CHAPTER I

THOUGHT AND IMAGERY IN POETRY:
A THEORETICAL APPROACH
A study of thought and imagery in poetry should begin, I think, with a discussion of the two terms "thought" and "image". "Thought" and "Image" are very difficult terms to deal with, as the processes involved in them are so elusive and incapable of direct observation. Let us first take the term "thought". A casual reference to the O.E.D. for a clarification of the word "thought" leaves one more baffled than ever, because the word means so much that nothing can be strictly associated with it. It may refer to a number of things like reflection, meditation, memory, belief, opinion, judgment or fancy. The only way one can generalise the meaning of thought is to think of it as "something that goes on in the mind".\textsuperscript{1} Expert psychologists tell us that the term "has no definite meaning".\textsuperscript{2} In general usage, however, the word "thought" is associated with (1) discursive reflection, (2) images and (3) belief. Discursive reflection involves a chain of ideas in a sequence leading to, and ending in, a consequence. In the second sense of "thought as something synonymous with image", a thought... is a mental picture not actually
present and thinking is a succession of such pictures". In this sense, thought is process of thinking in terms of images or impressions. In the third sense, 'thought' refers to belief as, when a man says, "I thought X was cleverer than Y", he simply means, "I believed X was cleverer than Y". In a strange manner, "thought" has an interesting meaning, which, if analysed, means the opposite of discursive reflection. "Thought" is, according to the O.E.D., "anxiety or distress of the mind, solicitude, grief, sorrow, trouble, care, vexation". In this sense thought is synonymous with feeling.

"Image", similarly, is another word, the meaning of which is as difficult to fix as that of thought. Though a large number of books are written on imagery, each writer has given his own definition of it. There seems to be no agreement among the critics regarding what is meant by an image. Foakes sums up the various ways in which critics define it: "... a word picture, as the perception of hidden analogy, as the presentation of the spiritual through the creation of a concrete idea, a unity of two terms which still remain independent have a measure of truth...." Imagery from a different angle, "...is a sensation,
more or less refined by the transforming and modifying power of the mind through which the images pass."  

The word "image" has many associations, and, therefore, it is defined variously. 'Image' is a word that recalls to our mind any sensation which may not be essentially visual. C.F.E. Spurgeon describes the image as "... connoting any and every imaginative picture or other of experience, drawn in every kind of way, which may have come to the poet, not only through any of his senses but through his mind and emotions as well."  

In brief, Dr. Spurgeon says that an image is a "Little word-picture used by the poet or prose writer to illustrate, illuminate or embellish his thought". To Robert P. Tristram Coffin, images are the pictures of 'the things we can see, touch, hear, taste and smell'.

There are, however, two popular conceptions of the image found in modern criticism. To some critics, an image is a word-picture 'that recalls to our minds a sensation, an impression, not merely visual but belonging to anyone of the senses: sound, smell, balance, pressure, heat and cold and the like'. To others, an image is a relation between the two terms called the
tenor and the vehicle or the object-matter and the subject-matter. The two objects which are compared in a poetic image are called variously: H.W. Wells calls the idea underlying the image 'the major term'; I.A. Richards calls it the 'tenor'; and R.A. Foakes calls it the 'object matter'. The material illustrating the idea has been called the 'minor term', the 'vehicle' and the 'subject matter' by Wells, Richards and Fogle respectively. Some of the critics who consider the image as a relation between the major and the minor terms do not agree with those who argue that an image is essentially sensuous. Rosamond Tuve in her Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery has revealed that an image is not essentially but functionally sensuous. She argues that poets use metaphor not to present things sensuously, but fairly to "push one into an abstract process" and that, "when 'sensation' is left behind for a less concrete subject like the motive of a described action or the emotion felt, then the reader who tries to see continuously a physical thing, or to avoid gliding through an abstract process, is in a bad case". The particular sensuous picture or what is called the minor term in the image is not of much consequence in a continued metaphor or allegoria, as Rosamond Tuve argues, because
it "exhibits the normal relation of concretion to abstraction found in metaphor, in the shape of a series of particulars with further meanings".\textsuperscript{14}

W.B. Stanford, who calls the metaphor a "stereoscope of ideas"\textsuperscript{15} defines metaphor in his Greek Metaphor as follows:

The term metaphor is fully valid only when applied to a very definite and a rather complicated concept, \textit{viz.} the process and result of using a term (X) normally signifying an object or concept (A) in such a context that it must refer to another object or concept (B) which is distinct enough in characteristics from A to ensure that in the composite idea formed by the synthesis of the concepts A and B and now symbolized in the word X, the factors A and B retain their conceptual independence even while they merge in the unity symbolized by X \ldots \textsuperscript{16}

Stanford says that the objects or the ideas stereoscoped by the metaphor must be 'distinct' so that they retain their conceptual independence. If we use such an expression as "the lion roared like a wild beast", 
the expression has no metaphorical force, because the lion, being a wild beast itself is not distinct from the comparison. If, however, we substitute the word 'sea' for 'lion', we find a difference in the metaphoric force of the sentence. Stanford's definition of metaphor insists on this difference, because the metaphor, according to him, is neither the thing offered as the comparison nor the thing compared. The stereoscope of these two is what creates the depth picture which is metaphor. It is only by keeping the vehicle and the tenor distinct can the stereoscope use them to create a third thing, "the depth picture, which is a 'synthesis' of the two flat pictures", a picture in which the flat pictures may be said to 'merge' but which is in fact a third thing, quite different from either. I.A. Richards also seems to be saying the same thing when he calls the metaphor "a transaction between contexts". Since metaphor is neither the comparison nor the compared, and since it is different from and more important than the two, it cannot be called merely "a grace or ornament or added power of the language"; it is "its constitutive form". It is precisely this third thing, this depth picture, which goes beyond the two terms in a metaphor that is
called the image by Herbert Read in his essay 'Obscurity in poetry'. He says:

The modern poet has passed beyond the metaphor to a new figure of speech. This has been called the IMAGE. Jacques Maritain ... notes that the image thus conceived is the opposite of metaphor, which compares one known thing with another the better to express the former by comparing it with latter. The image DISCOVERS one thing with the help of another, and by their resemblance makes the unknown known. But it is not a logical resemblance...

The same attitude to imagery has been expressed by various critics in different words. For instance, Day Lewis says that the poetic image is the "happy marriage of object and sensation". Ezra Pound defines an image as "an intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time". The idea that an image is something distinct from its terms and that it is greater than its component parts seems to be in the mind of Ford Maddox Ford also when he speaks of the 'unearned increment' gained by the poet. Ford believes that this feature
of the image is a peculiarity found in modern poetry. He asserts that all modern art,

... began with the - perhaps discovery
... that the juxtaposition of the composed renderings of two or more unexaggerated actions or situations may be used to establish, like the juxtaposition of vital word to vital word, a sort of frictional current of electric life that will extraordinarily galvanize the work of art in which the device is employed ... Let us put more concretely by citing the algebraic truth that \((a + b)^2\) equals not merely \(a^2 + b^2\), but \(a^2 + \) an apparently unearned increment called \(2ab\) plus the expected \(b^2\). The point cannot be sufficiently laboured, since the whole fabric of modern art development depends on it. 21

Herbert Read calls this additional gain of the image which is different from either of the terms involved in it as the 'collage effect'. However, it is significant to note that many critics and poets believe that images are capable of saying more than what their component terms seem to convey.
In his *The Essence of Aesthetic* Benedetto Groce strikes a new note when he says that an image is always a nexus of images and a thought is always a nexus of thoughts. He says that "what is called an image is always a nexus of images, since image-atoms do not exist any more than thought-atoms." If one thinks on the lines suggested by Groce and considers 'thought' and 'image' as units of 'thought-atoms' and 'image-atoms', it is possible to redefine the words in a fresh manner. We generally speak of the 'thought' in the poetry of say, Keats, Shelley or Donne; but we rarely speak of the 'thoughts' in the poetry of those poets. The word ceases to have the same meaning when used in plural. Thought is a nexus of several ideas which are its component parts. It is possible to speak of the various ideas in a poem; and the sum of all the multiple ideas in the poem is the 'thought' of the poem. While 'thought' refers to the process of thinking and reflection, 'thoughts' refers to intentions.

A poetic image is, in the same manner, a nexus of many images, which could be considered as its component parts. It is possible to consider whole poems as images; the various images in poems become images.
only in so far as they are related to one another to create the whole image which is the poem. The poetic image, thus, can be the sum of all the images of the poem.

The diversity in the meanings, usages and definitions of the two words, 'thought' and 'image', thus, is appaling and confusing. But one should remember the fact that each approach or definition is correct to a certain extent and every meaning is valid in a given context. The meanings and the definitions given by critics, especially in the field of literary criticism, are selected by them for tools in their discussions of poetry and to that extent the selected meanings are all directed towards some end. Therefore, each definition can be expected to throw light upon a particular aspect of the 'image' or the 'thought'.

The study made so far suggests that some important facts have to be borne mind. The word 'thought' can be applied to discursive reflection, to a succession of mental pictures and belief. Thought also can be used as something similar to feeling. The 'image', on the other hand, is distinguished by its sensuousness whether
the sensuous aspect of it is instrumental or essential. A second way of conceiving the image is to consider it as a relation between two terms, namely, the major and the minor. The thought of a poem can be the aggregate of the ideas contained in it, and the whole poem can be an image wherein the separate images are its component parts.

But what kinds of relationship can there be between thought and imagery? The answer to the question might solve a large number of difficulties in studying the problem in relation to poetry.

A poet might introduce an image with a set purpose. Writing is a conscious process which requires a sequence and a consequence, and, as such, it is not improbable that poets introduce images consciously. More often than not, poets may also have a definite idea of the poem they are writing or the kind of image they are creating. For instance, the Imagists wanted to produce poetry "that is hard and clear, never blurred nor indefinite." They wanted to write what may be called the pure physical poetry. Poems, like H.D.'s oft quoted 'Oread', are supposed to treat the
thing directly. The lines, for instance,

Whirl up, sea --
whirl your pointed pines,
splash your great pines
on your rocks,
hurl your green over us,
cover us with your pools of fir.²⁴

do nothing other than presenting the 'thing'. Images of the purely sensuous type do not suffer when they are isolated from their contexts. The image of the sea presented in H.D.'s poem is independent in itself, in the sense that it does not depend on the context or anything else, for the aim in creating such images is to evoke a physical sensation. Thus, sensuous images could be employed by poets for the evocation of a physical sensation.

Again, a poet might introduce an image in order to illustrate or explain an idea. The idea may be plainly stated, and the image may be attached to it by way of an illustration as in the construction of paradigmatic models. For instance, when Day Lewis says,
Love is proved in its creation,
not eternity;
Like leaf or linnet the true
heart's affection
Is born dies later, asks no
reassurance

He is employing images to explain an idea. The abstract idea that the instant realised in intense love is better than the routine love of a prolonged period of eternity is more easily understood in association with the images of the leaf and the linnet. Sometimes it may also happen that the poet starts with an image and tethers it to an idea. Here is an example of that kind:

Over dark wood rises one dawn
felicitous
Bright through awakened shadows
fall her crystal
Cadenzas, and once for all the
wood is quickened,
So our joys visit and it suffices.

As in the earlier example, here also the poet is trying to explain an idea. The idea that one does not need to have pleasure throughout the life and that it is enough if the joys visit one like the rise of the dawn over the dark wood gains its force from the comparison offered.
Sometimes a poet might use an image as a kind of steno-language for an idea. By employing an image in constant association with an idea three or four times, the poet can tether the idea to the image. For instance, Day Lewis employs the image of the walled garden in association with the idea of the 'feather bedded middle class life' in some of his early poems. After some time he begins employing the image without any kind of association with the idea of social thought. But still the reader can associate the image with the idea, because the image as a kind of steno-expression for the idea is impressed upon his mind. In contexts where the poet wants to discuss the middle class way of life, he simply employs the image of the walled garden to achieve his purpose. In this way an image can become a symbol to some idea, just as the figure 1 represents one unit. Some images drawn from history and the classics could be used directly as their associations are traditionally fixed. Thus, images like Methuselah, Minos and Abraham are a kind of steno-expressions for the poet, since what they convey is traditionally established. Such images could be called "steno-images".
However, sensuous images, the kind of images which present the 'thing', might also be employed by the poet to develop an association of ideas. There are many poems in which poets present a clear picture of a scene or an object in the opening lines and develop ideas out of them through their associations. The image thus presented is just a starting point for the poet, and his real aim is not at all the presentation of a physical object. Poems of this kind begin with a pointed picture, such as

From where I am sitting, my
window frame
Offers a slate roof, four
chimney pots,
One aerial, half a leafless tree,
And sky the colour of dejection... 27

After presenting the picture and drawing the attention of the reader to the details of the picture presented, the poet begins to explore the image with a series of questions. He first asks: 'What am I meant to do with the prospect?' Should he take what the picture says of 'immediate relevance' and think that the picture is significant, because, like history, the various parts of the picture, such as, the roof, the chimney pots etc.,
'happened to happen that way'? Or should he amplify and exaggerate the picture? Suppose he begins to exaggerate, where is the margin or end to the process of exaggeration? He then asks the question:

But why if one is chasing the paradigm right forward and back
Stop at embryo, roots or sky? \(^{28}\)

No, exaggeration leads one nowhere; man should learn to see a 'fragment as a kind of whole' and understand the need for frames. The poem ends with the conclusion:

Who knows?—
Each of us may be set here,
.simply to compose
From a few grains of universe a
.finite view
By one who occasionally needs
.such frames
To look at his boundless creation
.through? \(^{29}\)

The image presented at the beginning of the poem is the starting point for the development of his thought. The image is generative, because it generates thought; its sensuousness is not for its own sake but to serve a purpose. Thus, poets might sometimes use sensuous images
to develop an association of ideas through them. Such images could be called 'generative images', because they generate ideas.

