Table of Contents

Abbreviations for MSS

A An album of Hopkins' poems kept by Robert Bridges to preserve his autographs or transcripts.

B An album of transcriptions of Hopkins' poems made by Bridges, and corrected by Hopkins in 1884.

Abbreviations for Published Hopkins Volumes

J *The Journals and Papers*. Eds. Humphrey House and Graham Storey. London: Oxford UP, 1959.

Li *The Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins to Robert Bridges* Ed. Claude Colleer Abbott. 2nd edition. London: Oxford UP, 1955. Print.

Lii *The Correspondence of Gerard Manley Hopkins and Richard Watson Dixon* Ed. Claude Colleer Abbott. 2nd edition. London: Oxford UP, 1955. Print.

Liii *Further Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins, including his correspondence with Coventry Patmore.* Ed. Claude Colleer Abbott. 2nd edition. London: Oxford UP, 1956. Print.

P *Poems*. 4th edition. Eds. W.H. Gardner and N.H. MacKenzie. London: Oxford, UP, 1967. Print.

S.D.W. *Sermons and Devotional Writings.* Ed. Christopher Devlin. London: Oxford UP, 1959. Print.

Acknowledgments

I would first like to thank the professors of the English literature department at Université Laval who have encouraged me throughout the researching and writing process. To **Dr. Elspeth Tulloch**, who guided me through the application process and made sure I would be well integrated into the program, a warm thank you. She later allowed me to gain valuable experience as a teacher's assistant and researcher. **Dr. Jean-Philippe Marcoux**, to whom I owe a debt of gratitude, also hired me as a corrector. He continually encouraged me to pursue opportunities to share the knowledge I had gleaned through research. I am thankful that he agreed to be the examiner of this thesis and that he provided me such useful feedback. Jason **Camlot** also gave of his time, energy, and expertise to be an examiner. His thoughtful analysis encourages me to continue my studies beyond this master's thesis. Finally, this thesis would not be in existence if not for the unwavering support from my thesis advisor, **Dr. Brad Kent**. He immediately understood its worth and prodded me to continue whenever I started to lose sight of it. His insightful comments and revisions made this thesis into one of which I am very proud. All three professors influenced me greatly through their excellently prepared courses.

I want to acknowledge the generous financial contribution provided by the **Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada** (SSHRC) which allowed me to put my full attention on my studies. I also wish to acknowledge the kind and helpful librarians at **Dartmouth College** who assisted me during a research trip.

My colleagues at Université Laval have also inspired this work, especially doctorate student **Mark Lepitre**. Our theoretical discussions of unifying binaries became workable theories that we both incorporated into our theses, although he to a much greater degree. The idea first came, however, from teasing out Hopkins' Trinitarian interpretations of Parmenides's binary worldview. We continued like abstract academic discussions with our colleagues and friends, **Carrie-Lynn Evans** and **Tara Connor**, making up the core group of the Unified Binaries Society, International Chapter. As researching and writing can be such solitary work, it was always wonderful to bounce ideas off of one another to see if some would stick. Other colleagues I must not neglect to thank for their encouragement and moral support are **Lysandre Malo-Cloutier**, **Murielle Cayouette**, **Pierre-Luc Beaulieu**, and **Joseph Dubé**.

My friends and family have also contributed to the completion of this project. The chapter on "God's Grandeur" would not be in this form if not for the gracious hospitality of

my best friend, **Rebecca Lauren Gidjunis**. A March break writing marathon was made possible by her delicious breakfasts ready for me when I awoke, coffee on demand, chats to sort out thorny concepts, and evening outings to keep us both sane. Thank you, Beck. My parents, **John** and **Mary Keller**, grandparents, **Robert** and **Anne Rebuck**, and **John** and **Grace Keller**, and **Grace Deering** and sister, **Erin Geiswhite**, were also constant supporters of my long endeavour. They never criticized how long it was taking to complete it but only urged me to continue. And, of course, my immensely supportive husband, **Jean-Philippe Murray**. Knowing I had always wanted to do a master's degree in English Literature, he encouraged me to go for it and made it a priority in our lives. Several times I would have stopped working on it, except for his encouragement to continue. This past June I had decided that since I wasn't going forward, I should just quit. Instead, he found a way for me to spend a week at Dartmouth College to be engrossed in the research materials. Merci, mon amour.

All of you have contributed to this final project. Thank you!

Introduction

Gerard Manley Hopkins' enigmatic poetic theories of "inscape," "instress," and sprung rhythm have intrigued critics since his poems were published in 1930, leading to many interpretations of what such terms may mean and how they apply to his canon. Critics have scoured his journals and papers for clues to their significance and have analysed his poems in consequence; however, they have yet to come to a consensus. An analysis of both Hopkins' poetic and personal manuscripts allow for the survey of these poetic theories from an initial spark of inspiration to a method that could be applied to any creative endeavour. Norman MacKenzie was recognisant of this utility of the manuscripts when he published the drafts of Hopkins' poems in facsimile form. One of his expressed goals was to "encourage a closer study of [Hopkins'] poetic development – both during his successive phases and, on a smaller scale, in his reshaping of individual pieces" (*The Early Poetic Manuscripts* 1). This study undertakes this mission. Through analysis of the drafts made available by MacKenzie, this study, by means of genetic criticism, adds to the comprehension of "inscape" and "instress," the overarching theories which informed Hopkins' theories of soundscape and metre. It then applies this knowledge to two of the poems that were written during the peak of Hopkins' poetic career: "God's Grandeur" and "The Windhover."

It may seem that nothing new could possibly be written on these much studied and canonical sonnets. I have chosen them specifically as the subjects of this study because of their explicit application of Hopkins' poetic theories and their appropriateness to the application of genetic criticism. By the time they were written, 1877, Hopkins' theory of inscape had been concretized. I believe that the first peak of Hopkins' creativity, that of 1875-1877, is directly due to his theory of inscape being fully developed into an applicable practice. In contrast, the poems he wrote before this period lack a spark of creative imagination. They read as mere imitations of Greek classics. And those that comprise his later peak, the so-called "terrible sonnets" of 1885-86, lack the immediacy of the discovery of inscape. "God's Grandeur" and "The Windhover," meanwhile, show the marked influence of this theory and its complementary poetic theories. The themes of both poems also enrich the understanding of inscape. Accordingly, given that this study relies on extant genetic materials, one of the first qualifications is that several versions of the poem be available for analysis. This is the case for

both “The Windhover,” which has three versions, and “God’s Grandeur,” which has five. In comparison “Pied Beauty,” another canonical sonnet from the same time period, has no extant manuscripts to analyze which summarily excluded it from the scope of this study.

This introduction will expound upon the worthiness of “God’s Grandeur” and “The Windhover” as subjects of study. It will also argue that Gerard Manley Hopkins’ works, as well as the sonnet verse form in particular, continue to be worthwhile foci of studies such as this. Furthermore, it will provide a precedent for the application of genetic analysis to poetry. It will conclude with a review of the literature concerning Gerard Manley Hopkins and his canon. Overall, the introduction reveals the uniqueness of Hopkins, his theories, and his work.

A Unique Perspective: Comparison of “God’s Grandeur” and “The Windhover”

As complementary pieces, “God’s Grandeur” and “The Windhover” illuminate various facets of inscape. “God’s Grandeur” follows the traditional sonnet verse form much more closely than does the experimental “The Windhover,” yet it reveals Hopkins’ belief that God’s presence can still be observed in the natural world, despite it suffering from the consequences of sin. “The Windhover,” the apogee of Hopkins’ poetic prowess, does not simply state the fact of God’s presence, but enacts it within itself.

A Unique Voice: Gerard Manley Hopkins

Gerard Manley Hopkins’ verse is particularly engaging as a subject of study because of his unique historical position as an experimental Victorian poet undiscovered until the modernist era. During his short life span covering 1844 to 1889, only nine of his hundreds of poems were published. Fortunately, he entrusted the faircopies of much of his poetry to one of his closest friends, Robert Bridges (1844-1930), who would later become England’s Poet Laureate. In this role Bridges published Hopkins’ work in a single volume in 1918, although the second edition of 1930 proved to be more influential. Therefore, critics who first analysed his work situated it within a modernist framework. For instance, William Empson, a critic often associated with New Criticism, applies Freudian psychoanalysis in his influential study of “The Windhover,” which appears in his breakout work *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930). Others, such as David A. Downes, insist that Hopkins is a modernist writer, not only according to the period in which his poems were published, but also in terms of their themes. He writes: “[Hopkins’] poetry is as expressive of the modern consciousness as is the poetry of T.S. Eliot,

William Butler Yeats, or Wallace Stevens" (Downes 2). There are other critics who concede that because he was a Victorian, Hopkins' poetry cannot be studied as if it were modern, but rather as proto-modern. An insightful and precocious fifteen-year-old Dylan Thomas wrote in an article entitled "Modern Poetry" (1930) for his school magazine that the "most important element that characterizes our poetical modernity is freedom," which "has its roots in the obscurity of Hopkins' lyrics" (qtd. in Boenig 91). Hopkins himself suggested that his poetry belonged to a later period. He wrote to Bridges: "If you do not like [my poetry], it is because there is something you have not seen and I see ... and if the whole world agreed to condemn it or see nothing in it I should tell them to take a generation and come to me again" (*Li* 214; 1 April 1885). The modernists had this opportunity to discover Hopkins' poetry a generation after it had been written, a generation which was much more avant-garde than Hopkins'.

More recent critics, however, compare it to the verse of his Victorian counterparts. For instance, F.R. Leavis' essay "Metaphysical Isolation" (1973) decried criticism, such as that of fellow New Critics, which categorized Hopkins as a proto-modernist; as he stated categorically: "[a] poet born in 1844 was a Victorian" (Leavis 115). The editor of the collection of essays *The Fine Delight* (1989) collected for the centenary of Hopkins' death, Francis L. Fennel, wrote "[a]ll the claims which have been made for Hopkins' influence or his precocity ("the forerunner of Modernism") need to be discounted as examples of [historical] fallacy" (Fennel 151). Alison G. Sulloway's 1972 much-cited work *Gerard Manley Hopkins and the Victorian Temper* continued the tendency to place Hopkins firmly within the Victorian tradition. To such claims Finn Fordham argues in his recent (2010) work that "[t]his historicizing turn is valuable for showing Hopkins' active engagement with the contemporary, but it can turn Hopkins into an effect and a symptom rather than a cause" (86-87), while also providing evidence that Hopkins expresses himself in "terms that feel ... decidedly modern and un-Victorian" (Fordham 88). Like Downes, he also groups Hopkins with Yeats, Conrad, Forster, Joyce and Woolf, in a study that reveals the "modernist selves" of these writers through the application of genetic criticism.

Hopkins' exceptional position in poetic history has led to him being claimed by both Victorian and modern camps. Yet, Bernard Bergonzi purported in his 1977 biography that Hopkins cannot be situated as a modern-before-his-time nor as a Victorian, but as a unique voice (xiii). This study will take Bergonzi's stance that Hopkins' poetic theories set him apart

from both modern and Victorian poets in terms of the themes, structure, sound, and metre of his poems. While this is the case, it will refer to sources that identify Hopkins as a Victorian, such as Sulloway's work, especially in its analysis of Ruskin's influence, and as a modern, such as Finn Fordham's genetic analysis of Hopkins' poems that have led him to assert that instress is an expression of the modernist conception of self.

Others may find Hopkins an old-fashioned subject for study. Long are the days when "the poet seen more than any other on the shelves of undergraduates [is] Gerard Manley Hopkins" (Hunter 6). His work went out of favour as a subject of study most likely due to its Christian worldview and themes that have declined in esteem within academia since the peak of his popularity in the 1960s. The emphasis on Hopkins as Christian was maintained by the early biographical studies, which were most often undertaken by Jesuits, and therefore focused on Hopkins as priest-poet. Examples include the first biography of Hopkins' life written by G.F. Lahay, S.J. (1930), John Pick's biography subtitled "Priest and Poet" (1966), and Alfred Thomas', S.J., *Hopkins the Jesuit* (1969). Likewise, Eleanor Ruggles' *Gerard Manley Hopkins: A Life* (1944) encapsulates his life in the first sentence of her introduction: "Gerard Manley Hopkins was an English Jesuit" (11). More recent studies, however, such as those conducted by Fordham and Wimsatt, have emphasized the power of his poetic voice rather than focusing solely on his position within the Christian faith.

A Unique Theory: Inscape

The uniqueness of his voice is due, I argue, to his poetic theories, especially his overarching theory of inscape. Based on a survey of Hopkins' references to inscape in his notes, journals, devotional writings, and correspondence, as well as its application in his poetry**, a working definition of inscape is the truth that God's creative energy unites all things, just as a painting of a landscape unites varied elements into a coherent whole**. Similarly, as this unification comes through viewing the landscape, Hopkins' contention is that all humans are able to access this truth through concentrated observation. The *Oxford English Dictionary* includes this component of observation in its definition of inscape; it states that it is "Hopkins' word for the individual or essential quality of a thing; the uniqueness of an observed object, scene, event, etc" ("Inscape"). The aspect of the particularizing qualities of a thing that set it apart from others of its species is a tenet of Duns Scotus's ideology, an ideology that Hopkins espouses since Scotism also "[makes] much of the distinction between general nature

and the particular, unique individuality of a person or thing" (Bergonzi 70). Yet the definition offered by the *OED* lacks the creative aspect of Hopkins' usage; he often employs this term to identify the creative force inherent in each individual thing. As an illustration of God's creative power, he reflects on the evidence of the sculptor's creation. After visiting the National Gallery in February 1874, he wrote in his journal:

> Especial note ... of two new Michael Angelos [sic] not seen before: touches of hammer-realism in the Entombment ... and masterly inscape of drapery in the other – But Mantagna's inscaping of drapery (in the grisaille Triumph of Scipio and the Madonna with saints by a scarlet canopy) is, I think, unequalled, it goes so deep. (*J* 241; 16 Feb. 1874)

From this and other passages from his journal, inscape is shown to reveal the creative power of the Creator/creator.

Instress is complementary to inscape in that it is the force that permits access to inscape and allows one to observe God and his attributes through close observation of fauna, flora, works of art, and humanity. The particularities that make the thing unique are then discovered. Hopkins judiciously chooses "stress" to denote this term, which invokes similar concepts such as tension and compression. Instress allows inscape to reveal itself by holding God's creative power fast for observation. Hopkins refers to two corresponding forces that he identifies as the "flush" and the "foredrawn." **That which is flush is completely full of its God-given uniqueness.** It is so full of its defining attributes that they risk to overflow. **Foredrawn is the coiling of God's creative power, pulling it tight before exploding into a revelation of God's presence, like a bow drawn tightly before the arrow's release.** According to Hopkins' theories, not only natural things, but that which is created artistically should reflect inscape through instress. The poet, like the sculptor, is a creator who is a creation of the Creator. Although once removed from supreme truth, the poet should strive to reveal God's attributes in order to induce worship of the Creator. In the case of poetry, a multiplication of alliteration and the superimposition of an irregular metre upon a regular one create the instress necessary to reveal inscape. Therefore, according to the theory of inscape, each poem should replicate its own individuality through the stress created through alliteration and metre for the purpose of worshipping God.

A Unique Sound: Soundscape

A cursory reading of any of Hopkins' well-known poems reveals his penchant for alliteration and rhyme. Consider just the first phrase of "The Windhover": "I caught this morning morning's minion, king- / dom of daylight's dauphin, dapple-dawn-drawn Falcon, in his riding / Of the rolling level underneath him steady air, and striding" (*P* 36); these three lines include nineteen instances of assonance and fifty-five instances of consonance. The intertwining of alliteration and metre will be referred to as "soundscape," after Wimsatt (*Hopkins' Poetics* 41). The usage of the term adheres to the second definition of "soundscape" according to the *OED* – "the sounds which form an auditory environment" ("Soundscape") – to emphasize the affinity sound repetition has to inscape. In his essay "Poetry and Verse" (1873-4), Hopkins clarifies that sound repetition is not inscape itself, but rather an "instrument for *detaching* inscape" (*Hopkins' Poetics* Wimsatt 7, italics in original); in Hopkins' words: "[p]oetry is in fact speech only employed to carry the inscape of speech for the inscape's sake" (*J* 289). In this essay, which Wimsatt qualifies as a "manifesto" in that it "manifests ... a firm and lasting declaration of principles" (*Hopkins' Poetics* Wimsatt 4), Hopkins explains how soundscape releases inscape so that the mind may contemplate it. He writes that in poetry, "[i]f not repetition, *oftening, over-and-overing, aftering* of the inscape must take place in order to detach it to the mind and in this light[,] poetry is speech which afters and oftens its inscape, speech couched in a repeating figure and verse is spoken sound having a repeating figure" (*J* 289; italics in original). Therefore, alliteration, assonance, consonance, rhymes, half-rhymes, and other poetic sound figures release the inscape to the hearer.

For the metre to express the inscape of "God's Grandeur" as he saw it in nature, Hopkins developed what he called "sprung rhythm." As an introduction to the concept, the *OED*'s definition provides a cursory understanding of the term. It states that sprung rhythm is "a term coined by Gerard Manley Hopkins for a poetic metre used by him which approximates to the rhythm of speech and in which each foot consists of one stressed syllable either alone or followed by a varying number of unstressed syllables" ("Sprung Rhythm"). To emphasize the importance of this practice, MacKenzie credits "Sprung Rhythm [as helping] liberate Twentieth Century English verse from the domination of the iambic two-step" (*Later Manuscripts* 3). The result is often breathlessness in anticipation of the next accented syllable. As the extrametrical syllables are added to the sonnet's line, it paradoxically lightens and

quickens the line instead of causing it to read heavier and slower (Fordham 100). To maintain metre while using this inventive metrical cadence, he employed alliteration (Stevenson 330) since the stress falls logically upon syllables that chime similarly in the ear. His poems read as verse and not as prose precisely because of his ample use of assonance and consonance, internal rhyme, and end rhyme.

A Unique Take on a Classic: The Sonnet

Hopkins, then, is a viable subject of study for his unique position bridging the Victorian and the Modern eras and for his individual poetic theory. Without an envisaged audience and without editorial constraints, he had the freedom to experiment with the time-honoured poetic form, the sonnet. The sonnet is also a versatile art form that can be modulated, allowing for comparison within the traditional form. In her practical guide *The Art of Poetry: How to Read a Poem*, Shira Wolosky explains that "despite ... these set forms, the sonnet as a verse form is extremely flexible" (53), and that the variations refer to a common theme, since "invention relies on the norm" (54). Analyses can be made based on the results of stretching the parameters of the sonnet structure. Hopkins chose to write most of his verse within the sonnet tradition, although he experimented freely with the form. Consider, for example, the "curtal sonnet" "Pied Beauty" (1877), which modifies the Petrarchan sonnet to exactly three-quarters ratio in quantity of lines and feet per line. In fact, although he wrote some longer works, his most successful and well-known are his sonnets, with the possible exception of *The Wreck of the Deutschland*.

