In the Preface to the edition of 1815 Wordsworth gives us his considered views about the nature of Fancy and he proceeds to define it by contrast with Imagination. He objects to Coleridge's definition on the ground that it is too general. Fancy, according to Wordsworth, is also a different faculty. The materials are different or they are brought together under a different law and for a different purpose. Fancy does not require that the materials which she makes use of be susceptible of change, and where they admit of such modification, it is enough for her purpose if it be slight, limited, and evanescent. Wordsworth gives us an example of Fancy from Shakespeare:

In shape no bigger than an agate-stone
On the fore-finger of an alderman.

Then Wordsworth goes on to say that when imagination frames a comparison, it may not be very striking at first sight; the resemblance depends less upon outline than upon effect. But

The law under which the processes of Fancy are carried on is capricious as the accidents of things, and the effects are surprising, playful, ludicrous, amusing, tender, or pathetic, as the objects happen to be appositely produced or fortunately combined.
Fancy depends upon the rapidity and profusion with which she scatters her thoughts and images; trusting that their number, and the felicity with which they are linked together, will make amends for the want of individual value: or she prides herself upon the curious subtlety and the successful elaboration with which she can detect their lurking affinities.¹

We have already seen that this definition did not satisfy Coleridge. In his well-known summary of Wordsworth's poetic powers in the *Biographia Literaria*, Coleridge allows his friend "the gift of imagination in the highest and strictest sense of the word", but he has no praise for Wordsworth's talent for fancy. He writes:

In the play of fancy, Wordsworth, to my feelings, is not always graceful, and sometimes recondite. The likeness is occasionally too strange, or demands too peculiar a point of view, or is such as appears the creature of predetermined research, rather than spontaneous presentation. Indeed his fancy seldom displays itself, as mere and unmodified fancy.²

Coleridge's complaint, in this passage just quoted, that Wordsworth's fancy produces ungraceful, recondite and strange likeness, can be attributed to two favourite neo-classical tenets, the principles of decorum and universality — the same principle, in fact, which underlie his attacks on Wordsworth's 'mental bombast'.

There are confusions and contradictions in Wordsworth's scattered comments on imagination, but there are even more in his comments on the fancy. This confusion, quite naturally is reflected in the discussions of this faculty by Wordsworth's critics. According to Beatty, fancy "had two striking characteristics; it was untrue to fact, and it was melancholy"; and he continues, fancy was untrue because under its influence Wordsworth "saw the world of reality only through 'analogies' " which are supplied by his own thought:

To every natural form, rock, fruit, or flower,
Even the loose stones that cover the highway,
I gave a moral life; I saw them feel,
Or linked them to some feeling: the great mass
Lay bedded in a quickening soul, and all
That I behold respired with inward meaning.

The last part of Beatty's statement is misleading; the first part is utterly false. Even a random sampling of Wordsworth's "Poems of the Fancy" will demonstrate that the fancy was not consistently a source of melancholy. The opening poem "A Morning Exercise" seems to fit Beatty's description. Light, playful and even insignificant these poems may be, but they are poems of hope, faith and gratitude.

Sperry asserts that to Wordsworth "Fancy was ... the energy of a mind engaged in aimless invention without salutary reference to the external world." But neither critic

realizes that Wordsworth believed that this power, when it operated under its proper laws and in its proper sphere, was capable of performing noble functions; Wordsworth can, indeed, even speak of fancy as aiming "at a rivalship with imagination" and "Imagination stoops to work with the materials of Fancy." The one clear aim of Wordsworth seems to be to refute Coleridge's definition of the terms 'imagination' and 'fancy', and to free the latter from Coleridge's implication that it is a faculty unworthy of genius. Wordsworth states quite explicitly:

To aggregate and to associate, to evoke and to combine, belong as well to the Imagination as to the Fancy; but either the materials evoked and combined are different; or they are brought together under a different law, and for a different purpose.

Wordsworth does not hesitate to ascribe to fancy a creative power. He states:

Fancy is given to quicken and to beguile the temporal part of our nature; Imagination, to incite and support the eternal. - Yet is it not the less true that Fancy, as she is an active, is also under her own laws and in her own spirit, a creative faculty.

