All critics agree that Hopkins seems to construct his sentences in an unusual manner. Hostile critics maintain that his oddity was caused by his fundamental ignorance, that he would have written in a normal style if he had known how to do so. In opposition, another group claims that he wrote intuitively and therefore willfully abandoned traditional patterns of speech because they seemed to him sterile and passionless. As we shall see, neither of these positions is satisfactory. We must give a closer examination to three questions: Why did Hopkins feel compelled to distort normal grammar and syntax? Is it possible that his study of the classics could have encouraged him to do so? Is there any precedent for his practice in the literature he knew most thoroughly?

It is generally thought that the influence of the classical languages on English verse style is epitomized in Milton's Latinate periods. However it seems plausible that, under the proper conditions, the study of Latin and especially Greek could produce a radically different effect. We have seen that the tendency to shift attention from the nominal subject of a poem to the way the mind of the speaker works, the tendency to mount the psychological reaction of a peculiar character onto the spectacle of the affair, was a distinctive artistic movement in the nineteenth century. But this practice is apparent in both the structure of sentences and the rhetorical organiza-
tion of certain Latin and Greek poems as well. It is possible, therefore, that study of the classical languages might reinforce and encourage the kind of poetry that Richards and Read commend.

A fundamental difference between English and Latin or Greek is that the order of words in an English sentence indicates their logical relationship, whereas in Latin and Greek these same relationships of words are expressed mainly by inflection rather than position. Hence we have in both Latin and Greek the intentional placing of words in an unusual order within the sentence, called by the Greek critics hyperbaton, or transposition, which makes translation for the modern reader mainly a process of sorting or rearranging the words in a logical order.

For convenience of discussion, it is possible to identify several different kinds of hyperbaton in Greek. First, there is the placement of important words early in the sentence in violation of the logical order of ideas. This, of course, occurs at the beginning of the Iliad:

\[
\text{Mῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, πηληδέω Ἀχιλῆος}
\text{οἴλομένην, ἣ μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἀλγε ἔθηκεν}
\]

(The wrath, sing goddess, of the son of Peleus, of Achilles, Destructive, which many on-the-Greeks woes brought.)

There is a good reason to separate “wrath” by a whole line from “destructive” although the two words are grammatically connected, but that reason is not to make the sentence logically more coherent. If we discount the possibility that the opening line is fragmentary, we can only conjecture that “wrath” advances to the beginning of the line so that the main topic of the poem will be expressed in its first word. The same is true of The Aeneid:

\[
\text{Arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris}
\text{Italian fato profugus Laviniaque venit litora.}
\]
We often see an important word cut off from its modifiers and placed near the beginning of the sentence as a kind of topic word. A clear example occurs in *The Republic* when Plato discusses some diseases which were not known in the days of Aesculapius:

(I make the inference [that modern doctors invent needless rules] from the fact that his sons at Troy did not scold the girl who gave to wounded Eurypylus Pramnian wine to drink mixed thickly with barley and cheese, which certainly seems to be inflammatory, nor did they reproach Patroclus who was in charge.)

Here “wounded Eurypylus” is dislocated from its logical context, separated from its proper clause, and advanced into the middle of the clause preceding it. In this way the “wounded Eurypylus” and the “Pramnian wine” are brought into juxtaposition and the contrast between them, the incongruity of the drink, is emphasized. Moreover, the order of the sentence is not written in the normal pattern of grammatical subordination, but in chronological order. The events are listed in the order in which they occurred: Eurypylus was wounded, the drink was given, the nurse was not scolded. The fact that Eurypylus was wounded is what makes the example meaningful and it is therefore advanced toward the beginning of the sentence. Hyperbaton of this type is quite common. The most striking word in the sentence is separated from the words to which it is most closely connected logically and is moved forward leaving its modifiers in their normal position.

Another common form of hyperbaton occurs when interrogatives, relatives, and conjunctions are postponed. Since these words often determine the meaning of the sentence,
withholding them throws the phrase into obscurity until the last minute when parts suddenly fall into place. In Plato’s *Laws*, Book VII, there is an example of a postponed interrogative which is the result of the advancement of a main word in the sentence:

\[ \ldots \text{μανθάνειν δὲ ἐν τούτοις τοῖς χρόνοις δὴ τί ποτε δεῖ τοὺς νέους καὶ διδάσκειν αὐ τοὺς διδασκάλους, τοῦτο αὐτὸς πρῶτον μάθανε. (810 A) } \]

(During these times, whatever the young are to learn or the teachers to teach—this you must yourself learn first.)

The drift of this sentence is not clear until the interrogative is revealed. Necessarily, then, attention is called to the interrogative, “What they are to learn.” The advancement of “to learn” brings the topic word to the front of the sentence and, of course, the chiastic arrangement of *manthanein* . . . *manthane* stresses the paradox that the teachers must be learners as well.

A remarkable example of the postponement of a relative occurs in Plato’s *Laws*, Book IX. Plato discusses the penalty proper for suicide:

\[ \text{τὸν δὲ δὴ πάντων οἰκειότατον καὶ λεγόμενον φιλτατον δὲ ἄν ἀποκτείνῃ, τί χρὴ πάσχειν; (873 C)} \]

(What must he bear who kills the man who is said to be the nearest and dearest of all?)