Now, there are also poems in which the poet is content to present just an image without giving any suggestion about how the image should be interpreted. In other words, there are poems in which the tenor or the object-matter is dropped totally. It is about this kind of image that R.A. Foakes says: "...The greatest refinement of the image of impression is seen in the omission of this term, the tenor, altogether; it may be implied in the vehicle, or known through traditional associations". But images of this kind are also different from the purely sensuous images of the imagist poets in that there is a tenor implied in these images, whereas it is not generally implied in the 'Imagist' image.

Just as it is possible to find images in which the vehicle dominates the tenor or in which the tenor is altogether dropped, it is also possible to find images in which the tenor dominates the vehicle. The image for all appearances looks like a direct statement.
of thought. In other words, the poet seems to be making a direct statement of his thought without presenting it through, or in association with, an image. But however intellectual such statements seem, a trace of the sensuous is not altogether missing in such images. It can be said that such images gain force by the emotion with which the statement is uttered. The following is an example of that kind:

But there is nought surprising
Can explode the single mind
Let figs from thistles fall
Or stars from their pedestal
This architecture will stand.

The lines express the power of the single mind. It is obviously expressed in the form of a statement. Though the power of the single mind is expressed in terms of architecture, the metaphor does not seem sensuous as the visual element is subordinated to the intellectual. While the images in which the tenor is subordinated or entirely dropped seem to be predominantly sensuous, the images in which the visual element is subordinated to the intellectual seem to be predominantly intellectual. Such images could be called 'the images of thought' or 'intellectual images'.
Thus, one can find various kinds of images in which the relationship between the idea and the image or the subject-matter and the object-matter depends upon the function of the image. I have discussed so far the most common of these types of relationships. To sum up, an image can be used,

1. to present the 'thing' directly,
2. to illustrate or explain an idea,
3. to drive home an idea, it (i.e., the image) being used as a kind of a stenographic language,
4. to make a convenient beginning so that thought can be developed out of it, i.e., to generate ideas,
5. to present thought directly, with the sensuous element in it subordinated to its intellectual content.

Now, when we look at the theories, we find that there are certain theories (and these are quite popular both in aesthetic and literary criticism) which do not allow the possibility of the conscious element in the process of making a poem. There are certain other theories which do not take into consideration the poet's need or the inner urge to write a poem. The psychological critics belong to the first group, whereas the Marxists belong to the second. To study imagery without discussing
these modern theories seems to be rather a kind of mealy-mouthed approach. Further, recent approaches to poetry have brought certain facts about imagery to light and not to note them and make use of them would be irresponsible. Let us, therefore, study the various theories of imagery found in modern criticism and aesthetics.

II

A great amount of penetrating research has been conducted by the aestheticians of the present century to study the nature and function of the aesthetic image. The studies have been conducted from different angles and different aspects of the problem are brought to light. On the one hand, experimental psychological aesthetics, leaning heavily on the evidence offered by anthropological studies, and semantics, on the other, seem to have explored all the possible means of determining the nature of the aesthetic
image. While Neo-positivists and Neo-Freudists are trying to determine the general nature and function of the aesthetic image, literary critics are content to apply the scientific approaches to poetry in general and to poems in particular. The common assumption behind all these different ways of approaching the problem of the aesthetic image seems to be that "the artistic image is the central concept of aesthetic theory".  

However, the acceptance of the image as the 'constant' or as the central concept by critics belonging to different schools does not mean that they are all agreed upon the nature and function of imagery in poetry. Instead of agreement there is a great divergence among the critics regarding the function of imagery in poetry. To critics oriented in depth psychology, an image is the outcome of the poet's unconscious mind in a moment of absorption or 'self-abandonment'. About the unconscious as the source of literary creation, there are two theories in psychology. According to Freud, the unconscious out of which creative writing emerges is the individual unconscious. When the unconscious mind of the poet attains the unique state of absorption, it
expresses its likes and dislikes, its observations, its attitudes and so on. Therefore, images in poetry are the best means to study the personality of the poet. This attitude to poetry is clearly expressed by C.F.E. Spurgeon in her *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us*. She says that the poet, 'to some extent unconsciously' reveals his personality through his images. She says: "...The poet unwittingly lays bare his own innermost likes and dislikes, observations and interests, associations of thought, attitudes of mind and belief, in and through the images,..."33

Professor Livingstone Lowes in *The Road to Xanadu* and Edward A. Armstrong in *Shakespeare's Imagination* reveal the same attitude to imagery. While Lowes studies how various impressions of the unconscious mind combine and form into new wholes in some poems of Coleridge, Armstrong attempts at studying Shakespeare's mind "in the travail of composition by investigating the associative processes revealed in his imagery". In other words, critics who believe in the theory of Freudian Unconscious consider images as the right means to investigate the personality of the poet. Jung's modifications in the concept of the unconscious have also influenced some critics. To Jung, the unconscious of an individual is also the Collective Unconscious. That is to say, the
unconscious of the poet, during the time of composing a poem, delves deep into the common experiences of the whole human race. Maud Bodkin, whose study, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry*, is based on the Collective Unconscious theory of Jung, explains admirably what Jung thinks of the emotional significance of some poems:

The special emotional significance possessed by certain poems—a significance going beyond any definite meaning conveyed—he attributes to the stirring in the reader's mind, within or beneath his conscious response, of unconscious forces which he terms 'primordial images' or archetypes. These archetypes he describes as 'psychic residuum of numberless experiences of the same type', experiences which have happened not to the individual, but to his ancestors, and of which the results are inherited in the structure of brain, *A PRIORI* determinants of individual experiences.34

In her *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry*, Maud Bodkin reveals how certain themes of a particular form or pattern recur in literature of various ages and how that pattern
"corresponds to a pattern or configuration of emotional tendencies in the minds of those who are stirred by the theme". Maud Bodkin studies, therefore, the recurring images which are primordial or archetypal.

While to some critics who believe in the Freudian unconscious theory of poetry the image is a genuine means of studying the personality of the poet, to some others the image indicates the psychically regressive state of the poet's mind. They think that during the state of absorption the poet's mind casts off its acquired characteristics of civilization and works in a way similar to that in which the primitive mind works. The language and the thought process of the poet is similar to the language and the thought process of the primitive; the images in poetry are not deliberately chosen, but they occur to the poet in that state of mind which is peculiar to the poet. Literature is irrational because the mind of the poet works in an irrational way. Shumaker, in his Literature and the Irrational, introduces this theory and suggests that the imparting of a salubrious state of mind is the crown and glory of literature. The image is inevitably eidetic and beneficial to the reader, because it conveys a state of mind which makes the reader
attain the state of 'unitary consciousness'. Shumaker makes extensive use of anthropological documentation to prove the similarity between the poet and the primitive.

To some of the Elizabethans and Augustans, metaphor was a mode of expression and a figure concocted at will. Metaphor was supposed either to decorate or illustrate. The philologists and psychologists, who have now oriented themselves in the latest studies of psychology and anthropology, feel that such an approach to the metaphor is wrong. They have, for example, found that many expressions of the primitive are metaphorical, not because the primitive likes to indulge in metaphorical expression, but because metaphor is the only means to assimilate the new ideas into consciousness with the help of those already known. The history of any language shows that words which were once highly sensuous become stale and relatively abstract in course of time. Many words we use, such as 'the head' of a nail, the 'tooth' of a saw, the 'navel' of the forest, the 'flesh' of the fruit etc., were once highly sensuous, and in course of time they have become dull and stale with use.
The primitive who sees an object for the first time can remember it only by associating it with something else which he has already seen or known. Similarly, the poet who perceives a new object or idea, according to some anthropologists like Cassirer, employs metaphor not so much because he likes metaphorical expression, but because such an expression, for him, is only natural. Basing on this theory, some critics argue that the language of the poet is different from the language of an educated westerner because of the kind of the attitude with which he approaches phenomena. Wayne Shumaker, in his Literature and the Irrational, discusses Cassirer's theory of the 'Empirical-Theoretical reflection' and the 'Mythico-Religious Attitude' and arrives at the conclusion that the latter is the way in which the mind of the poet works during the composition of a poem. In his Language and Myth Cassirer uses the expression 'mythical thinking' as synonymous with 'Mythico-Religious Attitude'. Robin Skelton also seems to be in agreement with the explanation given by Cassirer regarding mythical thinking though he employs the expression 'mythropoetic mood' to describe the mental state of the poet during the time of composing a poem in his The Poetic Pattern. Works like F.C. Prescott's Poetry and Myth and Richard Chase's Quest For Myth also consider poetic thinking similar to the primitive apprehension.
The conclusions derived from the assumptions that the poet's mind works regressively during the state of absorption, and that the language of poetry is different from the language of discursive logic are however, appalling. Critics of various schools began interpreting poems not on the basis of what they say, but on the assumed basis of how poems might have come into existence. Some critics oriented in psychology and semantics began to feel that poems are useful because they impart the peculiar state of mind which is of a salubrious nature. I.A. Richards, by himself, and in collaboration with C.K. Ogden, arrived at certain conclusions which are greatly interesting. Richards, in addition to believing that a poem creates a desirable state of mind in the reader, also believes that poems 'say nothing'. In The Principles of Literary Criticism Richards maintains a subtle distinction between the 'emotive use' of language found in poetry and the 'scientific' or 'referential' use of language found in scientific discourse, and says that since the language of poetry cannot be verified by the objective question, "Is it true or false in the ordinary strict scientific sense?", it is not capable of saying anything. In The Meaning of Meaning Richards and Ogden arrive at the same
conclusion and say that poems say nothing.

To the Marxist Aestheticians, in contrast with the psychological critics, the process of writing a poem is an entirely conscious one. They acknowledge the cognitive value of poetry, and consider it a proper mode of approaching and comprehending reality. The image, they believe, is a reflection of reality, and as such it can reflect social and historical conditions. They believe, therefore, that poems not only have something to say, but that they are capable of having politics, dialectics and even scientific theories for subjects, provided the poetic consciousness abstracts some essential traits for reflection and interpretation.

The results of various approaches to poetry in general and to the problem of the image in poetry in particular, though greatly beneficial to the student of poetry for the fresh light they throw upon certain aspects of the poetic process and the poetic utterance, are, however, at times, greatly confusing. The theories are confusing mainly because they make the thought of a poem as something secondary or of no consequence. No doubt each theory explains a particular aspect of the
process, but each theorist claims absoluteness and completeness for his theory and proclaims that his theory alone explains the nature and the function of the image in poetry. In the face of the contradictions found among the critics it is impossible to accept any one theory merely because other critics have other criteria which might be equally valid. Therefore, it is now essential to examine the various theories regarding the image in poetry and find out their limitations.

