

**A CLOUDLESS STAR: NOTES ON A LATIN ELEGY BY
GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS (1844–1889)**

Helen Lenahan (University of KwaZulu-Natal)

By profession, Gerard Manley Hopkins was a Classicist. From his novitiate to his death, he taught Greek and Latin at Jesuit schools in England, then at University College Dublin. Remarks in his journals and letters make clear his deep and lifelong engagement with Classics, and the influence of classical literature, particularly the work of Pindar and the Pre-Socratic philosophers, on his English poetry has been observed by numerous critics. Subject to less attention are the poems Hopkins composed in Latin, which include verse composition and translations from English. This article considers one such poem, an original Latin elegy composed in 1867, and explores its language, imagery, literary influences, and possible interpretations.

Keywords: Gerard Manley Hopkins; Victorian poetry; Neo-Latin; Latin elegy; classical reception.

When Gerard Manley Hopkins died in 1889, he was better known to his acquaintances as a Classicist than as a poet.¹ In 1884, he had been appointed Professor of Greek at University College Dublin, which had been under Jesuit management since November the previous year and urgently needed to fill a Fellowship in Classics. At the time, Hopkins was the only English Jesuit both qualified for the position and, more importantly, considered dispensable by his previous institution, Stonyhurst College, where he had been teaching advanced Latin and Greek since September 1882 (Martin 1991:362). On the subject of Hopkins' suitability for the post, Jesuit administrators advised that he was 'clever, well-trained, teaches well but has never succeeded well: his mind runs in eccentric ways' (Morrissey 1987:195–196). Unsurprisingly, there followed initial uncertainty on the part of the University regarding Hopkins' appointment. These misgivings were eventually put aside, perhaps out of necessity, perhaps due to the glowing references Hopkins received from his contacts at Oxford. His old tutor at Balliol, Benjamin Jowett, is alleged to have called him the 'star of Balliol', and

¹ The first collection of Hopkins' previously unpublished poetry was produced by his close friend and fellow poet, Robert Bridges, in 1918, nearly thirty years after his death.

R.L. Nettleship, another of his teachers, described him as ‘one of the cleverest and most original men at Oxford in his time’ (Tierney 1954:32).²

In addition to these impressive recommendations, there is a wealth of evidence for Hopkins’ early academic success and enthusiastic engagement with the Classics. While a student at Highgate School, he won ‘prizes for Classics annually for seven years until he left the school’, including awards for both Latin prose and verse composition, but was seldom at the top of his class due to a marked weakness in mathematics (Martin 1991:14). In 1863, he won an exhibition or lesser scholarship to Balliol, where he studied Classics and attended weekly lectures on, amongst others, Aeschylus, Homer, Aeschines, Virgil and Thucydides, as well as seminars in Latin prose composition (Martin 1991:36). The ability to compose well in Latin and Greek, both in prose and in verse, held particular significance in the *Literae Humaniores* in Hopkins’ time and well into the 20th century.³ In their initial meeting, Jowett advised Hopkins that it was the quality of his Latin composition upon which ‘would depend [his] success more than anything else’ (Phillips 1991:13). Perhaps Hopkins took this advice to heart, for in 1867 he received a ‘Double First’ for his degree, with First Class passes in both ‘Mods’, the literary section of the degree, and ‘Greats’, the section dedicated to Greek and Roman history and philosophy. Prevented from taking up a Fellowship at an Oxford college by his recent conversion to Roman Catholicism, Hopkins spent much of his adult life as a Jesuit schoolmaster, teaching Latin, Greek, and English at various Catholic schools in England, including Manresa House, Mount St Mary’s College, and Stonyhurst, before accepting his professorship at University College Dublin.

While employed as a professor, Hopkins is known to have taught courses on Homer, Aeschylus’ *Libation Bearers*, Virgil’s *Georgics*, and Tacitus’ *Histories*. Some of his preparatory notes for the last of these are preserved in the Jesuit archives in Dublin, including marginalia in William Henry Simcox’s 1876 edition, which suggest that Hopkins ‘had read and prepared the text very closely indeed and had singled out for comment a number of difficult passages’ (Smith 1990:312). Regarding his academic research in Classics, Hopkins appears to have felt a duty to write and to publish that was far less complex than his feelings about the publication of his poetry. In 1887, he wrote to an old school friend,

² The approval of Jowett and Nettleship would have carried a great deal of weight at the time. Jowett was Regius Professor of Greek from 1855–1893 and Nettleship was the Corpus Christi Professor of Latin from 1878–1893.

³ Donald Russell recalls of his own experience as a ‘Mods’ student at Oxford in 1939 that composition and textual criticism dominated the curriculum, his timetable including ‘two half-hour tutorials a week for compositions and unseens, and maybe one essay a year, by way of light relief’ (2007:226).

Richard Watson Dixon, that ‘what becomes of my verses I care little, but about things like this, what I write or could write on philosophical matters, I do’ (Phillips 1991:246). He ultimately published nothing academic, but in Dublin he had plans for an article on the final choral ode of Aeschylus’ *Libation Bearers*, and books on choral lyric and Greek meter (Smith 1990:306; 313).

Hopkins himself insisted that the influence of this lifelong exposure to classical literature upon his English poetry was at most an exceedingly subtle one. In an 1888 letter to Robert Bridges, he claims that ‘the effect of studying masterpieces is to make me admire and do otherwise. So it must be on every original artist to some degree, on me to a marked degree. Perhaps then more reading would only refine my singularity.’ (Phillips 1991:282–283). Despite this, since the publication of Hopkins’ poetry, the classical influence on his meter, style, and motifs has been discussed at lengths too great to consider comprehensively here. Briefly, however, observations of a broadly Greek and Latin influence on Hopkins’ idiosyncrasies of metre and style, as well as the specific influence of a number of classical authors, may be of some immediate interest to classicists.

Bonn (1949) lays out a fascinating argument for the indebtedness of Hopkins’ sprung rhythm to his understanding (or happy misunderstanding) of Greek choral metre,⁴ and, indeed, Hopkins himself claimed, with a confidence difficult to justify, that ‘the rhythm of Greek tragic choruses or of Pindar [...] is pure sprung rhythm’ (Phillips 1991:172). Bender explores this further in his 1966 work on the classical background of Hopkins’ poetry, while contributing his own observations, more recently discussed in Arkins (1997), on the connection between Hopkins’ use of hyperbaton and the syntax of Greek and Latin, which in his English verse is used ‘to stress non-linear word order and so provide the defamiliarization so important in serious poetry’ (Arkins 1997:469). Of the more specific classical influences on Hopkins’ work, the most prominently recognized and convincingly argued are, in the author’s opinion, Aeschylus regarding style,⁵

⁴ Hopkins appears to have held that Dorian metre ‘was composed of dactylic and trochaic feet mixed indiscriminately, but that the feet were equivalent because they were isochronous’ (Bender 1966:73). This is not the modern consensus, and Hopkins admitted to having read very little of the contemporary scholarship on the issue (Bonn 1949:74). However, Bender 1966:73 argues that ‘even if Hopkins’ theory of Dorian metre is inaccurate as a description of the Greek, his misconception may have influenced his English metre.’

