CHAPTER 5

COLERIDGE: PROGRESSIVE BEING

by Meg Harris Williams

‘The imagination is the distinguishing characteristic of man as a progressive being’
Coleridge, lecture on literature, 1818

Coleridge, like Wordsworth, relinquished poetry as a means of mental exploration - the medium through which a ‘shaping spirit of imagination’ could take over from the self and construct his own mind for him. But while Wordsworth enshrined his past vision and made his earlier self a place of worship by his older self, Coleridge pursued a more rewarding means of assimilating poetic experience. The problem of what ‘imagination’ is - of what makes the mind continue to grow - became the cornerstone of Coleridge’s poetic philosophy, always proved upon the pulses of his own imagination. Though feeling himself to be abandoned by ‘the poet’ (the poet within himself, split off into Wordsworth), his mind seized another mode of working which seemed ugly and cumbersome by comparison with poetic language yet which essentially remained faithful to the poetic spirit. Coleridge was drawn reluctantly into ‘delving in the metaphysic depths’:

I was once a Volume of Gold Leaf, rising & riding on every breath of Fancy - but I have beaten myself back into weight & density, now I sink in quicksilver, yea, remain squat and square on the earth amid the hurricane, that makes Oaks and Straws join in one dance.

These ‘quicksilver mines’ remain Coleridge’s image for the mental depths in which it is impossible to escape the tumult of the soul. He felt himself driven into them against his will: ‘Sickness and some other and worse afflictions first forced me into downright metaphysics’, but in evolving
a way of thinking about poetic experience which was based on his own reading and writing of poetry, Coleridge made an invaluable contribution to the bridge between literature and psychology. Probably, part of him (his opium-addict self) would have liked to retire, like Wordsworth; but he was driven onwards by a sense of religious duty like Milton’s; as he wrote at the end of his life, ‘I have no fear of Dying other than that of being seized with the stolen goods on me - the talents which had been entrusted to me.’5 And Coleridge’s ‘talents’ for the major part of his career consisted in establishing an experiential philosophy which clearly differentiated the various types of imitative or mechanical learning from organic and imaginative learning in which knowledge is the mind’s ‘being’ and contributes to its growth:

All knowledge that enlightens and liberalizes, is a form and a means of self knowledge. . . . At the best, the several knowledges are in the Mind as in a Lumber-garret: while Principles with the Laws, by which they are unfolded into their consequences, when they are once thoroughly mastered, become the mind itself and are living and constituent parts of it.6

Coleridge’s concern was with how the mind acquired ‘principles’ not information, internal identity not external marks of status, a shaping spirit of imagination rather than a fixed form of fancy. He established the indispensability of the terms ‘subjective’ and ‘objective’ in defining the nature of the knowledge whose epitome is ‘know thyself’: for ‘All knowledge rests on the coincidence of an object with a subject.’7 And his immersion in poetry was integral to his approach to these questions; as a species of knowledge which only became real with self knowledge, it could be said to provide the foundation for Coleridge’s model of the mind.

One of the seminal events in Coleridge’s own experience was the writing of *The Ancient Mariner* in 1797. In its portrayal of unconscious guilt and remorse it forms an emotional counterpart to Wordsworth’s of infant joy, so is also a seminal event in Romantic literature. Later, Coleridge said the classification of ‘Fear, Hope, Rage, Shame, & (strongest of all) Remorse, forms . . . the most difficult & at the same time the most interesting Problem of Psychology’.8 In this poem, the figure of the poet divided between the personae of Mariner and Wedding Guest bears little relation to Coleridge’s sentimentalized idea of the poet ‘rising and riding on every breath of Fancy’ (apart from the impetus given by the simple ballad narrative); one suspects that
this image of the poet belongs to the realms of wish-fulfilment and idealized security such as those in which he placed the figure of Wordsworth. One side of Coleridge would have liked an indulgent view of inspiration as automatic fancy-riding, but the other side knew that this was not the emotional truth. Even ‘Kubla Khan’ which has this automatic quality as it mellifluously and effortlessly strings together an aggregation of Romantic hieroglyphs, was seen by Coleridge as a ‘psychological curiosity’ associated with his escapist opium-addiction, rather than as inspired symbol formation.9 In a poem of inspired self knowledge like the Mariner, the poet does not ride on the breath of fancy but is pursued by ‘the Storm-blast, tyrannous and strong’. The voyage of the Mariner is in a sense the dream or internal condition of the Wedding Guest, and is what prevents the Guest from entering the church (like Theseus’ ‘hallow’d house’) to celebrate the ‘marriage’ of his internal objects. The Mariner instinctively knows ‘the man that must hear me’, and ‘holds’ him with his ‘glittering eye’, until by the end the Guest has internalized the tale and finds he is barred by his spiritual state alone from the bridegroom’s door (and perhaps, from the status of bridegroom):