What is called the aesthetic image by the aestheticians is the 'poetic image' in relation to poetry in particular. The psychological approaches find absorption or 'unitary consciousness' as the basis of all imagery in poetry. The poet sees some object, loses himself in his perception, and enters into a world of absorption. He becomes oblivious to the whole of the external world. He cuts himself off from the external world and the acquired characteristics like education and civilization. The primitive in him enjoys a state of mind which gives him happiness of a very high nature. This state of mind is regressive. The poet once again thinks like the primitive, or enters
into a special kind of apprehension, which may be called, 'mythico-religious reflection' \(^38\) or 'mythical thinking' \(^39\) or 'mythopoetic mood'. \(^40\) This kind of psychic absorption is synonymous with psychic awareness. Psychic awareness leads a man back to his racial memories and the 'collective unconscious'. What is remarkable about psychic awareness is the fact that the individual begins to think not in terms of logic and ratiocination, but 'feels the connections'. Evidently a similar process is found in dreams also. So "...the important general conclusion of psycho-analysis is that the artist and the neurotic and the dreamer have much in common both with one another and with the primitive magico-mythical psychology". \(^41\) Therefore, the students of this kind of study have arrived at the conclusion that 'something of the primeval man lurks in us all', \(^42\) and that the poet's mind is a 'highly developed mind working in a primitive way'. \(^43\) Such a kind of the 'primitive mind', it is argued, is desirable, and, therefore, poetry is desirable. \(^44\)

Cassirer's theory of the two kinds of thinking happens to be at the base of the most modern psychological approach. To Cassirer, all thought is mythical on an ultimate level. \(^45\) While contrasting the primitive
apprehension and civilized apprehension of a sophisticated westerner, Cassirer speaks of absorption and says that the primitive mind is enthralled by the intuition 'which suddenly confronts it'.\textsuperscript{46} In such a state of absorption, Cassirer says, the immediate experience so captivates the mind that 'everything else dwindles before it'.\textsuperscript{47} This state of absorption is called the mythico-religious attitude. The ego, in this attitude, spends all its energy on the object of perception, "lives in it, loses itself in it". Since nothing else remains in the mind in such a state, there is no scope for expansion and comparison. Instead of 'extensive distribution', there is 'intensive compression'. "This focussing of all forces on a single point", says Cassirer, "is the prerequisite for all mythical thinking and mythical formulation".\textsuperscript{48} The Emperico-Theoritical thought of the sophisticated western "expands over a widening sphere of conception and contemplation".\textsuperscript{49}

If poetic thinking is similar to primitive's way of thinking, is it possible to prove that the poet's approach to phenomena and the primitive's approach to phenomena have similarities? Is there any similarity between the language of the poet and the language of the primitive? Both the questions are readily answered
by the scholars with the help of anthropological documentation. At this stage it is necessary to enumerate the points of similarity found in the perception and expression between the poet and the primitive, so that we can have a clear idea of the special kind of apprehension called the 'Mytho-Religious attitude'.

The theory that the mind of the poet works in a regressive manner during the state of unitary consciousness has been found in the text books of psychology since 1927. The similarity seems to have been suggested by George Edward Woodbury in 1927. According to Prescott, Woodbury has said that the poet's mind is a "highly developed mind working in a primitive way". 50 This idea of Woodbury has become a source of inspiration for several psychologists in studying the similarities between the mind of the primitive and the mind of the poet. Following Woodbury's trend of thought, Richard Chase said, in 1949, that, to the student of myth, "the important general conclusion of psycho-analysis is that the artist and neurotic and the dreamer have much in common both with one another and with the primitive magico-mythical psychology". 51 Many psychologists, after Frye's statement made in 1957, are working in that field and almost all of them agree
with him. R.R. Marett has declared that "something of the primeval man lurks in us all." Aldrich is more general in his statement than Marett when he says:

...I am assuming that there is no difference in kind between our psychic structure and process and those of the savage and the primitive; also that the primitive psyche and all its ways in the most highly cultured modern man and woman....

Some psychologists, in addition to believing in the theory of the similarity between the mind of the poet and the mind of the primitive, also feel that such a kind of thinking is greatly desirable, because, without it, all human development is not possible. In a French Lecture given at Oxford in 1931, Levy-Bruhl is supposed to have said:

...In our country districts, and even in our large cities, one would not have to search far to meet people who think, feel, and, indeed, act like primitive. Perhaps we must ... recognise that in every human spirit, whatever intellectual development may be, an ineradicable base of primitive mentality remains. It is improbable that this
will disappear or even weaken beyond a certain point, and no doubt it is not desirable that it should do so. For with it, perhaps, would disappear poetry, art, metaphysics, scientific invention - in short almost everything which makes the beauty and grandeur of human life. ...

From the last sentence of the statement cited above it is clear that Levy-Bruhl, like Cassirer, believes that all thought, whatever be its nature, is mythical on an "ultimate level".

The primitive perceptual habits, according to many psychologists, are not different from those of the educated Westerners. The point is proved with the help of anthropological documentation. The most striking points of similarity between the language of the poet and the language of the primitive as enumerated by Shumaker in his *Literature and the Irrational* are: (1) Concreteness in expression, (2) Association of contiguitities, (3) Parataxis, (4) Frequent employment of synecdoche, (5) Exactness in sensory and motor perception, and (6) In employing the 'Lautbilder' or the sound image. The common factors in the nature of
apprehension between the primitive and the poet are mainly two: (1) Animism, and (2) the eidetic element. Since the aspects of similarity, though well known among the philologists and anthropologists, are not generally stressed in literary criticism, it would do well to make a brief study of those aspects so that a clear idea can be had regarding the approach to the poetic process which considers the image in poetry as an inevitable result of the peculiar kind of apprehension called the mythical thinking or the 'mythico-religious attitude'. Let us, therefore, examine the various aspects of similarity under different heads as mentioned above.

(1) Concreteness in expression:

One of the most important features of the primitive languages seems to be "concrete, specific and sensory" expression. The primitive does not use words which convey a general sense. J.H. Trumbull informs that none of the American Indian languages have a term so general as the verb 'to eat'. Instead of general verbs, most of the Indian languages (American) have words which describe particular kinds of eating food. The Trasmanian aborigines have no generic word for 'tree', but they have special names for different
varieties of the same species of the tree. In Arabic there are about 5,744 words that have something to do with the camel denoting every possible variation of sex, age, physical traits and so on.

The detailed, concrete and sensuous way of speech seems to be common in all primitive languages throughout the world. In the Kwaiutal language there is no expression like 'that house'. The speaker of the language inevitably refers to the number, nearness or distance of the house from him.

Motor concepts are also remarkably specialised in the primitive languages. A Ponca Indian cannot say simply "A man killed a rabbit". He says, "The man, he, one, animate, standing ... purposely killed, by shooting an arrow, the rabbit, he (sic), the one, animate, sitting". The speaker is not generally satisfied unless he clearly gives the person, number, gender, and position. It is also to be noted that the speaker wants to be clear whether the person referred to is animate or inanimate, and whether he is sitting, standing or running.

Tendency towards concretion in primitive
languages develops more from the configurational perception than from the isolating perception. The primitive likes to present as many visual details as possible. The primitive dislikes using a general term like 'seeing' when he is capable of saying clearly whether it is 'peering', 'peeping', 'looking', 'glancing', 'gazing', 'staring' etc. The element suggestive of the visual quality is found even in the cardinal numerals of the primitive speech. The primitive dislikes numbers. He does not use them where we use. The hunters of Abipones of South America do not count their hounds before they set off for a hunt, because "they experience the individuality of all domestic animals in a characteristically concrete manner". The primitive does not count the hounds because he feels the individuality of each domestic animal. In the South Seas the arrival of a party will not be reported as 'five people have come, but "A man with a large nose, an old man, a child, a man with a skin disease, and a little fellow are waiting outside". Examples to indicate the love of the primitive for concrete expression can be easily multiplied.

(2) Association of contiguities:

Purely emotive and irrational association in the mind between logically disparate things is usually
termed 'the association of contiguities' in psychological texts. Such an association is found in the children and animals also. A dog associates the tea time with the drawing of curtains; a child associates his father's coming home with the serving of dinner at home. Cassirer illustrates how certain primitive people mistake the cause-effect relation owing to such associations. It is often mistaken, he says, by the primitive that certain animals which appear in certain seasons are the harbingers or the originators of the season. He points out that when we read a primitive song in which old age and wrinkles are associated, we generally find a confusion between cause and effect — wrinkles are not supposed to be the result of the old age, but the cause for the old age.

(3) Parataxis:

The syntactical equivalent of the association of contiguities is parataxis wherein grammatical elements are heaped without any logical connection. The contiguity of the grammatical elements itself is supposed to establish connections. According to Cassirer, parataxis is natural to any language in its early stages, which in course of time yields to hypotaxis or the grammatical subordination
of some syntactical elements to others. Cassirer considers hypotaxis as the 'highest product of language'.

Only one example is enough to make the point clear. A Bushman's complaint against the whites ran as follows:

Bushman-there-go, here-run-to-white-man, 
white-man-give-tobacco, Bushman-go-smoke, 
go-fill-tobacco-pouch, white-man-give-
meat-Bushman, Bushman-go-eat-meat, stand-
up-go-home, go-happy, go-sit, graze-
sheep-white-man, White-man-go-beat
Bushman, Bushman-cry-very painful, 
Bushman-go-run-away-white-man white-man-
run-after-Bushman, Bushman-there-
another i.e., another Bushman is 
found to replace the first, this-one-
graze-sheep, Bushman-entirely-away.

What the Bushman is trying to say, in our words, as paraphrased by Shumaker, is: "If the Whites, at first, treat the Bushmen fairly well, the reasons are selfish; the treatment soon becomes so severe that the Bushmen have to save themselves by flight." The expression of the Bushman is much nearer to the speech of a child than that of an adult, because, for the child also "causal relations are rarely expressed, but are generally indicated by a simple juxtaposition of the related terms". 
(4) The Frequent Employment of Synecdoche:

In primitive speech, there seems to be no distinction generally maintained between the part and the whole. What is true of the part is supposed to be equally true of the whole by the primitive. The result of this kind of thinking can be found in the magical practices of the primitive. To bewitch a person, the enchanter does not require the physical presence of the person; it is enough if he bewitches anything belonging to the person such as a lock of hair, a piece of clothing, or a bit of a nail. The restrictions put on the primitive husband while his wife is pregnant in the usual system called couvade is an example for this. A similar attitude is found in many fertility rites of the primitives in which powers conferred upon a few ears of Indian corn or some other agricultural product are assumed to communicate themselves to the whole crop...."63 The confusion between the part and the whole also seems to be the reason why the primitive gives a very great importance to every part of the ritual, because, for him, the negligence of the part is equal to the negligence of the whole.
(5) Exactness in describing sensory and motor perception:

The primitive tends to speak a language rich in motor imagery, which generally seems to be highly sensuous. In many primitive languages this quality seems to be an inherent one. They generally have different words for 'he, seated', 'he, lying down', and 'he, walking and visible', and so on. 64 In the Huron language the expressions that describe a journey by land are different from those that describe a journey by water. According to the information given by Shumaker in Literature and the Irrational, the primitive languages are rich in words indicating direction, posture and position. 65 For instance, some languages have more than 20 words to designate the different ways of walking. The words convey quite clearly whether one leans forward while one walks, or back with a swing, whether one walks lazily or vigorously, whether one swings both the arms or only one arm while walking and so on. 66

(6) The Employment of the Lautbilder or the Sound-image:

The 'Lautbild' or the sound-image is another feature commonly found in the primitive languages. It is not a mere imitation of sounds as conveyed by the term onomatopoeia; but it provides an auditory 'equivalent'
of appearances, smells, tastes, and movements. Many examples are given by Shumaker to explain this quality. In the Ewe language of Western Africa the verb zo means 'to walk'. Many descriptive variations are attached to it to describe the peculiar movements of walking by adding BAFO BAFO, BIA BIA, KONDZRA KONDZRA, etc., to describe swift movement, slow movement, or the movement of the stomach while one moves his legs. 67

A comparison of literary, or to be precise, poetic expression with the primitive expression indicates that poets, even poets who are supposed to be profound philosophers, are very concrete in their expression. The description of Satan floating in the fiery deluge by Milton, for example, indicates Milton's love for concrete and sensory expression. Here is the description:

Thus Satan, talking to the nearest mate
With head uplift above the wave,
and eyes
That sparkling blazed; his other parts besides
Prone on the flood, extended many long and large
Lay floating many a rood, in bulk as huge
As whom the fables name of monstrous size... 68
If Milton wanted to say the same thing in prose, he would have reported it something like: "Mighty Satan, lying on the flood, thus spoke to Beelzebub, his assistant." But, for Milton the poet, such a description is not only bare but vague. The anxiety to suggest the position of every part of the body of Satan, the size of his fabulous structure, and the movement of the limbs of Satan make such words as 'uplifted' and 'sparkling' inevitable. Another interesting characteristic can be perceived with reference to the employment of the Homeric simile, which indicates the love of Milton for the concrete expression. "The Daffodils" of Wordsworth serves as an example of the poet's insistence on the use of the exact word, or what might be called the 'solidity of specification'. The way in which Wordsworth employs different words for seeing like 'he saw', 'he glanced', and 'he gazed' indicates his love for concrete expression.