⁵ See Stanford 1941 on the shared ‘marks of style’ between Hopkins and Aeschylus, including ‘neologisms, rare words, accumulation of epithets, imaginative periphrases, and synaesthetic metaphor’ (366). The article is well worth reading for its side-by-side comparisons of selections from Hopkins and Aeschylus.

Pindar regarding meter and form,⁶ and the pre-Socratic philosophers regarding recurring philosophical motifs.⁷

Notably sparse in this otherwise rich and varied discourse on Hopkins as a classicist and as a classically-inspired poet is close analysis of his Latin poetry. It may well surprise a reader, even one otherwise familiar with Hopkins' English work, to discover that he composed several original Latin poems, ten of which have been published, as well as another nine translations of English verse into Latin, including verses from Christina Rossetti, Milton, and Shakespeare. These Latin works, though dwarfed in number by Hopkins' English verse, were a remarkably constant feature of his poetic life. The earliest Latin poem of note, *Inundatio Oxoniana*, was written around 1865, when Hopkins was an undergraduate at Oxford, while the Latin translations of Shakespeare were sent to Bridges in October 1886, three years before Hopkins' death. In the same letter, Hopkins notes a sudden reawakening of his old interest in Latin composition, his 'Latin muse having been wholly mum for years' (Phillips 1991:236). With such an extensive timeframe available for Hopkins' composition of his Latin poems, it is perhaps predictable that their content and form should be quite varied. I would suggest that the original Latin poetry may be divided into three categories: the personal and largely secular, the explicitly religious, and the 'presentation pieces' written on behalf of Jesuit superiors.

The first category is comprised largely of the earlier poems, including *Inundatio Oxoniana*, on the subject of the flooding of the Isis in Oxford in 1865, *Tristi tu, memini*, a short, cryptic elegy written on the back of a letter to Bridges in 1867, and *Miror surgentem*, a reflection on the night sky, undated, but possibly around 1875 (MacKenzie 1990:311) and taken from one of Hopkins' journals. After Hopkins' conversion to Roman Catholicism and acceptance into the Jesuit order, Latin poems of the second and third category are dominant and can often be dated to this time with some confidence by the inclusion of the abbreviations AMDG (*ad maiorem Dei gloriam*) above each and LDS (*laus Deo semper*) below.⁸ Of the four religious poems, three are in praise of the Virgin Mary, including *Ad matrem virginem*, a pastiche of medieval Latin hymns, and one of St

⁶ For the influence of Pindar, and particularly the *Fourth Pythian*, on the form of 'The wreck of the Deutschland', see Jenkyns 1980:89–90. This influence was recognised by Hopkins, who defends the dearth of narrative in the poem on the grounds that it is an ode, and that 'there is some narrative in Pindar but the principal business is lyrical' (Phillips 1991:95).

⁷ For Hopkins' long-held affinity for pre-Socratic philosophers, including Heraclitus and Parmenides, see Johnson 1972, Foltz 1980, Arkins 1997, and Leshner 2011.

⁸ These being the motto of the Society of Jesus and a common Catholic monastic phrase respectively. Traditionally, both Jesuits and school children under the instruction of Jesuits were in the habit of placing the abbreviations at the beginning and end of all written work.

Winefred, the patron saint of Holywell in North Wales, where Hopkins spent three years as a novitiate at St Beuno's College. The final category comprises three 'presentation pieces', poems in honour of Catholic clergymen, either on notable occasions or upon their visits to Hopkins' various places of residence during his Jesuit training. Subjects of these pieces include James Brown, the Bishop of Shrewsbury from 1851–1881, the prominent Irish Dominican, Father Thomas Burke, whom Hopkins met at St Beuno's in 1877, and an unnamed Jesuit Provincial.

The first edition of Hopkins' works to contain a complete account of the Latin poems, along with prose translations for the Latinless reader, was the seminal 1967 edition by Gardner and MacKenzie. The Latin poems were translated and briefly commented upon by an acquaintance of Gardner's, one Professor B H P Farrer of the Classics Department of the University of Natal. Farrer was born in Grahamstown, completed a BA in Greek and Latin at Rhodes and an MA at the University of South Africa, before reading 'Greats' at Oriol College, Oxford. He was on the staff of the University of Natal Classics Department, Pietermaritzburg, from 1935–1971 and Chairman of the Classical Association of South Africa in 1966. Following his death in 1986, an obituary by V J Bredenkamp appeared in volume 27 of *Akroterion*. That Gardner approached Farrer for translation and advice on the classical elements of the Latin poems is not as surprising as it may first appear. Gardner was himself a staff member at Natal, the Head of the English Department from 1962–1967 and long-time editor of the journal *Theoria*, in which Farrer published 'Cicero's friend Atticus' in 1963. His translations in the 1967 edition are in plain, workmanly prose; his comments, while of real grammatical assistance, decline to pass judgement on the quality of the work.

The editors of the third and fourth editions of Hopkins' poetry, Gardner and MacKenzie for the former (1967), MacKenzie alone for the latter (1990), are not Classicists. Perhaps not unrelatedly, they discuss the Latin poems and translations with rather hopeful enthusiasm. MacKenzie asserts in his foreword of 1967, regarding the inclusion of previously unpublished Latin poems, that 'every aspect of G.M.H.'s remarkable achievement is worthy of scrutiny' and 'the individual touch of genius in these classical renderings must not be obscured by their occasional oversights' (lxi–lxii). In his own foreword, Gardner suggests evidence of Hopkins' English style in his Latin verse, such as a tendency 'towards the fastidiously individual word or the rare construction' and 'the desire to strike upon the least common diction' (lx–lxi). These comments appear in the introduction to an edition that, as Gardner acknowledges, felt the pressure of an 'intense general and critical interest in Hopkins ... [that] stirred in many scholars and students the desire to read everything he had ever written' (xiv), in direct

opposition to the more discreet editing style adopted by Bridges in his first edition of 1918. It is therefore to be expected that the editors of such a collection would feel the need to justify this approach and hence also the inclusion of the Latin poems.

However, from the minimal notes by Farrer and occasional attributions to unnamed 'Latin scholars' and 'Classicists' in both the third and fourth editions, it is possible to infer a cooler attitude towards Hopkins' Latin efforts. MacKenzie relates the tendency of Classicists, sent the Latin poems for comment, to return them with 'G.M.H.'s eccentricities in meter or vocabulary [...] tactfully corrected' or some phrases simply 'considered inexplicable' (1967:lx–lxi). In the notes of Farrer and of Colin G. Hardy, who contributed fresh translations to the fourth edition, one comes across a range of remarks from the tepid: 'not unattractive' (1967:333), 'involved and obscure' (319), 'unusual' (320), to the unimpressed: 'somewhat abrupt' (ibid), 'abrupt and awkward' (1990:293).⁹ More recently, Classicists wholly unconnected to the compilation of these editions have made their feelings known even more plainly. Watt (1997:83) observes that 'as a writer of Latin verse Hopkins is unremarkable, many of his contemporaries [...] could do much better' and rejects Gardner and MacKenzie's suggestions that 'the awkwardness and infelicities of his Latin can reasonably be attributed to that deliberate avoidance of commonplace syntax which characterises his English poetry'. His article, 'Notes on the Latin Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins', offers an unbiased review of problems in the Latin poems, identifying several 'feeble stopgaps' (1997:84) and solecisms. In a 2006 analysis of Hopkins in the Classics, West wonders whether, in publishing certain of the Latin works, 'his editors have really done Hopkins a service' (2006:32).

