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Introduction

Spiritual desolation, while a perennial human experience, is expressed in historically-determined diction, influenced by poetic and religious predecessors. Gerard Manley Hopkins and Charles Williams, two Anglo/Catholic poets, are an interesting case study, especially as Hopkins helped shape Williams's later prosody. Today, we are sharing our findings on only two forms of spiritual darkness in the later poetry of these two writers: Ignatian desolation and the crisis of schism.

Charles Williams's early poems are frequently called "pastiche" (see, for instance, Dunning 113), and employ rigid, archaic, juvenile rhyme schemes and metrical patterns. Then, according to Anne Ridler, he "re-read Hopkins at the right moment—the moment when he was able to make use of certain technical effects which were much better suited to his needs than the elaborate stanzas and the too-well-used blank verse forms which he had been employing" (Ridler lxii).

What had happened? In July of 1930, Robert Bridges asked Williams to edit the second edition of Hopkins's poems. He did so, and also wrote the critical introduction. This volume was published by Oxford University Press that same year (Ridler lxii, 49). Then, in 1938, Williams's Taliessin Through Logres appeared in 1938. The change is startling.

These poems are fresh, original, and musical. Glen Cavaliero writes: “the influence of Hopkins becomes apparent: enjambment, internal rhymes, alliteration, irregular stress meters, above all, the deployment of monosyllables and a judiciously arcane vocabulary. Williams's editing of Hopkins's poems obviously has much to do with this” (Cavaliero 98). Stephen Dunning writes that in 1938, Williams was “a writer in the throes of a major stylistic revolution” and that “the new verse is distinctively Hopkinsesque” (112).

Hopkins's Ignatian Desolation

During 1885, Gerard Manley Hopkins (1844-1889) composed six sonnets— "Carrion Comfort," "No worst, there is none," "To seem the stranger," "I wake and feel," "Patience, hard thing!" and "My own heart"—that have been called both "desolate" and "terrible" sonnets. Calling them "desolate" evidences scholars' desire for these sonnets to fall within the safe boundaries of a spiritual tradition. Spiritual writers including Bernard of Clairvaux, Dante, and John of the Cross have all vividly described experiencing both God's comforting presence and the feeling that this presence has withdrawn (Bump 177). Significantly, Ignatius Loyola, who influenced the Jesuit Hopkins, gives these two tides of the spiritual life both names and definitions. He defines desolation as...
contrary to the love for God that consolation excites (Sermons 203), and describes its symptoms as:

Darkness and confusion of soul, attraction toward low and earthly objects, disquietude caused by various agitations and temptations, which move the soul to diffidence without hope and without love, so that it finds itself altogether slothful, tepid, sad, and as it were separated from its Creator and Lord (qtd. in Sermons 204).

Both the description and the experience would have been familiar to Jesuits who examined their souls in Ignatian concentration.

Though desolation and consolation are well-established as patterns in the spiritual life, the question remains: do the six sonnets fit within this tradition, or is this just a comforting way of dealing with spiritual crisis and even loss of faith? Scholars disagree, with David A. Downes concluding that Ignatian spirituality “is clearly evident in much of the mature poetry of the Jesuit period except those sonnets of the last years usually designated as the ‘terrible sonnets’” (11), Daniel A. Harris describing the sonnets as an “abrupt... alteration” that “entail nothing less than Hopkins's unwilled submission to solipsism” (3), and Jerome Bump, on the other hand, placing them within the existing framework of medieval acedia and spiritual desolation (167-196).

One logical way of investigating the question is to look closely at Hopkins’s notes for his Spiritual Exercises commentary he was writing in the 1880s and to compare their diction with the desolate sonnets’ diction, composed that same decade. This will bring us closer to understanding whether or not there is a connection between Ignatian desolation and the desolate sonnets. Since the Spiritual Exercises was the guidebook for Jesuit retreats, and since it is known that Hopkins’s spiritual directors had counseled him about desolation by using it (S 205), its influence cannot be dismissed. Thus, even though others have proposed other spiritual fathers who may have influenced the way Hopkins thought of his desolation (Downes suggests John of the Cross and Thomas à Kempis; 131 and 132-36; 138-145), Ignatian desolation must remain the logical stating point. “All his ideas,” says Christopher Devlin, “stem from the making of the Spiritual Exercises” (Sermons 109).