A Unique Application: Genetic Analysis

The methodology of this study relies on close readings of the sonnets based on genetic criticism of the manuscripts. By analysing the changes made throughout the writing process, Hopkins' poetic preoccupations are revealed. For example, additional syllables added to a line may indicate a desire to adhere closer to sprung rhythm and changes in word choice may suggest emphasis on stress through consonance and assonance. Norman H. MacKenzie expresses his opinion in his introduction to the facsimiles by noting that

> a merely adequate line or phrase in the MS. A version [the first version] is suddenly lifted into the realm of inspiration in MS. B [the second version]. With only slight changes – a superfluous article or syllable struck through or a word repeated or replaced – Hopkins reinforced the effects that have outlasted the

> popular successes of so many of his contemporaries. (*Later Manuscripts* MacKenzie 3)

The consistencies from one version to another also reveal his goals in achieving the desired effect.

According to Pierre-Marc de Biasi's influential clarification of the practice, *What is a Literary Draft?: Towards a Functional Typology of Genetic Documentation,* the goal of genetic criticism is not to determine a definitive version. Rather, its goal is to analyse the *avant-textes* – that is, the manuscripts as well as journal entries, correspondence, and other relevant documents – so that "the work of art becomes interpretable through the very movement which gave birth to it" (26). The results of an analysis of the *avant-textes* may indeed confirm the observations made by textual or literary analysis, but according to de Baisi it is rare that genetic criticism does not reap valuable discoveries as to the processes that brought the work to its final version (26); indeed, rough drafts reveal the "choices, indecisions among the array of invented possibilities" (29) that form the foundations of the printed text.

Genetic analysis is analogous to geological research. It strips away the layers of text that cover the original stroke of inspiration. As Hopkins was preoccupied with capturing the power of his initial impressions in poetry, genetic analysis is an especially appropriate mode of study. MacKenzie was aware of this value by making Hopkins' manuscripts available to the public in facsimile. He compares the manuscripts to "geological sites" (*Later* 6). By applying concepts borrowed from stratigraphic studies, he commences his notes to each facsimile with the oldest layer and then moves successively to the most recent layer. This was made possible due to an infrared converter that allowed him to determine the order of the writing and gave him the opportunity to see words hidden underneath black deletion lines. The explanatory section, "How to Interpret the Plates and Notes," clarifies his identification process of the manuscripts and explains the origins of each, thereby assuring the practical use of the facsimiles for the purpose of analysis.

To mine these depths, de Baisi advocates applying two processes to the text. The first, "endogenesis,"[1] he describes as the process of analysing solely the rough drafts without

[1] De Baisi defines endogenesis thusly: "Endogenetics designates any writing process focusing on a reflexive or self-referential activity of elaborating pre-textual data, be it exploratory, conceptual, structuring or textualizing work, and regardless of the nature of, or how far advanced, such elaboration might be" (33).

recourse to contextualising information. The second, "exogenesis,"[2] is the analytical process devoted to researching documentation including letters, journal entries, contextualizing newspaper articles, sketches, and notes, which provides insight into the writing of the rough drafts (33). Through these two processes, the genetic critic constructs the "motivations, strategies and metamorphoses of writing" that have often been effaced from the published text (29).

Applying this critical approach to Gerard Manley Hopkins provides three insights into its practice; the first, that it applies to works written in the English language; second, that it applies to poetry as opposed to prose; and third, that it applies to a posthumously published writer. Genetic criticism, as a critical approach, has been centred in France, thereby tending to concentrate on French-language authors. As of yet, the majority of the English-language authors whose manuscripts have been analysed have been modern prose writers, such as Joyce and Woolf. While changes in a prose manuscript may be thematic or plot-related, in poetry the changes are more commonly made to accommodate sound repetition and rhythm or to enhance imagery. Furthermore, the problematic developed by using this methodology to study a poet who never saw his anthology printed is that he could have no editorial input. Unlike his contemporaries – like Yeats who famously repeatedly reworked his publications – Hopkins never had the opportunity to republish a work or even to oversee the first edition of his work so that it would reflect his authorial decisions. A genetic critic can then only rely on the poems in manuscript form; therefore, even the last version of the manuscripts cannot be assumed to be his final judgement.

Applying genetic criticism to Gerard Manley Hopkins' sonnets would be impossible without Norman H. MacKenzie's meticulous categorizing and assembling of the extant *avant-textes* into two volumes: *The Early Poetic Manuscripts and Note-books of Gerard Manley Hopkins in Facsimile* and *The Later Poetic Manuscripts of Gerard Manley Hopkins in Facsimile*. The only other course of action would have been to consult the original documents held in the Bodleian Library of Oxford and Campion Hall, but these are unavailable for the purposes of my research as the preservation of the originals is a comprehensible concern of the university. In fact, one of MacKenzie's "driving motives" in publishing the volumes was "to

[2] De Baisi defines exogenesis thusly: "Exogenetics designates any writing process devoted to research, selection, and incorporation work, focused on documentation which stems from a source exterior to the writing" (33).

make the benefits of manuscript study available to all serious students of Hopkins without exposing the original documents to unnecessary multiple use" (*Later* 20). MacKenzie laments that Hopkins' poetry has not been widely subjected to manuscript analysis; thus, he notes that "there have been comparatively few published attempts to follow the development of any mature poem from start to finish. This is a pity, because it may prove a more profitable exercise than the measuring of [Hopkins'] verse against some current theory of criticism" (*Later* 8). However, genetic criticism is itself a school of critical analysis, though of a more classical scholarly methodology than many other interpretative approaches. This form of criticism will offer support, disavowal, and modification to interpretations based on other modes of criticism.

Chapter Breakdown

Chapter One: Inscape: The Genesis of a Poetic Theory

The first chapter will reveal the development of Hopkins' theory of inscape and instress, along with instress' corresponding theories of the flush and the foredrawn. The study will focus on the development of these theories in four stages: first, from their conception in 1865 when the undergraduate Hopkins was inspired by the pre-Socratic philosopher Parmenides' cosmogony as applied to the concept of inshape, the Trinity revealed in nature; second, when as a Jesuit Hopkins was influenced by the works of the founder of the Jesuit Order, Saint Thomas Aquinas, which allowed him to apply Orthodox doctrines in defining the otherwise pantheistic viewpoint; third, when influenced by the prominent Victorian aesthete John Ruskin, which enabled him to develop a practical application of the theories to artistic compositions; and fourth, when Hopkins encountered the philosopher-theologian John Duns Scotus's philosophy in 1872, thereby adding the notion of *haecceity*, or "individual essence" (Honderich 357), to his understanding of inscape. The theories of "inscape" and "instress" are thus an intertwining of philosophical, theological, and artistic theories that, once formally constructed into a workable model, culminated in Hopkins' peak of poetic inspiration that lasted from 1875 to 1877. "God's Grandeur" (1877) and "The Windhover" (1877) are then both a result of the concretization of these concepts into applicable theories. A genetic analysis of these two sonnets will determine how Hopkins applies them.

Chapter Two: Inscape as Theme of "God's Grandeur"

The second chapter provides a genetic analysis of the manuscripts "God's Grandeur" within the framework of inscape and instress. The sonnet provides a theological treatise to the incarnation of God in the natural world. While this pantheistic perspective may seem contrary to Catholic doctrine, Hopkins is able to remain within orthodoxy through his understanding of Thomas Aquinas's and Duns Scotus's writings. Although the natural world is tainted with the sin brought on by Adam and Eve, God's presence continues to be observable to the trained eye. The genetic analysis reveals the strengthening of this theological position through subsequent modifications.

Chapter Three: Inscape Applied in "The Windhover"

The third chapter follows the enacting of inscape in "The Windhover" through an analysis of the manuscripts. More than a theme, as it is in "God's Grandeur," inscape is brought to life through an adherence to the theory in "The Windhover." The poem itself expresses its *haecceity*, its "thisness." Genetic analysis reveals that Hopkins accomplishes this feat by closely adhering to Ruskin's aesthetic theories. Ruskin's three stages of aesthetic theory, then, become the lens through which the analysis gains its focus.

Genetic criticism allows one to view the underlying inspiration of the poet before the poem reaches its maturity. As Hopkins wrote in his poem "To R. B.," writing is a process like the gestation period of a pregnancy. The idea is "conceived" in a moment of inspiration and is then quickly "quenched," leaving the mind as the "mother of immortal song" to try to recapture the inspired thought (*P* 75, lines 2-3). The process takes time, sometimes years, to "wear, bear, care and mould" (*P* 75, line 6) the words in order to achieve the effect of the moment of inspiration. To Dixon he writes that poems are the "darling children of [the] mind" (*Lii* 8; 13 June 1878). They start as a tiny seed, grow imperceptibly and are finally brought to maturation when they are birthed into the public. We will thus follow this maturation process that, like the gestation process, contains minute changes with significant outcomes.

Chapter One:

The Genesis of Inscape: Parmenides' Monist Philosophy

Inscape was such a vital part of Hopkins' worldview that he believed that the instructed mind naturally observed inscape in nature. Consider, for example, his lamentation that the "beauty of inscape was unknown and buried away from simple people and yet how near at hand it was if they had eyes to see it and it could be called out everywhere again" (*J* 221; 19 July 1872). Perhaps because he assumed that inscape is a concept that is instinctively understood by all but the "simple," Hopkins never provided a precise definition of this term he coined. Hence, there is no consensus among Hopkins scholars as to the signification of the term, whereas there is little doubt as to its significance in the poetic ideals he set out for himself. Scholars have been right to try to untangle the meaning of this term that Hopkins considered "the very soul of art" (*Lii*, 135; 30 June 1886).

Although this study will not attempt to determine a decisive definition of inscape or its companion concept instress, it will establish a theory of the terms' development from Hopkins' first use of them in notes pertaining to Parmenides' poem "On Nature" in 1868, the subtle shifting of their meanings after Hopkins was introduced to Duns Scotus's philosophies in 1872, and the practical use of the terms as he employs them in his correspondence and journals throughout his lifetime. Furthermore, a genetic analysis of the 1877 sonnets "God's Grandeur" and "The Windhover" will establish to what extent Hopkins seeks to attain inscape and instress in these poems throughout the writing process. As foundational concepts, a review of the genesis and evolution of the theory of inscape and its accompanying concept instress, will then allow for an analysis of the development of Hopkins' poetic theories of soundscape and "sprung rhythm" in the proceeding chapters.

Hopkins first refers to inscape and instress, as well as the complementary terms "flush and "foredrawn," in notes about the Greek philosopher Parmenides. In commenting on his respect for Parmenides' philosophy he writes: "[h]is feeling for instress, for the flush and foredrawn, and for inscape is most striking" (*J* 127). The notebook containing these remarks is entitled "Notes on the history of Greek Philosophers" and dates from February 9, 1868, several months after the twenty-three-year-old's graduation from Balliol College, Oxford, but before he entered the Jesuit novitiate later in the year. He was teaching at Cardinal John Henry

Newman's Oratory School in Birmingham, a private boarding school for Catholic boys, where many were converted, like Hopkins, from Anglicanism through the influence of the Oxford Movement. It was while researching Parmenides' philosophy, most likely for class preparation, that I conjecture that he came across Sir Philip Sidney's and Arthur Golding's use of the similar nonce word "inshape," thereby influencing Hopkins' concept of inscape. The similarities in terms lend clarity to Hopkins' early usage of the term.

The Genesis: Inscape as Inshape: The Incarnation of Divine Being

Two references to "inshape" can be found in Sidney's and Golding's 1587 translation[3] of Philippe de Mornay's *De la vérité de la religion chrestienne* (1581), entitled *The Woorke concerning the Trewnesse of the Christian Religion* (1587), which was available to Hopkins in the Bodleian Library on Oxford's campus when he was a student (Cotter, "The Inshape of Inscape" 195). The first and most relevant to our discussion occurs in a paragraph in which Parmenides is mentioned specifically. As for the change from inshape to inscape, as Cotter points out, in his philological notes Hopkins observes that "sk and sc are notoriously often exchanged for sh" (*J* 46). He was correct about this etymological transition; according to the *OED*, "shape" in Middle English was in fact "scape" ("Shape"). Only a few months after his initial usage of inscape, Hopkins notes that the "wholeness and general scape of the anatomy" of a statue depicting the "good thief" beside Christ at the Crucifixion were "original and interesting" (*J* 170; 7 July 1868). Scape here can be a synonym to shape. As a landscape is a unified view incorporating the shapes of land or as "cloudscape," in Hopkins' terminology, refers to a scene of clouds that "seem prism-shaped, flat-bottomed and banked up to a ridge: their make is like light tufty snow in coats" (*J* 208), so inscape is an "inner landscape," the shape of the soul (Wimsatt 4).

The first occurrence of the term "inshape" in the volume follows immediately after a description of Parmenides' belief that Love (Eros) is the Prime Mover. Although Parmenides' philosophy is strictly binary in nature, allowing only for Being and Not-being, as will be seen presently, de Mornay insists on a Trinitarian interpretation of Parmenides' theories. He writes that in Plato's work *Parmenides*, *"[Plato] nous y laisse une marque apparante des trois subsistences*" (103). In the following sentence he writes that, according to Alcinous, Plato and

[3] There is debate as to what extent Sidney was involved in the translation (See Cotter 195-6). For the purposes of this study, we will consider both Sidney and Golding to have translated de Mornay's work.

Socrates taught that "*Dieu est un Entendement: qu'en iceluy il y a une Idée*" (de Mornay 103). Sidney and Golding translate *Idée* as "Inshape": "And Alcinous reporteth that Socrates and Plato taught that God is a mynde, and that in the same there is a certaine Inshape" (Sidney-Golding 344). Cotter identifies this shift from *Idée*, which is a Platonic term, to Inshape as reflective of de Mornay's Trinitarian treatise ("The Inshape of Inscape" 198). Also evident of their Christian worldview is their translation of de Mornay's "*trois subsistences*" (103), in regards to the Trinity, to "three Inbéeings or Persones" (Sidney-Golding 284). "Inshape" and "Inbéeings" are only two of such examples. As terms uniquely found in this single work, the *Oxford English Dictionary* has provided lexical entries based solely on the use in Sidney and Golding's volume. The denotative definition for "inbeing" is then "an indwelling being: applied to 'Persons' of the Trinity" ("Inbeing"); and "inshape" is "inward shape; inward form" ("Inshape").

These definitions are lacking. In fact, Sidney and Golding's volume provides a triad of definitions for the term inshape, each corresponding to a Person of the Godhead. In regards to inshape, God the Father, as "mynd,"[4] is the "knowledge God hath of himselfe"; God the Son, God Incarnate, is the matter, "the Patterne or Mould" of the world; and God the Holy Spirit is the soul or "very essence" of inshape (344). Furthermore, in very recently published notes on "Plato's Philosophy" (1866), Hopkins identifies the three elements of Plato's creation myth, which are mind (νοὺν), matter, and soul (quid) (ψυχήν), with the three Persons of the Godhead[5] (Cotter *Inscape* 16). Notably, these three correspond to the three modes of inshape, which, in turn, inform Hopkins' conception of inscape and its companion term, instress.

At this stage in his life Hopkins' worldview, as influenced by the Trinitarian doctrines of both his Anglican upbringing and his newfound Catholic faith, as well as his reading of Greek philosophers, particularly Plato and Aristotle, includes not only what is tangible, "matter," but also what is intangible, "soul." The third, "mind," is a hybrid of the physical brain and the metaphysical intellect. His encounter with Parmenides' philosophy introduces him to a seemingly conflicting worldview of a binary of Being, what exists, and Not-being, that which is inexistent. Even before Trinitarian Christian beliefs had developed with Jesus's

[4] The preceding paragraph of the text states that at the universe's creation the "Mynd of the Father ... did shed forth shapes of all sorts" (343). Again, Sidney and Golding take the liberty to translate "idée" to "shape" as de Mornay's phrase reads: "L'intellect du Père ... espandit des idées de toutes sortes" (102).

[5] Here, mind refers to God, the Father, as in Sidney and Golding's translation. Matter refers to God, the Son, as God Incarnate. And soul refers to the Holy Spirit.

claims to Divinity, Aristotle had contested Parmenides' binaries by introducing a third element, "Becoming." At the time of reading Parmenides' "On Nature," Hopkins was already aware of Aristotle's views as evidenced in his essay discussing his philosophy, which begins by stating "There are three stages in the conception of all Being – the potential, the actual, and the passing from the one to the other: these answer to the Not-being, Being, and Becoming" (1866 or 1867) (Cotter *Inscape* Appendix II 310). Hence, a tension develops between binaries and trinities in his psyche. He resolves this conflict by uniting the two worldviews; when Hopkins jotted down these notes on Parmenides' philosophy, he was welding together a Realist worldview, or as Cotter conceives it, "a mythology" (*Inscape* xviii), from his classical studies, his Catholic faith, and his Anglican upbringing.

Realism makes two claims; the first is that "what is" exists and has properties unique to it, and the second is that this existence and its properties is independent of opinion, belief or language concepts ("Realism"). In his undergraduate essay "The Probable Future of Metaphysics" (1867), Hopkins predicts "new Realism" will "conquer" earlier philosophies of the Scholastics, the Positivists, and Historicists (*J* 119). This new Realism he identifies in Platonic terms; he writes: "[r]ealism will undoubtedly once more maintain that the Idea is only given – whatever may be the actual form education takes – from the whole downwards to the parts" (*J* 120) and that "[t]he new school of metaphysics will probably encounter this atomism of personality with some shape of the Platonic Ideas" (*J* 121). He carries these Platonic ideals of Realism into his notes on Parmenides: he writes that after reading Parmenides's "On Nature" that he came to "understand Plato's reverence for him as the great father of Realism" (*J* 127).