Here the postponement of the relative seems to withhold the meaning from the reader until the sentence is half over. In a similar manner, Thucydides often withholds a conjunction so as to suspend the meaning of his statement until the last possible minute. He compares Sparta’s treatment of allies to Athens’s:

\[ \ldots \text{καὶ’ ἄλγαρχιαν δὲ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς μόνον ἐπιτηδεῖως ὅπως πολιτεύσονται θεραπεύοντες, (i. 19)} \]

(They ruled so as to maintain an oligarchy serviceable only to themselves.)
The conjunction is postponed so that the meaning of the clause comes in a flash. The arrangement of words, of course, in this sentence is unnatural; that is, it is not the customary arrangement, and therefore it seems intentional and contrived.

A third kind of hyperbaton is the deliberate separation of logically cohering words in the line. The reader often feels that this device produces a very moving account. For example, Herodotus tells of the suicide of Adrastus, who had killed his own brother:

*Ἀδραστός δὲ ὁ Γορδίεω τοῦ Μῖδεω, οὗτος δὴ ὁ φονεὺς μὲν τοῦ ἐωντοῦ ἄδελφου γενόμενος φονεὺς δὲ τοῦ καθήραντος, ἔπειτε ἁπαξή τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐγένετο περὶ τὸ σήμα, συγγνωσκόμενος ἀνθρώπων εἶναι τῶν αὐτὸς ἤδεε βαρυσυμφορώτατος, ἐπικατασφάξει τῷ τύμβῳ ἑωντὸν. (1.45.3)

(Adrastus, the son of Gordias who was the son of Midas, he who was the murderer of his own brother and the killer of the man who had purified him, when there was no bustle of men about the tomb, seeing that he was the most unfortunate of the men he had ever known, killed himself on the grave.)

The separation of logically cohering words can be divided into several different classifications. First, there is the division of a substantive from adjectives in agreement with it, or of a substantive from a genitive construction dependent on it. For example, in Book II of Plato’s *Laws*, he speaks of education:

τούτου γὰρ, ὡς γ' ἐγὼ τοπάξω τὰ νῦν, ἔστιν ἐν τῷ ἐπιτηθεόματι τούτῳ καλῶς κατορθουμένῳ σωτηρίᾳ. (653A)

(Of this [right education], as I now guess, the safety resides in well-established custom.)

Here the genitive is separated from the substantive which it modifies by the whole sentence. Quite frequently the adjective or article is separated from the noun so as to include a modifying clause which, if translated into English, produces a quaint effect, as for example, in the *Phaedo*:
In the before-we-were-born time.

A more complex form of hyperbaton occurs when there is a double splitting so that one hyperbaton is included within another. In Plato’s *Laws*, Book VI, the proper relationship of rulers and servants is discussed in this form:

οὔτ' ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων γεωργῶν τε καὶ κομιτῶν τοῖς ἐκείνον ἐπὶ τὰ ἰδία χρήσονται ὑπηρετήματα διακόνους, ἄλλα μόνον ὡσα εἰς τὰ δημόσια. (763A)

([The rulers] will not employ any servants belonging to the other farmers or villagers for their private services but only for the public requirements.)

Here *tais* is split from *diakonoi* so as to include *ta idia* which is in turn separated from *huperetemata*. A third form of hyperbaton involves the arrangement of a sentence so that the logical connections seem interlaced or braided together. For example in Book VI of *The Republic* Plato says:

μηδεμίαν ἄξιαν εἶναι τῶν νῦν κατάστασιν πόλεως φιλοσόφου φύσεως. (497 B)

(No present constitution of a city is worthy of a philosophic nature.)

Such word order seems almost perverse and could hardly have been written inadvertently.

In the examples quoted, the authors seem to use hyperbaton consciously as a stylistic device. The very word *hyperbaton* in Greek indicates that the practice was recognized as something out of the ordinary. It cannot be maintained that the practice was caused by the requirements of writing in verse, because I have purposely quoted examples mainly from prose. It therefore appears that it is contrived for some artistic end. Lindhamer suggests five motives for the contrivance: (1) striving for phonetic dissimilation, especially in the case of adjectives of the first and second declension; (2) striving for
rhythmic dissimilation, or the avoidance of juxtaposed oxytone words; (3) avoidance of hiatus; (4) seeking for clausula; and (5) emphasis.\textsuperscript{1} Denniston, however, rejects number one and two altogether and questions number four because we have no certain knowledge of the rhythmic laws of the Greek clausula. He agrees that upon occasion hyperbaton is apparently used to avoid hiatus, but that by far the dominant motive for its use is to achieve emphasis. He says, “Logically connected words stand out in higher relief when spatially separated: and, looking at the clause or sentence as a whole, alternating rise and fall of emphasis produce a pleasing effect. To this motive we must add two others: a desire to bind the clause into a compact unity, and, in the case of Plato, a love for pattern weaving for its own sake.”\textsuperscript{2} Denniston’s explanation is not really very satisfactory. It is not clear how splitting an important noun from its adjectives binds a clause into a “compact unity” nor does it explain Plato’s peculiar practice to say that he liked to write that way. Plato does use hyperbaton more than most other prose writers and perhaps this gives us a key to a major motivation for the use of hyperbaton generally. Plato writes mainly in the form of a dialogue, of course, and when he uses hyperbaton he is representing impromptu speech, often agitated or emotional speech.