The fact that Hopkins was working on a commentary on the Spiritual Exercises during the same decade he composed his “inspirations unbidden” (Sermons 107; Letters 221) further solidifies the connection. Though no copy of the commentary itself exists (Downes 34), lengthy notes for it do exist and offer an unpolished and perhaps therefore more honest insight into the connections between Hopkins’s desolate poetry and spiritual desolation. One particular sonnet has been noted for the similarity of its diction and Hopkins’s commentary notes (Sermons, n. 135), and it is on “My own heart” that this study will focus. Furthermore, scholars have noted how heavily the first week of Ignatius’s Exercises, rather than later weeks, weighs into Hopkins’s meditations (Downes 146), so this can further narrow this study’s scope.

Ignatian Colloquy

In the first week of Ignatius’s Spiritual Exercises, the retreatant scrutinizes his conscience for particular and general sins, cataloguing and repenting of all his sins, year by year, for his entire past, and meditating upon sin and hell. This leads the retreatant to a colloquy overflowing in loving gratitude for God’s mercy. Ignatian colloquy is a blend of “imagining Christ our Lord present” and “reflecting on myself” (Ignatius qtd. in Sermons 132). Hopkins found a harmony between colloquy and
sonnet that gave further form to his poetry (Harris 4). The desolate sonnets, likewise, show the colloquial structure that is “made properly,” says Ignatius:

by speaking as a friend speaks to a friend, or as a servant to his master, at one time asking for some favour, at another accusing oneself of some evil done, at another informing him of one’s affairs and seeking counsel concerning them. (Sermons 132)

As “My own heart” begins, the speaker initiates the colloquy by asking “for some favour”: more pity, self-kindness, and self-charity. In this case, the speaker must be addressing Christ because it is clear that he has not yet found enough pity, kindness, and charity within himself. “My own heart let me more have pity on,” he requests, “let/Me live to my sad self hereafter kind,/Charitable.” Then, Hopkins enacts the second part of the colloquy by accusing himself, and specifically by picturing his prior casting about for comfort within his own “comfortless,” a state so empty it has become a noun—a “dramatic coinage to define the absence of any consoling presence of Jesus” (Cotter 229).

Finally, in the sestet, the speaker diverges from the Ignatian pattern of “seeking counsel concerning” one’s affairs, and instead, presents a self that has already received this counsel. James Finn Cotter concludes that this indicates “an absence of all sensible spiritual comfort” (231). In Inspirations Unbidden, Harris takes this a step further, arguing that since Fr. John Roothan, who translated the Spiritual Exercises, has made the point that no link—even the link of God’s answer to the colloquy—can be left out of the chain of meditation, this desolate sonnet’s promise lies unfulfilled. Yet Hopkins has not skipped a link in the chain of meditation by self-counseling, nor does this indicate an absence of spiritual comfort. Throughout Hopkins’s sonnets, self-reflection blends with prayer, and the speaker can often be heard relating back to himself what Christ has already said: the self mediating with self as if the divided self has become a wise spiritual director. Like a wise spiritual counselor, he comforts the Jackself, or common man (Johnson 159), using the comfort with which he has been comforted by God (NKJV, 2 Cor. 1:4). He has not skipped a link; rather, that link happens outside of the poem while leaving the poem to bear witness of it.

**Particular Diction**

Not only the poem’s colloquial structure, but also its diction, is Ignatian. Hopkins’s “My own heart” and his commentary notes for the first week of the Exercises both use the words heart, pity, blind, dark, and thirst in sections that are significant enough to be well worth comparing.

