics:

But what the character of poetry is will be found best by looking at the structure of verse. The artificial part of poetry...reduces itself to the principle of parallelism. ...And moreover parallelism in expression tends to beget or passes into parallelism of thought. This point reached we shall be able to see and account for the peculiarities of poetic diction. (J 84-85)

³ The quotation is from *Lyrical Ballads*, ed. by R. L. Brett and A. R. Jones (London: Methuen, 1965).

Then, Hopkins traces the history of poetic structure and reduces the artificial part of poetry to the principle of parallelism, which is distinguished into two kinds: ‘marked parallelism’ which ‘is concerned with the structure of verse—in rhythm, in alliteration, in assonance and in rhyme’ and ‘transitional or chromatic parallelism’ (J 84) – a concept explained in the passage I quote below. He apparently attaches more importance to marked parallelism as the first kind of parallelism than to transitional as the second kind because he gives extensive explanation of the former here. Hopkins states that only ‘the first kind, that of marked parallelism, is concerned with the structure of verse’ or the artificial or rhetorical elements of poetry, attaching much importance to a recurrence or parallelism in words and thought. Then, Hopkins develops his theory of poetic diction from ‘the best thoughts in the best words’ to parallelism in thought and expression (J 84-85). Finally, he connects these two kinds of parallelism with the terms ‘Fancy’ and ‘Imagination’:

To the marked or abrupt kind of parallelism belong metaphor, simile, parable, and so on.... To the chromatic parallelism belong gradation, intensity, climax, tone, expression..., *chiaroscuro*, perhaps emphasis: while the faculties of Fancy and Imagination might range widely over both kinds, Fancy belonging more especially to the abrupt than to the transitional class. (J 85)

Hopkins’s use of the terms fancy and imagination here is certainly borrowed from his predecessors. In his definition, fancy is particularly relevant to marked and abrupt parallelism, which is a distinctive feature of his poetics.

While Ruskin connects contemplation to imagination, Hopkins directly relates the faculty of contemplation to fancy in his notes on the history of Greek Philosophy (1868), and equates its fixity with the ‘abiding’ nature of contemplation, in contrast with the transitional nature of meditation and the discursive reason in imagination:

The mind has two kinds of energy, a transitional kind, when one thought or sensation follows another...; (ii) an abiding kind...in which the mind is absorbed..., taken up by, dwells upon, enjoys, a single thought: we may call it contemplation, but it includes pleasures, supposing they...do not require a transition to another term of *another kind*, for contemplation in its absoluteness is impossible unless in a trance and it is enough for the mind to repeat the same energy on the same matter. (J 125-126)

The contrast between two kinds of energy in the mind, an 'abiding' kind which he calls 'contemplation' and a transitional kind which corresponds to meditation, matches the aforementioned dichotomy between abrupt and transitional parallelisms or between fancy and imagination in 'Poetic Diction', written three years earlier. The association of meditation and discursive reason with imagination is based on Coleridge's argument, and Lichtmann admits this as well. After she remarks that 'Hopkins meant his poetry to be read...not only with the "transitional energy" of reasoning...but above all with the mind's "abiding energy"...with contemplation' (Lichtmann 131), she goes on to relate reason to imagination: 'Where meditation involves the use of deductive reason, imagination, and "affections" of the soul, contemplation is regarded as the point of passage from self-effort to grace' (Lichtmann 132). However, she does not mention that contemplation is associated with fancy, in contrast with meditation which involves imagination. Lichtmann unintentionally suggests Hopkins's privileging of fancy as contemplation over imagination as meditation, and concludes that Hopkins's 'understanding of meditation as *reasoning*... reiterates the distinction...between transitional energy as reasoning and abiding energy as contemplation' (Lichtmann 149).

Ruskin's definition of the third function of fancy as 'the highest', and closely related to contemplation, evokes its nature as defined by Hopkins and Coleridge, and is similar to Hopkins's idea of abrupt parallelism, which in turn is supported by Coleridge's definition of fancy as 'bring[ing] together images which have no connection'. Though the dwelling (or abiding) nature of fancy described by Ruskin corresponds to Hopkins's definition of contemplation, the difference between them is that Ruskin's fancy is irrelevant to actuality or reality.