However, there are I believe, two distinct kinds of fancy in Wordsworth's theory. The first is the 'wilful' power of The Prelude:

7. Ibid., p.441.
8. Ibid., p.442.
There came
Among the simple shapes of human life
A wilfulness of fancy and conceit:
And Nature and her objects beautified
These fictions, as in some sort, in their turn,
They burnished her. From touch of this new power
Nothing was safe: the elder-tree that grew
Beside the well-known charnel-house had then
A dismal look; the yew-tree had its ghost,
That took its station there for ornament:
The dignities of plain occurrence then
Were tasteless, and truth's golden mean, a point
Where no sufficient pleasure could be found. 9

This is the only fancy that Beatty and Speery recognize. I find
another fancy, a power that can perform not only a poetic but
a distinctly moral function. This fancy is not a faculty of
deceit, playful or melancholy, but a power with quite serious
aims and accomplishments. Its mode is not that of the imagi-
nation and its effects are not as permanent as those of the
higher faculty, but its aims are sometimes similar. Beatty
does not recognize the exercise of a mature fancy, which, puri-
fied and steadied by judgment, might aid the poet. 10

Wilson Knight states that Wordsworth's later work
reads as a search for various 'objective equivalents' to his
sense of the eternal. 11 As a description of Wordsworth's
secondary poetic mode, the mode of fancy, Knight's statement
is incorrect; and in its implication that this mode began with

11. Knight, op. cit., p. 69.
Wordsworth's later poetry, it is misleading. This implication, is never the less the accepted view. In the following passage from *Wordsworth And the Vocabulary of Emotion*, Josephine Miles elaborates on this point of view:

Perhaps the outward devices of personifications and conceit are best expressive of the nature of the later poetry. They both increase in amount after 1807... Yet they increase in usefulness as illustration with the effect or allusion, rather than as central complexities... these are not intrinsic to their respective poems or to the philosophy as a whole, unless one can call it now the philosophy of literary precedent.  

Miles is certainly right to say that the traditional poetic devices she speaks of are used more frequently in the later poetry, but these devices were really seen from the very beginning, to operate in the poetry of Wordsworth.

John Jones finds the change in Wordsworth's poetry after about 1805 "sadly reflected in the disassociation of his poetry's landscape and his poetry's morality." Jones's discussion of a change in mode in the poetry of Wordsworth is less misleading than that of the other critics. Jones at least makes it clear that Wordsworth "always had a weakness for overt moralizing."  

---

question of Wordsworth's decline in correct perspective; for though there is no doubt that the later poetry is inferior to that of the period roughly from 1797 to 1807, it should be emphasized that these two modes - fancy and imagination - existed from the beginning and that Wordsworth's decline came about when the mode of imagination began to fail, and he was forced to fall back more and more on the less demanding mode of fancy. Jones characterizes the decline in terms of "The fate that overtakes the landscape of Wordsworth's early poetry", and "its loss of depth and width and detail, its sacrifice of the universal and the particular for the merely general."\(^{14}\) Miles's observation seems to be opposite to that of Jones, for she speaks of a "lessening of significant generalization in favor of an increased location in nature..."\(^{15}\) But truly speaking, they are dealing with two different characteristics of Wordsworth's poems of fancy, and both statements are quite correct. What they both point to is the essential difference between poems of imagination and poems of fancy, that is, between the poetry of symbol and the poetry of emblem.

Wordsworth

The reason why he adopted the mode of fancy is not clear. Increasingly he lost faith in the symbolism of his poems of imagination, and became more and more conscious of the poverty of language which prevented him from communicating

\(^{14}\) Ibid., p.138.

\(^{15}\) Miles, op.cit., p.158.
more clearly the meaning of his mystical experiences.

In 1831 Wordsworth wrote to a friend: "...years have deprived me of courage, in the sense the word bears when applied by Chaucer to the animation of birds in springtime." Abercrombie admirably sums up the poetic result of this loss of 'courage': "As I read it, the crucial change in Wordsworth was a retreat from that mystical experience of the world which entailed a loneliness he could no longer support... He turned to experiences in which, after that sublime solitude, he could know community with his fellow-men..." Wordsworth would still be a man speaking to men, but he would now speak down to him.

