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Abstract of a thesis submitted in the Department of Classical Studies for the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy of the Open University, January 2000.

This thesis examines the validity of the usual assumptions and generalisations about Classical reception in the Victorian period with specific regard to the ideas and writings of Matthew Arnold and Gerard Manley Hopkins. These poets have been selected for the similarity of their intellectual backgrounds and the dissimilarity of their poetry: the principal concern of the thesis is to emphasise the variety of educated Victorians' attitudes to and uses of the Classics, despite the apparent homogeneity of their experience of ancient literature. After outlining, from their own backgrounds and comments, some of the general ideas about antiquity held in the nineteenth century, it compares and contrasts the versions of the Classics which the two men adopted (including the way in which these may have changed over the years) and the uses they made of them, examining the contents, styles and origins of their principal relevant poems and, to a lesser extent, their other writings on the subject. As an important part of the thesis is the setting of the work of these poets in the context of that part of Victorian culture which concerned itself with attitudes to antiquity, it also, where appropriate, considers the degree to which their ideas conformed to the expectations of contemporary critics.
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1. Introduction

The Argument

The Victorians valued and were influenced by their classical education: this is apparent from the classical bias of the curriculum of grammar and public schools and universities, the frequent references to the characters, stories and motifs of ancient history and myth in their literature, and the way in which ideas from the classical writers permeated other aspects of life, such as politics and religion. This aspect of Victorian culture has been well documented; however, there has been less appreciation of the range of ways in which this one influence could show itself, and of the fact that different writers could respond differently to the same stimulus, while paying tribute to the same heritage.

This work addresses this idea by considering two poets, Matthew Arnold and Gerard Manley Hopkins, who are not usually thought of as being comparable but whose backgrounds were similar, both being from literate, middle-class backgrounds, and crucially both being trained as classicists in the same tradition, in the same Oxford college. It might, therefore, have been expected that their poetry would have been in some respects similar, or at least recognisably from the same poetic tradition, but on the surface they appear to be as dissimilar as possible in terms of their subjects, their use of language and their employment of classical elements, the work of one being permeated
by them and that of the other almost devoid of them. Nevertheless, both were
deply affected by their contact with the classics, as shown by Arnold’s
construction of a whole view of art, culture and their connection with society
which is based on his understanding of the ancient authors, and by Hopkins’
life-long obsession with such matters as classical prosody and a Socratic
inquiry into the nature of beauty. In this depth of influence, they stand apart
from writers who used classical backdrops and props for Victorian sentiments
(Tennyson’s “Ulysses” being the most familiar example of this).

This work attempts to trace the different ways in which the classics influenced
both of them profoundly, and to find more in common between them than is
usually credited; its theme is a complex situation in which similar input
produces two contrasting outputs, which nevertheless contain certain
elements which can be traced back to the same roots. As a secondary
objective, this treatment also seeks to be more specific in identifying echoes
of the ancient writers in their writing than has often been the practice of
commentators.

The main sources employed to this end have been as follows: the writers’
own relevant poems and, where appropriate, classical models; their other
relevant writings, most importantly Arnold’s published prose and Hopkins’
journals; relevant items of their correspondence; in the case of Arnold,
contemporary critical reviews; published studies of the two poets and of the
Victorian reception of the classics, as indicated throughout. Although a
detailed study of the nineteenth-century curriculum is beyond its scope, some attention is paid to the relevant reading done by the two men to illustrate the range and depth of their study.

Differing Versions of the Classical Past in Victorian England

One of the quirks of the nineteenth century's belief in the utility of study of the classics (particularly Greek literature, philosophy and history) was that, like every age, it could reinvent the ancient world in its own image, to represent almost any position, and could find kinship with the Greeks. Thus, commentators like Thomas Arnold could see the heyday of the Athenian democracy as a kind of paradigm of the British Empire. Multifaceted authors such as Plato could be read in many different ways and for different purposes, so that that philosopher could be referred to in defence of philosophies as different as the aesthetic and the authoritarian, and invoked as a model by men as disparate as two of Hopkins' tutors, the aesthete Pater and Jowett, who saw himself as a kind of Plato, influencing society by cultivating the minds of the governing elite and creating the philosopher-kings of the Republic. The classical past held not just political and moral but also aesthetic relevance, and so Matthew Arnold could go back to ancient poets for his touchstones of poetic taste, just as the Romans of the age of Augustus had done in adopting Greek culture and its standards. Pater's comment on this phenomenon in the age of Marcus Aurelius could equally be applied to Victorian England: "in a voluntary archaism, the polite world of that day went
back to a choicer generation, as it fancied, for the purpose of a fastidious self-correction, in matters of art, of literature, and even ... of religion".

Similarly, each individual student could find in the broad field of classical studies something to which he could relate, and so each of the three Balliol poets of the period (Arnold, an undergraduate 1841-4; Swinburne, 1856-9; Hopkins, 1863-7) found something different in or made a different use of the literature. Swinburne, for example, adopting a version of its paganism as Shelley had earlier found in it justification for atheism (not a step commonly condoned: the final thrust of J.D. Coleridge's criticism of Arnold iv concerns his leaving out of the Christian message, which Coleridge claims the Greeks would not have ignored had they been aware of the Gospel).

Steve Dillon's "The Archaeology of Victorian Literature" v emphasises the rise of historical consciousness from around 1830 and the way Victorian writers were aware of the links between past and present. Noting the publication of such books as Lyell's *Geology* in 1830 and the change from mere collecting to scientific archaeology, he points out the difference between, on the one hand, the romantic forgeries of Ossian and the antiquarianism of Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* and, on the other, a work like Bulwer-Lytton's *Last Days of Pompeii* (1834). He offers *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* as an example of "life that is like being wedged between times" vi (and with a symbolic catastrophe at Stonehenge), and one could similarly point to Arnold seeing himself re-enacting the thoughts of Sophocles or the confusion of
Epipolae (in "Dover Beach"). Dillon's thesis emphasises the way the Victorians saw the classical period of Greece as being an age in essence like their own and having important political, moral and artistic lessons for them, despite the fact that ancient paganism presented a problem for what was, at least conventionally, a Christian society; the resulting confusion or conflict, exemplified by the clashes within and between Jude and Sue in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*, could not be resolved, although it could be avoided by, for example, Hopkins' virtual dismissal of that whole side of ancient culture as "foolery". Dillon also reminds us that the use of classicising motifs in Victorian writing is not, at least in the work of the greater poets, a matter of showing off knowledge or of decoration but the consequence of a definite feeling of closeness and of reliving ancient experiences (historical, as with Arnold's examples above, or mythical, as when he identifies with the characters of pastoral elegy in "Thyrsis").

It is this relevance of application, together with the feeling that it adds validity and resonance to what is said, which underlies the Victorian habit of quoting from the classics, rather than, in the best examples, any display of pretension; indeed, in writings of the calibre with which we will be concerned classical references appear not as quotations but as integrated parts of the essential fibre of the thought.
The Place of Arnold and Hopkins in the Range of Versions of the Classics

A consequence of this multiplicity of versions of the classical past and its significance is that there could be profound disagreements within the overall tradition without its basic tenets being denied. In the case of Arnold and Hopkins, for example, devotion to the classics could produce from one writing in which the ancient characters and stories abound but within an essentially English setting of language and landscape (seen most clearly in "The Scholar-Gipsy" and "Thyrsis"), and from the other a poetry from which they are almost absent but which uses a form of language and structure which appears to owe much to classical writers (especially Pindar).

The Victorian addiction to the classics was not indiscriminate, and pundits differed not only in emphasis (some, for example, being encouraged by the example of Greek eroticism while others adhered to austere stoic philosophy; Arnold generally favoured the stoic approach to life, Hopkins the aesthetic) but also over such issues as whether or not it was appropriate to try to imitate Greek metrical effects in English verse, or whether the conventions of Greek drama could and should be transferred to the nineteenth-century stage. Thus we have the initially surprising fact that classically-educated critics could disapprove of Arnold's classically-based works while praising Tennyson's pieces in the same vein, though in a watered-down form. It seems that the Victorian reader wanted to be presented with a classical past which was comfortingly familiar: the Keatsian romanticism of Tennyson's "The Lotos-
Eaters” and the imperialistic overtones of his “Ulysses” caught the mood of the time more readily than the strangeness of “The Strayed Reveller” and the starkness of Merope. There is nothing that is specifically Homeric in “The Lotos-Eaters”, and little in “Ulysses” apart from one imitative reference to “windy Troy” and the names; the bulk of the latter piece could easily have been transferred, with the same effect, to the mouth of Richard I after his release from Austria or Napoleon on Elba. “Empedocles on Etna”, on the other hand, not only contains the mythological songs of Callicles and the well-known ancient story of the suicide, but displays easy (rather than forced) familiarity with such details as the “laurel bough” and the geography of Sicily, and even sketches in the story of the rise of the sophists (relevantly, rather than as decoration) - and yet this work failed to please, basically because, although the classical setting of the drama is fully realised, the central figure is a disturbingly “modern” man (in Arnold’s sense), conveying nothing of the picturesquely antique, or of the presumed classical serenity Arnold himself later promoted.

On the other hand, it could be argued that the occasional use of the classical allusion, rather than the full-blown imitation of classical form and style, is a more subtle device and a more acceptable way of achieving a compromise between ancient and modern, and is not simply a sign that the writer is half-hearted in his method: reviewing the 1853 volume, John Duke Coleridge refers to Tennyson’s “the ringing plains of windy Troy” and speaks of his “skill and taste” in employing such allusions: “a classical image, a heroic subject, a
quaintly translated phrase from a Greek or Latin writer... will, when met with in a modern poem, often... give singular delight to a reader acquainted with the classics... But such arts must be used sparingly... or they degenerate into grotesqueness and affectation, and ceasing to be agreeable, become ridiculous... Mr. Arnold has much of his art to learn, and a great deal of tact and experience to acquire...” More bluntly, he says “his love of the ancients has led him into many a harshness and obscurity, many a bald passage intended to be austere, many a childish one intended to be simple.”

The adverse critical notices Arnold received, therefore, usually stemmed not from the fact that he believed in the value of the classics, since this was a common tenet of the age, but from some of his particular versions of it, which clashed with those held by some of his critics. The pastoral elegy “Thyrsis” was, unusually for one of Arnold’s classically-inspired pieces, received positively by contemporary critics, perhaps because by its appearance in 1866 they had become used to Arnold’s methods but more probably because this poem wears its scholarship lightly, expresses personal feeling and successfully mixes a well-known classical motif long absorbed into the English tradition (the conventions of Theocritean pastoral idyll, with idealised, sophisticated shepherd-singers) with the expression of recognisable emotions (grief, nostalgia, hope) and a credible setting realised in concrete terms (as in “Dover Beach”). Revealingly, Swinburne, while commending its “sweet sound and sweet savour of things past... a perfume and an echo of Grecian flutes and flowers”, also praises it as the most “English-coloured verse” since Shakespeare, in its descriptions. The critical approval of “The Scholar-
Gipsy" and "Thyrsis" reinforces the idea that Arnold was most successful with Victorian readers when he was less obviously or intrusively classical in his tone, form and content, as there is very little in either poem which is closely derived from an ancient source and the overwhelming impression is instead of realistically-portrayed English scenes and powerful personal emotions; Arnold here does much what Tennyson did in a poem like "Ulysses", exploiting the charm of familiarity by the use of a classical reference or device but relying on the presentation of emotion or the force of description for the real effect.

Arnold was perhaps unusual in the strength of his convictions, and the extent to which he promoted his view was sometimes rather beyond what his period could take. For example, the Victorian norm was to read and praise the classical dramatists, but to expect to see at the theatre Shakespeare performed behind a proscenium arch; the critics reacted badly when Arnold actually produced in Merope a text which resembled in detail a Greek play, and suggested that its establishing as a norm would cure many defects in the modern theatre.

In his zeal for the classics, Arnold was also inconsistent in his use of the conventions and trappings of the ancient world: according to his criticism and his prose writings about literature, chronological concerns and matters of historical accuracy are irrelevant when compared to the significance of what he calls the "action" of the piece, but his own poetry strives hard to reproduce
the classical atmosphere and setting in detail. According to his 1853 Preface, "The date of an action, then signifies nothing: the action itself, its selection and construction, this is what is all-important... With (the Greeks) the action predominated over the expression of it; with us, the expression predominates over the action" and he goes on to state that the Greek drama was dominated by a few mythical stories which were particularly suited for the expression of tragedy; however, his bias towards the classical leads him, in the Preface to *Merope*, a few years later, to reject the equally suitable (and perhaps equally "mythical") tragedy of Samson as a fitting plot because it was unknown to the Greeks.

To be fair, in the briefer 1854 Preface he refuted the claims that he wanted "to limit the poet, in his choice of subjects, to the period of Greek and Roman antiquity", and that he preached the need to mimic externals; he stressed, however, the need to study the classics in order to "emulate" their "sanity". The kind of criticism he was answering can be illustrated from Coleridge’s review already referred to - "(Arnold) proceeds to argue that time is unessential, and that a great action of a thousand years ago is more interesting and fitter for poetry than a small one of yesterday. From this he arrives, by a curious sort of logic, at the conclusion that ancient subjects are in themselves fitter for poetical handling..."

In the case of Hopkins, who makes scarcely any use of classical stories and motifs despite sharing much of Arnold’s background and training, it is the
ancients' use of language and ways of structuring poetry which affect his writing, an altogether more subtle, less obvious influence; not only is it harder to pin down, but it is much less easy to judge what the contemporary critical response would have been, as so little of his work was seen by more than a couple of friends until the next century. However, given the bafflement of the Jesuit editors who saw “The Wreck of the Deutschland” and the apologetic editorial comments of his own friend Robert Bridges, one can assume that Victorian critics would have found Hopkins incomprehensible and would not have perceived any classical influence on him; for them, valid English imitation of the classical necessitated the use of recognisable, familiar English poetic conventions as a basis. For example, imitation of epic metre would be expected to adopt the nearest English equivalent, pentameter blank verse, as in “Ulysses”, and not sprung rhythm derived from early English alliterative models.

*Materials and Chronology for the Study of Classicism in Arnold and Hopkins*

In considering what the classics meant to Hopkins and Arnold, and how their own poetry was shaped by their education in classics, one needs to examine not only their poetry but also the evidence left in the form of letters and other prose writings. In what follows, the approach tends to be to work from the published text back to its origins, in the ancient works (the translations being my own, unless otherwise acknowledged) and in the poet's background.

---

However, there is some difference in the way the two are treated: as Arnold's work was published in the usual way, use is made of contemporary reviews to gauge the extent to which his work could be considered as representative of the period; as Hopkins made few obvious references in his poetry, there is more emphasis on his thoughts about the classics, taken from letters and other personal writings, and it is often with these that connections with his own poems are made. Among critical works consulted, particular mention may be made of Anderson's appendix of classical references in Arnold's work, especially for the Homeric echoes in “Sohrab and Rustum”.

Of necessity, consideration of Arnold's large body of work has had to be selective, and the focus is on key areas of classical influence, such as the idea that the ancient world can supply lessons and images appropriate to the contemporary world or the great devotion to Homer; the most substantial classically-inspired pieces, “Empedocles on Etna” and Merope, are considered at some length, not only because they are longer but also because they differ so much from each other and evoked strong, if negative, critical responses, and also some explanatory comment from Arnold himself (in the 1853 Preface and the Preface to Merope).

As there is little explicit of immediate relevance in Hopkins' poetry, the few pieces which are clearly based on classical sources (an early translation from the Prometheus Bound and the sonnet “Andromeda”) are dealt with in some detail. Consideration of Hopkins' relationship with, in particular, Pindar gives
rise to discussion of specific aspects of poems which are not specifically classical in form or content, such as "The Wreck of the Deutschland".

With both poets, the approach tends to be roughly chronological, as both men display changes in attitude over time; the exception is the treatment of Arnold’s "Dover Beach", which is looked at early as a particularly useful example of the way in which a Victorian poet could deploy a classical reference, relying on the general knowledge of the target audience, and also give it a fresh or contemporary relevance in keeping with his own perception of what it could mean. The chronological approach is particularly relevant in Arnold’s career, since it is possible to discern phases in his development; the usual pattern detected is a three-fold one, and one of the earliest descriptions of it is given by Rowland Prothero writing retrospectively in the Edinburgh Review. In this scheme, Arnold starts as one disillusioned by the world and detecting no direction in modern life, and so his classical models tend to be similarly disappointed and seeking inappropriate remedies, such as the Reveller with his cup or Mycerinus attempting to cheat fate: "Empedocles" would be the epitome of this mood. The second phase, starting with the withdrawal of "Empedocles" from the 1853 volume, marks Arnold’s whole-hearted adoption of the stoic philosophy and an intensification of his adherence to classical models; thus we have the stoical affirmation of "The Scholar-Gipsy" and the image of man helpless in the hands of fate in "Sohrab and Rustum" and the deliberate classical form and content of Merope. The third phase, of growing "Hebraism" in place of this thorough-going Hellenism,
relates mainly to his prose writing, his poetry ceasing after the mid-sixties, and does not concern us much here, except in so far as it reinforces the idea of a change taking place in his view of the classical past. In this period, according to Prothero, Arnold increasingly realised that no poetry could be "adequate" (his own highest term of praise in "On the Modern Element in Literature", and applied to Sophocles) which did not reflect modern conditions: as this contradicted his own poetic practices and instincts, he could no longer write poetry with honesty.

School and Classical Education

Hopkins' Headmaster reflected his period in considering "the study of Latin and Greek the primary object of our creation," and even as a schoolboy Hopkins' deep involvement in his study of the classics is evident, not only from his Balliol Exhibition but also from the enthusiasm apparent in a letter to a friend in 1862: "Is your Sherborne standard high? And what do you do in the way of classics? Do you ever read Theocritus and Moschus? If not, you must; they are lovely: read Theocritus' *Thalusia* and *Hylas* and Moschus' *Elegy for Bion*, and say if there is anything so lovely in the classics.... I have been reading in the holidays the *Prometheus Bound*. It is immensely superior to anything else of Aeschylus' I have read; indeed, what stilted nonsense Greek tragedy usually is. It is really full of splendid poetry.... Of course you know the celebrated phrase ἄνηριθμον γέλασμα in it; I have translated the soliloquy in which it occurs as well as some beautiful lyric passages of which I give a specimen." (There follows the second half of the translation of a speech from *Prometheus Bound* discussed below.) Two other letters which mention the classics in 1864 encapsulate much that is typical not only of Hopkins' involvement with the classics but of the whole Victorian experience of them. One feature of this is the free way classical references and allusions

---

*a* "boundless smile" - used of the endless twinkling of sunlight on waves.

*b* Including an unfinished short story with many classical touches and a quotation from Virgil's *Eclogues* ("ex illo Corydon, Corydon est tempore nobis"), part of the Mods. reading (Joseph Feeney, "At St. Beuno's", *Times Literary Supplement*, January 29, 1999, pp.13-4.)
are used, including the practice of easy quotation from the Greek ("ευφυέας whiskers", "Εἰ ἔ δ' ἄν πᾶν ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ χρόνῳ", "a more ἀμήχανον condition")

Having adapted a classical allusion from Hamlet ("She is to her brother Hyperion to a satyr") he describes how he was cut off by a flood and "took refuge in a shepherd's hut and slept amongst the Corinthians". This readiness to quote and allude may be seen cynically as an affectation, but in fact it recognises the aptness of an ancient comment for a modern situation, the whole justification for the exercise in the view of someone like Thomas Arnold. There is also evidence of the sheer quantity of "hard" reading which was considered quite normal: "I have just finished The Philippics of Cicero and an hour remains before bedtime; no one except Wharton would begin a new book at that time of night, so I was reading Henry IV..." There is the typical Victorian enthusiasm for Homer: "I have been reading the twelve first (which is it? The first twelve then) books of the Odyssey, and have begun to receive Homer in earnest. How great his dramatic power is! Finally, there is an appreciation of scholarship, despite the labour entailed, and an acknowledgement of its importance to him: "I have been reading Sophocles with Herrmann's notes which are laborious beyond everything, but a great clue to scholarship I find."

In considering the enthusiasm for the classics, especially the Greek classics, that students like Arnold and Hopkins express and which is evident in the

* "well-grown"; "all may come about in the long run"; "helpless".*
mature Arnold's commitment to the cultural values he perceived in Periclean Athens and Hopkins' obsession with Greek metre, it should be borne in mind that in the mid-nineteenth century the serious study of Greek was rather a novelty, as in the later Middle Ages; in the eighteenth century, a classical education had involved study of the Latin poets, especially Horace, and practice in Latin verse composition, but prose writers and Greek had been little read except at such institutions as Samuel Parr's Stanmore school.

The Oxford Literae Humaniores of 1807 consisted of Latin and Greek, logic and moral philosophy, the only set Greek philosopher being Aristotle (often read in Latin); ancient history and political philosophy were added in 1830, and Greek prose composition did not feature until the same period.

Whatever the cause for the shift in emphasis at the end of the eighteenth century away from Latin verse and towards Greek and the prose writers of history and philosophy - whether the greater kinship of the Romantics with the aesthetics and picturesque mythology of the Greeks than with the practicalities in which the Romans excelled, or the greater attraction of Athenian democracy, compared with the excesses of Roman imperialism, in the aftermath of American and French revolutions - the actual process of change seems to have come about primarily as a result of the efforts of a few headmasters to change the agenda of the public schools, so that students started arriving at Oxford trained in Greek and the prose authors, obliging a response from the colleges. Both Arnold and Hopkins were affected by this
movement, the former most obviously by his own father but the latter also by
his experiences at Highgate.

An example of the pattern of lessons at Arnold's Rugby is given to us in Tom
Brown's Schooldays. When Tom joins the school in lower fourth, he works at
"a book of Livy, the Bucolics of Virgil, and the Hecuba of Euripides, which
were ground out in small daily portions." We hear of the "vulgus", the
exercise of composing (or at least copying and patching together) several
lines (the number depending on the seniority of the form) of Greek or Latin
verse on a theme announced by the master, to be shown at the beginning of
the next day, "every other day of the week", along with the recitation and
construing by heart of a section from one of the classical poets, a practice
introduced by Arnold. Learning huge amounts of text from the classics by
heart was a routine part of education, the "Standing-up" practised at
Winchester when Matthew Arnold was there involving the recitation of
thousands of lines. Hughes gives a description of the way in which Homer
was dealt with, the boys preparing about 40 lines in advance to be read aloud
and construed in a period of one hour. Such was the thoroughness with which
the texts were prepared by Victorian students.

There were some strong protests about the predominance of the classics in
the schools and universities and some questioning of the value of such study,
for example, from Sydney Smith. Richard Jebb, writing from Trinity College,
Cambridge, in 1860 complains, "For years everything conspired to make me
think that Greek and Latin were the end of existence. This miserable illusion
disappeared when I came up here, and yet I know that my pretensions to any
ability whatever rest solely on proficiency in these wretched classics, which I
now almost detest. What I yearn for is a start in the serious business of life,
and emancipation from these utterly barren studies - barren at least in
respect of all that is practically useful. On a lighter note, Tom Brown
ponders, on his last day at Rugby, "whether I should have got most good by
understanding Greek particles or cricket thoroughly". However, such
dissent was short-lived or ineffectual - Jebb became Regius Professor of
Greek at Cambridge - and headmasters like Thomas Arnold did not abandon
the classics in favour of a curriculum more geared to the needs of a
commercial and technological age; "What in fact they did was to reorientate
the study of the classics towards Greek and, above all, towards the masters
of philosophy and history, Plato and Thucydides. Trilling sums up Thomas
Arnold’s attitude: “The conventional classical education had been attacked on
grounds both of narrowness and of uselessness; Arnold admitted the former
charge but felt that by doing so he was invalidating the latter: he undertook to
make the classics useful by making them broad. He refused the obvious
alternative to the classical curriculum ... scientific in content only ... He
offered instead a reinterpretation, declaring what his son was often to repeat,
that the classics were important and useful because modern. He replaced the
old, polite, Greek-is-a-gentleman’s-language conception with philosophical
and historical study ..." Although Matthew concerned himself with the
poetry his father tended to ignore, he followed his father in seeing the works
of the ancients as having direct relevance to the development of contemporary culture. Although Hopkins is not explicit about this in the way Arnold is, his obsession with technical aspects of Greek metre and with language issues suggests that in some way he felt an understanding of the details of classical culture to be of burning importance, and the intensity of his correspondence suggests that he thought others shared this conviction.

The revived public schools also adopted and adapted Hellenic ideals in sport, the development of the mind being coupled with that of the body in a way of which Plato would have approved, combining to achieve individual excellence and cultivate the spirit; the first chapter of Tom Brown's Schooldays actually set in Rugby is a long account of a football match and its great significance. Rowing became important also, almost in imitation of the Athenian citizenry.

*Oxford and Classical Education*

Arnold and Hopkins were both products of Balliol, one of the colleges at the forefront of the nineteenth-century revival in classical studies, and were closely associated with some of its leading figures, such as Benjamin Jowett - a surprising choice of college for Hopkins, for as well as being at the intellectual forefront it was also dominated by the Anglican liberal party. There must have been strain for Hopkins in being tutored by Jowett and having to demonstrate the required loyalty to the college ("Jowett demanded ... exclusive loyalty to himself, to his college, and to his speculative brand of
Christianity... 

"... while being so out of sympathy with its prevailing religious climate; Hopkins' temper must have been severely tested even by Jowett's devotion to Plato, for it involved a displacing of the ancient orthodoxy of Aristotle and a whole-hearted adoption of the Socratic technique which could question even the fundamentals of faith.

The academic stagnation of the University which had caused Cobbett to be critical in 1830 ("... the great and prevalent characteristic is folly; emptiness of head; want of talent...") and which was to be remedied, under government pressure, in the middle of the century, had already been banished some years earlier from some of the colleges, Balliol perhaps having the best academic reputation in the middle decades: the scholarship for Balliol is mentioned throughout Tom Brown's Schooldays as the great academic prize at Thomas Arnold's Rugby. J.H.Jones traces Balliol's rise from near-collapse at the end of the eighteenth century, with only four admissions in 1800; by Arnold's time it had improved considerably since Robert Southey had been told by his tutors to work on his own, having surpassed them.

Hopkins' letters and Journal reveal the range of reading undertaken by students and their contact with staff at Balliol in the 1860s (although Arnold would not have had quite the same regime in the 1830s). He sets out his week in January, 1864, when reading for Moderations:


Ellis 9 P.M. Compo.

Hall.


("R.R." is, for example, "Riddell's Room"). The Mods. student thus received,
in a week, three sessions on the Odyssey with James Riddell, three on Virgil
with Edwin Palmer, two on Demosthenes (and in fact Aeschines also) with
Palmer, two with Benjamin Jowett on Sophocles' Ajax, and others on, for
example, composition and scripture. The same letter gives us a glimpse of
what classes with these tutors were like: "Riddell... lectures on Aeschylus and
Homer; he and his lectures are much thought of and popular...Palmer's
lectures on Aeschines and Virgil shew a height of scholarship which makes
me awestruck.... Jowett lectures on Thucydides. Each lecture lasts an hour.
Besides preparing these...we have an essay a week, alternately Latin and
English...When I called on Jowett, he advised me to take great pains with

---

Even after the 1850 reform, the texts a student was expected to prepare for examination
were limited - only one Greek and one Latin author for Responsions, with composition, and
the same, with the Greek gospels, for Moderations, although candidates for higher honours
were expected to offer four of each. Greats covered history and philosophy, as well as
composition and the study of rhetoric through either Aristotle or Cicero, but no literary texts,
although the study of the historians and philosophers was literary, with emphasis on textual
criticism. Recommended authors for Moderations included Virgil and Homer, the Greek
dramatists and Terence, Lucretius, Pindar and Plutarch - an emphasis which can be seen in
the principal influences on Arnold and Hopkins. (M.G.Brock & M.C.Curthoys, The History of
this, as on it would depend my success more than on anything else...\textsuperscript{a}

This pattern would be familiar to a classics student at Oxford today, with lectures in the morning (Hopkins' "preparing" being reading in advance for these) and the weekly individual tutorial based on the reading out of the student's essay. The main difference would be the greater importance of the lecture, at a time when modern translations of and commentaries on many texts were less easy to obtain; the reciting of ad hoc translations seems to have been a significant part of the exercise, and, judging from the extremely dense and detailed marginal notes in copies used by Hopkins, a diligent student would make substantial annotations to a text during the lecture. Another feature of Oxford teaching which emerges from Hopkins' account is the classically-inspired peripatetic method, the teaching "walks" taken with, for example, Pater.

The Oxford classics student was expected to do a great deal of the reading of texts in the vacations, and the scale of this is apparent from a letter of July 1863: "For the first week of the Long I read the Georgics... Now... In the mornings I read the Histories of Tacitus. I must say they are very hard.... I have Tacitus and Cicero's Philippics to read....\textsuperscript{a}

After taking Mods. in 1864, Hopkins lists "Greats books. Most of the following.\textsuperscript{a}

\textit{Aristotle}. Rhetoric, Ethics, Politics. \textit{Plato}. Republic. \textit{Herodotus}. \textit{Thucydides}. \textit{Livy}, 10 books. \textit{Tacitus}. Histories or 1st. 12 books of Annals. \textit{Bacon}'s "Novum Organon". \textit{Butler}'s Sermons or \textit{Analogy}, the Greats course being, where Moderations had been concerned with language and literature of an artistic...
sort, a study of ancient history and philosophy, the latter being brought "up to
date" with the inclusion of Bacon and, as the Christian element, Butler. Notes
in 1865 give some indication of the content and frequency of classes: "Greek
History. Herodotus. Newman. Monday and Friday, at 11" (William Newman,
Fellow and Senior Dean of Balliol), "The Epistles, Jowett. Tuesday and
"Aristotle's Ethics. Wall. Monday, Wednesday, and Friday at 10" (Henry Wall,
Fellow and Bursar of Balliol). There are also a few references to editions,
such as the bemused "Aristotle's Ethics, but what edition?" and the requests
for needed books to be sent from home.

The Importance of Education

Arnold's occupation as a school inspector is in keeping with him seeing
himself, as will be discussed later, as a defender of the permanent values
which education promotes - indeed his father saw his headmastership more
as a way of influencing the future leaders of society than as a pedagogical
role - and paradoxically this makes his educational philosophy much more
liberal and progressive than the kind of utilitarianism commonly held at the
time and pilloried by Dickens. Opposing the Revised Code of 1862, which
threatened to reduce education to rote learning, Arnold writes, "...the State
has an interest in the primary school as a civilising agent, even prior to its
interest in it as an instructing agent. Nevertheless, this is seen in terms of
its good for the State rather than for the individual, and has a practical
objective, as he wrote to his wife after his appointment: "I think I shall get interested in the schools after a little time; their effects on the children are so immense, and their future effects in civilising the next generation of the lower classes, who as things are going will have most of the political power of the country in their hands, may be so important. This accords with his father's and Plato's views, although they concerned themselves with the future ruling classes: "It was only fitting that a man for whom the State was the centre of social existence should be an educator: from Plato to Hegel and Marx the State-idea has had ultimately to rest on education. Of course, the kind of education Matthew Arnold is principally talking about above, in the elementary schools, is not the classical education he had enjoyed, but it is from the example of Athens that he derives the underlying ideas about the responsibilities of the state and the individual in a democracy, the benefits of education and the perfectibility of the individual.

Nevertheless, despite his background, his father's example at Rugby and his professional commitment to education, Arnold had some reservations about the way the classics were traditionally taught and was unsure about the appropriateness of the insistence on exact grammatical precision prior to literary appreciation and serious consideration of the content: "It may be said that the more we know about a classic the better we shall enjoy him... But the case here is much the same as the case with the Greek and Latin studies of our schoolboys. The elaborate philological groundwork which we require them to lay is in theory an admirable preparation for appreciating the Greek
and Latin authors worthily... True, if time were not so short, and schoolboys' wits not so soon tired and their power of attention exhausted; only, as it is, the elaborate philological preparation goes on, but the authors are little known and less enjoyed.\textsuperscript{xlii} Thomas Arnold's neglect of classical poetry at Rugby seems to have been prompted partly by similar doubts about the ability of boys to appreciate it (a notion reflected in \textit{Tom Brown's Schooldays} when both boys and master are puzzled, even shocked by Arthur's emotional reaction to "the most touching thing in Homer"\textsuperscript{xl}) and partly by the belief that the greatest utility of classical study lay in the application of the lessons of history and philosophy to contemporary public life. Hughes grasps the ultimate aim of Arnold's system but not the intended link between the methods and the objective: "The object of all schools is not to ram Latin and Greek into boys, but to make them good English boys, good future citizens."\textsuperscript{xlii} The Arnolds' promotion of and belief in the value of classical study were also tempered by a recognition of the limited nature of the access to the subject, as Matthew acknowledges in the \textit{Merope} Preface, when justifying his attempt to reproduce the "grand effects" of Greek drama in an English work: it is "vain to expect that the vast majority of mankind will ever undertake the toil of mastering a dead language, above all, a dead language so difficult as the Greek."\textsuperscript{xliii} This could also be seen as an expression of the Victorian esteem of the subject for its value as the badge of a privileged educated class, though the writer is in part freed from the taint of elitism by his desire to share with a wider audience "through the medium of a living, familiar language, a fuller
and more intense feeling of that beauty, which, even when apprehended through the medium of a dead language, so powerfully affected me”.