Pseudo-Longinus in \textit{On the Sublime} gives an explicit reason for using hyperbaton which Denniston overlooks. Immediately before Pseudo-Longinus discusses hyperbaton, he talks about the advantages of asyndeton, saying that just as one may deprive runners of their speed by tying them together, so emotion may be restrained by the use of connecting particles and similar parts of speech and thus the sentence gains freedom

\textsuperscript{1} Luise Lindhamer, \textit{Zur Wortstellung im Griechischen} (Dissertation, Leipzig, 1908).
\textsuperscript{2} J. D. Denniston, \textit{Greek Prose Style} (Oxford: Clarendon, 1952), p. 59. I acknowledge a great debt to Denniston’s analysis and I have used his examples where I could find none clearer.
of emotion and an effect of "coming like a missible from a catapult" through the use of asyndeton. He puts hyperbaton in the same category as asyndeton because hyperbaton, too, bears the "truest character of emotion in action" (χαρακτήρ ἐναγωγίου πάθους ἀληθέστατος. [192v]). The question is, of course, what does Pseudo-Longinus mean by the verisimilitude (χαρακτήρ . . . ἀληθέστατος) which he assumes is the object of the writer. What is it that the poet must truly record? Pseudo-Longinus is quite explicit in On the Sublime:

(Just as when men are angry or frightened or displeased or are carried away by jealousy or some other passion [for there are countless emotions, more than one can mention] then putting forward one idea; many times they leap aside turning away from the point, inserting some illogical middle term, and then circle back to the first idea in every way driven before the anguish just as ships are driven before an uncertain wind, suddenly changing the direction of the words and ideas and changing the natural order of sequence into countless variations, thus by means of hyperbaton an imitation of the workings of nature is made by the best prose writers.)

The point of this quotation is that Pseudo-Longinus is using the phrase mimesis . . . phuseos (an imitation of the workings of nature) precisely as Herbert Read demands when he says that a poet must create "an objective equivalence of his emotional experience: the words may not make sense, but
they make emotion—follow the contour of the thought."\(^3\) Pseudo-Longinus demands that a sentence, if it is to be elevated, must be constructed according to *phusis* rather than *nomos*, and *phusis* apparently means the immediate, natural flow of ideas as opposed to the final, logical disposition of those thoughts according to the *nomos*. This idea brings to mind, of course, Ford Madox Ford’s statement that he and Conrad decided a literary work must not be a narration or a report, but must make the same kind of impression on the reader that life naturally makes. That seems to be what Pseudo-Longinus means by *ta tes phuseos erga*, the workings of nature; the principle of verisimilitude he recommends seems identical to the aesthetic principles of Read and Ford.

Pseudo-Longinus then gives an example of hyperbaton in Herodotus and rewrites the line to show that it becomes dull when the hyperbaton is removed and the sentence is restored to natural order. Because of his use of hyperbaton, he seems to utter thoughts forced from him and not premeditated (ὡς μὴ δοκεῖν ἐσκεμμένα λέγειν ἀλλ’ ἵνα γιαγκασμένα. [193v]). The use of hyperbaton by Thucydides shows another motivation, however. Pseudo-Longinus says that he tries to give the impression of improvisation by making his audience fear that his sentence will suffer a logical collapse until at the last moment the lost word turns up at the end of the sentence and astounds the audience with a flash of understanding. Pseudo-Longinus makes two assumptions in this passage: (1) he believes that ideas do not cross the mind in a logical order when it is excited, and (2) hyperbaton is intentionally used to imitate this non-logical sequence of ideas. The word order leads the audience through the pattern of association of a mind in a state of excitement and hence induces excitement. The inflections indicate the logical relationships of the words; the word order indicates the order in which the words occurred to the

\(^3\) Read, *Collected Essays in Literary Criticism*, p. 100.
speaker. This is a possible reason for the relatively more frequent use of hyperbaton in Plato’s dialogue where he tries to make the speech seem impromptu by imitating the association of ideas of his speaker. Incidentally, we should note that the rise of Pseudo-Longinus’ reputation in the eighteenth century is due at least in part to his implicit reinforcement of the associative theories of art which were developing at that time, leading to Wordsworth’s desire for poetry which imitates “the manner in which we associate ideas in a state of excitement.” And this movement probably led to Read’s “collage effect” and Ford’s theory of the “unearned increment” in poetry: “the juxtaposition of vital word to vital word [establishes] a sort of frictional current of electric life that will extraordinarily galvanize the work of art in which the device is employed.”

Ford gives us several examples of the unearned increment in both his Latin and English poetry. At the end of his On Heaven and Other Poems, there are several translations of his English poems. He explains that these poems were written in a contest. His friend, H. C. James, supplied the rhyme words which Ford had to use to write the English version and then James translated the poem into Latin. Ford is notoriously untrustworthy when he writes about biographical matters so it is hard to know precisely what his share in the composition of the Latin poems was. We can be certain that he at least read them carefully and recognized the principles of construction employed in them, but it is possible that he actually took a hand in the composition as well. One product of this contest is the sonnet “Sanctuary”:

Shadowed by your dear hair, your kind soft eyes,
Look on wine-purple seas, whitening afar
With marble foam where the dim islands are.
We sit forgetting. For the great pines rise

*Ford, The March of Literature, p. 734.*
Above dark cypress to the dim white skies
So clear and dark and still with one great star,
And marble Dryads round a great white jar
Gleam from the grove. Glimmering the white owl flies
In the dark shades . . . .

If ever life was harsh
Here we forget—if ever friends turned foes.
The sea-cliffs beetle down above the marsh,
And through sea-holly the black panther goes.
And in the shadow of that secret place;
your kind, dear eyes shine in your dear, dear face.

The translation of this poem into Latin hexameters seems much better than the English, except for the last line which is slightly bathetic because of the repetition of *benigna* . . . *benigno*.