These grammatical difficulties and, in some cases, real obscurity of intended meaning in the Latin poems may go some way towards explaining why, as West (2006:30) remarks, 'Hopkins' Latin verse attracts little attention', despite the stalwart assurances of Gardner and MacKenzie of its literary value. What attention the Latin poems have attracted has been largely editorial, particularly in the cases of the undergraduate composition *Inundatio Oxoniana*, which is riddled

⁹ It is amusing to note in Hopkins' letters that he was a far harsher critic of the Latin composition of others than Farrer and Hardy are of his, despite frequent opportunity. In a letter to Bridges, dated April 3, 1877, Hopkins praises the Latin verse sent to him by Bridges as 'most elegant and Latin, full of happiness', but goes on to call it 'often obscured or crabbed' and, surely playfully, 'a waste of time and money' (Phillips 1991:85). In general, this letter offers wonderful insight into the rigorous process of drafting and feedback Hopkins himself undertook when composing many of his Latin pieces, both at school and university, and in private.

with grammatical problems,¹⁰ and a heavily-revised poem written in honour of the Silver Jubilee of the Bishop of Shrewsbury *Ad episcopum salopiensem*.¹¹ The first draft of the latter was considered by its commissioners so unintelligible that Hopkins was made to abandon his first nine couplets in favour of something more straightforward (Gardner & MacKenzie 1967:329). The accepted version still contains some extraordinary contortions, as in lines 7–12, here bravely translated by Farrer:

*venit enim quintus vegeto et vigesimus annus
ex quo sacra tuumst lamina nacta caput.
ut reor, is numerus mortalia saecula quadrat:
saecla quadras, eadem dimidiare queas.
si Pius ille Petri pertingit et amplius annos
est cui longaevi nempe Joannis erunt.*

For, still in your prime, you have reached the twenty-fifth year since the time when the sacred mitre crowned your head. As I believe, that number adds a quarter to the mortal centuries [you add a quarter to the centuries]; may you in the same manner be able to halve them. If the famous Pius attains to the years of Peter, and more, then surely there is one whose years will be those of long-lived John.

Aside from these two problematic poems, a third piece, *Mirror surgentem*, has been examined by West (2006) from a more literary standpoint with some success, particularly regarding its relationship to Horace's *Odes* 4.7 and its focus on an ancient literary motif: the power of the night sky to console mortal man and bring him nearer the Divine (2006:29–30). West concludes that, although Hopkins' Latin poetry has its faults, *Mirror surgentem* suggests that 'he was well equipped to meet the challenge of expressing Christian themes in classical language and metre, a form of composition particularly associated with his order' (2006:30).

This is a remark in line with West's general approach to Hopkins' Latin verse, which I admire and will strive to emulate here. West touches lightly upon the much-debated questions of the eruditeness of Hopkins' Latin and of the possibility that its often awkward style shares something of the ingenuity and originality of his English verse, but her interest shifts smoothly to the thoughts

¹⁰ See the notes on *Inundatio Oxoniana* in Gardner & MacKenzie 1967:319–320, MacKenzie 1990:293–294, Watt 1997:83–84, West 2006:31–32. Watt considers lines 20–21 of this poem to be the 'two worst Latin lines that survive from Hopkins' pen'.

¹¹ See the thorough discussion of Hopkins' obscure use of the word *lamina* in line 8 of this poem, as well as its original opening, in Gardner & MacKenzie 1967:329–331.

and themes expressed by the Latin, rather than becoming ensnared in the minutiae of the Latin *per se*. In this way, she is able to make convincing observations on a distinct Horatian influence on *Mirror surgentem* and to suggest that Hopkins' poem may reply to it in certain ways that, when taken into consideration, add meaningfully to its appreciation. As West notes, 'Hopkins' New Year poem, marked by an unusually optimistic confidence in things to come, gains life from the contrast with Horace's sombre pagan melancholy' (2006:29). West's approach to *Mirror surgentem*, with its fresh analytical curiosity and a willingness to move past old sticking points, is one I would like to see applied to the other examples of Hopkins' Latin poetry, much of which has not been the subject of analysis at all. It is only fair, then, that I should make at least a small contribution in this regard, and that will be the subject of the remainder of my paper.

West observes in her conclusion that 'training in Latin verse composition is normally done by translation; free composition is a rare treat' (2006:32), and while there is undeniable value in Hopkins' translations into Latin which, among other points of interest, offer useful insights into his reading habits and taste as well as his Latin vocabulary and style, the original Latin poems seem, by their originality, even clearer windows into Hopkins' poetic imagination. This is particularly true of the Latin poems I have placed in the first category, which Hopkins wrote for himself only, with a personal rather than an explicitly religious, hymnic, or commemorative motivation.¹² These, unlike many of the translations and the compositions related to Hopkins' formal religious life, seem never to have been intended for publication or to be seen by eyes other than his own.¹³ They have been found, often in multiple rough drafts, among his journals and notes. Of this category of poems, the infamous *Inundatio Oxoniana* has been considered at some length by editors and critics, as already discussed, and West has made progress on the analysis of another, *Mirror surgentem*. The third, *Tristitu, memini*, which I previously described as a short and cryptic elegy, composed in 1867 when Hopkins was twenty-three and an undergraduate at Oxford, has been the subject of no analysis other than brief editorial notes in Gardner & MacKenzie (1967:320–321) and Watt (1997:84–85). It is, however, a fascinating

¹² This is not to suggest that the personal Latin poems are purely secular. Indeed, religious imagery and ideas are at the forefront, as in so many of Hopkins' English poems, but they are not medieval pastiche, theological, or commissioned by the Jesuit clergy.

¹³ Hopkins regularly presented his translations to others and intended to publish some, as shown in an 1886 letter to Bridges in which he reveals that he has sent some of his translations of Shakespeare to a 'Fr. Mat Russell of ours ... who edits a little half-religious publication the *Irish Monthly*' and others he believes he 'can and shall get published in the Trinity *Hermathena*' (Phillips 1991:136). The same year, he sent Bridges an incomplete Latin translation of 'In all things beautiful', one of Bridges' own poems (Gardner & MacKenzie 1967:341).

example of Hopkins' Latin work, if an obscure one, and I will here try to offer some suggestions on its context, interpretation, and classical influences.

Firstly, regarding the nature of *Tristi tu, memini* as Latin verse composition, it is worth recalling that at the time of its composition, Hopkins had already completed his degree and was under no academic obligation to compose it in Latin. He wrote his last Oxford exams in June 1867 and *Tristi tu, memini* was found on the back of a letter to Bridges dated 30 August 1867. At the least, this suggests that Latin composition was an earnest pleasure of Hopkins' and not a chore he longed to be rid of. However, when considered in its historical context, at a time when the place of Greek and Latin composition in upper-class English education was not without heated critical scrutiny and ideological baggage, Hopkins' uncoerced appreciation for composition may also be a subtle but expressive part of his identity as a descendant of the Oxford Movement and a devotee of John Henry Newton.