The Mariner, whose eye is bright,
Whose beard is age with hoar,
Is gone: and now the Wedding-Guest
Turned from the bridegroom’s door.

He went like one that hath been stunned,
And is of sense forlorn . . . (11. 618-23)

He is ‘stunned’ essentially by revelations about himself and his attitude to creativity, the spiritual governors of his inner life. Initially, the bride herself is an alarming figure as she sweeps past and paces into the hall, not so different in her movements from the ‘nightmare Life-in-Death’ into whom she metamorphoses in the centre of the poem. On her first appearance,

The bride hath paced into the hall,
Red as a rose is she;
Nodding their heads before her goes
The merry minstrelsy. (ll. 33-6)
Almost immediately her rhythmic pacing turns into that of the Storm-blast, who sweeps the shipful of men before him just as she swept the merry ministrelsy:

And now the STORM-BLAST came, and he
Was tyrannous and strong:
He struck with his o’ertaking wings,
And chased us south along.

With sloping masts and dipping prow,
As who pursued with yell and blow
Still treads the shadow of his foe,
And forward bends his head,
The ship drove fast, loud roared the blast,
And southward aye we fled.   (ll. 41-50)

The poet’s ship or body is pursued by alarming forces, not yet retributive but raining yells and blows like a child before an adult’s temper tantrum. In the sudden wondrous calm which ensues, when ‘ice, mast-high, came floating by,/As green as emerald’, voices from tumultuous unconscious depths become audible, seeking expression yet speaking a language which is unrecognizable:

The ice was here, the ice was there,
The ice was all around:
It cracked and growled, and roared and howled,
Like noises in a swound! (ll. 59-62)

From these primitive heathen growlings (like Wordsworth’s cliff, chasms and ‘homeless voice of waters’), the Albatross emerges like a ‘Christian soul’ and seems to contain these infantile tempestuous roarings within a framework of simple piety which steers the sailors through the ice: coming every day for food, play and ‘vespers nine’. It perches on the mast, level with the huge icebergs. This representation of an early stage in psychic and poetic development is shattered by the shooting of the Albatross. The Mariner had been unaware of his dependence on the life of the Albatross, and had assumed it was the other way round - a species of infantile misconception about the poetic mother or Muse: in what sense does the bird respond to
the ‘mariners’ hollo’ (like an infant’s cry) when it is called? Following this misconception, the Storm-blast reappears as the retributive Sun-god, and fixes the boat to the ‘painted ocean’ by the masthead where the Albatross used to perch:

All in a hot and copper sky,
The bloody Sun, at noon,
Right up above the mast did stand,
No bigger than the Moon.

Day after day, day after day,
We stuck, nor breath nor motion;
As idle as a painted ship
Upon a painted ocean.

Water, water, everywhere,
And all the boards did shrink;
Water, water, everywhere,
Nor any drop to drink. (ll. 1-22)

The poet-mariner has cut himself off from his sources of spiritual nourishment, in particular what Wordsworth calls the ‘drinking’ of the visionary power, owing to his crime of omnipotence. His mind is drained, ‘and all the boards did shrink’. He is immobilized within a condition of false poetry, an anti-symbolic universe of artificial ‘painting’ - painting which replaces or covers life (like Blake’s view of error) rather than imagery which springs from inner life and gives a local habitation to the imagination. The effect of this type of (false) poetry was defined by Coleridge: ‘Poetry - excites us to artificial feelings - makes us callous to real ones.’ Riding on the breath of fancy leads only to the ‘wicked whisper’ from a ‘heart as dry as dust’ (11. 246-7).