The Careers of Arnold and Hopkins Compared

In their differing relationships with the classical tradition, Arnold and Hopkins make an interesting contrast and serve to exemplify the wide range of ways in which classical scholarship could affect a poet writing in English in the nineteenth century. Arnold, superficially a dandy, took only a Second Class in Greats whereas Hopkins, “the star of Balliol”, took a First in both Moderations and Greats. However, there was irony in this, as Arnold went on to be identified with classical education in the public view and continued to write and lecture on the subject for the rest of his life, in the conviction that the ancient world, as embodying much of what is best, should be the guide for the present. Hopkins, on the other hand, cut himself off from any kind of public life, and effectively prevented his work being published, by becoming a Jesuit; his public contribution to classical scholarship after this was limited to letters to friends and to spells of school and university teaching (and even his recognition as Professor of Greek at Dublin was marred by disillusionment there). However, Hopkins as a student appears to have seen himself as aspiring to be part of a tradition of "Oxford poets", judging from a list compiled as a diary entry in 1865: "Oxford poets. - Southey (Balliol), Shelley (University), John Wilson (Magdalen), Milman (Brasenose), Walter Savage Landor (Trinity), Bowles (Trinity), William Morris (Ch.Ch.), Dixon (Pembroke),
Keble, J.H. Newman. However, his poetry is very different from the re-use of classical characters, settings and stories which one finds in the work of Swinburne, Tennyson and of course Arnold.

**The Literary Outlooks of Arnold and Hopkins Compared**

Arnold and Hopkins, in their different ways, one as a public figure of considerable cultural influence and published writer and the other as a priest and barely published writer, can be seen as typical of Victorian Oxford as described by Alison Sulloway: unlike Cambridge men, Oxonians were driven by "their passion for Oxford herself and for whatever spiritual commonwealth they had chosen to stand and defend there", preaching to all "in search of some prescription that would minister to the sick soul of industrial England," and indeed one of the things which unites Arnold and Hopkins is their regard for their University. More importantly, Sulloway's description of the Oxonian's mission is also an exact description of what Arnold is doing in "The Scholar-Gipsy" and Hopkins in "God's Grandeur", though their remedies are different. Neither man saw poetry as the main tool in his work, though Arnold saw poetry as being in itself the most likely salvation of civilised man and for Hopkins the writing of poetry was something he could not stop despite moral scruples about its suitability for his calling. For Arnold, his main mission was in his field as an educational reformer and in his work as a critic of and adviser to other poets and in his own day he was known more for his prose than for his verse, a Professor of Poetry rather than
a poet; he wrote little verse after the 1850s, and the total of his output is small, much in his published volumes being reworkings or, usually, simply republications of earlier poems. Hopkins was essentially a priest, despite his failure as a parish worker and his late outpourings of despair, and hardly known as a writer beyond a tiny circle of friends. The difference between the two men is clearly at its greatest not in their attitude to the classics but in their attitude to the other principal preoccupation of the Victorian mind, religion, both coming from devout Anglican backgrounds from which they broke away, but with Arnold in pursuit of an Hellenic ideal and Hopkins pursuing a different faith to an extreme degree, the doubts and lack of direction of Empedocles set against the rejection of Heraclitus in favour of belief in the resurrection.

For Arnold, what he learned from the classics and the example they set him became the dominating elements in all of his thinking about art and literature and in most of his thinking on all other subjects; for Hopkins, the nature of the relationship between God and his creation, especially man, had this position. Nevertheless, in what follows, the assumption is that in his poetry Hopkins was as influenced by his classical education and interests as Arnold was, though this shows itself differently and is balanced in Hopkins' case by a number of other concerns (such as religious belief and concern for nature) which do not compete with the ancients for the foreground in Arnold's poems; when Arnold seriously concerns himself with society or religion, he abandons verse for prose. The classical element in Hopkins has received little attention,
though critical work on Arnold has often focussed on this aspect, as the critic Arnold himself did in his writings. For example, in one collection of reviews and articles on Hopkins, which devotes almost 350 pages to 102 items up to 1940, there are scarcely any references to the classics; a few articles refer to or quote from medieval religious writers of Latin as sources for some of Hopkins' theological ideas, but only two are, briefly, specific about technical features of the poetry in this connection (Charles K. Ogden comparing sprung-rhythm to stressed medieval Latin verse and Alan Pryce-Jones commenting on the Greek flavour of Hopkins' rhythm and vocabulary, or rather the freedom of expression which Greek shares with English: "the fresh rhythm which every tongue can set on our broad numbers - a glory which we share only with the Greeks, whose ebullience breaks over the exactness of their scansion. In Greek alone would it be possible for Hopkins to write, if not in English, for only in Greek could the supple composites dapple-dawn-drawn, O-seal-that-so, no-man-fathomed, wind-lilylocks-laced (the last a tmesis) be built into the language). Only one (C. Day Lewis) mentions a possible influence from Greek dramatic sources (perceptively, given that Hopkins' letters on the subject were still unpublished): "the nearest approach to his verse texture I can find is in the Greek choruses, more especially those of Aeschylus: we may note in his work something of the same fluidity of line, the same architectural massiveness and decorated verbal accumulation."

Another popular digest of criticism of Hopkins, the volume in the Casebook series, contains nothing beyond a couple of brief acknowledgements of Hopkins' classical interests. Even more tellingly, the hundred pages of the
first thorough treatment of Hopkins’ metrical theories and practice made no mention at all of any possible direct classical influences in this crucial area of his poetry, and omitted all the relevant quotations from his writings.

In at least one respect, the artistic philosophies of Arnold and Hopkins coincide: both believe that there is an objective reality in nature which it is the artist’s duty to be true to, at least initially. Arnold expresses this in his dictum that one must “see the object as in itself it really is” (in On Translating Homer), and it is at the heart of Hopkins’ way of looking in a detailed way at the patterns and distinguishing characteristics of natural phenomena - “inscape” - neatly summarised in “If the picture that makes a whole and single thing out of an area of land is a landscape, then what makes up a single thing out of its inner nature would be its “inscape”.” As an early review of Hopkins puts it, “when did (a poet)... give diviner report of the thing seen?”

Sulloway draws attention to this link between them and Ruskin: “all appear as versions of a post-Romantic sensibility”, stressing “the importance of the artist first as a camera eye and then as a transforming alchemist, a remaker of beauty in his own right”. For Hopkins, the close observation of the natural world can outweigh classical culture in importance, as in his account of a visit to "Kensington museum" in 1874, when he saw a plaster cast of the Louvre Melpomene but was most interested in patterns of vegetation: "Looked at a Graeco-Roman statue of Melpomene: these Greek gowns are of linen which makes crisp pleat-like folds; I marked especially how on the bosom the folds
For Hopkins, it would appear that Arnold is essentially, in his terms, a "Parnassian", a user of poetic language who fails to be a true poet ("Parnassian, that is the language of poetry draping prose thought, a fine rhetoric, such as there is a good deal of in Wordsworth's blank verse"). and, although he recognises and values his integrity, he finds fault with values which, while moral, are nevertheless more social than religious; nevertheless, it is the difference of emphasis in their reading of the classics which is perhaps the essential difference between the two men and which is mainly explored here. Both men had been trained in the same way and their reading had been broadly similar, both having been along the Oxford classical route. The fact that they can then write in such radically different ways lends support to the idea that they see very different lessons in their education, Arnold valuing (at least after the despair of "Empedocles") the serenity which is one aspect of the classics, and the civilising effects of their study, and Hopkins giving priority to notions of energy and variety, as seen in the delight which he takes in listing all the varied metres used by the Greeks, and putting this vigour at the service of his own religion in most of his work. Indeed, the sublime serenity which is the chief good for one school of admirers of the classical is not what Hopkins values at all: "...ancient works, which are perfectly regular, are mostly much wanting in grace, so much so that those Venuses of Cnidus and Milo and what not can scarcely be said to
be beautiful in face at all; while modern ones, which have plenty of charms, are often irregular. Strict adherence to rules and forms he finds too constraining: "Servius, the commentator on Virgil, whom I admire, is often too observant and subtle for his author...The most inveterate fault of critics is the tendency to cramp and hedge in by rules the free movements of genius."

Bender says of Hopkins, "We would perhaps expect the study of classical literature to produce a neoclassical style that is urbane, limpid, polished, and tightly logical. Is it possible that, instead, the study of Latin and Greek could encourage a style which is quite the opposite - urgent, obscure, unsymmetrical, and non-logical?" While some of this description of Hopkins' style is rather extreme, the overall idea might go some way to explain the difference between what he and Arnold produced.

The poems of Arnold and those of Hopkins are clearly different, even at the simplest levels: the former tend to be regular in line-length and rhythm and rely on syllable-timing and traditional rhyming, without much eccentricity in grammar and diction, while the latter experiment with stress-timed rhythm, eccentric rhymes, ambiguous grammar and a wide range of sources of vocabulary and imagery. At this level, Arnold's poems comply with the "norm" for early and mid-nineteenth century verse, whereas publication of Hopkins' work was delayed for three decades after his death, by a friend who even then felt a need to be apologetic about their difficulties, and proper recognition had to wait until the nineteen-thirties. In comparing their poetic languages, Pater's comment on Apuleius is relevant: Hopkins' language,
like that of Apuleius, has a "precise literary effect he had intended, including a certain tincture of "neology" in expression" and "it was certainly not that old-fashioned, unconscious ease of the early literature, which could never come again", and which could perhaps, in terms of the history of English literature, be associated with earlier Victorian writers like Arnold, copying the clarity and linguistic simplicity of Wordsworth. "What words," Hopkins like Pater's Apuleius, "found for conveying, with a single touch, the sense of textures, colours, incidents!" However, to be fair to Arnold, the sentiments later in Pater's long paragraph could be applied to both writers as they, in their different ways, sought to make use of their education and outlooks in fashioning poetry: "And then, in an age when people, from the emperor Aurelius downwards, prided themselves unwisely on writing in Greek, he had written for Latin people in their own tongue; though still, in truth, with all the care of a learned language."

Classical Education as the Common Ground of Writer and Reader

In the nineteenth century, a training in the classics was not merely a means to a qualification but was a true education, a forming of the mind in certain ways as preparation for all aspects of later life: it was not, at an advanced level, merely the mastering of two difficult languages and their literature, but a training in the habit of analysis, the making of moral judgements, political and social thinking and aesthetics, and its influence was intended to be long-term. The effects of such study on the forming of a young poet would thus include an awareness of poetic forms more varied than the handful of forms native to English literature (although the attraction of Greek drama to Arnold proved to be a blind alley, as his attempt to produce an alternative type of drama was too far out of keeping with English theatrical tradition to be acceptable), a heightened sense of the meanings of words through an appreciation of their etymology (clearly of major importance to Hopkins) and the acquisition of a mass of symbolic stories and images which could be used to develop a theme or as a kind of cultural shorthand by which the poet could rely on the reader's pre-existing knowledge to make a rich point swiftly but clearly. Hopkins can thus invoke the image of Andromeda without having to spell out the details of the story of how she is threatened but rescued, or even identify Perseus, and Arnold can rely on the reader to understand the implications of a reference to
Achilles sulking in his tent as being about the inactivity of those who should lead and the chaos which ensues. An example of the use of stories by a poet, on a large scale, would be Tennyson's exploitations of the Odysseus legend (presenting in "Ulysses" and "The Lotos-Eaters" some unexpectedly unheroic insights into the old scenarios), while for an example of the use of images, on a smaller scale, one could perhaps look at Arnold's recurrent use of the image of water in his descriptive passages, which may seem obvious and unremarkable but which do perhaps have resonances derived from his reading of the classics.

An Example: Uses and Sources of Water Imagery

In most of Arnold's major poems, including those with a classical setting, rivers and seas feature prominently: "Dover Beach" is set on a shore and refers to other seas, real and metaphorical; the Thames flows through "The Scholar-Gipsy" and the Oxus through "Sohrab and Rustum", the former ending with a nautical picture; Empedocles leaves a cool stream to travel to the heights of the volcano. The ancient picture of a spot with water and shade which is an obvious image of peace, comfort and refreshment for both Mediterranean peoples and desert dwellers, and which recurs in both the Biblical and the classical traditions, feeds strongly into Victorian thinking:

Fortunate senex, hinc inter flumina nota
et fontes sacros frigus captabis opacum.
Virgil, *Eclogues*, no.1, ll.51-52

Te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae  
nescit tangere, tu frigus amabile  
fessis vomere tauris  
praebes et pecori vago.

Horace, *Odes*, Book 3, no.13, ll.9-12

However, for the classical scholar, the flowing of water had other strong connotations derived from images found in both poetry and philosophy. The sea for Arnold (and Hopkins, whose two most substantial poems deal with shipwrecks) is a dangerous place, and while for Hopkins the strength of this idea could be traced to his father’s business, for Arnold it appears to derive entirely from literary influences. The sea in “Dover Beach” changes rapidly from being a tranquil surface in moonlight to being constantly churning, sparking tragic ideas in poets, and the sea which is the Tyrian trader’s livelihood in “The Scholar-Gipsy” brings a threat to him in the shape of the Greek ship, reminding us of, if not the tempests of the epics, at least Horace’s fear “ne Cypriae Tyriaeque merces / addant avaro divitias mari”\(^\text{a}\) (Odes, Book 3, no.29, ll.61-62); the word “avarus” used of the sea (echoed also in the “exitio est avidum mare nautis”\(^\text{b}\) of Odes, Book 1, no.28, l. 18) and Homer’s characterisation of the sea as infertile perhaps lie behind the line “Hungry, and barren, and sharp as the sea” in “Stagyrus”. Horace’s warnings in Odes,

\(^\text{a}\) “Happy old man, here among your familiar streams and sacred springs you will enjoy a shady cool spot.” “The fierce noon of the blazing Dog-star knows not how to touch you; you offer welcome coolness to oxen tired by the plough and to the wandering flock.”  
\(^\text{b}\) “Lest my cargoes from Cyprus and Tyre contribute more riches to the greedy sea.”  
\(^\text{c}\) “The sea is greedy for the death of sailors.”
Book 1, no. 14 ("O navis, referent in mare te novi / fluctus! o quid agis?"a) also remind us of the importance of the image of flowing water as a symbol for change in philosophy at least as far back as Heraclitus, whom Plato quotes in the *Cratylus* as saying that one cannot step into the same river twice; Heraclitus' philosophy of change is set against the certainty of the Christian belief in Hopkins' Heraclitean Fire sonnet, and often in the works of the atomists and stoics in whom Arnold was so interested there is the image of water flowing downhill as a symbol of the basic laws and inevitability of the universe (in our terms, gravity): ἦ τε γὰρ οὐσία σῶν ποταμὸς ἐν διψεκεὶ ῥόσει.\(^{b}\) Seen in this light, "the sparkling Thames" which counterpoints the travels of the Scholar-Gipsy becomes more than local detail: it is a symbol of the change which has occurred since his day and which he seeks to avoid, since life no long runs "gaily" on its banks and those who now use the river in the poem cannot see him clearly, being affected by "this strange disease of modern life". The river which ironically links the two periods by its continuing existence, even if it is in a state of constant change, serves merely to point out the inexorable nature of the process and the transience of mortals.

Similarly, the Oxus which dominates "Sohrab and Rustum" both symbolises the constant, irreversible vicissitudes of life which are the substance of the tragedy and represents the "majestic" indifference of the natural world as it continues to flow "rejoicing" at the end of the poem. One could take some comfort from the fact that it eventually joins the "home of waters" and

---

a "O ship, what are you doing? Fresh currents are bearing you back out to sea."

b "For substance is like a river, in continual flow."
becomes “tranquil” when merged with the shining sea (here perhaps a symbol for the eventual reuniting with the infinite, though this is not the image of the sea presented in “Dover Beach”). Not all commentators are impressed with the ending of “Sohrab and Rustum”, however: Charles Kingsley was outraged that Arnold should cut away from the human tragedy to mere geography - “to believe that man is no less than phenomenal nature, and a part of it... that all the noble human pathos... is at heart cold and unreal...”

A different twist has been given to these images in Arnold by Alan Weber; he sees them as being mainly sexual and linked to Victorian fears about the loss of vitality in semen, pointing to the death of Sohrab, the reference to the “bright girdle” (i.e. of Aphrodite) in “Dover Beach” as a symbol for the sexual energy which the sea could represent and the description of the mountain stream flowing at last into the sea which “received” in “A Dream” (about Marguerite). Such a view is supported by classical references, such as the stoic representation of the inner workings of the human body as a river: πάντα τὰ μὲν τὸ ὅματος ποταμὸς, τὰ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄνειρος καὶ τύφος. Descriptions of water which are relevant to both the idea of the nature of change and to Weber’s notion are found frequently in Lucretius’ De Rerum Natura, which, interestingly enough given Arnold’s interest in him, contains a description of the home of Empedocles seen in such terms:

Quorum Acragantinus cum primis Empedocles est,

---

*a “Everything which pertains to the body is a river, and everything which pertains to the soul is a dream or cloud.”*
insula quern triquetris terrarum gessit in oris,
quam fluitans circum magnis anfractibus aequor
Ionium glaucis aspergit virus ab undis
angustoque fretu rapidum mare dividit undis
Italae terrarum oras a finibus eius.® (Book 1, ll.716-721)

The description of erosion and evaporation shows water as an agent of change:

Quod superest, umore novo mare flumina fontis
semper abundare et latices manare perennis
nil opus est verbis: magnus decursus aquarum
undique declarat.® (Book 5, ll.261-264)

The same process occurs on a smaller scale in the human body, and Lucretius, as Weber notes, describes sex in terms of the flow of fluids, including the kind of experience which Weber interprets "A Dream" as being:

"ut quasi transactis saepe omnibu' rebu' profundant / fluminis ingentis fluctus
vestemque cruentent"° (Book 4, ll.1035-1036). Before leaving Lucretius, one may note that there may be even stronger echoes of his descriptions of the action of wind and water on the earth in Hopkins:

° "Amongst the foremost of these is Empedocles of Acragas. The island of Sicily produced him within its three-cornered shores. The Ionian Sea, flowing around this with great swirlings, splashes spray from its grey waves onto it. The fast-flowing sea divides with waves its shores from the furthest point of Italy by means of a narrow channel."

°° "It needs no words to show that the sea, the rivers and the springs are always being filled up with fresh water and liquids flow unendingly: the great downpouring of waters everywhere demonstrates it."

°°° "Often, as though the deed had actually happened, the flood of a great stream pours forth and soaks the garment."
principio pars terrai nonnulla, perusta
solibus assiduis, multa pulsata pedum vi,
pulveris exhalat nebulam nubisque volantis
quas validi toto dispergunt aere venti* (Book 5, ll.251-254)

could be seen as the ultimate source of the image of the drying footprint being blown away in the Heraclitean Fire sonnet:

Delightfully the bright wind boisterous ropes, wrestles, beats earth bare Of yestertempest's creases; in pool and rut peel parches Squandering ooze to squeezed dough, crust, dust; stanches, starches Squadroned masks and manmarks treadmire toil there Footfretted in it.

The idea of “multa pulsata pedum vi” could even underlie the “Generations have trod, have trod, have trod...the soil Is bare now, nor can foot feel, being shod” of “God's Grandeur”.

The Uses and Effects of Classical Education

Arnold and Hopkins differ in their notions of what is an appropriate use of classical motifs and ideas in English poetry, Arnold, especially in his early

* “Firstly, some part of the earth, dried by unrelenting sun and stamped on with the force of many feet, exhales mist and flying clouds of dust which strong winds disperse through the whole of the air.”
work, freely introducing mythological figures such as Circe and Ulysses into a poem and Hopkins in contrast writing, “the Greek gods are a totally unworkable material; the merest frigidity, which must chill and kill every living work of art they are brought into...What did Athene do after leaving Ulysses? Lounged back to Olympus to afternoon nectar. Nothing can be made of it.”

Even in the midst of an excited account of the principle of construction which he had discerned in the tragic choruses, Hopkins dismisses the actual mythological content of Aeschylus as “foolery.” However, this difference must not be overemphasised: it is clear, in context, that Hopkins is objecting largely to the immorality of many of the Greek myths, a reflection of his religious convictions, and he is prepared to use an appropriate mythical reference at times, as in the sonnet “Andromeda”; nor is Arnold’s use of the classical material facile or decorative, except in a few early examples.

Hopkins’ poetry, on the other hand, owes its greatest debt to his classical training in his interest in etymology which it sparked; in this he is unusual among the Victorians, whose use of the classics is generally a more obvious employment of classical motifs, but the philological bias of the Honours Moderations in Hopkins’ day, as illustrated by Cary Plotkin, probably encouraged his interest. Hopkins’ obsession with the sounds and meanings of words, and especially the relationship between those two aspects, can readily be traced back to an early interest derived from his reflections on the links between English words and those in the languages he was studying; in this, we may see a definite difference between Hopkins, whose interest is often at the level of the word, and Arnold, who is more concerned with the
idea. A simple instance of this is the note which sets "wade, waddle" next to "vadere, vadum". A longer example is the 1863 diary entry in which he considers the word "horn" and explores its connections with κορωνίς, corona, granum, crinis, κέρας, κάρα, cresco, grandis, curvus, κορώνη, corvus, cornix, cornu, γέρανος, cornus, ἄρνος, ἄρνις. Again, in 1864, he notes, "Steel. Connected perhaps with στίλβειν, star, stella, ἀστήρ. Stella perhaps for sterila ..." A related interest in puns is often evident in the mature poems, as with the probable play on "rude/rood" in "Carrion Comfort" and "Andromeda" and the classical pun underlying the coinage "unselve" in "Binsey Poplars" spotted by Rick Casson, who suggests a connection between "unselving" as a destroying of identity and "un-silva-ing" to describe the cutting down of trees.

It is at times possible to see in such speculations the germs of ideas which appear later developed in the poems: a note on a Pindar fragment, "πέταλον. Ὀκεανοῦ πέταλα, springs" leads to the quoting, glossed as "stars", of "πέταλα πυρίνα" from Plutarch's De Placitis Philosophorum and of "the floor of heaven Is thick inlaid with patines of bright gold" from The Merchant of Venice, and this is turn may be in Hopkins' mind when he writes of the "stars, lovely-asunder Starlight", a token of God's presence in the "ocean" poem "The Wreck of the Deutschland", and the picture of the night-sky dotted with "diamond delves" and "where gold, where quickgold lies" in "The Starlight Night". More obviously, the way in which Hopkins forms chains of connection

---

a "sparkling springs", literally "fiery springs".
between words across the languages, playing on meaning, sound and associations, as in the group "spuere, spit, spuma, spume, spoon, spawn, spittle, spatter, spot, sputter" has an important part to play in the English poems: "The Leaden Echo and the Golden Echo" opens with such a chain ("... is there none such, nowhere known some, bow or brooch or braid or brace, lace, latch or catch or key to keep Back beauty...") and the "Heraclitean Fire" sonnet ends with one ("This Jack, joke, poor potsherd, patch, matchwood, immortal diamond, Is immortal diamond"). Interest in classical philology continues to the end of his correspondence, especially a number of lengthy, almost fanatical, letters from Dublin to Baillie, in 1886-7, aimed at establishing an Egyptian influence on the early Greeks from, for example, considering the names of places and gods in the two cultures (linking Greek Αθήνη and Egyptian Aten). However, Hopkins’ interest in philology, though deriving from his interest in the classics, did not lead him to copy Milton and make his poetic language redolent of classical roots or constructions; indeed, he rather emphasises the native and dialectal elements of English in his diction. The Miltonic Latinising of English for epic was not copied by any of the major Victorian poets (Arnold in On Translating Homer being careful to distinguish between Homeric and Miltonic epic styles), though the tendency to use an archaic style when dealing with classical themes and stories is a weaker form of the same impulse, illustrated by Althaea’s "Woe, woe for him that breaketh; and a rod Smote it of old, and now the axe is here" in Swinburne’s Atalanta in Calydon.
Hopkins' attitude to such practices is clear when, being critical of Bridges' *Ulysses*, he says "I cannot take the heathen gods in earnest; and want of earnest I take to be the deepest fault a work of art can have...Also *Ulysses* is sicklied o'er too much with archaic diction. This too will wither." As early as 1867 he speaks of poetic language with "uneffective archaism reminding one of translations from the classics" being "a real fault in the diction" shared by Swinburne's *Atalanta*. There is an irony in that Hopkins, whose work is criticised for its difficulties and its often unconventional use of grammar and vocabulary, should have in his own writings always praised simplicity and euphony, many times using the analogy of music and often thinking of his poems as potential songs; in writing to Bridges about one of his pieces, he says, "The diction too, though it is distinguished - it has "τὸ κομψὸν καὶ τὸ περιττὸν καὶ τὸ καινοτόμον"" as Aristotle says of Plato - has no lyric ease." In fact, Hopkins is himself not above blatant archaism at times (such as the prayerlike "thou art above, thou Orion of light" in "The Wreck of the Deutschland"), but generally in his major poems Hopkins rarely makes explicit use of any of the obvious classicising devices: the sonnet "Andromeda", the Orion reference and little more than the titles of "Spelt from Sibyl's Leaves" and "That Nature is a Heraclitean Fire and of the Comfort of the Resurrection" would be all that could be found on the surface of the well-known pieces.

---

* "What is elegant and distinguished and innovative."
This might be considered surprising, given that Hopkins was as much of a classical scholar as Swinburne or Arnold, and more so than Tennyson, but not when one thinks of the principal poetic aims of the writers. Hopkins is never concerned to tell stories, unless they are in the form of commentaries on contemporary events (as with the shipwreck poems), and (except in "Andromeda") he does not re-use old tales for ironic effect in the way that Tennyson does in his Homeric pieces. His aim is often the precise delineation of a particular natural scene or feature - this often being the point of the poem, rather than just a setting - rather than the suggesting of a mythical landscape, which can be vague and romantically dream-like in Tennyson; the ruggedly physical account of the stream in "Inversnaid" is the antithesis of that of the slow-motion waterfall in "The Lotos-Eaters". What appears to be noted in the diary in 1864 as an essay subject - "Do the ancients appear to have possessed a sense of the Picturesque in external nature?" - was perhaps a genuine source of concern for the young poet, and a note in the diaries perhaps sees him looking for classical validation of a nature-loving poet: "Juvenal speaks of a true poet as 'cupidus silvarum aptusque bibendis Fontibus Aonidum.' VII, 58,59" His ultimate theme is Christian faith, which would sit oddly with overt classicism, and this separates him from Arnold, for whom faith in art and culture has replaced conventional religious belief, and Swinburne, the avowed neo-pagan; the final point in a Hopkins poem is often a disconcertingly bald statement of a point of dogma (such as the idea of resurrection of the body in the closing lines of "The Caged Skylark"), and sometimes a specifically Catholic one (like the doctrine of the
Immaculate Conception, at the end of the otherwise straightforward "Duns Scotus' Oxford"). One might almost see these references as Hopkins' equivalent of the classical references in the writing of his contemporaries - the point of common ground between the writer and his expected reader or, more cynically, the display of the writer's intellectual qualifications.

**Classical Education as a Way of Life**

As already mentioned, a classical education was a training for life not to be discontinued at graduation: even more obviously than in the case of Hopkins, who was professionally involved as a classicist in Dublin in his last years, Arnold retained a passionate interest in and commitment to the subject although it was not his profession; in this, Arnold is typical of the Victorian gentleman who retained an interest in some aspect of the classics in addition to his actual occupation. Thus, five years after graduating, we find him writing to his mother to tell her that he has just read the *Iliad* straight through and five years further on he writes to tell his wife that he has given up reading a modern novel, "and I betook myself to Hesiod, a Greek friend I had with me, with excellent effect."

Indeed, although emphasis was always placed on the universal and practical applicability of the classics, communing with the ancient writers seems also to have been a way of remedying the effects, or defects, of everyday life, as

---

* Such as Gladstone, author of *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age* in 3 volumes.
Arnold found after a long day of inspecting schools: "...I shall report on a light school, write two or three letters, read about a hundred lines of the Odyssey to keep myself from putrefaction, and go to bed about twelve." The habit of reading the classics as readily as anything else remained; writing in 1850, he lists his activities at Fox How thus: "I heard family letters read - talked a little - read a Greek book - lunched - read Bacon’s essays - wrote." Trilling notes that in later years he "made a point of reading half an hour of Greek before dinner and in freer times went through five pages a day of the Greek Anthology, looking up all the words he did not know." Hopkins, having set aside poetry while studying for the priesthood, demonstrates his continuing taste for the classics in a letter of 1872, describing "an Academy or kind of literary reception" in honour of the new bishop of Salford: "I was bidden to write Greek and shed twenty four iambics with much ado but I was glad of it as it fell out as it raised a blister in my dry and shrunken Greek and led me to begin reading the beautiful Iphigenia among the Tauri: I wish I could have more of such reading." Ten years later at Stonyhurst, "I shall try and read the Greek tragic poets, but it is sad how slow I am. I am now in the Agamemnon and Supplices (Aeschylus’s, I mean). There is regret at not being able to do justice to such reading - "it was with sorrow I put back Aristotle’s Metaphysics in the library some time ago feeling that I could not read them now and so probably should never."

The variety of material in Hopkins’ casual writings at Oxford gives an indication of the range of ways in which the importance and authority of the
classics were acknowledged, from such scholarly concerns as his note on the
scholiast's ignorance concerning the source of a line in Aristophanes\footnote{xcvii} to
the folksiness of "Latin weather-proverb. Si sol splendescat Maria purificante,
Major erit glacies post festum quam fuit ante\footnote{xcviii} and humour of a sort not
encountered in his poetry: "'virginibus puerisque canto.' I sing to the virginals
and hautboys" is a whimsical interpretation of Horace, Odes 3.i. 1.4\footnote{4}, and
there is probably also a joke about Homeric omens in "The other day I heard
a crow sitting in a tree in a field on my left croaking dolefully."\footnote{xcix} Along with
this is a tendency to judge everything against a classical standard, sometimes
to our ears inappropriately: while inspecting schools in Birmingham in 1851,
Arnold writes that the city has a "Music Hall unequalled by any Greek building
in England that I have seen."\footnote{xc} The Alpine landscape catches Hopkins'
imagination in the form of an ancient ship: "the Matterhorn is like a Greek
galley stranded, a reared-up rostrum - the sharp quains or arretes the
gunwales, the deck of the forecastle looking upon Zermatt, the figurehead
looking the other way reaching up in the air, the cutwater and ram
descending and abutting on a long reef."\footnote{ci} In a lengthy description of the
shapes of mountains, he uses another analogy from his classical training, this
time a detail from the other end of the scale of size; he compares the shapes
of overhanging snow-lips to "thatch-eaves and rows of little three-cornered
drops...the \textit{guttae} in the Doric entablature."\footnote{cii}

\footnote{a} "If the sun shines on the feast of the purification of Mary, there will be more ice after the
feast than there was before it."
\footnote{b} "I sing to the maids and youths."
\footnote{c} This inappropriateness could also extend to literary references, as when in "Geist's Grave",
speaking of the death of a dog, Arnold invokes Virgil's profound "sunt lachrimae rerum" from
\textit{Aeneid} Book 1, I. 462 - "The sense of tears in mortal things".
Classical Education as a Guide to Life

Thomas Arnold believed strongly in the value of the practical (including moral) application of classical scholarship to contemporary problems: for him, the history of Rome and, more especially, of the high point of Greek civilisation was, much more so than the irrational intervening centuries, a parallel to the rational and cultured world of the nineteenth century and had lessons for it: "The state of Greece from Pericles to Alexander... affords a political lesson perhaps more applicable to our own times... than any other portion of history." A minor example of how deep this idea is in the thinking of Dr. Arnold (and then his son) is afforded by the footnote to Book 8, chapter 68, in his edition of Thucydides: the assessment of the character of Antiphon is not only seen in terms of classical Greek culture but also in the context of Roman history and early nineteenth-century society (and, characteristically, takes a theological turn). In a similar way, Matthew Arnold when lecturing on the "modern" in literature actually talked about the ancient Greeks. An example of the way the Victorians in general saw themselves as being more like the ancient Greeks than their own immediate ancestors is found in Matthew's inaugural lecture as Professor of Poetry at Oxford: taking the Elizabethan period as the high point of earlier English culture, he argues that the rationality of Thucydides is more like the contemporary idea of history.

---

*a* A good example of this thinking, connecting education, morality and practical usefulness, is in a letter to an old pupil, in 1840: "...a good man, highly educated, cannot possibly be in a more important position in this kingdom than as one of the heads of a great manufacturing establishment" (Arthur P. Stanley, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold*, 2 vols., London: B.Fellowes, 5th. ed., 1845; vol.2, p.239.)
than the credulity of Walter Raleigh, and points out that Englishmen carried arms in the sixteenth century, whereas the Athenians were the first to abandon the practice. Similarly, a strong sense of the link between the ancient and modern, viewing the intervening centuries as a separate and inferior period in which sight had been temporarily lost of important truths and values, can be seen in Arnold's comment on the (pre-unification) idea that Italy had always been divided and ruled by foreigners; he points out that the linguistic and cultural links between ancient Rome and modern Italy are stronger than those between the world of Alfred and England post-1066.

The way in which history was seen as cyclical and in which the ancient world and the modern could be seen as virtually touching is illustrated in an extreme way in a letter of 1851, in which it is the modern world which is seen as the less immediate and substantial of the two, because it is only an echo (almost, in the terms of the Platonic Doctrine of the Ideal, a shadow of the classical original): "I...retire more and more from the modern world and modern literature, which is all only what has been before and what will be again, and not bracing or edifying in the least... when I hear of some new dispute or rage that has arisen, it sounds quite historical; as if it was only the smiths at Ephesus being alarmed again for their trade, when the Bishops remonstrate against Cardinal Wiseman's appearance; or Pompey blundering away his chances, when I hear of the King of Prussia..."

There were substantial differences of detail and emphasis between Thomas and Matthew Arnold, however: the father understood more readily the
practical application of philosophy and history and was suspicious of poetry ("he thought the Greek tragedians overrated and shrank for moral reasons from Aristophanes, Tibullus, Propertius and Juvenal"), whereas for the son poetry will be, the thing which comforts and sustains civilised man. The overriding significance of the classics and their study for Hopkins is more elusive, his main preoccupation in this area in his later years being a technical corner of the subject, the metre of Greek lyric odes, but in Arnold's case it is quite explicit, an ideal of human perfectibility itself derived from the Greeks and seen as achievable by close study of their "culture"; his notion of what this can bring about is thus wider than his father's belief that statesmanship can be learned from Thucydides, and can be summed up in his famous phrase, "sweetness and light". The essence of his view is seen in a passage from *Culture and Anarchy*, explicitly rejecting Bright's dismissing of "culture" as "frivolous and useless" and calling for attention to be paid to studies promoting the modern "mechanical and external" instead: "culture...is a study of perfection, and of harmonious perfection...in an inward condition of the mind and spirit, not in an outward set of circumstances."