That there is an irrational element in the association of contiguities in poetry cannot be entirely denied. In Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* Caesar dies and ghosts squeak and gibber in the streets of Rome. At the time of Owen Glendower's birth (in *Henry IV Part I*),
In the story of the Fisher King, which was supposed to be the source that inspired Eliot to write *The Wasteland*, an injury to the king's genitals causes the sterility to the whole country. Shumaker, therefore, says: "In all, however, at the root of a fictive situation is a conjunction between objects or phenomena that to the scientific or philosophical consciousness would appear unrelated."

There is a second kind of contiguity, found by psychologists, in literature in general, namely, the affective contiguity. The association between gloomy weather and death, happiness and spring, irritation and hot weather etc, are found in poetry because the induced feelings are near to each other in the mind; 'the thought of one easily becomes involved' with the thought of another.

The point that in the language of poetry the syntactical elements are heaped together is so obvious that it requires no proof. Expressions like 'I know not' for 'I do not know' and 'Fear death' for 'Do you think I fear death' are too common to be quoted.
Apart from finding such expressions like 'bench' for jury, 'crown' for king, and 'poop' for sail, synecdoche appears in literature in a more important aspect. The idea that the few characters that appear in a poem or play represent the whole mankind, in fact, seems to be the basis for the poet or the dramatist to think of his work as a means of reflecting life. In this sense the world of letters becomes a microcosm or part for the macrocosm or the whole which is the world. In other words, the whole idea of the creative process is based on synecdoche.

The similarity between the language of the primitive and the language of the poet is also highly remarkable. What is 'he came' in ordinary speech becomes 'he rose, stood up, moved his legs and came slowly' in literary speech. The minute details are not left out by the poet or the dramatist because he wants the reader to visualise everything. The passage from Paradise Lost quoted slightly earlier, serves as an example for the element of the sensory and motor emphasis in poetry. For the poet somehow every movement in the universe is a source of wonder and suspense. D.H. Lawrence, for instance, admirably presents the movements of the snake that came to drink water in the poem The Snake. Thus
poetry indicates that poets like the kind of expression which is strong in sensory and motor emphasis.

Though most images in literature seem to be strong in the visual element, the appearance of the sound-image is not altogether absent. Alliteration and such rhetorical devices indicate that the writer cares for the sound element greatly. Peculiarly enough, some poems in modern literature concentrate more on the sound image than on the visual image. T.S. Eliot, in his 'Introduction' to St. John Perse's Anabasis, says that he had to read the poem four or five times to get at it. The music of the poem attracted him in the first reading; he felt that the beauty of the poem was enough. He also felt that it would be absurd to attempt to translate a musical melody into explicit statement. After five readings he was able to trace the idea behind the sound, which was the medium of the idea in this context. In one of his letters Hopkins advises his friend to read his poems aloud so that the sound of the poem would help him in understanding the poem.

Thus, the language of literature, or the language of poetry to be precise, resembles the language of the
primitive in several respects. After making an elaborate study of the similarity of the two kinds of language, Shumaker arrives at the following conclusion:

...adjacent perceptual items are assumed to be mutually involved; a part is often assumed to act or to be equivalent to the whole; and visual contours are so delicately registered that motor impulses which affect them are absorbed into the descriptive locutions. The language of literature, distinct from the language of philosophy or science, shares all these primitive traits, if not in every sentence, yet consistently enough to appear psychically regressive. 74

Two important points of similarity found between the poet and the primitive lie in their attitude to phenomena. The primitive and the poet have a highly insisting animistic tendency, and both are susceptible to the 'Eidetic' element. Tendency to animism is found not only in the primitive times; it could be seen even in the sufficiently advanced periods of history. In Greek mythology, fire becomes Hephaestus; thunder, Zeus; rainbow, Iris etc. Even objects of nature receive the same kind of treatment. Trees becomes Dryads, streams
Niads and Mountains become Oreads. "In Homer", says Shumaker, "rivers speak; in Virgil branches bleed. Nature was more fully alive for our cultural ancestors than it is for us".75

The tendency to animism appears in a stronger way among the primitive people. As Ralph Linton informs, there is a very great tendency to animism among the Marquesans:

...Just as each individual was a distinct entity in his tribe, so every axe or food bowl or canoe was also a distinct entity and had a name ... A house not only went through the process of creation, but was hung with a loin-cloth so that it would be decently clad....76

The Zuni Indians think of everything made "whether structure, utensil, or weapon, as animistic and living".77 The savage attributes personality to every object whether existing in nature, or made by man, without exception. Even stones are believed to be reproductive.

That poets and other creative writers tend to animise is a point which is very obvious. Hardly can
one turn a page of the poetry of Wordsworth without noticing an example for his tendency to personify natural phenomena. Wordsworth is quite conscious of this himself. He says:

To every natural form, rock, fruit
or flower
Even the loose stones that cover
the highway
I gave a moral life ....

In Hardy's novels trees shed tears in sympathising with the sad plight of the heroes and heroines. Even those poets, like Milton and Joyce, who are supposed to be thinkers among poets have not escaped the influence of animism.

Next to animism, another common feature found in primitive songs and paintings is the eidetic perception. It is observed that, among the primitive people, the pictures painted on a wall or canvass are greatly different from the pictures of the original objects. The primitive's feelings or ideas about the object colour and influence his mental images. Thus, the actual object and the image of the object in the mind of the primitive are rarely alike. This interesting
feature is so obviously present in primitive paintings that it is impossible to miss it. If the primitive paints a picture wherein a tiger or a lion pounces upon the deer, the tiger or lion is presented as ten times bigger or stronger, whereas the deer is painted ten times smaller. This exaggeration of size, the bigness or the smallness in size, is not an indication of the ignorance of the primitive regarding the physics of perception; on the other hand, it is an indication of his strong emotional responses.

Exaggeration and Hyperbole, as figures of speech, are frequently found in poetry. But there are examples to suggest that human perception differs from the exact scientific perception. How the 'eidetic element' works with reference to the perception of things can be understood from a passage from C. Day Lewis's *The Poetic Image*:

Not long ago I was looking at a book of coloured photographs. I thought the colours crude, exaggerated; and they seemed to make subjects of the photographs curiously flat and unreal. The publisher defended his book to me by saying that the colours were,
in fact, dead accurate: the apparatus which took the photographs and reproduced them, he claimed, are more sensitive and truthful than the human eye. I was unconvinced. It is immodest on my part, I suspect, but I would rather trust my own eye than the eye of a machine: and, even were I convinced that the machine was more gifted than myself, I should still, in this instance, dislike what I saw—those photographs would still look flat and unreal to me. Dead accurate is just what they were.

This love of perceiving things in their own unique way is found in almost all poets. The passage cited explains that exaggeration occurs in the poetic mind not because the poet purposely intends to introduce it, but because it is a way of perception.

So, on the basis of a number of points of similarity found between the poet and the primitive, psychologists arrived at the conclusion that the poet's mind works in a regressive way while composing a poem, and that his way of thinking is different from the scientist's way of thinking. They do not consider poetry
as the proper means for conveying any kind of organised or coherent thought. Such an idea is quite clearly expressed by Shumaker in his Literature and the Irrational. The theory of the poet's way of thinking as a distinct way of thinking, though it throws a good deal of light on many of the similarities between the poet's perception and expression, and the primitive's is not so impressive when the result of such an approach is summarised. To consider literature as something irrational seems neither true to facts, nor helpful in arriving at a just estimate of any work in particular. In his Literature and the Irrational Shumaker says:

...It appears to have been assumed — and this for several hundreds of years, by men of a reflective temperament — that in literary speech, which perhaps grew out of excitement and certainly had the power to sway men's emotions, the mind tended to function less rationally than in other speech; to imagine inanimate objects as living, to accept the container for the thing contained, to address absent persons as though present and so on. Such illogicality was not, of course, condemned. On the contrary it was admired; for did not it illustrate the force of the writer's passion?...
The theory, while it gives importance to the writer's 'passion', refuses, at the same time, to give enough credit to the conscious process in literary creation.

Before proceeding further to examine the other approaches to the poetic process and the poetic image, it is better to analyse the results of the two psychological approaches, already discussed in detail, so that we can have an idea regarding the soundness of the approaches. The first kind of approach, the approach based either on the Individual Unconscious theory of Freud or on the Collective Unconscious theory of Jung, considers poetry as the outcome of the unconscious mind and, therefore, considers it the best means to study the various aspects of the personality of the poet. This approach denies the meaning or the thought of the poem as something little importance. The second approach, based on the theory of mythical thinking as expounded by Cassirer, and developed by Shumaker and others considers poetic thinking as a special way of thinking, and believes that the poet's way of thinking is irrational. Let us examine the validity of both these concepts.

The limitations of the psychological approaches
to poetry and the poetic image are, however, obvious. For one who is not prepared to believe in the hypotheses of depth psychology, the unconscious as the source of poetic creation is not an established truth. There are poets and critics who maintain that critical labour is as much important to write a poem as the state of absorption. According to Valery, "it is impossible for an author to produce a beautiful poem without correcting, expunging and ordering; in other words thinking consciously". Nor is there any undeniable proof to say that all poems originate and end in unconscious reflection. In fact, there is proof for the contrary. There are instances where poets have prepared prose drafts for the poems they wanted to write. For instance, Yeats is said to have dictated the prose draft of a poem at 3 a.m. on 7 January 1939, but the poem was not completed until 13 January. Cecil Day Lewis in his *The Poetic Image* says:

More commonly, an image is chosen without excitement, after much conscious deliberation, because it is seen to fit best a certain place in the pattern and lead on most energetically to the next development. Yet it cannot be said too often that
a poet does not fully know what
is the poem he is writing until
he has written it ...

In the face of the existing evidence from the poets
about the way they write poetry it cannot be said that
the unconscious mind is the only poetry-making organ.
It may, however, be accepted that some poems of some
poets, like, say Coleridge's "Kubla Khan" suggest that
their origin and development followed a process which
might be termed unconscious.

The theory of mythical thinking, when applied
to poetry, does not hold good, because what it explains
is only the state of 'unitary consciousness' and not the
process of writing poetry. A poet may be in raptures
when he is moved by an object, but rapture or unitary
consciousness cannot, by itself, be supposed to produce
finished poems, because some poets, as seen in the above
quotation, seem to believe that conscious thinking also
is important in the process of writing poems. Absorption
may be a necessary state; it may even be the initial step,
but the process of writing, 'correcting and expunging'
cannot be done when the mind is in the process of mythical
reflection. The critical labour of a poet is a conscious
and deliberate process which needs the comprehension of sequence and consequence, or logical thought. The theory of Mytho-Religious attitude, however, helps one to grasp a very vital point: the importance of the unitary consciousness which can be the initial step in the making of a poem. Whatever be the points of similarity found between the language of the poet and the language of the primitive, it is essential to bear in mind that the poet is not a primitive. If the primitive employs the kind of language which is highly sensuous because of his lack of understanding, the poet cannot be said to be employing the sensuous language for the same reason. Most of the poets are highly educated and some of them may also happen to have undergone some discipline in highly specialized fields. In the case of the primitive it cannot be said that he can employ the kind of denotative language such as we find in scientific and discursive texts, whereas, in the case of the poet, we can certainly say that he is capable of employing the precise kind of language found in logical works. Therefore, to call the language of poetry as the inevitable outcome of the special kind, or a special way, of thinking called 'mythical thinking' does not hold good.

While the service rendered by the psychological
studies by enquiring into the nature of the image or the language of poetry is unquestionably remarkable, it has also exerted a harmful influence on some critics in making them believe that the use or the importance of poetry lies essentially in imparting a state of mind which is highly desirable. To consider poetry as something that balances 'the disturbed interests' in the psyche of the poet or reader may or may not be correct from the point of view of experimental psychology; but to consider that poems are written by poets only to create a desirable state of mind in the reader requires proof. Creating a salutary state of mind one can accept, may be one of the effects of a good poem; but the implication that a poem does nothing else seems rather unacceptable. There are as many kinds of poems as there are poets and critics. To term only one kind of poem as the best just because it appeals to the critic may be missing the wood for the tree.

The danger of applying a particular theory to poetry in preference to all other theories is also seen in the 'semantic positivist' approach to poetry. In order to study thought in poetry, it has to be first established that poems can express thought through its images; and
such a contention is challenged by critics who think that poems have nothing to say. Since their approach to poetry happens to be semantic and philological, it is now essential to examine the viewpoint that poems have nothing to say.