The central section of the Mariner is a brilliant symbolic expression of this anti-symbolic mental state: the state which bars the mind from witnessing the internal marriage of contraries which constitutes inspiration. Having symbolized this condition, the poet with equal inspiration intuits the remedy, though this involves first of all a confrontation with the ‘Nightmare Life-in-Death’ which the bride and the Albatross have become in his imagination:
Her lips were red, her looks were free,
Her locks were yellow as gold:
Her skin was white as leprosy,
The Night-mare LIFE-IN-DEATH was she,
Who thickens man's blood with cold.

The naked hulk alongside came,
And the twain were casting dice . . . (ll. 190-6)

In the game of dice between Death and Life-in-Death, the inhabitants of this spectre-ship or false body of poetry, the latter wins the poet’s soul and thereby condemns him to a lifelong struggle with the imagination (which begins to be recounted during the later part of the poem). The ambiguous concept of ‘life in death’ was, for Coleridge, certainly the most painful of the alternatives, yet also the most fruitful for the soul, and was identified by him with the eternal life of godliness or reason. Thus in an ‘epitaph’ written for himself he uses the same phrase:

O, lift one thought in prayer for S.T.C.;
That he who many a year with toil of breath
Found death in life, may here find life in death!

In a sense, life in death is the object of the soul’s search for development and an essential part of imaginative experience. Immediately after the revelation brought him by the spectre-ship, the Mariner sees the Albatross in another light - as it were spiritualized, in the form of the ‘moving Moon’ who inhabits realms unreachable by any cross-bow:

The moving Moon went up the sky,
And no where did abide:
Softly she was going up,
And a star or two beside (ll. 263--6)

The moonlight transfigures the water-snakes which he had found so hideous: first outside the ship’s shadow (burning ‘a still and awful red’), and then within it:

Within the shadow of the ship
I watched their rich attire:
Blue, glossy green, and velvet black,
They coiled and swam; and every track
Was a flash of golden fire.
O happy living things! no tongue
Their beauty might declare:
A spring of love gushed from my heart,
And I blessed them unaware: (ll. 277-87)

The play of light traces the restored line of identification between the poet and his source of inspiration, the moon who transforms the dry burning shadow into a vital inner world of flashing lights and fountains (Coleridge’s characteristic imagery for ‘reason’). When the ugly is seen to become beautiful, and the vision of poetry and beauty is restored, the ‘naked hulk’ aspect of the feminine principle is exorcized - represented by the corpse of the Albatross falling ‘like lead into the sea’. The ugliness which had been in the mind of the beholder is lifted when the doors of perception are cleansed. The inspiring force of the moving Moon restores movement to the Mariner’s mind, by contrast with the arrow shot from the cross-bow of his ignorant omnipotent self.

This is not the end of the Mariner’s story but the beginning; just as the Wedding Guest’s assimilation of the dream, and his sense of being turned away from the sacred chamber of his internal objects, may perhaps be the beginning of a future story to be told truthfully rather than omnipotently. Certainly it haunted Coleridge for years, like one of those dreams which he described as the ‘very Substances and foot-thick Calamities of my Life’, the sort of dream that Emily Bronte would have described as going ‘through and through [one] like wine through water, changing the very colour of [one’s] life’.

Its symbolic presentation of the drama between inspiration and omnipotence came as a species of revelation, and underlies the whole series of distinctions between true and false (or limited) modes of coming to knowledge, which form the backbone of the essential Coleridgean philosophy. His distinctions between organic and mechanical, wisdom and knowledge, symbol and allegory (or sign-systems), reason and understanding, imagination and fancy, are all founded on this primary revelation of self-knowledge. His own version of the ‘organic’ philosophy originating in Germany was worked out on the pulses of his Shakespeare criticism, in the context of trying to
define the nature of the poetic or imaginative mind which Shakespeare supremely modelled:

He projected his mind out of his particular being, and felt and made others feel, on subjects in no way connected with himself, except by force of contemplation, and that sublime faculty, by which a great mind becomes that which it meditates on.13

The process of self-knowledge is the opposite of egocentric; the mind which ‘becomes’ its own ideas, does so by projecting itself out of its selfhood, and by imaginatively entering-in is entered into, so grows or ‘becomes’ an extension of its own being. In this mind-extending process, the poet gives form to ‘our own Feelings, that never perhaps were attached by us consciously to our own personal Selves’.14 Poetry gives form to the unknown which is a latent part of our being, such that we become it, and it becomes us. In analogy with this, Coleridge defined the nature of Shakespeare’s works as coming into existence in accordance with a shaping spirit of imagination outside the dominance of the poet’s self:

The form is mechanic when on any given material we impress a pre-determined form, not necessarily arising out of the properties of the material. . . . The organic form, on the other hand, is innate; it shapes as it develops itself from within, and the fullness of its development is one and the same with the perfection of its outward form. Such is the life, such the form.15

Time and again Coleridge reworks the contrast between forms which are ‘super-induced’ by a static mind, and forms which ‘evolve’ according to an innate principle of evolution, such that the ‘form’ of the inspired work of art is a manifestation of the evolving mind itself, and its internal form:

The difference therefore between Fabrication and Generation becomes clearly indicable/the Form of the latter is ab intra, evolved, the other ab extra, impressed - the latter is representative always of something not itself, . . . but the former is representative of its own cause within itself.16

We remember Theseus’ problems with the ‘form in wax’ false aesthetics of Egeus. Here as there, the key to the process of internal development which makes the personality of the poem a manifestation of its inner principle of causation, is the operation of imagination. Like Blake,
Coleridge sometimes speaks of imagination not as a faculty but as a place, in which the forms of meaning are generated and contained:

Form is factitious Being, and Thinking is the process, Imagination the Laboratory, in which Thought elaborates Essence into Existence. A Philosopher, i.e. a nominal Philosopher without Imagination, is a Coiner - Vanity, the Froth of the molten Mass, is his Stuff - and Verbiage the Stamp & Impression.\textsuperscript{17}

True thinking is a product of imagination and a form of being (that is, of becoming); in this Coleridge’s idea of organic mental growth consists; and as always, it is contrasted with the fake, omnipotent; super-induced version of the merely ‘nominal’ philosopher with his ‘verbiage’. In the famous definition of the Biographia Literaria (1817), Coleridge formulates ‘fancy’ as a ‘mode of memory’ which has ‘no other counters to play with, but only fixities and definites’.\textsuperscript{18} Although he sometimes allows a limited usefulness to fancy, he always stresses that it must be kept subordinate as a tool of the imagination, and not worshipped as if it were itself a creative power (which would involve stifling the imagination). Fancy, the ‘aggregating’ power (as he terms it elsewhere), is not a lower form of imagination (the ‘modifying’ power), but a different quality altogether. And

The primary Imagination I hold to be the living power and prime agent of all human perception, and as a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM.\textsuperscript{19}

The ‘secondary imagination’ differs only in ‘degree’ not in ‘kind’, and ‘dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to re-create’. Imagination is thus the condition of the mind’s creating- not only works of art - but itself; it allows the god-like principle of creativity to operate within and to shape its identity.

This brings us to the problem of symbol formation, with which Coleridge was increasingly preoccupied over the years. When the imagination in its laboratory is giving to airy nothing a local habitation and a name, and elaborating ‘essence into existence’, symbols are being produced. And Coleridge was emphatic that ‘An Idea, in the highest sense of that word, cannot be conveyed but by a symbol.’\textsuperscript{20} Symbols are the concrete evidence of communication between the self and its internal deities who inhabit
the realm of ideas - in Coleridge’s terminology, the realm of Reason - which he regards as either co-extensive with imagination or (in his later works) as a further realm which nevertheless can only operate through imagination. Symbols are the language of the imagination and the food of the mind, because they carry within them the ideas which are the mind’s prerequisite for a condition of continuing growth:

Every living principle is actuated by an idea; and every idea is living, productive, partaketh of infinity, and (as Bacon has sublimely observed) containeth an endless power of semination.21

The *Statesman’s Manual*, written at about the same time as the *Biographia*, perhaps contains Coleridge’s clearest descriptions of symbolic functioning. As always, he begins by making a differentiation between the real thing and its look-alike - namely, symbols and allegories (sign-systems):

Now an Allegory is but a translation of abstract notions into a picture-language which is itself nothing but an abstraction from objects of the senses; the principal being more worthless even than its phantom proxy, both alike unsubstantial, and the former shapeless to boot. On the other hand a Symbol . . . is characterized by the translucence of the Eternal through and in the Temporal. It always partakes of the Reality which it renders intelligible; and while it enunciates the whole, abides itself as a living part in that Unity, of which it is the representative. The others are but empty echoes which the fancy arbitrarily associates with apparitions of matter. . . . Alas! for the flocks that are to be led forth to such pastures!22