Russell offers us an interesting explanation. Ironi­cally meditating on the harm that good men do, he refers to Wordsworth: "In his youth he sympathized with the French Revolution, went to France, wrote good poetry, and had a natural daughter. At this period he was a 'bad' man. Then he became 'good', abandoned his daughter, adopted correct principles, and wrote bad poetry." Russell's statement may be regarded as somewhat intriguing, yet it may be said to contain some measure of truth.

Yet another explanation is that Wordsworth turned more and more to the mode of fancy because he lost faith in the higher symbolism of imagination, or perhaps he did so

because he had lost his power to experience sublime intimations of eternity. In 1843 he wrote to an unknown correspondent:

"... no change has taken place in my manner for the last forty-five years, you will not be at a loss to gather from them (his poems) upon what principle I write..."¹⁹ Given the poet's belief in the unity of the mind we should be closer to the truth, if we stated that the relationship among his philosophy, poetics, mood, and the external forces that affected these is of such complex intervention that we should not demand simple explanations such as advancing years, poor eyesight, headaches, domestic problems, guilt concerning Annette, apostasy, and an unnatural love for Dorothy.

A handful of critics, notably Dicey, Burton, and Batho,²⁰ have argued that Wordsworth underwent no basic change in his thinking; but this view has few adherents. Their works have value as correctives to some extreme views of Wordsworth's change of attitude but each of them employs special pleading, and to the extent that they do so, they vitiate their studies. Dicey, for example, attempts to deny any basic shift in Wordsworth's politics by proving that the poet was never either Whig or Tory. But it does not dispose of the fact that in his youth he could write the "Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff" in which he advocated an end to all monarchies of any description,

and years later he could become an indefatigable defender of the monarchy. Burton seeks to prove that Wordsworth did not decline by demonstrating the superiority of selected passages of the 1850 version of the Prelude to that of 1805-6. Everywhere in her book there is the assumption that skill in revision is equal to creative power. Batho carefully selects isolated poems and parts of poems of the later years as if to suggest that these brief flashes of genius are comparable to the sustained grandeur of the poems of the great decade. She claims that Wordsworth's post-1815 production "contains much that is good, some that is magnificent, and little that is positively bad." As examples of the 'good things' she lists "Dion", the Duddon sonnets, "Mutability" and the King's College Chapel sonnets in the Ecclesiastical series, "Ethereal Minstrel", "The Triad", the Abbotsford sonnet, "Why art thou silent?", the lines on Charles Lamb, the "Extempore Effusion", the poem on a mountain daisy ( 'So fair, so sweet' ), and nearly all the poems of 1846. Unfortunately, no serious attempt is made to justify these claims. There are, of course, good lines in most of the poems Edith Batho has listed, but only two of them can possibly be called 'magnificent' - the Duddon "After-thought" and the "Extempore Effusion".

Matthew Arnold suggests that "Wordsworth needs to be relieved of a great deal of the poetical baggage" which

encumbers him. In fact, there are long, enormously boring stretches even in The Prelude which are a cause of grief to the sensitive reader. But The Prelude without these passages would be a very much smaller poem in terms of both quality and length. Wordsworth, then, should be accepted with all his prosaic poems of moral statement and the sublime and poetically effective pieces. J.K. Stephen's two voices, it is suggested, are complementary instead of being contradictory. In other words, the modes of fancy and the modes of imagination are not different and there is no need to pare away the allegedly dead wood in his works. A process of reconciliation is perhaps in progress among the modern critics. A.C. Bradley considers "Resolution and Independence" as "the most Wordsworthian of Wordsworth's poems, and the best test of ability to understand

23. J.K. Stephen's parody of Wordsworth is given below:

There are two Voices: one is of the deep;
It learns the storm-cloud's thundrous melody,
Now roars, now murmurs with the changing sea,
Now bird-like pipes, now closes soft in sleep.
And one is of an old half-witted sheep
Which bleats articulate monotony,
And indicates that two and one are three,
That grass is green, lakes damp, and mountains steep,
And, Wordsworth, both are thine ...