Many students of philology believe that the language of poetry, as distinct from the language of prose, is essentially sensuous. Some critics who are not philologists also believe that sensuousness is the main feature of the language of poetry. To Robert P. Tristram Coffin, for instance, poetry presents "...the clearest image, the most memorable of objects seen. But objects always. The things we can see, here, touch, taste and smell". To Bliss Perry, poetry is imagery and imagery is nothing but sensation, "more or less refined by the transforming and modifying power of the mind through the images pass." According to him the function of poetry is "to convey the 'sense' of things rather than the knowledge of things". The reader, according to Perry, should concentrate on the imagery of a poem as if "the image were not made of words at all, but were naked sense-stimulus". Edith Rickert presents the same attitude to imagery in her New Methods for the Study of Literature.
Among the students of semantics, I.A. Richards is one who considers the language of poetry sensuous and purely emotive. Language, he says, can be used in two ways, either emotively or scientifically. If words are used in a strict scientific sense, they are referential, and, therefore, it is possible to verify the truth or the falseness of a statement. Poetry, unlike science, employs words emotively. The emotive employment of words can create either an attitude or an emotion. Since Religion and Poetry do not employ words referentially, neither of them is capable of saying anything. The validity of a statement can be verified by the objective question: "Is it true or false in the ordinary strict scientific sense?" The emotive use of language can stand no such test. When a poet speaks of a flower, he speaks of some qualities that the flower does not possess (the picture of the flower given by the poet is so eidetic that it contains certain features which the real flower of that kind does not possess), because a scientific analysis reveals that a flower of that kind does not exist. Therefore, when a poet seems to be speaking about something, he is, all the time, speaking of nothing in reality. So poems say nothing.88

When applied to poetry, the theory of poetry as
propounded by Richards and Ogden does not hold good, because statements, whether they are scientific or emotive, are still statements, and, as such, they state something. A statement, irrespective of its nature, contains words; and words have meanings because they are symbols for something else. Further, statements do not lose meaning just because the meaning cannot be scientifically verified. Even in science there are so many truths which require imagination for comprehension and which cannot be objectively verified.89 The theory, at the same time, is useful in pointing out the fact that emotions do find a greater place in poetry than in scientific discourse.

Richards's theory of poetry regarding the use of poetry has been thoroughly examined by several critics, and many of them are not in favour of it. For instance, Philip Wheather in his The Burning Fountain calls Richards a 'semantic positivist' and says that his approach to poetry itself is wrong. He says:

...Every science has its proper object; and the object of poetic interpretation rightly conceived is the poem, and not either the poet's supposed feelings or the reader's expected benefits. An
adequate study of the meaning of poetry then — what I shall call 'the semantics of poetry' — must first establish unhampering postulates and find a suitable language whereby the nature and the reference of poetic utterance can be indicated, without evasion into fields of discourse peripheral and sometimes alien to poetry....

R.G. Collingwood discusses Richards's theory of poetry in his The Principles of Art and suggests that we should treat poetry as a kind of 'Pharmacopoeia' if we believe in the theory Richards. Collingwood says:

...If art is art only so far as it stimulates certain reactions, the artist as such is simply a purveyor of drugs, noxious, or wholesome; what we call works of art are nothing but a section of the Pharmacopoeia...

It does not mean that all the critics who disagree with Richards agree with one another with regard to any particular theory of poetry. For instance, Collingwood considers poetry (art) as the best way of expressing one's
ideas and feelings to gain control or mastery over things which are vague to him. Day Lewis, who disagrees with Richards, considers poetry as a way of knowledge. But it is evident from their writings that they are not prepared to contribute to the idea that poems have nothing to say.

A brief examination is necessary, at this stage, to verify the validity of the idea that poems say nothing because they contain language which is of the emotive kind. To make such an examination it is essential to understand what we mean by the word 'truth' when we apply it to poetry. The fundamental difference between art and science lies in that the former deals with the general whereas the latter deals with the particular. If a scientist deals with the thing, the artist deals with the feel of the thing. The feel of a thing, one can agree, is as much real as the thing felt. The truths of science, it is believed, can be scientifically verified, whereas the truths of poetry cannot be verified in the same way. Scientifically, an experiment on the same subject must always yield the same results. Does a poem, then, yield the same result to all the readers? In other words, can it be said that the experience of a poem is the same to all the readers?
The answer to the question can be easily given. There may be various responses among various readers when they have finished reading a poem, but, as Day Lewis points out, "...their responses have one thing in common – the conviction of truth, a sense that the poem has enabled them to know more clearly more deeply or more passionately". Knowledge, as Day Lewis argues, is not associated with predictability even in science. While describing the truth of an experiment, the scientist says, "there is a probability amounting to a certainty that the result of a given experiment will be x". Then what harm can be there if readers disagree slightly now and then regarding their responses to poems?

Again, how does a positivist approach help us in understanding the way in which poetic truth operates upon us? The truth or the falseness of a statement made in poetry is of the least consequence as long as the poem convinces us of its truth. The poetic truth is known and valued for the operativeness and not for its verbal truth. We do not read poems or plays or novels for the scientifically verifiable information they contain. We do not read the Historical Plays of Shakespeare for the factual historical element they contain. I think, no
critic, even the greatest of the positivists, appreciates Shelley's 'The Cloud' for the factual presentation of the upper region for the formation or the malformation of the cloud. The description of the Casurina Tree in the eponymous poem by Toru Dutt may or may not be exact from a botanist's point of view; but such a point of view leads us nowhere in our appreciation of the poem.

Therefore, it stands to reason to say that poems can say something, and that they are capable of expressing even profound truths. However, it is worth remembering that the poet is not so much concerned about the thing per se as about the feel of the thing. If science teaches us about things, poetry teaches us about the 'feel' of the things. Conceived thus, poetry is also a genuine way of knowledge which cannot be gained in any other way.

Thus, the two approaches to poetry -- the psychological and the 'semantic' -- though highly original in certain aspects, as in their explanation of the state of absorption, or the emotive employment of language in poetry, cannot be said to be true in all respects, because poems not only impart a state of mind which is desirable, but they also state something. Further,
Richards's theory of poetry, as observed by Wheelwright, seems to be sometimes irrelevant, because he tries to associate the poetic truth with the method of the objective verification found in science. Richards's objections to the meaning of poetry or the capacity of the poem in saying something seem to be really ontological and positivist rather than semantic.

If the psychological and 'semantic' theories of poetry stress the importance of the unconscious and the emotive elements in poetry, there are some other theories which give importance to the conscious element. The Marxist Aesthetics considers the process of writing poetry as an entirely conscious process. In between the two extremist theories that consider the unconscious or the conscious as the source of all literary creation, there are many theories which consider poetry as the outcome of the intuitive perception. Benedetto Croce's analysis of knowledge indicates that the knowledge conveyed through images is intuitive knowledge. In his *Aesthetic* Croce says:

Knowledge has two forms; it is either intuitive knowledge or logical knowledge; knowledge obtained through imagination.
or knowledge obtained through the intellect; knowledge of the individual or knowledge of the universal; of individual things or the relations between them; it is in fact, productive either of images or of concepts....

From Croce's analysis cited above it is clear that, according to him intuitive knowledge has its origin in imagination, and that it deals with the individual things and that it is expressed in the form of images. Jacques Maritain in his Creative Intuition in Art and Poetry expresses his opinion that we should think of two kinds of unconscious instead of one. His analysis can be best explained with the help of a quotation from his own work:

....My contention, then, is that everything depends, in the issue we are discussing, on the recognition of a spiritual unconscious, or rather preconscious, of which Plato and the ancient wise men were well aware, and the disregard of which in favour of the Freudian Unconscious alone is a sign of the dullness of our times. There are two kinds of unconscious, two great domains of psychological
activity screened from the grasp of consciousness: the preconscious of the spirit in its living strings, and the unconscious of blood and flesh, instincts, tendencies, complexes, repressed images and desires, traumatic memories, as constituting a closed or autonomous dynamic whole. I would like to designate the first kind of unconscious by name of *Spiritual* or, for the sake of Plato, *Musical* unconscious or preconscious; and the second by the name of *automatic* unconscious or *deaf* unconscious—deaf to the intellect, and structured into a world of its own apart from the intellect. 95

Jacques Maritain considers the Spiritual Unconscious or the musical unconscious of the poet as the source out of which all the intuitive flashes occur. The reasons why he arrives at the conclusion that intuitive perception is the basis of poetry are obvious. He finds that in the fields of science and philosophy intuitive reason is fundamentally at work. He argues that "...any demonstration finally resolves into first principles which are not demonstrated but seen; and any discovery which really reveals a new aspect of being is born in a flash of intuitivity before being discursively tested and justified."
But when it comes to poetry, the part of intuitive reason becomes absolutely predominant..."96

The intuitivist theories, too, do not explain the poetic process completely, for they primarily deal with the way in which intuitive perceptions are grasped and not with the process of writing poetry. Intuition, or the unconscious, may provide the poet with a special kind of apprehension useful for his expression. But perception is not everything; to put his perception in the form of a poem, the poet has to write words, and words do not write themselves. In fact, it may be noted that some of the very good poems we happen to have now are not written in a flash of intuitive reflection.97 There are evidences to prove that a poet gives greater importance to the critical labour which is a conscious process. It is wrong to suppose that the images in a poem come to the poet either easily or naturally. Keats's corrections of the opening lines of Hyperion, which have become a locus classicus of criticism, testify to the point that poets often correct and alter the images in their poems quite consciously. Therefore, I believe that it would be wrong to consider only the source of inspiration and neglect the conscious process of writing while writing of poetry.
It remains, now, to be seen how the Marxists, for whom the process of writing a poem is entirely a conscious process, explain the nature and function of the image in poetry. Let us therefore, make a study of some of the important aspects found in the Marxist approach to the poetic image.

The theory of 'cognition' or 'reflection' found in Marxist Aesthetics approaches the problem of meaning and the problem of the aesthetic image on the assumed basis that literary creation is a form of conscious reflection. For the Marxists, matter has an objective reality independent of consciousness, and consciousness reflects reality. Aesthetic consciousness, while reflecting reality, tries to master it. Aesthetic feelings, tastes, ideals, ideas, theories of art, etc., are all different forms of the process of mastering reality. Since aesthetic consciousness reflects reality, it can either be true or false, the criterion being social and historical experience. The closer a person is linked to life, the richer is his aesthetic consciousness. Art, like science, is a specific form of the reflection of reality.

To the Marxists, an image, like an idea, is an abstraction from reality. So the conception that an
image is something concrete in contrast to that of the idea as something abstract is not valid. The image is not a replica of reality, because if it is reality itself, there is no need to call it an image. 99

The artistic reflection of reality, according to the Marxists, attains maximal concreteness. Ideas, even scientific ideas based on concepts, are not completely abstract, because they also possess a certain degree of consciousness. A higher degree of concreteness in the image results from the aims and methods of selecting the aspects of reality that is reflected. The artistic image does not exist without the subjective element. The main difference between the idea and the image, to the Marxist aestheticians, is that an idea can be represented in any form, whereas the image exists only in the given form. Therefore, an image is an image only in a given context.

The image is distinguished by the fact that it does not make use of theoretical, logical, experimental, statistical and other forms of scientific thinking in the reflection of reality, but 'reproduces the essential general traits through the medium of senses. 100 An
artistic image cannot be a replica of reality because it is a subjective image of the objective world. Since the idea as well as the image are abstracted from reality, they do not claim to repeat reality. The distinguishing feature of the image is that it not only excludes some features of the object but introduces new ones, that is, the features that the object does not possess. The idea, on the other hand, draws its content from the properties possessed by the object. Such a distinction is not absolute, for, in scientific studies the juxtaposition of cognizable objects often brings together that which is dissimilar and unidentical, as in deriving conclusions by analogy. By portraying phenomena without slavishly reproducing it, art succeeds in penetrating deep into the essence of reality. Thus, the artistic image is a means of exploration for the poet in his search for reality.

Thus, to the Marxist aestheticians, the Artistic Image, is a means of exploration. Poetry, whose essence lies in the artistic image, reflects the social and historical conditions interpreted through the subjective element, and it has, therefore, truth to convey. It is as valid as science in the apprehension of reality.
The essential difference between the psychological and the semantic approaches on the one hand, and the Marxist approach on the other, boils down to the fact that the former consider poetry a source of pleasure even though it has nothing to say, whereas the latter acknowledges the cognitive value of poetry and considers it a genuine method of approaching and comprehending reality. According to the Marxist, the image, as a reflection of consciousness, can reflect the social and historical conditions. Therefore, they believe that poetry can have politics, dialectics and even scientific theories for its subject, provided the poetic consciousness abstracts some essential traits for reflection and interpretation.