Quoting from Ritter and Preller's Latin translation of Parmenides' poem "On Nature," Aristotle's commentary on Parmenides' philosophy from book one of *Metaphysics* and from Theophrastus's *De Sensibus*, Hopkins outlines Parmenides' arguments of Being and Not-being, which are related to the discussion of distinguishing particulars from universals and to Parmenides' cosmology. Parmenides' logic is fundamentally deductive, asserting that "it is impossible of anything not to be" (II.3-4)[6] and that it is also impossible to "know what is not ... nor utter it" (II.5, 7-8). His philosophy, according to twentieth-century philosopher Karl R. Popper, is "the first deductive theory of the world, the first deductive cosmology: One further

[6] I have chosen to refer to John Burnet's 1892 translation of "On Nature" since it was written soon after Hopkins' death. As Hopkins was not referring to an English translation, but rather Ritter and Preller's Latin translation, Burnet's translation provides an English-language alternative for our study.

step led to theoretical physics, and to the atomic theory" (143). "On Nature" takes three theories: of Being and Not-being, of particulars and universals, and of a spherical limited cosmology. It develops these theories through deductive reasoning to form the basis of one hypothesis, that of the philosopher's radical monism ("Eleaticism"). Monism, as developed by Parmenides and expounded by his followers in the Eleatic school[7] of philosophy, expounds a

> doctrine of the One, according to which all that exists (or is really true) is a static plenum of Being as such, and nothing exists that stands either in contrast or in contradiction to Being. Thus, all differentiation, motion, and change must be illusory. This monism is also reflected in its view that existence, thought, and expression coalesce into one. ("Eleaticism")

Monism, then, lends itself to a pantheistic vision of reality.

"On Nature" is replete with Parmenides' defense of monism. As Hopkins understands Parmenides' argument, he notes that in "On Nature," "Not-being is [conceived as] want of oneness" (*J* 129) and thus Being is oneness. Henceforth, Hopkins' Trinitarian views are merged into a pantheistic monism, in which "Being," "Not-being," and "Becoming" become one united "God," the Three-in-One. Through inscape, the artist seeks to unify God's creation into a coherent whole. It finds Christ in the details of Nature. Cotter claims, based on an analysis of Hopkins' philosophical notes, that "Hopkins's quest for oneness was a spiritual odyssey and adventure" (*Inscape* 3). For instance, in an undergraduate essay for his professor Walter Pater written in 1865 entitled "The Origin of our Moral Ideas," Hopkins remarks that "[a]ll thought is of course in a sense an effort at unity" (*J* 83). Answering his own question "why do we desire unity?," he replies: "the ideal, the one, is our only means of recognising successfully our being to ourselves, it unifies us" (*J* 83). Although paradoxical, this pantheistic monism was therefore attractive to the young Hopkins, who soon converted to Catholicism.

Parmenides' "On Nature": The Ways of Search

Parmenides' philosophy is expounded in the poem "On Nature" as consisting of three parts. In the first, the proem, the philosopher is taken to the goddess' abode. She states that having been chosen of all men to stand before her, there are "two ways of search" that she will disclose to him. The binary aspect of Parmenides' philosophy is thus immediately revealed. The first, the way of conviction, is that "It is" since "it is impossible for anything not to be" (II.3-4); the second, the "untrustworthy" way of mortals, is that "It is not" for one "cannot

[7] A pre-Socratic form of Greek philosophy that flourished in the fifth century BCE?.

know what is not – that is impossible – nor utter it" (II.5, 7-8).[8] While acknowledging that the verb rendered "It is" (ἔστι) may be "expressed by "*things are* or *there is truth*" and that grammatically it is equivalent to "*it is* or *there is*," Hopkins notes that "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*" (*J* 127, italics in original). "Is" is the copula of all argument; it is that which the Realist Parmenides argues acknowledges existence. The affirmation of existence is then a sincere "yes."

Aristotle later adopted Parmenides' logic, whereby influencing Saint Thomas Aquinas through whom Hopkins came to accept it. The argument follows that since the "bridge, the stem of stress" (*J* 127), conceives of God, God must therefore exist; or as the early Christian apologist Thomas Aquinas argues: "this proposition, 'God exists,' of itself is self-evident, for the predicate is the same as the subject" (Ia.2a.1). Even that of which we can conceive yet know does not truly exist, an imaginary creature such as a unicorn for instance, exists in a parallel state similar to the Platonic world of Forms and Ideas.[9] According to this logic, which Hopkins cites from the Greek to close his notes on the proem, "it is not possible for ... what is nothing to be (VI.1-3).

Hopkins continues his exposition of the proem by providing a free translation of Parmenides' argument as to why Not-being cannot exist. He writes, "[t]hou couldst never either know or say what was not, there would be no coming at it" (*J* 127). He follows this by commenting that to him this statement signifies that

> There would be no bridge, no stem of stress. We might not and could not say Blood is red, but only, This blood is red, or, The last blood I saw was red, nor even that, for in later language not only universals would not be true but the copula would break down even in particular judgments. (*J* 127)

Since Being is one, the conception of particulars, Parmenides argues, is based on humans' faulty perceptions. Instress holds together the particulars, which through close observation allows one to see the hidden truth of universal Being. Beyond Hopkins' example of "Blood is red," one can push the example further by considering the universal Being as God, and blood is then just one manifestation of this universal. In fact, this sub-context leads Hopkins to the conclusion that Parmenides' poem, and its inherent monism, reveals Parmenides' "Pantheist idealism" (*J* 127). All that is seen is infused with God and is God. Later in Hopkins' poetic

[8] The accepted translations of "it is" and "it is not" at the time of Hopkins' studies were "Being" and "Not-being" (House 344).
[9] Although Parmenides precedes Plato, Platonic philosophy has informed Parmenides' claims for later readers.

career, he will commence his poem "God's Grandeur" with the affirmation that "[t]he world is charged with the grandeur of God" (*P* 31, line 1). Perhaps we could then conclude that Hopkins thought that every atom, even in its postlapsarian state, is full of God's glory and potentially capable of "flam[ing] out" and "gather[ing] to a greatness" (*P* 31, lines 2-3) that would reveal the truth that "the Holy Ghost over the bent / World broods" (*P* 31, line 13).

Parmenides' "On Nature": The Way of Truth

The second part of the poem "On Nature," which is found in the first fifty lines of fragment eight, expounds the way of conviction (Ἀληθεία, alethia), often translated as "the way of truth" in modern translations. Of Being, Parmenides claims that "what is, is uncreated and indestructible, alone, complete, immovable and without end" (VIII.3-4), which is reminiscent of monotheistic understandings of God.[10] In fact, the Greek theologian Clement of Alexandria (AD c. 150- c. 215) explicitly equates Parmenides' Being with the Christian God by analyzing "On Nature" thusly: "Parmenides the great ... writes of God thus: 'Very much, since unborn and indestructible He is, Whole, only-begotten, and immoveable, and unoriginated'" (V.xiv). Within the Catholic tradition of which Hopkins was a part, St. Thomas Aquinas established, through deductive logic similar to Parmenides', five divine qualities of God that are reminiscent of Parmenides' qualities of Being. Firstly, for him God is simple, meaning that He cannot be divided into parts; secondly, that God is perfect, lacking nothing, both of which echo Parmenides' claim that Being is complete. Thirdly, Aquinas argues that He is infinite and eternal, which evokes Parmenides' view of Being as uncreated and without end. Fourthly, God is immutable and unchanging, as Being is indestructible and immovable. And fifthly, He is One, which relates to Being as alone (Clement of Alexandria Ia.1-11).[11] In the eighth fragment, Parmenides extends this aspect of the characteristics of Being by writing that it is one, it is indivisible (VIII.xx) and a "continuous one" (VIII.v). This final aspect makes inscape into a theory of "oneness." It is to be noted, however, that although inscape strives to

[10] The Qur'an 112.1-4 states that Allah is "One and Only ... Eternal, Absolute. He begets not, nor is He begotten. And there is none like unto Him." The affirmation of Jewish faith is similar. Taken from Deuteronomy 6:4, the Shema declares, "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one." More relevant to our own study, Christianity defines God in terms similar to that of Parmenides's Being. The Nicean Creed (AD 325), the creed most widely accepted by Christendom, begins with the avowal that

> We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things, visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father the only-begotten; that is, of the essence of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father.

[11] In Thomism, the Prime Mover is God Himself (Thomas Ia.44.3).

reveal the Platonic Form, which is the essence of Being, and ultimately reveals God Himself throughout His creation, all five aspects of Being are relevant to a comprehensive understanding of inscape.

Logically, if Being is "uncreated, indestructible, alone, complete, immovable, and without end," then, as Hopkins writes, Being "could not come from Not-being nor can being come from being" (*J* 128). Being is, in Hopkins' words, "unextended, foredrawn" (*J* 128). Citing from the fourth fragment to advance his point, Hopkins uses the imperative "look"[12]: "Look at it [Being], though absent, yet to the mind's eye as fast present here; for absence cannot break off Being from its hold on Being: it is not a thing to scatter here, there, and everywhere through all the world nor to come together from here and there and everywhere" (*J* 128). Although not mentioned, inscape is at work. The "mind's eye" is described as holding "fast" that which is absent just as in his previous paragraph inscape is shown to hold "fast" a thing. The imperative "look" is also related to inscape as it was frequently used by Hopkins as a synonym for inscape since, as Cotter contends, scape is etymologically related to "scope" (σκοπεῖν), which means "to look at" or "to contemplate, examine, inquire or learn" (Cotter *Inscape* 20).

Significantly, the first time Hopkins incites the reader to look in the context of his poetry, it is used as an imperative in *The Wreck of the Deutschland* (1875). He urges the reader to imagine the shipwreck as the casualties experienced it: "look at it loom there, / Thing that she ... there then! The Master / *Ipse*, the only one, Christ, King, Head" (*P* 28 219-221). Through the use of the imperative look, the reader recognises God's influence over the situation though He is invisible. Only the fourth poem written after *The Wreck*, "The Starlight Night" (1877) urges the reader no less than seven times in the sonnet to "look." It begins: "Look at the stars! Look, look up at the skies! // O look at all the fire-folk sitting in the air!" (*P* 8, lines 1-2). Furthermore, his poem reflecting on the beauty of the masculine body, "Harry Ploughman" (1887), implores readers both to "look" at Harry's bending form and also to "see his wind-lilylocks-laced" (*P* 43, line 15). Through inscape, then, what is invisible, Being or God, is made visible to the "mind's eye." Instress, according to Hopkins, is what allows inscape to be noticed. As Philip Ballinger of Gonzaga University, where much of the Hopkins'

[12] Hopkins' translation is in the active voice rather than the passive voice arrived at in the translations of others. For instance, translations from the twenty-first century use the weaker "behold" (Palmer 365), "see" (Geldard 24, Thanassas 93), or "gaze upon" (Adluri 137). Ritter and Preller's Latin translation (1857), from which Hopkins was referring, does not provide a translation of these lines and neither does Burnet's 1892 English translation.

archives are held, explains, "[i]nscape is the objective reality that exists independent of the beholder," as is purported by realism, "while instress is partly the response of the beholder and partly the force of being which links the object and the beholder" (122). Thus, we now turn to Hopkins' use of instress in notes on "On Nature."

Instress: Upholding All Things

Recognising the dialectic nature of Parmenides' argument, Hopkins deduces his premise to "Being is" and "Not-being is not" (*J* 127) on which he comments that "perhaps ... a little over-defining [Parmenides'] meaning, means that all things are upheld by instress and are meaningless without it" (*J* 127). Instress, according to this passage, serves a two-fold purpose. It functions first to uphold all things, and second to attribute meaning to them. We will examine these two functions.

First, that of upholding all things. According to Hopkins, instress' ability to uphold all things is due to the exercise of the foredrawn and the flush. Hopkins groups the terms "flush" and "foredrawn" with instress when stating that Parmenides' "feeling for instress, for the flush and foredrawn, and for inscape, is most striking" (*J* 127). The three terms are separated from the term "inscape" as complementary concepts. He first examines the work of the foredrawn. He cites from the eighth fragment to further his exposition of Parmenides' poem. Burnet's 1892 translation of this fragment reads: "Nor is it [Being] divisible, since it is all alike, and there is no more of it in one place than in another, to hinder it from holding together, nor less of it, but everything is full of what is" (VIII.xx). Notably, Hopkins identifies the verbal phrase "holding together" (σὺνἔχεσθαι) as "foredrawing" (*J* 128). The following line, again from the 1892 translation states: "nor less of it [Being], but everything is full of what is. Wherefore all holds together; for what is; is in contact with what is" (VIII.xv). Immediately below, Hopkins writes: "for Being draws-home to Being" (*J* 128). "Draws-home" would then be a descriptive turn of phrase for "holds together what is." Atomic theory purports that nuclear force binds the subatomic particles together, but many Christians refer to Colossians 1:17 to claim that Christ holds atoms together.[13] The same word, σὺνἔχεσθαι, used here in Parmenides' text is also used

[13] Consider the exegesis of this verse by the Institute for Creation Research, an Evangelical Christian organisation:

> The Greek word translated 'consist' is *sunistano*, from which we get 'sustain.' The things created by Christ are now being sustained, or conserved, or held together, by Him. He is 'upholding all things by the word of His power' (Hebrews 1:3). 'In Him we live, and move, and have our being' (Acts 17:28). The most basic of all scientific principles is implied in these two

in the Greek original of this verse to state that "in him [Christ] all things hold together" (*NIV*). Therefore, within Hopkins' Christological mythology, Christ holds atoms together through instress, thereby upholding "all things" (*J* 127). At this period of his life recently following his conversion, inscape reveals Christ's upholding ministry. Taking on a second application beyond Platonic Forms, the ideal Form was to be found in God's prelapsarian creation. Inscape allows access to identifying the aspects of the prelapsarian in a sin-tainted postlapsarian element. This access to the Form and also to the paradisiacal Ideal is possible through close observation, which Hopkins terms the "foredrawing act" (*J* 129).

Instress: Attributing Meaning

Now, to examine the second function of instress as proposed by Hopkins in his opening paragraph of this essay, that of attributing meaning to "all things" (*J* 127). The "foredrawing act," identified by Hopkins as *voεīv* ("thought"), allows one to instill presence into absence (*J* 129); this act is memory activating "the mind's eye" (*J* 128) or "the mind's grasp" (*J* 129). Parmenides urges his followers to "[*L*]ook at it" (*J* 128), "it" being that which is absent yet present through the foredrawing act (*J* 128). This foredrawing act and Being are closely interlinked since, as Hopkins conjectures "[t]o be and to know or Being and thought are the same" (*J* 129). Close observation is an integral part of foredrawing instress, for "Not-being is ... want of oneness, all that is unforedrawn, waste space which offers ... nothing to the eye to foredraw" (*J* 129). Therefore, the wholeness of nature can only be found through observation. The *OED* includes this aspect of observation in its definition of inscape; it states the inscape is "Hopkins' word for the individual or essential quality of a thing; the uniqueness of an *observed* object, scene, event, etc." ("Inscape," italics mine). The majority of Hopkins' references to inscape in his journals also indicate that it is observed, or, in Hopkins' parlance, "caught." His journal entry from 24 February 1873 illustrates the role of observation in inscape: "All the world is full of inscape ... looking out of my window I *caught* it in the random clods and broken heaps of snow made by the cast of a broom" (*J* 230, italics mine). One is left to understand then that inscape is at work in Hopkins' most known poem "The Windhover," in

---

verses (Colossians 1:16-17), that is, the principle of conservation of mass/energy, or 'all things ... The reason nothing is now being created is because Christ created all things in the past. The reason why nothing is now being annihilated is because all things are now being sustained by Him. If it were not so, the "binding energy" of the atom, which holds its structure together, would collapse, and the whole universe would disintegrate into chaos. ("Consist")

which he begins the sonnet with the statement: "I *caught* this morning morning's minion" (*P* 36, italics mine). The eye captures and then the heart reflects; inscape leads to instress.

The Development of Inscape: Ruskin's and Scotus's Influence

As many of his generation, Hopkins was influenced by Ruskinian artistic theory (Sulloway 66), what Hopkins referred to as the "Ruskinese point of view" (*Liii* 202; 10 July 1863), whereby realistic sketches could reach the essence of the thing through deep concentration (Heuser 14-15). Hopkins' aesthetic theory was so greatly influenced by Ruskin that Ballinger claims that in Hopkins' undergraduate essays *On the Signs of Health and Decay in the Arts* (1863) and "On the Origin of Beauty" (1864), "it seems as if he is quoting Ruskin unconsciously, so imbued is he with the thought of the Victorian aesthete" (117). Alison G. Sulloway, who devotes an entire chapter to Ruskin's influence on Hopkins in her work *Gerard Manley Hopkins and the Victorian Temper*, claims that Hopkins was "saturated with Ruskin's works" (65). George Eliot wrote that Ruskin taught his contemporaries "a truth of infinite value," that of "realism – the doctrine that all truth and beauty are to be attained by a humble and faithful study of nature" (626). What is this essence or truth that was to be found? Unlike Paremenides who advocates one Being, of which distinctions are due to erroneous perceptions, Ruskin believes that the "word of truth" about nature is that it is "one infinite variety" (III.135). He writes: "[t]here is no bush on the face of the globe exactly like another bush; – there are no two trees in the forest whose boughs bend in the same network, nor two leaves on the same tree which could not be told one from the other, nor two waves in the sea exactly alike" (III.145-46).

Less than a year after first mentioning Ruskin in his journals, Hopkins notes his affinity for Duns Scotus, whose writings both informed and reinforced his conception of inscape. Hopkins writes that while reading Scotus's *Sentences* as an undergraduate in the summer of 1872 he became "flush with a new stroke of enthusiasm" (*J* 221; 3 Aug. 1872). He conjectures that perhaps his encounter with Scotus will "come to nothing or it may be a mercy from God" (*J* 221), yet has already noted a change in his own observations of inscape since he notices that "just then when I took in any inscape of the sky or sea I thought of Scotus" (*J* 221). Furthermore, Scotus's theories coincide well with those of Parmenides as both men espouse realism and monism. Accordingly, two weeks after being first introduced to Scotus, Hopkins writes down his account of watching and hearing "[b]ig waves" crash against the shore of the

Isle of Man. He notes that "[i]n watching the sea one should be alive to the oneness which all its motion and tumult receives from its perpetual balance and falling this way and that to its level" (*J* 225; 16 Aug 1872, italics mine). Ultimately, his appreciation of Scotus's thought is evident in his 1879 poem "Duns Scotus's Oxford," in which he praises Scotus as he "who of all men most sways my spirit to peace" (*P* 11, line 11). While Ruskin applies his theories directly to visual arts, Scotus applies his metaphysical concept of *haecceitas*,[14] or this-ness, to poetry. Scotus claims that "[o]ne of the conditions of essential poetry is that universal and singular be interlinked, so that the unique can be represented in the general and the general manifested in the unique" (Mackey 179). This Scotist influence on inscape is clear in a November 1886 letter to Coventry Patmore, in which Hopkins criticises the Irish poet Samuel Ferguson's poems because "the essential and only lasting thing [is] left out—what I call *inscape*, that is species or individually-distinctive beauty of style" (*Liii* 373; 7 Nov. 1886, italics in original).