(Quoted by F.W. Bateson, op. cit., p.4.)

24. Bateson, op. cit., p.4.)
him* The pathetic elements serve to guarantee the authentic humanity of the more lofty passages, which in turn lend a poetic suggestiveness to the prosaic details that precede or succeed them. W.W. Robson states the case very clearly: "The conclusion of the poem gives us the reconciliation or 'resolution' of the two attitudes: an achieved integrity." Danby reminds us that "It is most important to remember the seriousness that embraces the comic in Wordsworth's achievement." What these critics are attempting is really to demonstrate the inherent improbability of J.K. Stephens' conclusion: the notion that the same poet will write complete drivel in June 1798 when Wordsworth finished Peter Bell and a sublime masterpiece in July when he finished 'Tintern Abbey'. Arnold had, therefore, to offer a theory of Wordsworth's intermittent inspiration:

To give aright what he wishes to give, to interpret and render successfully, is not always within Wordsworth's own command. It is within no poet's command; here is the part of the Muse, the inspiration, the God, the 'not ourselves'. In Wordsworth's case, the accident, for so it may almost be called,

of inspiration, is of peculiar importance. No poet, perhaps, is so evidently filled with a new and sacred energy when the inspiration is upon him; no poet, when it fails him, is so left 'weak as is a breaking wave'.

Though Arnold does not seem to have realized it, the implication of this is disparaging to Wordsworth. F.W. Bateson states it thus: "... the upshot of such an interpretation is far from complimentary. It turns Wordsworth into a psychological freak, a poetic Jekyll and Hyde, who is at one moment a genius and at the next an imbecile ... To assume a lack of psychological continuity in the evolution of his personality is simply to melodramatise our own failures of comprehension." Bateson tells us that if the Victorians did not always understand a large part of Wordsworth's poetry, it was primarily because of their lack of understanding of the Augustan poets and in Wordsworth there is an intermixture of the Augustan and the Romantic modes. Therefore, a proper appreciation of Wordsworth demands from the reader an equally sensitive response to two very different kinds of poetry. The great poems of Wordsworth are those in which these two modes have been blended in a new inclusive whole. Such a combination may be said to have been achieved in the best passages in The Prelude, in the Lucy poems, in "Michael", in "Resolution

30. Ibid., p. 13.
and Independence" and in a considerable number of other poems. A more cogent defence of Wordsworth's new mode is that of Beatty, who contends that Wordsworth not only accepted the fact that the change described in "Tintern Abbey" and "Immortality Ode" is the inevitable result of the growth of the human mind, but actually welcomed "the years that bring the philosophic mind." as a stage of growth preferable to the "time when meadow, grove, and stream,The earth and every common sight" seemed to him "Apparelled in celestial light". To Beatty it seems that in the last three stanzas of the "Ode" Wordsworth enters the full flood of his main thought that the love, the intellect, the emotion, of maturity are all of more profound importance than those of either childhood or Youth... and that Wordsworth recognized that "Delight may depart; but the deeper Joy remains". Lionel Trilling, clearly a disciple of Beatty, speaks of the "Ode" as "the very opposite" of a dirge, "a welcome of new powers", dismissing as irrelevant the question whether Wordsworth's celebration was justified in terms of the poetry written with these new powers. Trilling "found it to be Wordsworth's farewell to the characteristic mode of his poetry, the mode that Keats called 'the egotistical sublime' and a dedication to the mode of tragedy."  