In his commentary, as he reflects on the most beneficial way to meditate on one’s lifetime of sin, Hopkins’s word choice is similar to that of the voice that counsels his own heart in the sonnet: “There is a way of thinking of past sin such that the thought numbs and kills the heart, as all this Week of the Exercises will do if care is not taken in giving it” (Sermons 134). Thus, putting himself in the role of spiritual director, Hopkins will care for his heart, rather than permitting it to grow numb and die. Ultimately, his attitude will be one of pity, since he goes on to say in the same paragraph that the Christian should have the same feelings toward his sin that Christ and Mary have toward it:

For they turn from sin by nature... and finding it embodied with a thing they love find it infinitely piteous: ‘O the pity of it!’ and why should it ever have been?—these are the sort of words that express it. So that we may pity ourselves in the same way, that such a thing as
sin should ever have got hold of us. (Sermons 134)

Devlin rightly connects this passage with “My own heart” (n. Sermons 135), and Bump concurs that rooting out sin is a primary concern of the desolate sonnets (169). In connecting the rooting out of sin and the attitude of pity toward one’s own heart, Hopkins contextualizes his comfortless state as part of his continuing quest to understand and develop his spirituality within an Ignatian framework.

In the commentary, a meditation on hell is the section that immediately follows the one in which Hopkins reflects on attitudes toward sin. Do we find an imaginative descent into hell in the sonnet, too? Its diction is certainly revealing, showing that Hopkins, in his “tormented” and “tormenting” mind, has lost himself in an exact earthly replica of what the commentary notes imagine hell is like: blindness and constraint. The sonnet reads:

I cast for comfort I can no more get
By groping round my comfortless,
than blind
Eyes in their dark can day or thirst can find
thirst’s all-in-all in all a world of wet (Poems 111).

The comfortless state of the speaker’s mind is remarkably close to the vision of the torment the fallen angels will suffer, the suffering with which the Ignatian meditation begins (Sermons 131). Though their torment will be greater than humans’ because “the higher the nature the greater the penalty” (Sermons 138), the vision of hell Hopkins presents in his commentary notes is telling:

An imprisonment in darkness, a being in the dark; for darkness is the phenomenon of foiled action in the sense of sight. But this constraint and this blindness will be most painful when it is the main stress or energy of the whole being that is thus balked (Sermons 137).

Hopkins indicates that not seeing is a greater punishment than seeing. The sense of “foiled action” that also haunted Hopkins in his private life is inherent in both of these passages, since in the sonnet, day and water may both exist but cannot be perceived.

In the final stanza, the resolution of the colloquy offers an image that does not depart from the diction of the commentary notes, yet offers far more hope. In the final stanza, we see the speaker delivered from hell because the action of sight is no longer foiled. The speaker perceives the sky, sees what has been unforeseen, and sees light that extends not just in the path in front of him, but along a lovely mile. As Cotter puts it, “Hopkins begins the slow ascent upward from his Inferno to the dawn of Easter Day” (230). From this final stanza, we might even hope that, ascending from his hell, the speaker has come to an even greater assurance of forgiveness and finds true pity for his heart.

The words found in the desolate sonnets have often been considered shocking and hopeless enough to be labeled anomalies. They should not be so surprising to encounter, though, in a poet who had absorbed the language of the Exercises’ first week. They are not the words of a madman, nor of one who had completely lost faith. They are the words of a poet who, in his desolation, uses the words, structure, and imagery of his own spiritual tradition. Bringing a personal desolation, a “darkness and confusion of soul” (Sermons 204), to the first week’s meditations, Gerard Manley Hopkins makes sense of the hell of his tormented mind and finds, in appropriating Christ and Mary’s pity, comfort enough to find day and to find thirst’s all-in-all.
Williams’s Crisis of Schism

Charles Williams, on the other hand, does not turn to a particular Christian tradition for comfort in desolation. Instead, he turns to aesthetics and a kind of monistic holism he learned in an occult society. The particular kind of desolation he seeks to resolve is not, or at least not primarily, personal. Instead, it is literary. This type of spiritual darkness seems to be peculiar to Williams. Williams gives an extended account of this “crisis of schism” in *The English Poetic Mind* (1932).