Ellis has shown evidence of a tension as early as the turn of the 19th century regarding the Classics syllabus at Oxford and the perceived dominance of High Church, Anglo-Catholic influence, as opposed to that of the Low Church or the more utilitarian-minded (2007:47). One flashpoint in this long-running conflict was the importance placed on the study of Latin and Greek, and on composition in particular. In 1809, R.L. Edgeworth's *Essays on Professional Education*, which outlines a utilitarian approach to education with far less focus on Classics, objects strongly to the prestige accorded composition thus:

It is not requisite that every man should make Latin and Greek verses; therefore a knowledge of prosody beyond the structure of hexameter and pentameter verses is as worthless an acquisition as any which folly or fashion has introduced amongst the higher classes of mankind (Edgeworth 1809:47).

In the same year, Sydney Smith reviewed *Essays on professional education* in the *Edinburgh Review*, and wholeheartedly supports Edgeworth's position on composition (1809:171). Moreover, Smith offers his own opinion that this approach 'cultivates the imagination a great deal too much [...] and trains too many young men to a style of elegant imbecility' (1809:172).

Ellis regards this claim, that the traditional public school method of classical instruction was at best unsuitable to the formation of youths useful to the modern state, as a forerunner to that made by Thomas Arnold and his supporters in the 1830s (2007:47–48). Arnold was at pains to argue for the potential utility of Classics, specifically advocating for the practical benefits of the study of ancient history and the political theory of Plato and Aristotle (2007:51; 53–54). Arnold, like Smith and Edgeworth before him, positioned the High Church clergymen at

Oxford, and especially John Henry Newman, in direct opposition to this approach. Arnold seems to associate what he considered a traditional Oxonian ‘idle and self-indulgent’ pursuit of classical knowledge without explicit functionality in modern society with the Tractarians’ Anglo-Catholic religious practices, which he describes as similarly ‘sentimental’, ‘excessive’ and ‘a fanaticism of mere foolery’ (2007:58). Notably, Arnold is alleged to have despised Newman’s enthusiasm for Latin verse composition as ‘one of the most contemptible prettinesses of the understanding’ (ibid).

When Hopkins went up to Oxford in 1863, Newman had been a Roman Catholic convert for eighteen years and so was no longer a member of the University. Nonetheless, among Hopkins’ distinctly Tractarian circle, Newman was viewed as ‘the departed leader’ of their movement and his influence on Hopkins was undeniable (Martin 1991:43). Indeed, Hopkins’ ultimate conversion to Roman Catholicism was made under the mentorship of Newman himself (1991:145). In this way, Hopkins’ composition of *Tristi tu, memini* at his leisure, for no purpose other than the intellectual exertion and personal satisfaction of composition, is an ideological statement in its own right. Like Newman, Hopkins was a follower of a conservative, classical, and Catholic academic tradition which ‘stressed contemplation, seclusion and the acquisition of knowledge for its own sake’ over the urgently practical focus of utilitarians like Smith and Arnold.

Personal and largely unpolished as it is, the Latin text of *Tristi tu, memini*¹⁴ must be consolidated from several rough drafts and is located among many variants (Gardner & MacKenzie 1967:320). I will use the text found in the third and fourth editions, which is as follows:

*Tristi tu, memini, virgo cum sorte fuisti,
illo nec steterat tempore primus amor.
iamque abeo: rursus tu sola relinqueris: ergo
tristior haec aetas; tristis et illa fuit.
adsum gratus ego necopini apparitor ignis,
inter ego vacuas stella serena nives.*¹⁵

The translation by Farrer in the 1967 edition is preferred by Watt due to its interpretation of the rather slippery *nec steterat [...] primus amor* (1997:85). Here I will give first Farrer’s and then the 1990 translation by Hardy.

I remember, girl, when your lot (plight?) was a sad one, nor at that time had my early love (for you) ceased. And now I am going away: again you

¹⁴ Poem 163 in Gardner & MacKenzie 1967 and Poem 84 (a) in MacKenzie 1990.

¹⁵ A draft of the first couplet gives a colon after *fuisti* (1) and *non illo* instead of *illo nec* (2); Gardner & MacKenzie 1967:320.

are being left alone: so, this occasion is a sadder one; yet that other was sad too. I am here welcome as one who lights and tends an unexpected fire, I am a tranquil star amid a waste of snows.

At that time, as I remember, when you, girl, were in a state of sadness, then your first love had not even existed. Now I depart, and you are again left alone: hence this is a sadder period; [though] that was sad too. I am welcome here as the minister of an unexpected fire, a cloudless star amid a waste of snows.

I am in agreement with Watt that Hardy's choice of the phrase 'had not even existed' is bold for *nec steterat*. However, Farrer's 'not ceased' is not the obvious choice, either. Watt offers the best and simplest translation, 'not yet stood firm (better "been established")' (1997:85).¹⁶ The other major difference between the two published translations is the attribution of the '*primus amor*' in question, for which the Latin offers no clarity. Farrer gives it to the poet, Hardy to the *virgo*. In combination, these two divergences in the translation of an admittedly ambiguous line produce subtly different readings of the first two couplets of the poem. In Farrer's, the poet addresses a girl he once loved, during which time she was sad, but he has since had to abandon her, his love implied to have faded or changed in some way since then. In Hardy's, the girl was sad before her love for the poet was awakened. Now she has been abandoned and so she is fated to be sad once again. Hardy's interpretation, to my ear at least, makes the best sense:

1. The *virgo* was sad before she fell in love.
2. She fell in love and was not so sad (implied).
3. The subject of her love abandoned her.
4. The *virgo* is sad again.

Something of a solution to the problem of the attribution of *primus amor* is the following variant of the line found in the same notes as the final text: *non illo steterat tempore noster amor* (MacKenzie 1990:295). The love is 'ours' and is meant to be attributed to both poet and girl. With these textual issues considered, I offer a modified translation, based on those of both Farrer and Hardy, and the notes by Watt:

I remember, girl, when your lot was a sad one, and at that time our first love had not yet stood firm. Now I depart: again you are being left alone: so, this period is a sadder one; though that other was sad too. I am here,

¹⁶ Cf. *OLD* '*sto*' 3 for the sense 'to stand firm' or 'succeed' and '*sto*' 14 for the sense 'to be established'.

welcomed as a servant of an unexpected fire, a cloudless star amid a waste of snows.

Translated this way, the poem's interpretation is more straightforward, but it is still an opaque piece, and several questions remain. Why the use of the comparative *tristior* in reference to the present moment, but the positive *tristis* in reference to the past? We are not told the context of the poet's departure and so we cannot know with certainty why the addressee's present cause for sadness is more serious than the previous one. More intriguing still is the final couplet, which shifts the focus of the poem from the sad maiden to the poet himself, abruptly and enigmatically. Where is the poet now? To whom is he *gratus*? To what fire is he attendant? Why is he comparable to a star? These questions are as crucial to the poem's interpretation as its textual difficulties.