32. Ibid., p.84.  
34. Ibid., p.152.
"Immortality Ode" is a complex poem and the majority of critics doubt that its mood will justify such interpretations as that of Beatty and Trilling. Perhaps the most common view of Wordsworth's attitude toward the change recorded in the "Ode" and in the poems that soon followed it, is that expressed by Garrod:

I doubt whether Wordsworth, in his best period, ever abandoned the doctrine that the highest moral achievement is that which presents itself as an inspiration, that which is part of our natural life, that which is bound up with childhood and its unthinking 'vision'. Duty is a second-best; we seek support from that power when higher and freer powers fail us. The purer moral life is that which so binds together our days that the vision of childhood suffices to later years.35

According to this interpretation, the unity of the human mind, celebrated in the lines from "My heart leaps up" which Wordsworth prefixed to the "Ode", provides some relief from the fact that though the original glory passes from the earth in man's youth, it is nevertheless part of the development of his soul, and is, therefore, the material upon which the mature mind is founded. But I think that Wordsworth to some extent abandoned Nature, abandoned it first for duty and then for truth. As a result of this, his later poetry deals with experiences and subjects other than the moments of vision which are admittedly his special prerogative.

David Perkins speculates that the various experiences of his life that produced and added to his despondency "seem to have gradually weakened Wordsworth's earlier hope that the 'Spirit of the Universe' exercised a loving care on behalf of man. "But Perkins qualifies the statement with the remark that "the majority of the late poems do not seem inconsistent with the earlier ones", because "on the whole, the late poems can be described as effusions in praise of meekness, tranquility, order, and repose in the human mind and in society, and ... these are qualities which Wordsworth always valued and espoused".\(^\text{36}\) Perkins's last statement is true in a sense, but it is also misleading in that it seems to equate identity of mode. Though certain basic values recur throughout Wordsworth's poetry of every period, the mode of his earlier poetry is different from that of his later.

When we are aware that even in the period of the Great Decade Wordsworth was employing, in such poems as "The Waterfall and Eglantine" (1800), "The Oak and the Broom (1800)," "To a Sexton (1799)", "To the Daisy (1802)", and many of the miscellaneous and political sonnets, the same mode of explicit statement and traditional image that characterizes the bulk of his later poetry, we shall be ready to state the question of the "two Wordsworths" in clearer terms. Essentially, the later poetry merely follows and exaggerates trends already established.

in the early Poems of the Fancy and the social doctrine poems of the *Lyrical Ballads*. Indeed "an account of why Wordsworth ceased to write great poetry must at the same time be an account of how he once did write great poetry." 37

In his discussion of the "definitely ethical moral" tone of "Laodamia" Abercrombie remarks that this mode of moralising "is not very usual with" Wordsworth, because "his sense of the significance of things could seldom be formulated in that way." 38 But, this judgment is true of his poems of the imagination only. The mode of the poems of the fancy is the mode of overt moralising.

"Laodamia" may be taken as an object lesson for the correction of a common tendency to assume that didactic poetry is necessarily bad art. That the poem is consciously didactic Wordsworth will not allow us to doubt. Not only in his role as narrator but through the lips of the spirit of Protesilaus Wordsworth repeatedly reminds us of the moral lesson of the poem.

"Be taught, 0 faithful Consort, to control Rebellious passion: for the Gods approve The depth, and not the tumult, of the soul; A fervent, not ungovernable, love." 39

In such accents we recognize the voice that earlier had addressed the "Stern Daughter of the Voice of God" and

38. L. Abercrombie, op.cit., p.64.
praised the nappy warrior who learns to control, subdue and transmute his emotions. "Laodamia" is not a symbolic poem; it is overtly moral. Yet the poem satisfies the aesthetic demand. The moral of the poem is not one that most readers would value; but because the poem succeeds artistically it does produce "that quickening of our moral nature which necessarily accompanies noble imagination." It is this recognition of the necessary connection between aesthetic and moral experience that has been in every age the central argument in defences of poetry. In Kant the propensity is to separate the faculties of knowing, willing, and feeling, and therefore to isolate from each other the realms of truth, goodness, and beauty. It is in terms of this progressive tendency toward the isolation of the elements of pleasure and instruction in poetry that the disintegration of most eighteenth-century descriptive poetry into "scene" and "moral" is to be explained. More and more it means that a poem does not, as Renaissance critics had maintained, instruct at the same time it pleases; it does not instruct in the very act of achieving aesthetic success. Wordsworth's Preface (1800) asserts the doctrine that "we have no sympathy but what is propagated by pleasure". He refuses to give theoretical sanction to poetry in which aesthetic and moral elements are disunited. Indeed, certain of the statements that the Preface makes about the nature of poetry have come to exist for us