1 Caesaries teneros suavis ubi incumbrat ocellos:
2 Nos quoque contenti laetique sedemus, obli
ti
3 Si quid amari animos turbarit, et aequora soli
4 Cernimus atra procul spuma canescere salis,
5 Ultima qua franguntur terrae in litora fluetus.
6 Candida marnoreae Dryades prope dolia fulgent,
7 Pergracilisque pinus miscetur imagine coeli
8 (omnes exsuperans herbas, abrasque cupressos)
9 Unica qua Veneris constanter stella refulget
10 Per tenebras radians Stygias. Umbris in opacis
11 Noctua sublustris volitat . . . .
12 Si quid acerbi inerat vitae, si fallimur usque
13 Quod nimium credimus, nobis nunc omnia cedunt.
14 Imminet et scopulas praeceps aequoribus atris;
15 Perque herbas niger insepit pantaera marinas,
16 Longae iam subeunt umbrae, sed lumina semper
17 Vestra benigna mihi fulgent ex ore benigno.

The use of well-defined forms of hyperbaton in this poem is clear. In line 1, there is interlacing, “Caesaries teneros suavis . . . ocellos”; likewise in lines 9 and 10, “. . . Stella . . . per tenebras radians Stygias . . .”; or in line 4, “. . . cernimus atra

Hyperbaton is used to include a phrase between substantive and modifying adjective in line 6, “Candida marmoreae Dryades prope dolia . . .”, or in line 9, “. . . Unica qua Veneris constanter stella. . . .” There is double inclusion in line 15 with one hyperbaton inside another,” . . . herbas niger insepit pantaera marinas. . . .” Advancement of a word occurs in lines 10 and 11, “Umbris in opacis noctua sublustris volitat. . . .” This Latin poem, therefore, demonstrates the major recognized patterns of word order which the Greek critics called hyperbaton. But, moreover, there is a tendency in this poem for the unnaturally juxtaposed words to supply a logically irrelevant point of comparison between the two items mentioned. So in line 1, the juxtaposition of teneros and suavis stresses the point that the girl’s little eyes and her hair are both agreeable. We now know that Ford organized the sequence of ideas in his stream of consciousness monologues in his novels according to the principles of association suggested by Hume: similarity or contrast, contiguity, and cause or effect. These principles of association seem to dictate the word order in the more violent hyperbaton in this Latin poem as well. In line 1, teneros suggests suavis because of their similarity. In line 10, “shadow” suggests “shining” because it contrasts. In line 6, however, the rationale behind the hyperbaton seems somewhat different. Ford wanted verisimilitude in art, by which he meant an imitation of the way the mind works when it imposes order on the chaos of incoming sensations and confused memories. Line 6 of the Latin poem is simply such a representation of the mind at work, trying to make sense of incoming sensations which are not altogether clear in the twilight. Suppose this sentence were read aloud. The hearer could not know what the intended logical relationship of the words was until the sentence

* See Bender, “The Sad Tale of Dowell: Ford Madox Ford’s The Good Soldier.”
was complete. He therefore would think, “White things. Of marble. Around vases they shine.” There are, therefore, two reasons for the more violent hyperbata in these lines. (1) The order of words is sometimes intended to show the mind in the process of associating ideas according to Hume’s laws of association. (2) The order of words is intended to record truly the chaos of incoming sensations and random memories upon which the mind imposes a logical order. The word order becomes a tool for mounting for psychological reaction of one of the characters onto the spectacle of the affair.

In the same way, Walter Savage Landor tries to represent the flow of a character’s thoughts in his monologues. Broken or fragmentary diction indicates a state of agitation in the character speaking. In “The Last of Ulysses,” for example, Penelope has been granted extended beauty while waiting for the return of Ulysses but Venus, in jealousy, hopes to make her marry one of the suitors. Venus approaches the sleeping Penelope and, seeing her for the first time, speaks a soliloquy:

“If Paris had beheld thee . . . but just then
Thy husband took thee from the Spartan land . . .
I was wrong then . . . I am much wiser now . . .
But, had he seen thee, he, his house, his realm,
Had still been safe; no guest betray’d, no wrath,
By armure ript from heroes drag’d thro’ dust,
By temples sunk in ashes, by the wounds
Of Gods, and even their bloodshed, unappeas’d,”
Gazing once more ere vanishing, she said
“How beautiful! how modest!”

The incoherence of the diction is intended to reflect the indecision of Venus. She is astounded by the beauty of Penelope and disconnected thoughts flash across her mind. Landor

tries to imitate these mental processes and as a result his logical statement disintegrates for the first four lines quoted above.

The attempt to copy the associative process of an agitated mind destroys the logic of the sentence in English. But Landor published this poem in Latin in *Idyllia Heroica*, 1820; an English text did not appear until 1847. Therefore, as in the composition of *Gebir*, Landor wrote a Latin version before the English. The speech of Venus, quoted above, is in fact a close translation from Landor's own Latin. When he first wrote this speech Venus said,

"Si te olim Spartae . . . sed eras abducta marito . . .
Viderat Idaeus . . . feci inconsulta . . maneret
Ipse, domus, regnum, neque in Ilion, hospite laeso,
Ilia ducum exuviis, cinere implacabilis urbis,
Deletoque opere atque effuso sanguine divum,
Ex Agamemnoniiis proruperat ira Mycenis." 8

These lines differ from the English version in several important ways. First, in the English lines there is little syntactical connection between the fragmentary phrases. This is not true in the Latin. Two clauses are inserted into an otherwise normal Latin sentence. "Si te olim Spartae . . . viderat Idaeus . . . maneret ipse, domus, regnum, neque in Ilion, hospite laeso, Ilia ducum exuviis, cinere implacabilis urbis, deletoque opere atque effuso sanguine divum, ex Agamemnoniiis proruperat ira Mycenis" seems to be a normal sentence which, incidentally, employs several of the common modes of hyperbaton. It says, "If Paris had once seen you at Sparta, he himself, his house, and his kingdom would have endured and that implacable wrath would not have burst forth [when the hospitality was abused] from Agamemnonian Mycenae into Ilium with the arms of the leaders, the destruction of the town, and the waste of effort and bloodshed of the gods."