1.4.2. Fancy as 'Diatonic Beauty': 'The Origin of Our Moral Ideas' and 'On the Origin of Beauty: A Platonic Dialogue'

In his journals and essays, Hopkins often tends to dig carefully into the idea of beauty. He begins with trivial matters, then inquires into the nature of art, and finally arrives at philosophical consideration. Before the establishment of his own poetics, Hopkins expresses his idea of beauty in his undergraduate essays of 1865, 'The Origin of Our Moral Ideas' and 'On the Origin of Beauty: A Platonic Dialogue'. They epitomize his interest in the classics and Platonism as a student of the classics before his conversion to Catholicism in 1866 under the guidance of John Henry

Newman. In 'On the Origin of Our Moral Ideas', submitted to his tutor Walter Pater, he refers to the idea of beauty:

Beauty lies in the relation of the parts of a sensuous thing to each other, that is in a certain relation, it being absolute at one point and comparative in those nearing it or falling from it.... In sensuous things a certain proportion in the intervals makes up beauty.... (J 80-81)

Hopkins points out that what makes up beauty is the relation of the parts or the proportion in the intervals between the parts of the things. This suggests that he was highly influenced by the Platonic idea of beauty. Then, Hopkins discusses the necessity of recognizing unity in art:

All thought is of course in a sense an effort a[t] unity. ...In art it is essential to recognise and strive to realise...this unity in some shape or other. ...In art we strive to realise not only unity, permanence of law, likeness, but also, with it, difference, variety, contrast: it is rhyme we like, not echo, and not unison but harmony. (J 83)

This statement suggests that an artist has the ability to recognize beauty in art and to compare and unite the parts.

In 'On the Origin of Beauty', Hopkins pursues the origin of beauty using a Platonic form of dialogue between a character called John Hanbury and the Professor. Although the dialogue discusses the Platonic idea of beauty as consisting of symmetry, Hanbury suggests that the beauty of nature is produced by irregularity as well (J 89). Then, the example of an oak shows that, though it is asymmetrical and irregular, 'the outline of its head is drawn by a long curve...of a parabola, which...is of almost mathematical correctness' (J 89). Such irregularity in nature is related to the character of poetry. In the end, 'beauty...is a mixture of regularity and irregularity', and the example of a tree shows that 'all the leaves on the tree' have 'precisely' the 'same irregularity' (J 90). The irregularity of parts in the regularity of the whole is what Hopkins regards as individuality. Regularity is here defined as 'likeness or agreement or consistency' and irregularity as 'difference or disagreement or change or variety' (J 90). Beauty consists of likeness and difference, and the 'beauty we find is from the comparison we make of the things with themselves, seeing their likeness and difference' (J 90-91). Beautiful forms are neither too symmetrical nor asymmetrical, implying a Platonic beauty of the golden mean. The beauty and individuality of leaves lies in likeness with slight difference. In conclusion, universality lies in analogous forms. As the leaves of a tree as parts have diversity with resemblance and are united

in a tree as the whole, 'there is a relation between the parts of the thing to each other and again of the parts to the whole' (J 97).

Then, the discussion moves to structural unity in art: 'the collective effect of a work of art is due to the effect of each part to the rest, in a play of each act to the rest, in a smaller poem each stanza to the rest...' (J 99). The structural unity in a sonnet is emphasized here, and if one of fourteen lines were taken away, 'that would be an important loss to the structural unity' (J 100). Hopkins has high regard for regularity in poetry as well, and refers to the repetitive effect of sound in rhythm, meter and rhyme. Consequently, beauty is 'considered as regularity or likeness tempered by irregularity or difference'. The aim of rhythm is to find difference in likeness, and 'a meter is a whole of which each rhythmic foot is a part' (J 101).