40. Abercrombie, op. cit., p.112.
as something like proverbs of criticism. "The grand elementary principle of pleasure", he points out, constitutes "the naked and native dignity of man" and that it is the principle by which man "knows, and feels, and lives, and moves".\footnote{42} Wordsworth's statement seems to controvert St. Paul's message: "For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring."\footnote{43} And in addition to its intrinsic interest, it has great historical interest, not only because it sums up a characteristic tendency of eighteenth century thought, but also because it bears significantly upon a characteristic tendency of our contemporary culture. Its relation to our contemporary culture is chiefly a negative one. Our present sense of life does not accommodate the idea of pleasure as something which constitutes the "naked and native dignity of man". For Wordsworth pleasure was the defining attribute of life and nature. Pleasure is the "impulse from the vernal wood" which teaches us more of man. The fallen condition of humanity - "what man has made of man?" - is characterized by the circumstance that man alone of natural beings does not experience the pleasure, which, Wordsworth believes, moves the living world.

Yet, ironically, Wordsworth's poems of fancy represents pleasures of a quite limited kind. Certainly he ruled out pleasures that are strictly physical, those that derive from

\footnote{42} \textit{Ibid.}, p.395. \footnote{43} Acts 17:28.
the indulgence of the appetites, more particularly erotic gratification. His world of springtime is far removed from that of Lucretius; nothing in it is driven by the irresistible power of Venus. Wordsworth's pleasure tended toward joy, a purer and more nearly transcendent faith. This pleasure he often expounds through moral statements in his poetry. But we need not accept the moral which Wordsworth expounds; we should rather accept the moral, which as a triumph of art, the poem embodies. To succeed in a poem in which moral and aesthetic claims are even slightly in tension is a difficult feat.

In Dion the moral is explicitly stated:

him only pleasure leads, and peace attends,
Him, only him, the shield of Jove defends,
Whose means are fair and spotless as his ends.  

The poem stands as a sad monument to his failure to leave moral teaching to the imagination, which alone could preserve the integrity of a poem. This artistic failure is magnified in the poems which Wordsworth classified as Poems of Fancy. If there are in them moments of vision, such are very rare.

Moreover, Wordsworth's later poems of fancy employ a mode of expression much more direct than the poems of this class in earlier years. Morals are more explicitly stated, and moral and aesthetic purposes are now clearly separate. One misses the condition of hushed expectancy that in the poems

---

"Dion, 122-24."
of imagination introduces an experience of ineffable revelation.
In the poems of fancy Wordsworth approaches scenes and objects
with the cold-blooded design of extracting from them a sermon
for his moral muse. In "A Morning Exercise" the lark is clearly
selected for service.

So constant with thy downward eye of love,
Yet, in aerial singleness, so free;
So humble, yet so ready to rejoice
In power of wing and never-wearied voice. 45

The lark is constant with its downward eye of love, free,
humble, yet so ready to rejoice. Opposites are said to be
reconciled in the lark, but they are only mildly in opposition
and they are reconciled too easily. The second poem "A Flower
Garden" states the moral:

apt emblem (for reproof of pride)
This delicate enclosure shows
Of modest kindness, that would hide
The firm protection she bestows; 46

The language is deliberately didactic. "To the Daisy" is a
more well-known poem celebrating the joys of the poet's mind
in the presence of the daisy. He discovers in it:

The homely sympathy that needs
The common life our nature breeds;
A wisdom fitted to the needs
Of hearts at leisure. 47

47. "To the Daisy", 53-56.
As philosophy it is quite sound; but it is not humanised. It remains a statement. In the poem "The Waterfall and the Eglantine" the briar is similarly endowed with some favourite Wordsworthian virtues:

"Ah! said the Briar, "blame me not;
Why should we dwell in strife?
We who in this sequestered spot
Once lived a happy life!"  