At this point it is of use to turn to the drafts, variants and other lines of Latin verse found among the same notes as *Tristi tu, memini*, in order to take into account any reoccurring themes or images at the forefront of Hopkins' imagination at the time of its composition. Most evidently connected to *Tristi tu, memini* are two couplets which Gardner & MacKenzie consider 'a condensed variant of the whole' (1967:320). In the 1990 edition, MacKenzie numbers this fragment 84 (b):

*tristis eras dum me venturum, Cythna, putares.
et veni et redeo: iam quoque tristis eris.
adsum gratus ego necopini apparitor ignis,
inter ego gelidas stella serena nives.*

You were sad, Cythna, until you thought I was going to come.¹⁷ I have arrived and I return:¹⁸ now you will also be sad. I am here, welcomed as the servant of an unexpected fire, a cloudless star amid the cold snow.¹⁹

¹⁷ *Dum* should be taken as 'until' (cf. *OLD* 'dum' 5.b), rather than 'while', in order to make good sense here. *Putares* in the subjunctive indicates an expected event: 'until such time as you thought...'

¹⁸ I translate *redeo* simply as 'I return' (cf. *OLD* 'redeo' 1.), but the place to which the speaker is returning is not indicated. Is he to be imagined returning home, i.e., leaving Cythna, or returning to her now, as he once arrived on a separate occasion in the past? The phrase *veni et redeo*, with *veni* in the perfect, followed closely by *redeo* in the present, suggests to me that what is intended is a coming, already completed, followed closely by a departure, without a significant passage of time between them (cf. *OLD* 'redeo' 1.d for the use of *redeo* as 'to go' in the sense of 'to come and go'). In this case, *redeo* would be taken as the opposite of 'I arrive', i.e., to mean 'I leave' or 'depart'. This is supported by the fact that Cythna is sad at the speaker's 'return', just as she was before he initially arrived. If the common cause of both periods of sadness is his absence, *redeo* must imply departure

If this fragment is indeed the same idea reframed, it does shed some light onto the interpretation of *Tristi tu, memini*. From these lines, for example, it is possible to suggest that the use of ‘tristior’ in line 2 of *Tristi tu, memini* is *metri causa*, since 84 (b) makes no such distinction between present sorrow and past sorrow. The girl will simply be sad *quoque*, again. Additionally, Hopkins’ use of the last couplet in both poems, almost unchanged between them, suggests a particular affection for it, or perhaps that it is the distillation of the thought that the poem was written to express, and that the earlier lines were composed, with some difficulty, to complement it.

Of greatest interpretative interest, perhaps, is the name given in 84 (b) for the elegiac mistress, later called only *virgo*. Here she is ‘Cythna’, a name which is likely a reference to Shelley’s 1817 epic ‘The revolt of Islam’, in which two pious, incestuous lovers and revolutionaries, Laon and Cythna, Greeks living under Ottoman rule, defy the despot Othman and are ultimately martyred and transported to paradise. Indeed, the final couplet of Hopkins’ elegy is not dissimilar to sections from the final cantos of ‘The revolt of Islam’, in which Laon and Cythna are welcomed into the presence of ‘The better genius of this world’s estate’ (12.31). Consider, for example, these three lines, delivered by an angel to the dying lovers, on their martyrdom and the salvation of their souls by God:

And to long ages shall this hour be known,
And slowly shall its memory, ever burning,
Fill this dark night of things with an eternal morning (*Canto* 12.29).

The speaker in Hopkins’ elegy cannot, however, be taken as the voice of Laon addressing Shelley’s Cythna herself from heaven, since, in ‘The revolt of Islam’, the two are executed in the same moment, burned together at the stake. The use of the name must, therefore, be referential only, though this is enough to suggest that Hopkins has the image of ill-fated lovers, and of the consolation of paradise, in mind in *Tristi tu, memini*.

This idea is supported by other compositions by Hopkins from this period. In the same year he composed *Tristi tu, memini*, Hopkins also produced a translation into Latin of paragraphs 1 and 9 of ‘The convent threshold’, an 1862 poem by Christina Rossetti²⁰ written in reply to an earlier Dante Gabriel Rossetti

rather than another arrival. Note also the use of *abeo* in place of *redeo* in line 3 of *Tristi tu, memini*.

¹⁹ The translation here is my own.

²⁰ This poem is numbered 164 in the 1967 edition and 85 in the 1990 edition. Hopkins was significantly inspired by the poetry of Rossetti, whom he had met in London in July of 1864 (Martin 1991:72). Of her, he wrote that ‘for pathos and pure beauty of art I do not

poem, 'The blessed Damozel'. Both works recount the pleas of a young woman, who, about to take her orders as a nun, longs for her lover's redemption so that they might be reunited one day in heaven. The last paragraph of 'The convent threshold', while not one of those translated by Hopkins, best represents the trope I would suggest Hopkins may mean to invoke in *Tristi tu, memini*:

If now you saw me you would say:
 Where is the face I used to love?
 And I would answer: Gone before;
 It tarries veiled in Paradise.
 When once the morning star shall rise,
 When earth with shadow flees away
 And we stand safe within the door,
 Then you shall lift the veil thereof. (11.1–8)

Hopkins' preoccupation with 'The convent threshold' is evident three years earlier than his Latin translations of it, when, in 1864, he composed 'A voice from the world' as a reply to Rossetti's poem (MacKenzie 1990:251). Here the lover, abandoned for the convent and the promise of heaven, mourns the loss of his beloved, who is now as distant from him as though dead, or an unfeeling star:

And you are gone so heavenly far
 You hear nor care of love and pain.
 [...]
 You see but with a holier mind –
 You hear and, alter'd, do not hear
 Being a stoled apparel'd star. (34–42)

Undeniably similar, *Tristi tu, memini* not only recognises the grief of the lover left behind in its first two couplets, but in the last couplet also uses the same image of the departed beloved as a pure but distant star. On a higher, spiritual plane, the beloved is unaffected by the distress of the *virgo* at his absence, and instead fulfils a holy calling as a servant or 'apparitor' of God, who is represented by the '*ignis*' of *Tristi tu, memini*. The image of God or Christ as a holy fire, both terrifying and sustaining, is central to several of Hopkins' English poems. In 'The wreck of the Deutschland', for example, God is depicted as simultaneously incarnate in the violent fire of lightning at sea (9–16) and 'Our hearts' charity's hearth's fire' (280). Those who perish on the *Deutschland* and go to meet God 'flash from the flame to the flame' (24). Likewise, in 'God's grandeur', the glory

think [Dante Gabriel Rossetti] is her equal: in fact, the simple beauty of her work cannot be matched' (Gardner 1953:174).

of God makes the world ‘flame out, like shining from shook foil’ (2), and in ‘Windhover’ the presence of Christ in man is compared to the fire exposed in the hearts of embers when they are disturbed (12–14).²¹

The depiction of the beloved in *Tristi tu, memini* as the chaste attendant to a divine fire, kept at a privileged distance from the material world, is also perhaps a reference to the Vestal Virgins of Rome, who maintained the sacred flame of the goddess Vesta. The association of Vestal imagery with later Christian virginity and specifically with Catholic nuns is discussed at length by Bybee (2002) and Undheim (2017; 2020), and this comparison may well be what Hopkins intends here. Whether the beloved of *Tristi tu, memini* has departed for the monastery or for heaven itself is not clear or necessarily a crucial distinction for Hopkins. Both are equally ‘alien eaves’ (3) to the speaker of ‘A voice from the world’ and the ‘*virgo*’ of *Tristi tu, memini*. The beloved is in a heavenly sphere already, regardless, and is thus ‘alter’d’ and essentially lost to the worldly lover.