The important point to be noted in the Marxist literary criticism is that they consider poetry as the outcome of a conscious process. But, it is also interesting to note that the Marxist Aesthetician does not consider the urge or the motive out of which the poem comes into being. Marxist critics do not believe in inspiration or mythical thinking as the source of poetry. To them poetry, like philosophy and science, is a method of reflecting reality. John Press cleverly explains this defect in the Marxist approach in his *The Fire and the Fountain*, when he says:
The prime defect of Marxist literary criticism is its failure to perceive, or unwillingness to admit that poetry buds and flowers according to its own inner necessity. If we seek to discover the reasons for the rise and fall of a verse form or for the employment by the poets of a particular set of images, we shall not gain much enlightenment from a perusal of sociological trends.  

Marxist literary criticism is founded on the philosophical concept that social and philosophical views do not arise by themselves and that they, ultimately, are a product of the social, political and economic conditions of a given society. Therefore, the Marxist critic believes that poetry expresses the 'interests of definite social classes and social groups'. Edward Upward in his "Sketch for a Marxist interpretation of Literature" says:

...Yet literary criticism which aims at being Marxist must begin by recognizing that literature does reflect social and economic conditions, and must proclaim that no book written at the present time can be 'good' unless it is written from a Marxist or near Marxist viewpoint...
From whatever angle one views it, this kind of attitude to literature must be said to be biassed. There can be nothing objectionable when the Marxist says that the images in a poem or the characters in a novel are not created by the writer out of the pure mind-stuff, but are suggested to him by the society in which he lives. But there is everything objectionable when the Marxist dogmatically says:

...For the Marxist the fundamental forces of today are those which are working to destroy capitalism and to establish socialism. Consequently he considers that no modern book can be true to life unless it recognises, more or less clearly, both the decadence of present-day society and the inevitability of a revolution...

That is, if one is prepared to accept the premises of the Marxist, one must consider only those poems or novels to be 'good' which reveal commitment to a particular kind of social or political thought. All other poems or novels which do not depict life from a Marxist point of view are bad.

If one is to accept this kind of attitude, one has to throw into the dustbin a large number of poems
found in any language. For instance, is Wordsworth's 'Daffodils' a good poem or a bad one? It does not certainly reflect the life of the period from a Marxist point of view. Should we, then, refuse to consider it a poem of worth on the basis of the thrill it gives one through its images? It is impossible to consider "Daffodils" a good poem from the Marxist viewpoint.

The Marxist approach may be useful, like the psychological approaches, is studying some poems. To apply it, however, as the perfect or the most original theory to all the poems looks dogmatic. On the other hand, one can always accept, on the evidence of some poems, that some poets present their conscious reflection of the social, political, and economic aspects of life in their poems.

Marxist approach to the image has, however, certain points to its credit which throw light on the poetic process. It is helpful in making us realise the importance of the conscious process out of which poems come into being. Upward's analysis of the poetic process is enlightening in this context. He says:

...Literature, like science, generalises about the world, but its generalisations are more emotional and less intellectual than those of science. Whereas science translated material reality into terms of thought,
literature translates it into terms of feeling. Literature, however, can never be entirely unintellectual — anymore than science can be entirely unemotional. Even the stupidest writer must think as he writes, and even the most austere scientist must feel some interest in his scientific work. To suppose that a poet's images, because they are emotional, correspond to nothing at all in the material world would be to suppose that emotions can exist independently even of the nervous system — or that the nervous system itself is nothing more than an emotion....

Upward's analysis of literary creation is remarkably Marxist as the title of his essay indicates. The important point to be grasped in his analysis is that he considers thinking as something inherent in the process of creative writing. The other approaches to the problem neglect the conscious process of writing in literary creation, whereas the Marxists make it a point to stress it. Because literary creation is a conscious process, they believe that thought, whatever be its nature, is generally present in poetry, and that the image as the reflection of consciousness reflects the social and
Images, whatever be their origin, are a means for the poet to explore the domain of his experience and to interpret it. The psychological theories fail to notice it when they consider imagery in poetry as the outcome of the unconscious. As pure word-pictures, images may emerge from the unconscious mind of the poet; but as parts of a pattern, they are consciously employed by him to serve a variety of purposes such as illustration, explanation, interpretation etc. To conceive imagery as the result of intuitive perception also does not explain how they function in poems. The Marxist approach to imagery considers it a way of reflecting reality, but the biased view that poetry should recognize 'the decadence of present day society and the inevitability of a revolution', makes its approach dogmatic. The approach of the 'semantic positivists' also does not help one in studying imagery because it considers imagery in poetry as a meaningless expression of emotions. It is clear that emotions do find place in poetry; but those emotions are there to be studied, clarified and interpreted. Since interpretation of experience is the aim of poetic-creation, the argument that poems say nothing cannot be
accepted. What poetry does is to clarify experience; as Robert Frost has said, "a poem ends in a clarification of life — not necessarily a great clarification, such as sects and cults are founded on, but a momentary stay against confusion." Frost also said that a poem "begins in delight and ends in wisdom." If the poem gives us wisdom, it does so not through logic, but through conviction. The image is a gestalt abstracted from experience; the interpretation of that experience, or the explanation of the significance of that experience, is certainly associated with it. Imagery, therefore, might spring from the unconscious mind of the poet, but it passes through the conscious mind also during the process of reflection. That conscious interpretation of the image appears as 'thought' which is closely linked with the image. So, we cannot fully comprehend the nature and the function of the image in poetry unless we consider it as the outcome of both the unconscious and the conscious processes.

Day Lewis considers image-making as both a conscious and an unconscious process. He has much to say on the subject of imagery in poetry. A study of his theory of poetry and the poetic image, I think, will help us in understanding the subject. Further,
we are going to study his literary ideas and their relation to imagery in Chapter III. Before we undertake to study the major concerns of Day Lewis and their relation to imagery, it would be legitimate, I think, to examine Day Lewis's own theory of poetry and the poetic image, in the light of the theoretical approach that has been adumbrated in this chapter. The next section, therefore, will be devoted to Day Lewis's ideas about poetry and the poetic image.

III

Day Lewis believes that poetry, like science, is a legitimate way of knowledge. According to him, science tells us about 'things' and poetry tells us about 'the feel of the thing'. To know something about the feel of things is as much important as to know about things themselves. He, therefore, asks: "Is not the feel of a thing as real, as much a fact, as the thing felt?" Science tells us about the general, whereas
poetry tells us about the particular. Bach, therefore, according to Day Lewis, is a way of apprehending reality and grasping truth.

The scientific study of phenomenon requires recurrence, acquaintance and comparison for the purpose of generalisation. The scientific approach, therefore, is helpful in studying only those things which could be observed many times, at least more than once. But feelings are limited by time and space. They are so unique and fleeting in that, they do not recur. Day Lewis, therefore, thinks that science cannot study feelings. The experience of feeling is a kind of perpetual flux in which nothing remains the same. Collingwood, who analyses the nature of 'feelings' in an admirable way in The Principles of Art, says: "...what we take for permanence or recurrence \( \text{of feeling} \) is not the sameness of feeling at different times, but only a greater or less degree resemblance between two feelings".\(^{109}\) That is to say that we give some common name to some feelings which resemble one another, but actually no two feelings are alike. Grief may recur and a man might be acquainted with grief; but this feeling of sorrow is uniquely present in this particular experience of feeling it, and has been
certainly never felt before. Since the same feeling cannot be traced twice, it is impossible to compare. Science which is concerned with generality cannot do it. Art, which deals with the unique and the particular alone, can do it. Day Lewis is, therefore, right when he says that the "knowledge we get from a poem is the knowledge of a certain mood, and this is the mood of 'Man is in love with what vanishes'." 110

In *A Hope for Poetry* Day Lewis talks about the personality of the poet in a most illuminating way. He thinks that the personality of the poet is a combination of the poetic self and the human self. As a man, the poet is interested in social and metaphysical ideas; and as a poet he absorbs some of these ideas and makes poetry out of them. If a poet writes about any subject, Day Lewis says, it is always possible to find two kinds of emotions in his work, namely, the human emotion and the poetic emotion. The reader shares the ideas or the emotions created by the human self of the poet; he gains knowledge by apprehending the new dimensions imposed by the poet on what he knows. Day Lewis says that in most poets"... there is an intermittent conflict between the poetic self and the rest of the man", and he believes
that poets can reach their full stature "by reconciling
the two \[\text{and}\] not by eliminating the one". That is
why Day Lewis thinks that ideas are fit material for
poetry, if the poet, as a man, has strong feelings about
them. He, however, thinks that ideas are material for
poetry only when they are moulded and suffused by emotion.

Day Lewis’s analysis of the two kinds of emotions
and the different planes on which they affect the reader
is the most original, and hence it can be called his
original contribution to literary criticism. His analysis
of the dual nature of the effect of poetry is highly
interesting in that it tells us of the distinction
between an experience and the how that experience is
transformed into poetry, and the distinction between
'subject' and 'theme' in poetry. Let us, therefore,
examine his theory of the two kinds of emotions.

In a passage where a poet deals with grief and
disillusionment, Day Lewis says, the reader is not
touched only by grief and disillusionment. To understand
what Lewis means by the poetic emotion, it is advantageous
to quote his own example and his own commentary. Day
Lewis, in *The Poetic Image*, quotes the lines

    Finish good lady, the bright day is done
    And we are for the dark.
and comments:

The context is tragic; the feeling of the speaker is all sadness, a deeper emotion than despair because it has accepted the tragic experience. Hearing those lines, we too feel the sadness, by only as a faint reminiscent undertone; it is a dark streak tingeying a radiance. That radiance, of which the shadow is but a servant, is the overmastering emotion we receive from the image. We feel it as pleasure, exhilaration; we accept it as a kind of truth which could not have been given us in any other form or through any other medium. 112

That is to say, the human experience is only a basis for the poet to build his poetry. The reader, probably, is not new to the human emotion, since he also has certain similar emotions in him as a man; but he feels thrilled to know something more about his emotion and the significance of that emotion which imparts him the new knowledge of relations. Human emotions such as love, hate, anger, jealousy and so on, are common to all. They are subjects for poetry. The poet who takes the subject makes a theme out of it by interpreting the
uniqueness of it as HIS emotion. That is why Day Lewis calls theme an 'individual interpretation of a general subject'. When the poetic emotion operates on a subject, it brings to light certain new relationships and new perceptions that the reader feels the thrill of revelation which, according to Day Lewis, is a "furtherance of life". In the passage cited and explained by Day Lewis, for instance, there is practically no relationship between Cleopatra's tragedy and the end of day; the two different ideas are yoked together by the poet in order to create a spark, which thrills us. We are made to feel that we have become aware of a new relationship, and our exhilaration depends upon, according to Day Lewis, the kind of the knowledge of relationships that we get from poetry.

Apart from considering poetry as a way of knowledge, Day Lewis considers poetry as a way of mastering reality. This attitude of Day Lewis seems to be nearer to the Leninist doctrine of the nature of apprehension and the Spinozic concept of sub specie aeternitatis than to any other theory. Lenin argues that man's thought is not lifeless and that it certainly influences his own life and the life of all those living around him. He says
that "the reflection of nature in man's thought must be understood not lifelessly, not 'abstractly', not devoid of movement, nor without contradictions and their solution". To Spinoza, the whole problem of ethics is the question: how can man become a master of his feelings by overcoming the state of 'passio' (the state of undergoing things) to the state of 'actio' (the state of doing things)? The answer given by Spinoza is simple, but clear: he thinks that as soon as man forms a clear and defined idea of his passion, it ceases to be a passion. Bay Lewis expresses ideas similar to those of Lenin and Spinoza when he speaks of the mastery a poet achieves by writing poetry. Day Lewis thinks that the poet writes, first of all, not to impart knowledge to others, but to gain knowledge for himself. He says: "the poet's problem of communication is this: he wishes to communicate something to himself; if he succeeds in doing so, he will also communicate something, though not precisely the same something to the reader." The poet, according to Day Lewis, works like a scientist thinking that his work is a kind of exploration. More than anything else, Day Lewis thinks, the poet tries to relate and clarify experience and to arrive at a greater self-knowledge through poetry. "I believe," says Day Lewis, "that his
Day Lewis thinks that poetry is capable of operating upon us by convincing us of its truth, which he calls the 'poetic truth'. He cites Wordsworth's definition that "poetic truth is not individual and local, but general and operative", and declares vehemently that he is "not prepared to yield an inch" on the matter of poetic truth. The truth or falseness in the strict scientific sense does not apply to poetry because it is a matter of conviction. A positivist approach to the problem of 'truth' in poetry, according to Day Lewis, therefore, serves no purpose. He says:

We might go, equipped with a pair of field glasses and text book on ornithology to the seas where, Shelley sang,

The Halcyons brood around the foamless seas.