Hopkins espouses this same "Ruskinese"/Scotist point of view in his poem "As Kingfishers Catch Fire," another of the 1877 sonnets. He reminds his readers that "each mortal thing" – whether mineral ("stone"), plant, animal ("kingfisher" and "dragonfly"), human invention (a stringed instrument and a "bell") or human ("the just man") – reveals through vocalisation, sounds, and actions its essential nature that "each one dwells" (*P* 6), since "[e]ach mortal thing ... Selves – goes itself; *myself* it speaks and spells" (*P* 6, lines 5, 7, italics in original). Yet, the tension between the observable individual identifiers, as suggested by both Ruskin and Scotus, and the Parmenidean claim that all markers of unique selfhood are illusory is also present. The poem claims that all perceptions of distinctions between genera or individuals within a genus are, in fact, faulty since each "does one thing and the same" (*P* 6 line 5), "for Christ plays in ten thousand places" (*P* 6, line 12). To Hopkins, Christ, then, is a manifestation of the pantheistic Being. Through careful observation the distinctions fall away, revealing the oneness of all things and, ultimately, revealing Christ. This truth could thus be revealed to any observer, even the "simple people" of his lament, "if they [only] had eyes to see it" (*J* 221; 19 July 1872), and, in this case, ears to hear it. Inscape, the unveiling of the divine in all things, is thus accessible to all.

[14] According to *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, haecceity or "individual essence is a property such that exactly one individual thing can have it" (Honderich 357).

Ruskin's Aesthtic Theories: Applied to Attaining Inscape

Hopkins relies on Ruskins' aesthetic advice to amateur visual artists in order to develop a theory as to how even the "simple," or uneducated, may attain inscape through observation. In the first volume of *Modern Painters* (1843), Ruskin advocates the incorporation, and not the separation, of three skills: that of observation and calculation, that of moral and emotional reflection, and the technical skills necessary to reproduce the scene on canvas. He taught that "[a]ll three talents are essential for the artist who is searching for the hint of God's soul upon the flesh of things" (Sulloway 70). To marry these talents, the artist is first advised to observe what is before him or her both quietly and accurately with the "*innocence of the eye*" (Ruskin XV.27n, italics in original). Hopkins is certainly referring to this theory of artistic expression when he writes in an undergraduate essay that "when the innocent eye of the uneducated or of children is spoken of in art it is understood to be correct, that is that they are free from fallacies implying some education" (*J* 80; 1865). Secondly, the artist is to respond to what the eye sees. In this stage, Hopkins would become aware of his "fury," "passion," "admiration," or "enthusiasm"[15] for "Nature's self"[16] (Sulloway 71). The instress latent in nature would burst forth hence, through Ruskian observation. Hopkins notes that "[w]hat you look hard at seems to look hard at you, hence the true and false instress of nature" (*J* 204; March 1871).

Lastly, the artist is to accurately reproduce the scene while taking into account this emotional response. Hopkins' own journals reveal Ruskin's influence, as the drawings and descriptions are imbued with his emotional responses. One such example is, in fact, that which Hopkins gives for the above axiom. Hopkins continues:

> One day early in March when long streamers were rising from over Kemble End, one large flake loop-shaped, not a streamer but belonging to the string, moving too slowly to be seen, seemed to cap and fill the zenith with a white shire of cloud. I looked long up at it till the tall height and the beauty of the scaping – regularly curled knots springing if I remember from fine stems, like foliation in wood or stone – had strongly grown on me. It changed beautiful changes, growing more into ribs and one stretch of running into branching like coral. (*J* 204-5; March 1871)

[15] These terms "fury," "passion," "admiration," and "enthusiasm" are taken from Hopkins' letter to his correspondent Baillie in which he writes "I think I have told you that I have particular periods of admiration for particular things in Nature; for a certain time I am astonished at the beauty of a tree, shape, effect etc, then when the passion so to speak has subsided, it is consigned to my treasure of explored beauty and acknowledged admiration and interest ever after, while something new takes its place in my enthusiasm. The present fury is the ash..." (*Lii*, 202; 10 July 1863).

[16] This reference is taken from the same letter to Baillie (*Lii*, 201; 10 July 1863).

He concludes this example with the claim that, "[u]nless you refresh the mind from time to time you cannot remember or believe how deep the inscape in things is" (*J* 205). Note that Hopkins refers to both inscape and instress while engaging in Ruskian observation and description. "Refreshing the mind" hearkens back to renewing the innocence of the eye. Ruskin suggests that this can be done by seeking solitude. Hopkins finds this to be true as well. He remarks in an intriguing journal entry less than a year later that after seeing snow on grass he "saw the inscape though freshly, as if my eye were still growing" (*J* 228; 12 December 1872). He conjectures that the reason is that he was alone, since with "a companion the eye and ear for the most part shut and instress cannot come" (*J* 228).

Through Ruskian influence, inscape and instress have retained their genetic links with "inshape" in that they both exist in the three modes of inshape: the mind which relates the God the Father, the matter of the physical world which corresponds to God the Son, and the soul, fittingly God the Holy Spirit. First, inscape, in its mode "Mind" distinguishes true emotional response from pathetic fallacy, a tenet of Ruskian theory of observation. In fact, Ruskin coined the term "pathetic fallacy" to distinguish between verifiable responses to the sublime with unverifiable projections of emotion unto a scene. To scientifically verify if the strong emotions evoked by a natural element are due to instress, Hopkins advocates revisiting the same scene at a later date, a notion he deduces from Ruskin's anecdote: "It is so true what Ruskin says talking of the carriage in Turner's Pass of Faido that what he could not forget was that 'he had come by the road'" (*J* 215, 14 Sept 1871). Thus, if the emotional response is similar, it can be trusted. If the response is weakened, it can be assumed that it was due to pathetic fallacy, which "imposed outwards from the mind, as for instance by melancholy or strong feelings" (*J* 215, 14 Sept 1871). Hopkins then advocates a process of mental checks to avoid misappropriating pathetic fallacy as a reaction to the sublime. He writes: "we identify or, better, test and refuse to identify with our various suggestions" (*J* 215, 14 Sept 1871). It is thus through mental reflection, and scientific empiricism, that one thus determines "the true [from the] false instress of nature" (*J* 204, March 1871).

In its second mode, inscape is brought forth through pattern, in the same way that inshape, when pertaining to the "world," is its "Patterne or Mould" (Sidney Golding 344). As corresponding to Christ, God Incarnate, pattern relates to the physical body and its senses. Hopkins acknowledges this connection in the collected *Sermons and Devotional Writings* in

which he states that inscape is revealed in "any bodily action ... as of sight, sound, taste, smell" (*S.D.W.* 136; 3 Sept 1883). The body of art is its pattern or mold. As Hopkins later explained to his poet friend Robert Bridges: "But as air, melody, is what strikes me most of all in music and design in painting, so design, pattern or what I am in the habit of calling 'inscape' is what I above all aim at in poetry" (*Li* 66; 15 Feb. 1879). This idea of inscape as pattern informs his further exploration of poetry in his manifesto. He writes that "[p]oetry is in fact speech only employed to carry the inscape of speech for the inscape's sake" (*J* 289). So, according to this definition of inscape, poetry is speech that carries forth the true, inner, identifying characteristics of speech for the sole sake of expressing this unique patterning of speech, thereby releasing instress to arrive at inscape.

Lastly, in its third mode, inscape pertains to inshape itself, in its "very essence" (Sidney Golding 344). As related to both the Holy Spirit and the soul, "essence" solidifies a Trinitarian view of Godhood, as well as selfhood. As a counterbalance to the Classicism of the intellect, the soul represents the Romanticism of emotional expression, while the body balances both through the hedonism of the senses. Hopkins combines these three elements of selfhood in a passage from his retreat notes entitled "A Meditation on Hell," which depicts Satan's rebellion as a representation of human death, whereby instress loses all tension. To paraphrase, he writes that after death the results of human actions leave traces of instress in the mind. Also, in the case of the fires of hell, the pain induced would be that of the body's sensations at a peak state of stress. As the mind and body no longer exist after death, the soul is uniquely subjected to the instress of pain to suffer for sins committed by all three elements in life (*S.D.W.* 136; 3 Sept 1883). Therefore, the trinity of selfhood is reduced to a monistic essence.

Inscape reveals the inshape, the Incarnation of God in His creation. The works produced by human minds and hands are thus one remove from divine creation. Therefore, all human artistic endeavours may reveal a fraction of God's glory, even if obscured. The artist must however concentrate on discovering and conveying the aspects of the Incarnation that are left untainted by the Fall. To do so takes concentration, meditation, and artistic talent, the three tenets of Ruskin's aesthetic theory. Developing a cosmology based on Parmenides's philosophy and his Christian beliefs led Hopkins to write spectacular poetry by allowing him to form a unifying poetic theory. As Dixon writes to Hopkins much later in his life, and without knowing that Hopkins had developed his own cosmology, that the greatest poets,

being in his opinion Milton and Lucretius, were great because they have "given a cosmogony in poetry" (*Lii* 18; 10 Jan. 1879). This unifying cosmogony allowed Hopkins to experiment with intertwining sounds and metres that merge into one unifying whole to reveal both the individual particularities of the poem's subject and the poem itself within an over-arching, identifiable type. A genetic treatment of "God's Grandeur" and "The Windhover" not only confirms Hopkins' preoccupations with attaining the fullness of Being, but also reveals inscape and instress to the reader.

God's Grandeur

The world is charged with the grandeur of God.
It will flame out, like shining from shook foil;
It gathers to a greatness, like the ooze of oil
Crushed. Why do men then now not reck his rod?
Generations have trod, have trod, have trod;
And all is seared with trade; bleared, smeared with toil;
And wears man's smudge and shares man's smell: the soil
Is bare now, nor can foot feel, being shod.

And for all this, nature is never spent;
There lives the dearest freshness deep down things;
And though the last lights off the black West went
Oh, morning, at the brown brink eastward, springs —
Because the Holy Ghost over the bent
World broods with warm breast and with ah! Bright wings.

Chapter Two:

Inscape as Theme of "God's Grandeur": Revealed through Genetic Criticism

There are five extant manuscripts of "God's Grandeur," providing the genetic critic rich veins to mine; as MacKenzie makes the analogy, the manuscripts "are like geological sites" (*Later* 6). The earliest manuscript is an autograph faircopy; thus, the first version or versions have been lost. Moreover, even if we had access to these jottings, it would be unlikely that these remnants would represent the earliest imaginings of the poem because, as influenced by Ruskin, Hopkins often composed his poems while alone in the natural world. When he succeeded in gaining access to inscape through intense concentration, his artistic reaction would be to respond by mentally composing a poem. He would then memorize the poem and later write it down when he returned to his rooms. Therefore, the earliest written version may be quite modified from the initial mental conception. His manner of composition is reminiscent of Wordsworth's "emotion recollected in tranquility" (Greenblatt 1506).

A description of each manuscript is fitting at this juncture. The first manuscript is dated 23 February 1877. Most likely this is also the date of its first conception, or at least the day that it attained its mature form, because Hopkins writes this date on the bottom of MS3. This first manuscript, then, dates between 23 February and 3 March, 1877, which is the date written on MS2, the copy that Hopkins sent to his mother for her birthday along with "The Starlight Night." The third manuscript is a faircopy Hopkins sent to Bridges before 4 January 1883.[17] Hopkins then sent Bridges a second modified faircopy (MS4); this is the first to carry the title "God's Grandeur" (MS4, Plate 287, 95), as the other manuscripts were title-less or simply entitled "Sonnet." Besides providing a title, the only significant change between the two faircopies is on line five. It is modified from "Generations have hard trod, have hard trod" (MS3, Plate 286, 94) to "Generations have trod, have trod, have trod" (MS4, Plate 287, 95). The last extant manuscript, MS5, is that of Bridges' copy of the poem based on MS4, which Hopkins revised in 1884. These five manuscripts provide outstanding evidence of Hopkins' preoccupation with his theories of inscape and instress.

[17] This is the date that Hopkins writes a letter to Bridges answering his questions about the uncommon diction of the poem.

A Unifying Metre: Counterpointing

While on earlier manuscripts Hopkins provides some metrical cues, on MS4 Hopkins indicates clearly that the sonnet is written in "standard rhythm," thus iambic pentameter, "counterpointed" (MS4, Plate 287, 95). "Counterpointed" is the term that Hopkins borrowed from musical notation to indicate that a second rhythm is superimposed upon the first. In the Preface to the 1918 edition of *Poems*, Bridges explains counterpoint rhythm as

> the superinducing or *mounting* of a new rhythm upon the old; and since the new or mounted rhythm is actually heard and at the same time the mind naturally supplies the natural or standard foregoing rhythm, for we do not forget what the rhythm is that by rights we should be hearing, two rhythms are in some manner running at once and we have something answerable to counterpoint in music, which is two or more strains of tune going on together, and this is Counterpoint Rhythm. (7, italics in original)

In "God's Grandeur," Hopkins borrowed the musical symbol *gruppetto* (∾) to indicate a counterpoint. According to MSS 1, 4 and 5, even the first line has inversions as indicated by *gruppettos*. Since he counterpointed the very first line of the poem, it seems that Hopkins expected his readers' minds to automatically supply the "standard rhythm" of the traditional sonnet form, that of iambic measure. Therefore, the "old rhythm" does not have to be established in the first line. In these manuscripts (MSS 1, 4 and 5), the first line has two inversions of the iambic measure in the third and the fourth feet, making them trochees. On MSS 1 and 4, the *gruppetto* is written over the syllables "with" and the "grand" indicating that they are to take the stress (MS4, Plate 287, 95); however, on MS5 the symbol encompasses both beats of these feet, more clearly showing that the counterpoint is an inversion of the foot, not simply an accent of the first syllable (MS5, Plate 287a, 96). The line is thus to be scanned as "The **world** / is **charged** / **with** the / **grand**eur / of **God**." Other counterpoints include two *gruppettos* over "**Gen**er**a**tions" (MSS 1, 4 and 5, line 5), one over "**And**, for" (uniquely on MS4, line 9), "**na**ture" (MSS 1 and 4, line 9), and "**o**ver" (MSS 1 and 4, line 13). These feet are thus to be scanned as trochees rather than the iambic feet of the rest of the poem.

Only the counterpoint signs of lines 1 and 5 are repeated on MS5, Bridges' faircopy that Hopkins notated and corrected to his guise in 1884, seven years after first composing the poem. However, these signals indicating that the feet are trochees seem redundant based on the stresses natural to speech patterns in all cases except "with the" (line 1) and "And, for" (line 9). Yet, of these two instances, only the neglect of placing a counterpoint over "And" (line 9)

on MS5 effects the poem substantially. An insistence on the accent falling on "And" at the beginning of the volta denotes the *continuation* of the "dearest freshness" (line 10) of nature within the ostensibly incompatible context of a world "seared with trade," "bleared, smeared with toil," wearing "man's smudge" and sharing "man's smell" (lines 6-8). The speaker declares that, "**And**, for all this . . . nature is never spent" (line 9). He provides the reason at the end of the phrase: "Because the Holy Ghost over the bent // World broods with warm breast and with ah! Bright wings" (lines 13-14). The comma after "And"[18] further accentuates its importance as it invokes a pause. Although Hopkins had included a comma after "And" on all of the manuscripts, he neglected to reinsert it in Bridges' copy (MS5). Editors W.H. Gardner and N.H. MacKenzie rightfully restore this oversight in the fourth edition (1967) of the *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (*OET*).

The Inshape of God Revealed after the Fall

The sonnet's argument, as put forth in the volta, then, is that the glory of God can be observed even in sin-stained nature. In fact, the speaker claims that "the dearest freshness" (line 10) of the "grandeur of God" (line 1), which is observable to those sensitive to inscape, lives "deep down" (line 10) under the surface of the natural world. In its very first formulation, Hopkins wrote "Yet for all this" before immediately crossing it out and replacing it with "And," (MS1, Plate 284, 92). "Yet" is a signal word typical of a volta, but Hopkins seems to determine that it undermines the declaration of the first line that the "world *is* charged with grandeur of God" (italics mine), not that it only *will be* when the morning springs eastward (line 12). The stressed "And," then, insists upon the fact that God's presence, or inscape, is detectible even now through instress.

This argument has been developed through biblical exegesis based in part on Paul's letter to the Romans, which states that since the Fall of Adam and Eve "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together ... waiting for ... redemption" (*KJV*, Rom. 8.22-23). And yet, according to Romans 1:20, Paul is clear that the natural world continues to reveal the existence of God since in nature: "the invisible things of him ... are clearly seen ... even his eternal power and Godhead" (*KJV*). This is the same contention that inscape claims: that God can be accessed through close observation of "his handiwork" (*KJV*, Ps. 19.1).

[18] The first edition, that which was published by Bridges in 1918, does not include it.

It is this paradigm that I will now discuss through genetic analysis: that inscape is available even after the banishment from the Garden of Eden. The development of the fifth line of "God's Grandeur" emphasises the consequences of the Fall on humankind through alliteration. The first extant version reads: "Generations have passed and have hard trod," which was cursorily edited to "Generations have trod, have hard trod" to be revised on the same sheet of paper to "Generations have trod, have trod, have trod" (MS1, Plate 284, 92). The next manuscript reads "Generations have hard trod, have hard trod" (MS2, Plate 285, 93). These are the four versions that Hopkins considered before deciding conclusively on "Generations have trod, have trod, have trod" (MS1, MS4, MS5), as evidenced by both the fact that he sent Bridges a second faircopy with this line as the only major modification and by his acceptance of this configuration on Bridges' faircopy (MS5, Plate 287a, 96). The first version can be dismissed as quickly as Hopkins himself dismissed it since "passed" does not contribute to the poem's alliteration or imagery. Thus, we must consider why, or if, the finalised version "have trod, have trod, have trod" better demonstrates the themes of the poem, and thus informs a complete understanding of inscape, than "have trod, have hard trod" (MS1 v.2) or "have hard trod, have hard trod" (MS2).

To establish the theme as developed in this line, it may be interpreted as the generations since Adam have each trod the soil and generations of men will continue to do so until the time when the "grandeur of God ... will flame out" (1-2). The inclusion of the word "hard" reinforces both the theme and the auxiliary "have" through alliteration. Paradoxically, this may be in fact one reason why it was eliminated. First of all, an auxiliary need not be emphasized through alliteration as it has no sense on its own. Secondly, the theme is emphasized more completely with the repetition of the clause "have trod" three times, which symbolically suggests infinity, than by two clauses. Scansion would not allow for a third clause in the lines as formulated in either MS1 v.2 or MS2, whereas the iambic foot created by "have **trod** / have **trod** / have **trod**" reinforces the physical foot repeatedly hitting the ground as it trods, an effect that is lost in the other versions. Thus, the thrice repeated iambic foot reifies the theme of humankind's callousness to inscape since the moment of expulsion from the Garden of Eden.