This belief in the perfectibility of the human being in all aspects through an appropriate education underlies a passage from a review Arnold copied into a note-book: "The Greek ideal is this; a purely human education, and elevation of all the powers of mind and soul to a beautiful harmony of the inner and

---

* This phrase, summing up the benefits of classical culture, has become debased, suggesting feeble-minded optimism, but as originally used was lifted from Swift and described the natural beauty of the hive as opposed to the mechanical nature of the web.
outer man, the ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία of the ancients." The influence of Plato, and of Jowett's championing of that writer at Balliol, is here evident: at the root of Arnold's social thinking is the idea that each man is potentially a Socrates, able to question life and then in Platonic fashion act on the perceived good, a process to which the legalism and conventionality of "Hebraism" are inimical if unchecked. The young Hopkins was also obviously deeply influenced by the example of Plato as presented by Jowett, who taught him the Republic, despite his later theoretical commitment to the Aristotelian slant of Thomist Catholic philosophy (further compromised by the kinship he felt with Duns Scotus, in the matter of the importance of the natural world); the undergraduate essay "On the Origin of Beauty" copies the form and atmosphere of the Platonic dialogue closely, with the argument being conducted by means of progressive questioning within a dramatic setting rooted in familiar surroundings and with topical allusions and recognisable characters.

Classics and Class

Some support for the view that one of the attractions of the classics was their exclusivity (advanced, for example, by James Bowen and explored by Christopher Stray) can be found in Arnold's writings. Quite reasonably for the period, he associates a classical training with the upper strata of society and also believes those classes to be the guardians of social stability and values; putting these two beliefs together, we have a notion that the essence
of civilisation has been passed to the English educated classes, making them responsible for its protection and transmission to other levels of society. However, he sees the upper classes as having duties as well as privileges, and is not motivated just by fear of the masses; he tells how "...Lord Ravensworth seized upon me to consult me about his Latin poetry, of which I had to read a great deal...he is rather a proficient at it; but I like and respect these "polite" tastes in a grandee; it weakens the English nobility that they are so dying out among them...At present far too many of Lord Ravensworth's class are mere men of business...or mere men of pleasure." The middle classes have a crucial role here: "I am convinced that nothing can be done effectively to raise (the lower) class except through the agency of a transformed middle class; for, till the middle class is transformed, the aristocratic class, which will do nothing effectively, will rule."

The importance to Arnold of defending the position of the educated classes as the custodians of civilisation at times leads him into statements which today seem dangerously undemocratic but which perhaps seemed less extreme in a nineteenth century in which popular insurrection was not unknown and full-scale revolution appeared possible, as even Hopkins, otherwise different from Arnold in his social outlook, acknowledges in "Tom's Garland". In Culture and Anarchy, Arnold speaks regretfully of the passing of "feudal habits of subordination and deference" and the consequent danger of an "anarchical tendency" whereby "an Englishman's right to do what he likes" leads him to "smash as he likes" (presumably because he is without the
civilising effects of "culture" derived from the classics); here we see a firm belief in the old hierarchical ordering of society, given philosophical reinforcement by the theory of fixed human types seen in Plato's *Republic.*

An even more extreme expression of this, quoting his father and perhaps meant partly ironically, was included in the first edition of *Culture and Anarchy* but repented of and later removed: "As for rioting, the old Roman way of dealing with *that* is always the right one: flog the rank and file, and fling the ringleaders from the Tarpeian Rock." (It is a sign of the difference in outlook between Arnold and Hopkins that the latter's use of the expression "Tarpeian" - describing the tall nun of "The Wreck of the Deutschland", in stanza 29, as "Tarpeian-fast" in the storm, rock-like like "Simon Peter" himself - refers not to the idea of punishment and the external imposition of order but to the idea of dedication and an inner resolution, the nature of the rock and not its use.) Arnold sees the state as supreme and the ultimate arbiter of conduct, a reflection of Plato's *Republic* and of the ideals of public service seen by Thomas Arnold to be a major legacy of Hellenism. This can be seen not only in his public utterances but in his correspondence; he writes to Clough that "the state should see to it" that those without Greek "should have their reading censored." In the view of history refined by Giovanni Battista Vico in the preceding century and taken up by Thomas Arnold, England in the
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*αλλ' ο θεός πλάτων, όσοι μὲν ύμων ἰκανοὶ ἄρχειν, χρυσῶν ἐν τῇ γενέσει συνέμειξεν αὐτοῖς, διὸ τιμώτατοι εἶσιν; όσοι δ' ἐπίκουροι, ἄργυρον, σάδηρον δὲ καὶ χαλκὸν τοῖς τε γεωργοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις δήμουργοις. (Plato, *Republic,* Book 3, chapter 415; ed. J.Burnet, Oxford, 1902, reprinted 1967.) "But when god was making you he added gold to the composition of those of you who are competent to rule, so that you are honoured; silver to their assistants; iron and bronze to the farmers and other workers." The deterministic tripartite division of abilities which is the "noble lie" on which Plato's ideal state is built has had a long life in British education, being reflected in the Clarendon Commission's three-fold classification of schools (1864) and being the ultimate origin of the 1944 Education Act's division of secondary school pupils into grammar, technical and secondary modern types.
nineteenth century had reached the stage at which serious degeneration sets in, with a growing economic gap and eventually a destructive class-struggle between a corrupt aristocracy and a belligerent populace, leading to decline into barbarism: both Arnolds avoid Vico’s two possible remedies for this situation - conquest by a healthier state or the establishment of a dictatorship - by putting their faith in a strong centralised State.

Similarly, writing about his membership of the Queen’s Westminster Rifle Volunteers, Arnold claims that “Far from being a measure dangerous by its arming the people... the establishment of these Rifle Corps will more than ever throw the power into the hands of the upper and middle classes, as it is of these that they are mainly composed, and these classes will thus have over the lower classes the superiority, not only of wealth and intelligence, which they have now, but of physical force.” More surprisingly, Father Hopkins often expresses respect for the armed forces and their role, in both his poetry and his prose writings; a Journal entry concerning manoeuvres by the Volunteer Rifle Corps on Wimbledon Common brings together his love of the vitality and patterning of nature, his classical background, his patriotism and this militarism, and he is so excited by what he describes that he becomes less coherent than usual: “caught that inscape in the horse that you see in the pediment especially and other basreliefs of the Parthenon and even which Sophocles had felt and expresses in two choruses of the Oedipus Coloneus, running on the likeness of a horse to a breaker, a wave of the sea curling over. I looked at the groin or the flank and saw how the set of the hair
symmetrically flowed outwards from it to all parts of the body, so that, following that one may inscape the whole beast very simply".\textsuperscript{cxxx}

Arnold's belief in permanent values and his insistence on the need for firm control have come in for much criticism in the present century, with regard to his ideas about literature as well as his political stance. In a positive vein, Francis Mulhern \textsuperscript{cxi} recalls the title of \textit{Culture and Anarchy} in his essay "Culture and Authority" and portrays Arnold as the promoter of liberal humanism, but he also sees significance in the evolution of Arnold's title, from the lecture "Culture and Its Enemies", through the articles called "Anarchy and Authority", to the book \textit{Culture and Anarchy}: this pattern equates "culture" with "authority", so that criticism becomes the agent of authority, rather than that to which authority must defer and by which it must be educated. These ideas are developed by Bill Ben\textsuperscript{cxi} in "The Function of Arnold at the Present Time" - another play on the title of an Arnold piece - which deals with the common view of Arnold as the founder of university English studies. This belief in strong government, and, along with that, in permanent absolute values, which Arnold and Hopkins share, is quite typical of the middle classes in the nineteenth century, but can be seen as being in part derived from a classical education, as well as from the legalistic side of the Judaeo-Christian tradition and the Established Church (and the Church of Rome, in Hopkins' case); it reflected the position of Plato in the \textit{Republic} and took its justification from the experience of ancient history.
An Example of the Power of the Classical Precedent

Another aspect of classical culture which needs to be given brief attention because it appealed to some Victorians and has received critical attention in recent decades is concerned with subject-matter, or at least a recurrent type of wording and image, namely the matter of homosexuality. This issue also serves as a good example of how the existence of classical precedents could give validity to ideas and practices which would otherwise have been untenable amongst the middle classes of nineteenth-century England, a society at least outwardly committed to a rigid adherence to the traditional Christian values, family life and the maintenance of conventional respectability. It has no bearing on the study of Arnold, whose high morality would have chosen to ignore its existence in the texts - his rejection of contemporary French society was prompted by distaste for what he called "lubricity" - but could be seen as relevant to a recurrent if discreet aspect of Hopkins' writing. Peter Swaab pursues the theme of the Victorian interest in this feature of classical times, and in attempting to demonstrate the homosexual tendency in Hopkins, often claimed but not able to be proved, it rehearses the references to young men and male beauty in the poems and some confessional notes; although offering no specific textual links with the classical writers, it speculates that Hopkins may have read J.A. Symond's Studies of the Greek Poets of 1873, which attempted to legitimate homosexuality by appealing to the example of Greece - although this would come rather late to be a formative influence on Hopkins (almost thirty years
old, and well advanced in his studies for the priesthood). A sensible comment on this issue is provided by Bernard Bergonzi: positing that most of Hopkins' contemporaries would have been shocked by open discussion of such matters, he says "Now, however, the pendulum has swung so far the other way that it is often taken for granted that Hopkins was tout court a homosexual and that all his psychological problems arose from this one unacknowledged cause. This seems to me crudely reductive... Hopkins grew up at a time when romantic friendships between men, with warm expressions of sentiment, were both common and acceptable... There are in Hopkins' private writings, and in a less blatant way in some of the poems, some comments on the appearance of young men, which strike the modern reader as odd for a priest, but it must also be kept in mind that beauty of all kinds was important to Hopkins as a sign of the benevolence of the deity who gives it as a "gift" - and the fervour with which he describes the bluebell and the ash tree puts his comments on human beauty in perspective.

Taking a wider view, Maureen F. Moran presents Hopkins rather as attempting to reconcile two Victorian views of beauty, the Hellenic emphasis on physical beauty, as expressed by Pater and Arnold, and the Tractarian emphasis on spiritual beauty put forward by Keble and Newman; in Hopkins, the physical beauty is always appreciated, but seen as transitory (as in "The Leaden Echo and the Golden Echo") where the spiritual is permanent, whereas for Pater physical beauty is in some way the permanent truth (as in Keats' "a thing of beauty is a joy forever"). Similar concerns lie behind Jesse
Mats' "Walter Pater's Literary Impression", which traces a line of development from the muscular Christianity of Arnoldian Rugby to the effete decadence of Wilde and the end of the century - effectively, though not explicitly, from the vision of Greece as morally and physically sound, typified by clear reason and spirited sportsmanship, to the vision of Greece as concerned with emotions, ideals of beauty and homoeroticism. In this pattern, Pater is the link between Arnold and Wilde, with a movement from Arnold's critical (and hence poetic) aim to "see the object as in itself it really is" through Pater's "in aesthetic criticism, the first step towards seeing one's object is to know one's impression as it really is" to Wilde's idea that a critic should "see the object as in itself it is not". There is a continuous spectrum, from Arnold's earnest and objective attempts to define beauty absolutely and apply the intellect, to Wilde's postmodern insistence on the supremacy of the subjective view and the need to discriminate one's own feelings, with Pater occupying a mid-way position, with the impression as a compromise between the sensations and the reason.
4. The Final Lines of "Dover Beach" - an example of Victorian classicising.

The closing lines of Arnold's "Dover Beach" are an apt, if rich, example of the way in which classical reference could be used by the Victorian poet, and reveal some aspects of Arnold's attitude to and use of the classics. They are well-known to be derived from the account of the Battle of Epipolae given in Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Book 7, chapter 44. This battle between the Athenians and the Syracusans in 413 B.C., in the course of the disastrous Sicilian Expedition, was a desperate struggle by night, in which friend could not be distinguished from foe, and is picked out by Thucydides as unique: ἡ μόνη δὴ στρατοπέδων μεγάλων ἐν γε τῶδε τῷ πολέμῳ ἔγενετο. The episode would have been part of the shared classical heritage of all educated Victorians, and seems to have made a particularly strong impression on the collective consciousness: it features in other literary works, such as Clough's 1848 "The Bothie of Toper-na-Fuosich" and in *Sketches in Italy and Greece* Symonds' description of how one could paint a reconstruction of the fate of the Athenian prisoners in the quarries specifies that his imagined foreground figures "have stood together...through the battle of Epipolae," making the death of one even more tragic and affecting. The earliest autograph of the poem, on the back of notes made during Arnold's reading of Empedocles some time in the period 1849-51 (that is, during the period when his work was dominated by images of

---

* "The only such instance which took place in this war between large armies."
disillusionment rather than by a belief that the ideals of Hellenism could provide a solution to human misery), includes only the first 28 lines, suggesting either that the final image was added subsequently or that it already existed; in either case, it indicates that the reference was very much common currency with him - which is not to question its effectiveness in the context of this particular poem. The most important likely immediate influence on Arnold in his use of the allusion is Newman's sermon of January 1839, published in 1843, where the context is, as in Arnold's poem, not so much military as spiritual: "Controversy, at least in this age, does not lie between the hosts of heaven, Michael and his angels on the one side, and the powers of evil on the other; but it is a sort of night battle, where each fights for himself, and friend and foe stand together."

Arnold too is talking specifically about the world of "controversy", of "The Sea of Faith... Retreating" in the face of scepticism and mid-century change, as well as dealing more generally with the idea of "human misery"; for a moment, characteristic Arnoldian melancholy leads him into nostalgia for a security of religious faith and community which he himself lacked. The image of the night-battle and the inability to tell friend from foe fits well into both the specifically religious and the more general contexts of Arnold's bleak vision: it covers both the everyday treachery and unreliability of one's fellow human beings (which, it is hoped, can be alleviated locally to a limited extent by two people being "true To one another") and the subversion and defection of those who should know better, one's trusted intellectual peers and mentors. If
churchmen and academics are the new threat (and "ignorant", as well as its literal meaning of "unaware of what they are doing", may be calling into question their intellectual fitness for the role they have), distinguishing right from wrong becomes impossible. The only responses, as with the Athenian soldiers, are to flee from the world, like the Scholar-Gipsy or the Tyrian trader at the end of that poem, or to fight on, as Arnold tried to do in his lecturing, journalism and poetry. Although written probably in 1851, "Dover Beach" was published in 1867, at the time when the *Culture and Anarchy* articles began to appear in the *Cornhill Magazine*, in the midst of the disputes surrounding the Second Reform Bill, one of Arnold's stimuli being the attack by Bright and others on the assumption that the classical education of the Establishment equipped them alone for the taking of political decisions: the poem describes, amongst other things, the realisation that not all is at it seems, as though by moonlight, and that there is a danger that, in Yeats' later words, "things (may) fall apart".

That Arnold should make this classical allusion the final element in his most well-known poem, the ostensible subject of which appears to be the doubts and fears assailing the sensitive consciousness even in the most romantic of settings, is typical of Arnold's use of classical literature and ideas and of an attitude to them common in the Victorian period. Firstly, there is the appeal, to which reference has already been made, to a common stock of images and responses derived from texts known to the cultivated reader, which can act as a poetic shorthand and has the charm of familiarity, though in lesser hands it
can lapse into padding or a self-conscious display of learning. Secondly, developing from this, there is the implication that the ancients expressed it in an inimitable fashion, that the ancient text and hence the event which it describes are in some way more valid than the modern; far from obscuring it, the classical allusion gives the idea greater weight and resonance, here by putting it into a much grander context than the view from a hotel window in Dover. Finally, most importantly and following on from the preceding, there is the desire to make connection with a past seen as essentially the same as the present and to learn from the experiences of the earlier period; Arnold makes explicit the doctrine that humanity is always essentially the same ("Sophocles long ago.... we... also") and then looks at the battle as a symbol for the contemporary situation and takes the message that disaster will follow. Although history does not supply a solution or a way to avoid the disaster, it does at least warn of the danger. This reflects what was a common view of history and its value, derived from Hegelian notions of cycles of history which suggest that two civilisations centuries apart can be at the same stage of development and hence have much more in common than they do with chronologically closer cultures; as has already been suggested, the mercantile, sea-going Athenian democracy and its issues were seen as parallel to nineteenth-century Britain and its concerns, and so study of Athenian experience was directly relevant to contemporary society. There was thus no artifice or incongruity in adapting the description of an Athenian problem of 413 B.C. to fit the contemporary situation in Britain, and the parallel actually strengthens the point Arnold is making; in "On the Modern
Element in Literature” (his inaugural address as Oxford Professor of Poetry, largely about the modernity of fifth-century Greek literature and "the literatures which have most successfully solved for their ages the problem which occupies ours"), he sees the failure of Athens at Syracuse as the turning-point downwards in classical history and culture, so to evoke Epipolae is to issue the sternest warning.

Like Arnold the school inspector, most Victorian classicists were amateurs who brought to bear their own preoccupations and values on the texts, so that a churchman might look for support for Christian beliefs in texts which another might exploit to put the case for atheistic humanism. This was true of Thomas Arnold, for whom the study of prose writers, especially the historians, for their practical application was of the greatest importance (to be coupled with the study of modern history), and for whom the study of Thucydides was paramount; he produced the first modern edition of Thucydides, with introductions and notes, in 1830-35, during Matthew Arnold’s childhood, and the second edition appeared in 1839 when Matthew was in his second year at his father’s school; Clough begins his list of the texts he recalls reading at Rugby a few years before Matthew with Thucydides. It is clear that the son was strongly influenced by the father’s outlook: the idea “that the period to which the work of Thucydides refers belongs properly to modern and not to ancient history” permeates "On the Modern Element in Literature", is equivalent to the Sophocles reference in "Dover Beach" and reinforces the direct relevance of the Epipolae allusion, which is thus far from being a piece
of mere scholarly decoration. Knowing the wider context of the episode, which Arnold expects, also serves to deepen its significance: the battle of Epipolae was a significant step in the defeat of the Athenians, and for Arnold the defeat of the Athenians was the end of the culture that defined all that was best in humanity and was its best chance of perfectibility; as he says in "On the Modern Element in Literature", "That was the true catastrophe of the ancient world...from that date the intellectual and spiritual life of Greece was left without an adequate basis of political and practical life." The dangers outlined in "Dover Beach" are thus of the most damaging kind.

The notes which Dr. Arnold provided for chapter 44 of Book 7 are helpful in considering the origins of the poet’s response to and use of the reference. For example, the lines, ἐν δὲ νυκτομαχίᾳ, ἦ μόνη δὴ στρατοπέδων μεγάλων ἐν τῷ τῷ πολέμῳ ἐγένετο, πῶς ἂν τις σαφῶς τι ηδέι;” carry the gloss, "How could anyone have known any thing distinctly in a battle fought, as this was, by night?", which clearly contains the hint of the idea of general intellectual confusion, rather than simple physical blindness, and this is the theme of the poem, which works from the idea of literal darkness as night falls, through the idea of confusion, and then back to the historical event. This broader idea is absent from, say, the straightforward description of the immediate event contained in the modern Penguin translation of the passage ("...how could anyone be sure of what happened exactly?") , though the translation later published by Jowett is closer ("who could be certain of anything?").

"How could anyone know anything clearly in a battle by night, the only one which took place in this war between large armies?"
"Confusion" of an intellectual kind is how Arnold describes what he sees as principally wrong with contemporary society and thinking, and what clear-headed Hellenism would counteract: in the 1853 Preface he writes, specifically of literature: "The confusion of the present times is great, the multitude of voices counselling different things bewildering ....What (a young writer) wants is a hand to guide him through the confusion, a voice to prescribe to him the aim which he should keep in view...." The praise for the Scholar-Gipsy is "Thou hadst one aim, one business, one desire", thus avoiding "this strange disease of modern life, With its sick hurry, its divided aims" ("The Scholar-Gipsy", ll.152 and 203-4).

The allusion to the account in Thucydides is commonly taken to occupy the last three lines of the poem only, as indicated in the notes to, for example, The Oxford Authors edition, but in fact it permeates the whole poem, which begins with an image of concrete things seen clearly, reinforced by lexical and syntactic simplicity ("...the cliffs of England stand"), until the implications of moonlight are revealed to be not romantic ("the moon lies fair") but dangerously deceptive ("moon-blanch'd", with the suggestion of deathliness), as in the Thucydides passage, which draws attention to the irony of the moon being bright but not bright enough: ἤν μὲν γὰρ σελήνη λαμπρά but one could only see ὡς ἐν σελήνῃ εἰκὸς. As Dr. Arnold goes on in his notes, "They saw one another as men naturally would by moonlight, that is, to see before them the form of the object, but to mistrust their knowing who

---

* "For there was a bright moon... as it is usual to do in moonlight."
was friend and who was foe." Consideration of the implications of this gloss on the text makes the poem even more disturbing when we recall the supposed contemporary setting of the poem - the form which Arnold sees before him in the moonlight and cannot be sure of is, more immediately than cliffs and beach, his new wife, which adds even greater urgency to his appeal concerning "one another". One may also note in passing the importance of knowing "the object" for what it really is in Arnold's thinking, as noted above.

There is another interesting link between Thomas Arnold's notes and that part of the poem not in the early autograph. Lines 30-31 talk about "the world, which seems To lie before us like a land of dreams", which turns out to lack a number of things vital to well-being, including "certitude", which stands out as the only polysyllabic word in a list of monosyllables; this ties in with a note in Thomas Arnold's edition which glosses τὰ πρόσθεν...ἐτετάρκτο πάντα as, "All in front of them was in utter confusion", again implying (like Jowett's "there was nothing but confusion") rather more than the Penguin translation, "Everything in front of them was now in disorder", where the adverb of time pins the meaning down more precisely. The wording of Dr. Arnold's version, with that broad "all", perhaps leaves open the possibility of a temporal rather than a spatial meaning for "in front", and the poem clearly has both meanings in mind when it talks about what lies "before us" (the view we have of the immediate physical world, and the future).
The final lines of this poem may seem to a modern reader to be an artificial flourish, an unnecessary and obscure reference which does nothing to clarify the argument, but for the educated reader of the time they would have summarised, clarified and universalised the ideas within the poem; the range of the poem expands geographically, chronologically and in scale, to connect with the whole of human experience. In terms of the present thesis, they demonstrate succinctly the way in which a Victorian poet could exploit the common ground of writer and reader provided by a shared classical education, and illustrate the difference between Arnold, who uses this technique regularly, and Hopkins, who rarely does (the exception being "Andromeda").
5. Some Early Uses of the Classics in "The Strayed Reveller, and Other Poems" - the classics as decoration and as vehicle.

Weaker Uses of the Classical Setting and Motifs

Some of Arnold's early poems which demonstrate a classical influence or contain classical elements illustrate aspects of Victorian classicising which are abandoned or significantly modified in his later work. In particular, they contain examples of the use of classical props to heighten the effect of material which has no intrinsic link with recognisable classical themes or issues, a derivative classicism already referred to in connection with Tennyson's Odyssey-derived pieces and which sometimes extends no further than a title (e.g. "A Modern Sappho"); this kind of deliberate "uneffective archaism reminding one of translations from the classics" was to be rejected by Hopkins completely. However, some of the poems do contain foreshadowings of the concerns of the older Arnold: "Mycerinus", for example, puts a Stoic gloss on a story from Herodotus.

As an example of how Arnold's taste and practices changed later in his career, one can consider "Horatian Echo", not published in this collection but written in 1847; it begins with a modern version of the opening of Horace's Ode 11 in Book 2, with "bellicosus Cantaber et Scythes" being updated to "France and... the Russian Czar", and contains other clear Horatian themes and motifs - "Fresh garlands of this dewy rose, To crown Eugenia's hair" - but
has little by way of thought and perhaps represents Arnold dabbling briefly in a light-hearted form of classical imitation which he did not find particularly congenial. This kind of classicising, and indeed this kind of classical literature, was actually to be rejected by Arnold in his inaugural lecture as Oxford Professor of Poetry: "Horace wants seriousness... the best men in the best ages have never been thoroughly satisfied with Horace", because he is "inadequate" for not covering such concepts as faith and enthusiasm.

Horace's satires had appealed to the socially-minded eighteenth century, but he did not command the same respect in the sterner nineteenth century - and certainly the more sensuous side of Epicureanism was out of favour in the age of Victoria, to be embraced only by those wishing to shock.

Contemporary Response

The title poem is the main classicising piece in The Strayed Reveller, and Other Poems, by A. of 1849, but the sonnet "To a Friend" is about Arnold's relationship with the classics, the "Fragment of an Antigone" announces its relevance and "Mycerinus", "In Ulrumque Paratus" and in part "The New Sirens" derive from classical sources. Critical response to the volume was harsh, and illustrates the way in which most Victorians wanted a version of the classics which was anglicised and conforming to their own notions of what it should be like, decorous and uplifting: Charlés Kingsley, while praising "The Forsaken Merman" and declaring "Mycerinus" to be "worthy of Tennyson", asked, "What does the age want with fragments of an Antigone?"
or with certain “New Sirens”?”, attacked “the poet’s attempt to graft Greek choric metres on our English language” in “The Strayed Reveller” for “utter want of rhythm and melody”, and encouraged him to pay more attention to life and beauty - ironically, referring to Dr. Arnold’s advice to his students. William Aytoun was more facetious, claiming “we can discover very little genius to vindicate the existence of so vast a quantity of woe” and being scathing of what he saw as feeble attempts at classical imitation, holding up Tennyson as an example of how it could be done “in mellifluous English verse” - a comparison echoed by several of Arnold’s early reviewers; not until Clodd’s essay nearly forty years later was he to be compared favourably with Tennyson, and then for the quality of his “thought” on “the profounder questions which seethe in men’s minds today” rather than for his actual verse. Of the poet “A.”, Aytoun says, “He claims to be a classical scholar of no mean acquirements, and a good deal of his inspiration is traceable to the Greek dramatists. In certain of his poems he tries to think like Sophocles, and has so far succeeded as to have constructed certain choric passages, which might be taken by an unlettered person for translations from the antique...The poem from which the volume takes its name is a confused kind of chaunt about Circe, Ulysses, and the Gods, from which no exercise of ingenuity can extract the vestige of a meaning.” His criticisms of the classical poems included a lack of melody, a confusion of structure into which decorative passages and motifs had been thrust at random, the tendency to imitate and an absence of clear purpose and message. The complaint about the lack of recognisable verse-melody, especially in the title poem, which was made by
Kingsley and Aytoun was reinforced in a later review by James Froude, who demonstrated his point by writing out part as prose and declared it not to be a poem in the generally accepted sense, finding in it and "Empedocles" an absence of emotion and beauty and preferring Arnold’s more romantic, less intellectual, pieces, as did Coventry Patmore. Less damning was William Rossetti, whose chief complaint was again lack of "passion".

This reaction could be taken as a salutary corrective to the sweeping generalisation that the Victorians always responded positively to classical antiquity, as the complaint of the critics was that Arnold over-indulged a private passion for it. However, it should be borne in mind that they were probably reacting to the grimness of the picture he presented, rather than to the habit of imitation that they tended to declare as their target. Neither the volume of 1849 nor that of 1852 was well received, mainly because of the kind of complaints about the melancholy tone of many of the poems which led Arnold to withdraw "Empedocles on Etna" in 1853; as Trilling points out, few contemporary readers could appreciate his dissatisfaction with their bourgeois world, or his description of loss of energy at a time of self-confident expansion. However, in some cases the complaint was about the apparent retreat of the poems into an irrelevant dream of the past; neither of these versions of the classical past found favour.
More Substantial Uses of the Classics: "The Strayed Reveller"

"The New Sirens" and "The Strayed Reveller" both have a classical setting, both feature legendary "witches", the Sirens and Circe, and both appear to be concerned with a conflict between alternatives: in "The Strayed Reveller" we have different ways of life and different forms of inspiration being contrasted. Both poems refer to the *Odyssey*, but, unlike Tennyson, Arnold seems uninterested in Ulysses as a character: he is much more concerned with the doomed glory and earthly tragedy of the *Iliad*, echoed frequently in his poetry, than he is with the optimistic striving and fantasy elements of the *Odyssey*. Nevertheless, in "The Strayed Reveller" there seems to be a contrast between Ulysses, the active man who appears in the poem coming in from hunting, and the Youth, whose life is one of visions, under the influence first of Dionysus himself and then of Circe's cup. Initially, another pair of alternatives is implied here, when the Youth deserts "Iacchus' white fane" for the palace of Circe, but they turn out to be similar: the cup induces visions, if not frantic Maenad activity, culminating in the sight of "The desired, the divine, Beloved Iacchus" himself. In the visions themselves, the Youth is told by Silenus of a wide range of human activities and geographical settings; he has been given glimpses of the world even more wide-ranging than the real experiences of Ulysses, though he remains "Sitting on the warm steps, Looking over the valley". The Youth delights in being thus able to enjoy the experience of life "Without pain, without labour" which even "the wise bards" must normally endure; in this, he can share in the deeds of the heroes and
almost imitates the gods themselves, looking down at the events of the world, detached and unmoved. The references to the heroes include a brief mention of Troy - which surely must affect the listening Ulysses; there is also irony in Ulysses' inquiry as to whether the Youth has been listening to some bard "delighting The chiefs and people In the banquet", an unconscious glance ahead to Telemachus being stirred by hearing Phemius singing just such a song in the opening Book of the _Odyssey_.

However, we are not to take the Youth's enthusiasm and devotion to Circe and her cup at face value; even if we pass over the implied distinction between his world of shadows and Ulysses' real achievements, not dwelt on in the poem, we cannot overlook the fact that the Romantic experience of visions following the use of some drug (like Coleridge writing "Kublai Khan" or the opening of Keats' "Ode to a Nightingale"), is a tenuous one, artificially induced and sustained, and, as described in "The New Sirens", results in a wearying alternation of frenzy and total collapse, rather than sustained creativity: under the influence of Circe, the Youth spends much of the time in a drugged sleep and he has become addicted to the cup which is the sole source of his experience and for which he is desperate, and what he sees are "eddying forms" which "waver" and "fade". He has come down to join the revellers, and the palace of Circe is lower even than Iacchus' temple "On yonder hill", being "Down the dark valley". On the other hand, this kind of activity may also seem a blessed relief from the misery of the world which he has glimpsed, where there are wars, decline and death - the merchants are
not free from the worry of being robbed, the happy centaurs in their natural environment are destroyed and even the fruits being gathered contain the seeds of decay.

The poem can thus be seen as a presentation of the attractive and unattractive aspects of a surrender to Romanticism, emotionalism and withdrawal; although little is made of the alternative approach of to life, based on reason and discipline, these are two extreme versions of what can loosely be described "as the classical", which can embrace everything from the bacchanalia to asceticism. The poem is not about the classical world but about the Victorian poet's inner debate about which version of the classical to adopt, and at this stage Arnold is rejecting, with regret and reservations, one version without yet committing himself to another. The piece is therefore a mixture of elements, some conventionally classical in a costume-drama sense (the white robes of Circe, the fawn-skin of the Youth), some more seriously evocative of ancient literature, some (like the Oxus merchants) clearly modern, as though indicating the contemporary relevance of the classical story. The echoes of the original texts are stronger here than in "The New Sirens": the Youth sees the palace from above, screened by trees, just as Ulysses sees it in the Odyssey (although, reinforcing the hollowness of what Circe offers, Arnold makes it "smokeless", whereas the hero first sees the smoke rising), and it is complete with lions; Ulysses comes in from hunting, recalling his first action on Aeaea, clearly in the course of the year Homer says he spent with Circe after the initial conflict over the enchantment of his
men; the first of the examples the Youth mentions is the figure of Tiresias, to whose ghost, we know, Circe is soon to send Ulysses for advice. However, there are changes: Circe herself is an attractive and divine figure, as in Homer, but the opening description of her from the Youth - "Thou standest, smiling Down on me! thy right arm, Lean'd up against the column there, Props thy soft cheek; Thy left holds, hanging loosely, The deep cup..." - resembles Leighton's painting of another heroine from the Odyssey, his "Nausicaa" of 1878, of which Jenkyns says "...there is a touch of archness in that pose....Leighton has made the girl... too Victorian.... it may be that he designed her to be in some degree both Greek and English, and aimed....for an art that was both of its day and in a grand classical tradition." The most obvious change is in the effect of Circe's brew, which is clearly spiced wine, the drink of Dionysus and a symbol for the release of the emotions and the imagination at the expense of reason and responsibility, rather than the curious drugged porridge which transforms men physically (but significantly not mentally) into animals; we have moved out of the realm of fairy-tale and magic into something more like the real world, and out of the realm of the purely material and outward into consideration of the mind and the soul.

Three final points need to be made about "The Strayed Reveller" before moving on to Arnold's later classical poems. Firstly, although its obvious "moral" is the ambiguity of the reveller's position, in some ways enviable and in some ways not, there is also a moral point concerning the presentation of the gods here, as they appear to look on indifferently: the reaction of the
Youth is the Epicurean one, to ignore them in return and seek the least painful life, though we already know we are not expected to trust his judgement (and certainly should not trust blindly what he claims he has heard from the vision of Silenus, while under Circe's influence). Secondly, again undermining the literal reading and acceptance of the ideas expressed in the poem, we know that this is not the end of the story for Ulysses - he will not in fact be content to hide in the forest-screened palace enjoying himself aimlessly, but will be moved to action again soon; this is like the irony of Tennyson's "The Lotus-Eaters", where we outside the poem know that the idyll will soon be broken by Ulysses. Thirdly, the picture of the world which emerges when the Youth goes back over his examples of human activity is essentially a harsh one, where peace and prosperity prove to be illusory and the norm is tragedy - typical of Arnold, as in "Dover Beach".
6. “Empedocles on Etna” - one side of Arnold’s classicising.