The Nature of the Schism

What is this schism? Grevel Lindop describes it as “a moment when [poets] perceive a fundamental conflict or contradiction within their most cherished values.” Williams says it occurs when “Entire union and absolute division are experienced at once” (*English Poetic Mind* 42). It is a sense that something at once cannot be, and yet is. Reality clashes with reality when the poet exclaims at once “It cannot be; it is impossible” (*English Poetic Mind* 45), and “It is.” Williams judges poetic success by how well the poet confronts and surmounts this impossibility.

In explaining this crisis, Williams claims that “The crisis ...is one common to all men.... It is that in which every nerve of the body, every consciousness of the mind, shrieks that something cannot be. Only it is” (*English Poetic Mind* 59-60). The essential words to notice in that quote are *cannot be*, *is*, and *crisis*. This crisis is intense, and the way each poet confronts it in his verse, Williams argues, determines his greatness or mediocrity. “In the poets,” he claims, “the poetic mind is the most intense and enduring thing for good or evil, and they must feel such a conflict, such a revolution and subversion, in their genius. That genius is their soul; the wound is dealt to their soul.” (*English Poetic Mind* 24-25) Notice the words *conflict*, *contraries*, *revolution*, *subversion*, and *wound*.

Incidentally, for all his claims of impersonality, there may have been an autobiographical catalyst in the formation of Williams’s theory of schism. All the evidence of his correspondence and circumstances suggests that Williams himself experienced this crisis personally, and his own poetic *oeuvre* can be read in its light. As Cavaliero summarizes: “The personal crisis arose from Williams’s own discovery of divided loyalties, even of divided truth” when he fell in love with someone other than his wife (25), and then later when the woman fell in love with someone else (Bosky 15, Hadfield 83-4). This double personal tragedy, according to Glen Cavaliero, “seems to have caused a self-questioning that was to result in the release of his full creative powers. It forced upon him the tragic awareness of a division within the good” (emphasis added). Williams himself described it in these terms in a letter: “there is a street in South London I have walked through quicker (almost literally) than the wind because of pain; and the other girl...O ...! the rending agony” and “It is eighteen [years] now since my own small Impossibility began.... Madness and pain and horror—and inexorable beauty still” (*Letters to Lalage* 43, 55-56). Notice there the words *rendering*, implying a tearing apart, and *impossibility* (a term he coined in 1943 in his introduction to the letters of Evelyn Underhill; Cavaliero 26). These two terms are essential for understanding the nature of Williams’s crisis. This idea of divided loyalties within the self and a sense of division from and within metaphysical reality permeates Williams’ writing, especially the later works.

The Crisis in Williams’s *oeuvre*

The crisis permeates Williams’s work. It is clearly articulated in his second
book, Poems of Conformity, which was published in 1917—the year he got married, and the year he joined the Fellowship of the Rosy Cross. The narrative persona of Poems of Conformity reveals a “deeply-divided ego” (Dunning 5) where the soul “trod a dangerous cleft,” “dropped to separating depths, / And drifted there alone” (“Richmond Park,” l. 10, Poems of Conformity 18).

Williams’s third book of poetry, Windows of Night, focuses on the poet’s tormented self-consciousness, bordering on madness. In this volume, says Dunning, “In addition to the avoidance and repression he uses to keep self-knowledge in check, he occasionally relegates problematic aspects of the self to the ‘not-me’” (Dunning 10, 11). This idea of the divided self-consciousness, of the not-me, will be of prime importance presently in comparing Williams’s later poetry to Hopkins’s desolate sonnets.

The divided consciousness is personified and dramatized in one of Williams’s late novels, Descent into Hell (1937). The protagonist, Pauline, is tormented by a doppelganger: perhaps the clearest literary expression of a sense of divided self. When she is finally granted the courage to face this fear, it turns out that the other self is her real self, her sanctified and glorified self, and she finds spiritual healing by unifying with her other half.