Into this sentence, Landor inserts two unconnected phrases, “Sed eras abducta marito,” (but you were taken away by your husband) and, “Feci inconstulta,” (I made a mistake). Although the word order is deformed in Latin just as it is in English, the Latin sentence is logically coherent while the English is not. A fundamental difference between the two languages is that the word order in Latin can be used to represent a non-logical pattern of thought while the logical statement remains unimpaired, but such word order in English leads to incoherence.

The most interesting element in this passage, however, is that Landor himself makes the pattern of association clear. Why is the phrase, “Sed Eras abducta marito,” inserted in the sentence? The answer lies in the word *Spartae*. In the Latin, “Si te olim Spartae . . sed eras abducta marito . . Viderat Idaeus . ., *Spartae* is in the locative case and modifies *viderat*: “If Paris had seen you at Sparta. . . .” But Landor translates these lines, “If Paris had beheld thee . . but just then thy husband took thee from the Spartan land. . . .” In his translation, Landor transfers the word *Spartae* into the wrong clause. It would seem therefore that the word *Spartae* connects the two clauses in his mind. The occurrence of the word in the first clause would therefore suggest the second by a non-logical association of ideas. The association follows Hume’s rules, of course, if we supply the missing term, “If only Paris had seen you, but [he could not because] you were led away by your husband.” The study of Latin reinforced for Landor the theory that a poem should truly represent the association of ideas of a mind in a state of excitement. He learned in Latin to copy the flow of a character’s ideas in the word order of a sentence while the inflections maintained the logic of the statement. In an agitated speech there is a kind of friction or opposition of the two elements of the language. But when Landor tried to use the same technique in English
he had no way to keep the logic of his lines from becoming disjointed. A passage which is exciting in Latin, therefore, becomes meaningless and prolix in English because the English has to repeat the Latin sentence—once to get the effect of non-logical association, a second time to get the meaning across. And this is precisely what Landor does in his translation of the speech of Venus above.

Hopkins, in preparation for his "moderations" in Classical Greats, had to practice for years in double translation from English into specified meters in Latin and Greek. Therefore if we want to see the direction of the early development of his poetic powers, we should look first to his Latin and Greek verse of which, unfortunately, very little is published—or indeed extant. There is, however, an interesting set of translations of songs from Shakespeare which were made late in Hopkins' career. These translations, in general, differ from the original in that they tend to involve the speaker in the situation. The speaker seems more directly concerned with the topic of the poem. He is more excited; his reaction to the affair is made more obvious in the Latin and especially in the Greek than in the English. For example, Bassanio's song in _The Merchant of Venice_, III, ii:

Tell me where is Fancy bred,
Or in the heart or in the head?
How begot, how nourished?
Reply, reply.
It is engender'd in the eyes
With gazing fed; and fancy dies
In the cradle where it lies.
Let us all ring Fancy's knell;
I'll begin it,—Ding, dong, bell.

Hopkins' Latin version reads:

Rogo vos Amor unde sit, Camenae:
Quis illum genuit? quis educavit?
Qua vel parte oriundus ille nostra
Non-logical Syntax

Sit frontis mage pectorisne alumnus
Consultae memorabitis, sorores.
Amorem teneri creant ocelli;
Pascunt qui peperere; mox eumdem
Aversi patiuntur interire.
Nam curas abisse ita in feretrum!
Amorem tamen efferamus omnes,
Quem salvere jubemus et valere
Sic, O vos pueri atque vos puella:
Eheu, heu, Amor, ilicit, valeto.
Eheu, heu, Amor, ilicit, valeto.

And this, in turn, is rendered in Greek:

οτροφή. χο-]
tis ἔρωτος, tis ποτ' ἄρ' ἄ πατρὶς ἤν;
ρευτής χ] tis de νιυ τίκτει, tis ἐθρεψεν, ἀνδρών ἢ θεῶν;
πότερ' αὐτὸν καρδίας ἢ κεφαλᾶς ἐτήσιμον εἴπω
tὸν καὶ πάλαι ὡς ἐπιστροφώντα μᾶλλον
tόπον; οὐ γάρ, οὐκ ἔχω πά τάδε θεῖς δὴ τύχωμ’ ἂν.

ἀντιοτροφή. χο-] tὸν ἔρωτ' ἅρ' οὖχ ἐλικοβλεφάριος
ρευτής β'] ὃς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τραφέντ' ἀκούεις ταίδα
μέν,
συνέφασον δ' ἰμέρον καὶ χάριτος τέως νεοθάλοις
tηλαυγήσιν ἐν πρόσωπον τοῖς θεάτροις
tέλος ἐκπεσόντα φρούδον, θανάτο φρούδον ἐρρεῖν;

ἐπιθοῦς. κορυφαῖος] φρούδος ἐρως, φρούδος ἡμῖν.
ἡμιχώριον α] ἀλλ' αἴλινον αἴλινον εἰπόμεν, ἄνδρες.
ἡμιχώριον β] αἴλινον γὰρ αἴλινον εἰπωμεν.
χορός] αἰαὶ,
φρούδος ἐρως τὸ λοιπὸν, φρούδος ἡμῖν
ἐρως.