“Empedocles on Etna” provoked adverse critical response as the 1849 volume had done, so much so that Arnold subsequently withdrew the piece and defended his position in the Preface to the 1853 edition; a few years later, in his inaugural lecture as Professor of Poetry, Arnold, without naming his own poem, was to reject works which dwelt too much on depression in the “modern” fashion - “a state of feeling unknown to less enlightened but perhaps healthier epochs - the feeling of depression, the feeling of ennui - though negative feelings are not automatically unfit subjects for poetry (as Tennyson shows in Mariana). George Boyle, though speaking quite mildly of “The Strayed Reveller” (in which, for him, “A.” has actually “gathered fruits” from Sophocles and Homer by imitating), called “Empedocles” “an utter mistake.... it hardly possesses one attribute of dramatic poetry.... failing to touch the reader” and offered an unfavourable comparison with Tennyson in adapting the antique to English verse. For Froude in the Westminster Review, the character of Empedocles was the stumbling block, expressing no sentiments strong enough to make the suicide credible. The poem did not reappear until the New Poems of 1867, when Swinburne, who bought the original volume as a schoolboy, welcomed “Empedocles” as a long-lost friend and spoke highly of its “noble” qualities. However, Leslie Stephen, apparently seeing it for the first time, condemned its bleakness, along with that of most of the rest of the volume, but perceptively grasped its significance to Arnold, as being close to an expression of the writer’s own
view of the world and his position in it: "... instead of the light and joy of the poet - is this a dig at Arnold's professed belief in the "sweetness and light" of the classical world? - "he is, like his own Empedocles, filled with the gloom and weariness of the baffled philosopher". clv

Only the title poem of Empedocles on Etna, and Other Poems, by A., 1852, is heavily indebted to the classics, and even this poem seems modelled on the Romantic stereotype of a melancholy central figure suffering from a sense of persecution and a loathing of the world, isolating himself and ultimately committing suicide. The obvious parallel, down to the journey up the mountain shadowed by a possible helper, is Byron's Manfred, prototype of the dark and tormented Romantic hero, and Arnold's dramatic poem dominated by introspective monologue clearly differs from the surviving fragments of Empedocles' philosophy, which are its catalyst rather than its original. Because of this, it is easy to dismiss the poem as an example of a post-Romantic piece simply dressed in classical garb, as Alma-Tadema's paintings of classical scenes have been described as "modern people in Greek or Roman clothes" nclvi, especially given the obvious piling on of classicising and pastoral detail in the opening scene: "With thy head full of wine, and thy hair crown'd, Touching thy harp..." (Act 1, scene 1, ll.32-33). We are taken back to the world of "The Strayed Reveller" in such details as "... I threw round me My dappled fawn skin;..... I snatch'd up my vine-crown...", and Callicles has much in common with the Youth of the earlier poem. However, although it can be argued that "Empedocles on Etna" is a
pretentious exploitation of a particularly obscure corner of classicism and has a lot more to do with Arnold's mid-century thinking than it has to do with the pre-Socratic's doctrines concerning the operation of Love and Strife in the universe and the fate of the daimon (Anderson claiming that Arnold "borrowed nothing but a name and a collection of miscellaneous biographical details. Regarding the Empedoclean Leitmotiv of a cosmic struggle between Love and Strife he has nothing to say ...", there is in fact in the poem a significant element derived from Arnold's reading of the Empedoclean fragments. Empedocles was clearly very significant for Arnold, as he is mentioned in the most exalted company in his essay on his philosophical hero, Marcus Aurelius: "The noblest souls of whatever creed, the pagan Empedocles as well as the Christian Paul, have insisted on the necessity of an inspiration, a joyful emotion, to make moral action perfect".

The Empedoclean credentials of the piece are established in the opening speech of the character who might be least expected to echo the philosophy, the musician Callicles, who has often been seen as set up in opposition to the philosopher. Anderson sees the poem as demonstrating a complete dichotomy between the two - "an alternation between two different worlds" with even "the impossibility of communication between the inner worlds represented by Callicles and Empedocles", and Trilling earlier saw them as representing entirely different outlooks or experiences: "two kinds of poetry. Interspersed among the harsh and crabbed verses by which Empedocles reasons his way from despair to suicide are the restrained but sensuous
songs of the faithful harp-player, Callicles, and while the philosopher chants
the rational and scientific facts of painful, unharmonious life, the poet
continues to sing in rich and fluent verse of the ancient world of myth.\textsuperscript{a,b,c}

Although this seems initially to be a fair reading of the poem, in my view it
fails to take account of several features of the poem and the story of
Empedocles. Arnold is not simply presenting the Empedoclean philosophy
and one of its alternatives: he is presenting a disillusioned Empedocles at the
end of his life, in an emotional rather than an intellectual crisis, and Callicles
as a friend and potential helper, not a rival. Empedocles in his prime is
described by Callicles (Act 1, scene 1, II.59-66) in terms which recall not only
the traditional portrait of the philosopher but also the passage in Fragment
102\textsuperscript{a,b,c}, in which Empedocles appears to be describing himself - not so much
boastfully as in recognition of the upward progress of his daimon:

\begin{quote}
...ἐγὼ δ’ ὑμῖν θεὸς ἀμβροτος οὐκέτι θνητός
πωλεῖμαι μετὰ πᾶσι τετμένωσι, ὡσπερ ἐοίκεν,
tαινίαις τε περίστερον στεφεόν τε θαλείοις.
tοῖσιν ἀμ ἤκωμαι ἐς ἀστέα τηλεθάοντα
ἀνθράσιν ἡδὲ γυναιξὶ σεβίζομαι. οἱ δ’ ἀμ’ ἐπονται
μυρίωι...
\end{quote}

Callicles himself may be an invention of Arnold, unlike Pausanias (mentioned
in the fragments and traditionally known as a doctor) and the name

\textsuperscript{a} "I go about among you as an immortal god, no longer mortal, honoured amongst all, as is
fitting, crowned with fillets and flowering garlands. Whenever I enter flourishing towns, I am
honoured by men and women. They follow me in tens of thousands ..."
Peisianax, which features in Heraclides' account of Empedocles' death, but he is not without Empedoclean precedent, and in a manner which links rather than divides the two characters. Fragment 132 lists the highest types of people, seen in the Empedoclean philosophy as the final incarnations before the daimon finally ascends to the divine state:

\[ \text{eis dë télos múnteis te kai ýmónólovi kai ítropi} \\
\text{kai prómoi ánthrópoi in épihthoníoi pélonTai.} \\
\text{ènthen ánablastoúai theoi tímaíi fýrístoi.}\]

The list includes prophets and leaders (presumably Empedocles himself in the poem, although in the tradition he also has claim to the other categories), physicians (Pausanias) and musicians - which means that Callicles is of the same exalted rank himself. Empedocles has a harp, and we are told at lines 82-83 that he used to play - and here is the clue; this is not the triumphant philosopher, but Empedocles as he might have been after the spark of inspiration and in the belief in perfectibility (these being the most important elements in Arnold's version of Hellenism) had deserted him. Callicles is not the same as the drunken Youth of "The Strayed Reveller" - he has "slipp'd out.... to breathe" and has removed the "soil'd garland" (Act 1, scene 1, ll.37-40) as sobriety returns, whereas the Youth is under the influence of the cup and still apparently sports the crown. Callicles calls on Apollo, the god of

---

\[ \text{"At the end they become prophets and musicians and physicians and the foremost among men on earth. Thence they arise as gods, greatest in honour."} \]
rational creativity, not on Dionysus, who embodies the irrational, and this
distinguishes him from the Youth and puts him firmly on the side of the
Hellenists who, like Arnold, saw reason and serenity as being the essential
quality of the Greeks. (The other god he mentions, Pan, is closer to the
irrational and untamed force, but could simply represent Callicles' openness
to the natural world, compared with Empedocles' concern with his own
internal world; Pan was favoured by Hellenists of a Romantic persuasion as
an alternative to Christianity, and his name may also contain a hint of the
"pantheistic" harmony which Callicles' songs seem to portray.) Empedocles'
own speech does not refer to the traditional names of the anthropomorphic
gods in the way that Callicles' does; with the exception of the mention of
Apollo in Act 2, when pointedly he discards the laurel, he speaks only of the
remote Epicurean gods who create but then remain remote, or the
generalised gods which man creates for himself, whereas the more poetic or
romantic (or, in Empedocles' view, more innocent - "he fables"; Act 2, 1.89)
Callicles names and tells stories of Pan, Apollo, Jove, Hebe, the Muses and
anthropomorphc gods who could attend Cadmus' wedding. In this, Arnold's
Empedocles is much more austere than the writer of the philosophy, who
regularly uses the names of the gods, albeit as substitutes for the physical
elements, and names the force of attraction in the world Aphrodite or Kypris.
There is no evidence in the fragments that Empedocles had any belief in the
traditional pantheon or in intelligent divine personalities concerning
themselves with human matters (Fragment 118 making it clear that he
regarded them as inventions, and ones associated with unholy blood
sacrifices); it is just that Arnold’s figure has become more austere, more Epicurean or Lucretian in his attitude.

Callicles’ opening speech is not simply a piece of poetic natural description to set against Empedocles’ later view of the world, for, unconsciously, it epitomises the main features of Empedocles’ own Physics; doing so in metaphorical form does not negate its Empedoclean origin, for the philosopher himself used similar means to convey his teachings, in verse. In the opening seventeen lines, Callicles’ speech emphasises the presence of water (“the cool wet turf”, “the stream-side”, “the stream’s edge”, etc.) as well as the earth (“the dusty lanes”, “mountain-crests”); he draws attention to “the mist” and the fact that “One’s breath curls in the air”, and tells us “the sun is shining”. What he has done is to list the four roots or elements in Empedoclean physics, in the way which Empedocles himself might have done: the pre-Socratics commonly take all or some of earth, air, water and fire as the primary building-blocks of the universe, but Empedocles’ verses frequently use synonyms for them (e.g. using πῦρ and ἡέλιος as alternatives, and calling water ὄξωρ, πόντος, θάλασσα or ὄμβρος). He also uses the names of the gods to refer to the elements,

tέσσαρα γὰρ πάντων ριζώματα πρῶτον ἀκοῦε.
Ζεὺς ἀργῆς Ἡρη τε φερέσθιος ἢδο Ἄιδωνεύς,
Νῆστις θ’ ἢ δακρύοις τέγει κρούνωμα Βρότειον

\*(Fragment 7),

* “Hear first the four roots of all things: bright Zeus, life-bringing Hera, Hades and Nestis, who moistens the mortal springs with tears.”
although there has been dispute since ancient times about which god
represents which element, the arguments being set out by Wright: Nestis is
water and Hades can only represent earth; Zeus, usually associated with the
sky and so air, is described as ἀργίς ("bright"), suggesting that he stands for
fire (as in the lightning flash), leaving Hera as air.

Empedocles recites the list of elements towards the end of the poem:

To the elements it came from
Everything will return -
Our bodies to earth,
Our blood to water,
Heat to fire,
Breath to air (Act 2, ll.331-6), an account of the disintegration of the body
which is certainly implied by but never spelled out in the extant lines from the
historical Empedocles' writings, which say much about how things come into
being but not how they end. The creation of the material world is brought
about in this philosophy by the action of a principle usually called Aphrodite
by Empedocles, which serves to unite disparate elements or objects made
from them, and its destruction is caused by the contrary force, Strife, which
separates the elements out and make each congeal in a uniform mass; the
history of the universe is a very slow alternation between these two extreme
states, our history occupying one of the transitory phases in which Love and
Strife both operate:
The emphasis on the destruction of things which preoccupies the final moments of Empedocles in the poem before he throws himself into the volcano is not typical of the fragments of his work which we have; unlike the cynical and bitter character in Arnold's version, the writer of the philosophy tends to be optimistic, stressing the creative power of nature and the ability of man to improve himself by attending to philosophy, and the promise that in due course the daimon in the human body will evolve into a divine state. And this is the message of Callicles in the poem: his opening speech is not just a list of the elements but a picture of how they fit together to form a harmony, all the elements combining to create a refreshing scene:

One sees one's footprints crush'd in the wet grass,
One's breath curls in the air, and on these pines
That climb from the stream's edge, the long grey tufts,
Which the goats love, are jewell'd thick with dew. (Act 1, scene 1, ll.14-7).

His song about Cadmus and Harmonia, physically central in the poem, again opens with a combination of "hills", "sunshine", "sea", and "air", mentioned in the space of four lines, and it goes on to describe how the couple passed

---

* "And all things in no way cease from always changing, at one time all coming together as one by love, at another time being torn apart separately by the hatred caused by strife."
through the troubles of life to achieve, "in changed forms", serenity, "Wholly forgot their first sad life, and home, / ... and stray For ever through the glens, placid and dumb." (Act 1, scene 2, II.458-60) This is similar to the picture of the final tranquillity awaiting the daimon in the fragments:

\[ \text{άθανάτοις ἄλλοις ὀμέστοι αὐτοτράπεζοι} \]
\[ \text{ἔοντες ἀνδρείων ἀχέων ἀπόκληροι, ἄτειρεῖς.} \]

(Fragment 133)

Thus, Callicles can represent not the opposite point of view from Empedocles, but one side of him - the positive side of him, or even the younger Empedocles, whereas the character with that name in the poem is an older, disillusioned version, the sort of character the writer of the fragments might have become when displaced by the sophists and driven to suicide, as some of the biographers contend: "half mad With exile, and with brooding on his wrongs" (Act 1, scene 1, II.23-4). He is spoken of by Callicles as having passed from "such a majesty As drew of old the people after him" (II.62-3); it is a method similar to that followed by Tennyson when he pictures a restless and less responsible Ulysses in old age, and it is significant that it is Callicles and not Pausanias who recalls the image of the philosopher in his prime. The closeness between Callicles and Empedocles is reinforced when the singer reveals that he shares Empedocles' secret about the true nature of Pantheia's revival, and that he has realised the real problem - not the sophists, but

---

* "... sharing hearth and table with the other immortals, not sharing in mortal sorrows, unwearied."
"some root of suffering in himself" (l.151); not even the doctor Pausanias has understood these things. Callicles thus understands Empedocles' problems, despite himself lacking such inner turmoil ("What mortal could be sick or sorry here?" l.20) and despite being an unwelcome sight for the philosopher, according to Pausanias; perhaps it is the fear of realising what he once was and how much he has changed that makes Empedocles loath to look on Callicles. What has happened to Empedocles, in Arnold's terminology, is that he has fallen victim to "the strange disease of modern life" referred to in "The Scholar-Gipsy", which may simplistically be glossed as fragmentation of aims and efforts, with stress and self-doubt. The word "modern" has two senses in Arnold's work - it can be used in a positive sense, as when he urges the study of the ancients because they are "modern" and relevant to contemporary issues, and in a negative sense when it implies what is wrong with such a world (usually the contemporary one). Arnold makes this clear near the beginning of the 1853 Preface: Empedocles in the poem represents the moment of transition from the Hellenic "modern" to the contemporary "modern" (the centuries between being, in the Arnolds' view, irrelevant, as being of a wholly different type of culture), when the objectivity and serenity of the classical period has been replaced by doubt and the destructive "dialogue of the mind with itself" has commenced. For this picture to be convincing, we need to see the position from which Empedocles has moved, and this is represented by Callicles. The move is a psychological one, but is represented on stage by the move from the watered woodlands of Act 1 to the "charr'd, blacken'd, melancholy waste" of Act 2, from the dialogues of Act 1 to the
insistence on "Alone!" at the start of Act 2, and, centrally in the middle section of Act 1 scene 2, from Callicles' singing about Chiron on Pelion to Empedocles' first long speech; it is important to note that Callicles - the old Empedocles - never quite deserts the philosopher: the off-stage singing may not prevent the suicide, but it outlives him, perhaps an optimistic note. The change from the Chiron song shows much about the gap which has developed between Callicles and Empedocles, and about the way the world has changed. Callicles presents a picture of a harmonious world, with heroes, gods and legendary creatures such as the centaur inhabiting a pastoral Eden, whereas Empedocles begins with a picture of the gods wantonly tormenting the soul, goes on to paint a nearly existential view of life and ends with a humanistic assertion of man's need to make his own way; this appears to mark the change from a Romantic, idealised vision to a more realistic and practical, "modern", one. However, this is perhaps too simple a view, although it is true that the rejection of Romanticism and the embracing of the humanist stance are definite features of Arnold's development. Callicles' description is not without hints of the harsher world - Chiron speaks of wars, and we recall that his pupil Achilles is doomed so to die in a short time, as symbolised by "the straight ashes (which) grow for spears"- and Empedocles' final teaching that "Life still Leaves human effort scope" and that one should not despair is contradicted by his final action in the piece. We return to Callicles' account of the Cadmus and Harmonia story, with the attainment of serenity and contentment, albeit in a myth. The overall effect is perhaps to illustrate the need to strike a balance between the two views, which are not
opposites but which emphasise different aspects of experience; Callicles
dwells too much on the wish-fulfilment aspect of myth-making and decorates
his message too much, whereas Empedocles dwells too much on the
difficulties of life and presents it too bleakly.

The reference to the immortals in Fragment 133 suggests that Empedocles
shares the Epicurean view of the gods, that they live remote from the affairs
of men; in the fragments, the names of the gods are used metaphorically for
the elements (e.g. Hephaistos for fire) or the natural forces (e.g. Aphrodite for
Love), but not to refer to supernatural intelligences. Arnold's Empedocles,
however, does initially refer to the gods in the conventional way, but seeing
them as tormentors or jokers: in his long speech in the second scene of the
first Act, they hang the human soul up in the winds, and "The Gods laugh in
their sleeve To watch man doubt and fear" (Act 1, scene 2, ll.87-8). However,
in the course of the long speech Arnold shows us the philosopher arguing his
way towards the Epicurean position of dismissing the fear of the gods - a
reconstruction of the reasoning which might have led to the Stoic and
Lucretian view which Arnold admired in Marcus Aurelius. Rejecting fear of the
gods as degrading, he asserts the need to "be a man" and make the most of
what the visible world offers: "The world is what it is, for all our dust and din"
(l.206), so "Born into life we are, and life must be our mould" (l.186). It is, as
Trilling says, "a doctrine of acquiescence", but the realisation that nature is
neutral and there is no natural morality cannot be taken with Epicurean lack
of emotion, because it makes man inescapably simply a part of nature and he
cannot easily endure the idea that his efforts at self-improvement and the establishment of justice are in fact meaningless, indeed unnatural: he feels himself mocked rather than ignored, as “Nature, with equal mind, Sees all her sons at play; Sees man control the wind, The wind sweep man away”.

Empedocles envisages early men inventing things to blame for their sorrows, "Stern Powers" to account for the difficulties of life, "Lend(ing) life to the dumb stones Whereon to vent their rage", "With God and Fate to rail at, suffering easily" (ll. 274-275 and 281); they then "feign kind Gods" (l. 316) as a comfort. However, it is typical of Arnold's struggling Stoic that he describes this process the other way round from Lucretius, who describes man first having the positive idea of gods as superhumans, derived from dreams,

et enim iam tum divum mortalia saecla
egregias animo facies vigilante videbant
et magis in somnis mirando corporis auctu *

(Lucretius, De Rerum Natura, Book 5, ll.1169-71),

before making them responsible for everything and the causers of his own misfortunes:

ergo perfugium sibi habebant omnia divis

* "For indeed already in those days men were seeing, while their senses were awake and even more in their dreams, the extraordinary forms of gods, with their astonishingly greater bodily stature."
The harshness of life on earth is not, of course, absent from the extant Empedoclean fragments,

ω πότις, ω δειλὸν θνητῶν γένος, ω δυσάνολβον,
o‘ων ἐδ ἐρίδων ἐκ τε στοναχῶν ἐγένεσθε.\(^b\) (Fragment 114),

but there is not the extended expression of the Arnold's version. This particular fragment perhaps inspired the "Born into life!" refrain of the central part of the speech in Act 1, scene 2. The harshness of life when the daimon comes into the world is probably the context of fragments like 112 κλαδόν τε καὶ κόκκος ἰδὼν ἁπανήθεα χώρον\(^c\) and 113 "Ἀτης ἂν λειψόνα κατὰ σκότος ἡλιάσκουσιν\(^d\) which perhaps is at the back of Arnold's mind when he uses the battle in the dark at the end of "Dover Beach" as a symbol for the confusions and struggles of life; the autograph of the bulk of that poem, but without those closing lines, is actually on the back of notes from Empedocles. Here, the line describes the daimon born as a mortal creature living aimlessly in a world wracked by the force of Strife rather than Love.

It must also be borne in mind that Empedocles in the poem, perhaps like Arnold but not like the philosopher at the height of his powers, is suffering not

---

\(^a\) "Therefore they took refuge for themselves in handing over everything to gods and making everything be caused by their whim."

\(^b\) "Alas, o unfortunate race of mortals, most wretched, you were born out of such strife and groaning."

\(^c\) "I wept and wailed on seeing the unfamiliar place."

\(^d\) "They wander in darkness over the meadow of folly."
merely a philosophical and religious crisis as his ideas and world-picture sour and lead to despair over the position of man in the universe, but from a profound unease over the development of society, always seen by the Arnolds as being paramount. The rise of the Sophists which leads to Empedocles falling from favour and leaving the city could be likened to the threat posed to the health of British society by the rise of Philistinism and the persistence of Hebraism, as described in *Culture and Anarchy*, leaving Arnold too as a lone voice outside society.

The bulk of the surviving Empedoclean fragments is concerned with technical matters, the details of his version of biological and geological genesis and the way the elements and forces in the universe interact, such as the long passage comparing respiration to the clepsydra (Fragment 91), and these have no place in Arnold's poem, which is concerned with the human condition. Nevertheless, there are suggestions of Arnold's wording being influenced by some of the more technical passages: "one's footprints crush'd in the wet grass" (Act 1, scene 1, l.14) may be linked to Fragment 92, apparently on the way hounds track - ἀπέλευψε ποδῶν ἀπαλῇ περὶ ποῖῳ.

Jennifer Wallace's article "Translation in Arnold's *Empedocles*" adds some points, particularly with regard to our understanding of Callicles' songs, although she does not really look at the specific matter of how Arnold used Empedocles to create his own poem (not looking specifically at the use made

---

* "... it left behind from its feet on the soft grass."
of the fragments). She discusses "Arnold's ambiguous attitude to translation", seeing it on the one hand as a means of infusing what is best in the ancient world into contemporary life and, on the other, as "not so much a necessary strengthening of modern resources but rather an escape from present difficulties."® As evidence of the latter tendency, she quotes "To a Friend", which names Homer, "clearest-souled of men", "even-balanced" Epictetus and Sophocles, "Who saw life steadily, and saw it whole", as those who "prop" his mind in difficult days without actually providing solutions to current problems. Although she does not give other specific examples, perhaps what she has in mind is the image of the retiring Scholar-Gipsy, or Tyrian trader, fleeing from the confusion of the present, although later she goes on to suggest that, in addition to his returning to the classics for personal support and consolation, the kind of wide-spread effect which he hoped the infusion of the classical spirit (for example, through improved education and the example of such works as Merope) into the populace would produce was nearer to social control by "calming" than to enlightenment. A different ambiguity is also present in "Empedocles on Etna": although it presents the songs of Callicles almost as examples of the kind of "serene" experience Arnold wishes all to derive from the classics - as mentioned below, the stories he tells tend to be censored and sanitised, and it is significant that Callicles is heard as a disembodied voice but not seen by Empedocles, just as the ancient writers exist for us only as their works - they do not in fact work, and Empedocles leaps into the volcano despite them. Just so, in Callicles' story, Typho under the volcano is not soothed by the lyre, though the gods are.
"Translation" as presented by Wallace is not the business of turning text in one language into text in another - she does not consider the Empedoclean fragments directly - but a more wide-ranging process, particularly apt in the case of Empedocles, whose beliefs include the notion that the very basis of the visible universe is the continuous transformation of the same essential matter (a combination of endless turmoil and inescapability which leads to Empedocles' despair - "Empedocles himself is the object or victim of translation", unable to find true tranquillity or satisfaction in the world of action, like the one "Wandering between two worlds" in "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse"). Arnold's piece is not a translation, in the usual sense, of the source text, despite the fact that more links between it and the original fragments than critics have generally allowed have been identified above: "Empedocles on Etna" is rather a specific response to reading an ancient text, a response to a catalyst which is shaped as much by the writer's individual concerns and context (in this case, Arnold's doubts about the social and spiritual development of nineteenth-century society).

One aspect of translation is the altering of a story to fit a purpose, as Callicles in his attempt to calm and cure the philosopher (or Arnold in his attempt to demonstrate the restorative effect of the classics) modifies the tales he tells: his song about Chiron's education of Achilles hardly mentions his military training and ignores the centaur's end; the version he gives of the Cadmus and Harmonia story differs from Ovid's in *Metamorphoses* by making the
snakes shun mankind and be oblivious of their earlier tragic lives; his account of the flaying of Marsyas omits Ovid's gory details but shifts the attention to the grief of the victim's friend. "Translation" is also applied to the characters in the poem by Arnold, Callicles being the re-incarnation of the Callicles of Plato's Gorgias, who believes that philosophical speculation should be abandoned at manhood, and the traditional picture of Empedocles becoming "a psychological study of despair or...the isolation of the modern poet". Putting more strain on the word, Wallace also uses "translation" to describe the influence characters have on each other, the way Empedocles draws Callicles and the "spell" he used to cast over the people, to the point of raising the dead (perhaps an image for one effect Arnold would like the classics to have on his contemporaries), and the way in which Callicles hopes to calm the philosopher by his music (ditto).

Nevertheless, although Callicles tries to save Empedocles, it is by deception, or at least the telling of half-truths, and it fails, with the philosopher and with the reader; the picture with which we are left is of the profoundly unhappy philosopher despairing of the modern world and abandoning his own teachings, and throwing himself into the volcano. Because it failed to embody the classical virtues which Arnold perceived and appeared to deal only with defeat, he removed "Empedocles on Etna" from the 1853 edition of his poems, though he included the "Cadmus and Harmonia" passage and added classicising pieces of different types ("The Scholar-Gipsy", "Philomela" and "Sohrab and Rustum"), as well as reprinting "To a Friend", "Mycerinus" and
"The Strayed Reveller". The later Merope, his second attempt at a dramatic piece on a classical theme, he believed presented the positive aspect of the Greek spirit more clearly. The irony is that "Empedocles on Etna" is still studied and discussed, whereas Merope is unread, failing (unlike "Empedocles") to gain a place in either of the standard single-volume selections of Arnold, the Everyman and The Oxford Authors: the earlier piece represents an intellectually and emotionally engaged response by a reader to a classical text, bringing the concerns of his own age to bear on it, whereas the later piece, though equally sincerely meant, is a purely academic response. In the long run, Arnold's expression of the serenity, formality and positive qualities which he found in the classics has proved to be less convincing than the anguished dialogue between the ancient texts and his own age which is "Empedocles on Etna".

Hopkins too concerned himself with the Presocratics, as seen in his 1868 notes on Parmenides, another philosopher writing dactylic hexameters, though this is not a particularly significant link, since an interest in the Presocratics would not have been uncommon. Hopkins' notes contain the first recorded use of the crucial words "inscape" and "instress", suggesting that, even if these ideas and even the names for them had already occurred to him, the reading of Parmenides helped him to justify their importance as the main motive behind his poetry. Ultimately, the "instress" of everything (its organisational principle) is its existence, Parmenides' fundamental "being" or ἐστι.
The image of change derived from the early philosophers is predominant in and closely linked to the presentation of the elements in such poems as Arnold’s “Empedocles on Etna” and Hopkins’ Heraclitean Fire sonnet, and is present in many other places (such as the switch to the Oxus flowing past the dying warrior in “Sohrab and Rustum” or the picture of erosion in “God’s Grandeur”); both poets’ sense of the transience of life and the permanence of change, common enough in all poets at all times on at least a physical level (as in the first part of “The Leaden Echo and the Golden Echo”), appears to have been deepened by exposure to the teachings of the Presocratics on such themes, as evidenced by the titles of the poems. (They may have been further influenced in this by the revelations of the geologists and Darwinists about change and decay, as was Tennyson more explicitly in In Memoriam). Although Hopkins claimed that the Heraclitean Fire sonnet contained “a great deal of early Greek philosophical thought”\(^\text{a}\), there is in it no specific reference to the surviving fragments of Heraclitus, which is unsurprising, given their paucity, with the primacy of fire in his system evident only briefly (as in the quotation at the end of this paragraph); however, the idea of permanent flux is present in several fragments, the most well-known concerning the ever-changing content of a river which appears to remain unchanged - \( \text{ποταμοῦσι τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐμβαίνωμεν ἐτερα καὶ ἐτερα ὑδάτα ἐπρετῇ} \) (Fragment 12)\(^\text{b}\) and \( \text{ποταμοῖς τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐμβαίνομεν τε καὶ οὐκ αὐτοῖς ἐμβαίνομεν} \) (Fragment 49a).\(^\text{b}\) In Hopkins, the picture of permanent

\(\text{a} \) “Different and again different waters flow upon those who step into the same rivers.”

\(\text{b} \) “We step into the same rivers, and we do not step into the same ones.”
change and the image of "nature's bonfire" are eventually replaced by the Christian message of the Resurrection. Hopkins is familiar with and pays lip service to the ancient interpretation of the changeable physical world (and the beauty of "variety" is the substance of "On the Origin of Beauty: a Platonic Dialogue", the lists of words in his early notes and much of the poetry), but his religious faith enables him to move beyond that to an image of a state of being which defies universal change - "whose beauty is past change" ("Pied Beauty") - although this idea is not unknown to Heraclitus too:

κόσμον τόνδε, τόν αὐτὸν ἀπάντων, οὔτε τις θεῶν οὔτε ἄνθρωπον ἐποίησεν, ἀλλ' ἂν αἰὲ καὶ ἔστων καὶ ἔσται πῦρ αἰὲξων, ἀπτόμενον μέτρα καὶ ἀποσβεβηλίμενον μέτρα (Fragment 30).

Parmenides' philosophy can be considered "diametrically opposed to Heraclitus". In the case of Parmenides, Hopkins is discussing the writings directly, rather than using one image or idea as a starting point, as is the case with the Heraclitean Fire sonnet, and Parmenides' insistence on the unchanging and immovable entity is perhaps closer to Christian thinking about the divine than Heraclitus' vision of permanent change, albeit within a kind of stability: ταύτων τ' ἐν ταύτῳ τε μένον καθ' ἐαυτό τε κεῖται χοῦτως ἐμπέδων αὕτη μένει (Fragment 8), the subject of which is the grammatical subject of the existential statement "it is". More importantly, Hopkins seems to

---

* None of the gods or of men made the cosmos, which is the same for all, but it always was and is and shall be, an eternal fire, kindled bit by bit and extinguished bit by bit."

* "The same, in the same state, alone and by itself it lies and it remains there unchanging."
find concord with his own belief in the reality of the physical world, and the
close relationship between the things of the world and the words used to
express them, in Parmenides’ insistence on the importance of this simple idea
of “being”, guaranteed by logical arguments based on the structure of the
sentence and the nature of subjects, verbs and predicates, most clearly
expressed in the line quoted by Plato in the *Theaetetus* and defended by
Cornford as genuine: οἶνον ἀκίνητον τελέσθαι τῷ παντὶ ὐνομί εἶναι.
Although he also notes the importance of love and fire to Parmenides,
Hopkins’ strongest reaction is to the treatment of the implications of the use
of the verb “be” which dominates the surviving fragments, and (interestingly,
given the grammatical complexity and ambiguity of his later poems) he sees
the force and overtones of the individual word as more significant than
precise grammatical accuracy: “ἐστι may roughly be expressed by things are
or there is truth. Grammatically it = it is or there is. But indeed I have often felt
when I have been in this mood and felt the depth of an instress or how fast
the inscape holds a thing that nothing is so pregnant and straightforward to
the truth as simple yes and is.” In effect, Parmenides provides Hopkins
with a philosophical or theoretical justification for something which he already
felt intuitively; this recalls the kinship Hopkins felt with Duns Scotus and his
idea of haecceitas (“reality” in “Duns Scotus’ Oxford”), and finds expression in
the poems when he speaks of the uniqueness of the individual and the
significance of its existence, and coins a verb for the phenomenon: “Selves -

b “Alone unchanging is that which comes into being by the name overall of “to be”.”
goes itself; *myself* it speaks and spells, Crying *What I do is me: for that I came.*" ("Kingfishers" sonnet) J.Hillis Miller goes further, and suggests that "his reading of Parmenides is a turning point in his thinking, and prepares him for the decisive encounter some years later with Scotus and St. Ignatius."
7. The close of "The Scholar-Gipsy" - "Hebrew" and "Hellene".

The Source and its Significance for Arnold

The last two stanzas of "The Scholar-Gipsy" derive loosely from Thomas Arnold's favourite, Herodotus. In Book 4, chapter 196, the most westerly, unnamed people of North Africa, beyond the Pillars of Herakles, are described by Carthaginian merchants as carrying out trade in the way detailed in the poem: the Carthaginians leave cargo on the beach and return to their ships, and then the natives come out and leave gold in exchange for the goods they want: ἓς τοὺς ἐπεδὰν ἀπίκονται καὶ ἐξέλονται τὰ φορτία. θέντες αὐτὰ ἐπεξῆς παρὰ τὴν κυματώγην, ἐσβάντες ἐς τὰ πολοία τύφειν καπνόν. τῶς δ' ἐπιχωρίους ἱδομένους τὸν καπνὸν ιέναι ἐπὶ θάλασσαν καὶ ἔπειτα ἀντὶ τῶν φορτίων χρυσὸν τιθέναι...