The moral of the poem "To the Small Celandine" is also consciously organised. The flower is the Prophet of delight and mirth, Ill-requited upon earth;  

Thus truths delivered by fancy are of a lower order than those derived from the imagination. Fancy is not a faculty of discovering truths at all, but only of illustrating truths already accepted, and accepted not by the imagination but by the understanding. Wordsworth, therefore, criticizes this faculty as one that "does not require that the materials which she makes use of should be susceptible of change in their constitution, from her touch." Fancy makes no demands on her material because that material already exists in the understanding in fixed intellectual values. Imagination on the other hand "recoils from everything but the plastic, the pliant, and

49. "To the Small Celandine", 57-58.
For these reasons, there is a drama in the poems of imagination that is lacking in the poems of the fancy. Fancy is on the leash, its limits circumscribed by the unyielding truths which it can only illustrate by fable and emblem. Imagination is unlimited; its aim is to create value by transforming the materials on which it acts, to create of everyday objects symbols of eternity. Imagination does not illustrate truths given to it; it yields truths that defy illustration.

Wilson Knight remarks that "Wordsworth distrusts all easy symbolisms, all 'nature's secondary grace' and the 'charm more superficial' of natural works used as 'moral illustrations'." Unhappily, this is not quite true. More nearly accurate is Raleigh's recognition of "the convincing testimony that Wordsworth was habitually unconscious of inequalities in his work." To Wordsworth the fancy was clearly a faculty of value to the mature poet, charged with an important moral task.

Basil Willey finds the basic difference between Wordsworth's nature poetry and Thomson's Seasons, to which, he says, Wordsworth's poems bear a superficial resemblance, in the fact that for Thomson, "The poetry exists to decorate,

51. Ibid., II, p.441.
52. Knight, op.cit., p.18.
53. Raleigh, op.cit., p.3.
to render agreeable, a set of abstract notions; and these abstractions have been taken over, as truth, from the natural philosophers. In contrast, says Willey, "Wordsworth's beliefs ... were largely the formulation of his own dealings with 'substantial things'; they are held intellectually only because they had first been 'proved upon the pulses'. I think Willey's contrast holds true for Wordsworth's poems of imagination, but in the poems of fancy acceptance of "abstract notions" particularly the traditional beliefs of Christianity, replaces truths imaginatively derived from personal experience with reality. Willey rightly states that any translation of Wordsworth's "experience into myth, personification or fable, though not necessarily culpable, is inevitably a lapse towards a lower level of truth, a fall in fact from imagination to fancy." 

At first glance "A Whirl Blast" and the poem on daffodils are strikingly similar. Both describe a scene in which inanimate objects of nature seem to come to life. But the essential difference is between the modes of experience which characterizes the two. The leaves in "A Whirl Blast" only seem to be "dancing to the minstrelsy" of "some Robin Good-Fellow", whereas of the daffodils it is asserted without qualification that they are endowed, in fact, with life and feeling:

The waves beside them danced; but they
Out-did the sparkling waves in glee;

A poet could not but be gay,
In such a jocund company;\textsuperscript{57}

More revealing still is the difference in the poet's reaction to the two scenes described. The poem on daffodils does not end with description, because the chief concern is clearly not the scene but the significance of that scene to the poet's mind. It reminds him of the brightness and multitude of stars at night. The poet's loneliness is transformed into fellowship; he becomes a part of all the "jocund company;" he realizes the sense of joy and unity and continuity in the natural elements of air, water, and earth. All this is now alive in his own being too. It incites and supports the eternal. Moreover, the perceptions of imagination contain an inner principle of growth which makes them gain in effect long after the experiences which give rise to them have ended.

I gazed - and gazed - but little thought
What wealth the show to me had brought.\textsuperscript{58}

It is much later and often under quite different circumstances that the experience is recalled and with it a meaning that now enriches the original scene.