Yet it would not establish the truth of the line if we observed whole colonies of halcyons brooding there; nor would it detract from its truth if we find not a single halcyon, but a great deal of foam. We judge poetic truth because
it is 'operative', because it operates upon us to cause the kind of pleasure, which, in the Kantian sense, is a furtherance of life.\textsuperscript{118}

The kind of pleasure one receives from poetry, thus, according to Day Lewis, is not the same kind of pleasure that the psychological aestheticians speak of, i.e., the pleasure one gets from the balancing of the impulse in the disturbed psyche.

To Day Lewis, thus, poetry is a way of knowledge, a way of mastering reality, and a way of imparting 'poetic truth' which could not be conveyed in any other manner. It is because of these strong views about poetry, which, I think, are justified, that Day Lewis has little patience with the psychological theory of Richards regarding the nature of pleasure one gets from poetry. To Day Lewis, ideas are material for poetry. He does not see eye to eye with Richards on the latter's doctrine of belief, though he acknowledges the great services rendered by Richards to literary criticism. For instance, he says that Richards admires \textit{The Waste Land} because it effects a 'complete severance between poetry and all beliefs', and dubs that kind of criticism as an
"example of criticism at its most vicious". In contrast to Richards, Day Lewis thinks that "the beliefs which a writer holds or against which he is reacting, are bound to affect his work". Day Lewis's views about 'ideas' and 'beliefs' in poetry can be clearly understood, if we bear in mind his analysis of the two selves and the two kinds of emotions in the poet and poetry respectively. In The Poet's Way of Knowledge he condemns the theory of Richards regarding the kind of pleasure one receives from poetry and says that, if that view is maintained, poetry can be considered only of a remedial value to the sick poet and the reader. He satirically comments on Richards's theory of pleasure: "a poem a day keeps the psychiatrist away".

If a poet presents the ideas and beliefs in poetry, how does he do so? Day Lewis is very clear about this point also. He has given a clear picture of what he thinks is the process of making a poem. To Day Lewis imagery is the 'constant' in all poetry. He, therefore, considers poetry as a presentation and interpretation of images. Let us, now, briefly examine his views about 'image-making'.
According to Cecil Day Lewis, "the identification of the poet with the objects which appeal to his senses is the initial step in image-making." It is a stage where the mind assumes a musical mood and gropes in the dark. The poet starts with an impression, a drop of the river of experience, crystallized, perhaps, into an image.

That impression, or the image, is the initial step. The second stage is that wherein "a series of images" pass through the mind. It is almost an unconscious process. Then comes the third stage wherein the poet begins to pick and choose by exercising his judgement. Day Lewis frequently speaks of this process of image-making in terms of angling in a metaphorical way. The original impression or image of the initial step may or may not have anything to do with what happens to be preoccupying the poet at the time. 'The clue or the donee' (the impression) is the bait to catch further. When this line goes deep down into the sea of experience, it catches many fishes in the form of memories, images, phrases, rhythms, metre etc. But 'all fishes' do not suit the poet. He chooses some and throws the rest back into the sea. Slowly a pattern develops out of the dark. The interpretation of his experience and the pattern of
the images grouped together is the theme of the poem.

The process, if analysed, amounts to this: first, there is an image or impression grasped in a unique state of absorption. This stage, according to Lewis, can be summarized in Keats's expression of negative capability — 'when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason'. The particular impression, in the second stage, which is a stage of poetic imagination working in an unconscious way, brings in a nexus of images along with it, and out of the cluster of these images develops a pattern. Then comes the third and the last stage; namely the stage of picking, choosing, correcting, expunging and interpreting.

The analysis is important in that it tells us of two vital stages in image making to which Lewis pays a great attention — the stage of absorption and the stage of interpretation. Absorption alone is not the whole process out of which a poem comes into being. Absorption may give pleasure, but the sensuous pleasure received through absorption is of little use to poetry unless it is subjected to the intellect for interpretation, which is a rational process.
Lewis's disagreement with the psychological theories of pleasure and the 'semantic' theories of the meaninglessness of poetry can be understood from the analysis of the poetic process as described by him. Since interpretation and judgement are involved in the process of making a poem, poetry has, certainly, something to say. Since sensuous pleasure or the pleasure-inducing state of mind is only one of the stages in the process, it cannot explain the process completely.

Day Lewis's analysis of the process of image-making enlightens us about the two aspects of poetry to which he pays a great deal of attention, namely, 'thought' and 'imagery'. The poetic image of Day Lewis is neither the sensuous part of the image (the vehicle) nor its interpretation (the tenor); it is a fusion of both, which is greater than both its terms. The sensuous part of the image is something abstracted from life, either from immediate experience, or from memory; the interpretation of the significance of the experience, is its intellectual part. That is why Day Lewis defines the poetic image as "a happy marriage between object and sensation". This attitude of Day Lewis to the poetic image is nearer to Stanford's conception of the image as a 'depth picture', which view-point is discussed in Section II.
Regarding the element of thought in poetry, too, Day Lewis has clear-cut ideas. He thinks that, as stated earlier, ideas are material for poetry. He precisely describes how an idea becomes material for poetry. He says:

The poetic faculty will, in fact, have to deal not with an abstract idea — but with an idea suffused and moulded by emotion; and that is a common subject for poetry. What is really undesirable is that the poet should have dealings with ideas as a poet without first having feelings about them as a man; for direct contact between the poetic function and abstract ideas can give birth only to rhetoric. The man must pass the idea through the medium of emotion before the poet can get to work upon it. 125

So, ideas — even political and philosophical ideas — can be found in poetry, but the important factor in poetry is not the political or the philosophical element. Politics, or philosophy, is there in poetry, as a kind of a foundation for a super-structure — the superstructure of poetic emotion. A poem, therefore, according to Day Lewis, should be judged not on the basis of politics, or the
metaphysics it deals with, but on the basis of the poetic emotion it generates. That is why Day Lewis says: "it is always dangerous and impertinent to commend a poem for anything but its poetry." 126

Day Lewis thinks that imagery presents the feelings, or the 'stills' taken from the flux of life through its patterns. I think we will understand Day Lewis's concept of the pattern of images better if we approach it through 'gestalt psychology' because his views on image-patterns seem to have been based on the perception of 'segregated wholes'.

Gestalt psychology informs us that a man must, at any given moment in his life, see, hear, feel, smell and perceive by means of 'the segregation of organised wholes'. Experience is composed of disparate elements, and so, it is always complex. Experience cannot be be labelled as "completely dominated by any one emotion except for a very, very short space, an infinitesimal portion of time". 127 It is not composed of one segregated whole, but several, We cannot perceive them all together, but can only shift our attention from one to another rapidly.
According to Day Lewis, poetry patterns experience—the essential core of experience—by abstracting a gestalt from experience. This gestalt may be, again, made of either one segregated whole which is clearly seen and to which all other 'segregated wholes' are subordinated, or it may be made of several disparate wholes contained in one single experience. Whatever be the nature of experience, Day Lewis thinks, "the poem as experience, has coherence, and unity, which is almost never found in our experience of any other part of life."128

The poetic image, Day Lewis argues, gives an impression of reality as it presents a slice of life. In this sense, it is multi-sided and inexhaustible. Therefore, it gives scope for various interpretations. Whatever interpretation one tries to give of an image, one is conscious of a pattern, an ordering of experience. Day Lewis says that I.A. Richards correctly directs our attention to the point when he (Richards) observes that "the poet's capacity for ordering speech is only a part of his more amazing capacity for ordering experience". Metaphor presents the poetic mind with the proper means in its exploration of reality and ordering experience.

Poetic patterns depend upon consistency of
impression and the congruity of images. The images in a poem, Day Lewis explains, "are like a series of mirrors set at different angles so that, as the theme moves on, it is reflected in a number of different aspects. But they are magic mirrors: they do not merely reflect the theme, they give it the life and form; it is in their power to make a spirit visible". The kind of pattern depends upon what the poet aims at achieving. If the poet attempts at presenting one segregated whole in one poem, all the images in that poem refer to that 'whole' which becomes the central image, and the other images are subordinated to the central image. If, on the other hand, the poet attempts at bringing a unity among several segregated wholes, each image has its importance, the thread between one image and another being 'the emotional logic' or the 'Poetic logic'.

Regarding the pattern of images in poetry, Lewis has expressed his views very clearly in his The Poetic Image. After summing up the various comments of the critics regarding the apparent 'logiclessness' in modern poetry, Day Lewis says that there must be some kind of relationship among the various images in a poem. Day Lewis thinks that, when used by a romantic poet, an image yields a number of interpretations because, "with the
romantic poet the image-seeking faculty is unleashed and wanders at large whereas with the classical it is tethered to a thought, a meaning, a poetic purpose and its radius of action is thus far limited. An image yields infinite interpretations, and, therefore, it is difficult to pin down the meaning of an image as something definite. But, however, Day Lewis wants that an 'inflated value' should not be given to the images in thinking that they would mean something even when presented in a medley. Day Lewis considers the viewpoint of some of the modern poets and critics who say that the modern poets employ the 'cinematic technique' in presenting their images, and says that comparing poetry to the cinema does not hold good because the cinema has a gripping and powerful story, whereas modern poetry has none. The argument that imagery becomes a medley because the world of experience is complex, does not, according to Day Lewis, hold good, because he thinks that it is the business of the poet to create order out of chaos and to give a clarification of experience in his poems, which clarification, coming as a slice of life, becomes a clarification of life. Day Lewis argues that "a painter will not give us a picture of dark night by covering his whole canvas with lamp black". Day Lewis thinks that few modern poets could "justify the anarchy of their verse".
Whether a poem is modern or not, Day Lewis thinks that it should have a pattern, and that it should have a beginning, a middle and an end. If logical sequence and consequence are discarded, Day Lewis argues, the poet can always bring about the coherence and congruity of his pattern by resorting to 'poetic logic' — through a change of mood or a change of position. Regarding what he means by poetic logic, Day Lewis quotes W.P. Ker in complete agreement with him. "Poetic logic" is "not the proving of a position through discourse and evidence, but the change of a position so that every stage is satisfactory to the mind of the hearer, and the transition intelligible, and the progress not refutation of the earlier stages". Thus, Day Lewis thinks, a pattern, or a sequence of images is essential for the poet to express his ideas. There must be coherence in poetry, because it is only coherence that makes the poems comprehensible to the reader. Day Lewis thinks that in a poem the images "must develop theme, or may be developed by the theme following a sequence". Thus Day Lewis considers imagery in poetry as mainly functional. He is very clear about the principle that organises images in poetry. He says:

The principle which organizes images is a concord between image and theme,
the images lighting the way for the theme and helping to reveal it step by step to the writer, the theme as it grows up controlling more and more and deployment of images.

Day Lewis, therefore, thinks that mere images are nothing until they are patterned in a sequence leading to a consequence.

We have seen, in this section, that Day Lewis considers poetry as a means of attaining and imparting knowledge, a way of mastering reality, and a way of imparting truth which is called 'the poetic truth' as different from any other kind of objectively verifiable truth. The process of image-making according to him originates in the unconscious and ends in conscious 'ordering'. That is to say, his theory of poetry harmonizes the two approaches to poetry, namely, the psychological and the Marxist. It supports my contention that an image should be considered from the functional point of view. In the light of the discussion conducted in Section II, his theory seems to be very sound.

It is worth observing that one's attitude to imagery influences one's attitude to poetry and vice-versa,
since the image is the expressive means for the poet.
If we consider imagery as the outcome of the unconscious alone, we study it as the 'sensuous word-picture'; if we consider it as the outcome of pure intellect, we study it as something created by the poet at will. That is to say, our methods of studying imagery depend upon our approach to poetry. Now, let us examine the various methods employed by critics in their study of imagery, so that we might decide the methods which we are to employ in our study of Day Lewis's poetry.