Arnold adds much to this account. The shyness of the natives (which can be inferred from the elaborate ritual by which trade is conducted without contact) is acknowledged in the poem, "Shy traffickers", but also apparently ascribed to the Tyrian who seeks out the "Iberians" because they will not impinge on his tranquillity; this is an addition to Herodotus, whose Carthaginians are looking for profit. The description of the Greeks is also an addition to the original, but fits into the analogy because their behaviour parallels the noisy countrymen whom the Scholar-Gipsy avoids. On the other hand, Arnold leaves out of his account of the Tyrian the lighting of the smoky fire, which

---

"They come to this place and unload their cargo. Having set it out in order along the beach and re-embarked, they make a smoky fire. The native people, seeing the smoke, come down to the shore and then put down gold in return for the goods ..."
would detract from the perfect tranquillity of the picture. A letter reveals
Arnold's own desire for the life of the Tyrian trader or the Scholar-Gipsy, the
tendency to withdraw to tranquillity which is so attractive but so at odds with
the recognition of the need to act seen in "Stanzas from the Grande
Chartreuse": "I fly and hide myself here... in the profoundest secrecy... "Hide
thy life," said Epicurus, and the exquisite zest there is in doing so can only be
appreciated by those who, desiring to introduce some method into their lives,
have suffered from the malicious pleasure the world takes in trying to distract
them till they are as shatter-brained and empty-headed as the world itself.

The poem's "sick hurry" and "divided aims" which plague "modern" life and
deprive it of the serenity and clarity which for Arnold embody the best of the
ancient world have a source in classical literature: in his inaugural lecture as
Professor of Poetry at Oxford, he draws attention to the picture of the
unsettled and unsatisfied man at the end of Book 3 of Lucretius' *De Rerum
Natura* as an illustration of what he sees as wrong with the world.

*The Strangeness of the Image*

It is curious that it is "grave Tyrian trader", rather than the Greeks from whom
he flees in the last two stanzas of the poem, who is the ancient parallel for the
Scholar-Gipsy, whose avoidance of "this strange disease of modern life" has
been held up in the poem as an ideal, now reduced to a legend rather than a
possibility. Whereas earlier commentators tended to see the appropriateness

---

* This tension is seen in Hopkins also: the desired tranquillity of the early "Heaven-Haven"
comes to be replaced in later poems by regret at being left out of the business of the world.
of the image (e.g. "The trade of the Mediterranean was in the hands of the Phoenicians... before the Greeks had become sufficiently civilised for commerce. Then gradually the Greeks ousted the Phoenicians from the eastern half, but they retained their preponderance in the western half... The effect of the passage is heightened by the poetical device of making the representatives of the youthful Grecian race, now rising to preponderance, themselves youthful, and the Tyrian trader, who is being driven out, a man of mature years"). More recently the apparent inconsistency of Arnold here has been noted. Anderson draws attention to the "unfavorable portrait of the Greeks. The coaster is merry, its crew light-hearted; its cargo of delicacies appeals to the senses. Yet the entire picture is Arnold's chosen image "of the strange disease of modern life" apparently representing a rejection of Arnold's own background and beliefs. Anderson goes on to explain away the problem by postulating two different types of Hellenism, one being the life of sensuous experience, which Arnold rejected after The Strayed Reveller, and the other being the "Periclean" emphasis on formal excellence and moral or intellectual elevation, here represented more by the Tyrian than by the Greeks.

However, this is not a wholly adequate explanation: although it is possible to see the Tyrian as an expression of one version of the classical experience, with a high moral tone, the bulk of the piece does not suggest a rejection of the senses and light-heartedness, being a lengthy poetic description of different aspects of the Oxfordshire countryside in different seasons, such as...
"the frail-leaf'd white anemony, Dark bluebells drench'd with dews of summer eves, And purple orchises with spotted leaves" and looking back to "days when wits were fresh and clear, And life ran gaily as the sparkling Thames". (There is a connection here with Hopkins: the descriptions of the Oxfordshire countryside are similar to the prose description given by Hopkins of a walk undertaken on May, 1866, across "Bablock Hythe" and up "Cumnor Hill", the "Bab-lock-hithe" and "Cumner hills" of the poem; both writers focus on the flowers, including "bluebells... And purple orchises" or "Bluebells, purple orchis." cf.

Stephen Prickett emphasises the oddness of the passage in the light of the terminology of Culture and Anarchy even more strongly; not only is the Tyrian "Hebraic", which implies inward-looking and narrow moralising, but he comes from what had been the principal city of the Philistines, the word adopted by Arnold for those who have a wrong notion of what constitutes culture, and flees from "the hearty extroverts of the Greek rowing-club". Prickett points out the difficulty of the latter characters being the early originators of the Hellenism which represents true culture in Culture and Anarchy; one could also see in the poem, paraphrased this way, a rejection of the cult of games which was the complement to intellectual pursuits in the public school system as re-created by Thomas Arnold and over-emphasised by Brooke in Tom Brown's Schooldays: "I know I'd sooner win two Schoolhouse matches running than get the Balliol scholarship any day."
The "Hellene and Hebrew" Dichotomy

It is, however, probably a mistake to overplay the apparent strangeness of the treatment of the Tyrian and the Greeks in this passage, and to lay so much emphasis on the difference between Hebraism and Hellenism in Arnold's thinking, as Trilling does when he sums up this aspect of Culture and Anarchy with "Hebraism is the root of anarchy." Much has been written about the conflict, or at least potential for conflict, between the two strongest cultural influences in nineteenth-century England, the classical and pagan world, seen as being in tune with contemporary ideas of liberal humanism, and the sternly moralistic and prescriptive Judaeo-Christian tradition, seen as being the word of God and hence needing to be taken seriously even if unpalatable; the distinction between the two, and the defeat of the former by the latter, had been sharply drawn by Gibbon in The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, and can be seen at the end of the century in the clashes between Sue and Jude in Hardy's Jude the Obscure. Nevertheless, the issue does not feature overtly in Hopkins' thinking (although his doubts about the propriety of indulging in writing poetry may be seen as an aspect of it), and Arnold's stance is not simple or static. Although Hellene and Hebrew appear to be neat opposites (Arnold's distinction between them generally seen as deriving from his reading of Heine's memorial speech for Ludwig Borne and taken to mean that he wanted to see much more creative "Hellenism" in British intellectual life to counter the dominance of legalistic "Hebraism"), Arnold's view of history sees them as intertwining strands which need to be
kept in balance, or postulates an almost Empedoclean situation, in which the universe is a process of repeated alternation between one state of being and another, being most of the time in a transitional phase, reciprocally rising and falling, as Trilling neatly puts it, "like buckets in a well": the pre-Christian world and the Renaissance were times in which Hellenism dominated, and the early Christian and Reformation periods of dominant Hebraism. Where England has gone wrong, in Arnold's view, is in being trapped in rigid Hebraism at a time when the rest of Europe has been restoring Hellenism through Enlightenment and the energy of Revolution.

Lionel Gossman, in "Philhellenism and Antisemitism: Matthew Arnold and his German Models" sets Arnold's discussion in the context of continental, especially German, versions of philhellenism, often marked by open anti-Judaism or antisemitism in their distinction between the self-sufficient, community-conscious Greek living in harmony with nature and the body and the dependent, self-centred Jew who rejects the body and seeks to ignore or dominate nature (although with regard to Arnold's terminology one must avoid equating intellectual "Hebraism" with actual "Judaism") Gossman sees Arnold's presentation of the divide as being characterised not by a clear favouring of one way of life over the other but by a willingness to compromise, as his programme involves a blending of the two, albeit with a correction to compensate for a recent under-representation of Hellenism; this is quite different from the rejection of the Jew (and sometimes the Christian too) and his view of the world which is found in such writers as Hegel and Nietzsche. As
evidence of his aim to arrive at a balance between the two, Gossman points
to a speech made at Eton in which Arnold distinguishes in the same way
between the moral and manly but stiff and solitary (i.e. "Hebraic") Dorian
Greeks and the creative and cheerful but lightweight Ionian Greeks: he sees
not one overcoming the other, but a perfect blend being created in the
classical Athenians. Arnold's treatment of "Hellenism" and "Hebraism" should
thus rather be seen as part of his attempt to synthesise the various facets of
society - culture, democracy, religion - in order to prevent the overthrow of all
by radical transformation or proletarian revolution, and as prompted by
particular political conditions in Britain at the time rather than by set
philosophical or racial attitudes. Ideas similar to Gossman's notion of Arnold
as tolerant and unprejudiced appear in Eugene Goodheart's "Arnold, Critic of
Ideology", which claims that "the subject of Arnold's social criticism is
bias", the way in which the aims and prejudices of the classes - the liberal
Barbarians, the practical Philistines and the active Populace - grow to excess
and degenerate into, respectively, uncontrolled individualism, a mechanistic
approach and violence. Arnold is seen as seeking instead an objectivity, a
freedom from bias and ideology which leads to an enlargement of the view,
and the mind, and is thus an aspect of Hellenism.

The Virgilian Reference

However, the strangeness of Arnold taking the side of the non-Hellene in the
closing image is not the only way in which the presentation of the classical
past is rendered ambiguous in this poem. As well as the Greeks being made disruptive and less than attractive, Aeneas, the model of Roman piety, embodying Victorian ideals of patriotism, duty and responsibility, is implicitly criticised and attention is drawn to the one major episode in which he fails, his deviation from his fate when he lingers with Dido and his subsequent rejection of her, opposed but linked actions which call into question both his sense of duty and his human decency. The only classical allusion in the poem, apart from the closing scene, is one which casts this shadow over the reputation of Virgil’s "pius" hero; Aeneas’ moral uprightness having been compromised by his relationship with Dido in Book 4, his resolve is shaken for a moment when he is brought face to face with the consequences of his desertion of her in Book 6, when he meets her ghost in the underworld - and is snubbed:

inter quas Phoenissa recens a vulnere Dido
errabat Silva in magna .......
illa solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat;
nec magis incepto vultum sermone movetur,
quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes.
tandem corripuit sese, atque inimica refugit
in nemus umberiferum ....... 

Virgil, Aeneid 6, ll.450-73

---

"Among them, Carthaginian Dido, fresh from her wound, was wandering in the great wood ... She kept her eyes fixed on the ground, her face turned away; she no more changed her expression when he began to speak than if she had been a hard flint or a Parian rock. At length, she tore herself away, and retreated in her hatred back into the shadowy grove ..."
Arnold urges the Scholar-Gipsy to retreat into the wood in the same way, to avoid contagion, and even borrows the word "aversa":

Still fly, plunge deeper in the bowering wood!
Averse, as Dido did with gesture stern
From her false friend's approach in Hades turn,
Wave us away, and keep thy solitude!

Arnold, "The Scholar-Gipsy", ll.207-10

The "false friend" may recall the confusion between friend and foe mentioned at the end of "Dover Beach", where again the world is seen as a place of pain and suffering (the implication of the Dido reference being that we are all in Hades already) and the shadow of faithlessness appears to fall across the relationship of two lovers. There are obvious connections between the Dido reference and the picture of the Tyrian trader: not only do both flee from unwelcome intruders, the resolute and vigorous hero who has come incongruously into the land of shadows and the noisy Greeks, but both are also giving way before the rising force which will replace them - Dido returns to the comfort of the shade of her previous husband and Aeneas goes on to his destiny of laying the foundations of the state which will in time destroy her city of Carthage, just as the Greek traders will replace the Tyrians as "Masters of the waves". The connection is even closer: both Dido (described as "Phoenissa" in the Virgil passage to which Arnold alludes) and the Tyrian are of the same Phoenician stock, both Semites and hence alien to the Graeco-Roman tradition which Aeneas and the sailors represent; the
Scholar-Gipsy too, in deserting the "Oxford halls" where the classics were studied in order "To learn strange arts, and join a gipsy-tribe", is turning his back on that civilised tradition and joining with a "wild brotherhood" of eastern origin and living in the natural world (the woods around Oxford described in the poem and paralleling those into which Dido retreats).

"The Scholar-Gipsy" thus intensifies the ambiguity felt in "Empedocles on Etna": as the wonder-working philosopher despairs of life and the magical songs of the poet fail to calm him, so here the representatives of the classical world symbolise upset and the recommended behaviour is to retreat before them, in apparent contradiction of everything Arnold urges in his prose. An explanation for this inconsistency can be attempted in two ways. Firstly, it could be argued that in such pieces Arnold the poet describes the actual state in which he finds himself as a sensitive representative of his age, repelled by the state of nineteenth-century society while being attracted by an earlier age and unable to reconcile the two, resulting in the kind of frustration and desire for escape which is a common motif in his poetry; in his prose writings, on the other hand, Arnold expounds the problems rationally as well as reacting to them emotionally, and then suggests how they could be solved. The alternative view is suggested by Arnold in the 1853 Preface, where he says that his aim in "Empedocles" was "to delineate the feelings of one of the last of the Greek religious philosophers ... having survived his fellows, living on into a time when the habits of Greek thought and feeling had begun fast to change, character to dwindle..." In other words, "Empedocles" and "The
Scholar-Gipsy” represent not the failings present in the classical world but the actual failing of that world, what happens when the optimism, confidence, social-feeling and creativity which Arnold sees as typifying the ancient world at its best are replaced by self-doubt and a turning inwards or away, so that Empedocles can no longer believe in the sunny and harmonious world sung of by a harpist, unseen and so almost a voice from a lost past. This is also the point of the final lines of “Dover Beach”, where the reference to the disaster at Epipolae signals, for both the ancient and modern worlds, the collapse of society and the coming of more than literal darkness.
8. The Evocation of Homer in "Sohrab and Rustum" - and the importance of Homer to the Victorians.

The Greek poet who made the deepest impression on Victorian readers was Homer, as shown by the way in which echoing or translating Homer became a major occupation of poets: a dozen full verse versions of the *Iliad* appeared within twenty years, mid-century, "... as if copying Homer had become an end in itself. And the same can be said of the Victorian passion for translating him."  With exceptions amongst professional academics who might view certain prose writers (Thucydides for Thomas Arnold, Plato for Jowett) as more directly concerned with contemporary issues of public conduct and morality (though many, including Gladstone, would have seen Homer's examples and values as relevant even here), Victorian readers tended to see Homer as the pinnacle of the Greek achievement, or indeed of the entirety of civilised culture.  (Another exception would perhaps be Hopkins, for whom the dramatists' and Pindar's use of metre and of allusion is a more significant influence.) Arnold tried to reconcile the supremacy of Homer with his devotion to Sophocles: "Homer himself is eternally interesting; he is a greater poetical power than even Sophocles or Aeschylus; but his age is less interesting than himself. Aeschylus and Sophocles represent an age as interesting as themselves." It is therefore not surprising that Arnold's Homeric poem was

---

*a* On the Albert Memorial, Homer is central in the frieze of poets, ahead of Shakespeare; Bridges' ode for the tercentenary of Shakespeare's death acknowledges Homer as a greater poet, with which Gladstone would have agreed, judging from his comments on "The Place of Homer in Classical Education" (William E. Gladstone, *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age*, in 3 vols, Oxford: OUP, 1858, Section 2 of the Prolegomena to vol.1, pp.9-20).
one of his few critical successes: "To have written "Sohrab and Rustum" was to win the lasting admiration and gratitude of every lover of poetry." There were, however, some partially dissenting voices: George Henry Lewes questioned the wisdom of imitating the ancients ("Homer, with all his fine qualities, is as rude as hemp; Aeschylus is often as fantastic, obscure, and incongruous, and Virgil as feeble, affected, and unpictorial as the very worst specimens which can be selected from eminent poets of Modern times") and saw Arnold's works as appealing mainly to "scholars, who will with curious pleasure follow him in his undisguised imitation of works which have long been their ideals; they will note his curiosities of verse, and his Graecism of imagery." Nevertheless, even though Victorian England was more like Augustan Rome than ancient Greece (and certainly the Homeric world), the Victorians, partly in reaction against the Augustan style of the pre-Romantic period, looked to Greece for their inspiration, much as Virgil and his contemporaries had looked back to Homer as a touchstone and guide.

One reason for this adulation was the fact that Homer was seen as representing the same direct, physical, open-air quality (and hence moral soundness) that was supposed to be present in Greek art, especially its masculinity and open presentation of nudity, and in marked contrast to the stuffiness of Victorian polite society. Hopkins is not untouched by this feeling, the admiration of the muscular seaman in "The Loss of the Eurydice" perhaps owing something to Homer: "Achilles is such a brilliant figure: Shakspere did not read Homer, otherwise he could not have been guilty of that hideous and perverse freak of a cowardly Achilles in Troilus and
Arnold sees Homer as animating, rather than being concerned with unhealthy introspection. Along with this was recognition of his rapidity and simplicity of style, all of which Arnold sees as adding up to a quality he repeatedly (in *On Translating Homer*) refers to as "noble". He identifies "four qualities" of Homer thus: "that he is eminently rapid; that he is eminently plain and direct, both in the evolution of his thought and in the expression of it, that is, both in his syntax and in his words; that he is eminently plain and direct in the substance of his thought, that is, in his matter and ideas; and, finally that he is eminently noble." An example of the grand simplicity of style and depth of sentiment which Arnold admired in Homer is afforded by the accolade he gives to the pathos behind the simple lines commenting on Helen's search for her brothers in the Achaean ranks:

οὐς φάτο, τοὺς δ' ἤδη κατέχεν φυσίζοος αἰα
ἐν Λακεδαίμονι αὕτη, φίλη ἐν πατρίδι γαῖῃ. (Iliad, 3, ll. 243-4)

Comparing this to medieval epic, Arnold says, "We are here in another world, another order of poetry altogether." The poet himself was almost invisible and the poem lacked signs of stress and struggle, but seemed naturally grand - and the Victorians put this above Virgil and Milton as they put Bach above Beethoven: "Nature was not imitable and it was not intellectual. Nor was Homer, and that was his glory." It is this combination of simple nobility and straightforwardness of style, which could be linked to his desire for tranquillity

---

*a "So she spoke, but the life-giving earth already held them there in Lacedaemon, in their dear native land."*
and singleness of purpose (as in "The Scholar-Gipsy"), that Arnold seeks to imitate in "Sohrab and Rustum": "I think it will be found that the grand style arises in poetry when a noble nature, poetically gifted, treats with simplicity or with severity a serious subject." James Froude, thinking particularly of Arnold's tragic climax, agreed that Homer had "taught him the great lesson that the language on such occasions cannot be too simple and the style too little ornamented", but wondered if the extreme simplicity of the language and its repetitions were overdone to the point of being self-defeating - drawing attention to its artificiality rather than deflecting attention onto the action by its simplicity; "a perfect style does not strike at all."Instead of indulging in a recital of well-known Homeric details, Arnold sought to evoke the style of the original, and shifting the setting to the orient helped him to do the latter without lapsing into the former and producing pastiche. As Professor Conington admitted in his attack on Merope in 1858, "the reader of "Sohrab and Rustum" could scarcely fail to gain a new insight into the conduct of the Homeric narrative and the structure of the Homeric simile." Arnold had already used an oriental setting, in "The Sick King in Bokhara"\(^a\), and although the tetrameters in abcb stanza form in that poem are different from the blank verse pentameters of "Sohrab and Rustum", in imitation of Milton's adaptation of the epic metre, there is something in the earlier piece of

\(^a\) This material was from A. Burnes' *Travels in Bokhara* (1834), a best-selling memoir of the Great Game, which supplied both the story and the geographical details of the Oxus region.
the sweep and range which is part of the later poem's strong Homeric 
element. There are perhaps other echoes of the classics in the earlier poem 
also: the idea of a relentless and unavoidable justice is perhaps similar to that 
presented in Aeschylean tragedy, and the detail of the story, with a man 
seeking his own punishment for abusing his mother, is reminiscent of 
Sophocles' "Oedipus". The closing speech of the king features the old theme 
of the vanity of riches and a Stoic resolution -

Even the great honour which I have, 
When I am dead, will soon grow still; 
So have I neither joy, nor fame. 
But what I can do, that I will -

which would not be out of place in "Empedocles on Etna" (and which also in 
part foreshadows "Dover Beach" - "neither joy, nor love, nor light...").

There are, nevertheless, many obvious parallels between the actual episodes 
of Homer and those of "Sohrab and Rustum": the Oxus dominates the 
background and at times intrudes strongly into the foreground, like the 
Scamander; Rustum meditates in his tent on his old father at home, as 
Achilles refers to Peleus; Sohrab's dying speech recalls that of Patroclus, 
with the added irony that there is no Achilles to avenge him, since he has 
been killed by the equivalent of Achilles. Arnold recognised a similarity 
between his poem and Tennyson's "Morte d'Arthur", and ascribed it to their 
both being in imitation of Homer.
"Sohrab and Rustum" clearly meant a great deal to its author, and, although references to pieces on which he is working are few (especially when compared with Hopkins' letters), he expresses anxiety about its success: "All my spare time has been spent on a poem which I have just finished, and which I think by far the best thing I have yet done, and that it will be generally liked, though one can never be sure of this. I have had the greatest pleasure in composing it - a rare thing with me..." and later, "I certainly was very anxious that you should like "Sohrab and Rustum"... about the similes...I took a great deal of trouble to orientalise them (the Bahrein diver was originally an ordinary fisher), because I thought they looked strange, and jarred, if Western." This last comment is not a denial of its Homeric source; rather, it is evidence of how he had to make a conscious effort to make his work different from the ancient poem in which he was steeped (as shown in the comment to his mother a few years earlier: "I have finished the Iliad, going straight through it, that is. I have within this year read through all Homer's works, & all those ascribed to him").

In Anderson's appendix of classical references in Arnold's work, 61 passages of "Sohrab and Rustum" are listed as having clear or possible Homeric sources (plus 3 with precedents in the Aeneid), ranging from instances of particular couplings of words, such as the expression "slaughterous hands" in l.241, traced to Iliad 18.317 and 23.18 (χείρας ἐπ' ἀνδροφόνους δέμενος στήθεσαιν ἑταίρου) and 24.478-479 (χείρας ἐπὶ δεινὰς ἀνδροφόνους) to sections eight or nine lines long, though being mostly two or
three lines in length. As in several cases more than one Homeric reference is
given, as with a formulaic expression like the one quoted above, a total of 83
specific references to Homer are listed, ranging from part-lines to sections of
five or six and in one case sixteen lines. 67 references are from the *Iliad* and
sixteen from the *Odyssey*, an unsurprising ratio given the military setting and
subject of the poem. Within the *Iliad* references, there is again a
predominance of those Books which have most bearing on the events in
Arnold’s tale, the sections concerned with combats to the death between
heroes on the plain: Books 16-18, the death of and fight over Patroclus
(which contains a hint of the mistaken identity theme, as Patroclus is in
Achilles’ armour), and 22, the death of Hector. Nevertheless, we are rarely
away from Homer in Arnold’s poem: if one were to consider it as nine sections
each a hundred lines long, each section would have at least three of the 61
Homer-inspired passages in it, and the references range widely over the *Iliad*.
There are nine references to each of Books 16 and 22, between four and six
to Books 1, 3, 6, 17, 18 and 24, and between one and three to another eleven
Books; only 8, 12, 14, 20 and 21 appear to be unused, there being, for
example, nothing in the Arnold to parallel the attack on the Achaean wall, the
seduction of Zeus or Achilles’ fight with the river. Similarly, the lengthy
stretches of the poem in which Arnold does not in any obvious way echo
Homer’s words are those where he is using his eastern material most
strongly, but even in these cases there is usually something corresponding to
a feature of Homer’s epics: the longest such passages are I.117-53, a list of
military contingents which in general terms echoes Book 2 of the *Iliad*, II.242-
92, which include an account of Rustum's oriental arms to match the descriptions of heroic gear in the *Iliad*, and II.596-633, which concern the unique family history of the heroes, a Homeric feature. The final hundred lines of the poem are also thin in Homeric reference, but those that are present are particularly telling: at II.854-6 we get a direct echo at Sohrab's death of the pathos of Patroclus' death at *Iliad* 16.856-7:

> ἴσιν γὰρ ἐν ρηθέων πταμένη Ἀιδώδει βεβήκειν,
> δὲν ποτήν γοῶσα, λυποῖσιν ἀδροτήτα καὶ ἥβην.\(^a\)

The final section of the poem, contrasting human mortality and tragedy with the permanence of an indifferent natural world but also suggesting ideas of cycles, purpose and beauty as the Oxus flows on into the Aral, ends with "the new-bathed stars", an image of freshness and renewal in the penultimate line which recalls both *Iliad* 18.489 and *Odyssey* 5.275: οὔ ἔι ἀμμορὸς ἐστι λοετρῶν 'Οσεανόῖ.\(^b\) There is one other clear Homeric echo in this final part of the poem, the image of campfires as the armies prepare to eat, around II.869-71, as the episode of Sohrab and Rustum passes into history and life goes on - a fitting way to conclude the action before the final geographical passage. The exact reference here is not really as clear-cut as Anderson indicates - his suggestion of 24.801-2 (...αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα ἐδ οὐναγειρόμενοι δαίνωντ' ἐρικυδέα δαίτα...\(^a\)), the end of the *Iliad*, would be highly suitable and

\(^a\) "His spirit, flying from his limbs, had made its way to Hades, lamenting its fate, leaving behind its manliness and youth."

\(^b\) "It is alone in not sharing in the baths of Ocean."

\(^a\) "Then moreover gathering together they consumed a glorious feast."
would have a clear meaning for the educated reader, but the wording is not very close, and Allott and Super\textsuperscript{cxxvi} suggest the description of the Trojan campfires at the end of Book 8 (misprinted as vii) as a closer parallel for the passage, with mentions of a river, fires and food, ending with the simile:

...πυρὰ δὲ σφις καίετο πολλά.

ός δ' ὄτ' ἐν οὐρανῷ ἁστρα ϕαινήν ἀμφὶ σελήνην

ϕαίνετ' ἀριπρεπέα, ὅτε τ' ἐπετευ νήνεμος αἴθήρ;

πάντα δὲ εἰδετα ἁστρα, γέγηθε δὲ τε φρένα πομήν;

τόσσα μεσηγὸ νεῶν ἣδε Ξάνθοιο ῥόαων

Τρώων καϊόντων πυρὰ ϕαίνετο Ἰλιόθι πρό.

χίλι' ἄρ' ἐν πεδίῳ πυρὰ καίετο, πάρ δὲ ἐκάστῳ

εἰτατο πεντήκοντα σέλαι πυρὸς αἴθομένοιο.

ἲπποι δὲ κρὶ λευκὸν ἐρεπτόμενοι καὶ ὀλύρας,

ἐσταότες παρ' όχεσφιν, ἐὔθρονον Ἡὼ μίμνον. (Iliad, 8, II.554-6, 559-65)

This seems to be a passage which greatly engaged Arnold's attention; e.g., in On Translating Homer\textsuperscript{b} \textsuperscript{cxxvii} he refers to it four times: firstly briefly, to criticise two and a half lines of Cowper's translation \textsuperscript{cxxviii} for lacking simplicity and smoothness; then at greater length \textsuperscript{cxxix} to consider Pope's treatment, again found lacking, as being too much concerned with style and ornate ("Homer invariably composes 'with his eye on the object'...Pope composes with his eye on the style"); thirdly, he offers his own version;\textsuperscript{cxxi} fourthly, in "Last

\textsuperscript{b} The published version of three lectures given in Oxford between November 1860 and January 1861, plus a fourth ("Last Words") from November 1861, published together in 1862.
Words... he refers dismissively to a couple of lines of translation from J. Spedding's reply to the first three lectures. His aim in his own version of the passage is to show how what he considers Homer's essential qualities of rapidity and directness can be preserved (although this judgement is based in part on ignorance of the nature of oral poetry and the use of formulaic phrases: Arnold sees Homeric repetition as simply that - "to keep Homer's effect of perfect plainness and directness I repeat the word "fires" as he repeats "πυρά" without scruple"). He gives a prose version of the passage in the second of these sections: "So many in number, between the ships and the streams of Xanthus, shone forth in front of Troy the fires kindled by the Trojans. There were kindled a thousand fires in the plain; and by each one there sat fifty men in the light of the blazing fire. And the horses, munching white barley and rye, and standing by the chariots, waited for the bright-throned Morning". In the third we have his own verse translation:

As numerous as are the stars on a clear night,
So shone forth, in front of Troy, by the bed of Xanthus,
Between that and the ships, the Trojans' numerous fires.
In the plain there were kindled a thousand fires: by each
There sat fifty men, in the ruddy light of the fire:
By their chariots stood the steeds, and champed the white barley
While their masters sat by the fire, and waited for Morning.
The Homeric influence on his poem is evident more in the imitating of Homer's methods than in the copying of his words or episodes. For example, Homer heightens the tension and elevates the style at times of crisis and maximum effort in his story by increasing the frequency of the epic similes; e.g., there are five such passages in ll.40-180 of Book 12, as the triumphant Trojans attack the Achaean wall. Thus, Arnold uses more Homeric echoes during the central and most active event in the poem, the fight between Sohrab and Rustum and the speeches which conclude it before they realise who they are; for the alert, educated Victorian reader, this Homeric practice works in the same way as the epic simile did for Homer's audience, broadening the immediate range of the story, setting the episode in a wider geographical and historical context. In this part of the poem, ll.398-601, Anderson lists 22 Homeric passages or allusions in the Arnold, linked to 29 Iliad references (seven and eight respectively from the two main heroic combats, Book 16 and Book 22) - over 40% of the Iliad references (and well over 80% of those from Books 16 and 22) relate to under 25% of the poem.

The opening of the poem demonstrates how Homeric features are incorporated. The poem being "an episode", we are plunged (as in Homer and Virgil) into the story - into Iliad 10 in effect, with Agamemnon unable to sleep with the Trojans camped outside: Sohrab is unable to sleep in the Tartar camp, opposite the Persian lines, so, as Agamemnon goes to Nestor for advice, he makes his way to Peran-Wisa's tent. There are, of course, differences: what is troubling Sohrab is very different from what is troubling
Agamemnon, and will inform the whole of the plot in a more concise and integrated way than the general worry about the Trojan successes will affect the outcome of the *Iliad*. Sohrab is not Agamemnon (who is paralleled by Peran-Wisa), and has a role more akin to that of Patroclus, killed (this time directly) by a version of Achilles. Nevertheless, the echoes are clear:

Was hush'd, and still the men were plunged in sleep;
Sohrab alone, he slept not; all night long
He had lain wakeful, tossing on his bed; (ll.4-6)

```
eξδδόν παννύχιοι, μαλακῷ δεδημένοι ὕπνῳ
ἀλλ' οὐκ Ἀτρείδην Ἀγαμήμονα ποιμένα λαῶν
ὕπνος εἶχε γλυκέρος, πολλὰ φρεσῖν ὅρμαίνοντα. (Iliad 10, ll.2-4)```

He rose, and clad himself, and girt his sword,
And took his horseman's cloak, and left his tent, (ll.8-9)

```
ὀρθωθεὶς δὲ ἐνδυνε περὶ στήθεσι χιτῶνα,
pοσοὶ δὲ ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσιν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα,
ἀμφὶ δὲ ἑπείτα δαφοῖνον ἐέσσατο δέρμα λέοντος
αἰθωνὸς μεγάλοιο ποδηνεκές, εἶλετο δὲ ἔχος, (Iliad 10, ll.21-4)```

---

*a* "They slept all night, overcome by gentle sleep. But sweet sleep did not hold Agamemnon son of Atreus, shepherd of the people, turning over many thoughts in his mind."

*b* "He sat up and put his tunic on round his chest, tied his fine sandals under his oiled feet, then put round himself the great, bright, tawny skin of a lion, reaching to his feet, and took up his spear."
before the description of Menelaus. This second parallel is not in Anderson's list, but seems apt; Anderson does note the closer link between this passage and the later description of Peran-Wisa at II.95-8 -

And o'er his chilly limbs his woollen coat
He pass'd, and tied his sandals on his feet,
And threw a white cloak around him, and he took
In his right hand a ruler's staff, no sword -
but to note the one and not the other is to miss the point: Arnold is copying the way Homer uses stock formulaic expressions and events, making the detailed account of Peran-Wisa's dressing remind us of Sohrab's, just as Agamemnon's dressing is paralleled a few lines later by a similar description of Menelaus. With the benefit of modern scholarship, we know the mundane reasons why an oral poet employs this technique, but these were not appreciated by Victorian readers, for whom repetition was simply a feature of the epic style, sanctified by Homer and capable of being explained in terms of adding to the weightiness and solemnity and to the descriptive realism. In using this method, Arnold is indicating to the reader exactly what sort of poem is being written, what sorts of values the characters can be expected to uphold and what kinds of actions will be described; he is also warning us that it is to be a tragedy, though the composition of an actual tragic drama, his next major exercise in classicism, was to be much less successful.

In writing Merope, Arnold set out deliberately to produce something as close as possible to the spirit and conventions of Greek drama, in subject matter, style and tone. His reason in doing this, according to what he says in the Preface, is not simply his “supposed addiction to the classical school in poetry” but practically an educational one, to correct “an ill-informed curiosity” about classical literature which he sees in those “who have been brought up among the productions of the romantic school” - in other words, those who have an inadequate grasp of the classics but recognise the need to know something about the subject and, in Arnold’s view, need a corrective to the romantic sensibility which was the mid-nineteenth-century norm. The problem Arnold identifies here is the one he had with Tennyson, an alleged lack of intellectual grasp and of first-hand experience of the classicism he sought at times to imitate. In terms of the present thesis, Merope represents one extreme of Arnold’s classicising tendency, the desire to imitate the forms of Greek culture precisely, to which, judging from his own output, Hopkins would not subscribe.