Significantly, through insistent repetition "trod" takes on the signification of "trudge," a term that means "to walk laboriously, wearily, or without spirit, but steadily and persistently" ("Trudge"). This adds to the denotation of the more neutral "trod," the past participle of "tread," which means "to step upon; to pace or walk on" ("Tread"). The inclusion of "smudge"

in line seven chimes this unconscious relationship. Hence, by treading through life unconscious of God's grandeur, humans are walking wearily and without spirit on the earth, thereby leaving their smudge of sin upon it. Thus, of the three alternatives, the published version of this line is thus the most representative of the theme as reinforced through rhythm and repetition.

Instress Revealing Inscape

Although the fifth line suggests that humankind has consistently ignored God's glory in His creation, the sonnet makes it clear that, for those who are alert to God's creative spirit imbuing the earth, inscape shines forth. In this sonnet, inscape bursts for the close observer through instress. The coiling tension of instress is demonstrated through the tightening of the initial alliteration of the first three lines. The "grandeur of God" (1) "gathers to a greatness" (3) at the orgasmic "Crushed" (4). The / g / alliteration of the first line emphasises "grandeur" and "God," which reinforces the themes of the poem: God's greatness revealed in creation.[19] The second line includes the chiasmic alliteration of the sounds f / ʃ / f / ʃ / f in "flame," "shining," "from," "shook," and "foil." Other versions play with "flash"[20] for "flame" which would have accentuated both alliterated sounds; however, this hyper-accumulation of sounds would have increased the stress too quickly. Rather, the tension grows slowly from one line to the next, ending in the ejaculatory enjambed "Crushed" (4). Hopkins also considers "lightning" to replace "shining" in this line, but this would have led to "like" and "lightning" forming the central chiasmic element, which would have led to the insignificant emphasis of "like," and left "shook" without repetitive emphasis. The third line tightens the proximity of the alliterated sounds through use of the parallelism of g / g // u / ɔ, separated by a caesura. Hence, the thematically significant / g / alliteration of the first line is also reiterated. The instress of the growing tension of God's grandeur gathering to a greatness that will eventually reveal itself by flaming out like the scent of crushed oil is therefore exemplified through the accumulated alliteration.

[19] This line also features the rather insignificant alliteration of "world" and "with," which is then repeated in the "will" of the second line. This alliteration seems to fulfil no other function than of unifying the two lines.
[20] Another alternative, on MS2, was "break" for "flame." Yet "break" was summarily crossed out and replaced with "flame." As MS2 was sent to his mother on 3 March 1877, it is likely that it was written from memory of his first version of 23 February. Accordingly, the fire and light imagery of the quatrain would be greatly weakened by "break." Furthermore, as for sound, "break" only shares assonance with "greatness," which "flame" also shares.

Inscape: Divine Presence to be Revered

The speaker of the poem is astonished that even though God's greatness and power are infused throughout the natural world, humans have lost their fear and reverence of their Creator and Judge. He asks himself: "Why do men then now not reck his rod?" (4). The rhetorical question deserves attention. In MS2, the autograph faircopy sent to his mother, Hopkins writes "fear" rather than "reck" (MS2, Plate 285, 93). As with the other variations of this manuscript, it is unique to it, which suggests that Hopkins wrote it from memory. "Fear" would seem appropriate as it is the biblical term used throughout the Old Testament to admonish the Israelites to obey God's commands such as in the passage in which Moses expresses his hope for his followers: "That thou mightest fear the Lord thy God, to keep all his statutes and his commandments, which I command thee, thou, and thy son, and thy son's son, all the days of thy life; and that thy days may be prolonged" (*KJV*, Deut. 6:2). Yet "fear" has several connotations, of which "to regard with reverence and awe" ("Fear") is far from the primary sense. However, "reck" has a much stronger implication of punishment than "fear" since "[f]rom its earliest appearance in English, the verb is almost exclusively employed in negative or interrogative clauses" ("Reck"). Its second most common denotation is "[t]o take notice of or be concerned about something, so as to be alarmed or troubled by it, or so as to modify one's behaviour or purposes on account of it" ("Reck"). As for the alliteration, whereas "fear" echoes the "f"-sound scheme of two lines previous ("flame," "from," and "foil" of line 2), the initial alliteration of the stressed "reck" and "rod" is much more significant as they occur in adjoining feet of the same line.

What must one reck according to the speaker? God's rod. Within Christianity, "rod" conjures up the image of a father chastising his son, for in Proverbs the parent is encouraged to punish his child because "[h]e that spareth his rod hateth his son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes" (*KJV*, Prov. 13:24). The logic follows that since God is a loving Father, he also does not "spare his rod"; thus, His children should "reck" his rod in obedience to His precepts. This rod reminds one of Zeus's weapon of choice, the thunderbolt; the Christian God's rod as well his "grandeur" "will … flame out like shining from shook foil" (1-2). In fact, on MS4 Hopkins explicitly likens this flame to "lightning,"[21] which emanates from

[21] Bridges was unsure of Hopkins' preference for "shining" or "lightning" after consulting the versions to which he had access. Bridges therefore placed an asterisk beside "shining" with a footnote at the bottom of the faircopy

shook foil (MS4, Plate 287, 95). Furthermore, when Bridges asked Hopkins about the ambiguous use of "foil" in this poem, Hopkins wrote back the reasons for which the term must be retained, an answer that supports its resemblance to "lightning": "I mean foil in its sense of leaf or tinsel … Shaken goldfoil gives off broad glares like sheet lightning and also, … owing to its zigzag dints[,] … a sort of fork lightning" (*Li* 69; 4 Jan. 1883), both reminiscent of Zeus' punishing rod. Finally, foil that is shaken does not only reflect light, it also makes a thunderous noise, whereby it has long been used in theatre productions to mimic thunder. "Shook foil" then refers to thunder and lightning, Zeus' weapons. The Christian God's rod, in Hopkins' estimation, is similar to that of the predominant Greek god's.

As the rods of these pagan gods are to be "recked" out of fear of the punishment of lightning, thunder, and earthquakes, Hopkins claims that the Christian God holds a rod that not only effects these physical phenomena, but also reaches down to the "deep down things" of the metaphysical conditions of man. This "battle of the gods" is a tradition within Judeo-Christianity. For instance, each of the six days of the creation as recounted in Genesis[22] are commonly interpreted as corresponding to the claims of Egyptian creation mythology, whereby the Hebrew God is revealed to be superior to the Egyptian gods. Likewise, each of the Ten Plagues sent by the Hebrew God to secure the release of the Hebrews from Egyptian slavery supplants an Egyptian god.[23] Later, when Israel was ruled by a king who encouraged idol worship, the Bible records that the prophet Elijah challenged the prophets of Baal to a duel to determine which god answered prayer.[24] Yahweh is the only to respond. Hopkins, imbued with the classical mythologies he studied at Oxford, establishes that the Christian God is more powerful than the gods of Greek mythology. Humans are to reck His rod because God fills the world with the electrical charge of His glory which can flame out to punish the wicked.

---

that reads "or lightning" (MS5, Plate 287a, 96). Hopkins crossed out this alternative and even the asterisk to leave out all doubt for his preference for "shining."

[22]Recounted in Genesis chapters 1-2. See A.H. Sayce, "The Egyptian Background of Genesis I." *Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith*. London, 1932; A.S. Yahuda *The Accuracy of the Bible*. London: W. Heinemann, 1934; Gordon, Cyrus H. "Khnum and El." *Scripta Hierosolymitana: Egyptological Studies*, ed. Sarah Israelit-Groll. vol. 28. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1982; and James K. Hoffmeier, "Some Thoughts on Genesis 1 & 2 and Egyptian Cosmology." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* vol. 15, 1983.

[23] Recounted in Exodus chapters 7-11. The order of the plagues also echo the chronology of the Creation myth: first plagues from water, then land, then effecting the light, then from the sky, then causing darkness. See Norman Fredman, "The Ten Plagues." *Tradition*. Vol. 20 No. 4 (Winter 1982), New York City: The Rabbinical Council of America.

[24] See I Kings chapter 18.

Instress: the Fullness of the Holy Spirit's Presence

Now that we have explored the rhetorical question, let us now consider the answer. The speaker claims that humankind has forgotten the Creator God over the centuries that generations have trod this world and the remnants of God's presence in nature "wears" the "smudge" and "smell" of man. Humans' soles (and by extension, their "souls") cannot feel God since they are "shod." Indeed, hearts have become insensitive to God's presence in nature due to the consequences of the Fall, which include preoccupations with survival ("toiling the soil") and the accumulation of goods ("trade"). And, yet, the speaker declares at the volta "for all this, nature is never spent" (9), because, as the sestet continues the argument, "deep down things" (10) contain the "dearest freshness" (10). The Holy Spirit is present even though "the last lights off the black West went" (11), for He "broods" (14) over the "bent world" (13-14) as the morning springs "eastward" (12). The Holy Spirit endows creation with God's Being, enacting inscape through instress.

These lines allude to the Holy Spirit's presence at the creation of the universe in the Genesis account, which states: In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And *the* Spirit *of* God moved upon the face of the waters" (KJV, Gen. 1:1-2, italics mine). The Hebrew word translated here as "moved" (מְרַחֶפֶת) is "literally, brooding" ("Genesis 1" 4). The Spirit's role, then? That of "brooding," as in Hopkins' last line, which is a term that was never modified throughout the versions of the manuscript. The Message Bible translates the verse as "God's Spirit *brooded like a bird* above the watery abyss" (*MSG*, Gen. 1:2, italics mine). In one of the two other instances in which the Hebrew term is used in the Old Testament, it compares God's "brooding" over the Hebrews during their forty-year exodus to an eagle who "*fluttereth* over her young" (*KJV*, Deut. 32:11, italics mine). In *John Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible* (1763), the commentary of Genesis 1:2 reads: "[t]his same Spirit 'moved' or brooded upon the face of the waters, to impregnate them, as an hen upon eggs to hatch them, so he to separate the parts which were mixed together, and give them a quickening virtue to produce living creatures in them," of which he notes that "brooded" reflects careful attention "as a dove [dotes] on her young" (10). From such an interpretation comes Milton's invocation of the Holy Spirit as the Muse of his epic: "Thou from the first / Wast present, and, with mighty wings

outspread, / Dove-like satst brooding on the vast abyss, / And mad'st it pregnant" (*Paradise Lost* I. 19-22).

As the Holy Spirit impregnated the Virgin Mary, He impregnates the natural world through inscape. In His role of impregnator in the form of a dove, the Holy Spirit "broods with warm breast and with ah! Bright wings" over the sexually-connotative "bent world" (13-14). He is Zeus in the form of the Swan impregnating Leda. He is the dove impregnating the Virgin with the Son of God. And He is the dove present at Christ's baptism when God the Father declares: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (*KJV*, Matt 3:17).[25] Christ "springs" forth out of the baptismal waters of the Jordan, an anointing which promises both death and resurrection, an analogy similar to Hopkins' setting sun which then "springs" forth "eastward" in the morning. And He, the Holy Spirit, is implicitly present as the dove fluttering over the waters as He brings an olive branch to Noah, renewing hope for the world's restoration. The bookended "world" of the first and last lines of the sonnet reinforces the cyclic nature of hope, as the world turns daily on its axis away from the "black West" (11), which represents this sin-stained world, towards the "brown brink eastwards" (12), the redeemed creation of New Jerusalem. This promised paradisiacal city offers a second chance for humanity in the order of the Garden of Eden.

Hopkins must, then, have realised that his first choice for lines seven and eight – "The soil is barren" (MS1 and 2) – undermines his claim of the Holy Spirit's "insemination" of the world through inscape. He changes "barren" to "bare" on his third manuscript (MS3, Plate 286, 94) while preserving the metre by adding "now," which also indicates the hope that in the future the soil will no longer be bare. He assures readers that the present state of nature is a temporary condition caused by sin, but the earth will be redeemed. When he changes "barren" to "bare now" on MS3, he changes the homonym "bears" of the seventh line to "shews" (MS3, Plate 286, 94). "Bears" also would suggest that the earth carries the child of the consequences of sin: man's "smudge" and "smell." Therefore, this interpretation would have undermined Hopkins' claims that the earth in fact "bears" the "insemination" of the divine "seed" of the Holy Spirit. On this same manuscript (MS3), he also replaces "wears man's smell" for "shares man's smell" on this seventh line, thereby creating alliteration with "shews." In this configuration, the world shows and shares the consequences of sin rather than the more implicative bearing and wearing of it. "Shews" only figures on this manuscript, as on the next

[25] This Scriptural passage is the only one in which all three members of the Trinity are explicitly present.

(MS4) it is restored to "bears" while the "shares" of the second clause remains. Hopkins remedies this arrangement by changing Bridges' faircopy (MS5). On this final version, Hopkins crosses out the "b" of "bears" and replaces it with a "w," thus decisively indicating his preference for "wears man's smudge and shares man's smell," a combination not tried previously. This choice reinforces his theme, as now the natural world can cast off its "soiled" garment – which is "seared," "bleared," "smeared," "smudged," and "shares man's smell" – and thereby reveal its inscape. "Wears" is an impermanent condition with fewer implications than "bears." The Holy Spirit's "seed" resides in the "deep down things" (10), the womb of the earth, while mankind and its sinfulness are only the earth's temporary garment.

But not only is the Holy Spirit the "rapist" of the natural world, He is also paradoxically the female dove who carries the divine nature of God in her fertilised egg. The manuscripts reveal that Hopkins insisted upon portraying the Holy Spirit as a feminine entity because when Robert Bridges surreptitiously modified "breast" for the gender-neutral "heart" on his faircopy (MS5, Plate 287a, 96), Hopkins caught this unauthorized change and restored it to "breast." Although orthodox Christianity has always insisted on the masculine nature of all three Persons of the Godhead, since antiquity biblical scholars, such as Saint Jerome (c. 342-420), have suggested that the Holy Spirit is in fact a feminine entity ("Genesis" 5). One reason for such is that in the previously cited second verse of the Old Testament – "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" (*KJV*, Gen. 1:2) – the Hebrew word for "Spirit," *ruach*, is a feminine noun. For those Christians who consider the Holy Spirit to be feminine, the clue of the noun's gender is reinforced by the account of the creation of Adam and Eve, which states "in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them" (*KJV*, Gen. 1:27). By following their logic, only an androgynous God could engender both men and women in His/Her image.

The layers of sediment of this sonnet have been mined to reveal that "deep down" the Holy Spirit is present not only in the world, but also charges this verse with the "grandeur of God." As influenced by Parmenides, this poem is flush and foredrawn with Being due to its accumulation of alliteration. The pantheistic aspects of Parmenides's monist philosophy also seep into the poems for which God is present and observable in the natural things He created. Furthermore, his faith and theology inform his perspective that humans should revere God, as His glory will flame out. Yet, there is hope for a new morning when the world, and

humankind, will be redeemed. “God’s Grandeur” reveals both the theory and the practice of inscape as defined by Gerard Manley Hopkins.

"The Windhover"

To Christ our Lord

I caught this morning morning's minion, king-

dom of daylight's dauphin, dapple-dawn-drawn Falcon, in his riding

Of the rolling level underneath him steady air, and striding

High there, how he rung upon the rein of a wimpling wing

In his ecstasy! Then off, off forth on swing,

As a skate's heel sweeps smooth on a bow-bend: the hurl and gliding

Rebuffed the big wind. My heart in hiding

Stirred for a bird, – the achieve of, the mastery of the thing!

Brute beauty and valour and act, oh, air, pride, plume, here

Buckle! AND the fire that breaks from thee then, a billion

Times told lovelier, more dangerous, O my chevalier!

No wonder of it: shéer plód makes plough down sillion

Shine, and blue-bleak embers, ah my dear,

Fall, gall themselves, and gash gold-vermilion.

Chapter Three:

Inscape Applied in "The Windhover": Revealed through Genetic Criticism

In a letter of 22 June 1879, Hopkins claimed that, in his estimation, "The Windhover" "is the best thing I ever wrote" (*Li* 85). One reason that he may have particularly enjoyed this poem is that it subtly enacts inscape, according to the terms of his poem, "As kingfishers catch fire" (1877). The message of "As kingfishers catch fire" is that "each mortal thing ... deals out that being indoors each one dwells" (*P* 34, line 6), or, in the context of this study, every living thing expresses its inscape when it "speaks" or enacts its unique identity (line 7). Not only must the "mortal thing" (*P* 34,line 6) act according to the constraints of its species in order to express inscape, it must also articulate its own unique identity, for the thing speaks "*myself*": "*What I do is me: for that I came*" (*P* 34, lines 7-8, italics in original). This practical definition of inscape is directly related to Scotus's concept of *haecceitas*, "thisness." For a Christian, such as Hopkins, it is God who determines the purpose of His creation, both as a species and as an individual member of a species. Thus, when the kingfisher's body reflects the sun as it darts about on wing, it is doing what it was created to do. Likewise, the predatory windhover fulfills its purpose when it hovers on the wind and dashes down towards its prey. **Inscape can then be defined as living out one's God-given purpose.** In "The Windhover," not only is the windhover shown to be expressing its unique inscape, its *haeccity*, but Christ, the speaker, the reader, and the poem itself are also engaged in fulfilling their divine purposes.

Inscape: Revealed through Ruskin's Theory

The revelation of inscape for each of these actors becomes apparent by tracking Hopkins' adhesion to Ruskin's three-step aesthetic theory in "The Windhover." In fact, another reason that Hopkins may have appreciated this poem in particular is that it closely follows Ruskin's artistic process. Hopkins had already observed that applying Ruskin's theories reveals inscape.[26] The first step, intense observation, privileges the sense of sight. The first line of the poem emphasises the importance of sight as the speaker "catches" a glimpse of the falcon. The immediacy of the retold sight is accentuated through the use of adjectives[27] and

[26] See chapter 1.
[27] These would comprise "rolling" (3) and "wimpling" (4). "Striding" (3) is the only present participle.

nouns in the gerund form, [28] such as "morning" (a noun) and "rolling" (an adjective). Significantly, these words ending in "-ing" are all situated within the octet, the stanza that relates the first-hand experience. Furthermore, the breathlessness induced by the rushing metre, as in "off, off forth on swing" (*P* 13, 5), also accounts for the sense of present action. As though he were accompanying the speaker, the reader can imagine viewing the circling windhover and can sense the thrill of its rushing dive. This is made possible by the speaker's profound perception and concentration, the first tenet of Ruskin's theory. Through adherence to the theory, Hopkins reveals the windhover's divine purpose: as a predator the windhover floats on the wind, reserving its energy for its fierce dash towards its prey. As well, the reader, as a human who is created to consciously praise God, [29] enacts his or her inscape by appreciating the imagined scene, which may then provoke him or her to worship God.