Strophe: Where of love, wherever was the homeland? Who begot it, who nourished it, of men or gods? Say truly whether it is from the heart or head and where it used to dwell. For I do not know where these things are ordained. Antistrophe: Did you not hear as children that love is nourished in intertwined glances, and the maturity of desire and loveliness fresh-budded in the face with far-shining looks at last is struck down ruined, to limp ruined to death?
Gerard Manley Hopkins

Commonweal, December 28, 1927. Robinson maintains that the oddity in Hopkins is "pure form" and that "conjecture yields dark psychical reasons for . . . obscurity" (pp. 869-71). And, of course, Richards' justification of obscurity as intrinsically valuable underlies most of the reviews of the second edition of Hopkins' poems wherein Hopkins is praised for the very characteristics which Bridges criticized. Michael Roberts in Poetry, May, 1932, maintains that the industrial revolution makes necessary a new kind of poetry, the kind written by T. S. Eliot and by Hopkins. He grants that we ought to admire the old poets, but "if, as Mr. Richards suggests, poetry is to assume some of the functions of religion, it cannot spend its energy in such futility nor can it deck contemporary life in romantic trappings. . . . It is necessary at present to emphasize the need for 'actuality' in poetry rather than the need for elegance, for that technical beauty which is independent of the psychological value of the poet's attitude" (p. 275). It is clear from subsequent critical writing that Richards' essay replaced Bridges' critical preface as the dominant evaluation of Hopkins' work. In a review of an early critical work on Hopkins in Commonweal, April 13, 1934, Harris Downey says, "Hopkins sought a new mode of expression, and he perfected that mode; but only time could educate man to understanding and appreciation. What makes Hopkins a peculiar poet is what makes him a great poet" (p. 667). He assumes that the change in attitude toward Hopkins is the consequence of a better "understanding" of the poet. There are, of course, other possible reasons for a change in attitude.

Just as Bridges objected to the poetry of Hopkins because it did not fit his notions of what poetry ought to be, so Richards praises the poetry because it seems to fit his preconceived notion of what poetry ought to be. It does not follow necessarily that, because Richards liked the poetry of Hopkins more than Bridges, Richards understood the poetry any better than
in the proposition which he discusses and, therefore, the speaker is much more excited and emotional in the Greek version. The readers' interest shifts from the topic of the speech to the speaker's reaction to what is being said. The tone of the opening line of Hopkins' translation, "τίς ἐρωτος τίς ποτ' ἄρ' ἀ πατρίς ἤμ," is more like the opening line of Sophocles' strophe, "δεινὰ μὲν οὖν, δεινὰ ταράσσει σοφὸς οἰωνοθέτας," than Shakespeare's original, "Tell me where is Fancy bred." By making the speaker personally involved in the outcome of the proposition which he discusses, Hopkins adopts a convention of the choral ode so as to make the psychological reaction of the speaker a main subject of attention and the psychological reaction, the emotional disturbance of the speaker, is made apparent mainly through the agitated order of the words in the line.

In Hopkins' translation, he deforms the word order into all the common patterns of hyperbaton. To list only a few examples: the advancement of an important word in line 1, tis erotos; the postponement of a particle in line 5, an; the separation of a modifying genitive in line 2, tis . . . andron e theon; and especially the effect of interlacing in lines 6 and 7:

\[
\text{τὸν ἐρωτ' ἄρ' ὀφ' ἐλικόβλεφαρος}
\[
\text{ὡς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι τραφεῖτ' ἁκούεις παῖδα μὲν.}
\]

Hopkins' practice is consistent with the advice of Pseudo-Longinus to use hyperbaton to express the true character of emotion in action. Hopkins practiced this kind of double translation throughout his school days and necessarily had to ask himself before beginning each piece, "How is the speaker dramatically involved in what he says? How does he react to what he says? Is he overjoyed, grieved, or puzzled? How can I express the psychological reaction simultaneously with the logical statement of the proposition he considers?" If Hopkins did not take this approach, he could not have written
a passable imitation of the prescribed Greek form. Such presuppositions about how poetry ought to be written are perhaps more likely to be accepted implicitly and unconsciously than through deliberation about the nature of art. At any rate, it is clear that Hopkins alters Shakespeare's lyrics (1) by making the speaker more intimately concerned with what he says, (2) therefore increasing the intensity of the speaker's emotional reaction to what he says, and (3) by expressing this emotional reaction mainly through the use of hyperbaton. Thus, for example, Ariel's song from *The Tempest*, I, ii, begins, "Come unto the yellow sands / And then take hands" but Hopkins' Latin reads, "Ocius O flavas, has ocius O ad arenas, / Manusque manibus jungite." The mode of address becomes more urgent through the advancement of *ocius* and, of course, the repetition and the omission of the verb. "Full fathom five thy father lies," from *The Tempest*, I, ii, becomes "Occidit, O juvenis, pater et sub syrtibus his est." This pattern of hyperbaton is identical to one quoted by Pseudo-Longinus (*On the Sublime*, 193r) from Herodotus reporting the speech of Dionysius, the Phocaean. The quoted passage postpones the salutation to the audience so as to state the disaster which occasions the speech immediately. Pseudo-Longinus explains that "so pressing was the danger that he would not even address the audience first" and as a result "his words do not seem thought out but rather wrung from him." The advancement of *occidit* and its separation from *pater* by *O juvenis* is therefore a conventional way to indicate extreme excitement. "It is engender'd in the eyes" becomes "Amorem teneri creant ocelli," and "Let us all ring Fancy's knell; I'll begin it,—Ding, dong, bell," becomes

\[
\text{aîlîon γὰρ aîlîon ἀπωμεν.}
\]

\[
\text{aiâi}
\]

\[
\text{φροúdos ėρως τὸ λοιπόν, φροúdos ήμιν ėρως.}
\]
Non-logical Syntax

These changes indicate that the emotional reaction of the speaker is given more prominence in the translations than in the original.