Among other elements, rhyme is most highly valued in Hopkins's poetics 'as shewing the proportion of disagreement joined with agreement which the ear finds most pleasurable...' (J 101). Rhymes resound to emphasize the sound and meaning in a stanza while each part is connected to compose the whole. Not only in poetry, but when we replace a stanza with a work of visual art, there is the point 'where the principle of beauty is to be strongly marked' and 'the intervals at which a combination of regularity with disagreement so very pronounced as rhyme may be well asserted...' (J 102). The term 'intervals' shows that there are connections among the parts and between the parts and the whole, based on mathematical ratios or the correspondence between relative structures in parallelism. Hopkins notes the type of relationship in which the parts are connected to compose the whole with comparative intervals based on the principle of beauty.

The discussion of the distinction between fancy as abrupt parallelism and imagination as chromatic or transitional in 'Poetic Diction' can be linked to 'On the Origin of Beauty' which mentions 'transitional and abrupt' or '*chromatic* and *diatonic* beauty': 'Then of many divisions one might make of beautiful things, I shall consider that there is one...of transitional and abrupt. I think I would call it...a division into *chromatic* and *diatonic* beauty' (J 104). The term 'abrupt' is transformed into a musical term, 'diatonic', and the discussion is similar to that in 'Poetic Diction'. The dialogue leads to 'these two kinds of comparison in poetry, comparison for likeness' sake, to which belong metaphor, simile' and 'comparison for unlikeness' sake, to which belong antithesis, contrast, and so on' (J 106). Comparison is connected with parallelism as the structure

of verse, which is distinguished from that of prose. Then, the discussion moves to parallelism as ‘diatonic beauty’ which includes ‘metaphor, simile, and antitheses’ while ‘chromatic beauty’ is reduced to ‘emphasis, expression..., tone, intensity, climax’ (J 106). Hopkins simply mentions ‘Parallelism’, which he previously called ‘abrupt parallelism’ in ‘Poetic Diction’. This means that his idea of parallelism may be changed so as to consider that parallelism is essentially diatonic and abrupt.

For Hopkins, who attaches a high value to abrupt elements in poetry, fancy connects different things, and is related to the inspiration given to artists in the form of the Idea of Beauty. In this sense, he contrasts with Coleridge and other Romantic poets who regard imagination as a higher faculty than fancy. In the ‘abrupt kind of parallelism’ of fancy, there is an interval between things, and the proportion between them forms beauty, where we find a relation of correspondence. In ‘On the Origin of Beauty’, Hopkins repeatedly mentions the importance of comparison and a relation between things, which confirms his belief in analogy or the correspondence in relative structures. It is correspondences between the parts and also between the parts and the whole that compose works of art. As the two essays written in 1865, ‘Poetic Diction’ and ‘On the Origin of Beauty’, show, fancy is parallel to diatonic beauty while imagination is chromatic.

1.4.3. Hopkins’s Quest for the Origin of Words as Christ and Fancy

Hopkins’s idea of beauty mentioned in ‘On the Origin of Beauty’ and other essays is reflected in his view of nature, art and words. The discussion of individuality in universality in ‘On the Origin of Beauty’ can be traced back to his study of word origins mentioned in his journals in 1863 and 1864. In the journal written in 1863, Hopkins writes down words that have meanings derived from the word ‘horn’:

Horn.

The various lights under which a horn may be looked at have given rise to a vast number of words in language. It may be regarded as a projection, a climax, a badge of strength, power or vigour, a tapering body, a spiral, a wavy object, a bow, a vessel to hold withal or to drink from, a smooth hard material not brittle, stony, metallic or wooden, something sprouting up....
...From the shape, kernel and *granum, grain, corn*. From the curve of a horn, ...*corona, crown*. From the spiral crinis, meaning ringlets, locks. ...;

then for its sprouting up and growing, compare *keren*, *cornu*, ...horn with grow, *cresco*, *grandis*, grass, great, *groot*. For its curving, *curvuvus* is probably from the root *horn* in one of its forms. ...crow...in English bear a striking resemblance to *cornu*.... So also...crane, *heron*, *herne*. Why these birds should derive their names from *horn* I cannot presume to say. ...*Corner* is so called from its shape, indeed the Latin is *cornu*. Possibly...*grin* may mean to curve up the end of the mouth like horns.