As for the second step of Ruskin's theory, that of reflecting on one's moral and emotional response, the speaker reveals that his "heart in hiding stirred for a bird" (*P* 13, 7-8). His heart is stirred towards worshipping Christ the Lord, as the dedication indicates. The speaker thus also enacts his inscape, for the Bible makes clear that one of mankind's purposes is the worship of the Creator. For instance, Peter writes to Christians, both Gentiles and Jews, that "you are a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's special possession, *that you may declare the praises of him* who called you out of darkness into his wonderful light" (*KJV*, I Pet. 2:9, italics mine). As God declared each of his creations "good," [30] He takes pleasure when mankind echoes His estimation. The moral and emotional response to the sight of the windhover is worship of God.

Ruskin's second stage then allows for worship. The first tercet of "The Windhover" embodies this stage. In it the speaker claims that the bird's swoop towards earth reminds him of the fierce, brave, and daring actions of a "chevalier" rushing to battle to defend king and country (*P* 13, 11). He considers it to be among the loveliest and the most dangerous of actions he has ever seen. The dash towards possible death inspires the speaker to live dangerously and

[28] These would comprise "morning," (1), "morning's" (1), "king-" (1), "riding" (2), "wing" (4), "swing" (5), "gliding" (6), "hiding" (7), and "thing"(8).
[29] Isaiah 43:21 states that God has created mankind to worship Him: "This people have I formed for myself; they shall shew forth my praise" (*KJV*).
[30] After each day of creation, God sees that what He has created is "good" (*KJV*, Gen. 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25). On the last day, after He creates the first man and woman, God sees that His creation is "very good" (*KJV*, Gen. 1:31).

bravely, which he considers to be the loveliest way to fully and truly live, as exemplified by Christ. After all, Christ fulfilled His purpose, His inscape, by rushing towards a victorious death that brings life. For, according to the Gospel account the reason that "the Son of man came ... [was] to give his life [as] a ransom for many" (*KJV*, Matt. 20:28). Moreover, Christ encourages His followers to live dangerously for their faith by promising that "he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it" (*KJV*, Matt. 10:39). The poem follows this logic by determining that the best way to enact inscape is through a death that is the result of living dangerously, as the windhover, or as Christ.

Again, the objectivity required to attain this reflection is noticeable in the octet. Although many of the words of this stanza end in "-ing," the speaker employs the simple past tense to recount what he saw. The distancing of the simple past is initially established in the first line: "I *caught* this morning morning's minion." It is then sustained by recounting how the windhover "*rung* upon the rein of a wimpling wing" (*P* 13, 4), then "*rebuffed* the big wind" (*P* 13, 7). This objective distancing accounts for the bird hanging "high *there*," in relation to the speaker's physical position as well as his current temporal position, whereas the reflection occurs "*here*" (*P* 13, 9), in the present and in the speaker's heart. The change in both time and place provide the necessary distance to allow for a reflection on one's own inscape, Hopkins' version of Ruskin's third stage. The speaker is brought to reflect on whether he lives his life in a way that makes those who observe him, most importantly God, stir at the "thrill of; the mastery of the thing" (*P* 13, 8).

This third and final stage is the artistic representation made possible through the first two stages: that of close observation of the scene and a conscious reflection on the speaker's emotional response to it. The last stanza represents the third stage. Within the poem the artistic reflection is realised in the metaphors comparing the bird's flight to plowed land and dying embers. "No wonder of it" (*P* 13, 12) signals to the reader that the windhover's flight has deeper implications for the speaker's heart than has yet been revealed. These implications concern the five actors in this poem: the windhover, Christ, the speaker, Hopkins, and the reader. In the first metaphor, that of "sheer plod makes plough down sillion shine," the windhover's dangerous dash towards earth is compared to a thing made beautiful. Furthermore, the imagery of the plowed land reminds the reader of Jesus's warning that "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God" (*KJV*,

Luke 9:62). Christ himself followed His God-given path even though it led towards death. Through this association, Hopkins asserts that for readers who do continue faithfully, as he the aesthete priest has, obedience makes earthly things, such as overturned earth – "sillion" – shine (*P* 13, 12). Such is also true of dying embers. While they give up their life in sacrifice, they shine "gold-vermillion" (*P* 13, 14), fulfilling their purpose, their inscape. Of course, the blood gushing from the side of Christ at the crucifixion is esteemed by Christians to be the ultimate sacrifice for sin, whereby they have access to a worthwhile and "lovely" (*P* 13, 11), albeit "dangerous" (*P* 13, 11), life in the Kingdom of God, both on earth and in heaven.

The speaker has revealed his inscape, and the reader is able to as well. As a Victorian, Hopkins would naturally consider the poem to have one solidified individuality to express. However, the intricacies of the scanning of this poem, which are rendered all the more perplexing by the diacritical markings, cause each reader to scan it differently. Thus, Hopkins ironically attains his goal of attaining inscape through instress since each individual enacts his or her subjective *haeccity* upon its interpretation and scanning. As in the case of spoken conversation, readers will each recite this poem differently.

The Poem's Enacted Inscape: Revealed through Genetic Criticism

Furthermore, the poem itself expresses its inscape by revealing its unique identity, its *haecceity*, as made apparent through genetic analysis. We shall now consider this aspect. First of all, as supported by genetic evidence, "The Windhover" is a sonnet unlike any other in structure and metre. There are three surviving manuscripts of "The Windhover," none of which is the first written manifestation as is indicated by the fact that the earliest extant manuscript, dated 30 May 1877, is intended to be a faircopy. Yet Hopkins revised this faircopy (MS1) while transcribing it, making it an interesting study in itself. The second (MS2) is an autograph faircopy, without any changes made to it, although it differs from MS1. It was most likely written in the summer of 1877. The last of the three manuscripts (MS3) is Bridges' faircopy based on MS2 that Hopkins also modified spontaneously when reviewing it in 1884, seven years after first writing the poem down.

Haecceity within the Tradition of the Sonnet

The idiosyncrasies of the poem express its unique identity within the "species" of the sonnet tradition. Let us first consider its structure. The rhyme scheme is unique as the end rhymes of the octet are each "-ing": "king-", "riding," "striding," "wing," "swing," "gliding," "hiding," and "thing," leading some critics to identify it as having only a-rhymes (MacKenzie 124); however, the manuscripts suggest a traditional rhyme scheme of abbaabba. Each of the "b-rhymes" are indented on both MSS 1 and 2, a decision that is reinforced where Hopkins crossed out the entire seventh line to rewrite it with an indent, thereby emphasising its end rhyme ("hiding") as a "b-rhyme." The distinction between the a- and the b-rhymes would therefore be that the a-rhymes are monosyllabic ("king-", "wing," "swing," "thing") while the b-rhymes are disyllabic ("riding," "striding," "gliding," "hiding"). Thus, Hopkins creates a unique rhyme scheme within the traditional abbaabba sonnet form.

Furthermore, the manuscripts make clear that Hopkins conceived this sonnet as an octet followed by two tercets, rather than a unified sestet. On both MSS 1 and 2, Hopkins separated the sestet into two stanzas. On MS1, the separation may appear to be incidental as he had come to the end of the page and had to write the last three lines on the back of the piece of paper; yet a cursory regard of MS2 confirms that Hopkins separated the two with a space similar to the one that separates the octet and the rest of the sonnet. Additionally, the indentations of MS2 continue those of corresponding end rhymes as was the case in the octet. Here, in the two tercets, the "d-rhymes" are indented. It seems that on MS2 Hopkins corrected the inconsistent indentation of the tercets of MS1, as on it the central line of each tercet is indented rather than following the rhyme-scheme. The evidence collected from genetic analysis points to a modified sonnet structure. It, as unique to itself, expresses the poem's inscape, just as a kingfisher that reflects the fire of the sun. While remaining identifiable as a sonnet, the poem enacts its own inscape.

Haecceity within the Traditional Metre

Acknowledging the uniqueness of this sonnet, Hopkins provided his readers with instructions as to how to scan it: "Falling paeonic rhym (sic), sprung and out-riding" (MS1, Plate 306, 120). Here he is "unshodding" the sonnet's "trodding" metrical foot from its conventional iamb in order to mirror the unique identity of the poem. We will consider each of

the three metrical "performance directions" (Scott 276) by beginning with the falling paeon. Significantly, according to the *OED*, Hopkins "is one of the few poets to have used the paeon in English verse" ("paeon"). A paeon is a foot of one stressed and three unstressed syllables. Evidence reveals that Hopkins chooses it for its unpredictability; in his estimation, above all poetry must not be monotonous (*J* 280). Indeed, Hopkins summarised Aristotle's preference for the paeon for the purposes of oratory: "the paeon is recommended by the complexity of its ratio, which is hard to catch, and by its length, which makes the longs and beats wide apart and so also hard to catch the particular rhythm of, though rhythmical" (*J* 276). Likewise, the paeonic foot was chosen because, as Hopkins writes in his journal, "by itself [it] does not make metre, so that it passes unnoticed the easiest" (*J* 275-6). As Hopkins preferred his poetry "to be heard" (*Li* 46) as in oratory, the paeon is an optimal choice of metre. It allows the poem to maintain a rhythm that is more like the rhythm of natural speech than of poetry, especially that of the sonnet's traditional iambic pentameter. A sonnet can then express its own unique identity within the genre.

As for the rest of this indication "[f]alling paeonic rhythm" (MS1, Plate 306, 120), a falling rhythm is one in which the stress falls on one of the first syllables of the foot. It would include feet such as trochees and dactyls. Thus, a falling paeon is one in which any but the last syllable is stressed. In "The Windhover," the third paeon, a foot in which the stress falls on the third of the four syllables, is the most common. For example, by adding a stress on "dawn" on MS3 (Robert Bridges' faircopy), Hopkins creates a third paeon of "dap-ple – **dawn** – drawn" (MS3, Plate 309, 123). He does the same over "roll" to make line 3 begin with a third paeon as well: "Of the **roll**-ing" (MS3, Plate 309, 123). Hopkins claims that the function of the third paeon is to "[express] present action" (*J* 274), as opposed to the first and second paeon, which he claims are suited to "succession and … narrative" (*J* 274). Hopkins' intention in employing the third paeon in "The Windhover," then, is to reinforce the impression that the action is occurring simultaneously to the reading of the poem, an impression reiterated by the "-ing" endings of the octet in which the action occurs. By so doing, Hopkins prods the reader to "see" the sight with the mind's eye and thereby fulfil Ruskin's first tenet.

Although Latin and Greek poets employed the paeon before him, Hopkins developed a theory of metre that allowed for experimentation and for a poem to express its own inscape: "sprung rhythm" (MS1, Plate 306, 120). Hopkins' use of "sprung rhythm" allows inscape to

seep through the constraints of the sonnet form. In a letter to Richard Watson Dixon that explains the unusual prosody of *The Wreck of the Deutschland* (1876), Hopkins wrote of sprung rhythm:

> I had long had haunting my ear the echo of a new rhythm which now I realised on paper. To speak shortly, it consists in scanning by accents or stresses alone, without any account of the number of syllables, so that a foot may be one strong syllable or it may be many light and one strong. (*Lii* 14; 5 Oct 1878)

In another letter to Dixon dated 27 February 1879, thus two years after composing "The Windhover" and six months after the preceding explanation, he wrote: "[t]his then is the essence of sprung rhythm: *one stress makes one foot*, no matter how many or few the syllables" (*L* ii 23; 27 Feb. 1879, italics in original). Consequently, paeons, due to their series of syllables between stresses, are conducive to sprung rhythm; as Hopkins noted to Dixon: "paeons … are regular in sprung rhythm, but in common rhythm can occur only by licence" (*L* ii 39; 22 Dec. 1880). Hopkins also developed the technique of "outrides," which are extrametrical syllables added to a line. They facilitate the adding of syllables to a line without accumulating stresses. He denoted them by a swooping arch underneath syllables. Hopkins concludes his explanation of sprung rhythm by claiming that "the word Sprung which I use for this rhythm means something like *abrupt* and applies by rights only where one stress follows another running, without syllable between" (*L* ii 23; 27 Feb. 1879, italics in original). Hopkins developed another technique to indicate these adjacent stresses: the "great colon." It indicates that the syllables on either side of the great colon are to be stressed. He differentiates these colons from others in the poem by making them more prominent. They are darker and have a space before and after them, rather than just after them. They also often occur at the beginning of a line to indicate that the first syllable of the line is to be stressed.

Why this insistence upon his "new prosody"? Hopkins responded to Bridges' reservations by writing that he employed it "[b]ecause it is the nearest to the rhythm of prose, that is the native and natural rhythm of speech, the least forced, the most rhetorical and emphatic of all possible rhythms, combining … opposite and, one would have thought, incompatible excellences, markedness of rhythm – that is rhythm's self – and naturalness of expression" (*L*, i 46; 25 Feb 1878). Hence, the reason for developing sprung rhythm was to make poetry, and specifically this sonnet, as prose-like as possible. By utilising both the paeon and sprung rhythm, Hopkins hopes to achieve a poem that is natural to speech patterns when

read aloud. Indeed, Hopkins wrote to Bridges: "take breath and read it with the ears, as I always wish to be read, and my verse becomes right" (*Li* 79; 22 April 1879). As in oratory, poetry is founded upon more than just the metre; it is also built on sound patterns.

Unifying devices of sound are employed in order to make "The Windhover" read as verse rather than prose. As the metre approximates prose through its "falling paeonic rhythm, sprung and outriding" (MS1, Plate 306, 120), alliteration creates verse, and with it the tension, the instress, of "The Windhover." This fundamental pull between prose and poetry allows the sonnet to enact its own inscape. To distinguish the work as poetical, despite its metrical abnormalities, Hopkins intertwined sound patterns into a unified whole, an effect that is concretised through genetic analysis. In his poetry, Hopkins relied upon alliteration, especially that of primary stresses, whether following the metrical patterns of sprung rhythm, counterpointed verse, or strict iambic pentameter. Wimsatt has quantified the alliterated primary stresses of Hopkins' sonnets, determining that on average 58.0% of the primary stresses are alliterated ("Alliteration" 561). Of the seventy stresses in "The Windhover," thirty-eight are alliterated.

The unification of metre and sound patterns: Soundscape

The intertwining of both metre and sound patterns creates what Wimsatt terms "soundscape" based on Hopkins' invention of the term inscape (*Hopkins' Poetics* 41). Just as landscape is a unified whole of various elements – trees, mountains, fields, clouds – soundscape unifies the individual sounds of the poem into a cohesive whole to attain inscape. For this analysis, then, soundscape will be defined as the unique and unifying quality of the sound patterns. Hopkins refers to the term "scape" in his journals to describe a scene for which he is able to sense its inscape. In the case of a sunset or a meteor he accomplishes this by "stalling" the movement by focusing on each individual moment of the moving scene.[31] This is what we shall do in this analysis: "stall" on each syllable in order to ascertain the effect of its metre and sound on the whole.

[31] See *The Journals and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins* page 196 (12 March 1870) and page 232 (25 June 1873).

Lines 1-4: The Sight: The Bird's Climbing and Hovering

First, let us consider the opening lines of the poem as formulated in the final version: "I caught this morning morning's minion, king // -dom of daylight's dauphin, dapple-dawn-drawn Falcon, in his riding" (MS3, lines 1-2). The controlled and rhythmic flapping of the bird's wings is established though the iambic rhythm of the first line. The wings beat slowly, with a long pause between each, suggesting the bird's strength and control. The "m" alliteration, which is superimposed onto the stresses of the iambic pentameter, is also slow and purposeful. It modifies to a more staccato and explosive "d" alliteration in the second line. The "d" alliterations are closer together and more numerous, indicating a quickening pulse of the wings; yet each pulse remains controlled and slow, as suggested by the drawn-out /ɔ/ assonance of "d**au**phin," "d**aw**n," "dr**aw**n" and "F**al**con." This pace remains steady until line five when the bird flies "off, off forth on swing." Furthermore, the "n" alliterations unify the two lines and continue the slow, drawn-out sound of the "m" alliterations. The two stressed "k" sounds, "**c**aught" and **k**ing," suggest the surprise and awe of the viewer, a breath caught in the throat.

When compared to its first iteration, the final version more successfully captures the wings' movements. The first line of the poem remains the same in all three manuscripts but the second line is changed in two slight but significant ways. The addition of "-dom" as the first syllable of the line was a stroke of genius that came seven years after first writing down the poem (MS3). The addition of a syllable changing "king" to the enjambed "kingdom" accentuates the bird's quickening flight. It adds another syllable to the line, yet the number of stresses has remained the same (six), a quickening of the rhythm that suggests the light flutter of the wings. The second modification is the final phrase that changes from "Falcon — he was riding" (MS1) to "Falcon, in his riding" (MS2 and 3). The first version provides a pregnant pause that leads the reader to naturally place a medium stress on the syllable that follows it, "he." This leads to a stilting rhythm: / strong pause, medium stress, unstress, full stress /. The modification creates a flowing third paeon – /in his **rid**-ing/ – which is fitting, as Hopkins claimed that the third paeon "expresses present action" (*J* 274). The bird catches an updraft in the time it takes to speak these four syllables: "in his **rid**ing."

Hopkins creates a parallel paeonic structure in the following phrase: /Of the **roll**-ing/ (MS2 and 3, line 3) which had been the trochee /**Roll**-ing/ in its first form (MS1, line 3). The

peaon reinforces the string of third paeons in these lines: /-dom of **day**-light's/, /dap-ple-**dawn**-drawn/, /in his **rid**-ing/, /Of the **roll**-ing/, /lev-el **un**-der/, and /stead-y **air**, and/. The effect is of a rapid lifting of the bird on puffs of air. This is contrary to the effect of the trochee /**Roll**-ing/, which suggests a falling. In fact, the bird has now reached the peak of its climb and will now hover on the wind, as indicated in the following lines. The metre supports the rise of the bird and its cresting.