The Latin poem "Inundatio Oxoniana," apparently written by Hopkins in 1865, was not discovered until 1947. Gardner includes it in his third edition of the Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins with this note:

Classicists whom I have consulted are not unanimous about this poem; but the majority feel that the style, involved and obscure, is not due to metrical difficulties: 'it seems to be deliberate, and is therefore of interest in any study of the writer's development.'

The poem, however, demonstrates the familiar patterns of hyperbaton. It begins,

Verna diu saevas senserunt pascua nubes
Imribus assiduis . . .
(For a long time the vernal pastures felt the clouds
savage with continual storms . . .)

Verna is in an advanced position; saevas is separated from its substantive; and so on. As in his translations from Shakespeare, Hopkins follows Pseudo-Longinus' advice to express emotion through the use of hyperbaton. Verna advances to the emphatic first position and there is a non-logical association of verna and saevas according to Hume's principle of contiguity. Hopkins therefore imitates the association of ideas of a mind in a state of excitement in the word order of his line in the poem just as in his later translations.

A recurrent thread in the criticism of Hopkins has been the assumption that the ellipsis and inversion in his English verse show that he was not in control of his medium or that he was forced to use inversion to make the rhyme or meter come out right. For example, Arthur MacGillivray says, "Inversion as a poetic device to allow for end rhymes is not only old fashioned but cumbersome. 'Fair thy fling,' 'Thy
creature dear,' 'mighty a master,' 'aspen's dear,' 'disappoint-

ment all I endeavour end,' 'your round me roving end and
under be my boughs' are negligible compared with

Leaves, like the things of man, you
With your fresh thoughts care for, can you?"

But Hopkins in a letter to Bridges on August 14, 1879, specific-
cally denies this charge: "By and by, inversions—As you say,
I do avoid them, because they weaken and because they de-
stroy the earnestness or in-earnestness of the utterance. Never-
thelss in prose I use them more than other people, because
there they have great advantages of another sort. Now these
advantages they should have in verse too, but they must not
seem to be due to the verse: that is what is so enfeebling."

A poet, of course, if often a poor critic of his own work and
cannot judge his own motivation in a distinterested way, but
it is only fair to try to see what he might be getting at here.
He says that he avoids inversion except when it has "great
advantages," but he does not tell us what those advantages are.
In a similar manner, when Bridges accuses him of obscurity,
he replies, "Obscurity I do and will try to avoid so far as is
consistent with excellences higher than clearness at a first
reading. . . . As for affectation I do not believe I am guilty
of it." He asserts that he is obscure only when it is con-
sistent with some higher excellence, but, again, he does not
tell us what that excellence may be. It seems that the quality
which justifies obscurity in the English verse and the ad-
vantages obtained by inversion may be identical for Hopkins.
He often admitted obscurity when it imitated the mental pro-
cesses in action and he found the advantage of inversion to
be that it allowed words to be arranged in a non-logical,
associative pattern which indicates the state of excitement of the speaker and induces a similar state in the reader.

To achieve this effect in "The Wreck of the Deutschland," stanzas 27 and 28, Hopkins uses inverted and broken diction in precisely the same way as Landor in Venus' speech. He quotes the nun's monologue when she is at the point of death; the fragmentary diction is intended to convey her distraction.

\[
\ldots \text{I gather, in measure her mind's Burden, in wind's burly and beat of endragonèd seas.}
\]
\[
\text{But how shall I\ldots make me room there:}
\]
\[
\text{Reach me a\ldots Fancy, come faster—}
\]
\[
\text{Strike you the sight of it? look at it loom there,}
\]
\[
\text{Thing that she\ldots there then! the Master,}
\]

\textit{Ipse}, the only one, Christ, King, Head:

Both Hopkins and Landor use deformed word order to imitate the flow of thoughts across a mind in a state of excitement in the way which Pseudo-Longinus recommends, and Hopkins runs into the same problem in English which bothered Landor. He has no way to maintain his logical statement once he has given over word order to imitation of a non-logical process. Hopkins, like Landor, is trying rather unsuccessfully to introduce a poetic technique peculiar to highly inflected languages into English and the result is a tendency toward incoherence.

Throughout Hopkins' English poetry, he follows tendencies apparent in his Latin verse. First, he often goes out of his way to involve the speaker personally and intimately in what he discusses; for example, the young sailor drowned with the Eurydice is especially to be mourned because he dies outside the Roman Catholic Church:

\[
\text{He was but one like thousands more,}
\]
\[
\text{Day and night I deplore}
\]
\[
\text{My people and born own nation,}
\]
\[
\text{Fast foundering own generation.}
\]

These lines, which incidentally show a common form of hyperbaton, explain the speaker's personal concern for the
death of one sailor. In fact, the relation of the speaker to his subject matter in Hopkins' verse is seldom detached or calm.

A second tendency in both the English and Latin verse is that the principle governing the transition from one topic to another is often associative rather than logical. For example, The Leaden Echo says that there is no way to preserve beauty so,

Be beginning to despair, to despair,
Despair, despair, despair, despair.