The mind which does nothing but fabricate sign-systems (a function of the omnipotent selfhood) and in the ‘blindness of self complacency’ is unable to see that they are not symbols but a ‘counterfeit product of the mechanical understanding’, is condemned to spiritual dehydration like the Mariner when his throat was ‘dry as dust’, unable to drink the water of faith which ‘becomes a well within himself springing up to life everlasting’. A true symbol has its source not in the self but in the fountain of faith or the light of reason, a realm of infinite resource with which the self is organically connected when it incorporates a ‘living part’ of it into the growing structure of the mind. He wrote in *The Friend*, in
the context of defining the ‘method’ of the mind’s progress, that the object of the ‘poetic philosopher Plato’ was not to ‘establish any particular truth’, but to ‘open anew a well of springing water . . . by awakening the principle and method of self development’. For ‘all true and living knowledge must proceed from within’. When the inner self makes organic contact with these symbol-producing realms of the mind, then the idea itself becomes known, not in the sense of being owned, but rather, incorporated through this living link of self development. This is Coleridge’s knowledge-as-being, or knowledge-as-becoming. In the same way, the realm of ideas is itself not a ‘lumber garret’ for filing mechanical codes, but a breeding ground for principles. Contact with a living ‘principle’ means the ‘swallowing-up of self in an object dearer than self, or an idea more vivid’:

At the annunciation of principles, of ideas, the soul of man wakes and starts up, as an exile in a far distant land at the unexpected sounds of his native language, when after long years of absence, and almost of oblivion, he is suddenly addressed in his own mother tongue?

Principles speak with the ‘mother tongue’ of the internal mother or poetic Muse - the mind’s deities, who give birth to ideas,

that most glorious birth of the God-like within us, which even as the Light, its material symbol, reflects itself from a thousand surfaces, and flies homeward to its Parent Mind enriched with a thousand forms, itself above form and still remaining in its own simplicity and identity!

The essential feature of a symbol for Coleridge was thus its organic link with a realm of existence outside the selfhood yet drawn within the mind, being the mind’s own ‘Parent Mind’, with which intimate identification is established, flying back and forth, carrying with it a potential for thousandfold enrichment or endless semination.

Coleridge’s conception of a ‘symbol’ is therefore inseparable from his view of mental growth. The symbol contains the piece of self knowledge which is organically incorporated as the new part of the mind’s structure, retaining its links with its source and hence the potential for future development. The imagination in its laboratory ‘gives birth to a system of symbols, harmonious in themselves, and consubstantial with the truths, of which they are the conductors’. The system of symbols resembles Blake’s little
children of Jerusalem emanating from the eternal mind, but Coleridge is far more emphatic about the principle of progression and about the complexity of the internal identifications on which it is founded. Coleridge wrote: ‘we can have no notion of desirable Progression . . . but what supposes a growth of consciousness - or the image of that incommunicable attribute of self comprehension’;\(^{28}\) the human soul has a ‘reflex consciousness of its own continuousness’ which allows it to see or imagine mental states beyond its own present condition, hence to grope towards the ‘terra incognita of knowledge’:

I do not like that presumptuous Philosophy which in its rage of explanation allows no xyz, no symbol representative of the vast Terra Incognita of Knowledge, for the Facts and Agencies of Mind and matter reserved for future Explorers/ while the ultimate grounds of all must remain inexplicable or Man must cease to be progressive. Our Ignorance with all the intermediates of obscurity is the condition of our ever-increasing Knowledge.\(^{29}\)

A key feature of the progressive mind is the space known only as the Unknown; without this necessary part of an internal landscape, there is no possibility of the organic link (the ‘reflex’ or ‘reflective’ consciousness) with the principle of self development. Coleridge was fascinated by the conditions which had to prevail for the mind to be able to explore its own mystery; and by how these differed from the subjugation of internal structures by the tyranny of the self’s fixed ideas and backwards-looking recollective consciousness. He emphasized symbolization rather than verbalization (which he distrusted, despite his own overflowing capacity for it); verbalization is the manipulation of fixed counters, and symbolization (which can include verbal symbolization) the imaginative containment of a living idea. The core of his method of observing the mind was to focus not on ‘things only’, but on ‘the relations of things’.\(^{30}\) For Coleridge, the very concept of transcendence was a complex one, based not on a ladder of abstraction but on an idea of ‘interpenetration’:

The transcendental philosophy demands . . . this one power with its two inherent indestructible yet counteracting forces, and the results or generations to which their inter-penetration gives existence, in the living principle and in the process of our own self-consciousness.\(^{31}\)
The ‘one power’ becomes active when a relationship is set up between dialectical forces - perhaps contrary emotions (as in Blake’s marriage of contraries), or through the projective-introjective relation between the self and its objects which Coleridge’s descriptions frequently foreshadow. He was continually inventing ways of describing this phenomenon of interpenetration, or immanent transcendence: such as, the term ‘cons substantial’, or the ‘prothesis of Inwardness and Outness’, or ‘the identity of subject and object, subjective and objective’ (which he made key critical terms); the ‘immanence of ALL in each’, or the ‘inherence’ of the ‘empirical I’ in ‘the absolute I AM’.32 In this, he felt, lay the crux of the reality of ideas; the Statesman’s Manual ends with this formulation of the ‘highest problem of Philosophy’:

Whether Ideas are regulative only, according to Aristotle and Kant; or likewise CONSTITUTIVE, and one with the power and Life of Nature, according to Plato, and Plotinus . . . is the highest problem of Philosophy, and not part of its nomenclature.33

For Coleridge, with his ‘substantial’ concept of ideas-in-symbols generating an internal principle of development, there was no question but that ideas could only regulate the mind by being ‘constitutive’, not in the adhesive sense of the pathetic fallacy but in the sense of organic incorporation. Coleridge’s immersion in poetry gave him a conception of the mind as a substantial entity whose internal qualities were like organic fibres linked up by interpenetration. He was interested perhaps obsessively so - in the relation between mind and body, and in ‘psychosomatic’ functioning (his own term); he even speculated on the possibility of the soul’s prenatal growth:

One might make a very amusing allegory of an embryo soul up to birth! . . . One tiny particle combines with another its like, and, so, lengthens and thickens, and this is, at once, memory and increasing vividness of impression.34

Whether pre- or post-natal, he saw the nature of the mind’s growth in terms of a continuing transformation from within; the boundaries of the self must be in a potential condition of dissolving to be recreated, under the agency of imagination:

They and only they can acquire the philosophic imagination, the sacred power of self-intuition, who within themselves can interpret and understand
the symbol, that the wings of the air-sylph are forming within the skin of the
caterpillar; those only, who feel in their own spirits the same instinct, which
impels the chrysalis of the horned fly to leave room in its involucrum for
antennae yet to come. They know and feel, that the potential works in them,
even as the actual works on them.35

This exploration of the mind’s terra incognita is a form of spiritual meta-
morphosis, which occurs when the waters of faith and the energies of
reason start to flow; and this only begins when an emotional current of
imaginative identification is set up within the mind, and the principle of
self development is activated: ‘such as the life is, such the form’. Coleridge
recognized that the status quo of the human consciousness was in effect a
‘negation and voluntary Act of no-thinking’, but that occasionally devel-
opment had to occur, whether within the individual or the human race,
and that this was the province of ‘poetry and religion’:

It is necessary for our limited powers of Consciousness that we should be
brought to this negative state, & that should pass into Custom - but likewise
necessary that at times we should awake & step forward - this is effected by
Poetry & Religion.36

Coleridge made the concept of ‘the poetic’ integral to the quality of
an experience - developing hints made by Milton in his tractate Of Educa-
tion, in the passage much admired by Coleridge.37 Poetry, as a principle of
mental action not simply as a verbal discipline, was defined by Coleridge
in a way which illuminates it as a touchstone of judgement, a primary cri-
terion of value - the key to the reality or artificiality of a relationship. If
an experience or mode of apprehension is poetic - that is, shaped by the
imagination - then it is a growth-promoting experience, ‘irradiated by the
reason’ (in one of Coleridge’s favourite phrases), leading to ‘man as a pro-
gressive being’. If not, then it belongs to the sphere of mechanical fancy or
un-irradiated understanding dependent on fixities and definites - a sphere
of rearrangement, not of growth and transformation: not in itself useless,
but liable to be misused and become a ‘dead progression’. Poetry awakens
the mind from the torpor of its basic assumptions and makes it ‘awake and
step forward’.
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