For a story, as one would expect of one who sought classical precedent for everything of value, he went to a traditional one, related by Apollodorus, Pausanias and Hyginus, used in a (lost) play by Euripides and set in the late heroic period of Greece. His reasons for this choice are that he wished to avoid imitation of an extant play and that a non-Greek story, such as Milton used in Samson Agonistes, would be unsuitable, apparently on the ground
that Greek dramatic style is most fitted to "Greek manners...the practice of chorus-dancing... the ancient habitual transaction of affairs in the open air in front of the dwellings of kings." Similarly, in the 1853 Preface, despite claiming that "the date of an action... signifies nothing", he is prepared to discount even Aeschylus' *Persae* as being merely "of contemporary interest", his point being that what is not dependent for its significance on a specific historical and geographical context is of greater validity and more worthy of classical artistry; he is, however, prepared to admit that even an ancient myth may become irrelevant, as has the conflict between regard for a brother and regard for the law in *Antigone*. This over-concern with quasi-historical details is one of the things about *Merope* criticised in Rowland Prothero's long retrospective essay on Arnold, which develops the idea into what is virtually a rejection of the whole basis of Arnold's work in this area: "... the narrowness of view... mars the value of Arnold's criticism... He seized ... upon the salient fact that English dramatists are prone to neglect clearness of outline, symmetry of form, propriety of detail and expression. But his inability to grasp whole truths led him to suppose that an alien literature which had originated in forgotten ceremonials and obsolete sacrificial observances, which depended for its life on a dead religion, on faded traditions, and extinct ideas, could supplant the native literature in which England had expressed her own national spirit." Prothero is not, as some other critics were, concerned to find fault with *Merope* as an example of the classical, or even to

---

* There is a tenuous connection with Hopkins here: since at least 1919 it has been routine for critics to see a precedent for Hopkins' kind of verse in that of Milton's drama. (Review by Peter O'Brien in *Irish Rosary*, June 1919, quoted by Roberts, p.122.)
condemn it as a piece of dramatic writing, but to reject what he saw as Arnold’s attempt to replace the native form of theatre with an obsolete, alien and inferior model.

Arnold follows as closely as possible the structure of the ancient drama, with the initial explanatory speeches (Laias and Aepytus in the first fifty lines), the restriction to three actors (as with the final trio of Aepytus, Laias and Merope), the interaction of actor and chorus (as between Merope and the Chorus at ll.385-627), many instances of στιχομυθία (such as that between Merope and Polyphontes at ll.347 and 359) and the long messenger speech near the end in which the bloody conclusion of the action is related (ll.1908-65). In particular, he preserves the ancient structure of the lyric, with strophe, parallel antistrophe and epode; the choral ode at ll.628-708, for example, is carefully annotated, marking four strophes, of seven, eight, twelve and ten lines, each with an equal and answering antistrophe, and an epode of seven lines. Again, in the Preface Arnold sees Milton’s decision not to observe this convention but to follow the “relaxed form of the later Greek tragedy” as a fault, on the ground that the essential spirit of the drama is one of balance and order, with the structure of the choric song, in which part answers part until the final, independent resolution, reflecting the structure of the whole play. Here one sees what appeals most to the mature Arnold about Greek culture, the sense of symmetry and the recognition of an overall design to things (which, in the different context of natural beauty, is what stirs Hopkins most): “the regular correspondence of part with part, the antithesis, in
answering stanzas, of thought to thought, feeling to feeling, with the balance of the whole struck in one independent final stanza or epode... the peculiar distinctness and symmetry, which constitute the vital force of the Greek tragic forms. He might be describing classical architecture, and clearly sees the two arts as exhibiting the same spirit and values; in this, he differs from Hopkins, for whom the fascination of the ode lies not in the predictable elements but in the variety of rhythms and the unexpectedness of the allusions and connections, as will be discussed later. The thing which Arnold does not attempt to imitate is the actual rhythms of Greek verse, admitting that "to adapt Greek measures to English verse is impossible" and describing his practice as "to try to follow rhythms which produced on my own feeling a similar impression to that produced on it by the rhythms of Greek choric poetry", while admitting that this was purely a matter of subjective judgement; in this, he does not seem to have particular emotions produced by specific passages in the existing plays in mind, but just a general sense that certain English verse-rhythms in particular places would produce an effect not out of keeping with what a Greek poet might have done.

As regards the overall tone of the piece, Arnold's stated aim is to produce "grand effects" similar to those of the Greek masters, a concept clearly less easy to pin down but identified at once by Arnold as an "intense feeling of...beauty." Here we come up against the vagueness which always defeats Arnold's attempts to define what it is he sees as so worthwhile in Greek literature; he is clearer when not writing about his own work, as in the
introduction to Ward's anthology of English poetry. Here (pp.xxxiv - xxxv) he speaks of, and gives a classical source for, the thing "which poetry must have before it can be placed in the glorious class of the best. And there is no doubt what that something is. It is the αἰσθήσεως, the high and excellent seriousness, which Aristotle assigns as one of the grand virtues of poetry."

Arnold denies this quality to Chaucer but grants it to Dante, Shakespeare and "Homer's criticism of life"; where one locates the "seriousness" is not clear, though we are told that it is "in the matter and substance of the poetry, and ...in its manner and style" (p.xxviii), the former also being called "truth" and the latter being specified as being in "accent ...diction, and ...movement."

Arnold, as often in his criticism, falls back on short examples intended as touchstones, to illustrate "high poetical quality" - a few lines of Dante, Hamlet's last words, a description of Satan from Paradise Lost and, from Homer, Zeus' pitying words to the horses in Iliad Book 17 and the lines about Helen's brothers in Book 2. Trilling suggests that these pieces are all marked by "grimness or sadness or melancholy or resignation", which seem to mark the grand style, so that when Arnold says "seriousness" he really means "solemnity". In his argument he quotes from Mark Van Doren's John Dryden the reason why Arnold tends to be dismissive of Moliere, Dryden and Pope as poets, while respecting the seriousness of their intentions: "A poem 'conceived in the soul' suggests (for Arnold) a poem conceived in spiritual pain. Arnold's touchstones, if not sentimental, did deal in pain, sad old memories, and death ... If there were to be no touchstones ringing with malice, disdain or merriment, Dryden could lay no claim to a soul ..."
However, the "seriousness" is not all gloom, and for Arnold, "The best poetry will be found to have a power of forming, delighting and sustaining us, as nothing else can." Indeed, Arnold sees the main future function of poetry in these terms: "In poetry, as a criticism of life ...the spirit of our race will find ...as time goes on and as other helps fail, its consolation and stay." 

For his example of classicism at its best, Arnold chooses a tragedy, as touching most closely on the "seriousness" of life. This was probably inevitable, even without Arnold's own preference for tragedy over comedy ("Tragedy breasts the pressure of life. Comedy eludes it, half liberates itself from it"), and Trilling makes too much of it as a sign of the limitations of Arnold's critical insight. As his model for his tragedy Arnold takes Sophocles, rather than Euripides, who had used the story before him: listing the classical references or echoes in the text, Anderson (suggesting that, in addition to the other weaknesses of the piece, "such a compilation runs the risk of having no character of its own") ascribes twenty-two to Sophocles, fourteen being from Electra (most noticeably the closeness between its opening twenty-two lines and Arnold's first twenty-eight), five from Antigone and three from Ajax, as opposed to seventeen for Aeschylus (all but one, understandably, from the Oresteia) and just one echo of the extant fifty lines of the C Cresphontes of Euripides, his classical precedent, together with a few details from elsewhere. For Arnold, Sophocles represented the best in the dramatic tradition, and alongside Homer the best in the whole classical tradition of poetry: Sophocles dominates the Preface to Merope, is given as
the example of “adequacy” (the highest praise) in “On the Modern Element in Literature”, features centrally in “Dover Beach” and is given the final place in the pantheon of mental supporters in “To a Friend”, balancing Homer at the head of the list. It might surprise that Aeschylus was not the first choice for one so concerned with “the grand style” and “seriousness” in poetry, or Euripides for one so concerned to see a closeness between the ancient and the modern (Euripides’ questioning of old certainties and troubled humanistic approach to problems perhaps being similar to Arnold’s own position and in tune with what he sees as the “disease” of the modern mind). However, it is perhaps because Euripides is so troubled that he figures largely in Arnold’s own reading but hardly at all in his poetry and criticism: Euripides is for Arnold a product of the decline of Hellenism, and the failure of belief and undue interest in the self are the main dangers for the nineteenth century.

Just as Arnold removed “Empedocles on Etna” from his 1853 edition, after it had given a title to the 1852 edition, because it was “a traitor to the position Arnold himself had taken in the cultural battle between the ideal of methodistic self-contemplation and the ideal which lay in “a lofty sense of the mastery of the human spirit over its own stormiest agitations”, so he denied Euripides a place in the first rank of poets, or rather almost ignored his existence publicly.

Exactly what positive quality Arnold saw in Sophocles to cause him to elevate him so is not clear, and indeed he presents him in different ways. In “To a Friend”, we have, associated with such words as “mellow” and “sweet”, the
man "Who saw life steadily, and saw it whole", which, as Anderson says, is less to do with range of experience of the world than with the ability to see the underlying pattern to life and grasp "that wholeness of understanding (which) always moves us to affirmation, always gives rise to joy." As Trilling points out, the line does not mean that Sophocles saw all of life "but that what he did see he saw as a whole", demonstrating an ability to integrate the experience of life, which was rare in the Romantic and post-Romantic age, which tended to stress the multitudinous nature of life and dwell on fragments of experience and sensation. The "Dover Beach" reference, on the other hand, almost sees the pathetic fallacy in action, with a lone Sophocles prompted to consider "the turbid ebb and flow Of human misery" on hearing the surf, a picture more romantic than classical and decidedly negative and at odds with the conception of Hellenism as an essentially "cheerful" and positive force; the lone poet's ideas being linked to images of seas or rivers is much more representative of Arnold himself, the other half of this shared "thought", than of Sophocles, though images of the sea do occur in his plays. The image in "To a Friend" is more like the one in "On the Modern Element in Literature" and the Preface to Merope; the point about Sophocles for Arnold is that "Business could not make dull, nor passion wild" one who achieved a life of balance, writing "philosophical" and "serious" poetry and at the same time serving and even representing the state (a practical application of intellect and integrity of which Thomas Arnold would have approved; Euripides' position by comparison was detached from the state, as a critical observer), and by that healthy balance living to a ripe and productive old age.
In a perfect state, as Arnold envisaged Athens to be, a Sophocles is right to involve himself fully in the life of society, and does not need to flee like the Scholar-Gypsy (or stand desolate on the seashore, as in "Dover Beach"); like Sophocles, the Scholar-Gypsy makes sure that "Business could not make dull" his spirit and the Tyrian trader that "passion" does not make him "wild". Sophocles achieves his pre-eminence for Arnold because of his moderate and "balanced" position (for Arnold the essential quality of Hellenism), avoiding the excesses of the other tragedians: "Like Aristotle ... we return instinctively to Sophocles as a true center, a balance point nearer humanity than either Aeschylean grandeur or the feverish Euripidean brilliance. If he is less close to the gods than Aeschylus, he seeks the meaning of existence within a wider context than Euripides' preoccupation with man can offer." The same moderate position, avoiding extremes in either direction, is perhaps the message of his plays, if there is such a thing: it is perhaps Oedipus's obsessive quest for answers and Jocasta's contrary desire to turn a blind eye to everything, and the opposed positions taken up by Antigone and Creon, which lead to their tragedies. In the context of Sophocles, as of Lucretius, moderation can lead to happiness, or at least absence of severe upset: in the nineteenth-century context, however, the mid-way position can lead to lack of fulfilment, as in Arnold's image of himself "Wandering between two worlds, one dead, The other powerless to be born, With nowhere yet to rest my head", in "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse".
However, as Trilling suggests, although the Preface presents the case for the classical dramatic form effectively, *Merope* itself is an ineffective illustration of its strengths. The main problem with Arnold's play is perhaps the choice of subject, or at least the obscurity of the subject, as a consequence of which Arnold, in his attempt to recreate the experience of the Greek drama, fails to reproduce one of the basic conditions of the genre, namely the audience's familiarity with the essentials of the plot; he deliberately, as stated in the Preface, decided to go against the common practice of continental writers from the Renaissance to his own day, namely reusing the familiar stories of Agamemnon, Electra, Oedipus and Antigone, but in so doing he seems not to have fully appreciated (unlike those earlier writers) that the new working of old material was one of the main features of classical literature; as he himself states in the 1853 Preface, "the terrible old mythic story on which the drama was founded stood, before he entered the theatre, traced in its bare outlines upon the spectator's mind; it stood in his memory, as a group of statuary, faintly seen, at the end of a long and dark vista and it was the poet's job to illuminate the scene. Thus, although the plot does contain elements found in Greek drama (such as the "recognition" theme) with which at least the educated in the audience would have been familiar, the employment of a story and cast of characters unfamiliar to his audience was not only a barrier to their understanding but was also a departure from the classical experience which he was trying to recreate. This added to the difficulty of attempting to come to terms with dramatic conventions which were wholly unfamiliar in practice even if theoretically
Another important aspect of the problem of the plot was raised immediately by the Professor Conington: although Arnold explicitly rejects Milton's choice of a Biblical subject for his classical drama, *Samson Agonistes*, in reworking a story from Holy Scripture, comes nearer the semi-religious atmosphere of a Greek dramatic performance, and hence is more closely an "imitation" of that experience than Arnold's contrived piece.

Furthermore, *Merope* fails to illustrate Arnold's stated thesis about Sophocles, namely his ability to deal with a violent and emotional story in a philosophical and restrained way, within a rigorous framework. As Trilling suggests, the story is inconsequential and lacks moral point, and is devoid of emotional involvement; it is melodramatic and relies on such cliched and unconvincing devices as a mother's failure to recognise her son, while the inarticulate response of Merope to the revelation of the identity of the son she is about to axe ("Ah!") is farcical. Merope herself lacks the determination and energy with which Sophocles endues Electra (or Antigone), and Polyphontes is a weak picture of tyranny; Arnold has even sanitised the story for Victorian sensibilities by not having the two married. It is as though Arnold understands the control and restraint needed to contain passion, but not the passion which needs to be so contained; in seeking to demonstrate classical restraint he has simply obliterated its object - and hence the need for it. Another reviewer doubted whether any classical poetry could really appeal to an audience whose vision and emotions had been extended by Romantic poetry and whose world had become more complex - not to mention the effort involved in
its appreciation: “To relish it requires a special and most laborious cultivation, and to imitate it requires the abnegation of endless feelings which are most intimately a part of ourselves.” The lack of recognisable emotions and dramatic qualities in *Merope* was commented on by W.E. Henley, for whom “Empedocles on Etna” does not seem to count even nominally as a dramatic work: “… evidently Arnold is no dramatist. Empedocles, the Strayed Reveller, even the Forsaken Merman, all these are expressions of purely personal feeling - are so many metamorphoses of Arnold. In *Merope* there is no such basis of reality... He knew little or nothing of his characters....” Conington speaks at length of the lack of psychological credibility of Arnold’s characters, which he sees as a greater fault even than the form and language of the play, though he is scathing of “the language (which) is sometimes the language, not of Greek poetry, but of English philosophical prose” and of Arnold’s introduction of some neologisms into the text (such as “dumbfounded” and “used up”) and a very modern image (“electrifying”), as spoiling the “archaic” atmosphere “on the dim borderland which separates Grecian history from Grecian fable.” He finds fault with the moral softening of the character of Polyphontes and its lack of clear definition, and with the modern, un-Greek reflective and sentimental side of Merope: “The Greek Merope ... would not have shrunk from bloodshedding any more than the Greek Electra.” The most virulent contemporary attack on Arnold, and especially on the poetic qualities of *Merope*, was launched by H.B. Forman in a general essay following the publication of the 1867 volume: describing Arnold as having “dug up” the story from Greek examples of “uncompromising vengeance” and comparing
his piece unfavourably with Swinburne's *Atalanta*, he speaks of *Merope's* choric metres as being "prose, broken into little, unrhythmic, unmusical, unmeaning lengths."^c0i^c1i^c2i^c3i^c4i^c5i^c6i^c7i^c8i^c9i^c10i^c11i^c12i Anderson notes another major deviation from the Sophoclean pattern which lessens the moral impact of the play, namely the absence of the gods and that fateful synchronisation of divine and human action which is central to Sophocles' vision. Anderson takes this as a sign that Arnold is not to be trusted as an interpreter of Sophocles. There were even contemporary criticisms of Arnold's assumptions about the history of Greek drama on which the whole enterprise was based. Conington, while not doubting Arnold's grasp of Sophocles ("The reader of the "Fragment of an Antigone" could hardly help feeling that he understood Sophocles better") questions Arnold's belief, echoing Aristotle, that Sophocles represents a perfect completion of the development of Greek drama; he shows that it continued to change, the dialogue gaining ground on the chorus, which eventually died out as tragedy passed into the new comedy. Again, commenting on Arnold's belief that the conditions of Greek performances had been devised as being the best possible, Conington points out that it is more likely that the conventions of Greek drama arose as compromises enforced by the peculiar physical nature of their vast public theatres than that the theatres were built to exploit the particular qualities of the plays, and that therefore a modern writer is perverse
to reject the effects now possible. As Prothero said later, "Greek actors were necessarily obliged to forego all that rapid interchange of voice and gesture and that minute and varied by-play which help the modern stage to reproduce human life with such fidelity" and were therefore at a disadvantage rather than representing some higher truth.

Arnold's reasons for choosing the story of Merope's family, as set out in the Preface, were laudable: he had the humility to wish to avoid the pitfalls of attempting to translate or imitate the work of one of the Greek masters, but desired a theme "considered to possess the true requirements of good tragic subjects." He thus took a subject approved of by the mythographers and known to have been used by a tragedian. However, despite the frequency with which the story had been exploited by previous writers, the story was not familiar to even an educated English audience in the way that, for example, the stories of the House of Atreus or Meleager, as utilised by Swinburne, would have been. Arnold himself felt the need to provide an "historical introduction" of well over a thousand words detailing the earlier history of the Heracleidae and other relevant matters, and some of the early parts of the play, notably the long speeches of Polyphontes at ll.197-277 and Merope at ll.278-337, drown in obscure references, often expressed less than fluently ("I speak not now of Argos, where his brother, Not now of Sparta, where his brothers reign'd", ll.231-2): the unfamiliarity of the historical, legendary and

---

* There is a parallel with Shakespeare, who, despite the enthusiasm which greeted the recent reconstruction of the Globe, himself abandoned the vagaries and limitations of an open-air theatre when an indoor one became available.
geographical material and the forced, almost embarrassed, way in which Arnold tries to present it as concisely as he can make this part of the play quite indigestible:

And, finally, this land, then half-subdued,
Which from one central city's guarded seat
As from a fastness in the rocks our scant
Handful of Dorian conquerors might have curb'd,
He parcell'd out in five confederate states,
Sowing his victors thinly through them all,
Mere prisoners, meant or not, among our foes. (II.245-51)

When Anderson describes the play as Arnold's only "effort not to create but to recreate" he pinpoints the essential problem: Arnold was working to a formula, a pattern of ideal drama derived from his understanding of Sophocles, writing from his head rather than from his heart, and the result is a wooden exercise. He was also concerned, according to the Preface, that his audience should learn something about classical civilisation from it, so that it becomes at times almost an antiquarian reconstruction rather than real literature; borrowings (as the Chorus comforting Merope use at II.505-6 words recalling those of the Chorus doing a similar job at II.153-4 of Electra, "Not to thee only hath come Sorrow, O Queen, of mankind", before drawing an explicit comparison between the two women), the heavy use of compounds
(“seven-cubit-statur’d son”, l.441, being particularly inept) and distorted syntax in pursuit of the grand style produce a stilted and clumsy effect.

One brief example will suffice to illustrate these shortcomings. At ll.556-61, Merope speaks of Polyphontes, who has been courting her, and accounts for her failure to take revenge on him by saying she leaves his judgement to his own conscience - an important moral point in the play, and one out of keeping with the general message of the Greek tragedy, which locates divine judgement and destiny outside the human heart; however, the issue here is the quality of the writing.

Impious I deem the alliance which he asks;
Requite him words severe, for seeming kind;
And righteous, if he falls, I count his fall.
With this, to those unbrib’d inquisitors,
Who in man’s inmost bosom sit and judge,
The true avengers these, I leave his deed,
By him shown fair, but, I believe, most foul.

Although this passage has none of the Aeschylean compound-adjectives (“dark-streaming blood”, “all-seeing Sun”, etc.) with which Arnold decorates his verse in Merope (despite disallowing them in Homer translation), it still manages to sound uncomfortable and archaic. The initial position of the adjective in the first line, which in prose would follow the verb (or the noun,
perhaps preceded by "to be") causes no real problem, being a common poetic device; it is, however, perhaps more familiar to those with a classical background, as it is a technique regularly used by ancient writers to give emphasis to a crucial adjective the force of which might be masked by more conventional word-order. The inversion of the normal English adjective-noun sequence in the second line ("words severe") is similarly Latinate in the manner of Milton (though Arnold denies that Milton possesses the grand style), not unfamiliar, and perhaps serving a similar purpose. However, the rest of the second line is more problematic. It may take a moment, which we are not granted in the theatre, to work out that it does not open with another reversed word-order (perhaps a rhetorical request for "words severe" to "requite him"), but in fact requires one to assume the subject "I" from the previous line, another device common in the classical languages, where pronouns tend not to be stated and words are often assumed from one phrase or clause to another, but one unusual in English. The clipped "seeming kind" for "seeming to be kind" again causes no more problems than the use of "asks" for "asks for", though perhaps sounding archaic, but the way in which it runs into "And righteous", making good sense, is confusing, because in fact the latter adjective goes with the later noun "fall"; the sense is perfectly clear to the eye, but sounds confusing when heard, and is evidence that the piece is really a written, and bookish, piece rather than the stage-play Arnold wants it to be. "With this" lacks a clear referent - perhaps it is technically if imprecisely "words severe" - but the rest of lines 4 to 6 is straightforward enough: the nature and description of the "inquisitors" are
clear and effective, and the late placing of the subject and verb is both
understandable and useful, in allowing line 7 to come naturally after the noun
it describes. The change of “those” to “these” is reasonable, and no more
clumsy than the repetition of “fall” in line 3: at first the “inquisitors” have to be
defined (“those ... who ...”), then immediately they can be called familiarly
“these” and given another title. In line 7, we by now readily supply “to be”
before “fair”, but the sense of “shown” is a little unusual - presumably it
means “presented as”, “claimed to be”. To be fair, the poet Arnold has not
failed completely, and there are some effective points here as elsewhere in
the piece: the contrast between “severe” and “kind” in line 2 is developed in
the alliterating contrast of “fair” and “foul” in line 7.
10. "Palladium" - a summing up.

"Palladium" is not one of Arnold's better-known poems, and the very obvious drawing of the comparison on which the poem depends - "So ... lives the soul" - could be seen as clumsy, but it is one of those most obviously indebted to his classical training and appealing directly to the classical background of his anticipated readership: as well as containing echoes of other texts, it assumes both an understanding of precise references to Homer and a knowledge of an element of the myth of Troy not present in the Iliad but mentioned in a range of other texts. These references are sometimes obscure but include some well-known ones from Ovid (Fasti Book 6) and Virgil (Aeneid Book 2).

As in "Sohrab and Rustum", Homer is here not merely a source of examples or stories but a universal point of reference, part of the mental furniture of the educated reader along with the Bible and seen as more contemporary than ancient; the Homeric (or at least Trojan) content is not decorative but essential to the meaning and the atmosphere of the piece. Just as Gladstone saw Homer as of immediate significance, a guide to life in general rather than simply an account of specific events, so Arnold uses Homeric references to encapsulate aspects of the human experience. "The Victorians admired Homer for being so un-Victorian; yet some of them thought that his poetry was of practical use in the conduct of modern life." 

ccvi
The Palladium itself, the wooden image of Athene as a maiden (rather than a warrior) on which depended the security of Troy (the city being doomed when it was stolen by Diomedes and Odysseus), was not strictly Homeric but was found in other parts of the cycle of the Trojan War and was celebrated by Roman poets because it was believed to have been carried to Italy by Aeneas and preserved in the temple of Vesta in Rome, guaranteeing the city's safety through divine favour: "omnis spes Danaum .../ Palladis auxiliis semper stetit" (Virgil, Aeneid, Book 2, II.162-3). Its divine associations and its role as a protecting force thus make it in Arnold's poem a fit image for the soul, equally divine in origin and serving as the seat of the rationality and objectivity by which the mind protects the individual from the excesses of the flesh; this duality of Man is a common theme in Arnold's classically-inspired poems, as with the distinction between "Man's grave reasons" and "what we feel" in "The New Sirens". The site of the Palladium is located "high", with "Ilium, far below" (as Virgil speaks of its being in a temple "summae ... arcis", on an acropolis); the soul is loftier than the body metaphorically (and perhaps literally, if seen as predominantly sited in the mind, in the brain; in the middle of the poem it looks out, as though through Helen's eyes), and also in Arnold's work there is a strong connection between height and spirituality, rationality and insight. Thus, the strayed reveller descends the valley prior to falling victim to the lure of Circe's bowl, the vital tree in "Thyrsis" is seen silhouetted on a high ridge and Empedocles must climb the volcano to escape the troublesome intrusion of the world. It is linked not only with height

---

* "The whole hope of the Greeks always rested on the assistance of Pallas."
but also with light, from both sun and moon - the latter not connected with the ideas of deception prominent in "Dover Beach" but linked here with the notions of purity deriving from the association with the virgin warrior ("pure" and "virgin" are key words in the first two stanzas) and reinforced by the references to water: the poem opens with "the upper streams of Simois" which then become "crystal waters".

The Homeric connection is signalled in the first line by the reference to Simois, and followed up with the mention of Hector, the active man who is the physical embodiment of Trojan hopes for victory in the Iliad and so is in the terms of the symbolism of the poem the body as opposed to the soul; the thrust of the rest of the poem is at once apparent to the classically-minded reader, for we are meant to know that Hector is doomed - the flesh and hopes dependent on its effort will fail. The classical serenity of the cold high mountain setting associated with the Palladium (serenity being ultimately what Arnold read into the idea of Hellenism) is reinforced by the references to the "pure columns" of its temple and the bare elements, "rock and wood", "virgin air", "crystal waters" and light; we, however, are caught up like Hector in the contrasting turbulence of life and "Backward and forward roll'd" - another common notion in Arnold's poetry, as in "Dover Beach" and "The Scholar-Gipsy" - and so are scarcely aware of the soul, despite its significance, and our visits are "too rare".
The second half of the poem begins with another apparent echo of Virgil in, "We shall renew the battle in the plain (i.e. of Troy) Tomorrow" - "... erunt etiam altera bella / atque iterum ad Troiam magnus mittetur Achilles" (Virgil, *Eclogues* 4, ll.35-6). Apart from being an expression of the simple idea of the relentlessness of the wearying business of life, this echo serves to remind us again of the ultimate fate of the Hector who stands for us in the poem. The Virgil original plays on the timelessness of the events and characters of Troy (in the sense of their not being limited to a particular time or place uniquely), and suggests the repetitive cycle of history, the Hegelian notion of recurrence which lies behind Thomas Arnold's belief that the events of ancient Athens would, in essence, be replayed in nineteenth-century British history; the same idea underlies his son's insistence on the contemporary relevance of the classics. As though to emphasise the way in which history can be rewound and paid out again, the selection of episodes which follows is, curiously, in reverse order, beginning with the reddening of the Xanthos, presumably in Book 21 of the *Iliad*, yet another reminder of fate in the form of the slaying by Achilles; the river churned up by battle contrasts with the untroubled upper reaches of the Simois, the other river of Troy with which the poem opened and which surrounded the Palladium. We then go to either the duel of Ajax and Hector in Book 7 or the struggle over the ships in Book 15, if that specific a reference is intended in the poem, before finishing with a reference to the incident in Book 2 when Helen looks on the Greeks from the walls of Troy and names them. Here we perhaps switch back to a consideration of the role of

* "For wars will be repeated, and mighty Achilles will be despatched to Troy again."
the soul, looking down on the world from a lofty position of security - although Helen would be a curious choice of symbol for the distant maiden.

Helen looks on the armies from a distance and in safety, but she is not unmoved by what she sees and her own fate depends on the outcome of the war; this is a fair reflection of the position of the mind, but in the Palladium Arnold is presenting us with a soul which is more remote from interaction with the world than is the conscious mind, or with a soul which has been trained and disciplined to withdraw in this way. This idea of a withdrawal from the world we have seen before in Arnold, sometimes condemned as defeatist ("Achilles ponders in his tent, The kings of modern thought are dumb" - "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse", lines 115-6) but more commonly praised as a sensible reaction to the state of the world (as with the Scholar-Gipsy himself and the Tyrian trader with whom he is compared), or at least as the only desperate way out (as it is for Empedocles, or the speaker at the end of "Dover Beach"). In "Palladium" we have an echo of the ancient doctrine of detachment presented in different forms in Democritus, Lucretius and the Stoics and influential on Arnold's thinking; like Zeus looking on the battlefield in the Iliad, or the true Stoic for whom the affairs of the world are trivial, the idealised soul which is the Palladium is unmoved: "suave etiam belli certamina magna tueri / per campos instructa tua sine parte pericii".\(^a\)

(Lucretius, De Rerum Natura, Book 2, II.5-6) Lucretius even uses the specific image of the temple standing above the world and untouched by it: "... munita

\(^a\) "It is pleasant to watch the great contests of war ranged across the plains, without there being any hint of danger to yourself."
tenere / edita doctrina sapientium templ a serena" (Book 2, ll.7-8). The effect of the practice of this doctrine on the personality is a "ruling effluence" which should be recognised constantly instead of "by moments", for its being ignored (like the Trojans' neglect, which leads to the loss of the Palladium) leads to ruin.

The loss of the Palladium inevitably presages the fall of Troy, regardless of Trojan efforts, and so "when it fails, fight as we will, we die"; exactly what Arnold means here by the death of the soul is vague - it could be that he is simply saying that death comes at the separation of body and soul, fated by God and outside our control, or perhaps there is something here about the betrayal of the soul by the individual, by sinfulness or too great a commitment to the concerns of the world, which leads to its destruction. It is also possible to read into the last line ("And while it lasts, we cannot wholly die.") a promise of the immortality of the soul, a comfort familiar to the Victorians, but one at odds with the threat of the line preceding it; it is clear in the poem that our grip on the soul, like that on the Palladium, is breakable if we give in to "blind hopes and blind despairs", the extremes of emotion which the Stoics and their followers sought to avoid as being destructive of the spirit and which in this poem are symbolised (as they are in "Dover Beach" by a literal tide, resulting in "human misery") by the rolling backwards and forwards of the tide of battle to which Homer draws attention frequently, and which in Arnold's poem is perhaps caught for us in the collocation of Achilles' charge towards the city in

"... to keep to the serene temples defended by the doctrine declared by the wise."
Book 21 and, at the other edge of the plain, Hector's incursion behind the Greek wall in Book 15.

"Palladium" was one of Arnold's later poems and from this date, his serious thoughts about the classics and their connection with the modern world were in prose; compared to a piece like "The Strayed Reveller", it shows how far he had moved towards a version of classicism favouring serenity, balance and the Stoic outlook - which is a very different version from that held by Hopkins, favouring energy and variety and not interfering with a commitment to orthodox Christianity.
11. Hopkins' translation of the first speech of Prometheus - a classic personalised.

The study of Sophocles' Ajax which Hopkins undertook with Jowett in 1864 clearly made a strong impression, despite his earlier comment about Greek tragedy being "stilted nonsense"; his academic concerns in his last years were to be wholly with the choric parts of the tragedies - "The wreck of me that remains to study anything is studying Aeschylus." There is in his student diary for that year a lengthy soliloquy for Ajax, in English, introduced by some notes on appearance and setting, presumably an idea for one of several projected dramas never completed. The fragment breaks down towards the end with a lapse from first to third person and some hesitations: Hopkins has Ajax refer to "the polished shield I got from" and then inserts "(some Trojan)", no doubt intending to find the name of a suitable victim from the Iliad; when Ajax considers his death, he says, "perhaps some one may bury his bones, scattering dust on them or digging a hole", but interrupts himself with "But Query. is this a Greek custom?" The student's interest in the story of Ajax and the injustice of his end (dwelt on by Hopkins' favourite, Pindar, in Nemean 7) could be seen as ironically echoed much later when the older poet has to confront, with the power of faith, the temptation of suicide, as in "Carrion Comfort".

Another story from the Greek drama which made a deep and lasting impression on Hopkins was that of Prometheus, as shown by his later close
concern with Bridges’ *Prometheus the Firegiver*, although writing in 1888 he
says his friend is free to translate the play as “It would not be much to my
purpose; I do not care for a verse translation.” Nevertheless, even earlier
than the Ajax piece is a translation by Hopkins of ll.88-127 of Aeschylus’
*Prometheus Bound*, mentioned in a letter as having been shown to
Baillie, in 1863. Hopkins writes with some humility (“I am afraid you object to
being a critic of MS poetry; on one occasion I remember when I shewed you
some, only a translation of a chorus in the *Prometheus Bound*, you would
give no opinion on it. Indeed, I believe you were right, it is the only safe
course), but that he was willing to show it suggests that he was pleased
with it and wanted to share it. There may be another reference to the
Greek play in a letter of 1864, referring to writing “three verses, a fragment,
being a description of Io (transformed into a heifer).

The passage which is the basis for the extant poem is the first speech of
Prometheus in the play, after he has been fastened to the rock by *Kράτος,
*Βία and *Ὑπαιτος, in which he speaks of his sufferings at the hands of those
who are gods like himself. The translation appears to cover ll.88-100 (treating
ll.88-93 quite closely and then becoming freer), and then picks up again with
ll.114-27, again quite closely, breaking off at the expression of fear (“And all
that comes is fraught to me with fear”) at the ominous approaching sound and
failing to identify its source as a friendly chorus (*μηδεν φοβηθησι*).