That Hopkins composed *Tristi tu, memini* as an elegy seems a noteworthy choice when considering an interpretation both romantic, the poem being an address from one lover to another, and mournful, since it concerns their separation by either untimely death or vows of celibacy. As a Victorian poet, Hopkins is the inheritor of three major elegiac traditions: Greek elegy, Latin love elegy, and the English elegy of the 16th century onward. A Latin poem in elegiac couplets, *Tristi tu, memini* is most clearly indebted in its language and metre to the second of these traditions, including the elegies of Catullus, Tibullus, Sulpicia, Propertius, and Ovid.²² I would also suggest several significant points of Latin elegiac influence in addition to those of form. For example, both *Tristi tu, memini* and its variant, 84 (b), make use of the Latin elegiac conceit of the poem as a direct address to a *puella* or mistress. The speaker of *Tristi tu, memini* addresses the elegiac *puella* only as *virgo*, much as Catullus refers to his own mistress on occasion simply as *puella* (8.12), but in Hopkins’ 84 (b) the name ‘Cythna’ is used, as already discussed. As with Catullus’ Lesbia, Tibullus’ Delia, and Propertius’ Cynthia, Hopkins’ choice of ‘Cythna’ as the pseudonym of his poem’s *puella* is a literary allusion, in this case to the poetry of Shelley rather than to that of Sappho or to Apollo, the patron of the Muses.

From the opening line of *Tristi tu, memini*, Hopkins’ *virgo* is a dejected figure, alone and abandoned, and this is not an entirely unfamiliar depiction of the

²¹ For a thorough review of the motif of divine fire in Hopkins’ poetry, see Wooton 1962.

²² Hopkins’ professional familiarity with the Latin elegists is confirmed by numerous references to Propertius, Catullus, and Ovid in his journals and correspondence. See, for example, Hopkins’ lecture notes on Latin and Greek metre (House & Storey 1959:279–282).

Latin elegiac *puella*. James, on the frequency of female tears in Latin elegy, notes that ‘both lover and beloved weep as part of a strategic program in the complex game of elegiac love affairs’ (2003:100). Regularly, as in *Tristi tu, memini*, the source of the unhappiness of the *puella* lies in the speaker’s departure or death, whether real or imagined. Thus, Tibullus recalls Delia’s tears and anxiety over his absence (1.3.14) and predicts her inconsolable grief at his funeral (1.1.61–63), while Propertius hopes no other love will prevent Cynthia from crying her fill at his graveside (1.19.23). As observed by James, however, ‘most of the weeping in Propertius and Tibullus is ... male, enacted by the lover’ (2003:104). Indeed, the emotional suffering of the male lover at the hands of his mistress is an important *topos* of Latin erotic elegy, a significant feature of both *servitium amoris*, the slavery of love, and *morbus amoris*, the disease of love. A major cause of this distress is that, while the elegiac lover is hopelessly in thrall to his beloved, she, the *dura puella*, remains callously unmoved by his pain, as in the case of the figure of the *exclusus amator*, the lover shut out of his beloved’s presence, who pleads with her to admit him.²³

This is the image from Latin elegy that seems to me the most recognisable in *Tristi tu, memini*, if one allows for some manipulation of the standard elegiac roles of speaker/lover/male and addressed/beloved/female. Here, the speaker himself is the cold beloved, a kind of *durus puer*. He observes the *virgo*, the tortured lover in this instance, and is aware of both her love for him and her sorrow at his absence but makes no mention of reciprocal feelings or a willingness to bring her suffering to an end. The *virgo*, on the other hand, takes the part of the *exclusus amator*, or *exclusa amatrix* in this case: a pathetic figure, separated from the object of her desire and unable to move him by her sadness, a typical elegiac predicament. Here, however, the obstacle between lover and beloved is not a physical door or a door-keeping slave, as in the pagan *paraklausithyron*, but the transcendence of the beloved to a higher, holier spiritual plane.

Untimely death and the soul’s apotheosis or, in more Christian terms, the promise of eternal life after death, are familiar elegiac motifs, not from Latin erotic elegy, but from the laments of Greek and Latin pastoral elegy, which would become the main model for later English elegy. The subject of the pastoral elegy is typically a deceased youth, prominent classical examples of which include Daphnis in Theocritus’ *Idyll* 1 and Virgil’s Fifth Eclogue, Adonis in *Idyll* 15 and Bion’s *Lament for Adonis*, and Gallus in Virgil’s Tenth Eclogue. In pagan pastoral elegy, there may or may not be a consolation offered regarding the fate

²³ For Latin elegiac examples of the *exclusus amator*, see Tibullus 1.2, Propertius 1.16 and 2.17 and Ovid’s *Amores* 1.6. Copley 1956 offers an exhaustive review of the trope.

of the subject's soul after death. In *Idyll* 1, Theocritus' Daphnis causes a great upset of nature by his death because of the grief of the whole natural world (132–136), but there is no hint given of his elevation to a higher spiritual plain, and the lament of *Idyll* 1 ends on a strictly mournful note. In the Fifth Eclogue, however, Virgil's Daphnis experiences apotheosis proper upon his death, during which he enters the gates of Olympus and becomes a pastoral deity and protector of the flock, to whom herdsmen offer prayers and sacrifice (64–80). The upheaval of the natural world caused by Daphnis' death in *Idyll* 1 is inverted: there is peace among its animal inhabitants and the mountains themselves sing with joy at Daphnis' divine resurrection (56–64).

This consolatory inversion, in which the grief and suffering of death turns into joy and the recognition of new life, is received and richly developed in English elegy, incorporating the Christian reassurance that the dead are saved from eternal death by Christ. It is prominently included, for example, in two well-known English elegies: Milton's 'Lycidas' and Shelley's 'Adonais'. In both poems, the subject, a young man who has died, is said to be not truly dead, but resurrected like a star that sets and rises again. Thus, Milton reassures the reader that 'Lycidas, your sorrow, is not dead, / Sunk though he be beneath the wat'ry floor; / So sinks the day-star in the ocean bed, / And yet anon repairs his drooping head' (165–169). Even more reminiscent of the imagery of *Tristi tu, memini* is that of 'Adonais', Shelley's elegy on the death of John Keats, in which the fear and darkness of death is held at bay by the transformed soul of Adonais, which acts as the speaker's guide into heaven:

I am borne darkly, fearfully, afar
 Whilst, burning through the inmost veil of Heaven,
 The soul of Adonais, like a star,
 Beacons from the abode where the Eternal are. (LV 6–9)

Just so does the speaker of *Tristi tu, memini*, who takes the place of Adonais here, call himself *inter [...] vacuas stella serena nives*, 'a cloudless star amid a waste of snow' (6). The departed speaker of *Tristi tu, memini* is also welcomed into heaven to be a guiding star, a beacon to those still living, for whom mortality is a cold, dark shroud yet to be cast aside.²⁴

Thus *Tristi tu, memini* may be interpreted as an amalgamation of *topoi* from both Latin erotic elegy and English elegy, as received from Greek pastoral poetry. The dead youth of the traditional pastoral elegy is presented as a variant on the *dura puella* of Latin erotic elegy. He is as detached and as unmoved by the

²⁴ For a thorough review of the provenance of Shelley's image of Adonais' soul as a star, see Wasserman 1971:477–488.

grief of those left behind as any Delia or Lesbia, and as unattainable in heaven, if not more so, as if he were behind the locked gates of the *paraklausithyron*. The *virgo*, locked out of her beloved's chaste happiness like the lover of Latin elegy, is made wretched by her exile from him. Indeed, rather than consoled by the guiding star his soul is proposed to be and by the knowledge of her lover's resurrection through Christ, the *virgo* is *tristior*, sadder than before she loved at all.