The Schism in Hopkins

Even when speaking of Hopkins’s desolate sonnets in The English Poetic Mind, Williams uses his unique diction: “those sonnets awake our sense of a capacity for so much suffering that the only possibility is to ‘not choose not to be’” (English Poetic Mind 198). Hopkins could still choose to believe—or at least choose not to commit suicide—in the face of the crisis.

In his introduction to the second edition of Hopkins’s poems, Williams writes: “The simultaneous consciousness of a controlled universe, and yet of division, conflict, and crises within that universe, is hardly so poignantly expressed in any other English poets than” in Hopkins and Milton (xiv-xv; emphasis mine). Here he uses the same diction as in The English Poetic Mind, making it absolutely clear that he thought the spiritual desolation of these sonnets is the crisis of schism. He goes on to say that Milton and Hopkins both have a “sense of division and pain, of summons and effort” and that “Both their imaginations... felt the universe as divided within them and without them” (ibid.). Finally, Williams says that Hopkins has “a passionate intellect which is striving at once to recognize and explain both the singleness and division of the accepted universe....” (xiv-xv; emphasis mine).

This seems a pretty fair catalog of all the diction of despair encountered in other parts of Williams’s work: division, conflict, and crises. Perhaps the most significant clause is the claim that Hopkins felt the universe divided both within himself (the split self) and outside of himself (the division from God).

Williams’s word choice characterizes both the ontological nature and the emotional experience of this particular crisis as it was known and felt by the poetic persona. They are quite different from Hopkins’s Ignatian diction of heart, pity, blind, dark, and thirst. They are more abstract, Latinate, political, and holistic.

Occult Monism in “The Prayers of the Pope”

I speculate that William’s diction of an abstract, universal division came from the ten years he spent in A.E. Waite’s occult Fellowship of the Rosy Cross: a Christian, alchemical, cabbalistic, hermetic society. An essential principle of hermeticism is the idea of “correspondence,” a form of monism. According to the “Emerald Tablet” of
Hermes Trismagistus, a formative document in Rosicrucian thought, “What is below is like that which is above, and what is above is similar to that which is below to accomplish the wonders of the one thing” and “As all things were produced by the mediation of one being, so all things were produced from this one by adaption.” In other words, all things are one. The worst crisis, then, is a division within that unity.

Glen Cavaliero believes this concept of crisis was so central to Williams’s mental and emotional life that he was “obsessed” by it (25). Stephen Dunning examines Williams’s entire body of work and whole system of thought through the lens of this crisis. Williams works this crisis into the plot, characters, geography, and diction of his two published collections of Arthurian verse, *Taliessin Through Logres* (1938) and *The Region of the Summer Stars* (1944).

One example will suffice. The crisis and its resolution occur in the very last poem of *The Region of the Summer Stars*: “The Prayers of the Pope.” In this poem, the Byzantine Empire (the setting of his Arthurian myth) is falling apart. Islamic armies are attacking it from without; Christian heresies are splitting it apart from within. King Arthur and Lancelot are at war against one another in France while Mordred torments the kingdom of Logres at home. In Rome, a young pope watches all of this and prays before celebrating the Christmas Eucharist: “The Pope saw himself—he sighed and prayed— / as a ruin of the Empire; he died in a foreboding” (ll. 126-7). He pictures himself as a microcosm of the empire and foresees himself/itself split apart as its provinces were divided:

He felt within himself the themes divide, each
dreadfully autonomous in its own corporeal place,
its virtue monopolized, its grace prized, in schism,

...everywhere in mind and body
the terrible schism of identity.
(128-30, 135-36).

Notice the key words here: divide, schism (twice). The Pope himself is experiencing the personal crisis of division within his sense of selfhood, but he is also the locus of a much more terrible division. The political, historical division of the Empire represents the human separation from God. Hence, it symbolizes damnation. The result is the most dreadful catastrophe that could possibly befall the human race: “Against the rule of the Emperor the indivisible / Empire was divided; therefore the Parousia suspended / its coming, and abode still in the land of the Trinity” (145-7). The sins of Arthur and his kingdom have postponed the second coming of Christ! This is the ultimate separation: the division of the human race from its Creator.