(J 4)

Hopkins's consideration of the word 'horn' suggests that various words with diverse meanings are united in a single word. He looks for Christ as the Word in the origin of words that unites diversity. Hopkins pursues the essence of Christ by discovering how words are connected with each other, or their origin and the law that unites them. From 1863 to 1864, he further considers the origin of words and the relation between their meanings. In most of his journals at that time, Hopkins studies the root meanings of words that have similar sounds such as '*[g]rind, gride, gird, grit, goat, greet...crush, crash*'. He comments on other words as well: '*Crook, crank, crick, cranky*. Original meaning crooked, not straight or right, wrong, awry' (J 5); '*Drill, trill, thrill, nostril, nese-thirl* (Wiclif etc.) Common idea piercing' (J 10).

These are just a few examples of root words which Hopkins connects to others with similar sounds and meanings. Hopkins thus tries to find common meanings in words with similar forms and sounds in order to reach their origin or the nature of Christ as the Word. He makes use of his study of words with similar sounds in his poems, which unite the parts to compose the whole and connect each word by virtue of parallelism. Hopkins's interest in etymology is linked to his exploration of the beauty in nature, which he might have thought involves similar relations to those which words have to each other. Christ as the Word or the origin of words, who unites diversity, is also the origin of beauty, and that is why Hopkins's poems are called 'sacramental poetry', being permeated by his inclination to the doctrine of the Real Presence and the Incarnation, which reveal Christ's nature as the unity of opposites.

*

As James Milroy persuasively argues, Hopkins's linguistic interest, and his interest in Christ as the origin of words, seems to have its roots in the etymological theory of Max Müller, the chief exponent of philology in the Victorian era: 'There is direct evidence that Hopkins probably read Müller's work after July 1864, by which time he had already made most of

the etymological entries in his diary. Some time between 25 July and 7 September 1864, Hopkins makes a memo in his diary to read various works and authors, and includes Max Müller among them' (Milroy 50). It is interesting to see Hopkins's memo of the books to read mentioned above because the name of Müller appears among the works of Shakespeare, Gray's poems, *Vanity Fair*, Henry Nelson Coleridge's *Greek Classic Poets*, Gresley's *Short Treatise on the English Church* and *The Christians of St. Thomas* (J 35-36). It shows his wide-ranging interest in his literary milieu. H. N. Coleridge was the nephew of S. T. Coleridge and an editor of the works of his uncle. Max Müller (1823-1900) 'was already one of the chief living authorities on comparative philology as well as an outstanding Sanskrit scholar. At the time of this note (summer 1864), he held the Taylorian Chair of Modern European Languages in Oxford' (J 317n). Among his works, Hopkins 'certainly read *The Science of Language*', which includes 'two courses of public lectures given at the Royal Institution 1861 and 1863' (J 317n). He was also interested in Müller's pioneering work in comparative mythology. His father Manly Hopkins, a successful businessman, sent Müller a copy of his book *Hawaii* (1862), and 'they corresponded about the chapter on language and later met in Oxford' (J 317n). Müller called linguistics 'a physical science', which 'deals with the works of God' (Milroy 51-52).

Milroy points out that Hopkins's lifetime coincides with the heyday of English philology: 'he was born shortly after the founding of the Philological Society and died just after the publication of the first volume of that Society's great achievement — the *Oxford Dictionary*' (Milroy 49). Hopkins owed his observation of nature, and his perception of regularity in it discussed in 'On the Origin of Beauty', not only to Ruskin but also to the historical and comparative researches of nineteenth century philology, which made great strides in the 1850s and 1860s. Therefore, if Hopkins 'had been born thirty years earlier, it is highly unlikely that he would have developed such interests' (Milroy 35).

Milroy also mentions that 'the rise of philology can be clearly seen as related to the Romantic movement with all that implies with regard to interest in the past, interest in folk-culture, and the rise of nationalism' (Milroy 40). Hopkins also shows his interest in medievalism 'in various entries in the 1864 diary, where he records an intention to read the work of Tieck (a German Romantic medievalist) and the Schlegels (best known for their work on Sanskrit and Indian philosophy); he also makes various comments about pre-Raphaelitism and German and other Continental medievalists in art' (Milroy 40).