But the Golden Echo immediately interrupts,

Spare!
There is one, yes I have one (Hush there!).

Clearly the similarity between the sounds of the second syllable of despair and of the word spare causes a non-logical association in the mind of The Golden Echo. Hopkins is imitating the action of a mind according to Hume's principles.

Since there is a tendency in Hopkins' English poetry to construct a narrator who is intimately concerned with his subject matter and therefore in a state of excitement, and also a tendency to imitate the non-logical association of ideas in such a mind, we might expect that the word order of his English poetry, like that of his Latin and Greek, to be often unnatural. He does, in fact, employ all the familiar patterns of hyperbaton frequently. There is advancement similar to that at the beginning of the great classical epics. "The Loss of the Eurydice" begins, "The Eurydice—it concerned thee, O Lord." Or the untitled poem number 71 begins, "My own heart let me have more pity on. . . ." Postponement of an interrogative occurs, for example, in "The Wreck of the Deutschland," stanza 18:

Ah, touched in your bower of bone
Are you! turned for an exquisite smart,
Have you! make words break from me here all alone,
Do you!—mother of being in me, heart.
Non-logical Syntax

An example of postponement which withholds the meaning of the sentence occurs in "(Carrion Comfort)"; "Not, I'll not, carrion comfort, Despair, not feast on thee." Here despair looks like a verb modified by the initial not until the final words in the first line reveal that despair is a noun. Bridges, in his preface, violently deplored this tendency to confuse the function of a single word so as to suggest two different grammatical functions for it, but it is a common technical device in the Greek choral odes. Hopkins seems to use the device deliberately as, for example, in "Inversnaid":

In coop and in comb the fleece of his foam
Flutes and low to the lake falls home.

Because of the inversion in the second line, it is difficult to tell which word low modifies.

There is also the separation of grammatically connected phrases so as to indicate a non-logical association of ideas. For example, "To what serves Mortal Beauty?" begins:

To what serves mortal beauty'—dangerous; does set dancing blood—the O-seal-that-so' feature, flung prouder form
Than Purcell tune lets trend to? . . .

Mortal beauty is in apposition to O-seal-that-so feature, but the contiguity of beauty and danger, the simultaneous occurrence of them, sets off a non-logical pattern of association which Hopkins imitates by interrupting the logic of the line.

Perhaps most distinctive is his tendency to interlace sets of logically related words. For example, in "Peace,"

When will you ever, Peace, wild wooddove, shy wings shut,
Your round me roaming end, and under be my boughs?
Meaning, "Peace, wild wooddove, when will you ever shut your shy wings, end your roaming round me, and be under my boughs?" The same pattern of inversion occurs in "Spring and Fall."

Leaves, like the things of man, you
With your fresh thoughts care for, can you?
Meaning, "Can you, with your fresh thoughts, care for the things of man, or leaves?" In all these cases, Hopkins is using identifiable patterns of non-logical word order in his English verse just as he uses hyperbaton in his Latin and Greek.

Among the unpublished notes by Hopkins on classical texts there is abundant evidence that he understood grammatical distortion, hyperbaton, and obscurity to be an expression of the thought processes of the character speaking. Hopkins' comment on the *Choephoroi*, line 725, which occurs in the unpublished MSS C.II, dated May 23, 1862, reads:

725. θέρο; Paley substitutes ἐθέρο, but I think that the whole speech is purposely ungrammatical etc. to suit the character of the nurse: . . . witness the monstrous anacoluthon in 745-47, the probable one in 736 et. seq., the clumsy sentence in 724-28, in 738-41, the phrase εὐν’ ἄν πώθηται and the line 743: θέρο then is probably an old-fashioned country form.

From such a comment it is clear that Hopkins was learning from his study of Latin and Greek at an early age that a distortion in language indicates the way the mind of a particular speaker works.

In Ford Madox Ford, Walter Savage Landor, and especially in Hopkins, there is a strange confluence of two different, but complementary, literary tendencies. On the one hand, there is the typical Victorian distrust of the reflective faculty which induces Victorian, and indeed modern, art and criticism to turn to the activity of the mind as the only thing in the world which can be verified. This attitude produces both the artistic form of the dramatic monologue and the postwar psychological criticism of Richards and his associates. Its distinctive expression is a kind of art which mounts the psychological reaction of the observer directly onto the spectacle of the affair. Such art strives for verisimilitude, not by reflecting the external world accurately, but by imitating the way the perceiving mind works. One of the important techniques of such art involves the use of a monologue or revery to juxta-
pose logically disparate ideas either so as to indicate that the mind associates ideas roughly according to Hume's principles, or so as to imitate the supposed chaos of ideas upon which the mind imposes order. This artistic method dominates Ford's *The Good Soldier* and, indeed, works like Joyce's *Ulysses* and Eliot's *The Waste Land* as well. On the other hand, Ford, Landor, and Hopkins—in varying degrees, of course—studied Latin and Greek literature. In Latin and Greek composition they had to practice certain basically non-logical patterns of hyperbaton. They could perhaps feel, as Pseudo-Longinus explicitly states, that hyperbaton is often used to imitate the non-logical sequence of ideas of a mind in a state of excitement. Pseudo-Longinus claims that hyperbaton is used to achieve the same kind of verisimilitude which Richards, Read, and Ford seek—the accurate and direct record of the pattern of ideas crossing the speaker's mind. Once again, Hopkins fortuitously synthesizes two traditions. Through his study of the classics, especially Greek poetry, he accepts assumptions and learns techniques which induce a precocious development ahead of the trend in Victorian art and which foresee the critical assumptions of the postwar critics.