---

*It exists in a school note-book and is assumed to have been produced in 1862-3, during his
last terms at Highgate; at least the first half was in existence in September, 1862, as it is
enclosed in a letter to E.H. Coleridge then.*
Even at this early date Hopkins is pondering the nature of divine justice, and the sentiments of Prometheus curiously echo in some ways the Dark Sonnets of more than twenty years later when Hopkins, having already dealt to his own satisfaction with the divine purpose behind such human tragedies as those described in the shipwreck poems and seen them as positive, ironically then feels himself to be deserted by his god and suffering anguish and a sense of injustice and betrayal much as does Prometheus when he speaks of his treatment by Zeus. The difference is that Prometheus suffers physically, whereas Hopkins' suffering is mental, although often expressed in terms of physical torture: "More pangs will, schooled at forepangs, wilder wring" ("No worst, there is none") is not far removed in sense from, though much more intense than, the "drear dull burden of unending pains" in the translation, which is perhaps closer to "The jading and jar of the cart, Time’s tasking" which is contrasted with a sudden pain in "The Wreck of the Deutschland". The image evoked by Aeschylus of one suffering chained on the rock is one which occurs several times in Hopkins' work, although there is only the bare mention of chains twice in the translation. The opening of the play shows one who might well be said to "on an age-old anvil wince" ("No worst, there is none"), and there is a clear link to the nightmare image of "cliffs of fall, Frightful, sheer" in the same poem; the image of the human frame subjected to this kind of treatment ("With an anvil-ding And with fire in him forge thy will") is seen in a constructive light earlier in "The Wreck of the Deutschland". In "Andromeda", the heroine is a victim "on this rude rock". However,
although the Dark Sonnets certainly seem to be autobiographical and "Andromeda", though usually taken as an allegory of the Church rescued by Christ, could be seen as in part picturing Hopkins' own position, it is perhaps unlikely that the young Hopkins thinks of himself as being tortured as Prometheus is; a more likely reason for the interest shown in the Aeschylus passage is the parallel between Prometheus and Christ, on the cross, momentarily forgetting himself and calling out to question the god who seems to have forsaken him. There is a close parallel between Prometheus as the benefactor of mankind and persecuted for it and the "suffering Christ" who was, like the persecuted nuns, "Loathed for a love men knew in" him ("The Wreck of the Deutschland"), and Hopkins' translation omits the central section of the speech, with the specific and hence limiting mention of the gift of fire: Prometheus' crime against Zeus (diabolical supernatural power, or human tyranny) then becomes simply (in the second section) having "lov'd too well The race of man", which could equally apply to Christ.

Some features of the translation could be seen as pointing to Hopkins' developing view of the world. In what follows, Hopkins' version is compared with the Greek text, and also to a standard modern translation, by Vellacott, in Penguin, and two other nineteenth-century translations (by Lewis Campbell, an Honorary Fellow of Balliol College, published in 1890 and by Edward Harmon, published in 1920 but having been delayed by the First World War; Harmon, writing in 1915, stated "the translation was made a good many years ago").
The opening address, ὁ διὸς αἰθήρ, is translated unremarkably as "divinity of air" (as in Vellacott), but this slight ambiguity, suggesting perhaps a divinity present in the air rather than merely divine air ("Ether of Heaven" in Campbell), fits better with Hopkins' religious faith; however, the following lines, listing the elements (πνεύμα, πνεῦμα, γῆ, ἡλίον) seen as almost pantheistically divine, is in keeping with Hopkins' fascination with nature as an expression of divine goodness (for one who will "lift up heart, eyes, Down all that glory in the heavens to glean our Saviour", like the one who watches the clouds in "Hurrahing in Harvest") or even a container for the divine ("The world is charged with the grandeur of God..... deep down things", as "God's Grandeur" has it). Prometheus is distinguishing between the divine aspects of the elements, associated in Hopkins' mind with the bounty of the Christian god and here called upon to bear witness, and the vengeful Zeus, so the criticism of Zeus does not compromise Hopkins' faith in a "saviour" - this Zeus is not "god" in his sense (at least not until the Dark Sonnets). The picture of the natural world in the Aeschylus (translated as "fleet-feather'd gales, Ye river-heads, thou billowy deep" and so on) is one which is alive and in motion, and this accords well with Hopkins' later vision (especially in the opening description of moving clouds and effects of light in the Heraclitean Fire sonnet - "Cloud-puffball, torn tufts, tossed pillows flaunt forth, then chevy on an air-built thoroughfare...").

The personification of the elements in this passage is thus expressed more rather than less strongly in Hopkins' version: the imagery of "countless
laughter of the sea's waves" (Vellacott, and similar in Harmon, from ποντίον ὑπὸν κυμάτων ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα) is extended into a verb by Hopkins ("billowy deep that laugh'st A countless laughter"). Most interesting, perhaps, is the personification of the sun, which is turned into the "all-seeing eyeball of the day"; τὸν πανόπτην κύκλον ἡλίου can be translated several ways, depending on the sense taken for κύκλον. Harmon avoids the word ("all-seeing Sun"), Campbell sees it as the disc itself ("orb scans all things") and Vellacott sees it as this or perhaps its assumed orbit around the earth ("all-seeing circle of the sun" - "all-seeing" because it passes right round the earth). Hopkins goes for the less common meaning of "eyeball", normally found in the plural, strengthening the element of personification, and this idea is perhaps recalled in two references in Hopkins' later poetry, although in very different contexts, the less relevant but more memorable instance being the "seeing ball" which is a symbol for the fragility of nature in "Binsey Poplars". The more relevant example is the "darksome devouring eyes" of god in "Carrion Comfort", where it is the dark opposite of the bright divine eye which Prometheus calls on in hopes of support, but again is ineluctable and immortal.

Prometheus then goes on to point out the irony and outrage of a god being punished by gods (πρὸς θεῶν πᾶσχω θεός). The schoolboy Hopkins cannot really be thinking of himself when he writes "I am a god, And these from the gods are my penalties", but of the divine Christ, on the cross as part of the divine plan. However, in the later poems there is at times the idea of a divine
presence in man to parallel Christ's assumption of humanity, and Hopkins speaks, quite daringly, in extreme terms of the connection between man and god through the dual nature of Christ - not, as in the Prometheus speech, to criticise the harsh justice of Aeschylus' god but to praise the mercy of the Christian one; thus, at the end of the Heraclitean Fire sonnet, recognition of the promise of the resurrection and redemption leads to the exclamation "I am all at once what Christ is", given the immortality of the soul ("immortal diamond"), and at the end of the Kingfishers sonnet "the just man....Acts in God's eye what in God's eye he is - Christ - for Christ plays in ten thousand places..." The link between Prometheus and Christ is perhaps hinted at also in Hopkins' treatment of I.117, ἰκετο τερμόνιον ἐπὶ πάγον, where Vellacott has "peak at the world's end" and Campbell the less clear "craggy bourne of the world", and Harmon omits πάγον altogether ("these bounds of the world"); Hopkins goes for "hill", as though invoking the image of Calvary, and stresses the idea of the end of things in a way which hints at apocalypse rather than something merely geographical ("To the world's end, to the last hill"); the following line, "Comes one to gaze upon my ill" and similar things in the other versions, perhaps has overtones of "They shall look on him whom they have pierced" (John 19.37, quoting Zechariah 12.10).

Although Hopkins often seems to intensify the picture presented in the play, compared to the language chosen by the other translators, there is something of an exception in the treatment of II.93-5: whereas Campbell and Vellacott
both go for "outrage" at αἰκίασιν (Harmon being freer, but containing the idea in "these shameful bonds"), Hopkins has only "unseemliness", and διακναίδεινος, "torn" in Campbell and "racked and tortured" in Vellacott (incorporated in "beat upon my head" in Harmon), is lost in Hopkins' invention of "I a thousand thousand years Must watch down with weariness Fallen from my peers" - an expression similar in form to though distant in mood from "I lift up heart, eyes, Down all that glory in the heavens..." ("Hurrahing in Harvest"). However, before the end of the first section Hopkins does reassert the bleakness of his version: in accounting for the Greek up to l.99 rather than to l.100, he omits any reference to the idea of looking ahead with hopes of an end (τέρματα) to the pain, which in some of the translations is given prominence ("The star of my deliverance" in Vellacott). Instead, the section is given a closed and introspective ending with an elaborate rhyme-scheme, the highly worked epigram "What is, and what is to be, All alike is grief to me" and the picture of a total universe of pain ("I look always but only see...") which foreshadows the late sonnets, such as the "blind Eyes in the dark" of "My own heart..." (and also the experience of Sydney Fletcher in "The Loss of the Eurydice" - "Now he gasps, now he gazes everywhere; But his eye no cliff, no coast or Mark makes...").

An interesting choice of words for ὅ νέος ταγὸς, describing Zeus, makes Hopkins' Prometheus more scathing about the god who has only recently made himself supreme among the immortals than those in the versions presented by the other translators, and perhaps again steps back from
associating him too closely with God: Hopkins has the slightly derogatory “young”, rather than the blander “new” of all the others, and goes for the less dignified and permanent-sounding “chief” (rather than “ruler”, “master” and “lord”). The word “new” he saves for his expansion of the idea of “inventing”, εἰκότητα, in the next line - “devised new”.

The main features of the second section of the translation (from l.114), which is quite close to the Greek, have been pointed out above. The piece ends with a display of alliteration (“pulse of pinions”, “fraught to me with fear”) typical of Hopkins’ writing and appropriate here as echoing the sound of approaching wings; as the piece breaks off here, we are left with the feeling of an ominous approach (as with Andromeda’s “now hears roar A wilder beast”), rather than being given the relief of seeing what it is.
12. The "great discovery" - a scholarly focus.

Recent published articles on Hopkins have not been much concerned with his classical antecedents: Peter MacDonald's "Rhyme and Determination in Hopkins and Edward Thomas" is obviously concerned with a matter alien to the ancients, but at least serves to focus attention on the great significance Hopkins attached to technical matters, an emphasis which would be more relevant to the theme of classical reception with regard to rhythm, in which matter Hopkins probably sees himself as following the practices of the Greek lyricists, at least as regards freedom and variety. Indeed, the most striking feature of Hopkins' later correspondence with Bridges is the presence of lengthy technical discussions of matters of rhythm, in both English and Greek verse, such as the discussion of the Alexandrine in his letter of New Year's Day, 1885, from Dublin.

A letter of 1881 refers to a performance of Agamemnon in the hall of Balliol in June 1880 and shows Hopkins concerned about the music used, saying, "I have sometimes set music to a little Greek verse", and mentioning in particular "a bit of a chorus in the Prometheus Bound" (again) and the opening words of Pindar's Olympian Odes 2, the plainsong-style theme of which he quotes. A letter of 1886 likewise includes a setting of Sappho's Ode to Aphrodite, reminding us of the link in Hopkins' mind always between music and language, a major poetic interest always being their meeting in rhythm.

---

*This is believed to have been the first proper performance of a play in Greek in England, by what Hopkins calls "the Balliol company", later to develop into OUDS.*
and metre, as in the chorus of the tragedy; this differentiates him from most Victorians, whose main focuses tended to be Homer or the historians or the philosophers. Despite his total dedication to his religious vocation, Hopkins also continued to have academic ambitions, as is clear from the numerous references in the later letters to ideas for books ("drawing up," in his final months, "a Paper...on the Argei, a curious subject"), and his main interests in this connection are the dramatic chorus and metrical matters. Writing to Bridges in 1882, he speaks of "the art of the choric parts, for this was one of the subjects on which I had proposed to write, the art of the Greek lyric poets, including of course the lyric parts of dramatic poets" and to Baillie early in 1883 of writing a book on "Greek Lyric Art or on, more narrowly the art of the choric and lyric parts of the Gk. plays. I want it to be in two parts, one the metre, the other the style." Three years later, in Dublin, he has switched his focus to "a work on Homer's Art" and another year on he is saying, "What I want if possible to get done first is a book on the Dorian Measure, one of the rhythms employed by Pindar and the other lyric poets, the most important and the least understood; nominally on this but with an introduction on the philosophy...of rhythm in general," which he later claims to have largely written.

However, he invariably admits that these books are unlikely to be written, recognising that the pressures of his duties in Ireland, and something in his own nature, will prevent it: "My book on the Dorian Measure is going on, but may easily either wreck (by external difficulties, examinations and other ones)
or founder (of its own). Just as he appears to express regret in the Dark Sonnets at his failure to get poems published, he seems to want publication and official recognition of his academic work: “I have been reading the Choephoroi carefully and believe I have restored the text and sense almost completely in the corrupted choral odes...Perhaps I might get a paper on it into the *Classical Review or Hermathena* which never happened, and, “I wrote a paper of Readings and Renderings of Sophocles this year and sent it to the *Classical Review*.” Neither piece appeared. He is also concerned that his work should be accessible as well as sound: “I propose to print the Greek in Roman type, so that no scholarship should be required, only study (which must be close) of the book, for it will be thoroughgoing.” Much debate about Hopkins has focussed on the question of whether his religious commitment damaged or inspired his poetic creativity, Leavis speaking of the “strenuous dissipation” of energy that could have gone into poetry but John Pick seeing the two elements in his life as inseparable and feeding each other; it would seem that Hopkins’ own attitude changed, from his early reluctance to write and then to be published (as in his refusal to allow Dixon to send his work to a paper) to his later willingness to write and concern to be published, especially in his academic work.

It is in his thinking about the Greek dramatic choruses, or about rhythm in general, that we see the real fruits of Hopkins’ classical training, the awareness of rhythm in language and the realisation that Greek poets used much more varied metrical effects than English poets have done, being tied
to the basically iambic line of regular length: the apparently unclassical notion of "sprung rhythm" actually stems from this observation about the practices of Greek poets, although many writers on Hopkins' prosody have failed to see this (as did Sr. Marcella Holloway in her early and otherwise thorough account ). The first of two key documents here is a letter to Bridges in 1882, in which he is distinguishing between Whitman's "irregular rhythmic prose" and his own "The Leaden Echo and the Golden Echo", in which everything is "very highly wrought. The long lines are not rhythm run to seed: everything is weighed and timed in them. Wait till they have taken hold of your ear and you will find it so." Significantly, he goes on to claim, "what it is like is the rhythm of Greek tragic choruses or of Pindar: which is pure sprung rhythm. And that has the same changes of cadence from point to point as this piece. If you want to try it, read one till you have settled the true places of the stress, mark these, then read it aloud, and you will see." The second comes four years later: Hopkins describes the "great discovery" which was to be the subject of a proposed book, that "The Dorian rhythm, the most used of the lyric rhythms, arises from the Dorian measure or bar. The Dorian bar is originally a march step in three-time executed in four steps to the bar" from which "arose the structure of most of Pindar's odes and most of the choral odes in the drama" and from which Hopkins derives a variety of metrical feet and the important significance for his own practices; "With all this the rhythm came to have an infinite flexibility, of which the Greeks seem never to have tired." The detail of Hopkins' analysis of Greek metre - basically, that Greek verse consists of dactylic and trochaic feet mixed indiscriminately
because they are considered to take equal time and so are equivalents - is generally reckoned to be inaccurate, but "a false theory may lead to excellent metrical and architectonic effects."

Hopkins' notion of what is acceptable as verse in English was thus expanded by his consideration of the nature of Greek verse, although one should bear in mind that he could have been led to the same position by his reading of Old and Middle English verse, in which the only fixed features of the line are the two units of two stressed syllables each and the linking of the two units by alliteration, the number and position of weak syllables being variable; Hopkins' extensive use of alliteration was probably influenced by this example. It must also be borne in mind that the earliest expositions of the "great discovery" which we have date from the decade after "The Wreck of the Deutschland" and many of the other major pieces, and the long letter of 1880 in which Sprung Rhythm is explained to Dixon does not make any mention of classical parallels or precedents. Of course, this does not rule out the possibility that the method of composition which the later theory formalises had already been employed in a subconscious way, practice dictating theory rather than the other way round; describing the genesis of "The Wreck of the Deutschland", he speaks of "a new rhythm" which had long been "haunting my ear," though he refers to influences from earlier English poets, Welsh poetry and nursery rhymes but not the classics.
Also plausible is the idea that the structure of the sentence in Latin and Greek, with its greater flexibility of word-order and greater ability to exploit devices of emphasis, connection and ambiguity by the collocation or misplacement of words, played a major part in forming Hopkins’ use of language in poetry. Whereas Milton limits himself to such obvious Latinate devices as the adjective placed after the noun or the delayed verb, imitating perhaps the orderly complexity of a Cicero or Livy in his use of long sentences with subordination, Hopkins favours a disjunctive style owing more to the more impassioned and flexible style of poets.

However, less convincing is the argument that the entire structure of some of Hopkins’ poems (or usually just the uniquely lengthy “The Wreck of the Deutschland”) derives from the principle of construction which was part of the “great discovery”, as is argued by, for example, Bender. Hopkins’ proposed work on metre was intended to develop the theme into consideration of principles of construction in the choral lyric, and indeed principles of art in general; the main idea (presented in a letter to Baillie in 1883) was that, just as the verse is a mixture of two basic rhythmic patterns in counterpoint, so many of the lyric passages in the tragedies are constructed from “two strains of thought running together and like counterpointed”; the idea is rather like Pindar’s own πολλῶν πείρατα συνταξόσας ἐν Βραχεί (Pythian 1, ll.81-2), to which one could compare Hopkins’ “How all’s to one thing wrought! /The members, how they sit!” (“On

* “Bringing together many strands in a small space.”
In addition to the "overthought", the main subject, there is "the afterthought, conveyed chiefly in the choice of metaphors etc. used and often only half-realised by the poet himself, not necessarily having any connection with the subject in hand," and Hopkins gives as an example the way in which the vocabulary of the opening chorus of Aeschylus' *Suppliants* has overtones suggestive of cattle in order to create a link between the immediate story of the Danaids fleeing from their cousins and that of their ancestor Io. For example, the Danaids describe their cousins as a "épòv", a swarm of insects, thereby comparing themselves to Io tormented by the gadfly. In a very general way, one can see Hopkins as at times utilising this kind of principle of construction as it is first and simply stated, namely, as the way in which two strands of thought can be run together; although again one cannot take a document about a "discovery" in the 1880's as evidence of a conscious method of composition in the 1870's, there are clearly two themes in "The Wreck of the Deutschland" (the actual wreck and the death of the nuns, and Hopkins' own spiritual development and acceptance of God's acts in the world), "Andromeda" (the myth of Andromeda and whatever Andromeda and Perseus represent allegorically), "The Loss of the Eurydice" (the shipwreck and the consequences of the Protestant Reformation in England), and others of Hopkins' poems. However, this is not to claim anything exceptional: the device of allegory is a common and ancient one, as is that of combining a description or narrative with a statement of the speaker's reactions to or perception of it - we need to look no further afield than the conclusion of "Dover Beach" for an perfectly normal example of extended
comparison in English poetry or "The Scholar-Gipsy" for an example of how
description and narrative can be combined with personal emotion and
thought for the enrichment of both. Attempts to show that Hopkins’ procedure
here is unusual can go too far.

Bender, for example, lays great stress on the alleged obscurity and episodic
nature of "The Wreck of the Deutschland" and claims that it has a particular
structure derived from the practices of Pindar, but this ignores two relevant
facts of chronology. Firstly, as already stated, the researches which led the
Professor of Greek to the "great discovery" predate the "The Wreck of the
Deutschland", written when Hopkins had for some time been reading little of
the classics (although he had read at least some Pindar at Oxford). Secondly,
the reading of Pindar on which the claim rests was one not advanced until
Gilbert Norwood’s Pindar. In the letter to Baillie, Hopkins talks about
ambiguity of vocabulary which allows one story to contain echoes of another,
but he does not advance a theory like Norwood’s, in which the whole of a
Pindar ode is seen as a number of apparently unconnected stories and
scenes which in fact crystallise around an object which symbolises the
athlete’s victory (as Pythian 1 is said to focus on Apollo’s golden lyre, Χρυσός
φόρμιγξ, as a symbol of the order which Hiero’s family have brought to Sicily).
Furthermore, not only does Norwood’s theory not fit all Pindar’s poems
equally clearly, but "The Wreck of the Deutschland" is not nearly as strange
in construction as is often claimed, and is not as obscure as a Pindaric ode.
Following Bridges’ own description of the poem as "a great dragon folded in
the gate to forbid all entrance", Bender claims that the poem has coherence neither as description nor as narration nor as argument, but this is an exaggeration; Hopkins often uses unusual word-order and rich vocabulary, and the sheer length of "The Wreck of the Deutschland" intensifies this effect, but there is much in the poem which is actually straightforward for Hopkins (as compared to, for example, "The Windhover", despite Bender claiming, "Hopkins began with an extreme statement and then retreated from it somewhat"): stanzas 12 to 17 tell the story of the shipwreck in a clear if descriptive way, the first nine stanzas are clearly separated as a kind of prologue about Hopkins' own faith, and in stanza 24 the link between the two elements is made explicitly (the fact that Hopkins was having some kind of crisis of faith simply at the same time as the wreck). Even the rest of the poem does not really go beyond matters immediately related to these stories: the mention of the nuns leads quite naturally to them becoming the focus of the poem from stanza 19 to the end, with only relevant "digressions", such as the comparison with St. Francis (23) or the account of the effects of suffering (27). The complexity of the last two stanzas, with thickly compounded words, is of a verbal, rather than logical kind. This is a long way from the kind of procedure described by Norwood, where the central metaphor which connects the elements is never made explicit: Hopkins continually takes us back to the image of God as omnipotent and controlling events to bring about his purposes, which is the overall message of the poem, so Bender's claim that no principle of organisation or structure is apparent is inaccurate. Certainly a reader who is familiar with the allusiveness and symbolism of
much twentieth-century poetry should not be as puzzled by it as was the Jesuit editor of *The Month* who rejected it for publication in 1876.

Nor is there much evidence of classical influence in the content of the poem, though it would not have been hard for Hopkins to have introduced into this piece references to, as an obvious example, Virgilian and Homeric shipwrecks; it is perhaps far-fetched to make a connection between the nun drowned off and then sanctifying the English coast and the piece of holy earth washed overboard and landing on Thera in *Pythian 4*. The representation of God as a paradoxical blend of destroyer and saviour gives rise to the image of him (as Christ) as the heavenly hunter, the constellation Orion, and there is the reference to the Tarpeian rock already mentioned, but otherwise there are no apparent classical images; James Finn Cotter points out that the underlying images of the poem are Biblical in inspiration, recalling the Book of Job, which similarly deals with the imponderable nature of God and the mystery of the existence of evil and injustice in his creation: from Job come the themes of good and evil and of patience, and the images of storms, winnowing and pottery common in "The Wreck of the Deutschland" and the Dark Sonnets.

Nevertheless, it is possible that the reading of Pindar influenced Hopkins in some respects in the writing of "The Wreck of the Deutschland", in ways more precise than the obvious similarities of length, freedom of verse and frequent references to the sea and ships. Even though the Victorian piece seems to
concern itself with a disaster rather than a triumph and is very personal whereas Pindar is essentially for public performance, there are features which the two have in common, most noticeably in their conceptions of the deity, although for Hopkins God is essentially benign and never motivated by the human weaknesses and vindictiveness which the Greeks ascribed to their gods: χόλος ὤν ἀλήθιος ι γίνεται παίδων Δῶς. Both poets see God as being an all-powerful being pursuing a divine plan, the main point of the Hopkins piece being the impenetrability of God's mind and the need to trust to his will despite external appearances:

θεὸς ἄπαν ἐπὶ ἐλπίδεσσι τόκμαρ ἀνύεται,
θεὸς, ὅ καὶ πτερόντι' αἰετὸν κίθε, καὶ θαλασσαῖον παραμείβεται
dελφίνα, καὶ ὑμηρόνς τιν' ἐκάμψε βροτῶν,
ἐτεροσὶ δὲ κύδως ἀγήραον παρέδωκ. (Pythian 2, 11.49-52)

There are other similarities between Hopkins' view of God and Pindar's, in other poems, although these may be coincidental and one cannot imagine that Hopkins' theology was at all affected by the pagan poet. Nevertheless, Pindar's assertion that the gods are related to men but essentially different from them -

Ἐν ἀνδρῶν, ἐν θεῶν γένος, ἐκ μίᾶς δὲ πνεόμεν
ματρὸς ἄμφοτεροι, διείργει δὲ πᾶσα κεκριμένα

---

a "The wrath of the sons of god arises not in vain."

b "God accomplishes every deed according to his wishes, god, who matches the winged eagle, excels the dolphin in the sea, humbles some of proud mortals and gives to others undying glory."
ties in neatly with the Christian conception of Christ as being human but also
divine, and of human beings as having some of the properties of the divinity
(in the soul): “the just man... Acts in God’s eye what in God’s eye he is -
Christ...” (Kingfishers sonnet), or “I am all at once what Christ is, since he
was what I am” (Heraclitean Fire sonnet). In “The Wreck of the Deutschland”,
Hopkins sees God as an initially ambiguous figure, destroyer as well as
saviour; in his later poems, he usually focusses on one aspect or the other,
as in the Dark Sonnets, but here the two faces as viewed as complementary
and necessary: “Father and fondler of heart thou hast wrung: Hast thy dark
descending and most art merciful then.” A similar sentiment is expressed in a
Pindaric fragment, although it is talking literally about the power of god as
seen in the eclipse:

θεοῦ δὲ δύνατὸν μελαίνας
ἐκ νυκτὸς ἄμιάντον ὀρσαὶ φῶς,
κελαινεφὴ δὲ σκότει
καλύμαι σέλας καθαρὸν
ἀμέρας.² (Pindar, Fragment 142)

Just as Hopkins presents God as using an apparently terrible event to mask
the creating of new saints and send a message which is ultimately one of

---

¹ “There is one race of men and one of gods, though we both take our breath from one
mother, but a power that is wholly apart separates us, so that one is nothing while for the
other the brazen heaven stands forever as a safe abode.”

² “The power of god brings forth pure light from black night and it cloaks with murky darkness
the pure brightness of day.”
hope, so Pindar sees the gods as working deceptively, though in the opposite
direction (ἀντε δόλον αὐτῷ θέσαιν / Ζηνός παλάμαι, καλὸν πῆμα - Pythian 2,
ll.39-40), which would fit in with Hopkins' religious conviction that the worship
of the true God had replaced that of the false and turned morality upside
down. Although Hopkins could have been influenced by the picture of Zeus
as a destructive influence, symbolised by his lightning bolt, presented in
many texts from Homer on, this image comes up often in Pindar (e.g. in
Pythian 3, ll.57-8: ιεροῦ δ' ἄρα Κρονίων ῥήγαις δι' ἀμφοῖν ἁμπνοῶν
στέρνων καθέλεν ὠκέως, αὖθιν δὲ κεραυνὸς ἐνέσκυψεν μόρον). Although
Hopkins does not specifically mention thunder and lightning in connection
with the storm which wrecks the Deutschland, the image of an electrical storm
recurs in the imagery ("electrical horror") and personal comments ("I did say
yes / O at lightning and lashed rod", where the "rod" might be, as in "God's
Grandeur", a symbol for divine authority, either the Biblical rod or staff of
office or the classical bolt of lightning, or perhaps even literally a lightning
conductor). Pindar makes no explicit mentions of the goodness or, in our
sense, justice of the divine actions, but, like Hopkins, he includes prayers,
and it might be significant that both "The Wreck of the Deutschland" and
Olympian 6 end with a prayer for the future, Pindar calling Poseidon δέσποτα
ποντύμεδων (I.103), much as Hopkins refers to the "master of the tides Of the
Yore-flood", with "sway of the sea", although Hopkins' prayer is a much more

---

a "The hands of Zeus set a trap for him, a fair source of woe."

b "The son of Kronos drew the breath from both their breasts swiftly with casts from his
hands, the burning thunderbolt brought doom to them."
generalised plea for the acceptance of God's will (and the conversion of England).

The structure of Hopkins' poem bears some resemblance to Pindar's procedure of blending an account of the athletic victor's achievements and background with mythological stories, setting the one in the eternal context of the other. Both Pindar and Hopkins begin with something other than the central story, Hopkins opening with an elliptical account of some stressful spiritual experience of his own and Pindar starting, for example, *Pythian 1* with an account of Apollo's lyre and *Pythian 3* with the story of Asclepius. It is possible to discern a similarity between the structure of a Pindaric ode and "The Wreck of the Deutschland" in a more detailed way, though whether this is deliberate on Hopkins' part is pure speculation; as an example, I take the short *Olympian 3* as a pattern of the essence of Pindar's model. Pindar begins, in the first strophe and antistrophe, with a mixture of praise for the victor and an account of his own inspiration to sing; Hopkins opens (in the first part of the poem) with praise of the true "victor" of his poem, God himself (as Pindar often opens - for example, with praise of Zeus in *Olympian 2*), and with an account of his own experience of God and why he is compelled to praise. In the first epode, Pindar makes the transition to the central myth of his poem by jumping from the awarding of the crown to Theron back to the establishing of the rules of the games by Herakles; this is less obvious in Hopkins - "part the first" appears to have reached a conclusion with a prayer, but then "part the second" starts - but there is the transitional stanza 11, on
the unexpected arrival of death, which links back implicitly to the ideas of
death and suffering underlying the latter part of "part the first" (especially
stanzas 6-8). Pindar similarly links his material by moving from the στέφανοι,
"crowns", (l.6) of the poet to the κόσμον ἑλαῖας, "decoration of olive", (l.13)
awarded by the judge in memory of the olive brought by Herakles from the
Hyperboreans to Olympia. The central part of Pindar's ode (the second triad
and the third strophe), as usual, is an account of the myth, how, in this case,
Herakles, in order to honour Zeus, travels from Arcadia to the north to secure
trees, which he saw in the quest for the deer with the golden horns, in order
to shade the altar and festival site at Olympia; in Hopkins' case, the central
part of the poem is the account of the nun and her words, which honour
Christ, framed by a detailed account of the shipwreck; she actually first
appears exactly in the centre of the poem, the second half of the seventeenth
stanza of thirty-five. Pindar uses the olive-spray and the hero Herakles to link
the present and the past; Hopkins' method is different, using the initially
apparently irrelevant narrative of the voyage to introduce the "myth", but the
effect is similar. Pindar achieves the transition back to the present in the third
antistrophe, by linking the foundation of the festival by Herakles with his
handing over of its patronage at his apotheosis to Castor and Pollux, at
whose feast of the Theonexia the ode was performed; Hopkins similarly
switches focus before the end, from the nun to the Virgin Mary in stanza 30
(by the link between the date of the wreck and the following feast of the
Immaculate Conception, paralleling Pindar's reference to the Theonexia) and
in stanza 31 from the nun's behaviour in the wreck to the way in which it
could give an example to others. Finally, Pindar's last epode prays for the growth of the fame of the hero Theron, and Hopkins' last two stanzas pray for the wider acceptance of the "hero" Christ.

Pindar thus moves from the present of his performance to the recent past of the victory and then to the distant past of myth, before coming back to the present and looking ahead; Hopkins' chronology is more complex (moving first to an event at some unspecified date in his own past and then much further back to Christ's life, with glances at more modern history in the lives of Francis and Luther, and later to the recent past of the newspaper story), but has similar shifts between the present and a past which serves to illustrate and explain it. His "part the first" could almost be seen as a miniature ode in itself, beginning with a generalised "present" of his view of God, then moving to a recent past in which he accepted it ("I did say yes", stanza 2) before going back to a telescoped account of Christ's life in stanza 7 (the central "myth") and ending with a return to the present and a prayer. The whole poem could be seen in a similar way, with the sentiments in "part the first" and elsewhere being exemplified by the conduct of the nun in the story and also, implicitly, by the story of Christ which is hinted at throughout the piece (for example, in the reference to the stigmata, suggesting the crucifixion, at the mention of the word "five" in stanzas 22 and 23, or the hints of the scourging suggested by the "exquisite smart" of stanza 18 and the description of the "smart slogging brine" in stanza 19).
Hopkins is much more explicit in the telling of his story than Pindar, who never describes the actual contest and sometimes almost ignores the event celebrated (as in Pythian 4, which devotes almost all its 299 lines to an account of the Argonauts and mentions the victor Arcesilas only briefly at beginning and end); however, some features are common to both Hopkins' poem and Pindar's typical procedure. The tall nun who is Hopkins' focus of interest as a victim of the storm may not be a victor in earthly terms and her personal background is not explored, both of which would be expected in a piece of Pindar, but she is seen as winning the martyr's "crown" (mentioned in stanza 25) in parallel with the crowns won by Pindar's athletes. Pindar typically praises also the festival in which the victory was won, just as Olympian 1 starts with praise of the Olympian festival and Olympian 2 with a mention of its founding; there is something of a parallel in the case of the events Hopkins describes, in that he plays a great deal towards the end of the poem on the coincidence of the shipwreck taking place on the eve of the feast of the Immaculate Conception ("Feast of the one woman without stain", stanza 30), which allows him the far-fetched conceit of Mary's bearing of Jesus being echoed in the nun's speaking of the "word" Christ ("birth of a brain"). Although there is no Pindaric praise for the land which actually "banned" the nun, like the praise of Corinth in Olympian 13 or of Syracuse and Athens in the opening lines of Pythian 2 and Pythian 7, there is at least a mention of her homeland and the irony of "Gertrude, lily, and Luther, are two of a town", and in place of an account of her family there is mention of the "coifed sisterhood" to which she belonged; just as Pindar might have sung of
both her real family and the achievements of her mythological ancestors (as he does in *Olympian 2*, with Theron of Acragas, his brother Xenocrates and their ancestor Cadmus), so Hopkins praises also "father Francis", founder of her order, and tells the story of his stigmata. Again, there is for Hopkins the crucial difference that he regards the "myths" of his poem - the story of St. Francis, the Immaculate Conception, the birth, death and resurrection of Christ - as historical realities; but perhaps Pindar approached his myths with the same faith and fervour.

Another way of looking at the poem might see the story of the drowning of the nun as a cover for the cryptic telling of the story of Christ, now seen as his principal subject: Hopkins could be talking about the sacrifice and rising from the dead of Christ when he describes the martyrdom and heavenly reward of the nun, in much the same way as Pindar describes and praises Hieron of Syracuse in *Olympian 1* by recounting the story of the charioteer Pelops, or Theron of Acragas in *Olympian 3* by telling of the deeds of Herakles. Pindar's real subject is the present, but it is the past which he describes in detail, whereas Hopkins' real subject is the past and he describes the present. This view could be supported by reference to the way Christ is described as "hero of Calvary" in stanza 8 and "Orion (hero) of light" in stanza 21; the story of Christ is told briefly in the first part of the poem (a few lines of stanza 7), and ends the piece, as Pindar might refer to the victor early in his ode and at the end, and is referred to parenthetically throughout the poem - "the Life that
died” in the account of St. Francis, or the reference to the cry of the sailors being “a we are perishing in the weather of Gennesareth”.