The alliteration of the next line, line four, continues the impression of puffs of air with the aspirated /h/ alliteration of "high," "how," "he." In MS1, Hopkins struggles with the beginning of this line, vacillating between "Hung" and "He hung," finally deciding upon "Hung." There are no more "h" alliterations in this line in MS1. He struggles again when making the faircopy of MS2. He starts with "O how he h[ung]," immediately scratching out the "h" of "hung" before he even finishes writing the word, replacing it with "rung" in order to provide an alliteration with "rein." There are thus two "h" alliterations on line four of MS2. When reviewing Bridges' faircopy in 1844, Hopkins again revised this phrase to "High there how he rung," creating a strong triple alliteration, thereby emphasising the puffs of air that sustain the bird's flight. Although "hung," which notes the bird's motionless hovering has been obscured, the addition of "high" indicates that the bird is at the peak of its climb. With the inclusion of "rein," "hung" is redundant: the rein-metaphor allows readers to visualise the bird circling slowly as if attached to an invisible rein, a cord, from which it is hung. The soundscape thus provides all the information necessary to determine that the bird is now hovering in a circular pattern.

The "h" alliteration that begins line three then modulates to an /r/ alliteration, a sound that is quite similar to the "h" but rougher, signifying the bird's strain against the wind. This "r" alliteration then modulates in turn to the semi-vowel /w/ alliteration, simulating the whooshing of the air over the windhover's wings. Whereas in the first iterations of this fourth line the pace of the wings slows, by the last version the pace is sustained to that of the first three lines. Consider the first iteration: "**Hung** so / and **rung** / the **rein** / of a **wimpl** / -ed **wing**" (MS1, line 4). It is constructed of a trochee, two iambs, an anapest, and another iamb, which gives it a stilted walking pace, not the movements of a majestic bird floating on gusts of wind. In the second version, he adds two more syllables to lighten the pace: "**O** how / he **rung** / up-on the **rein** / of a **wimpl** / -ing **wing**." The fourth paeon (/up-on the **rein**/) followed by the

anapest (/of a **wimpl**/) suggest two bursts of air. The change from "wimpled" to "wimpling" lengthens the syllable, thus slowing the pace. The side-by-side "ing" rhymes, reinforced by the /w/ alliteration, again concentrates the reader's attention on the wings and the air that is rippling the feathers.

The third and final iteration of this fourth line most successfully denotes the hovering. Hopkins crossed out the "O" that began the line and replaced it with "**High** there," effectively adding yet another syllable without adding any stresses to the line, which is reinforced by the outride Hopkins placed under "there" to indicate that it is extrametrical. He also succeeds in creating the impression of a third gust of wind by adding an anapest before the fourth paeon-anapest structure: / how he **rung** / up-on the **rein** / of a **wimpl** /. Furthermore, the addition of "there" chimes with the "air" of the previous line, bringing it back to the reader's mind. It is, after all, the "steady air" that makes the hovering "high there" possible. "There" also accentuates the physical and emotional distance between the speaker and the bird. The speaker is solidly on the ground and will always remain so, a fact that leads to longing for the freedom to fly closer to Heaven. Reflecting on it causes his "heart in hiding" to "[stir] for a bird, for the mastery of the thing." Additionally, the choice of "wimpling" (MS2 and 3) over "wimpled" (MS1) accentuates the rippling of the wings. "Wimpled" is closer to the most common signification of the noun "wimple" – that of a nun's headdress – whereas "wimpling" by being in the present participle form implies its least common use, that of causing to "ripple or undulate" ("wimple").

In this circling formation the windhover is a type of Christ, overseeing Creation. He is not the King, but a "dauphin" and a "minion" in the kingdom of daylight. The three terms the speaker uses for the Falcon – "minion," "dauphin," and "chevalier" – are taken from the realms of French chivalry and each signifies subordination to an authority. A "minion" is "an obsequious or servile dependant" who is also "a favourite of a sovereign" ("minion"). "Dauphin" is the official "title of the eldest son of the King of France" ("dauphin") and "chevalier" is a knight in the king's service. Although the Falcon is to be honoured as the favoured Son of the King, not he but God is the one to be worshipped and obeyed. In this role, he thus circles above, observing all that his Father has created and reporting back to Him. By adding the dedication "To Christ our Lord" to Bridges' faircopy (MS3), Hopkins removes all doubt that the Falcon is a type of Christ.

Lines 5-8: The Sight: The Bird's Diving

In the following lines of the octet, lines five through eight, the pace quickens in a flurry of action. The bird is no longer carrying out its role of overseer, but now risks its life in a dive towards earth, paralleling Christ's sacrifice on the cross. An analysis of the soundscape supports this interpretation. First Hopkins wrote "In an ecstasy" (MS1), which he changed to "In his ecstasy" (MS2 and 3). Although this is a small modification, the "h" of "his" reinforces the /h/ alliteration of the preceding line, and thus creates the last puff of air sustaining the bird before the dive. Then the "s" begins a succession of sibilance which serves to re-enact the hissing of the air as the bird's body falls towards earth. He also changed the punctuation following this phrase from a semi-colon (MS1) to an exclamation mark (MS2 and 3) to vividly portray the bird's ecstasy. The exclamation mark also makes a clear separation of this line into two parts. "In his ecstasy!" finishes the sentence begun on the first line, that which describes the uplift and then the hovering movement of the bird. It also creates a caesura separating the line into two halves with a long, decisive pause. The pause is broken with the forceful "then off."

The only other modification of this line might appear minor, but it is significant. On the third manuscript, Hopkins added a second "off" (MS3), emphasising the beginning of an exhilarating new stage in the bird's flight. The iambic rhythm combined with the voiceless "f" alliteration of "then **o*ff***, / o*ff* ***f*orth** / on **swing**" mirrors three spurts of energy as the bird swings off of its "rein." The addition of the second "off" creates a springboard from which the "forth" gains momentum, thereby providing an impression of dynamic headfirst movement. The second "off" replaced a great colon, a diacritical symbol used by Hopkins to denote that the syllables on either side of it were to be stressed. The result is jilting: "In an / **ec**stasy!/ then **off**, / **forth** / on **swing**." The reader naturally takes a breath between the two stressed syllables "off" and "forth," especially since there is a comma between them, thereby weakening the impact of the meaningful rest beat at the exclamation mark.

On the next line, line six, the bird's swift downward spiraling flight is depicted in a simile comparing it to the graceful, quick, controlled, and smooth glide of an ice skate as it rounds the bend of a rink. There are no modifications to this line in the manuscripts; the constancy of the soundscape can, however, be analysed. The double sibilance of "**s**kate'**s**" reinforces that begun with "ec**sta**sy" and "**s**wing" and is continued with "**s**weep**s** **s**mooth."

Reading line six aloud emphasises the sounds of the air whistling around the falcon. Significantly, the "h" alliteration is reinstated with "**h**eel" and "**h**url," again suggesting puffs of air. The wide, swooping motion is also enacted in the rhythm of line six, which combines four expansive feet with a total of fifteen beats. Hopkins succeeded in packing so many syllables in so few feet by consistently adding an outride under "heel," making it extrametrical, and a slur over "the hurl," combining them into one syllable. The line scans thus: "As a **skate's** (heel) / sweeps **smooth** / on a **bow**-bend: / [the hurl] and **glid-**ing."[32] The line would be predominantly third paeon, especially if we ignore the outrided "heel," thereby scanning the syllable in the same way it is spoken. Again, the third paeon, in Hopkins' estimation, "expresses present action" (*J* 274), an effect evident in this line.

The reader's attention is now brought back to the bird in flight, which is "rebuff[ing] the big wind" (line 7). No changes were made to this line either. Hopkins selected the term "rebuffed" to describe the falcon's defensive actions against the wind which is fighting to gain control. The word is astutely chosen as it not only means "to repel bluntly," it also means "to blow or drive back" as informed by its etymology: "gust, puff" (*OED*, "rebuff"). Furthermore, the "b" alliteration reinforces the combative nature of the flight at this stage; since a /b/ is made through a forceful voiced breath of air. "Re**b**uffed" also echoes the alliteration of the previous line "**b**ow-**b**end" when the wind first begins to gather its forces against the bird. The "b" alliteration, and thus the gust of wind, is brought to a climax with the stressed "**b**ig" (line 7). The "chevalier" is now at battle, hurling against the wind. This adversary is revealed to be formidable through the double stresses of "big" and "wind," as indicated by the great colon that separates them.

At the volta, as the focus turns to the speaker and his reflection of the significance of the frantic battle, the panting "h" alliteration is restored with "heart" and "hiding." Rather than denoting the sound of the wind and the movement of the bird's wings, the soundscape now reflects the speaker's panting respiration and driving heartbeat. He reveals that "My heart in hiding / Stirred for a bird – for the mastery of the thing!" (MS1 and 2). The consistent use of "heart" on each of the manuscripts is not to be ignored. According to the calculations compiled in *A Hopkins Concordance*, "heart" is the second most common noun in Hopkins' canon, after

[32] The parentheses denotes an outride (extrametrical) and the brackets denote a slur (combining two syllables into one)

"love," which is, of course, related (303). Here, the heart's pumping is also referenced. In the first version (MS1 and 2), there are six beats: on "heart," "hid-," "Stirred," "bird," "mast-," and "thing!" The final version (MS3) adds an additional beat and fluttering pace with the insertion of "the achieve of." Instead of the relatively stable heartbeats of the first version (iamb / iamb / iamb / anapest / anapest / anapest), the final version enacts arrhythmia and a quickening of the pace. The arrhythmia is so severe the last three feet cannot be determined definitively.[33]

Genetic analysis does not resolve this ambiguity as to the metrical pattern of this ninth line. By strengthening the comma and dash on MS3, Hopkins indicates that there should be a caesura dividing the line. If this rest beat is to be scanned, the foot is a fourth paeon, considering the "of" is outrided and therefore extrametrical: "— the a-**chieve** of."[34] If the pause is not counted, the foot becomes an anapest. And if the "of" is counted, despite Hopkins' directives, the foot is now a third paeon. The next foot is just as problematic. We know that the stress falls on "mast-" through both a natural reading and also due to Hopkins' placement of a sforzando sign over it, indicating a forceful stress as it does in musical notation (Stephenson 111). This foot cannot, therefore, be parallel to the preceding foot, despite its similar structure, because the stress falls one beat earlier: "— the **mast** –ery of /, as compared to / — the a-**chieve** of." Furthermore, there is no indication if "ery" is to be slurred into one syllable or if it is to remain as two syllables. And since it is not parallel to "the achieve of," there is no indication whether "of" should be included in this foot, or rather considered to be extrametrical, or in fact inserted into the following foot: "the **thing**!" A sporadic, fluttering beat is thus introduced in direct relation to the speaker's ecstatic heartbeat.

Lines 9-11: The Moral and Emotional Response

The following tercet expounds the speaker's reaction to the sight of the falcon hovering and then diving through the air. He remarks on the brute beauty and valour of the daring act. Although the terms appear to be a list of nouns upon first reading, a deeper reading suggests that "plume" is in fact an imperative verb, as is also the case of "buckle." The sforzando sign

[33] Consider that the same critic, Charles T. Scott, asserts that this line is hexameter (280-281), but then identifies it as pentameter in the appendix (287). As hexameter he scans it thus: **Stirred**/ for a **bird**/ the ach**ieve**/ of **the mast** /ery **of** / the **thing**! (280). Whereas Finn Fordham scans it as pentameter thus: **Stirred** for a / **bird,** the ach- / **ieve** of the / **mas**tery / of the **thing**! (101).

[34] The symbol is that of the outride, which Hopkins uses to indicate extrametrical syllables.

over “plume” sets it apart from the other monosyllabic words on the line, an insistence that reads like a command. The invocation of “O air” (MS1 and 2) suggests that the source of these values comes from the air. The invocation of a pantheistic entity is contrary to the poem’s dedication to “Christ our Lord.” The invocation is thus modified on MS3 to “oh, air,” which restores the “chevalier’s” place as the source of valour (o my chevalier) (line 11).

Before delving into the imperatives, let us first consider the values that the speaker wishes to acquire. The succession of terms “brute,” “beauty,” “valour,” “act,” “air,” “pride,” “plume” and “buckle” are interconnected in etymology, alliteration, and metre. Like the titles applied to the falcon, these terms are also derived from French,[35] giving them an elevated tone that highlights their worth as values. As for alliteration, “brute and beauty” as well as “pride and plume” are paired off, separated by the lone “valour.” “Air” and “here” provide a connection through assonance, which also harkens to the “there” of line four. The alliteration adds emphasis to the stresses, creating an incantation-like summoning of these values. The exhilarating, dangerous way of faith, as typified by the falcon, stirs up these sentiments of bravery and valour. The metre interconnects these terms through counterpoint. The first two feet are amphibrachic: “Brute **beaut**-y / and **val**-our” which sets the base-line metre. The rest of the line can also be scanned as amphibrach: “and **act** [o air], / pride, **plume** here” while still respecting Hopkins’ diacritical marks. As this amphibrachic tetrametre line is not the most natural reading, it creates a counterpoint to the two iambs: “and **act**, / [oh, air] **pride**” and the trochee: “**plume** here.” Counterpoint successfully intertwines the musicality of the line while also transitioning from the immediate action and reaction of the octet to the reflections of the two tercets.

Now to return to the two imperatives: “plume” and “buckle.” What can these terms, which are both commonly used as nouns, signify in an imperative verb form? They are both ambiguous, which adds to their complexity and interest. First of all, the choice of “plume” is a purposeful pun on the windhover’s feathers, and perhaps on the writer’s pen as well. Each value that he hopes to glean from the experience of watching the bird’s majestic dive becomes a feather to be plumed, or preened (“plume”). This preening is similar then to the cultivation of fields described in the concluding tercet. In such an interpretation, the speaker is invoking

[35] “Pride” is based on “proud,” which is related to the modern French word *preux* through its root OF *prud* (*OED*, “proud”).

these chivalrous values to roost "here" into his own life and heart, after which the speaker must continue their maturation.

Although "plume" is the first imperative, "buckle" has a more central role in the poem. Its placement at the end of the list of terms, enjambement at the beginning of a new line, and being followed by an exclamation mark all indicate its vital place in the understanding of this tercet and of the poem as a whole. The incantation's tension rises to a peak. The tension is flush and foredrawn with no more coiling fullness possible. Then the tension explodes in "Buckle!", an orgasmic release similar to the "Crushed" of "God's Grandeur" (*P* 8, line 4). The exclamation point provokes an intake of air leading to an enthralling pause. The capitalised "AND" is appropriate, then, as the tension unexpectedly rebuilds.

The signification of "Buckle" has been notoriously difficult for critics to interpret, a fact that has led in part to continued interest in and analysis of this poem. William Empson, a New Critic, refers specifically to "buckle" as an exemplary case of the ambiguity of a term heightening the art of poetry (225). In fact, "buckle" has at least two contradictory senses that are applicable here: first, of buckling under pressure, "to warp, crumple," and second, to reinforce one's strengths, "to equip, prepare (for battle)" ("buckle"). These conflicting senses create a tension between passivity and action. If we are to consider "buckle" an imperative, the latter denotation applies most aptly. The windhover is fighting a battle against the wind, rebuffing it, and so the speaker is "stirred" by this "valour," and now desires to "buckle" up for a similarly daring life lived in faith.

The fact that these string of terms all come from French roots, the French equivalent of "buckle," *boucler*, should not be ignored. The Old French "*boucler*" is directly related to the modern "*bouclier*," a shield ("buckle," "buckler"). Both as a belt buckle and as a shield, the Christian is reminded of the call to put on spiritual armour in the battle against the powers of darkness. Paul urges the Ephesians: "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. ... Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth. ... Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked." (*KJV*, Eph. 6:11, 14, 16).[36] If, however, we take into account the rest of this biblical exhortation and the final line of the sonnet, "buckle" in its sense of "crumple" also

[36] In French, this last phrase is translated as "*le bouclier de la foi*" (*LSG*, Eph. 6:16).

applies fittingly. The bird, as in the case of the saint, may lose its "dangerous" battle, but as Christ's death proves, beauty will be the result of a life lived in daring faith (*P* 13, line 11). The insistent "AND" allows for both contradictory significations to coexist and complement each other (*P* 13, line 10).

The "And" has a sforzando sign over it on both MS1 and MS2, indicating that it was to be strongly stressed, contrary to a natural reading of this seemingly insignificant conjunction. Hopkins made his intentions clear when he crossed out the ampersand that Bridges had transcribed onto his faircopy and replaced it with an all-caps "AND" (MS3). Bridges neglected to include diacritical marks on his faircopies, so Hopkins resorted to this typography to reassert his will over the scansion of this vital syllable. "AND" thus encapsulates both opposing denotations and connotations of "Buckle." The stress on "and" adds to the complexity of scansion. It suggests that the second foot is a trochee as well as the first: "**Buck**-le! / **And** the" thereby creating a trochaic base-line: "**Buck** –le! / **And** the / **fire** that / **breaks** from / **thee** then, / (a) **billi**on / **Times** told / **lov**-elier / **more** dang-erous / **o** my / **chev**-alier!", a scansion that respects Hopkins' diacritical marks, which indicate that "Times" is stressed and that "lier" and "erous" are to be slurred into one syllable (*P* 13, lines 10 and 11). This scansion is jilting and unnatural to speech patterns, yet introduces a metre that the mind unconsciously deduces under the spoken metre. This consistency is necessary in order to cohere the varied feet of these lines. Without counterpointing, the lines would read as prose, not as poetry.

Lines 12-14: The Artist's Representation

There is a shift in the final tercet to two images that support the thesis that living out one's faith dangerously leads to redemption and beauty. The first image is of a plowed field. The field is scarred by the burrows dragged through it. The stones have been forcefully removed. Through this process, the field has become fertile and full of life. The sun now reflects where people and mules have plod its surface smooth. Rather than becoming "bare" as in "God's Grandeur" (*P* 8, lines 5, 7-8), here the "soil" is shown to be redeemed through the "trodding" of mankind's feet. The second image is of embers that also shine "gold-vermilion" as they die out. The imagery suggests that the windhover has smashed against the ground, having lost its battle with the wind, at least in the speaker's imagination. Like Christ on the cross, the blood oozes from its side. The speaker, and the reader, can thus apply this lesson:

choosing to live fearfully, without danger or excitement, or fearlessly, knowing the cost but also the benefits.

There are no changes to this tercet throughout the manuscripts other than to reassert his wishes for stress marks where Bridges had neglected to include them. Hopkins' intentions for these stressed syllables are thus ascertained: "No **wond**-er of it: **sheer plod** makes **plough** down **sill**-ion // **Shine**, and blue-bleak embers, ah my dear, // Fall, **gall** them-**selves**, and **gash gold**-ver-**mil**-ion."[37] The metre no longer imitates the soaring of wings, the fluttering of a heartbeat, or the ecstatic notes of an incantation, but rather the weight of a lesson hard learned. The pace has slowed through the placement of a succession of spondees. Although not emphasised specifically by Hopkins, the scansion allows for three additional spondees: "**blue-bleak**," "**Fall**, **gall"** and "**plough down**." As for alliteration, there remains some sibilance: "sheer," "sillion," "shine", "selves," and "gash" provide unity with the rest of the sonnet, yet the overriding impression is of the plodding "pl" alliteration that modulates to the harder /bl/ alliteration. It is followed by the /ɔl/ assonance of "fall" and "gall." "Gall" also serves as alliteration with the harsh /g/ of "gash" and "gold." These monosyllabic, alliterated spondees focus attention on the moral of the poem and provide closure to it.