In Gabriel Rossetti's 'The blessed Damozel', Christina Rossetti's 'The convent threshold', and Hopkins' 'A voice from the world' there exists this same irreconcilable tension between the tortured love of the *exclusus amator* of Latin erotic elegy and the joy of the departed lover as promised by the Christian consolation of English elegy. In all of these poems, the selfish demands of erotic love, as represented by the worldly lover, are pitted against the allegedly selfless, but simultaneously callous, transformation of the soul after death or holy orders, as represented by the pious beloved. The chaste Christian consolation falls short: the beloved lives on in heaven, but in this new state of being they are utterly abstracted from the tangible desires of the worldly lover, so that their very sanctity is barely distinguishable from the cruel indifference of the *dura puella*. In *Tristi tu, memini* this tension is expressed specifically in Latin elegiac couplets, and the combination of the form and language of Latin erotic elegy with imagery from the English elegiac consolation, bring it into particularly sharp relief.

Worth further mention is that, alongside *Tristi tu, memini* and the translation of 'The convent threshold', there exists a third classical translation from Hopkins dated to around 1867. This piece, 'Not kind! To freeze me with forecast'²⁵ shares the central motif of heavenly separation and the grief of those left behind. It has also been the subject of critical analysis exploring a point of autobiographical context equally relevant to *Tristi tu, memini*, which may be significant to the latter poem's interpretation. At the time of the publication of the Gardner & MacKenzie edition of 1967, 'Not kind! To freeze me with forecast' had not yet been recognised as a translation. In the 1990 edition, however, MacKenzie declares a long-held suspicion that it is a 'free translation from the classics', and notes that the poem has been identified as a 'vigorous rendering of the opening to Horace, *Odes*, ii, 17' (297) by Dr. Ross Kilpatrick, a Latinist at Queen's University, Canada.²⁶ The Latin original is on the subject of the death of Horace's literary patron, Maecenas:

*cur me querellis exanimas tuis?
nec dis amicum est nec mihi te prius*

²⁵ Numbered 134 in the 1967 edition and 86 in the 1990 edition.

²⁶ See also MacKenzie's 1984 and 1986 articles.

*obire, Maecenas, mearum
grande decus columenque rerum.*

Why do you exhaust me with laments for you?
Neither to the gods is it pleasing, nor to me, that you
Depart before I do, Maecenas,
Great grace and pillar of all I do.²⁷

Hopkins' poem is, indeed, sufficiently similar to be a free translation of the above. The only substantial differences are the shift of the praise of the poem's subject from the last line of the original to the second line of the Hopkins, and, predictably, the replacement of Horace's pagan *dei* (line 2) with Hopkins' Christian 'heaven' (line 4):

Not kind! To freeze me with forecast,
Dear grace and girder of mine and me.
You to be gone and I lag last—
Nor I nor heaven would have it be.

In the 1959 edition of *The Journals and papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, its editor, Humphrey House, who, like Gardner, does not recognise 'Not kind! To freeze me with forecast' as a translation of Horace,²⁸ suggests that it is an 'intimate comment' on the sudden death of a much-admired young acquaintance, Digby Mackworth Dolben, in June 1867 (1959:326). The suggestion was seconded by Gardner in the 1967 edition of Hopkins' poetry (1967:308). MacKenzie, on the other hand, maintains that his discovery of the poem's nature as a Horatian translation should put to rest prior autobiographical interpretations of 'Not kind! To freeze me with forecast' as 'an emotional reference' on the death of Dolben (1990:lxviii). However, I do not see why this should necessarily be the case. As many Classicists know, the Classics are often most potent for the modern reader when they reflect in ancient language the reader's own present, internal feeling. *Pace* MacKenzie, there are no grounds *a priori* to dismiss any personal, autobiographical, or emotional motivation behind a poem simply because it is a translation of, or homage to, a classical work.

With regards to the motif previously discussed and tentatively identified in *Tristi tu, memini* and 'The convent threshold', of the 'voice from the convent/monastery/heaven', it is intriguing to note that both House and Gardner make a connection between 'Not kind! To freeze me with forecast' and a remark in Hopkins' journal from five years after its composition, the beginning of

²⁷ The translation here is my own.

²⁸ This is in spite of the fact that House 1959:326 notes that the poem is found 'on the back of [Hopkins'] translation of Horace's *Odi profanum volgus*.

September 1873. Here, Hopkins notes that he has received ‘a great mercy about Dolben’ (House 1959:236). House observes that this is ‘a phrase he uses elsewhere to express his conviction of a token from heaven signifying someone’s salvation’ (1959:326).²⁹ House and Gardner seem to suggest that this later revelation about Dolben only strengthened Hopkins’s pre-existing belief, of which ‘Not kind! To freeze me with forecast’ is evidence, that upon Dolben’s death, he departed to heaven, saved, and left Hopkins to ‘lag last’.

The relationship between Dolben and Hopkins, its true nature, and its influence on Hopkins’ poetry, is the source of academic disagreement not limited to that discussed here between House, Gardner, and MacKenzie (cf. Sobolev 2011:173–174). Dolben was an eccentric and intellectually brilliant cousin of Robert Bridges, whom Hopkins met only once, at Oxford in February 1865, when Dolben was still a schoolboy at Eton. They had some correspondence afterwards, though evidence suggests it was largely one-sided, to Hopkins’ frustration (Phillips 1991:31). There is also, somewhat contradictorily, some indication that Dolben was partly inspired to consider conversion to Roman Catholicism seriously by Hopkins’ example.³⁰ Ultimately, however, Dolben did not have the opportunity either to convert or to strengthen his relationship with Hopkins, as he drowned in a swimming accident in 1867, aged only nineteen.

Allusions to Dolben and his death have been proposed, eclectically and with differing levels of confidence, in poems other than ‘Not kind! To freeze me with forecast’, including ‘Where art thou, friend’³¹ and ‘The wreck of the Deutschland’.³² None of these, however, have quite the proximity to Dolben’s death that can be attributed to *Tristi tu, memini*. It, along with the variant 84 (b), was written in pencil on a page that included drafts of a letter Hopkins was writing to Bridges, dated 30 August 1867, a month after Dolben’s death, to express his sympathies, having had news of the tragedy on his return from a

²⁹ Hopkins makes further reference to a belief that he receives occasional signs from the departed in heaven in a letter to his mother on 9 October 1877, asking that she take seriously the fact that he has on several prior occasions ‘had some token from heaven in connection with the death of people in whom I am interested’ (Phillips 1991:93).