Consideration of the influence of Pindar on the structure of “The Wreck of the Deutschland” leads to a link between Hopkins and Arnold, in that Arnold’s late poem “Westminster Abbey” is clearly an imitation of Pindaric procedures, and was recognised as such by Norwood (who claimed it to be the only modern poem using Pindaric technique⁹⁹) and later by Anderson.¹⁰¹ It has a recurrent central image which binds it together, in this case the idea of light, and at its heart is a trio of myths (St. Peter’s visiting of the site, Demeter and Demophoon, the deaths of the builders of the temple at Delphi) connecting the ideas of the giving of life and of building, the central one being elaborated at some length, in Pindaric fashion.

It is also possible to see some influence of Pindar even on the content of Hopkins’ writing, his sentiments and images: the descriptions of himself in stanza 4 (“I am soft sift in an hourglass... I steady as a water in a well...”) are similar to an image Pindar applies to himself in Pythian 2, l.80 (... ἄμπαπιστος εἰμι, φελλὸς ὅς ὑπὲρ ἔρκοσ...), and ἄφενυδει δὲ πρὸς ἀκμονὶ χάλκεον γλῶσσαν (Pythian 1, l.86) might, though it is not addressed to the god, be recalled in stanza 10 of “The Wreck of the Deutschland” (“With an anvil-ding And with fire in him forge thy will”), though not in the more negative usage of the image in “No worst, there is none” (“on an age-old anvil wince”). Turning to the

---

ᵃ “I am like the unsinkable cork at the top of the net.”
ᵇ “Forge your tongue on the anvil of truth.”
shorter lyrics, particularly clear example of this is afforded by a comparison of
the opening half a dozen lines of Olympian 1,

"Αριστον μὲν ὤδωρ, ὡ δὲ χροῶσ αἰθόμενον πῦρ
ἄτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου;
εἰ δ' ἄθληα γαρ ἀποθανεὶ
ἐλθεῖν, φίλον ἑτορ,
µηκέθ' ἀλίου σκόπει

ἄλλο θαλπνότερον ἐν ἁμέρα φαεννὸν ἀστρον ἐρήμασ δι' αἰθέρος,\(^a\)

with the octave of Hopkins' "The Starlight Night":

Look at the stars! look, look up at the skies!

Ω look at all the fire-folk sitting in the air!

The bright boroughs, the circle-citadels there!

Down in dim woods the diamond delves! the elves'-eyes!

The grey lawns cold where gold, where quickgold lies!

Wind-beat whitebeam! airy abeles set on a flare!

Flake-doves sent floating forth at a farmyard scare! -

Ah well! it is all a purchase, all is a prize.

Both poets are talking about "prizes" (ἄθληα and "prize") and, although these
are going to be different, since Hopkins later appears to be talking about the
"prize" of spiritual enlightenment to be gained from contemplation of nature
whereas Pindar is talking about the prize for the winner of the horse race, the
ways in which they are described are similar. (As so often in Hopkins, the

\(^a\) "Water is the best of things, and gold, just like a fire burning in the night, is distinguished
above all other forms of manly wealth; if you wish to sing of prizes, dear heart, look for no
star more warming than the sun shining by day in the lonely sky."
"prize" is to be won by the effort of looking properly at Nature, or "inscaping"; this idea is present in Pindar as it is in Duns Scotus - 
\( \text{εἰ δὲ τὶς ὀλβὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἄνευ καμάτου λοῦ φαίνεται} \), Pythian 12, I.28-9.) For Pindar, the best of prizes is like the brightest of elements, gold, which can be likened in its shining to fire, which appears brightest when seen at night; he goes on to talk about the brightness of stars. Similarly, although he is actually describing stars and not using them as an image for the grandeur of the Olympian games, Hopkins makes a connection between the stars (\( \alphaστρον \)) and fire (\( πῦρ \)) and gold (\( χρυσός \)). The setting of Hopkins' poem is outdoors at night, looking up, as, in the imagery, is Pindar's (\( νυκτὶ, δὲ αἰθέρος \)). This could be purely coincidence, the links between stars, fire and precious objects being too obvious to be traced to particular sources in this way, but the description of "stars" as "golden" is actually not natural in English usage ("silvery" is the more obvious epithet) and the trick of the opening line of the Pindar, mentioning something as common as water as being the best of things (echoed in Olympian 3, I.42) before launching into more rarefied ideas, is partly paralleled in the Hopkins, where the picture of cities and treasure suddenly has a bathetic collapse into the image of the "farmyard scare". As a final point, we may note that Pindar's \( φίλον ἠτόρ \) ("dear heart") echoes typical expressions of Hopkins throughout his poetical career, if not in this poem: "My heart", "you... heart" ("The Wreck of the Deutschland" stanzas 3 and 18), "ah my dear" ("The Windhover") and "you, heart" ("I wake and feel the fell of dark").

\( ^a \) "If there is any happiness among men, it does not show itself without labour."
There may thus be Pindaric influence on the structure of “The Wreck of the Deutschland” and certainly the weaker case that Hopkins was influenced by his classical studies at the level of the phrase or sentence is very credible. Some of the features which are typical of his style, such as alliteration, are common enough in English poetry and do not need to be traced to classical precedents, but others, such as word-order deliberately manipulated for special purposes, are not native devices and can reasonably be ascribed to his particular training. A simple example from a poem known to be very familiar to Hopkins (the opening of *Aeneid*, Book 2) will identify some of the relevant features of Latin and Greek writing which were second nature to him and presumably entered his consciousness; these features will then be linked to some well-known lines of Hopkins. In lines 13-6, Aeneas commences his account of the fall of Troy with the building of the wooden horse:

incipiam. fracti bello fatisque repulsi
ductores Danaum, tot iam labentibus annis,
instar montis equum divina Palladis arte
aedificant, sectaque intexunt abiete costas.a

The sentence starts not with the subject, but with the participial phrases describing it; those phrases are arranged in a neat chiasmus, linked by the alliteration of “fracti/fatis” (also found in “ductores Danaum”); starting the sentence thus stresses the state in which the Greeks find themselves (rather than just identifying them as the subject) and gives the reasons for the

---

*a “I shall begin. Broken by war and disappointed by fate, and since by now so many years were slipping by, the leaders of the Greeks built, by the divine skill of Athene, a horse as big as a mountain, and wove its ribs with sawn fir.”*
extraordinary and dangerous trick they are about to play. After the subject, there is inserted an ablative absolute, before the object of the sentence. The present participle and its adverb, "iam labentibus", precede the noun "annis", whereas the prose norm would be to have them placed after; the effect is almost to make "labentibus" look back to the immediately preceding "ductores Danaum" as well as ahead to "annis", either reinforcing "fracti...repulsi" or hinting at the coming (false) departure of the ships. "instar montis" refers literally to the following "equum", but its position could be seen as looking back to "tot", to reinforce the idea of the burden of years on the Greeks. The sandwiching of "Palladis" between "divina" and "arte" allows, disregarding the strict grammatical forms, "divina" to be associated closely with "Palladis" and, in terms of strict sense, it is "Pallas" which is "divina" rather than "ars". The final line balances and reverses the opening "fracti" with "aedificant". The passage thus illustrates, as well as other devices, the two main versions of the technique of using unusual word-order for special effects, or hyperbaton, namely the forward placing of a word for emphasis and the placing of a word so that it can suggest connections with both what comes before it and what comes after it. The reverse of the former, the late placing of a word, is also common in Latin and Greek; indeed, the late placing of the verb formalises this practice of waiting until the end of the sentence before nailing the main point; in the passage quoted, the delay in the arrival of the verb "aedificant" is really only the prose norm and carries no particular weight, but there is perhaps a weak example of a word being deliberately delayed in the final
position of "costas", which finally makes sense of the curious words "sectaque intexunt abiete".

Starting with a lengthy descriptive phrase rather than the subject itself, rather as "Spelt from Sibyl's Leaves" begins with a string of adjectives, is by no means unusual in English, though there are few close parallels to our Virgil example in Hopkins; the first words of "The Wreck of the Deutschland" commence with the vocative "Thou", but the participial phrase "mastering me" is put before "God" in an emphatic and concise way (in place of the "normal" longer form, "Thou God, mastering me" or "Thou God who masters me").

More obvious is the opening of stanza 21, though in this case the participles refer to the object rather than the subject, making the grammatical distance between them even greater:

Loathed for a love men knew in them,

Banned by the land of their birth,

Rhine refused them....

The flexible nature of word-order in Latin and Greek allows the writer to emphasise the crucial word or idea by placing it at the start of the sentence, whereas English expects the grammatical subject to start the clause. The most obvious example of this is the way the epics commence with the object of the sentence (the Iliad commencing with its overall theme, μῆνιν, and the Aeneid likewise, "arma virumque"), and, although these examples are not grammatically identical, Hopkins often likes to stress the main theme of his poem by bringing it forward and making it explicit in some way. The methods
he uses include the use of an isolated vocative ("Thou mastering me God!", "Patience, hard thing!") or of a grammatical duplication (as happens in the openings of two poems - "The Eurydice - it concerned thee, O Lord", in which "it" is strictly redundant after "The Eurydice", and "Felix Randal the farrier, O he is dead then?", in which the first four words are an expansion of the later "he"). The contrary device, of delaying a word or phrase for its emotional effect, can be illustrated from "The Wreck of the Deutschland" stanza 18 ("Ah, touched in your bower of bone Are you!"), and a particularly effective example comes from a line in "God's Grandeur", where the verb is delayed by an adverbial phrase in a way which throws extra weight on it: "Oh, morning, at the brown brink eastward, springs." Perhaps the most daring delay of this kind occurs at the end of "Andromeda", where the object of "disarming" comes only at the end of the poem, after an interposed clause and a long adverbial phrase: "...disarming, no one dreams, With Gorgon's gear and barebill, thongs and fangs." The other main purpose of hyperbaton, making a word carry more than one meaning by its position, is harder to achieve in English and so less common in Hopkins' works, but can be seen in, for example, "since I had our sweet reprieve and ransom Tendered to him" ("Felix Randal"), where the shift of "tendered" from its normal position straight after the auxiliary "had" allows the suggestion of a description of the "ransom" (i.e. the sacrifice of Christ on the cross) to balance chiasmatically the description of "reprieve" as "sweet". Less obviously, in "The Wreck of the Deutschland" (stanza 14), we have "night drew her Dead to the Kentish Knock", where reading forward the word "dead" merely has the meaning of "in a straight line", but looking backwards
only it has a more sinister meaning. Here we are moving into consideration of
the much simpler matter of words having several meanings or ambiguity of
meaning, for which we do not have to look for classical precedents. This is a
common feature of Hopkins' work, and could be illustrated from virtually every
stanza of "The Wreck of the Deutschland", in which ambiguity is an especially
strong idea, as a central idea is the dual nature of God, "a winter and warm",
"fondler of heart thou hast wrung", so that "storm flakes" become "lily
showers". Stanza 2, for example, gives us the ambiguity of "lashed rod"
(either looking back to the idea of "lightning" or picturing God as wielding a
"rod", as in "God's Grandeur", where we similarly have the several possible,
and all relevant, meanings of "foil"); the last line of stanza 15 gives us the
grim play on the word "shroud" (the "rigging" of the next stanza, or, looking
back in the stanza, linked to the idea of "lives...washing away").

The way in which the epics can open with the object is helped by, for
example, the fact that Virgil does not need to express his subject (contained
in the following verb, "cano"), and Hopkins often avails himself of the classical
conciseness allowed by, for example, the omission of the pronoun subject (as
in stanza 9, of "The Wreck of he Deutschland", "Hast thy dark descending
and most art merciful then") or by the verb "be" being understood. Thus, in
"Andromeda", the first line of the sestet omits the auxiliary ("Her Perseus
linger and leave her to her extremes?") and in stanza 4 of "The Wreck of the
Deutschland", following "I am soft sift" in l.1, Hopkins can leave the verb
understood in l.5, "I steady as a water in a well", and even more strikingly in
stanza 3 ("The frown of his face Before me, the hurtle of hell Behind,..."). In
the latter example, it may be that an absolute construction is implied, with a
participle understood rather than a finite verb, and there are examples of this
in Hopkins, most obviously in the opening of "Felix Randal", where "my duty
all ended" stands apart from the grammar of the sentence.

In a recent article which touches on this aspect of Hopkins' work, though it
tends to rely on general assertions about Greek originals rather than specific
eamples, Brian Arkins describes briefly what is known of Hopkins'
unfinished research into classical subjects, especially the rhythms of
Greek verse, and points out the Christian glosses on classical images which
are present in the sonnets "Heraclitean Fire" and "Andromeda". He illustrates
the work of Bender on Hopkins' use of hyperbaton by reference to "The
Leaden Echo and the Golden Echo", making the same general link with
Pindar's procedures, and that of W.B. Stanford on the link between Hopkins
and Aeschylus by reference to their use of compound adjectives, though
quoting only from Hopkins.

This all demonstrates the extent to which Hopkins, the precise observer of
nature in its most minute details, analysed the technicalities of the ancient
languages and their literary devices and the ways in which he attempted to
incorporate them into his work. It is a very different approach to that of
Arnold, for whom the moral (rather than emotional) content and the effect of
the English style used, rather than the detailed metrical effects (which he eschews copying in the Preface to *Merope*) and images, are vital in literature.
13. Hopkins' sonnet on a classical subject: "Andromeda"

Hopkins' renewal of his association with Oxford, when, from November 1878 to October 1879, he was posted to the recently-opened parish church of St. Aloysius, was one of his most creative times: like the great outpouring of nature poems in Wales (1877) and the agonised period of the Dark Sonnets in Dublin (1885), his months in Oxford were very productive, even if the poems do not form a kind of sequence in the way that the Welsh and Irish ones do. Despite this, this time close to his old college seems to have been less than happy, despite his affection for his old university, the site of his conversion. For one thing, Oxford had changed since he had left it: the growth of the suburbs had begun to alter its appearance, and no longer did fields come almost up to college walls as they had done earlier in the century.

In his undergraduate days, Hopkins seems to have been insensitive to old fabric (speaking unemotionally of the rebuilding of Balliol) but some of the pieces from 1878-9 do celebrate a past Oxford: "Duns Scotus' Oxford" regrets the change which urban growth has brought about, as well as describing the medieval heart of the city in a romantic way, and "Binsey Poplars" is a more personal statement of grief at the destruction of a scene of natural beauty and a cherished reminder of the past. Whereas for Arnold in "Thyrsis" the survival of "That lonely tree against the western sky" provides some validation for the quest and struggle of life and is a permanent reminder of friendship, despite the death of the shepherd, Hopkins, having expressed his keenness to go up the river, has to note, "I have been up to Godstow
this afternoon. I am sorry to say that the aspens that lined the river are everyone felled", as recorded in "Binsey Poplars": his "aspens dear.... are all felled", so that "After-comers cannot guess the beauty been." Hopkins, who can draw attention to "a base and brickish skirt" which "sours" the medieval "towery city" ("Duns Scotus' Oxford") has a less idealised image of Oxford than Arnold, for whom Oxford is forever "steeped in sentiment, spreading her gardens to the moonlight, and whispering from her towers the last enchantments of the Middle Ages"; in 1865, Arnold can speak of Oxford as "so venerable, so lovely, so unravaged by the fierce intellectual life of our century, so serene!" at the time when Hopkins was living through the bitter controversy surrounding Jowett in the struggle between the Tractarians and his Broad Church faction.

The sonnet "Andromeda", written on August 12th., 1879, seems to represent a brief recalling of Hopkins' classical training at Balliol, and, in its fear of the terrible threat posed in the legend to which it refers, perhaps reflects the unease and foreboding about change which seem to have accompanied his return to Oxford. In this, it can almost be seen as Hopkins' equivalent of Arnold's more pessimistic utterances about the human condition (since Arnold never expresses the personal despair of the Dark Sonnets). The poem is unusual in Hopkins' output in being openly based on a classical story (indeed, unique in its use of classical mythology, which he tended to condemn as trivial - or even blasphemous - when commenting on Bridges' work); however, from the start (which speaks figuratively of "Time's
Andromeda") it is clear that this is not just a retelling of a story, as it would have been from Tennyson or Swinburne, but is invoking the ancient image only as a metaphor for the real subject, which appears to be the besieged state of the Church, although this is not made explicit. Nevertheless, the details of the original story as told most familiarly by Ovid in book 4 of *Metamorphoses* are referred to repeatedly throughout the piece: the "rude rock" to which Andromeda is tied as "doomed dragon food", the figure of Perseus who treads "pillowy air" as he hovers over the rock and falls in love with her ("hangs His thoughts on her"), and finally his weapons of the Gorgon's head and curved sword ("With Gorgon's gear and barebill") with which he faces the monster's "fangs". One geographical feature of the sonnet is not in the Latin text, the idea of a sharply pointed bay ("both horns of shore"): this detail, if it has a literary source and is not just a device by which Hopkins hints at the nature of the monster (the horned beast of the Apocalypse, or the devil himself), probably derives from the conventional representation of the bay at Joppa, the traditional setting for the story, and mentioned as such by Pausanias, Pliny, Strabo and others. Josephus, for example, has a typical reference to the place towards the end of Book 3 of *The Jewish War*, it being where a Jewish pirate fleet was wrecked on the cliffs while fleeing Vespasian's army; Josephus tells how the marks of Andromeda's chains can still be seen (ἐνθα καὶ τῶν Ἀνδρομέδας δεσμῶν ἔτι δεικνύμενοι τόποι πιστοῦνται τὴν ἀρχαιότητα τοῦ μύθου"), a detail echoed in Pliny's *Natural History* (v.69) and Strabo (xvi.2,28), and describes the sharp-

---

* "There the impressions made by the chains of Andromeda are shown to give evidence of the antiquity of the legend."
ended bay which Joppa has instead of a port: \textit{kata\tau\acute{a} \tau\acute{a}s \kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota\sigma \iota \kappa\acute{a}t\acute{e}r\omega\theta\epsilon\nu.}\textsuperscript{a}

If Hopkins did know this passage, the "roar" of the beast and the "blows and banes" which Andromeda suffers may have been prompted by the vivid account of the rough waves and wild wind which wrecked the ships (itself always an image which stirred Hopkins, as in the shipwreck poems): \textit{\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{y}μa \beta\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron \varepsilon\varphi\acute{a}p\acute{i}π\pi\tau\epsilon\iota.}\textsuperscript{b} However, some of the details in Hopkins' version can be linked quite precisely to the wording of Ovid's version, even though it is a long way from being a "translation" in any normal sense. Thus, the "rude rock" of I.1 recalls the description of Andromeda tied "ad duras...cautes" (I.672), the description of Perseus as he "linger(s)" and "treads a time" (II.9-10) picks up "stupet" (I.676), and the strange "barebill" (I.14) conveys the idea of a hooked or curved blade (bill) insisted on by Ovid ("telo...unco", I.666; "falcato...ense", I.727).

However, the general impression created by Hopkins' version is different from that created by Ovid's, and the former is selective, focussing really on just II.670-7 and a few details from elsewhere, out of some forty lines of Latin covering the meeting of Perseus and Andromeda and his preparing to face the monster; Hopkins omits the conversation between the two lovers, and that between Perseus and the parents asking for her hand if he rescues her, and he ends his piece before the description of the fight, the marriage of Perseus and Andromeda and Perseus' account of how he came to kill the Gorgon

\textsuperscript{a} "On either side in the form of horns."

\textsuperscript{b} "A violent gust assailed them."
originally (all of which occupies almost another hundred lines of Latin). On the other hand, Hopkins' short piece has features not found in the Ovid: the idea of previous attempts on Andromeda and even the emphasis on her suffering ("injury", "doomed", "wrongs", "extremes", "forsaken", "patience", "pangs") are hard to trace in Ovid, where comment on Andromeda's feelings is surprisingly slight, being limited to two conventional references to generalised tears ("tepido manabant lumina fletu", I.674; "lumina...lacrimis inplevit obortis", I.684) and one to a shriek as the monster appears ("conclamat virgo", I.691), just past the point reached by the sonnet. Hopkins is altering the emphasis of the story, away from the heroics of the story of Perseus, where there is never real doubt about the outcome and the attention is all on his decisive actions, to the state of Andromeda herself, not privy to the ending of the tale or even sure of the stranger's help.

Stylistically, this piece contains a couple of striking examples of Hopkins' use of hyperbaton to add emphasis or create complexity of meaning, mentioned above as something which he may have derived from his studies of the classical languages and their freer word-order. The delayed object of "disarming" has already been mentioned, and one should also note the double meaning of "hangs" in "he treads a time and hangs His thoughts on her"; looking back, it forms half of a pair of parallel ideas with "treads" to describe the hovering of the hero in the air ("His thoughts on her" being an "absolute" phrase tacked on), and looking forward it has "His thoughts" as an object and so introduces a new idea of equal importance to the "treading".
We are left in a subtle doubt as to whether Perseus is thinking of rescuing Andromeda almost incidentally or whether he pauses rapt in active contemplation of her.

The Christian interpretation of this story would equate Andromeda with the Church (her name, meaning "ruler of men", being a suitable title for the Universal Church), as Bride of Christ (as in Apocalypse 21.2). She is first exposed on a rock (recalling the rock on which Christ in Matthew 16.18 establishes his Church in the person of Peter, a suitably Papal reference for Hopkins) and threatened by the dragon as the woman is in Apocalypse 12, until rescued by the hero Perseus (meaning "destroyer", i.e. "of sin and death") or Christ, first at the Crucifixion ("hangs" again) and presumably latterly at the Final Judgement. ("Hero" is Hopkins' title for Christ in, for example, "The Wreck of the Deutschland" and "The Loss of the Eurydice"; on November 23rd., 1879, the subject of his sermon at St. Joseph's, Bedford Leigh, his next post, was Jesus Christ as hero: "Often mothers make a hero of a son; girls of a sweetheart and good wives of a husband. Soldiers make a hero of a great general, a party of its leader, a nation of any great man that brings it glory, whether king, warrior, statesman, thinker, poet, or whatever it shall be. But Christ, he is the hero... He is a warrior and a conqueror... He is all the world's hero..." After the rescue, Perseus marries Andromeda, as Christ is said to marry the Church ("spouse" being his title in "Hurrahing in Harvest"), though Hopkins does not take the story that far. Paul Mariani, in his commentary on the poems, gives this straightforward reading of the
allegory: "Hopkins sees in the mythological story of Perseus and Andromeda a foreshadowing of Christ's protection of his Church." John le Vey reinforces the Biblical connection by pointing out the hovering of Perseus in the clouds fits the description of the Second Coming of Christ in Matthew 24.30, and the curious expression "no one dreams" is a version of the warning about the unexpected nature of that coming given in Mark 13.22. (It should be noted that the identification of Perseus with Christ is not uncontested: Wain points out that the immediate threat to the beast Biblically should be St. Michael - or even St. George, as Mariani also notes.)

However, some of the details in Hopkins' modified version do not quite fit the old story: he says of his central character that "Time past she has been attempted and pursued By many blows and banes", which would not fit Andromeda but would fit the Catholic Church in times of persecution, a theme to which Hopkins often alludes, if with discretion, as in the reference to "The riving off that race So at home, time was, to his truth and grace" in "The Loss of the Eurydice". More puzzling is the idea that she now faces "A wilder beast from West than all were, more Rife in her wrongs, more lawless, and more lewd"; Andromeda in the story faces only one monster, and in Revelations, though two different beasts are described in chapters 12 and 13, neither can really be said to be more dangerous than the other. Exactly what "beast" Hopkins has in mind as a special threat to the Church is not clear; Mariani makes a case for it being quite simply the devil in the traditional shape of the dragon (pointing to the fact that in the night sky the constellations of Perseus
and Andromeda are threatened as much by Draco, to the north-west, as by the sea-monster Cetus\textsuperscript{ccxviii}, but it is unlikely that Hopkins is thinking in a general sense of the power of evil or death - Peter was promised that it would not prevail against him, and it was overcome by Christ at the Crucifixion, so it poses no serious threat to the faithful. Presumably Hopkins therefore has in mind some threat to orthodox belief (perhaps posed by liberalism, in the form of Gladstone, or by Irish nationalism, or by scientific scepticism, or even, as has been suggested, by Walt Whitman, whom Hopkins described as a "very great scoundrel"\textsuperscript{ccxix} despite recognising similarities between them) which could shake faith itself in the absence of divine assistance which, in terms of the description of Perseus' behaviour in the poem, is overdue; Hopkins is perhaps fearful of the "melancholy, long, withdrawing roar" of "The Sea of Faith" which Arnold heard a quarter of a century earlier in "Dover Beach".

The perceived threats to conventional religious belief posed by Darwinian theory and the rise of scepticism and socialism may have been in Hopkins' mind at this date, especially in Oxford. It should be noted that the anti-modernist pope Pius IX had died the previous year, and he may have been fearful of a threat to the traditions of the Church; more immediately, the Jesuits were expelled from France in 1879, which he must have seen as proof of the danger posed to his deepest convictions by the modern reformist world. As le Vey points out, Andromeda is a good if disturbing image for the Church because she was threatened not only by the dragon, from the outside, but also from within, her family having agreed to sacrifice her.
Furthermore, some of the words used of Andromeda's state in her time of trial are the words which Hopkins uses habitually to describe his own situation and frustrations, particularly in the later, darker poems, suggesting that perhaps he sees already himself as "Time's Andromeda", threatened by the world and awaiting the release which only the Master to whom he has dedicated himself can bring about (as He releases the nun in "The Wreck of the Deutschland" - "her master and mine"). It is perhaps significant that the curious expression "Time's Andromeda" is similar to a phrase he uses to describe himself, "Time's eunuch", in "Thou art indeed just, Lord", in which he laments the fruitlessness of his labours, shortly before his death in 1889. Andromeda's ordeal tests her "patience", a virtue Hopkins needed when he felt himself abandoned "to hoard unheard" ("To seem the stranger lies my lot") his poetry and scholarship and which is the subject of a sonnet of, probably, 1885; Andromeda's "patience" is "morselled into pangs", the word used for sufferings in "No worst, there is none". The onlooker would think of Andromeda "forsaken that she seems", and, although the word is not used in the Dark Sonnets, "forsaken" would aptly sum up the situation described there of one "now at a third Remove" ("To seem the stranger lies my lot") and praying to an absent God with "cries like dead letters" ("I wake and feel the fell of dark") - and would recall the despairing words of Christ on the cross (although "Despair" is explicitly rejected in "Carrion Comfort"). It is perhaps disturbing that the poet highlights the fact that the hero in "Andromeda" stays aloof as he "treads a time" - we are invited to wonder if he will "leave her to her extremes" - and that there is no clear reference to the happy end, only the
grim final picture of his weapons and those of his opponent, and we pull away
while still "no one dreams" the end of the story. There may in this be a
foreshadowing of the unresponsive god of the Dark Sonnets, who seems to
be a "hero" of an ambiguous kind, "the hero whose heaven-handling flung
me, foot trod Me" ("Carrion Comfort"). The most obvious linguistic link
between "Andromeda" and the Dark Sonnets is the parallel between the
expression "rock rude", describing the cliff on which Andromeda is exposed,
and the exclamation of shocked surprise at his treatment by God in "Carrion
Comfort", where "rock" has become a verb: "why wouldst thou rude on me
Thy wring-world right foot rock?" In both cases, one can detect a pun on
"rude/rood" - the rock which supports the Church and that which supports
Andromeda come together in the image of a "rock-rood", the crucifix itself,
and in "Carrion Comfort" there is irony in that Hopkins in his despair
simultaneously criticises God as being cruel while praying to him on the cross
(taking "rood" as a vocative). If the "rock" on which Andromeda stands is
indeed a symbol for the bedrock on which the Church is founded, it is a rough
and uncomfortable situation to be in, as Hopkins often found in following his
vocation; although one can only speculate on whether Hopkins had the
episode from Josephus in mind when he wrote the poem, there might be
some relevance here in the fact that in it representatives of the people of God
are under threat from the pagan Romans from the west, and in fact come to
grief.
It may be that the apparently grim nature of this piece is deliberately contrived rather than a sign that Hopkins was suffering profound doubt or depression during his time in Oxford: in his letter to Bridges with which he sent this poem, he says that he deliberately aimed at "Miltonic plainness and severity" in it and he did revisit old haunts while in Oxford, for example hearing Jowett (Master of Balliol since 1870) preach and seeing old friends. However, he writes, "Many of our contemporaries at Oxford were up, and I used to come on more and more of them. But.... my work was parish work and left no time, that was of any use, for reading. Oxford was not to me a congenial field, fond as I am of it and a couple of years later, he confesses to Paravicini that he was not happy there: "At Oxford, in my last stay there, I was not happy... Often I was in a black mood, 'but still,' I used to say to myself like the people in Euripides, 'I see the sun,' not only the literal sun but nature and the many things which make Oxford attractive. Now at Liverpool one can not see the sun." His attitude to Oxford became ambiguous: "Not to love my University would be to undo the very buttons of my being... But I could not but feel how alien it was, how chilling, and deeply to be distrusted. I could have wished, and yet I could not, that there had been no-one that had known me there." There are several possible reasons for this unhappiness, the obvious one being overwork, largely caused by the sickness of his parish priest, but his correspondence also refers to the unfriendliness of the people and the fact that "they criticised what went on in our church a great deal too freely, which is d--d impertinence of the sheep towards the shepherd." Although he enjoyed his role as chaplain of the
Young Men’s Association, a photograph of the Oxford Catholic Club shows Hopkins standing very awkwardly at the edge of the group. It is also likely that simply being back in Oxford in a different role, as curate of a church serving a minority religion (a Jesuit priest and hence, in the eyes of many in the Oxford establishment, a threat), rather than as “the star of Balliol”, caused Hopkins to feel uncomfortable and, as he says, tend to avoid his peers. Oxford, the intellectual headquarters of the Church of England, had now become almost an enemy camp, and the return there may even have revived memories of the rift with his father which his conversion occasioned during his final year at Balliol and led to Manley Hopkins accusing him of callous behaviour: “Have you not dealt hardly, may I not say unfairly by us...the manner in which you seem to repel & throw us off cuts us to the heart...” He would not have been in any way ashamed of his calling, but this failure to fit back into Oxford life in 1878-9 may be seen as the first manifestation of the alienation was to become intense later in Ireland. He might also have felt a sense of loss in being reminded of the academic career which he had not pursued, the very fact that he did have some contact with former fellow-students and teachers making this harder to bear; Paravicini had become one of the first Catholic tutors in Oxford, after the easing of restrictions, and Hopkins presumably knew that he could have had this distinction too, had he not entered the priesthood. Being back in Oxford must have reminded him of the years when he had been engaged every day in intellectual dispute with the brightest minds of his generation, instead of being shunted around the country in a variety of short-term teaching, preaching and parish jobs. This
feeling of frustration was made especially acute by his inability to get his work published: starting with "The Wreck of the Deutschland", he suffered several disappointments when Jesuit editors rejected his work, "unheard" as the sonnet "I wake and feel" has it. The poem "Peace", which he wrote at the beginning of October, shows that he felt that he was neither really withdrawn from the world and at peace nor caught up in its work fully constructively - leading to the kind of frustration and exhaustion which underlies the later Dark Sonnets. Ironically, the Andromeda sonnet and two others unidentified were among the few poems which Hopkins offered for publication, to Hall Cain, for a book, and they were rejected, "because," in Hopkins' view, "the purpose of his book...is to 'demonstrate the impossibility of improving upon the acknowledged structure whether as to rhyme-scheme or measure'...However he had Andromeda and one cannot say there is any novelty in rhythm there."
Hopkins and Arnold, though very different in their characters and careers, were nevertheless similar in that they were strongly influenced by their classical education, both intellectually and emotionally: the content and style of the writers they had studied and the scholarly ambience of Oxford both contributed to their development as writers and stayed with them throughout their lives. In this, they were typical of educated men of a period which had an obsession with and felt an affinity for the ancient, particularly Greek, past, although their giving of primacy to poetry marked them out from most of the more serious-minded of the Victorians who, though revering Homer and studying the dramatists assiduously, were tending to look to the prose writers for the heart of classicism. The criticisms levelled at Arnold were provoked not by his use of the classics or his belief in their value but by differences in interpretation and emphasis (such as the pessimistic introspection of “Empedocles”, felt, later by himself, to be out of keeping with the prevailing understanding of the classical spirit). Such differences lie also behind the differences in the poetic output of the two writers: Arnold, for example, avoided lexical, grammatical and metrical innovation, whereas Hopkins was much influenced by his philological interests and by ancient examples of grammatical and metrical flexibility. Hopkins’ notion of the epitome of Greek literature being an emotionally vigorous and intellectually demanding chorus is not the same as Arnold’s idealised image of classical serenity and reasonableness. Nevertheless, Arnold and Hopkins were, despite being the
public champion of the classics and a professor of them, also perhaps linked by a strong strain of Romanticism, evident in Arnold's devotion to Wordsworth (and his debt to Byron in "Empedocles") and Hopkins' near-pantheism; in keeping with this, both also found much wrong with nineteenth-century society, such as its materialism and its lack of clear purpose, commitment and direction (unlike the "heart right" and "single eye" of the tall nun and the "one aim, one business, one desire" of the Scholar-Gipsy), and shared such feelings as a fear of the uncultured masses. Where they differed from each other most strikingly was in the way their philosophical or religious beliefs influenced their thinking: for Hopkins, aspects of classical style and form helped him to express notions derived from Christianity which have few precedents in the ancients, whereas Arnold, lacking this Christian conviction, actually sought the substance of his beliefs in the Stoic philosophy of the ancients and (eventually) in what he perceived as the "sweetness and light" of the classical vision, supplied for Hopkins by his religious faith.
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