**Reading Hopkins Through Williams**

Since Williams evaluates the success of poets by how they face and overcome this schism, it is important to examine how Williams writes about this crisis in Hopkins’s desolate sonnets. Let us turn, then, to “My Own Heart” and read it as Williams might have done.

The concept of the split self is rampant throughout the sonnet. The narrator carries on a colloquy with himself throughout the poem. Some parts of this colloquy are self-reflection, and some parts are prayer and evidence of Christ’s comfort. The narrator’s talking to himself suggests a bi-partite identity in which one self occupies the position of insight and has the right to address, cajole, chastise, and encourage the sorrier self. In line 1, “me” needs to have pity on “my own heart.” There are two selves there: the one having pity, and the one being pitied. In line 2, the “me” needs to be kind to “my sad self.” The heart, then, is the sad self. In lines 3 and 4, the picture
becomes more complex: there are two tormented minds, one of which (the “me” of lines 1-2, presumably) is tormenting the other. Who is tormenting the tormenter remains an open question.

The sestet introduces a shift to a sweeter, softer tone. The sad-self-heart becomes the “Soul” and the “Jackself.” There are, then, two selves within the speaker, in colloquy with each other and with God, Who has the power to “let” one pity the other. The first self is “Me” and “I”: the other is the soul-self-heart-Jackself. Both have tormented minds. Yet it is clear that the Me/I self is the Ignatian advisor, pointing the Jackself’s attention towards God’s smile.

As noted above, self is mediating with self as if the divided self, or at least one half of it, has become a wise spiritual director. Except for the three references to torment, however, Hopkins’s narrator’s divided self does not seem the same as the “not-me” bordering on madness that haunts Williams’s early verse (Dunning 11). Instead, is more like the divided Pope at the end of Williams’s poem, praying for hope in the form of “a promulgation of sacred union.”

It would seem, then, from Williams’s point of view, that Hopkins faced up to the great crisis of schism, wrote his way through it in the form of the narrative persona in the desolate sonnets, and took his place within the canon of English poets through his particular kind of spiritual courage. It took courage to seem a stranger, look that carrion comfort Despair in the face, wrestle with God to a pitch past pitch of grief, and still not chose not to be.

**Conclusions**

The schism or division that Williams saw in Hopkins verse is, in “My Own Heart,” represented by the two “Betweenpie mountains.” Picture one mountain to the north, one to the south, each signifying one half of the split self. But the two halves are in colloquy, creating a rainbow-bridge in the sky between them. This rainbow is God’s smile, which unites the two. It is not “wrung”: it is one “lovely mile.”

Similarly, “The Prayers of the Pope” ends with a “hope” that God will “Bestow now the double inseparable wonder, / the irrevocable union.” Notice that both poems end with hope of a future resolution to their desolation. In “My Own Heart,” the directing self is advising the Jackself to take comfort; the Jackself has not yet done so. In “The Prayers of the Pope,” the prayer has not yet been answered. But notice, too, that “My Own Heart” ends in the present tense: God’s smile already lights a lovely mile, here and now. “The Prayers of the Pope” ends in the past tense, where “The gnosis of separation in the Pope’s soul / had become”—already—“a promulgation of sacred union” and the “consuls and lords within the Empire” already “felt the Empire / revive in a live hope.”

In conclusion, while Williams shows no direction connection to Ignatian spirituality, he did absorb some of that ethos via a trickle-down effect: Ignatian desolation is the most important kind of desolation Hopkins deals with in his sonnets, which in turn makes his sonnets stronger. Williams, encountering these sonnets, strengthens his poetry, expresses his own schism in verse, and possibly finds consolation, as well. Both poets end these poems in hope, pointing beyond the split existence of the here and now to an eternal, consolatory unity.
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