³⁰ In a letter written to John Henry Newman, one of the great leaders of the Oxford Movement and a significant mentor to Hopkins during his undergraduate years, Dolben discusses his interest in conversion and claims that ‘Hopkins’ conversion hastened the end’ (House & Storey 1959:326).

³¹ Amongst others, House 1937:xxi, Ruggles 1944:71, Iyengar 1948:30, and Gardner 1967:249–250 argue that Dolben is likely the anonymous addressee of ‘Where art thou, friend’, but this is vehemently contested by Bremer 1980, who is supported by MacKenzie 1990:lxviii.

³² Cf. Sobolev 1999 on the theme of death by drowning as a significant connection between the death of Dolben and ‘The wreck of the Deutschland’.

vacation in France some days before. The coincidence is striking, and could support an interpretation of *Tristi tu, memini* in the same vein as the House and Gardner interpretation of ‘Not kind! To freeze me with forecast’: a veiled response to the premature death of Dolben.

If such an interpretation is considered, Hopkins must be placed in the position of the *virgo*, sad before his acquaintance with Dolben, sadder now that Dolben has died and gone before him to heaven. Dolben, like the beloved of ‘A voice from the world’ has entered a ‘heavenly sphere’ where he is starlike: purer and brighter than when he lived but also more alien.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arkins, B 1997. Heraclitean fire: Greek themes in Hopkins. *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 3.4:458–472.
- Barsby, J (ed.). 1991. *Ovid: Amores I*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Bender, T K 1966. *Gerard Manley Hopkins: The classical background and critical reception of his work*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bonn, J L 1949. Greco-Roman verse theory and Gerard Manley Hopkins. *Immortal Diamond: Studies in Gerard Manley Hopkins*. New York: Sheed & Ward.
- Bremer, R 1980. Where art thou friend, whom I shall never see. *The Hopkins Quarterly* 7.1:9–14.
- Bybee, A E 2001. From vestal virgin to bride of Christ: Elements of a Roman cult in early Christian asceticism. *Studia Antiqua*. 1.1:3–19.
- Copley, F O 1956. *Exclusus amator: A study in Latin love poetry*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Edgeworth, R L 1809. *Essays on professional education*. London: J Johnson.
- Ellis, H 2007. Newman and Arnold: Classics, Christianity and manliness in Tractarian Oxford’. In Stray, C (ed.), *Oxford Classics: Teaching and Learning 1800–2000*, 46–63. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Foltz, W D 1980. Hopkins’ Greek fire. *Victorian Poetry*. 18.1:23–34.
- Gardner, W H (ed.) 1953. *Gerard Manley Hopkins: Poems and prose*. London: Penguin.
- Gardner, W H & MacKenzie, N H (eds.) 1967. *The poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Glare, P G W 1982. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gould, G P (ed.) 1990. *Propertius: Elegies*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Gow, A S F (ed.) 1950. *Theocritus: Volume I & II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Greenough, J B (ed.) 1900. *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics of Vergil*. Boston: Ginn & Co.
- House, H (ed.) 1937. *The notebooks and papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- House, H & Storey, G (eds.) 1959. *The journals and papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Iyengar, K R S 1948. *Gerard Manley Hopkins: The man and the poet*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackson, H J 2011. The ai in Adonais. *The Review of English Studies* 62.257:777–784.
- James, S J 2003. ‘Her turn to cry’: The politics of weeping in Roman love elegy. *TAPA* 133.1:99–122.
- Jenkyns, R 1980. *The Victorians and ancient Greece*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Johnson, M L 1972. Hopkins, Heraclitus, cosmic instress and of the comfort of the resurrection. *Victorian Poetry* 10.3:235–242.
- Leshner, J H 2011. Hopkins’ creative use of Heraclitean materials. *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*. 18.2:262–269.
- MacKenzie, N H 1984. Gerard Manly Hopkins: An unrecognised translation. *Classical and Modern Literature* 5.1:7–11.
- 1986. Hopkins and Horace: A new discovery. *English Language Notes* 23.3:41–42.
- MacKenzie, N H (ed.) 1990. *The poetical works of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Martin, R B 1991. *Gerard Manley Hopkins: A very private life*. New York: G P Putnam’s Sons.
- Merrill, E T (ed.) 1893. *Catullus*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Milton, J 2010. Lycidas. In Rosenblatt, J P (ed.), *Milton’s selected poetry and prose*. New York: W W Norton & Company.
- Morrissey, T 1987. *Towards a national university: William Delaney, SJ*. Dublin: Wolfhound Press.
- Murgatroyd, P (ed.) 1998. *Tibullus: Elegies I*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Norlin, G 1911. The conventions of the pastoral elegy. *AJPh* 31.3:294–312.
- Phillips, C (ed.) 1991. *Gerard Manley Hopkins: Selected letters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rossetti, C 1862. The convent threshold. *Goblin market and other poems*. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Ruggles, E 1944. *Gerard Manley Hopkins: A life*. New York: W W Norton and Co.
- Shelley, P B 1818. *The revolt of Islam*. London: C and J Ollier.

- 1891. *Adonais*. ed. W.M. Rossetti. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Smith, A 1990. Gerard Manley Hopkins as a classicist. *Irish University Review*. 20.2:299–317.
- Smith, S 1870. *Wit and wisdom of the Rev. Sydney Smith*, 166–175. New York: Widdleton.
- Shorey, P & Laing, G J (ed.) 1919. *Horace: Odes and epodes*. Chicago: Benj H. Sanborn & Co.
- Sobolev, D 1999. Death by drowning. *Victorian Newsletter* 96:1–7.
- 2011. *The split world of Gerard Manley Hopkins: An essay in semiotic phenomenology*. Washington DC: Catholic University Press of America.
- Stanford, W B 1941. Gerard Manley Hopkins and Aeschylus. *Irish Quarterly Review* 30.119:359–368.
- Stray, C 2007. *Oxford Classics: Teaching and learning*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Tierney, M 1954. *Struggle with fortune: A miscellany for the centenary of the Catholic University of Ireland. 1854–1954*. Dublin: Browne & Nolan.
- Undheim, S 2017. The wise and the foolish virgins: Representations of vestal virginity and pagan chastity by Christian writers in Late Antiquity. *Journal of Early Christian Studies*. 25.3:384–409.
- 2020. The vestal nun: The afterlife and reception of vestal virgins in art and literature in late antiquity and after. *Journal of Early Christian Studies*. 10.2:8–27.
- Wasserman, E R 1971. *Shelley: A critical reading*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Watt, W S 1997. Notes on the Latin poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins. *Translation and Literature*. 6.1:83–88.
- West, S R 2006. Classical notes on Gerard Manley Hopkins. *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*. 13.1:21–32.
- Wooton, C 1962. The terrible fire of Gerard Manley Hopkins. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*. 4.3:367–375.