The speaker has come to a conclusion he wishes to share with the reader, as noted by the introductory phrase "No wonder of it" (line 12). Readers should not be surprised by the conclusion of his reflection, as he is simply reiterating a fact observable in all of nature. However, his conclusion is rather depressing, as noted by the comforting, yet resolved, "ah my dear" directed to the reader. The diction supports his weariness. "Sheer" and "shine" are quite similar in meaning, as "sheer" means "of light: bright, shining" and may have the same PIE root word as "shine" ("sheer"). The light and warmth provided by the dying embers is thus multiplied. "Sillion" is a nonce word, used only here by Hopkins, but the *OED* concludes that it means "a furrow turned over by the plough" ("sillion"). The "selves" of "themselves" rings clear due to this sibilance, reminding one that inscape is the living out of one's haecceity, "selving"; for, according to Hopkins' "As Kingfishers Catch Fire," "Each mortal thing ... / Selves – goes itself; *myself* it speaks and spells, / Crying *What I do is me: for that I came*" (*P* 34, lines 5, 7-8, italics in original). The embers then fulfil their purpose in death.

[37] Although he did not reinsert a stress over "Shine," it can be inferred that he desired it to be so, as MSS 1 and 2 place a great colon in front of it, indicating a stress on the first syllable of the line.

As for the "plod" and "plough" alliteration, they also augment the meaning of each other. "Plod" is similar to the "trod" of "God's Grandeur," in that it also denotes "to trudge" ("trod"). In conjunction with "plough," it signifies "to work with steady perseverance, to toil in a laborious, stolid, monotonous fashion" ("trod"). Hopkins was entranced by the life of the common labourer, as evidenced in his ode to "Harry Ploughman." In this archetype, Hopkins found a counterpart to his own steadfast humility. It could be argued that he yearned to lead the life of a farmer, closer to nature, but his station in life did not allow for it. The /p/ alliterations modulate into the "bleaker" /b/ alliterations of "**b**lue," "**b**leak," and "em**b**er." The choice of "blue" not only vividly describes the colour of a dying flame, but also connotes "fear, discomfort, anxiety" ("blue"), terms closely related to "bleak." "Embers" also connects to "bleak" as they refer to the ashes that remain after the death of a fire ("ember"). The destruction of these embers is emphasised through the spondaic assonance of "fall, gall." Like the windhover falling from the sky, the embers also fall. "Gall" is bitterness, invoking the bitter death of Christ since his tormentors offered him vinegar "mingled with gall" on the cross (*KJV*, Matt. 27:34). They also "gashed" his side with a spear (*P* 13, line 14). Yet, the blood, the light, the end of life is shown to shine "gold-vermilion." The gold suggests riches, beauty, and worth, while vermilion, "a bright red or scarlet," suggests blood ("vermilion"). There is glory in a humble, plodding existence as there is beauty in Christ's humble life, tragic death, and glorious resurrection.

Genetic analysis of "The Windhover" reveals its particularities within the sonnet genre. The impact of the "new stroke of enthusiasm" (*J* 221; 3 Aug. 1872) brought on by Scotus's writings on *haecceity* has been shown to have been sustained five years later when writing "The Windhover." Individual markers set the poem apart as a sonnet, the windhover apart as one of his species, the speaker apart as a man, and the reader apart as one human. The stroke of inspiration occasioned by Parmenides and influenced by Ruskin, Scotus and his biblical studies culminated in this peak of poetic energy in which Hopkins composed his most renowned and most well-loved poetry. Hopkins not only developed theories, but also developed the tools to put them into practice, as this analysis has substantiated. He relies on accumulated alliteration, sprung rhythm, outrides, slurs, and great colons to build instress which then bursts forth into meaning. He relies on obscure metrical patterns to recreate the sensation of present action. By following Ruskin's aesthetic process, Hopkins' advocates the

moral that glory comes thorugh enacting one's inscape by fulfilling one's divine purpose, no matter how dangerous it may be. Christ, to whom the sonnet is dedicated, is the model for all to follow.

Conclusion: Inscape

What I initially appreciated about Gerard Manley Hopkins' poems, specifically "God's Grandeur," "The Windhover," and "Pied Beauty," and what first attracted me to them was a sense of vicariously experiencing the subject of the poems, such as a windhover abruptly dashing from its circling control in a fury of feathers towards the ground. What I understood emotionally, I have now substantiated as being due to Hopkins' quest for inscape. A study of the genesis of his theory has shed light onto its meaning and application, as a tightening fullness of Being that explodes into meaning as the thing (whether the subject of the poem, the poem itself, the poet, or the reader) lives out its God-given purpose. Hopkins attains this tightening through soundscape, the poem's alliteration and rhythm. So, what first attracted me to Hopkins' unique poetry, I now comprehend as the effect of the theory of inscape – the incarnation of Christ – in practice. The soundscape creates a sensation of movement, as the windhover hurls towards the ground, as well as immobility and silence, as it sagely observes God's creation from above. It also reenacts the ring of a stone bouncing off the side of a well and then its thud as it hits the water and sinks to the bottom. The poem itself becomes a metaphor through inscape, by way of the instressed soundscape.

It is a pity that a genetic analysis could not be effectuated on "Pied Beauty" due to a lack of manuscript material.[38] Likewise, only a relatively short analysis could have been effected on "As Kingfishers" as there is only one manuscript. This analysis, although brief in nature, would be worthwhile since the manuscript is a working document in which Hopkins rewrites every line until it satisfies him (*Later*, Plates 114-5, 106-7).

Moreover, it is a pity for the literary critic and reader that, due to Hopkins' conscience, he burned other poems. At the beginning of his correspondence with poet Richard Watson Dixon, while they were still coming to know each other, Hopkins wrote: "You ask, do I write verse myself. What I had written I burnt before I became a Jesuit and resolved to write no more, as not belonging to my profession" (*Lii* 14; 5 Oct. 1878). This gives a clue to the enigmatic journal entry of 11 May 1868 that reads: "Dull; afternoon fine. Slaughter of the Innocents" (*J* 165) written just six days after he "[r]esolved to be a religious" (*J* 165; 5 May

[38] There are two manuscripts. The first is a faircopy sent to Bridges (*Later*, Plate 310, 126) and the second is the faircopy that Bridges transcribed from the first (*Later,* Plate 311, 127). Hopkins did verify Bridges' transcriptions, but made no changes to it, only reinserting the diacritical marks that Bridges had neglected to include.

1868). The poems were innocent victims of his devotion to God, becoming a burnt sacrifice. Poems were to him, after all, "darling children of [the] mind" (*Lii* 8; 13 June 1878).

It is also seems a pity that his works were not published in his lifetime, though it cannot be known what effect publication would have had on his poetic impulses or even the public and the future shape of letters. His friend and fellow poet Richard Watson Dixon shared my opinion. After receiving the only copies of the *Eurydice*, the *Deutschland*, and several sonnets including "Starlight Night, "Duns Scotus's Oxford," and "The Windhover" that Hopkins had in his possession, he wrote to Hopkins: "They are among the most extraordinary I ever read & amazingly original. … It seems to me they ought to be published" (*Lii* 26-27; 5 April 1879). He then offered to include a footnote about Hopkins' poems in his upcoming volume of Church History, for which "[his] object would be to awaken public interest & expectation in your as yet unpublished poems" (*Lii* 27; 5 April 1879). Hopkins refused this exposure, citing a fear of seeming insubordinate to his superiors (*Lii* 28; 12 May 1879). He did qualify this concern by writing: "I could wish, I allow, that my pieces could at some time become known but in some spontaneous way, so to speak, and without my forcing" (*Lii* 28; 12 May 1879). So, although it seems a pity that his contemporaries did not have the opportunity to read his works, we can only be pleased that his wishes were respected in this manner.

Beyond his dedication to the Order, his notes and letters reveal that he did not trust his readership to understand the works as he wished them to be understood. He feared unwarranted criticism. He also did not trust publications to print the pieces according to his wishes. In an explanation to Dixon about his reluctance for *Eurydice* to be published in a local newspaper, he wrote: "if the paper takes the piece (which it is sure to misprint) few will read it and of those few fewer will scan it, much less understand or like it" (*Lii* 31; 31 Oct. 1879). His defense mechanisms were developed to protect him from the overwhelming disappointment he experienced when *The Wreck of the Deutschland* was first accepted for publication in the Jesuit journal *The Month* and then summarily rejected (*Lii* 15; 5 Oct. 1878). The rejection was all the more hurtful in that he was specifically asked by his rector to write a poem commemorating the shipwreck which led to the drowning of seventy-eight people, five of whom were Franciscan nuns escaping the persecution of the anti-Catholic Falk Laws of Germany (*Lii* 15; 5 Oct. 1878). He had ceased to write ever since he had joined the Order and only accepted to take up the pen again through submission to his authority.

Although he was now "free to compose" (*Lii* 15; 5 Oct. 1878), he found that "the impulse to write is wanting, for I have no thought of publishing" (*Lii* 15; 5 Oct. 1878). He had been so devastated by the rejection of a journal that seemed the most likely to publish his work, that he had given up the desire to publish. And this lack of desire, he expressly stated, had directly led to a reduction in his poetic output and inspiration. We are all at a loss for what this man may have created.

Although it seems that his true motive was to remove all possibility of further disappointment and hurt, he continued to use his faith as a defense that could not be opposed. Consider this argument that he gave Dixon for not seeking publication: "Nevertheless fame[,] whether won or lost[,] is a thing which lies in the award of a random, reckless, incompetent, and unjust judge, the public, the multitude. The only just judge, the only just literary critic, is Christ" (*Lii* 8; 13 June 1878). I hope that I, in this study, have proven to be a just literary critic of Gerard Manley Hopkins' work.

I leave you with Bridges' sonnet for Hopkins, which he placed in the Preface of the *Poems*:

Our generation already is overpast,
And they lov'd legacy, Gerard, hath lain
Coy in my home; as once thy heart was fain
Of shelter, when God's terror held thee fast
In life's wild wood at Beauty and Sorrow aghast;
Thy sainted sense trammel'd in ghostly pain,
Thy rare ill-broker'd talent in disdain:
Yet love of Christ will win man's love at last.
Hell wars without; but, dear, the while my hands
Gather'd thy book, I heard, this wintry day,
Thy spirit thank me, in his young delight
Stepping again upon the yellow sands.
Go forth: amidst our chaffinch flock display
Thy plumage of far wonder and heavenward flight!

Chilswell, Jan. 1918

Bibliography

Adluri, Vishwa. *Parmenides, Plato and Mortal Philosophy: Return from Transcendence.* London: Continuum International Publishing, 2011. Print.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica.* London: Burns Oates and Washburn, 1920. Print.

Ballinger, Philip. "Ruskin: Hopkins' 'Silent Don.'" *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*. 85.338 (1996): 116-124. JSTOR. *Irish Province of the Society of Jesus*. Web. 25 Feb 2013.

Bergonzi, Bernard. *Gerard Manley Hopkins.* New York: Macmillan, 1977. Print.

"Blue." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Boenig, Robert. "Hopkins and Dylan Thomas." *Hopkins among the Poets: Studies in Modern Responses to GMH.* Vol 3. Ed. Robert F. Giles. Waterloo, ON: International Hopkins Assoc., 1985. Print.

"Buckle." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

"Buckler." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Clement of Alexandria. *Stromata.* Trans. William Wilson. *The Writings of Clement of Alexandria.* Eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1869. Print.

"Consist: Colossians 1:17." Institute for Creation Research. Web. 12 Aug. 2010.

Cotter, Finn. *Inscape: The Christology and Poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1972. Print.

---."The Inshape of Inscape." *Victorian Poetry.* 42.2 (2004). *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2012.

"Dauphin." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

de Biasi, Pierre-Marc. "What is a Literary Draft?: Towards a Functional Typology of Genetic Documentation." *Yale French Studies.* 89 (1996): 26-58. *JSTOR.* Web. 3 Aug. 2009.

de Mornay, Philippe. *De la vérité de la religion chrestienne, contre les athées, épicuriens, payens, juifs, mahumédistes et autres infidèles.* Anvers : Christophe Plantin, 1581. Print.

Downes, David A. "Religious Consciousness in Hopkins." *The Fine Delight: Centenary Essays on Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Ed. Francis L. Fennel. Chicago: Loyola UP, 1989. Print.

"Eleaticism." *Encyc*lop*ædia Britannica*. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., 2005. Print.

Eliot, George. "Art and Belles Lettres." *The Westminster Review.* 65 (1856): 625-50. Print.

"Ember." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Empson, William. *Seven Types of Ambiguity.* New York: New Directions, 1930. Print.

"Fear." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Fennel, Francis L. "'The Terrible Crystal": Hopkins' Poetry after 100 Years." *The Fine Delight: Centenary Essays on Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Ed. Francis L. Fennel. Chicago: Loyola UP, 1989. Print.

Fordham, Finn. *I Do I Undo I Redo: The Textual Genesis of Modernist Selves in Hopkins, Yeats, Conrad, Forster, Joyce, and Woolf.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. Print.

Geldard, Richard G. *Parmenides and the Way of Truth: Translation and Commentary*. Rhinebeck, NY: Monkfish Book Publishing, 2007. Print.

"Genesis 1." *Pulpit Commentary.* Ed. Joseph S. Exell and H.D.M. Spence-Jones. Vol. 1. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1897. Print.

Gill, John. *Exposition of the Old and New Testaments.* London: George Keith, 1765. Print.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature: The Major Authors*. 8th ed. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2006. Print.

Heuser, Alan. *The Shaping Vision of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. London: Oxford UP, 1958. Print.

Honderich, Ted, ed. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Hopkins, Gerard Manley. *Further Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins, including his correspondence with Coventry Patmore.* Ed. Claude Colleer Abbott. 2nd edition. London: Oxford UP, 1956. Print.

---. *The Journals and Papers*. Eds. Humphrey House and Graham Storey. London: Oxford UP, 1959. Print.

---. *Poems*. 4th edition. Eds. W.H. Gardner and N.H. MacKenzie. London: Oxford, UP, 1967. Print.

---. *Sermons and Devotional Writings.* Ed. Christopher Devlin. London: Oxford UP, 1959. Print.

Hopkins, Gerard Manley, and Richard Watson Dixon. *The Correspondence of Gerard Manley Hopkins and Richard Watson Dixon: Edited with Notes and an Introduction by Claude Colleer Abbott.* Ed. Claude Colleer Abbott. 2nd edition. London: Oxford UP, 1955. Print.

Hopkins, Gerard Manley, and Robert Bridges. *The Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins to Robert Bridges: Edited with Notes and an Introduction by Claude Colleer Abbott.* Ed. Claude Colleer Abbott. 2nd edition. London: Oxford UP, 1955. Print.

House, Humphrey. Footnotes. *The Journals and Papers*. Eds. Humphrey House and Graham Storey. London: Oxford UP, 1959. Print.

Hunter, Jim. *Gerard Manley Hopkins*. London: Evans Brothers, 1966. Print.

"Inbeing." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

"Inscape." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

"Inshape." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

King James Version. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989. Print.

Leavis, F.R. "Metaphysical Isolation" *Gerard Manley Hopkins: A Critical Symposium*. Ed. Leavis, F.R. 2nd edition. London: Burns and Oates, 1975. Print.

MacKenzie, Norman H. *The Early Poetic Manuscripts and Note-Books of Gerard Manley Hopkins in Facsimile: Edited with Annotations, Transcriptions of Unpublished Passages and an Explanatory Introduction.* New York: Garland Publishing, 1989. Print.

Mackey, Louis. *Peregrinations of the World: Essays in Medieval Philosophy*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1997. Print.

---. *The Later Poetic Manuscripts of Gerard Manley Hopkins in Facsimile: Edited with Annotations, Transcriptions of Obscure Words and an Explanatory Introduction.* New York: Garland Publishing, 1991. Print.

"Minion." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

New International Version. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984. Print.

"Realism." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995. Print.

"Reck." OED. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

"Paeon." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Parmenides. "On Nature." Trans. Burnet, John. *Early Greek Philosophy*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1892. Print.

Pick, John.*Gerard Manley Hopkins, Priest and Poet*. London: Oxford, UP, 1942. Print.

"Plume." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Popper, Karl R. *The World of Parmenides: Essays on the Pre-Socratic Enlightenment*. London: Routledge, 1998. Print.

Ruggles, Eleanor. *Gerard Manley Hopkins: A Life*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1944. Print.

Ruskin, John. *The Works of John Ruskin*. Vol. 3. Eds. E.T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn, London: George Allen, 1899. Print.

Scott, Charles T. "Towards a Formal Poetics: Metrical Patterning in 'The Windhover.'" *Essays in Modern Stylistics*. Ed. Donald C. Freeman. London: Methuen, 1981. Print.

"Shape." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

"Sheer." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Sidney, Sir Philip and Arthur Golding. *The Woorke Concerning the Trewnesse of the Christian Religion Against Atheists, Epicures, Paynims, Jewes, Mahumetists, and Other Infidels.* London: Thomas Cadman, 1587. Print.

"Sillion." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

"Sprung Rhythm." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Stephenson, Edward A. "Hopkins' 'Sprung Rhythm' and the Rhythm of 'Beowulf.'" *Victorian Poetry* 19.2 (1981): 97-116. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 October 2011.

"Soundscape." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Stevenson, Charles L. "The Rhythm of English Verse." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. 28.3 (1970): 327-344. *JSTOR.* Web. 23 October 2011.

Sulloway, Alison G. *Gerard Manley Hopkins and the Victorian Temper.* New York: Columbia UP, 1972. Print.

Thanassas, Panagiotis. *Parmenides, Cosmos, and Being: A Philosophical Interpretation*. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette UP, 2007. Print.

"Tread." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

"Trod." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

"Trudge." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

"Vermilion." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

"Wimple." *OED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Wimsatt, James I. *Hopkins' Poetics of Speech Sound: Sprung Rhythm, Lettering, Inscape.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006. Print.

Wolosky, Shira. *The Art of Poetry: How to Read a Poem*. London: Oxford UP, 2001. Print.