For oft, when on my couch I lie
In vacant or in pensive mood,
They flash upon that inward eye
Which is the bliss of solitude;
And then my heart with pleasure fills
And dances with the daffodils.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{57} "I wandered lonely as a cloud", 13-16.
\textsuperscript{58} "I wandered" etc., 17-18.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 19-24.
The significance of this final stanza becomes more obvious when we recall Wordsworth's remark that the imagination depends "less upon casual and outstanding, than upon inherent and internal, properties." Only later when the scene has ceased to be the product of the visual sense, can the "inward eye" reveal its "inherent and internal properties". Through the 'inward eye' of memory, other moods of loneliness and listlessness can be animated with the sense of fulfilment which was experienced on that first spring morning. In the poems of the fancy the scene remains the product of the senses and no permanent value is assigned to the experience.

Most of Wordsworth's poems of the imagination clearly define his statement that the resemblances discovered by imagination depend less upon the casual and outstanding than upon the inherent and internal properties. We shall, Wordsworth tells us, never understand experiences until we learn to concentrate on processes rather than objects. While it is true that some objects, incidents and settings of nature are more likely than others to "send the soul into herself" it is also true that the imagination is not circumscribed by objects and that the imagination not only does not require for its exercise the intervention of supernatural agency, but that, though such agency be excluded, "the faculty may be called forth imperiously ... by incidents within the compass of poetic probability, in the humblest departments of daily life." 61

60. Works, II, p.441.
The circumstances described in "There was a Boy" and "A Whirl-Blast" are both capable of setting free the imagination. But in the second poem the mood is not right for an imaginative experience and the image is dependent upon accidental and fortuitous circumstances. It is not the physical setting itself that accounts for this experience, for as Wordsworth makes quite clear, the same conditions do not invariably call forth the same response described in "There was a Boy":

Then, sometimes, in that silence, while he hung listening, a gentle shock of mild surprise has carried far into his heart the voice of mountain torrents; or the visible scene would enter unawares into his mind with all its solemn imagery, its rocks, its woods, and that uncertain heaven received into the bosom of the steady lake.  

It is not action and situation of the poems of imagination that distinguish them essentially from the poems of fancy, but the difference in the feelings developed in them. And it is in their representation of these feelings that we shall find the most significant difference between two major ways of conveying experience, the one resorting to images that restrict the mind's activity, the other denying all limits and forsaking all attempts to substitute concepts for original experience.

62. "There was a Boy", 18-25.
I shall, therefore, conclude that Fancy and Imagination are two distinct powers and they have different modes of expression. It is indeed difficult to agree with Beatty's interpretation. He says that fancy and imagination are separate stages of the mind in its growth, imagination appearing "first as Fancy in Youth, and only in Maturity assuming its authentic (sic) shape and its function as the presiding genius of art and poetry." In support of his thesis Beatty quotes the following lines from The Prelude which do not appear in the 1850 version:

Yes, having track'd the main essential Power,
Imagination, up her way sublime,
In turn might Fancy also be pursued
Through all her transmigrations, till she too
Was purified, had learn'd to ply her craft
By judgment steadied.

This passage does not suggest at all that fancy is transformed into imagination. Indeed, the clear implication is that fancy, like imagination, passes through stages and also like imagination, is purified and steadied by judgment until it becomes a mature faculty. As far as I have understood it, the one clear aim of Wordsworth seems to refute Coleridge's definition of the terms 'imagination' and 'fancy' and to free the latter from Coleridge's implication that it is a faculty unworthy of genius. Wordsworth states quite explicitly:

64. The Prelude, ed. by E. de Selincourt, Oxford, 1926, p.488.
To aggregate and to associate, to evoke and to combine, belong as well to the imagination as to the Fancy; but either the materials evoked and combined are different; or they are brought together under a different law, and for a different purpose. Wordsworth also does not hesitate to ascribe to it a creative power:

...it is nonetheless true that Fancy, as she is an active, is also under her own laws and her own spirit, a creative faculty.

But this creative power has not been clearly demonstrated. The fancy of Wordsworth was clearly a faculty of value to the mature poet, charged with the important moral task of detecting lurking affinities between nature and moral lesson. But far from guarding the moral, Wordsworth has often explained it at great length and with much iteration which aroused suspicion of untried possibilities in the scope and power of his poetic art.

66. Ibid., p. 442