IV

The method of studying the 'minor-term' or the 'vehicle' or the 'subject-matter' of the image has become highly popular after the publication of C.F.E. Spurgeon's Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us. While discussing the poetic image as a 'word picture', C.F.E. Spurgeon has clearly indicated that she has given importance to the 'minor-term' of the image. She started with the assumption that though the 'major-term' or the 'tenor' or the
'object-matter' of the image might spring from the conscious mind, the minor-term must inevitably have its origin in the unconscious mind. Naturally she came to the conclusion that it was possible to know the personality of the poet by assorting and cataloguing various images with reference to the 'subject-matter'. Her knowledge of Freudian analysis made her think that the study of the imagery in Shakespeare would give her an idea of Shakespeare the man. She says:

The imagery he instinctively uses, is thus a revelation, largely unconscious of the furniture of his mind, the channels of his thought, the qualities of things, the objects and incidents he observes and remembers, and perhaps most significant of all, those which he does not observe or remember. 135

The method employed by C.F.E. Spurgeon, though based on psychological grounds, suffers from certain defects when put into practice. The first defect of the method is that it gives equal importance to all images by presenting them in the catalogue form. If there are a dozen images from city life and only three or four from exploration, the few images from exploration may be more significant than the many images from city life. By cataloguing
images, and by studying their significance, there is the scope for the critic to be misled. The second defect is that many images can be classified under many heads. This defect has been pointed out by Dr. R.S. Varma in his Imagery and Thought in the Metaphysical Poets, where he says:

.... an image at times can be placed under more than one head. For instance, 'To take arms against a sea of troubles / And by opposing end them' can be classified as a war image or a sea image. Then the assumption that the subject matter of imagery gives a clue to the author's personality by revealing his tastes and interests is also wrong.136

Dr. Varma observes that 'certain conclusions arrived at by C.F.E. Spurgeon about Shakespeare's personality by analysing his imagery seem to be 'ludicrously inaccurate'; as he says: "her inference, for instance, that Shakespeare hated dogs in a case in point."137 Dr. Varma goes a step further when he argues that imagery "is no index of an author's personality in his analysis of imagery."138 L.H. Hornstein also expresses that imagery need not necessarily be derived from an author's environment or his personal experience.139
If, however, the method of analysing the subject matter is not the proper or the perfect method to study the personality of the poet, it cannot be said that images cannot or do not reveal the personality of the poet. It can be argued, especially in the case of a poet like Day Lewis, that a poet's poetry can be the outcome of his environment and his personality. If the psychological method of studying imagery from the viewpoint of the subject-matter fails, a different method can be used to prove the point. The biographical data of a poet can be studied in relation to imagery to see whether the personal life of the poet can be the source of his imagery. Instead of involving himself in guess work, the critic can safely conduct his examination on the basis of factual information.

The third defect in the method is that it neglects the conscious element involved in the process of image-making. Images in poetry can be chosen or manufactured by a poet deliberately, and there are many instances where poets have testified to such a fact. For instance, Day Lewis says,

More commonly, an image is chosen without excitement, after much conscious deliberation, because it is seen
to fit best a certain place in the pattern and lead on most energetically to the next development. If, as Day Lewis says, some images can be the outcome of conscious deliberation, it is not possible to know which image is the product of the unconscious mind, and, which is not. The problem of studying the personality of the poet becomes more threatening when one begins to apply 'the Freudian method' of deriving negative inferences from positive evidence. In her critical work on Shakespeare's imagery C.F.E. Spurgeon says:

The imagery he [i.e., Shakespeare] instinctively uses is thus a revelation ... perhaps most significant of all those he does not observe and remember.

This kind of deriving negative inferences from the positive evidence is not only risky but highly misleading since there is no way of knowing what experience an author had, or what experience he wished to have. It is because of the unfounded inferences of this kind that L.H. Hornstein said that one would require superhuman insight to understand "when an author used an image because he had had an experience and when he used it because not having had the experience he subconsciously wished he had."
For the reasons cited above, the method of analysing the subject-matter of imagery in order to study the personality of the poet is risky. However, the method can be profitably employed to study the sources from which a poet derives his imagery as revealed by Milton A. Rugoff in his study, Donne's Imagery. But the method of making a biographical study of an author's work can be more useful in that it can reveal both the personality of the poet and the sources out of which he derives his imagery. The method can be greatly helpful if the poet under study has also written his autobiography. By studying what the poet says in his autobiography about himself, his experiences, his habits, one can study how images reveal the personality of the poet. Again, since memories, attitudes, etc. are the sources of imagery, the sources of a poet's imagery can be profitably studied through this method.

A second way of studying images is from the viewpoint of symbolical interpretation. This method can be very useful in studying poems where the major term is dropped. When the poem contains only the image or images in which the subject-matter is dominant, the critic can explain the significance of the vehicle and explain the symbolism behind it. Critics like Wilson
Knight think that poets express, through images, profounder meanings than they are generally aware of. Starting his study on this assumption, Wilson Knight has given certain wonderful interpretations of some plays of Shakespeare. There is, however, a great risk in this kind of method. Since the unconscious element in poetry is only a matter of conjecture, it can be said that the interpretation given by a critic of an image or poem may sometimes happen to be the critic's own construct which he reads into the lines. That is, there is the probability of the critic forcing his ideas on a poem or image.

But the method of interpreting images from a symbolic point of view can be profitably employed in the case of those poems about which we have some kind of corroborative evidence or other. The method can be definitely useful in the case of a poem about which the poet himself says something in his other works. The method in that sense can be more useful in the case of living poets, or poets who happen to have recorded their personal experiences. By studying the life of the poet and his attitudes to various subjects, one can understand the association of ideas found in his thought process and that knowledge is useful in interpreting his images symbolically.
A third way of studying imagery is to study it in relation to theme. The method can be called 'organic' as it is based on the assumption that an image is valid only in a given context, since it is only a part of the whole. W.H. Clemen, who followed this method in his study of Shakespeare's imagery, has said:

An isolated image, an image viewed outside of its context, is only half the image. Every image, every metaphor gains full life and significance only from its context. It appears as a cell in the organism of the play linked with it in many ways.

An image according to Clemen, is valid only in a given context. C.Day Lewis also speaks of imagery in similar terms when he speaks of the 'concord between image and theme'. The relationship between image and theme is admirably explained by Day Lewis in The Poetic Image, where Lewis says:

The principle which organizes images is a concord between image and theme, the images lighting the way for the theme and helping to reveal it step by step to the writer, the theme as it grows up controlling more and more the deployment of images.
What Bay Lewis and Clemens say of the images is valid only in the case of functional images, and not in the case of the decorative images. A poet can use an image to embellish or to decorate; such images are also functional in the sense they add to the 'atmosphere' of the poem, but they are not functional in the sense they light 'the way for the theme'.

Of these three methods, namely, the study of the subject-matter of imagery, the symbolic interpretation of imagery and the study of the images in relation to theme, the last seems to be the most advantageous and the least risky because it is based purely on internal evidence. Thus the three methods, namely, (1) the study of imagery in poetry from a biographical point of view, (2) the study of imagery in relation to theme, and (3) the symbolical interpretation of images governed by (1) and (2) can be profitably employed in the study of a poet's imagery. However, the methods cannot be treated purely as exclusive because a critic might employ all the three methods in his work if he is inclined that way.

Now, how should we study "thought" in relation to imagery? "Thought" in the poetry of a poet is the sum of the various ideas expressed by him in various poems on the same subject. So, in order to study "thought" and "imagery"
in poetry, it is necessary to group images and ideas together under suitable heads. And since groups of images and ideas are what we should concentrate on, a mere poem by poem analysis from a chronological point of view is undesirable though the latter is implied in arriving at the required groups. For instance, the metaphysical thought in the poetry of a poet can be studied by sorting and discussing various images expressing various ideas touching metaphysical subjects such as birth, death, love, the real, apparent and so on.

There is an advantage in this method. The study of both thought and imagery could be carried on almost simultaneously, that is, the minor term of the image and its major term could be considered together. The minor term or the "vehicle" falls into a pattern provided by the critic on the basis of certain groups of ideas. Further, it is also helpful in understanding how images frequently recur and why certain kinds of images alone are employed to express a certain kind of thought. For instance; Day Lewis employs a large number of images from geography when he deals with political thought. These images are rarely employed by him in dealing with other kinds of thought. The method makes such inclinations of the poet very clear because it explains the relationship between thought and imagery.
In this thesis all the four methods of studying imagery are employed, the first and the last extensively and the second and the third occasionally. The first method, i.e., the 'biographical method', is employed in the study of the various sources of the poet's imagery. The fourth method, the method of studying imagery in relation to thought, by grouping various ideas which constitute the thought about a subject, is employed in studying the poetic, political, and the metaphysical ideas in the poetry of C. Day Lewis. The method of symbolical interpretation is employed in explaining certain key images or recurring images and in interpreting certain poems in which only the vehicle is present. In all the chapters, wherever an image is traced in constant relation to a particular thought which happens to be the theme of some poems, the method of studying images in relation to theme is employed.

It is time to sum up the discussion conducted in the foregoing sections of this chapter in order to arrive at a plan for the following sections. In Section I
it is shown how the words 'thought' and 'image' have various shades of meanings and usage, which at times, seem contradictory. Though 'thought' has 'no definite meaning', it is associated with reflection, imagery and belief. Sometimes 'thought' refers to feelings such as grief, sorrow, care, etc. Image, similarly, has various meanings. It is thought of as a sensuous word-picture, a relation between the subject-matter and the object-matter, as the depth picture distinct from and greater than its two terms, and as a 'happy marriage between the object and the sensation'. Thought and image are not individual but a nexus of 'thought-atoms' and 'image-atoms' according to Croce. In this sense, thought is the sum of various ideas in a poem whereas the whole poem can be an image itself comprising several images. Images can be used by the poet for various purposes. He can present, through images, physical sensations; he can illustrate ideas with their help; he can use them as a kind of steno-language; he can use them as the convenient means to begin his poems; he can use them to suggest traditional associations, and he can use them to convey intellectual thought by making their sensuous element subordinated to the intellectual.

In the Second Section, it is shown how the
various approaches to imagery are confusing to the student of imagery because of the divergence among them. It is shown how the psychological, semantic, intuitive and Marxist theories of poetry and image fail to explain the nature and function of imagery in poetry, completely. Since the process of making a poem involves both the conscious and the unconscious selves of the poet it is argued that no one-sided approach, which gives importance to either of the two can help us in understanding the nature and function of the image which is, by its very nature, functional in poetry.

In the Third Section a critical study of some of the views of Day Lewis about poetry are examined, so that an idea can be had of what he thinks of imagery in poetry in relation to thought. On examination it is found that Day Lewis thinks of poetry as a way of knowledge, that it has truth to convey, and that it conveys truth through its images. To Day Lewis image-making is both an unconscious and conscious process. Poetry tells us of the feel of things, and it imparts the knowledge of the relationship between things and relationship between things and feelings. He also believes that poetry is a way of mastering reality, and
hence the poet can and deal with thought. The poet assimilates thought as a human being and this thought is transformed into poetry through the poetic emotion. Day Lewis further believes that poetry patterns experience and the skill of the poet lies in the patterning of experience. He does not subscribe to the view that poetry should be chaotic because life is chaotic. He believes that images should be functional and that they should develop the theme or be developed by the theme following a sequence.

In the Fourth Section the three methods of studying imagery as employed by various critics are discussed, and their limitations are discussed. It is explained why a biographical approach is more useful in studying the personality and the sources of imagery than the method of analysing the subject-matter of imagery. A fourth method of studying imagery in relation to thought is suggested. It is also explained how the fourth method can be more beneficial than the other methods, how all methods are not exclusive and how all of them can be employed in one single study.

Let me now explain the few of study conducted in the following chapters. I have borrowed the term
'self' from Day Lewis, which I have employed in giving titles to my chapters. Day Lewis says that man is a combination of 'myriad selves', such as the thinking, acting and feeling selves (his concept of 'selves' is examined in chapter V). The chapters beginning from the second to the sixth are organised from three points of view, namely (1) the way in which Day Lewis' ideas on a subject gets expressed through images, (2) the way in which the transitions of thought affect his imagery, and (3) the way in which a group of ideas under study are associated with particular fields of imagery. In the second chapter entitled "The Human Self: Sources of Thought and Imagery in Day Lewis's Poetry", I have employed the biographical method to study how Day Lewis's experiences, memories, attitudes etc., enter his poems as images. In the third chapter, "The Poetic Self: Literary Ideas and Imagery in Day Lewis's Poetry", I have studied the relationship between literary thought and imagery in Day Lewis's poetry. In the fourth chapter, "The Social Self: Social Ideas and Imagery in Day Lewis's Poetry", I have studied the social thought of Day Lewis in relation to imagery. In the fifth chapter, "The Philosophical Self: Metaphysical Ideas and Imagery in Day Lewis's Poetry", I have studied the relationship between Day Lewis's metaphysical thought and its relation
to imagery. In the sixth chapter, "The Various Ways of Relationship between Thought and Imagery in Day Lewis's Poetry", I have examined the various kinds of images and the various ways in which Day Lewis expresses his thought. In the seventh and the last chapter, "Conclusions", I have presented the central features of thought-image relationship in Day Lewis's poetry and attempted at a fresh definition of the image. Towards the end of the chapter I have worked out some theoretical implications of my study.
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